

## The Position of the Pamir Languages within East Iranian

Antje Wendtland  
Göttingen

### Abstract

The Pamir languages are a group of East Iranian languages which are linguistically quite diverse and cannot be traced back to a common ancestor. The term “Pamir languages” is based on their geographical position rather than on their genetic closeness. Their relation to other East Iranian languages is rarely studied. In this context the position of Yaghnobi, which is usually mostly compared with the Middle Iranian Sogdian language, might be of some interest. But Sogdian also shows traits found in some of the Pamir languages. Therefore it might be interesting to compare some phonological and morphological characteristics of individual Modern East Iranian and East Middle Iranian languages in order to find out if there are specific relations between them – and also to see if particular developments are innovations characteristic of Modern East Iranian or have already occurred in Middle Iranian.

### 1. Introduction

The classification of some of the Iranian languages still raises questions and cannot be said to have been completely resolved. The criteria for their affiliation to one group or another do not seem to be clear and agreed upon in every respect. As an especially striking example, one can mention Ormuri and Parachi, two Iranian languages spoken in Afghanistan, which have been classified as belonging to completely different branches of the Iranian languages despite usually being regarded as “South East Iranian”.<sup>1</sup>

The term “South East Iranian” is not always used for these two languages alone. Sometimes Pashto and the Pamir languages are also classified as South East Iranian, whereas Ossetic and Yaghnobi are described as North East Iranian languages.<sup>2</sup> Even within East Iranian (broadly defined) one group is quite diverse in itself. The Pamir languages comprise about 15 different modern East Iranian languages spoken in the frontier area of Tajikistan, Afghanistan, Pakistan and China.<sup>3</sup> It was soon found out that the languages of the so-called Shughni-Roshani group

<sup>1</sup> After they were first held to be West Iranian by GRIERSON 1918: 49–52, a similar view was later advanced by other scholars like ORANSKIJ 1979a: 81–121, and EFIMOV 1986. But MORGENSTIERNE 1926: 28ff., 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 that they share with West Iranian. He defined a South-East Iranian sub-group consisting of Ormuri and Parachi. Others, like KIEFFER 1989: 451ff., follow this classification in their grammatical descriptions. See also SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996: 650.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. by Soviet scholars, in *Osnovy*; cf. also the genealogical tree of the Iranian languages at the site of the Institute of Indo-European Studies, University of Frankfurt, <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/didact/idg/iran/iranstam.htm>

<sup>3</sup> Their genetic relations were first extensively studied by MORGENSTIERNE 1938 and later, in more detail, by Russian scholars like SOKOLOVA 1967, 1973, PAHALINA 1969, 1983 and ÈDEL'MAN 1987a.

are closely related to Yazghulami and Sarikoli, whereas languages like Munji and Yidgha, or Wakhi seem to be more isolated. Although the genetic relations among the Pamir languages are not yet understood in full detail, it can be said that it is not possible to trace all of them back to a single common ancestor that would be unique to this group.<sup>4</sup>

**Table 1.** Genetic relations of the Pamir languages.<sup>5</sup>

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

Thus, the term “Pamir languages” is based on their geographical position rather than on their genetic proximity, and they have also been called a “Sprachbund” (linguistic area), which seems to be more appropriate.<sup>6</sup> Contrary to the “Balkan languages”, which belong to various branches of Indo-European and are therefore more obviously defined as a linguistic area, a *sprachbund* of languages from one branch of a language family can easily be mistaken for a genetically closely related unit. For instance, the frequent use of the term “Pamir dialects” might create the impression of a dialect continuum with only small divergences.

Another language belonging to the Eastern branch of the Iranian languages is Yaghnobi. Its closeness to the Middle Iranian Sogdian language has often been pointed out, and when first studied it was even considered to be a kind of modern successor of Sogdian.<sup>7</sup> Others believe that a direct derivation of Yaghnobi from Sogdian is not possible because of a number of divergences in the phonology and morphology of these languages. One of the main arguments is the so-called Rhythmic Law, which shaped the phonological development of Sogdian but did not have an effect on the predecessor of the Yaghnobi language.<sup>8</sup> Yaghnobi is usually described as deriving from a dialect similar to Sogdian.<sup>9</sup> When one compares Yaghnobi with the Pamir languages, and some of the other East Middle Iranian languages, one can find a considerable number of similar phonological and morphological developments and isoglosses. Still, Yaghnobi is rarely compared with the Pamir languages.

All the Modern East Iranian languages (except Ossetic) contain many loanwords from Tajik or Dari, and their original vocabularies are very often imperfectly documented. Moreover, they all have dialects, which are not well studied and may show a wide range of lexical variation. One further important point is that in the study of these relatively diverse languages, similar sound changes – when viewed in isolation

<sup>4</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1938: XVIII; STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1982: 3; SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996: 651. Occasionally some of the languages are not classified as “Pamir” and are treated separately, e.g. Munji and Yidgha by PAYNE 1989a, as they are spoken outside the Pamir region.

<sup>5</sup> This presentation of the Shughni-Yazghulami group follows SOKOLOVA 1967: 124.

<sup>6</sup> GRJUNBERG 1980.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. ORANSKIJ 1963: 164.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. SIMS-WILLIAMS 1989: 165.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. HROMOV 1987: 645.

– cannot be considered proof of common ancestry in every case.<sup>10</sup> There are a number of phonological and morphological characteristics which are commonly said to be typical of the East Iranian languages, although no universal traits distinguishing East Iranian from West Iranian have been found so far.<sup>11</sup> Below some phonological and morphological characteristics of the East Middle Iranian and Modern East Iranian will be discussed in order to see if some new insights into their genetic relations can be found.

## 2. Phonological characteristics

### 2.1 Old Iranian word-initial \*č-

In most East Iranian languages Old Iranian \*č was depalatalized and became *ts*,<sup>12</sup> as in Chorasmian, Bactrian, most of the Pamir languages, and Ossetic. In Khotanese it was depalatalized before non-palatals.<sup>13</sup> Only Sogdian did not take part in the development. Here \*č was preserved.<sup>14</sup> Among the Modern East Iranian languages č was preserved in Parachi<sup>15</sup> and Yaghnobi,<sup>16</sup> and word-initially in Yazghulami and Munji.<sup>17</sup>

**Table 2.** Old Iranian \*č-: \*čaθuār- “four”; \*či- “what”.<sup>18</sup>

Yaghn.	Shughni <sup>19</sup>	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Par.	Pashto	Oss.
( <i>tufor</i> )	<i>cavūr</i> , <i>cavōr</i>	<i>cavur</i>	<i>čer</i>	<i>cɣfur</i>	<i>čfir</i> , <i>čfūr</i>	<i>cəbɣr</i>	<i>čōr</i> <sup>20</sup> Orm. <i>cār</i>	<i>calor</i>	<i>cyppar</i> / <i>cuppar</i>
<i>čo</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>či</i>	<i>ce</i>	Yidgha <i>ce</i>	<i>cə</i>	Par. <i>če</i> , Orm. <i>ca</i>	<i>cə</i>	<i>cy</i>
Bactr.		Chor.		Sogd.		Khot.			
σoσapo [(t)sufar]		<i>cfʳ</i> [tsafār]		<i>ctβʳ</i> , <i>ctfʳ</i> , <i>cfʳ</i> [ča(t)fār]		<i>tcohaurā</i> ( <i>kye</i> , <i>ci</i> etc.)			
σα-		c- [ts-]		c- [č-]					

