743. Arabic Sentence-structure
The typical A sentence-order is verb-subject-object. A is thus classified as a VSO language, quite unlike P or HU, which are SOV languages, or English, which is an SVO language. Since the A sentences and expressions that commonly occur in U tend to be restricted to quite simple religious formulae, the full pattern seldom emerges.

The placing of the verb first in the sentence or clause is, however, to be noted in such expressions as:

\[
\begin{align*}
a'\dot{a}zu bill\dot{a}h & \quad \text{I take refuge with God!} \\
insall\dot{a}h & \quad \text{if God wishes!} \\
ill\dot{a} m\ddot{a}sall\dot{a}h & \quad \text{except as God wishes!}
\end{align*}
\]

In the last two phrases the verb šā ‘wish’ precedes the subject allāh.

A is also a language which favours nominal sentences, i.e. sentences without a verb, which would be expressed in languages like HU or E with some form of the verb ‘to be’. The commonest examples of all are:

\[
\begin{align*}
as-salāmū 'alaikum & \quad \text{peace (be) upon you!} \\
va-'alaikum as-salām & \quad \text{and upon you (be) peace!}
\end{align*}
\]

A similar pattern is also found in negative sentences, beginning with the negative adv. lā ‘not’, e.g.:

\[
lā haul va lā quvvā illā billāh
\]

(there is) no strength or power but through God!

Note that such A phrases are conventionally distinguished in calligraphy by being written in the nāṣx script, as opposed to the nastālīq employed for U and P. Examples may be seen in the texts of 3, 6 and 13.

8. The Persian Component
The status for so long enjoyed by P as the premier language of Indo-Muslim civilization (12-21) continues to be reflected in the immense importance of the P component in U, particularly in vocabulary, in processes of word-formation, and in the syntax of many common types of phrase. Although the deliberate differentiation of H through Sanskritization has naturally resulted in a much lower prominence for its P component, a great many common P words, e.g. dost ‘friend’ or nān ‘flat bread’, continue to be used in all natural styles of H, many of whose syntactic structures also continue to be influenced by the underlying example of P. The P component of H is, in other words, of much greater significance than the minimal S component of U.

The historic spread of P far beyond its homeland in the central Iranian province of Fars, which gave the language its name fārsī, was surely due in large part to its intrinsic simplicity. If HU can be reasonably compared in terms of difficulty to prospective learners with Italian or Spanish, P is more like E. Having a remarkably straightforward phonemic system and nouns
without genders or cases, P must have proved even more readily acceptable in India thanks to its intrinsic character as one of the nearest cousins of the NIA group to which HU belongs. Several common words are identical, e.g. andar ‘inside’ or do ‘two’: and many more are obviously closely related, e.g. \( P \text{ cahār} = \text{HU cār} \) ‘four’.

A general understanding of this intrinsic closeness between P and HU is taken for granted in the following paragraphs, which also assume a similar understanding of the status of P as a composite language that already incorporated many A elements before its transfer to India. Such elements are marked as ‘A’ where appropriate below.

81.  Phonology

Like all languages long imported into alien speech-territory, the P of South Asia has come to assume a number of archaic and locally-determined features. The following descriptions of P are therefore to be understood as relating to Indo-Persian, which is quite as different from the modern P of Iran as Indian E is from the contemporary E of Britain or of the United States.

This consideration applies particularly to the phonology of the vowels, where Indo-Persian has the same 10-term system as HU, i.e. \( a \, a \, i \, i \, u \, u \, e \, a i \, o \, a u \) with an amalgamation in pronunciation of the common written final \(-\ddot{a}\) with \(-\ddot{u}\), and with the possibility of the final nasализation \(-n\). This convenient congruence with IA norms has long been lost in standard Iranian pronunciation, and is one of the main reasons for the difficulties experienced by those South Asians who can still speak P in conversing with Iranians.

