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Abstract

The present study provides a description of the standardization process of Persian orthography since the introduction of the Arabic alphabet, with a focus on this process in modern times (1850–2000). Using theories related to orthography standardization as its background, this work seeks an explanation for the prolonged standardization process of Persian orthography and presents the frameworks within which this standardization has been carried out. The most recent state of Persian orthography is presented through an investigation of the current attitudes towards the problems of Persian orthography and possible frameworks for a potential reform, as well as through an investigation of the current tendencies in the manner of presenting different orthographic parameters within Persian contemporary texts. How and by whom the orthography of today’s Persian texts is governed is another aspect to be examined here.

The most important conclusion to be drawn from the present study is that there is a strong tendency towards approving reform proposals that can be integrated with the present orthography, and maintain the present appearance of Persian orthography as much as possible. One of the main reasons behind this tendency is the concern of an interruption in cultural continuity in the event of an alphabet reform or any other drastic change in the present appearance of the orthography. This concern takes into account the political, social, cultural, structural, and economic conditions in Iran, as well as the complexity of language planning projects.
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As this study is on Persian orthography, and as it contains references to words, proper and geographical names, and names of journals and book titles in Persian, Arabic, and Turkish, different systems of transcription have been applied.

English conventions have been applied to well-known geographical names, and names of the languages, as well as the names of the Iranian dynasties. Less-known geographical names, proper names, and names of publishing houses are spelled according to a modified version of the transliteration standards of e.g. the Library of Congress, in which š, č, ġ, ž, and x are replaced by sh, ch, gh, zh, and kh. Turkish proper names and words are transliterated according to the English convention, in which some elements from Turkish orthography are included, e.g. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk or Fowad Paşa.

Names of societies, journals, institutions, and book titles, as well as Persian and Arabic phrases, are all spelled according to a narrow system of transliteration shown below. Names of the authors of texts in English or Swedish are spelled as they appear in the respective texts. In some cases, the original transliteration of the names of journals and websites are kept, and these cases are noted in footnotes. Because of the limitations of the word-processing programs, the stressed ā is displayed as â. I have tried to mark bound and unbound writing in all quoted phrases, book titles, names of journals, and names of societies. Unbound writing, whatever the type, is marked by a hyphen.

I have also chosen to display «h> in final position with <h>, even when it represents a short vowel, i.e. as –eh or –ah, in order to show the increasing interest within modern Persian orthography towards keeping this letter in writing for marking the short vowel /el/, e.g. in words as زندگی vs. زندگان. In cases where «h>
/h/ is omitted in the original Persian word, the <h> is omitted in my transcription as well.

### Transcriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Long Vowel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ً</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٠</td>
<td>١</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢</td>
<td>٣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٤</td>
<td>٥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٦</td>
<td>٧</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٨</td>
<td>٩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٠</td>
<td>١١</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٢</td>
<td>١٣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٤</td>
<td>١٥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٦</td>
<td>١٧</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٨</td>
<td>١٩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٠</td>
<td>٢١</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Short Vowels

| ْ | a |
| َ | o |
| َ | e |

2 ـ/ة may either display –eh /e/ or –ah /a/. I have chosen to display it as –ah in Arabic book titles as well as phrases quoted from Arabic books.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

1.1 Purpose and significance of the study
Several centuries after the Arab conquest of Iran in the seventh century, the official script of the Sasanian Empire, called *Pahlavi*, was replaced by Arabic script, while the spoken language continued to be *Dari*. Exactly when, why, and how this replacement took place is still under discussion, but the shortcomings of the *Pahlavi* script, the new Islamic aspirations, and the vast use of Arabic language in administration, religion, and science are among the reasons mentioned for this replacement. It has been said that the new script, still consonantal and Semitic, was welcome, as it was much easier to learn and master compared to the 14-lettered alphabet of *Pahlavi* script with its strong underrepresentation of sounds.

Even if the shortcomings of the Arabic alphabet were discussed by scholars from the tenth century like Ḥamzeh Eșfahāni, as well as scholars from the eleventh century like Abu Reyḥān Biruni, the inadequacy of the Arabic alphabet in representing spoken Persian is a relatively modern concern. It has been believed that the Semitic consonantal writing system, adopted for the synthetic structure of Semitic languages, is not suitable for an Indo-European language like New Persian with a dominating analytical structure.³ This belief, in its turn, is rooted in the “representational view of writing,” as Pettersson (1996:2) calls it, where the task of writing is supposed to be that of representing the spoken language, and where a one-to-one correspondence between the letters and phonemes of the language is believed to be the ideal situation.

Intensive discussions on the incapability of the consonantal writing system of Arabic in representing spoken Persian were initiated first in the mid-nineteenth century when Iran came into close and serious contact with Europe. The Iranian encounter with Europe convinced many members of the Constitutional Revolution’s intelligentsia that the root of illiteracy, and consequently, the economic and cultural backwardness in Iran, was the

³ For more information, see footnote 43.
problematic alphabet.\(^4\) Since then, the problem of Persian script has been a frequently recurrent subject within the Iranian intellectual circles, although not always with the same point of departure. The number of books and articles written on the subject exceeds 350.\(^5\) All of the three Iranian Academies (Farhangestān) since 1935 have seen it as a major task of theirs to elaborate some orthographic conventions to at least modify the shortcomings of the Persian script.\(^6\) The proposals that have been put forth by individuals, societies, and the three Iranian Academies stretch from minor modification of the orthographic conventions to a total changeover of the script. The recent expansion of information technology has once again intensified the discussions on the problems of Persian orthography, and on the urgent need for solutions to the problem.\(^7\)

In spite of the fact that it has been more than one hundred years since the discussions on the inefficiency of Persian orthography were initiated, and that the subject has always been of immediate importance, no radical changes have taken place. In comparing a contemporary text with a text written fifty years ago, one will find nothing indicating any remarkable change, not even at the level of orthographic rules. We still find books and articles with the same words of warning on the urgent need of taking some measures as it was the case much earlier.\(^8\) This situation can to some degree be explained by factors like political instability, the large gap of trust between the intelligentsia and the state, lack of executive institutions, etc., but it is far from a complete explanation. Judging by appearances, other external non-linguistic factors than practical ones, including national identity, concern about losing the cultural heritage, religious factors, and the spirit of the times have all played a vital role in the standardization process of Persian orthography in modern times. Even proposals that advocate a total change to another script are strongly influenced by these non-linguistic factors.


\(^5\) See, for instance, Golbon (2536:123–140).

\(^6\) See ch. 4.2.5

\(^7\) See, for instance, Emāmī (1371), Ṣan’āti (1371), and Rejā’i (1372).

\(^8\) Compare, for example, the title of Dehqān’s article (1374a), “Agar emruz najonbim fardā pašimān x‘āhim šod!”, which means “If we do not hurry today, we will regret it tomorrow” to Kasravi’s words from about fifty years earlier “Bī goftogust ke bāyad alefbā-ye mā digar gardad ” which means “There is no doubt that our alphabet must be changed.” Kasravi expresses his discontent with the issue having already been discussed for fifty years without any result and urges for action immediately (Kasravi 2536a:57). Almost the same words of warning can be found in the writings of most advocates of script reform in Iran since 1850.
The purpose of this study is, therefore, to present a detailed and comprehensive picture of the standardization process of Persian orthography since the introduction of the Arabic alphabet, with a focus on the standardization process in modern times (1850–2000) and the discussions around it. The ambition has been to create a multi-dimensional mirror in which it would be possible to locate some logical and inclusive explanation for the situation mentioned above, by providing details on the following eight components that according to Cooper (1989:98) are essential for any adequate analysis of cases of language planning or standardization:

What *actors* […] attempt to influence what *behaviors* […] of which *people* […] for what *ends* […] under what *conditions* […] by what *means* […] through what *decision-making process* […] with what *effects*.

The history of Persian orthography in chapter 4 is intended to represent a detailed account of the above eight components within different periods. An investigation of the current attitudes towards the possible framework of a potential reform, as well as the main current tendencies in the way of presenting different orthographic parameters, are meant to present the most recent state of the orthography. The aim of this presentation is to make it possible for those who are interested in the subject not to repeat steps that have already been taken, and to pave the way for a realistic approach rooted in linguistic and non-linguistic factors.

I hope the case of Persian orthography can contribute to the understanding of the complex mechanism involved in script reforms, especially when an already established script with a long tradition of written language is the target. I also hope my study can contribute as well to the understanding of script modernization in developing countries longing for modernization within different aspects of life, and as such towards the understanding of the non-linguistic ends of such processes.

1.2 Research questions and scope of the study

Since the study deals with a wide range of topics over a relatively long period, it is of importance to focus on some clear research questions to maintain coherence and focus within the study. The whole thesis can be summarized by the following questions: “Modification or changeover? Why?” This is then followed by the sub-question of: “Within which frameworks has the standardization been carried out, and what measures have gained ground?”

As it is evident from the main focus of the study, the history of the standardization of Persian orthography is divided into two fields: Changeover and modification. This situation turns the study of the
standardization process of Persian orthography into a relatively unusual study, as it is not a straightforward study of the major standardization processes, whereby a special norm is selected, codified, elaborated, and implemented. The process is rather marked by norms, consciously not selected. Since there are so many norms which have been proposed, yet not selected, it has been necessary to narrow the scope of the study by avoiding a detailed analysis of all the proposals. A presentation of five major categories of proposals in chapter 5 has been accompanied by an appendix, where samples of some of the proposals are presented.

The elaboration of orthographic rules with the intent of making the process of reading easier has always been of great interest and has been given major space in this study. Since bound and unbound writing\(^9\) is one of the main sources of orthographic variation in modern Persian texts, one of the main characteristics of Persian orthography of any certain period,\(^{10}\) and the core of the latest debate on Persian orthography by an independent society\(^{11}\), the focus of the second part of this study is on the issue of bound and unbound writing. The following aspects of the orthography have not been addressed: the orthography of borrowed Arabic words; the way of presenting colloquial language in written form; punctuation; the orthography of borrowed foreign words; the orthography of foreign names; and rules of spelling applied in hand-written texts.

1.3 Previous research on Persian orthography

From 1850 onwards, Persian orthography and its alleged inadequacy has been a much-debated subject. Numerous monographs and articles of both prescriptive and descriptive nature have been written. Many proposals have also been put forth, all falling within the following five categories:

\[
\text{ [...] (1) modifications of the present script; (2) adoption of Latin script, with different kinds of proposed modifications; (3) reviving an ancient Iranian script; (4) combining elements from several scripts; (5) entirely new invented scripts [...] (Jazayery 1983:261).}
\]

Since the major proposals within the above five categories will be discussed in chapter 5, I will here confine myself to giving an account of the present state of studies on Persian orthography.

---

\(^9\) It must be indicated that bound and unbound writing in Persian does not mean the same as in English or Swedish. A detailed account of the issue is given in ch. 3.7.

\(^{10}\) See ch. 4.1.4, 4.1.5, and 4.1.6.

\(^{11}\) Šourā'-ye bāznegarī dar šiveh-ye negārēš-e xaṭṭe fārsī.
The last three categories do not seem to be of immediate interest at present. Current studies on Persian orthography are largely carried out within the first two categories, where the modification of the present script occupies a larger space. The latest debate on Persian orthography within this category was initiated in the 1990s by an independent society of Iranian writers, linguists, and computer programmers called Šourā-ye bāznegari dar šiveh-ye negāreš-e xatţ-e fārsi\(^{12}\) (The council for studying the rules of spelling for Persian orthography). The writings and discussions of Šourā-ye bāznegari were published in Ādineh, a literary periodical published in Iran. The guiding principle in Šourā-ye bāznegari’s proposal is to make the process of reading easier by letting the building morphemes of a word keep their original shapes, through keeping a separation of a half-space from one other.\(^{13}\) The principle has been called bi-fāseleh-nevisi, ‘without-space-writing.’

The romanization of the alphabet, which has always been an important element in discussions on Persian orthography, occupies, on the other hand, a smaller space, but it is far from being a completed chapter in the history of Persian orthography. While the advocates of modifications are mostly active in Iran, the romanization of the alphabet has its advocates mostly among Iranians in exile. It does not at all mean that the romanization is a concern only for those living abroad. Primarily, this polarization can be explained by the very limited possibility in Iran for carrying out research projects that can be perceived as threatening by the Islamic government.

Specifically, the latest debates on the romanization of the alphabet have been carried out by a forum composed of Iranians in exile called Konvânsion e Urofârši\(^{14}\) (Eurofarsi Convention). The details of the romanization proposal are presented on the website of the Konvânsion e Urofârši,\(^{15}\) as well as in its periodical, Xatt e Now\(^{16}\) (New Script).\(^{17}\) In addition to the activity of the Eurofarsi Convention, discussions on the need of changing to a Latin alphabet have been carried out by individuals on websites and in periodicals published abroad.

Apart from some short articles on the issue of language planning in Iran, I have not been able to find any other work on the subject in other languages,

---

\(^{12}\) Henceforth I will refer to it as Šourā-ye bāznegari. Šourā-ye bāznegari has been presented in three different ways: 1) Šourā-ye bāznegari-ye šiveh-ye negāreš va xatţ-e fârsi; 2) Šourā-ye bāznegari dar šiveh-ye negāreš-e xatţ-e fârsi; and 3) Šourā-ye bāznegari-ye šiveh-ye negāreš-e xatţ-e fârsi. Whenever I give the full name, I will use the second one, which has occurred most frequently in the texts.

\(^{13}\) Ctrl+space on the computer

\(^{14}\) Rendered as by the Eurofarsi Convention.


\(^{16}\) Rendered as on the front page of the journal.

\(^{17}\) Details of the proposal of the Eurofarsi Convention have been presented in ch. 5.1.
although there are a great number of books and articles written in Persian. These writings constitute the basis of my dissertation, and a large number of them have been mentioned or summarized in this dissertation. Still, I would like to name three recently-written monographs:

1) Darāmadi bar čegunegi-ye šiveh-ye xaṭṭ-e fārsi (An Introduction to Problems of Persian Orthography)\(^\text{18}\) by Mir Shams al-Din Adib Solṭāni (1371), where Persian orthography is studied both synchronically and diachronically, and where recommendations for presenting each parameter in Persian orthography have been put forth. In the last chapter, Adib Solṭāni gives a historical account of different writing systems since the immigration of Aryans onto the Iranian plateau. This historical account is accompanied by a similar account on modern Persian orthography accompanies, where he briefly mentions different discussions on reforming Persian orthography. Adib Solṭāni concludes his study by stating that it is undoubtedly more logical to change the alphabet instead of modifying it and that an alphabet based on ‘Avestan-Greek-Latin’ principles, as he puts it, would be the most logical and accurate alphabet. Such an alphabet or a Latin alphabet with some modification can, according to him, be chosen for Persian, when the time is ripe for changing the alphabet. What is interesting about Adib Solṭāni’s work is that he mentions an alternative approach to the relationship between writing and speech. He writes that in the case of languages with writing, ‘language’ may be conveyed either through the natural organ of speech or the conventional system of the script (Adib Solṭāni 1371:222). He then adds that the expansive modern technology imposes new definitions of the two media, and asks whether TV films and cassette tapes should be counted as written media or spoken media. Whatever the approach, he emphasizes that the point of departure for making a new alphabet or reforming an already-existing alphabet should be its fidelity to what is supposed to be conveyed. As such, it must be simple, with as few exceptions as possible, so that the reader may grasp the message without any difficulty (ibid.:223–224).

2) Barrasi-ye ʿelmi-ye šiveh-ye xaṭṭ-e fārsi (A Scientific Study of Persian orthography) by Nāzilā Khalkhāli (1375). After devoting the first chapter to the issue of language planning and the characteristics of Persian orthography, she then gives an account of Persian orthography in manuscripts as well as in printed material in the next two chapters. Chapter 5 is dedicated to the orthography of Persian words, which is, apart from some sections on the orthography of hamzeh and ezāfeh, concentrated on bound and unbound writing. Chapter 6 is dedicated to the orthography of words of

\(^{18}\) The English title is given by the author himself.
Arabic origin in Persian. In the last chapter, she reviews the latest attempts to address the problems of Persian orthography. She names the two major institutes involved in the issue: the unofficial society of Šourā-ye bāznegari, and the Iranian Academy’s Department of Persian Grammar and Writing System, and then gives an account of the main principles governing their recommendations.

3) Dastur-e xaṭṭ-e fārsi: pažuheši dar bāreh-ye peyvastegi-ye xaṭṭ-e fārsi bā zabān-e fārsi (A study on Persian orthography)\textsuperscript{19} by Salim Neysāri (1374). The first chapter starts out by reviewing the relationship between speech and writing. The author clearly advocates the idea of spoken language as the primary language, and of writing as something secondary and auxiliary which should follow speech (Neysāri 1374:25). After presenting the terminology and the components of a language at a phonological and a morphological level, as well as the terminology and elements present in orthography, the author presents principles that, according to him, should govern Persian orthography. This is accompanied by a very detailed account of the manner of presenting different parameters in Persian orthography.

1.4 Methods and data
Since this study is a case study of language standardization, and since any language standardization is a process involving a complex interaction of linguistic and social factors, the methods employed and data used will vary accordingly in all the chapters. The three different types of methods applied and data used in this study are:

1) Corpus investigation
The corpus data used for the investigation of the most recent orthographic conventions applied in written texts consists of published written texts in Persian during 1990–2000 in Iran. It includes books; both fiction and non-fiction; and journals and newspapers. These sources are used for the study of the basic linguistic aspects of the standardization. The other sources have, on the other hand, been used for the study of both the non-linguistic aspects of the standardization as well as the linguistic aspects of the process. Details of the method employed in this section will be discussed in the relevant section in chapter 7.

2) Diachronic comparative investigation of documents

\textsuperscript{19} The English title is given by the author himself.
The existing literature in the field constitutes the basic sources of this study. It has been my ambition to include as many documents as could be found in the context of Persian orthography since 1850 that contained information on the standardization process. The documents may be of an official nature, such as documents belonging to the Iranian Academy, as well as non-official documents, which are much more comprehensive. The documents are used for the description of the components and processes involved in the standardization of Persian orthography, for the description of the non-linguistic factors influencing the process, and for the linguistic description of different proposals and the non-linguistic ends implied by each of them. They include: a) books, b) editorial manuals, c) websites, d) articles, e) published interviews, f) periodicals, etc. The method applied in chapters 3, 4, and 5 involves a diachronic comparative investigation of these documents.

3) Questionnaire survey
To discover current attitudes and views towards a possible reform of the orthography, as well as the non-linguistic factors influencing the attitudes, an informal open-ended questionnaire was sent to 59 Iranian writers, translators, journalists, and linguists in Iran and outside of Iran. Parts of the questionnaire aimed at discovering the main tendencies within the application of orthographic conventions. Those parts were designed to be incorporated with results from questionnaires sent to publishing houses and Persian journals.

Two other questionnaires were also sent to publishing houses in Iran, as well as to Persian newspapers and journals published both in Iran and outside of Iran. Together with parts of the questionnaire sent to writers and linguists, these questionnaires were aimed at finding out how and by whom the published texts were orthographically edited and which orthographic conventions were applied, to get a clear picture of the present state of the standardization process. Details of the methods employed within the questionnaire surveys will be presented in the relevant sections of chapter 6.

1.5 Structure of the study
My study is organized into eight chapters. Aside from the first three chapters, and the concluding chapter, the body of the study is divided into two parts. The first part, consisting of chapters 4 and 5, comprises the diachronic part of the study, and deals with the standardization process of the orthography since the introduction of the Arabic alphabet up to the present. Chapters 6 and 7 comprise the synchronic part of the study and deal with the most recent state of standardization.

The present chapter, chapter 1, deals with the methods and aims of the study. The theoretical framework of the study has been given a chapter of its
own, namely chapter 2. It is worth mentioning that the representational view on writing, according to which, writing is nothing more than a representational device for speech (Pettersson 1996:1), has for quite a long time dominated almost all studies on writing and orthographic reforms. Persian orthography is not an exception. The discussions on Persian orthography have so far been strongly influenced by the representational and phonemic concept of writing, even by those who have been against any reform towards a more phonemic writing. It has therefore been of special interest for this study to present the recent ideas and theories on the relationship between written and spoken language, as well as between writing and speech. Some psycholinguistic concepts and theories relating to writing and the process of reading have been presented. Theories on language planning and the role of non-linguistic parameters have also been discussed.

Chapter 3 gives an outline of the Persian language, both historically and linguistically. Persian written in other writing systems is also presented. The sound system of Persian and its writing system, the frequently discussed shortcomings of the Persian orthography, word boundaries in Persian, and the issue of bound and unbound writing in Persian orthography will be presented in this chapter.

Chapter 4, as one of the main chapters of the study, deals with the history of Persian orthography since the Arabic conquest of Iran, and the replacement of Pahlavi script by Arabic script. The history of Persian orthography has been divided into two sections. The first section deals with Persian orthography in manuscripts, while the second section deals with Persian orthography after the introduction of printing. Influences from outside, especially the script reform in Turkey; the history of the Iranian Academy and language planning in Iran; the role of the independent institutes, journals, and individuals; and the role of the socio-politic condition in the standardization process of Persian orthography are among the issues to be discussed in chapter 4.

Chapter 5 presents a comprehensive picture of the main proposals for the reformation of Persian orthography within the five major categories mentioned above. An Appendix, in which samples of different proposals are presented, will accompany this chapter (Appendix 1). In chapter 6, the methods and the results of the study’s three questionnaires sent to individual writers and linguists, publishing houses, and journals and newspapers will be presented. In chapter 7, the corpus investigation of orthographic conventions applied in Persian texts published during 1990–2000 will be presented. The

20 See, for instance, Bāṭeni’s article (1372:20), Rābeṭeh-ye xaṭṭ va zabān (The relationship between writing and speech), in which he emphasizes writing as being secondary to speech and an instrument invented in order to represent speech.
questionnaire surveys, together with the corpus investigation, will hopefully present a comprehensive view of today’s Persian orthography. Chapter 8 will conclude the study. The questionnaires, lists of the publishing houses and journals who participated in questionnaire surveys I and II, and lists of the books and journals included in the corpus investigation will be presented in Appendix 2, Appendix 3, and Appendix 4.

I would like to finish this introductory chapter with some remarks on the translations and the terminology used within the dissertation. All translations from Persian into English are my own if nothing else is noted. I have used the terms ‘writing system’, ‘script’ or ‘orthography’ interchangeably, and in the same sense as Sampson (1985:19–20):

[T]o refer to a given set of written marks together with a particular set of conventions for their use. English and German are written with more or less the same set of symbols […]; but the ‘English script’, or ‘English writing-system’ or ‘English orthography’, is rather different from the ‘German script/writing-system/orthography, because the conventions for using the symbols are rather different.

Even if no sharp distinction governs the use of the terms, I tend to use ‘writing system’ when I am referring to the type of the script, for instance, the phonemic consonantal writing system of Persian, and ‘orthography’ “in connection with alternative conventions for using a given set of written marks” (ibid.:20). Coulmas (1996:379) defines orthography as the standardized variety of a given, language-specific writing system and script as the graphic form of the units of a writing system (ibid.:454). I have used ‘script’ in a wider sense, in which Coulmas’ definition of orthography is partly combined with his definition of ‘script’. ‘Script’ is then used for a given language-specific writing system with its peculiarities in graphic form. It is in this sense we can speak of Arabic script and Persian script.

It is worth mentioning that the Persian equivalents of the above terms are also used interchangeably in Persian texts. Xaṭṭ-e fārsi is used interchangeably for both ‘Persian writing system’ and ‘Persian script’, as well as for ‘Persian orthography’. In the case of Persian orthography, other equivalents are also used. Some frequently used Persian equivalents for Persian orthography are as follows: Dastur-e xatṭ-e fārsī, šiveh-ye xatṭ-e fārsī, šiveh-ye negāreš-e xatṭ-e fārsī, rasm al-xatṭ-e fārsi, šiveh-ye emlā-ye fārsī. ‘Orthographic rules’, ‘orthographic conventions’ and ‘rules of spelling’ are also used interchangeably in this dissertation.

Since Persian script is comprised of two different types of elements, letters, and diacritic marks, the general terms of ‘character’ or ‘grapheme’ has been used to refer to both of them.
Another important and recurrent group of terms in the context of Persian orthography includes ‘shortcomings’, ‘defaults’, ‘inadequacies’ etc. In almost all cases, the terms presuppose a phonemic writing system, where a one-to-one correspondence between the sounds and the letters of the language is the ideal situation, and where the task of writing is considered to represent speech. It must be noticed that the use of these terms by me does not imply that I share the representational view on writing. I may believe that Persian orthography has some shortcomings, but my point of departure differs from the point of departure in these writings. In more recent works, for instance in the writings of the Iranian Academy, “vižegi-hā” ‘characteristics’ (Dastur-e xaṭṭ-e fārsi 1378:14) is used instead of ‘shortcomings’, which in my opinion is scientifically more correct. It does not necessarily imply any change in the representational view in the context of Persian orthography, but it may be an indication towards a greater cautiousness in using judgemental terms.

The last group of terms to be discussed includes ‘reform’, ‘alphabet reform’, ‘changeover’, ‘modification’, and ‘orthographic reform’. The ambiguity arises from the way the term ešlāḥ (reform) has been used in Persian texts. In most texts from the earlier period, the word ešlāḥ has been used in the sense of ‘alphabet reform’ or ‘changeover’, but in today’s Persian it is used only in the sense of ‘modification’. It has therefore been of great importance to interpret every occurrence of the word in its context. I have used ‘script reform’, ‘alphabet reform’ and ‘changeover’ interchangeably, referring to radical changes such as romanization of the alphabet, inventing a new alphabet, using Avestan alphabet, or a drastic change in the present script. ‘Orthographic reform’ has been used as a general term, and may refer to both changeover and modification. Modification has been used exclusively to refer to the modification and establishment of the orthographic rules of the present orthography.
Any attempts to study or implement an orthographic reform should involve a multi-dimensional theoretical framework, within which the following issues could be touched upon: written language vs. spoken language, writing and psycholinguistics, language planning, and external non-linguistic factors. The present chapter constitutes the theoretical framework of the dissertation and is arranged under the four major topics already mentioned. The subtopics will deal with subjects such as linguistics and the position of written language; the frequently discussed differences between written and spoken language; the relationship between writing and speech; optimality and efficiency in orthographies; the two basic theories on the process of reading; and spelling.

Before dealing with the theoretical aspects of orthographic reform, it is necessary to discuss some basic concepts and keywords, as there are certain ambiguities regarding these keywords. The theoretical framework of the present work is not free from these ambiguities, as in many parts, I had to quote terms the way they were used in the literature. As such, words like speech or writing may refer to different concepts in different parts of the theoretical framework.

Ambiguities originate from the fact that linguists from different schools, depending on their understanding of language, have used these terms in different ways. The signifier simply does not refer to one and the same signified, and it is not always clear what everybody is referring to when using the following words: written language; writing; spoken language; and speech. Let us begin with the definition of some basic concepts by Saussure, and compare them with the definition of these concepts by the major representative of functional linguistics, Vachek. It was Saussure who introduced terms like *la langue* and *la parole*. By *la langue* Saussure referred to an abstract system and by *la parole* to the concrete realization of this abstract system.\(^\text{21}\) In Saussurian linguistics, however, it is the spoken realization of this abstract system which is the primary sign. The written

\(^{21}\) Competence and performance, in Chomsky’s words.
form has no value of its own. It is just a secondary and auxiliary device to the spoken form:

Language and writing are two distinct systems of signs; the second exists for the sole purpose of representing the first (Saussure 1966:23).

Saussure’s *la parole* is usually translated as ‘speech’, and speech is usually understood as the spoken form of the language. In Saussure’s linguistics, speech is the sign of the first order, while writing is the sign of the second order.

However, these terms are not used in the same way by linguists from other schools. Vachek, one of the major spokesmen of the functionalist school of linguistics, also uses the word ‘speech’, but he maintains that “speech utterances are of two different kinds i.e. spoken and written utterances” (1945–49:87). In contrast to Saussure, Vachek is not afraid of using terms like ‘written language’ and ‘spoken language’. In his world of language, written language and spoken language are two equally justified modes of communication.

While Saussure reduces writing to an auxiliary system of signs that has the task of representing and visualizing the spoken language or speech, Vachek (1945–49:87–88) locates it within the written realm of language, letting it function as the means of written language:

It has been generally admitted that spoken language is based on a system of phonic oppositions capable of differentiating meanings in the given community. As is well known, the system is called the phonemic system and its units are known as phonemes. Analogously, written language must be based on a system of graphic oppositions capable of differentiating meanings in the given community. And it is this system, forming the basis of written language, which we call writing. The units of this system may be called graphemes.

In *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, Crystal (1997a:357) defines speech as follows:

For the most part, the term is used in LINGUISTICS in its everyday sense, providing the subject with its primary DATA. There are two main interpretations of these data, which are complementary rather than opposed. One interpretation is from the viewpoint of PHONETICS: here, speech is seen as MEDIUM of transmission for LANGUAGE – the *spoken medium* or PHONIC SUBSTANCE of language (as opposed to writing) […]. The other interpretation is from the viewpoint of linguistics, where *spoken language* (PERFORMANCE, or PAROLE) can be analysed in
PHONOLOGICAL, GRAMMATICAL, and SEMANTIC, as well as phonetic terms.

In Crystal’s Dictionary, there is no entry for ‘writing’ or ‘written medium’ or ‘written language’, but from the definition above, we can define writing as the MEDIUM of transmission for language – the written medium or GRAPHIC SUBSTANCE of the language. In this sense, speech and writing can be contrasted with each other.

Writing gives us the clues to read a text aloud, and phonographic writing gives us a clue to the phonetic make-up of the read text, but it is not the task of writing to represent speech.

I would like to conclude this part by making it clear that the spoken mode of communication does not necessarily presuppose the existence of physical sounds. There are other properties that turn a form of language into spoken or written than only the physical sounds and the ink, and it is these properties that challenge our traditional definitions of written and spoken language. The new information technology has already provided us with situations where the written signs are used for a kind of communication which functionally is almost spoken (i.e. chat in written form, e-mail...).

2.1 Written language vs. spoken language

2.1.1 Written language and linguistics

The attitudes concerning the position or the status of written language have not been the same throughout the time. The history of the study of language has already witnessed a shift from the supremacy of written language to the supremacy of spoken language. Before the twentieth century, linguistics was marked by an almost total focus on written language. The written language was the genuine and ideal language, and almost all research departed from and was concentrated on, written language. Written language was the medium of high cultural activities like literature and as such a source of standard language. In contrast to the ‘degenerated’ everyday spoken language, it was organized carefully and represented the ‘correct’ language. The spoken language, on the contrary, was considered to lack rules and norms. The study of spoken language was not of any great interest. To speak properly meant to speak according to the norms of the written language. Up to the end of the nineteenth century, the necessary terminology for the precise description of the sounds of the language was missing, and “the science of phonetics did not yet exist…” (Sampson 1985:12)

By Ferdinand de Saussure’s appearance in the early twentieth century, linguistics took a new course. It was now the spoken language’s turn. The
linguists started from the notion that since the spoken language was much older than its written alternative, and since the spoken language was the primary medium of communication among people, the study of language should focus on the spoken form. Written language became secondary, and the science of linguistics now focused on spoken language. Saussure, who had defined writing as a system of signs that existed for the sole purpose of representing language, declared the spoken language as the only object of general linguistics:

The linguistic object is not both the written and the spoken forms of words; the spoken forms alone constitute the object. But the spoken word is so intimately bound to its written image that the latter manages to usurp that main role. People attach even more importance to the written image of a vocal sign than to the sign itself. A similar mistake would be in thinking that more can be learnt about someone by looking at his photograph than by viewing him directly (Saussure 1966:23–24).

This tradition found its strongest manifestation in the American structuralism, whose main figure was Bloomfield. In his book, *Language*, Bloomfield wrote: “Writing is not language, but merely a way of recording language by means of visible marks” (1935:21). During the first half of the twentieth century, linguistics did not show any specific interest in written language. It was not considered as a system in its own right. Vachek (1973:9–10) writes:

The very term written language is hardly ever found in the linguistic books and papers of those periods – the terms usually met with are writing (Schrift, écriture), and even spelling [...].

Sampson (1985:11) writes that up to about thirty years ago, “the only group of linguists to take writing seriously were the Prague School (e.g. Vachek 1973), but their ideas were little discussed outside Continental Europe.” The meaning of ‘written language’ was simply reduced to ‘writing’, and writing was reduced to an instrument with the function of representing or visualizing the ‘real language’ for which the existence of physical sounds was decisive. It is not thus surprising that a phonemic writing system was the optimal goal for script reformers of this school. An ideal, ‘good’, and linguistically correct orthography was an orthography in which a one-to-one correspondence between the phonemes and letters was the general feature.

It took a while before the written language recovered its status as an alternative mode of communication alongside the spoken language. Our understanding of written language as a secondary device or as a system of its own right is of great importance for script reforms. Recent years witness the
emergence of a new attitude toward the written language and its relationship to spoken language, and new theories have been put forth by linguists. Modern linguistics believes in at least a mutual dependency between spoken and written language, if not in the total independence of these two modes of communication from each other. Whatever the attitude on this relationship, it can safely be stated that:

[N]either modern linguistics nor modern psycholinguistics require that a writing system should be phonetic or phonemic or even one-to-one. This once popular theory is now outdated (Berry 1977:12).

Written language, then, should not be reduced to either a phonemic or phonetic transcription of spoken language. The formal, structural, and functional differences between these two different modes of communication are so deep that such a reduction is impossible. A phonetic transcription of the spoken language can be desirable and ideal in some situations. However, it does not belong to the realm of written language, but instead to the realm of spoken language. Its aim is to render the acoustic facts of the spoken utterances.

2.1.2 Formal, structural, and functional differences
The foremost difference between the spoken and written form of language is the difference in substance. While the substance in spoken language is physical sounds, respectively signs and gestures, the substance in written language is ink. The aspect of formality can explain Another difference. The differences are deeper when written language is compared to informal spoken language. But it must be maintained that neither formality nor substance can stand for a sufficient explanation of the differences between these two modes of communication. The differences are much deeper, and they are most striking at the level of structure and function. It is exactly the structural and functional differences that justify both forms’ distinctive position and thus demand separate analysis. These structural and functional differences originate from the fact that spoken and written languages are two different modes of communication adopted for totally different communicative situations. As Crystal (1997b:181) puts it:

Speech is time-bound, dynamic, transient – part of an interaction in which, typically, both participants are present, and the speaker has a specific addressee (or group of addressees) in mind. Writing is space-bound, static, permanent – the result of a situation in which, typically, the producer is distant from the recipient – and, often, may not even know who the recipient is (as with most literature).
There are of course situations where interaction in written form is possible, but they are still limited. Personal correspondences, e-mail, and chat are examples of interaction in written form. It must be kept in mind that in-between modes of communication may continue to emerge. These in-between modes will certainly demand a higher degree of precision on the part of our definition of written and spoken language in the future. However, Crystal (1997b:181) has summarized some frequently discussed differences between spoken and written language, at both the structural and functional levels, as follows:

- Written language is a permanent medium that can be planned in advance. It can repeatedly be read; a matter that gives the writer the opportunity to analyze and reorganize the written word if necessary. That is why written language usually has a compact and well-organized structure. The rapidity and spontaneity in spoken language, on the other hand, do not leave any large space for a well-organized construction as in written form. The speaker’s chances for planning the utterance are usually very limited. Repetition, rephrasing, and fill phrases are features of spoken language, and their function is winning time, as well as helping the speaker to reorganize utterances. Filler phrases such as ‘you know’, ‘you see, etc. do not occur in written language.

- While written language takes advantage of punctuation, capitalization, color, and other graphical effects to distinguish the units of discourse, spoken language has a different repertoire to rely on. The prosodic features such as stress, intonation, loudness, as well as paralinguistic sounds and gestures, are among the instruments that spoken language uses to mark the units of discourse.

- The participants’ presence in a spoken interaction gives birth to constructions that can only be used in spoken context. Deictic expressions like ‘that one, this one, over there, and over here, appear only in a spoken interaction where the participants can see each other. Such expressions do not normally appear in a written context, in which the participants usually can not see each other. Written language, on the other hand, makes use of features that can not appear in a spoken context. Diagram, charts, tables and complicated formulas belong only to the realm of written language.

- The absence of immediate feedback in a written interaction demands a higher degree of clarity. The producer of the text should minimize the ambiguity and vagueness as much as possible.
There are grammatical constructions and lexical units that are either specific to written language (polysyllabic chemical terms, icons, etc), or to spoken language (slang and obscene expressions). Written language creates the framework of the standard language, and it is the written language that almost always is used in legal and official context. Written language is more formal.

2.1.3 Theories on the relationship between writing and speech
In my opinion, theories on the relationship between speech and writing can be divided into two major areas: representational and non-representational. The main question separating them is: what is the main function of writing? What is the main function of written language?

The history of written language shows that the intended function of the written form of language from the beginning was not as a representation of the spoken form. The written form of language was a new communicative medium, adopted to meet those communicative needs that could not be accomplished by the other medium, namely the spoken form, not to mention other mediums. Bolinger (1968:158) counts the functions that writing has fulfilled since its beginning as follows:

[C]ommunication across time (which until the invention of sound-recording devices was impossible for speech), communication across great distance (which likewise was impossible for speech until the appearance of telephone), and communication to great numbers of people (which was closed to speech until the invention of radio).

Stressing the function of the written form of the language, Bolinger maintains that if an alphabetic writing system fails to become completely phonemic, it is simply because the writers “have other needs and interests than that of making their writing a perfect image of their speech” (ibid.). Performing a perfect image of speech in visible marks has its functional justification and its history.

The interest in an exact transcription of the spoken language, phonetic notation, occurred simultaneously with the growing interest in the study of the languages and cultures of Asia, and the interest for representing the pronunciation of these languages in Roman characters. The first serious attempt in this field can be traced to 1788, when Sir William Jones, a British judge based in Calcutta, and the linguist who first presented the Indo-

---

22 It is clear that the specific constructions used in spoken language may occur in written form (e.g. in cases of writing down dialogues), but it must be noted that in those cases we are dealing with writing down a spoken utterance, and not with written language. The same is true when a written text is read aloud. The physical sounds do not turn it to spoken language.
European hypothesis of language family relationships, proposed a system, based on Roman letters and modified by a set of diacritics, for the phonetic notation of many Asian languages. Christian missionary and linguistic activity in the nineteenth century in Africa led to the design of several numbers of Roman-based alphabets for native African languages. The first instructions for the standardization of a single orthography were developed by the German Egyptologist Richard Lepsius in 1854. Lepsius’ notational system, which was based on the italic shapes of the Roman alphabet, some Greek characters, and a great number of diacritics, was accepted in England and Germany. The system was pushed aside by Sweet’s Broad Romic, as well as by the International Phonetic Alphabet. IPA came to become an important platform for creating orthographies for languages without a written form (MacMahon 1996:831–836, Venezky 1977:38–39, Robins 1969:202).

However, in 1930, a new system was presented by the International African Institute, in which attention had been paid to the psychological and pedagogical factors for the first time:

This attention to human factors in the design of orthographies for African languages preceded by almost twenty years any similar concern in the United States (Venezky 1977:39).

The interest in creating alphabets for languages lacking a written form was more or less synchronic with the emergence of the Saussurian and the American tradition of linguistics, according to which the written form existed for the sole purpose of representing the spoken form. It must not be surprising that the phonetic- or phonemic-based orthographies came to be considered as the best and most practical orthographies.

An influential organ in developing the principles for creating orthographies was the Summer Institute of Linguistics in the USA, with its “phonemic concept”. Pike, Gudschinsky, and Nida were three outstanding theorists of the Summer Institute. Pike (1947:208) wrote:

A practical orthography should be phonemic. There should be a one-to-one correspondence between each phoneme and the symbolization of that phoneme.

Pike’s strict phonemic principle was questioned by Nida (1963:23), who stressed the importance of external non-linguistic factors in making alphabets, as well as the complicated process of reading:

[R]eading consists of a complex series of reactions to visual symbols; and though visual symbols should be related to speech sounds, there are certain
exceptions to the rule of one-to-one correspondence and the requirement that writing must follow the precise manner in which people speak.

He stressed, among other things, the importance of the preservation of the graphic unit. To stress the role and importance of external non-linguistic factors was not new, it was “the unity of the visual impression” (ibid.:25) that was new, and which united this tradition to some degree with the linguistics of the Prague School.

The first thing the Prague School did was to take the study of written language seriously. The linguists from this school developed the “independence theory”, even if they did not always call it so. It was Vachek and Bolinger who “asserted the mutual independence of the phonic and graphic systems” (Berry 1977:8) and stressed the importance of studying written language as a system in its right, not as a phonetic transcription of the spoken language. In his book, Written Language: General Problems and Problems of English (1973:9, 14), Vachek refers to two different approaches towards written language: “The pre-functionalist view of written language” and “The functionalist approach to written language.” While the first approach is stamped by the absolute supremacy of the spoken language (ibid.:10), the other approach is more interested in working out a linguistic framework, within which there would be enough space for both the spoken and written language.

The Danish linguist, H. J. Uldall, was one of the first persons who, starting from Saussure’s distinction between la langue and la parole, tried to work out such a framework. According to Uldall (1944:11), the difference between written and spoken language could be explained by a difference in substance. He apprehended language as an abstract system, set apart from the substance in which it is manifested, and wrote:

> The system of speech and the system of writing are thus only two realizations out of an infinite number of possible systems, of which no one can be said to be more fundamental than any other (ibid.:16).

In Uldall’s theory, the supremacy of spoken language was questioned, as the supremacy was given to the abstract system of language. Vachek criticizes Uldall for seeing language as an abstract form, for which the substance is unimportant. He stresses that the differences between the two systems can not be obtained from the differences of the two substances alone, but “by introducing into our examination the functional consideration, in other words, by trying to find out the functional justification of the existence of written language alongside of spoken language” (Vachek 1973:15), but it does not mean that the substance is totally unimportant.
In 1959, and in his later version of his theory, Vachek proposed terms such as the ‘spoken norm of language’ and the ‘written norm of language’ instead of ‘spoken language’ and ‘written language’. Whatever the terms, the most important thing was to be able to answer the question “what justification each of the two [norms] may have within the community” (ibid.). Vachek answers this question by referring to his earlier definition of these norms:

The SPOKEN NORM of language is a system of phonically manifestable language elements whose function is to react to a given stimulus [...] in a dynamic way, i.e. in a ready and immediate manner, duly expressing not only the purely communicative but also the emotional aspect of the approach of the reacting language user. The WRITTEN NORM of language is a system of graphically manifestable language elements whose function is to react to a given stimulus [...] in a static way, i.e. in a preservable and easily surveyable manner, concentrating particularly on the purely communicative aspect of the approach of the reacting language user (ibid.:15–16).

Vachek indicates that the two norms are complementary and that, in a literate society, there is usually a good command of both norms. He emphasizes that since the written norm is usually applied in “higher cultural and civilizational” contexts, like literature, research, and administration, it should be considered to be “the marked member of an opposition whose unmarked member is the corresponding spoken norm.” Vachek emphasizes the special task that the written norm accomplishes, and rejects the alleged inferiority of the written norm (ibid.:16–17).

It is within the above functional framework that Vachek redefines terms like spelling and orthography, which are usually used vaguely. While orthography is, according to him, “a set of rules enabling the language user to transpose the spoken utterances into the corresponding written ones,” spelling “serves to express the material make-up of the written utterances by phonetic means.” He maintains that the phonetic transcription is the counterpart of spelling as it “serves to express the material make-up of the spoken utterances by graphical means.” Vachek then disapproves of the established belief of phonetic transcription belonging to “the domain of written language.” Phonetic transcription belongs, according to him, to the domain of spoken norm (ibid.:18–19). Clarifying the distinction between phonetic transcription and writing or orthography is a recurrent point in Vachek’s writings. In earlier writing Vachek (1945–49) had pointed out that:

Any sound linguistic theory must be based on concrete utterances of speech. It is often overlooked, however, that speech utterances are of two different kinds, i.e. spoken and written utterances. The latter cannot be simply
regarded as optical projections of the former […]. It should be added that whereas a transcribed text is to be regarded as a sign of the second order (i.e. the sign of a sign of the outside world…), the text recorded in writing is to be taken, at least in advanced cultural communities, as a sign of the first order (i.e. the sign of an outside world) (ibid.:87, 89–90).

Vachek is of the opinion that it is absolutely out of the functional framework of the written language to show “the phonic make-up” of the spoken language. Still, he maintains that writing was historically developed out of a kind of “quasi-transcription”, and was “a sign of the second order” from the beginning, but he emphasizes that it was the case within the very early phases, when man tried to catch and preserve the “fleeting spoken utterances by putting them down in writing. Soon, however, such a secondary system of signs became a primary one, i.e., written signs began to be bound directly to the content” (Vachek 1945–49:91). Pettersson (1996:30–31) criticizes Vachek for this statement and asks:

[W]hat kind of beginning is Vachek referring to? In fact, it misses the origin of writing by a couple of thousand years, at least. Because it is the early Greek writing that Vachek is describing […]. He lives in a world where writing is letters and speech is phonemes. And the issues which remain concern questions whether single letters and phonemes correspond or whether and what aggregates correspond.

The Prague school’s breakthrough in phonology, especially the theory of the non-atomic construction of phonemes (the theory of distinctive features), contributed strongly to the questioning of the phonemic principle as the best principle in all situations:

[A]lphabetic transcription (traditional orthography and phonemic transcription alike) treats successive segments of speech-sound as single atomic elements […]. Speech-sounds are not indivisible atoms. However, for convenience in reading and writing, it is advantageous to use a code which represents a whole bundle of such phonetic properties using a single symbol […]. This aspect of alphabetic writing is only a matter of practical convenience and long tradition, and there seems to be no good theoretical justification for it; functionally, as well as physically, sounds are ‘bundles of phonetic properties’ rather than unitary lumps […] It is these phonetic properties rather than phonemes that are the basic building blocks of phonology (Katamba 1989:25–26, 33).

Even if the functional school of Prague had contributed a great deal to the study of writing, other voices were still necessary so that the phonemic
principle of writing as the most optimal one could be questioned. Despite the contribution of the Prague school, the situation was the same until 1957, when Noam Chomsky presented his transformational-generative grammar:

Recent work in phonological theory within the framework of transformational grammar is [...] grammatically oriented. In contrast to the many structuralists’ descriptions, generative treatments begin by stating syntactic structure and only then pass on to phonology which can make use of any syntactic facts which are relevant (Berry 1977:8).

Chomsky and Halle presented in their common book, *The Sound Pattern of English*, the English orthography as “close to being an optimal orthographic system for English” (Chomsky and Halle 1968:49). They maintained:

Orthography is a system designed for readers who know the language, who understand sentences and therefore know the surface structure of sentences. Such readers can produce the correct phonetic forms, given the orthographic representation and the surface structure, by means of the rules that they employ in producing and interpreting speech (ibid.).

They were for a morphophonemic orthography, within which the original shape of the morphemes is preserved, and the graphic symbols can immediately be associated to the semantic. Chomsky’s linguistics has substantially contributed to the development of psycholinguistics, which in its turn has substantially contributed to the understanding of the complicated process involved in reading. Within the Chomskyan tradition of linguistics, the interdependency between the spoken form of the language and the written form moved to the level of semantics.

The final break with Saussure’s structuralism and his view on written language came in 1967 when Derrida in his book, *Of Grammatology*, called in question the traditional view of written language as a “derivative, auxiliary form of language in general” (Derrida 1998:7). He focuses on Saussure’s definition of written language and goes back to Plato and Aristotle to show how Saussure’s view on written language resembles theirs. Derrida (1998:30) maintains that such a view on written language is not peculiar to Saussure, it “reflects the structure of a certain type of writing: phonetic writing [...] which in fact is never completely phonetic.” He (ibid.:11) then quotes Aristotle’s definition to show how Saussure’s definition resembles it:

[S]poken words (ta en tē phonē) are the symbols of mental experience (pathēmata tes psychēs) and written words are the symbols of spoken words (*De interpretatione*, 1, 16a 3) [...].
He maintains that this view on written language reflects the Western “logocentrism: […] which has […] always assigned the origin of truth in general to logos” (Derrida 1998:3). He writes:

It is not a simple analogy: writing, the letter, the sensible inscription, has always been considered by Western tradition as the body and matter external to the spirit, to breath, to speech, and to the logos. (ibid.:35).

It was this logocentrism and accordingly phonocentrism that reduced the written language to “a symbol of the second order; a signifier of signifier.” The voice is considered as nearest to the mind and meaning, and as such a sign of the first order. Derrida criticizes Saussure for reducing the function of writing to a narrow and derivative one (ibid.:30):

Narrow because it is nothing but one modality among others […]. Derivative because representative: signifier of the first signifier, representation of the self-present voice, of the immediate, natural, and direct signification of the meaning (of the signified, of the concept, of the ideal object or what have you).

Derrida takes a step further than Vachek and Chomsky and questions the view on written language as a secondary form by questioning Saussure’s definition of sign, within which the mental concept of the referent, signified, and the word image, signifier, are united. Derrida maintains that the word writing today has ceased to designate the signifier of signifier in the sense of being something auxiliary, but the interesting thing is that:

[…] “signifier of the signifier” no longer defines accidental doubling and fallen secondarity. “Signifier of the signifier” describes on the contrary the movement of language […]. There is not a single signified that escapes, even if recaptured, the play of signifying reference that constitute language […]. This, strictly speaking, amounts to destroying the concept of “sign” and its entire logic (ibid.:7).

There is no final signified for Derrida, and every signified will function as a signifier. As such writing may be a signifier of signifier, but not necessarily a derivative and auxiliary form of spoken language.

Roy Harris follows, in his book The Origin of Writing, in Derrida’s footsteps and tries to break the dominance of the Western phonocentrism over the study of written language and to redefine the concept of writing. His primary aim in the book is to give a “satisfactory account of its [writing’s] origin,” but he notifies that before doing so he must answer: “the apparently prior question: ‘What is writing?’” (Harris 1986:vii). Harris emphasizes that
the definition of ‘writing’ has been controlled by the Western conception of the alphabet as “the writing system par excellence” (ibid.:7). It must be notified that the invention of the alphabet was ascribed to the Greeks for quite a long time (Gelb 1969:166, 197), while the syllabic writing systems were considered as systems belonging to an earlier phase in the evolution of writing systems (ibid.:191). Harris criticizes this “evolutionary fallacy” (1986:57) in the study of written language.

Derrida and Roy Harris are not alone in their critique of Western ethnocentrism and phonocentrism, within which real writing is considered to be phonographic and presupposes the purpose of writing to be representing speech. Pettersson criticizes in his book, Grammatological Studies (1996), this representational view on writing from a functional point of view. He devotes the third chapter of his book to presenting some attempts to reject the representational view. The main point of Pettersson’s criticism is that all these attempts are still moving in a world where writing is letters and speech is phonemes, and where written language is opposed to sounded spoken language (ibid.:23-45). According to Pettersson we should replace the traditional sound-oriented opposition by the opposition of written language versus non-written language, so that there would be space for other modes of communication like sign language (ibid.:55–58, 100–104).

