

INTRODUCTION.

1. For the earliest information about Ormuri (*Ōrmu'ri*) or Baraki we are indebted to Babur, who is also the first to mention Parachi. The passages in his Memoirs which refer to 'Bereki' have been quoted above (p. 3).

The first European scholar who is aware of the existence of the 'Vurmúd' tribe in 'Cánigúram' and the 'Barki' language is Leyden¹. Elphinstone writes in his 'Account of the Kingdom of Caubul'²: "The next class of Taujiks are the Burrukees, who inhabit Logur and part of Boot-Khauk. Though mixed with the Ghiljies, they differ from the other Taujiks, in as much as they form a tribe under chiefs of their own, and have a high reputation as soldiers.³ They have separate lands and castles of their own, furnish a good many troops to government, closely resemble the Afghauns in their manners, and are more respected than the other Taujiks. Their number are now about eight thousand families. All traditions agree that they were introduced into their present seats by Sooltaun Mahmood about the beginning of the eleventh century, and that their lands were once extensive; but their origin is uncertain; they pretend to be sprung from the Arabs, but other say that they are descended from the Kurds or Coords."

¹ Asiatic Researches, XI, pp. 363 ff., London 1812.

² I, p. 411.

³ Till recent times the Logaris have been reckoned among the best soldiers in the Afghan army.

Burnes¹ mentions "the Burukee or Kanigrammee spoken by the people of Logur", which "has an affinity to Persian, although those using it claim a descent from Arabia, and assert that they entered the country with Sultan Mahmood".

2. According to Leech² "there are two divisions of the tribe, the Barakis of Ràjân in the province of Lohgad, who speak Persian, and the Barakis of *Barak*, a city near the former, who speak the language called Barakî". Some of them settled in Kanigram in the country of the Waziris, and "the Barakis of this place and of Barak alone speak the Barakî language". "We receive a warning from the study of their vocabulary, not to be hasty in referring [?] the origin of a people merely from the construction of their language; for it is well known that the one now instanced was invented by Mir Yúzúf who led the first Barakis from *Yemen* into Afghanistan" (in the times of Mahmud of Ghazni). Raverty³, too, mentions the tradition about the Arab descent of the 'Bárakais'.

3. Bellew⁴ quotes a tradition according to which the Orakzai, Afridi, Mangal, Waziri, Khatak and Khogiani tribes of the Pathans are of Ormuri origin. The Ormurs are described as having been fire-worshippers, and as observing peculiar religious ceremonies. Once a week they congregated for worship, men and women together, and at the conclusion of their devotions the officiating priest extinguished the fire they worshipped, and, at the same time, exclaimed "Or mur", a term expressive of the act, for in Pukhtû "or" (*ôr*) means "fire", and "mur" (*mər*) means "dead", "extinct".

In 'An Inquiry into the Ethnography of Afghanistan'⁵ Bellew identifies the Barakis with the Barkaians, who according to Herodotus were transported "from the far distant Libya to the village in Kunduz of Bactria" (!), and he finds support for this theory in a

¹ Cabool, p. 269.

² JASB, VII, pp. 727, ff., quoted in LSI, X, 123.

³ JASB, XXXIII, pp. 267 ff., quoted in LSI, I, c.

⁴ Journal of a Mission to Afghanistan in 1857, p. 63 f. Cf. also *Târtî-i Murassa'*, Kalid-i-Afghani, p. 222.

— misunderstood — passage from Arrian. Of greater interest is Bellew's statement that the Barakis "besides their head quarters in Kunduz and Logar, have settlements in Butkhak, and at Kani-goram in the Vaziri country, and on the Hindu Kush, about Bamian and Ghorband districts". "Amongst themselves", he continues, "the Baraki use a peculiar dialect, which is more of a Hindi language than anything else, to judge from the few words I have met with". "They are a fine, tall, and active people, with fairer complexions than the generality of Afghans, and are held in consideration as a respectable people. They have no place in Afghan genealogies by that name, being generally reckoned along with the Tajik population". Bellew derives the ruling tribe of 'Bārakzi' in Afghanistan from the Baraki.

4. Among the authors mentioned above Leech and Raverty are the only ones who have given short vocabularies of the language (the Logar dialect); Leech has also given a few sentences with translation. Most of the words in Raverty's vocabulary are copied from Leech.

