

# DEUTSCHE MORGENLÄNDISCHE GESELLSCHAFT



**ANTJE WENDTLAND**

Some remarks on the genetic relations of the Pamir languages

XXX. Deutscher Orientalistentag  
Freiburg, 24.-28. September 2007  
Ausgewählte Vorträge  
Herausgegeben im Auftrag der DMG  
von Rainer Brunner, Jens Peter Laut  
und Maurus Reinkowski

online-Publikation, März 2008

<http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-92991>

ISSN 1866-2943

# Some remarks on the Genetic Relations of the Pamir languages

*Antje Wendtland*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The classification of some of the Iranian languages still raises questions and cannot be said to be resolved completely. The criteria for the affiliation to one group or another do not seem to be clear and agreed upon in every aspect. As an especially striking example Ormuri and Parachi may be mentioned, two Iranian languages spoken in Afghanistan, which have even been classified as belonging to completely different branches of the Iranian languages. After they were first held to be Western Iranian by Grierson<sup>1</sup> a similar view was later advanced by other scholars like Oranskij and Efimov.<sup>2</sup> But Morgenstierne who first studied these languages in detail attributed them to the Eastern branch of the Iranian languages, in spite of a number of phonological characteristics which they share with the Western Iranian languages.<sup>3</sup> He defined a South-Eastern Iranian sub-group consisting of Ormuri and Parachi. Others, like Kieffer follow this classification in their grammatical descriptions.<sup>4</sup>

The term ‘South East Iranian’ is not always used for these two languages solely. Sometimes Pashto and the Pamir languages are classified as South East Iranian, whereas Ossetic and Yaghnobi are described as North Eastern Iranian languages.<sup>5</sup> Even within Eastern Iranian one group is quite diverse in itself. The Pamir languages are about 15 different modern Eastern Iranian languages spoken in the frontier area of Tajikistan, Afghanistan, Pakistan and China. Their genetic relations have first been extensively studied by Morgenstierne and later, in more detail, by Russian scholars like Sokolova, Pakhalina and Edel'man.<sup>6</sup> It had soon been found out that the languages of the so-called Shughni-Roshani group are more closely related and nearer to Yazghulami and Sarikoli whereas languages like Munji and Yidgha or Wakhi seem to be more isolated. Although the genetic relations are not yet understood in every detail, it can be said that it is not possible to trace them back to a single common proto-Pamir ancestor.<sup>7</sup>

Table no. 1. *Genetic relations of the Pamir languages*

Shughni-Yazghulami group				Yazghulami	Ishkashmi	Munji	Wakhi
Shughni group							
Shughni	Roshani	Bartangi	Sarikoli				
Badzh.	Xufi	Roshorvi			Zebaki	Yidgha	
					Sanglechi		

<sup>1</sup> GRIERSON 1918, 49-52.

<sup>2</sup> ORANSKIJ 1979, 81-121, EFIMOV 1986.

<sup>3</sup> For more detail see MORGENSTIERNE 1926, 28ff.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. KIEFFER 1989, 451ff. See also SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996, 650.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. by Soviet scholars, in *Osnovy*; cf. also the genealogical tree of Iranian languages at the site of the Institute of Indo-European Studies, University of Frankfurt, Titus: <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/didact/idg/iran/iranstam.htm>.

<sup>6</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1938; SOKOLOVA 1967, 1973; EDEL'MAN 1987, PAKHALINA 1969, 1983.

<sup>7</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1938, XVIII; STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1982, 3; SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996, 651. Occasionally some of the languages are not classified as ‘Pamir’ and treated separately, e.g. Munji and Yidgha by PAYNE 1989, 411-416, as they are spoken outside the Pamir region.

Thus, the term ‘Pamir languages’ is rather based on the geographical position than on genetic closeness. They have therefore also been called a ‘Sprachbund’ – which seems to be more appropriate.<sup>8</sup> The use of the term of the Pamir languages in a linguistic sense wrongly suggests a genetic unity - which could be rather misleading.

Another language belonging to the Eastern branch of the Iranian languages is Yaghnobi. Its closeness to Middle Iranian Soghdian has often been pointed out and in the beginning of its study it has even been considered to be a kind of modern successor of Soghdian.<sup>9</sup> Others believe that a direct derivation is not possible because of a number of different developments in the phonology and morphology of these languages. One of the main arguments for this classification is the fact that the so-called rhythmic law which influenced the phonological development Soghdian, whereas it did not have an effect on the predecessor of the Yaghnobi language.<sup>10</sup> Soghdian is usually described as deriving from a dialect which belongs to a group of languages similar to Soghdian.<sup>11</sup>

When one compares Yaghnobi with the Pamir languages and some of the other Eastern Middle Iranian languages one may find a considerable number of similar phonological and morphological developments and isoglosses. Still, Yaghnobi is rarely compared with the Pamir languages.

In all of the Modern Eastern Iranian languages there are a lot of loanwords from Tajik, the original vocabulary is very often not documented. Moreover, they all have different dialects which are not equally well studied and may show a wide range of lexical variation. One further important point to observe is that in the study of these relatively diverse languages similar sound changes – when seen isolated – cannot easily be considered as proof for common ancestry in every case. The following example may illustrate the difficulties: Middle Iranian Khotanese and Modern Wakhi share some remarkable phonological features.<sup>12</sup> The Indo-European palatal *\*kʰ* does not develop into *sp*.<sup>13</sup> Thus, in Khotanese the word for ‘horse’, Persian *asp*, is *aśśa* and *yaš* in Wakhi. But this does not mean that Wakhi can be easily derived from Khotanese directly or that it is possible to track back both languages to a common ancestor. This becomes clear from some other developments. First, intervocalic stops which have been lost in Khotanese are still preserved in Wakhi, like in the word for ‘foot’, Khotanese *pāa-* and Wakhi *pyd*, from Old Iranian *\*pāda-*.

Moreover, Old Iranian *\*θr* is reduced to *r* in Khotanese in internal position but shows a more conservative outcome in Wakhi, where it becomes *tr*, e.g. in Khotanese *pura* ‘son’-as opposed to Wakhi *pətr*. In some cases Middle Iranian Khotanese shows a more advanced development than Modern Iranian Wakhi.<sup>14</sup>

There are a number of phonological and morphological characteristics which are commonly said to be typical for the Eastern Iranian languages. Although some of these are widespread, they cannot be found in all of the languages classified as Eastern Iranian. No universal traits distinguishing the Eastern from the Western Iranian languages have been found so far. Here some phonological and morphological characteristics of the

---

<sup>8</sup> GRJUNBERG 1980.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. ORANSKIJ 1963, 164.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. SIMS-WILLIAMS 198.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. HROMOV 1987, 645.

<sup>12</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1975, 432f.; SKJÆRVØ 1989, 375.

<sup>13</sup> SKJÆRVØ 1989, 375.

<sup>14</sup> SKJÆRVØ 1989, 375.

Eastern Middle and Modern Eastern Iranian languages shall be discussed to see if new insights in the genetic relations can be found.

## 2. PHONOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS

### 2.1. Old Iranian initial \*č-

In most of the Eastern Iranian languages that Old Iranian \*č was depalatalized and became *ts*.<sup>15</sup> In Eastern Middle Iranian Khotanese, Chwaresmian, Bactrian, most of the Pamir languages and Ossetic depalatalisation occurs. Only Soghdian did not take part in the development. Here \*č was preserved.<sup>16</sup> But also among the Pamir languages we find two languages in which č was preserved, although only initially, namely in Yazghulami and Munji.<sup>17</sup> Interestingly, in Parachi Old Iranian č was preserved in initial and internal position.<sup>18</sup> The development in Yaghnobi is a little more complicated: In the case of the numeral „4“ it develops to *t*.<sup>19</sup> In other cases \*č is preserved, as e.g. in Yaghnobi *čof* “how much, how many”, cf. Soghdian *c’β*, *c’f*.