In 1964, Andrée F. Sjoberg published the article: “Writing, Speech and Society: Some Changing Interrelationships.” Sjoberg’s article is also a functional approach towards the written language. In this article, Sjoberg emphasizes the importance of “the general socio-economic basis of the society” for the written language and how this factor influences written language. She takes up the different functional demands that different societies such as “Preindustrial civilized societies”, “Industrial societies” and “ Transitional societies” may impose on written language. Sjoberg may have had no idea of what demands a society driven by information technology would impose on written language, but her functional approach leaves space for the demands of the new society. The expansion of information technology has contributed to an increase of pictures and iconic elements, which are considered to belong to a lower phase in the evolution of writing, in at least one type of written texts. It seems, too, that we are in need of reconsidering the distinguishing borders between spoken and written language, and realigning our focus on finer distinctions. Modern technology seems to create new norms. Harris (1986:158) writes:

[W]ith this latest of the communications revolutions did it become obvious that the origin of writing must be linked to the future of writing in ways which bypass speech altogether.
2.2 Writing and psycholinguistics

2.2.1 Optimality, efficiency, and being easy to learn

Psycholinguistics as an almost new branch of linguistics still has a lot to contribute to the field of the perception and processing of language signs. Demystifying the anatomical and physiological processes involved in reading and writing acts has been of great interest for psycholinguistics. At a more practical level, psycholinguistics has tried to answer questions like: How does every writing system function for those who try to learn and those who already use it? What mental processes are involved when a fluent reader extracts the message from the written text? How do differences in writing systems influence these processes? To answer these questions, we have to define concepts like relative optimality and efficiency.

What is optimality? What is efficiency? What are the criteria for optimality and efficiency? The criteria are certainly many, and may vary from one language to another. We can define optimality and efficiency in external non-linguistic terms as well. Lotz (1972:121) writes:

One can also view optimality of a writing system in terms of its effectiveness in achieving continuity in time and comprehension in space. The optimal orthography of a writing system would then be the one which secures literacy for large numbers of people through a long period of time. In practice a writing system that secures literacy demands a constancy in orthography that cannot reflect fluctuations of language within social and regional dialects, or reflect too rapidly fluctuations due to historical change.

Still, there are two major criteria that apply to all writing systems: 1) how does the system work for those who master it, and 2) how does it work for those who are trying to learn it? In most cases, the needs of the two groups are in conflict with each other. A well-elaborated and well-functioning system, in which the needs of both groups can be satisfied, is, according to researchers, a system in which the following sub-criteria are met:

The optimal orthography for a language would be expected to reach the proper balance in minimizing arbitrariness, minimizing redundancy, and maximizing expressiveness while still maintaining a standardized spelling (Klima 1972:61).

Even these sub-criteria are often in conflict with each other. Neither is there a consensus on the definition of concepts like expressiveness, arbitrariness, and redundancy. The expressiveness in a phonemic writing system can be seen as redundancy in a morphophonemic writing system.
Optimality and efficiency cannot be discussed without taking into consideration the following facts: any specific script is a system directed to those who know the specific language; and to learn and master reading is not the same as mastering spelling. What is a source of efficiency in reading may, therefore, be a source of inefficiency in spelling. Up to now, most research on the optimality and efficiency aspects has been focused on the process of reading and the reader. There are different theories on how we read, and it is out of these theories that the optimality and the efficiency of different writing systems are appreciated.

2.2.2 Theories of how we read: Reading by ear and by eye

In addition to the anatomical and physiological processes involved in reading, a series of mental processes take place during reading. The mental processes are certainly not the same with a beginner as with a fluent reader. Every theory on the process of reading must, therefore, be able to explain what happens when a beginner reads as well as when a fluent reader reads. It must be observed that reading should not be confined to reading aloud, but should include reading for extracting the message. Reading is not just a simple deciphering: “It is this link – between graphology […] and semantics […] – that has to be explained by any theory of reading” (Crystal 1997b:211).

There are two major theories on how we read. The first one is based on the importance of learning to sound out words and letters in learning to read. It means that reading is possible only when the symbols are heard – the ‘ear’ approach. According to this theory, also called serial theory, or bottom-up processing, a phonic or phonological step is an essential step in reading. “The view implies that reading is a serial or linear process, taking place letter-by-letter, with larger units gradually being built up” (Crystal 1997b:212)

The point of departure of the other theory is the direct and immediate relationship between the symbols and the semantic – the ‘eye’ approach. According to this theory, also called parallel theory, or top-down processing, “a phonological bridge is unnecessary […]. Words are read as wholes, without being broken down into a linear sequence of letters and sounded out” (ibid.) To prefer a phonemic-based writing system before a morphophonemic-based or other types of writing systems and vice versa depends on what theory is our point of departure.

Both theories are based on a very long and intensive research, and there are plenty of arguments for both of them, but the fact is that neither of them is capable of covering all aspects of reading:

[I]t is likely that people make use of both strategies at various stages in learning and in handling different kinds of reading problem. The ‘ear’
The ‘eye’ approach [...] is evidently very important during the initial stages [...]. But the ‘eye’ approach [...] is certainly needed in order to explain most of what goes on in fluent adult reading (ibid.:213).

To be able to link graphemes to phonemes is considered as essential for the beginner, and for being able to read non-words as well as reading words we meet for the first time. To be able to link graphemes to phonemes, however, demands, according to some researchers, a degree of abstraction which does not exist in children beginning to learn to read. What the child hears is syllables, as phonemes are abstract units that cannot be heard by the child. The task of grapho-phonemic mapping is, therefore, a very difficult task for the child at the age of initiating reading (Savin 1972:321–324).

Eleanor J. Gibson (1972:12) also warns about an oversimplification of the relationship between phonemes and graphemes:

"Writing is a code for speech. But the mapping rule is not simply one letter for one phoneme. It would not even be particularly useful if this were true, if a phoneme is heard as invariant only over a speech segment no smaller than a syllable, at best."

Pettersson, too, questions the possibility of an innate capacity for apprehending phonemic structure, and of the existence of a degree of phonemic awareness among children beginning school. He maintains: “phonemes are not real units of a person’s use of language; phonemes are merely a convenient way of describing linguistic utterances” (1996:114). Pettersson is of the opinion that the phonemic awareness comes after some degree of training in alphabetic writing. Our phonemic concept is, as a matter of fact, a result of our training in alphabetic writing. Studies have shown that people not trained in alphabetic writing, like illiterate people or Chinese not acquainted with alphabet writing, have great difficulty in performing phonemic segmentation (ibid.:114–115)

It has also been emphasized that it is not the physical sounds that make a language. The existence of sign language is strong evidence. Some linguists consider sign language to be the initial language, not the sounded language (Crystal 1997b:293). Studies on how deaf people read show that reading can take place without a stage of phonological transformation (Brewer 1972:362). The phonological mapping may be a preference for hearing people, but not a necessity. The sound-oriented or phoneme-oriented study of writing misses the fact that most writing systems are mixed systems, within which elements from different systems are simultaneously present. In most alphabetic writing systems, like English, there exist a large number of non-alphabetic elements (Garman 1990:35); a feature that is expanding by the rapid expansion of computerized communication. It seems that most
writing systems are dependent on a parallel use of semantic-based strategies and phonographic-based strategies.

2.2.3 Spelling

Optimality and efficiency in a certain writing system cannot be estimated without taking into consideration the spelling. As mentioned before, what is a source of optimality and efficiency in reading may have an opposite effect in spelling. Up to now, almost all research has been concentrated on reading. It was also generally believed that proficiency in writing and spelling follows proficiency in reading. In the last few years, researchers have developed an interest in spelling difficulties and have found that there is no such direct correlation between proficiency in reading and spelling. Crystal (1997b:215) maintains that the processes involved in reading and writing are not the same at all:

> Whereas reading is largely a matter of developing direct links between graphic expression and meaning […], spelling seems to involve an obligatory phonological component from the very outset […]. To be a good speller, we need to have both this phonological awareness (to cope with the regular spelling patterns) and a good visual awareness (to cope with the exceptions). Poor spellers, it seems, lack this double skill.

Research shows that the correlation between reading and spelling ability is not a straightforward one. There are some good readers that are poor spellers and vice versa. A good speller has a good degree of phonemic awareness. It should still be noted that the degree of proficiency in reading, writing, and spelling is strongly directed by the amount of the read text a person is exposed to over his lifetime. Many poor readers and poor spellers, excluding dyslexics, are those who are not in continuous contact with written texts. It does not mean that the degree of difficulty in all writing systems is the same. There is no doubt that having a limited set of symbols and rules, less arbitrariness, and a clearer correlation between the written language and the spoken one make the script easier to learn and master. Vachek (1989:93) points out that the functional differentiation between the two norms of the language does not exclude the need for some correspondence between the two norms:

> Such correspondence is absolutely necessary for sheer practical reasons – and the language user will often find himself in a situation in which he must switch over from a spoken to a written utterance or vice versa (i.e. he has to

---

23 Not necessarily on a phonological level, but on any other level, e.g. morphological and syntactical levels.
put down in writing what has been spoken, or to read aloud what has been written). If the gap separating the two norms is found to be too wide, the process of switching over from the one to the other is felt to be very difficult and demands may emerge for the narrowing of the gap, in popular terms, for an orthographic reform.

Research on orthographic reforms, nevertheless, shows that it is seldom the linguistic and pedagogical factors but the external non-linguistic factors that determine if a script reform is going to succeed or not.

2.3. Language planning

Another effect of structuralist linguistics, especially American structuralism, with its focus on spoken language, was that it contributed to the spread of an anti-normative linguistics. It was a reaction to the normative linguistics that had dominated almost all linguistics before the twentieth century. Slogans like “Leave your language alone”24 characterized the linguistics of the 1950s in the USA. The extreme supremacy of spoken language and the anti-normative linguistics did not leave any space for activities like standardization or planning. Many linguists believed that language was an autonomous and self-contained system that should not be subjected to deliberate modification by variables outside this system. This situation was dominant up to the 1930s, when The Prague School, once again, contributed to a series of theoretical works on language standardization. It was first in the 1960s that Language Planning (LP) established itself as a branch of Applied Linguistics. What is language planning? According to Haugen (1972:512) language planning, like any other type of planning, is:

[… ] a human activity that arises from the need to find a solution to a problem. It can be completely informal and ad hoc, but it can also be organized and deliberated. It may be undertaken by private individuals or it may be official […]. LP is called for wherever there are language problems. If a linguistic situation for any reason is felt to be unsatisfactory, there is room for a program of LP.

Fishman (1993:2) points out that the sociology of language is concerned not only with behavior through language but also with behavior toward language. Language planning, according to him, is then nothing but organized behavior toward language. According to Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971:195–196):

Planning […] refers to the utilization of resources in a consciously controlled manner. Social planning is an example of decision-making behavior normally attributed to intelligent individual action for problem-solving […]. The logic of language planning is dictated by the recognition of language as a societal resource.

Three types of actors are usually involved in language problems: individuals – especially linguists, different groups and communities, and the state. According to Ager (2001:2–6), the goals and the motives behind any language planning vary depending on the planners’ approach to language as an expressive and communicative instrument or as an object, as well as the actors engaged in language planning. Ager is of the opinion that terms like “language planning” and “language policy” are usually used when the language is considered as an object, and when the language behavior of communities or states are under consideration rather than individuals. Therefore he prefers to use language policy for “official planning, carried out by political authorities” and language planning for:

[T]he ways in which organized communities, united by religious, ethnic or political ties, consciously attempt to influence the language(s) their members use, the languages used in education, or the ways in which, Academies, publishers or journalists make the language change” (ibid.:5).

Not all linguists use the terms similarly. While some prefer using language policy for state-governed actions, and language planning for non-official actions practiced by academics, individuals, and different groups and communities (Tauli 1974:56–57, Ager 2001:6), others emphasize that language planning involves decision-making; it is not an idealistic and exclusively linguistic activity. Language planning is, according to them, “a political and administrative activity for solving language problems in society” (Jernudd and Das Gupta 1971:211).

Language planning is usually divided into two fields of application: status planning and corpus planning. While status planning is concerned with a language’s or language variety’s status and prestige, the concern in corpus planning involves the forms of the language. Standardization, lexical expansion, making or reforming a script, and so on are parts of corpus planning (Ager 2001:6, Fishman 1974:18–24), but it does not mean that they are totally independent of each other. In Fishman’s words (1993:2):

When language planning efforts succeed in the sociopolitical realm they turn increasingly (and, ultimately, solely) to corpus planning. Although the two, status planning and corpus planning, should theoretically not be too far “out of synch” with one another […].
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However, in 1966, Einar Haugen presented a model in which he explained
the four phases involved in language planning. Some time later, the model
was elaborated by Haugen, himself, and other linguists, but the basic
dimensions were still the same as in the original model of Haugen: selection;
codification; implementation; and elaboration. Norm selection means
selection of one language or one language variety over another language or
language variety. This phase does usually take place at the national and
governmental level. It is first when a norm has been chosen at an official
level that the technical and linguistic aspect of the norm comes into
consideration. Codification deals with stabilizing and standardizing the
chosen norm through written language. At this phase, both individuals and
academics may be active. The implementation consists of activities for
spreading the chosen norm. Writers and academics, institutes, and the state
may all be involved in these activities. Elaboration is about activities for the
sake of expanding the functional domain of the chosen norm (Haugen

It is clear that the actors involved in language planning play a varying role
during the four different phases. Fishman (1993:2) maintains:

The various models of the language planning flow-chart […] all posit a
beginning stage at which time no authoritative policy decisions have yet been
reached.

Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971:197) criticize Haugen’s model for not
emphasizing this pre-initial stage. They maintain that language planning
should allow “for problems to be consciously recognized sometimes first
among the planners, rather than by a political authority.” Criticizing Tauli’s
understanding of language planning, they also maintain that language
planning should reflect “a composite urge articulated in the national
community” not “the abstract ideals of a selected, albeit deeply concerned,
group of linguists” (ibid.:198).

What the criteria are in language planning is, on the other hand, still under
discussion. Efficiency, economy, rationality, acceptability, and adequacy are
among the criteria that have been proposed by scholars. In his article from
1966, Haugen proposes efficiency, adequacy, and acceptability as criteria for
language planning (1972:520–523). It is unrealistic to believe that there is
any consensus on what each of these criteria mean, which one of them
weighs the heaviest, and how each of them can be achieved. Jernudd and
Das Gupta maintain that there is an interaction between the above criteria in
language planning. They are of the opinion that it is not possible to define
them in isolation from each other. They define efficiency, adequacy, and
acceptability in language planning as follows:
An alternative for solving a language problem is effective, in our definition of the term, when it is expected to accomplish what we want it to accomplish. When making a prognosis, planners take into account the “acceptability” of possible alternatives. The alternatives are formulated because a linguistic phenomenon is felt to be less “adequate” (1971:199).

It is clear that no norm can be selected without considering the functional capacity of the norm, and the probabilities of acceptance.

2.4 External non-linguistic factors

The need for language planning and language reform in most cases is a result of modernization in the society. Modernization creates demands for language change and standardization. The shape and the degree of language change are usually in accordance with modernization within the society. Language planning is a part of social change, and as such subjected to the rules of this kind of change. It is not the linguistic product in a language planning which is of the greatest importance but the change process itself. Fishman (1983:110) maintains:

Modernization, if it is to be broadly effective, rather than merely elitist and restricted or continually imposed from above, ultimately comes face to face with massive needs for sociocultural phenomenological continuity, stability, and legitimacy, regardless of how much econo-technical change occurs. The many examples of twentieth-century corpus planning in ‘developing countries’ reveal most clearly the dialectic between the modern and the traditional, the imported and the indigenous [...].

In language planning at the corpus level, there is always a risk in reducing all planning into merely technical and linguistic practice. There is also a risk for reducing the language into an instrument that can be changed at will. Haugen (1971:284) criticizes both Tauli and Ray for their instrumentalism, and opposes Tauli’s statement on language as an instrument that “can be evaluated, altered, regulated, improved, and replaced by others and new languages and components of a language can be created at will” (Tauli 1974:51). Tauli’s instrumentalism is an extreme reaction toward the anti-normative structuralism of the earlier century. However, language planning is a very complicated process in which a number of linguistic and external non-linguistic factors are involved. All instances of language planning should, therefore, be clear about the complex interaction of these external non-linguistic factors. Factors such as national, religious, and ethnic identity; political aspirations; the position of executive organs; the political stability; and economic resources all shape and determine the direction of a
language planning process and its chances of success. It is seldom practical, pedagogical or linguistic advantages that determine if a language planning is going to succeed or not. Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971:197) also emphasize the social aspects of language planning:

[A]n optimal design of a plan would require the coordinated attention of political, educational, economic, and linguistic authorities. It is important to recognize the relations of interdependency among the above authorities because, otherwise, the social rationale of language planning may become subordinated to a predominantly normative linguistic rationale, or hidden by method.

In most cases of language planning, the foremost important feature involves the motives behind the planning. The real motives are usually of a non-linguistic nature. Even in cases of corpus planning, such as word coinage, purism, selective purism, neologism, change of alphabet, and so on, the real goals are usually of a non-linguistic nature. These external non-linguistic goals can be ideological, political, nationalistic, ethnic, or religious. These goals may change over the course of time and in accordance with the ideological, political, social, and economic changes at both global and local levels.

The case of Hindi versus Urdu is an interesting one. From the beginning, the linguistic difference between them was insignificant, and the only major distinction between them was their different alphabets. When the ideology of a separate Muslim nation arose in Northern India, Urdu came to symbolize an ideology and a national and religious identity. To make Urdu a more powerful symbol of identity, it had to be changed. New Arabic and Persian words were adopted, while words of Sanskrit origin were removed. Hindi took the opposite course, adopting elements from Sanskrit and purifying itself from Arabic and Persian words. The two once mutually intelligible languages came to become almost unintelligible in relation to each other to intensify different identities (Even-Zohar 1986). Cases of language reforms driven by external non-linguistic goals are many and the literature in this field is so rich that we safely can talk about it being a general rule rather than an exception.

Orthographic reforms, like other types of corpus planning, are also dependent on a range of external non-linguistic factors. Cases where the adoption of particular scripts by different communities have been conditioned by religion are many. Sampson (1985:16) maintains:

[T]erritorial boundaries between different scripts frequently coincide with, and are explained by, boundaries between religions. One obvious case is the use of Roman versus Cyrillic alphabets by speakers of different Eastern
European languages: Russians, Bulgarians, Serbs use Cyrillic, while Poles, Czechs, Croats use Roman, and the division coincides with that between the Eastern Orthodox and the Western Catholic churches. It has nothing to do with differences between the languages; the nations listed all speak fairly closely-related Slavonic languages, and indeed Serbs and Croats speak the same language although they write it with different letters.

External non-linguistic factors are sometimes so decisive that it may become necessary to define concepts like optimality and efficiency regarding external non-linguistic factors, too. A certain orthography with possible linguistic and pedagogical shortcomings may in some cases be the most optimal, for example regarding being transdialectal. It can safely be said that without the support of external non-linguistic factors, language planning is doomed to fail. In the case of alphabet making, Berry (1968:737) verifies for example that:

> [A]n alphabet is successful in so far and only in so far as it is scientifically and socially acceptable. The two interests often conflict and it would be a fallacy to assume, as it sometimes is done [...], that the choice of an orthography can be determined solely on grounds that are linguistically or pedagogically desirable. Where systems of writing become identified (as often happens) with unreasoning and unreasonable political, national and religious passions [...] there is little that the linguist can or should do.

Even the authoritative way of carrying out the alphabet reform in Turkey in 1929, and the alphabet reform in the republics of the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s, had support from external non-linguistic factors. The real motives behind these reforms were also external to the actual linguistic structure. Breaking with an unwanted identity and the desire to be integrated into a new identity, or being forced into a new identity, were the main motives behind these reforms. Just the authoritative way of implementing the reforms played a decisive role in the success of these reforms. The alphabet reforms benefited from low level of literacy in pre-reform Turkey and the republics of the Soviet Union. In the case of Turkey, the lack of a long literary tradition has been mentioned as a positive factor for the alphabet reform. Scholars are of the opinion that in cases of languages with a long literary tradition, it is much more difficult to launch a script reform:

---


26 For more information, see Lewis (1968) and Henze (1977).
Indeed, the greater and grander the tradition of literacy, literature, and liturgy in an orthographic community, the less likely that even minor systematic orthographic change will be freely accepted and the less likely that any orthographic change will be considered minor. (Fishman 1977: XVI)

To show resistance against orthographic reforms is a frequently recurrent phenomenon. English, French, Japanese, and Chinese are examples of languages that have resisted script reform. In the case of Chinese, the first attempts to reform the script go back to 1892, when Lu Kan Chang presented “a system of fifty-five semi-Western, semi-Chinese symbols” (DeFrancis 1972:450). Since then, many different proposals have been presented, and there have been times when a homogeneous state authority has been positive to some of the proposals. In 1958 the romanized system Pinyin was presented, but even Pinyin has been used as an instrument for showing the correct pronunciation of graphs in the lexicon, for initiating children in reading, and as a supplement to the traditional orthography. It must be mentioned that there has never been any intention of letting Pinyin replace the traditional orthography (Sampson 1985:159). The only proposal that has gained ground is the simplification of Chinese characters. “The simplifications which have been adopted are by and large those which have been customarily used by Chinese in hasty and informal writing” (DeFrancis 1972:460)

The case of Chinese is just an example demonstrating that orthographic reforms are much more complicated than what is usually believed. In addition to the complex interaction of external non-linguistic factors in orthographic reforms, there are many practical factors that can complicate an alphabet reform. It is, for example, easier to create an alphabet for a language lacking a written form. It is even easier to launch an alphabet reform in a society in which the rate of illiteracy is high. In societies with a high degree of literacy, the immediate consequence of an alphabet reform would be that several generations of literate people suddenly become illiterate.

A script reform is a huge costly project that requires a degree of political stability that could guarantee its accomplishment. The costs and benefits of an alphabet reform must, therefore, be calculated precisely.
CHAPTER 3
Persian

This chapter is devoted to a brief description of Persian, including its history and dialectology, its phonology and morphology, and its writing system. Some frequently discussed shortcomings of the modern Persian orthography, word boundaries, and the issue of bound and unbound writing in Persian orthography will also be presented.

3.1 Introduction

Persian, also known as Farsi, is the official language of the multi-lingual Iran. Persian is a south-western Iranian language, derived from the Indo-Iranian branch of Indo-European languages. Its three major variants are Persian (Farsi) used in Iran, Persian (Dari) used in Afghanistan, and Persian (Tajiki) used in Tajikistan. Each of these three variants is influenced by the local environment and has its own dialects. Persian is the mother tongue of about 40 million in Iran, 9 million in Afghanistan and 5 million in Tajikistan.

As the official language of Iran, Persian (Farsi) is the mother tongue of more than half of the population. The mother tongues of the rest of the population are either other Iranian languages such as Kurdish and Balochi, or non-Iranian languages such as Arabic and Turkish. Various Turkic dialects used in different parts of Iran constitute the most used non-Iranian languages in Iran.

Persian, together with most of the minority languages used in Iran, is written in the Arabic-based alphabet. Iranian languages written in other alphabets do exist outside Iran, for instance, Kurdish (written both in Cyrillic and Latin), Ossetic (written in Russian Cyrillic-based script), and Tajiki (also written in Russian Cyrillic-based script).

27 Dari, together with Pashto, is the official language of Afghanistan.
28 It is difficult to find updated statistics in this field. In the Iran Statistical Yearbook of 1377/1998–1999, for instance, one finds a section on population, with the subsections of population by age, population by sex, by religion and so on, but there is no information about population by language or dialects (sālnāme-ye āmāri-ye kešvar1377 1378:54–88).
3.2 History

The history of Iranian languages can chronologically be divided into three periods: Old Iranian languages; Middle Iranian languages; New Iranian languages (Kent 1953:6). Nātel Khānlari (1366:158) emphasizes that the above division refers mainly to three different phases in the linguistic development of the languages, not necessarily to three different historical periods, but since the linguistic changes occur over the course of time, it is possible to recognize the approximate time for each of the above three phases.

I. Old Iranian languages refer to Iranian languages which were in use up to the end of the Achaemenian dynasty, which was about 300 BC. Of the Old Iranian languages, only two are known from texts and inscriptions:

a. Avestan is the language in which Avesta, the holy book of Zoroastrians, is composed. There are some disputes on whether Avestan is a north-western or a north-eastern language, as all parts of the Avesta are not composed at the same time. The oldest parts of the Avesta, the Gathas, are composed sometime between the tenth to the sixth century BC, while the other parts represent the language of several subsequent centuries. Nyberg (1937:55) is of the opinion that the dialectal differences between western and eastern Iranian languages must not have been so remarkable at the early stages, a matter that makes it difficult to pinpoint whether Avestan is a north-western or north-eastern language, even if he leans more towards an eastern Iranian origin for Avestan. Other scholars consider Avestan as an eastern or north-eastern Iranian language (Amuzgār & Tafazzoli 1375:11).

According to some Zoroastrian narratives, the original Avesta, written on leather, was burnt by Alexander, but there is no other evidence confirming the existence of a written Avesta. The present Avesta, however, was written down during the Sasanians. It is written in a phonetically precise script, which was designed in approximately the sixth century and consisted of 14 characters for representing vowels and 34 characters for representing consonants. The characters are derived from the Sasanian Pahlavi, and the writing runs from right to left. All vowels are represented by individual letters. There are some diacritics, but no diacritical dots. All words, except for some enclitics, are written separately, and a point follows each word. The elements of compound words are usually written as divided (Jackson 1975:1–2).

---

29 Most scholars are of the opinion that Gathas were composed by Zarathustra himself, but there are different opinions on when he lived. For more information, see Boyce (1975:1) and Nyberg (1937: 49).
Alphabet.

§ 1. The Avesta is written in the following characters

A. Vowels.

Short . . . a i u e o

Long . . . ā ī ū ē ō āō āq

B. Consonants.

Guttural . . . ĝ k ḥ ḫ g ĝ j

Palatal . . . c ʾ ʾ ā j

Dental . . . t d ʾ ḫ d ḫ f

Labial . . . p b ʾ ḫ ʾ f b w

Nasal . . . n n ʾ ḫ n m

Semivowels and

Liquid . . . r ρ (w) ʾ r ρ (n) ʾ v

Sibilant . . . s ʾ s š ʾ š ʾ h š ʾ ʃ ʾ ʰ ʾ e

Aspiration . . . h ž ž h

Ligature . . . ʾ w ē h

Avestan alphabet from: Jackson (1975:1)

b. Old Persian is a south-western Iranian language in which the inscriptions of the Achaemenian kings are written. According to Utas (2005:68), the language which was recorded in the special Old Persian syllabarium must have most probably been invented under Darius the Great around 520 BC. There are many inscriptions in Old Persian. The longest and the most important inscription is the inscription of Bisutun, or Behistan, by Darius I. It is written in three languages, Old Persian, Elamite, and Akkadian (Kent 1953:107–108). All inscriptions in Old Persian are written in cuneiform, which means that the characters are made of strokes that can be impressed on soft materials by a stylus with an angled end. The cuneiform of the Old Persian is derived from the Akkadian cuneiform. In the cuneiform of the Old Persian inscriptions, each letter represents either a single vowel or the combination of a consonant and a vowel. It consists of 36 characters, five ideograms, one ligature of an ideogram and one case ending, two word-dividers, and characters representing numbers (ibid.:9, 11–12). Except for some Median and Saka place and personal names in the writings of the
Greek historians and Old Persian and Syrian inscriptions, there are no preserved documents from the other languages of this period (Kent 1953:6, Nātel Khānlari 1366:161–62).

**SYLLABARY**

| a | j^a | n^a | r^a |
| i | j^i | n^u | r^u |
| u | t^a | p^a | l^a |
| k^a | t^u | f^a | v^a |
| k^u | θ^a | b^a | v^i |
| x^a | ζ^a | m^a | s^a |
| g^a | d^a | m^i | ĝ^a |
| g^u | d^i | m^u | z^a |
| c^a | d^u | y^a | h^a |

**IDEOGRAMS**

\[
\begin{align*}
&XŠ = xšāyațiya \\
&DH = dahyāuš \\
&BG = baga
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&BU = būmiš \\
&AM = Aura-
&mazdā
\end{align*}
\]

**WORD DIVIDERS**

Old Persian Syllabary from: Kent (1953:12)

II. Middle Iranian languages refer to the languages which were in use from about the end of the Achaemenian dynasty in 331 BC up to the beginning of the Islamic era in the seventh century AD. Writing in these languages continued up to the tenth or eleventh century, in the case of Khwārazmian,
up to the thirteenth century. It is not just the historical time that separates Old Iranian languages from Middle Iranian languages, but the developments in the morphology, through which the synthetic constructions are replaced by analytic ones (Payne 2003:306, Rypka 1967:71), as well as in phonology. The languages of this period are usually divided into two groups:

a. Eastern Middle Iranian languages, which in their turn are divided into northern and southern groups. Sogdian and Khwārazmian, for example, are north-eastern languages, while Saka and Bactrian are south-eastern languages. The oldest Sogdian documents are the so-called Ancient Letters found in a watchtower on the Chinese Great Wall from the fourth century (Dresden 1983:1228), but most Sogdian documents are from the period between eighth and eleventh centuries, mainly religious Manichaean, Buddhist and Christian texts (ibid.:1221). Preserved documents in Saka are in the main Saka dialect, Khotanese, from the seventh through tenth century. They are found in Khotan and Tumshuq and are mainly Buddhist texts or texts influenced by Buddhism (Bailey 1983:1231–1233). Little is preserved from Bactrian and old Khwārazmian. Late Khwārazmian written in the Arabic script is found in two Arabic works: the Arabic dictionary Moqaddemat al-Adab by al-Zamakhshari (1075–1144), and Qonyat al-monyah, a feqh work from the thirteenth century by al-Zāhedi (MacKenzie 1983:1246, 1248).

b. Western Middle Iranian languages are also divided into the northern and southern groups. An important north-western language was that used under the Arsacids (247 BC–224 AD), called Pahlavik/Pahlevānīk or Arsacid Pahlavi or Parthian. Parthian documents are of two kinds. The first include those in Parthian script, like inscriptions on Nisā pottery fragments from the first century BC; the Hawrāmān document from the first century AD; some coin legends dating before the third century; and the Parthian versions of the inscriptions from the Sasanian kings like the Hājiābad and Naqsh-e Rustam inscriptions from the third century. The second include those in Manichaean script, such as documents found in Turfan in the early twentieth century and which belong to the third through ninth centuries (Amuzgār & Tafaţzoli 1375: 12, MacKenzie 1969:453, Boyce 1983:1152–1153, 1164–1165).

An important south-western language was Sasanian Pahlavi, also called Pārsik or Middle Persian. Middle Persian was the official language of the Sasanians (224–651). Middle Persian documents are of five kinds: inscription Pahlavi, such as the third century inscription of Shāpur I with parallel versions in Greek and Parthian; book Pahlavi, such as Zoroastrian books; Manichaean documents from the third through ninth centuries in Manichaean script; Psalter or Zobur, which are translations to Pahlavi from Syria; and in the Arabic-based Persian alphabet, such as sporadic sentences or words in New Persian documents (Abu al-Qāsemi 1374:19–24, Amuzgār & Tafaţzoli 1375:19).
III. New Iranian Languages refers to the Iranian languages that have been in use since the end of the Sasanian dynasty. All Iranian languages and dialects that are in use inside and outside of Iran, such as Persian, Kurdish, Balochi, Ossetic, Gilaki, and Māzandarānī, belong to this group. Among the New
Iranian languages, the most widely spoken language is New Persian, which developed from Middle Persian and Parthian, incorporating elements from other Middle Iranian languages like Sogdian. Windfuhr (1989:524) maintains: “None of the known Middle Persian dialects is the direct predecessor of New Persian.” Utas (2005:72) maintains, too, that the roots of early New Persian are obscure, but he adds that the written form from the beginning of the tenth century is “a new combination of Middle Persian language with West Iranian dialects … incorporating a wide array of Arabic loan words” (ibid.).

Lazard is of the opinion that the language known as New Persian, also called as “darī, or parsī-i darī, can be classified linguistically as a continuation of Middle Persian, the official religious and literary language of Sāsānian Iran” (1975:596). According to Lazard (ibid.:596–97), the phonetic and grammatical development from Middle to New Persian is very slight, especially at the early stage of New Persian. He maintains that New Persian deviates from Middle Persian mostly in its vocabulary, as it contains words borrowed from northern or eastern dialects, as well as words borrowed from Arabic. Utas (2005:73) does not share Lazard’s opinion and writes: “There are a number of fundamental morphological and morphosyntactic differences, especially in the verbal system, and the vocabulary is also reshaped.”

Exactly when, why, and in what way New Persian emerged is not clear. Our information on New Persian is mostly based on written material. Windfuhr (1989:524) writes:

There are indications that New Persian developed between the seventh to ninth centuries, the period of the Muslim conquest of Iran and later of the high culture of the Arabic-speaking Abbasid court in Baghdad (c. 750–850), to which Iranians contributed so decisively. The first preserved documents come from the eastern regions: three brief inscriptions dating from the middle of the eighth century […] written in Hebrew characters […].

Lazard (1975:604) maintains that by about the ninth century there were two languages in Iran: Dari and Arabic. While Dari was used by the bulk of the population and only in speech, Arabic was the language of religion and the administration, of science, and of literature. This situation continued for a while after the emergence of Persian literature in the tenth century.

The emergence of Persian literature was of great importance for the elevation of the oral Dari to the rank of a language of general culture. The process took, according to Lazard, at least two centuries, and the literary language was based on the spoken language of the east, especially the colloquial forms of Transoxiana. Why literary Persian first emerged in the East, in Khorāsān and Transoxiana, is usually explained by the distance of
these regions from the capital, and by the existence of the independent Iranian dynasties who promoted a national literature. Among works from this period usually credited for their decisive role in the revival of the Persian language, we can mention Rudaki’s poetry which according to some exaggerated estimates amounted to 1,300,000 verses, Šāhnāmeh by Ferdousi, Tārix-e Bal’ami which is a Persian translation of the Arabic history of Ṭabari by Abu 'Ali Bal’ami, Hodud al-‘ālam, a book in geography, and the Persian translation of Ṭabari’s commentary on the Koran (Arberry 1958:32, 38–43, Browne 1956:470–477, Lazard 1975:622–629, Ṣafā 1371:359–360, 465, 618–621).

By the early eleventh century, the center of Persian literature was transferred from the East to other parts of Iran. One significant characteristic of the Persian language of the tenth century was the very limited amount of borrowed Arabic words. By the eleventh century, the penetration of the Arabic words into Persian took a new course, continued in the eleventh and twelfth century, reaching its culmination in the thirteenth century. At the same time, some Turkic words also entered Persian, but the total number of these words was not high (Arberry 1958:25, 53, Lazard 1975:620, Ṣafā 1368:22–23).

During the Mongolian conquest in the middle of the thirteenth century, Khorāsān, which had been the center of Persian language and literature for about three centuries, was totally destroyed. As a result, the focus was shifted from north-eastern areas to south-western areas. A characteristic of this period is that many Mongolian and Turkic words entered Persian. The amount of the words of Arabic origin in the texts of this period, especially history books, is so high that one must have a very good command of Arabic to read and understand these texts. By the emergence of the Safavids (1501–1722), the center of Persian shifted to the north, especially in poetic diction, and then to Tehran, the capital of the Qajars (1779–1924).

3.3 Standardization

It is generally accepted that New Persian was fairly standardized and cultivated already in the tenth century in poetic diction. The major document of this period is Šāhnāmeh. When it comes to prose, it took a while before it was more or less standardized. According to Windfuhr (1989:525), the shift of focus from north-east to west was synchronic with the beginning of Classical Persian and the standardization process, during which the local traces began to disappear. Alongside the efforts of the poets and writers, court chanceries where guides and textbooks on style and rhetoric were

---

30 See footnote 48.
compiled played a very important role in the standardization of the language. The dominance of Classical Persian continued until the beginning of the nineteenth century and the emergence of the Qajars.

By the time of the emergence of the Qajars and their endeavors in establishing a centralized government, the standardization of the language was accelerated. The new political, economic and cultural conditions and the expansion of bureaucracy contributed to a simplification of style. Qā’em Maqām, the chief minister of the Qajar prince, ṬAbbās Mirzā, is known both in administrative and literary history as the first person in modern time to use a simple style, free from flowery and elaborate forms, in his official correspondences (Keddie 1981:43, Utas 1966:74).

The centralization of the government caused many literate men from every corner of the country to move to the new capital, Tehran, to serve as government employees. Gradually Tehran became the center of literate and intellectual people. All these developments, together with the expansion of urbanism, the invitation of European teachers to Iran, the close contact with Europe, the introduction of printing, the expansion of journalism, and the ever-expanding translation of literary and scientific books into Persian all influenced the language. The many aspects of this influence included the simplification of style, the penetration of European words into the language, the coinage of new Persian words, and the appearance of colloquial and folklore terms and words into literary works. The establishment of the Iranian Academy contributed further to the standardization of the language and the emergence of modern Persian (Nātel Khānlari 1366:375–381).

3.4 Phonology

3.4.1 Sound System

There are different opinions on the number of phonemes in Persian. The most frequently disputed sound in the sound system of Persian is the glottal stop /ʔ/.\(^{31}\)

According to Windfuhr (1997:677), the sound system of Persian consists of 29 phonemes; 23 consonants and six vowels, in which the glottal stop is a phoneme. Counting the labial semivowel of /w/ as a phoneme in Persian, the number of phonemes increases to 30 in Lazard’s description (1992:7), and decreases to 28 in the description of Adib Solṭāni, who does not believe the glottal stop to be a segmental phoneme in Persian, and sees the discussion as an influence from Semitic languages (1371:10–18).

\(^{31}\) For a detailed discussion on the position of the glottal stop in Persian as a phoneme, see Bahmanyār (1337:159–60), Ḥaqqshenās (1382), and Jahani (2005).
The number of vowels is the same in all descriptions, three so-called short- and three so-called long vowels. Scholars do not agree on how to define Persian vowels. Samareh (1368:102–3) maintains that it is not the length of the vowels which is phonemic, but rather the manner of the articulation or the height of tongue at the moment of articulation. It is thus the degree of openness or closedness that creates the segmental phonemes of /u/ and /o/ in /tu/ ‘in’ and /to/ ‘you’ in Persian, not the length. Lazard (1992:17) maintains:

This distinction of quantity is retained in poetry and constitutes the base of the traditional system of versification [...]. In common pronunciation the differences in length are generally not important enough for a distinction of quantity to be appreciable. It is primarily by their quality that the vowels are differentiated. However, the contrasts of quantity, although less important than the contrasts of quality, still play a role in contemporary Persian. Different facts taken together lead to a grouping on the one hand of the vowels â i u and on the other of the vowels a e o. Nevertheless, rather than of “long” and “short”, it is better to speak of “stable” vowels and “unstable” vowels.

By stable and unstable, Lazard refers to the stability of duration. He is of the opinion that the vowel set “â i u” are of a relatively constant duration, and do not submit to vocalic assimilation in the colloquial language, while the set of “a e o” are of variable duration. In open unstressed syllable, they may be shorter than in other positions, and shorter than “â i u” in the same position (Lazard 1992:18).\(^\text{32}\)

Another point of dispute is diphthongs. While some scholars recognize diphthongs in Persian, especially in poetry (Adib Solțāni 1371:53), some other are of the opinion that the so-called diphthongs in Persian are just sequences of a vowel and a consonant, since these are never followed by two consonants the way other vowels are (Samareh 1368:100–102, Windfuhr 1989:529). A sketch of the Persian phonemic system can be presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels:</th>
<th>short</th>
<th>long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>front</td>
<td>central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close</td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-close</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{32}\) See also Jahani (2005:88) and Windfuhr (1997:679).
Consonants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>labial</th>
<th>dental-</th>
<th>palatal</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>plosive</td>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>(t)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affricate</td>
<td>(\dot{c})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(j)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fricative</td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(\dot{s})</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>(z)</td>
<td>(\dot{z})</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\dot{g})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flap</td>
<td></td>
<td>(r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(y)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 Writing system

Persian is written by means of the Arabic alphabet, using an additional four letters. It is a consonantal writing system in which there are graphemes for representing consonants, but not for all vowels, and the writing is from right to left. Persian orthography comprises two types of characters. The primary characters are 33\(^{33}\) in number and are called the Persian alphabet. The secondary characters or the diacritics are 9 in number and are usually placed over or under the primary characters (Dastur-e xat-e farsi 1378:17). The secondary characters, especially those that mark short vowels in the writing, are not usually displayed in the script. Unlike Arabic, short vowels in final positions are always displayed as follows: final /o/ by \(<\mathfrak{o}\>\) and final /e/ or /a/ by \(<\mathfrak{e}\>\). In order to represent sounds that exist in Persian, but not in Arabic, 4 Persian letters have also been created by adding dots to already-existing Arabic letters. Dots are added to \(<b>\), \(<j>\), \(<z>\) and \(<k>\) in order to represent the Persian sounds /p/, /č/, /ž/, and /g/. In the case of /g/, the dots have merged to form an extra stroke called sarkeš in Persian.

Aside from the above four letters, there are different opinions as to which letters occur only in words of Arabic origin. For Adib Solṭānī (1371:8) ص ح ض ط ث ق م are letters that occur only in words of Arabic origin, while Boyle (1966:2) adds the letter ث, and Lazard (1992:47) adds the letters ق ث to the list of letters occurring only in words of Arabic origin. All of them maintain that ط ص may also occur in words borrowed from Turkish, as well as in a very limited number of Persian words. The Persian alphabet is given in Table 3.1, presented by Lazard (1992:48a). Secondary characters are given in Table 3.2, which is based on the table presented by the Iranian Academy

---

\(^{33}\) In some Persian grammar books, the number given is 32, as hamzeh is not counted as a letter. See Table 3.1.
in *Dastur-e xatt-e fārsi* (1378:21). The terms used in Table 3.2 are the terms used by the Iranian Academy.

**Table 3.1 The Persian Alphabet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER</th>
<th>Joined to the preceding</th>
<th>Joined from the two sides</th>
<th>Joined to the following</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Phoneme represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>alef</strong></td>
<td>á and initial vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>be</strong></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>pe</strong></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>te</strong></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>se</strong></td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>jim</strong></td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>če</strong></td>
<td>č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>he-ye hotti</strong></td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>xe</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>dál</strong></td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>zál</strong></td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>re</strong></td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ze</strong></td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>že</strong></td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>sin</strong></td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>šin</strong></td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>sád</strong></td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>zád</strong></td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>tá (teyn)</strong></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>zá (zeyn)</strong></td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>eyn</strong></td>
<td>ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>qeyn</strong></td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>fe</strong></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>qâf</strong></td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>kâf</strong></td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>gâf</strong></td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>lâm</strong></td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>mim</strong></td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>nun</strong></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>vâv</strong></td>
<td>v w u (o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>hâ</strong></td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>or he-ye havvaz</strong></td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>yâ or ye</strong></td>
<td>y i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 Secondary characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zebar (fatheh)</td>
<td>In final position may be displayed by <code>&lt;a&gt;</code> as in نه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zir (kasreh)</td>
<td>In final position is usually displayed by <code>&lt;a&gt;</code> as in نامه</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piš (zammeh)</td>
<td>In final position is displayed by <code>&lt;o&gt;</code> as in تو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sokun</td>
<td>Resembles hamzeh, but is not hamzeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yā-ye kutāh</td>
<td>Resembles hamzeh, but is not hamzeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tašdid ʿ</td>
<td>Always together with alef</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.3 Stress

Stress in Persian is non-phonemic and predictable. The main stress falls usually on the last syllable of the main word, or on the derivational suffixes; e.g. pedār ‘father’, pedarānēh ‘fatherly’, širin ‘sweet’, širini ‘sweetness’. The same applies to verbal nouns; e.g. xordān ‘to eat’ and mordēh ‘the dead’, compound nouns zir-nevīs ‘footnote’ and to plural markers; e.g. dast-hā ‘hands’, deraxtān ‘trees’.

Verbal personal forms have regressive stress. The stress falls on the prefixes mi- and be-; e.g. mí-ravam ‘I am going’ and bé-ravam ‘that I go’. In the preterite, on the last syllable of the stem; e.g. ráft-am ‘I went’, and on the last syllable of the participle in compound forms derived from participle; e.g. raftēh-am ‘I have gone’ and raftēh budam ‘I had gone’. In verbs with preverbs, the stress falls on the preverb; e.g. bár-mi-gardam ‘I will return’. All the negative forms carry the stress on the negative particle; e.g. nāraftam ‘I did not go’.

The following suffixes or particles are unstressed: The ezāfeh particle -e, the conjunction of o, the indefinite article –i, the relative particle –i, the postposition rā, personal and pronominal suffixes, the preposition be, the particle ham, and the particle keh.34

3.5 Morphology

Unlike other Iranian languages, Persian, with its dialects, “has almost completely lost the inherited synthetic nominal and verbal inflection and their inflectional classes” (Windfuhr 1989:530). Most syntactic relationships in Persian are shown primarily by word order and by the use of pre- and

---

postpositions. This dominating non-inflectional structure of Persian and the use of a writing system suitable for the strictly inflectional structure of Semitic languages have been usually seen as major causes of the shortcomings of Persian orthography. The same non-inflectional structure has been invoked as an argument for modifying the present script according to the morpho-phonemic principle in writing.

3.6 Some frequently discussed shortcomings of Persian orthography

The consonantal writing system of Persian, initially adopted for Semitic languages, is usually been seen as the root of many of the shortcomings of Persian orthography. Some of the most discussed shortcomings of Persian orthography are, however, as follows:

1) The usage of several characters for one and the same phoneme

\(/t/\) in تار /tār/ ‘wet’ and طاهر /tāher/ ‘pure’.

\(/z/\) in زن /zan/ ‘woman’ and ضرب /zarb/ ‘multiplication’ and ظاهر /zāher/ ‘appearance’.

\(/s/\) in سید /sīd/ ‘to register’, صبر /sabr/ ‘patience’.

\(/q/\) in قالب /qāleb/ ‘matrix’ and غلب /qāleb/ ‘dominant’.

\(/h/\) in حاکم /hākem/ ‘governor’ and هاشم /hāšem/ ‘proper name’.

\(/l/\) in اسم /asm/ ‘name’ and نامه /nāme/ ‘letter’.

\(/a/\) in اسم /asm/ ‘horse’ and نه /na/ ‘no’.

2) The usage of one character for displaying several phonemes

\(/u/\) for displaying ت /t/ ‘ant’, وم /um/ ‘loan’, /joušan/ ‘cuirass’ and دو /do/ ‘two’.

\(/i/\) for displaying يار /yār/ ‘companion’ and پاری /pāri/ ‘proper name’ and سیل /seil/ ‘flooding’.

\(/e/\) for displaying ای /e/ ‘home’ and مشابه /mošābeh/ ‘similar’.

3) Omission of short vowels

35 As it was mentioned in the section on the sound system of Persian, this is a point of dispute. For practical reasons, I have chosen to display the common sound present in these words by /Ɂ/. It does not necessarily mean that we are dealing with a glottal stop.
This can lead to words with similar spelling and different meanings and pronunciations, like: مَرد /mard/ ‘man’ and مُرد /mord/ ‘he/she died’, both usually written as مرد.

4) The presence of two different types of letters
Letters that cannot be written bound to the left (ا‌د ذ ز و). Letters that can be written bound to the left (the rest of the alphabet). Most of the characters have two to four different shapes depending on their position in the word.

For example:

5) The presence of Arabic loan words and phrases which have kept their Arabic orthography.
For instance حتی ḥattā ‘even’, بالقوه belgovveh ‘potentially’.

6) The presence of diacritics that can be either displayed or left out, e.g. tašdid, tanvin, sokun, yā-ye kutāh or hamzeh ‘shortened’ ی and madd.

7) In certain words و is not pronounced after خ. This و is called vāv-e ma’duleh in Persian.
e.g. خواستن/xāstan/ ‘to want’, خویش/xiš/ ‘self’ and خواهر/xāhar/ ‘sister’.

3.7 Word boundaries and the issue of bound and unbound writing in Persian orthography

As was mentioned earlier, bound and unbound writing in Persian do not refer to the same concepts as in languages like Swedish and English. The presence of letters that take different shapes in different positions within a word (initial, medial, and final); the presence of the letters that can be written bound to the right, but not to the left; the presence of the letters with several dandāneh ‘dentations’ like ش and the aesthetic implications all give the concept of bound and unbound writing in Persian other proportions than in English and Swedish.

However, like all other orthographies, Persian orthography is dependent on being able to analyze the written utterance into its constituents. Even if there are both smaller and larger constituents that must be taken into consideration in analyzing the structure of utterances, the most distinguished
constituent is the word. But what is ‘word’? How do we define the concept of a word? In the *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics* (1994:5007), Fudge writes:

> It is normally assumed that words are units which would be set off by spaces in the written form of the language concerned. This, however, begs the question of why spaces should be inserted at certain points rather than others, a question that needs to be answered in terms of phonological properties, that is, on the basis of what happens in speech.

Crystal (1997a:419) defines ‘word’ as: “A unit of expression which has universal intuitive recognition by NATIVE SPEAKERS, in both spoken and written language.” He emphasizes himself that in practice the above definition is not enough for the identification of a word and its boundaries, and can not be applied consistently. He asks then: “is a unit such as *washing machine* two words, or is it one, to be written *washingmachine*? [...] is the a word in the same sense as is *chair*?”

Milāniān (1350:70–71) maintains that what gives a word its distinguishing position is not its form, but its function. The preliminary definition of a word, according to Milāniān, is a solid meaningful unit chosen by the language user, and a unit where the syntagmatic axis meets the paradigmatic axis. Structurally the unit may be complex, simple, or derived. He maintains that only after that the solidity in function is established can we then make use of other criteria to show the solidity of the unit.

Crystal (1997a:419–420) names several criteria for identification of a word in speech that can be applied to the written language as well:

One is that words are the most stable of all linguistic units, in respect of their internal structure, i.e. the CONSTITUENT parts of a complex word have little potential for rearrangement [...]. A second criterion refers to the relative ‘uninterruptibility’ or COHESIVENESS of words, i.e. new elements (including pauses) cannot usually be inserted within them in normal speech: pauses, by contrast, are always potentially present at word boundaries. A criterion which has influenced linguists’ views of the word since it was first suggested by Leonard Bloomfield is the definition of word as a ‘minimum free form’, i.e. the smallest unit which can constitute, by itself, a complete utterance [...]. On this basis, *possibility* is a word, as is *possible* [...], but *-ity* is not (nor would any AFFIX be). Not all word-like units satisfy this criterion, however (e.g. *a* and *the* in English), and how to handle these has been the subject of considerable discussion.

