

Borders

Itineraries on the Edges of Iran

edited by Stefano Pellò

Arabic *ḥadd* in Iranian

Notes on Some Cases of Grammaticalization

Ela Filippone

(Università degli Studi della Tuscia, Italia)

Abstract Arabic *ḥadd* – whose primary sense is that of ‘cutting edge’ – is a highly polysemic word which belongs to the Semitic root ḤDD and conveys the broad idea of ‘edge’ and ‘limit’. A well integrated term in many contexts of the Islamic cultural area (i.e. Persian, Turkish, Urdu, Hindi, Kashmiri, Marathi, Malay, etc.), Ar. *ḥadd* generally maintained the status of a polysemic word in the target languages, characterizing different semantic domains and different registers. Here the ecology of borrowings from Ar. *ḥadd* in the Iranian languages, where it is already recorded in Choresmian and Early New Persian, is examined. While describing some interesting cases of grammaticalization, semantic bleaching and semantic extensions, an extensive array of linguistic spaces will be excavated, suggesting as well a possible alternative hypothesis for the presumed extinction of the lexical set of OPrs. *ḥadiš-*.

Summary 1 Arabic *ḥadd*. – 2 Arabic *ḥadd* in the Iranian Languages. – 3 Some Cases of Grammaticalization. – 4 Final Remarks.

Keywords Iranian Studies. Iranian Dialectology. Arabic Dialectology. Loanwords. Grammaticalization.

1 Arabic *ḥadd*

Arabic *ḥadd* is a highly polysemic word. To have an idea of how great its semantic range is, suffice it to consider the complexity of the relevant lexical entries in the Arabic dictionaries (both bilingual and monolingual). Consider, for example, the (English and Italian) equivalents for *ḥadd* (pl. *ḥudūd*) provided in (1) Lane 1863-1893, s.vv. *ḥadd* and *ḥadda* (this latter sharing with the former some of its senses), (2) Wehr 1979, where two separate entries *ḥadd* are organized on the basis of different morphological behaviour and (3) VAI 1966-1973:

(1) (Lane 1863-1893)

ḥadd prevention, hinderance, impediment, withholding, restraint, debarring, inhibition, forbiddance, prohibition, interdiction [...]; a restrictive ordinance, or statute, of God, respecting things lawful and things unlawful [...] The *ḥudūd* of God are of two kinds: first, those ordinances

prescribed to men [...] the second kind, castigations, or punishments [...] the first kind are called *ḥudūd* because they denote limits which God has forbidden to transgress: the second, because they prevent one's committing again those acts for which they are appointed as punishments; bar, obstruction, partition, separation [...] between two things or between two places [...], or between two persons [...] to prevent their commixture, or confusion, or the encroachment of one upon the other; limit, boundary of a land or a territory [...]; (in Logic) definition [...]; end, extremity or utmost point [...]; the edge, or extremity of the edge, and point of anything as a sword, a knife, a spear-head or an arrow [...]; side, region, quarter or tract [...]; station, standing, rank, condition or the like [...]; case [...] class, category [...]; a quarter of the year [...]

ḥadda a man's sharpness, penetrating energy, or vigour, in the exercise of courage; his mettle; [...] his valour, or valiantness in war [...] *ḥadd* and *ḥadda* as denoting a quality of anything are syn. [both signify sharpness; vehemence; force; strength and both the force, or strength, of wine and the like [...]]

(2) (Wehr 1979)

ḥadd prevention, limitation; restriction (of the number or quantity of s.th.)
ḥadd (pl. *ḥudūd*) cutting edge (of a knife, of a sword); edge, border, brink, brim, verge; border (of a country), boundary, borderline; limit (fig.), the utmost, extremity, termination, end, terminal point, terminus; a (certain) measure, extent, or degree (attained); (*math.*) member (of an equation), term (of a fraction, of a proportion); divine ordinance, divine statute; legal punishment (*Isl. law*)

(3) (VAI 1966-1973)

ḥadd confine, frontiera, limite, termine; estremità, orlo, ciglio; misura, grado raggiunto; punta, cima aguzza; taglio, filo (di coltello, spada, ecc.); termine di un sillogismo; termine planetario (*astrol.*); membro (di un polinomio, di un'equazione, ecc.); definizione; pena stabilita dal Corano; *ḥudūdu Allāhi* i limiti, le restrizioni imposte da Dio alla libertà d'azione dell'uomo.

A comparison between these three dictionary entries highlights some differences. Some senses are recorded in only one of the dictionaries taken into consideration. Lane 1863-1893, for example, makes no mention of the notion MEASURE; both Lane 1863-1893 and Wehr 1979 lack the reference to the astronomical meaning while there is no trace of 'force' and 'vigour' in Wehr 1979 and VAI 1966-1973.

The primary sense of Ar. *ḥadd*, a word which belongs to the Semitic root ḤDD, is that of 'cutting edge', thence 'edge, limit'.¹ It enhances the notion BOUNDEDNESS and around this notion, a category of related senses has developed,² including several important technical ones.

In the Islamic literature, *ḥudūd* (pl.) has become the term to designate the restrictive ordinances of God. In a religious and juridical sense, *ḥadd* refers to the punishment for serious crimes (in particular the class of punishments that are fixed for the crimes considered to be 'crimes against the religion'). But *ḥadd* has also become a technical term in many other branches of knowledge (like philosophy, ethics, logic, mathematics, astrology, etc.). The matter is of particular relevance, but is not at issue in this paper.³

In the Medieval Muslim geography, Ar. *ḥadd* is one of the several terms with which some kind of boundary was denoted.⁴ Sometimes it was used by geographers with reference to political boundaries (generally between polities with hostile relationships), but mostly it was used with the sense of 'the end of anything' (in particular, geographical entities like countries, cities, lands, etc.). In a political sense, *ḥudūd* (pl.) mainly occurred in the description of the confines of specific regions within the Islamic realm and with it «a frontier zone enveloping a central core in the same sense as the cartographers' symbols, rather than a boundary line of demarcation defining a realm within which the power of the central government is felt uniformly» was generally meant (Brauer 1995, pp. 12-14).

The notion LIMIT conveyed by Ar. *ḥadd* favoured semantic bleaching and context generalization. Consequently, this word frequently occurs in phrasal units having a relational value, such as *li-ḥaddi* or *ila ḥaddi* 'until, till, up to, to the extent of', *ala ḥaddi* 'according to, commensurate with', *fī ḥudūd* 'within, within the framework of', etc.

Due to its strong cultural and ideological implications, Ar. *ḥadd* rapidly gained ground all over the Islamic world, and is nowadays a well integrated word in many languages of the Islamic cultural area (i.e., Persian, Turkish, Urdu, Hindi, Kashmiri, Marathi, Malay, etc.). In the target languages, borrowings from Ar. *ḥadd* generally maintained the status of polysemic words, characterizing different semantic domains and different registers (both everyday language and technical languages, with different degrees of technicality).

1 Words for 'edge' are often etymologically connected with adjectives for 'sharp' or verbs for 'cut'; for IE see Buck 1949, p. 859.

2 Cf. Bron, Cohen, Lonnet 2010, p. 834. A different view is in Zammit 2002 p. 135, where three separate roots are listed: 1) ḤDD for Qur. Ar. *ḥudūd* 'prescribed limits' (connected to Epigraphic South Arabic *ḥdd* 'to sacralise'?); 2) ḤDD, for Qur. Ar. *ḥidād* (adj. pl.) 'sharp' (and several cognates); 3) ḤDD for Qur. Ar. *ḥadīd* 'iron'.

3 For general information cf. Goichon 1971, pp. 20-22.

4 A list of these terms is in Brauer 1995, pp. 11-12 fn. 18.

2 Arabic *ḥadd* in the Iranian Languages

In Iranian, Ar. *ḥadd* penetrated very early, as is evidenced by its being recorded in Choresmian (see *ḥd* ‘Grenze; durch den Coran vorgeschriebene Strafzumessung’ in Benzing-Taraf 1983). In Persian it is recorded since the earliest phases of this language (i.e., Early New Persian); in the *Šāhnāme* it already appears naturalized (with loss of the final gemination in case of bare nouns) in accordance with the Persian phonemic structure (cf. Moïnfar 1970, p. 67).