<sup>10</sup> One example may illustrate the dilemma: Middle Iranian Khotanese and Modern Wakhi share some remarkable phonological features, as was first described by MORGENSTIERNE 1975: 432f. Unlike in many other Ir. languages, Proto-Indo-European \*k<sub>1</sub> does not develop into *sp*, but into *ś* or *š*. Thus, in Khotanese the word for “horse”, Persian *asp*, is *aśśa*, and in Wakhi *yaš*. But this does not mean that Wakhi can be derived directly from Khotanese or that it is possible to trace both languages back to a common ancestor. This becomes clear from some other developments: in some cases Middle Iranian Khotanese shows a more advanced development than Modern Iranian Wakhi (see SKJÆRVØ 1989a: 375). 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* < Old Iranian \*pāda-. Moreover, the Wakhi outcome of Old Iranian word-internal \*θr (viz., *tr*) cannot be derived from Khotanese (-r), see Section 2.5.2.

<sup>11</sup> Pace SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996: 650f., who lists a number of words which are held to be exclusively East Iranian. Most of these can also be found in West Iranian languages, e.g. Balochi *kutik* “dog” (see KORN 2005: 188, note 56) or Bal. *gar* “flank of a hill, abyss” (KORN 2005: 150).

<sup>12</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996: 650.

<sup>13</sup> EMMERICK 1989: 213.

<sup>14</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1989a: 168.

<sup>15</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929: 34; EFIMOV 1997: 450f.

<sup>16</sup> HROMOV 1987: 656; LIVŠIČ/HROMOV 1981: 450. For the special development of the numeral “4” in Yaghnobi, where \*č develops to *t-*, see SIMS-WILLIAMS 2004: 541f.

<sup>17</sup> GRJUNBERG 1987: 174; EDEL’MAN 1987b: 370.

<sup>18</sup> Forms from East Middle Iranian languages are given to illustrate specific relations between some of them and certain Modern East Iranian languages. The forms also show whether the discussed developments are innovations characteristic of Modern East Iranian or already occurred in Middle Iranian.

<sup>19</sup> “Shughni” in the tables stands for the whole Shughni group.

<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.

2.2 Word-initial voiced stops

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

Both Yaghnobi and Ishkashmi as well as Zebaki and Sanglechi share the development of \*d-. The stop seems to have been preserved, but d has been explained as a reverse development from \*δ.<sup>22</sup> In Bactrian, Munji, Yidgha, and Pashto, Old Iranian \*d became l – as well as in some Sogdian dialects.<sup>23</sup> The development to l may of course have occurred independently and at different periods.<sup>24</sup> Ossetic is divergent: \*b- and \*d- remain unchanged; \*g- becomes γ- in Digor and then develops into q- in Iron.<sup>25</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>26</sup>

**Table 3.** Word-initial voiced stops:  
\*band- “to bind”; \*dasa- “ten”; \*gari- “mountain”.

	Yaghn.	Shughni	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Pashto	Oss.
*b-	vant-, vand-	vīnd-	vind-	van(d)-	vond-	vond-	vand-	wandanai “rope”	bæddyn / bæddun
*d-	das	δīs, δus, δos	des	δūs	dos	Yidgha los	δas	las	dæs
*g-	γar	žīr, žēr “stone”	žer	γar, γarčug	– γu “cow”	γār	γar	γar	qarm / γarm “warm”
		Chor.		Sogdian		Bactrian	Khotanese		
*b-		βr<d		βr<ι		βραδο	brātar- [brādar-]		
*d-		δys		δs(<)		λασο	daso [δaso]		
*g-		γ<w “cow”		γr-		γαρο	ggara- [gara-]		

2.3 Voicing of \*xt and \*ft

In most East Middle Iranian languages the consonant clusters \*xt and \*ft are voiced, as in Sogdian, Bactrian or Chorasmian.<sup>27</sup> In Khotanese they are simplified.<sup>28</sup>

**Table 4.** Development of Old Iranian \*xt:  
\*duxtar- “daughter”; \*taxta- “gone away”.

Yaghn.	Shughni	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Par.	Pashto	Oss.
			δoyd	wūδūγ(d), Sangl. wudəγd	ləγda, Yidgha luγdo	δəγd	dot; Orm. dua, duka	lur	I. (xo)dyγd
uxta “went out”	tūγd-	təγd-	tūγd-	tūγd-		taγd-		tə, təγ	taγd
		Bactr.	Sogd.	Chor.	Khot.				
		λoγδο	δwγt(<), δγwt	δγd	dūta, dūva				

<sup>21</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1989a: 168.

<sup>22</sup> PAYNE 1989b: 420. MÖRGENSTIERNE 1938: 303 explains the reversal as a result of Persian influence in Sanglechi and Ishkashmi.

<sup>23</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1989a: 168; LIVSHITZ 1970: 262.

<sup>24</sup> SKJÆRVØ 1989a: 376.

<sup>25</sup> ISAEV 1987: 568.

<sup>26</sup> MÖRGENSTIERNE 1929: 34, 329; KIEFFER 1989: 453.

<sup>27</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1989a: 167. SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996: 650 describes the Sogdian clusters as partly voiced to γt and βt, though, whereas GHARIB 1995: 21, 146 and LIVŠIĆ/HROMOV 1981: 395f., 402 consider them to be voiced.

<sup>28</sup> EMMERICK 1989: 215, where more examples can be found; \*xt may develop into /dl/, /ɣ/, /l/ or /l/.

In Pashto *\*xt* may be reduced to *y* or zero,<sup>29</sup> whereas *\*ft* may result in *w* or *wd*, as in *owə* “seven” or *tawda* “warmed” < *\*tafta*-.<sup>30</sup> In Parachi *x* is lost, as in *dot* “daughter” or *p’arāt*- “to sell”, which is derived from *\*parā-waxta*- by MORGENSTIERNE.<sup>31</sup> For Ormuri he concludes that *x* and *f* were assimilated early and the cluster resulted in *t*, which is lost, as e.g. in *duka*, *dua* “daughter” or *ho*, *wo* “seven”.<sup>32</sup> In Yaghnobi *\*xt* is represented as such, and is not voiced; *\*ft* is voiced only in one dialect.<sup>33</sup>

Yaghn.	Shughni	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</i> ) <i>ūvd</i>	<i>ɣvd</i>	<i>uvd</i>	<i>uvd</i>	<i>ovda</i>	<i>ɣtb</i>	<i>owə</i>	<i>hōr</i> ; Orm. <i>ho</i> , <i>wo</i>	<i>avd</i>
Sogd.	Chor.	Khot.		Bactr.					
<i>βr</i>	<i>βd</i>	<i>hauda</i>		<i>πιδοροβδο</i> “received” < <i>*pati-grfta</i> -					

## 2.4 Old Iranian *\*θ*

The preservation of the phoneme *\*θ* is seen as one of the characteristics of the East Iranian languages.<sup>34</sup> The phoneme *\*θ* is preserved in Sogdian and Chorasmian.<sup>35</sup> In Khotanese it is preserved in initial position only<sup>36</sup> while it becomes *h* in intervocalic position, as in *ggāha*- “song” < Old Iranian *\*gāθa*-.<sup>37</sup> In Bactrian *\*θ* becomes *h*, e.g. in *ραυοβαναο* “highway robbery” (< *\*rāθa-pāna*-).<sup>38</sup> Wakhi, the Shughni group, Sarikoli, and Yazghulami preserve *θ*, whereas the development in Munji is different. Here the fricative yields *š*.<sup>39</sup> In Yaghnobi it became *-t* in one dialect, *-s* in the other.<sup>40</sup> In Ossetic *\*θ* became *t* in both dialects,<sup>41</sup> while it develops into *l* in Pashto.<sup>42</sup> In Ishkashmi *\*θ* becomes *s*, as in *sav*- “to burn” < *\*θav*-.<sup>43</sup> In Sanglechi it usually results in *t*, as in *tāv*- “to

<sup>29</sup> For *\*xt* > *-w*- or *-y*- see SKJÆRVØ 1989b: 402.