---

36 The same unit in Swedish is written as one word ‘tvättmaskin’, and in Persian as two words in genitive construction, *māšin-e lebās-šuyi*.

ماثئین لباسشویی.
These criteria may in general be applied to Persian orthography as well, but there are still special features in Persian orthography that need closer consideration. Utas (1978:6) admits that it is a difficult task to come to a general definition of a word in many languages, but emphasizes that “for Persian we cannot even use the escape offered by orthographic criteria.” Like other orthographies, Persian orthography takes advantage of phonological, morphological, and syntactical criteria to identify a word. The problem is that in Persian it is not always so easy to recognize the decisive criterion.

However, one phonological criterion is word stress. Unlike Swedish and English, in which there exist both primary and secondary stress, in Persian, there is, in almost all cases, one and only one stressed syllable in a word, no matter if the word is simple, compound, or derived. Milāniān (1350:72) also mentions that what turns the adjective phrase of bi-āb-o-'alāf in the noun phrase biyābān-e bi-āb-o-'alāf ‘dry desert’ into a solid unit is that it has only one stress. The same is valid for né-mi-rav-am ‘I will not go’, but Utas (1978:11) writes: “this would have far-reaching consequences for the handling of elements such as the short prepositions, the enclitical verbs and pronouns and the conjunction u.” In the case of Persian orthography, it is simply not enough to recognize the unit of word according to stress.

Another phonological criterion is that of pause. There is always a possibility of creating a pause between two words. In a language like Persian, there is a possibility to create a pause after the last syllable, which is usually stressed. However, in cases where enclitical units are involved, the word stress may be moved to other syllables than the last one. In a word like ketābi ‘one book’ or ketābaš ‘her book’, for instance, the stress is regressive. Should we view it as one and only one word, or two words?

It must not be forgotten that Persian, like any other language, consists of two types of words: content words and form or function words, where the latter are empty in meaning and only mark the grammatical structure (Dahl 1982:23). While noun, adjective, and verb belong to the first group, pronouns, prepositions, and conjunctions belong to the second group. Function words generally, and in Persian particularly, do not have any stress. As such, they should be written bound to the stressed unit preceding or following them, if the criterion used for defining the word boundary is word stress. This is nevertheless not the case either in Persian or in other languages as English or Swedish.

37 Usually the last syllable.
38 Prefix+substantive+conjunction+substantive
39 Substantive+genitive marker+prefix+substantive+conjunction+substantive
40 Negation+prefix+verb+personal ending
At the morphological level it is possible to mark off a word regardless of whether it is simple, derived, or complex by trying to replace it with a simple word on the paradigmatic axis. Take as an example *zan-pedar* ‘stepmother’ in *zan-pedar-am āmad* ‘My stepmother came’ vs. *zan-e pedar* ‘father’s wife’ in *zan-e pedaram āmad* ‘My father’s wife came’. While the compound word *zan-pedar* can be replaced only by a simple substantive as *xwāhar* ‘sister’, *barādar* ‘brother’ and so on, the two integrated substantives in *zan-e pedar* can be replaced by two completely new substantives, for instance *xwāhar-e dust-am āmad* ‘My friend’s sister came’. Despite the fact that *zan-pedar* has only one stressed syllable, Persian orthography prefers to apply unbound writing to it. The unbound writing may be applied by a complete space or a half-space.

At the syntactic level, a word is marked off on the basis of its uninterruptibility or cohesiveness, as well as its very limited potential for rearrangement. This can be tested by moving the dependents and seeing if it is possible to insert them within the word. *Kār-xāneh* ‘factory’ is a compound word, consisting of two free morphemes: *kār* ‘work’ and *xāneh* ‘house’. To test the solidity of this compound word, Milāniān (1350:77) applies a test by using two dependents: the plural – *hā* and the demonstrative pronoun *in*. The only possible sequences will be: *in kār-xāneh-hā* ‘these factories’, *kārxāneh-hā* ‘factories’ or *in kār-xāneh* ‘this factory’. Sequences like *kār-hā in-xāneh* or *kār-hā-xāneh* or *kār in xāneh* are not possible. The same test can be applied to derived words.41

The same criterion must be applicable to orthography. Imagine that boundaries of the word are completely clear and we are going to apply them to orthography. The main instrument for marking off the words in orthography is the blank space, but in an orthography like Persian, with letters that can not be written bound to the left, and the blank space that automatically follows these letters, it is not always completely risk-free to assume the blank space to be the marker of word boundaries. A higher degree of precision is needed, especially in handwritten texts. That is also why terms like *peyvasteh-nevisi* ‘bound writing’ and *jodā-nevisi* ‘unbound writing’ should be redefined in the context of Persian orthography. It is the special features of the Persian script, mentioned in the beginning of this section, that give birth to the term *bi-fāṣeleh-nevisi* ‘without-space-writing’ (unbound writing with a half-space). In many orthographies based on the Latin alphabet, bound and unbound writing do not refer to the same concept as in Persian orthography. In the context of Persian orthography, *Bi-fāṣeleh-

41 In Persian there are cases of genitive constructions that have turned into compound words in which the genitive marker is gone. In such cases, it is possible to insert the dependent within the word. An example is *kār-e dasti* ‘hand-work’ which has turned to *kārdasti*. We may then have two plural forms: *kārhā-ye dasti* or *kārdasti-hā*.  
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nevisi is the same as bound writing in Swedish, while jodā-nevisi is equivalent to a system that is applied to most compound words in English. Compare ‘tvättmaskin’ in Swedish with ‘washing machine’ in English. The Swedish orthography does not allow for unbound writing of the word, while both Persian and English do allow unbound writing. It is the dominating analytical agglutinative structure of Persian, together with the presence of the letters that cannot be bound to the left, which makes it necessary to redefine these terms in a Persian context.

The point of departure of all the three principles, however, is the morphemes of the language; the smallest meaningful unit of the language. Morphemes are divided into two groups: free morphemes and bound morphemes. Bound morphemes cannot stand independently. The word balls, for instance, consists of two morphemes: ball+s. While ball is a free morpheme that can stand independently, and its meaning is not dependent on –s, the –s morpheme is dependent on ball. The immediate logical conclusion is that bound writing should be applied to the integrated morphemes of a word. This simple rule, however, causes major problems in Persian orthography. Almost every derived or complex word in Persian orthography confronts the writer with the choice of one or the other principle. It is in this context that the above terms should be defined.

Persian has usually been referred to as an inflectional language, but the fact is that Persian has lost most of its inflectional and synthetic constructions from earlier phases, and moved towards a more agglutinative and analytic structure (See Jeremiás 2003:427). Crystal (1997a:13, 19, 196, 378) maintains that there are no sharp distinctions between these categories within morphological typology. Different languages show, according to him, the characteristic of inflection or agglutination as well as the characteristic of analyticity or synthesis to a greater or lesser degree. It is in this sense that Crystal (1997b:295) defines English typologically as “Three-in-one”: “Isolating: The boy will ask the girl. The girl will ask the boy. Inflecting: The biggest boys have been asking. Agglutinating: anti-dis-establishment-arian-ism.” Taking into consideration the definition of these categories, it can safely be said that Persian is dominantly agglutinative and analytic. Agglutinative in the sense that “Words are built up out of a long sequence of units, with each unit expressing a particular grammatical meaning” (ibid.), as in dāneš-gāh-i-ān (science+place+substantival -i+plural) ‘the university staff ’, and analytic in the sense that “words are invariable: there are no endings. Grammatical relationships are shown through the use of word order” (ibid.), as in pesar ketāb rā be doxtar dād (the boy+the book+ accusative particle+to+the gir+gave) ‘The boy gave the book to the girl’. Andersson (1987:26) also maintains that within typology we are not dealing with clear-cut categories but with differences in degree and adds that English, for instance, is more analytic than Swedish and Swedish is more analytic than German. He also writes that it is not so easy to determine whether Swedish is agglutinative or inflectional. In the case of Persian, Andersson (ibid.:57) maintains that Persian is agglutinative, but is also fairly analytic.

---

42 Persian has usually been referred to as an inflectional language, but the fact is that Persian has lost most of its inflectional and synthetic constructions from earlier phases, and moved towards a more agglutinative and analytic structure (See Jeremiás 2003:427). Crystal (1997a:13, 19, 196, 378) maintains that there are no sharp distinctions between these categories within morphological typology. Different languages show, according to him, the characteristic of inflection or agglutination as well as the characteristic of analyticity or synthesis to a greater or lesser degree. It is in this sense that Crystal (1997b:295) defines English typologically as “Three-in-one”: “Isolating: The boy will ask the girl. The girl will ask the boy. Inflecting: The biggest boys have been asking. Agglutinating: anti-dis-establishment-arian-ism.” Taking into consideration the definition of these categories, it can safely be said that Persian is dominantly agglutinative and analytic. Agglutinative in the sense that “Words are built up out of a long sequence of units, with each unit expressing a particular grammatical meaning” (ibid.), as in dāneš-gāh-i-ān (science+place+substantival -i+plural) ‘the university staff ’, and analytic in the sense that “words are invariable: there are no endings. Grammatical relationships are shown through the use of word order” (ibid.), as in pesar ketāb rā be doxtar dād (the boy+the book+ accusative particle+to+the gir+gave) ‘The boy gave the book to the girl’. Andersson (1987:26) also maintains that within typology we are not dealing with clear-cut categories but with differences in degree and adds that English, for instance, is more analytic than Swedish and Swedish is more analytic than German. He also writes that it is not so easy to determine whether Swedish is agglutinative or inflectional. In the case of Persian, Andersson (ibid.:57) maintains that Persian is agglutinative, but is also fairly analytic.
The advocates of bound writing emphasize that all the integrated morphemes in a word belong together and should be written together as a solid unit. There are after all many cases that unbound writing is applied due to aesthetic and pedagogical implications. Unbound writing is usually applied to words with many *dandāneh* ‘dentations’, for example: زیست شناسی vs. زیستشناسی ‘biologi’.

The main point of departure of the advocates of unbound writing involves aesthetic and pedagogical implications, and they propagate *avoiding* writing *all* the morphemes together. It does not mean that unbound writing can or may be applied to *all* morphemes. The advocates of unbound writing do not specifically emphasize that all the integrated morphemes in a word belong together. A result of this is that the unbound morphemes may sometimes stand so far from each other that reading becomes difficult. It is not of course an inherent shortcoming of unbound writing, but since the relation between the integrated morphemes of a word is not emphasized, such problems may come up.

*Bi-fāseleh-nevisi* is an attempt to meet both demands, by bridging bound and unbound writing. This model, which was presented in the 1990s, is based on letting the integrated morphemes of a word stand unbound, but nevertheless quite close to each other, by inserting a half-space instead of a complete space between them. In this way, the original shape of the integrated morphemes is preserved, and at the same time the entirety of the word is not broken. The idea behind this proposal is, according to its initiators, to simplify the process of reading by creating an immediate link to the semantic level. Trying to preserve the original shape of the morpheme, however, may in some cases have a negative effect on the process of reading. For instance, in words in which the first morpheme ends in *ر* and the second morpheme begins with *ال*، as in *bimār-aš* بیماراش ‘his patient’, there is a risk of reading the word as *bimārāš* ‘his patients’. Compared with bound and unbound writing, *bi-fāseleh-nevisi* is uneconomical. Inserting a half-space between every morpheme is time-consuming. All these proposals have their own advantages and disadvantages, and none of them alone seem to be able to meet all the demands of Persian orthography. Over the years, and in the absence of executive institutions, however, each of these proposals have also developed different variants. This of course increases the already existing confusion.

---

43 The contracted colloquial variant of *bimār-hā-yaš* ‘his patients’.
Chapter 4 presents an overview of the history of Persian orthography, beginning with the replacement of *Pahlavi* script by Arabic. This historical background has been divided into two parts. The first part deals with Persian orthography from the time of the introduction of Arabic script up to modern times, and the second part deals with the history of Persian orthography in modern times after the introduction of printing in Iran. Consequently, the focus of the first part is on Persian orthography in manuscripts, while the second part focuses mainly on orthography in printed material.

### 4.1 Persian orthography in manuscripts

#### 4.1.1 The replacement of Pahlavi script by Arabic script

The Arab conquest of Iran in the seventh century and the resulting spread of Islam affected many aspects of the Iranian lifestyle and culture. The Persian language was no exception, and could not remain untouched by the new situation. We do not have much information on spoken language. Written language, however, went through extensive changes. Many Arabic words entered Persian, many Middle Persian words became obsolete, and Arabic script replaced *Pahlavi* script (Rypka 1967:73, Utas 2005:72).

*Pahlavi* script was the official script of Iranians from the middle of the Arsacid Empire up to the time of its replacement by the Arabic script. It was derived from the Aramaic writing system, which was in use under the Achaemenians (Bahār 1369:68–69, Kent 1989:6–7). Nātel Khānlari (1366:242) maintains that it is not clear when and how the Aramaic alphabet developed into *Pahlavi* script, but he asserts that it must have taken place gradually. Four major variants of *Pahlavi* script have been recognized by scholars. Under the Sasanians there were also different orthographies with different numbers of letters for different purposes. Ebn al-Nadim, quoting Ebn al-Moqaffa’, lists the following seven orthographies: “*Viš dabiriyah*,

---

44 See ch.3.2.
Kastaj, Nim kastaj, Nāmah dabiriyah, Hām dabiriyah, Rāz soriyah, and Rās sohriyah” (Ebn al-Nadim 987–8/1964:12–14). The same issue was discussed by Ḥamzeh Ebn al-Ḥasan Eṣfahāni in his book, Ketāb al-Tanbih ‘alā Ḥodūs al-Taṣḥif,\(^4\) even if the names of the orthographies in his version are slightly different from the names above. He names the following: Ram dafirah, Gaštah dafirah, Nim gaštah dafirah, Farvardah dafirah, Rāz dafirah, Dain dafirah, and Vasf dafirah (Bahār 1369:98).

Similar to Arabic script, Pahlavi script, with only 14 letters, leaves much room for ambiguities. An extreme underrepresentation of the phonemes of the language is the main characteristic of Pahlavi script, where one letter may represent more than one phoneme, and in some cases up to four different phonemes, with short vowels not always represented in the script. Huzvāresh is another feature of Pahlavi script, where the Aramaic equivalent of the word is written, while the Middle Persian word is supposed to be read.\(^4\) A third feature of Pahlavi script is that the letters change shape when they are written together with other letters. Sometimes the combination of two letters results in a shape similar to the shape of one of the already-existing letters (Āmuzgār & Tafaẓẓoli 1375:49–61).

The fact that learning to read and write Pahlavi script was a difficult task has been mentioned as one of the factors as to why Arabic script replaced Pahlavi script. The new religious affiliations and the expansive use of Arabic in different fields are among other factors mentioned for the replacement of Pahlavi. At the same time, Persian, according to Rypka (1967:73), was exposed to the demands of the new way of life, and had to borrow from Arabic words, as the stock of Persian words did not meet those demands:

The existing stock of Persian words did not meet the demands of the new way of life, and for this reason certain Persian expressions fell into disuse as being superfluous on political and religious grounds. On the other hand the language had not become sufficiently flexible, especially when one bears in mind the astonishing creative capacity of Arabic, which had at its disposal ready-made expressions that were often more pregnant than the Persian equivalents. Thus we observe a slow but constant penetration of Arabic

\(^4\) Bahār refers to the book as as Ketāb al-Tanbih ‘alā Ḥoruf al-Taṣḥif, but Nātel Khānlari (1366:243), Taqizādeh (1351:56) and Kasravi (1352:375) refer to the book as Ketāb al-Tanbih ‘alā Hodūs al-Taṣḥif. Both Bahār and Kasravi refer to a manuscript which, according to them, is the only preserved manuscript of this book and is kept in the library of the Faculty of Law at Tehran University. Nātel Khānlari, on the other hand, refers to an edition of this book by al-Sheykh Ḍūlmāmammad Ḥasan Āl Yāsin, Baghdad, 1967. Taqizādeh gives no complete bibliography, only the name of the author and the name of the book.

\(^4\) Manichean script is free from huzvāresh.
words into Persian, which latter as a result becomes a mixed language, in particular as regards the manner of speech of the higher classes and the whole of its literature, which again represents a medium of expression for these classes only, in contrast to popular idioms that were less influenced by Arabic.

The ever-expanding penetration of Arabic words into Persian,\(^{47}\) which according Rypka led to Persian becoming a mixed language,\(^{48}\) together with the fact that written language was mostly in the hands of the upper classes, may have contributed to the fact that the Arabic alphabet, except for the Persian sounds not present in Arabic, was not regarded as quite as inefficient and ambiguous as it is today. We do not know, for example, if the original pronunciation of the borrowed words was preserved or not, because if it was, the problem of over-representation would not have existed at that stage. It does not mean that the Arabic alphabet was recognized as an adequate alphabet. Already in the tenth or eleventh century scholars had pointed out the shortcomings of the Arabic alphabet even for Arabic. Ḥamzeh Ebn al-Ḥasan Eṣfahānī wrote in his *Ketāb al-Tanbih 'ala Hodūs al-Taṣḥif* on the shortcomings of the Arabic alphabet, and maintained that these shortcomings caused misspelling as well as misreading. In order to avoid such mistakes (*taṣḥif*)\(^{49}\) one could, according to him, create an alphabet with at least 40 letters, 28 of which were already present in the Arabic alphabet. 4 new letters should be created for those sounds of Arabic that are not represented in the alphabet, and 8 for the sounds present especially in Persian and other languages (Taqizādeh 1351:56). Even Abu Reyḥān al-Biruni (early eleventh century) discussed the shortcomings of the Arabic alphabet in his writings (ibid.:57, Behruz 1363b:12).

Another factor that contributed to the survival of the Arabic script for writing Persian was its aesthetic value. Rypka (1967:75) maintains:

> Arabic script has the advantage of an almost stenographic terseness, and is moreover extremely ornamental, both of which factors are lacking in Latin script. Artists soon became aware of its aesthetic importance and raised fine

\(^{47}\) It is worthwhile mentioning that the amount of Arabic words in the written Persian of the first four-five Hijri centuries is much less than in written Persian texts from later periods. One of the extreme examples is *Tārix-e vaṣṣāf* from the seventh/thirteenth century. It is almost impossible to read and understand the text without a very good command of Arabic, while to read and understand *Qābusnāmeh* from the fifth/eleventh century or *Tārix-e balʿami* from the fourth/tenth century is possible for anybody with a secondary education (Forughī 1315:22–23).

\(^{48}\) See also Lazard (1975:597).

penmanship to one of the highest ranks in the field of Iranian art. The calligraphy, the miniature, binding and paper together provide splendid opportunities for the bibliophile. Here too the Persians demonstrate their mastery. But the ornamental factor in the script was not overlooked by the artists in words, the poets, who therefore sometimes associated the ideas expressed in the poem with the letter-forms. When such a poem is transcribed into Latin script or Azbuka it loses in efficacy, seeing that the letter-form is inseparably connected with the thought to be expressed.

4.1.2 The first Persian manuscripts written in Arabic script

The replacement of Pahlavi script by Arabic script did not take place immediately after the Arab conquest of Iran. It took a while before the Arabic script was introduced. The details of this introduction are not yet sufficiently clear, but what can safely be said is that the introduction took place gradually. We also do not know when the oldest form of the New Persian language, so-called Dari, was established. Rypka (1967:67) is of the opinion that it already existed in the seventh century.

However, the oldest preserved dated Persian manuscript written in the Arabic alphabet is Al-abniyah 'an haqāyeq al-adviyah by Abu Maṣṣūr Movaffaq Ebn-e ‘Ali al-Heravi, written down by Asadi Ṭusi in 1055, but it is not necessarily the oldest document in New Persian. According to scholars, New Persian was first written in Hebrew script, and by the Jewish minority. A fragment of a Persian letter written in Hebrew script, found by Sir Aurel Stein in Dandān Uiliq (the Ivory house) near Khotan, is one of the oldest preserved New Persian documents (Henning 1337:2, Utas 1968:124). The stylistic similarities between this letter and the Persian inscription of Tang-i-Azao from 752/753, also in Hebrew script, confirm that the letter belongs to the eighth century (Henning 1957:335–342, Henning 1337:2). There are even preserved Persian documents written in Manichean and Syriac, probably by Christian and Manichean minorities (Henning 1337:2–3, Nātel Khānlari 1366:328, Oranskij 1358:256, Ṣadiqi 1345:60–61), most of which date back to the tenth century. The oldest preserved Persian piece of poetry is from the tenth century. It is written in Manichean script, and belongs to the collection of Manichean manuscripts found in Turfan (Henning 1337:4–5).
Even if there is no preserved Persian manuscript written in the Arabic alphabet from the first three centuries of the Islamic era, scholars are of the opinion that New Persian must have been written in the Arabic alphabet much earlier than the date of Al-abniyah ‘an ḥaqāyeq al-adviyah, especially during the second century Hijri. Ṣadiqi (1345:60), referring to the following sentences from Abu Reyḥān Biruni’s Āsār al-bāqiyyah,50 “and he [Bahāfarid51] left a book in Persian for his followers…and I translated his sayings from Persian to Arabic,” maintains that this book must have been written in Arabic script, as it is known that Biruni did not know Pahlavi script.

Najib Māyel Heravi (1369:23), who shares Ṣadiqi’s opinion concerning an earlier introduction of the Arabic script, maintains that during the second century Hijri, Iranians, more than ever, needed written texts in order to understand the message of the holy Koran. To acquire a better understanding of the date of the introduction of Arabic script, it is therefore important to investigate the oldest manuscripts of the Koran where a Persian translation is included52. None of these are of course older than the end of the tenth century, but the translation of the Koran must have begun as early as the first half of the tenth century. This is supported by indications in some revāyat ‘narratives’ of a translation of the Koran by Salmān Fārsī, one of the sincere companions of the Prophet. According to Māyel Heravi, considering the harsh policy of the Umayyads and Abbasids, these translations must have been written in Arabic script. Many of the documents that could show the exact date of the introduction of the Arabic alphabet must have been destroyed during the political turbulences of ṣadr-e eslām (Early Islamic Times), and the later Turkish and Mongolian invasions (ibid.:23–24).

On the other hand, what is generally accepted is that the Arab conquerors, who were not acquainted with the administrative system of the Sasanians, let Iranian administrators run it. Administrative documents continued to be written in Pahlavi script, especially in the Eastern parts, for approximately one century after the Arab conquest. Jahshiyāri in Ketāb al-vozarā’ va al-kottāb from the ninth century, writes that the Sasanian administration in Khorāsān functioned until the end of the caliphate of Heshām Ebn-e ’Abd al-Mālek, and all accounts and financial registers were written in Pahlavi during this period. In 742, Yusef Ebn-e ‘Omar, the governor of Iraq, wrote a


51 The leader of a religious resistance movement against the Arabs and the Abbasid dynasty in the first half of the second/eighth century. He was killed by Abu Moslem, the founder of Abbasid dynasty (al-Biruni 1879:193).

52 See, for example, Ravāqi, ’A. (1364), Qor’ān-e qods: kohan-tarin bargardān-e qor’ān beh fārsi?.
letter to the governor of Khorāsān Naṣr Ebn-e Sayyār, and ordered him not to employ non-Muslim secretaries in his administration. Eshāq Ebn-e Ţolaiq then translated all the documents into Arabic, and the language of the administration became Arabic (al-Jahshiyārī 1938:67). In the western part of the country, the administrative documents began to be written in Arabic first under Ḥajjāj Ebn-e Yusef’s reign in 661–713. According to al-Balāzori in Fotuḥ al-boldān from the ninth century, the tribute books (divān-e xarāj) in Iraq were in Pārsik. When Ḥajjāj became the governor of Iraq, he appointed Zādān, the son of Farrokh, as scribe. Zādān saw to it that Šāleḥ Ebn-e ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, who knew both Arabic and Pārsik, was taken into Ḥajjāj’s service. When Zādān was killed, Ḥajjāj appointed Šāleḥ as scribe. When Ḥajjāj understood that Šāleḥ was able to translate the books into Arabic, he asked Šāleḥ to do so. When Mardānshāh, the son of Zādān, became aware that Šāleḥ was going to change the language of the books from Persian to Arabic, he told him: ‘May God eradicate you who eradicate Pārsik’ (al-Balāzori 1364:60–61).

Thus Pahlavi script continued to function as the official script, at least under the first century Hijri, as the Iranian administrators continued to run the administrative system. Coins and inscriptions in Pahlavi script from the first century Hijri have also been found. Some inscriptions from the eleventh century indicate that the Pahlavi script was in use up to that time, at least in some parts of Iran.

However, as time went by, and as Arabic became the official language of the administration, it became a sign of prestige to speak and write in Arabic. Many Iranians began learning Arabic, and many great Iranian scholars of the time began writing in Arabic, on a scale that led them to be considered as Arabs and their works as Arabic scientific and cultural works for quite a long time.

4.1.3 Orthographic variation in manuscripts

The production of manuscripts on a large scale was a direct result of the introduction of the Arabic script as well as the introduction of paper to the Islamic world. In the beginning, manuscript writing was limited to the Koran, but it spread rapidly into other fields and other networks, and became a business of its own. There are many reasons for the vast spread of manuscript writing, among which the new religious aspiration has been mentioned as the most important one (Māyel Heravi 1369:25). The tradition

---

53 For example, the inscription of Lājim tower in northern Iran, which is written both in Kufī and Pahlavi script (Nātel Khānlari 1366:332).

54 Paper came to Samarqand by Chinese prisoners of war in 134/751, but it was first in the ninth century that the use of paper became widespread and paper mills were established in Samarqand, Baghdād, Khorāsān, Damascus and Kairo (Māyel Heravi 1369:86).
of manuscript writing which began sometime around the ninth or tenth century has left us with a precious collection of manuscripts from different periods of Iranian history. Many of these manuscripts are of special importance for the study of the Persian language and its literature.

One of the distinguishing features of these manuscripts is their orthographic variation. These variations are not, of course, limited to manuscripts from different periods. Many times one may find variations in one and the same manuscript. In the manuscript of the Al-abniah 'an haqāyeq al-adviyah for example, four different ways of representing initial /ā/: ۱, ۱, ۱, ۱ can be observed. The Persian sounds /p/ and /č/ have been represented both with one or three dots (Matini 1346:166–172). Whatever the reasons, it is clear that there were no clear-cut instructions on the manner of presenting orthographic parameters. It was the writer himself who determined the orthographic presentation.

The orthographic variation in manuscripts is so extensive that it is not always easy to classify the manuscripts according to their orthography. In two articles, Jalāl Matini studied the orthography of Persian manuscripts in fifth/eleventh century and in the sixth-thirteenth/twelfth-nineteenth century. Matini’s study of Persian orthography in the fifth century Hijri was based on the following manuscripts:

- A part of Tafsir-e pāk, probably written before 450 Hijri.

Matini’s study of Persian orthography in sixth-thirteenth century Hijri was, on the other hand, based on 200 manuscripts. According to Matini (1346:160), most scholars divide the history of Persian orthography in manuscripts into only two periods:

- The first period, where writers usually registered /p/, /č/, /ž/ and /g/ as چ، ک، ج، ز and گ، که، چ، کی, keh and čeh were written as گ، که and که and čeh are written as که and čeh concurrent with the use of Persian zāl.55
- The second period was established in about the tenth century and is still continuing. In the orthography of this period /p/, /č/, /ž/ and /g/ are written as پ، چ، ز and گ، که and čeh are written as که and čeh, and the Persian zāl is gone.56

55 Even called dāl-e manquṭ ‘dotted dāl’ or zāl-e ‘ajami ‘non-Arabic zāl’, and occurring only after a vowel.
56 Persian zāl is kept only in a few words, e.g. گذشت، گذاشت، پذیرفت، کاغذ (Nātel Khānlari 1372:36).
Matini (1347:136), however, recognizes three periods in the history of Persian orthography from the fifth century Hijri forward. The first period is limited to the fifth century Hijri, where the 4 Persian letters as well as keh and čeh are written either in accordance with the first period above, or as ب، چ، خ، ژ. The second period begins in the early sixth century and ends around the tenth century Hijri. What is characteristic for the second period is the vast variation when it comes to the 4 Persian letters. Matini maintains that what other Iranists have said on Persian orthography of this period agrees only with some of the manuscripts of this period. The third period begins around the eleventh century Hijri, and comprises the orthography up to now.

Matini’s study of Persian orthography in sixth-thirteenth century Hijri is limited to the following set of orthographic parameters: the way to present /p/, /č/, /ž/ and /g/; Persian گāl; ۪-‘ajami ۭ۫ and bound or unbound writing of keh to the next word. The reason he has limited his study to these parameters is that this set of parameters is, according to him, the set that determines the basic characteristics of the Persian orthography of the fifth century Hijri as well.

Then he gives a comprehensive report on the above-defined orthographic parameters in the 200 manuscripts from sixth-thirteenth century Hijri with the names of the manuscripts of each century. Matini’s study of Persian orthography in manuscripts can be summarized as following:

- Writers of the fifth century Hijri wrote the 4 letters for representing /p/, /č/, /ž/ and /g/ either as ب، چ، خ، ژ or as ﭗ، ﭘ، ﭻ، ژ.

- The same method was applied during the sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth century and even the tenth century, with the difference that no cases of <g> with two dots above the letter are found. The number of manuscripts where all 4 letters were written with extra dots is very limited.

- Among the manuscripts he has studied, the majority is of the group in which one or two or three of the letters are written by extra dots, not all of them.

- Among the 65 manuscripts from the sixth, seventh and eighth century there are only 12 manuscripts where the 4 letters are consistently written without extra dots, which is characteristic of the first period.

- In manuscripts from the eleventh and the twelfth century <پ>, <چ> and <ژ> are written پ، چ، ژ and <گ> is written as گ. There is only one

57 Nātel Khānlari (1373:135) maintains that as the letter ۪ in Arabic script was used for displaying the bilabial /w/ and as this sound did not exist in Persian, ۪-‘ajami ۫ was adopted in order to display the Persian labiodental /v/. He adds that it is probably this letter that Ebn-e Sinā and Ḥamzeh Eṣfahāhani refer to as the letter between ۪ and ۫.
manuscript where $<g>$ is presented as $ﮒ$ and one manuscript where it is presented with three dots above $ลักษ$.

- In manuscripts from the thirteenth century $<p>$, $<ç>$, and $<ژ>$ are presented with three dots. $<g>$ is usually presented as $ﮎ$, without the extra especial diacritic of $sarkeš$. In 16 of 40 studied manuscripts, it is presented with the extra $sarkeš$ as $ﮒ$.

- Among the 4 Persian letters it is only $ﮔ$, whose shape has undergone changes during the fifth/eleventh century.

- In some decrees and royal mandates from the ninth-eleventh century, the dotted Arabic and Persian letters are written without dots.

- The Persian $ژāl$ is present in all manuscripts from the sixth century, most of the manuscripts from the seventh and eighth century, and a few manuscripts from the ninth century. It is completely absent in the manuscripts from the tenth century and forward.

- In addition to the manuscripts from the fifth century, $fā’-e ’ajami$ $ﮏ$ is present in a few manuscripts from the sixth and seventh century, $Keh$, apart from the manuscripts from the fifth century, is written together with the following word in most of the manuscripts from the sixth century as well as in some manuscripts from the seventh, eighth, and ninth century: كتو= که تو، کمر= که مر، کتابستان= که تابستان.

Māyel Heravi (1369:140–145) also recognizes three different periods in the history of Persian orthography, but his classification is slightly different from that of Matini: the first period of the fourth/tenth and the fifth/eleventh century, known as the old Persian orthography; the second period of sixth/twelfth century up to the late eighth/fourteenth century; and the third period of ninth/fifteenth century up to the thirteenth/nineteenth century.

In his earlier article on the orthography of the manuscripts from the fifth century Hijri (1346), Matini, in addition to the set of parameters studied above, deals with other parameters, among which the way of presenting compound words as well as derived words is of particular interest for the present study. Māyel Heravi, in his turn, completes Matini’s study by giving an account of the way of presenting derived and compound words, also in the other two periods mentioned in the history of Persian orthography in manuscripts. Matini’s and Māyel Heravi’s studies can be summarized as in sections 4.1.4, 4.1.5, and 4.1.6.

---

58 These parameters are still in a transitional state, and constitute a major part of the contemporary studies on Persian orthography, while parameters like the 4 Persian letters have established themselves by now.
4.1.4 Persian orthography in the fifth/eleventh century

Both Māyel Heravi (1369:143) and Matini (1346:192) maintain that, as far as the orthography in the fifth/eleventh century is concerned, while there was neither a complete set of rules nor a consistent application of rules, some general statements can still be made. The main principle governing the fifth century’s orthography was, according to both of them, unbound writing, except for the preposition be-, the preverb be-, the negation na-, the imperative ma-, and the plural –hā. In other cases, the conventions applied are, according Māyel Heravi (1369:142–144) and Matini (1346:192–203) as follows:

- In the case of compound words, composed of two nouns or a noun and an adjective, the generally applied principle is to keep them apart.
- In cases where ham-, nim-, kam-, and bi- are involved, the same rule is applied.
- Prefixes and suffixes are generally written apart from the main word. Exceptions have been observed where suffixes like -gāh, -nāk, -gân, and -mand are written together with the main words. Mi- and hami- are written separately.
- The plural suffix is written together with the main word, even in cases where the main word ends with hā-ye ġeyr-e malfuţ (unpronounced –h).
- The third person singular of the copula verb “to be” = ast is often written as an enclitic unit together with the preceding word, for example jahānast. The third person plural is represented either with or without hamzeh or alef: garm-and or garm[a]nd.
- Keh and čeh (no matter how they are presented) are written together with the following word.
- The comparative and superlative –tar and –tarin are in almost all cases written unbound.
- Another parameter is the way of presenting ezāfeh (genitive) in words ending in hā-ye ġeyr-e malfuţ. Three different ways have been observed: a) as ی, b) as ٞ, and c) unmarked.

59 The letter ی/ح in final position may display the vowel /el/ (Lazard 1992:49). It must be noted that the term hā-ye ġeyr-e malfuţ, nowadays, is replaced by the term he-ye namāyeş-e āharekat ‘the he for displaying the vowel’ (Kāboli 1374a:68) or e-ye āxar ‘final –e’. In the teaching instruction of the Persian textbook for the first grade (Jahānhāh & Ṣayyaḥi 1363:115–116), the letter is called e-ye āxar-e tanhā یس > ‘unbound final –e’ or e-ye āxar-e čashān یس > ‘bound final –e’. In the original textbook, two different lessons are devoted to this letter. In one of the lessons, the same letter is presented as /h/ with its four different shapes, and in another lesson as /e/ with its two shapes (Fārsi: avval-e dabestān 1379:40, 55).
4.1.5 Persian orthography in the sixth-eighth/twelfth-fourteenth
What can safely be said is that the orthography of this period in general is a continuation of the orthography of the earlier period. It deviates from the orthography of the fifth/eleventh century on some points (Māyel Heravi 1369:148–151):

- *Ham*-, in contrast to the earlier period where it was always written separately, is written separately as well as together with the following word.
- Suffixes are written either separately or together with the main word.
- Prefixes like *mi-* and *hami-* are written as in the earlier period, while there are cases where the negative *na-* is either written separately or together with the verb. The preposition *be-* is almost always written together with the following word, whether the word is a noun, an adjective, or an adverb.
- *Ast* (third person singular of the verb to be) is seldom written together with the preceding word.
- *Keh* is either written separately or together with the following word.
- The *ezāfeh* after *a* is presented either as *a* or *ə*.

4.1.6 Persian orthography in the ninth-thirteenth/fifteenth-nineteenth
The main feature of the orthography of this period is a greater tendency towards bound writing (Māyel Heravi 1369:156–157):

- Verbal prefixes like *mi-* and *hami-* are generally written together with the verb.
- Comparative and superlative *–tar* and *–tarin* are written together with the preceding adjective.
- Demonstrative pronouns like *in-* and *ān-* are written together with the following word.
- The only exception is *keh*, which is written separately from the following word as we move from the eighth century towards the ninth century. In manuscripts of the eleventh century Hijri and afterward, the tendency of writing *keh* together with the preceding word, not the following word, can be observed.
- *Ezāfeh* has not been mentioned.

The movement of Persian orthography from the fifth century towards the thirteenth century Hijri is a movement from unbound writing towards bound writing, while contemporary orthography shows a strong tendency towards unbound writing. The reasons for the vast orthographic variation in
manuscripts are certainly many. The analytic nature of the Persian language and the uncritical adoption of an orthography adapted to a synthetic language like Arabic is undoubtedly one of the main reasons. The absence of a general grammar of Persian; the absence of general rules of orthography; language change; carelessness; and writers’ different styles and preferences are among other reasons that can be mentioned. These reasons are not essentially different from the reasons for orthographic variations in modern printed texts, a subject that will be discussed later on.

4.1.7 Early voices on the necessity of compiling some general rules for Persian orthography

Iranians, who placed much effort into compiling Arabic grammars as well as establishing orthographic conventions for Arabic, failed to do the same for Persian. More than a thousand years passed before Iranians realized the need to establish some general rules of Persian orthography.

It is said that it was the spread of Persian outside Iran, especially in India and Asia Minor, which aroused an initial interest in establishing and presenting some general rules for orthography. Some of the first documents to contain an account of the conventions of Persian orthography are *Farhang-e Jahāngiri* from 1608 by Mir Jamāl al-Din Ḥosein Ebn-e Fakhr al-Din ḥasan Inju Shirāzi, *Farhang-e Rašidi* from 1653 by ṬAbd al-Rashid Ebn-e ṬAbd al-Ghafur al-Madani al-Tatavi, and *Borhān-e Qāte’* from 1651, by Mḥammad Ḥosein Ebn-e Khalaf Tabrizi, using the pen name of Borhān (Māyel Heravi 1369:134, 440).

The author of *Farhang-e Jahāngiri*, who had spent a great part of his life in India at the court of Jalāl al-Din Mḥammad Akbar Shāh and his son Jahāngir, was very interested in reading Persian masterpieces. It is said that as most of these works included many Middle Persian words, he decided to compile a dictionary. He devoted thirty years of his life to this work and compiled *Farhang-e Jahāngiri* by using 53 other dictionaries (*Farhang-e Jahāngiri* 1359:Preface 6). He wrote an introduction divided into twelve guiding ‘principles’, six of which, in one way or another, deal with orthography and rules of spelling.

The third principle, for example, is on the alphabet and the letters which are used by Arabs and ‘Ajjams (Iranians), the difference between dāl and z̄āl and their place in the word, and the tenses in Persian. He lists the letters that do not occur in Persian words; namely قاف، عين، طاء، ضاد، حاء، ثاء and the 4 letters, which only occur in Persian ژ، چ، پ، and گ ( *Farhang-e Jahāngiri* 1359:24–25).

In the fourth principle he discusses, among other things, the way of presenting initial Ā. The fifth principle contains a presentation of each letter in the dictionary. In his presentation of the 4 Persian letters, he writes: “I
have presented the four letters ۰، ۱، ۲، ۳، and ۴، each of which with three dots, and only used by 'Ajams, together with the adjective 'ajami' (ibid.:28).

The sixth principle is on how to replace some letters by others in order to make it easier for the scribes and poets (ibid.:28–29). The tenth principle is on ḥoruf-e mofradeh ‘individual letters’ in initial, medial, and final position, where he takes up the initial alef and maintains that there are two types of initial alef; one that can be left out and one that must be written (ibid.:38). He then devotes a long paragraph to emlā’ ‘rules of spelling’:

The eleventh principle is on what every scribe must have a good knowledge of, namely, emlā’ […] But what is emlā’? we should know that emlā’ for men of letters means writing individual letters and combinations of letters according to the method that the masters of this art have formulated, and when it is said that somebody has a command of emlā’, it means that he writes according to the method formulated by the masters of this art, and being without emlā’ is a huge default. It is therefore necessary for the scribes to derive the orthographic rules from writings and books on the issue or ask those who are reliable in this field and apply them, as there are letters which are written but are not pronounced and letters which are not written, but are pronounced […]. Whenever the imperative ma-, be-, the negation na-, or the preverb of be- is added to a word, beginning with alef, the alef will change to yā, as in oftād which becomes beyoftād […]. In the case of compound words, whenever the final letter of the first word and the initial letter of the second word are the same or have the same place of articulation, the final letter of the first word must either be eliminated or integrated in the initial letter of the second word […], for example if we combine یٰ نیم with یٰ من, we write یٰ نیم من not نیم یٰ من من […]. In the case of the plural form of the non-animate words ending in -h, which represent fathah ‘the short vowel of /a/', the final –h of the main word should be dropped, as in نامه ‘nāmahā, while the hā-ye malfuž should be kept as in زره ‘zerehhā (Ibid.:51–57)

The authors of Borhān-e Qāte’ and Farhang-e Rašidi have also devoted parts of their introduction to orthography and orthographic conventions. They, too, have divided their introduction into guiding principles, called fā’edeh ‘useful words’. The ninth fā’edeh in Borhān-e Qāte’ is devoted to emlā’ (1336:3–18). The orthographic conventions that have been taken up by this author are almost the same as those discussed by the author of Farhang-e Jahāngiri. In the case of Farhang-e Rašidi, the introduction is an almost exact copy of the introduction of Farhang-e Jahāngiri, even if the order of presentation is somewhat different. The author of Farhang-e Rašidi has even discussed the orthography of borrowed Arabic words (Farhang-e Rašidi 1337:34–42).

The similarities between the orthographic conventions that have been discussed in the three dictionaries and the references to the issue of emlā’ as
“the method formulated by the masters of this art” makes us think about the possibility of some existing handbook on orthographic conventions.

4.2 Persian orthography after the introduction of printing in Iran

The heading is a little deceptive, as it may suggest our modern sense of printing and printed material. What was called printing in Iran was for quite a long time limited to printing and copying handwritten manuscripts using a lithographic technique. However, the establishment of printing houses in Iran in the nineteenth century occurred simultaneously with the first serious encounter of Iranians with Europe, their aspirations toward modernization, and the constitutional revolution.

Āryanpur, refers to a French-Persian dictionary\textsuperscript{60} written in 1685 in which the author,\textsuperscript{61} in relation to the meaning of the words \textit{bāṣmeh-xāneh}, \textit{kārxāneh-ye bāṣmaji}, \textit{maṭba‘},\textsuperscript{62} writes that the Carmelite fathers (Carmelite Nestorian priests) had established a \textit{bāṣmeh-xāneh} with Arabic and Persian letters in their own house of worship in Isfahan. He maintains that the first printing house in Iran must have been established sometime after 1607 when Carmelite Nestorians first came to Isfahan. There are documents which indicate that Armenians had printing houses in Iran already in the seventeenth century, but it took quite a long time before Persian-speaking Iranians established their first printing house (Āryanpur 1367:228–229).

There is some dispute about who first established a non-Christian printing house in Iran in the nineteenth century. Āryanpur (1367:230–231), referring to a letter from Houtum Schindler to Taqizādeh, names Zein al-‘Ābedin Tabrizi as the first person to establish a printing house in Tabriz in 1816 or 1817. Golpāygāni (1378:11) is also of the same opinion. Fazlhashemi (1999:27) writes, on the other hand, that it was Mirzā Šāleḥ Shirāzi who “established Iran’s first modern, state-owned printing house in Tabriz,” when he returned to Iran in 1819. Mirzā Šāleḥ was one of the first students to be sent to England by ’Abbās Mirzā. He returned to Iran early in 1819 with a printing-machine and put it to work, but according to Āryanpur, it was “two to three years after Zein al-‘Ābedin Tabrizi” (1367:231). On the other hand, it is generally accepted that it was ’Abbās Mirzā who was the promoter.

\footnote{60} \textit{Gazophylacium Linguae persarum}

\footnote{61} Ange de Saint Joseph; a French priest who lived in Iran for some years.

\footnote{62} \textit{Baṣmeh} and \textit{bāṣmeh} means printing in Turkish and \textit{bāṣmeh-xāneh} and \textit{kārxāneh-ye baṣmaji} means printing house in Turkish. \textit{Maṭba‘} means printing house in Arabic.
However, the first printing houses in Tabriz and Tehran were typographies. Typography was not very popular in Iran, as it could cause unemployment among handwriters, and would leave no space for the Iranian art of calligraphy. Typography met with resistance, and after the death of ‘Abbās Mirzā the printing house in Tabriz was closed. Ten years later, the printing house in Tehran was closed, too. For about 60 years after that, printing in Iran was limited to lithography” (Āryanpur 1367:232), which had entered Iran from Russia in 1825 (Balaẏ 1377:17). Lithography quickly became popular and after Tehran and Tabriz, it spread rapidly to Isfahan, Shiraz, and other cities, while typography was almost abolished, until Nāşer al-Din Shāh, returning from his third trip to Europe, bought a typographical printing-machine in Istanbul and brought it to Iran. It was not in working order until Baron Louis de Norman, who had received permission to publish the French paper *La Patrie*63, repaired it and began to use it (Āryanpur 1367:233–234). Lithography was nothing but copying and multiplying handwritten manuscripts, without any direct and new implications for orthography.

4.2.1 The Constitutional Revolution and modernization

As was mentioned earlier, the issue of the inefficiency of Persian script is a relative modern issue. The issue had been discussed earlier, but mostly within a linguistic framework. It was first on the threshold of the Constitutional Revolution of 1906–11 that the need for a reform of Persian script began to be discussed seriously and intensively, this time even within circles beyond a linguistic framework, and as one of the essential steps towards modernization. It would therefore be unwise to study it in isolation from all the other developments in Iran that gave birth to the idea of modernity among a small group of Iranian intellectuals. The birth of the idea of modernity among Iranian intellectuals was in its turn not separate from all the developments in the Near- and Middle East, which were a result of the encounters of this part of the world with a powerful Europe seeking to expand its sphere of influence at the turn of the nineteenth century.

European expansion, however, was not met in the same way everywhere. While some countries like Japan met European civilization with a more positive attitude, others, like China, showed strong resistance and rejected it (Behnām 1375:4–7). During the period of European expansion, many Muslim countries willingly or unwillingly came into contact with Europe, the philosophy of the Age of Enlightenment, and the idea of modernity.64

---

63 According to Keddie, *La Patrie* was a bilingual paper, which was published in 1876, and lasted for only one issue (1981:64). Āryanpur may be referring to a new period of *La Patrie*.

64 It must be mentioned that the idea of modernity in the Iranian context has been interpreted in many different ways. It is beyond the limits of my study to discuss what the idea of
According to Lewis (1968:40): “The French Revolution was the first great movement of ideas in Western Christendom that had any real effect on the world of Islam.”

At the turn of the nineteenth century and in the years following, Ottoman-ruled Egypt was invaded by Napoleon, the Ottoman Empire experienced a severe defeat in the war with Russia, and Russia came out of a series of wars with Iran as victorious. Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt has been mentioned as the first and most important encounter of the cultural sphere of the Middle East with Europe. Moḥammad ʿAli Pāshā, who reigned in Egypt after Napoleon’s invasion, was among the first politicians in the Middle East to become aware of the need for reforms. He was the father of those reforms in Egypt that Turks and Iranians came to imitate later on. It was Moḥammad ʿAli Pāshā who showed an interest in a planned economy (eršādi) in Egypt; initiated primary, secondary and high schools; and sent students to Europe. Moḥammad ʿAli Pāshā’s reforms, known as eslāḥāt, were an introduction to the Turkish reforms known as tanẓimāt (Behnām 1375:12–13).

On November the third 1839, the Ottoman Sultan, Abdülmecid, signed the Noble Rescript of the Rose Chamber (Hatt-i Şerif-i Gülhane) and the tanẓimāt period was initiated. Among other principles, the Rescript of the Rose Chamber declared all Ottoman citizens to be equal before the law, whatever their religion (Lewis 1968:106–107). A new law of education was ratified, the administration was organized after the European model, and the Turkish constitution was ratified. The Ottoman reforms were followed by the Young Turks revolution. During this entire period, Iranian intellectuals were following the developments in Turkey.

Even if some scholars ascribe the beginning of the Iranian – Western relationship to the Safavid period or even earlier, this relationship took a serious and coherent form first at the end of the Iran – Russia wars. Relations during the reign of the Safavids were very limited, and the Safavids considered themselves as an equal part in a mutual relationship, with no modernity actually is and in what way Iranian modernity is in accordance with, or deviates from, the Western idea of modernity. For further information, see Milāni 1378 and Ājudāni 1997.

Similar demands by Iranian constitutionalists provoked a strong reaction by Sheykh Fazlollāh Nuri, who correctly maintained that the equality of all citizens, whatever their religion, was against Islamic laws. Āzādarmaki (2001:90) maintains that Sheykh Fazlollāh had expressed this idea in Tażkerat al-ğāfel va eršād al-jāhel, which, according to him, was written by Sheykh Fazlollāh Nuri. Ājudāni, too, emphasizes Sheykh Fazlollāh’s reactionary standpoint towards the equality of Iranian citizens before the law, but he refers to Sheykh Fazlollāh’s treatise, Hormat-e maṣrūteh, and maintains that the above book, named by Āzādarmaki, was not written by Sheykh Fazlollāh, but by Mirzā ʿAli Eşfahāni, who was also against the constitutional revolution, and was one of Sheykh Fazlollāh’s followers (1997:379, 530).
major need to learn from or adapt themselves to Western civilization, or to establish serious contact with it. In the eyes of the Safavids, Western civilization was a heretic civilization that had nothing to contribute to the Muslims. Those European merchants and ambassadors who visited the Iranian court, particularly their manners and their gifts, amused the Iranian kings, but that was all and no more. The main characteristic of the relationship of the Iranian rulers to the Europeans during the fourteenth-seventeenth centuries was that they turned to Europeans only when they needed military aid in pressed situations (Behnām 1375:14–15, Fazlhashemi 1999:13–16).

However, the serial defeats of Fatḥ 'Ali Shāh (1797–1834) by Russia, and the 1813 Treaty of Golestān and the 1828 Treaty of Turkmānchāy, which, among other results, led to Iran losing many of its provinces in the Caucasian territory to Russia, caused a small group of Iranians to notice Iran’s socio-cultural underdevelopment and to seek some solutions. It is not surprising that the first generation of Iranian reformists consisted of political leaders, and that the modernization process was initiated from above. It was they who first, in one way or another, came into contact with Western civilization and its military superiority, not to mention other fields.

One of the first persons to notice Iran’s severe underdevelopment in the educational, technological, and military fields was Prince 'Abbās Mirzā, governor general of Azerbaijan, who had personally participated in several wars against Russia. With Qā’em Maqām at his side as chief minister and mentor, he initiated a series of actions in order to modernize Iran. Beyond cultural activities like encouraging and sponsoring the translation of Western social, juridical, and scientific works into Persian, he introduced the modernization of the army. He made use of Western military instructors in order to establish a Western-style armed force in Azerbaijan. Some factories were also established in Tabriz, and the first Iranian students were sent to Europe. 'Abbās Mirzā’s modernization program was not welcomed by the 'ulamā, who were particularly annoyed with the use of Western-style uniforms. In 1833, 'Abbās Mirzā died very young before he could take the throne.

