



## FĀRS VIII. DIALECTS

---

### FĀRS

#### viii. Dialects

Oscar Mann (1909, p. XVII) described the linguistic diversity in Fārs as a kind of Babylonian confusion of languages. There have been many small-scale and larger-scale population movements inside and from outside Fārs, and major upheavals up to the present. This is also borne out by the linguistic diversity among the Fārs dialects proper, as shown below.

*Major groups of Iranian dialects.* Local variants of Persian are found in most cities and towns and their vicinities, and, rurally, mainly in the northeastern parts of the region, all of which tend to reflect a good deal of the vocabulary and idiomatic features of the earlier non-Persian dialects. Closely related are Lorī dialects circling the province from the Persian Gulf near Bušehr in the west to the northwest, and in some other areas (see BAQTĪĀRĪ DIALECT and boir AḤMADĪ DIALECT). A distinct continuum of dialects is represented by the group traditionally called the Fārs dialects west of a northeast-southwest diagonal, and, at considerable distance in the southeast, the Lārestān dialects. The latter, in turn, are adjacent to the dialects in the Southern Persian Gulf region (cf. Skjærvø, 1989), including the so-called Bandarī dialects in the Bandar ‘Abbās region, the dialects of Mīnāb and Hormoz, and Komzārī on the Musandam peninsula of ‘Omān. Further east are the two distinct dialect groups in the Baškard region, which constitute the boundary to the distinct Balūčī dialects. Smaller Iranian dialects represented include the dialect of the



island of Kārg, and pockets from other dialect areas, such as the Balūčī dialect of the Korošī, camel-keepers of the Qašqā'ī, and old enclaves, such as the Kurdish dialect of Kalānī-'Abdū'ī; the Gūrānī dialect of Tall-e Qedāšk, the northern dialect of Sīvand and the well-assimilated dialect of Davān (see [Figure 1](#) and [Appendix 1](#), below).

Non-Iranian languages include the Azarbaijani-Turkic dialects of the Qašqā'ī and part of the Kamsa tribal confederation (see ĀZARBAJĀNĪ, AYNALLŪ), found throughout the province, the Arabic dialects spoken by some of their sub-tribes, and others, as well as some Gypsy (for the geographic distribution of the Lors, see Amān-Allāhī, 1991, for the Qašqā'ī and Kamsa, Beck, 1986).

The Fārs dialects and the Lārestān dialects, the two major groups in Fārs proper, are grammatically distinct from Lorī and the local variants of Persian. In particular, they retain the ergative construction (q.v.), where the agent in past tenses of transitive verbs is marked by the personal affix. They are close to each other in much of their phonology, morphology, and syntax. This includes the marking of the perfect forms by *est(t)/es(t)ā(d)-* in a sub-group of the Fārs dialects, and in all of the Lārestān dialects. However, three features set the two dialect groups squarely apart from each other: (1) the ending of the second-person singular, Fārs dialect *-ē/-ī*, Lārestān dialects *-eš*; (2) the imperfective marker, Fārs dialects *mē-/mī-*, Lārestān dialects *a(t)-*; (3) the existence in the Lārestān dialects of a present progressive by means of a locative construction based on the verbal noun. Moreover, the particular way of regularizing verb stem formation in the Lārestān dialects may suggest input from a non-Iranian system. As part of this group, the dialect of Kārg Island has also retained the ergative, has intransitive perfect forms in *est-/estā(d)-* and the imperfective prefix *a(t)-*, but uniquely has the ending *-a* in the second person singular, as well as some other distinct features.

*Fārs Dialects.* The Fārs dialects proper used to be locally referred to as Tājīkī in the sense of the Iranian-speaking settled, non-tribal populations (Mann, 1909, p. XXVIII). They represent a regional continuum of southwestern Iranian dialects which originated in various forms of Middle Persian, and which have now been reduced to small rural areas, or individual villages. A distinct sub-group in the triangle of Kāzerūn, Ardakān, Shiraz can be identified by the formation of perfective forms with *es(t)-es(t)ā(d)-*. This feature is found in Middle Persian, and is apparently recessive in the triangle itself under the combined inference from Lorī and Persian, and is not found outside it, nor was it adopted by incoming groups such as the Īl-e Sorķī.



Field research on the Fārs dialects began in the late 19th century with the German Freidrich Carl Andreas (q.v.; 1876-80) and the Russian Valentin A. Zhukovskii (1883-86) and was continued in the earlier part of the 20th century by Oscar Mann (1901-3, 1906-7), followed by A. Romaskevich and by Wladimir Ivanow, and later by Georg Morgenstierne.

The Fārs dialects have been recorded in the following areas, which reveal a distinctive geographic distribution pattern in northwesterly to southeasterly direction along the parallel mountain ranges of western Fārs (see map):

1. The coastal region of Bušehr, Tangestān, and Daštī to its southeast, and Dašttestān to its north and northeast. Bušehrī, which has a considerable Persian component, has been briefly described by Jamāl Zayyānī, who includes a dialog and a full paradigm of one verb (“to come”), as well as comparative lexical and grammatical data from the neighboring Ṣaḥrā’ī dialect on the peninsula and from the colloquial dialect of Shiraz. Mann (1909, pp. XXVII-XXVIII) found only Persian in Bušehr, but noted “Tājīkī”-dialects in Tangestān. There are unpublished data from Rīšahr just south of Bušehr, and from Tangestān collected by Andreas. Moḥammad-Amīn Adīb Ṭūsī (1955b, pp. 183, 185) and Morgenstierne (1960, 130 n. 6, in Fārs 1957) also note dialects in Dašttestān outside the towns along the road from Bušehr to the north, in the areas of Borāzjān, Kamāraj south of Kāzerūn, and include a few linguistic items. Moḥammad-Mahdī Ja’farī (1982) includes two couplets in Daštī, as a somewhat weak argument for the Daštī origin of the 15th century dialect poet Šams Pos-e Nāšer Šīrāzī. Manūčehr Ātašī (1339/1950) gives brief notes on Daštī and Dašttestānī. Ḥ. ‘Erfān (pp. 21-22), without offering any linguistic data, identifies the following dialects: Dāsttestānī, Tangestānī, also called Tangsīrī (distinguishing a western, or coastal sub-dialect), and Daštī, also called Daštīātī, and Bardestānī further to the south.

2. The areas of the mountain ranges of the Kūhmarra-ye Nowdān, Kūhmarra-ye Jarūq, and Kūhmarra-ye Sorḳī, extending from north of Kāzerūn to southwest of Shiraz. In these areas the dialects have been best retained. Mann (1909) includes a detailed comparative-historical discussion, and the description, grammar, and texts of the dialects of Samḡān (Somḡūn, texts, pp. 59-81), Māsaram (Māsaram, texts, pp. 81- 89), Pāpūn (texts, pp. 89-91), and Būrenjān (texts, pp. 91-127). Ḥ. Mūsawī (1983, pp. 36-90; 113-82; 183-85) included some two hundred brief sayings, illustrated terminology, and a vocabulary of the dialect of Gāvkošak, and published a separate dictionary with dialect notes (1993). There are also unpublished notes by Andreas. ‘A.