<sup>30</sup> GRJUNBERG/ÉDEL’MAN 1987: 30f. According to SKJÆRVØ, 1989: 377, table I and 1989: 378, in Parachi *\*xt* becomes *y* and *\*ft* becomes *w*, whereas both result in *w* or become zero in Ormuri.

<sup>31</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929: 38, 279 transcribes *dut* and *pharāt*. *\*fra*- would yield *rh*- (e.g. *\*fra-vaz*- > *rhāz*- MORGENSTIERNE 1929: 38).

<sup>32</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929: 333 transcribed as *dūa*, *duka* and *hō*, *wō*.

<sup>33</sup> This has been explained as a reversal, see LIVŠIČ/HROMOV 1981: 395, 402; SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996: 650.

<sup>34</sup> E.g. SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996: 650. Several of these languages do not have a phoneme *θ*, though, e.g. Yaghnobi, Sanglechi, Ishkashmi, Munji, Yidgha, Pashto, Ormuri, and Parachi. A. KORN has kindly drawn my attention to the development in Balochi, where (in contrast to the coalescence of *\*θ* and *\*h* > *h* common in West Iranian) *\*θ* becomes *t*, cf. KORN 2005: 81.

<sup>35</sup> E.g. SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996: 650.

<sup>36</sup> EMMERICK 1989: 213. Some scholars believe that the Iranian fricatives *f*, *θ*, and *x* reverted to aspirate stops through the influence of Indian languages like Sanskrit and Prakrit, e.g. EMMERICK 1989: 209; EMMERICK/PULLEYBLANK 1993.

<sup>37</sup> EMMERICK 1989: 214.

<sup>38</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 2007: 259. The only word which seems to have preserved *θ* is *τθαο* “thus, so”.

<sup>39</sup> GRJUNBERG 1987: 177.

<sup>40</sup> HROMOV 1987: 655, 659.

<sup>41</sup> ISAEV 1987: 566.

<sup>42</sup> GRJUNBERG/ÉDEL’MAN 1987: 35.

<sup>43</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1938: 305. For the derivation from *\*θav*- see STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999: 374.

burn”.<sup>44</sup> In Ormuri *θ* develops into *y*, as in *rāy* “way” < *\*rāθa*-.<sup>45</sup> The development in Parachi is not clear.<sup>46</sup>

**Table 6.** Old Iranian *\*θ*: *\*maiθa*- “day”, etc.

Yaghn.	Shughni	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Orm.	Pashto	Oss.
<i>met, mes</i>	<i>mēθ, mīθ</i>	<i>maθ</i>	<i>miθ</i>	<i>mi, may</i> , but <i>sav</i> - < <i>*θav</i> -; Sang. <i>mēi</i>	<i>mīč</i>	<i>θaw</i> - “burn” < <i>*θav</i> -	<i>rāy</i> < <i>*rāθa</i> - “way”	<i>yele</i> < <i>*gaiθyā</i> - “flocks”	<i>fætæn</i> “broad” < <i>*paθana</i> -
Sogdian		Chor.		Bactr.		Khot.			
<i>myθ, myδ</i>		<i>myθ</i>		𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬀-		<i>ggāha</i> -			

### 2.5 The development of Old Iranian *\*θr*-

#### 2.5.1 Word-initial position

Old Iranian *\*θr* shows quite divergent developments in the East Iranian languages, both initially and internally. In Sogdian, and partly also in Chorasmian and Parachi, *\*θr* becomes *š*. In Yazghulami *\*θr* is reduced to *c*.<sup>47</sup> In initial position the cluster is preveved as *tr*- in Wakhi, becomes *dr*- in Khotanese and Pashto, and *tir*- or *sar*- in Yaghnobi.<sup>48</sup> In Munji it becomes *šir*-.<sup>49</sup> The development in Bactrian, the Shughni group, and Sarikoli can be compared. In Bactrian it becomes *har*-; in the languages of the Shughni group and in Sarikoli it results in *ar*-.<sup>50</sup> The Bactrian outcome of *\*θr* matches the general development of *\*θ* (cf. Section 2.4), whereas in the Shughni group it is divergent.

**Table 7.** Development of Old Iranian initial *\*θr*-: *\*θraījah* “three”.

Yaghn.	Shughni	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Pashto	Par.	Oss.
<i>tiray, saray</i>	<i>aray</i>	<i>aroy</i>	<i>cūy</i>	<i>rūy</i>	<i>širay</i> ; Yidgha <i>šuroy</i>	<i>tru(y)</i>	<i>dre</i>	<i>ši</i> ; Orm. <i>šo</i>	<i>ærtæ</i>
Bactr.			Khot.			Sogd.		Chor.	
𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬀 [harei]			<i>drai</i>			<i>šy</i> [šē/i]		<i>šy</i>	

#### 2.5.2 Word-internal position

In Khotanese, Bactrian, and Chorasmian, *\*-θr-* is reduced to *-r-*.<sup>51</sup> Among the Modern East 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 Sogdian

<sup>44</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1938: 305, 313. In the word for “day”, *mi, may*, it seems to have developed to *y*, but this has been explained as an “elision” of *\*θ* by MORGENSTIERNE, who traces the word back to *\*māθya*-.  
<sup>45</sup> EFIMOV 1991: 271. MORGENSTIERNE 1929: 405 derives the word from *\*raiθya*-.  
<sup>46</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929: 44 transcribes *thī*-; he writes that *\*θ* may result in an aspirated stop, like in *t i*- “to be burning” (see also STEBLIN-KAMENSKII 1999: 374). EFIMOV 1997: 459, 463 gives examples of intervocalic spirants developing into *h*.  
<sup>47</sup> EDEL’MAN 1987b: 369.  
<sup>48</sup> SKJÆRVØ 1989a: 375 and 377, table I.  
<sup>49</sup> GRJUNBERG 1987: 177.  
<sup>50</sup> SKJÆRVØ 1989a: 376.  
<sup>51</sup> The development from *\*-θr-* to *-r-* via *\*-hr-* may be documented in Bactrian in 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬀 “family” < *\*gauθra-ka*- (see SIMS-WILLIAMS 2007: 207) and 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬀 “relatives” (LEE/SIMS-WILLIAMS 2003: 170f.), otherwise *-γωρο*. The spelling *-υρ*- is also once attested in a pseudo-historical writing, in the word 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬀 “belief” (LEE/SIMS-WILLIAMS 2003: 170), otherwise 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬀 (SIMS-WILLIAMS 2007: 253).