Another important figure when it comes to the modernization of Iran is Mīrzā Taqi Khān Amir Kabīr, the chief minister under Nāṣer al-Din Shāh (1848–1896). Amir Kabīr, who had spent four years of his life in Istanbul as the representative of the Iranian government, had the opportunity to follow the tanẓimāt period in Turkey and to learn about Moḥammad Ḥasan Pāshā’s eslāhāt in Egypt. Amir Kabīr, too, sent students to Europe and established Dār al-Fonun (1851), the first non-religious school in Iran (Behnām

66 The similarities in the way Iranians and Turks meet Western civilization in different periods is amazing (See Lewis 1968, chapter 3).
Those students who had been sent to Europe became a major source of information on Western civilization and the rapid and comprehensive progress in Western countries. Their travel books were of great importance in the awakening of Iranians. In 1851 Nāşer al-Dīn Shāh dismissed Amir Kabīr. The following year the shāh had him assassinated in the Bath of Fin in Kashan (Keddie 1981:54).

The third figure to be mentioned is Mirzā Ḥosein Khān Moshir al-Douleḥ, Sepahsālār, he, too, a chief minister of Nāşer al-Dīn Shāh. Sepahsālār was a liberal of his time and believed in nationalism and a constitution, as well as the need for learning from and adopting Western civilization. In order to make Nāşer al-Dīn Shāh aware of the need for modernization, he arranged Nāşer al-Dīn Shāh’s journeys to Europe. He was hoping that these journeys would affect Nāşer al-Dīn Shāh the way similar journeys had affected Peter the Great. However, Sepahsālār was a major figure in cultivating the Constitutional Movement in Iran, and in planting the seeds of the idea of modernity (Ājudāni 1997:229, Behnām 1375:34). One of Sepahsālār’s advisors was Mirzā Malkom Khān, a figure very much hated by the Iranian clergy. It is generally believed that Malkom propagated for the unconditional adoption of Western civilization in all aspects of life, a belief strongly rejected by Ājudāni.67 Mirzā Malkom Khān, together with some other Iranian intellectuals, most of whom lived abroad, formed the unofficial or predominantly unofficial second generation of reformers. Through their writings they initiated a cultural movement in Iran, which in the end led to the Constitutional Revolution of 1906–11, and they came to be known as the intelligentsia of the Constitutional Revolution.

Both the first and second generation of reformists had more or less realized that the modernization of the political system was a necessary prerequisite for modernization in other fields. The major concern now was letting Iranians become familiar with Western civilization through a cultural movement. The establishment of printing houses and the circulation of newspapers were of great importance for the cultural movement of the Constitutional Revolution. The establishment of printing houses, whatever the type, increased the production of newspapers and books and treaties in many different fields. Iranian intellectuals abroad were also very productive, and intellectuals in Iran used to read their books and newspapers. The major theme of most of these books was the miserable situation of Iran compared to the situation in Western countries and the search for a solution. Most scholars regard Ākhundzādeh, Seyyed Jamāl al-Dīn, Mirzā Malkom Khān, Zein al-Ḥābedīn Marāḡhehī, Tālebof, Mirzā Āqā Khān Kerēmānī, Mostashār al-Douleḥ, Amin al-Douleḥ, and Jalāl al-Dīn Mirzā as major ideologists of

67 Ājudāni maintains that this is a misunderstanding of the modern history of Iran. According to him, Malkom never was in favour of an unconditional adoption of Western civilization in all aspects of life. What he meant by an adoption of Western civilization was only the adoption of a Western style of ruling (Ājudāni 1997:337).
Iranian modernity, which in my opinion can be summarized in three words: law, education, and economical independence.

In texts written by these intellectuals, a large space is devoted to the high rate of illiteracy as one of the major sources of the severe underdevelopment in Iran. An immediate and comprehensive literacy program was the first step to be taken, but according to some, the Persian alphabet was a major obstacle for literacy and these intellectuals tried to convince both individuals and authorities to change or modify the alphabet. It was among the second generation of Iranian reformists, the unofficial or predominantly unofficial reformists, that the first generation of Iranian intellectuals advocating an alphabet reform was born.

4.2.2 First generation advocates of an alphabet reform

One of the first persons to discuss the issue was Mirzā Fatḥ ʿAli Ākhundzādeh (1812–78). Ākhundzādeh, also called Akhundof, was an Azerbaijani playwright, who lived in Tbilisi, Caucasus, and wrote in Azeri Turkish, and Persian. Ākhundzādeh, who was an atheist and a strong critic of Islam, showed a special interest in Iran and its cultural and intellectual life. As a matter of fact, he regarded himself as partly Iranian, for his father’s ancestors were Persian-speaking. In 1865 he wrote Kamāl-al-dawle Maktublārī (Kamāl-al-dawle’s Correspondences), which consisted of a series of fictitious letters exchanged between the Indian prince Kamāl al-Douleh and the Persian prince Jalāl al-Douleh, where Islam and its prophet are harshly criticized (Algar 1985:738).

Ākhundzādeh considered the Arabic alphabet to be one of the major causes of underdevelopment and the high rate of illiteracy in the Islamic world. He devoted a lot of time and effort to finding a solution and to convincing the authorities in the Ottoman Empire as well as in Iran of the need for some kind of reform. In September 1857 he published a treatise in Persian, where he presented his newly-invented alphabet (alefbāʿ-e jadid), which consisted of letters without dots, written together yet within the framework of the Arabic alphabet. The treatise was introduced by a presentation of the author’s horrible experiences as a child in learning to read the Koran and later on learning to read Persian classical texts like Golestān, stressing the fact that it took him three to four years to learn to read, a length of time that not many children could sustain. He asserts, then, that this is exactly why not even one out of ten thousand is literate, and why women are illiterate. Afterward, he discusses the shortcomings of the Arabic alphabet, the importance of the alphabet in cultural and economical
development, the need for reforming the alphabets of the Islamic world, and then presents the details of his invented alphabet (Akhundof 1963:3–15).

Ākhundzādeh, who had heard about some script reform aspirations in the Ottoman Empire, traveled to Istanbul in 1863, in order to present his newly invented alphabet to the Ottoman authorities. He presented his treatise and his new alphabet to the chief minister Fowad Paşa. The Ottoman authorities welcomed him as a high-ranking Russian guest, and the chief minister personally presented him to the Ottoman Scientific Society under the chairmanship of Mehmet Münif Paşa, himself an advocate of script reform. Ākhundzādeh presented his treatise and his new alphabet at the society. “The Society, in its report, conceded the reality of the problem, but could not recommend the acceptance of Feth Ali’s proposals as a solution” (Lewis 1968:427). Ākhundzādeh returned to the Caucasus and continued his efforts to develop his alphabet furthermore. He knew that the time was not ready for a radical change.

In 1868, he sent the modified version of his treatise on the new alphabet to Nāṣer al-Din Shāh’s Minister of Education. In this treatise, the letters were written separately, but still from right to left. The Iranian authorities recommended that Ākhundzādeh present his ideas to the Ottoman authorities who were willing to change the alphabet, not to Iranians who were not interested in changing the alphabet at all.

Ākhundzādeh did not give up, but persisted in refining his alphabet. He made some modifications in the second version of his alphabet and composed his third treatise, which he this time sent to Ali Paşa, the Ottoman chief minister. His alphabet did not receive the support he had hoped for this time, either. At last, he gave up the idea of reforming the Arabic alphabet and compiled a new alphabet, based on the Roman and Cyrillic alphabet, with 24 characters for consonants, 10 characters for vowels, 8 characters for letters of Arabic origin, and 𔁞 for displaying hamzeh. The new alphabet could, according to him, meet the needs of all nations of the Islamic world, whatever their spoken language. Ākhundzādeh, who believed in his cause, never gave up, and devoted every minute of his life to convincing other people of the need for changing the alphabet. He wrote hundreds of letters to Iranian and Ottoman authorities and intellectuals. Major parts of his letters to his friends are also on the alphabet. Mirzā Malkom Khān was one of the friends with whom he repeatedly discussed the issue in his correspondence (Āryanpur 1374:38–40, Ākhundzādeh 2535:VI–VII). Algar (1985:738) is of the opinion that:

Although the arguments he advanced publicly in favor of reform were mostly linguistic in nature, his chief purpose seems to have been the expunging of a

---

69 Ākhundzādeh’s proposals and text samples are presented in chapter 5, as well as in Appendix 1.
major sign of Muslim cultural identity. Writing to a trusted correspondent, Mīrzā Malkom Khan, Āḵūndzāda predicted that the cause of Islam would be lost after the printing and diffusion of the letters of Kamāl-al-dawla, and that his reformed alphabet would then automatically be accepted.

Another prominent figure was Mirzā Malkom Khān (1833–1908), a Perso-Armenian diplomat, essayist, and journalist. According to Zabiḥ Behruz, Malkom was the first Iranian intellectual in modern time who raised the issue of alphabet reform publicly. Behruz is of the opinion that it was first after Malkom’s writings on the alphabet that Ākhundzādeh raised the issue in the Caucasus (1363b:13). Like his friend Ākhundzādeh, Malkom found the inefficient writing system to be one of the major obstacles in the way of cultural and economical development in the Islamic world, and tried to think of some solutions. Malkom expressed his ideas on script reform in two of his treatises: Roušanāyi and Šeix o Vazir.

Šeix o Vazir is a critical treatise in the form of a dialogue between the progressive Vazir ‘minister’ and the conservative Šeix ‘priest’. The Vazir is for reforming of the alphabet. Throughout the entire dialogue, the Vazir tries to convince the Šeix that reform is necessary and that it has nothing to do with Islam, yet he is well aware that he has to remain within the framework of the Arabic alphabet. He tries to convince the Šeix that the secret behind the European’s progress is their alphabet, which makes their access to knowledge very easy. He writes that European children can read books after being instructed in twenty days, while our children are not able to read a text without mistakes after even ten years of school. He then lists the shortcomings of Persian orthography, which amount to 24 in number, and presents his own proposal which is based on three principles: writing the letters separately, introducing diacritics between the letters, and changing the shape of the letters if necessary (Mirzā Malkom Khān 1381:371–401).

Ākhundzādeh (1963:235), who had received Malkom’s treatise, praised it very much in a letter, and wrote: “I would have died of sorrow if you had not written this treatise.” In another letter dated from 1868, he praised Malkom’s alphabet as being suitable for print, in that the four different shapes of each letter had been eliminated, but criticized it for not being economical in handwriting, as the dots and diacritics had been kept, and writing was still from right to left, while the letters were written separately. He criticizes Malkom for his idea of letting the dots and diacritics be eliminated gradually, and asks why one should adopt an alphabet that needs to be changed later (ibid.:115–118). Sometime later Ākhundzādeh praised the idea of writing letters separately, provided that they were written from left to right (ibid.:186).
Malkom presented his new alphabet in his treatise *Nemuneh-ye xatt-e ādamiyyat* (A sample of a human script), which, together with his treatise *Roušanāyi*, was published in London in 1886. The same year, he also published some narratives of *Golestān*, as well as selected words of the first Imām, ‘Ali, in his new alphabet in London (Āryanpur 1374:41). He was strongly convinced that the first step in a script reform would be writing the letters separately. Malkom never gave up the idea. In 1869, the Turkish newspaper *Hürriyet*, published an article in which the educational system of Turkey was criticized. Malkom wrote a letter in Persian to the editors of the *Hürriyet* and laid the main blame on the Arabic script. In a reply to Malkom Khān, Namik Kemal, a famous Turkish intellectual of the time and one of the pioneers of modernization in Turkey, wrote that it was not the alphabet which was the root of underdevelopment, but a lack of knowledge and science. He wrote that the English script is as erratic and ambiguous as the Turkish, yet the rate of illiteracy is very low in England and America, while Spaniards with a phonetic script are less literate (Lewis 1968:428).

Malkom tried to establish a printing house in Istanbul, and aimed at publishing a newspaper in *Malkomi* script, but the Ottoman authorities were skeptical and did not allow him to do so. Malkom’s alphabet met the same destiny as Ākhundzāde’s alphabet. Neither of the two alphabets was accepted or adopted. Apart from the linguistic shortcomings of their alphabets, the cultural and social conditions were not yet ready for such a change (Āryanpur 1374:41, Nurā’i 1352:105–106).

A third figure to be mentioned in this context is *Mirzā Yusef Khān Mostashār al-Douleh Tabrizi* (1845–1895), a friend of both Ākhundzādeh and Malkom. Mirzā Yusef Khān was the son of Mirzā Kāzem Tabrizi, a respected man in Azerbaijan. His encounter with European civilization began with his position as the Iranian government’s *chargé de affaires* in St. Petersburg, then as the consul of the Iranian government in Tbilisi (1864–1868). It was in Tbilisi that he met Ākhundzādeh for the first time and initiated a friendship with him. In 1868, he was appointed the Iranian Embassy’s *chargé de affaires* in Paris. He stayed in Paris for three years, during which he visited London on four occasions. Each time he was in London he would meet with Mirzā Malkom Khān. He wrote his most famous book *Yek kalameh* during his stay in Paris, after long discussions with Mirzā Malkom Khān during their meetings in London. The title of the book refers to the word ‘law’. Both Mostashār al-Douleh and Mirzā Malkom Khān were of the opinion that the only thing that could help Iran out of her miserable condition was legislation, nothing else. Among the books and trea-

---

70 The Malkomi alphabet and text samples are presented in ch. 5.4, as well as in Appendix 1.
71 In *Yek kalameh* (One word) Mostashār al-Douleh translated parts of the human rights declaration in the introduction of the French constitution, and tried to show that it was in accordance with the Koranic laws and *Hadith* (See Ājudāni 1997:248).

Mirzā Yusef Khān Mostashār al-Douleh Tabrizi, too, was a pioneer when it comes to alphabet reform, and placed a lot of effort into convincing the authorities of the need for this reform, even if he, unlike Ākhundzādeh, did not see the alphabet reform as the most essential step away from the miserable situation in Iran and in the Islamic world. In 1886, he wrote the treatise of *Eslāḥ-e xaxṭ-e eslām* on alphabet reform. Mostashār al-Douleh was one of the persons Ākhundzādeh used to correspond with. In 1879, he was exiled to Mashhad. Āryanpur writes (1374:41–42):

[D]uring his stay in Mashhad he asked the respected mojtahed of the city to make a statement (*esteftā/fatwā*) on alphabet reform. Mirzā Naṣrollāh Mojtahed issued a *fatwā* as follows: ‘Modifying the present script, or inventing a new alphabet is absolutely permitted, and there is no jurisprudential obstacle in doing so. What is most preferable is to make reading, teaching and learning easier. If somebody believes that this would be an imitation of foreigners, this belief is not correct and it is a weak-rooted illusion. To imitate in this manner is not forbidden (*ḥarām*), otherwise it would be forbidden to use the samovar’.

In 1880, he wrote an article in *Axtar*, and the above *fatwa* was published as an appendix to the article. He died in 1895.

The fourth important figure in this context is Mirzā ’Ali Khān Amin al-Douleh (1843–1904). Amin al-Douleh, who was one of the ministers advocating reforms, came from an intellectual family. After finishing his ordinary education he began learning French. He held a variety of positions, chiefly as the Minister of Postal Services under Nasir al-Din Shāh, and chief minister under Moẓaffar al-Din Shāh. He is generally considered to be a sincere reformist who thought of nothing but the progress of Iran. Ājudānī claims that even though the period that Amin al-Douleh was chief minister was very short, not longer than 14 months (1897–1898), the Iranian press nevertheless experienced a more favorable situation. Freedom of the press, compared to the earlier periods, was much greater. It was he who promoted the establishment of the *Roṣdiyeh* School and certain other schools, established the *Anjoman-e ma’āref* (a kind of Department of Education) and promoted new methods of teaching in schools (Ājudānī 1997:264–265).

Amin al-Douleh is known for his reforms on the cultural front, but he also attempted tax reform and tried to fight corruption. He was, of course, not popular among the ‘vested interests at court’ who found him a threat to their

---

72 A Persian newspaper published by Iranians in Istanbul. Its first issue came out in 1875, and it lasted 22 years (Bala'y 1377:26).
own interests. When he presented a bill to Możaffar al-Din Shāh, in which he proposed clarity about the Shāh’s own income as the first measure, they made the Shāh believe that he was trying to abolish the Qajar dynasty. Soon Amin al-Douleh was dismissed by Możaffar al-Din Shāh (Āryanpur 1367:274, Kermāni 1357:158). The destiny of Amin al-Douleh was not different from other reformist ministers. As Keddie correctly writes: “All these man [sic.] were hindered, pushed from office and sometimes to their death by vested interests at court and among the ulama” (1981:186).

Amin al-Douleh was a friend of Mirzā Malkom Khān, with whom he used to correspond on different matters, including alphabet reform. His private letters to Malkom show that he, too, believed in the need for an alphabet reform. In a letter dated 15 Rajab 1296 H.Q. (5 July 1879), where he seemingly reflects on Malkom’s proposed alphabet in his treatise *Nemuneh-ye xaṭṭ-e ādamiyyat*, he writes:

*Nemuneh-ye xaṭṭ* is getting better and better, if it were not for its strangeness to the eyes that hinders easily reading at the beginning, I would have said that the letters could be recognized even without dots […] (Nurā’i 1352:107).

Even if Amin al-Douleh, like Ākhundzādeh, was critical of the preservation of the dots in Malkom’s proposed alphabet, he was still interested in promoting the new alphabet. As Nurā’i maintains, he wrote to Malkom that the new alphabet was gaining ground, and was circulating like a bouquet in the hands of the people. He nevertheless emphasized that he was not satisfied with this limited progress, and that he was considering publishing a newspaper in the *Malkomi* alphabet. So he wrote to Malkom and asked him to send a typesetting machine with all the letters to him:

I am still not satisfied. What I want is to use these letters and present the alphabet to our poor children […] There is a little printing machine in the Post Office, which I am going to use for publishing a newspaper in this new script, […], and distribute it among the people. The treacherous old script will disappear in the process of time. We have not overcome our opponents yet, but this script is the key to knowledge and science, and will solve our problems in the future (Nurā’i 1352:108).

While Ākhundzādeh and Mirzā Malkom Khān both presented concrete proposals, Mostashār al-Douleh and Amin al-Douleh were merely supporters of the alphabet reform. Alphabet reform was an idea that both at that special time and even later had many supporters. Among other people and societies who were engaged in alphabet reform within the Islamic world from the late
nineteenth through the early twentieth centuries, Āryanpur 1374:42) and Taqizādeh (1351:33) name:73

- Mirzā Reżā Khān Begshlu Qazvini, the secretary at the Iranian Embassy in Istanbul. He invented a new alphabet and wrote the treatise of Alefbā-ye behruzī (An alphabet for prosperity) in 1300 H.Q.
- Mirzā Reżā Khān Arfa’ al-Douleh wrote in 1296 H.Q. a treatise in which he advocated a change of script. He had composed a new script based on Latin and Russian letters. His treatise was called Resāleh-ye rošdiyeh (The Roshdiyeh treatise).
- Anjoman-e dāneš (Dānesh Society) in Bomby, which invented a script similar to Kufi script. In 1308 H.Q., they published a treatise called xatt-e dāneš-e ensāniyat (A script for human knowledge).
- Āqā Mirzā ’Ali-Moḥammad Khān Oveisi, too, wrote the treatise of Xatt-e nou (The new script) on alphabet reform in 1331 H.Q.
- Ḥāji Mirzā Loṭf’ali Mojtahed Tabrizi invented a new alphabet and wrote a treatise on the matter in 1302 H.Q.
- Mirzā Kāżem KhānĀlān Barāghushi also invented an alphabet and wrote a treatise on the issue in 1308 H.Q.
- Ākhund Mullā Aḥmad Ḥoseinzādeh Shēykh al-Islam, who in 1297 H.Q. wrote the treatise of Mo’allem al-atfāl (Children’s teacher) concerning the need of an alphabet reform.

As Āryanpur (1374:42) notes, in addition to these intellectuals directly engaged in the issue of alphabet reform, there were other intellectuals who were in favor of an alphabet reform, and whose ideas and writings had been of great importance in the promotion of the Constitutional Movement. One of these intellectuals was Ṭālebof, who repeatedly takes up the inadequacy of Persian orthography in his books Ketāb-e Aḥmad and Masālek al-Moḥsenin.74 Advising his fictitious son in Ketāb-e Aḥmad not to begin school at an early age, he says:

[A]nd if our alphabet were only one-tenth as easy as other alphabets, I would have let you to go to school. But our alphabet is so difficult and the way of teaching in schools is so undisciplined that I would not let you go to school for another three years (Ṭālebof 2536:22).

He then continues:

73 See also Golbon (2536:136-140).
74 Ādamiyyat (1363:85) writes that Ṭālebof was not in favor of a total changeover to another alphabet, and refers to him admiring the proposal of Mirzā Malkom Khān in his book Masālek al-moḥsenin.
Children in other countries learn their alphabets through games, and they learn to read and write easily before they begin school, while our children can not read a single word correctly after five years in school (ibid.).

4.2.3 Second generation advocates of an alphabet reform

In 1906, after mass demonstrations in Tehran, Możaffar al-Din Shāh agreed to the demands of the constitutionalists for a majles (parliament). The first majles opened in 1906, and appointed a committee to write the Constitution, which was finally signed by Możaffar al-Din Shāh. Soon after signing the Constitution, Możaffar al-Din Shāh died, and his cruel and autocratic son Moḩammad 'Ali took the throne.

1907–1911 is marked by Moḩammad 'Ali Shāh’s attempts to demolish the Iranian constitution and the majles, which started with his cannon attacks on the building of the majles, assisted by the Russian-led Cossack Brigade in July 1908. After the closure of the majles, many constitutionalists were arrested, tortured, and executed, while others went abroad.75

World War I brought new problems and devastation to Iran. Despite the declaration of neutrality by the Iranian government, Iran was used as a battlefield. Iranians’ decades of bitter experience in their relations with the British and Russians reached a peak during the war, when the two powers, over the heads of Iranians, again divided Iran into their own two zones of control in 1915. This situation resulted in a growing sympathy for Germany among Iranian nationalists,76 which lasted quite a long time after Reẓā Khān’s coup d’état in 1921. During this period, some Iranian intellectuals and nationalists emigrated to Germany and established a society called Anjoman-e adabi-ye ālmān (The Literary Society in Germany). Jamālzādeh, himself a member of the Anjoman, writes in his memoirs (Jamālzādeh 1380:187):

The Founders of this society, called the Committee, were the following persons: Taqizādeh, Kāżemzādeh Irānshahr, Mirzā Fazl’ali Tabrizi, Moḩammad Qazvini, Moḩammad 'Ali Tarbiyyat, and Jamālzādeh.

---

75 For more information see Kasravi (2536b:577–675).
76 Pro-German sentiments can clearly be traced in the poetry of Malek al-Sho’arā Bahār, Mirzādeh ‘Eshqi, and ‘Āref, as well as in Adīb Pishāvari’s Qeyṣarānāmeh, where he likens the different European countries to different birds: England to the raven, France to the sparrow, Russia to the kite, Belgium to the wagtail, and Germany to the Persian mythological bird of Homā which is going to emerge victorious (Behnām 1375:54).
Very soon after, the *Anjoman* decided to publish the journal *Kāveh*\(^{77}\) and distribute it among Iranians both in Iran and abroad. *Kāveh* was the tribune of the *Anjoman* and its modernization program for Iran. It came to dominate the cultural atmosphere for quite a long time afterward. The members of the *Anjoman* had come to the agreement that the only alternative for Iran was the adoption of Western civilization in all aspects of life, excepting language and religion\(^{78}\) (Behnām 1375:54–55).

However, one of the major concerns of the *Anjoman* was the Persian language. It was manifested in different attempts, from simplifying Persian prose to protecting it from an invasion of foreign words. The members of the *Anjoman-e adabi-ye ālmān*, like their ancestors, believed in education as an essential step towards modernization, but among the founders of the *Anjoman* it was only Taqizādeh who advocated an alphabet reform. Language purification, word coinage, and alphabet reform had now come to dominate all discussions on the Persian language and language planning in Iran.

Along with other intellectuals in Iran, Seyyed Ḥasan Taqizādeh (1878–1969) came to build the third generation of Iranian reformists and the second generation of advocates of an alphabet reform, appearing after World War I. Taqizādeh was an influential politician who lived under the Qajar dynasty as well as the Pahlavi dynasty. He was born into a traditional religious family. His father made certain that he received a religious education. When he was young, he began to learn French without letting his father know. This opened his eyes to the philosophy of the Enlightenment and the Western concept of constitutional government. During his first stay abroad, first six months in Istanbul, then a couple of months in Egypt, he came closer to Western ideas. In 1906, he returned to Iran, as he had been elected deputy to the first *majles*. His career as a deputy continued as he was elected three more times to the 2\(^{nd}\), 5\(^{th}\), and 6\(^{th}\) *majles*. He was the leader of the first modern political party in Iran, the Iranian Democratic Party. He held a wide variety of other positions, too. During the course of his life he went into exile two times. It was during his second exile that he, along with the persons named above, founded the *Anjoman-e adabi-ye ālmān* (Taqizādeh 1372:24–26, 37–45, 52–55, 155, 184–186).

The political and intellectual life of Taqizādeh is generally divided into two different periods. While the first period bears the stamp of total Westernization, the second period witnesses a modification of earlier standpoints. In an article published in the first issue of the second series of *Kāveh*, he wrote: “Iran must become Europeanized in appearance, and in

---

\(^{77}\) The Persian journal that was published in Berlin in two series: the first period in 1916–1919, and the second period in 1920–1921.

\(^{78}\) Jamālzādeh maintains that they soon decided that issues like religion and politics should be put aside totally, in order to protect the *Anjoman* from inner conflicts (Jamālzādeh 1380:176).
essence, physically and spiritually”⁷⁹ (Gheissari 1998:41). In his famous manifest on alphabet reform, Moqaddameh-ye ta’lim-e ‘omumi yā yeki az sarfaṣlhā-ye tamaddon (The prerequisite of a general compulsory literacy program or one of the main steps towards civilization) from 1928, he emphasized the need for an unconditional adoption of Western civilization as the prerequisite of a prosperous civilized life (Taqizādeh 1351:29) and wrote:

One of the most important foundations of civilization is script, which is an instrument for the registration, passing on, and cultivation of ideas and knowledge. Since a general literacy program is one of the main prerequisites for civilization, the easiness of the script is of special concern, and may be considered as one of the priorities. Unfortunately through the cruelty of history against our nation, we are lagging behind even in this respect, and the gate to general literacy, which is one of the main prerequisites for progress, is closed to us (ibid.:31).

Taqizādeh then formulates his representational and instrumental view on writing and adds:

A script has nothing at all to do with nationality or religion and is solely an instrument for the registration of the sounds of the language in the form of characters on paper, stone, etc […] In order to get onto the road of civilization we have no alternative but to launch a general compulsory literacy program, and to do it rapidly and easily, and to save our youngsters’ brains from tiring of unnecessary pain, we have to change our puzzling script into an instrument for the easy and correct registration of the sounds of the language […], where there would be no place for either overrepresentation or underrepresentation of the sounds, namely, the exact registration of the speech in writing (ibid.:31–32).

Afterward, he lists the shortcomings of the Persian alphabet, which, according to him, amount to eleven. Shortcomings mentioned by Taqizādeh are not much different from what had been said before him as well as after him⁸⁰. He continues by discussing the advantages of a Latin-based alphabet, and writes that it would be unwise to choose an obsolete alphabet like the Avestan instead of a Latin alphabet, which is in use in major parts of the world. Such a choice would according to Taqizādeh simply remove us away from the rest of the world and the road to civilization (ibid.:33–34, 43–44).

Taqizādeh is critical of the alphabets proposed by Ākhundzādeh, Malkom, and others. He also emphasizes that it would be wrong to take over

⁷⁹ “Irān bāyad żāheran va bāṭenan, jesman va ruḥan farangi maʿāb šavad.”
⁸⁰ See ch. 3.6.
the Latin alphabet as it is, given its shortcomings. Under the heading of *alefbā’-e jadid* (1973:62) he writes:

[I]t would probably be wiser and more cautious of me not to propose any alphabet and leave this important, difficult, and subtle task, which demands a lot of consideration to the masters of knowledge and literature […], but it strikes me that this article would be defective and incomplete if it did not present the proposal of an alphabet that reflected my own ideas.

Taqizādeh’s proposed alphabet consisted of 31 character for Persian phonemes and 8 characters for the redundant Arabic letters. He maintains that with these 31 characters it would be possible to reflect spoken Persian at a nearly ideal level. The additional 8 characters can be used for an exact transliteration of names and words of Arabic origin (ibid.:64, 66–67). Taqizādeh asserts that the new alphabet should be cultivated gradually, and at the beginning be parallel to the Arabic alphabet, and that Persian newspapers should begin to publish parts of the newspaper in the new alphabet (ibid.:67).

In the second period of his life, Taqizādeh modified his ideas on the unconditional adoption of Western civilization as well as on alphabet reform and wrote:

Twenty years ago I advocated the adoption of a Latin alphabet for Persian and wrote the treatise *Moqaddameh-ye ta’lim-e ’omumi* on this issue. But later on, after becoming aware of the faults and the harm it would cause our cultural heritage, I gave up the idea, and now I ask forgiveness (Taqizādeh 1351:137).

It is worth mentioning that Taqizādeh was against the language purification movement of that time. In his article “Jonbeš-e melli-ye adabi” (National Literary Movement), he strongly criticized efforts to purify Persian from Arabic words, as well as the proposed use of obsolete ancient words. The article was published in the journal *Ta’lim o tarbiyyat*, no. 5, in 1935. Reżā Shāh, who found it critical to his purification program, ordered the journal to be confiscated from the hands of subscribers. They then deleted Taqizādeh’s article and published the rest of the journal together with no. 6, and sent it to the subscribers as compensation (Taqizādeh 1351:87, Taqizādeh 1320:1).

Another advocate of alphabet reform was Aḥmad Kasravi (1890–1945), a prominent jurist and scholar. He, too, was born into a clerical family in Tabriz. His father was the first person in the family to resign as *mullā* and to begin working in the *bāzār*. By the time of the ‘Lesser Despotism’ of Moḥammad ‘Ali Shāh, Kasravi was about seventeen years old, and, as he himself describes it in his autobiography, *Zendegāni-ye man* (Kasravi

---

81 The proposal is presented in Appendix 1.
1323:33–34), he was surrounded by anti-constitutionalists in his family and neighborhood, and therefore had to hide his sympathies for the Constitutional Revolution. He came into contact with Europe and European science through the writings of Ṭālebof and Arabic journals and books. He was very touched when he first read Siyāhatnāmeh-ye ebrāhim beik (ibid.: 44, 47).

Kasravi, who had completed his studies as mullā, did not like working as a mullā. He was ashamed of it, and very soon ceased to work as a mullā (ibid.:41–42). After World War I, he began teaching Arabic at the American Memorial School of Tabriz in order to learn English himself. He was a scholar by nature, and devoted almost all of his life to learning and research. For about twelve years of his life he worked at the Ministry of Justice in different parts of the country, but he was not very popular with the authorities, as he would always speak out about the corruption he observed.

According to Āryanpur, Kasravi’s life can also be divided into two periods. During the first period, which lasted until 1933, he was not especially engaged in political and social issues, and devoted most of his time to historical and linguistic research. Tārix-e pānṣad sāleh-ye xuzestān, Āzeri yā zabān-e bāstān-e āzerbāījān, and Nām-hā-ye šahr-hā va dih-hā-ye īrān are among the works he wrote during this period. In 1933 he also started to publish the monthly journal Peymān, which lasted until 1942. The second period of his life started with the publishing of Peymān and the book Āyin in two volumes. He also had a strong engagement in politics and social issues. In 1942 he started publishing the daily Parčam, which later on became a monthly journal. Parčam was much more political than the earlier Peymān. Tārix-e mašruṭ-e irān, Tārix-e hijdah sāleh-ye āzerbāiǰān, Bahā’īgārī, and Ši’īgārī are among the long list of books and treatises he wrote during the second period of his life (Āryanpur 1374:93–102).

However, religious fanatics, who could not tolerate his open-mindedness and his critical treatment of cultural and religious institutions, accused him of being against Islam and having burnt the Koran, and put him on trial. During the last session of the court they assassinated him. It is not possible to give a fair account of all aspects of Kasravi’s thinking in such a limited space, as he, unlike his contemporary modernists, was critical of Europe, European civilization, and its materialistic foundation and its mechanisms. At the same time, he was much more critical of the traditional institutions of the Iranian society than most of the other modernists.

The Persian language and alphabet reform were two of his main concerns. A large part of both Peymān and Parčam was often devoted to the modernization of the Persian language. It was first in the daily Parčam (1942) that he brought up the alphabet reform and wrote:
One of the subjects that has been discussed for a long time now is alphabet reform, which is one of the wishes of the people [...] We would like to have a discussion on it in Parčam [...] There is no doubt that the present alphabet is inadequate and we have to change it [...] Some people say: If we change the alphabet, our literature will get lost. I say: I do not know what you mean by literature [...] most of our literature is harmful and one of the advantages of an alphabet reform is that we can get rid of these worthless and inauspicious books82 (Kasravi 2537:451–452).

Modifying the present alphabet would be, according to him, nothing but a waste of time, as it would still be impossible to write it from left to right. If possible, he would prefer a totally new alphabet instead of a Latin alphabet, and asks: “why should we always imitate Europeans? Let us for once do a better job so that they can imitate us” (ibid.:453).

In Gāmhāyi dar rāh-e alefbā barxāhim dāšt (Some steps towards an alphabet reform), published in Zabān-e pāk (Pure language) in 1944, Kasravi gives up the idea of inventing a new alphabet for the moment, as he finds it difficult to manufacture new matrices in Iran, and accepts the adoption of a Latin alphabet with some modifications and writes:

It should be noticed that we use twenty two consonants83 and eight vowels84 (harekah) in Persian as follows:

Some may ask why I have not counted alef or hamzeh. It must be said that alef or hamzeh is not a consonant but a vowel and I will return to it when discussing the vowels [...] But vowels (harekah), we have eight vowels in Persian, and now I will present eight words, the first letter of each of which is followed by a vowel: [bar], bār, deraxt, dir, pol, pul, pei, jou. There are only five vowels in the Latin alphabet, as follows: A, I, U, E, O. Three letters are thus missing for displaying the vowels of Persian [...] (Kasravi 2536a:57, 59–60).

He then mentions some of the possible objections, including the exclusion of the redundant Arabic letters. Kasravi maintains that with a gradual purification of Persian from Arabic words there would be no need for them

82 Kasravi had his own ideas on literature. He was totally against Persian classical literature, especially classical poetry.
83 He uses the term harf for both consonant and letter. Harf is usually used for letter in today’s Persian.
84 Kasravi uses the word Āvāz for vowels, in which diphthongs are included. He indicates harekah in parentheses as an alternative to Āvāz.
in our daily writing, and as most of these consonants have lost their original pronunciation in Persian, they can be replaced by Persian consonants. He then continues that the Latin alphabet lacks single letters for the Persian چ and ش. In order to meet this inadequacy, Kasravi (2536a:58–60) presents three alternatives:

1. To invent new letters or to borrow two letters from other alphabets like Russian, Armenian, or Georgian.
2. To use two letters together as in French and English.
3. To add diacritics to existing letters like C and S, and use them for چ, and шло, as it has been done in Turkey and Caucasus, as well as in Esperanto. To meet the lack of letters for three of the Persians vowels (/a/ as in bar, /ei/ as in pei, and /ou/ as in jou) in the Latin alphabet, he presents the same alternatives as above, and suggests the third alternative, with the addition of diacritics, as the best one in both cases.

Kasravi was one of the most enthusiastic advocates of language purification, who was always striving to use Persian words in his own writing, as well as coining new ones.

The third prominent figure among the second generation of alphabet reform advocates is Sa’id Nafisi (1896–1966). He was born into an intellectual family in Tehran. His father was Nāżem al-Aṭebbā’, one of the first Iranian physicians with a degree from Europe. Nafisi was only fifteen years old when his brother took him to Europe for further studies. After seven years of study in both Switzerland and France, he returned to Iran in 1918. In 1915, Malek al-Sho’arā Bahār had founded the society of Dāneškadeh, where young writers, poets, and literary men would gather and discuss related issues. Soon after returning to Iran, Nafisi joined the society. That same year, the society began to publish the journal Dāneškadeh, and Nafisi together with Bahār, Rashid Yăsami and ’Abbās Eqbāl Āshtiyāni became the main contributors.

Nafisi is mostly known as a novelist, but is also known as a leading literary historian. He worked in other fields, too, and has left a long list of translations and historical works. He was the editor-in-chief of the literary journal Partou (1922), and wrote in the journal Šarq, which was published in three periods, 1924, 1926, and 1930. With the establishment of Tehran University in 1935, Nafisi, who had already lectured at different institutes, began as a lecturer, first at the Faculty of Law and then at the Faculty of Literature. He had lectured at foreign universities, including those in Cairo, Beirut, and Kabul. Nafisi was a permanent member of the Iranian Academy. Some of his most famous works include the following: Tārix-e nażm va nasr dar irān va dar zabān-e ārsī tā pāyān-e qarn-e dahom-e hijri I–II (1344), Āxarin yādgār-e nāder šāh (1305), Farangis (1310), Setāregān-e siyāh (1310)
According to Āryanpur, Nafisi was among those who found the modification of the Arabic alphabet meaningless, and who believed that the future alphabet for Persian could not be anything but a Latin alphabet. He writes that Nafisi was an obstinate advocate of alphabet reform, who very soon noticed the deficiencies of the present alphabet, and who never gave up his own beliefs (Āryanpur 1374:46–47). He then quotes the Russian professor Zhirkov, who had met Nafisi in Tehran in 1928, discussed the subject with him, and who then wrote in an article⁸⁵ that Nafisi was fascinated by alphabet reform in the republics of the Soviet Union, and pondered over how to make a practical alphabet based on Latin for Persian. The article also indicates that Nafisi was well aware of the near impossibility of launching a similar alphabet reform in Iran, at least in the near future. His aim was to use this alphabet as a guide for foreigners who were interested in learning Persian and its different dialects. Nafisi believed that the departure point should be the present Latin alphabet, in which digraphs and letters with diacritics should be avoided, and that overrepresentation should also be avoided (ibid.:47).

Nafisi was the chairman of the Anjoman-e eșlāḥ-e xatţ (The society for alphabet reform), which was founded in 1945 in Tehran. The members of the Anjoman-e eșlāḥ-e xatţ used to write and speak on the shortcomings of the present alphabet and on the need for an alphabet reform. Anjoman presented a new alphabet of its own. The members of the Anjoman were well aware of the difficulties involved in launching an alphabet reform, and did not believe in launching a reform by force. They knew that it might lead to strong negative reactions (Āryanpur 1374:48).

In 1959, the literary journal Soxan opened a discussion on Persian orthography, and asked everybody to contribute with their ideas on the matter. In a notice on a bound or unbound writing of Nafisi wrote:

As I seriously believe that, in order to meet all these difficulties, it is absolutely necessary for Persian to choose another alphabet than the present one, whatever I write on the matter is temporary until the day we can free our language from the harm caused by an alphabet which is not suitable for it (Nafisi 1338:135).

Another famous advocate of alphabet reform in Iran was Ṣādeq Hedāyat (1902–1951). He was born into a rich and influential family in Tehran. His father was E’tezād al-Malek, a high-ranking official. At the age of six he was

⁸⁵ The article was, according to Āryanpur, published in the journal The culture and the scripts of the East (original title in Russian of course), no. 1, 1928, Moscow.
sent to the primary school of ‘Elmiyeh, which was followed by studies at Dār al-Fonun. After finishing his course of study at Dār al-Fonun, he was sent to the French school of St Louis in 1919, and graduated in 1925. He had a great interest in literature and very soon began to read both French and Persian literature with great enthusiasm (Katouzian 1991:18–19)

Hedāyat was among the first students to be sent to Europe under the auspices of the Pahlavi dynasty. He was sent to Europe in 1926, to study architectural engineering. Later on, the authorities allowed him to change his subject of study to French literature within the context of a teacher-training course. He returned to Iran in 1930 without finishing his studies at the teacher’s training school in France. In December 1950, he left Tehran for Paris and in April 1951 he killed himself in his apartment in Paris (ibid.:32–33, 243).

The intellectual life of Hedāyat can be divided into three periods. The first period is strongly impressed by “an almost extreme nationalism, which expresses itself in the praise of ancient Iran, and an extreme aversion towards Arabs and all their cultural manifestations” (Khāmeh-i 1368:167). The first period of Hedāyat’s life coincided with the increasing support of modernization and nationalistic sentiments among Iranian intellectuals and the Pan-Iranism of the newly-founded Pahlavi dynasty.

The second period of Hedāyat’s intellectual life is marked by a subsiding of his nationalism. This was replaced by a modified internationalism and sympathy for Western civilization, although he did not give up his aversion towards Arabs or his interest in the Zoroastrian cultural heritage (ibid.:). Hedāyat is generally known for having been against the language purification movement (sareh-nevisi) of that time. According to Khāmeh-i, Hedāyat was for the purification of Persian during the first period of his life, but he gave it up later on, to the degree that he began to make fun of it in his Vaḡ vaḡ sāhāb (ibid.:168), where both the title and the table of content are ironically written in Pārsi-ye sareh ‘pure Persian’ (Hedāyat 1369).

During the first and second periods of his life, Hedāyat was very productive, and composed almost all of his famous works during this time, including Neyrangestān (1933), Vaḡ vaḡ sāhāb (1934), ‘Alaviyeh xānom (1933), and Buf-e Kur (1936). In 1945 he wrote his Xaṭṭ-e pahlavi va alefbā-ye ṣouti (Pahlavi script and phonetic alphabet) where he advocated a switch to a Latin alphabet. The article was first published in Soxan, no. 8–9, 2nd year. He begins the article as follows:

As the journal Soxan has taken up the shortcomings of the present alphabet, it is not irrelevant to see what writing system was current before the adoption of the present alphabet and to what degree it accurately registered the sounds

---

86 Sareh means good, pure, and faultless. Sareh-nevisi here means writing pure Persian.
of the language. To make it clear, it seems necessary to give an outline of the Pahlavi script (Hedāyat 1379:595).

He then gives an account of the Pahlavi script and the use of huzvāresh. While admitting the inadequacy and difficulty of the official Pahlavi script, he maintains that under the Sasanians there were seven different orthographies, each of which was adapted for a certain purpose. This, according to Hedāyat, made it possible to register different dialects with a tolerable degree of accuracy, while the only existing orthography of our time, with its many diacritics, leaves room for an inaccurate registration of sounds. He writes:

An alphabet reform is therefore very important and vital to the Persian language. Without this reform, namely adopting a phonetic Latin alphabet, fitted to the Persian language’s sounds and characteristics, the way to any kind of research on the Persian language is obstructed. This has already been tested seriously by the Kurds outside of Iran, and the Tajiks, who speak two of the dialects of Persian. They have adopted a phonetic alphabet of Latin and have made great achievements (Hedāyat 1379:613–614).

The third period of Hedāyat’s life is marked by an overwhelming pessimism. During this period, which begins after the end of World War II, Hedāyat is not productive anymore. The second generation of alphabet reformers was of course not limited to the above-mentioned persons. Among the long list of figures and societies propagating for an alphabet reform, Āryanpur names the following:

- Rashid Yāsami (1896-1951), who was a member of the Iranian Academy and the editor of Nāmeh-ye farhangestān in some periods. He was an enthusiastic advocate of alphabet reform, and wrote poems where he discussed the shortcomings of Persian alphabet.
- Abu al-Qāsem Āzād Marāgheh-i (d.1946) who in 1945 wrote the treatise of Alefbā-ye āsān (Easy alphabet). In the same year, he founded the society of Ṭarafdārān-e alefbā-ye āsān (Adherents of easy alphabet). It was Āzād Marāgheh-i’s ambition to present the alphabet reform as a bill to the parliament so that it could be promoted officially.
- Anjoman-e tarvij-e zabān-e fārsi (The society of Persian language cultivation) was a society founded in 1964 in Tehran, and began to publish the journal of Bonyād-e farhang, where they presented an alphabet called Alefbā-ye fārsī beh xaṭṭ-e jahānī (A Persian alphabet in universal script). They asked the readers to express their ideas on this alphabet.
• In 1965, the two journals Sepid o siyāh and Roušanfekr, both published in Tehran, opened a tribunal for discussing the problem of Persian alphabet. Raḥmat Moṣṭafavi, who was the chief editor of the Roušanfekr, wrote a series of articles on the subject, where he discussed the shortcomings of the Persian alphabet, and propagated for an alphabet reform (Āryanpur 1374:47–49).

Unlike the first generation, the second generation met active resistance, and the problem of the Persian alphabet came to engage many intellectuals, journals, societies, and official institutes like Farhangestān for a long time after.87 Xaṭṭ-e fārsi: eṣlāḥ yā taḡyir? ‘Persian orthography: modification or changeover?’ had now come to establish itself as the main question of all studies and discussions on Persian orthography, and effectively divide all those engaged in the subject into two separate groups ever after. Advocates of modification and advocates of a changeover agree with each other on most matters when it comes to the shortcomings of Persian orthography. However, they propose two different solutions.

4.2.4 Outside influences: Turkey 1929

At the end of October 1923, the Turkish parliament declared the form of government of Turkey to be a Republic and Mustafa Kemal, Atatürk, was elected the first president of the Republic. Atatürk was determined to continue those reforms that had started under the reign of the Ottoman Sultan, Abdülmecid. He was convinced that the salvation of Turkey was dependent on the total adoption of European civilization, and on breaking the links with its past and with Islam. He planned an attack on the theocracy, which started with abolishing the Caliphate and was extended to forbidding the use of the Fez (traditional Ottoman hat) and the use of traditional dress and religious symbols for ordinary people with no official religious status. Atatürk’s project was to give the Turkish state and people a more secular, more national, more modern and less Islamic character (Lewis 1968:261–269). By deleting the second article of the 1924 constitution, where Islam was declared the religion of the Turkish state, in 1928, Atatürk completed the disestablishment of Islam:

[T]urkey was now, legally and constitutionally, a lay state, secular and modern in her constitution, her laws, and her aspirations. But there remained one symbol, potent and universal, that bound her to the Orient and set her apart from the Western community of nations – the Arabic script. It was this

---

87 In the 1950s through the 1970s, Persian orthography and alphabet reform was also discussed in the Persian journals Soxan and Yaḡmā.
The shortcomings of the Arabic script for Turkish written language had been discussed since the *Tanzimāt* period, and proposals had been presented for meeting them. Münif Paşa is named as the first person to propose a reform within the framework of Arabic-based script. A total changeover to a Latin alphabet was put forward and discussed in Turkey in 1923 and 1924, but met strong resistance.

The adoption of a Latin alphabet in place of the Arabic for the Turkic languages of the Soviet Union, which was proclaimed as official policy at a Turkological Congress in Baku in 1926 (Henze 1977:376), was a factor of some importance for Atatürk, who wanted to strengthen the bonds with the Turkish-speaking population of the Soviet Union. Discussions on the need of a script reform began to intensify. The first step was taken when the Arabic numerals were replaced by international numerals in May 1928. A special commission was appointed in order to examine the possibility of an alphabet reform. Atatürk himself was present at the meetings of the commission in Istanbul and led and directed the discussions. The new alphabet was ready in six weeks, and Atatürk presented it at the garden party of The Republican People’s Party on 9 August, 1928 and called for its launch. He personally took part in teaching the new alphabet. In November 1928, the Assembly passed a law establishing the new Turkish alphabet. The deadline for using the Arabic-based script for Turkish was set at the end of the same year (Lewis 1968:277–278).

A purification movement aimed at purifying Turkish from Arabic and Persian loan words accompanied the script reform in Turkey. Language reform in Turkey in general, and script reform in particular, was a part of Turkey’s “over-all post World War I program of seeking a new Turkish identity” through breaking its links with its old Ottoman-Islamic identity (Fishman 1971:11).

Due to Iran’s geographical position, the Iranian encounter with Western civilization passed through Turkey and Russia. The developments in these two countries were followed by Iranians, and influenced them. It would thus be surprising if the script reform in Turkey and the Republics of the Soviet did not affect the Iranians.

In 1934, Reżā Shāh visited Turkey. Moḥammad ‘Ali Forughi, the Prime Minister, had arranged the journey in order to let him learn about the different aspects of modernization in Turkey. The journey lasted one month. Reżā Shāh was very impressed by Atatürk’s initiatives, but only on a surface level. Meeting Turks in frock and jackets, the replacement of Friday by Sunday, the Hijri calendar by the Christian one, and the Arabic alphabet by Latin characters all filled him with a great desire to do the same in Iran (Behnud 1368:129). The language purification movement in Turkey...
specifically impressed him. In order to meet the need for new words within the military field, a society consisting of representatives from the Ministry of War and the Ministry of Education had already been founded in Iran in 1924. This was the first society for coining words for foreign terms (Sadeghi 2001:21). The sessions of the society were held once a week. Words like havâpeymâ ‘airplane’, forudgâh ‘airport’, xalabân ‘pilot’, ātašbâr ‘artillery’, gordân ‘battalion’, havâsanj ‘barometer’ and bâdsanj ‘anemometer’ are among the many words that the society coined (Badreh-i 2535:9–10) It was the need for new words and the purification movement in Iran which finally led to the foundation of Farhangestân ‘The Iranian Academy’.

4.2.5 The history of Farhangestân ‘The Iranian Academy’

As was mentioned above, the first society for word coinage was the society patronized by the Ministry of War. In 1932 a second society of this kind, named “The society for coining scientific terms” was founded in the Teachers’ Training College. Some of the words proposed by this society are as follows: garmāsanj ‘thermometer’, tarāvosh ‘osmosis’, hamrixt ‘isomorph’ and tapeš ‘pulsation’. The activities of this society lasted until 1940 (Badreh-i 2535:14–15, Sadeghi 2001:21).

About five months before the foundation of the Iranian Academy, the Ministry of Public Education planned the foundation of a number of societies consisting of scholars from different disciplines. The foundation of the Medical Academy in 1934 was the first step. A number of famous Iranian physicians and men of letters gathered in the society and held sessions. In one of the sessions the term Farhangestân was suggested as an equivalent to French ‘académie’, and the charter of the Medical Academy was codified. Farhangestân is a derived word made by the word farhang ‘culture, knowledge’ and the locative suffix of -estân ‘place’; a place for knowledge. Out of the tasks considered in the charter of Medical Academy, we can mention the task of translating and editing medical textbooks, the coinage of words for medical loan words, the editing of a medical lexicon, and the collection of medical terms.