Šahbāzī (pp. 192-98) includes a vocabulary, some of its verb forms, of the dialect of the mountain-dwelling Sorḳī tribe of Kūhmarra-ye Sorḳī southwest of Shiraz, who emigrated from Daštī some 150 years ago. The dialect of Davān just north of Kāzerūn is briefly discussed by Morgenstierne (1960, pp. 123-29), Čangīz Ḥosāmzāda, ‘Abbās Salmī, and ‘Abd-al-Nabī Salāmī. ‘A.-A. Šādeqī (1988) established its phonology, and it is succinctly described by Hamid Mahamedi (1994), who had earlier published notes on the verb system (1979, pp. 279-83), and a unique local version of the Rostam and Esfandiār episode (1982).

3. The villages along the road from Ardakān to Shiraz. Mann (1909) includes scattered data on the dialects of Ardakān and the villages of Ḳollār and Qalāt (Kelāt) from Andreas’ unpublished data. Ivanow (1935, pp. 62-3, 76-7; in Fārs, 1928) cites the forms of Ardakānī in two comparative tables of the pronouns and personal endings in West Iranian dialects. Mahīn Jalīlī (1979) presents the pronouns and the basic verb system of Ardakānī, based on some 150 pages of field notes taken while a student at the Asia Institute in Shiraz.

4. The villages of Daštak, Emāmzāda Esmā‘īl, and Kondāzī in the Dehestān of Abarj east of Ardakān. Romaskevich (1924) published two short texts of the dialect of Emāmzāda Esmā‘īl, recorded in 1912 in Tehran, while Morgenstierne (1960, pp. 121-22) includes brief grammatical notes on Kondāzī. Ivanow (1935) includes the personal pronouns and endings of Daštakī in his two comparative tables.

The Jewish communities of Fārs (cf. Loeb) have retained their local dialects. W. Ivanow (1935) included the personal pronouns and endings of the dialect of the Šīrāzī Jews in his two tables, and suggested that this dialect was “exactly the same” as that of the dialect poetry of Sa’dī, Ḥāfeẓ, and Bošḥāq, and closest to Daštakī (pp. 41-42). Morgenstierne (1960, pp. 129-32) includes brief grammatical notes, while Ehsan Yarshater (1974, pp. 465-66) published a short text and suggests Ḳollārī as the closest dialect (p. 460, n. 14).

In addition to these materials, there are also unpublished data collections and theses by scholars and students of academic institutions in Persia. The most extensive textual materials published remain those of Mann (1909). For earlier specimens of Fārs dialects up to the 15th century, see below, Appendix 2.

General surveys and discussions of the Fārs dialects are based on the four dialects in Mann (1909), who presents a detailed synchronic, comparative, and historical description and analysis preceding the texts. Arthur Christensen and



Kaj Barr extensively discuss the phonology and morphology the Fārs dialects in the comparative-historical notes accompanying their edition of Andreas' materials on Sīvand, the Central dialect Soī, and some Kurdish dialects, including Kalānī-'Abdū'ī and Korūnī (Andreas). More recent studies and surveys include the extensive analytical-descriptive study by A. A. Kerimova (1982; summarized in 1997; see also 1976), based on Mann (1909), and the succinct overview by Pierre Lecoq (1989a).

#### LINGUISTIC OVERVIEW

Abbreviations: Ard. = Ardakānī; Būr. = Būrenjānī; Buš. = Bušehrī; Dšk. = Daštakī; Dav. = Davānī; EzE. = Emāmzāda Esmā'īlī; Gāv. = Gāvkošakī; Kho. = Kollārī; Kon. = Kondāzī; KzO. = Old Kāzerūnī; Mās. = Māsaramī; Pāp. = Pāpūnī; Sam. = Samgānī; Šīr. = Šīrāzī; J. = Jewish, O. = Old; Srx. = Sorqī; Khā. = Kārgī; and Sīv. = Sīvandī; s.= singular; p.= plural.

*Phonology.* The study of the Fārs dialects provided Andreas and Mann with the crucial data to postulate a binary division of West Iranian languages into “Southwest” versus “Northwest” Iranian dialects, leading to the two fundamental studies by Paul Tedesco (1921) and Wolfgang Lenz (1923). This issue was particularly important for the dialectological identification, as Middle Persian or (Middle) Parthian, of the West Iranian Manichean texts found in Chinese Turkestan. It soon became evident that no dialect, including Old and Middle Persian, represents a “pure” type where all changes affect all items of the lexicon, and where there is no interference from outside. In reality, of course, there is no binary division, but spatial and social networks of retentions versus changes which spread unevenly. Nevertheless, the speakers in smaller focal areas like larger ones tend to acquire, retain, and propagate loose clusters of linguistic features recognized as typical for them, in spite of continual population moves (see also Morgenstierne, 1958; Windfuhr, 1975 and 1995; Lecoq, 1989b; Hadank, 1992; Sims-Williams 1996).

The typical “Southwest” Iranian features found in the Fārs dialects include the following: Two of the distinctive early changes from Indo-European to Proto-Iranian, and further to Avestan and to Old Persian, already show considerable variation (cf. Gershevitch, 1964; MacKenzie, p. 19 n. 8): (1) IE. palatal *\*kī* > Proto-Ir. *\*ts* > OP. *θ* > *h*; e.g., all Fārs dialects *pah* “small herd animals” (Av. *pasu-*, reflecting non-Southwest Iranian *\*ts* > *s*); ŠīrO. *šnah-* “to know” (OP., Av. *xšnā-sa-*); in initial position, Old Šīrāzī has evidence for *θ-*, *t-*, e.g., *θal* “year” (OP. *θard-*, Av. *sard-*; NPers. *sāl*), *tuxun* “speech” (NPers. *soḡan*); (2) IE. palatal



\**k*<sup>v</sup> > Proto-Ir. \**tsw* > *θ* > *t*, e.g., ŠīrOJ., Srx. *teš* “louse,” but Gāv., Kon. *šeš* (note NPers. *šepeš*); (3) IE. palatal \**gī* > Proto-Ir. \**dz* > *d*, e.g., Buš., Sam., Būr., Mās., Kond. *dan-* “know” (OP. *dan-*, Av. *zan-*, *z* representing the “Northwest” Iranian change); (4) Ir. *θr* > *ç* > *s*, all dialects *pos* “son, boy” (OP. *puça-*, Av. *puθra*).

Later changes from Old to Middle Iranian: (5) Initial *dw-* > *d*, e.g., Sam., Pāp., Būr., Mās., *dīya* “other” (cf. NPers. *dīgar*; OP. *duvita-* “second, Younger Av. *bitya-*, *b-* representing the Northwest Iranian change); (6) Ir. *j*, intervocalic *-č-* > *z*, e.g., all dialects *zan-* “hit” (OP., Av. *jan*, Mid. Pers. *zan-*, Parthian *žan-*), Gāv. *soz-*, “burn,” ŠīrO. *θoz-*, most other dialects *sūz-* (Av. *saoča-*, Parthian *sōž-*).

The following further changes are typically Southwest Iranian: (7) Initial Ir. *y* > *j*, e.g., Srx. *jome* “clothes” (Mid. Pers. *jāmag*, historical spelling *y`mk*); (8) initial Ir. *w-* > *b-*, e.g., Mās. *mī-bān-om*, *mī-bī* “I see, he sees” (Mid. Pers. *wēn-*); (9) initial Ir. *wi-* > *bi-*, e.g., ŠīrO. *bedaht* “melted” (Mid. Pers. *wi-dāxt*, NPers. *godāxt*); (10) SWIr. *rd* (< Proto-Ir. \**rdz*, \**rd*) > *l*, e.g., Gāv. *mola* “neck, mountain pass” (Av. *mṛzu-*), and *sāl*, ŠīrO. *θal* “year” (< *θard*, see above).