While the 23-term system of consonantal phonemes is both simpler and much closer to HU than the characteristically Semitic pattern of the A consonants (71), the typically Iranian preference for fricatives — as opposed to the IA distinction of aspirated consonants (51) — is notably different from HU. Features to notice in the following table, therefore, include — besides the \( q \) imported from A — both the way in which the oddly assorted A series of ‘simple’ plosive consonants is filled out by the P phonemes \( g \, c \, p \), which demanded intrinsic modifications of the A alphabet to write P, and the very full set of fricative consonants, demanding only the addition of a letter to write \( z \) to the A alphabet, but to be transferred only with some difficulty to the norms of IA pronunciation so accurately reflected in the Nagari writing-system (511). For the sake of clarity, the table disregards the A letters already assimilated to P phonemes (71):

| \( \ddot{a} \) | \( q \) | \( k \) | \( c \) | \( t \) | \( p \) |
| \( \ddot{a} \) | \( g \) | \( j \) | \( d \) | \( b \) | \( m \) |
| \( x \) | \( š \) | \( s \) | \( f \) | \( v \) |
| \( ġ \) | \( ž \) | \( r \) | \( l \) |
The syllabic structure of P is quite close to that of A: in this respect it resembles HU rather than S. There are no initial clusters, and no medial clusters of more than two members, nor any final short vowels. Two-member final consonant-clusters are, however, very common: these are easily assimilated to HU norms when the first member is a sibilant, e.g. dost ‘friend’, somewhat more awkwardly when it is a distinctively P fricative, e.g. daraxt ‘tree’, liable to be pronounced by speakers careless of proper U usage as e.g. darakhat.

811. Script
Apart from the addition of letters to write the P phonemes p c ç g absent from A phonology, which subsequently provided the model for the addition to the alphabet of modified characters to write the U phonemes ð ð r, the A script proved intrinsically quite well adapted to the writing of P.

Subsequent phonetic changes have resulted in only a few historically determined ambiguities in the spelling of P loan-words in U, notably the redundant writing of vão after initial xe, e.g.:

\[ \text{xud} \quad \text{pr. self} \quad \text{xuš} \quad \text{adj. happy} \]

These historical spellings continue to reflect the long-obsolete pronunciations xwad and xwas, cf. U xwāb ‘dream’.

The A script also had to be adapted to record that most characteristic of P constructions, the izāfat -i which is normally pronounced in Indo-P and U as -e (841), and so written in Nagari where it occurs in P phrases in H. U spelling-rules for the izāfat are adapted from P, and may be summarized as follows:

(a) after a consonant, the optional writing of zer is regularly reproduced in the text of the U passages in this book, e.g.:

\[ \text{barr-e sağır} \quad \text{m. subcontinent} \]
\[ \text{qāid-e a’zam} \quad \text{m. ‘Great Leader’, i.e. Jinnah} \]

(b) after final -ā or -ī, the standard P and U notation of hamzā over he or ye is followed, e.g.:

\[ \text{sarmāyā-e alfāz} \quad \text{m. stock of words, vocabulary} \]
\[ \text{vādī-e sindh} \quad \text{f. the Indus Valley} \]

(c) after final -ā or -ū, the standard U practice of writing barī ye after hamzā is observed, e.g.:

\[ \text{daryā-e sindh} \quad \text{m. the River Indus} \]
\[ \text{urdū-e mu’āllā} \quad \text{f. the Exalted Camp} \]

Finally, while the A script is admirably suited to indicate the Semitic process of root-modification, it copes much less well with long polysyllables of the kind which result from the Indo-European preference for word-formation through compounds. Hence the practice of breaking such compounds into their constituent elements in P and U orthography,
82.

e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{P } & \text{kitāb-farōs} & \text{m. bookseller} \\
\text{S } & \text{janam-bhūm} & \text{f. birthplace} \\
\text{E } & \text{ṭāip-raṭar} & \text{m. typewriter}
\end{align*}
\]

82. Lexicon

The close genetic relationship between the Iranian and the IA groups within Indo-European, illustrated by the obvious similarity between many pairs of P and HU words (8), is to be seen in such etymological rules as that which establishes the correspondence of Iranian \(h\)-\(fī\)-\(d\) with IA \(s\)-\(pt\)-\(dh\), hence:

\[
\begin{align*}
P \text{haft} \quad \text{num. seven} & = S \text{ sapta} \succ \text{HU sät} \quad \text{num. seven} \\
P \text{hind} \quad \text{m. India} & = S \text{ sindhu} \succ \text{HU sindh} \quad \text{m. Indus, Sind}
\end{align*}
\]

Except in the language of classical P poetry (in its turn largely transferred to H poetry), however, it must be remembered that this native P vocabulary tends to be outweighed by the huge numbers of A borrowings and the many composite PA forms developed therefrom. P also incorporates a few loan-words from Turkish, some of which have been transferred to HU, e.g. the name urdū itself, qulī ‘porter’, or qainčī ‘scissors’, besides the agentive suf. -cī found in bāvarcī ‘cook’ or tabalcī ‘tabla-player’.