4.2.5.1 The First Iranian Academy: Farhangestân-e avval

By early 1935, after Režâ Shâh had returned from Turkey, the purification movement in Iran was accelerated. A number of societies were founded, and

---

88 Vezârat-e Ma’âref o ouqâf va şanâye’-e mostaţrafeh, earlier Vezârat-e ’olom under Nâşer al-Din Shâh, and later Vezârat-e farhang under the Pahlavi dynasty.
89 Farhang also means ‘dictionary’. Although word coinage was the main concern of the founders of the Academy, it does not seem that they were referring to this meaning of the word farhang.
an unrestrained wave of word coinage was started. According to Sami’i Gilāni (1374:138), the Prime Minister, Forughī, who was worried about this development, proposed the foundation of the Iranian Academy to the Shāh. His aim was to strain the unhealthy purification and word coinage movement, which was strongly affected by extreme nationalistic sentiments and a glorification of ancient Iran. In 1935, and before the ratification of the charter of the Medical Academy, Reżā Shāh issued an order and appointed Forughī to unify these scattered unofficial societies into a single official authoritative organization (Badreh-i 2535:18, Sadeghi 2001:22). In a letter to the Ministry of Public Education, Forughī wrote:

Seeing that some people try these days to coin words for new concepts for which Persian has no means of expression, and seeing that these people’s methods are unfounded and do not conform to good taste, it is incumbent upon the ministry of public education to ponder on the idea of the establishment of such a society (Sadeghi 2001:22–23).

In cooperation with a number of scholars, the Ministry of Public Education codified the charter (asās-nāmeh) of Farhangestān, which comprised 16 articles. The cabinet sanctioned the charter on 19 May, 1935. Farhangestān’s first official session with its 24 permanent members, under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister, Moḥammad ’Ali Forughī, was held in Madrese-ye ’āli-ye hoqeq (The faculty of Law) on 2 June, 1935. The second article of the charter described Farhangestān’s tasks as follows:

1. To compile a Persian dictionary for accepting or rejecting words and expressions in Persian.
2. To coin words within different branches of knowledge; Persian should as far as possible be the departure point.
3. To purify the Persian language from unsuitable foreign words.
4. To create a Persian grammar and establishing principles for coining Persian words and accepting or rejecting foreign terms.
5. To collect artisans’ terms and expressions.
6. To collect words and expressions from old texts.

90 In addition to the 24 permanent members, Farhangestān had 10 honorary members. Among the permanent members we can mention ‘Ali Asghar Ḥekmat, Rashid Yāsami, Ḥosein Golegolāb, Moḥammad Taqi Bahār, Badi’ al-Zamān Foruzānfar, ‘Abd al-’Aẓīm Qarib, and ‘Ali Akbar Dehkhodā, and among honorary members we can mention Jan Rypka, Arthur Christensen, Henri Massé, Reynold Nicholson, Moḥammad ’Ali Jamālzādeh, and Mohammad Raf’at Pāshā, the chairman of the Egyptian Academy. In the following years, the number of permanent members increased and Ebrāhim Purdāvud, Moḥammad Qazvini, Jalāl Homāyi, Moḥammad Ḵejāzi, and Aḥmad Bahmanyār were among the scholars who were elected permanent members of Farhangestān (Badreh-i 2535:42–43, 82–85).
7. To collect local words and expressions, poems, proverbs, tales, jokes, and folklore hymns and tunes.
8. To find and present old texts and to encourage publishing such books.
9. To guide public thought towards a better understanding of literature, poetry, and prose; to cultivate those parts of the old literature which are good; and to reject what is not good and give guidance for the future.
10. To encourage poets and writers in creating literary masterpieces.
11. To encourage scholars to translate and edit textbooks in clear and current Persian.
12. To investigate the reform (eslāḥ) of the Persian orthography.

In the regulations of the Farhangestān (Ā’in-nāmeh-ye dāxeli-ye farhangestān), which included 19 articles, the tenth article was devoted to the establishment of different committees for accomplishing the above tasks: **Tenth article: Farhangestān** establishes the following committees of permanent members for the accomplishment of the tasks considered in paragraphs of the second article of the charter.

1. Committee for word coinage for the tasks considered in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3.
2. Committee for Persian grammar, paragraph 4.
3. Committee for collecting artisans’ terms and expressions, paragraph 5.
4. Committee for old texts, paragraphs 6 and 8.
5. Committee for local words and expressions, paragraph 7.
6. Committee for guidance of public thought, paragraphs 9, 10, and 11.
7. Committee for the reform of Persian orthography, paragraph 12.

(Ṣadiq 1337:104–109).

Under the heading eslāḥ-e xaṭṭ, Badreh-i writes that investigating the reform of the Persian orthography was considered one of the tasks of the Farhangestān in the charter, and a committee was established to accomplish this task. He indicates, however, there are no documents on this committee and its activities, except for Bahmanyār’s article on Persian orthography, which was presented at the introducing ceremony after he was elected the permanent member of the Academy (Badreh-i 2535:78–79). It is therefore not very easy to establish what exactly is meant by the word eslāḥ ‘reform’ in the charter of the Farhangestān. In the same section, Badreh-i (ibid.:78) writes: “It must be noted that at that time the issue of taġyir yā eslāḥ-e xaṭṭ ‘changeover or modification’ was one of the hotly debated issues.” It seems that he interprets the term eslāḥ as modification or improvement.
In a letter entitled *Payām-e man be farhangestān* (My message to the Academy) in 1936, Forughi presented his thoughts on Persian and the Arabic loan words, Persian orthography, and the manner in which it should be handled. He was critical towards extreme purification, *sareh-nevisi*, as well as to opening up Persian to Arabic loan words without any control. This *Farhangestān*, which was founded in 1935, became known as *Farhangestān-e avval* (The First Iranian Academy). The members of the first Academy, like Forughi, did not believe in the extreme purification of Persian, and did not invest as much in coining pure Persian words as Reżā Shāh had expected. After about seven months, Reżā Shāh, who was not satisfied with the work of the Academy, replaced Forughi with Voşuq. Voşuq tried to accelerate the activity of *Farhangestān*, and he accomplished a lot during his time as the chairman of the Academy. Reżā Shāh, however, was still unsatisfied with the activity of the Academy\(^91\), and dissolved it on 27 April, 1938. A week later he issued an order to open the Academy again, and the minister of Education, ʿAli Aṣghr Ḥekmat, was elected the chairman (Badreh-i 1976:36–41).

World War II and the political events in Iran caused no major interruptions in the activities of the Iranian Academy. After the abdication of Reżā Shāh in September 1941, Forughi was once again elected chairman of the Academy. During the new period after September 1941 there was less stress on purification and word coinage, and more stress on literature and research. The first issue of *Nāmeh-ye farhangestān* was published in 1943. *Nāmeh-ye farhangestān* became a tribune for articles and writings of high quality, among which we can mention Aḥmad Bahmanyār’s valuable article on Persian orthography, published in November 1943, 1\(^{st}\) year, no. 4 (Badreh-i 2535:95, Samiʿi Gilāni 1374:140–141). According to Badreh-i (2535:79), Bahmanyār’s article, consisting of fifty orthographic rules, was one of the best studies of that time on Persian orthography, and a work that undoubtedly has influenced all the studies on Persian orthography which came after it. However, shortly after the 1953 coup, the first Academy closed down. It was not re-opened again until 1970.

### 4.2.5.2 The Second Iranian Academy: *Farhangestān-e dovvom*

In 1968, Mohammad Reżā Shāh Pahlavi issued an order for the establishment of the Iranian Academy of Language. On 31 October, 1970, the minister of Education presented eleven permanent members\(^92\) of the

---

\(^91\) Badreh-i writes that the reason was that the Academy, until the end of the 1937, had managed to coin and ratify only 600 words and geographical names, and this was not an achievement that could satisfy Reżā Shāh (2535:41).

\(^92\) Out of these Şādeq Kiyā (chair), Moḥammad Moqaddam, Ḥosein Golegolāb, Maḥmud Ḥesābi, Yahyā Māḥyār Navvābi, Moṣṭafā Moqarrabi, and Zabiḥ Behruz can be mentioned.
Academy to Moḥammad Reżā Shāh, and Farhangestān-e dovvom (The Second Iranian Academy) was established. The first session of the Second Academy was held on 4 November, 1970 (Samiʿi Gilāni 1374:141–142). The second Academy contained the following four department descriptions (Sadeghi 2001:25):

1. Department of word selection and coinage
2. Department of the study of Persian vocabulary
3. Department of ancient, middle, and modern Iranian languages and dialects
4. Department of the study of Persian grammar and orthography

Later on, the following department descriptions also appeared:

1. Department of studying Iranian languages in relation to other languages
2. Department of studying Persian proper nouns
3. Department of studying spoken dialects
4. Department of collecting artisans’ terms and expressions

(Ṣaffār Moqaddam 1374:160–168)

The second Academy’s research and activities were mainly concentrated on word coinage, and on research concerning Persian and other Iranian languages and dialects. The tasks of the department of the study of Persian grammar and orthography were established as following:

1. To compile a grammar for contemporary Persian, a historical grammar of Persian, and a comparative grammar of Persian and its dialects, as well as Persian and other Iranian languages.
2. To study the impact of sociolects, dialects, and other languages on Persian.
3. To study Persian orthography in order to compile a set of rules for consequent application.

In order to compile a set of consequent orthographic rules with regard to the historical development of Persian orthography, the department published the following two treatises, where the orthography of two handwritten commentaries of the Koran was studied:

In order to find out which orthographic rules were preferred, a questionnaire was sent to scholars and writers. The presence of a number of linguists and scholars in the department of grammar and Persian orthography resulted in an orthographic handbook, which was eventually used within educational institutes. An orthographic study of the manuscripts of Al-abniyah 'an ḥaqāyeq al-adviyah, Tārix-e bal’ami, and Ṣovar al-kavākeb by Khājeh Nasir Ṭusi, was one of the planned research projects which were broken off by the Islamic Revolution in 1979, after which almost all the activities of the Iranian Academy ceased (Ṣaffār Moqaddam 1374:164–165).

4.2.5.3 The Third Iranian Academy: Farhangestān-e sevvom

The third period in the activities of the Iranian Academy began seriously in 1990, when the charter of the third Academy was sanctioned by Šourā-ye ʿāli-ye enqelāb-e farhangi (The High Council of the Cultural Revolution). The name of the Academy had now changed to Farhangestān-e zabān va adab-e fārsi (Academy of Persian Language and Literature). According to the third article of the charter, the number of permanent members was established at a minimum of 15 and a maximum of 25. The High Council of the Cultural Revolution was supposed to elect 15 of the permanent members. The other 10 members were supposed to be elected by the high council of the Academy, once it had started its work. The first fifteen members were elected, and the first session of the Academy of Persian Language and Literature, Farhangestān-e sevvom, was held on 17 September, 1990.

According to the tenth article of the charter, the high council of the Academy elected Ḥasan Ḥabibi chair of the Academy on 18 June, 1991. Since then, sessions of the Academy have been held regularly every other week (Nāmeh-ye farhangestān 1374, no.1, p.7–8). In order to carry the different tasks properly, seven departments were established (Sadeghi 2001:28):

1. Department of word selection

---

93 The 15 members elected by the High Council of the Cultural Revolution were as follows: Ṣafārzādeh, Aḥmad Ārām, Naṣrollāḥ Purjavādī, Ḩasan Ḥabibi, Gholām ʿAlī Ḥaddād Ṭāheb, Bahā’ al-Din Khorramshāhī, Moḥammad Khānsārī, Moḥammad Taqi Dāneshpazuh, ʿAlī Ravāqi, Ḥamid Farzām, Seyyed Moḥammad Ṭabātabāyī, Abu al-Ḥasan Najafi, Gholām Ḥossein Yusefi, Mehdi Moḥaqqeq, and Simin Dāneshvar. In 1991, Aḥmad Tafazzoli, Bahrām Sarkārātī, Ṣadeqi, and Aḥmad Sami’i Gilāni were elected as members by the High Council of the Academy. Simin Dāneshvar resigned in 1991 (Nāmeh-ye farhangestān 1374, no. 1, p. 144).

94 Ḥabibi resigned in 1995, and Ḥaddād Ṭāheb was elected chair.
2. Department for the compilation of a comprehensive Persian dictionary
3. Department of Iranian dialects
4. Department for the editing of classical Persian texts
5. Department for the compilation of an encyclopedia for Persian literature
6. Department of ancient Iranian languages
7. Department of Persian grammar and writing system.

The main goal of the department of Persian grammar and writing system is, in addition to the study of Persian grammar in order to compile a comprehensive grammar for the students of Persian language and literature, to study the Persian writing system in order to reform it. The amendments are communicated to the ministry of education to be used in primary and high school textbooks (Sadeghi 2001:29).

The first issue of the quarterly journal of the third Academy, **Nāmeh-ye farhangestān**, was published in the spring of 1995. It is stressed in the journal that: “The orthography applied in this issue should not be seen as the final ratified orthography by the Academy” (**Nāmeh-ye farhangestān**, 1374, no. 1). A letter written by Iraj Kāboli, published in the second issue of **Nāmeh-ye farhangestān**, indicates that the orthography applied in the first issue is the orthography proposed by **komision-e šiveh-ye emlāyi** (The committee of the study of orthographic rules). Some interesting characteristics of this proposal are: the vast application of unbound writing; the vast use of **kasreh-ye ezāfeh**; and the use of ی instead of ә as the genitive marker after hā-ye ġeyr-e malfūz.

The preliminary proposal of the committee of the study of the orthographic rules was discussed at several sessions in 1995, 1996, and 1997. At the 159th session in 1998, it was at last sanctioned with some modifications (**Nāmeh-ye farhangestān** 1375:137, 1376:139, 1377:158). In 2000 the proposal of the Academy95 was published. It was supposed to be sanctioned after the Academy had received the comments and recommendations of other scholars and experts on the proposal.96

95 **Dastūr-e xaṭṭ-e fārsi; matn-e pišnahādi-ye farhangestān-e zabān va adab-e fārsi** (1378), Supplement no.7, **Nāmeh-ye farhangestān**, Tehran.

96 The details of the proposal will be presented in chapter 6.
4.3 Persian orthography after the Islamic Revolution

Alongside the activities of Farhangestān, there have always existed independent societies which have been engaged in the problems of the Persian language. Some of these societies from earlier periods have already been mentioned. None of these societies has ever had any executive power, but it does not mean that they have not been influential at all. They have always had a crucial role in moving the discussions in one or the other direction.

However, I do not intend to further discuss societies from earlier periods. I would like to focus on the period after the 1978–79 Revolution in Iran. Nor do I intend to discuss the revolution itself, as it demands a study of its own. What is of special interest for this part of my study is the Islamic nature of the revolution, the revival of debates on modernity, and last but not least, the mass emigration of Iranians and its effect on attitudes towards alphabet reform.

In an interview with Ganji,97 Āshuri, one of the Iran’s contemporary social thinkers,98 maintains that the 1978–79 Revolution in Iran was one of the strongest reactions ever against modernity. He maintains that the chain of revolutions beginning with the French Revolution, and progressing towards the revolutions in Cuba and Algeria were all ideologically based on historical progress and humanism. He claims, however, that the Iranian Revolution appeared in another orbit. Instead of ‘progress’, which is the foundation of a modern perspective, the revolution sought a ‘return’ to another historical period (Āshuri 1375:26). The Iranian Revolution resulted in a religious state, with a strong antipathy towards every manifestation of Western civilization and modernity. It is thus not surprising that the revolution intensified the debates on modernity. Pursued by traditionalism, the idea of modernity once again came into focus; this time in a global post-modern era, where the idea of modernity was under question and revision, and the idea of ‘cultural relativism’ had made it possible for different cultures to take alternative courses. Āshuri notices that in the case of language, for example, the official language of nation-states of the modern era was now forced to allow space for non-official and minority languages. Mere utility was no longer in focus (ibid.:23–24).

97 Iranian reformist journalist with the daily Ṣobḥ-e emruz, Nešāṭ and 'Aṣr-e āzādegān. After returning from a conference in Berlin in 2000, he was arrested and sentenced to ten years in jail and to banishment.
98 Āshuri (b.1938) is, among other things, known for his English-Persian Dictionary for Human Sciences (1995), his writings on Persian and Persian orthography (two of which have been refered to in Appendix 1 in this study), and his translations of philosophical works. Āshuri is living in France now.
Even if Iranian intellectuals, irrespective of their ideological anchorage, were more or less influenced by the new situation, and had left behind their obsession with the total adoption of Western norms, it was at the same time impossible for them to neglect modernity and its achievements. Modernity had more than ever become a vital issue for Iranian intellectuals, who found themselves obliged to defend the achievements of modernity against a religious state, one which attempted to destroy those achievements and label the defenders as anti-revolutionary Westernized spies. It took, of course, a long time before modernity and its related issues could be debated at all. The hard political climate in Iran did not allow for any debate that could question the absoluteness of the Islamic state, and many issues like orthography were considered ‘secondary’ and ‘unimportant’. The problem of Persian orthography came to be debated first after the end of the Iran-Iraq war.

The vast use of personal computers and the expansion of information technology, together with some indications on aspirations among the Tajiks for changing the Cyrillic script to Arabic in the 1990s (Borjiyān 1372:170) intensified the discussions on the problems of Persian orthography, and the urgent need of finding some solution to the problems faced. In 1992, the monthly journal Ādineh published an article by Iraj Kāboli, entitled “Farāxān beh fārsi-nevisān va piš-nahād beh tājikān” (A roll call to all who write in Persian and a proposition to the Tajiks). Ādineh had introduced the article with the following words:

Persian is our mother tongue, and Ādineh has always raised vital issues concerning the Persian language. Those problems Persian orthography imposes on learning to read and write have not been unknown to experts and teachers, and the issue has a long history. So far we have neglected these difficulties, but two important recent developments have made it a necessity for us to deal with them. Firstly the fast spread of personal computers. It will not take long before writing with computers will replace writing with pens. Technology is marching on and we can not hinder its expansion. If we do not manage to meet it consciously, deliberately, and with planning, technology will rule over us blindly. The present Persian orthography is incompatible with computers, and it is our duty to work out an immediate solution. Secondly, the Tajik people are willing to change the ‘Cyrillic’ alphabet to Persian. To begin with, they need clear orthographic conventions compatible with Persian language and the needs of technology. These two events had turned work on Persian orthography from being voluntary to becoming an immediate and serious duty, but working on Persian orthography is not within the capacity of each individual. That is why Ādineh, by publishing an article of Doktor Ṣan’ati and “Farāxān beh fārsi-nevisān va piš-nahād beh tājikān,” is hoping to be able to bring about a platform so that all Persian language teachers, members of Farhangestān, linguists, writers, poets, editors, …and all who are fond of the Persian language and know it, receive
the opportunity to discuss Persian orthography. In the following issues, Ādineh will devote some pages to this vital issue so that it can pay its debt back to our mother tongue (Ādineh 1371, no. 72, p. 49).

After the above introduction, Iraj Kāboli presented his preliminary proposal, which he had already applied in his own article. Kāboli’s proposal for meeting the problems of Persian orthography was based on bi-fāseleh-nevisi ‘without space writing’. The idea of the proposal was to write the integrated morphemes of a word separately, using a half-space⁹⁹ (Kāboli 1371:50–55). Kāboli’s article was followed by Ṣan’atī’s article “Došvāri-hā-ye zabān-e fārsi bā kāmpyuter” (Difficulties in adapting the Persian language to computers). Ṣan’atī, who is a software programmer, invited Iranian linguists to cooperate with programmers in order to work out clear orthographic conventions compatible with word processors. Among other points he mentioned the importance of defining the limits of a word clearly (Ṣan’atī 1371:56–57).

A short notice in the next issue of Ādineh reported on a first session concerning the problems of orthography. The following persons participated in the session: Karim Emāmi (translator), Moḥammad Reżā Bāṭeni (linguist), Iraj Kāboli (linguist and literary researcher), Aḥmad Shāmlu (poet), ‘Ali Moḥammad Ḥaqqšenās (linguist), and Kāžem Kardavānī (writer). Among others who had been invited, Ādineh named Hushang Golshiri (novelist), Shafi’i Kadkani (literary researcher), Moḥammad Ṣan’atī (software programmer), and the editor-in-chief of Ādineh, Faraj Sarkuhi. The notice was concluded with a promise to publish continuous reports on the sessions of this group (Ādineh 1972, no. 73/74, p. 4).

The above group, together with some other persons, came to act as Šourā-ye bāznegari dar šiveh-ye negāres-e xaṭṭ-e fārsi (The council for the study of the rules of spelling for Persian orthography). In most of the following issues of Ādineh, up to 1996, when its editor-in-chief, Faraj Sarkuhi, was arrested, a few pages were devoted to the problem of Persian orthography. Iraj Kāboli wrote most of the articles, in which he, among other things, tried to elucidate different aspects of bi-fāseleh-nevisi.¹⁰⁰ In 1993, Ādineh published the annual report of Šourā-ye bāznegari, written by Kāžem Kardavānī. The members of the Šourā-ye bāznegari were presented as following: Karim Emāmi, Moḥammad Reżā Bāṭeni, Iraj Kāboli, Aḥmad Shāmlu, ‘Ali Moḥammad Ḥaqqšenās, Kāžem Kardavānī, Hushang Golshiri, Moḥammad Ṣan’atī, and Moṣṭafā Āṣi.

---

⁹⁹ The proposal will be presented in detail in the next chapter.

The report was introduced by presenting the foundation of Šourā-ye bāznegari as an urgent action for dealing with the problem of Persian orthography. In addition to the two events mentioned earlier, the huge population of Iranian emigrants, and the necessity of making it easier for their children to learn to read and write Persian so that they would not lose contact with Iranian culture, was mentioned reasons behind the urgent need to deal with Persian orthography, and led as such to the foundation of Šourā-ye bāznegari (Kardavâni 1372:72). The report continued by presenting some major principles of the Šourā-ye bāznegari:

The council has no intention to propose an alphabet reform. Therefore proposals like adopting the orthographic rules of scripts based on the Latin alphabet or ‘writing from left to right’ is out of the question.

The main goal of the study of Persian orthography is to establish orthographic rules that could make it easier to learn to read and write Persian.

In achieving this goal, the main concern will be to keep the present appearance of Persian orthography as untouched as possible.

Faster and better preparation of Persian text in computers is a necessity of our time. Šourā-ye bāznegari will pay extra attention to those proposals that serve the above goal, provided that they do not contradict other goals. Šourā-ye bāznegari nevertheless does believe that it is the programmers’ task to adapt themselves to the characteristics of Persian orthography, not the other way around […] (ibid.).

On the following page there is a notice on the tenth and the eleventh session of the Šourā-ye bāznegari, during which the three guiding principles for modification of Persian orthography were sanctioned.101 Šourā-ye bāznegari eventually compiled a little handbook, where its proposal was presented in detail. Writers, experts, and those interested in the issue were asked to express their opinions on each point. The Chain Murders in Iran,102 which were targeted at intellectuals, activists, and writers, interrupted the activities of Šourā-ye bāznegari.

---

101 The principles will be presented in the next chapter.
102 A series of murders of liberal writers and intellectuals in 1997–1998. Later investigations have shown that the Chain Murders were organized by a faction in the Ministry of Intelligence run by Sa’id Emâmi. The murders were legitimated by the fatwâs of some of the high-ranking conservative members of the Iranian clergy. After these murders, the authorities arrested a number of people, including Sa’id Emâmi, and accused them of being ‘rogue agents’ of the Ministry of Intelligence. Shortly after Sa’id Emâmi’s arrest, the authorities announced that Sa’id Emâmi had killed himself in the prison.
The mass emigration of Iranians began a couple of months before the fall of the Pahlavi dynasty in 1978–9, reached its peak in the 1980s and early 1990s, and is still continuing. According to some estimates, there are more than three million Iranian emigrants living around the world, especially in Western Europe, the USA, and Canada. The new emigrants’ encounter with Western languages and their children’s difficulty in learning to read and write Persian turned the problem of Persian orthography into a practical issue for ordinary emigrants. The spread of email and the lack of email programs in Persian at the beginning, which caused emails to be written in Latin script, contributed to the acceleration of the discussions on the need for the romanization of Persian script. However, it should be noted that these discussions did not occupy any large space in the debates on the problem of Persian orthography.

According to some estimates, more than 200 Persian journals and newspapers are published by Iranians abroad. I have had the chance to follow many of them in one or another way, but I have not been able to find more than three journals in which Persian orthography has been discussed. One of these journals is Ruzgār-e nou, which has been published in France since 1981. In two periods, 1983 and 1995, Persian orthography was a hotly debated issue in Ruzgār-e nou, which itself advocated alphabet reform. In a series of articles, the advocates and the opponents of the romanization of the alphabet write about their concerns, and invoke the same arguments that have always been invoked by the two groups. Another journal which included an orthographic discussion was Barrasi-ye ketāb in the USA, which in 1999, in reaction to those who advocated the romanization of alphabet, republished Mojtabā Minovi’s article “Eşlāḥ yā taġyir-e xaṭṭ-e fārsi” (Persian orthography: modification or changeover) from 1965, in which he writes why he is against an alphabet reform (Minovi 1378:11–22). Majid Roushangar (1378:7), the editor-in-chief of Barrasi-ye ketāb writes:

As some people these days, especially abroad, have got it into their heads that they can overnight overcome our underdevelopment by omitting some letters of the alphabet or changing over to a Latin alphabet and leading us onto the highway of modernity and civilization, I found it relevant to publish the article of one of the most competent persons in this field.

The third journal was Porseš, one of the many journals attached to the Worker-communist Party of Iran, in which Esmā’īl Nuri ‘Alā was interviewed on the romanization of the Persian alphabet.

---

103 See Dehqān (1374b), Hādi (1374), Negāhi (1374), Purvāli (1374a, 1374b, 1374c), Sheybāni (1374), and Matini (1374a, 1374b).
In 1993, a society that advocated script reform was founded in USA. It was called *Konvânsion e Urofârși* (Eurofarsi Convention). According to the Eurofarsi Convention’s website:

The Eurofarsi Convention is an independent scientific and cultural center founded in August 1993, for the purpose of promoting and facilitating a fundamental changeover from the present Arabic-based Farsi-alphabet and script to Latin. Eurofarsi Convention is a center for initiating and directing a series of research, educational and technological activities that can help bring about this significant cultural transformation.


The major areas of the work of the Eurofarsi Convention are then presented, among which we can mention: designing, testing, and perfecting Eurofarsi script and its rules and conventions; producing educational documents and texts necessary for teaching and learning Eurofarsi; explaining the necessity of changing the Persian script; the publication of an ever-expanding collection of Persian books, texts and literature, ancient and classical as well as modern in Eurofarsi; the production and distribution of computer programs in Eurofarsi; the production of computer programs for teaching Eurofarsi; converting texts and data from Arabic Farsi to Eurofarsi and vice versa; and the production and publication of children’s books and literature in Eurofarsi.

In 1996 the first issue of *Xatt e Now*, the journal of the Eurofarsi Convention, was published. Two of the articles were written by Nâder Ḥaqiqiyân, which was one of the many pseudonyms Manşur Ḥekmat, the leader of the Worker-communist Party of Iran, used to use.

In July 1994, the Programme of the Worker-communist Party of Iran *Yek donyâ-ye behtar* (A Better World), written by Manşur Ḥekmat, was published. The first English edition was published in 1997. In the second part of the Programme, there is an article on ‘Modern and Progressive Social and Cultural Norms’, where the party, among many other things calls for changing the Persian alphabet:

In order to help bridge the gap that separates Iranian society from the forefronts of scientific, industrial and cultural progress in the world today,

---

105 It is noted that “As the first step, Eurofarsi Convention has designed and produced the first version of Eurofarsi alphabet and script, Eurofarsi #1[...]. ‘The Eurofarsi #1’ script is registered and copyrighted by the Convention.” There are also instructions on how to install a Eurofarsi keyboard and download Eurofarsi fonts (www.eurofarsi.com 2000).

106 The details of the Latin-based Eurofarsi script will be presented in the next chapter.
and in order to help people benefit from the results of this progress and take a more direct and active part in it, the official Farsi alphabet should be systematically changed to Latin.

(www.wpiran.org/publication/program.html 2000)

Eurofarsi Convention is generally considered to be a society founded by members of the Worker-communist Party of Iran. Neither the Party nor the Eurofarsi Convention have come up with anything new on Persian orthography since the publication of A Better World, or since the first only issue of Xatt e Now. There is little sign of the promised computer programs, children’s books, or ancient, classical, and modern Persian texts in Eurofarsi, etc. The official website of the Eurofarsi Convention has not undergone any changes since 1999, when I, for the first time, visited the website. It seems that this project has met the same destiny as many other similar projects.
CHAPTER 5
Different proposals on reforming Persian orthography

In order to describe and arrive at some logical solutions for the shortcomings of Persian orthography, a great number of monographs and articles of both a prescriptive and descriptive nature have been written, and many proposals have been put forth. These proposals fall within the following five categories: 1) an adoption of a Latin alphabet; 2) a modification of the present script; 3) a combination of elements from different existing scripts; 4) an entirely new invented script; and 5) a revival of an ancient script. While there is a wide range of documented samples from the first two categories, the other three categories do not include much at this point. Consequently, the space devoted to each category will be in accordance with the space devoted to each category in debates on Persian orthography. I will try to present each category in detail, preferably through a characteristic example, and, in the case of the two first categories, through the most recent proposals. In Appendix 1, which accompanies this chapter, other examples of each category will be presented. I have not had access to all of the original proposals. A shortened version of some of the proposals are published in Ketābšenāsi-ye zabān va xaṭṭ by Moḥammad Golbon (2536). In these cases, I have tried to figure out and describe the principles governing these proposals as much as is been possible.

5.1 Adoption of a Latin alphabet
Adoption of a Latin-based script has been an inseparable part of debates on the problem of Persian orthography since the second half of the nineteenth century. In some periods, it has been the most favored alternative, while in other periods it has not. In almost all cases, however, the advocates of the adoption of a Latin alphabet have pointed out the shortcomings of the existing Latin-based alphabets, and propagated for a modified Latin alphabet, in which, in contrast to scripts like English, each sound would be represented by only one letter. This one-to-one correspondence is not, however, indicated in all Latin-based proposals. In some of these proposals,
extra characters or letters have been considered in order to display Arabic letters within words of Arabic origin.

The proposals differ from each other also in their choice of different characters for displaying letters like خ/ـ/غ, ش. The latest elaborated proposal comes from the Eurofarsi Convention. The Latin-based alphabet of the Eurofarsi Convention is called Eurofarsi. The guiding principles of Eurofarsi have been summarized in their website, as well as in their journal (www.eurofarsi.com 2000 & Xatt e Now 1996:5) as follows:

Eurofarsi is a regular and easy script, which follows the phonetic characteristics of the Persian language. Eurofarsi is written from left to right and in Latin letters. The alphabet of Eurofarsi comprises 29 letters and one diacritic, 'alāmat- e maks\(^7\). All the phonemes are written and all the letters are pronounced. Each letter presents only one sound. Each sound is shown by only one letter, except for ow.

The Latin characters used in Eurofarsi are as shown in the following tables:\(^8\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1 Vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) 'Alāmat- e maks\(_7\) is supposed to display the glottal stop heard in certain words of Arabic origin containing hamzeh ـ or ْeyn ع.

\(^8\) All tables are copied from the website of the Eurofarsi Convention.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.2 Consonants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ž</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nešān e maks (')</th>
<th>ba’d, ra’s</th>
<th>بعد، راس</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maks beyn e 2 harf e bāsedā hazf mišavad, mānand e</td>
<td>soāl</td>
<td>سنوال</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miād</td>
<td>معیاد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moāmele</td>
<td>معامله</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the above table, the character used for displaying the glottal stop is not employed between two vowels. As a result, words like معاون، جامعه，سوال and روسایی will be written as moāven, jāmeе, soāl, and rustāī, while words like مسول، مامور و رفع و رجوع will be written as ma’mur, mas’ul, and raf’ o roju’. According to the Eurofarsi Convention, in Eurofarsi script there is no word that begins with the glottal stop maks. This means that words like ایران، عمر، عبارت，عربی and ایشان are written as Arabī, ebārat, Omar, Irān, and išān.

Under the heading of “The orthographic conventions of Eurofarsi” it has been pointed out that bound writing is the main principle, and that all the integrated morphemes of one and the same word, such as suffixes, prefixes, enclitic pronouns, personal endings etc. should be written together, except for:
• *Kasreh-yê eẓâfêh,* which should always be written as an independent letter, *e,* for example, *dast e man.* After words ending in a vowel (except for *î*) it should be written with an extra *<y> as ye,* for example, *sedâ ye ävâz and zuze ye gorg.*

• The auxiliary, verbs in the form of personal suffixes, for example *raft e am, dide im.* There is, however nothing clearly said on compound words, or on pronouns, prepositions and postpositions, conjunctions, etc. As far as the texts show, bound writing is applied to all compound words except for compound verbs. Unbound writing is applied to pronouns, pre- and postpositions, and conjunctions.

It is also pointed out that the third person singular of the verb ‘to be’ *ast* can be written either with or without *a,* depending on the context, for example, *nikust* or *niku ast,* *xubast* or *xub ast.* Another point concerns the use of a double consonant instead of *tašdid* ‘consonant gemination’ in words like *tahammol* and *mosavvar.* Punctuation and paragraph setting will be according the rules of English ([www.eurofarsi.com](http://www.eurofarsi.com) 2000). Some other samples of a Latin-based alphabet for Persian are presented in Appendix 1.

5.2 Modification of the present script

The modification of the present script has always occupied the largest space in debates on the problems of Persian script. A great number of proposals in this field are usually introduced by a detailed account of the shortcomings of the Persian orthography, and end by declaring the practical obstacles in launching a radical reform. As a result, most of these proposals are focused on the ratification of orthographic conventions. A great number of books, articles, and handbooks have been written on the orthographic conventions of Persian, most of them with the ambition of diminishing orthographic problems. There have been some sporadic attempts in order to meet the problems of over- and underrepresentation, the varying shapes of the letters, and the presence of too many dots within the framework of the present alphabet, but they have been met with skepticism, as they imply a drastic change in the present appearance of the script. Samples of such proposals will also be presented in Appendix 1.

The latest modification proposal has been put forth by the independent society Šourâ-ye bâznegari-ye dar šiveh-ye negâreš-e xaṭṭ-e fârsi, presented in the previous chapter. The proposal of the Šourâ-ye bâznegari is based on a system aimed at making the process of reading and writing easier. This
system is called *bi-fāseleh-nevisi* ‘without space writing’,\(^{109}\) which in practice is unbound writing with a half-space. The system is based on the morphophonemic principle of writing, in which the original shapes of the integrated morphemes of a word are more or less preserved. Šourā-ye bāznegari is of the opinion that the process of reading would become easier if an immediate link between the units of the writing and semantics was created. The three guiding principles for modification of Persian orthography sanctioned by Šourā-ye bāznegari in 1993 are as follows:

1) A desirable orthography that makes learning to read and write easier, and is compatible with the computerized preparation of texts, is an orthography where the basic form of the head word stays unchanged as much as possible. For example if *هم آهنگ* is written as it is, the basic forms of both *هم* and *آهنگ* are kept unchanged, while they will be changed if it is written as *هماهنگ*.

2) Applying *bi-fāseleh-nevisi* to derived and compound words is the same as bound writing when it comes to show the relation between the integrated morphemes of the derived and compound word. The only difference is that in *bi-fāseleh-nevisi*, the basic written forms of the integrated words change much less than in bound writing: *

\[
\text{پیآماد (پیامد)} \ldots \text{زندانبان (زندانبان)}
\]

3) Since there are two types of letters in the Persian alphabet – letters that can be written bound to the left and letters that cannot – and since the nature of Persian orthography is both alphabetical and logographical,\(^{110}\) it cannot be directed according to mere linguistic principles (\(Seh\ asl-e\ mohe m\)^{111} 1372:73).

In the handbook *Nażarxāhi-ye nahāyi dar bāreh-ye šiveh-ye negāreš va xaṭṭ-e fārsi*, which is a summary of the articles already published in \(Ādineh\), the details of the proposal and some of the exceptions are presented.\(^{112}\) According to this handbook, edited by Kāboli, *bi-fāseleh-nevisi* will increase Persian’s capacity of coining new words,\(^{113}\) decrease the possibility of incorrect pronunciation of some compound words like *پیآماد* peyāmad ‘consequence’, which can be pronounced as *payāmad* when it is written as *پیامد*, and will make the pronunciation of foreign words and names easier

\(^{109}\) See ch. 3.7.

\(^{110}\) By logographical, Šourā-ye bāznegari is referring to the presence of elements such as the conjunction ۰ and the genitive marker *kasreh-ye eżāfeh*. In these cases, one grapheme represents one word or one morpheme (See Crystal 1997b:202).

\(^{111}\) Three Important Principles.

\(^{112}\) The list of exceptions is open.

\(^{113}\) See also Kāboli (1373b).
Under the heading of **unbound writing of compound words**, the following eight points are discussed:

1. **Bi-fāseleh-nevisi** will be applied to all suffixes, for example, *barq-āsā* ‘in a flash’, *namak-dān* ‘salt-cellar’, *ast-hā* ‘hands’, *servat-mand* ‘rich’. Exceptions will be made for suffixes beginning with vowels, for example, *simin* ‘silvery’, *dustāneh* ‘friendly’, *ranjur* ‘afflicted’, and *dastān* ‘hands’.

2. **Bi-fāseleh-nevisi** will be applied to all prefixes, for example, *bi-pāyān* ‘endless’, *ham-kelās* ‘classmate’, *yek-kalām* ‘fixed’. Exceptions will be made for words like *bigāneh* ‘foreign’, *bimār* ‘sick’, *bizār* ‘disgusted’, and *hamvāreh* ‘always’.

3. **Bi-fāseleh-nevisi** will be applied to all compound words, for example, *kam-rang* ‘pale’, *xoš-ru* ‘cheerful face’, and *ketāb-xāneh* ‘library’. Exceptions will be made for compound words in which one of the integrated parts does not bear any meaning independently, for example, *xošnud* ‘content’.

4. **Bi-fāseleh-nevisi** will be applied to all compound words in which the two integrated words are bound with each other by /o/ or /ā/, for example, *goft-gu* instead of *goft-gū* ‘conversation’, and *kešākeš* instead of *kešākeš* ‘contention’.

5. **Bi-fāseleh-nevisi** will be applied to *hamin* ‘this’ and *hamān* ‘that’, and the following word, for example, *hamin-jā* ‘here’, and *hamān-ruz* ‘that day’, instead of *hamin-jā* and *hamān-ruz*.

6. The postposition *ra* will be written separately and with a space, for example, *čehe* ‘what’, *keh rā* ‘whom’, *man rā* ‘me’. Exceptions will be made for *čerā* ‘why’ and *marā* ‘me’.

7. **Bi-fāseleh-nevisi** will be applied to comparative and superlative *tar* and *tārīn* *tārin*, except for *bēt* and *bētar* ‘better; poetic form’.

8. The preposition *beh* ‘to’ will be written unbound with a space. The author of the handbook adds that *beh* has different functions. It may be written in different ways according to the specific function. As a preposition, it should be written unbound with a space as in *beh-ud* ‘to him’, while **Bi-fāseleh-nevisi** should be applied when it builds an adverb or adjective along with another word, as in *beh-tadrij* ‘gradually’, and *beh-nām* ‘famous’. Whenever *beh* is

---

114 The handbook is undated. Considering the date the articles were published in Ādīneh and the date I, myself, received the handbook, it must have been published sometime in 1996–1997.

115 It seems that exceptions have been made for words in which the second part of the word no longer has a meaning of its own.
incorporated in the second word, particularly in a manner that has changed the pronunciation of the second word, it should be written as bound, for example, in بخرد bexrad ‘wise’.

The handbook proposes that ordinal numbers be written as يک-om ‘first’, دو-om ‘second’, سه-om ‘third’, čahār-om ‘fourth’, پنج-om ‘fifth’, هفتم-om ‘sixth’, هشت-om ‘seventh’, نهم-om ‘eighth’, دهم-om ‘ninth’, بیست-om ‘tenth’ and بیستم-om ‘twentieth’, respectively. The handbook proposes the genitive marker, کس-ye eẓāfeh, to be displayed. After vowels it is proposed to be displayed with ای, as in خانه‌ام xāneh-ye am ‘my house’, عصای تو ʿasā-ye to ‘your stick’, عموی او āmū-ye u ‘her uncle’; but the question of putting a کس-ر under the ای in such cases is still open. After consonants it is proposed to be displayed by کس-ر. In order to distinguish the indefinite ای as in mardi ‘a man’ from the substantival and adjectival suffix ای, as in bozorgi ‘greatness’, respectively انتقادی enteqādi ‘critical’, the handbook proposes ای in the second case. Another orthographic parameter that has been discussed both in the handbook and in several articles in Ādineh is keeping the so-called ه-ye āq-e malfuz in words like بی‌حوزه–که bi-houseleh-gi. Kāboli writes that the fact that words like bandeh ‘slave’ and xasteh ‘tired’ were written as bandag and xastag in Middle Persian does not necessarily imply that the /g/ is a remainder from Middle Persian. He maintains that as /g/ occurs both in Persian words and in words of Arabic origin, it must be considered to be a hiatus. There is therefore no reason for the omission of ه-ye āq-e malfuz, which marks the short vowel /e/. (Kāboli 1374a, 1374b, 1375b). The handbook contains proposals on how to write hamzeh, on a transcription system based on the Persian alphabet, and on the way of presenting eliminated phonemes, etc.

116 The form استن astan has been used in the handbook, p. 18. It has also been used by others who have written on Persian, for instance Parhām (1378:374), Neysāri (1374:274), who refers to it as an infinitive form in classical Persian which was conjugated as astam, asti, ast…, Kākhi (1378:40, 1373:24), and Abu al-Qāsemi (1373:29), who names astan and hastan as verbs in Dari Fārsi. Farshidvard (1378:27), on the other hand, writes that the use of the form astan is absolutely wrong. He writes that the infinitive form of both ast and hast is budan and nothing else.

117 In two different issues of Ādineh, Kāboli (1372, 1375b) takes up the difficulties caused by the omission of the genitive marker in Persian, and argues in favor of displaying it in the writing.
It should be noted that the basic guiding principle in the latest proposal of the Third Iranian Academy also involves unbound writing.\textsuperscript{118} Even if the term bi-fāseleh-nevisi is not mentioned in the proposal, one can see that bi-fāseleh-nevisi is followed whenever unbound writing is applied. The proposal of the Academy is a modified version in which an extreme application of bi-fāseleh-nevisi on all morphemes is avoided. It is also worth mentioning that the sanctions of the Academy shape the orthography in textbooks at least at a primary and secondary level, as can be observed in the textbooks themselves. In the textbook used within the first grade of primary school published in 2000, it is noted: “in the orthography of the book the hiatus ‘ײ’ is used instead of ‘إ’. The plural ending ی is written separately” (Fārsi; avval-e dabestān 1379:1). Studying the whole book, one can find out that bi-fāseleh-nevisi is applied whenever unbound writing is applied, and that unbound writing is applied to compound words. Some other examples and text samples are presented in Appendix 1.

\textsuperscript{118} Details of the proposal are presented in ch. 7.
پس آنگاه زمین به سخن درآمد
و آدمی، خسته و تنها و اندیش ناک بر سر، سنگی نشسته بود پشیمان از
کرد و کار خوشی
و زمین. به سخن درآمده با او و چنین می گفت:
به تو نان دادم من، و علف به گوسفندان و به گاوان تو، و برگ های
نازک. تزه که قاتق. نان کنی.
انسان گفت: ۲- میدانم.
پس زمین گفت: ۲- به گونه صدا من با تو به سخن درآمدم: با نسیم و
باد، و با جوشیدن. چشمها از سنگ، و با ریزش. آبشاران؛ و با
فرو غلتیدن. بهمان از کوه آنگاه که سخت بی خبرت می یافتم، و
به کوس. ندرد و ترقی، تو فان.
انسان گفت: ۲- میدانم می دانم، اما چه گونه می تنیستم راز، پیام. تو را
دریابم؟
پس زمین با او، با انسان، چنین گفت:
۲- از خود این سهل بود، که پیام گزاران نیز اندک نیودند.
تو می دانستی که منات به پرستندگی عاشقی. نیز نه به گونه.
عاشی ی بخت یار، که زرخریده، دوا کندزکی برای. تو بودم به رای
خوشی. که تو را چندان دوست می داشتی که چون دست بر من
می گشودی تن و چنان به هزار نغمه. خوش جواب گوی. تو
می شد. همچون نوعروسی در رخت. زفاف، که ناله های
ت نازدیک اش به ترانه. کشف و کامپاری بدل شود یا چنگی
که هر زخمه را به زیر و بیه دل پذیری گوگونه جوابی گوید. ۲-

One page text written according to bi-fāseleh-nevisi from: Shāmlu (2001:891–892)
5.3 A combination of elements from different existing scripts

This category actually seems to be a subcategory of a Latin-based alphabet. I have been unable to find any sample in which the present alphabet would be the base, and elements from other alphabets would be integrated in the alphabet. Among proposals that have incorporated elements from different existing alphabets, we can mention Akhundzādeh’s last proposal, which was based on a mixture of the Latin and Cyrillic alphabets. The alphabet consisted of 24 characters for consonants, 10 for vowels, and 8 for sounds found in Arabic. The character ฯ was kept for displaying hamzeh. The alphabet, called tāza alifbā ‘The new alphabet’ by Ākhundzādeh, is presented on the next page. I have also had access to a sample of Latin-based alphabet, proposed by Arasṭā, in which characters such as س and ح from the present alphabet are preserved in order to display ش and ج, which are not displayed with a single letter in scripts like that of English. Arasṭā’s proposal is presented in Appendix 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ا</th>
<th>ب</th>
<th>ج</th>
<th>د</th>
<th>ذ</th>
<th>س</th>
<th>ش</th>
<th>ض</th>
<th>س</th>
<th>ش</th>
<th>چ</th>
<th>گ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>ی</td>
<td>ی</td>
<td>ت</td>
<td>ی</td>
<td>ی</td>
<td>ت</td>
<td>ی</td>
<td>ی</td>
<td>ت</td>
<td>ی</td>
<td>ی</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tāza alifbā* proposed by Ākhundzādeh from: Ākhundof (1963:53)
5.4 An entirely new invented script

I have found only two alphabets that can be considered as entirely new invented alphabets: the alphabet of Esma‘il Āshtiyāni, and the alphabet of Jibrīl A‘lāyī. Both of them are based on newly-invented letters, but some of the letters in Āshtiyāni’s alphabet are inspired by Persian and Roman letters. These two alphabets will be presented in Appendix 1.

The point of departure for most of the proposals in this category is, otherwise, the present alphabet, but the degree of modification is so high and the resemblances to the old version are so low that the modified version can be counted as a totally new alphabet. The sensitivity of challenging the Arabic alphabet, the alphabet of the holy Koran, has been a strong reason for trying to reform or design a new alphabet within the framework of the Arabic-based alphabet, or at least in claiming the new alphabet to be a modification of the Arabic alphabet.

However, the least modified of these alphabets is the Malkomi alphabet, proposed by Mirzā Malkom Khān. Another proposal in this category belongs to Akhoundzādeh, but the most modified alphabet is Xaṭṭ-e nou, designed by Mirzā ‘Ali Moḥammad Khān Oveisi, which I found the most interesting sample to be presented here. In order to reform our alphabet it is, according to Oveisi, necessary to accept the following four principles:

1. To eliminate letters displaying one and the same phoneme.
2. To insert vowels into the script.
3. To impose unbound writing of the letters.
4. To eliminate dots.

(Oveisi 1331 H.Q.:3)

Applying the above four principles, Oveisi modifies the letters of the alphabet step by step. He then proposes eight additional characters made out of the existing characters with diacritics to display the phonemes found only in words of Arabic origin, emphasizing at the same time that he actually believes in the elimination of letters displaying one and the same phoneme. He proposes writing from left to right. In order to do so, he modifies the letter even further. The whole process leads to an alphabet having absolutely nothing in common with the Arabic-based alphabet.

After eliminating letters displaying the one and the same phoneme, Oveisi chooses the following 24 letters as the basis of the new alphabet:

١ ٢ ٣ ٤ ٥ ٦ ٧ ٨ ٩ ١٠ ١١ ١٢ ١٣ ١٤ ١٥ ١٦ ١٧ ١٨ ١٩ ٢٠ ٢١ ٢٢ ٢٣ ٢٤

He maintains that <ی> and <ی> will display vowels /ā/ and /i/, and proposes <ی> for /a/, <ی> for /e/, <ی> for /o/ and <ی> for /u/. The number of...
letters would be 28. He continues with some “slight changes” in the shape of the letters and the elimination of the dots as in the following two steps:

\textit{Step 1.}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺏ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺏ} \\
\text{ﺝ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺝ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺡ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺡ} \\
\text{ﺥ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺥ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺏ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺏ} \\
\text{ﺝ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺝ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺡ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺡ} \\
\text{ﺥ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺥ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺱ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺱ} \\
\text{ﺹ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺹ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺽ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺽ} \\
\text{ﻁ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻁ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﻅ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻅ} \\
\text{ﻡ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻡ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺵ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺵ} \\
\text{ﺹ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺹ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺽ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺽ} \\
\text{ﻁ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻁ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﻅ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻅ} \\
\text{ﻡ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻡ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺵ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺵ} \\
\text{ﺹ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺹ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺽ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺽ} \\
\text{ﻁ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻁ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﻅ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻅ} \\
\text{ﻡ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻡ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺵ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺵ} \\
\text{ﺹ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺹ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺽ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺽ} \\
\text{ﻁ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻁ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﻅ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻅ} \\
\text{ﻡ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻡ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺵ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺵ} \\
\text{ﺹ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺹ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺽ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺽ} \\
\text{ﻁ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻁ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﻅ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻅ} \\
\text{ﻡ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻡ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺵ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺵ} \\
\text{ﺹ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺹ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺽ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺽ} \\
\text{ﻁ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻁ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﻅ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻅ} \\
\text{ﻡ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻡ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺵ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺵ} \\
\text{ﺹ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺹ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺽ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺽ} \\
\text{ﻁ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻁ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﻅ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻅ} \\
\text{ﻡ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻡ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺵ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺵ} \\
\text{ﺹ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺹ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﺽ} & \rightarrow \text{ﺽ} \\
\text{ﻁ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻁ}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{ﻅ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻅ} \\
\text{ﻡ} & \rightarrow \text{ﻡ}
\end{align*}

In order to be able to display the correct pronunciation of the Arabic words, he proposes the following 8 letters for displaying the phonemes which are present in Arabic words:
The new alphabet consists of the following 36 letters, and is called \textit{Xaṭṭ-e now}:

He maintains that \textit{Xaṭṭ-e now} is the last modification alternative for us in order to overcome the shortcomings of Persian orthography. Otherwise, we have to adopt a Latin-based alphabet, which he preferably wants to avoid. The last step in Oveisi’s proposal is writing from left to right. Emphasizing that the alphabet is still “our own alphabet”, Oveisi presents the following characters after applying a form of writing the letters from left to right:
Oveisi proposes unbound writing of the letters in printing and bound writing in hand-written material. He then proposes the following letters for hand-written material:

The letters for printed material are also presented as follows:

**Capital letters**
He maintains that the already presented letters for displaying the exact pronunciation of words of Arabic origin should also be written from left to right and be a part of this alphabet. These letters are presented as follows:

Zabiḥ Behruz, who did not advocate an alphabet reform, proposed an alphabet in order to make it easier for children and illiterate adults to read and write. He called his alphabet the natural alphabet, in which the letters are shaped according to the manner and the place of articulation of sounds in the vocal tract.
5.5 Reviving an ancient script

Reviving an ancient script seems to be a nationalistic reaction against both Arabic and Western civilization. Whenever the romanization of the script is in focus, this reaction comes up. A script based on the Avestan alphabet has always been mentioned as a possible alternative to a Latin alphabet or other invented alphabets. The Avestan script is the script in which the Zoroastrian religious texts are written. It was invented during the Sasanian dynasty, some time in the sixth or seventh century. Avestan alphabet, with its 14 characters for displaying vowels and 34 characters for displaying consonants,\textsuperscript{120} has been seen as one of the most advanced phonetic scripts in the world. The writing is from right to left. Unfortunately, I have not been able to find any complete proposal based on the Avestan alphabet. As was mentioned earlier, reviving an ancient script is mostly a reaction against changing the present alphabet, and those who really believe in changing the alphabet do not find any logic in changing to another alphabet than a Latin-based one.