and Parachi the internal *\*-θr-* becomes *-š-* as in initial position. In Wakhi the development is more conservative: the cluster is preserved as *-tr-* as in initial position.<sup>52</sup> In Ossetic it becomes *-rt-*.<sup>53</sup>

In Yaghnobi there are only very few examples of the development of Old Iranian *\*-θr-*.<sup>54</sup> GEIGER postulated that Old Iranian *\*-θr-* in internal position developed into *-l(l)-* in Yaghnobi.<sup>55</sup> He mentioned *ōl* “fire” and *pula* “son” as examples of this development. This was doubted by LIVSHITZ who writes that *ōl* is only used in combination with the verb *xasš* in *ōlxaš* “to catch fire, to begin to burn”, whereas the common word for fire, *ōlōw*, is borrowed from Tajik.<sup>56</sup> He points out that the common word for “son” in Yaghnobi is *žūta*, 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, since a word for “child” might as well have the meaning “son”, LIVSHITZ puts forward another, much stronger argument. He remarks that *\*-δr-* develops into *-rδ-* in Yaghnobi, as in *mirδa* “beads” from *\*mudraka-* (as opposed to Sogdian *mwž:kk*), and concludes that *\*-θr-* in Yaghnobi may be expected to yield *\*-rt-* or *-rs-*. As an example to stress the plausibility of this argument one may mention Yaghnobi *dirot*, *diros* “sickle”, which can be traced back to *\*dāθra-*, cf. Ishkashmi *dur*, Bartangi and Roshorvi *δōc*, Yazghulami *δac*, Wakhi *δytr*, *δətr*, Pashto *lor*, etc.<sup>57</sup> It therefore seems reasonable to follow LIVSHITZ’ view that *\*-θr-* might not have given *-l(l)-* as previously assumed.

**Table 8.** Development of Old Iranian word-internal *\*-θr-*: *\*puθra-* “son”.

Yaghn.	Shughni	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Pashto	Par.	Oss.
<i>pulla</i> or <i>dirot</i> , <i>diros</i>	<i>puc</i>	<i>pyc</i> , <i>pūc</i>	<i>poc</i>	– <i>usər</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>58</sup> “sun”	<i>fyrt</i>
			Khot.		Bactr.		Chor.		Sogd.
			<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 Sogdian and Yaghnobi share the same plural suffixes, *-t* in the direct case and *-ti* in the oblique.<sup>59</sup> These are the plural suffixes of the so-called heavy stems in Sogdian. Plural suffixes in *-t* are also found in Ossetic and in Yazghulami, which have *-tə* and *-aθ*. Moreover, the Sogdian plural suffix *-yšt*, which is only found with animate nouns, 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 Chorasmian.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>52</sup> STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999: 31.

<sup>53</sup> ISAEV 1987: 571.

<sup>54</sup> GEIGER 1898–1901b: 336.

<sup>55</sup> GEIGER 1898–1901b: 336.

<sup>56</sup> LIVSHITZ 1970: 262f., note 28.

<sup>57</sup> STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999: 168.

<sup>58</sup> Attested in the dialect of Kāñigrām, see Efimov 1991: 269.

<sup>59</sup> SKJÆRVØ 1989a: 375.

<sup>60</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1938: 122, follows Tedesco in deriving the plural ending from Old Iranian *\*-āh*. SOKOLOVA 1973: 160–162 derives the ending from the pronominal flexion. See also GRJUNBERG 1987: 181f.

The plural in Pashto is more complex and shows a wide range of variation which also may involve ablaut.<sup>61</sup> The plural suffix in Parachi is *-ān*.<sup>62</sup> The plural *-i*, which is used for non-animates in Ormuri is traced back to *\*-aiāh*.<sup>63</sup> The etymology of the plural ending used for animates, *-in*, does not seem to be clear.<sup>64</sup>

**Table 9.** Plural suffixes.<sup>65</sup>

	Yaghn.	Shugh.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Orm.	Oss.
dir.	-t	-ēn	-aθ	-o	-i	-išt	-i	-tæ
obl.	-ti				-āf <sup>66</sup>	-əv		
	Sogd.	Chor.			Bactr.			
	heavy	light						
dir.	-t	-t <sup>&lt;</sup> -yšt, -y <sup>&lt;</sup>	-i			-avo, -ε <sup>67</sup>		
		only animate						
obl.	-ty	-ty <sup>&lt;</sup> -yšty, -n	-<n			-avo		
		only animate						

### 3.2 Verbs: 3<sup>rd</sup> plural ending

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 Sogdian. It may be compared with the 3<sup>rd</sup> plural ending of Chorasmian, which also contains an *r*, and with the 3<sup>rd</sup> plural middle ending in Khotanese.<sup>68</sup>

**Table 10.** Verbal endings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> plural present.

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

### 3.3 The 2<sup>nd</sup> plural pronoun

A very interesting isogloss is found in Bactrian, the Shughni group, Yazghulami, Ishkashmi, and Sarikoli.<sup>69</sup> All these languages share a specific formation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> plural pronoun – different from Sogdian and Yaghnobi as well as from Munji and

<sup>61</sup> For details see SKJÆRVØ 1989b: 389–392 and GRJUNBERG/ÈDEL’MAN 1987: 44–58.

<sup>62</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929: 50 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; for more details, see EFIMOV 1997: 478ff.

<sup>63</sup> EFIMOV 1991: 281. It is compared with Pashto *-i* by MORGENSTIERNE 1929: 342, who transcribes it as *-ī*.

<sup>64</sup> EFIMOV 1991: 281 explains it as going back to the Old Iranian genitive ending of the *i*-stems, *\*-inām*.

<sup>65</sup> In Khotanese the categories of noun inflection have been preserved and can more readily be compared with Old Iranian languages than with the other Middle or Modern East Iranian languages. They are therefore not listed here. For an overview see EMMERICK 1989: 216–219.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Rošorvī *-īf*, Sarikoli oblique plural *-ef*, PAYNE 1989b: 428.

<sup>67</sup> *-ε* is only attested in inscriptions.

<sup>68</sup> In Khotanese most verbs occur either with indicative or middle endings (see e.g. EMMERICK 1989: 220). The present subjunctive and optative active endings also contain *-r*: *-āru* and *-īru*.

<sup>69</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996: 651.