5. The first fuller description of the language is that given by Sir George Grierson in the *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*¹, and subsequently in the *Linguistic Survey of India*.² His account deals with the Kaniguram (Waziristan) dialect, and is based chiefly on Ghulam Muhammad Khan's *Qawāid-e Bargistā* supplemented by material furnished by British officials in Waziristan. My indebtedness to these works, both in their descriptive and in their etymological parts, is so great that it has been impossible to acknowledge it in each case in the following pages. I may be permitted to testify once for all how much every page of the following account of Ormuri owes to Sir George's lucid survey of the grammatical system of the language and of its affinities.

6. Our knowledge of the Logar dialect of Ormuri being limited to Leech's and Raverty's short vocabularies, I tried during my stay

in Kabul in 1924 to get into touch with Ormurs from this valley. To begin with I was told by people who knew the Logar valley well that Baraki was no longer spoken in Barak-i Barak, the ancient headquarters of the Ormur tribe. Even a man said to be from this village denied the existence of any other language than Persian and Pashto in his native place. After some difficulty I got hold of a young man from Barak-i Barak, who, though not an Ormur himself knew something about the language. The information he could give me was very limited; but it proved on the whole to be fairly correct, and the vocabulary which I got out of him included a few evidently genuine Ormuri words which my second informant did not seem to recollect.

In the beginning of August, just at the moment when I had arranged to go to Barak-i Barak myself, news was received in Kabul that the insurrection had spread to Logar and that the rebels from Khost had crossed the Altimur Pass and entered the valley. But in spite of these difficulties the Afghan Foreign Office managed to fetch an old man, Dīn Muhammad by name, from Barak-i Barak to Kabul. He worked with me for about a week, but could not be induced to stay longer away from his home.

7. Dīn Muhammad said that he was one of the few persons in Barak-i Barak still speaking pure Ormuri, and this statement agreed fairly well with what had been told me by my first informant. According to the LSI,¹ the Ormurs now occupy some four or five hundred houses in Kaniguram. At Butkhak, about ten miles east of Kabul, people said that they belonged to the Ormur tribe; but they all spoke Pashto, and I met with no one there who knew any Ormuri. The Ormurs living in the Khalsa Pargana of the Nowshehra Tahsil in the Peshawar district² are also all of them Pashto-speaking. I did not hear anything about Ormurs living in Ghorband, Bamian or Kunduz (cf. Bellew, quoted above), and I think it is at

¹ X, p. 123.

² Called *Urmars* in the Gazetteer of the Peshawar District, 1883—84, pp. 103, 106, 114.

any rate very improbable that they have preserved their original language.

8. Dīn Muhammad was not acquainted with *Bargistā*¹ as a name for his own language, which he called *Ōrmu'ri*. According to him the Ormur tribe are Sayyids and are descended from the two brothers *Mir-i Barak* and *Mir-i Barakāt*, who came from *Bar-yaman* (Yemen) into Turkistan, the former being buried in *Anzōi* (Andkhui), and the latter in Mazar-i Sharif. *Mir Yūzūf* (cf. Leech quoted above, 2) was the son of *Mir-i Barakāt*.

9. I do not think the traditions about the Arab or Kurdish descent of the Ormurs quoted above are much more valuable than those which make the Pathans Israelites, the Baloches Syrians, the Ōzbin Pashais Quraishis from Mekka, the Chitralis descendants of Alexander's deported prisoners, the Bashgali Kafirs the poorer brethren of the Englishmen, the *nimča* tribes of Kunar Germans, or the Gurkhas and Burmese Hazaras.² Nor is the tradition rendered more credible by being connected with Mahmud of Ghazni. Solomon, Alexander, Ali and Mahmud are the four historical personages to whom popular fancy generally attributes all important events of the past. The tradition about the Ormurs being Kurds, mentioned by Elphinstone, cannot be reconciled with the one which makes them Arabs from Yemen, and cannot be upheld without the support of linguistic facts, a question which will be discussed below.

It is, however, very probable that the tradition of their having emigrated to Kaniguram in Waziristan from Barak-i Barak is true. The names *Baraki* and *Bargistā* seem to indicate that Barak was their old, if not original, home.

Nor is it impossible that there may be a nucleus of truth in the statement that they were 'fire-worshippers' till comparatively recent

¹ Cf. LSI, X, p. 123.