The following change, *fr* > *hr*, is not typically “Southwest” and is not found in Persian or Lorī, but is found in the Lārestān dialects, in the Central dialects to the north, in Ṭālešī and Tātī, and others. Examples. Sam., Būr. *ārš-* “sell” (Mid. Pers. *froš-*), Sam. *ārīs-* “send,” Dav. *ers-* (Mid. Pers. *frēst-*); the verbal prefixes *hu-/ho-* “down” (Mid. Pers. *frōd*) and *hā-* (cf. NPers. *farā* “forth, forward”). Note *fr* > *hl* in Dav., Srx. *bahl* “snow” (Mid. Pers. *wafṛ*). Other changes, found also in the Central dialects, Lorī, Lārestānī, and elsewhere, include the following: Initial *hwa-* > *xa-*, e.g., *xaš* “good,” but *xo-š* “him-self;” *xt* > *ht*, e.g., Sam., Pāp., Mās., Gāv. *doht* “girl, daughter,” but Buš., Srx. *doxt*, Kond., EzE. *duft*; *ft* > *ht*, e.g., Dav., Pāp., Būr., Mās. *xat-* “to sleep” (< *xwafṛ*), Būr. *gōt* “said,” but Pāp. *goft*; intervocalic *-d-* > *-y-*, e.g., Būr. *däy-* “give” (< *dad-*), *day-* > *dy-* > *j* in Sam., Mās., Srx., Šīr., EzE, e.g., Sam. *mī-j-ām* “I give.” Some widely found recent changes reflect the processes of assimilation and simplification typical for spoken languages: *f*, *b* before consonant > *w*, e.g., Gāv. *koū* “partridge” (NPers. *kabk*); *st*, *zd* > *s(s)*, *z(z)*, e.g., *has(s)-* “be (there),” *doz* “thief;” *nd* > *n*, e.g., Sam. *gānom* “wheat;” dentals tend to be elided in final position, e.g., Būr. *gō*, *gōt* “he said” < *goft*, Sam. *-bā* “he carried” < *bart*; intervocalic weakening, e.g., *-g-* > *-y-*, e.g., *isfāhūnī-yāl* “the Isfahānīs.” Postvocalic voiced stops are liable to become fricatives. Most notable is *d* > *δ* in Sam., Būr., Dav., e.g., Sam., Būr. *mī-δ-ī* “He gives,” Dav. *baδ* “bad.”

**Vowels.** Earlier long *ē*, *ō*, are retained in a good many instances (as they were



in earlier NPers.), but there is a tendency to merge with the short vowels *e*, *o* < *i*, *u*, or with long *ī* and *ū* under Persian influence: (1) *ē*, e.g., *ē* = *ē*, Dav. *re:z* “small” (NPers. *rīz*), vs. *rez* “vine,” Gāv. *eīn* “this,” imperfective prefix Dav. *mei-*, *me:-*, but *mī-* elsewhere, indefinite suffix *-ī*; (2) *ō* = *ō*, e.g., Dav., Gāv. *soz-* “burn,” all dialects *koh* “mountain”; *ō* may be fronted, e.g., ŠīrJ. *des* < *dōst* “friend,” *re* “day” < *rōz*; (3) *ū* is fronted before dentals, palatals, and in final position, to *ü* in Sam., elsewhere > *ī*, e.g., Sam. *pül* “money,” but elsewhere *pīl*. (4) *ā* is strongly rounded, and merges with *ū* before nasal. Long vowels tend to be shortened; thus *ah* < *āh*, e.g., all dialects *rah* “way” < *rāh*; Sam., Mās. *bān* “see” < *bēn*; Srx. *jome* “clothes” < *jōma* < *jāma*. These processes combined may result in considerable contraction with high frequency verbs, e.g., *mē-vā-t* > *ma*, *mat-*, as in Sam., Pāp., Gāv. *om-ma* “I want”; Pāp. *mat-om*, *mē-vāyest* > *mes* in ŠīrJ. *eš-mes* “He wanted.”

The synchronic vowel system (Table 1) distinguishes two sets: (1) Short, lax vowels, of which *e* and *o* are high-mid (often recorded as *i* and *u*), while *a* is mid-low (often recorded by Mann as *ä*). These have considerable conditioned variation, such as *e* ~ *i*, *o* ~ *u*, *a* ~ *e*, and may be reduced to the central mid vowel *ə*. (2) Long, tense vowels, which are liable to be shortened. The latter include the mid-vowels *ē*, *ō* (of various origins), *ü* in Sam. The system shown is that given by Šādeqī and Mahamedi for Davānī, which also appears to be that of most of the other Fārs dialects. Kerimova (1982, pp. 320-24; 1997, p. 178) posits the Persian-type system of *ī*, *ā*, *ū* vs. *e*, *a*, *o* for Māsaramī, but additionally phonemic short *i*, *u* for the other dialects.

Among the consonants, the velars *q* and *g̃* may be distinguished and phonemic, e.g., Dav. *qāvel* “able” vs. *gāfel* “unaware.” *q* tends to merge with *k*, e.g., Srx. *korūn* “Qor’ān.” Dav. has a number of further distinctions: dental vs. palatal affricates, e.g., *tsel* “forty” vs. *čel* “armpit”; simple vs. rolled *r*, e.g., *mor* “chicken” vs. *morr* “round.”

*Noun.* Gender and case are not morphologically marked. Plural is marked by *-gal* (*-g-* > *-y-*, and may be elided after consonant). Buš., Šīr., EzE. have *-hā*, *-hō*. Most dialects with *-gal* also have semantic subsets with *-hā*, or *-ūn*. Some examples are Sam. *mīš-gāl* “sheep,” *ādām-yāl* “persons,” Mās. *hārf-āl* “words,” Būr. [*piḍār-sūhtā*]-*gāl* “the cursed ones”; Buš. *pos-ā* “boys, sons,” EzE. *doft-ak-ō* “the girls.”

*Noun phrase.* The head noun and noun phrase precede the dependent noun and noun phrase, with which they are connected by *-ī*, or *-e*, e.g., Gav., *tang ī*



se “black enclosure,” Būr. *murvāk-i čāk* “fat chicken,” *xūnā-yi kulāng* “the house of the crane,” EzE. *duft-ak-ō-ye Tehrūn* “the girls of Tehran,” Sam. *da tā āz ādām-āl-e xū-š* “ten men of his own people.”

Determinatives are found in all dialects, and marked by one or more suffixes, -a, -ū, -ak-ū, ō, which follow the plural marker (cf. colloquial NPers. *baččehe* “that/this child” [I am talking about]). The noun or noun phrase so marked is often introduced by the demonstratives *ī* “this” and *ū* “that,” e.g., Būr. [*pus-i xurd*]-ū “the youngest (“little”) son,” Buš. *ī havā-y-akū* “this weather,” Sam. *ī mīš-gāl-ū* “these sheep.” The indefinite marker of noun phrases is unstressed -ī in all dialects, e.g., Gāv. *ya bard-ī-yen* “It is a stone.”