Wakhi. Before the Bactrian form became known it was thought to be a peculiarity of some Pamir languages, and was described as one of several characteristics alien to Iranian and therefore attributed to substratum influence.<sup>70</sup> The formation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> plural pronoun involves a form of the 2<sup>nd</sup> singular pronoun. Likewise the 2<sup>nd</sup> plural pronoun in Pashto seems to contain a form of the singular, whereas the second element of the word is not clear.<sup>71</sup> The Chorasmian 2<sup>nd</sup> plural pronoun also seems to be composed of an element  $-\beta(y)$  connected with the enclitic forms of the 2<sup>nd</sup> singular pronoun,  $\beta$ -, acc.  $-\beta$ -.<sup>72</sup>

**Table 11.** The 2<sup>nd</sup> plural pronoun.

Yaghn.	Shughni	Bart.	Sar.	Yazgh.	Ishk.	Munji	Wakhi	Par.	Pashto	Oss.
<i>šumox</i>	<i>tama</i>	<i>tamāš</i>	<i>tamaš</i>	<i>tətox</i>	<i>təmbəx</i>	<i>mof</i> <sup>73</sup>	<i>sa(y)-iš(t)</i> , obl. <i>sav</i>	<i>wā</i> ; Orm. <sup>74</sup> <i>tyos, tos</i>	<i>tāse/o</i>	<i>symax / sumax</i>
Sogd.	Bactrian					Chor.	Khot.			
( $\prec$ ) <i>šm-<math>\prec</math>(<i>w</i>)</i>	τωμαχο, τομαχο, ταμαχο					<i>hβy</i>	<i>uhu</i>			

### 3.4 Demonstrative pronouns

Between the demonstrative systems of the East Iranian languages there are some noteworthy correspondences. Most of the Pamir languages, including Munji and Wakhi, possess a three-stem system with forms going back to Old Iranian *\*ima-*, *\*aita-*, and *\*aūa-*, which function as near, medial, and distal demonstratives respectively. In Yazghulami only two forms are found, *du* and *yu*. ÈDEL'MAN derives *du* from *\*aita-*. The etymology of *yu* is less clear. ÈDEL'MAN assumes that *yu* goes back to the Old Iranian nominative *\*ijam / aīam* originally representing the proximate deixis, whereas she derives the oblique form *way* from the distal demonstrative *\*aūa-*.<sup>75</sup> In addition to the phonological problems of deriving *yu* from Old Iranian *\*aīam*, a contamination of different demonstrative stems representing virtually contradictory 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 Old Iranian *\*aiša-* and *\*hay*. The Yaghnobi forms have been compared with the demonstratives in Sogdian, where remnants of three stems can be found.<sup>76</sup> They go back to *\*aīam / ima-*, *\*aiša- / aita-*, and *\*hay / aūa-*.<sup>77</sup> In contrast to Yaghnobi, where the *\*aiša- / aita-* forms are preserved, the forms of the medial deixis disappear in Sogdian.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>70</sup> Summarized by PAYNE 1989b: 423.

<sup>71</sup> For a summary of different etymological explanations of the second part of the pronoun see GRJUNBERG 1987: 75f.

<sup>72</sup> The *h-* is not clear. One might speculate that it is connected to the 3<sup>rd</sup> singular pronoun, *hy* “he, she, it”, encl. *h*, i.e. “he and you”. A similar formation was presumed by GEIGER 1898–1901a: 217, for Pashto.

<sup>73</sup> Derived from *\*(yu)šmābyā*, see GRJUNBERG 1987: 189.

<sup>74</sup> Explained as loans from Pashto by MORGENSTIERNE 2003: 84, who transcribes *tōs, tyōs*.

<sup>75</sup> ÈDEL'MAN 1987b: 390.

<sup>76</sup> LIVŠIČ/HROMOV 1981: 465f.; SIMS-WILLIAMS 1994.

<sup>77</sup> See WENDTLAND (forthcoming). SIMS-WILLIAMS 1994: 49f. derives the oblique form from *\*ta-* instead of *\*aita-*.

<sup>78</sup> Only very few forms are attested: in the Ancient Letters, the Mury documents, and one Buddhist text.

**Table 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-</i> / <i>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>*haṣ-</i> / <i>aṣa-</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>aḡō</i>	<i>haya</i>	<i>u-</i> / <i>ie</i> (nom.), <i>uo-</i> (obl.)
Sogdian		Bactrian			Khot.		
<i>yw</i> , obl. < <i>mw</i> , < <i>myn</i> , < <i>my(H)</i> < OIr. <i>*aijam</i> / <i>ima-</i>		<i>ειο</i> ; <i>ειμο</i>			<i>ṣā</i>		
< <i>šw</i> , obl. < <i>tw</i> < OIr. <i>*aiša-</i> / <i>aita-</i>		<i>το</i> , <i>τι</i> ; <i>ειδο</i> , <i>εδο</i>			<i>ṣātā</i>		
(<) <i>xw</i> , obl. < <i>w(w)</i> , < <i>wyn</i> , < <i>wy(H)</i> < OIr. <i>*haṣ-</i> / <i>aṣa-</i>					<i>ṣārā</i>		

Bactrian *ειο* “this” may be derived from *\*aijam*.<sup>79</sup> The form *ειδο* “this” represents a less proximate deixis and is sometimes connected to the 2<sup>nd</sup> person.<sup>80</sup> It is traced back to *\*aita-* by Sims-Williams.<sup>81</sup> He explains *ειμο* “this” as going back to *\*ima-* “with vocalization adapted to that of *ειο*.”<sup>82</sup> So both *ειο* and *ειμο* would originate from the same demonstrative stem *\*aijam* / *ima-*, which seems probable because both forms represent proximal deixis. One form is said to go back to the nominative, the other to the stem forming the oblique cases. But there is no case difference between the forms. The function of the Bactrian demonstratives has not yet been studied in detail, but in the manuscripts *ειο* is mainly used anaphorically, whereas *ειμο* can be used cataphorically.<sup>83</sup> It has been presumed earlier that *ειμο* and *ειδο* might be compound forms of *ειο*, which seems quite probable considering the fact that two pronouns representing proximal deixis co-exist in Bactrian.<sup>84</sup> By now another demonstrative, *το*, *τι*, has been identified, which is derived from *\*ta-* and represents a second person deixis.<sup>85</sup> It is therefore probable that *ειμο* and *ειδο* are compound forms of *ειο* and *μο* and *το* respectively.

The system in Khotanese is completely different. There are newly developed forms which all go back to *\*aiša-* and *\*ta-*.<sup>86</sup> In Chorasmian some innovations have occurred as well. There are the forms *ny(n)* “this”, plur. *nšw* “these”, *nšwyr* “that”,

<sup>79</sup> See e.g. SIMS-WILLIAMS 2007: 210.

<sup>80</sup> Examples SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000 (C1'), SIMS-WILLIAMS 2007 (ca5, xm5, ch6).

<sup>81</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000: 191.

<sup>82</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000: 191.

<sup>83</sup> Examples SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000, e.g. *ειο* in A11, C7, etc., and *ειμο* in C7, J12, etc.

<sup>84</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 1989b: 235.

<sup>85</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 2007: 269.

<sup>86</sup> EMMERICK 1989: 220.

which is also used as a 3<sup>rd</sup> singular pronoun, *nyš-k* “this, who/which” and *n<n* “that”. They all have a prefix *n-* which is explained as a strengthening particle.<sup>87</sup> These developments show that already in Middle Iranian languages many changes and innovations have occurred. Tracing back forms of modern Iranian languages, especially those that only consist of one letter, may therefore be very difficult or impossible, as seen in the next example.