² This "tradition" was probably invented on the spot by my Pathan servant in order to explain the similarity between the Hazaras and those Mongoloid peoples which he knew from his service in the Indian army. According to him Mahmud of Ghazni had conquered the whole of India, and had settled Hazaras in Burma and Nepal!

times. And it is interesting to note that Ormuri is the only modern Ir. dialect, which has preserved the ancient technical term of Zoroastrian theology for "studying", "reading."¹ The account of the extinguishing of lamps at their religious festivals, reminds us of the slanders told about Yezidis, Druses and other sects of Western Asia, and need not have any foundation in fact. And the etymology of the word *Ōrmur* suggested by Bellew (3) seems rather fanciful.²

10. In connexion with these traditions regarding the "lamp-extinguishing" ceremonies of the Ormurs, it is well worth noticing that the only member of this tribe who has played any rôle in history, was the famous arch heretic *Bāyazid Anşāri*, the *Pir Rōšan* ('The Saint of Light') of his own adherents, and the *Pir Tārik* ('The Saint of Darkness') of his opponents. According to the *Makhzan-ul-Islām*³ Bayazid was an Ormur (*Wurmar*) from Kaniguram. And, according to Leyden⁴, the famous and important sect founded by him was accused "of practising the abominations of the unchaste sect termed Cherāgh-cush" ('Lamp-Extinguishers'). It seems quite possible that the heretical tendencies of Bayazid were based in some way on religious traditions and practices peculiar to his native tribe.⁵

¹ V. Voc. s.v. *aw*.

² In Rep. p. 16 I proposed to explain *Ōrmur* as a Psht. form, derived from **ārya-myŷya*. *ārya* would, however, probably result in Psht. **ār*, not in **ōr*. — The Ormurs of Logar call the Afghans *Kās* (Kaniguram pl. *kāst* "the Wazirs"). The *š* in this word may be derived from **s(t)r*, **xšy*, **fšy*. Is there any possibility that the original form is **Kāfšya*, connected with *Kapishā*, etc. (cf. Sylvain Lévi, *JA*, 1923, p. 52 f.)?

³ British Museum, Or. Mscr. 6274, f. 117 v.; India Office Mscr. 2792, f. 187 a; Dorn, *Chrestomathy of the Pushtū Language*. p. 22.

⁴ l. c. p. 378.

⁵ In London in 1926 I had an opportunity, through the courtesy of Sir E. Denison Ross, to examine a unique manuscript of Bayazid's theological work, the *Xair-ul-Bayān*, which had been supposed to be lost. The manuscript was written by *Bahār Tūst*, a disciple of Bayazid, and was finished on Wednesday the 20th of *Ramazan*, A.H. 1061 (A.D. 1650). This book is the oldest Psht. work extant, and presents many interesting orthographic and linguistic peculiarities. But the language

11. The Ormuri of Kaniguram (Waziristan) and the Ormuri of Barak-i Barak (Logar) are two distinct dialects, the Kaniguram form being, generally speaking, the more archaic.

Regarding phonetics one of the most important points of difference between the two dialects is that Log. has preserved *š* (< *sr*, *str*, *xšy*, *šy* etc.), *ž* which has become *s*, *z* in K.; e. g. Log. *γwāši* "grass": K. *γwāsi*, Log. *rōž* "day": K. *ryüz*; cf. 54, 57. On the other hand Log. has given up the distinction between K. *š* and *šʳ*; e. g. Log. *šō* "3", *šū* "6": K. *šʳē*, *šʳh*; cf. 60. In loan-words we find *š* in both dialects e. g. in Log. *šāsta*, K. *šāista* "pretty", *š* in both dialects in Log. *šaitān*, K. *šaitān* "devil" etc.; but e. g. Log. *šār*, K. *šōr* "town", Log. *ušyār*, K. *hušyār* "wise". This variation depends on the date of the borrowing and whether its source is Prs. or some Psht. dialect. — Log. *širwā*, K. *širwā* "soup" must be an ancient loan-word from Prs. *šōrwā*, *šōrbā*. — K. *ž* has resulted in Log. *g* (v. 65). Regarding the occasional change of *s* < *c* in K. cf. 69; regarding the dropping of *h* in Log., and the prothetic *h* of K. v. 74. Note Log. *g* "to seize" < K. *gl*. (v. Voc. s.v.).