*Prepositions:* The most frequent preposition is the bi-polar *a* “to, at, from” (cf. Pers. *be, az*), e.g., Sam. *ā kūh-e dārm* “on the D. mountain,” Sam. *a šar a dār-and-in* “They came out of the town” (Pers. *az šahr be dar*). It also marks change of state or of situation, e.g., *vā-b-ām a zān-e tu* “so that I become your wife” [*a zan vā-b-am*, cf. Germ. *zu deiner Frau werde*]. This preposition occurs even when its object is expressed by a verbal ending or possessive affix, e.g., *š-a kir-sā-y-ām* “He has done this to me” [*š-a Vb-am*] and *š-a vā-sād-ām* “He took it from me” [*š-a Vb-am*]. The preposition Dav. *an* “in,” ŠīrO. *ana*, and ŠīrO. *xo* “with” are noteworthy.

Direct object noun phrases are not marked, although NPers. -*rā* is found in Buš. and ŠīrJ., e.g., note both -*rā* and object suffix -*eš* in ŠīrJ. *Isof-rā am-pāye xod-ešu a Mesr-eš mi-br-en* “They carry Joseph with themselves to Egypt.”

*Demonstrative pronouns.* There appear to be three systems: two members, *ū, ī*; three members, *ōi : ū(N) : ī(N)*, similar to Persian *ū : ān : īn*; and four members, as in EzE. and ŠīrO. (Table 2).

*Independent pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons* (Table 3). In some dialects, *me* vs. *mo* “I” as well as *ta, te* vs. *to, tu* “you” may represent remnants of oblique cases; e.g., Būr. *tā mā vā-b-ām a zān-e tu, hamā-š a sī tā* “so that I become your [-*e tu*] wife, all this is for you [*sī ta*],” ŠīrJ. *te des mi-dār-om* “I love you [*te*],” but *šā to a dār mi-zen* “The king hangs you.”

*Possessives*, “mine,” “yours,” “his/hers,” etc., are expressed by the pronoun *en*, Gāv. *eīn*, followed by the independent pronoun, e.g., Gāv. *eīn (-e) xo-d en* “It is yours [-*d*].” This demonstrative also introduces the topic of complement clauses, e.g., ŠīrJ. *ta bir-eš en en, ke* “the interpretation is this that.”



*Personal affixes, attachment and functions.* The personal affixes of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd persons in all dialects are: Singular *-m*, *-t*, *-š*, plural *-mu(n)*, *-tu(n)*, *-šu(n)*, with connecting vowels *e-*, or *o-*. They are either suffixed or prefixed. As possessives, the affixes follow the noun phrase, Buš. *kākō-y kūček-ū-[t]* “your youngest (“little”) brother.” In other instances, they are optionally attached as follows: (Pause)<sub>x</sub> + (Conjunction)<sub>x</sub> + (NP)<sub>x</sub> + (Prefix)<sub>x</sub> + (Verb)<sub>x</sub>. Thus, in most reduced form, the verb forms have the pattern Verb-Affix or Affix-Verb, and may occur in clause initial position, *šū-go/go-šū* “They said.” E.g., present tense, Sam. *ū-š-mi-z-äm* “I hit him;” past tense, Dav. *u-š go-š, ke-t me:-šā* “He [*u-š*] said that you [*ke-t*] can,” with [*-t*] affixed to the conjunction. There is a remarkable inversion by which the affix precedes the preposition, most notably with *a* “to, from,” e.g., Sam. *hüč gäp š-ä nä-zu* “He said no word to him [*š-a*],” Sam. *sarmā mū-a mī-ns-ä* “Cold is settling on us [*mu-a*].” This is also found with noun phrases, in ŠirO., e.g., *mo-z dast* “from my hand” (NPers. *az dast-am*; see Adib Ṭūsī, 1965b, p. 260).

Semantically, the personal affixes have a wide range of functions:

1. The “logical subject,” or, agent, in past tenses of transitive verbs, e.g., Buš. *xodā yī bače-š sī to dād-en* “God [*-š*] gave/has given another child to you,” Būr. *mā-šū luht ki* “They [*-šū*] plundered us [*mā-*].”

(The following functions are not unlike those of the personal suffixes, or of the enclitic *-rā* in modern or earlier forms of Persian:)

2. The “indirect object,” which includes the following: (a) possessor, “to have,” e.g., Būr. *yā dih-i-mū bī* “We had a village” (“One village was to us [*-mū*];” cf. NPers. *ō-rā yak duxtar būd* “He had one daughter.”); KzO. *ī-š yek na-būd* “He had not one”; (b) beneficiary, e.g., Būr. *yā mihmūnī-t bān-om* “that I make a feast for you [*-t*]” (cf. NPers. expression *xodā-rā šokr* “Thanks [be] to God.”); (c) affectee, or experiencer, e.g., Gāv. *xasta-š vo-nī-mī-y-ū* “He [*-š*] does not get tired,” Būr. *dahavā-mū avas* “We began to fight” (“Fighting befell us [*-mū*];” cf. colloquial Pers. *da’vā-mūn šod*). This function is notably found with the modal verbs, e.g., Dav. *bāyad-ot hā-d-e* “You [*-ot*] must give,” (cf. earlier NPers. *tu rā bāy-ad/bāy-ad-at dādan* “You must give”; Mās. *mu-m tu mī-ā-t-um* “I [*-m*] want you [*tu*]” (for *mīāt-*, cf. Pers. *mī-bāy-ad*); Buš. *ne-mī-taness-eš beres-e* “He [*-eš*] could not get there”; Dav. *u-š go-š, ke-t me:-šā* “He said that you [*-t*] can” (for *me:-šā*, cf. Pers. (*mī-*)*šāy-ad*).

3. Location and direction, e.g., Sam. *a kuh-e dāšt-e bārm šir-iš hān* “On the Kūh-



e Dasht-e Barm there are lions” (*-iš hen*, literally “to it is”), Būr. *išt-ūm*, *koh-emū gāšt* “We went, and we [-emū] walked (around on) the mountain.” (cf. Mod.Pers. *hama-ye šahr-rā gašt-īm* “We walked around the whole city.”)

The system of Sam. has retained the option of expressing the “logical object,” or patient, as well as the affectee, by the verbal ending in past tenses, e.g., Sam. *šu-kuš-säy-äm* “They [šū-] killed me [-am],” Sam. *yä kūr-ī ī-čänī š-a kir-sä-yäm* “A blind man has done this to me” [*š-a Vb-am* “he to me”], *yä kūr-ī š-a vā-säd-äm* “A blind man took it from me” [*š-a Vb-am* “he from me”] (NPers. *az man setād*). The same is likely to be found in some other dialects.

#### VERBAL SYSTEM

*Stem formation.* The conjugation is based on two stems, present and past. Some present stems originate in earlier past stems, e.g., Sam. present *xaft-* “sleep,” to which a new past stem, *xaft-ād*, was formed. This past morpheme (< *-ād*) has been generalized in a sub-set of intransitive verbs, e.g., Dav. *gašt-eδ-* “walked around.” A similar innovation is found in Buš., e.g., *mī-and-īd-om* “I was coming” vs. *and-om* “I came.”

Causative: *n-/en-*, e.g., Dav. *xat-/xat-n-* (, Mās. *xōs-/xōs-än-* “sleep” / “make sleep” (< *xwafs-*), Būr. *jim-än-* “make move, wag” (NPers. *jomb-än-*). Passive, or inchoative: There is no morphological marker, but the periphrastic construction participle + *vā-b-* “become,” e.g., Sam. *kušta vā-bīd-a* “He was killed.” Dav. has a directional construction, *a* + infinitive + *š-* “go,” e.g., *nu a xord-an še* “The bread was eaten” (literally, “went to being eaten”).