The Parachi distal demonstrative (*h*)*ō* goes back to Old Iranian \**hāu*.<sup>88</sup> The etymology of Parachi (*h*)*e* is not certain. According to MORGENSTIERNE: “Av. *aēšō*, *aētaṭ*, and prob. *aēm*, would result in \**i*; but gen. sg. m. *ahē* (Gath. *ahyā*) > *ē*?”<sup>89</sup> EFIMOV also believes that it goes back to the old genitive-dative.<sup>90</sup> Ormuri *a* is derived from \**ha-*; the origin of *-fo* is unclear.<sup>91</sup>

Pashto *dā* has been explained as going back to Old Iranian \**aita-*, and *ha-* in *haya* is traced back to \**ha-*.<sup>92</sup> Ossetic *a-* “this” is derived from Old Iranian \**a-*, Iron *u-* from \**aua-* or \**hay*, and Digor *ie* is thought to go back to \**ajam*.<sup>93</sup>

### 3.5 Personal pronouns with prefixes

In some East Iranian languages personal pronouns occur with prefixes or suffixes.<sup>94</sup> Examples can be found in Bactrian, e.g. *ασαμαχο* “from/by us”,<sup>95</sup> in Chorasmian, e.g. *c-myk* “from me” or in Sogdian, but not in Yaghnobi. One example is Sogdian *c<m<(kH)* “from me” from \**hačā* “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, only singular personal pronouns with prefixes are documented in Sogdian, whereas in Munji only the plural forms are prefixed. In Bactrian both singular and plural forms are attested (see Table 13 on the next page).

### 3.6 Demonstratives: pre- and suffixes

In Sogdian, forms of the demonstrative stems may occur with pre- and suffixes. Forms with the prefixes *c-* < \**hačā* “from”, *δ-* < \**hadā* “with”, *n-* < \**anu-* or \**ana-* “to”, and *pr-* < \**upari* “on” are found.<sup>96</sup> There are two different suffixes, *-nt* and

<sup>87</sup> BOGOLJUBOV 1963b: 102.

<sup>88</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1974: 68 transcribes *α*, *hα*.

<sup>89</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929: 67 (MORGENSTIERNE’s orthography).

<sup>90</sup> EFIMOV 1997: 439, 490.

<sup>91</sup> MORGENSTIERNE 1929: 350. EFIMOV 1991: 292 presents a less convincing etymology, deriving *afo* from a proximal demonstrative \**hva-*. He presumes a development *f* < \**hv-*, which he compares to Parth. *f* < \**x’-*, citing *farrah* < \**x’arnah-* “glory”. However, \**x’-* does not develop into *f-* in Parthian but into <*wx*> (maybe a devoiced *w*, see SUNDERMANN 1989: 122). Also, in the exceptional case of \**x’arnah-* the relation between \**x’-* and *f-* may be explained differently, see LUBOTSKY 1998.

<sup>92</sup> GRJUNBERG 1987: 78ff. The *h-* must of course be secondary as \**h* is lost in Pashto.

<sup>93</sup> WEBER 1983: 86–88.

<sup>94</sup> Possessive forms in some languages of northwest Iran may be prefixed as well, see e.g. LECOQ 1989: 299, 302.

<sup>95</sup> SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000: 179 (Q20).

<sup>96</sup> LIVŠIĆ/HROMOV 1981: 461.

**Table 13.** Prefixed personal pronouns.

Sogdian			Bactrian	Munji		
1 <sup>st</sup> sing.	2 <sup>nd</sup> sing.			1 <sup>st</sup> plur.	2 <sup>nd</sup> plur.	
<i>δ-m-(k)</i> “with me”	<i>δ-f&lt;</i> “with you”	<i>δ- &lt; *hadā</i> “with”	<i>αλαμαγο</i> “with me”; <i>αλαφαγο</i> “with you”	<i>dāmox</i> “i/on us”	<i>dānof</i> “i/on you”	<i>da</i> “in” < * <i>antara</i>
<i>pr-m-k</i> “for me”	<i>pr-β-k</i> “for you”	<i>pr- &lt; *upari</i> “for”		<i>nāmox</i> “(to) us”	<i>nānof</i> “(to) you”	<i>nā</i> “to” < * <i>ana</i>
<i>c-m-(kH)</i> “from me”	<i>c-f-(kH)</i> “from you”	<i>c- &lt; *hačā</i> “from”	<i>ασαφαγο</i> “from you” 2 <sup>nd</sup> sg.; <i>ασαμαχο</i> “from us”	<i>žāmox</i> “from us”	<i>žānof</i> “from you”	<i>ž</i> “from” < * <i>hačā</i>
<i>t-m-(kH)</i> “me”	<i>t-β-(kH)</i> “you”	marks the direct def. object, cf. prep. <i>t(w)</i> “to”	<i>αβοφαγο</i> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> sg.; <i>αβομαχο</i> “us” dir. object	<i>vāmox</i> “us”	<i>vānof</i> “you”	marks the direct def. object, < * <i>upa-</i> , * <i>apa-</i>

-<yδ, e.g. *cyw<nt* “from that” and *cyw(<)yδ* “from that”. They occur both in attributive and predicative position. The suffix *-nt* presumably goes back to \**antara*.<sup>97</sup> The origin of *-yδ* is not clear. It has been compared with Roshani *-aθ*, *-θ*.<sup>98</sup>

In Shughni, morphologically similar formations occur, which function as local adverbs, like e.g. *azamand* “from there”, with *az- < \*hačā* “from”, a form of the demonstrative, and *-and* (< \**antara-*, see above), and *azamard* “from there” with a suffix *-ard*,<sup>99</sup> which has been derived from \**arda-* “side”.<sup>100</sup> The suffixes have different functions. Forms with *-and* are used to mark definite location, whereas those with *-ard* mark indefinite location.<sup>101</sup>

**Table 14.** Demonstratives with pre- and suffixes.

		Sogdian			Shughni		
dist.	<i>c-</i>	<i>cyw&lt;nt</i>	<i>cyw(&lt;)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&lt;nt</i>	<i>cym(&lt;)yδ</i>	“from”	<i>azūdand</i>	<i>azūd</i>	<i>azūdard</i>
dist.	<i>δ-</i>	<i>δyw&lt;nt</i>	<i>δyw&lt;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&lt;nt</i>	<i>δym&lt;yδ</i>	“to”	<i>tarūdand</i>	<i>tarūd</i>	<i>tarūdard</i>
dist.	<i>n-</i>	<i>nyw&lt;nt</i>	<i>nyw&lt;yδ</i>				
med.			<i>nytyδ</i>				
prox.	“to”		<i>nymyδ</i>				
dist.	<i>pr-</i>	<i>prywynd</i>	<i>pr&lt;yw&lt;yδ</i>				
med.			<i>prytyδ</i>				
prox.	“on”	<i>prymnd</i>	<i>prymyδ</i>				

<sup>97</sup> LIVŠIĆ/HROMOV 1981: 466.

<sup>98</sup> BOGOLJUBOV 1963a: 9, note 2.

<sup>99</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 yet been explained.

<sup>100</sup> EDEL’MAN 1987a: 339f.

<sup>101</sup> KARAMŠOEV 1988: 56f.

### 3.7 Local adverbs

In Sogdian the suffix *-rδ* also occurs in local adverbs. As in Shughni (see Section 3.6), these adverbs mark indefinite location.<sup>102</sup> Among the Modern East Iranian languages forms with *-ard* are found in Xufi, a language closely related to Shughni: *amard*, *adard*, *udard*.<sup>103</sup> In Ossetic the local adverbs *ardæm* “here” and *ūrðæm* “there” (with *ærd-* “side”) can be compared.<sup>104</sup> Similar morphological formations can be found in Sogdian and Bactrian. It has so far not been investigated whether they also have comparable functions in Bactrian.