\textsuperscript{120} See ch. 3.2.
Chapter 6 introduces the synchronic part of this study which consists of chapter 6 and 7. Chapter 6 is devoted to three questionnaire surveys directed towards: 1) writers and linguists, 2) publishing houses, and 3) journals and newspapers. The purpose of the questionnaire surveys is presented in section 6.1. Section 6.2 is devoted to the methods. The methods and the results from each of the three surveys are presented in sections 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5. Discussion and concluding remarks are presented in sections 6.6 and 6.7.

6.1 The purpose of the questionnaire surveys

It is well known that writers and linguists, journals, and publishing houses have an influential role on written language in general and on orthographic issues in particular. They are usually involved in the pre-initial stage of language planning, when language problems are first recognized. They are also involved in the codification, implementation, and elaboration of the selected norm. The history of Persian orthography also bears witness to these actors’ crucial role in the recognition of problems, in the determination of the direction of the debates on Persian orthography, and in the establishment of selected norms. They are in close interaction with each other, and build the three sides of an unofficial triangle, with Persian orthography as its center. It has thus been of great importance for this study to present the latest views of these actors regarding the problems of Persian orthography and a possible framework for an orthographic reform, as well as the way these unofficial actors cooperate in terms of the orthographic edition of the published works.

As was mentioned earlier, both in the introduction and in the theoretical framework of the study, language reforms, and especially script and orthographic reforms, are very complicated processes in which many linguistic and non-linguistic factors are involved. Resistance against orthographic reforms is not at all unusual. Chinese and English are two illuminating examples of such resistance. What is considered rational and

\[121\] See ch. 2.3 for the role of individuals in language planning.

\[122\] See ch. 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.3.
pedagogically correct does not necessarily gain ground, as there are usually many political, national, and religious sentiments involved. Outsiders may find these sentiments irrational, but rationality and irrationality in the case of script reforms are very often dependent on the context. It is therefore important to understand the role of external non-linguistic factors. Joshua Fishman (1997:XVII) rightly emphasizes the importance of “insider views” in his book *In Praise of the Beloved Language*, where he studies the relationship between language and ethnicity. He criticizes his own earlier studies for not being anchored in insider views:

> [M]y earlier efforts [...] began to strike me as looking-in from the outside and commenting upon a gripping human experience (a typical scholarly stance), rather than trying to understand it from the inside and to convey it from that perspective.

The main purpose of the first part of the questionnaire survey directed towards writers and linguists is to present “insider views” towards the problem of Persian orthography, and to find out how those who daily wrestle with the shortcomings of the Persian orthography experience them, and to what degree and in what ways they are willing to reform the present orthography. The results from this questionnaire survey can also shed light on the past, and contribute to an understanding of those external non-linguistic factors which may be behind the prolonged process of orthographic reforms and standardization which, after more than one hundred years, is still under way.

The main purpose of the second part of the questionnaire survey directed towards writers and linguists, together with the questionnaire surveys directed towards publishing houses, and journals and newspapers, is to discover how and by whom the orthographic conventions are governed, how the published texts are edited, and towards which direction the present orthography tends: bound or unbound writing?

### 6.2 Method

Doing research in the Iranian context, particularly on sensitive issues like script reform, is a difficult task in itself. It becomes more difficult if one needs to carry out the research from a distance. As far as attitudes towards the problem of Persian orthography, a possible framework for an orthographic reform, and the external non-linguistic factors behind these attitudes are concerned, I would have preferred an interview survey not only

---

123 See ch. 3.6.
for practical reasons, but also because of the nature of the survey. One practical advantage of an interview survey is that one can personally carry out the survey and see to it that it is accomplished as planned, but for personal reasons I could not carry out an interview survey, so I chose a questionnaire survey instead.

The surveys were carried out both in and outside of Iran for two reasons: first because of the mass emigration of Iranians after the Islamic revolution in Iran in 1979, and their constant and continuous contact with Persian language and Iranian culture. As was mentioned in ch. 4.3, there are more than three million Iranian emigrants around the world, especially in Western Europe, the USA, and Canada. The journalistic and literary production by Iranian emigrants in these countries is so high that one cannot talk about Persian literature and journalism without taking into consideration the journalistic and literary production outside of Iran; second because of the fact that contact with western civilization has had a strong impact on all discussions related to the issue of modernity in Iran, and as such, on the issue of orthographic reform as a step towards modernism. The history of Persian orthography shows that around a century ago attitudes towards a possible framework for an alphabet reform were strongly influenced by the actors’ contact with western civilization. Most advocates of the romanization of the alphabet in those days had spent parts of their lives in Europe.

Three different questionnaires were sent to: writers and linguists in Iran and outside of Iran; journals and newspapers in Iran and outside of Iran; and publishing houses in Iran. The questionnaires were followed by an explanatory letter, in which I presented myself, what I was working with, the purpose of the surveys, and so on. The orthographic conventions applied in the letter were in accordance with the recommendations of the third Iranian Academy.

Handbooks on methodology emphasize the importance of formulating the questions as simply as possible and avoiding technical terms (Trost 1994:82). Still, a somewhat advanced level with some technical terms was applied, as the questions were directed to people who were supposed to be familiar with the subject.

The special circumstances in Iran made the ideal of holding to a particular deadline quite unreal. The only thing one could do was to be patient and wait. It was also known that the harsh political climate in Iran could prevent people from taking part in such surveys, especially when the researcher is not personally present. It was therefore of great importance to send the

---

124 Aside from publishing houses outside of Iran, as Persian-language publishing houses outside of Iran are very limited in number, and due to very limited financial resources have problems consulting professional editors. See also ch. 6.4.1.

125 See ch. 2.4 for the relationship between language change and modernization.

126 See ch. 4.2.2 and 4.2.3
questionnaires to as many writers, linguists, journals, newspapers, and publishing houses as possible. All in all, 97 questionnaires were sent to writers and linguists in Iran, 56 to writers outside of Iran, 34 to publishing houses in Iran, 22 to journals and newspapers in Iran, and 16 to journals outside of Iran.

It did not take long before replies from informants outside of Iran came in. One of the reasons was that I happened to have access to an up-to-date address record of Iranian writers outside of Iran. It took a good while before I received any replies from Iran at all. I received a number of answers without delay, but then no answers appeared for a while. I then chose to ask a friend of mine to go to see the informants and personally ask them to answer the questions. She was a graduate anthropologist who herself had carried out similar surveys in Iran, and was well aware of the difficulties. She succeeded in convincing a number of the informants to answer the questions. The next step was sending reminders. At the same time, I wrote letters to those writers who had already replied, and asked them for help in getting more writers to take part in the survey. I happened also to meet some Iranian writers who were visiting Sweden, and asked them to help me to involve more writers in the survey.

However, during a period of eleven months, I received replies from 29 writers outside of Iran, 31 writers and linguists in Iran, 19 publishing houses in Iran, 9 journals and newspapers in Iran and 7 journals outside of Iran. This means that, despite all efforts, only 95 out of the 225 preliminary informants (over 42 %) participated in the surveys. This is one of the greatest disadvantages of mail-questionnaires in general and within the Iranian context in particular but, as was mentioned earlier, it was expected.

The questionnaires were based on open-ended questions. Handbooks on questionnaire surveys usually advise the researcher against using open-ended questions, among other things, because of the difficulties in handling and analyzing the responses (Trost 1994:68). The nature of the study, however, was such that questionnaires in which the informants are asked to choose one answer out of a limited number of possible answers did not seem appropriate. There was also a great risk of asking leading questions. In some cases the possible answers were not at all known to me, either.

However, in some cases, I received letters or already published writings or interviews as a reply to the questionnaire. This means that in some cases the questions were not answered in the order that I had indicated, while in other cases some of the questions were left out.
6.3 Questionnaire survey I: Writers and linguists

6.3.1 Selection of the informants

Issues like language reforms do not usually engage the general public, at least, not in the early phases. This is especially the case with orthographic reforms. Orthographic reforms usually engage and affect specific groups in a society. According to Fishman (1977:XVI):

Orthographic change represents the abandonment of written tradition and as such it must cope with the gatekeepers of written tradition, the poets, priests, principals, and professors [...].

I have, therefore, chosen to confine my survey to men of letters from different genres (novelists, translators, journalists, and so on) and linguists. Writers are professionals for whom written language is the primary tool in their work. It is they who are daily confronted with the practical shortcomings of this tool. For linguists, on the other hand, written language, like all other manifestations of the language, is an object of study. A near cooperation between the two groups mentioned above, together with pedagogues and teachers, is a necessary prerequisite for the scientific adequacy of any proposal of orthographic reform. As far as I know, and as far as the writings on Persian orthography show, pedagogues and teachers have not been especially engaged in the issue, and their voices have seldom been heard. It is easy to observe that it has almost always been the former two groups, namely the writers and the linguists, who have been and still are engaged in the issue of Persian orthography.

The next step, however, was to make a representative selection within these two groups. What literary genre they represented, or to which literary or linguistic school they belonged, were not of any interest for my study. The only parameter of some importance was that the participants were established to some degree. There are of course no defined criteria for determining the degree of establishment of an author. Whatever criterion one may invoke, it can be questioned. An author with only one published book may be considered to be established, while one with several published books may not. What I did was to rely on my common sense and my common knowledge in the first place, and on published books and journals in the respective field in the second place. I have considered all those writers and linguists who have contributed with at least one book or several articles as established, specifically in the sense of being engaged with written language in a professional manner.

127 Here I am referring to teachers at the primary and secondary levels, not university teachers.
6.3.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of twelve questions, of which the first five were background questions such as name (optional), age, length of cultural activity, place of living: Iran/outside of Iran, and length of residence abroad (Appendix 2). A preliminary reform proposal within the framework of the Arabic alphabet, already presented in the explanatory letter, was annexed to the questionnaire, and the informants were asked to give their opinion on it. Two of the questions (numbers five and six) were designed to be incorporated in the results from the questionnaire surveys directed towards journals and publishing houses. The questions directly related to the problem of Persian orthography were as follows:

1. What are the shortcomings of the Persian script?
2. Are you for a total changeover to a Latin alphabet? If yes, why? And if no, why?
3. If you advocate reform within the framework of the present alphabet, what kind of modifications do you agree upon, for instance:
   a. To create new characters for the short vowels, /a/, /o/, /e/
   b. To display kasreh-ye ezāfēh (genitive marker) in the script
   c. To omit the redundant Arabic letters
   d. Your propositions:
4. Do you have any other proposals than the two main proposal categories (modification or changeover); for instance, adopting an Avestan-based alphabet or a totally new script?
5. Do you maintain your own orthography in your writing, or do you leave it to the publisher?
6. What orthographic principle do you apply in your writings: bi-fāšeleh-nevisi, ‘unbound writing with a half-space’ jodā-nevisi

128 Certain paragraphs of Zanburak-xāneh, a short story written by Gholām Hāosein Sā’edi, were rewritten according to the proposal, and the main principles governing the proposal were presented (Appendix 2). The proposal was developed by Carina Jahani, lecturer at the Iranian section of the Department of African and Asian Languages at Uppsala University. The department is now part of the Department of Linguistics and Philology.

129 The proposal was presented very cautiously, to avoid provoking negative reactions. It was mentioned that the proposal was developed by one of the lecturers of the Department of Asian and African Languages at Uppsala University, who had written a doctoral dissertation on the standardization of Balochi language and orthography. It was also emphasized that she herself considers the proposal as only a desk-exercise, and as one among many other possible phonemic proposals for Persian orthography.

130 One’s “own orthography” may sound a little strange, but it is a common and frequently recurrent phrase in the context of Persian orthography.
‘unbound writing’, *peyvasteh-nevisi* ‘bound writing’, or a combination of all the three?\(^{131}\)

7. What do you think of the annexed proposal?

Annexed proposal

---

\(^{131}\) A detailed account of these Persian terms has already presented in ch. 3.7.
The main characteristics of the annexed proposal can be summarized as follows: it is designed within the framework of the present Arabic-based alphabet of Persian;\textsuperscript{132} and it is a phonemic-based proposal, in which every phoneme is represented by only one letter \textsuperscript{133} and vice versa. The proposal is in line with the modern Arabic-based alphabet for Kurdish used in Iraq and Iran, and the main aim of it is to show that a full phonemic representation in Arabic script is possible. The proposal, however, means a drastic change in the present appearance\textsuperscript{134} of the Persian orthography.

Through the above open-ended questions and the annexed proposal, I was seeking answers to the following questions: how serious the problem was felt to be; to what degree the Iranian writers and linguists were ready to change the present appearance of the script in order to address the shortcomings of Persian orthography; and what the external non-linguistic factors behind the resistance against a script reform of any kind were.

6.3.3 Results

31\textsuperscript{135} out of the 97 preliminarily chosen informants in Iran and 29 out of the 56 preliminarily chosen informants outside of Iran in one way or the other replied to me. The response of one of the informants outside of Iran was excluded as it said nothing about the issue.\textsuperscript{136} From the beginning, the following four variables seemed to be relevant for the attitudes towards a possible framework for an alphabet reform: place of residence Iran/outside of Iran; age; length of residence abroad; and the length of activity as writer or linguist. After analyzing the collected data, it appeared that length of residence abroad and length of activity did not cause any relevant difference in the results. Therefore, the results in relation to these two variables were found to be redundant as presented in the survey. Part of the results will be presented in tables and part of it in running text, as it was found either unnecessary or impossible to summarize all the answers in table form.

Table 6.1 relates to background questions and presents the basic information on the informants’ age and place of residence.

\textsuperscript{132} By moving within the framework of the Arabic-based alphabet, the proposal neutralizes one important external non-linguistic factor, namely the link between religion and the present alphabet.

\textsuperscript{133} Except for diphthongs.

\textsuperscript{134} A well-established and frequently recurrent expression in the context of Persian orthography. See, for instance \textit{Dastur-e xaṭṭ-e fārsi} (1378:13).

\textsuperscript{135} Eight of them were linguists.

\textsuperscript{136} The informant had written that he knew nothing about the issue, and had proposed another person that, according to him, was well-informed on Persian orthography.
Table 6.1 Age/place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Iran</th>
<th>Outside Iran</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29–37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38–46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47–55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56–64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, there are no informants under the age of 38 outside of Iran. 11 informants have not answered the question about the age. Some of them are among those who have sent me a letter or an already published article as a reply. Otherwise, there is nothing specific to the distribution of age.

**Question 1**

Question number one refers to the Iranian writers’ and linguists’ opinions on the shortcomings of Persian orthography. The purpose of the question is to discover how the informants see the problem, and how serious the problem is in their eyes. The answers are divided into the Iran/outside Iran categories with 11 different main alternatives.

Table 6.2 What are the shortcomings of Persian orthography?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shortcomings</th>
<th>Iran</th>
<th>Outside Iran</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overrepresentation of consonants</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresentation of short vowels</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No serious shortcomings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consistent orthographic rules</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in writing and reading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of one-to-one correspondence between phonemes and letters and irregularity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of bound and unbound letters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same letter for different phonemes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alien system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incapability of showing syntactic relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different shapes of the letters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first point to be noted is that not all the informants gave clear-cut answers to the question.\(^{137}\) The list of shortcomings named by the informants is almost identical to the list presented by the Iranian Academy.\(^ {138}\) As Table 6.2 shows, the overrepresentation of consonants and the underrepresentation of short vowels are considered to be the major shortcomings of Persian orthography. As a matter of fact, the major shortcomings named by the informants, aside from the lack of consistent orthographic rules, can be summarized as the lack of one-to-one correspondence between phonemes and letters in Persian orthography. Other shortcomings do not receive as much attention from the informants.\(^ {139}\) In 16 cases, the informants have in one way or the other maintained that Persian orthography does not have any serious shortcomings. Some of them have pointed to the shortcomings of other orthographies, especially English, and maintained that such shortcomings, if they can at all be called shortcomings, are a natural component of the written words.

**Question 2, part I**

The first part of question number two refers to the Iranian writers’ and linguists’ opinions towards a total changeover to a Latin alphabet. Table 6.3 presents the distribution of answers to this question by writers and linguists in Iran and outside of Iran, and in relation to the ages of the informants.

---

\(^{137}\) Some of the informants have pointed to the problems of Persian in general. 3 of the informants have responded by saying that these problems are so numerous that they cannot be discussed properly in such a short time.

\(^{138}\) See ch. 3.6.

\(^{139}\) One informant names the absence of a system of capital and non-capital letters, the different sizes of the letters, the presence of so many diacritics and dentations, and the similarity of the letters as additional shortcomings of Persian orthography. It must be mentioned that this informant is in favor of two scripts for Persian, of which one should be based on the the Latin alphabet.
Table 6.3 Are you in favor of a total changeover to a Latin alphabet?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Iran</th>
<th>Outside Iran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29–37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38–46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47–55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56–64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i Missing cases 2. One of the missing cases involves an informant whose response is that a necessary prerequisite for any attempt in reforming Persian orthography is a stable and wise government, and as we do not have such a government in Iran, such discussions are only theoretical discussions that would not result in any solution.

ii The informant believes in one and the same international language for all the people of the world.

iii The informant is for a total changeover to a Latin alphabet, provided that there is already an existing and well-functioning democracy in Iran.

iv The informant, a linguist, has answered yes, but he adds that it is not the only alternative he can think of. A modification of the present orthography can be an alternative for him as well.

v The informant is in favor of having two scripts, as he finds it almost impossible to render and republish the whole of the Persian cultural heritage in Latin.

vi The informant has answered “both yes and no; yes because it may let us get rid of both a’rāb ‘Arabs’ and e’rāb ‘diacritics [both written as اعراب]; and no, because of the fact that no ideal Latin-based alphabet has yet been presented.” The interesting point is that the informant is against the omission of the redundant Arabic letters.

vii Three of the informants advocate the use of a Latin-based alphabet for the Iranians living abroad in order to simplify learning Persian for the younger generation. Even if these three informants, theoretically, are in favor of a total changeover to a Latin alphabet, they admit that it is almost impossible to carry out such a reform in Iran, not even in a distant future. One of the informants emphasizes that the script reform project is not one of our national priorities, and that the necessary prerequisites do not exist in Iran.

Table 6.3 shows that 13 % of the informants in Iran are in favor of a total changeover to a Latin alphabet, and 87 % are against it. What is interesting is that the resistance among the younger generation is much stronger than that seen in the older generation. Table 6.3 shows also that 27 % of the informants outside of Iran are, at least theoretically, in favor of a total changeover to a Latin alphabet, while 73 % of them are against it. To summarize the table, it can be said that those who say ‘no’ have the clear

---

140 I have not included the 2 informants who did not answer the question.
majority both in Iran and outside of Iran. Those who say ‘yes’ are more likely to live outside of Iran than in Iran, provided that all the affirmative answers from informants outside of Iran are counted as clear affirmative answers. The place of residence and a continuous contact with the Latin alphabet must have had some effect. Yet it should be noted that three of the six affirmative answers advocate a changeover to a Latin alphabet only outside of Iran. The interesting thing is that there are more negative responses from the youngest generation both in Iran and outside of Iran. Only 9% of the youngest generation (the first two age groups: 29–37 and 38–46) are in favor of a total changeover to a Latin alphabet, and this tendency is stronger among those who live in Iran.

**Question 2, part II**
The second part of question number two refers to the linguistic and non-linguistic factors that have been invoked by Iranian writers and linguists as a motivation for adopting or rejecting a total changeover to a Latin alphabet. As it was shown earlier, 46 out of the 57 informants expressed themselves as against a total changeover to a Latin alphabet. As motivations for their responses, they have mentioned the following factors:

- A total changeover may mean an interruption in the cultural continuity. It means nothing but a cultural suicide; at best a cultural chaos (35 cases).
- Persian orthography is a part of our national, historical, and cultural identity. There is also an emotional relation to it. The script is not just an instrument (11 cases).
- A changeover to a Latin alphabet is both unnecessary and useless. The informants have referred to the case of Turkish and Tajik (5 cases).
- The internal and external aesthetic aspect of the script, as well as the calligraphy (8 cases).
- It may open the gate for the invasion of European words, referring to Turkish and Tajik (1 case).
- The Latin alphabet has its own shortcomings (5 cases).
- Persian orthography is a result of our historical progress and our needs. It can not be changed in a stereotypical way (1 case).
- Persian orthography is trans-dialectal and fits well into the multi-ethnic and multi-lingual context of Iran (1 case).
- Persian orthography is a natural part of the Persian language (1 case).
- A changeover to a Latin alphabet is unnecessary. It will neither speed up the process of learning to read nor increase the functionality of the orthography (1 case).\textsuperscript{141}

As the results show, the written word is regarded as a part of the national, cultural, and historical identity, not as an instrument that can be turned and twisted at will for the sake of maximum efficiency. There is a serious concern about Iran’s cultural heritage. Those who have expressed this concern believe that any drastic reform, specifically in the context of Iran, may lead to losing parts of its cultural heritage, as was the case when Pahlavi script was replaced by Arabic script. They maintain that the younger generation may be deprived of Iran’s cultural heritage. The interesting thing is that none of the informants refers to any relation between the alphabet and religion. It is easy to observe that external non-linguistic factors lie behind almost all of the arguments in favor of the present alphabet.

The arguments in favor of a total changeover to a Latin alphabet can be summarized as follows:

- Any script is just an instrument, the main task of which is to render the spoken language into the written form,\textsuperscript{142} and Persian script is simply incapable of performing this task.
- The Arabic-based alphabet does not suit the Persian language, and it is complete nonsense to say that changing the alphabet will harm the national identity.
- The present script is not modern.\textsuperscript{143}
- A changeover to a Latin alphabet may make it easier for children and foreigners to learn to read and write Persian.
- The fifth argument has been put forth by informants in Iran, who have maintained that the romanization of the alphabet may connect us to the rest of the world, and make it easier for those who already know the Latin script to learn about our culture and literature.

The arguments invoked by the advocates of a total changeover to a Latin alphabet are mainly linguistic arguments.

**Question 3**

Question number three refers to the writers’ and linguists’ opinions on how the shortcomings of Persian orthography, as expressed in question number one, should be handled. The purpose of question number three is to find out

\textsuperscript{141} The informant refers to the concern about the functionality of Persian orthography within information technology. He maintains that Persian script functions well with computers.

\textsuperscript{142} See ch. 1. and 2.1.3 on the representational view on writing.

\textsuperscript{143} The informant has not made it clear in which way it is not modern.
to what degree the informants are ready to change the present appearance of the orthography to cope with its shortcomings.

Table 6.4 Suggestions of modification within the framework of the present alphabet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Iran</th>
<th>Outside Iran</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New characters for short vowels</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of redundant Arabic letters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaying the genitive marker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i It must be noted that not all the informants have responded with clear answers to the question, especially informants who advocate a changeover to a Latin alphabet.

As Table 6.4 shows, 17 of the informants are positive towards designing new characters for showing the short vowels, while in most cases emphasizing that the design of the new characters, either for short vowels or any other phoneme, should fit into the present appearance of Persian orthography, and should not change it too much. Even the informant who is in favor of having two different scripts for Persian emphasizes the importance of preserving the present appearance of Persian orthography in as unchanged of form as possible. Designing new characters for short vowels has been rejected in 14 cases. It has been maintained that the present diacritics can be used as well, if necessary. One of the informants has proposed that the present diacritics be rendered into letters, but in such a way that the present appearance of the orthography could be kept as unchanged as possible. Another informant has written that he advocates the design of new characters, provided that they are designed with regard to the language’s historical heritage.

Despite the fact that so many informants see the overrepresentation of a number of phonemes as one of the major shortcomings of Persian orthography (see Table 6.2), the removal of the redundant Arabic letters does not have as many advocates. In 28 cases, the removal of the redundant Arabic letters has been rejected. In 3 of the cases, it has been claimed that through the gradual replacement of words of Arabic origin by Persian words, which is a current tendency in Persian, the problem of overrepresentation will become less and less over the course of time. In 18 cases, the informants have been in favor of the removal of the redundant Arabic letters, but 2 of them have expressed concern about a delay in semantic linking, and one advocates the removal of these redundant letters, only within the framework of the Persian words (e.g. تهران (Tehran), اطهران (Atehran)). In several cases, it has been noted that the removal of the redundant Arabic letters should be done gradually, and over a long course of time. Among those who have responded to question number three, no one has expressed a clear opposition towards displaying
kasreh-ye ezâfeh. In 2 cases, however, the informants have mentioned that it should be displayed only when the absence of the genitive marker may result in a misreading. In 16 cases, the informants have responded with a clear ‘yes’ and welcome the proposal, even if it has not been named as one of the shortcomings of the orthography by very many respondents.

As far as the informants’ propositions are concerned, there are propositions such as the introduction of two different types of /ii/; ‘ъ’ for the indefinite /î/, and ө for the substantival/adjectival /î/, or unbound writing of all the letters. One of the informants has maintained that he is for any reasonable and carefully prepared proposals, provided that it is introduced gradually over a long period of time.

The above responses all point to a relatively strong concern for preserving the present appearance of Persian orthography in as unchanged a form as possible. To obtain a better grasp of the concern regarding the preservation of the present appearance of Persian orthography, the results from this part of questionnaire will be combined with the results from the responses to question number seven.

**Question 4**

Question number four refers to the informants’ alternative reform proposals, such as adopting an Avestan-based alphabet, or adopting a totally new alphabet. The results are presented in running text.

No one has directly answered the question. In some cases, it has been emphasized that consistent application of established orthographic rules or some other minor modification will solve most of the problems. Only a few of the informants have mentioned an Avestan-based alphabet in the event of a total changeover. An entirely new invented alphabet is almost out of the question, a matter which is in accordance with the way the annexed proposal and other drastic changes are received.

**Question 5**

Question number 5 relates to the writers’ opinions on the orthographic editing of their works.
Table 6.5 Do you maintain your orthography or do you leave it to the publisher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of living</th>
<th>Own</th>
<th>Own with flexibility</th>
<th>Publisher’s</th>
<th>Unclear answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Iran</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7i</td>
<td>53i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i Among unclear answers one finds answers such as “it must be left to the expertise” or “I follow the following handbooks” or so on.
ii Missing cases 6.

As Table 6.5 shows, in most cases, it is the writers’ orthographies that have the last word. This tendency is much stronger among writers outside of Iran. Only one writer outside of Iran is ready to leave orthography to the publisher. If we now leave out of this account any unclear answers, we will find that 75% of the writers in Iran, in one way or the other, maintain their own orthographies. The percentage among writers outside of Iran is over 95%. This can be explained by the limited resources of Iranian publishing houses outside of Iran. The writers outside of Iran are well aware of these limitations, and they know that they cannot count on a consistent professional editing of their works by the publisher.

The fact that the application of orthographic conventions, outlined broadly, is governed by the writers themselves explains the orthographic variation in Persian texts, except for Persian textbooks. Textbooks at all levels are usually published by state-owned publishing houses, and the orthographic conventions applied in them are more or less in accordance with the recommendations of Farhangestān in the case of primary and secondary school textbooks, and in accordance with the recommendations of the Šiveh-nāme-h-yar markaz-e našr-e dānešgāh (The handbook of the university press) in the case of textbooks for higher education. Unfortunately, they do not come with the same recommendations on all points, but the points of difference are not many. What is clear is that these textbooks, whichever orthography they apply, are consistent in the application of the sanctioned conventions.

In ch. 3.7, I presented the terms peyvasteh-nevisi ‘bound writing’, jodā-nevisi ‘unbound writing’, and bi-fāsēleh-nevisi ‘unbound writing with a half-space’. If we put aside bi-fāsēleh-nevisi, which is a new variant of unbound

---

144 It must be noted that this writers books are usually published both in Iran and outside of Iran.
145 The textbooks at the primary and secondary levels are published by Sherkat-e chāp va nasr-e ketāb-hā-ye darsi dar irān (The Educational Publishing House in Iran) and textbooks at the university level are published by Markaz-e nasr-e dāneshgāh (Iran University Press).
writing, the choice between bound or unbound writing has been one of the main characteristics of Persian orthography in different periods,\footnote{See ch. 4.1.3, Orthographic variations in manuscripts.} and it is still the main point of dispute in the discussions on the standardization of Persian orthography, and in writings and handbooks on Persian orthography.\footnote{See, for instance: Sami’i Gilānī (1376), Sho’ār (1378), Sho’ār (1375), Yāḥaqqi & Nāseḥ (1377), Farshidvard (1375), Shafi’i (1352), and Aḥmadi Birjandi (1377).}

**Question 6**

Question number six refers to the writers’ choice between bound writing and the two different types of unbound writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of living</th>
<th>Bound writing</th>
<th>Unbound writing with a half-space</th>
<th>Unbound writing</th>
<th>A combination of all</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29\textsuperscript{i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Iran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{ii}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18\textsuperscript{iii}</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{i} Missing cases 2.
\textsuperscript{ii} Missing cases 8.
\textsuperscript{iii} Two of the informants have named unbound writing as the main principle, but they have also mentioned that they might apply bound writing when it is seems more appropriate.

Table 6.6 shows that the choice of bound writing, as the main principle, only rarely occurs. Only one informant (2 \%) has named bound writing as the main choice. 37 \% out of the 49 informants who have answered the question have named unbound writing, and 49 \% have named a combination of all principles as their main choice. When it comes to bi-fāseleh-nevisi (12 \%), it seems that not everyone is referring to the bi-fāseleh-nevisi proposed by Šourā-ye bāznegari. Most of the informants are either referring to a modified version of bi-fāseleh-nevisi or are critical to the extreme application of it. The fact that so many have named a combination of all principles as the main principle reflects the nature of Persian orthography, which is of a kind that makes the exclusive and consistent application of the one or the other principle almost impossible. It also reflects the fact that in the case of Persian orthography, it is not possible to rely on mere linguistic principles and ignore the aesthetic aspect.
Question 7

Question number seven refers to the writer’s opinion on the annexed proposal. The results are presented in running text.

The annexed proposal, apart from some shortcomings, can be considered to be a logical proposal within the framework of a phonemic writing system. At the same time, it is based on Arabic script. 28 of the 59 informants have not expressed their opinion at all. Some of them are among those who have responded in the form of letters or already published articles of their own. My personal impression is that some may have found it outside their own knowledge and preferred not to express any idea on the proposal.

Of the 31 informants who have expressed their opinion on the proposal, no one has been positive to the proposal. In many cases, the annexed proposal has caused strong negative reactions. There are only a few of the informants, mostly linguists, who have at least tried to approach the proposal scientifically and discuss its shortcomings. Some of them have, for instance, asked: why should we introduce so many new diacritics, and not use the old ones? Why should we introduce <ٕ> for ā, when we already have <ٕ>. It has also been maintained that the proposal overlooks Persian orthography’s own possibilities and that the proposal may in abstraction be a logical system, but it has nothing to do with the reality of Persian orthography. Even informants advocating a total changeover to a Latin alphabet have rejected the proposal totally. One of the informants has written: “An orthographic reform according to this phonemic orthography has all the disadvantages of an orthographic reform, minus any possible advantages of an orthographic reform.” What is obvious from the answers is the strong concern about dramatic changes that may erase the similarities to the present orthography. The results seem to be in accordance with the results from the second and third question. It is even in accordance with one of the important external non-linguistic factors invoked in favor of preserving the present Persian orthography, namely not interrupting cultural continuity.

6.4 Questionnaire survey II: Publishing houses

6.4.1 Selection of publishing houses

As was mentioned earlier, I have excluded publishers outside of Iran because of the fact that publishing houses outside of Iran do not have the same resources as the publishing houses in Iran. They are only few, and in some cases, they are limited to only one person and a post box. Not even the most established Iranian publishing houses outside of Iran have enough financial resources to consult professional editors. In my selection of publishing houses in Iran, I have tried to include publishing houses established both
before and after the Islamic Revolution in Iran. The survey includes, therefore, publishing houses established as early as in 1948 and publishing houses established as late as in 1994 (Appendix 3).

Questionnaires were sent to a total of 34 publishing houses in Iran, 4 of which were returned as the publishing houses had moved from those addresses. 19 publishing houses responded to the questions and returned the questionnaires to me.

6.4.2 Questionnaire
The questionnaire consisted of six questions, of which the first two were background questions relating to the name of the publishing house and the date of its establishment.\textsuperscript{148} The four other questions, directly related to the problem of Persian orthography, were as follows:

1. Have you always followed certain orthographic handbooks for the editing of your books?
2. If you have used different handbooks in different periods, please name the handbook from each period.
3. What references have your publishing house had for choosing orthographic conventions or for creating a handbook of its own?
4. What do you do when an author insists on applying his/her own orthography? Do you accept it, or do you insist on applying the orthography of the publishing house?

As was mentioned in the introductory chapter, a great number of books and articles have been written on Persian orthography. Many of these writings are handbooks with detailed orthographic recommendations. Writers, publishers, newspapers, and journals make usually use of one or several orthographic handbooks as references in the edition of their works or in creating an orthographic handbook of their own. Some of the publishers and journals are strict about the edition of all works according to a certain handbook, and some of them are more flexible. It is the purpose of these questions to find out how and by whom the written material in Persian is orthographically edited.

6.4.3 Results
Part of the results will be presented in tables and part of them in running text.

\textsuperscript{148} See Appendix 2.
Question 1

Question number one refers to the use of orthographic handbooks in the edition of books. The results from the responses to this question are presented in running text.

Only 8 out of the 19 publishing houses have given an affirmative answer to the first question. This means that in at least half of the cases, it is the orthography of the author which is applied. Some of the publishers have responded with a negative answer to question number one, but they have mentioned that they might have used some orthographic handbooks or other recommendations if necessary.

Question 2+3

Question number two refers to the use of the publisher’s handbooks within different periods, and question number three refers to the references used by the publishers. I have combined answers to the second and third questions, as there were only two publishing houses with handbooks of their own. The rest of the publishing houses have named other handbooks as reference books in their work. In some cases, the publishers have not named any specific handbook. It must also be noted that some of the publishing houses have used several different handbooks at the same time. The results are presented in Table 6.7.
Table 6.7 Orthographic references used by publishers in different periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthographic references</th>
<th>Before the revolution</th>
<th>After the revolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-yé emlá-yé fārsí; Markaz-e nashr-e dāneshgāhí</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dastur-e xaṭṭ-e fārsí; Farhangestán-e zabān va adab-e fārsí</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-yé negāreš va xaṭṭ-e fārsí dar ketābhá-yé darsi; Vezārat-e āmuzesh va parvaresh</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āyin-yé negāreš; Mo’asseseh-yé enteshārāti-yé Frānklin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-námehe-yé dā’erat al-ma’āref-e fārsí; Gholām Ḥosein Moṣāheb</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-námehe-yé dāneš-námehe-yé jahān-e eslām; Ahmad Sami’i Gilānī</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-námehe-yé sāzmán-e virāyeš va toulid-e fanni-yé dānešgāh-e ʿızād</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-námehe-yé Amir kābir; Kāmrān Fāni &amp; Bahā al-Din Khorramshāhí</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-námehe-yé negāreš; Morteżā Kākhi</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ġalat nanevisim; Abu al-Ḥasan Najafi</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pažuheš; Amir Ḥosein Āryanpur</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farhang-e emláyi; Ja’far Sho’ār</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-yé xaṭṭ-e me’yār; Ja’far Sho’ār</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāmlū’s orthographyi</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals of independent expertise</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current normsii</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i The great and influential Iranian contemporary poet (1925-2000), who was strongly engaged in the problems of Persian language and Persian orthography. He was a member of Šourá-yé bāznegari.

ii By current norms, the informants seem to refer to norms that are most frequently used by established authors, publishing houses, and journals.

As Table 6.7 shows, Šiveh-yé emlá-yé fārsí, Markaz-e nashr-e dāneshgāhí; Dastur-e xaṭṭ-e fārsí, Farhangestán-e zabān va adab-e fārsí; and Šiveh-yé negāreš va xaṭṭ-e fārsí dar ketābhá-yé darsi, Vezārat-e āmuzesh va parvaresh are the three most frequently used handbooks by publishing houses. As the orthographic conventions applied within textbooks for primary and secondary school are normally in accordance with the recommendations of the Iranian Academy, and as Markaz-e nashr-e dāneshgāhí is the publisher of textbooks for higher education, it can be said that there is a relatively strong tendency towards the application of the official recommendations. It must be noted that the handbook of the
Farhangestān-e zabān va adab-e fārsi differs from the handbook of the Markaz-e nashr-e dāneshghāhi on some points, but the differences are not many. To use one or the other handbook does not necessarily mean that the publishing houses are committed to the established conventions in the handbooks, or that they apply them exclusively without any compromise whatsoever.

**Question 4**

Question number four refers to the policy of the publishing houses in the orthographic edition of the works. The responses to question number four are summarized in Table 6.8.

*Table 6.8 What do you do in case of disagreement with the authors?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Publisher’s orthography with flexibility</th>
<th>Author’s orthography</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>3i</td>
<td>3ii</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i One of the publishers has maintained that the house only seldom shows flexibility and only in cases of minor deviations.

ii They have maintained that in very special cases, depending on the status of the author or the value of the work, they accept the orthography of the author.

As Table 6.8 shows, only 6 out of the 19 publishing houses hold to their own orthographic conventions. One of the publishing houses which applies the chosen orthography of the author has maintained that out of the 250 book titles published by the house so far, there have been only three authors who have asked for the publishing house’s standard orthography in their books. The rest of the authors have insisted on applying their own orthographies.

If we now combine the results above with the results presented in Table 6.5 from the questionnaire survey directed towards writers and linguists, we find that the results in both cases point towards the same direction, namely, to the fact that it is still the authors who have the last word.

**6.5 Questionnaire survey III: Newspapers and journals**

**6.5.1 Selection of newspapers and journals**

Unlike the publishing houses outside of Iran, the number of Persian journals and newspapers published outside Iran is very high. Since Iranians are spread all over the world, it is not easy to come with precise statistics on this, but it is said that there are about 240 Persian newspapers and journals published outside Iran.
In the selection of newspapers and journals, I have tried to follow the principle of the greatest possible variety. Questionnaires were sent to newspapers and journals within different fields, to both well-established and newly-established ones, and in the case of newspapers and journals published in Iran, to both state-controlled and independent ones (Appendix 3). A total of 22 questionnaires were sent to the newspapers and journals in Iran, and 16 questionnaires to journals outside of Iran. The time when the questionnaires were sent out coincided in an unfortunate way with a new wave of repressions in Iran. The freedom of the press was under duress, and some independent journals were banned. Therefore, only 11 newspapers and journals from Iran replied to the questionnaire. Seven journals outside of Iran replied to the questionnaire, of which one was excluded from the survey, as it turned out to be in English. I am well aware that the number of participating journals is not quite satisfactory, but such setbacks are an inseparable part of carrying out surveys in Iran.

6.5.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of five questions, of which the first two were related to the name of the journal and its date of establishment. The three questions directly related to the problem of Persian orthography were as follows:

1. Do you follow a certain orthographic handbook for the edition of the contributions?
2. What references has your journal had for choosing orthographic conventions or creating its own handbook?
3. What do you do when an author insists on applying his/her own orthography? Do you accept it, or do you insist on applying the orthography of the journal?

The questions are almost the same as the questions directed to the publishing houses.

6.5.3 Results

The results will be presented partly in tables and partly in running text.

**Question 1**

Question number one refers to the use of certain orthographic handbooks for the editing of contributions. The answers are divided into Iran/outside Iran categories and are presented in Table 6.9.
Table 6.9 Do you follow a certain orthographic handbook for the editing of contributions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of publication</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Iran</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6.9 shows, most of the journals and newspapers use certain orthographic handbooks for the editing of contributions.

Question 2

Question number two refers to the orthographic references used by the journals and newspapers. The answers are divided into Iran/outside Iran categories and are presented in Table 6.10.

Table 6.10 Orthographic references used by newspapers/journals in Iran and outside Iran.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthographic reference</th>
<th>Iran</th>
<th>Outside Iran</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dastur-e xāṭṭ-e fārsi; Farhangestān-e zabān va adab-e fārsi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-ye emlā-ye fārsi; Markaz-e nashr-e dānešgāhi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-nāmeh-ye sāzmān-e virāyeš va toulid-e fanni-ye dānešgāh-e āzād</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majalleh-ye Soxan and Farhangestān-e avval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-ye negāreš; Mortezā Kākhi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šourā-ye bāznegari</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ġalaṭ nanevisim; Abu al-Ḥasan Najafi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šiveh-nāmeh-ye āstān-e qods-e razavi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current norms</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6.10 shows, the most frequently named handbooks are the official handbooks also named frequently by publishers. The current norms cannot naturally be very different from the norms or conventions presented in the most frequently used handbooks. However, the results from this part of the survey are in accordance with the results of the survey directed towards the publishing houses, namely the tendency towards an application of more official regulations.
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Question 3
Question number three refers to the policy of the journals and newspapers as regards the orthographic editing of the contributions. The answers are divided into Iran/outside Iran categories, with four different alternatives.

Table 6.11 what do you do in case of disagreement with authors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of publication</th>
<th>Journal’s with flexibility</th>
<th>Journal’s with flexibility</th>
<th>Author’s with flexibility</th>
<th>Total with flexibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Iran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6.11 shows, it is only one journal outside of Iran that has established orthographic conventions of its own, and that does not accept the orthography of the authors. In Iran, on the other hand, 5 out of the nine journals are strict about the application of the orthographic conventions of the journal.

A combination of the results from questions number two and three for publishing houses (Table 6.7) and question number two for newspapers and journals (Table 6.10) will show the most frequently used orthographic handbooks in the editing of written material in Persian. The results are presented in Table 6.12.
Table 6.12 Orthographic references used in the editing of written material in Persian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthographic references</th>
<th>Publishing houses</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Šiveh-ye emlā-ye fārsi; Markaz-e nachr-e dāneshgāhi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dastur-e xatḥ-e fārsi; Farhangestān-e zabān va adab-e fārsi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Šiveh-ye negāreš va xatḥ-e fārsi dar ketāḥā-ye darsi; Vezārat-e āmuzesh va parvaresh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Āyīn-e negāreš; Mo’asseseh-ye enteshārātī-ye Frānklin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Šiveh-nāmeh-ye dā’erat al-ma’āref-e fārsi; Gholām Ḥosein Moṣāheb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Šiveh-nāmeh-ye dāneš-nāmeh-ye jahān-e eslām; Aḥmad Samī’i Gilānī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Šiveh-nāmeh-ye sāzmān-e virāyeš va toulid-e fanni-ye dānešgāh-e Āzād</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Šiveh-nāmeh-ye Amir kābir; Kāmrān Fāni &amp; Bahā al-Din Khorramshāhī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Majalleh-ye Soxan and Farhangestān-e avval</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Šiveh-nāmeh-ye negāreš; Morteza Kākhī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ġalaṭ nanevisim; Abu al-Ḥasan Najafī</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The proposals of independent expertise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pažuheš; Amir Ḥoseyn Āryanpur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Farhang-e emlāyī; Ja’far Sho’ār</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Šiveh-ye xatḥ-e me’ yār; Ja’far Sho’ār</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Shāmlu’s orthography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Šourā-ye bāznegari</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Šiveh-nāmeh-ye āstān-e qods-e ražavi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Current norms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6.12 shows, 19 references have been named by publishers and journals. The most frequently named references are the first two handbooks, which are also the official handbooks used in the orthographic editing of textbooks at all levels. In nine cases, the publishers and journals have maintained that they hold to the current norms, which do not differ significantly from the norms in the most frequently used handbooks.

Combining the results from question number five from questionnaire survey I (Table 6.5), question number four from questionnaire survey II
(Table 6.8), and question number three from questionnaire survey III (Table 6.11) clearly shows who says the final word on the orthography which appears in written material in Persian. The results are presented in Table 6.13.

**Table 6.13 Who determines the orthography in Persian books/journal?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher/journal with flexibility</th>
<th>Publisher/journal</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QSI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSIII</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6.13 shows, in at least 59 cases out of 82, the author chooses the orthography which appears in published books and journals.

### 6.6 Discussion

The results from the questionnaire survey directed towards writers and linguists show that the lack of a one-to-one correspondence between the phonemes and letters and the absence of consistent orthographic rules are seen as the major shortcomings of Persian orthography. There is a consensus that some measures must be taken, but Iranian writers in general doubt if the Iranians would benefit from a drastic reform of any type. Even among the advocates of the romanization of the alphabet, one hears voices which are skeptical of the possibility of carrying out such script reform in Iran at all. Proposals that can be viewed as integrating part of the present orthography are generally more welcome. The establishment of orthographic conventions and the consistent application of those conventions to all texts seem to be appreciated as the most urgent and rational solution by many of the informants. The guiding principle, however, seems to be that of trying to preserve the present appearance of the orthography, avoiding drastic and extreme changes. This is actually in accordance with the first guiding principle of the Iranian Academy in its proposal for the modification and standardization of Persian orthography:

> Since the orthography has a decisive role in preserving cultural continuity, we are not allowed to choose a system which changes the present appearance of Persian orthography such that it loses its similarity to the preserved Persian cultural heritage, meaning that older Persian texts become unfamiliar to the present generation, and the next generations will have difficulty in reading
and using manuscripts and older printed material and will require special training (Dastur-e xatt-e fārsi, 1378:13).

Within the framework of orthographic rules, the main observable tendency is to avoid rules that may imply drastic changes in the present appearance of the orthography. Most writers have mentioned a combination of bound and unbound writing, with a strong focus on unbound writing as the predominant orthographic principle applied in their writings. The majority of the writers have also maintained that they maintain their own orthographies, and do not let the publisher change the orthography in their works.

The results from the survey directed to the publishing houses in Iran show that even if there is a tendency towards establishing the right of the publishing houses to edit all the books according to their own orthographic conventions, authors still have the last word. In 68% of the cases, the decision about orthography is left to the writers, and this is in accordance with the results from the survey directed to writers and linguists. In those cases where orthographic references are used, there is a strong tendency towards the use of more official references.

The results from the survey directed towards newspapers and journals in Iran and outside of Iran show that they, unlike publishing houses, are much stricter about holding to their own orthographic conventions. This can be explained by the fact that there are usually many contributions to the journal, and it would be impossible to let each author apply his or her own orthography. This would lead to a chaotic situation in which the orthography might then vary within every single article. As far as the use of orthographic references are concerned, there is a strong tendency towards the use of more official references, as in the case of publishing houses.

As far as the shortcomings of Persian orthography, suggestions on minor modifications, orthographic rules, and the use of orthographic references are concerned, no remarkable difference is observable in Iran vs. outside Iran. The only difference is that the lack of financial resources and professional editors outside of Iran leave a larger space for authors to decide over the orthography in their works. Persian orthography outside of Iran seems to follow Persian orthography in Iran, generally speaking. Positive attitudes towards a total changeover to a Latin alphabet are slightly stronger outside of Iran, but the differences are not so striking.

6.7 Concluding remarks

The results from the survey directed to writers and linguists indicate, more than anything else, a general awareness of the difficulties in launching an orthographic reform in the Iranian context. The linguistic rationality is not felt to be enough of a reason to launch a huge language planning project.
whose success and benefits are not at all clear. The rationale in this specific context is simply not the same as the rationale in a more abstract context. One of the main concerns of these Iranian writers is the possibility of an interruption of cultural continuity as a result of an alphabet reform.

The advocates of the romanization of the alphabet correctly claim that an alphabet reform does not need to result in an interruption of cultural continuity or a loss of cultural heritage. This is true, if the necessary prerequisites for an alphabet reform, such as well-functioning language planning organs, a well-functioning educational system, and last but not least a certain degree of political stability are all present. It seems that the awareness of the absence of these necessary prerequisites is what lies behind the concern for preserving the present appearance of the Persian orthography and therefore cultural continuity, not just irrational sentiments. The most rational thing for Iranian writers at this historical moment is to safeguard cultural continuity, and to protect what they perceive as linked to national, historical, and cultural identity.

As the results from the study’s three surveys show, the orthography of the written material in Iran, apart from the textbooks, is generally determined by the authors, a fact that explains the orthographic variations in Persian written material. At the same time, there is a strong tendency towards the application of the more official regulations, and towards a greater consistency. The majority of the writers have named a combination of all the current principles along with a strong tendency towards unbound writing as the basis of their orthographies. This is in accordance with the recommendations in official handbooks, and as such in textbooks at all levels. It seems that both the official and unofficial actors are moving in the same direction, which is of great importance for the standardization of Persian orthography.

Results from the different parts of the surveys show that a modified application of unbound writing is seen as a logical, rational, and practical solution to the problem of Persian orthography, as it can compensate for the difficulties in the phonological mapping needed in reading by ear through encouraging reading by eye, in a system in which the integrated morphemes of a word are kept unchanged. It can also address the problem of word boundaries in Persian orthography.149

---

149 See ch. 2.2.1, ch. 3.7 and ch.7.5.
CHAPTER 7
Corpus investigation

The present chapter is devoted to a corpus investigation of Persian texts from the period 1990–2000. The purpose of the corpus investigation is presented in section 7.1. Sections 7.2 and 7.3 are devoted to the methods. The studied parameters and the results are presented in section 7.4. Discussion and concluding remarks will be presented in sections 7.5 and 7.6.

7.1 Purpose of the investigation
The results from the present study’s three questionnaire surveys all point to increased support for unbound writing. The purpose of the corpus investigation is to supplement the three other surveys with corpus data to find out which orthographic rules are predominant in today’s Persian orthography, and in what direction orthographic conventions tend towards. I have therefore chosen to carry out a corpus investigation of texts from the period 1990–2000. Out of all the other general reasons, there are three specific reasons that make the above period particularly interesting: 1) it was during this period that the Iranian Academy began its activity after a long hiatus, and declared it as one of its main tasks to compile consistent orthographic conventions, 2) discussions on Persian orthography had once again intensified, and the unofficial society Šourā-ye bāznegari was established, and 3) production of prose was intensive, and a large number of books, newspapers, and journals were being published.