*Prefixes.* There are three sets of prefixes:

1. (a) The imperfective aspect in the present and past is marked by Dav. *mei-/me:-*, and *mī-* elsewhere; e.g., Būr. *mī-xat-i* ‘he sleeps,’ Dav.

It;em>*mei-xat-eδ* “He was sleeping.” (b) The marker of the present subjunctive is *be-*, e.g., Sam., Mās. *bu-kun-am*, Būr., Pāp. *bi-kun-am* “that I do.” (c) In all dialects, the reflex of the earlier perfective *be-* in past tenses is found with the verb *š-* “go,” Buš., Dav., Būr. *bi-št-*, Mās. *u-št-*, Šīr., Kon., EzE. *e-št-* “went.”

2. (a) Directional prefixes are *dar-*, *var-*, *vā-/ā-*, which may be contrastive, e.g., Gāv. *xor-* “eat,” *vā-xor-* “drink.” (b) Reflexes of other prefixes, which only occur in the subjunctive, are *hā-* (cf. NPers. *farā* “forth, forward”), e.g., *hā-da* “give!”; *hū-* (Mid.Pers. *frōd* “down”), e.g., Šahrāī (outside Buš.) *ho-koh* “do!”;



Sam., Mās., Būr., Pāp. *hū-nā* “put down!”; Dav. *hu-bān* “tie!”; *ul-* (Mid.Pers. *ul* “upward,” Av. *arəδwa-*), e.g., Sam. *ul-ū/ul-isī* “stand up!” (sing./plur.); ŠīrO. *ol-ār* “bring up!” These prefixes replace the subjunctive *be-*, e.g., Mās. *hā-j-om* “that I give” (*j-* < *dy-* < *day-*).

3. The negative marker is *na-*, prohibitive *ma-*, both of which replace *be-* and the other subjunctive prefixes. The sequence is Prefix-*na-mi*-Verb Stem, e.g., Gāv. *tamūm vō-nī-mī-bū-t-ī* “It will not end.”

*Personal endings.* There is no distinction of gender. The 3rd person singular ending is unmarked in past stems, and *-at*, or forms derived from it, with present stems. All dialects have a distinct, small subset of verbs where this ending is reduced, or lost, after present stems ending in continuants. These include those ending in *-n*, and *-r*, as well as those whose stem originally ended in *-w* and *-y*, e.g., *-n*, e.g., Buš. *mī-kō*, Sam. *mī-kōn-t*, Dav., Būr., Mās. *mī-kū* “does” (*kun-*); *-r*, e.g., Sam. *mī-bā* “carries” (*bar-*), Dav. *me:-gi-t* “takes” (*gīr-*); all dialects *bū*, *vā-bū* “that he be, becomes” (< *\*baw-t* < *\*baw-at*, cf. Gershevitch, 1970).

“To be”: In the 3rd person singular, all dialects have *hen*; *hē* is recorded for Dav., Šīr., Kon.; *-ā* for Dav. In the other persons, the copula is identical with the personal endings. Most dialects also have *has* + Personal Ending, 3rd person singular *has-en*.

Table 4 highlights that Kārgī and Sīvandī are extraneous to the dialects area. Similarly, the endings of the 1st person singular and 1st person plural in Davānī show that it, too, is not indigenous, although substantially assimilated otherwise.

*System of tenses.* All dialects have the ergative (“passive”) construction in the past tenses of transitive verbs, where the agent, or logical subject, is marked by the personal affix, and the verb generally has the form of the 3rd person singular (for examples, see affixes above).

*Tenses.* There are a present imperfect and a past imperfect, both marked by *mē-*, *mī-*, as well as a present subjunctive, marked by *be-*, and a perfect subjunctive. The latter is formed with the perfect participle + the subjunctive of *b-* “to be,” e.g., Buš. *anda bū* “he may have come,” Sam. *mur-sā bū* “He may have died/be dead,” Dav. *dovesse bu-t* “He may have run.” The forms of the counterfactual are identical with the past imperfective and the past perfect,



e.g., Mās. *ägār tämbäl näbī, ōi hām yā gusfänd a gīr-iš mī-ama* “If he would not have been lazy, he too would have gotten a sheep” (*a gīr-iš mī-ama*, literally “would come, have come to his hold”).

There is much variation in the system of past tenses other than the imperfective. The “typical” Fārs systems include forms with *es-*, which are found in Dav., Sam., Būr., Mās., ŠīrOJ., and Ard. These derive from Middle Persian stative past forms of intransitive verbs, and of transitive verbs where the agent was unmarked. In Sam. and Mās., the 3rd person singular does not have *-es* in the perfect, as shown by the transitive forms Sam. (*kird*)-*i*, Mās. (*kird*)-*in*. The basic pattern is indicated by the past tenses of transitive verbs. In Dav., earlier *ēst-/ēstād-* have phonologically merged into a single tense form, and a compound form has evolved, e.g., (*ames*)-*se beδ-*. Note that Kārgī likewise has *est-*, e.g., *koj bīr-est-a, key umar-est-a* “Where were you, when did you come?” (< *umada* with regular *-d-* > *-r-*).

Another, Lorī-type system is reflected in Būr. and Pāp., where the present and past perfect are marked by the copula with stress on the verb stem: *b’iδ a, b’iδ a bī*. This type of formation is distinct from the Persian-type perfect participles with *-a* (< Mid. Persian *-ag*) in Mās. and in Buš. Table 5 arranges the systems of the better documented dialects according to type. Blanks indicate that no form is recorded, or may exist; parentheses indicate doubtful forms recorded only once.

The function of the perfect forms marked by *es-* (and analogically the function of the corresponding perfect forms without *es-* in the other dialects) appears to be to express state, result, or reference; e.g., state: Būr. *tu sī čī mijāl xat-is-a?* “Why are you asleep/sleeping?,” result: Būr. *hamā-mū yāk vā-gīr vā-bīd-is-ūm* “(And so) we became all united;” reference: ŠīrJ. *tā ya:šow nun-bā-wo šarbat-dār-e šā xow-ēsu de:s-ā. sob xeyli nārāhat bod-en* “Until one night the baker and the cup-bearer of the king dreamt (lit. saw) a dream. In the morning they were very unhappy” (text and tr. Yarshater, p. 465). As such, the forms with *es-* typically occur at the beginning of narratives, e.g., Sam. *yā Šīrāzī a Isfāhūn and-is-a, š-išnuft-is-a ki* “A Šīrāzī had gone to Isfahān, he had heard that;” similarly, Mās. *yāk Šīrāzī ušt-ās-a Isfāhūn, š-išnuft-ās-a ki*. Pāp., which does not have *es-*, has here *anda bī, išnufta bī-š*. That the function of these forms is fundamentally different from that of the perfects in Persian is shown by the fact that translations by the researchers often render these forms with *es-* either as past perfects, or preterits, whether Persian, German, or English.