**Table 15.** Local adverbs.

Sogdian					Bactrian			Xufi
indef.	def.	known	unknown					
<i>mrδ</i>	<i>mδ</i>	<i>mδy</i>	<i>mδ-yδ</i>	“here” prox.	μαρο	μαλο	μαληλο	<i>amard</i> “there”
<i>trδ</i>		<i>tδy</i>	<i>tδ-yδ</i>	“there” med.			ταληλο	<i>adard</i> “there”
<i>wrδ</i>	<i>wδ</i>	<i>wδy</i>	<i>wδ-yδ</i>	“there” dist.	οαρο	οαλο		<i>udard</i> “here”

## 4. Conclusion

The East Iranian languages are linguistically extremely diverse. No phonological or morphological characteristics can be found which are shared by all of them. The isoglosses discussed in this paper can be summarized as shown in Table 16 on the next page.

Exclusive features by which the Pamir languages can be distinguished from all other East Iranian languages cannot be found either. Some traits, like the voicing of *\*xt* and *\*ft*, or the development of *\*b-*, *\*d-*, *\*g-* to fricatives, are shared by the majority of the other East Iranian languages.

Conversely, the depalatalization of Old Iranian *\*č-* is found in many East Iranian languages but is not shared by Yazghulami, Munji, or Parachi.

The development of a *t*-plural in Yaghnobi and Ossetic, which was seen as a characteristic of a Northern branch (see Section 1) of the East Iranian languages by Oranskij, can also be found in Yazghulami. The preservation of the cluster *\*θr*, which he also mentions as a trait common to Yaghnobi (*tVr/sVr*) and Ossetic (*rt*), is also shared by Wakhi (*tr*) and partly by Sanglechi (*-tVr*) and Ishkashmi (*-sVr*).<sup>105</sup>

The formation of a 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural pronoun in combination with a form of the 2<sup>nd</sup> singular is shared by the Shughni group, Sarikoli, Yazghulami, and Ishkashmi, but not by Munji or Wakhi, whereas in Pashto or Chorasmian similar constructions can be found.

Some traits of certain Pamir languages, like the prefixing of personal pronouns in Munji, the formation of demonstratives with pre- and suffixes in Shughni, or the use

<sup>102</sup> WENDTLAND 2006.

<sup>103</sup> SOKOLOVA 1959: 112, 116, 267.

<sup>104</sup> BOGOLJUBOV 1963a: 4.

<sup>105</sup> ORANSKIJ 1979b: 179f.

of local adverbs in Xufi, have parallels in Sogdian or Bactrian. The Wakhi plural in *-išt* is also attested in Sogdian.

The distribution of the characteristics discussed in this article supports the interpretation of the Pamir languages as a *sprachbund*, and speaks against a distinction between a Northern and a Southern branch of the East Iranian languages.

**Table 16.** Isoglosses in East Iranian languages (selection).

	shared by	no change (shared archaism)	different development
*č- > ts-, s-	Shughni, Sarikoli, Ishkashmi, Yidgha, Wakhi; Ormuri, Pashto, Ossetic; Bactrian, Chorasmian, Khotanese	Yazghulami, Munji, Yaghnobi; Parachi; Sogdian	
*b-, d-, g- > fricatives	Shughni, Sarikoli, Yazghulami, Wakhi; Sogdian, Chorasmian	Parachi, Ormuri, Ossetic; Khotanese g-	further development: Yaghnobi, Ishkashmi d-; Munji, Yidgha, Pashto, Bactrian, Sogdian dial. l
*xt voiced	Yazghulami, Ishkashmi, Munji, Wakhi; Ossetic; Sogdian, Chorasmian, Bactrian	Yaghnobi	further simplified: Parachi, Ormuri; Shughni, Sarikoli; Khotanese, Pashto
*ft voiced	Shughni, Sarikoli, Yazghulami, Ishkashmi, Munji, Yaghnobi (E dial.); Ossetic; Sogdian, Chorasmian, Bactrian	Yaghnobi (W dial.)	further simplified: Wakhi, Parachi, Ormuri; Pashto; Khotanese
*θ preserved		Shughni, Sarikoli, Yazghulami, Wakhi; Sogdian, Chorasmian	Ishkashmi, Ormuri y; Yaghnobi, Ishkashmi s, Munji ʃ, Yaghnobi, Ossetic t; Pashto l; Bactrian, Khotanese h
*θr- > š-, c-	Yazghulami c-, Parachi, Ormuri, Sogdian, Chorasmian š-	Wakhi, Yaghnobi; Ossetic	Shughni, Sarikoli, Bactrian (h)ar-; Pashto, Khotanese dr-
*-θr- > š-, c-	Shughni, Sarikoli, Yazghulami c, Parachi, Ormuri, Sogd. š-	Ishkashmi, Yaghnobi, Wakhi; Ossetic	further simplified: Munji; Pashto; Khotanese, Bactrian, Chorasmian
plural suffixes	t-plural: (Yazghulami,) Yaghnobi, Ossetic; Sogdian; -išt: Wakhi; Sogdian		plural in -i (-e): Munji, Ormuri, Bactrian, Chorasmian; obl. pl. in -f/-v: Roshorvi (Shughni group), Sarikoli, Munji, Wakhi
3 <sup>rd</sup> plural			Munji; Ossetic "medial" ending: Yaghnobi, Chorasmian
2 <sup>nd</sup> plural pronoun combination with 2 <sup>nd</sup> sg.	Shughni, Sarikoli, Yazghulami, Ishkashmi; Pashto; Chorasmian	Yaghnobi; Ossetic; Sogdian	Munji, Wakhi; Parachi; Khotanese
demonstratives from same stems	Shughni, Yazghulami, Munji, Wakhi, Yaghnobi; Sogdian		Parachi, Ormuri, Pashto, Ossetic; Khotanese
prefixed pers. pron.	Munji; Sogdian, Bactrian		
demonstratives with pre- and suffixes	Shughni; Sogdian		
local adverbs with suffix	Xufi (Shughni group); Sogdian, Bactrian		

**Table 17.** Genetic relations of the Pamir languages and the other East Iranian languages.

Shughni-Yazghulami group					Ishkashmi	Munji
Shughni group				Yazghulami		
Shughni	Roshani	Bartangi	Sarikoli		Yazghulami	Zebaki
Badzh.	Xufi	Roshorvi		Sanglechi		
Wakhi	Yagnobi	Ossetic	Pashto	Parachi	Omuri	