As an illustration of the treatment of Prs. *had(d)* and its plural form *hodud* in lexicography, I quote in what follows the relevant dictionary entries⁵ from (1) Mo‘in 1992; (2) Haim 1992; (3) Lazard 1990:

(1) (Mo‘in 1992)

had(d) (1) obstruction between two things [hāyel-e miyān-e do čiz]; (2) edge of something, border, limit [kenāre-ye čizi, entehā, kerāne, marz], like that of a field [ex.: *yek ḥadd-e in mazra‘e rud ast* «one of the borders of this field is the river»]; (3) edge (of a scimitar or similar) [tizi (šamšir va mānande ān)] [...]; (4) measure [andāze] [...]; (5) (religious jurisprudence) for any crime for which there is a decreed punishment, there is a penalty which Islam has established with fixed texts, and this corporal punishment and its measure are definite, i.e., it does not have a minimum and a maximum [...]; (6) (logic) definition [...], etc.
hodud (1) measures [andāzehā] [...]; (2) directions, edges, borders [suyhā, karānehā, marzhā]; (3) customs [āyyinhā, ravešhā]

(2) (Haim 1992)

hadd, had (1) limit; (2) boundary; (3) extent, measure; (4) penance, punishment by the lash; (5) Log. term, also definition; (6) goal; (7) (Rare) bar, impediment; (8) (Rare) edge
hodud boundaries, bounds, confines, frontiers, limits; definitions, terms; rules, laws // whereabouts // neighborhood, vicinity // regions

5 For convenience, the glosses defining Persian and other Iranian words drawn from dictionaries whose exit language is Persian or Russian have been translated into English; the original gloss in transcription has been added into square brackets only when considered as relevant to the discussion or useful to avoid misunderstanding. Persian is transcribed (not transliterated), according to Lazard 1990 (with minor divergences). A tendentially phonemic transcription has been used for Balochi; for all the other Iranian languages, I have conformed with the systems used by the individual authors of the written sources from which any single expression has been extrapolated (always mentioned into brackets). In source references, the number of page is not given when the work is (or contains a section which is) alphabetically ordered. The following abbreviations have been used: Ar. = Arabic; Bal. = Balochi; Kurd. = Kurdish; Prs. = Persian; (Zor.) Yzd. = (Zoroastrian) Yazdi; (Zor.) Kerm. = (Zoroastrian) Kermāni.

(3) (Lazard 1990)

*had(d)*¹ (pl. *hodud*) limite, borne // étendue, mesure // log. définition // pl. *hodud* région, voisinage, environs

*had(d)*² anc. pénitence par le fouet; *had zadan* (*be* ou *rā*) infliger le fouet (à).

The phraseology provided in the Persian dictionaries is rich and includes many idioms of current usage. Some of these find their motivation in the idea that a *had(d)* marks the space which pertains to and characterizes any single individual, the «sphère de chacun» (cf. Desmaisons 1908, s.v.) in a concrete and figurative sense (including the sphere of authority, competence, responsibility, possibility, action, etc.): *az hadd-e xod taǰāvoz kardan* or *az had(d) (dar) gozaštan* 'to exceed (one's own) limits', *az had(d) birun budan* 'to be beyond limit', etc., all point to transgressive, blameworthy behaviours.⁶

Other common idioms are *hadd-e boluy* '(age of) puberty, full-age', *had(d) zadan* 'to administer a legal punishment to (a person) by the lash',⁷ *hadd-e aqal* 'minimum', *hadd-e aksar* 'maximum', *tā hadd-i ke, be hadd-i ke* 'to the extent that, as far as', etc.

Ar. *ḥadd* was borrowed in Persian and in other Iranian languages and dialects mainly in its original uses, though not homogeneously, or at least not consistently; it is self-explanatory, for example, that some technical senses have only found their way into target languages with a literary tradition.

Both senses 'limit/border' and 'measure, extent' have proved to be fairly stable: cf. Afghanian Prs. (*h*)*ad* 'limite' (Bau 2003), Sistāni *had* 'measure, boundary' (Afšār Sistāni 1986), Kurmanji Kurdish *ḥed* (also *ḥedd, hed*) 'border, limit, frontier, boundary (*ḥed û sed* 'obstacles and barriers'); (legal) right' (Chyet 2003), Southern Kurdish *had* 'measure; degree, rank; boundary' (Hažār 1990, p. 228, written with initial ح), *had* 'suitability, appropriateness [*hadd-e liyāqat, šāyastegi*]; boundary; measure' (Hažār 1990, p. 965, written with initial ه), Lori *had* 'measure; boundary' (Izadpanāh 2001), Balochi *hədd* 'border, limit' (see also below), Tāleši *həd* 'border; edge' (Pirejko 1976), Gilaki *hadd* 'border' (Kerimova, Memedzade, Rastorgueva 1980), Qohrudi *hadd* 'limite' (Lecoq 2002, p. 646), Waxi *ad* 'boundary, edge; measure' (Grjunberg, Steblin-Kamenskij 1976), Yaghnobi *xad* 'border, limit' (Andreev, Peščereva 1957), Pashto *hadd* 'boundary, extent, limit, extremity; impediment; definition; starting post; lashes inflicted for certain crimes, prescribed by the laws of Islam' (Raverty 1860), etc. As for Pashto, Aslanov (1966), besides *hadd* ('border; punishment for a crime'),

6 Similar expressions are found in Arabic as well as in any language having borrowed Ar. *ḥadd*.

7 Haim 1992. The typology of corporal punishment may vary; cf. *hadd zadan* 'punire con la pena del bastone' in Coletti, Grünbaum Coletti 1978.

also mentions a form *hand* (p. 977 with initial *o*) ‘measure, dimension’. Similarly, Badaxši 1960 gives *hand* ‘measure [andāze], limit [hadd]’. Pashto *hand* reminds Southern Kurdish *hind* ‘measure, quantity [andāze, meqdār]’ (Hažār 1990, initial *o*),⁸ Tonekāboni (Māzandarān) *handi* ‘measure, size, figure [andāze, qāmat, heykal]’, given as a ‘retrieved’ [bāzyāfte (mostadrek)] word in Adib Tusi 1963-1964. If these words do belong here,⁹ the intrusive *n* could be due to the interference with another Ir. lexical set connected to the notion of MEASURE (i.e., Prs. *andāze* and its Iranian cognates¹⁰).

Somewhere semantic specializations for *had(d)* have emerged and/or morphosemantically motivated words (i.e., compounds and derivatives) or specific idioms with a local diffusion have been created. Prs. *sarhadd* ‘frontier, borderline, boundary region between countries’ and *bihad(d)* ‘boundless, unlimited, excessive’ have been borrowed throughout Iranian. Limited to local diffusion are Šuštari *hedda* ‘stone walls in the course of a river’ (Fāzeli 2004), Zarqāni (Fārs) *hadgāh* ‘enclosed part of a graveyard where the members of a family are buried’ (Malekzāde 2001), Kurdish *hed* ‘race (de cheveux)’ (Jaba-Justi 1879), and the lexical set which includes Māzandarāni (Tabari) *hadārī* ‘border, boundary’ (Humand 2003), (Āmoli) *hedār* ‘straightforward [mostaqim]’ (Partavi Āmoli 1979), Semnāni *hedār* ‘boundary between two fields belonging to different landowners’ (Sotude 1963), Sangesāri *hed@r* ‘vicinity; area [Prs. barābar, jehat]’ (Azami, Windfuhr 1972), Damāvandi *hedār* ‘in the extension; on a line; border, bordered; direction’ (Timuri Far 1983).

Worth noting is also Daštstāni *had zadan* ‘to reach the age of puberty’¹¹ (Borāzjāni 2003), which contrasts with Prs. *had(d) zadan* ‘to inflict a corporal punishment’, mentioned above.

In some Iranian dialects, borrowings from Ar. *ḥadd* still preserve the sense of ‘strength’, ‘power’, as illustrated by Tajik *hadd doštan* ‘to have the power or the possibility’ (FZT), Sorani Kurdish *hed* ‘power, authority; weight’ (Kurdoev, Jusupova 1983), Ĵirofti *had kerdn* ‘to press, to push; to strengthen [mohkem kardan]’ (Dehqāni 1998) and probably Zarqāni *hend* (also *hen*) ‘strength, power [niru, tavānāyi]’ (Malekzāde 2001), in this case with an intrusive nasal.

8 On Southern Kurdish *hind* see also below.

9 In the case of Pashto *hand* and Kurdish *hind*, the difference in orthography (initial *o* vs. *o*) could point to a more advanced degree in the integration process.

10 Cf. Pahl. *handāxtan* ‘to plan, allot, reckon, judge’ and cognates, whose etymology has been a matter of debate; see lastly Cheung 2007, p. 374 s.v. **tač*².