But P is extremely rich in native processes of word-formation, through the use of prefixes, suffixes, and compounds. In this respect, P is quite comparable to S (62), although it lacks the archaic S features of sandhi or guṇa and vrddhi. U therefore draws upon the rich resources of P word-formation in the same way that H does upon those provided by S, to make up for the meagre patterns provided by the native HU component (523). Not only have great numbers of P and PA derivative forms been historically assimilated into U, but it is also P patterns of word-formation which are chiefly relied upon in the coinage of U neologisms calqued upon E, e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
taraqqī-pazīr & \quad \text{adj. developing (‘progress-receiving’)} \\
taraqqī-yāftā & \quad \text{adj. developed (‘progress-found’)} \\
\text{gāir-taraqqī-yāftā} & \quad \text{adj. undeveloped (‘non-progress-found’)}
\end{align*}
\]

821. Prefixes

Although P prefixes function in the same way as those of S (621) in the formation of derivatives, typically converting a noun into an adj., most of them also have an independent status in the language as adj., adv., or prepn. (843). The commonest P pref. include:

(a) \(bā\) ‘with’, typically the opposite of (c) \(be\)-:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A } & \text{qā'idā} \quad \text{m. rule} \quad \text{bā-qā'idā} \quad \text{adj. regular} \\
\text{A } & \text{murād} \quad \text{f. desire} \quad \text{bā-murād} \quad \text{adj. as wished for}
\end{align*}
\]
(b) bad- ‘bad’, typically the opposite of (d) xūb- or (e) xuš-:
   A tamīz f. manners bad-tamīz adj. rude
   A sūrat f. form bad-sūrat adj. ugly

(c) be- ‘without’, one of the commonest negative pref.:
   A qā'idā m. rule be-qā'idā adj. irregular
   kār m. work be-kār adj. unemployed

(d) xūb- ‘good’:
   A sūrat f. form xūb-sūrat adj. beautiful

(e) xuš- ‘happy, nice’ (cf. S su- 621u):
   bū f. smell xuš-bū f. fragrance
   A qismat f. fortune xuš-qismat adj. fortunate

(f) A ǧair- ‘other’, very common in the sense of E ‘un-’:
   A mutavāzī adj. balanced ǧair-mutavāzī adj. unbalanced
   A matlūb adj. desired ǧair-matlūb adj. undesired

(g) kam- ‘less’:
   zor m. strength kam-zor adj. weak
   A sin m. age kam-sin adj. young

(h) A lā- ‘not’, another common negative pref.:
   A sānī adj. second lā-sānī adj. unequalled
   A ta-'āvun m. cooperation lā-ta‘āvun m. non-cooperation

(i) nā- ‘not’, with be- the commonest negative pref.:
   gavārā adj. pleasant nā-gavār adj. unpleasant
   A vāqif adj. acquainted nā-vāqif adj. unacquainted

(j) ham- ‘co-, con-’ (cf. S sama- 621s):
   A ma’ne mp. meaning ham-ma’ne adj. synonymous
   A vatan m. country ham-vatan m. compatriot

Although the independent status of many of these pref. blurs their distinction from the P compounds of the bahuvrihi type (825c), the frequency with which e.g. xuš- or kam- are used in word-formation makes it sensible to treat them under this heading.