The vowel system of Log. makes a less original impression than that of K., owing chiefly to the frequent change of *a* into *u* (v. 27). It seems probable that K. *ā* has been changed into Log. *ā* (cf. 29) through the influence of Afghan Prs.

12. The morphological system of Log. has been very much simplified. The geographical position of the two dialects renders it very natural that this should be so. K. is spoken by a comparatively strong community in an isolated part of the rugged Waziristan hills, surrounded only by culturally and socially unimportant Psht. dialects. Log., on the other hand, is a dialect that is rapidly dying-out; the Ormurs of Logar inhabit a broad, open valley, not far

conforms in the main to ordinary literary Psht., which is based chiefly on the Mohmand and Yunsfai dialects. We find very few traces of any influence of the Waziri dialect. Note, however, the word *taštan* "master, husband". Lorimer gives *taštan* as the Waziri form of the word; but Orm. of Kaniguram has *taštan*, a form which is evidently borrowed from the local Waziri dialect of this village.

from Kabul, are in constant contact with Persian-speaking neighbours, and for several generations have served extensively in the Afghan army.¹ No wonder, then, that Log. has lost the distinction of gender (v. 81), has simplified the formation of the plural of nouns (v. 82), and has reduced the number of irregular past participles (v. 123). The system of contracted pronouns (v. 102) is also much simpler in Log. than in K., and the use of the particles *aī* and *dī* has been discarded on account of its intricacies.² Regarding the termination of the aorist 2 sg. v. 118. I have been able to detect one instance only of greater morphological archaism in Log., viz. the preservation of the aorist 1 sg. in *-im* (v. 120).

13. While K. has borrowed freely from Waziri Psht., the vocabulary of Log. has been influenced by other Psht. dialects, and, to a still greater extent, by Prs.

A number of genuine Orm. words found in K. seem to be missing in Log., although it is of course possible that they may, after all, exist in the dialect.

We find e. g.:

K. <i>hōnd</i> "blind":	Log. <i>kōr</i> .
» <i>hiṅs</i> "bear":	» <i>xīrs</i> .
» <i>nōršr</i> (<i>narm</i>) "soft":	» <i>narm</i> .
» <i>pis-</i> "to write":	» <i>nimišta k-</i> .
» <i>rō</i> "iron":	» <i>āin</i> .
» <i>rawas</i> "fox":	» <i>rōbā</i> .
» <i>sikak</i> "hare":	» <i>zargōš</i> .
» <i>šrak</i> "flea":	» <i>kaik</i> .
» <i>tusk</i> (<i>xālī</i>) "empty":	» <i>xālī</i> .
» <i>winjōk</i> "son of a co-wife":	» <i>bačandar</i> .
» <i>xwarinc</i> ^a "right (hand)":	» <i>râst</i> .
» <i>yānak</i> "ashes":	» <i>xākistār</i> .

Cf. also words such as K. *sukal* "porcupine", *pin* "honey", *imbāi* "friends", *hēncčī* "tears", *šramōt* "forgetting" etc., of which

¹ V. 1.

² Cf. LSI, X, p. 219 ff.

I found no corresponding forms in Log. K. *nwastak* "to lie down" was probably discarded because it became Log. **nustuk* and could be confused with *nustuk* "to sit down" < K. *nastak*.

On the other hand we do not find recorded among the words from K. such good Ir. words as Log. *undərəw*- "to sew", *bēs* "rope", *γōš* "snow", *jušp* "span", *kālī* "knife", *mālī* "husband", *mōž*- "to loosen", *nefak* "navel", *ninēk* "salt", *ʹskan* "cow-dung", *pōm* "wool", *šinī* "needle", *zemāk* "winter", *zināk* "chin" etc. The interesting loan-word *grām* "village" is also peculiar to Log. (K. *kʹlai* from Psht.).

14. The dialect of Logar does not seem to have changed very much since Leech published his vocabulary in 1838. The forms found in his vocabulary and collection of sentences, and in the vocabulary published by Raverty, agree very well with those I heard. We find e. g. *she* "1" (Log. *šē*, K. *sō*), *rosh* "day" (Log. *rōž*, K. *ryūz*), *yāsp* "horse" (Log. *yāsp*, K. *yāns*), *wokh* "water" (Log. *wōk*, K. *wʹk*).