*Modal verbs.* The basic construction is Personal Affix + Modal Verb in the impersonal 3rd singular + Subjunctive (for examples, see personal affixes above). The common verb for “can” is present *šā-*, past *šāyest* or *šayī(d)* (cf. Parthian *šāh-*, OP., Av. *xšā(y)-* “be able, have power”). Būr. has present *tar-*, past *tarist* (like Lorī), Buš. has *tan-/toness-*. The notions of “want” and “must” are both expressed by *vā-t/vāyest-* or *vāyī(d)-* (Mid.Pers. *abāy-/abāyist* “want, must”). Note that the initial *v-* merges with the preceding *me-*, *mī-*, e.g., Sam. *ma*, Mās. *mīā* “want, must” (see phonological changes above). In the past tense, some dialects distinguish “want” by forms of *x(w)āst* (Mid.Pers. *xwāstan*). For “must” NPers. *bāyad/bāyest* is also found. EzE. distinguishes *mī-bū-t* “it is possible to” (cf. NPers. *mī-šav-ad*). Particularly noteworthy is Ard. It has *šā-/šas* “can” like the majority of the dialects, but has the adjectival *eskār* “want” + present and perfect subjunctive, which also function to express the present and past future, e.g., *mo m-eskā(r-en) be-š-am* “I [*m-*] want to go;” combined with “to have,” present tense, with present subjunctive: *mo m-eskā(r-en) bū-t-om* “I [*m-*] want to have (literally, “that to me [*-om*] is”); past tense, with perfect subjunctive: *mo m-eskā-r-e bī bū-t-om* “I wanted to have.”

In terms of the modals, there appears to be some similarity between the northern Fārs dialects and the dialect of Kārg Island, where “want” is *eskār*, as in Ardakānī, e.g., *bečak-š-eš got: eskār-em-e šekār ho-kon-āh* “The child [*-š*] said to him [*-eš*]: I [*-em*] want to go hunt” (note the subjunctive prefix *ho-*, and 1st sing. ending *-ah*). Similarly, “can” is expressed by *b-* in the sense of “be possible” (NPers. *mišavad*) as also found in EzE., e.g., note *na-d bu* in Kārgī *tā xorūs injā nāre bi, na-d bu* “As long as the rooster was put down here, you [*-d*] could not (do it)” (*nāre* < *nāde*, NPers. *nehāde*; examples, Āl-e Aḥmad 1960, p. 112, 114). The dialectal variation is shown in [Table 6](#).

*Future.* Besides Ard., there is no distinct formation for expressing the future. However, Gāv., Būr., Pāp. have a “euphonic” *-ī* (< Mid. Persian optative *hē* “it may be”) after personal endings in various tenses, which can have similar connotations, e.g., Gāv. *harče be-š-ēy, tamūm vō-nī-mī-šū[-t-ī]* “However much you may go, it will not end”; Būr. *mī-š-ūm-ī, čār pānj rū a kuh mī-xāt[-ūm-ī], tā bi-nīš-ūm* “We will go, we will sleep in the mountain for 4-5 days; so that we may see”; Pāp. *intizār-iš kešī, ki yā jībbur-iš jīb-iš be-bur[-at-ī]* “He was waiting that one of the pickpockets pick his pockets.” Dav. has *-ā* (Mid. Persian subjunctive *hād*).

*Subordination and tenses.* The most frequent conjunction is *ke*, e.g., with “preterit” implying future perfective action, Būr. *ūjā ki bi-št-a, bi-gū-ī, ke mā*



*dar ī bīyābūn hasta-m* “When you get (“went”) there, say, that I am here in this desert.” Also frequent is the conjunction of temporal-spatial extension *tā* “until, as soon/long as,” e.g., with subjunctive implying future reference, Būr. [tā] *mā īn-a vel bu-kun-om, bi-š-om yā šōhar dā bā-kun-om, umr-e ma a sār-in* “Before/until I let this one go and get another husband, my life will be (“is”) at its end.” Noteworthy is *tā* in the sense of “sees, saw” (as in Lorī), e.g., Būr. *yā galā-ī amēy sar-e ōw, [tā] ruvā dim-iš mī-jim-ān-i* “A herd came to the water, they saw that a fox was (“is”) wagging his tail.”

*Conditional clauses.* An example with preterit in the protasis, anticipated completed action, followed by imperfective conditional (identical with past imperfective) in the apodosis, EzE. *age kōr-ī ke, ke ōy-em mī-dī, xūb bī* “If you do (“did”) something, so that I would [mi-] see her, that would be good.”

*Lexicon.* In addition to the dictionaries mentioned, several works cited include glossaries or topical word lists. Some widely found items, also found in the local Persian variants, are *nīš-* “see,” *češ* “eye,” *pal* “hair,” *kom* “belley,” *got* “big,” *xāg* “egg,” *taš* “fire,” *bard* “stone,” *so* “three.” Typical Southwest Iranian verbs are *g(ū)-* “say” (< *gaub-* vs. Northwest *vāč-*), *oft-* “fall” (< *pat-* vs. Northwest *kap-*), and the present stem *kun-* “do” (< *\*kr-nu-* vs. Northwest *kar-*). The present stem *kur-* “do” in Dav. reflects a compromise between these two forms. This *r* was analogically extended to the original *n*-stems of *kor-* “dig” (< *kan-*), *zer-* “hit” (< *zan-*). This could imply a group of incoming speakers from a dialect area with *kar-*. The same three stem forms are found in Berentīnī among the Baškardī dialects (cf. Gershevitch 1970, p. 172).

#### APPENDIX 1. OTHER DIALECTS AND LANGUAGES

Other Iranian dialects represented in the area of the Fārs dialects include the dialect of the Island of Kārg (Āl-e Aḥmad, pp. 108-15, 122-29) which shares many features with the Fārs dialects, but differs in some basic morphology (see above). There are, or were, also small enclaves from other Iranian dialect groups:

1. Sīvandī north of Shiraz on the road to Isfahan, which shares features with the dialects of the Kūr region in the Kavīr (for a brief description and bibliography, cf. Lecoq, 1989, pp. 246-8).
2. The southeast Kurdish dialect of the village pair of Kalānī and ‘Abdū’ī of Kāzerūn (Mann 1909, pp. 135-35; Zhukovskii, *Materialy*, texts, pp. 75-81;



Andreas, ed. Barr, pp. 359-483).

3. The southeast Kurdish Lakī dialect of the Korūnī tribe near Shiraz (Andreas, ed. Barr, pp. 285-358).

4. The Gūrānī dialect of Tall-e Keḏāšk (Zhukovskiĭ, *Materialy*, texts, pp. 82-85).

5. The Balūčī dialect of the Korošī, a small group of camel keepers of the Qašqāī tribes (Mahamedi 1979, pp. 286-88).

## APPENDIX 2. EARLIER SPECIMENS OF FĀRS DIALECTS

Earlier textual specimens of the Fārs dialects up to the 15th century are found scattered in literary sources, which present considerable challenges for the recovery of the original text due to the Arabo-Persian script and the problems of textual transmission. Pioneering work on recovering this dialect material was done at the end of the 19th century by Clement Huart as well as E. G. Browne, and was continued most actively between the 1950s and 1980s by Persian scholars, foremost among whom are Adīb Ṭūsī, Māhyār Nawwābī, and M.-J. Wājed Šīrāzī.

Old Kazerūnī: There are ample quotations in this dialect from the Sufī Abū Eshāq Kāzarūnī (q.v.; d. 426/1033), transmitted from the Arabic original of his vita in two Persian translations, Maḥmūd b. ‘Oṭmān’s *Ferdaws al-moršedīya fī asrār al-šamādīya* (q.v.; dated 728/1327-28) and ‘Alā’ b. Sa’d Kāzerūnī’s *Maršad al-aḥrār fī sayr moršed al-abrār* (composed ca. 750/1349; ms. dated 830/1427, which also provide Persian translations for most of the passages. A. J. Arberry (1950, pp. 178-83) collated seventeen lines, in Arabic script, which occur in both texts. These were transcribed and interpreted by Adīb Ṭūsī (1955a); see also Wājed (1970a) and Meier (pp. 77-81).