Table no. 2. Old Iranian \*č-: \*čaθuar- “four”

Yaghn.	Shughni group	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Par.	Pashto	Oss.
<i>tufor</i>	<i>cavūr</i> , <i>cavōr</i>	<i>cavur</i>	<i>čer</i>	<i>cβfur</i>	<i>čfir</i> , <i>čfūr</i>	<i>cəbūr</i>	<i>čōr</i> <sup>20</sup> Orm. <i>cār</i>	<i>calor</i>	<i>cyppar</i> / <i>cuppar</i>
Bactr.		Chor.		Soghd.		Khot.			
<i>σοφαρο</i> [( <i>t</i> ) <i>sufar</i> ]		<i>cf’r</i> [ <i>tsafār</i> ]		<i>ctβ’r</i> , <i>ctf’r</i> , <i>cf’r</i> [ <i>ča(t)fār</i> ]		<i>tcohaurā</i>			

### 2.2. Initial voiced stops

A further characteristic of most Eastern Iranian languages is the development of initial voiced stops to fricatives. In Khotanese \*g- remains unchanged, which is indicated by the doubling *gg-* as in *ggara-* “mountain”, whereas *b-* and *d-* are mostly interpreted as fricatives.<sup>21</sup>

It is interesting to see that both Yaghnobi and Ishkashmi as well as Zebaki and Sanglechi show the same development of \*d-. The stop seems to have been preserved but this has been explained as a reversion.<sup>22</sup> This was already suggested by Morgenstierne for Sanglechi and Ishkashmi, as a result of Persian influence.<sup>23</sup> In Bactrian, Munji, Yidgha and Pashto Old Iranian \*d became *l*.<sup>24</sup> This development may of course have occurred at

<sup>15</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996, 650.

<sup>16</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1989, 168.

<sup>17</sup> GRJUNBERG 1987, 174; EDEL’MANN 1987, 370.

<sup>18</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929, 34; EFIMOV 1997, 450f.

<sup>19</sup> HROMOV 1987, 656; LIVSHITZ/HROMOV 1981, 450.

<sup>20</sup> For Ormuri and Parachi here the transcription used by KIEFFER and EFIMOV is used which in some respects differs from that of MORGENSTIERNE.

<sup>21</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1989, 168.

<sup>22</sup> PAYNE 1989, 420.

<sup>23</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1938, 303.

<sup>24</sup> A development also found in Soghdian dialects, SIMS-WILLIAMS 1989, 168; LIVSHITZ 1970, 262.

different periods and independently.<sup>25</sup> Ossetic is divergent, \*b- and \*d- remain unchanged, \*g- becomes ɣ- in Digor and then develops into q- in Iron.<sup>26</sup> In Parachi and Ormuri initial voiced stops are preserved, e.g. Par. *dōs*, Orm. *das* “ten”; Par. *gir* “stone”; Orm. *girī* “mountain”; Par. *byā* “brother”, Orm. *bēš* “rope” < \**bastrā*-.<sup>27</sup>

Table no. 3. *Initial voiced stops: \*brātar- “brother”; \*dasa- “ten”; \*gari- “mountain”*

	Yaghn.	Shughni group	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Pashto	Oss.
*b-	<i>virot</i>	<i>v(i)rō(d)</i>	<i>v(ɪ)rud</i>	<i>v(ə)red</i>	<i>v(ə)ru(d)</i>	<i>vroy</i> , Yidgha <i>vrai</i>	<i>vɾɪt</i>	<i>wror</i>	<i>bon</i> “day” < * <i>bānu</i> -
*d-	<i>das</i>	<i>ḍīs</i> , <i>ḍus</i> , <i>ḍos</i>	<i>ḍes</i>	<i>ḍūs</i>	<i>dos</i>	Yidgha <i>los</i>	<i>ḍas</i>	<i>las</i>	<i>dæs</i>
*g-	<i>ɣar</i>	<i>žīr</i> , <i>žēr</i> “stone”	<i>žer</i>	<i>ɣar</i> , <i>ɣarčug</i>	- <i>ɣu</i> “cow”	<i>ɣār</i>	<i>ɣar</i>	<i>ɣar</i>	<i>qarm</i> / <i>ɣarm</i> “warm”
		Chor.	Soghdian	Bactrian	Khotanese				
*b-		<i>βr'd</i>	<i>βr't</i>	<i>βpaδo</i>	<i>brātar-</i> [ <i>βrādar-</i> ]				
*d-		<i>ḍys</i>	<i>ḍs(ʻ)</i>	<i>λασο</i>	<i>daso</i> [ <i>ḍaso</i> ]				
*g-		<i>ɣʷw</i> “cow”	<i>ɣr-</i>	<i>ɣapo</i>	<i>ggara-</i> [ <i>gara-</i> ]				

### 2.3. Old Iranian \*θ

The preservation of the phoneme \*θ is seen as one of the characteristics of Eastern Iranian languages.<sup>28</sup> But several of these languages do not possess a phoneme θ, e.g. Yaghnobi, Sanglechi, Ishkashmi, Munji, Yidgha, Pashto, Ormuri or Parachi.

A phoneme \*θ is preserved in Soghdian and Choresmian.<sup>29</sup> In Khotanese Old Iranian it is preserved in initial position only.<sup>30</sup> Some scholars believe that the Iranian fricatives *f*, *θ* and *x* are reverted to aspirate stops through the influence of Indian languages like Sanskrit and Prakrit.<sup>31</sup> In intervocalic position \*-θ- becomes *b* in Khotanese, like in *ggāha-* “song” < Old Iranian \**gāθa*-.<sup>32</sup>

In Bactrian the only word which seems to preserve θ is *ιθao* “thus, so” < \**iθā*. Sims-Williams presumes that θ is a historical writing for [*h*].<sup>33</sup> The usual development of \*θ in Bactrian is *b*, e.g. in *ρανοβαναιο* “highway robbery” which goes back to \**rāθa-pāna*-.<sup>34</sup>

Wakhi, the Shughni group, Sarikoli and Yazghulami preserve θ, whereas the development in Munji differs. Here the fricative becomes *š*.<sup>35</sup> In Yaghnobi it became *-t* in one dialect, *-s* in the other.<sup>36</sup> In Ossetic \*θ became *t* in both dialects.<sup>37</sup> In Pashto Old Iranian \*θ

<sup>25</sup> SKJÆRVØ 1989, 376.

<sup>26</sup> THODARSON 1989, 464.

<sup>27</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929, 34, 329; KIEFFER 1989, 453.

<sup>28</sup> E.g. SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996, 650.

<sup>29</sup> E.g. SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996, 650

<sup>30</sup> EMMERICK 1989, 213.

<sup>31</sup> EMMERICK 1989, 209; EMMERICK/PULLEYBLANK 1993.

<sup>32</sup> EMMERICK 1989, 214.

<sup>33</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 2007, 218.

<sup>34</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 2007, 259.

<sup>35</sup> GRJUNBERG 1987, 177.