7.2 Selection of the texts
The selection of the texts has been governed by the attempt to have the greatest variation possible and has resulted in 162 pages of prose from different books and journals. I have selected at least two books and one journal from each year. Five pages of each book and the equivalent of 2 book pages of each journal have been investigated. The basic corpus data consists of a total of 140 pages from 28 books by 28 different authors, published by 28 different publishing houses, plus 22 book pages from 11 different journals published during the indicated period (Appendix 4). In
almost all cases, the first five pages of the books and the first two pages of the journals have been investigated. In several cases, where the first pages consisted of e.g. dialogues written in a spoken style, other pages have been selected.

The literary genres of the selected texts did not seem especially relevant. Still, I have tried to include both fiction and non-fiction. Poetry is omitted, firstly because of the amount of text that appears on a page, and secondly because of the aesthetic demands that Persian poetry might place on the choice of one orthographic convention over another. The selection of the journals has also been governed by the principle of greatest possible variation.

Textbooks are not included, for the reason that textbooks at almost all levels follow orthographic conventions sanctioned by state-owned institutes such as the Department of Education and the University Press. These institutes usually apply what is sanctioned or recommended by the Iranian Academy. Variation within textbooks is therefore very limited.

7.3 Selection of the parameters

Different opinions regarding the orthographic conventions of Persian orthography are not, of course, limited to bound and unbound writing. The problem of Persian orthography is usually divided into two fundamental parts: the orthography of the borrowed Arabic words; and the orthography of Persian words. I have chosen to omit consideration of the orthography of borrowed Arabic words, such as the place of hamze, etc., as Persian orthography demonstrates a tendency towards the application of the conventions of Persian orthography on Arabic words as well. Only in rare cases, when the entire construction is borrowed or the external non-linguistic factors are decisive, should one continue to apply the conventions of Arabic orthography. The third Iranian Academy, too, prescribes the application of the conventions of Persian orthography on Arabic words. For that reason, I have chosen to limit my corpus investigation to those parameters which make the writer choose between bound and unbound writing. Only one very frequently discussed parameter, which has nothing to do with bound and unbound writing, is included in my investigation, namely, the manner of writing kasreh-ye ezāfeh (genitive marker) after hā-ye ġeyr-e malfūz or e-ye ā xor ‘final –e’.

150 Some examples given in Farhangestān’s proposal are as follows: in Arabic words like رحمة is written as ت in رحمت. Whenever is not pronounced as /l/, it should be written as in words like زکات. For more examples see MPF (1378:33).

151 For example in the case of quoting words and phrases from the Koran or certain holy names.
Furthermore, I have compared three orthographic manuals and one article, in order to select the parameters that should be examined. I have included those parameters which usually have appeared as the object of discussion in the following four reference works:


The above four reference works, each in its own way, have been and are of great importance for the standardization of Persian orthography.¹⁵³ The first two reference works, *Dastur-e xaṭṭ-e fārsi* and *Šiveh-nāme-ye markaz-e nasr-e dānešgāhi*, are official handbooks. The orthographic recommendations in these two handbooks are applied to textbooks at all levels.

The third reference work is *Šiveh-nāme-ye negāreš*, edited by Kākhi. One of the first publishing houses to formulate a handbook for a consistent application of orthographic conventions was *Mo’asseseh-ye enteshārāti-ye Frānklin* (Frānklin Publishing House).¹⁵⁴ This handbook is called *Āyin negāreš-e mo’asseseh-ye entešārāti-ye Frānklin* and has been cited by three of the publishing houses as their reference handbook before the Islamic Revolution. Morteżā Kākhi is a well-known and established poet and literary critic. He has been appointed MD for Amir Kabir Publishing House, which was confiscated after the Islamic Revolution. Kākhi’s handbook is the reference handbook for the Publishing House Amir Kabir, which has been, and still is, the most established publishing house in Iran. Kākhi’s handbook is, according to the preface, a further elaboration of the old Frānklin handbook. *Šiveh-nāme-ye negāreš*, edited by Kākhi, is therefore of great importance to the future directions of Persian orthography.

¹⁵² The first edition of this manual was published in 1364 with the title of *Šiveh-ye emlā-ye fārsi*. In the context of Persian orthography, it is common to refer to this manual as *Šiveh-nāme-ye markaz-e našr-e dānešgāhi*, which I will also adopt in the study.

¹⁵³ These manuals, especially the first two, have been named as their reference handbooks by many of the writers, publishers, newspapers, and journals in the three questionnaire surveys presented in the previous chapter (see table 6.12).

¹⁵⁴ After the 1979 Revolution in Iran, *Mo’asseseh-ye enteshārāti-ye Frānklin* (Frānklin Publishing House) changed its name; first to *Sāzmān-e enteshārāt va āmuzesh-e enqelāb eslāmi* and then to *Sherkat-e enteshārāt-e ’elmi va farhangi*.
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The fourth reference work is Bahmanyār’s article “Emlā-ye fārsi: pišnahād beh maqām-e farhangestān”, which is also one of the most frequently mentioned articles in the context of Persian orthography. In 1942, Bahmanyār, who was elected as a permanent member of the Academy, presented his article on Persian orthography at the introduction ceremony. Bahmanyār’s article is considered to be one of the most important and scientific articles in the field, and it is one of the first writings on Persian orthography in modern time. Many of those who have written on Persian orthography have in one way or the other discussed this article, and there is a general consensus that most of the rules recommended by Bahmanyār are still applicable.

The differences between these four reference works are relatively few. The general recommendations are similar. There are only a few points where one or more of the handbooks make different recommends. The guiding principles in these handbooks can be broadly summarized as follows: to try to preserve the present appearance of the Persian orthography and to avoid strange innovations; to try to attain a correspondence between the spoken and the written form of the language; to elaborate conventions with a wide applicability and limited exceptions; to write correctly according to the grammar of Persian; to simplify learning to read and write; and to elaborate rules that are easy to learn and apply.

7.4 The studied parameters and the results

The statistical presentation of each parameter will be introduced by first including the recommendation of the Iranian Academy which is derived from Dastur-e xaṭṭ-e fārsi; matn-e pišnahādi-ye farhangestān-e zabān va adab-e fārsi (MPF). Except in cases where the recommendations in other handbooks deviate from the recommendations of MPF, or in cases where a certain parameter is not discussed at all, the relevant handbook or handbooks are presented by the abbreviation. Since most of the morphemes in Persian have different functions, they are not indicated by their grammatical denominations in MPF. The grammatical denominations are presented afterward. However, I have chosen to introduce each parameter or morpheme with its grammatical denominations in order to make it easier for those readers who are unfamiliar with the Persian language. The examples presented here are the exact examples presented in MPF, SMN, SNK, and EFB.

---

155 See page 115.
156 Bahmanyār’s article is probably the first writing in modern times, in which the use of ی instead of ی is recommended after hā-ye ġeyr-e malfuż or e-ye āxar ‘final –e’.
In my calculation, I have not included cases of unbound writing which were natural consequences of the presence of letters that cannot be written bound to the left. Nor have I included cases in which unbound writing has been a result of the presence of hā-ye geyr-e malfūz (final –e). Today’s Persian has a tendency towards letting final –e remain separate from the following language unit. It is believed that one therefore can save a short vowel and simplify the reading. In almost all handbooks, it is emphasized that bound writing should not be applied after the final –e. Morphemes that are always written bound are not included in the calculation, either. Some examples of such morphemes are: the adjectival/substantival morpheme -i/ﯼ as in ābil ‘blue’ and xubi/خوبﻰ ‘goodness’, and the substantival -eʃ in words like kušeʃ/کوشش ‘striving’. As a matter of fact, it is usually derived morphemes, beginning with a consonant, that are subject to unbound writing. They are usually considered to possess a greater potential for unbound writing; as -bān in the word bāġbān ‘gardener’. The verbal prefixes be- and ne-/na- (subjunctive, imperative, and negation) are not included, either. In modern Persian, these verbal prefixes are written as bound almost exclusively, and all of the handbooks recommend bound writing of these verbal prefixes. It must also be mentioned that unbound writing of verbal prefixes was usually the case in classical Persian. Compound verbs and compound words that are created through ezāfeh construction are not included either, as words with ezāfeh construction are almost exclusively written unbound. I have marked all cases of unbound writing, whether they are written with a complete space or half-space with a hyphen, for example ketāb-xāneh کتابخانه ‘library’ vs. ketābxāneh کتابخانه.

1. Demonstrative pronouns: in, ān, hamin, hamān
   MPF: in ‘this’ and ān ‘that’ should always be written unbound to the following word or morpheme, except for ānčeh ‘what’, inhā ‘these’, ānhā ‘those’.
   Hamin ‘just this’ and hamān ‘just that’ are always written unbound to the following word.
   SMN: Extends MPF’s list of exceptions by words such as inkeh/lānkeh ‘the fact that/the one who’, as well as ‘in spite of the fact’ in phrases as bā inkehlbā ānkeh, injālānjā ‘here/there’. SMN adds that haminkeh ‘just as, just when’ can be written bound.

---

157 However, I have included those cases where the presence of letters that cannot be written bound to the left demands that the writer choose between keeping or leaving the letter alef, for example, in the case of enclitic possessive pronouns or enclitic verbal endings after these letters.

158 I myself have seen cases of unbound writing of these verbal prefixes, but only in Persian texts produced outside of Iran.
SNK: Extends the list of exceptions with words such as *hamin/hamān*, *čonin/čonān* ‘such a/in a way’, and *āngāh* ‘then’.

**BEF:** Adds the following words to the list of exceptions: *ānkas* ‘the one’ (for person), *ānčonān* ‘in a way’ *inčonin*159 ‘in this way’.

**Results:** Unbound writing has been applied to 511 (67.5 %) of 758 cases of *inlān*, and bound writing to 247 cases (32.5 %). Except for three cases of bound writing in which enclitic verbal endings have been involved, namely in phrases *barānim* ‘we are going to’, *barānand* ‘they are going to’ and *inast* ‘... it is...’, as well as 2 cases of *ānvaqt/lāŋghā* ‘then’ and *ānčeh* ‘whatever’, bound writing has been applied only to *injālānjā* and *inkehlāńkeh*, in accordance with the recommendations of Farhangestān. In three of the books and one of the journals, unbound writing has been applied exclusively.

Unbound writing has been applied to 93 (90 %) of the 103 cases of *hamin/hamān*, and bound writing to 10 cases (10 %). In spite of the fact that *hamin/hamān* neither grammatically nor phonologically differs from *inlān*, unbound writing has been applied more often. Except for the SMN that allows for bound writing of *haminkeh* ‘just as’, bound writing is not recommended by any of the handbooks. It seems that the length of the word has had some significance regarding the choice of unbound writing as opposed bound writing.

2. Preposition/prefix *beh/be*-160

**MPF:** Bound writing should be applied to *be-* as a verbal prefix, to the adjectival *be-* as in *bexrad* ‘wise’, and to the *be-* in classical and formal prepositional phrases such as *bedu* ‘to him/her’, *bedin* ‘with this’, *bedān* ‘to that, with that’, and *bedišān* ‘to them’.161

Unbound writing should be applied to the prepositional *beh*, the adverbial *beh* as in *beh-sor’at* ‘rapidly’, in compound verbs such as *beh-sar bordan* ‘to spend’, in compound adverbs such as *beh āvāz-e boland* ‘loudly’ and to *beh* as a conjunction between two similar words, for instance: *xāneh beh xāneh* ‘house to house’, and *dar beh dar* ‘door to door’.

**SMN:** Bound writing should be applied in *bejoz* ‘except for’, as well as in words of Arabic origin in which *be-* is an integrated part of the borrowed word, as in *belāfāṣ eleh* ‘immediately’.

**SMK:** Extends MPF’s and SMN’s lists of exceptions by prescribing bound writing with some cases of adverbial *beh-* , for instance in words such as *bemoqe* ‘punctually’, *begā’edeh* ‘moderate’, *bejā* ‘rightly’, and so on.

159 In the original text, it is written *ānčonin*, which is not correct. It seems to be a spelling mistake.

160 The final –*h* in *beh* will be omitted in cases of unbound writing.

161 These forms occur only in written language.
**EFB:** Recommends bound writing except for cases in which the application of bound writing may make the reading more difficult.

**Results:** Unbound writing has been applied to 987 (91.5 %) of 1080 cases and bound writing to 93 (8.5 %) of the cases. Most cases of bound writing are in accordance with the recommendations of *Farhangestān* or the other handbooks. There have been cases of bound writing of the adverbial *be-*-, for instance, *bezudi* ‘soon’ and compound words such as *jābejāyi* ‘removal’. It must be mentioned that 50 cases of bound writing have occurred in only four of the texts, which means that unbound writing is the dominant tendency in the rest of the texts.

3. The prefix *bi-*

**MPF:** *bi-* ‘less’ should always be written separately from the following word, except for *bihudeh* ‘meaningless’, *bixod* ‘useless’, *bičāreh* ‘poor creature’, *binavā* ‘poor’, and *birāh* ‘irrelevant’.

**EFB:** *bi-* should always be written bound to the following word, except for compound words in which the conjunction *–o* is included, for instance, *binang o ūr* ‘immoral’.

**Results:** Unbound writing has been applied to 64 (80 %) of 80 cases and bound writing to 16 cases (20 %). Except for the following four cases, namely, *bikāreh* ‘strolling’, *bikāri* ‘unemployment’, *bizāri* ‘hatred’ and *bikarān* ‘endless’, all other cases of bound writing have been applied in the exceptional cases named by *Farhangestān*.

4. Comparative/Superlative -*tar*, -*tarin*

**MPF:** -*tar*, -*tarin* should be written separately from the following word, except for *behtar* ‘better’, *mehtar* ‘older’, *kehtar* ‘younger’, and *bištar* ‘more’.

**SMN:** Recommends bound writing, except for words ending in -*t*, for instance *dorošt*-tar ‘bigger’, as well as for derived and compound words as in *xaṭarnāk*-tar ‘more dangerous’ and *gomrāh*-tar ‘more lost’, and so on.

**SMK:** recommends bound writing and extends SMN’s list of exceptions by including words in which too many *dandāneh* ‘dentations’ are included, as in *del-nešin*-tar ‘more pleasant’, in which bound writing leads to the form دلنشینتر vs the unbound form دلنشین.

**EFB:** Has not discussed this parameter at all.

**Results:** Unbound writing has been applied to 42 (32 %) of 131 cases and bound writing to 89 (68 %) cases. In 2 of the journals, no cases of bound

---

162 As in letters ـ and ـ in the Persian alphabet.
writing have occurred at all, but as the total number of the cases with -tar/-tarin has been very limited, it is not possible to conclude that these journals exclusively apply unbound writing. As the results show, there is still stronger support for the application of bound writing.

5. The Pronoun čeh
MPF: Čeh should be written separately from the preceding word, except for ánčeh ‘what’ and čonánčeh ‘if’. Čeh should be written separately from the following word, except for čerā ‘why, yes’ and čeguneh ‘how’.¹⁶³
SMN: Prescribes bound writing even with words such as četour ‘in what way’, čekāreh ‘what occupation’, čeqadr ‘how much’.
SMK: Approves bound writing only for čerā ‘why, yes’.

Results: Unbound writing has been applied to 43 (39 %) of 110 cases and bound writing to 67 (61 %) of cases. Even if these percentages are in favor of bound writing, unbound writing still dominates, as almost all cases of bound writing have been applied to the exceptional cases indicated by Farhangestān. Bound writing has very seldom been applied to words such as četour, čeqadr, and čekār ‘what errand’.

While both bound and unbound writing can be applied to the pronoun čeh/-čeh ‘what’, it is not possible to apply bound writing to the conjunction čeh ‘as/since’. Bound writing is not applied to the accusative čeh followed by the postposition –rā, either. The diminishing -čeh has not been included in this section, instead appearing in the section for derived words.

6. The relative pronoun/conjunction keh¹⁶⁴
MPF: Keh should be written unbound, separate from the preceding word.
SMN: Makes an exception for inkeh/länkeh ‘the fact that, the one who’, and balkeh ‘but’
SMK: Also makes an exception for the above three words.
BEF: Also makes an exception for the above three words.

Results: Unbound writing has been applied to 626 (87.5 %) of 716 cases and bound writing to 90 (12.5 %) of the cases. All cases of bound writing have been applied to inkeh/länkeh and balkeh.

¹⁶³ In such cases the final <h> is dropped.
¹⁶⁴ Keh has several functions and meanings. Alone or in combination with prepositions and pronouns, e.g. بایان که، it introduces, for instance, subordinated clauses. In my calculation I have not included the simple keh that introduces subordinated clauses, or keh in the meaning of who, the interrogative pronoun.
7. The postposition -rā

**MPF:** Should always be written as separate from the preceding word, except for čerā ‘why’.

**SMK:** Recommends unbound writing except for čerā ‘why’ and marā165 ‘me’.

**FEB:** Accepts both bound and unbound writing except for torā ‘accusative you’, kerā ‘whom’, čerā, and marā, to which bound writing should be applied exclusively.

**Results:** Unbound writing has been applied to 507 (94 %) of 539 cases and bound writing to 32 (6 %) of the cases. All cases of bound writing have been applied to čerā ‘why’, marā ‘me’, zirā166 ‘therefore, because’, and ānrā ‘that’. While it is impossible to apply unbound writing to marā and zirā, the application of unbound writing to čerā can result in a semantic change. An unbound written form of čerā would be written as čeh rā, which means ‘what’, not ‘why’. However, the occurring cases of bound writing are in accordance with the recommendation of Farhangestān on not applying unbound writing to words that are understood to be simple words.

8. The plural ending -hā

**MPF:** -hā is always written as separate from the preceding word, except for inhā ‘these’ and ānhā ‘those’.

**SMN:** Recommends, on the other hand, bound writing, except for foreign words as in merkāntilist-hā ‘mercantilists’ as well as after proper names, as in Ferdousi-hā, and words ending in –eh, as in nāmeh-hā.

**SMK:** Same recommendation as SMN.

**EFB:** Recommends bound writing, except for words ending in –eh, as in parvāneh-hā ‘butterflies’.

**Results:** Unbound writing has been applied to 337 (53.5 %) of 628 cases and bound writing to 291 (46.5 %) of the cases. In almost all texts, consistency in applying one or the other principle can be seen. In those texts in which both principles are applied, the length of the word seems to have had a role in determining which principle is used. The books demonstrate a greater consistency in comparison to the journals. It is not always easy to determine which principle has been applied in journals. Only 5 out of the 11 journals in this study show consistency in applying one or the other principle.

---

165 The contracted form of man+rā.

166 Etymologically zirā is a fusion of ze+in+rā (from+this+rā)
9. The verbal prefix *mi*-, *hami*—

**MPF:** Unbound writing should be applied exclusively. For instance, *mi-ravad* ‘He goes’, and *hami-guyad* ‘She says’.

**EFB:** Allows both bound and unbound writing, but prefers the application of bound writing to *mi*-, and unbound writing to *hami*-.  

**Results:** Unbound writing has been applied to 1126 (99%) of 1136 cases and bound writing to 10 (1%) of the cases. Nine of ten cases of bound writing occur in one and the same book, which does not show any great consistency in the application of orthographic conventions. In the same book, unbound writing has been applied to 16 cases of *mi*-. The last case of bound writing occurs in the rendering of the colloquial, where *miyād* ‘He/She will come’ has been chosen before *mi-āyad*.

10. The prefix/adverb *ham*

**MPF:** Unbound writing should be applied to *ham-* as a prefix except for cases in which:

a. *Ham-* is an integrated part of the word, for instance, in words such as *hamšahri* ‘from the same town’, *hamšireh* ‘sister’, *hamdigar* ‘each other’, and *hamsāyeh* ‘neighbor’.

b. The second part of the word is mono-syllabic. Exceptions should be made for words beginning with the letter م / *mim* or ل/ *lalef*, for instance, *ham-marz* ‘with the same border, borderland, ham-esm ‘with the same name’.

c. The second part of the word begins with long –ā, shown by  

  a-ye bi-kolāh), for instance, in words such as همایش *hamāyeš* ‘gathering’, همآورد *hamāvard* ‘opponent’. Only in cases where a ‘glottal plosive’ is pronounced before the long -ā, should *ham-* be written separately from the following words. In such cases, the beginning long -ā is shown by a-ye bā-kolāh), for instance, in words such as هم آرزو *ham-ārezu* ‘with the same wish’, هم آرمان *ham-ārmān* ‘with the same goal. MPF confines itself to *ham-* as a prefix, and does not discuss *ham* as an adverb.

**SMN:** As a prefix, *ham-* is always written bound to the following word, except for words beginning with the letter *mim*. As an adverb *ham* is always

---

167 Occurs seldom in modern Persian prose, only in quotations and in texts where the classical style is consciously chosen.

168 Whether it is a glottal stop demands a closer investigation. In my opinion, it is not the presence of a glottal stop that justifies unbound writing, but the presence of a secondary stress. The difference between the word *hāmārmān* and *hamāyēš*, in my opinion, is that the secondary stress has disappeared in the latter word. Lazard (1992:39) writes: “In very common compounds the formation of which is scarcely felt, the secondary stress disappears.”
written unbound to the preceding word: *man ham mi-āyam* ‘I will come, too’.

**SMK:** As a prefix, it is always written bound to the following word, except for words beginning with the letters *mim* or *alef*. As an adverb, *ham* is always written unbound to the preceding word.

**EFB:** Does not discuss this parameter at all.

**Results:** Unbound writing has been applied to 76 (56 %) of 135 cases and bound writing to 59 (44 %) of the cases. Since the frequency of *ham* in most of the studied texts is limited, it is not easy to determine which of the two principles dominates.

**11. The copula verb/personal endings: -am, -i, -ast, -im, -id, -and**

**MPF:**

a. Bound writing should be applied with words ending in a consonant, except for the third person singular. The personal ending in such cases preserves its original shape (namely with *alef*).

b. With words ending in –ā and –u, the personal ending is written with the help of a hiatus: *dānā-y-am* ‘I am wise’, *dānešju-y-i* ‘You are a student’. In the case of third person singular, the letter */alef* is dropped; *dānā-ø-st* ‘He/She is wise’.

c. With words ending in –o and –eh, the hiatus is a glottal plosive, written as the letter *alef*: *xasteh-am* ‘I am tired’. The *alef* of the third person singular is dropped with words ending in –o: *ketāb māl-e to-ø-st* ‘The book is yours’.

d. With words ending in –ey and –i, the letter *alef* is retained exclusively: *kāri-am* ‘I am a hardworking person’, *kāri-ast* ‘He/She is a hardworking person’, *tizpey-im* ‘we are rapid’, *tizpey-ast* ‘He/She is rapid’.

**SMN:** Prescribes bound writing even with words ending in –i, as in *iraniam* ‘I am Iranian’.

**EFB:** Recommends unbound writing of –ast in all cases.

**Results:** Unbound writing has been applied to 374 (79 %) of 475 cases and bound writing to 101 (21 %) of the cases. Most cases of unbound writing have been applied to the third person singular: –ast. The studied texts show a clear tendency towards letting the third person singular retain its original shape as است, even after words ending in –ā and –u. Only a few cases of unbound writing with words ending in consonants have been observed. The dominating tendency in such cases is bound writing. Unbound writing has been applied to words ending in –i. The texts in general show a strong accordance with the recommendations of *Farhangestān*.

---

169 All cases in which the letter *alef* is dropped have been considered to be cases of bound writing, for instance, after words ending in –ā and –u.
12. Enclitic possessive pronouns, as well as enclitic pronominal objects: -am, -at, -aš, -emān, -etān, -ešān

MPF: As in the case of personal endings, bound writing is the general principle. There are cases in which a hiatus should be inserted, for instance after -ā, and -u: pā-y-am ‘my foot’, ’amu-y-at ‘your uncle’. Unbound writing is applied only after -eh, -i, -ey, and -o, and the alef is retained in first, second, and third person singular: xāneh-am/خانه‌ام ‘my home’, pey-at/پی ات ‘after you’, kešti-aš/کشتنی اش ‘his/her ship’, rádio-am ‘my radio’.

Alef is omitted in plural forms as follows: xāneh-mān/خانه‌مان ‘our home’, pey-e-mān/پی مان ‘after us’, kešti-tān کشتنی تان ‘your ship’, rádio-mān ‘our radio’.

SMN: Prescribes bound writing even with words ending in –i.

Results: Unbound writing has been applied to 37 (8 %) of 454 cases and bound writing to 417 (92 %) of the cases. The application of unbound writing to the plural enclitics has been more common. It may be due to the fact that “plural personal suffixes often carry a secondary accent” (Lazard 1992:42).

Even in those texts in which unbound writing is the dominating principle bound writing occurs. There is no text in which unbound writing is applied exclusively. Not even the journal Ādineh,170 which is the journal that advocates the special type of unbound writing called bi-fāseleh-nevisi, has applied unbound writing to the enclitic pronouns exclusively.

13. Kasreh-yə ezāfeh after final –e: _periods

MPF: Kasreh-yə ezāfeh is not normally displayed in the script, except for cases in which ambiguity can arise. When the head word in a genitive construction ends in final –e, kasreh-yə ezāfeh is displayed as ی,171 which in reality is a shortened ی. It must be noticed that in today’s Persian, kasreh-yə ezāfeh is displayed more often than what was usual, for instance, 15 years ago.172

EFB: Recommends the use of ی instead of ی.

---

170 It must be mentioned that those issues of Ādineh that are included in my study have all been published under the uneasy circumstances after the arrest of its editor-in-chief. This is a matter that may have affected the journal in many aspects, one of them being the consistency in applying orthographic conventions.

171 Some people call this symbol hamzeh, and it is often among those who see this symbol as the Arabic hamzeh that one finds advocates of replacing it with ی. For more information, see: Bahmanyār (1337:160).

172 According to Āmeneh Ghazanfari (1354), the omission of kasreh-yə ezāfeh, more than any other parameter, decreases the rate of reading (see http://database.irandoc.ac.ir 2003, a summary of the dissertation Sanjesh-e kārāyi dar xe`āndan-e fārsi).
Results: Except for two journals and one book in which kasreh-ye ezāfeh is dropped totally, and except for one journal in which ے is used instead of ṣ, the symbol ṣ is chosen in all texts. Occasional dropping of ṣ in one and the same text is not unusual.

14. Compound words

MPF: Bound writing is applied to compound words in the following cases:

a. In cases where the compound word is no longer seen as a compound but as simple: Āberu ‘reputation, good name’, alefbā ‘alphabet’, ābšār ‘waterfall’, neyšekar ‘sugar cane’.

b. In cases where the second word is mono-syllabic and begins with –ā, as in golāb ‘rosewater’.

c. In cases where a kind of phonetic alteration has occurred, as in hošyār ‘alert’, originally huš-yār ‘intelligence’s friend’.

d. When at least one of the integrated words cannot stand independently, as in nānvāyī ‘bakery’, ġamxār ‘sympathetic’, rangraz ‘dyer’, xānevādeh ‘family’.

e. In cases where unbound writing may result in semantic indistinctness, as in behyār ‘assistant nurse’ vs. beh-yār ‘the best friend’, Behruz ‘proper name’, and beh-ruz ‘the best day’.

f. In cases where the second part of the word is mono-syllabic and the whole word refers either to a national profession, as in ostāndār ‘Governor-General’, or a private one, as in ketābdār ‘librarian’, āšpaz ‘cook’.

Unbound writing is applied to compound words in the following cases:

a. With genitive constructions, as in dast-e kam ‘at least’, Šourā-ye āli ‘The High Council’, ḥašel-e ẓarb ‘production, ṣarf-e nāzar az ‘apart from that’.

b. When the second part begins with alef, as in del-angiz ‘delightful’, ‘aqab-oftādegi ‘retardation’, kam-eḥsās ‘emotionally cold’.

c. When the last letter (phoneme) of the first part has the same place of articulation as the first letter (phoneme) of the second part of the compound word, as in āyin-nāmeh ‘charter’, pāk-kon ‘eraser’, čubbori ‘sawmill’, čub-pardeh ‘curtain rod’.

d. When two alliterative words constitute the compound word, as in sangin-rangin ‘with dignity’, pul-mul ‘some money’, or in cases where the compound word consists of two repeating parts, as in tak-tak ‘one for one, and heq-heq ‘crying loudly’.

e. With compound verbs, as in soxan-goftan ‘to speak’, negāh-dāštan ‘to keep’.

f. With compound words in which one of the words is of foreign origin, as in šik-puš ‘well-dressed’.
g. When one of the integrated parts is a number, as in *haft-gonbad* ‘the seven cupolas’, *panj-tan* ‘the five figures’, *noh-falak* ‘the nine firmaments’. In cases where the integrated number is *yek* ‘one’, both bound and unbound writing can be applied, as in *yek-suyeh/yeksuyeh* ‘one-sided’.

**SMN:** Recommends bound writing in general. Its list of exceptions does not differ much from MPF’s. Some of the cases mentioned by MPF are not mentioned by SMN. SMN recommends unbound writing even with words ending in *šenās*-‘-logist’, as in *ravān-šenās* ‘psychologist’, in *šenāsi*173 ‘-logy’, as in *ravān-šenāsi* ‘psychology’, as well as with words where bound writing may make the reading more difficult, as in خوش سخن vs. خوشسخن *xošsoxan* ‘eloquent’.

**SMK:** Recommends the same as SMN.

**Results:** Unbound writing has been applied to 263 (50.5 %) of 520 cases and bound writing to 257 (49.5 %) of the cases. Almost all cases of bound or unbound writing have been in accordance with the recommendations of MPF or the other handbooks. It is very difficult to determine what governs the choice of the one or the other principle. The only distinguishable factor is the length of the word, even if it does not affect the choices consistently.

### 15. Derived words

**MPF:** As derived words in Persian are usually constituted by the help of suffixes and prefixes, they follow the same rules as applied to prefixes and suffixes.

a. **Bound writing** should be applied to suffixes, except for those derived words in which the ending consonant of the main word is the same as the beginning consonant of the suffix, as in *nežām-mand* ‘systematically’, *āb-bān* ‘water distributor’. The suffix –*vār* can be written either bound as in *bozorgvār* ‘large-minded’, or unbound as in *tuš-vār* ‘as parrot’.

b. Except for the prefixes *ham-* and *bi-*., which are usually written unbound, bound writing is applied to most of the prefixes.

**SMN:** Has not discussed the derived words.

**SMK:** Bound writing has been recommended.

**EFB:** Derived words have already been discussed in the section for compound words, and bound writing has been recommended.

**Results:** Unbound writing has been applied to 3 (2 %) of 149 cases and bound writing to 146 (98 %) of the cases. The interesting thing is that the

173 It must be noted that it is not derived from the causative verb *šenāsāndan* ‘to let to know, to let to learn about’.
above three cases of unbound writing have not occurred in Ādineh, which advocates bi-fāseleh-nevisi.

7.5 Discussion
The results show that unbound writing dominates in more than half of the studied parameters. Bound writing dominates in only 3 of the 15 studied parameters. The interesting thing is that MPF and SMN – both official handbooks – do not agree on all points. There is a greater agreement between SMN, SMK, and EFB. They recommend bound writing more often than MPF.

The mixture of bound and unbound writing that the handbooks do allow and that the texts display does not seem to be governed by one and the same principle which determines the word boundaries. It seems that the departure point for SMN, SMK, and EFB in more frequently recommending bound writing is the word stress in Persian, but it is not clear why they recommend bound writing of the stressed -hā as well as of the stressed tár/tárin, unbound writing of the stressed mí-, bound writing of the unstressed enclitic possessive pronouns, or bound writing of the unstressed postposition –rā, preposition be- and the correlate –ke.

The result of this corpus investigation is in general accordance with the results of the earlier surveys in the present work. While a strong tendency toward the application of unbound writing is observable, bound writing is applied in some cases. The presence of suffixes and prefixes that naturally are written bound to the preceding and following words leaves the door slightly open for bound writing.

7.6 Concluding remarks
Linguistics uses phonological, morphological, and syntactical criteria to determine the boundary of words. One important phonological criterion is word stress. In a language like Persian, where all stress falls on only one syllable, word stress cannot automatically be used for a choice between bound or unbound writing. The nature of Persian script is of a type that because of pedagogical and aesthetic reasons it is not always appropriate to apply bound writing based on phonological criteria, letting all the unstressed morphemes in a derived or compound word then gather around the stressed morpheme. It seems that beginning with the status of the morpheme as the smallest meaningful constituent of the language creates less problems for Persian orthography, and justifies the interchangeable

174 See ch. 3.6 and 3.7
application of bound and unbound writing to both unstressed morphemes such as -rā, -keh, stressed morphemes such as -hā, mī-, and so on.

Considering the present state of Persian word-processing programs, unbound writing, especially unbound writing with a half space,\textsuperscript{175} may be uneconomical in writing but it has a greater capacity to meet the peculiarities of Persian orthography. As far as handwriting is concerned, it is not easy to decide which principle is more economical. From personal experience I can say that unbound writing works better with longer words with too many dentations, while bound writing is more economical with shorter words. It is obvious that applying unbound writing with a half-space in handwriting is very time-consuming and almost impossible, as one needs to be very careful about inserting the right amount of space between and within the words.

However, the greater advantage of unbound writing seems to be in reading. The advocates of unbound writing with a half-space maintain that this principle makes the process of reading easier, as the original shape of the semantic units are kept untouched and an immediate link to the semantic is possible. Unbound writing is extremely helpful, when reading by eye is the dominant strategy.

\textsuperscript{175} As one needs to simultaneously press two keys on the keyboard.
Fig 7.1 Statistical presentation of bound and unbound writing
As was mentioned in the introductory chapter, the shortcomings of Persian orthography and the urgent need for addressing this problem have repeatedly been discussed over the last 150 years. Yet, no radical changes have taken place. In the diachronic part of this study, especially in chapter 4, I have tried to provide details on the following eight components that, according to Cooper (1989:98), are of essential importance for any adequate analysis of cases of language planning or standardization:

What actors [...] attempt to influence what behaviors [...] of which people [...] for what ends [...] under what conditions [...] by what means [...] through what decision-making process [...] with what effects.

Here I will try to give a summary of the history of Persian orthography in modern times to show which of the above components have had the most decisive role in the slow-moving standardization process of Persian orthography.

The history of Persian orthography in modern times can, with some reservations, be divided into two major periods. The first period begins in the mid-nineteenth century, ending around the time of the abdication of Reżā Shāh. The second period begins in the 1950s and is ongoing. This division does not refer only to two different historical periods, but also to two different periods in the direction and focus of the debate on Persian orthography. While the first period is marked by radical alphabet proposals that ultimately amount to a total changeover to another script (taḡyir-e xaṭṭ), especially to Latin, the second period is marked by proposals advocating minor modifications of the present orthography (eṣlāḥ-e xaṭṭ).

As was mentioned in the theoretical framework of this study, the need for language planning and language reform in most cases is a result of modernization in the society. Persian orthography is not an exception. In the mid-nineteenth century, Iran came into serious contact with Europe. Seeing Europe’s military, economic, cultural, and educational progress as compared to the severe backwardness of Iran in all fields came as a shock to many
Iranian intellectuals. The modernization of Iranian society became the main mission, and the main focus of the Constitutional Revolution and its intelligentsia, who found that the poor level of public education was one of the major reasons for this backwardness, and the phonemically inadequate Persian orthography was one of the major reasons for the poor level of public education. Alphabet reform subsequently came to be seen as one of the prerequisites of modernization, and intensive debates on the issue were initiated. The Iranian intellectuals and reformists (actors) attempted to change the alphabet (behaviour) for mostly illiterate Iranians (people), in order to make it easier to learn to read and write (language-related ends), and to increase the rate of literacy as a necessary step towards modernization (non-language-related ends) in a politically unstable, traditional, and religious society (condition), yet with an absence of language planning organs (means and decision-making process). The debates did not lead to any changes, and none of the alphabet reform proposals gained ground (effects).

It is not difficult to understand why alphabet reform proposals of this period did not gain ground. Almost all factors, aside from the high rate of illiteracy and modernization aspirations of a small group of intellectuals, worked against an alphabet reform. It is obvious that in a traditional society with powerful religious authorities, it must have been extremely difficult for such challenging projects to succeed. I have not been able to find any documents on the specific reactions against the alphabet reform proposals, but the concern of certain advocates of an alphabet reform, such as Mirzā Malkom Khān, for operating within the framework of the Arabic alphabet as well as their concern for obtaining the consent of the religious authorities all indicate opposition. A decisive prerequisite for the success of huge projects such as an alphabet reform, especially in such societies, is, therefore, a powerful state and a powerful executive organ that can launch and carry out the whole project authoritatively, as was seen in Turkey. In the case of Persian orthography, however, the state, which is the major decisive actor of the three actors usually involved in language planning (Ager 2001:6), as well as language planning organs which could carry out the decision-making processes, were completely absent during that period. As a matter of fact, the authorities were against the project.176 If it is true that language planning is a decision-making political and administrative activity for solving language problems in society, not an idealistic and exclusively linguistic activity (Jernudd and Das Gupta 1971:211), and if it is true that language planning demands the coordinated attention of political, educational, and linguistic authorities (ibid.: 197), then it is not so strange that language reform aspirations of that period did not lead to any results. The wishes and the

176 See ch. 4.2.2 on Ākhundzādeh’s unsuccessful attempts to convince the Ottoman and Iranian authorities of the need for an alphabet reform.
aspirations of a limited number of non-influential eager *actors* were simply not enough, and therefore the entire project remained on paper, at only a theoretical level.

The same model can be applied to the attempts of the second generation of advocates of alphabet reform. While a number of the components are the same, some are different. As in the earlier period, the *actors* were intellectuals, usually Western-educated. The *behaviour*, the *people*, and both the linguistic and non-linguistic *ends* were almost the same as in the earlier period. The *condition* was in general almost the same as in the early years of this period. Although the Constitutional Revolution had at last resulted in Iran’s first parliament and the Constitution, we were still dealing with political instability, a war situation, a religious and traditional society, and so on. It was first after Reẕā Shāh had been crowned that the *condition* began to change somewhat. Iranian society began to enjoy a higher degree of political stability. Executive organs in different fields became more powerful, and the success of this or that project was no longer totally dependent on the good will of certain ministers. Modernization of society was more than ever in focus, and Reẕā Shāh launched a series of actions to accomplish this modernization. Reẕā Shāh, who was impressed by Atatürk’s actions for language purification and alphabet reform in Turkey, saw to it that the Iranian Academy was finally founded in 1935. The state had now entered the scene as one of the *actors*. The foundation of the Iranian Academy, the presence of a powerful state with a powerful charismatic leader and a more centralized educational system (*actor*, *means*, and *decision-making processes*), the presence of eager advocates of alphabet reform in *decision-making* organs, and the high rate of illiteracy, had all made the entire situation extremely favorable for an alphabet reform. Still, one cannot find any clear indications of serious plans for an alphabet reform in the documents of the first Iranian Academy (1935–1953). Āryanpur (1374:33) writes that when Reẕā Shāh came back from Turkey, he ordered that the possibility of an alphabet reform (*ešlāḥ-e alefbā*) be investigated. The first Iranian Academy declared it as a task of its own to investigate the reform of Persian orthography (*ešlāḥ-e xaṭṭ-e fārsi*), but I have not been able to find any documents indicating any investigation on or planning for an alphabet reform such as that seen in Turkey. There are, however, numerous documents on language purification and word coinage projects of the first Iranian Academy. The documents of the first Iranian Academy show that Reẕā Shāh was particularly interested in language purification and word coinage, and his personal engagement resulted in the first Iranian Academy placing much effort into coining new Persian words based on ancient Persia’s language heritage. The idea of an alphabet reform, on the other hand, led nowhere, but to numerous writings and proposals by independent intellectuals (*effects*). Why?
Nuri ‘Alā states correctly that this question demands a study of its own, but he maintains that one speculation can be that the modernization in Iran, in contrast to the modernization in Turkey, did not aim at totally breaking with the past. While Turkish authorities were ready to throw away what they had and wanted to give birth to a totally new nation, Iranian authorities wanted to revive and integrate elements from that ancient civilization into the modern context. As such, their choices were limited, and this is why an alphabet reform was not launched (1999:94–95). I believe, too, that the modernization project of Reżā Shāh went hand in hand with strong nationalistic sentiments and praise of ancient Iran. It was simply supposed to revive the glory of an ancient civilization. Reżā Shāh was primarily engaged in those projects that were more in line with these sentiments, and therefore the first Iranian Academy focused more on language purification and word coinage based on ancient Persia’s language heritage. It has been said that the people around Reżā Shāh, frightened him away from an alphabet reform (Purvāli 1374d:47). Whether it was he who hesitated in launching an alphabet reform or if it was the people around him does not matter. It seems that an alphabet reform was not seen as one of the priorities by the main actor of that time, as the non-linguistic ends were not felt to be strong enough. Reżā Shāh could have launched an alphabet reform in the manner of Atatürk if he had wanted to. Still, it must be admitted that this was the only period in the history of Persian orthography where the authorities showed some interest in an alphabet reform. This interest, however, never amounted to serious plans for an alphabet reform at the official level. Like the first generation, the second generation of the advocates of alphabet reform was strongly influenced by the representational view on writing. Writing was considered to be an instrument with the function of visualizing speech. The phonemic concept of writing and the need for a one-to-one correspondence between the phonemes and letters marked almost all written material concerning alphabet reform in Iran. Even if the linguistic goals were those that were invoked as demonstrating the need for an alphabet reform, the external non-linguistic goals behind alphabet reform proposals were nevertheless very strong. As was mentioned in the theoretical framework of this study, the real motives behind language planning are usually of a non-linguistic nature. Even in cases of corpus planning, such as word coinage, purism, selective purism, neologism, change of alphabet, and so on, the real goals are usually non-linguistic.

As a result of Reżā Shāh departing the political scene, the alphabet reform project lost even its slightest chance to be launched at all. The second period

---

177 It is also said that an article written by a German Iranist against alphabet reform and in favor of the present Persian orthography, made Režā Shāh change his mind regarding an alphabet reform (Rahnamā 1346:101).
178 See ch. 4.2.3.
in the history of Persian orthography began. The second period, which began in the 1950s and is ongoing, is marked by both long interruptions in the standardization process of Persian orthography and by a clear shift in the direction of the debates on the problem of Persian orthography. Shortly after the 1953 coup, the first Academy was closed and ceased to function. Discussions on the need for an alphabet reform began to meet strong and active resistance.

By 1953, the Iranian society had, to some degree, developed beyond the severe backwardness which had made the Iranian intellectuals of the earlier periods seek salvation in a total adoption of Western civilization. Iranian society enjoyed a degree of modernization, and the literacy rate was improving (*condition* and *people*). The mindset of Iranian intellectuals was slowly changing, and the state showed no interest in an alphabet reform (*unofficial and official actors*). A total adoption of Western civilization was questioned even by its prior advocates. The second Iranian Academy began its activity in 1970, after 17 years without an academy. The Department of Persian grammar and orthography within the second Iranian Academy concentrated its research on the orthographic studies of older Persian manuscripts in order to establish orthographic conventions for modern Persian, and the authorities showed no interest in an alphabet reform. The reasons behind this shift can be found within the social, structural, and psychological changes in Iranian society.

As a matter of fact, Iranian society by 1970 had begun to develop anti-Western feelings. These reached their peak in the Islamic revolution in 1979. The external ideological and political non-linguistic factors that once worked in favor of a changeover to a Latin alphabet had by now disappeared from the scene.

Shortly after the Islamic revolution in 1979, the activities of the second Iranian Academy also ceased. The Iran-Iraq war, which began shortly after the revolution, as well as the harsh political climate, left no space for “secondary issues” such as the problem of Persian orthography. The number of journals in which independent intellectuals could write was extremely limited. Once again, we are dealing with a serious interruption in the standardization process of the orthography as a consequence of the political situation within society.

The third Iranian Academy began its activity in 1990, about 11 years after the revolution and two years after the end of the war. The vast expansion of personal computers, as well as information technology, had already

---

179 See page 102.

180 In 1972, for instance, the daily Keyhān published the article “Tarafdarān-e ta’gīr-e xāṭ xā’en-and”, the translation of which is: ‘The advocates of a changeover of the script are traitors’ written by Farrokh-ru Pārs ā, the Minister of Public Education in 1968–1974. She was among the first individuals executed after the Islamic revolution.
intensified discussions on the shortcomings of Persian orthography. In addition to the activities of the third Iranian Academy, individuals, and independent societies began to work on the problem of Persian orthography. The debates in Iran were focused on a modification of the present orthography. Considering the Islamic nature of the revolution, with its strong opposition to modernity and all its manifestations, it would be very surprising if the romanization of the alphabet was discussed at all in Iran. The mass emigration of Iranians and concern for defending the achievements of modernity in Iran, however, revived the discussions on the romanization of the alphabet outside of Iran. Even if the number of individuals and societies that propagated for the romanization of the alphabet were limited, and even if the debates were held, at least openly, only outside of Iran, the revival of the debates on the romanization of the alphabet is a very interesting phenomenon which shows the roll of non-language-related ends within language planning. Most advocates of the romanization of the alphabet, overtly or latently, state that the romanization of the alphabet is a step in line with the modernization of Iranian society. Despite the debates on the romanization of the alphabet, the history of Persian orthography after the Islamic revolution is, in general, a continuation of what had been started in the 1950s. It can easily be observed that external non-linguistic factors are what determine the direction of debates on Persian orthography.

If we now apply Cooper’s model on the second period in the standardization process of Persian orthography, which as was mentioned above began in the 1950s and is ongoing, we find that most of the components have changed. The actors, behaviour, people, and condition have changed. Unlike the first period, means and decision-making processes are present to some degree. The educational system is centralized, and the orthography of the text books, at least at the primary and secondary levels, is governed centrally by the Ministry of Public education. The effects, on the other hand, are not so striking. Even if some improvement on the level of orthographic conventions is observable, Persian orthography is far from a standardized orthography, and the orthographic variation in Persian texts is high. Not even textbooks show any consistency in the case of orthographic conventions.

\[\text{\footnotesize Why?}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 181 From 1963 onwards, the editing and publication of textbooks became centralized, as Sāzmān-e ketābhā-ye darsi-ye Iran (The Iranian institute for the editing of textbooks) and Markaz-e enteshārāt-e āmuzeši (The center for the publication of textbooks), both under the auspices of the Ministry of Public Education, were established in 1963 and 1964, respectively.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 182 As late as in 1977, orthographic variation in the textbooks was so high that the monthly journal of the Ministry of Public Education found it necessary to take certain actions. The journal presented a proposal, and urged the Iranian experts in the field to respond with their comments, promising to send all comments to the Iranian Academy for a final decision on orthographic conventions (Māhnāmeh-ye āmuzeš o parvareš 2536:8–9).}\]
One main explanation involves the political turbulence within Iranian society, the shift in the composition of the actors, and the long interruptions in the activities of the Iranian Academy. The history of the Iranian Academy is quite simply the history of a series of unfulfilled projects. Another explanation, in my opinion, is the historical gap of trust between Iranian intellectuals and the state. It is accepted that the writers, journals, and publishing houses can have a decisive role in the standardization process of languages. They can function as an influential means for promoting the decisions made by the decision-making organs, but the gap of trust between the state and the Iranian intellectuals has usually made independent writers, journals, and publishing houses function as parallel decision-making organs alongside official organs, using the written texts in their own possession as a means for promoting their decisions. As in the first period, despite all differences or shifts in the direction of the discussions on Persian orthography, it is again the political instability, the means and the decision-making processes which shape and determine the destiny of the standardization process of Persian orthography.

The purpose of the synchronic part of this study is to present the underlying attitudes towards an alphabet reform and to present the most recent scenario on the standardization of Persian orthography, as well as its directions. The results from the questionnaire surveys directed to writers and linguists in Iran indicate a consensus on the difficulties of launching an alphabet reform in the Iranian context. Iranian writers in general doubt if Iranians would have any benefit at all from a drastic reform of any type. Even among those who advocate the romanization of the alphabet, one hears voices which are skeptical about the possibility of carrying out such script reform in Iran at all. Both the advocates of an alphabet reform and the advocates of a modification of the present orthography are aware of the role of the practical external non-linguistic factors, and attempt to move within the possible frameworks.

The main tendency, however, is to approve reform proposals that can become an integrated part of the present orthography, and that keep the present appearance of Persian orthography as unchanged as possible. One of the main concerns of the Iranian writers is an interruption in cultural continuity in the event of an alphabet reform or any other drastic change in the present appearance of the orthography. Even within the framework of establishing orthographic conventions, the main observable tendency is to avoid sanctioning orthographic conventions that imply any drastic changes to the present appearance of the orthography.

External non-linguistic rationality weighs heavier than linguistic rationality. The script is no longer seen as just an instrument that can be altered at will for the sake of the highest linguistic optimality and efficiency. As was mentioned in the theoretical framework of this study, the criteria for optimality and efficiency of a script can be defined in non-linguistic terms as
well. Lotz (1971:121) maintains that the optimality of a writing system can be defined “in terms of its effectiveness in achieving continuity in time and comprehension in space.” A certain orthography with possible linguistic and pedagogical shortcomings may in some cases be the most optimal one, for example, if it is transdialectal, as in the case of Persian orthography. It seems that Iranian writers are more focused on the non-linguistic optimality of Persian orthography. The results from the questionnaire survey directed towards writer and linguists are generally in accordance with the standardization process of Persian orthography from earlier periods. As a matter of fact, almost all of the arguments invoked by both advocates and opponents of an alphabet reform in the questionnaire survey of this study resemble the arguments of advocates and opponents of an alphabet reform from earlier periods. I, therefore, believe that the results from the questionnaire survey used in this study can provide a better understanding of the standardization processes from earlier periods beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, and can also shed light on unstudied aspects of language planning during earlier periods.

The results from the survey directed towards publishing houses in Iran, the results from the survey directed towards newspapers and journals both in and outside of Iran, and the results from parts of the first questionnaire survey all indicate a tendency towards the application of the more official orthographic regulations. However, we are still far from reaching a standardized orthography. Just the facts that there are so many orthographic handbooks and that new handbooks are constantly being published both indicate that it will take a good while before any tendency towards the application of official orthographic recommendations is established. This is a matter of great importance to the standardization process of Persian orthography.

Even if there is a tendency towards establishing the rights of the publishing houses and journals to edit all books and contributions according to their own orthographic conventions, authors still have the last word. This means that the orthography of written material in Iran, aside from textbooks, is usually determined by the authors. This in its turn explains the orthographic variations in written texts, but as the results from the statistical survey of this study show, this orthographic variation is decreasing, and a greater degree of consistency is now observable.