822. Suffixes
A great number of suffixes are simply inbuilt into P, in the sense that they exist in several words without generating new forms: this type of bound suf. is of course equally characteristic of HU (522). P examples include:

(a) -ār, used to form f. nouns from verbal roots:
   raft- going raftār f. movement
   guft- talking guftār f. speech
(b) -iš, a very common alternative to (a):

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{āmez-} & \text{mixing} & \text{āmeziš} & \text{f. mixture} \\
\text{koš-} & \text{trying} & \text{košiš} & \text{f. effort}
\end{array}
\]

Other such bound suf. are used to derive adj. from nouns, e.g.:

(c) -mand:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{dāniš} & \text{f. wisdom} & \text{dāniš-mand} & \text{adj. intellectual} \\
\text{hoš} & \text{f. sense} & \text{hoš-mand} & \text{adj. sensible}
\end{array}
\]

Besides such numerous bound suf., there is also a smaller number of P. suf. which continue to generate derived words in U. These fall into two formal classes, the first serving to generate adj., the second nouns. The commonest adj. suf. are:

(d) -ānā, added to both nouns and adj. to generate fresh forms, often patterned on E ‘-ly, -ical, -al’, e.g.: 

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{dost} & \text{m. friend} & \text{dostānā} & \text{adj. friendly} \\
\text{A šā'ir} & \text{m. poet} & \text{šā'irānā} & \text{adj. poetical} \\
\text{A falsafī} & \text{adj. philosophic} & \text{falsafīyānā} & \text{adj. philosophical}
\end{array}
\]

(e) -ā, an adj. extension with various functions in U, including semantic differentiation, e.g.:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{A maujūd} & \text{adj. present} & \text{maujūdā} & \text{adj. current}
\end{array}
\]

This P -ā is, however, most frequently used in U to distinguish adj. not so much in meaning as in their use as qualifiers before a noun, e.g. muqarrarā vaqt par ‘at the appointed time’, vs. the predicative vaqt muqarrar ho gayā ‘the time was appointed’. The suf. is to be distinguished from the graphically identical -ā which marks the f. of the A adj. (735).

(f) -ī, the exceedingly common adj. suf. which P shares with A, and which consequently marks huge numbers of adj. in U:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{berūn} & \text{adv.outside} & \text{berūnī} & \text{adj. external} \\
\text{pākistān} & \text{m. Pakistan} & \text{pākistānī} & \text{adj. Pakistani}
\end{array}
\]

Nouns ending in -ā produce adj. with the written ending -āī:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{A sūbā} & \text{m. province} & \text{sūbāī} & \text{adj. provincial} \\
\text{A ‘ilāqā} & \text{m. locality} & \text{‘ilāqāī} & \text{adj. local}
\end{array}
\]

The commonest suf. of the second class, used to generate nouns, is formally identical:

(g) -ī, the standard marker of abstract nouns derived from P adj., in U equivalent in function with the extended A -iyat (722):

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{bihtar} & \text{adj. better} & \text{bihtarī} & \text{f. welfare} \\
\text{xūb} & \text{adj. good} & \text{xūbī} & \text{f. excellence}
\end{array}
\]
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Adj. ending in -ā, whether this is intrinsic or determined by the addition of the suf. (e) -ā, regularly follow this pattern with the special termination -agī:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sāistā</td>
<td>adj. cultured</td>
<td>sāistagī</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA maujūdā</td>
<td>adj. current</td>
<td>maujūdagī</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>currency, presence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This nominal suf. -ī is applied in U with complete freedom to derived adj. of all types, whether formed by prefixation (821) or the suffixion of P verbal elements (823):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA taraqqī-yāftā</td>
<td>adj. developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taraqqī-yāftagī</td>
<td>f. development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA xuš-uslūb</td>
<td>adj. elegant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xuš-uslūbī</td>
<td>f. elegance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other P nominal suf. are more specialized in function, e.g.:

(h) -dān m. or -dānī f. ‘receptacle for’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A qalam</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU nas</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>snuff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) -zādā m. ‘son of’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A navvāb</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navvāb-zādā</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>princeling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This in turn produces the U suf. -zādī f. ‘daughter of’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sāh</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šah-zādī</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>princess</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(j) -stān m. ‘home of’ (= S -sthān):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pāk</td>
<td>adj. pure</td>
<td>pākistān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hindū</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(k) -gāh f. ‘place of’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A dars</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dast</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>hand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While many other P nominal suf. may be distinguished in U, it is often hard to place them in a formally separate compartment from P compounds of the karmadhārāya type (825b), given their additional status as independent words, e.g. xānā m. ‘drawer’, besides numerous suf. uses as in dāk-xānā ‘post office’ or ‘ajāib-xānā m. ‘museum’.

823. Verbal suffixes
The P pref. and suf. types so far described for U largely overlap with the S types so actively employed in H (621–2). U also, however, makes much use of a special type of P suf., those derived from the P verb (834).