<sup>36</sup> HROMOV 1987, 655, 659.

developed into *l*.<sup>38</sup> In Ishkashmi it becomes *s*, like in *sav-* “to burn” < \**θav-*.<sup>39</sup> In Sanglechi it usually resulted in *t*, as in *tav-* “to burn”. In the word for “day”, *mi*, *may*, (it seems to have developed to *y*, but has been explained as an elision by Morgenstierne, who traces the word back to \**māθya-*.<sup>40</sup> In Ormuri also *θ* develops into *y*, as in *rāy* “way” < \**rāθa-*.<sup>41</sup> The development in Parachi is not clear. Morgenstierne writes that \**θ* may result in an aspirated stop, like in *tʼi-* “to be burning”.<sup>42</sup> Efimov gives examples of intervocalic spirants developing into *b*.<sup>43</sup>

Table no. 4. *Old Iranian* \**θ*: \**maiθa-* “day”;

Yaghn.	Shughni group	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Orm.	Pashto	Oss.
<i>met</i> , <i>mes</i>	<i>mēθ</i> , <i>mīθ</i>	<i>maθ</i>	<i>miθ</i>	<i>mi</i> , <i>may</i> Sang. <i>mēi</i>	<i>mīx̄</i>	<i>θaw-</i> “burn” < * <i>θav</i>	<i>rāy</i> < <i>rāθa-</i> “way”	<i>yele</i> < * <i>gaiθyā-</i> “flocks”	<i>feten</i> “broad” < * <i>paθana-</i>
Soghdian		Chor.		Bactr.		Khot.			
<i>myθ</i> , <i>myδ</i>		<i>myθ</i>		<i>pavo-</i>		<i>ggāha-</i>			

#### 2.4. Voicing of \**xt* and \**ft*

In most of the Eastern Iranian languages the Old Iranian consonant clusters \**xt* and \**ft* are voiced, like in Bactrian or Choresmian.<sup>44</sup> In Khotanese they are simplified.<sup>45</sup> Sims-Williams believes that in Soghdian the cluster is only partly voiced to *vt* and *yt*, whereas Gharib transcribes it as completely voiced, e.g. [*aβd*], [*aβda*] “seven” and *duγd(ā)* “daughter”.<sup>46</sup> Also Livshitz/Hromov consider the cluster as voiced.<sup>47</sup>

In Pashto \**xt* may be reduced to *y* or disappear<sup>48</sup>, whereas \**ft* may result in *w* or *wd*, as in *owə* “seven” or in *tawda* “warmed” < \**tafta-*.<sup>49</sup> According to Skjærvø in Parachi \**xt* becomes *y* and \**ft* becomes *w*, whereas both result in *w* or are elided in Ormuri.<sup>50</sup> But the examples given by Morgenstierne show that in Parachi the fricative is elided, as in *dot* “daughter” or in *pʼarāt-* “to sell” < \**parawaxta-*.<sup>51</sup> For Ormuri Morgenstierne concludes that *x* and *f* were assimilated early and the cluster resulted in *t*, which is elided, as e.g. in

<sup>37</sup> ISAEV 1987, 566.

<sup>38</sup> GRJUNBERG/EDEL'MAN 1987, 35.

<sup>39</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1938, 305.

<sup>40</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1938, 305, 313.

<sup>41</sup> Efimov 1991, 271. MORGENSTIERNE 1929, 405, explains it as an elision and traces the word back to \**raiθya-*.

<sup>42</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929, 44, who transcribes *thī-*; see also STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999, 374.

<sup>43</sup> EFIMOV 1997, 459, 463.

<sup>44</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1989, 167.

<sup>45</sup> EMMERICK 1989, 215, where more examples can be found, as \**xt* may also develop into /*γ*/ or /*j*/.

<sup>46</sup> GHARIB 1995, 21, 146.

<sup>47</sup> LIVSHITZ/HROMOV 1981, 395f., 402.

<sup>48</sup> For \**xt* to *-w-* or *-y-* see SKJÆRVØ 1989, 402.

<sup>49</sup> GRJUNBERG/EDEL'MAN 1987, 30f.

<sup>50</sup> SKJÆRVØ 1989, 377, table I and 378.

<sup>51</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929, 38, who transcribes *dut* and *pharāt*.

*duka, dua* “daughter” or in *ho, wo* “seven”.<sup>52</sup> In Yaghnobi *\*xt* and *\*ft* subsisted but are not voiced. This has been explained as a reversion.<sup>53</sup>

Table no. 5. *Development of Old Iranian \*xt; \*duxtar- “daughter”; \*taxta- “gone away”*

Yaghn.	Shughni group	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Par.	Pashto	Oss.
<i>uxta</i> ‘went out’			<i>δoyd</i>	<i>wūδūγ(d),</i> Sangl. <i>wuδəγd</i>	<i>ləγda,</i> Yidgha <i>luγdo</i>	<i>δəγd</i>	<i>dot;</i> Orm. <i>dua,</i> <i>duka</i>	<i>lur</i>	I. <i>(xo)dyγd</i>
	<i>tūyd-</i>	<i>tyγd-</i>	<i>tūyd-</i>	<i>tūyd-</i>		<i>taγd-</i>		<i>tə, təy</i>	<i>tayd</i>
	Bactr.		Soghd.		Chor.		Khot.		
	<i>loydo</i>		<i>δωγτ(’),</i> <i>δγωτ</i>		<i>δγd</i>		<i>dūta, dūva</i>		

Table no. 6. *Development of Old Iranian \*ft, e.g. \*hafta- “seven”*

Yaghn.	Shughni group	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Pashto	Par.	Oss.
<i>aft</i> (W), <i>avd</i> (E) <i>ufta</i> “slept” < <i>*hufta-</i>	<i>(w)ūvd</i>	<i>ʔvōd</i>	<i>uvd</i>	<i>wvd</i>	<i>ovda</i>	<i>ʔib</i>	<i>owə</i>	<i>hōt</i> Orm. <i>ho,</i> <i>wo</i>	<i>avd</i>
	Soghd.	Chor.	Khot.	Bactr.					
	<i>ʔbt’</i>	<i>ʔbd</i>	<i>handa</i>	<i>πιδροβδο</i> “received” < <i>*pati-grfta-</i>					

## 2.5. The development of Old Iranian *\*θr-* in initial position

Old Iranian *\*θr* shows quite different developments in the Eastern Iranian languages, both initially and internally. It is interesting to note, though, that we can observe a similar sound change in Soghdian, partly in Choresmian and in Parachi, where it becomes *š*. In Yazghulami *\*θr* is reduced to *c*.<sup>54</sup> In initial position the cluster is preserved as *tr-* in Wakhi, becomes *dr-* in Khotanese and in Pashto and *tir-* or *sar-* in Yaghnobi.<sup>55</sup> In Munji it becomes *šir-*.<sup>56</sup> We can see a comparable development in Bactrian, the Shughni group and Sarikoli. In Bactrian it becomes *har-*, in the languages of the Shughni group and in Sarikoli it results in *ar-*.<sup>57</sup>

Table no. 7. *Development of Old Iranian initial \*θr-, e.g. in \*θraiah ‘three’*

Yaghn.	Shughni group	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Pashto	Par.	Oss.

<sup>52</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929, 333, transcribed as *dūa, duka* and *hō, wō*.

<sup>53</sup> LIVSHITZ/HROMOV 1981, 395, 402; SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996, 650.

<sup>54</sup> EDEL’MAN 1987, 369.

<sup>55</sup> SKJÆRVØ 1989, 375 and 377, table I.

<sup>56</sup> GRJUNBERG 1987, 177.

<sup>57</sup> SKJÆRVØ 1989, 376.