Most of the innovations of Log. had already taken place. Thus *ž* had become *g* in *glon* "thou takest", *pabega* "above"; *wa*, *wē* had resulted in *o* (*u*) in *ar-ghoshṭakai* "you did fall", *ghok* "said"; there was no distinction of gender, *shuk* "became", for instance, being used as a masculine; the termination *-on* had been introduced into the aorist 2 sg. (cf. 118), e. g. *on* "thou art", *daron* "thou hast"; *shera* "gives", *shok* "gave" correspond to the modern Log. forms (v. Voc. s. v. *šēr*-) etc.

In some cases we find more archaic forms surviving than in present day Log. Thus we find *ghe* (**šē*) "3" (Log. *šō*, K. *šʹē*), *khuranak* "hungry" (Log. *xrunuk*, K. *azıcaranak*), *glon* "thou takest" (Log. *g*-, K. *gl*-), *wrosht* (Rav. *warosht*) "beard" (Log. *aurūšt*, K. *wʹštʹ*), *-ner*-, *-ne* "in" (Log. *-ne*, K. *inar*), Rav. *wʹrizza* (but Leech *rizza*) "rice" (Log. *rezan*, K. *rījan*), Rav. *ra-dzai* "come" but Leech *raza* "comes" (Log. *ar-zam*, K. *rī-jam* "I come"), *sūgh* (= **sūš*) "red" (Log. *šūš*, K. *sūšʹ*). Of special interest are the numerals: *khoshty* "60" (Log. *šūštu*, K. *šwaišti*), *hawai* "70" (Log.

awaitu, K. *awāi*), *hashtai* "80" (Log. *cār jistu*, K. *haštāi*), *nuvi* "90" (Log. *niwē*, K. *nawī*). *shīst* "30", *tsasht* "40", *panzast* "50" are more archaic forms than either Log. *šistu*, *cāštu*, *panjāstu* or K. *šīstū*, *cāštū*, *panjāštū* (cf. 99).

15. The affinities of Orm. within the range of the Ir. languages has been discussed in Rep. pp. 26 ff.

With W. Ir. and Par. Orm. shares the preservation of initial voiced stops (cf. Par. Gr. 7). The development of *dw* > *b* and the loss of intervocalic dentals, changes which are characteristic of N.W. Ir. and Par., are also found in Orm. But the points of special resemblance between Orm. and N.W. Ir. are not so many as those between Par. and N.W. Ir. mentioned p. 9. E.g. Orm. has *n*- "to sit down", but Par. has *nhin*-, Sāmn. *-nīn*-, Orm. does not possess the verb **ā-nī*- "to bring" etc.

According to Tedesco¹ Ir. **ah* became *-i* in E.Ir. I have tried² to show that this development was not universal in E.Ir., and we find no trace of it in Orm. On the contrary, we find Orm. K. *sō* "1" (Log. *šē* with palatalization due to the *š*, v. 28) < **syō*, **syah*, Orm. *kōk* "who" < **kō-ka* < **kah*, and probably Orm. Log. *afō* "that" (K. *hafō* m., *hafō* f.) < *-ō*, *-ah*.

There seem to be no linguistic facts in support of the tradition of the Kurdish origin of the Ormurs. The only point of special resemblance that I have been able to detect, is the employment of an extra *l*-suffix in the word denoting "egg": Orm. K. *hanwalk*, Log. *wulk*: Kurd. *hīlka* etc.

16. Regarding the relations between Orm. and Par. v. above pp. 9 f. There are, however, profound differences between the two languages, cf. e.g. the treatment of the groups *ft*, *xl*, the demonstrative pronouns, the personal pronoun 1 pl. Par. *mā*, but Orm. *māx* etc.

17. Rep. p. 36 n. I have pointed out the possibility that Bal. may contain some elements borrowed from an Ir. dialect spoken in

¹ Monde Oriental, XV, p. 256; ZII, IV pp. 127 ff.; cf. my remarks Rep. p. 30-

² NShgh., p. 84.

the country before the advent of the Baloches. To the examples adduced there may be added Bal. *gwaš-* "to speak": Orm. Log. $\gamma\ddot{o}š-$ (**\gamma waš-*); cf. also Bal. dialect forms, such as *šai* "3", N. Bal. *ša* < **fra-* (e.g. in N. Bal. *šamušt'a* "forgotten": Orm. K. *š'amōt*), *goi* "ear" etc. When the Baloches first came into contact with the Indians, they still retained *w-*, as appears from the Khetrani loan-word *vahor* "snow": Bal. *gwahar*, and from Bal. *gwač* (recent borrowing *wač*) "buffalo-calf" < Sindhi *vachi*. Possibly the transition from *w-* to *gw-* in Bal. is due to the influence of an Ir. substratum akin to Orm., *gw-* being substituted for $\gamma w-$.