Although P verbs are often closely related to their HU opposite numbers in etymology and conjugation, their main parts are differently classified. Most HU verbs follow the regular model of ānā ‘to come’, from which the stem ā- and the past ptc. āyā can be regularly derived: only a few follow the
pattern of jānā ‘to go’, with the regular stem jā- but the irregular past ptc. gayā ‘gone’. The P verb is rather different, since the inf. is formed from the past stem ending in -d- or -t-, e.g. āmadan ‘to come’, past ptc. āmadā ‘came’, or raftan ‘to go’, past ptc. raftā ‘gone’: and, like the majority of common P verbs, these form their present tenses from irregular bases, ā- ‘coming’ and rau- ‘going’. It is these ‘present-stems’, sometimes matched by the corresponding past ptc., which furnish the majority of the P verbal suffixes in active use in U.

From the 50-odd P verbs so used in compound U nouns and adj., the following commonest examples may be cited as illustrations of typical word-building formations.

(a) pasandīdan ‘to approve’, pres. stem pasand- used in U to represent E ‘-ive, -ist’:
   A taraqqī f. progress taraqqī-pasand adj. progressive
   A dahsāt f. terror dahsāt-pasandī f. terrorism

(b) dāstān ‘to have’, pres. stem dār- very commonly used in U as a simple adj. suf., with the f. derivative -dārī:
   A tamīz f. manners tamīz-dārī f. discretion
   xuṣ-bū f. fragrance xuṣ-bū-dār adj. fragrant

(c) dānīstān ‘to know’, pres. stem dān-, not to be confused with the ‘receptacle’ suf. -dān (822h):
   A ‘arabī f. Arabic ‘arabī-dān adj. Arabic-knowing
   fārsī f. Persian fārsī-dānī f. knowing Persian
   A qadar f. worth qadar-dān m. patron

(d) didān ‘to see’, with the quite irregular pres. stem bīn-:
   jahān m. world jahān-dīdā adj. experienced
   dūr adv. far dūr-bīn m. telescope

(e) mālīdan ‘to rub’, pres. stem māl-:
   pā m. foot pā-māl adj. trampled
   rū m. face rū-māl m. handkerchief
   goš m. ear goš-mālī f. punishment

(f) yāftān ‘to find’, pres. stem yāb-:
   A taraqqī f. progress taraqqī-yāftā adj. developed
   dast m. hand dast-yāb adj. obtainable
   kām m. desire kām-yāb adj. successful
824. Numerals
The lower P numerals, whose etymological relationship to their HU counterparts has been indicated above (82), are very frequently used in U where E favours a Roman numeral, e.g. ‘George VI’, ‘volume II’, etc., exactly as H favours the use of S numerals in similar contexts (624). This is particularly true of the P ordinals, formed with the suf. -um:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cardinals</th>
<th>Ordinals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>yak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>cahār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>panj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>šis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>haft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>hašt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>nuh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>dah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The established A loan avval ‘first’ is sometimes supplemented, e.g. in kinglists, by the following A ordinals sānī ‘second’, sālis ‘third’, rābi ‘fourth’, xāmis ‘fifth’, etc.

Higher numerals are seldom encountered, except for the standard hazār ‘thousand’.

825. Compounds
The formal categories into which S compounds are slotted (625) are less tidily applied to the classification of P compounds, given the overlap with the various types of derivatives formed by the prefixes and suffixes described above (831–3).

(a) dvandva-compounds are effectively replaced in P by phrases joined with the copula o ‘and’ (842), e.g. xuši o gam ‘joy and sorrow’, vs. S sukha-duḥkha.

(b) Most P words that might be assigned to the tatpurusa category may equally be treated as suffixed derivatives (822). But the dvigu-type, whose first element is a P numeral, is well represented in compounds also incorporating P, HU, or A components, e.g.:

\[ P + P \quad \text{cahār-šambā} \quad \text{m. Wednesday (‘day 4’)} \]
\[ P + HU \quad \text{se-pahar} \quad \text{m. afternoon (‘watch 3’)} \]
\[ P + A \quad \text{yak-tarfā} \quad \text{adj. one-sided} \]

(c) bahuvrihi-compounds of various types, though similarly hardly distinct from many pref.-formations (821), yield many P adj., e.g.:

\[ \text{PA} \quad \text{pur-fāidā} \quad \text{adj. edifying (‘full of benefit’)} \]
\[ \text{P} \quad \text{zabar-dast} \quad \text{adj. overwhelming (‘upper-handed’)} \]
83. Morphology
While P is historically much richer than HU in resources for word-formation, it is much simpler in grammatical structure. It is therefore possible to treat the substantial influence of morphologically-derived P forms on U, also far from negligible in H, in terms of lexically conditioned items.