<i>tiray,</i> <i>saray</i>	<i>aray</i>	<i>aroy</i>	<i>cūy</i>	<i>rūy</i>	<i>ǰiray</i> Yidgha <i>ǰuroy</i>	<i>tru(y)</i>	<i>dre</i>	<i>ǰi;</i> Orm. <i>ǰo</i>	<i>ǰertæ</i>
Bactr.				Khot.		Soghd.		Chor.	
<i>varḡio</i> [ <i>harei</i> ]				<i>drai</i>		<i>ǰy</i> [ <i>ǰē/i</i> ]		<i>ǰy</i>	

## 2.6. The development of Old Iranian \*-θr- in internal position

Internally the development may be different. In Khotanese, Bactrian or Choresmian it is reduced to *-r-*. Among the Modern Eastern Iranian languages, a development to *-r-* can be found in Pashto and in Munji. In the Shughni group and Sarikoli we have *-c* like in Yazghulami. In Soghdian and Parachi internal \*-θr- becomes *-ǰ-* like in initial position. In Wakhi the development is more conservative, the cluster is preserved as *-tr-* as in initial position.<sup>58</sup> In Ossetic it becomes *-rt-*.<sup>59</sup> In Yaghnobi there are only very few examples of the development of Old Iranian \*-θr-.<sup>60</sup> Geiger postulated that Old Iranian \*-θr- in internal position developed into *-l(l)-* in Yaghnobi.<sup>61</sup> He mentioned *ōl* “fire” and *pula* “son” as examples for this development. This was doubted by Livshitz who writes that *ōl* is only used in combination with the verb *xaš* in *ōlxaš* “to catch fire, to begin to burn”, whereas the common word for fire, *ōlōw*, is borrowed from Tajik.<sup>62</sup> He points out that the common word for “son” in Yaghnobi is *ǰūta* and *pul(l)a* is mainly used for “infant, child” in general. Therefore he concludes that it can be taken as a nursery word. Although these semantic considerations hardly seem convincing, as a word for “child” might as well have the meaning “son”, Livshitz puts forward another, much stronger argument. He remarks that \*-θr- develops into *-rδ-* in Yaghnobi, as in *mirδa* “beads” from *\*muθraka-* (as opposed to Soghdian *mwǰ’kk*), and concludes that the expected development of \*-θr- in Yaghnobi should have been *\*-rt-* or *-rs-*. As an example to stress the plausibility of this argument one may mention Yaghn. *dirot*, *diros* “sickle”, which can be traced back to *\*dāθra-*, cf. Ishkashmi *dur*, Bartangi and Roshorvi *δōc*, Yazghulami *δac*, Wakhi *δytr*, *δθtr* Pashto *lor* etc.<sup>63</sup> It therefore seems plausible to follow Livshitz’ view that the development of internal \*-θr- might not have been to *-l(l)-* as previously thought.

Table no. 8. *Development of Old Iranian \*-θr- in internal position*

Yaghn.	Shughni group	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Pashto	Par.	Oss.
<i>pulla</i> or <i>dirot</i> , <i>diros</i>	<i>puc</i>	<i>pys</i> , <i>pūc</i>	<i>poc</i>	- <i>usθr</i> ‘ashes’ Sangl. <i>wuter</i>	<i>pūr</i>	<i>pətr</i>	- <i>bur</i> < <i>*apuθrah</i> “sonless”; or “fire”	<i>poš</i> ; Orm. <i>*meš</i> <sup>64</sup> “sun”	<i>fyrt</i>
Khot.				Bactr.		Chor.		Soghd.	

<sup>58</sup> STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999, 31.

<sup>59</sup> ISAEV 1987, 571.

<sup>60</sup> GEIGER 1898-1901, 336.

<sup>61</sup> GEIGER 1898-1901, 336.

<sup>62</sup> LIVSHITZ 1970, 262f., note 28.

<sup>63</sup> STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999, 168.

<sup>64</sup> Attested in the dialect of Kāñīgrām, see EFIMOV 1991, 269.



<i>pūra-</i>	<i>πορο</i> [pur]	<i>pr</i>	<i>-pšyy</i>
--------------	-------------------	-----------	--------------

### 3. MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS

#### 3.1. Nouns: Plural suffixes

It has been mentioned that Soghdian and Yaghnobi share the same plural suffixes, *-t* in the direct case and *-ti* in the oblique.<sup>65</sup> These are the plural suffixes of the so-called heavy stems in Soghdian. Plural suffixes in *-t* are also found in Ossetic and in Yazghulami where we have *-tā* and *-aθ*. Moreover the Soghdian plural suffix *-γšt* which is only found with animate beings has a parallel in Wakhi where it is the normal plural suffix. The plural in *-i* in Munji was compared with the plural ending in Bactrian and Choresmian. Morgenstierne follows Tedesco in deriving the plural ending from Old Iranian *\*-āb*.<sup>66</sup> Sokolova derives the ending from the pronominal flexion.<sup>67</sup>

The plural in Pashto is more complex and shows a wide range of variation which also may involve ablaut.<sup>68</sup> The plural suffix in Parachi is *-ān*. Morgenstierne states that it cannot have been borrowed from Persian, as there also exists a genitive ending in *-āna* and *-ān* also occurs with inanimate nouns.<sup>69</sup> The plural *-i*, which is used for non-animates in Ormuri is traced back to *\*-ayah*.<sup>70</sup> The etymology of the plural ending used for animates, *-in*, does not seem to be clear. Efimov explains it as going back to the Old Iranian genitive ending of the *i*-stems, *\*-inām*.<sup>71</sup>

Table no. 9. *Plural endings*<sup>72</sup>

	Yaghn.	Shugh. group	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Orm.	Oss.
dir.	<i>-t</i>	<i>-ēn</i>	<i>-aθ</i>	<i>-o</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-išt</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-tā</i>
obl.	<i>-ti</i>				<i>-āf</i>	<i>-əv</i>		
	Soghd.		Chor.		Bactr.			
	heavy	light						
dir.	<i>-t</i>	<i>-t'</i>	<i>-i</i>		<i>-e</i>			
		<i>-γšt</i>						
		<i>-γ'</i>			only animate			
obl.	<i>-ty</i>	<i>-ty'</i>	<i>-ʾn</i>					
		<i>-γšty</i>						
		<i>-ʾn</i>			only animate			

#### 3.2. Verbs: 3rd plural ending

<sup>65</sup> SKJÆRVØ 1989, 375.

<sup>66</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1938, 122.

<sup>67</sup> SOKOLOVA 1973, 160-162. See also GRJUNBERG 1987, 181f.

<sup>68</sup> For details see SKJÆRVØ 1989, 389-392 and GRJUNBERG/EDEL'MAN 1987; 44-58.

<sup>69</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929, 50; more detailed EFIMOV 1997, 478ff.

<sup>70</sup> EFIMOV 1991, 281. It is compared with Pashto *-i* by MORGENSTIERNE 1929, 342, transcribed *-ī*.

<sup>71</sup> EFIMOV 1991, 281.

<sup>72</sup> In Khotanese categories of noun inflection have been preserved and may rather be compared with Old Iranian languages than with the other Middle or Modern Eastern Iranian languages. They are therefore not listed here. For an overview see EMMERICK 1989, 216-219.

A further interesting feature is the verbal ending of the third person plural. In Yaghnobi the ending is *-or* which differs significantly from that of Soghdian. It may be compared with the 3rd plural ending of Choresmian which also contains an *r* and with the third plural middle ending in Khotanese.<sup>73</sup>

Table no. 10. *Verbal endings of the 3rd plural present*

Yaghn.	Shughni group	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Pashto	Par.	Oss.
<i>-or</i>	<i>-ēn, -an</i>	<i>-(y)in</i>	<i>-an</i>	<i>-on</i>	<i>-āt</i>	<i>-ən</i>	<i>-ī, -ī,</i> <i>īn</i>	<i>-an</i>	D. <i>-uncæ,</i> I. <i>-ync</i>
Soghd.	Chor.	Khot.	Bactr.						
<i>'nt</i>	<i>-ri</i>	mid. <i>-āre</i>	<i>-ivdo [-ind]</i>						

#### 4. ISOGLOSSES

##### 4. 1. The second plural personal pronoun

A very interesting isogloss is found in Bactrian, the Shughni group, Yazghulami, Ishkashmi and Sarikoli.<sup>74</sup> All these languages share the same formation of the second person plural pronoun – different from Soghdian and Yaghnobi as well as from Munji and Wakhi. Before the Bactrian form was known it was thought that it is a peculiarity of some Pamir languages. It was described as one of several characteristics which were thought to be alien to Iranian and therefore attributed to substratum influence.<sup>75</sup> There is a significant correspondence between Soghdian, Yaghnobi and Ossetic on the one hand and between Bactrian and the Shughni-Yazghulami group of the Pamir languages and Ishkashmi on the other. Here the formation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> plural personal pronoun involves a form of the 2<sup>nd</sup> singular pronoun. Likewise the second plural personal pronoun in Pashto seems to contain a form of the singular, whereas the second element of the word is not clear.<sup>76</sup> The Choresmian second plural personal pronoun also seems to be composed of an element *-β(y)* connected with the oblique/enclitic forms of the second singular pronoun, *β-*, acc. *β'*.<sup>77</sup>

Table no. 11. *The second plural personal pronoun 'you'*

Yaghn.	Shughni	Bart.	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Par.	Pashto	Oss.
<i>šumox</i>	<i>tama</i>	<i>tamāš</i>	<i>tamaš</i>	<i>təmox</i>	<i>тѣмѣх</i>	<i>moj</i> <sup>78</sup>	<i>sa(y)-</i> <i>iš(t),</i> obl. <i>sav</i>	<i>wā;</i> Orm. <sup>79</sup> <i>tyos,</i> <i>tos</i>	<i>tāse/o</i>	<i>symax/</i> <i>sumax</i>

<sup>73</sup> In Khotanese most verbs occur either with indicative or with middle endings. See e.g. EMMERICK 1989, 220. The present subjunctive and optative active endings also contain *-r*: *-āru* and *-īru*.

<sup>74</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996, 651.

<sup>75</sup> Summarised by PAYNE 1989, 423.

<sup>76</sup> For a summary of different etymological explanations of the second part of the pronoun see GRJUNBERG 1987, 75f.

<sup>77</sup> The first part of the word, *h-* is not clear. One might speculate if it could be connected to the 3rd singular pronoun, *hy* “he, she, it”, encl. *h*, i.e. “he and you”. A similar formation was presumed by GEIGER 101, 217, for Pashto.

<sup>78</sup> Derived from *\*(yu)šmābyā*, see Grjunberg 1987, 189.

<sup>79</sup> Explained as loans from Pashto by MORGENSTIERNE 2003, 84, who transcribes *tōs, tyōs*.

Soghd.	Bactrian	Chor.	Khot.
šm'x(w), šm'xw	τομαχο, τομαχο, ταμαχο	hβy	uhu

#### 4.2. Demonstrative stems

Among the demonstrative systems of the Eastern Iranian languages there are some noticeable correspondences. Most of the Pamir languages, including Munji and Wakhi, possess a three-stem-system with forms going back to the Old Iranian obliques *\*ima-*, *\*aita-* and *\*aūa-* which function as near, medial and distal demonstratives. In Yazghulami only two forms are found, *du* and *yū*. Edel'man derives *du* from *\*aita-*. The etymology of *yū* is less clear. Edel'man assumes that *yū* goes back to the Old Iranian nominative *\*iīam/aīam* originally representing the proximate deixis, whereas she derives the oblique form *way* from the distal demonstrative *\*aūa-*.<sup>80</sup> Despite the phonological problems of deriving *yū* from Old Iranian *\*aūa-*, a contamination of different demonstrative stems representing virtually opposing levels of deixis seems highly unlikely.

Forms of two stems also occur in Yaghnobi, but here the direct forms *iš* and *ax* can be derived from the Old Iranian stem forming the nominative *\*aiša-* and *\*hau-*.

The Yaghnobi forms have been compared with the demonstratives in Soghdian, where remnants of three stems can be found.<sup>81</sup> They go back to *\*aiam/ima-*, *\*aiša-/aita-* and *\*hau/aūa-*. Sims-Williams assumes a different etymology for the forms of the medial deixis. He derives the oblique form from *\*ta-* instead of *\*aita*.<sup>82</sup> Different from Yaghnobi, where the *\*aiša-/aita-* forms are preserved, in Soghdian the forms of the medial deixis disappear first.

Bactrian *ειο* “this” is derived from *\*aiam*. The form *ειδο* “this”, represents a less proximate deixis and is sometimes connected to the 2<sup>nd</sup> person.<sup>83</sup> It is traced back to *\*aita-* by Sims-Williams.<sup>84</sup> He explains *ειμο* “this” as going back to *\*ima-* “with vocalization adapted to that of *ειο*.”<sup>85</sup> Both *ειο* and *ειμο* are therefore held to originate from the same demonstrative stem *\*aiam/\*ima-*, one from the nominative, the other from the stem forming the oblique cases. But in Bactrian there is no case difference between the forms. A difference in deixis cannot be seen either. Both pronouns represent proximal deixis. The function of the Bactrian demonstratives is not studied yet in detail but in the documents *ειο* is used mainly anaphorically, whereas *ειμο* may be used cataphorically.<sup>86</sup> Sims-Williams presumed earlier that *ειμο* and *ειδο* might be compound forms of *ειο* which seems quite probable regarding the fact that two pronouns representing proximal deixis co-exist in Bactrian.<sup>87</sup> By now another demonstrative, *το, τι* is attested, which is derived from *\*ta-* by Sims-Williams and represents a second person deixis.<sup>88</sup> It is therefore probable that *ειμο* and *ειδο* are compound forms of *ειο* and *μιο* and *το* respectively.

<sup>80</sup> EDEL'MAN 1987, 390.

<sup>81</sup> LIVSHITZ/HROMOV 1981, 465f.; SIMS-WILLIAMS 1994.

<sup>82</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1994, 49f.

<sup>83</sup> Examples SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000, C1', SIMS-WILLIAMS 2007, ca5, xm5, ch6.

<sup>84</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000, 191.

<sup>85</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000, 191.

<sup>86</sup> Examples SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000, e.g. *ειο* in A11, C7, etc. and *ειμο* in C7, J12 etc.

<sup>87</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1989, 235.

<sup>88</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 2007, 269.

The system in Khotanese is completely different. There are newly developed forms which all go back to *\*aiša-* and *\*ta-*.<sup>89</sup> In Choresmian some innovations have occurred. There are the forms *ny(n)* “this”, plur. *nʷ* “these”, *nʷyr* “that”, which is also used as a 3<sup>rd</sup> singular pronoun, *nyš-k* “this, who/which” and *nʷn* “that”. They all have a prefix *n-* which is explained as a strengthening particle.<sup>90</sup> These developments show that already in Middle Iranian languages a lot of changes and innovations have occurred. Tracing back forms of Modern Iranian languages, especially those which only consist of one letter, may therefore be very difficult or impossible as in the next example.