11 Cf. Prs. *hadd-e boluy* ‘the age of puberty, full-age’, mentioned above.

3 Some Cases of Grammaticalization

In my essay on Balochi locative expressions of some years ago (Filippone 1996), I illustrated the usage in Western and (less frequently) Southern Balochi of the function word (*h*)*əddā* in connection with the category of spatial relationships which I unified under the label ‘Control of the surrounding space’ (Filippone 1996, pp. 255 ff.). As I stated there (p. 259), the locative *həddā* «refers more frequently to the area of conceptual control, i.e. the area to which one belongs. Nevertheless, it is also used to indicate the concrete physical space in which the Figure is placed». ¹² I also provided the following examples (pp. 259-260):

- (1) *fuṭbal drəxte ədda int* (Noške [Pakistan])
‘the ball is near the tree’
- (2) *kəša əmməy ədda ɪstɪmal nəbit* (Xāš [Pakistan])
‘*kəša* is not used by us’
- (3) *məy ədda məz int* (Irānšahr [Iran])
‘next to us there is the table’

Bal. (*h*)*əddā* clearly comes out from the content word *hədd*,¹³ which is ‘border, limit’ all over in Balochi, but also means ‘place’ in Western and Southern Balochi¹⁴; Brāhui *had* (‘boundary, bonds; place’, Bray 1934 s.v.) behaves in a similar way. As remarked in Barker, Mengal 1969, 1, pp. 143-144, however, (*h*)*ədd* means ‘place’ only when occurring in locative constructions;¹⁵ to illustrate the point, the authors compare «/e məni [h]ədd ynt/ This is my boundary. [I.e. the border line between my field and someone else’s.]» with «/ a məni [h]əddā nyndit./ He will sit by me» (p. 144).

There is a word in Balochi whose meaning partially overlaps with that of (*h*)*ədd* and which displays a certain phonetic similarity with the latter: this is *hənd* ‘place’. Explaining the differences in meaning between four Bal. words which can be translated in English as ‘place’, Barker and Mengal state, with regard to *hədd* and *hənd*, that «/[h]ədd/ is the more specific, denoting a place delimited by rather specific borders. /[h]ənd/ refers to a

¹² See also Barker, Mengal 1969: [*h*]əddā ‘at the place of, near, by, at, *chez*’; Collett 1986: *haddā* ‘at the home of, at the place of, by, near’; Elfenbein 1990: *haddā* ‘nearby, at the house of’.

¹³ On the morphosyntactic features of the Balochi spatial lexicon see Filippone 1996, pp. 67-83.

¹⁴ Cf. Filippone 1996, p. 332; Sayad Hashmi 2000, s.v.

¹⁵ Apparently, this is not true for Brāhui *had*; cf. *nī arā haddān-a barēsa?* ‘what place do you come from?’; *nan hamē haddaṭī kḥanān-ta* ‘we saw him at that place’ in Bray 1934, s.v. *had*.

larger, less well-defined area: a region, district, etc.» (p. 266 [32]). This assertion probably holds for the Western Balochi dialect described by the authors, where (*h*)*ənd* seems to be rarely used. In fact, it is not clear to me whether this word is to be considered as peculiar to some dialectal areas only. It is surely a basic word in Eastern Balochi, of a very high frequency and well documented in dictionaries and texts.¹⁶ It is also used in (at least) some Southern varieties, as confirmed to me by a Bal. speaker native of Turbat.¹⁷ Seemingly, in these varieties the physical dimension of the referent does not condition the usage of *hənd*, which may refer to the place where one is sitting, where one lives (one's dwelling place – home or village), where one is buried in the graveyard, to the land which one possesses, etc., with no restrictions at all (cf. Sayad Hashmi 2000, s.v.).

Nowadays, Bal. *hədd* and *hənd* are doubtless perceived as two different words; only the former seems to be able to lose referentiality and be used with relational implications, becoming one of the countless instances in all the languages of the world of a spatial grammatical marker generated by the 'place' > 'locative' process (cf. Heine, Kuteva 2002, p. 240). Strangely enough, the situation would seem to be inverted in Sayad Hashmi 2000, where *hənd* (and not *hədd*) has been accredited with the sense 'near [*gwər*, *kurr*, *nəzik*]' ; this apparent oddity, in fact, attests that lexical contamination/blending is in this case a predictable phenomenon. Different etymologies (going back to different linguistic families) have been attributed to these two Bal. words. Scholars generally consider *hənd* as a Sindhi loan-word¹⁸ and refer to Si. *handhu* 'place, abode, bed', to which Kalasha *han*, *hand* «(1) temple of the goddess Jestak; (2) (Birin dialect) house» (Trail, Cooper 1999) may be associated. However, the isolation of the Sindhi and Kalasha words may be viewed as suspect; the reconstruction of an Indo-Aryan form **handha-* by Turner (CDIAL 1966, p. 808 [no. 13970]) appears to be a rather *ad hoc* solution.

With regard to *hədd*, I wrote (Filippone 1996, p. 332) that the 'limit' → 'place' semantic extension «seems to occur solely in Balochi and Brāhui, in comparison with several Indian and Iranian languages with direct or indirect borrowing from Ar. *ḥadd* 'border'». This statement is

16 Cf. *hand* 'abode; home; house; place; seat' in Mayer 1910 s.vv. In Eastern Balochi, *hənd* also works as an element halfway between a morphological device and an autonomous lexical item to create derivate/compound words, similarly to Prs. *xāne* and *jā* (cf. *āshand* 'fireplace', *adālat hand* 'Court of Justice', *qaiz-hand* 'jail' and many others in Mayer 1910).

17 See also Sayad Hashmi 2000, s.v. This word also appears several times in the love ballad published in Elfenbein 1983, pp. 82-96 (from a MS probably written in a Coastal dialect, cf. pp. 4-5), but is missing from the final *Glossary*. I thank the anonymous reviewer who confirmed the usage of this word with the sense of 'region, district' in Southern Balochi.

18 Cf. Geiger 1890-1891, p. 450. It is uncertain whether Brāhui *hand* 'place, locality' has been borrowed from Balochi or directly from Sindhi; cf. Rossi 1979, p. 308 [I 111].

definitely wrong. I was unaware at that time that the mentioned semantic extension is in fact not so rare, and that, in some Iranian varieties spoken in South-East Iran, cognates of Bal. *hədd* also work with relational (spatial) implications.

Compare the following examples in Banāruye, Bixei and Qalāti (Lārestān), with *had[-e]* paralleling Prs. *kenār[-e]* and evoking the topological notion of PROXIMITY:¹⁹

Persian	Banāruye	Bixei	Qalāti (Evaz)
(4a) <i>čerâγ</i>	(4b) <i>čerâγ had-e</i>	(4c) <i>čerâx</i>	(4d) <i>čerâγ had-e</i>
<i>kenār-e divār</i>	<i>dovâr-e</i>	<i>haδ-e divâr-en</i>	<i>dovâr-e</i>
<i>ast</i>			

‘the lamp is near the wall’ (Salāmi 2009, p. 322; 2007, p. 312)

Persian	Banāruye
(5a) <i>baččehā kenār-e howz</i>	(5b) <i>bače-yâ had-e hōz avâz bod-</i>
<i>nešaste budand</i>	<i>et</i>

‘the children were sitting by the pond’ (Salāmi 2009, p. 368)

Rudāni *had* ‘near to [nazdik, kenār]’ (Mota‘medi 2001, p. 352), Fini *had* ‘near to [nazd, piš]’ (Naĵibi Fini 2002, p. 144); Minābi *had[-e]* ‘vicino, a fianco’ (Barbera 2004, p. 172)²⁰ are similarly deployed as function words, and show the same locative specialization.

In a handout distributed by Hamid Mahamedi on the occasion of one of the Meetings of the Middle East Studies Association,²¹ the author presented the following Koroshi sentence, with the corresponding English translation:

- (6) *hade emâmbârâ boda*
 ‘he has been with the Imams’.

19 According to Nabi Salāmi, who kindly answered to a question of mine, «*had* purely means ‘pahlu - by the side of’, ‘kenār - side’ in Banarouye‘i, Bikhe‘i and Qalati [...] *had* is merely an adverb of place in the Persian dialects and has no nominal usage» (e-mail dated 10 September 2011).

20 Cf. Min. *had-e me biey, aks begiri!* ‘venite a fianco a me per fare la foto’ (Barbera 2004, p. 172).

21 *Koroshi. The Iranian Dialect of Qashqâ‘î’s Camel-Keeper*, MESA 1986.

For this and some other Koroshi sentences I am indebted to Gernot Windfuhr, from whom I received some years ago²² a selection of examples drawn from the mentioned Mahamedi's handout. Answering to a question of mine, Gernot Windfuhr also suggested a connection of Koroshi *hade* 'with' with Lārestāni dialects *xode*, Fārs dialects/Shirāzi *xo* etc. 'id.' (on this matter see also below). However, the only other example with a 'with'-phrase (in this case, instrumental) among the Koroshi sentences kindly sent to me contains the preposition *gu*, which is the usual Bal. preposition *go/gō* 'with':

- (7) *nagana gu čiya mapačagət*
 'with what do you cook the bread?'

That to express both comitative and instrumental relation *gu/go* is the preposition commonly used in Koroshi, is confirmed by the relevant examples in Salāmi 2006, where it occurs as the counterpart of Prs. *bā*:²³

Persian	Koroshi
(8a) <i>diruz bā xānevāde</i>	(8b) <i>zi go čokk-obâr raft-en</i>
<i>be ĵangal raftim</i>	<i>ba ĵanġalâ²⁴</i>

'yesterday we went to the wood with the family'

- (9a) *barādaram Ahmad rā bā xod* (9b) *a:mad berâdâ gu vad-om*
mibordam *mabarayad-ân²⁵*

'I brought my brother Ahmad with myself'.

Since Koroshi is a Balochi dialect spoken by camel herders working for the Qashqais in several spot of Fārs and elsewhere (cf. Jahani, Nourzaei 2011, p. 63) it seems reasonable to assume that *hade* occurring in the Koroshi sentence cited above is to be analyzed as *had* ('limit, edge') plus the *ezāfe*, with the same locative function we have seen in other Balochi varieties and in some dialects of South Iran; the inversion of the syntactic sequence, usual in Koroshi, and the introduction of the *ezāfe* construction may be due to interference through contact. In fact, this is not an 'exceptional'

22 E-mail dated 30 October 2004.

23 In concomitance with Koroshi *go* 'with', one finds: Davāni, Dahlei *xođ-e* (Salāmi 2004, p. 279); Dusirāni *xođ-e* (Salāmi 2005, p. 281); Birovakāni *xođ-e* (Salāmi 2006, pp. 299 and 311); Aheli *xoy*, Qalāti *xođ-e* (Salāmi 2007, p. 325); Evazi *xođ-e*, Banāruye, Fedāyi *xođ-e*, Galedāri *xođ-e* (Salāmi 2009, p. 335), Bixei *a:re-y* (Salāmi 2009, pp. 335 and 347).

24 Salāmi 2006, p. 299 [31].

25 Salāmi 2006, p. 311 [56].

construction in Koroshi, as evidenced by the phrases *rū-ye ordā* 'at the camp', *sar-e šeyā* 'at the slope', etc. occurring in a Koroshi folktale published in Jahani, Nourzaei (2011, pp. 65 and 67). If this suggestion is correct, Koroshi (6) *hade emâmbârâ boda* may be intended as 'he has been with the Imams' only in the sense that 'he has been *chez/by* the Imams', or in a similar way.²⁶

In his Dictionary of Zoroastrian Yazdi, Kešavarz (1993, p. 121) introduces the word *had* 'side, direction [taraf]' with relevant phraseology (*o hadæ* 'that side', *kom hadi* 'which side'). It is not clear whether he considers the subsequent entry, *hadi* 'to [be]' – for which the variants (dial. of Šarif Ābād) *xoy* and (dial. of Xoramšāh, Ahrestān and Bāy-e Golestān) *hāre* are also given in brackets²⁷ – as having to do with the already mentioned *had* 'side': i.e., an originally content word which would have acquired a new function through a grammaticalization process. This seems to be the opinion of David Lorimer as far as Zoroastrian Kermāni/Yazdi *had i* is concerned. In his *Notes on the Gabri Dialect of Modern Persian* (Lorimer 1916), intended as a critical comment on the Central Dialect material contained in the *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, he mentions *had-i* 'towards', equivalent to Prs. (*be*) *taraf-e*, among the «nouns which are followed by the *izāfa* and have a preposition expressed or understood before them» (p. 481); therefore, in that same paragraph, entitled *Indeclinabilia*, he keeps it separated from «*χadō* occasionally *χadī* = with, along with (association, instrument, means)», which is given in a list of 'Independent Prepositions' (p. 479). The problem, however, is far from being solved.

In Zor. Yazdi and Kermāni, 'with'-relations are expressed by means of a preposition which occurs in several variants, some of which dialectally marked. The same preposition is commonly used to express directionality in the case of verbs of saying (i.e., it introduces the person to which something is said). According to the different describers, we find the following variants:

Gabri *xad*, *xado*, *xadū*, *ado*, *adū*, *adu*, etc. (Ivanow 1936-1939, p. 96)²⁸

Zor. Yzd. *ado*, *xadi*; Zor. Kerm. *xodi*; Zor. Yzd. / Kerm. *âr* (Sorušian 1956)

Zor. Yzd. (*h*)*ado*, *hadi*, *hade* [urban variants]; *xodo*, *xodi*, *xode*, *xadi*; *hāre* [rustic variants] (Mazdāpur 1995, s.v. *bā*)

26 Many thanks go to the anonymous reviewer of this paper who provided the following additional examples: (1) *arra hade ya cōbānēyā* 'he goes to a shepherd'; (2) *korraga akay hadī* 'the foal comes to him'.

27 Note that in the texts published at the end of the volume (*baxš-e sevvom*) only the form *hāre* is attested.

28 Note that in the texts published, *a*°-forms only occur in Yazdi, *x*°-forms prevalently in Kermāni.

Zor. Yzd. *xadō*, *xad/t*, *xadū*, *adō*, *adū* (Vahman, Asatrian 2002, p. 26 in a paragraph in which «interesting archaic units» are commented on)

Kerm. *xod* (Sotude 1957, etc.)

Cognates of Yzd. (*h*)*ado*, *hadi*, *xadi*, *har*²⁹ etc. are well attested in several Central dialects (without characterizing any specific sub-group in particular); cf., e.g., Xunsāri *χud*, *χo*, *χō^u* (Eilers 1976, p. 59), Gazi *χōu*, *χō*, Esfahāni *χod* (Eilers 1979, 2, p. 697), Farizandi, Yarani *χāj*, Zefrei, Sedehi, etc. *hō*, *hū*, *how*, Kešei *how* (Christensen 1930, pp. 194, 238), Bizovoi *xodō*, Abyānei, Anāraki *xoy*, Ardestāni *xow*, Nāini *xo*, *xoy*, Qohrudi *xod*, Tāri, Varzenei *xo* (Lecoq 2002), Arāni/Bidgoli *xoj* ('Alījānzāde 1993), Bardesiri *xod* (Barumand Sa'īd 1991). But we also find them in the 'Persic' area of South and South-East Iran [cf. Davāni *xoδ* (Salāmi 2002), Dašttestāni *xode* (Borāzjāni 2003), Lāri *xod(-e)* (Kamioka, Yamada 1979, nn. 413, 415, 498)]³⁰ and in Eastern Persian dialects [cf. Xorasāni *xedey* (Šālči 1991), Birjāndi *xod* (Rezāi 1994), Qāini *xod*, *xodeyi* (Zomorrodīān 1989), Sistāni *xe* (Mohammadi Xomak 2000) and probably also Hazaragi *xon*, *xō* (Dulling 1973)]³¹.

In the light of what has been said above, one hesitates to attribute to Yazdi a function word *hadi* 'towards' (from < *had* 'direction'), distinct from *hadi*, *hado* etc. 'with'. Introducing the example *hadi un veva* 'tell him [be u begul]' s.v. *hadi* 'towards', Kešāvarz (1993) might have been conditioned by its Persian equivalent in this particular context: as already mentioned, a

29 Consider here also Bixei *a:re* above in fn. 26.

30 For other instances in Lārestāni and Fārs dialects, see also above, fn. 26.

31 The etymology of this set of cognate function words is questionable. Many scholars refer to OIr. **hadā/ā* (OP *hadā*, Av. *haða*, Man. Parthian 'd, Oss. *æd*, etc.); see Ivanow 1936-1939, p. 96, Rezāi 1994, p. 192, Monchi-Zadeh 1990 no. 576, Vahman, Asatrian 2002, p. 26. Personally, I am more inclined to support the tentative suggestion by Eilers (1976, p. 59), who thinks to a possible connection with the reflexive pronoun («Ist das *χ^vad-i?*»). To a special usage of *xod* also points Mohammadi Xomak 2000, p. 179. Evidence for the latter hypothesis may be the phonetical correspondence of the 'with'-forms with the 'self'-forms peculiar to each dialect, the frequent presence of *ezāfe* constructions and, even more, the usage in Sarawāni Balochi (Baranzehi 2003, p. 85: *wate gaḏḏagān* 'with the seeds') and probably in some other (unspecified) Iranian Bal. dialect (Ayyubi 2002, p. 104: *wæt əhməda* 'with Ahmad') of a form *wæt* heading 'with'-phrases, hardly to be separated from Bal. *wæt* 'self'. It could be reasonable to consider this very peculiar usage of *wæt* as an instance of a linguistic calque ('self' → 'with') due to the influence of the languages in contact, i.e. Larestāni and Sistāni dialects. Admittedly, this path cannot be included in a list of regular paths of grammaticalization with reflexive as a source (in Persian, e.g., *xod* is used as 'self'-intensifier, reflexive anaphora and focus particle since Early New Persian onwards [cf. Lazard 1963, pp. 446-449], according to universal patterns of grammaticalization), and I am not able to mention at the moment any other language where a 'with'-form has derived from a 'self'-form.

'with'-phrase with *hadi*, *hado* etc. is the most common strategy with verbs of saying in Yazdi and other languages.³² Whatever the situation in Yazdi, the usage in some Iranian varieties of *had(d)* as a function word conveying the notion DIRECTIONALITY is considered by some Iranian scholars as a well-known phenomenon and we may take it for granted.³³

I would analyse in this connection also Zazaki *het* 'Seite' (Paul 1998), which works as a secondary adposition (preposition *hetē* 'zu... hin' [p. 105], postposition *het(i)* 'zu... (hin) (meist nach belebten Nomina)' [p. 109]). The usage of this item (*het* 'Seite, Richtung, Region') as a function word («Ezafekonstruktion») has been suggested by Keskin (2008, p. 50 and fn. 79) as a major linguistic trait relevant to the dialectological classification of Zazaki. According to him, it characterizes the Central and Southern dialects, though «ist aber auch in Bingöl-Adaklı (Karêr) gängig, z.B. šona hetē amika xo „sie geht zu ihrer Tante“».

As a function word, Zazaki *het* conveys locative implications which may include or not the notion DIRECTIONALITY;³⁴ see the following sentences which display a strong similarity in usage of Zazaki *het* with Bal. [*h*]ədd etc., seen above:³⁵

(10) *bē mā het* (dial. of. Eğil)
'komm zu uns' (Paul 1998, p. 234)

(11) *o yo to hetî*
'he is with you' (Paul 2009, p. 568).

32 Note, however, that even in Persian the second argument of a verb of saying may be expressed with a 'with'-phrase (i.e., it may be introduced by the preposition *bā*).

33 In reply to a question of mine, Hasan Rezāi Bāghbidi wrote to me what follows: «I can add that the Arabic word '*hadd*' plus the Persian *ezafe* particle *-e* functions as a preposition in some Iranian dialects, thus *had(d)-e* means 'in the direction of, to the direction of, towards, etc.'» (e-mail dated 8 May 2011).

34 In fact, this is only true for the secondary postposition *het(i)*. As far as I know, a phrase headed by the secondary preposition *hetē* always points to the goal of a motion. An analogous behaviour could be that of (Marv) Balochi *demî* (prep.) 'towards' vs. *dema* (postp.) 'in front of; towards'; cf. Filippone 1996, pp. 81-82, 163-164. In the Siwerek Zaza Glossary (Hadank 1932, p. 158), «*hāt* [Postpos.] zu, nach» is distinguished from «*hāti* [Postpos.] mit, bei», the latter referred to Oss. *æd* 'with'. However, this differentiation does not find a confirmation in the description of the Siwerek dialect which precedes the Glossary; cf. Hadank 1932, p. 81. Highlighting the strong influence exerted by Armenian on Zazaki, Garnik Asatrian (e-mail dated 6 September 2012) points out the fact that Zaz. *het(i)* «at least when it expresses the notion of instrumentality, may probably be from Arm. *het* 'with' (< IE *ped-?)».

35 Interestingly, Todd (1985, p. 120) finds it difficult to give an English equivalent for the 'postposition' *hət* («Fr. 'chez', Ger. 'bei'»).

In the Kurdish–Persian dictionary compiled by Hažār (1990), which mainly collects Southern Kurdish material, one finds the form *hat* ‘near [piš, nazd]’. Āmorei *hat* ‘side, direction [samt, jehat, su]’ (‘Ādelxāni 2000) likely belongs here. To explain these words as naturalized forms of a (direct or indirect) borrowing from Ar. *ḥadd*, one has to account for the loss of sonority ($d > t$). As for Zazaki, I can only mention *kāyid/t* ‘paper’, *kilīt* ‘key’ and a few other words. Desonorization of word-final *d*, however, is a fairly frequent phenomenon in Southern Kurdish dialects and has already been described by Fattah (2000, pp. 141-142).

Probably, here also belongs *han* ‘side, direction’ attested in the Lori dialect of Bālā Garive (Amanolahi, Thackston 1986): one has to assume $d(d) > nd$ (dissimilated with unetymological *n*) $> n$, an expected development in this dialect, where /d/ is regularly deleted when occurring in the sequence /nd/ (p. 198). At this point, one could also fall into the temptation of expanding the dossier with Kurdish (Kurmanji) *hind* ‘side, direction’; *hinda* ‘2) prep. around, beside, by, near; to’; *henda* ‘1) side, direction; 2) prep. around, beside, by, near; to’ (Kurdoev 1960); (Southern Kurdish) *hind* ‘measure [andāze, meqdār]; side, direction [taraf, su]; near, beside [nazd, piš]’ (Hažār 1990), etc. However, here the situation might be different. To explain Kurd. *hind(a)*, scholars generally refer to Ar. ‘*inda* (‘at, near, by, etc.’³⁶),³⁷ and in fact the similarity of meaning and functions makes it difficult to dismiss this connection definitively. One should note, however, that, by rule, Arabic words starting with the pharyngeal fricative/approximant, when borrowed into Kurdish, do not change their initial consonant into a voiceless glottal or pharyngeal fricative.³⁸ Though, as noted by MacKenzie (1961, p. 23), in Kurdish loanwords from Arabic «there is a considerable confusion between *h* and ‘», this confusion mainly affects the inner or final part of the word. Exceptions may be found: Cabolov (1976, p. 66), e.g. quotes Kurd. *hamd* ‘will’ (< Ar. ‘*amd* ‘intention’) and *habas* ‘in vain’ (< Ar. ‘*abat*^{an}’) as instances of Ar. ‘ $>$ Kurd. *h* («v načale i v seredine slova»); these two words, however, are variant forms of ‘*amd* and ‘*abas* (see also Cabolov 2001, s.vv.). In conclusion, for

36 Cf. Jaba-Justi 1879, p. 452 (s.v. *hinda* ‘à, vers’), Chyet 2003, p. 258 (s.v. *hinda* ‘prep. near, by, at the house of, over s.o.’s house [Fr. *chez*]’), Cabolov 2001, p. 420 (s.v. *handā, hind, hindā*). This latter in particular explains the nominal forms *hand, hind* ‘side, direction’ as secondary constructions from *handā*.

37 Cf. Lane 1863-1893, s.v. ‘*ind*: «app. as meaning The vicinage or the quarter, tract, region, or place of a person or thing [...] used in the manner of a prep., though properly a prefixed noun [...] it signifies at, near, nigh, near by, or close by, a place, or thing; with, present with, or in the presence of a person, or persons, or a thing or things; at the abode of a person; at the place of, or in the region of, a thing [...]».

38 Cf., e.g., from Chyet 2003: ‘*adet* ‘custom’ (< Ar. ‘*ādat*), ‘*evd* ‘slave’ (< Ar. ‘*abd*), ‘*ehd* ‘promise’ (< Ar. *ahd*), ‘*elamet* ‘report’ (< Ar. ‘*alāmat*), ‘*emal* ‘work’ (< Ar. ‘*amal*), ‘*ilm, ulm* ‘science’ (< Ar. ‘*ilm*), ‘*eşq* ‘love’ (< Ar. ‘*işq*), etc.

Kurd. *hind(a)*, one cannot exclude some kind of contamination between etymologically unrelated forms.³⁹

As for Prs. *had(d)*, the conceptual association 'limit' → 'side/direction' favoured the acquisition of new senses, though in this case it is the plural form *hodud* which has mainly been affected, as attested in the dictionary entries listed above.⁴⁰ Persian *hodud* may lose its referential value and be used with locative relational implications, in particular in the phrasal expression *dar hodud[-e]* 'about, in the neighbourhood of, in the whereabouts of'.

In his Preface to the English edition of Barthold's Russian translation of the *Hodud al-Ālam*, the famous geographical work dating back to the fourth/tenth century, Vladimir Minorsky motivated the English title *The Regions of the World* with the following words: «The word *ḥudūd* (properly 'boundaries') in our case evidently refers to the 'regions with definite boundaries' into which the world is divided in the H.-Ā., the author indicating with special care the frontiers of each one of these areas», adding: «As I use the word 'region' mostly for *nāḥiyat* it would have been better, perhaps, to translate *Ḥudūd al-Ālam* as "The limited areas of the World"» (Minorski 1937, p. vii fn. 2). He also refers to Barthold's statement on the matter, which one can read in *V.V. Barthold's Preface* (p. 30): «The word *ḥudūd* in Arabic geographical literature means not so much 'frontiers', in the sense of frontier-line, as 'limits' in the sense of *the total extent of a territory* [my italic]» (see also Minorsky 1955, p. 256). The cognitive association 'limit → (delimited) place' can be traced back to the contiguity relationship between these two concepts, and does not differ from that which produced Lat. *fīnēs* 'territory, land, country enclosed within boundaries' from (sing.) *fīnis* 'boundary, limit, border'.

A similar usage of this word is found in some dialects of Iran. In one of the tales in the Lori dialect of Bālā Garive published in Amanolahi, Thackston 1986 one can read (p. 136):

(12) *ma baram-at tâ hudûd ʔ giya.*

Exactly the same sequence occurs in the same page, nine lines below; unfairly, the two *hudûd* receive different treatments by the translators (p. 37):

(12a) I will take you to the border of the [first] brother

(12b) I will take you to my brother's territory.

³⁹ G. Asatrian (see fn. 39 above) rejects an Arabic origin for Kurd. *hind(a/ā)*, [«- from **ima-da-?*»] and suggests considering *ha/ind-* forms as «enlarged variants [...] with *han/m*» of *d*-particles, as *da/i* in Kurdish, *de/a* in Central dialects, etc. (according to him, auxiliary words with no historical background), «contaminated further [...] with foreign forms».

⁴⁰ See however also *hadd* 'side, direction [jāneb, suy, taraf]' in Ānandarāĵ and other references in Dehxodā s.v.

That no idea of 'border' is implied in both passages is beyond question. In some Eastern varieties of Persian, however, borrowings from Ar. *ḥadd* may convey the sense of 'place', 'region', etc. even in the singular form. In dialectal Tajik, e.g., besides *had* 'border' (*ad* in Badaxšāni, cf. *adi zamin* 'border of a field'), we find Karategin *həd* '(upper or lower) part of a village', *hədi bolo* 'upper part of a village', *hədi poyon* 'lower part of a village' (Rozenfel'd 1982). To it one may add Herati *adə/ade/ede* 'side; stretch of road' (Ioannesjan 1999, p. 101) and Sistāni *add* 'whereabouts, location [hadd-o-hodud]' (Mohammadi Xomak 2000). Possibly, to an Eastern dialectal feature also points the presence of *hadd* in the following sentence from the *Tarjome-ye Tafsir-e Tabari* III 125 b (quoted according to Lazard 1963, pp. 447-448):

- (13) *az ḥadd i man bērūn šau ki xudāy i tu har kuḡā ki šavē tu rā xʷad
nigāh darād*
'sors de mon territoire, car ton Dieu te protège où que tu ailles'.

The semantic extensions of the Iranian borrowings from Ar. *ḥadd* we have seen above are not completely extraneous to the original Arabic word (cf. above 'side, region, quarter or tract' in Lane 1863-1893). Even the grammaticalization processes traced in some Iranian varieties are already attested in Arabic, at least in some of its local varieties. Apart from the fact that in different dialectal areas Ar. *ḥadd*, preceded by a preposition (*li*, 'ilā), is used to express a temporal or spatial end point, as in (Jerusalem) *la-ḥadd il-'ēn* (Procházka 1993, p. 226) 'up to the spring', (Gulf region) *miša 'ila ḥadd l-kubri* 'he walked as far as the bridge' (Qafisheh 1997, s.v.), particularly worth noting is that in the Arabic varieties of Lebanon, Palestine and the region of Maṣyāf, it has become «die übliche Präposition für die Angabe eines lokalen Nebeinenderer» (Procházka 1993, p. 225). Here *ḥadd* presents striking similarities in function with Bal. *hədda*, Minābi *had[-e]*, etc.; cf. Ar. *ḥadd əl-ḥayṭ* 'near the wall', (Jerusalem) *ḥadd el-bāb* 'near the door', (Lebanon) *t'a q'od ḥadd manne* 'come and seat by me', etc. (Procházka 1993, pp. 225-226). However, I am not in a position to say whether we are facing here with independent developments, or with a phenomenon first originated in one of the Arabic dialects.

4 Final Remarks

The analysis of the data presented above may lead to various considerations, which however is not my intention to expand. The first is the more general question about the possible multiple transfer channels in a borrowing process: if one believes that Bal. *hədda*, Minābi *had[-e]*, etc. are somehow connected to (Palestinian, Lebanese etc.) Ar. *ḥadd* 'near', one

should emphasize the fact that both Literary Arabic and Literary Persian (mostly considered as the vehicle for Ar. borrowings into other Iranian languages) are not involved, and the interested areas are not in a contact situation. The second consideration concerns the possible effects of borrowing in the target language lexicon, and the impacts a new entry may produce on native words. From this perspective, I wonder if inner factors may also have contributed to determine the status of *had(d)* in Iranian, as depicted in this paper.

The Old Persian word *hadiš-*, occurring several times in the Achaemenid inscriptions, always in passages where the King ascribes to himself (or even to his own father, in the case of Xerxes) the construction of a *hadiš*, is traditionally translated ‘palace’, but probably is to be intended as ‘seat, dwelling place, abode’. The standard reference is to Avestan *hadiš-*, which is the name of the Household God, and Sanskrit *sádas-* ‘seat, abode, home’.⁴¹ Apparently, Old Persian *hadiš-* disappeared, without leaving traces in Middle Iranian (at least, judging from the available documentation), but if we look for cognates in modern times, Zor. Yazdi *hedeš* ‘summer quarter [mahalle tābestāni, yilāq]’ (Sorušiān 1956) seems to be a good candidate. According to Afšār 1990, *Hedeš* is the ancient name of one of the famous summer quarters of Yazd, nowadays commonly called *Deh-e bālā*; this ancient toponym is still used in contracts and by old people in conversation.⁴²

My tentative suggestion is to take into consideration an alternative hypothesis to that of the mere extinction of the lexical set of Old Prs. *hadiš-* and its possible cognates in other Iranian languages, and to assume a sort of sound-induced blending of foreign and native words, whose semantic range happened to overlap partially, with the latter got entangled up in the former, but still responsible for some particular semantic developments. This is however a pure conjecture, which, by the very nature of the surmised phenomenon and lack of evidence, is doomed to remain such.

41 Cf. lastly Schmitt 2014 s.v. On more details and bibliographical references on *hadiš-*, I refer to the relevant voice in Glossary in Basello, Giovinazzo, Filipponi, Rossi (forthcoming).

42 Garnik Asatrian (see fn. 39 above) has brought to my attention other possible New Iranic outcomes of Old Iranian **had-*, which he quotes under the entry غوشاد [yōšād] ‘a ni ght-fold for cattle; a halting place for caravans’ in the draft of his etymological Persian dictionary (in preparation). In particular, apart from *yōšād* itself (< **gau-šāda-* ‘cowshed, cow-place’, the second element from Old Iranian **had-*), he also mentions Abyānei *hās* and Bizovoi *xas* ‘sheep-fold; stable’ (< **hasta-*, cf. Avestan *pasuš-hasta-*, Pahlavi *pahast* ‘sheep-fold’).

Acknowledgements

Since I have decided to write the present paper, and even before, when I have started to collect material on the topic, several people have been approached by me with questions on single points and kindly contributed in different ways (giving information, suggestions, bibliographical references, reading the draft, etc.). They are (in alphabetical order): Garnik Asatrian, Riccardo Contini, Matteo De Chiara, Mansoor Farahpoor, Angelo Piemontese, Hassan Rezāi Bāghbidi, Adriano V. Rossi, Badal Khan Sabir, Nabi Salāmi, Gernot Windfuhr. To all of them, a friendly, heartfelt 'thanks'.

Bibliography

- Ādelxāni, Hasan (2000). *Farhange Āmorei (vāženāme, farhang-e emsāl va kenāyāt va..)*. *Jeld-e avval*. Arāk: Payām-e digar, 1379.
- Adib Tusi, Mohammad Amin (1963-1964). «Farhang-e loyāt-e bāzyāfte (mostadarak)». *Našrie-ye dāneškade-ye adabiāt-e Tabriz*, 15 (3-4) (1342/1963); 16 (1-3) (1343/1964).
- Afšār, Iraǰ (1990). *Vāženāme-ye yazdi*. Tanzim va āvānevisi az Mohammad Rezā Mohammadi. Tehrān: s.n., 1369.
- Afšār Sistāni, Iraǰ (1986). *Vāženāme-ye sistāni*. Tehrān: Bonyād-e Neyšābur, 1365.
- ‘Alijānzāde, Hossein (1993). *Zabān-e Kavir. Ketāb-e avval: Tahqiq dar zabān-e Ārān va Bidgol*. N.p.: Mo‘allef, 1372.
- Amanolahi, Sekandar; Thackston, Wheeler M. (1986). *Tales from Luristan (Matalyā Lurissu)*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Andreev, Mixail S.; Peščereva, Elena M. (1957). *Jagnobskie teksty*. Moskva; Leningrad: Izd. Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Aslanov, Martiros G. (1966). *Afgansko-russkij slovar’ (puštu): 50000 slov. Pod red. N.A. Dvorjankova*. Moskva: Izdat. Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija.
- Ayyubi, Ayyub (2002). *Dastur-e zabān-e fārsi be baluči*. Irānšahr: Asātir, 1381.
- Azami, Cheragh Ali; Windfuhr, Gernot L. (1972). *A Dictionary of Sangesari with a Grammatical Outline*. Tehran; Šerkat-e Sahāmi-e Ketabhā-ye Jibi.
- Badaxši, Š. [= Šāh ‘Abdullāh] (1960). *Də Afyānistān də cīno žəbo o lahjo qāmus - Dictionary of Some Languages and Dialects of Afghanistan*. Kābul: Pašto Țolana, 1339.
- Baranzehi, Adam N. (2003). «The Sarawani dialect of Balochi and Persian influence on it». In: Jahani, Carina; Korn, Agnes (eds.), *The Baloch and their Neighbours: Ethnic and Linguistic Contact in Balochistan in Historical and Modern Times*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, pp. 75-111.
- Barbera, Gerardo (2004). *Lingua e cultura a Mināb (Iran sud-orientale). Profilo grammaticale, testi e vocabolario* [doctoral dissertation]. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli «L’Orientale».