831. Nouns
P nouns have no distinction of gender, and virtually none of case (unless the object-marker -rā is treated as synonymous with the HU ppn. ko). There are two types of p., both of which appear only in the most formal U styles:

(a) -ān for animate nouns:
   dāniśmand  m. intellectual  dāniśmandān  mp. intellectuals
   A ṣāqil     m. wise man    ‘ṣāqilān     mp. the wise

The p. of animate P nouns ending in -ā appears as -agān:
   baccā    m. child  baccagān  mp. children

(b) -hā for inanimate nouns:
   A kitāb    f. book  kitāb-hā  fp. books

This p. ending is more frequently used in adv. phrases in U, and may be added therein to HU nouns:
   bār      f. time  bār-hā  adv. time after time
   HU baras  m. year  baras-hā  adv. year after year
   hazār    num. thousand  hazār-hā  adv. thousands of

As the last example shows, this P -hā is often used as a learned equivalent of the specialized functions of the HU obl. p. -oň, e.g. hazāroň ‘thousands of’.

832. Adjectives
Although simple P adj. do not decline, they share with E the regular pattern of a comparative form in -tar ‘-er’ and a superlative in -tarīn ‘-est’. The commonest examples in U are:
   xūb    good  bih-tar    better  bih-tarīn  best
   bad    bad  bad-tar    worse  bad-tarīn  worst

Since HU lacks any mark of distinction between the comparative and superlative degrees, such P adj. forms tend to be treated in U as intensives of the same type as the single A elative degree (735).
The P comparative suf. -tar thus generates a few intensive adv. in U, e.g.:

\[
\begin{align*}
A & \text{ ziyādā } & \text{adv. more} & \text{ziyādā-tar} & \text{adv. mostly} \\
\text{kam} & \text{adv. less} & \text{kam-tar} & \text{adv. seldom}
\end{align*}
\]

The P comparative construction employs the prepn. az which is directly comparable to the HU'ppn. se 'from, than' but also involves the use of the comparative suf. -tar, e.g. the equivalent renderings of the tag 'the excuse is worse than the sin':

\[
P 'uzr bad-tar az gunāh ast
U 'uzr gunāh se burā hai
\]

833. Pronouns

While the general rule of comparative linguistics which states that languages are seldom influenced in such basic components as pronouns by other languages is almost universally true, the profound influence of P upon U is illustrated by such completely assimilated pronominal loans as xud 'self' for HU āp, cand or PA ba'z for HU koī 'some', and the P har 'every' in har koī or har kuch for HU sab koī 'everyone' or sab kuch 'everything'.

Otherwise, the organization of personal pronouns in P is very similar to that of HU, although the genuine 3rd person s. pr. o 'he, she, it' exists in P alongside the frequently employed demonstratives ān (= HU vo) 'that' and īn (= HU ye) 'this'.

834. Verbs

The conjugation of P verbs is determined by the basic contrast between the pres. and the past stem (823). Although personal forms of the P verb seldom appear in U except in set loan-tags, it is useful to have a picture of the basic paradigms, as illustrated by the common verb dādan 'to give', pres. stem dih-:

\[
\begin{align*}
dihandā & \text{pres. ptc. giving} & dādā & \text{past ptc. given} \\
\text{mī-diham} & 1s. & \text{I give} & dādam & 1s. & \text{I gave} \\
\text{mī-dihī} & 2s. & \text{you give} & dādī & 2s. & \text{you gave} \\
\text{mī-dihad} & 3s. & \text{he gives} & dād & 3s. & \text{he gave} \\
\text{mī-dihīm} & 1p. & \text{we give} & dādīm & 1p. & \text{we gave} \\
\text{mī-dihīd} & 2p. & \text{you give} & dādī & 2p. & \text{you gave} \\
\text{mī-dihand} & 3p. & \text{they give} & dādand & 3p. & \text{they gave}
\end{align*}
\]

Apart from their function as suffixes in word-formation (823), verbal stems appear independently in a few common U nouns, e.g. the doublets just-ūf f. 'search' and guft-gū f. 'conversation'.

The participles have a certain artificial independence in the most Persianized styles of U, e.g. in'ām-dihandā 'prize giver' for the inf. ptc. in'ām dene-vālā, but are more genuinely restricted to a number of common adj. loans. The pres. ptc. has the ending -indā after vowel-stems, e.g. āindā 'coming', used in U as an adj. 'next': cf. the P phrase from the Pakistani
national anthem pākistān pāindā bād ‘may Pakistan endure!’ (The 3s. bād ‘may it be!’ also occurs in the common HU expression mubārak-bād ‘congratulations!’ Another specialized P 3s. is the HU adv. sāyad ‘perhaps’.)

Many P past ptc., ending in -dā or -tā, appear as adj. in U, e.g. sāistā ‘cultured’, guzāstā ‘past, last’, besides such compounds as pas-mândā ‘backward’ or in’ām-raftā ‘prize-winning’. The past ptc. raftā ‘gone’ is used as an adv. in U raftā raftā ‘gradually’.

84. Syntax
If P resembles S in its rich patterns of word-formation, it is more like E not only in the simplicity of its morphology, but also in the apparent simplicity of its syntax, several of whose most characteristic phrasal constructions are regularly used in U. More generally, the continuing overt debt of U to P is directly reflected in many features of U syntax: and the same patterns continue to characterize H syntax also, even if P words may have been replaced by S loans.

841. Izafat Phrases
Rules for writing the izafat -e in the U script are explained above (811). In meaning, the izafat has two principal functions in P: the indication of a possessive relationship between two nouns, or the qualification of a noun by an adj. In both types, the P word-order is the reverse of the comparable HU constructions.

Izafat phrases of noun + noun correspond to those linked by kā in HU, e.g. šurafā-e lakhnaū mp. ‘the gentlemen of Lucknow’ for lakhnaū ke šurafā. Although formally of this type, phrases headed by the PA ahl-e ‘people of’ are effectively used as compounds in U, e.g. ahl-e zabān mp. ‘native speakers’, or ahl-e ma’rīb mp. ‘Westerners’.

Izafat phrases of noun + adj. similarly follow the reverse order of words from HU, e.g. zamān-e darāz m. ‘a long time’, vs. lambā qaqt. Many izafat phrases of this type also are effectively used as compounds in U, e.g. barr-e sagīr m. ‘subcontinent’, from A barr ‘continent’ + A sagīr ‘small’.

A third possibility provided by the flexible izafat is the linkage of adj. + noun, e.g. sar-garm-e savār ‘actively embarked on the journey’: but this is less common than the two main types. The frequency with which izafat phrases are employed is one of the most obvious indicators of a Persianized style in U, whose heaviest varieties may occasionally resort to phrases of more than two members, e.g. ahl-e zabān-e lakhnaū ‘the native speakers of Lucknow’.

842. Copular Phrases
The P copula ə tends to be restricted in U to a number of common phrases which effectively function as compounds of fresh meaning, e.g.:

əb o havā f. climate (‘water & air’)
əmad o raft f. traffic (‘coming & going’)
naʃv o numā f. development (‘growth & production’)
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843. Prepositional Phrases
Like A, but unlike HU, P has prepositions. These frequently appear as the first members of loan-phrases in U, typically adverbial in sense, just like the A prepositional phrases (742). The commonest simple P prepositions include:

(a) az ‘from, than’:
   az sar-e nau  afresh ('from a new head')
   kam az kam  at least ('less than less')

Compare the HU synonyms nae sire se and kam se kam.

(b) ba- ‘by, with’, to be distinguished from A [bi-] ‘in, on’ (742), but similarly often written together with the following word:
   ba-xūbī  well ('with excellence')
   ba-rāh-e rāst  directly ('by the straight path')
   roz ba-roz  day by day

The last type of reduplicated adv. phrase gives rise to fresh formations incorporating native HU words, e.g. the HU synonym din ba-din ‘day by day’, or pīrīhī ba-pīrīhī ‘generation by generation’.