According to Morgenstierne the etymology of Parachi (*h*)*e* is not certain: “Av. *aēšo*, *aētat*, and prob. *aēm*, would result in *\*ī*; but gen. sg. m. *abē* (Gath. *abyā*) > *ē*?”.<sup>91</sup> Efimov also believes it goes back to the old genitive-dative.<sup>92</sup> This reconstruction may be phonologically possible but seems to be a rather unlikely explanation from a typological point of view as no comparable example of a similar development can be found. The distal demonstrative (*h*)*ō* goes back to Old Iranian *\*hāu*.<sup>93</sup> Ormuri *a* is derived from *\*ha-* by Morgenstierne. To his opinion the origin of *-fo* is unclear.<sup>94</sup> Pashto *dā* has been explained as going back to Old Iranian *\*aita-*, and *ha-* in *haya* is traced back to *\*ha-*.<sup>95</sup> Ossetic *a-* “this” is derived from Old Iranian *\*a-*, Iron *u-* from *\*aua-* or *\*hau* and Digor *ie* is thought to go back to *\*aiam*.<sup>96</sup>

Table no. 12. *Demonstratives*

Yaghnobi	Shughni	Yazgh.	Munji	Wakhi	Par.	Pashto	Oss.
-	<i>yam</i> obl.m. <i>mi</i> obl.f. <i>mam</i>		<i>ma</i> obl.m. <i>mān</i> obl.f. <i>māy</i>	<i>yəm</i>	( <i>h</i> ) <i>ē</i> ; Orm. <i>a</i>		<i>a-</i>
<i>iš</i> , <i>it</i> < OIr. <i>*aiša-/aita-</i>	<i>yid</i> obl.m. <i>di</i> obl.f. <i>dam</i>	<i>du</i> , Obl.	<i>ya</i>	<i>yət</i>		<i>dā</i> , <i>daya</i>	
<i>ax</i> , <i>aw</i> < OIr. <i>*hau/aua-</i>	<i>yu</i> , <i>yā</i> (f.) obl.m. <i>wi</i> obl.f. <i>wam</i>	<i>yu</i> , obl. <i>way</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>ya(w)</i>	Par. ( <i>h</i> ) <i>ō</i> ; Orm. <i>afō</i>	<i>haya</i>	I. <i>u-</i> , D. <i>ie</i> (nom.), <i>uo-</i> (obl.)
Soghdian		Bactrian			Khot.		
<i>yw</i> obl. <i>ʷmʷ</i> , <i>ʷmyn</i> , <i>ʷmy(H)</i>		<i>εiw</i> ; <i>ειμo</i>			<i>šā</i>		

<sup>89</sup> EMMERICK 1989, 220.

<sup>90</sup> BOGOLJUBOV 1963, 102.

<sup>91</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929, 67.

<sup>92</sup> EFIMOV 1997, 439, 490.

<sup>93</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1997, 68, transcribes *ō*, *hō*.

<sup>94</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929, 350. EFIMOV 1991, 292, presents a less convincing etymology, deriving *afō* from a proximal demonstrative *\*hva-* with a development *f* < *\*hv-* which he (irritatingly) compares with Parth. *f* < *\*xʷ-* as in the case of *farrab* < *\*xʷarnab-* which, as is known, is an unclear etymology.

<sup>95</sup> GRJUNBERG 1987, 78ff. The *h-* must of course be secondary as *\*h* is lost in Pashto.

<sup>96</sup> THODARSON 1989, 472.

< OIr. * <i>aīam/ima-</i>						
ʃw obl. ʔw < OIr. * <i>aiša-/aita-</i>		το, τι; ειδο, εδο			šätä	
(ʔ)xw obl. ʔw(w), ʔwyn, ʔwy(H) < OIr. * <i>hau-/aua-</i>					šärä	

### 4.3. Personal pronouns with prefixes

In some of the Eastern Iranian languages personal pronouns occur with pre- or suffixes. Examples can be found in Bactrian, e.g. *ασαμαχο* “from/by us”,<sup>97</sup> in Choresmian, e.g. *c-myk* “from me” or in Soghdian. There are correspondences with some of the Pamir languages which cannot be found in Yaghnobi. One example is the use of personal pronouns with prefixes, like Soghdian *cʔmʔ(kH)* “from me” from \**hačä* “from” and the enclitic personal pronoun of the 1<sup>st</sup> singular. A comparable formation can be found in Munji, e.g. *žāmox* “from us”. Interestingly, in Soghdian only singular personal pronouns with prefixes are found, whereas in Munji only the plural forms are prefixed.

Table no. 13. *Prefixed personal pronouns.*

Soghdian			Bactrian	Munji		
1st sing.	2nd sing.			1st plur.	2nd plur.	
<i>δʔmʔ(k)</i> “with me”	<i>δʔ</i> “with you”	<i>δ-</i> < * <i>hadā</i> “with”		<i>dāmox</i> “i/on us”	<i>dāmoʔ</i> “i/on you”	<i>da</i> “in” < * <i>antara</i>
<i>prʔmʔk</i> “for me”	<i>prʔβʔk</i> “for you”	<i>pr-</i> < * <i>upari</i> “for”		<i>nāmox</i> “(to) us”	<i>nāmoʔ</i> “(to) you”	<i>na</i> “to” < * <i>ana</i>
<i>cʔmʔ(kH)</i> “from me”	<i>cʔβʔk(H)</i> “from you”	<i>c-</i> < * <i>hačä</i> “from”	<i>ασαμαχο</i> “from us”	<i>žāmox</i> “from us”	<i>žāmoʔ</i> “from you”	<i>ža</i> “from” < * <i>hačä</i>
<i>tʔmʔ(kH)</i> “me”	<i>tʔβʔ(kH)</i> “you”	marks the direct definite object, cf. prep. ʔ <i>t(w)</i> to	<i>αβαμαχο</i> “us” dir. object	<i>vāmox</i> “us”	<i>vāmoʔ</i> “you”	marks the direct definite object, < * <i>upa-</i> , * <i>apa-</i>

### 4.4. Demonstratives: pre- and suffixes

In Soghdian forms of the demonstrative stems may occur with pre- and suffixes. Forms with the prefixes *c-* < \**hačä* “from”, *δ-* < \**hadā* “with”, *n-* < \**anu-* or \**ana-* “to” and *pr-* < \**upari* “on” can be found.<sup>98</sup> There are two different suffixes, *-ʔnt* and *-ʔyδ*, e.g. *cywʔnt* “from that” and *cyw(ʔ)yδ* “from that”. They occur both in attributive and predicative position. The origin of the suffixes *-ʔnt* and *-ʔyδ* is not clear. Livshitz/Hromov derive *-ʔyδ*

<sup>97</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000, 1790, Q20.

<sup>98</sup> LIVSHITZ/HROMOV 1981, 461.

from *\*aita-*.<sup>99</sup> It has been compared with Roshani *-aθ*, *-θ*, a suffix forming adverbs, by Bogoljubov.<sup>100</sup> A difference in meaning has not been noticed so far.

In Shughni morphologically similar formations occur, which function as local adverbs, like e.g. *azamand* “from there”, with *az-* < *\*bačā* “from”, a form of the demonstrative and a suffix *-and* and *azamard* “from there” with a suffix *-ard*.<sup>101</sup> The suffix *-and* has been compared with *\*antara-*, and *-ard* is derived from *\*arda-* “side”.<sup>102</sup> The suffixes have different functions. Forms with *-and* are used to mark definite location, whereas those with *-ard* mark indefinite location.<sup>103</sup>

Table no. 14. *Demonstratives with pre- and suffixes*

		Soghdian			Shughni		
dist.	c-	<i>cyw'nt</i>	<i>cyw(')yδ</i>	<i>az</i>	<i>azamand</i>	<i>azam</i>	<i>azamard</i>
med.			<i>cytyδ</i>		<i>azedand</i>	<i>azed</i>	<i>azedard</i>
prox.		“from”	<i>cym'nt</i>		<i>cym(')yδ</i>	“from”	<i>azūdand</i>
dist.	δ-	<i>δyw'nt</i>	<i>δyw'yδ</i>	<i>tar</i>	<i>taramand</i>	<i>taram</i>	<i>taramard</i>
med.					<i>taredand</i>	<i>tared</i>	<i>taredard</i>
prox.		“with”	<i>δym'nt</i>		<i>δym'yδ</i>	“to”	<i>tarūdand</i>
dist.	n-	<i>nyw'nt</i>	<i>nyw'yδ</i>				
med.			<i>nytyδ</i>				
prox.		“to”		<i>nymyδ</i>			
dist.	<i>pr-</i>	<i>prywynd</i>	<i>pr'yw'yδ</i>				
med.			<i>prytyδ</i>				
prox.		“on”	<i>prymnd</i>	<i>prymyδ</i>			

#### 4.5. Local adverbs

In Soghdian the suffix *-rδ* also occurs in local adverbs. Similar to Shughni, forms with *-rδ* also mark indefinite location.<sup>104</sup> Among the Modern Eastern Iranian languages forms with *-ard* are found in Xufi, a language closely related to Shughni: *amard*, *adard*, *udard*.<sup>105</sup> Also in Ossetic the local adverbs *ardæm* “here” and *ūrdæm* “there” with *ærd-* “side” may be compared.<sup>106</sup>

Similar morphological formations can be found in Soghdian and Bactrian. It has not been studied so far if they also have comparable functions in Bactrian.