Old Šīrāzī: (1) Shaykh Rūzbehān (d. 606/1209): three lines, Wājed (1970b). (2) Sa’dī (d. 691/1292): eighteen lines in a trilingual poem, Browne (1895, pp. 794-802, plus two other lines); Adīb Ṭūsī (1955b); Wājed (1967-68). (3) Qoṭb-al-Dīn Šīrāzī (d. 710/1311): a seven line *gāzal*, Adīb Ṭūsī (1959). (4) Ḥāfez (d. 792/1390), four lines, Browne (1895, pp. 802-8); Nawwābī (1965; 1975); an eight line trilingual piece, Wājed (1968). (5) The satirical poet Boshāq Aṭ’ema Ḥallāj (q.v.; d. 827/1423 or 830/1427), 10 lines, Browne (1895, pp. 820-23). (6) Šāh Dā’ī (d. 870/1465), the *Kān-e malāḥat*, which is the most extensive specimen of the dialect, of which Adīb Ṭūsī discussed 177 lines of the concluding section (1965) and 544 lines of the remainder, supplying substantial grammatical notes,



collation of verbal forms, and a glossary (1965-66). Some sixteen lines were discussed by Nawwābī (1965; 1975), while Wājed (1969) interpreted a *ġazal*. (7) Šams Pos-e Nāšer (15th century): His *dīvān* in the dialect of Shiraz was first noted by Mann (1909, p. xx), and was discussed by Nawwābī (1977; 1981; 1983), which generated numerous comments, e.g. by Aḥmad Eqtedārī (1982) and M. M. Ja'farī (1982). Other discussion of dialect specimens include Meier (p. 81), Yaḥyā Dōkā' (1957), and Karīm Sanjābī (1967).

Old Īrāhestānī (for Īrāhestān, see *Nozhat al-qolūb*, ed. Le Strange, pp. 118-119): Some examples are listed in Meier (p. 81); see also Adīb Ṭūsī (1955a, pp. 33-34).

Old Nayrīzī: Discussions include Adīb Ṭūsī (1959), nineteen quatrains in a 14th-century manuscript.

*Bibliography* (for cited works not given in detail, see “Short References”):

For a comprehensive and topical bibliography of Fārs, see Sāzmān-e barnāma wa būdja-ye ostān-e Fārs, *Fehrestgān-e Fārs*, 2 vols., Shiraz, 1369 Š./1990; see also 'A. Deyhīmī, *Ketāb-šenāktī-e Fārs*, Shiraz, 1363 Š./1984.

M. 'A. Adīb Ṭūsī, “Lahja-ye Kāzerūnī-e qadīm,” *NDA Tabrīz* 7/1, 1334 Š./1955a, pp. 26-40.

Idem, “Motallaṭāt-e Šayḵ Sa'dī,” *NDA Tabrīz* 7.2, 1334 Š./1955b, pp. 175-89.

Idem, “Do ġazal ba lahja-ye Šīrāzī wa čand tarāna-ye Nayrīzī,” *NDA Tabrīz* 11/1, 1338 Š./1959, pp. 1-18.

Idem, “Se goftār ba lahja-ye Šīrāzī-e qarn-e nohom,” *NDA Tabrīz* 17/2, 1344 Š./1965a, pp. 149-82.

Idem, “*Kān-e malāḥat* be lahja-ye Šīrāzī-e qarn-e nohom az Šāh Dā'ī,” *NDA Tabrīz* 17, 1344 Š./1965b, pp. 353-76, 466-89; 18, 1966, pp. 33-48, 197-212, 287-310, 459-75 (introduction and 544 lines of text: 17, pp. 353-76, 466-89; 18, pp. 33-48, 197-201; grammatical notes and verb forms: 18, pp. 203-12, 287-301; glossary: 18, pp. 302-10, 459-75). J. Āl-e Aḥmad, *Jazīra-ye Kārg: Dorr-e yatīm-e Kalīj*, Tehran, 1339 Š./1960.

S. Amān-Allāhī, *Qawm-e Lor: Pažūheš-ī dar bāra-ye payvastagī-e qawmī o parākandagī-e joġrāfiā'ī-e Lor dar Īrān*, Shiraz, 1370 Š./1991.

F. C. Andreas, *Iranische Dialektaufzeichnungen aus dem Nachlass von F.C.*



*Andreas, zusammen mit Kaj Barr und W. Henning bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Arthur Christensen, Erster Teil: Sīvandī, Yāzdī und Sōī, bearbeitet von Arthur Christensen, Kurdische Dialekte, bearbeitet von Kaj Barr, Berlin, 1939.*

A. J. Arberry, "The Biography of Shaikh Abū Ishāq al-Kāzarūnī," *Oriens* 3, 1950, pp. 163-82.

M. Ātašī, "Lahja-ye Daštī wa Dašttestān," *Īrān-e ābād* 1/9, 1339 Š./1950, pp. 67-68.

L. Beck, *The Qashqa'i of Iran*, New Haven, 1986.

E. G. Browne, "Some Notes on the Poetry of the Persian Dialects," *JRAS*, 1895, pp. 773-825.

Y. Dokā', "Yak taṣnīf-e qadīmī-e Šīrāzī," *Majalla-ye mūsīqī*, 3rd series, no. 21, 1336 Š./1957, pp. 67-72.

A. Eqtedārī, "Dīvān-e Šams Pos-e Nāṣer wa čand vāža-ye ān," *Āyanda* 8/3-4, 1362 Š./1982, pp. 157-61.

Ḥ. 'Erfān, *Naḵlestān dar ostān-e Bušeher (Dašttestān-e bozorg)*, Tehran, 1374 Š./1995.

I. Gershevitch, "Dialect Variation in Early Persian," *TPS* 1964, pp. 1-29.

Idem, "The Crushing of the Third Singular Present," in M. Boyce and I. Gershevich, eds., *W. B. Henning Memorial Volume*, London, 1970, pp. 161-74.

K. Hadank, "Zur Klassifizierung westiranischer Sprachen," *Acta Orientalia* 53, 1992, pp. 28-75 (ms. ca. 1944).

Č. Ḥosāmzāda Ḥaḡīqī, "Gūyeš-e Davān," in M. Baḡtīār, ed., *Majmū'a-ye kaṭābahā-ye naḡostīn Kongera-ye taḡqīqāt-e īrānī/Proceedings of the First Congress of Iranian Studies*, Tehran, 1350 Š./1971, pp. 77-98.

W. Ivanow, "The Gabri Dialect Spoken by the Zoroastrians of Persia," *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 16, 1935, pp. 31-97; 17, 1938, pp. 1-39; 18, 1939, pp. 1-59 (repr. Rome, 1940).

M.-M. Jafarī, "Dar bāra-ye dīvān-e Šams Pos-e Nāṣer," *Čīstā* 1/9, 1361 Š./1982, pp. 1104-8.



M. Jalīlī, “Raveš-e ba kār bordan-e ba’ż-ī afāl dar gūyeš-e mardom-e Ardakān-e Fārs,” in M. Rowšan, ed., *Haštomīn kongera-ye taḥqīqāt-e īrānī* (Kermān) II, Tehran, 1358 Š./1979, pp. 24-27.