- Barker, Muhammad Abd-al Rahman; Mengal, Aqil Khan (1969). *A Course in Baluchi*. 2 vols. Montreal: Institute of Islamic Studies McGill University.
- Barumand Sa'īd, Javād (1991). *Vāženāme-ye guyeš-e Bardesir*. Tehrān: Markaz-e Kermānšenāsi, 1370.
- Basello, Gian Pietro; Filippone, Ela; Giovinazzo, Grazia; Rossi, Adriano V. (forthcoming). «XPc». In: Basello, Gian Pietro; Filippone, Ela; Giovinazzo, Grazia; Rossi, Adriano V., *DARIOSH Studies I: The Achaemenid Royal Inscriptions in an Intertextual Perspective*. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli «L'Orientale», pp. 1-98.
- Bau, Pierre (2003). *Dictionnaire persan-français / français-persan*. Paris: La Maison du dictionnaire.
- Benzing-Taraf (1983). Benzing, Johannes. *Chwaresmischer Wortindex, mit einer Einleitung von H. Humbach herausgegeben von Zahra Taraf*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Borāzjāni, Tayyeb (2003). *Seyr-i dar guyeš-e Dašttestān*. Širāz: Rāhgošā, 1382.
- Brauer, Ralph W. (1995). *Boundaries and Frontiers in Medieval Muslim Geography*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Bray, Denis (1934). *The Brāhūī language, part 2, The Brāhūī problem; part 3, Etymological vocabulary*. Delhi: Manager of Publications. Repr. 1978.
- Bron, François; Cohen, David; Lonnet, Antoine (2010). *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitique*. Vol. 2, Fasc. 9 (H). Leuven: Peeters.
- Buck, Carl Darling (1949). *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages: A Contribution to the History of the Ideas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Repr. 1988.
- Cabолоv, Ruslan L. (1986). *Očerk istoričeskoj fonetiki kurdsogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Cabолоv, Ruslan L. (2001). *Ètimologičeskij slovar' kurdsogo jazyka*. Tom 1. Moskva: Izd. firma Vostočnaja literatura RAN.
- CDIAL (1996). Turner, Ralph L. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cheung, Johnny (2007). *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Christensen, Arthur (1930). *Contributions à la dialectologie iranienne: Dialecte guilākī de Recht, dialectes de Fārīzānd, de Yaran et de Natanz: Avec un supplément contenant quelques textes dans le persan vulgaire de Téhéran*. København.
- Chyet, Michael L. (2003). *Kurdish-english Dictionary / Ferhenga Kurmançî-Inglîzî*. Yale: Yale University Press.

- Coletti, Alessandro; Grünbaum Coletti, Hanne (1978). *Dizionario persiano/italiano classico-moderno-familiare*. Roma: Centro Culturale Italo-Iraniano.
- Collett, N.A. (1986). *A Grammar, Phrase Book and Vocabulary of Baluchi (as Spoken in the Sultanate of Oman)*. 2nd ed. Abingdon: Burgess & Son.
- Dehqāni, Eslām N. (1998). *Barresi-ye guyeš-e Ĵiroft va Kahnuĵ*. Kermān: Markaz-e Kermānšenāsi, 1377.
- Dehxodā, A.A. (1946-1981). *Loyatnāme*. Tehrān 1325-1360.
- Desmaisons, Jean Jacques Pierre (1908). *Dictionnaire persan-français par le Baron Jean Jacques Pierre Desmaisons, publié par ses neveux*, vol. 1. Roma.
- Dulling, Gurth Kenton (1973). *The Hazaragi Dialect of Afghan Persian: a Preliminary Study*. London: Central Asian Research Centre.
- Eilers, Wilhelm (1976). *Die Mundart von Chunsar. [...] Unter Mitarbeit von Ulrich Schapka*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Eilers, Wilhelm (1979). *Die Mundart von Gāz. [...] Unter Mitarbeit von Ulrich Schapka*. 2 Bd. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Elfenbein, Josef (1983). «A Baluchi Miscellanea of Erotica and Poetry: Codex Oriental Additional 24048 of the British Library». *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli*, 43 (2), Suppl. 35.
- Elfenbein, Josef (1990). *An Anthology of Classical and Modern Balochi Literature*, vol. 2, *Glossary*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Fattah, Ismail K. (2000). *Les dialectes kurdes méridionaux: Étude linguistique et dialectologique*. Lovanii: Peeters. Acta Iranica 37.
- Fāzeli, Mohammad Taĳi T. (2004). *Farhang-e guyeš-e šuštari: Rišešenāsi va moqāyese bā fārsi va guyešhā-ye irāni: Zarb-ol-masalhā, nemunehā, vāženāme*. Tehrān: Pāzine, 1383.
- Filippone, Ela (1996). *Spatial Models and Locative Expressions in Baluchi*. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- FZT (1969). Šukurov, Muhammadjon Š.; Kapranov, Vladimir A.; Hošim, Rahim; Ma'sumī Nosirjon. *Farhang-i zabon-i toĳiki*. 2 vols. Moskva: Našrijoti «Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija».
- Geiger, Wilhelm (1890-1891). «Lautlehre des Balūčī». *Abhandlungen der I. Classe der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 19 (2), pp. 397-464.
- Goichon, Amelie-Marie (1971). «Ĥadd». In: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. New edition, vol. 3 (H-Iram). Leiden; London: Brill.
- Grjunberg, Aleksandr L.; Steblin-Kamenskij, Ivan M. (1976). *Jazyki vostočnogo Gindukuša: Vaxanskij jazyk: Teksty, slovar', grammatičeskij očerk*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Hadank, Karl (1932). *Mundarten der Zāzā, hauptsächlich aus Siwerek and Kor*. Berlin: Verlag der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: in Kommission bei W. de Gruyter. Kurdisch-persische Forschungen Abt. 3, Nordwestiranisch 4.

- Haim, S. (1992). *Farhang-e bozorg-e fārsi-englisi*. Tehrān: Farhang-e mo'āser, 1371.
- Hažār (1990). *Farhang-e kordi-fārsi*. Tehrān: Soruš, 1369.
- Heine, Bernd; Kuteva, Tania (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Humand, Nasrollāh (2003). *Pažuheš-i dar zabān-e tabari (māzandarāni)*. Āmol: Entešārāt-e tāleb-e āmoli, 1382.
- Ioannesjan, Jurij A. (1999). *Geratskij dialekt jazyka dari sovremennogo Afganistana*. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura RAN.
- Ivanow, Wladimir (1936-1939). «The Gabri Dialect Spoken by the Zoroastrian of Persia». Parts 1-2 [pp. 1-67]; part 3 «Specimens of the Gabri Dialect» [pp. 68-106]; part 4 «Gabri Vocabulary» [pp. 107-164]. *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 16-18, pp. 31-97; pp. 1-39; pp. 1-58.
- Izadpanāh, Hamid (2001). *Farhang-e lori*. Tehrān: Asātir, 1380. 1st ed. 1343/1964.
- Jaba-Justi (1879). Jaba, Auguste. *Dictionnaire kurde-français, publié [...] par [...] Ferdinand Justi*. St.-Pétersbourg: Commissionnaire de l'Académie impériale des sciences.
- Jahani Carina; Nourzaei, Maryam (2011). «A Folktale in Koroshi Dedicated to Joy Edelman». In: *Leksika, ètimologija, jazykovye kontakty* [= Festschrift Edel'man]. Moskva: Akademija Nauk, pp. 62-70.
- Kamioka, Koji; Yamada, Minoru (1979). *Lārestāni Studies 1: Lāri Basic Vocabulary*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages of Asia and Africa.
- Kerimova, Aza Alimovna; Mamedzade, Achmed Kerimovič; Rastorgueva Vera Sergeevna (1980). *Gilyansko-Russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Keskin, Mesut (2008). *Zur dialektalen Gliederung des Zazaki* [MA thesis]. Frankfurt.
- Kešāvarz, Keyxosrow (1993). *Farhang-e zartoštiān-e ostān-e Yazd*. Baxš 2-3. Eskilstuna: s.n.
- Kurdoev, Kanat K. (1960). *Kurdsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej.
- Kurdoev, Kanat K.; Jusupova, Zara A. (1983). *Kurdsko-russkij slovar' (Sorani)*. Moskva: Russkij Jazyk.
- Lane, Edward W. (1863-1893). *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, vols. 1-8. London: Williams and Norgate. Repr. Beirut 1968.
- Lazard, Gilbert (1963). *La langue des plus anciens monuments de la prose persane*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Lazard, Gilbert (1990). *Dictionnaire persan-français, par [...], avec l'assistance de Mehdi Ghavam-Nejad*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lecoq, Pierre (2002). *Recherches sur les dialectes kermaniens (Iran central): Grammaire, textes, traductions et glossaires*. Leuven: Peeters. Acta Iranica 39.
- Lorimer, David L.R. (1916). «Notes on the Gabri Dialect of Modern Persian». *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 423-489.