Table no. 15. *Local adverbs*

Soghdian					Bactrian	Xufi
indef.	def.	known	unknown			

<sup>99</sup> LIVSHITZ/HROMOV 1981, 466.

<sup>100</sup> BOGOLJUBOV 1960, 9.

<sup>101</sup> Forms with *-m-*, which usually represent the proximal deixis, are used for distal deixis here, whereas the forms containing the distal demonstrative stem are used for proximal deixis. This also occurs in other languages of the Shughni group, e.g. in Xufi. This “switch” in deixis has not been explained so far.

<sup>102</sup> EDEL'MAN 1987, 339f.

<sup>103</sup> KARASHOEV 1988, 56f.

<sup>104</sup> WENDTLAND 2006.

<sup>105</sup> SOKOLOVA 1959, 112, 116, 267.

<sup>106</sup> BOGOLJUBOV 1960, 4.

<i>mrd</i>	<i>mδ</i>	<i>mδy</i>	<i>mδ'yδ</i>	“here” prox.	<i>μαρο</i>	<i>μαλο</i>	<i>μαληλο</i>	<i>amard</i> “there”
<i>trδ</i>		<i>tδy</i>	<i>tδ'yδ</i>	“there” med.			<i>ταληλο</i>	<i>adard</i> “there”
<i>'wrδ</i>	<i>'wδ</i>	<i>wδy</i>	<i>wδyδ</i>	“there” dist.	<i>οαρο</i>	<i>οαλο</i>		<i>udard</i> “here”

## 5. Lexicon

There are some words which are often mentioned as being characteristic for the Eastern Iranian language group.<sup>107</sup> Among them are archaisms and innovations. An example often cited is the word for ‘fish’ which is held to be a common Eastern Iranian innovation. In Western Iranian languages the word for ‘fish’ goes back to Old Iranian *\*masyā-*, whereas in Eastern Iranian languages an innovation is found that can be traced back to *\*kapā-*. Thus, the word for ‘fish’ in Khotanese is *kavā-*, in Soghdian *kp-* and in Choresmian *kb*. In Modern Eastern Iranian we find *kæf* in Ossetic, *kab* in Pashto and *kop* in Munji. For Wakhi *kūp* is cited. The word is listed in several dictionaries but no evidence can be found in the word lists.<sup>108</sup> It is not mentioned by Morgenstierne and Steblin-Kamenskij lists it as an extinct word.<sup>109</sup> In the word lists of the Wakhi language it appears that a loan from Tajik, *mo(h)i*, *moyi*, *mabi*, is used.<sup>110</sup> Also in Parachi, Ormuri and Yaghnobi there seems to be no trace of *\*kapā-*.<sup>111</sup>

As can be seen from this example the comparison of the vocabulary is often complicated by the high percentage of Tajik loanwords which very often replace the original words. It would be much more significant to compare a word for which in all the Eastern Iranian languages have retained the original expression.

The word for “day”, which in most of the Eastern Iranian languages does not seem to have been replaced by a Tajik loanword might be a clearer example. Soghdian, Choresmian and Modern Iranian Yaghnobi, the Shughni group, Yazghulami, Ishkashmi and Munji share the same word for “day”, Old Iranian *\*maiθa-*.

In Bactrian and Pashto the word for “day” goes back to Old Iranian *\*raucah*. The other Eastern Iranian languages show quite different words. Wakhi *rwor* is said to go back to *\*fra-vāh(a)r-*.<sup>112</sup> Pashto *rwaĵ* is derived from *\*raucah*. Ossetic *bon* goes back to *\*bānu-*.<sup>113</sup> the etymology of Khotanese *hadāa-* is not clear.

Table. no. 16. *Lexicon: “day”*

Yaghn.	Shughni	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Pashto	Par.	Oss.
	+								
<i>met,</i> <i>mes</i>	<i>mēθ, mīθ</i>	<i>maθ</i>	<i>miθ</i>	<i>mi,</i> <i>may</i>	<i>mīč</i>	<i>rwor</i> < <i>*fra-</i> <i>vāh(a)r-</i>	<i>rwa</i> □, <i>wra</i> □ < <i>*raucah</i>	<i>ruč</i> (Or. roz)	I., D. <i>bon</i>

<sup>107</sup> See e.g. SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996, 651.

<sup>108</sup> STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999, 458.

<sup>109</sup> STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999, 458.

<sup>110</sup> GRJUNBERG/STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1976, 387.

<sup>111</sup> Yaghnobi *mabi* is a Tajik loanword; Morgenstierne 1929, 271, 400: lists Parachi *mābī* and Ormuri *māī*, both loanwords from Persian.

<sup>112</sup> STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999, 300.

<sup>113</sup> THODARSON 1989, 464.

Soghdian	Chor.	Khot.	Bactr.
<i>myθ</i>	<i>myθ</i>	<i>haḏāa-</i>	<i>ρωσο</i>

## 6. Conclusion

The Eastern Iranian languages represent a branch of languages which are linguistically extremely diverse. No phonological or morphological characteristics can be found which are shared by all of them. Only Shughni and its related languages and dialects, Sarikoli and Yazghulami show correspondences which point to a common ancestor.<sup>114</sup> This group also shows some similarities with Ishkashmi and Sanglech; some relations with Munji and Yidgha were also presumed.<sup>115</sup> But as could be seen from the examples given here, in many cases Yaghnobi shows an equally great amount of similarities. Many phonological, morphological and lexical characteristics point to a greater closeness of Yaghnobi to the Pamir languages than to the other Eastern Iranian languages. In Middle Iranian Soghdian several characteristics can be observed that are found in some of the Pamir languages but not in Yaghnobi. Also correspondences between Bactrian and some Pamir languages, e.g. with Munji or with the Shughni group, can be found. Only Khotanese shows different developments in many respects. Likewise, among the languages classified as Pamir, Wakhi is clearly deviating in many phonological, morphological and lexical characteristics and as different from them as Pashto or Ossetic. For pure linguistic reasons it would be more appropriate to separate Wakhi from the Pamir languages, as the term suggests a linguistic unity, which does not exist. In view of the characteristics discussed here, the table given in the beginning of the paper could be modified in the following way:

Table no. X. *Genetic relations of the Pamir languages*

Shughni-Yazghulami group					Ishk.	Munji	Yaghn.	Wakhi		
Shughni group				Yazgh.					Zeb.	Yidgha
Shughni	Roshani	Bartangi	Sarikoli							
Badzh.	Xufi	Roshorvi								

## Literature

- АНДРЕЕВ, М.С., Пещерева, Е.М., *Ягнобские тексты*, Москва/Ленинград 1957.  
 BAILEY, H. W., *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*, Cambridge 1979.  
 БОГОЛЮБОВ, М.Н., Согдийские документы с горы Мут (языковые данные), in: *Труды XXV международного конгресса востоковедов*, Москва 1960.  
 БОГОЛЮБОВ, М.Н., Местонаимения в хорезмийском языке, *Краткие сообщения Института народов Азии* 67, *Иранская филология*, Москва 1963, 99-103.  
 ЕФИМОВ, В. А., *Язык ормури в синхронном и историческом освещении*, Москва 1986.  
 ЕФИМОВ, В. А., *Ормури*, in: *Основы иранского языкознания, новоиранские языки 3: северо-западная группа I*, Москва 1991, 247-315.  
 ЕФИМОВ, В. А., *Парачи*, in: *Основы иранского языкознания, новоиранские языки 3: северо-западная группа II*, Москва 1997, 419-549.  
 ЭДЕЛЬМАН, Д.И., *Язгулямско-русский словарь*, Москва 1971.  
 EDELMAN, J., History of the consonant system of the North-Pamir languages, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 22, 1980, 287-310.