As far as bound and unbound writing is concerned, all surveys of this study indicate an increasing interest in the application of unbound writing. The results from the corpus investigation of this study confirm that unbound writing is the dominant principle. Both of the official handbooks Dastur-e xatt-e fārsi, published by the Iranian Academy and Šiveh-ye emlā-ye fārsi, published by Iran University Press, recommend unbound writing for most of the parameters in Persian orthography.
Linguistic and orthographic studies in Iran have more or less followed the developments in linguistic and orthographic studies in Europe and the USA. As such, orthographic studies in Iran have hence been strongly influenced by the representational view on writing as a device of representing speech. The phonemic concept of writing and the need for a one-to-one correspondence between phonemes and letters have directed and still direct almost all discussions on Persian orthography. Most writings on Persian orthography, unfortunately, suffer from a weak anchorage in the latest research on how we read. Aside from one dissertation, I have not been able to find any other research on the process of reading in Persian. It seems, however, that alternative approaches towards writing, and the process of reading are entering the scene. The latest modification proposal by Šourā-ye bāznegārī, namely unbound writing with a half-space, is motivated by its making the process of reading easier through keeping the integrated morphemes of a word unchanged. As was mentioned in the theoretical framework of this study, people make use of two different strategies during the different stages of learning to read: Reading by ear and reading by eye. If this is true, then unbound writing is extremely helpful in the later stages when reading by eye is the dominant strategy. It is also extremely helpful in a writing system like Persian, in which phonological mapping, or reading by ear, is not always possible.

I would like to conclude this study with some personal reflections. When I first had the idea of writing on the problem of Persian orthography, the vast expansion of personal computer access and information technology had already intensified discussions on the shortcomings of Persian orthography and the need to adopt Persian orthography to the demands of new technology. Like many other Iranians, I was very concerned about Persian orthography lagging behind this process and was looking for a solution. It did not take long before a huge number of websites, e-mail programs, word-processing programs, etc. in Persian entered the scene, showing that an incompatibility of Persian orthography with modern technology was a myth. It does not mean that there are no problems at all, or that they do not need to be addressed, but it does indicate that there is no need for hasty decisions. Taking into consideration political, social, cultural, structural, and economic conditions in Iran, as well as the complexity of language planning projects, it seems that Persian orthography has a lot more to gain from gradual modifications than from drastic changes.

---
183 See footnote 172.
184 See ch. 2.2.1.
Appendix 1

As was mentioned in Chapter 5, reviving an ancient script like Avestan has often been a nationalistic reaction against changeover proposals to a Latin alphabet. I have not been able to find any example of orthographic proposals based on an ancient Iranian script. The proposals and sample texts in the appendix are therefore limited to four categories. It must only be noted that the proposals appear exactly as the authors presented them.

1. Some examples of proposed Latin-based alphabets for Persian

1.1 Taqizādeh’s proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persian Letter</th>
<th>Latin Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ه</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭘ</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭝ</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭘ</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭡ</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭢ</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭪ</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭤ</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭣ</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭥ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭤ</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭦ</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭨ</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭩ</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭩ</td>
<td>q (or ﭧ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭣ</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭦ</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭤ</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭨ</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭨ</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭥ</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭥ</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﭧ</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Latin characters for the redundant Arabic letters

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ذ} & = \breve{\text{ذ}} \\
\text{ص} & = \breve{\text{ص}} \\
\text{ض} & = \breve{\text{ض}} \\
\text{ظ} & = \breve{\text{ظ}} \\
\text{ث} & = \breve{\text{ث}} \\
\text{ح} & = \breve{\text{ح}} \\
\text{ط} & = \breve{\text{ط}} \\
\text{ف} & = \breve{\text{ف}} \\
\text{ع} & = \breve{\text{ع}} \\
\text{غ} & = \breve{\text{غ}} \\
\text{ک} & = \breve{\text{ک}} \\
\text{چ} & = \breve{\text{چ}} \\
\text{غ} & = \breve{\text{غ}} \\
\text{ئ} & = \breve{\text{ئ}} \\
\text{ی} & = \breve{\text{ی}}
\end{align*}
\]

1.2 *Alefba*-ye mehr by Abdollah Rahnamā

In his long treatise *Taklif-e xaṭṭ ċist? baḥsi dar navāges-e xaṭṭ-e ’arabi va ’alāj-e rahāyi az ān* (The Script Dilemma & Thoughts on a Solution)\(^{185}\) (1346), Rahnamā begins with a short presentation of the history of writing, then presents the leading principles in choosing a new alphabet, the advantages of a Latin alphabet, the way to adopt a Latin alphabet to Persian, the orthographic rules of the new alphabet, how to launch the new alphabet, some samples of Persian texts written in *Alefba*-ye mehr, and then concludes by addressing the arguments of opponents of an alphabet reform, especially Minovi’s arguments in his famous article: “Ešlāḥ yā taḡyir-e xaṭṭ-e fārsi” from 1965. Rahnamā emphasizes that the names of the letters of the alphabet should be kept as before, and should be in Persian. The name of the letter <g>, for example, continues to be gāf, not gi as in English. Rahnamā’s proposal is as follows:

**Consonants:**

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{B} & \text{Z} & \text{M} \\
\text{P} & \text{JJ} & \text{N} \\
\text{T} & \text{S} & \text{V} \\
\text{J} & \text{SH} & \text{Y} \\
\text{C} & \text{Q} & \\
\text{H} & \text{F} & \\
\text{X} & \text{K} & \\
\text{D} & \text{G} & \\
\text{R} & \text{L} & \\
\end{array}
\]

**Vowels:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{U} & = \text{zebar as in } \text{بَد} \rightarrow \text{BUD} \\
\text{E} & = \text{zir as in } \text{دل} \rightarrow \text{DEL} \\
\text{O} & = \text{piš as in } \text{گفت} \rightarrow \text{GOFT} \\
\text{A} & = \text{آ} \text{as in } \text{تار} \rightarrow \text{TAR} \\
\text{OO} & = \text{او} \text{as in } \text{طول} \rightarrow \text{TOOL} \\
\text{I} & = \text{ای} \text{as in } \text{ديد} \rightarrow \text{DID}
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^{185}\) The English title is given on the back page of the book.
In the following pages, the table of *Alefbā-ye mehr*, with names of the letters and examples appearing in both Persian and Latin, and a sample text written in the new alphabet are presented. Both the table and the text sample are copied from Rahnamā’s treatise.

*Alefbā-ye mehr (1346:46-47)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>شکل حرف</th>
<th>اسم حرف</th>
<th>نامه خط فلی</th>
<th>نامه لاتین</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>الف</td>
<td>بازار (ulaf)</td>
<td>BAZAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>بُه</td>
<td>بَه</td>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>پُه</td>
<td>پُه</td>
<td>POOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>تُه</td>
<td>تُناب تر</td>
<td>TUNABE TUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>زُبر</td>
<td>زُبر کُرم</td>
<td>KURGUDUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>جیم</td>
<td>جیم</td>
<td>JOOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>چه</td>
<td>چاهد چیست</td>
<td>CARE CIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>هُو (ح)</td>
<td>هُو</td>
<td>HAJI MEHDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>خُه</td>
<td>خُه خُلخال</td>
<td>XULXAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>زُبر</td>
<td>طَلَسم</td>
<td>TELESM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>دَال</td>
<td>دَال دَاوُد</td>
<td>DAVOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>دَر</td>
<td>دَر دَوَدَ سَر</td>
<td>DURDE SUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>زُه</td>
<td>زُه (ض طَّد)</td>
<td>ZOOZUNUQE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>زُه</td>
<td>زُه</td>
<td>JJALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>یَای</td>
<td>یَای</td>
<td>BIBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>شَین</td>
<td>شَین شَاهنشاها</td>
<td>SIAHAUNSHAHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>سن (س-ت)</td>
<td>سنگه ساف</td>
<td>SUNGE SAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>فَه</td>
<td>فَه فَرَفره</td>
<td>FERFERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>قَه</td>
<td>غرقَ ق</td>
<td>QURQAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>نَر</td>
<td>نَر بَیش</td>
<td>TOROB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>کاف</td>
<td>کاف کرکه</td>
<td>KERKERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>کاف (خاكسرخ)</td>
<td>کاف گُلگی</td>
<td>GELE GOLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>لام</td>
<td>لام</td>
<td>LOOLI CESHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>میم</td>
<td>میم</td>
<td>MIGOYUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>دوواو دوواو</td>
<td>دوواو</td>
<td>MOW VU MOO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>نون</td>
<td>نون</td>
<td>ZEMNUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>وار</td>
<td>وار</td>
<td>VURZUNDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>یه</td>
<td>یه</td>
<td>YEK MEYDAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O0</td>
<td>نمی دور</td>
<td>نمی دور</td>
<td>MOOYE BOOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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نیروی هوایی شاهنشاهی جهت تکمیل گدار پزشکی یکنفر قابل‌ه
که دارای گواهینامه رسمی باشد برای خدمات در خارج کز باحقوق
مکف در استفاده می‌کنند داوطلبان می‌توانند از تاریخ .... در روزهای
یکشنبه و سه شنبه هر هفته جهت مصاحبه و ثبت نام بکار گردنی ستاد
فرماندهی نیروی هوایی واقع در خیابان فرح آباد (دوشان تپه) مرجع به نمایند).

Nirooye Huvaiye Shahunshahi jubute tumkile Kadre Pezeshki yeknufur qabele ke daraye guvahinameye rusmi bashud buraye xedmut dur Xareje Murkuz ba boqooqe mokfi estexdam mikonud.

Davtuluban mituanund uz tarixe ...... dur roozbaye Yekshunbe vu Seshunbeye hur hufte Jubute mosabebe vu subte nam be Kargoziniye Setade Furmandehiye Nirooye Huvai vape dur Xibane Furuhabad (Dowshan Tuppe) morajee konund.

Sample text written in Alefbā-ye mehr (1346:64)
1.3 Xaṭṭ-e nou by Kāžem Ḥasibi

In 1966, Ḥasibi wrote the treatise Čeguneh xaṭṭ rā bāyad  eslāh kard (How the script should be reformed). Certain pages of the treatise are copied and presented in Ketābšenāsi-ye xaṭṭ va zabān by Golbon (2536). The title has been presented in three different Latin-based scripts on the front page of the treatise. These scripts are named Xaṭṭ-e lātini ‘Latin script’, Xaṭṭ-e noqṭeh-i ‘Dotted script’, and Xaṭṭ-e kelidi ‘Key script’. The amount of text is, of course, not enough to allow me to give a sufficient presentation of the principles governing the three scripts. The only thing that can be said is that Xaṭṭ-e lātini is based on the Latin alphabet, in which an overrepresentation of consonants and an underrepresentation of vowels are avoided, with some vowels and consonants displayed by two letters. Long vowels are unmarked, while short vowels are marked with a diacritic. Xaṭṭ-e kelidi seems to be inspired by the symbols/keys used in music books. The keys are used to represent vowels. Unlike Xaṭṭ-e lātini, in both Xaṭṭ-e kelidi and Xaṭṭ-e noqṭeh-i each phoneme is represented by only one letter, in some cases with the help of diacritics. On an additional page, Ḥasibi’s proposed alphabet, Alefbā-ye nou, is presented.

In Xaṭṭ-e nou there is a Latin-based letter for each letter present in the Persian alphabet. This means that letters used in words of Arabic origin are also represented in Xaṭṭ-e nou, but that each letter is represented by only one corresponding letter. The vowels are displayed by dots that can be incorporated in the consonant letters. Tanvins and diphthongs are also displayed by incorporated dots. Ḥasibi then presents the four diacritics used in Xaṭṭ-e nou: 1) the crown-like diacritic, which is used to mark capital letters, 2) the horizontal line above a letter, for marking tašdid, which can also be displayed by double consonants, according to Ḥasibi, 3) the horizontal line under a letter to mark the hiatus, and 4) the vertical line for marking the letters which are not pronounced.
چگونه خط رابطه اصلاح کرد.

Cigoni kit ton byd xsl'ih ord.

حق چاپ و تهیه وانتشار آزادیست

روی جلد رساله مهندس کاظم حسینی در پاره چگونی خط

The front page of Ḥasibi’s treatise (Golbon 2536:16)
دیناله ی چندام شماره (1)

1- درکایت بخط پیشنهادی از نکل حرفهای پژوه بجا جای حرفهای گرچک استفاده خواهد شد و حرف بزرگ توسط تاجی مشخص می‌شود مثل:

2- خط افقی بالای هر حرف بجای تشديد استفاده می‌تاند آن حرف را مکرر نکند.

3- خط افقی در زیر هر حرف غلاف حریق است که جزو گونه‌ی نیست ولی موقع فراز بندی در جمله ظاهر می‌شود مثلا در باید من.

4- خط ثانی در زیر هر حریق غلاف حریق است که در کلمه وجود دارد ولی موقع تلفظ و بخصوص در میان جمله‌ها تلفظ نمی‌شود مثل الفاء الله در بسم الله الهی

یک صفحه از رساله مهندس کامل حسابی در باره خط

One page from Ḥasibi’s treatise (Golbon 2536:17)
1.4 Alefbā-ye sumkā by Dāvud Monshizādeh\textsuperscript{186}

Monshizādeh begins his treatise by indicating that the present alphabet is the root of illiteracy and underdevelopment in Iran, and proposes a Latin alphabet as the best alternative. He maintains that Alefbā-ye sumkā is governed by a one-to-one correspondence, in which each letter represents a phoneme, and each phoneme is represented by a letter. Monshizādeh maintains that Xaṭṭ-e sumkā has been tested for more than 15 years and has demonstrated its functionality in typewriting, printing, and telegraph services, and so on. He then emphasizes that the national survival of Iranians is dependent on the rate of literacy in Iran, but with the present alphabet, there is no chance for cultural achievements or for fighting illiteracy. He writes that all cultural achievements in Turkey, Caucasus, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan are the result of an alphabet reform.

Alefbā-ye sumkā consists of 6 letters for vowels and 23 letters for consonants. The names of the letters are changed, except for seven letters. The orthographic rules of Xaṭṭ-e sumkā are presented as follows:

1. What is not pronounced is not written, either, e.g. hā-ye ġeyr-e malfuž and vāv-e ma’duleh.
2. Bound writing is applied in almost all cases.
3. The stressed substantival and adjectival /i/ is displayed by i, as in bozorgī ‘greatness’, not by i, as in bozorgi ‘a big’ in mard-e bozorgi ‘a big man’.
4. ’ will be used for the omitted letter, e. g. az’in ازین vs. az in از ‘from this’.
5. Hamzeh and ‘eyn are not displayed in initial position, e. g. ebārat instead of ēebārat ‘phrase’
6. In Persian words, hamzeh is not displayed in medial position, e. g. befarmāid instead of befarmāēid ‘help yourself’.

In cases where it is necessary to reproduce classical Persian texts, to show the exact spelling of the original word, or to mark some older pronunciations, diacritics have been added to the letters as follows: ocrine for displaying yā-ye majhul, ŏ for displaying vāv-e majhul (p. 12)

\begin{align*}
x &= x^w \\
ź &= ẓ \\
z &= ẓ \\
š &= ș \\
ṣ &= ș
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{186} Probably from 1950s.
اینک الفبای سومک‌ا:

حرکات (۷۷تا):

کناره

ا ا

و

ای

ی

و

و

 حرکت مركب (diphtongue)

حرف ییحرفک (۴۴تا):

b c d e f g h j k

l m n p q r s t

w x y z ŋ

ترتیب حروف و نام‌آنها (۹۹تا):

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p

بر این‌ان‌management حروف این‌ان‌ management

q r s t u w x y z ŋ

زیری‌حروف‌آمل‌ب‌یراد

حرف یزدک:

A B C D E Ė F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S Š T U W X Y Z ŋ
مثال ازمن های جدید:

بنیاد دولت تیت

اکرآب و هوا وزن‌های هندوستان مذهب بودا را در هند بوجود آوردند، پس چرا امروز سرمزمین به‌نتای بقایان بلند غود تبت است؟ نه آب و هوا و زمین این ناحیه دوست قطب مناطق نواحی که و سر از باعث می‌باشد. فلسفی هر روز بسته هم‌اکنون یکی از شهدترين و مختار مناطق کره ما می‌باشد. طوفان‌های متغییر هر روز به‌پایان ناوهای می‌باشد، زیبایی که به‌نیت قسم پرچم مذهبی رسیده‌اند، زمامبیش بی‌نیت قسم برک سال‌بیش در آنها فرو رود می‌باشد. ببینید جهت نبر دو آنها پروست قابل سرگردانی بر می‌رودند. که حظ الیم آرام نداشته و دلایل‌های دل‌ساز و سرسبز بودند. پیام آنها در جنگ‌ها و هم‌اکنون بودند، که از پروست کوسوندان بروز بجنه آنها می‌باشد.

آیبای سومکا

Bonyade Doulate Tabbat

Agar ی‌ب‌و‌ی‌ه‌ا تا‌ی‌ا وج‌ن‌ام‌ه‌ا بودا را در هند بوجود آورده‌اند، پس چرا امروز سرمزمین به‌ن‌ت‌ا‌ی‌ا بچ‌ایان بقایان بلند غود تبت نیست؟ چرا ی‌ب‌و‌ی‌ه‌ا تا‌ی‌ا وج‌ن‌ام‌ه‌ا بودا را در هند بوجود آورده‌اند، پس چرا امروز سرمزمین به‌ن‌ت‌ا‌ی‌ا بقایان بلند غود تبت نیست؟ چرا ی‌ب‌و‌ی‌ه‌ا تا‌ی‌ا وج‌ن‌ام‌ه‌ا بودا را در هند بوجود آورده‌اند، پس چرا امروز سرمزمین به‌ن‌ت‌ا‌ی‌ا بقایان بلند غود تبت نیست؟ چرا ی‌ب‌و‌ی‌ه‌ا تا‌ی‌ا وج‌ن‌ام‌ه‌ا بودا را در هند بوجود آورده‌اند، پس چرا امروز سرمزمین به‌ن‌ت‌ا‌ی‌ا بقایان بلند غود تبت نیست؟ چرا ی‌ب‌و‌ی‌ه‌ا تا‌ی‌ا وج‌ن‌ام‌ه‌ا بودا را در هند بوجود آورده‌اند، پس چرا امروز سرمزمین به‌ن‌ت‌ا‌ی‌ا بقایان بلند غود تبت نیست؟ چرا ی‌ب‌و‌ی‌ه‌ا تا‌ی‌ا وج‌ن‌ام‌ه‌ا بودا را در هند بوجود آورده‌اند، پس چرا امروز سرمزمین به‌ن‌ت‌ا‌ی‌ا بقایان بلند غود تبت نیست؟ چرا ی‌ب‌و‌ی‌ه‌ا تا‌ی‌ا وج‌ن‌ام‌ه‌ا بودا را در هند بوجود آورده‌اند، پس چرا امروز سرمزمین به‌ن‌ت‌ا‌ی‌ا بقایان بلند غود تبت نیست؟ چرا ی‌ب‌و‌ی‌ه‌ا تا‌ی‌ا وج‌ن‌ام‌ه‌ا بودا را در هند بوجود آورده‌اند، پس چرا امروز سرمزمین به‌ن‌ت‌ا‌ی‌ا بقایان بلند غود تبت نیست؟ چرا ی‌ب‌و‌ی‌ه‌ا تا‌ی‌ا وج‌ن‌ام‌ه‌ا بودا را در هند بوجود آورده‌اند، پس چرا امروز سرمزمین به‌ن‌ت‌ا‌ی‌ا بقایان بلند غود تبت نیست؟ چرا ی‌ب‌و‌ی‌ه‌ا تا‌ی‌ا وج‌ن‌ام‌ه‌ا بودا را در هند بوجود آورده‌اند، پس چرا امروز سرمزمین به‌ن‌ت‌ا‌ی‌ا بقایان بلند غود تبت N

Sample text from Xaṭṭ-e sumkā (p. 8-9)
مثال:

وسلطان محمود مردي منصب بود دروازاین تخلیط برگرفت

و اسماعيل پیامبر زاده مهدی دوست روبروی سنجر

 شد و گذارمه رنگ و برابر فناعی پیروز و آن سیم مینا حسی و

 فناعی فرم کرد سیاست محمود دانست شب ازغزین برگفت و به ی

 یدکان امسیل وران پدر ازرفت و نوردید و شمه درخانه اوروار

 یور تالابان منصور به طوس رسیده و با زکاتندوچون فردوسی ایبن

 یور ازهري روز به طوس نهاد و فانسانه برگرفت و به طبرستانه هد

 یور ریگ سیبی بیک شریارکازال باوندطربرستان پادشاه اوپرود و آل

 یوران آیداست برک نیست اشکان به یورفرید شریار پیرند پس محمود

 یور اهمکیکرد در دیباجه بینه صد بر شریار خواند و گفت من این

 کتاب را ازمان محمود با نام تور خواه کرد که این کتاب همه اخبار

 و آناد جدید نست شریار ماهرا بنواخت و به کویها فرصت

 نظامی عروضی


-13-

Sample text from Xaft-e sumkā (p. 13)
2. Some examples of modification proposals

2.1 Āshuri’s proposal

Āshuri presents his proposal in two articles, “Čand pišnahād dar bāreh-ye raveš-e negāreš va xaṭṭ-e fārsi” (Some proposals on orthographic rules in Persian) from 1365 and “Čand pišnahād-e digar barāye eslāh-e xaṭṭ-e fārsi: jodānevisi va sarham-nevisi” (Some additional proposals for the modification of Persian orthography: unbound and bound writing) form 1375, and writes that the omission of the redundant Arabic letters amounts to an alphabet reform, and that he is not in favor of an alphabet reform. The main point of focus in Āshuri’s first article is on vowels. He maintains that there are several problematic characters in Persian orthography that need to be dealt with:

A. The first problematic character in Persian orthography is alef, which, followed by other letters, can mark the vowels /a/, /e/, /u/, /o/ or /i/. He proposes the following:

1) \(\text{ا} (=a), \text{ا} (=e), \text{ا} (=o)\). The diacritics zebar, zir, and piš can be used as well, provided that they are displayed in all positions, but experience shows that these diacritics tend to be omitted. It is therefore wiser to introduce diacritics that are a part of the letter.

2) As far as \(\text{i/}i/\) and \(\text{u/}u/\) are concerned, they can be kept as they are.

B. The second problematic character is vāv \(<\text{س}>\), which can be used for displaying /o/ in the medial and final positions, /u/ as well as diphthong /aw/ or /ow\(^{187}\). He proposes the following:

1) \(\text{j} \) for displaying the short vowel /o/

\(\text{Vāv-e 'af} \) ‘conjunctive /o/” should also be written as \(\text{j}\)

2) \(\text{j} \) for displaying /u/.

In unfamiliar words in which there is a risk for confusing it with the consonant \(\text{j} /v/\), the character \(\text{j}\) can be used, e.g. ‘Dubcheck’, ‘بولووار’, ‘boulevard’.

3) \(\text{y} \) for displaying the diphthong /ow/ or /aw/ in medial position and \(\text{y} \) in initial position

Subsequently, the characters for displaying vowels in the initial, medial, and final position will be as follows:

\[\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{ā} = \text{ا} & \text{a} = \text{ا} & \text{e} = \text{ا} & \text{o} = \text{ا} & \text{i} = \text{ا} & \text{u} = \text{ا} & \text{aw} = \text{ا} & \text{ow} = \text{ا} & \text{ow} or \text{aw} = \text{ا} \\
\end{array}\]

\(^{187}\) The diphthongs are presented as /aw/ and /ow/ by Āshuri.
C. The third character is what is usually called kasreh-ye ezāfeh, which is a "character" or "word" for indicating the genitive construction. Āshuri maintains that, whatever the name, the omission of this character in writing is one of the major shortcomings of Persian orthography. He then presents different ways of displaying this character in older Persian manuscripts and in Middle Persian. In order to make it easier to read, he proposes this character to be displayed exclusively as follows:

1. Kasreh-ye ezāfeh should be displayed by the current character خ، e.g. سرﺪآب 'cold water'.
2. In cases it is pronounced as /ye/, it should be written as ي together with kasreh), e.g. موي من 'my hair'.
3. As ي after final –e or hā-ye  ġeyr-e malfuţ, e.g. خانه ي من xāneh-ye man 'my house'.
4. In cases where the word ends in /i/, kasreh-ye ezāfeh should be displayed only by خً، e.g. كشافژي ایران kešāvarzi-ye irān 'Iran’s agriculture’. Another alternative is to invent a new character، that can be used even after hā-ye  ġeyr-e malfuţ, provided that it will not be confused with a hamze followed by a kasreh خً.

D. The fourth character is the ي، which displays both indefinite /i/ and adjectival and substantival /i/. Āshuri proposes the indefinite /i/ to be displayed as ي and other /i/s as يً.

In the second article, Āshuri deals mainly with bound and unbound writing and recommends unbound writing especially for personal endings of the verb بودن، namely (اند ایم است آی ام) and also for possessive pronoun endings (شان تان مان اش ات ام).
2.2 Aḥmad Ḫāmi’s proposal

In his treatise Xaṭṭ-e fārsi (Persian script), Ḫāmi (1349) explains why he is against an alphabet reform, and presents some recommendations for teaching the Persian alphabet to beginners, children as well as adults. In order to make it easier to read and write without changing the present appearance of the script, he presents the following recommendations:

1. To avoid writing Persian words with specifically Arabic letters, e.g. تهران instead of طهران, سد instead of صد ‘hundred’.
2. To display ه-ye ġeyr-e malfuţ, the final -e, by ﻪ and ﻪ, e.g. نه na[h] ‘no’, زنده zendeh[h] ‘alive’, and the consonant /h/ by ﻪ and ﻪ, e.g. آگاه āgāh ‘conscious’, بهتر behtar ‘better’.
3. To display the consonant /y/ by ﻞ, namely without dots and the vowel /i/ by ﻢ, namely with dots, e.g. ﻪار yār ‘beloved’ respectively دیدن didan ‘to see’.
4. To display the long vowel /ā/ in all positions as ﻪ, e.g. آرام ārām ‘calm’, تنها tanhā ‘alone’.
5. To display the consonant /v/ as ﻪ and the vowel /u/ with a dot above, e.g. پرور آنه parvāneh ‘butterfly’ respectively زود zud ‘soon’.

2.3 Dehnād’s proposal

Two pages written in Dehnād’s proposed script are published in Ketābšenāsi-ye zabān va xaṭṭ by Golbon (2536), but the principles governing the proposal are not presented. Here I will try to both figure out and present the principles as much as the written sample allows me to do so. In cases in which no example is found in the text, I assume the general principle to be valid.

The main concern for Dehnād seems to be the underrepresentation of vowels and the use of one letter for displaying several phonemes. He then tries to overcome these shortcomings in Persian orthography either by using the already present diacritics or by adding or incorporating some new diacritics into the letters as follows:

/æ/ (initial) = ﻪ. In the word ألاهازرات a’lāhzrat ‘your majesty’, in which the initial < ﻪ > is followed by < ﻪ>, the initial /æ/ is displayed as ﻪ, perhaps for stressing the presence of a glottal stop. The diacritic in medial position is not displayed consistently.

/ε/ (initial) = ﻪ, /ε/ (medial/final) = a short vertical or oblique line incorporated in the letter, e.g. توسط کارشناسان tavașot-e kāršenāsān ‘by expertise’ and آرقام رسمی arqām-e rasmi ‘official statistic’.
/l/ (initial) = ٍ/، /l/ (medial/final) = َلـ، e.g. مَرْدُ ‘people’ and يُوْنَسُكَ ‘UNESCO’.
/u/ (initial) = ٍ/وـ، /u/ (medial/final) = ُوـ، e.g. وُجُودُ ‘There is no example of an initial /u/.
/أ/ (initial) = َأـ، /أ/ (medial/final) = ْأـ، e.g. أَنْهَا ‘those’, بِبَسَوَادَانِ ‘illiterates’, and سَازْمَانِ ‘organization’.
/ل/ (initial) = َلـ، /ل/ (medial/final) = ْلـ، e.g. أَيْنَ ‘in’, چَنَّینِ ‘such’, َوِ جَوْدُ ‘and rasmi ‘official’.
/ي/ (initial) = َيـ، /ي/ (medial/final) = ْيـ، e.g. مِلْيُونَ ‘million’ and جَامِعَهِ ‘today’ society’.
/أو/ = ِوـ، e.g. مُورَدُ ‘case’.
/أ/ = َ، e.g. مَعْنِوَيِ ‘spiritual’.
/ه/ = َهـ، e.g. فِرْهنِگَيِ ‘cultural’, فِيْنَفْسِ ‘in itself’.
Hamzeh will be displayed by َ in all positions, e.g. مَسْأَلَ ‘issues’, مَسْأَلَهُ ‘issue’, مَسْأَلَ ‘responsible’. After Hاَ-يَهَ-يَهَ-يَهَ-يَهَ, the genitive will be displayed by َي instead of َء. Words with a known historical spelling, e.g. xَإْسَأْنَ ‘to want’ will be written as xُأْسَأْنَ. خِوَاَسَتَنَ ‘to want’ will be written as xُأْسَأْنَ.
وحضرت و مراجع مسئول دولتی یک کشورمان نیز کامل متوحیم مهم‌ترین آن بوده و حضور جهانی به دست آمده می‌شود.
این موضوع مسئله مبارزه جهانی با بی‌سوادی و منظور نجات صدها میلیون نفر آن قرار جامعه انسانی آمیخته است.
که در حال حاضر داستان آن‌هاست.
آن‌ها می‌توانند با ارسال این پیام وامید ردد نزدیکی یک
تشکیل کنترل عمومی یک سازمان سرپرستی و عاملی و
فرهنگی یک سازمان محل متشدد (بی‌سوادی) و دو بخش اجلاسیه به
سازمان محل متشدد که مسئول مربوط به طرح و اجرای
برنامه‌های مبارزه می‌باشد. با بی‌سوادی آزمایش‌های
آن‌ها می‌کنند که با وجود تمام مسائل مختل یک سیسی
و بین‌المللی که در آن‌ها جزئی کار سازمان محل
متشدد قرار دارد هم مسئله‌ای آزمایش مهم‌ترین واقعی
آن و آر نظر تأثیر مستقیم آن در ضرورت جامعه
بی‌سواد و در ساختار خانواده یک برگ و سعادت‌آمیز انسانی
هزار میلیون بیسواد

یکطوریکه آن علاقه حضرت (حضرت) اطلاع دارند

آرمان رسمی که توسعت کارشناسان پیونسک تهیه شده به تعداد
بیسوادان را در چاره‌های امور زیبایی به پیش آن بک هزار
میلیون براورد کرده‌است.

تاکه این رقم فقط کشورهایی را شامل می‌شود که در دوران آنها
اطلاعات لازم کسب‌شده‌است و شک نیست که در این
اطلاعات تمکینی، این رقم را بی‌میزانی بالا خاک‌برد، و وجود
چنین آمار و حشطناکی در نفسها به پک مدرک محکم می‌باشد.

اخلاصاً برای بقیه‌ی مردم جهان، بخیر ممکن

کسا نیست که دن پرتو شرایط و عوامل مساعد امکان
برخورداری از همین بیسواد و در نتیجه نه بهربرداری آر
تام امکانات مادی و معنوی ی به‌تسدیم‌آموزی به‌نشر

One pages of text written in Dehnād’s proposed orthography
3. Some examples of alphabets which combine elements from different scripts

The first proposed alphabet for Persian in which elements from the Roman and the Cyrillic alphabet were combined was Tāza alifbā, by Ākhundzādeh, which has already been presented in chapter 5. Arasṭā’s proposal is another example of this category.

3.1 Arasṭā’s proposal

One page written in Arasṭā’s proposed script is published in Ketābšenāsi-ye zabān va xatṭ by Golbon (2536), but the guiding principles are not presented. As far as the sample text shows, a one-to-one correspondence between the phonemes and letters seems to be the main principle. The basis of the alphabet is Roman letters, both capital and non-capital letters. In order to avoid digraphs and diacritics in the script, Persian letters are adopted, e.g. <س> for displaying <ش>, and <ح> for displaying <ج>. Arasṭā’s alphabet can be summarized as follows:

Vowels

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ا} &= A \\
\text{ا} &= a \\
\text{ب} &= E \\
\text{ی} &= e \\
\text{ی} &= i/I \\
\text{ی} &= u
\end{align*}
\]

Consonants

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ب} &= B \\
\text{پ} &= n \\
\text{ت} &= t \\
\text{س} &= s \\
\text{ج} &= J \\
\text{ح} &= H \\
\text{خ} &= X/X \\
\text{د} &= D \\
\text{ظ} &= Z \\
\text{ط} &= Z \\
\text{غ} &= Q/q \\
\text{ز} &= K/k \\
\text{س} &= w \\
\text{ی} &= y
\end{align*}
\]
bar draxt nejest dar rahi.
ke az an migezast ru'ahi.
rubahe ner frib hilat saz.
raft naye draxte kard awaz
geft bah bah ce qadr ziba'1
toe sar'i! toe demi! ajab na'1.
nare balat siah range qa'ang
nist balatar az siah rang.
gar xe-awaz budie xe-xan,
nabedi behtar az te dar merqan
zag mixast qar qar kenad,
ta ke awaza-2 a-e kar kenad
temah eftad cen dahan begejud,
rubahak jaste te'ma ra berebud.

اندرزهای پزشکی

ANDarzHayE mezEki
mawazebat az xara-sa ha wa beridagiha.
agar qesmati az badane ensan beridagi ya xara-nayda kard mesameha wa qeflat
nabayad nemud wa nabayad kesafat wa

Sample text written in Arasṭā’s proposed alphabet (Gobon 1977: [30])
4. Some examples of entirely new invented scripts for Persian

4.1 Āshtiyāni’s alphabet

In *Ketābšenāsi-ye zabān va xaṭṭ* (2536:34), Golbon presents one page of the treatise *Resāleh-ye nou* (The new treatise) with Āshtiyāni’s alphabet. Some of the letters are inspired by Roman and Persian letters, but most of them are new. He proposes a double consonant instead of *tašdid*. The alphabet is as follows:

![Image of the alphabet]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ</td>
<td>New letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 The *Malkomi* alphabet by Mirzā Malkom Khān.

In his treatise *Nemuneh-ye xaṭṭ-e Ādamiyyat*, from 1886, Mirzā Malkom Khān presented the guiding principles of the *Malkomi* alphabet, which is an Arabic-based alphabet. The first principle of the *Malkomi* alphabet is unbound writing of letters. The second principle is to display the diacritics which represent short vowels. He chooses to replace *fatḥeh* and *kasreh* with short straight lines above and beneath the letters. The third principle is to modify the shape of the letters in such a way so that they can easily be distinguished from each other. The difference between the letters should not be limited to the dots (Mirzā Malkom Khān 1381:403-404). Two pages of text written in the *Malkomi* alphabet from:

a. Malkom Khān (1381:427)
در علامَتم تانه لته بر خطر ما بیان فذاید
و مر ناکامی لته بخوانید ای حرف دیو مان
لهم پیچید باید اورول سنجید لته ای
مطابق اصول ان سه قاعده فسه ما نه،
در ایا دار اسلام بدول و اهدام دار بخواه
خواندن خوابید شهد یا نه، اگر عمل
شما مطابق قواعد موضعه نیسته پس
مک که عینی تانه بر عیوب فیضی افزوده ایت
و اگر اختراع شما بان قواعد مطابقه است
امام اذ یزایی در میورد ر استعمال ان
مچ مدهن در زدرا و منشنی دنی ما یاید
پنگشینندگ در درس تانه یاد بکررند
یاقین بدانید لته خیال شما مرکز عفونی
و روزایی نخواهد داشت.
4.3 Ākhundzādeh’s proposal

ākhundzādeh’s proposal is also based on the Arabic alphabet. The main principles include bound writing of letters, elimination of the dots, and insertion of the vowels into the script. He revised this alphabet several times. He finally gave up the idea of reforming the Arabic-based alphabet, and designed an alphabet based on a mixture of Roman and Cyrillic letters (presented in chapter 5). It must be noted that Ākhundzādeh created this alphabet for all Arabic-based alphabets in the Islamic world. The shapes of the letters, especially the letters displaying the vowels, are slightly different depending on the language, but the principles are not always clearly formulated in the treatise. I have therefore extracted the characters proposed for Persian vowels from the sample text as follows:

Vowels: a=ались e=ا e=ا o=ا i=ی u=و

Consonants are presented in his treatise *Alefbā-ye jadid va maktubāt* (Ākhundof 1963:11-13) as follows:
یک صفحه از نگارش آخوندزاده در فرهنگمنزل، و در مجموع، نویسنده دیگری در سال ۱۹۶۳ (آخوندزاده ۱۹۶۳: ۳۰)
4.4 Zabiḥ Behruz’s natural alphabet

As was mentioned in chapter 5, the letters of the alphabet are shaped according to the manner and place of articulation of sounds in the vocal tract as follows (Behruz 1363a:14-16):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>宰</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>王</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>君</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>君</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>君</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>君</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>君</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>君</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>君</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Chart showing the natural alphabet]
4.5 Jebre’il A’lāyi’s proposal
The alphabet is presented in Golbon (2536:30).
پرسشنامه شماره 1

1. نام و نام خانوادگی (در صورت تمایل)؟
2. سن؟
3. محل زندگی: ایران؟ خارج از کشور؟
4. مدت اقامت خارج از کشور؟
5. تاریخ تقریبی شروع فعالیت فرهنگی؟
6. کمبودهای خط فارسی از نظر شما چیست؟
7. آیا با تغییر خط فارسی به لاتین موافقت هستید؟ آگر آری چرا؟ اگر خیر چرا؟
8. آگر موافقت اصلاح خط در چهارچوب الفبای فارسی فکر می‌کنید، دانشنامه این اصلاحات به نظر شما تا کجا باید باشد:
الف. طراحی نشان‌های جدید برای نماش مصوت‌های کوتاه مثل -ث-, -ز-؟
ب. وارد کردن نشان‌های اضافه؟
ج. حذف حروف عربی چندگانه برای نماش یک صدا، برای مثال حذف ص، ث، و حفظ می‌شوند شما؟
د. پیشنهاد شما؟
9. آیا برای برخورد به کمبودهای خط فارسی پیشنهاد دیگری دارید (برای مثال استفاده از خط اواستایی یا طراحی خطی کاملاً جدید)؟
10. آیا شما در کارتنان رسمالخط خودتان را اعمال می‌کنید؟ و یا اینکه تصمیم در مورد رسمالخط را به ناشر می‌سپارید؟
11. بنیان رسمالخط شما کدامیک از جنگ‌های زیر است؟ پوستخویی؟ جدایی؟ بی‌فصلخویی؟ ترکیبی از همه؟
12. محبت کنید و نظرتان را در مورد طرح پیشنهادی شما به نویسنده بفرستید.
سیاسی تجربه، حضور، و اثر برای آن‌ها به‌طور کلی گزارش می‌شود. به‌طور کلی، حضور سیاسی در کشورها در کنار تجربه‌ها و اثراتی که بر روی آن‌ها دارد. همچنین، سیاست‌ها و ادراک‌های آن‌ها در کشورها نیز نقش مهمی در تجربه‌های سیاسی دارد. به‌طور کلی، آن‌ها بر روی تجربه‌های سیاسی در کشورها نقش مهمی دارند. در این راستا، سیاست‌های انتخاباتی، سیاست‌های اقتصادی، سیاست‌های اجتماعی و سیاست‌های سیاسی در کشورها به‌طور کلی نقش مهمی دارند. همچنین، سیاست‌های انتخاباتی، سیاست‌های اقتصادی، سیاست‌های اجتماعی و سیاست‌های سیاسی در کشورها به‌طور کلی نقش مهمی دارند. در این راستا، سیاست‌های انتخاباتی، سیاست‌های اقتصادی، سیاست‌های اجتماعی و سیاست‌های سیاسی در کشورها به‌طور کلی نقش مهمی دارند.
هردوات وختری که پررونه رفت به پرگن کرهٔ بیرون‌بودند یکی سی‌سالش می‌شد، باصورت دراز و یک‌مای ورم کرده‌های دندان‌هاش بيرون‌بود. درومی، در سه‌سال گیسکطرو، با موهای بلند و صورت پت و پهن و چشم‌های ریز. هردوچهتار زانی نشسته بودند بر اینها، صورتشان رابی‌گذاشت بهردنده معلوم نیود از سر بی‌خیال‌خی آیا می‌خواستند خودشان را نشان‌می‌دهند. پیرمرد سیگارش را پایه چراغ خاموش کرد و گفت:

«من ناماز مونده، تا شام حاضر بشه، کارامو بپکم و بی‌گروه.»

و به شیر و رفت‌پیرون. من هم خم شدم و سیگارم را پای چراغ خاموش کردم و خودم را جمع و جور کردم و نشستم. منم دانستم چه کار بکنم. و همین‌جوری با انجستانم بازی‌ی می‌کردم که دختر بزر گرگ گفت: 

«خواستون چی چیه؟»

گفت: «باب، دختر وسطی بر سر. چی چیه؟»

و هردو زدن زیر خندن. و گفت: «باب، ابولا، ابولا، سیاد آبوالقاسم.»

دختر بزر گرگ پرسید: «دننه کا نداری؟»

گفت: «بی‌وقت داشتم، عصرشون دادن بهشما.»

دختر وسطی گفت: «خواهر برادر چی؟»

گفت: «ندارد.»

دختر بزر گرگ خشم و آهسته پرسید: «زن، زن و بچه چی؟»

گفت: «زن و بچم ندارم.»

دختر وسطی گفت: «هنوز داماد نشدی؟»

دختر بزر گرگ ادامه داد: «دارد پیر میشی همای»
پرسشنامه شماره 2

1. نام انتشارات

2. تاریخ تأسیس انتشارات

3. آیا در طول این مدت همواره از شیوه‌نامه‌های خاصی برای ویرایش و یک‌دست‌کردن رسم‌الخط کتاب‌های منتشره استفاده کرده‌اید؟

4. اگر از چند شیوه‌نامه مختلف استفاده کرده‌اید، تاریخ تقریبی استفاده از هر یک از شیوه‌نامه‌ها را ذکر بفرمایید. برای مثال: شیوه‌نامه شماره یک از 1342 تا 1350 و الی آخر.

5. برای تصمیم‌گیری در مورد انتخاب و یا تنظیم یک شیوه‌نامه برای یک‌دست‌کردن رسم‌الخط، مرجع‌تان تصمیمات چه ارگانی بوده است؟ آیا مثلاً تصمیمات فرهنگستان زبان ایران را می‌نظر داشته‌اید؟ و یا اینکه خودتان بر اساس پیشنهادات موجود در فضای فرهنگی شیوه‌نامه‌ای را تنظیم کرده‌اید؟

6. آیا در صورت تمایل و یا اتفاقاتی نویسندگی اثر برای حفظ رسم‌الخط شخصی خود، این مسئله را قبول می‌کنید و یا این که همه مقالات ارسالی را بر اساس رسم‌الخط انتشارات ویرایش می‌کنید؟
پرسشنامه شماره 3

1. نام نشریه

2. تاریخ انتشار اولین شماره

3. آیا از شیوه نامه‌های خاصی برای ویرایش و یک‌دست‌کردن رسم‌الخط نشریه‌های روزنامه استفاده می‌کنید؟

4. بروی تصمیم‌گیری در مورد انتخاب و یا تنظیم یک شیوه نامه برای یک‌دست‌کردن رسم‌الخط مرجع‌تان تصمیمات چه ارگانی بوده است؟ آیا مثلا تصمیمات فرهنگستان زبان ایران را می‌نظرداشتید؟ و یا این‌که خودتان بر اساس پیشنهادات موجود در فضای فرهنگی شیوه نامه‌ای را تنظیم کرده‌اید؟

5. آیا در صورت تمایل و یا پاسخ‌گویی‌ی نویسنده‌ی اثر برای حفظ رسم‌الخط شخصی خوده، این مسئله را قبول می‌کنید و یا این که هموار مقادیر ارسالی را بر اساس رسم‌الخط نشریه‌های روزنامه و ویرایش می‌کنید؟
Appendix 3

List of publishing houses, newspapers, and journals who participated in questionnaire surveys I and II:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iranian publishing houses</th>
<th>Date of establishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Āgah</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vistār</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouḥadi</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moʿin</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markaz</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāles</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārnāmeh</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shāludeh</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māzyār</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorush</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshmeh</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿElmi</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morvārid</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behjat</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahuri</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amir Kabir</td>
<td>Around 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tus</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qoqnus</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaṭreh</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers and journals in Iran and outside of Iran</td>
<td>Date of establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daftar-e qalam</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šahrzād</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran-šenāsi</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daftar-e šenaxt</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanješ</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faşlnāmeh-ye honar</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donyā-ye soxan</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gozāreš</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majalleh-ye haftegi-ye sorush</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resālat</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payām-e yunesko</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrār</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daftar-hā-ye kānun-e nevisandegān-e irān[^188]</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārnāmeh</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāmeh-ye farhangstān</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanteh[^189]</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^188]: Earlier published as Nāmeh-ye Kānun.
[^189]: Excluded, as it turned to be in English.
List of books and journals from which the basic data for the corpus investigation is collected. Both books and journals are ordered according to the date of publication.

Books:
Ṣāleḥī, S. ḡ. (1370), Šarḥ-e šoukarān, Tehran: Tehrān.
Cheheltan, A. H. (1371), Digar kāši sedāyām nazad, Tehran: Juyā.
Āqāyi, A., (1372), Šab-e gorg, Tehran: Beh-negār.
Raḩimi, F. (1373), Pāyīz rā farāmuš kon, Tehran: Chakāvak.
Beyzāyi, B. (1374), Hičkāk dar qāb, Tehran: Roshangarān.
Ma‘rūfī, ḡ. (1374), Peykar-e fārāhrd, Tehran: Fākhte.
Zibākalām, Ş. (1375), Moqadameh-ī bar engelāb-e eslāmī, Tehran: Rouzāneh.
Karimān, ḡ. (1375), Pāzuheši dar šāhnāmeh, Tehran: Sāzmān-e asnād-e mellī.
Bahār, M. (1376), Az osṭureh tā tārīx, Tehran: Cheshmeh.
Mandanipur, S. (1377), Šārq-e banafšeh, Tehran: Markaz.

**Journals:**

*Donyā-ye soxan* (1369), no. 32, Tehran.
*Faṣlnāmeh-ye zendehrud* (1371), no. 1, Isfahan.
*Takāpu* (1372), no. 5, Tehran.
*Gardun* (1373), no. 42, Tehran.
*Gozāreš-e film* (1374), no. 64, Tehran.
*Jahān-e ketāb* (1376), no. 21–22, Tehran.
Ādineh (1377), no. 129, Tehran.
*Kārnāmeh* (1378), no. 4, Tehran.
*Ketāb-e māh: Adabīyāt va falsafeh* (1379), no. 1, Tehran.
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Name index

'Abbās Mirzā, 61, 87, 88, 90
'Eshqi, 99
A'lāyi, xi, 137, 226
Abdülmecid, 89, 109
Abu al-Qāsemi, 57, 132, 236
Abu Moslem, 78
Abubakr Rabi' Ebn-e Aḥmad, 80
Ādamiyyat, 98, 219, 236
Adib Solṭāni, 22, 61, 62, 63, 236
Ager, 47, 190, 236
Aḥmadi Birjandi, 159, 236
Ājudāni, 89, 91, 95, 96, 236
Akbar Shāh, 85
Akhundof, 92, 93
Ākhundof, 136, 221, 223, 236
Ākhundzādeh, xi, 18, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 101, 135, 136, 137, 190, 216, 221, 223, 236
Āl Yāsin, 74
al-Abyāri, 240
al-Akhavaini al-Bokhāri, 80
Ālān Barāghushi, 98
al-Balāzori, 79, 237
al-Biruni, 75, 78, 237
Algar, 92, 93, 236
al-Heravi, 76, 80
Ali Paşa, 93
al-Jahshiyārī, 79, 240
al-Madani al-Tatavi, 85, 246
al-Saqqā, 240
al-Zāhedī, 57
Amin al-Douleh, 91, 96, 97
Amir Kabir, 90, 174, 232, 234, 236, 237, 238, 241, 246
Āmuzgār, 74, 236
Andersson, 71, 236
Ange de Saint Joseph, 87
Ārām, 116
Arasṭā, xi, 135, 216, 217
Arberry, 60, 236
Arfa’ al-Douleh, 98
Aristotle, 39
Āryanpur, 87, 88, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 103, 106, 108, 109, 163, 168, 191, 236
Āshīyāni, xi, 137, 218
Āshuri, xi, 118, 210, 211, 236
Āşi, 120
Atatürk, 13, 109, 110, 191, 192
Āzād Marāqheh-i, 108
Āzādarmaki, 89, 237
Badreh-i, 111, 112, 113, 114, 237
Bahār, 73, 74, 99, 105, 112, 234, 237
Bahmanyār, 15, 61, 112, 113, 114, 174, 175, 183, 237
Bailey, 57, 237
Bal’ami, 60
Balây, 88, 96, 237
Baron Louis de Norman, 88
Bāṭeni, 25, 120, 237
Begshlu Qazvini, 98
Behnām, 88, 89, 90, 91, 99, 100, 237
Behnud, 110, 237
Behruz, xi, 75, 94, 114, 141, 184, 224, 237
Berry, 32, 36, 39, 51, 237
Bloomfield, 31, 68, 237
Bolinger, 34, 36, 237
Borjyān, 119, 237
Boyce, 54, 57, 237
Reżā Shāh, 102, 110, 111, 114, 189, 191, 192
Robins, 35, 244
Roushangar, 122, 244
Rudaki, 60
Rypka, 57, 73, 74, 75, 76, 112, 244
Sachau, 78, 237
Sadeghi, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, 244
Ṣādeqi, 116
Ṣadiq, 113, 244
Ṣadiqi, 76, 78, 244
Ṣafā, 60, 244
Ṣaffār, 115, 116, 244
Ṣaffārzādeh, 116
Ṣāleḥ Ebn-e 'Abd al-Raḥmān, 79
Ṣamareh, 62, 244
Sami’i Gilāni, 116
Sami’i Gilāni, 112, 114, 115, 159, 163, 168, 244
Sampson, 26, 30, 31, 50, 52, 244
Ṣan’ati, 18, 119, 120, 244
Sarkārāti, 116
Sarkuhi, 120
Saussure, 28, 29, 30, 31, 36, 39, 40, 245
Savin, 44, 245
Ṣayyāḥi, 240
Shafi’i, 120, 159, 245
Shafi’i Kadkani, 120
Shalaby, 240
Shāmlu, 120, 134, 163, 168, 234, 245
Shāpur, 57
Sheybāni, 122, 245
Sho’är, 159, 163, 168, 245
Sjoberg, 41, 51, 245
Ṣabari, 60
Ṭabāṭabāyi, 116
Ṭabrizi, 85, 87, 95, 96, 98, 99, 246
Tafazzoli, 54, 57, 74, 116, 236
Ṭāhereh, 116
Ṭalbot, 77, 245
Ṭālebof, 91, 98, 103, 245
Taqizadeh, xi, 74, 75, 87, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 199, 245
Tauli, 47, 48, 49, 245
Trost, 145, 146, 245
Ṭusi, 76, 116
Uldall, 36, 245
Utas, 11, 55, 59, 61, 69, 73, 76, 245
Vachek, 28, 29, 31, 36, 37, 38, 40, 45, 246
Venezky, 35, 246
Windfuhr, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 246
Yāḥaqqi, 159, 246
Yāsami, 105, 108, 112
Yusef Ebn-e 'Omar, 78
Yusefi, 116
Zādān, 39, 79
Zamakhshari, 57
Zarathustra, 54
Zhirkov, 106