A. A. Kerimova, “O lichnyx mestoimeniyakh v dialektakh farsa” (On the personal pronouns in the Fars dialects), in *Iranskoe Yazykoznanie: Istorija, etimologiya, tipologiya. K 75-letiju V. I. Abaeva*, Moscow, 1976, pp. 97-103.

Idem, “Dialekty farsa,” *Osnovy Iranskogo Yazykoznanija* (Foundations of Iranian Linguistics) III/1, Moscow, 1982, pp. 316-63.

Idem, “Farsa dialekty,” in *Yazyki Mira, Iranskie Yazyki I: Yugo-zapadnye Iranskie Yazyki* (Languages of the World, Iranian Languages I, Southwest Iranian Languages), Moscow, 1997, pp.177-91.

P. Lecoq, “Les dialectes du sud-ouest de l’Iran,” in R. Schmitt, ed., *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden, 1989a, pp. 241-49 (“Les dialectes du Fārs,” pp. 241-43; “Les dialectes lori,” pp. 244-45; “Le sivandi,” pp. 246-48).

Idem, “Le classement des langues irano-aryennes occidentales,” in C.-H. de Fouchécour and Ph. Gignous, eds., *Études Irano-Aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard*, Paris, 1989b, pp. 247-64.

W. Lentz, “Die nordiranischen Elemente in der neupersischen Literatursprache bei Firdōsī,” *ZII* 4, 1926, pp. 251-316.

L. D. Loeb, *Outcaste: Jewish Life in Southern Iran*, New York, 1977.

D. N. MacKenzie, “Notes on the Transcription of Pahlavi,” *BSO(A)S* 30, 1967, pp. 17-29.

H. Mahamedi, “On the Verbal Systems in Three Iranian Dialects of Fārs,” *Stud. Ir* 8, 1979, pp. 277-97.

Idem, “The Story of Rostam and Esfandīyār in an Iranian Dialect,” *JAOS* 102, 1982, pp. 451-59.

Idem, “The Davānī Dialect,” *Elr.* VII, pp. 129-33.

O. Mann, *Die Tājīk-Mundarten der Provinz Fārs*, Berlin, 1909. F. Meier, *Die Vita des Scheich Abū Ishāq al-Kāzarūnī in der persischen bearbeitung von Maḥmūd Ūtmān*, Leipzig, 1948.



G. Morgenstierne, "Neuiranische Sprachen," in *HO I*, Leiden and Köln, 1958, pp. 155-76.

Idem, "Stray Notes on Persian Dialects II," *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskab* 19, 1960, pp. 121-29.

Ḥ. Mūsawī, *Gušahā-i az farhang wa ādāb o rosūm-e mardom-e Kūhmarra-ye Nowdān, Jarūq, Sorḡī-e Fārs*, Shiraz, 1362 Š./1983.

Idem, *Vāža-nāma-ye gūyeš-e Gāvkošak*, Shiraz, 1372 Š./1993.

Y. M. Nawwābī, "Lahja-ye Šīrāzī tā qarn-e nohom-e hejrī," *NDA Tabrīz* 17/1, 1344 Š./1965, pp. 77-90.

Idem, "The Dialect of Shiraz till the 9th Century H. (15th A.D.)," *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, 3-4, 1975, pp. 22-29.

Idem, *Majmū'a-ye maqālāt-e Māhyār Nawwābī*, ed. M. Ṭāwūsī, Shiraz, 1355 Š./1976 (includes: "Lahja-ye Šīrāz tā qarn-e nohom-e hejrī," pp. 211-24; "Zabān-e mardom-e Šīrāz dar zamān-e Sa'dī wa Ḥāfez," pp. 237-52).

Idem, "Se ḡazal az Šams Pos-e Nāšer," *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 3-4, Shiraz, 1977, pp. 83-100.

Idem, "Šams Pos-e Nāšer," *Āyanda* 6/7-8, 1360 Š./1981, pp. 501-6.

Idem, "Šams Pos-e Nāser Šīrāzī," *Fravahr* 18, 1362 Š./1983, pp. 403-22.

A. Romaskevich, "K dialektologii Persii," *Doklady Rossiyskoj Akademii Nauk* 1924, pp. 122-25.

A. Rūhbaḡšān, "Vāžahā-ye maḡallī dar aš'ār-e Ḥāfez," *Rāhnemā-ye Ketāb* 12/1-2, 1348 Š./1969, pp. 108-16.

'A.-A. Šādeqī, "Yāddāšt-i dar bāra-ye sāktēmān-e vājī-ye lahja-ye Davānī," *Majalla-ye zabān-šenāsī* 5/2, 1368 Š./1989, pp. 2-8.

'A. Šahbāzī, *Īl-e nāšenāḡta: Pažūheš-i dar kūhnešinān-e Sorḡī-e Fārs*, Tehran, 1366 Š./1987.

'A.-N. Salāmī, "Sākt-e fe'l dar gūyeš-e Davānī," *Majalla-ye zabān-šenāsī* 5/2, 1367 Š./1988, pp. 9-28.



‘A. Salmī, “Yek nokta-ye dastūrī dar gūyeš-e Davān,” in *Majmū‘a-ye Soḡanrānīhā-ye šešomīn Kongra-ye taḥqīqāt-e īrānī* III, 1357 Š./1978, pp. 91-95.

K. Sanjābī, “Nazar-ī dar bāra-ye moṭallaṭāt-e Sa’dī,” *Yaḡmā* 20, 1346 Š./1967, pp. 414-18. N. Sims-Williams, “Eastern Iranian,” in *EIr.* VII, pp. 649-52.

P. Tedesco, “Dialektologie,” pp. 184-258.

M.-J. Wājed Šīrāzī, “Moṭallaṭāt-e Sa’dī,” *Yaḡmā* 21-22, 1347-48 Š./1967-68, 28 pp. interspersed, with separate pagination.

Idem, “Šarḥ-e ḡazal-e moṭallaṭī az K̄vāja Ḥāfeẓ Šīrāzī,” *NDAT* 20, 1347 Š./1968, pp. 4-9.

Idem, “Šarḥ-e ḡazal-ī az Šāh Dāī Šīrāzī,” *NDAT* 21, 1348 Š./1969, pp. 3-8.

Idem, “Jawāb-e so‘āl-ī az Šayḡ Abū Eshāq Kāzerūnī,” *Yaḡmā* 23, 1349 Š./1970, pp. 477-79.

Idem, “Šarḥ-e seh bayt ba zabān-e Šīrāzī az Šayḡ Rūzbehān,” *Rāhnemā-ye ketāb* 13, pp. 1349 Š./1970, pp. 725-30.

G. Windfuhr, “Isoglosses: A Sketch on Persians and Parthians, Kurds and Medes,” *Acta Iranica* 5, 1975, pp. 457-62.

Idem, “Dialectology,” *EIr.* VII, pp. 362-70.

E. Yarshater, “The Jewish Communities of Persia and Their Dialects,” in Ph. Gignoux and A. Tafazzoli, eds., *Mélanges Jean de Menasce*, Louvain, 1974, pp. 453-65.

J. Zayyānī, “Lahja-ye Bušehrī,” *Sāl-nāma-ye Farhang-e koll-e banāder o jazā‘er-e Kalīj-e Fārs*, 1343 Š./1964, pp. 44-53.

Zhukovskii, *Materialy*.