<sup>114</sup> SOKOLOVA 1967.

<sup>115</sup> SOKOLOVA 1973.



- ЭДЕЛЬМАН, Д.И., Шугнано-рушанская языковая группа, in: *Основы иранского языкознания, новоиранские языки: восточная группа*, Москва 1987, 236-347.
- ЭДЕЛЬМАН, Д.И., Язгулямский язык, in: *Основы иранского языкознания, новоиранские языки: восточная группа*, Москва 1987, 348-407.
- EMMERICK, R. E., Khotanese and Tumshuqese, in: Schmitt, R., *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden 1989, 204-229.
- EMMERICK, R. E./PULLEYBLANK, E. G., *A Chinese text in Central Asian Brahmi script : new evidence for the pronunciation of Late Middle Chinese and Khotanese*, Roma 1993.
- GHARIB, B., *Sogdian Dictionary*, Teheran 1995.
- GEIGER, W., Über das Yaghnōbī, in: *Grundriß der Iranischen Philologie I/2*, Strassburg 1898-1901, 334-344.
- GRIERSON, G.A., The Ōrmuṛī or Bargistā language. An account of a little-known Eranian dialect, *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 7, 1918, I-XIV, 1-101.
- ГРЮНБЕРГ, А. Л., *Языки восточного гиндукуша: мунджанский язык*, Ленинград 1972.
- ГРЮНБЕРГ, А. Л., *Языки восточного гиндукуша: язык кати*, Москва 1980.
- ГРЮНБЕРГ, А. Л., *Мунджанский*, in: *Основы иранского языкознания, новоиранские языки: восточная группа*, Москва 1987, 155-235.
- ГРЮНБЕРГ, А. Л./Эдельман, Д.И., *Афганский язык*, in: *Основы иранского языкознания, новоиранские языки: восточная группа*, Москва 1987, 6-154.
- ГРЮНБЕРГ, А. Л./СТЕБАИН-КАМЕНСКИЙ, И. М., *Языки восточного гиндукуша: ваханский язык*, Москва 1976.
- HUMBACH, H., Choresmian, in: Schmitt, R. (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden 1989, 193-203.
- Исаев, М. И., Осетинский, in: *Основы иранского языкознания, новоиранские языки: восточная группа*, Москва 1987, 537-643.
- КАРАМШОЕВ, Д., *Шугнано-русский словарь I-III*, Москва 1988, 1991, 1999.
- KIEFFER, Ch. M., Le paračī, Ōrmuṛī, in: Schmitt, R. (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden 1989, 445-455.
- LIVSHITZ, V. A., A Soghdian alphabet from Panjikant, in: Boyce, M., Gershevitch, I. (eds.), *W. B. Henning Memorial Volume*, London 1970.
- Лившиц, В. А./Хромов, А. Л., Согдийский язык, *Основы иранского языкознания: среднеиранские языки*, Москва, 347-514.
- MORGENSTIERNE, G. *Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan*, Oslo, 1926.
- MORGENSTIERNE, G., *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages I: Parachi, Ormuri*, Oslo 1929.
- MORGENSTIERNE, G., *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages II: Iranian Pamir Languages: Yidgha-Munji, Sanglechi-Ishkashmi and Wakhi*, Oslo 1938.
- MORGENSTIERNE, G., *Etymological Vocabulary of the Shughni Group*, Wiesbaden 1974.
- MORGENSTIERNE, G., Ancient contacts between N. E. Iranian and Indo-Aryan?, in: *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Émile Benveniste*, Paris 1975, 431-434.
- MORGENSTIERNE, G., *A New Etymological Vocabulary of Pashto (compiled and edited by J. Elfenbein, D.N. MacKenzie and N. Sims-Williams)*, Wiesbaden 2003.
- Оранский, И. М., *Иранские языки*, Москва 1963.
- Оранский, И. М., *Основы иранского языкознания I: древнеиранские языки*, Москва 1979.
- ПАХАЛИНА, Т.Н., *Памирские языки*, Москва 1969.
- ПАХАЛИНА, Т.Н., *Сарыкольско-русский словарь*, Москва 1971.
- ПАХАЛИНА, Т.Н., *Исследование по сравнительно-исторической фонетике памирских языков*, Москва 1983.
- PAYNE, J., Munji and Yidgha, in: Schmitt, R. (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden 1989, 411-416.
- PAYNE, J., Pamir languages, in: Schmitt, R. (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden 1989, 417-444.

- SKJÆRVØ, P. O., Modern Eastern Iranian Languages, in: Schmitt, R. (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden 1989, 363-383.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, N., Soghdian, in: Schmitt, R. (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden 1989, 173-192.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, N., The Sogdian 'Rhythmic Law', in: Skalmowski, W. (ed.), *Middle Iranian Studies*, Leuven 1984, 204-215.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, N., The Triple System of Deixis in Sogdian, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92(1), 41-53.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, N., East Iranian languages, in: Yarshater, E. (ed.), *Encyclopædia Iranica VII*, Costa Mesa 1996, 649-652.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, N., *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan I: Legal and Economic Documents*, Studies in the Khalili Collection Vol. III, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia, Vol. III: Bactrian, Oxford 2000.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, N., *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan II: Letters and Buddhist Texts*, Studies in the Khalili Collection Vol. III, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia, Vol. III: Bactrian, London 2007.
- СОКОЛОВА, В. С., *Рушанские и хуфские тексты и словарь*, Москва/Ленинград 1959.
- СОКОЛОВА, В. С., *Генетические отношения язгулямского языка и шугнанской языковой группы*, Ленинград 1967.
- СОКОЛОВА, В. С., *Генетические отношения мунджанского языка и шугнано-язгулямской языковой группы*, Ленинград 1973.
- СТЕБЛИН-КАМЕНСКИЙ, И. М., *Очерки по истории лексики памирских языков. Названия культурных растений*, Москва 1981.
- СТЕБЛИН-КАМЕНСКИЙ, И. М., *Этимологический словарь ваханского языка*, Санкт-Петербург 1999.
- THODARSON, F., Ossetic, in: Schmitt, R. (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden 1989, 456-479.
- WENDTLAND, A.: Deixis im Soghdischen oder: Warum wird man *wd'y* („dort“) geboren und stirbt *wd'yδ* („dort“), Eichner, H. et al. (ed.), *Iranistik in Europa – gestern, heute, morgen*, Wien 2006, 241-259.
- ХРОМОВ, А.Л., Ягнобский язык, in: *Основы иранского языкознания, новоиранские языки: восточная группа*, Москва 1987, 644-701.
- ЗАРУБИН, И.И., *Шугнанские тексты и словарь*, Москва/Ленинград 1970.