(c) bar ‘on’:
   bar-pā  afoot ('on foot')
   bar-zabān  by heart ('on the tongue')

(d) dar ‘in’:
   dar asl  in fact
   dar miyān  in between

844. Compound Prepositions
Besides these simple prepositions, comparable in number to the small HU set kā, ko, tak, par, meṁ, se, P has a large number of compound prepositions.

Typically linked to the following noun by the possessive izafat, these may be simple words, e.g. mānind-e or misl-e ‘like’, or compounds introduced by a simple prepn., e.g. ba-jā-e ‘in place of’, ba-taur-e ‘by way of’, bar-xilāf-e ‘in opposition to’, bar-vazn-e ‘on the pattern of’.

In older U prose, such compound prepositions are frequently encountered, either in their purely P form with the izafat, or as prepositions without the izafat but with ke written after the noun. The modern preference for full loan-translations as ppn. headed by ke or kī thus took some time to become fully established. The process may be illustrated by successive versions of the phrase ‘like other poets’:

mānind-e sā’irān-e digar  (P)
mānind aur sā’iroň ke  (older U)
aur sā’iroň kī mānind  (modern U)
Although the intrinsic formation of compound postpositions is native to the NIA component of HU, a great many individual items have been transferred from P compound prepositions by this somewhat roundabout route. Direct loan-translations in U have often been further adapted in H by the substitution of S loans, e.g. *P ba-taur-e > U ke taur par > H ke prakār ‘by way of, like’, or *P qābil-e > U ke qābil > H ke yogya ‘worthy of’.

A few P prepositions are compounded with az ‘from’ instead of the linking izafat, e.g. peš az ‘before’. This may account for the exclusive U preference for se pahle, vs. the possibility of ke pahle in H.

845. Phrase-verbs
In exactly the same way as H and U have adapted their modern loans from E to function as verbs by the addition to nouns and adjectives of karnā or honā, e.g. telijon karnā ‘to telephone’ or pās honā ‘to pass’, so too did P expand the relatively small stock of its native verbal stems by adding kardan ‘to do’ or šudan ‘to become’ to great numbers of A loan-nouns and adj. Although it is not always possible to determine the order of historical priority, the influence of P in the development of many HU phrase-verbs is certainly often comparable to that described above for compound ppn. sets (844), e.g. *P rāzī kardan > U rāzī karnā > H santuṣṭ karnā ‘to satisfy’, similarly *P rāzī šudan > U rāzī honā > H santuṣṭ honā ‘to be satisfied’.

846. Sentence-structure
In terms of its typical sentence-structure, P is much closer to HU than to E or A (743), since it has the order SOV. Historically, however, P was developed much earlier than either H or U as a language of high culture and official administration, and the intrinsic resources of its syntax were correspondingly developed to meet the requirements of formal written expression. It is for this reason that the P component of HU extends beyond the familiar loan-categories of nouns and adj. to embrace not only compound postpositions and phrase-verbs or adv. and inlj. like sāyad ‘perhaps’ and kās ‘if only!’, but also the conjunctions which form the basic link-elements in the structure of the complex HU sentence.

The native HU preference is for the linking of clauses in parallel parataxis, e.g. jo..., vo... or jab..., to..., and for the linking of sentences through the enclitic particles bhī or to (54). More sophisticated clause linkages are largely expressed in U by the use of P loan-conjunctions, whose syntactic function is exactly reproduced in H by S substitutions.

The basic P conjunction is *ki ‘that’, equally used in U and H to introduce reported direct speech. It also appears in many P compound conjunctions used in U, e.g. balki ‘but rather’, bā-vuśude-ki ‘in spite of’, tā-ki ‘so that’, cünkî ‘since’, not to speak of the familiar HU kyonkî ‘because’. The P marker -ci functions similarly in the formation of cunānci ‘accordingly’, or the extension of P agar ‘if’ to form agarcî ‘although’, exactly synonymous in U with hālānki. Although H yadi ‘if’ and yadyapi ‘although’ are impeccably S in appearance, they are better understood as deliberately introduced loan-conversions from the P conjunctions, preserved in U, which did so much to facilitate the officialese of the Mughal chanceries.