## Literature

- BOGOLJUBOV, Mixail N. 1963a: *Sogdijskie dokumenty s gory Mug (jazykovye dannye)* [Trudy XXV meždunarodnogo kongressa vostokovedov, Moskva 9 - 16 Avgusta 1960]. Moscow: Izdat. Vostočnoj Literatury.
- 1963b: “Mestoimenija v xorezmijskom jazyke.” In: *Kratkie soobščeniya Instituta narodov Azii 67, Iranskaja filologija*. Moscow: Izdat. Vostočnoj Literatury, pp. 99–103.
- ÈDEL'MAN, Džoj I. 1987a: “Šugnano-rušanskaja jazykovaja grupa.” In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija, novoiranskie jazyki: vostočnaja grupa*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 236–347.
- 1987b: “Jazguljamskij jazyk.” In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija, novoiranskie jazyki: vostočnaja grupa*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 348–407.
- EFIMOV, Valentin A. 1986: *Jazyk ormuri v sinxronnom i istoričeskom osveščeni*. Moscow: Nauka.
- 1991: “Ormuri.” In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija: novoiranskie jazyki 3, severo-zapadnaja grupa I*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 247–315.
- 1997: “Parači.” In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija: novoiranskie jazyki 3, severo-zapadnaja grupa II*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 419–549.
- EMMERICK, Ronald E. 1989: “Khotanese and Tumshuqese.” In: SCHMITT, pp. 204–229.
- EMMERICK, Ronald E., and Edwin G. PULLEYBLANK 1993: *A Chinese text in Central Asian Brahmi script: new evidence for the pronunciation of Late Middle Chinese and Khotanese*, Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- GEIGER, Wilhelm 1898–1901a: “Die Sprache der Afghānen.” In: *Grundriß der Iranischen Philologie I/2*. Strassburg: Trübner, pp. 201–230.
- 1898–1901b: “Über das Yaghnōbī.” In: *Grundriß der Iranischen Philologie I/2*, Strassburg: Trübner, pp. 334–344.
- GHARIB, Badrozzamān 1995: *Sogdian Dictionary*. Teheran: Farhang Publications.
- GRIERSON, George A. 1918: “The Ōrmurī or Bargistā language. An account of a little-known Eranian dialect.” In: *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal 7, I–XIV*, pp. 1–101.
- GRJUNBERG, Aleksandr L. 1980: *Jazyki vostočnogo gindukuša: jazyk kati*, Moscow: Nauka.
- 1987: “Mundžanskij.” In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija, novoiranskie jazyki: vostočnaja grupa*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 155–235.
- GRJUNBERG, Aleksandr L., and Džoj I. ÈDEL'MAN, 1987: “Afganskij jazyk.” In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija, novoiranskie jazyki: vostočnaja grupa*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 6–154.
- HROMOV, Al'bert L. 1987: “Jagnobskij jazyk.” In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija, novoiranskie jazyki: vostočnaja grupa*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 644–701.
- ISAEV, Magomet I. 1987: “Osetinskij.” In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija, novoiranskie jazyki: vostočnaja grupa*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 537–643.
- KARAMŠOEVA, Dodxudo 1988, 1991, 1999: *Šugnansko-russkij slovar'* I–III. Moscow: Nauka.
- KIEFFER, Charles M. 1989: “Le parāčī, l'ōrmurī.” In: SCHMITT, pp. 445–455.
- KORN, Agnes 2005: *Towards a historical grammar of Balochi: Studies in Balochi historical phonology and vocabulary*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- LECOQ, Pierre 1989: "Les dialectes caspiens et du nord-ouest." In: SCHMITT, pp. 296–312.
- LEE, Jonathan, and Nicholas SIMS-WILLIAMS 2003: "The antiquities and inscription of Tang-i Safedak." In: *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 9, pp. 159–184.
- LIVSHITZ, Vladimir A. 1970: "A Sogdian alphabet from Panjikant." In: Mary BOYCE and Ilya GERSHEVITCH (eds.): *W. B. Henning Memorial Volume*. London: Lund Humphries, pp. 256–263.
- LIVŠIĆ, Vladimir A., and Al'bert L. HROMOV 1981, "Sogdijskij jazyk." In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija: sredneiranske jazyki*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 347–514.
- LUBOTSKY, Alexander 1998: "Avestan x<sup>h</sup>arənah-: the etymology and concept." In: Wolfgang MEID (ed.): *Sprache und Kultur. Akten der X. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Innsbruck, 22.-28. September 1996*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, pp. 479–488.
- MORGENSTIERNE, Georg 1926: *Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan*. Oslo etc.: Aschehoug.
- 1929: *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages I: Parachi, Ormuri*. Oslo etc.: Aschehoug.
- 1938: *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages II: Iranian Pamir Languages: Yidgha-Munji, Sanglechi-Ishkashmi and Wakhi*. Oslo etc.: Aschehoug.
- 1974: *Etymological Vocabulary of the Shughni group*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 1975: "Ancient contacts between N. E. Iranian and Indo-Aryan?" In: Françoise BADER (ed.): *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Émile Benveniste*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 431–434.
- 2003: *A New Etymological Vocabulary of Pashto (compiled and edited by J. Elfenbein, D.N. Mackenzie and N. Sims-Williams)*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- ORANSKIĬ, Iosif M. 1963: *Iranske jazyki*. Moscow: Izdat. Vostočnoj Literatry.
- 1979a: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija I: drevneiranske jazyki*. Moscow: Nauka.
- 1979b: *Iranske jazyki v istoričeskom osveščanii*. Moscow: Nauka.
- PAHALINA, Tat'jana N. 1969: *Pamirskie jazyki*. Moscow: Nauka.
- 1983: *Issledovaniie po sravitel'no-istoričeskoj fonetike pamirskix jazykov*. Moscow: Nauka.
- PAYNE, John 1989a: "Munji and Yidgha." In: SCHMITT, pp. 411–416.
- 1989b: "Pamir languages." In: SCHMITT, pp. 417–444.
- SCHMITT, Rüdiger (ed.) 1989: *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 1989a: "Eastern Middle Iranian." In: SCHMITT, pp. 165–172.
- 1989b: "Bactrian." In: SCHMITT, pp. 230–235.
- 1994: "The Triple System of Deixis in Sogdian." In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92(1), pp. 41–53.
- 1996: "East Iranian languages." In: *Encyclopædia Iranica* VII, pp. 649–652.
- 2000: *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]*. London: Nour Foundation etc.
- 2004: "The Parthian Abstract suffix -yft." In: John H. W. PENNEY (ed.): *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press, pp. 529–547.
- 2007: *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: Nour Foundation etc.
- SKJÆRVØ, Prods O. 1989a: "Modern East Iranian Languages." In: SCHMITT, pp. 370–383.
- 1989b: "Pashto." In: SCHMITT, pp. 384–410.
- SOKOLOVA, Valentina St. 1959: *Rušanske i xufiskie teksty i slovar'*. Moscow/Leningrad: Nauka.
- 1967: *Genetičeskie otnošenija jazguljamskogo jazyka i šugnanskoj jazykovoj grupy*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- 1973: *Genetičeskie otnošenija mundžanskogo jazyka i šugnano-jazguljamskoj jazykovoj grupy*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- STEBLIN-KAMENSKIĬ, Ivan M. 1982: *Očerki po istorii leksiki pamirskix jazykov. Nazvanija kul'turnyx rastenij*. Moscow: Nauka.
- 1999: *Étimologičeskij slovar' vaxanskogo jazyka*. St. Petersburg: Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie.

- SUNDERMANN, Werner 1989: "Parthisch." In: SCHMITT, pp. 114–137.
- WEBER, Dieter 1983: "Beiträge zur historischen Grammatik des Ossetischen." In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 88, pp. 84–91.
- WENDTLAND, Antje 2006: "Deixis im Soghdischen oder: Warum wird man *wδ:y* („dort“) geboren und stirbt *wδ:yδ* („dort“)?" In: Heiner EICHNER et al. (eds.): *Iranistik in Europa – gestern, heute, morgen*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 241–259.
- (forthc.): *Die Entwicklung von Demonstrativpronomen zu Artikeln im Sogdischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.