- MacKenzie, David Neil (1961). *Kurdish Dialect Studies - I*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Malekzāde, Mohammad Ja'far (2001). *Farhang-e Zarqān: Vāženāme-ye lahje-ye fārsi-ye mardom-e Zarqān-e Fārs*. 2nd ed. Tehrān: Farhangestān-e zabān-o-adab-e fārsi, 1380.
- Mayer, Thomas John Lee (1910). *English-Biluchi Dictionary*. Lahore: Sheikh Mubarak Ali.
- Mazdāpur, Katāyun (1995). *Vāženāme-ye guyeš-e Behdinān-e šahr-e Yazd: Fārsi be guyeš bā mesāl: Jeld-e avval (ā-p)*. Tehrān: Pažuhešgāh-e 'olum-e ensāni va motāle'āt-e farhangī, 1374.
- Minorsky, Vladimir (1955). «Addenda to the *Ḥudūd al-Ālam*». *BSOAS*, 17, pp. 250-270.
- Minorsky, Vladimir (1937). *Ḥudūd al-Ālam «The Regions of the World»: A Persian Geography 372 A.H.-982 A.D.* Translated and explained by V. Minorsky with the Preface of V.V. Barthold. London: London: Luzac & Company.
- Mohammadi Xomak, Javād (Sakāi-e Sistāni) (2000). *Vāženāme-ye sakzi (Farhang-e loyāt-e sistāni)*. Tehrān: Soruš, 1379.
- Mo'in, Mohammad (1992). *Farhang-e fārsi (motavasset)*. 6 vols. 8th ed. Tehrān: Mo'assese-ye entešārāt-e Amir Kabir, 1371.
- Moīnfar, Mohammad Dj. (1970). *Le vocabulaire arabe dans le Livre de Rois de Firdausī: Etude philologique et de statistique linguistique*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Monchi-Zadeh, Davoud (1990). *Wörter aus Xurāsān und ihre Herkunft*. Leiden: Brill. Acta Iranica 29.
- Mota'medi, 'Abdolhādi (2001). *Rudān, behešt-e jonub*. Bandar 'Abbās: Našr-e čičiKā, 1380.
- Nājibi Fini, Behjat (2002). *Barresi-e guyeš-e fini*. Tehrān: Farhangestān-e zabān-o-adab-e fārsi, 1381.
- Partavi Āmoli, Mehdi (1979). *Farhang-e 'avām-e Āmol*. Tehrān: Markaz-e mardomšenāsi-e Irān, 1358.
- Paul, Ludwig (1998). *Zazaki: Grammatik und Versuch einer Dialektologie*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Paul, Ludwig (2009). «Zazaki». In: Windfuhr, Gernot (ed.), *The Iranian Languages*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 545-586.
- Pirejko, Lia Aleksandrovna (1976). *Talyšsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Russkij Jazyk.
- Procházka, Stephan (1993). *Die Präpositionen in den neuarabischen Dialekten*. Wien: VWGÖ.
- Qafisheh, Hamdi A. (1997). *Ntc's Gulf Arabic-english Dictionary: A Compact Dictionary of the Contemporary Arabic of the Mideast*. Lincolnwood (IL): NTC Publishing Group.
- Raverty, Henry G. (1860). *A Dictionary of the Puk'hto, Pus'hto or Language of the Afghāns*. London: Longman.

- Rezāi, Jamāl (1994). *Vāženāme-ye guyeš-e Birjand*. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Ruzbehān, 1373.
- Rossi, Adriano V. (1979). *Iranian Lexical Elements in Brāhūi*. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- Rozenfel'd, Anna Z. (1982). *Tadžiksko-russkij dialektnyj slovar' (jugovostočnyj Tađžikistan)*. Leningrad: Izdat. Leningrad. Univ.
- Salāmi, 'Abdonnabi (2002). *Farhang-e guyeš-e davāni*. Tehrān: Farhangestān-e zabān-o-adab-e fārsi, 1381.
- Salāmi, 'Abdonnabi (2004). *Ganjine-ye guyeš-šenāsi-e Fārs, 1, Guyešhā-ye davāni, dahlei, 'abdui, kāzeruni, kalāni, kande'i, kuzargi, mamassani, māsarmi*. Tehrān: Farhangestān-e zabān-o-adab-e fārsi, 1383.
- Salāmi, 'Abdonnabi (2005). *Ganjine-ye guyeš-šenāsi-e Fārs, 2, Guyešhā-ye banāfi, pāpuni, dusirāni, riči, somyāni, kalāni (tājiki), gorganāi / gāvkošaki, mošqāni, nudāni*. Tehrān: Farhangestān-e zabān-o-adab-e fārsi, 1384.
- Salāmi, 'Abdonnabi (2006). *Ganjine-ye guyeš-šenāsi-e Fārs, 3, Guyešhā-ye baliāni, birovakāni, hayāti (dowlatābādi), dādenjāni, lor dārengāni, dorunaki / mehbudi, dežgāhi / guri, koroši, koruni*. Tehrān: Farhangestān-e zabān-o-adab-e fārsi, 1385.
- Salāmi, 'Abdonnabi (2007). *Ganjine-ye guyeš-šenāsi-e Fārs, 4, Guyešhā-ye asiri, aheli, tangkiši, xoŋji, zāxoruye, šowrābi, qalāti, kāriāni, gerāši / zeynalābādi*. Tehrān: Farhangestān-e zabān-o-adab-e fārsi, 1386.
- Salāmi, 'Abdonnabi (2009). *Ganjine-ye guyeš-šenāsi-e Fārs, 5, Guyešhā-ye aškanāni / pāqālāti, evazi, banāruyei, bixei, beyrami, bālādehi, keriški, fedāyi, fišvari, kowrdehi, galedāri, lāri*. Tehrān: Farhangestān-e zabān-o-adab-e fārsi, 1388.
- Sayad Hashmi (2000). *Sayad Ganj*. Karāčī: Balochi Academy.
- Šālči, Amir (1991). *Farhang-e guyeš-e Xorāsān-e bozorg*. Tehrān: Našr-e Markaz, 1370.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger (2014). *Die alt-persischen Inschriften der Achaimeniden: Editio minor mit deutscher Übersetzung*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Sorušīān, Jamšid Soruš (1956). *Farhang-e behdinān*. Ed. by M. Sotude. Tehrān: Mo'assese-ye Enteshārāt-o-čāp-e Dānešgāh-e Tehrān. Repr. 1370/1991.
- Sotude, Manučehr (1957). *Farhang-e kermāni*. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Farhang-e Irānzamin, 1335.
- Sotude, Manučehr (1963). *Farhang-e semnāni, sorxei, lāsgardi, sangsari, šahmerzādi*. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Dānešgāh-e Tehrān, 1342.
- Timuri Far, 'Ali (1983). *Guyeš-e damāvandi*. Tehrān: s.n., 1362.
- Todd, Terry Lynn (1985). *A Grammar of Dimilī (also known as Zaza)* [doctoral dissertation]. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.
- Trail, Ronald L.; Cooper, Gregory R. (1999). *Kalasha Dictionary with English and Urdu*. Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University.

- Vahman, Fereyduṅ; Asatrian, Garnik (2002). *Notes on the Language and Ethnography of the Zoroastrians of Yazd*. Copenhagen: Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab.
- VAI (1966-1973). *Vocabolario arabo-italiano*. 3 voll. [vol. 1, 1966; vol. 2, 1969; vol. 3, 1973]. Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente.
- Wehr, Hans (1979). *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic (Arabic-English)*. Ed. by J. Milton Cowan. 4th ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Zammit, Martin R. (2002). *A Comparative Lexical Study of Qur'ānic Arabic*. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill.
- Zomorrodīān, Rezā (1989). *Barresi-e guyeš-e Qāin. Āstān-e Qods-e Rezavi: Mo'āvenat-e farhangi-e Āstān-e Qods-e Rezavi*, 1368.