18. Orm. contains several words which are known only from E. Ir. (cf. Rep. p. 32). A certain number of such words are included in the list Par. Gr. 9. Others are:

ban- "to throw down": Psht. *lwan-*, Yazg. *ḍevan-* etc., Av. *dvan-*.
K. *hōnd* "blind": Sak. *hana-*, Minj. *yādōy*, Av. *anda-*.

K. *mēršr* "sun": Minj. *mīra*, Av. *mišra-*.

šē (K. *sō*) "1": Sak. *šsau*.

šir "good": Sak. *ššira-*, Soghd. *šir*, Av. *srīra-*.

waw- "to obtain": Sak. *byau-*. Av. *avi-ap-*.

K. *xwarinc^a* "right (hand)": Soghd. *xwarant*, Sak. *hvarandau* acc. sg., *hvaramcainī* "on the right hand".

This last word is possibly an ancient loan-word in Orm.

19. But the E. Ir. language with which Orm. has been in the closest contact for centuries, and which has exercised a profound and far-reaching influence on the development of the language, is Psht. Orm. possesses a great number of Psht. loan-words; but the connexion between the two languages is of a much more fundamental nature, and appears to me to exclude the possibility that the contact dates only from the time of Mahmud of Ghazni.

In the first instance there are several words in the two languages which, although showing a special relationship, have developed phonetically on different lines. Some of these words may be Psht. loan-words in Orm.; but the phonetical divergences show that the borrowing must have taken place a long time ago.

Rep. p. 33 f. I have mentioned Orm. K. *γark* "lost"; *γwāsī* "grass"; *gišī* "tooth"; K. *bazar* "fore-arm"; K. *wan* "co-wife"; K. *winjōk* "son of a co-wife"; K. *duškī* "a little", *prân* "yesterday"; K. *râš'ai* "brother's son"; K. *xwarkai* "sister's son"; K. *tā* "paternal uncle"; *xwâš* (K. *xwâš'*) "sweet", *nas-* (K. *nis-*) "to take out" etc.

Other instances are: Orm. *bruš-* "to glitter": Psht. *brēšēdal*; Orm. *γanj* "bad", *γūnj* "rag" (cf. 51); Orm. K. *mrig*, *mrik* "slave": Psht. *maryai*; Orm. *n-* (pret. K. *nastak*) "to sit down": Psht. *nāstol*; Orm. *nāk* "wife": Psht. *nāwē* "bride".

The most striking morphological correspondence between Orm. and Psht. is the use of the so-called contracted pronouns (cf. 102). There is evidently some connexion between the Psht. and the Orm. forms, even if its exact nature cannot be determined. Note also Orm. *tōs* (K. *tyūs*) "you": Psht. *tāsū* (Waz. *tus*); Orm. genitive particle *tar*, *ta*: Psht. *da* < Av. *tarō*.

The transition of *č* > *c* in Orm. is due to Psht. influence, cf. also Log. *g* < *ž* (v. 65).

All these features show that, notwithstanding the profound differences in the original dialectical bases of the two languages, Orm. and Psht. must have been neighbours for a lengthy period, and there is no reason to assume that Orm. was introduced from the west of Iran.

20. Orm. is at present completely separated from the Dard languages; but it contains a few loan-words which point to an earlier contact. The most important word is Log. *grām* "village"; cf. also *pīng* "cock", K. *pinga* "the time just before dawn": Khw. *pinga-čhūi* "cock-crow, early dawn", and possibly *drī* "hair" (v. Voc.).

INSTITUTTET
FOR SAMMENLIGNENDE KULTURFORSKNING

INDO-IRANIAN FRONTIER
LANGUAGES

BY

GEORG MORGENSTIERNE

VOL. I.

PARACHI AND ORMURI

OSLO 1929

H. ASCHEHOUG & CO. (W. NYGAARD)

LEIPZIG

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ

PARIS

HONORÉ CHAMPION

LONDON

WILLIAMS & NORGATE, LTD.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS