



Western Iranian Pronominal Clitics

Agnes Korn

► **To cite this version:**

Agnes Korn. Western Iranian Pronominal Clitics. *Orientalia Suecana*, Uppsala Universitet, 2009, 58, pp.159-171. .

HAL Id: hal-01340946

<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01340946>

Submitted on 2 Jul 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Western Iranian Pronominal Clitics

Agnes Korn
Frankfurt a.M.

Abstract

This article attempts to account for the derivation of pronominal clitics in contemporary Western Iranian languages. It argues against the common assumption (detailed in Section I) that all clitics derive from the genitive/dative ones of Old Iranian and explores the alternative possibility that some clitics in Western Iranian languages may derive from the OIr. accusative forms, or may represent a general oblique form resulting from a coalescence of the OIr. gen./dat. and acc. clitics (Section II). A derivation from such a general oblique is specifically plausible for the plural clitics in those Western Ir. varieties (discussed in Section III) whose pl. clitics are not derived from the sg. ones. This implies a revision of a morphological isogloss which has posited a certain grouping of the Western Iranian languages on the basis of the distribution of two variants of the 3rd sg. clitic, and suggests a more complex picture (Section IV). Although they do not belong to the Western Iranian group, data from Avestan and Sogdian will be used to broaden the basis for comparison with contemporary Ir. languages.¹

I. Introduction

Most contemporary Western Iranian languages make use of enclitic pronouns, which have also been called “suffixed pronouns” and “pronominal clitics”.² They are used as enclitic counterparts of the stressed personal pronouns in all oblique functions³ including the marking of objects, the possessor,⁴ and, in those Ir. varieties that show ergative patterns, the agent of ergative constructions.

The existence of pronominal clitics alongside the stressed pronouns is inherited from Old Iranian (and ultimately from Proto-Indo-European⁵). In ancient Indo-European languages, their paradigm differs from that of the stressed pronouns through their having fewer separate forms. For instance, there is only one clitic for the genitive and dative, while the full pronouns have separate forms for these cases. This situation is reflected in the OIr. languages Avestan and Old Persian (see Table 7).

¹ I am very grateful to Thomas Jügel for his careful reading and commenting of a previous version, and to Nicholas Sims-Williams for advice on Sogdian. In this paper, Old Iranian forms marked by an asterisk refer to phonological forms underlying both Old Persian and Avestan, but disregarding their specificities. The actual forms of the Old Ir. clitics are found in Table 7.

² Among the WIr. languages, no such clitics are found in Sangesari, Zazaki, and Northern Kurdish (WINDFUHR 1975: 462).

³ Broadly speaking, the oblique case of Western Middle and New Ir. languages derives from the OIr. genitive (cf. e.g. SALEMANN 1901: 275–276). Already within Old Iranian, the genitive and the dative cases merge (retaining the form of the genitive for both case functions). In some New Ir. varieties (including New Persian), the distinction of direct vs. oblique case has been lost, but even in these varieties, the pronominal clitics are still mostly used in the oblique functions.

⁴ In some WIr. varieties, it is not the pronominal clitics that are used in possessive function, but forms that derive from combinations with a preposition (OIr. **hača* “from, according to”, e.g. Talyshi *čaman*, LECOQ 1989b: 299) in Northern Talyshi, Tati, Harzandi and also in remnants elsewhere (WINDFUHR 1975: 462). Parallel forms are also found in Eastern Ir. languages (see WENDTLAND in this volume).

⁵ See e.g. FORTSON (2004: 129) for the PIE pronominal clitics.

The pronominal clitics for the singular in contemporary Ir. languages have generally been derived from the OIr. genitive/dative pronominal clitics, e.g. New Persian 1sg. *-am*, 2sg. *-at*, 3sg. *-aš* < Old Persian *-maiṣ*, *-taiṣ*, *-šaiṣ* (Table 1).⁶

Table 1. Derivation of New Persian pronominal clitics.⁷

		NP clitics	derivation
sg.	1st	<i>-am</i>	< OP <i>-maiṣ</i>
	2nd	<i>-at</i>	< OP <i>-taiṣ</i>
	3rd	<i>-aš</i>	< OP <i>-šaiṣ</i>
			: from OIr. gen./dat. clitics
pl.	1st	<i>-(e)mān</i>	← sg. + pl. suffix <i>-ān</i> ⁸
	2nd	<i>-(e)tān</i>	
	3rd	<i>-(e)šān</i>	

The New Persian forms are largely identical to those found in Middle Persian and Parthian (Table 2).

Table 2. Manichean Middle Persian and Parthian clitics.⁹

		Middle Persian	Parthian
sg.	1st		<i>-(u)m</i>
	2nd		<i>-(u)t</i> , <i>-(u)d</i>
	3rd		<i>-(i)š</i>
pl.	1st	<i>-n</i> (rare), <i>-mān</i>	<i>-mān</i>
	2nd	<i>-(i)tān</i> , <i>-idān</i>	<i>-tān</i>
	3rd		<i>-(i)šān</i>

The form of the 3sg. pronominal clitic has been considered a “long recognized Old Iranian isogloss” (WINDFUHR 1989: 259) defining the relationships within Western Iranian (Table 3). The 3sg. clitics have generally been held to derive from either OIr. **-šai*, as in Persian, or from **-hai*.¹⁰ Both forms are variants of the same 3sg. pronominal clitic. In Proto-Iranian, **-šai* figures in phonological contexts summarized by the so-called “*ruki* rule”, and **-hai* in other contexts, and this use can still be seen in Avestan.¹¹

⁶ An alternative to this *communis opinio* has been suggested by Lecoq (see footnote 37). For the plural clitics, see Section III. There are also pronominal clitics that appear to derive from the copula or from verbal endings (for examples, see Table 9). These will be discussed elsewhere.

⁷ Cf. e.g. RASTORGUEVA / MOLČANOVA (1981: 82). Here and in the following paradigms, forms with bracketed vowels imply the variants with vowel occurring after consonants and those without vowel after vowels (and occasionally also after sonorants).

⁸ The suffix *-ān* derives from the OIr. gen.pl. ending **-ānām*.

⁹ These forms are deduced from the transliterated ones given by SIMS-WILLIAMS (1981: 171–172, where more details can be found) and apply the observation by DURKIN-MEISTERERNST (2000: 169–172) that (specifically in Parthian) an orthographic variation <d> / <ḏ> encodes /d/ where it is the Middle Ir. reflex of OIr. *t*, while word-internal /t/ is written <t>: the orthographic variation in the clitics of the 2nd person appears to suggest that there are two variants, one with /d/ (showing the development of OIr. **t* after vowel) and one with /t/ (maybe adjusted to the full pronoun of the 2sg.).

¹⁰ See e.g. MACKENZIE (1961a: 83), Sims-Williams (in EMMERICK / SKJÆRVØ 1987: 74), WINDFUHR (1996: 365).

¹¹ See e.g. HOFFMANN / FORSSMAN (1996: 111, 162), BARTHOLOMAE (1904: 1726–1727).

Table 3. Isogloss grouping WIr. languages according to 3rd sg. pronominal clitics as assumed e.g. by TEDESCO (1921: 215–216), WINDFUHR (1975: 462, 469), LECOQ (1989a: 256–257, 263).

	< OIr. gen./dat. *-hai	< OIr. gen./dat. *-šai
Middle Ir.		Middle Persian, Parthian
New Ir.	Kurdish, Khuri, Kohrudi, Harzandi, Balochi, Bashkardi, Bandar Abbasi ¹²	New Persian, remaining New Western Iranian

The derivation of the clitics from the OIr. genitive/dative form is confirmed by the fact that the stressed pronouns also derive from the corresponding OIr. genitive forms, as e.g. in Middle Persian (Table 4).

Table 4. Derivation of Middle Persian pronouns (oblique or sole form).¹³

		Middle Persian	< OIr. genitive
sg.	1st	<i>man</i>	OP <i>manā</i>
	2nd	<i>tō</i>	OP * <i>tawā</i> (Av. <i>tauua</i>)
pl.	1st	<i>amā(h)</i>	OP <i>amāxam</i>
	2nd	<i>ašmā(h)</i>	OP * <i>xšmāxam</i> (Av. <i>xšmākəm</i>)

Similarly, the oblique case markers of the nouns have been assumed to go back to the OIr. genitive ending (Table 5).

Table 5. Derivation of the nominal endings of *Early MP and Parthian.¹⁴

	direct case	oblique case	< OIr. genitive endings
sg.	-∅	-ē (> -∅)	*-ahya
pl.		-ān (> pl. suffix)	*-ānām

So one can say that the Western Middle Ir. (MP and Parthian) oblique forms of nouns and pronouns collectively derive from the corresponding OIr. genitive forms and endings.¹⁵ This would fit with the general assumption that the clitics derive from the OIr. genitive/dative.

II. Clitics deriving from the OIr. accusative

However, in addition to the pronominal clitics going back to the OIr. genitive/dative, some Ir. languages also have forms deriving from the OIr. acc. forms. For instance, Sogdian has a 2sg. going back to the OIr. acc. clitic (Table 6).¹⁶ The pl. forms are based on the sg. ones, as in New Persian.¹⁷

¹² Khuri and Kohrudi belong to the so-called “central dialects”. Harzandi is a Tati variety (see Section III).

¹³ Cf. e.g. RASTORGUEVA / MOLČANOVA (1981: 81), KORN 2005b: 291 (also for the closely parallel Parthian system). For details about the 1pl. and 2pl. forms, see KLINGENSCHMITT (2000: 203 footnote 40).

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. RASTORGUEVA / MOLČANOVA (1981: 58), SIMS-WILLIAMS (1981: 169 footnote 20), KORN (2005b: 296).

¹⁵ The family terms pattern slightly differently, though, see SIMS-WILLIAMS (1981: 166–171), KORN (2005b: 295).

¹⁶ In some Sogdian texts, the difference in case functions is preserved, while Manichean and Buddhist Sogdian use *-f(y)*, *-β(y)* “indiscriminately for both acc. and gen.” (SIMS-WILLIAMS 1985: 77).

¹⁷ GERSHEVITCH (1942: 100) assumes the existence of a 1pl. acc. clitic *-n* (< OIr. acc. *-nāh), but the two or three alleged occurrences (all in the Buddhist text *Vessantara Jātaka*) can be interpreted differently (SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996).

		forms ¹⁸	derivation ¹⁹
sg.	1st	-m(y)	< OIr. gen./dat. *-mai, acc. *-mā, abl. *-mad
	2nd	gen./dat. -t(y)	< OIr. gen./dat. *-tai
		acc./abl. -f(y), -β(y)	< OIr. acc. *-θwā, abl. *-θwad ²⁰
3rd	gen./dat. -š(y)	< OIr. gen./dat. *-šai, acc. *-šim	
	acc. -šw	-š + nominal acc. ending ²¹	
pl.	1st	-mn	← sg. + -an (< *-anām < OIr. *-ānām)
	2nd	-tn	
		-fn, -βn	
3rd	-šn		

The presence of such forms in Middle Iranian opens up the possibility that some pronominal clitics which have so far not been explained convincingly²² could derive from OIr. acc. case forms, which are listed in Table 7.

		Old Iranian		cf. Vedic
		genitive/dative	accusative	
sg.	1st	OP -mai OAv. -mōi, YAv. -mē	OP, Av. -mā	gen./dat. -me acc. -mā
	2nd	OP -tai OAv. -tōi, -tē, YAv. -tē	Av. -θβā	gen./dat. -te acc. -tvā
	3rd	OP -šai OAv. -hōi, YAv. -hē, -šē	m., f.: OP -šim, -dim; Av. -īm, -hūm, -dim; n.: Av. -ī, -dī	acc. -īm, -sīm; n. -ī
pl.	1st	OAv. -nā, YAv. -nō ²⁴	OAv. -nā, YAv. -nō	obl. -nas
	2nd	OAv. -vā, YAv. -vō	OAv. -vā, YAv. -vō	obl. -vas
	3rd	OP -šām	m., f.: OP -šāš, -dīš; Av. -īš, -hīš, -dīš n.: Av. -ī, -dī	acc. -īm, -sīm; n. -ī

We will first turn to the 2sg. clitic, of which two different forms are found in Sogdian. Most New WIr. languages show a 2sg. pronominal clitic -(V)t, as does New Persian, but some varieties have other forms. Among these are the clitics found

¹⁸ GERSHEVITCH (1954: 202–205), SIMS-WILLIAMS (1985: 227, 233, 238).

¹⁹ SIMS-WILLIAMS (1996: 161, 164). The -y in the sg. is likely to be “the secondary addition of the (nominal) oblique ending -y” (SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996: 164 footnote 5).

²⁰ The variation -f vs. -β in the 2sg. acc./abl. form depends on the script employed: the Manichean and Christian texts have -f, texts in Sogdian script -β- (SIMS-WILLIAMS 2004: 542).

²¹ Nicholas Sims-Williams (p.c.).

²² Cf. e.g. MOŠKALO (1991: 47): “The history of the Balochi enclitic pronouns is not easily and clearly traceable. Although it is to be assumed that they derive from the gen./dat. sg. of the corresponding Old Iranian enclitic pronouns, it is not possible to trace the history of their development, and they differ considerably from their predecessors in their form.”

²³ The Avestan and Old Persian forms are quoted from HOFFMANN / FORSSMAN (1996: 160–162; hyphens for Avestan added), Old Persian also from BRANDENSTEIN / MAYRHOFER (1964: 66–67). OP clitics are not attested for all persons. For the distribution of the 3rd person clitics, see Section I. The Old Indic forms for the 3rd person given here are those that match the OIr. forms; they are relic forms already in Vedic, and both -īm and -sīm are not differentiated for number and gender (see KUPFER 2002: 128–150, 252–260, 315–323, 336–342 for a detailed analysis of these forms).

²⁴ The OAv. gen./dat. forms (and the YAv. acc. ones) derive from OIr. *-nah, *-wah, corresponding to the Old Indic forms. The OAv. acc. forms derive from *-nāh, *-wāh (HOFFMANN / FORSSMAN 1996: 160–161), so Young Avestan seems to show a generalization of the gen./dat. form (thus DE VAAN 2003: 9).

in some Sorani dialects (Table 8). These forms differ from those of Standard Sorani,²⁵ but appear particularly relevant for the discussion here.

Table 8. Pronominal clitics of some Sorani dialects.

		MACKENZIE (1961: 76–77) ²⁶	derivation
sg.	1st	-(i)m	< OIr. gen./dat. *-mai (and/or acc. *-mā)
	2nd	-(i)t	< OIr. gen./dat. -tai
		-u ²⁷	< OIr. acc. *-θwā?
3rd	-ē	< OIr. gen./dat. *(V)hai?	
	-ī	same as -ē, or < OIr. acc. *(h)īm? ²⁸	
pl.	1st	-(i)n ²⁹	< OIr. gen./dat. *-nah and/or acc. *nāh ³⁰
		-mān	← sg. + -ān
	2nd	-ī ²⁹	< OIr. gen./dat. *-wah (and/or acc. *wāh ?) ³¹
		-tān	
	3rd	-yān	← sg. + -ān

For the 2sg. clitic *-u*, a derivation from the OIr. gen./dat. *-tai does not at all appear likely. Conversely, a derivation from the OIr. accusative *-θwā would provide a convenient explanation for the form, since the same development of the cluster *θw is seen in the Sorani numeral “four”, which is *čwār* (< OIr. *čaθwārō), suggesting a regular change of OIr. *θw > w or u in Sorani.³² The more common variant for the 2sg. clitic in Sorani is -(i)t. Unless -(i)t has been borrowed from Persian, Sorani dialects would even preserve reflexes of two different OIr. clitics, as does Sogdian. At any rate, Sorani does appear to preserve a reflex of an OIr. acc. clitic.

The Sorani 3sg. clitic is also markedly different from that of NP. Its variants, -ē and -ī, have been derived from OIr. *-hai (see Table 3). A development of OIr. *-hai to Sorani -ī or -ē is indeed quite possible because -ī and -ē are also the results of a similar sequence in the verbal ending of the 2sg. (which is likely to go back to *-ayahi or *-ahi).³³

There is a problem, however, in that the OIr. verbal ending is a polysyllabic element, while a derivation of -ī or -ē from *-hai would have to assume a preservation of the word-final diphthong that seems to be without parallel in Western Iranian: it would be surprising if OIr. *-hai yielded -ī or -ē, whereas OIr. *-mai gives -m, and

²⁵ Standard Sorani has sg. -(i)m, -(i)t, -ī/y, pl. -mān, -tān, -yān (BLAU 1980: 55).

²⁶ The dialects relevant here belong to MacKenzie’s “Group 1” dialects. CABOLOV (1978: 27) assumes that these clitics may have been present in more Kurdish varieties in an earlier period. He also assumes a 1sg. clitic -ō for that earlier system.

²⁷ MACKENZIE (1961: 76) remarks -u / -w “is occasionally heard” in Sulaimaniya and Warmawa, adding that -o has been noted for the Sinai dialect in Mukri.

²⁸ Cf. CABOLOV (1978: 26), who derives the 3sg. clitic “< Av. hīm, hē”.

²⁹ “The Piž[dar], Muk[ri], and, less commonly, Sor[an] forms Pl. 1 -in, Pl. 2 -ū alternate freely with the general forms -mān, -tān” (MACKENZIE 1961: 77).

³⁰ CABOLOV (1978: 27, giving the form OIr. -nah), MACKENZIE (1978: 502, deriving the clitic from the OIr. clitic stem -na-).

³¹ MACKENZIE (1978: 502, deriving the clitic from the OIr. clitic stem *-wa-), while CABOLOV (1978: 26) rather unconvincingly suggests a derivation from the (unattested) acc. of the full pronoun (Av. “yūšma”).

³² The same change is seen in Zazaki *çor* (< *čewr) “four”, *çewres* “forty” (SELCAN 1998: 587). Note that the development of OIr. *θw in the numeral “four” and the pronominal clitic of the 2sg. may have been different from the development of the cluster in other contexts (cf. SIMS-WILLIAMS 2004).

³³ Thus RASTORGUEVA / MOLČANOVA (1981: 109) for Middle Persian -ē(h).

*-*tai*, *-*šai* give -*t*, -*š*, respectively, in otherwise rather closely related New Ir. languages.

One could assume that -*h*- was lost in a sequence OIr. *V+-*hai* (with V = *a* in most instances) and the vowels were contracted. This would surely be a possibility for Sorani, but it would not be particularly likely for other Ir. varieties that show -*ī* for the 3rd singular. For instance, the Balochi 3sg. clitics (see Table 9) include a form -*ī*, but in contrast to what was suggested by the isogloss in Table 3, -*ī* is not a regular outcome of OIr. *-*ahya*, *-*ahai* or *-*ayahi*. Such sequences yield Balochi -*ē* or -*ay* in the verbal ending of the 2sg. and other contexts.³⁴

An alternative explanation may be seen in the derivation of the 3sg. -*ī* from one of the OIr. acc. clitics, maybe OIr. *(*h*)*īm*. Here, the word-final consonant might perhaps have prevented the syllable from being lost altogether, so that the -*ī* could have been preserved. If this is correct for Balochi, it might be an alternative assumption also for the derivation of -*ī* in Sorani and some other WIr. varieties (e.g. Harzandi, Abyanei and Bashkardi, which will be discussed in Section III).

Table 9. Pronominal clitics in Balochi.

		forms ³⁵	derivation
sg.	1st	- <i>um</i>	< OIr. gen./dat. *- <i>mai</i> (and/or acc. *- <i>mā</i>)
		- <i>un</i> , - <i>ā</i> , - <i>ū</i>	← verb? ³⁶
	2nd	- <i>it</i>	< OIr. gen./dat. *- <i>tai</i>
		- <i>ē</i>	← verb?
	3rd	- <i>iš</i>	< OIr. gen./dat. *- <i>šai</i> (and/or acc. *- <i>šim</i>)
		- <i>ī</i>	< OIr. acc. *(<i>h</i>) <i>īm</i> ?
- <i>ē</i>		< OIr. gen./dat. *- <i>hai</i> , or ← demonstrative pronoun <i>ē</i> (< *- <i>ahya</i>)? ³⁷	
pl.	1st	- <i>in</i>	< OIr. gen./dat. *- <i>nah</i> and/or acc. *- <i>nāh</i> ³⁸
		- <i>ēn</i> , - <i>ā</i> , - <i>ū</i>	← verb?
	2nd	- <i>ō</i>	< OIr. gen./dat. *- <i>wah</i> (and/or acc. *- <i>wāh</i> ?) ³⁸
		- <i>iš</i>	← 3rd pl.?
	3rd	- <i>iš</i>	< OIr. gen./dat. *- <i>šām</i> and/or acc. *(<i>h</i>) <i>iš</i> , *- <i>šiš</i> or *- <i>šim</i> ? ³⁹
		- <i>ēš</i>	← demonstrative pronoun <i>ēš</i> (< *- <i>aišām</i>)? ³⁷
		- <i>ē</i>	← 3rd sg.?

³⁴ Pace MACKENZIE (1961a: 83), who derives Bal. -*ī* from OIr. *-*hai* (cf. KORN 2005a: 107–108). The -*ī* used as gen. ending on personal names in some Western Bal. dialects, on some pronouns, and on the gen.pl. ending -*ānī* is likely to be the adjective suffix -*ī*, and is thus not a case of *-*ahya* > *-*ī* (cf. KORN 2005b: 292–294). Cases of *ē* > *ī* do occur in Balochi (cf. KORN 2005a: 199–200), but these are usually limited to a certain source or subdialect, and such a distribution does not apply to the 3sg. clitic -*ī*, which is used in all three main dialect groups (while the distribution of the variant -*ē* is more limited).

³⁵ GRIERSON (1921: 344), GILBERTSON (1923: 71, 117–118), FARRELL (1990: 54), NAWATA (1981: 13), BARKER / MENGAL (1969/I: 243–244), BARANZEHI (2003: 86), YÜSEFYÂN (1992: 54), in some cases adjusted to phonemic notation. The Balochi dialects diverge considerably as far as the actual use of the clitics is concerned; in some of them only the 3rd person is common.

³⁶ Cf. LECOQ (1989a: 257): “emprunté aux désinences?”

³⁷ The 3sg. clitic -*ē* might go back to OIr. *-*hai* (thus agreeing with the isogloss in Table 3). However, if the 3pl. clitic is to be derived from the OIr. demonstrative gen.pl. *-*aišām* (Av. *aēšāq̄m*, OInd. *ešām*, HOFFMANN / FORSSMAN 1996: 168–168), the derivation of -*ē* from OIr. *-*ahya* (Av. *ahiiā* etc., OInd. *asyā*), the gen.sg. of the same demonstrative, is an alternative possibility. This solution has been suggested for Balochi, Parachi and Ormuri by LECOQ (1989a: 257), who also derives the 1sg. and 2sg. clitics of the Ir. varieties of the “Hyrcanian” group from the OIr. full pronouns (cf. Table 4) while for the other groups (including NP and Kurdish), he agrees with the communis opinio in the derivation from the OIr. gen./dat. clitics.

If the Sorani 2sg. and one variety of the 3sg. clitic in several WIr. varieties go back to OIr. accusatives, one might reconsider the possibility that the 1sg. clitic also goes back to the OIr. acc. **-mā*: both this form and **-mai* would give New Ir. *-m* anyway; i.e. the acc. and the gen./dat. coalesced, resulting in a general oblique, parallel to the nouns (see Table 5). The same might also apply to the 3sg. clitic *-š*, which is likely to be the reflex of both the OIr. gen./dat. **-šai* and the acc. **-šim* (the *ruki* variant of **(h)im*).⁴⁰

III. The plural clitics

At this point, it is worthwhile looking at the plural forms. In Persian, the plural clitics are based on the singular ones by way of adding the pluralizing *-ān* (Table 1). The overwhelming majority of New Ir. varieties have this type of plural clitics, showing *-ān* in various modifications, very often with labialization of the vowel to *-ōn* or *-ūn* (as in Harzandi and North Bashkardi discussed below) and/or with loss of the nasal (and some with further developments). However, none of the Balochi plural clitics show this suffix (see Table 9); neither do all the Sorani ones (Table 8).⁴¹ Both languages have a 1pl. and 2pl. variant that is likely to go back to the OIr. gen./dat. clitics 1pl. **-nah*, 2pl. **-wah*. In the 1pl., a derivation from the OIr. acc. **-nāh* seems equally possible, and the assumption of a coalescence of both, parallel to the one suggested for some sg. clitics in the preceding paragraph, appears even more likely. It is somewhat less clear whether the 2pl. acc. **-wāh* would have given *ū* or *ō* in Sorani and Balochi, respectively. On the other hand, the gen./dat. form could have developed into a general oblique **-wah* in the predecessors of both languages as it did in Young Avestan (cf. footnote 24). If so, a general oblique **-nah* is likely for the 1pl. as well.

Another noteworthy example of a plural clitic not based on the singular one is the 3pl. in the Tati dialect of Harzand (Table 10).

Table 10. Pronominal clitics in Harzandi Tati.⁴²

		agent clitic	derivation	other functions	derivation
sg.	1st	<i>-ma</i>	< gen./dat. <i>*-mai</i> (and/or acc. <i>*-mā</i>)	<i>-im</i>	\bar{i} + <i>*-mai</i> etc.
	2nd	<i>-la</i>	< gen./dat. <i>*-tai</i> ⁴³	<i>-ir</i>	
	3rd	<i>-ja</i>	< gen./dat. <i>*-šai</i> (and/or acc. <i>*-šim</i>) ⁴⁴	<i>-i</i>	< OIr. acc. <i>*-(h)im</i> ?
pl.	1st	<i>-muna</i>	← sg. + <i>-ān</i>	<i>-mun</i>	← sg. + <i>-ān</i>
	2nd	<i>-luna</i>		<i>-lun</i>	
	3rd	<i>-juna</i>		<i>-i</i>	(! not † <i>-iun</i> or † <i>-jun</i>); cf. Av. <i>*-(h)im</i>

³⁸ Cf. LECOQ (1989a: 257), who derives the 1pl. and 2pl. clitics of the Ir. varieties of the “Hyrcanian” group (see footnote 37) from OIr. **-nah*, **-wah*, which are also noted as the protoforms for the Bal. clitics by WINDFUHR (1989: 259).

³⁹ See Section III.

⁴⁰ Thus SIMS-WILLIAMS (1996: 161) for Middle Persian and Sogdian. HORN (1901: 119) considers this possibility for the 1sg. and 3sg. in NP.

⁴¹ The languages mentioned in this section include all WIr. varieties known to me whose pl. clitics are not based on the sg. ones. Minor variations like the ones seen in Vafsi (1sg. *-om* / *-im* vs. 1pl. *-oan* < **-owan* < **-Vmān*) or Xunsari (2sg. *-t/d* vs. 2pl. *-dun*) are not discussed here.

⁴² Forms from LECOQ (1989b: 302–303).

⁴³ *l* and *r* are the regular results of OIr. intervocalic *t* in Tati varieties (cf. GEIGER 1901: 355), cf. *vör* “wind”, *žar* “struck”, *jeru* “separate”, *kerom* “which” (all examples from YARSHATER 1989: 242, in the orthography used there).

Harzandi has two sets of clitics: one for agents of ergative constructions, the other for the remaining oblique functions. The former set is characterized by showing an element *-a* throughout. In the second series, the 3pl. object clitic is *-i* in a remarkably asymmetrical system with the other pl. persons showing the pluralizing suffix (1pl. *-mun*, 2pl. *-lun*). If the 3sg. goes back to OIr. **-(h)īm* in some NIr. varieties, as suggested in Section II, the Harzandi 3pl. *-i* might perhaps be linked to OIr. **-(h)īm* as well, since *-īm* is used for both singular and plural in Vedic. This could perhaps also have applied to the OIr. variety to which Harzandi goes back.⁴⁵

There is a similar situation in the central plateau dialect Abyanei (Table 11).

		forms ⁴⁶	derivation
sg.	1st	<i>-m</i>	< OIr. gen./dat. <i>*-mai</i> (and/or acc. <i>*-mā</i>)
	2nd	<i>-d</i>	< OIr. gen./dat. <i>*-tai</i>
	3rd	<i>-i, -y</i>	< OIr. acc. <i>*-(h)īm</i> ?
pl.	1st	<i>-mi</i>	← sg. + <i>-ān</i>
	2nd	<i>-yi</i>	
	3rd	<i>-š(i)</i>	< OIr. gen./dat. <i>*šām</i> (and/or acc. <i>*-šāš</i> or <i>*-(h)īš</i>)?

Abyanei shows a contrast between the obligatory *-i* (corresponding to *-ān* in this variety)⁴⁷ in the 1pl. *-mi* and the 2pl. *-yi*, while the *-i* is optional in the 3pl. *-š(i)*. More importantly, the 3pl. is not derived from the 3sg. either. This might indicate that the 3pl. clitic has an origin other than *-š* plus *-ān*,⁴⁸ perhaps a form as seen in OP gen./dat.pl. *-šām* or the acc.pl. *-šāš* or OIr. **-(h)īš*. The *-i* may then have been optionally added in analogy with the other pl. persons.

The Bashkardi varieties are also interesting in this context, as is Koroshi, a Balochi dialect spoken in Fars province (Table 12).

		North Bashkardi	South Bashkardi	Koroshi
sg.	1st			<i>-(o)m</i>
	2nd			<i>-(e)t</i>
	3rd		<i>-i, -e, -h</i>	<i>-i</i>
pl.	1st	<i>-mōn/-mūn</i>	<i>-an</i>	<i>-en</i>
	2nd	<i>-tōn/-tūn</i>	<i>-o(x)</i>	<i>-u</i>
	3rd	<i>-šōn/-šūn</i>	<i>-(e)š</i>	<i>-eš</i>

⁴⁴ *ǰ* is likely to have developed from *š* via *ž*; note that even OIr. *ž* yields *ǰ* in some North-Western Ir. varieties, e.g. *huž, hūǰ* “you (pl.)” vs. Av. *yūžəm* in some Semnani varieties (MORGENSTIERNE 1960: 103).

⁴⁵ A derivation from the Av. acc. n. *-ī* seems less plausible, as a vowel alone is less likely to be preserved.

⁴⁶ LECOQ (1989c: 318).

⁴⁷ Abyanei *-i* probably developed from *-ān* via *-ūn* and *-ū* > *-i*.

⁴⁸ If the 3pl. *-š(i)* were borrowed from Persian *-šān*, one would expect a 2pl. *-ti* (or *-di*, cf. the 2sg. *-d*) as well. Such a system is indeed shown by Naini, which has (whether originally or borrowed) sg. *-m, -t, -š*; pl. *-mi, -ti, -ši* (LECOQ 1989c: 322).

⁴⁹ SKJÆRVØ (1989: 366). South Bashkardi shows a preservation of OIr. postvocalic voiceless stops (cf. SKJÆRVØ 1989: 366), which otherwise within Western Iranian is only seen in Balochi.

⁵⁰ SALĀMĪ (2005: 44). The data given by MAHAMEDĪ 1979 differ a bit from these: 1sg. *-əm*, 2sg. *-ət*; 1pl. *-ən* (p. 287), 2pl. *-ət* (sic) (pp. 287, 288, 295) and *-o* (quoted twice on p. 296), 3pl. *-əš* (p. 287). For *-ə*-he also variously notes *-e-* (pp. 295, 296 bottom). EMĀDĪ 2005 notes two slightly different sets, one identical with the one in Table 12 (EMĀDĪ 2005: 46, 50, 72), and another one (for “accusative” and “complement” uses, EMĀDĪ 2005: 45, 49) with 1sg. *-am*, 2sg. *-at*, 3sg. *-ay*; 1pl. *-ayn*, 2pl. *-ow*, 3pl. *-aš*.

The 3sg. clitics of North Bashkardi include a variant *-i*, while the pl. is *-šōn* or *-šūn*, mirroring the NP type. The fact that the North Bashkardi 3pl. clitic does not match its 3sg. may hint at the possibility that the entire pl. series has been modelled on Persian and that North Bashkardi previously had a system like the one seen in South Bashkardi and Koroshi.

The pl. series of South Bashkardi and Koroshi correspond to the pl. clitics listed for Balochi in Table 9 (1pl. *-in*, 2pl. *-ō*, 3pl. *-iš*).⁵¹ They are likely to go back to OIr. 1pl. **-nah*, 2pl. **-wah*, and one of the clitics discussed for the 3pl. in Abyanei above.

It is striking that all the WIr. varieties whose plural clitics are not based on the singular (listed in Table 13) have 3sg. clitics *-ī*, sometimes also *-ē*, but that none of these variants has only *-š*.⁵²

	pl. clitics ≠ sg. + <i>-ān</i> :	3rd sg. clitic
Sorani dialects (Table 8):	1pl.–2pl.	<i>-ī</i> , <i>-ē</i>
Harzandi, Abyanei (Tables 10, 11):	3pl.	<i>-ī</i>
Koroshi (Table 12):		<i>-i</i>
South Bashkardi (Table 11):	1pl.–3pl.	<i>-i</i> , <i>-e</i> , <i>-h</i>
Balochi (Table 9):		<i>-ī</i> , <i>-ē</i> , <i>-iš</i>

IV. Conclusion

Summing up the discussion above, Table 14 groups New WIr. varieties according to the 2sg., 3sg., and 3pl. pronominal clitics.

2sg.	< OIr. acc. <i>*-θwā</i> <i>-u</i> in Sorani dialects	< OIr. gen./dat. <i>*-tai</i> <i>-(V)t</i> (etc.) in remaining New Western Iranian	
3sg.	< OIr. acc. <i>*-(h)īm</i> probably: <i>-ī</i> in Balochi, Koroshi, Bashkardi; maybe: <i>-ī</i> in Sorani, Harzandi, Abyanei	< OIr. gen./dat. <i>*-hai</i> <i>-ē</i> in Sorani, Balochi, Bashkardi (and others)	< OIr. gen./dat. <i>*-šai</i> and/or acc. <i>*-šim</i> <i>-ja</i> in Harzandi, <i>-h</i> in Bashkardi; <i>-(V)š</i> in Balochi, New Persian and remaining New Western Ir.
3pl.	< OIr. acc. <i>*-(h)īm</i> ? <i>-i</i> in Harzandi	< OIr. acc. <i>*-(h)īš</i> , <i>*-šīš</i> and/or gen./dat. <i>*-šām</i> <i>-(i)š</i> in Balochi, Koroshi, South Bashkardi; Abyanei <i>-š(i)</i>	sg. + <i>-ān</i> → pl. remaining New Western Iranian

The first noteworthy point is that in contrast to all other New WIr. varieties, some Sorani dialects appear to have a 2sg. clitic which goes back to the OIr. accusative one. Sorani dialects might also show a 3sg. clitic deriving from the OIr. accusative. Here, it is joined by several other varieties, among them Balochi, Koroshi, and

⁵¹ This assumption would be similar to the one made by Cabolov for Kurdish (see footnote 26).

⁵² The reverse does not apply: there are New Ir. varieties with 3sg. clitic *-ī* whose pl. clitics are built on the singular, among these Standard Sorani (see footnote 25) and several Fars dialects (cf. SALĀMĪ 2004: 43, 198ff.).

South Bashkardi, for which a derivation from something like OIr. *-(h)īm appears even more probable than for Sorani.

As far as the 3pl. clitic of the latter three varieties is concerned, it is not quite clear which OIr. form they go back to: it could be either gen./dat. *-šām or acc. *-(h)īš,⁵³ *-šīš, *-šīm, from which -š might have been preserved. Derivations of the 3sg. and the 3pl. clitic from an OIr. acc. clitic would of course mutually support each other. The possibility of a coalescence of several forms (see the end of Section II) must also be kept in mind.

A derivation of the 3pl. clitic from *-šīm would show that the 3rd person clitics may be unmarked for number as they are in Vedic. This unmarkedness may also be present in the 3pl. -i in Harzandi if it derives from OIr. *-(h)īm, as does the 3rd singular.

While one Ir. variety seen in isolation does not seem to say much, all the varieties taken together present an interesting picture and, as a group, preserve a remarkable variety of OIr. pronominal clitics, also indicating that it is not only the 3sg. clitic which may be relevant for the grouping of Western Iranian. Indeed, it seems that not even the WIr. 3sg. clitics quite fit into the pattern outlined by Table 3: several varieties show more than one clitic, and there are more than two options that they could choose from.

The question remains what the distribution shown in Table 14 implies for a grouping of WIr. varieties. As discussed in KORN 2003, shared innovations would be particularly significant for such a grouping, while shared archaisms could be due to chance. However, contrary to isoglosses that have been used for grouping Ir. varieties according to phonological criteria, the parallel features observed here cannot be sorted into shared archaisms and shared innovations.

There is indeed a noteworthy innovation, viz. the formation of the plural clitics by the agglutinative method of suffixing *-ān*, originally the ending of the oblique plural,⁵⁴ to the appropriate form of the sg. clitic. Many New WIr. languages share this pattern with New Persian. However, it seems difficult or even impossible to exclude the possibility that most (if not all) New WIr. languages which have such plural clitics (including modifications like *-ān* > *-ūn* etc.) can have adopted them from Middle or New Persian in the way assumed for North Bashkardi in Section III above. On the other hand, the fact that Parthian also has such plural clitics may date the spreading of the innovation to a stage preceding Middle Iranian, all the more since the innovation stretches beyond Western Iranian and includes Bactrian⁵⁵ and Sogdian (see Table 6). There seems to be no way to decide whether the presence of such plural clitics in a given New Ir. variety indicates whether they are modelled on the Persian type or inherited from an earlier stage of Western Iranian. So there is no certain instance of a common innovation that would point to a particularly close relationship among the languages that show such pl. clitics.

Conversely, with regard to the extent of the presence of pl. clitics of the form:

⁵³ A derivation of the 3pl. clitic from OIr. *-hīš is assumed by WINDFUHR (1989: 259).

⁵⁴ Note that the affixing of *-ān* in the pl. clitics is compatible both with an obl.pl. function of the suffix (as in early Middle Iranian, see Table 5) and with a general pl. marking function.

⁵⁵ For the forms of the Bactrian clitics, see GHOLAMI in this volume.

sg. + *-ān*, the preserved reflexes of the OIr. inflectional (not agglutinative) pl. clitics in Koroshi, South Bashkardi, Balochi, Sorani dialects, and maybe also Harzandi and Abyanei, are a shared archaism that is all the more remarkable. Indeed, were it not for New Ir. languages like these, the MP and Parthian clitics would lead one to believe that the innovation of the pattern 1sg. *-m* + *-ān* → 1pl. *-mān* etc. was generalized in Middle Western Iranian, and the only remnant of an OIr. pl. clitic is the MP 1pl. *-n*. While it is questionable whether a shared archaism says anything about the grouping of languages, it is worth noting that such pl. clitics are shared by Balochi, Koroshi, and South Bashkardi, which seem to have a particularly close relationship anyway, and furthermore by one variety each of Tati and the central plateau dialects, and some Sorani dialects.

So Tables 13 and 14 summarize the distribution of clitics in Western Iranian and in this sense attempt to revise Table 3 as far as the distribution of clitics is concerned. However, the results at the same time challenge the assumption that the distribution of the 3sg. clitics (or any pronominal clitics) in New WIr. languages allows conclusions on the grouping of Western Iranian.

Abbreviations

1sg.	1st sg. (other persons accordingly)
abl.	ablative
acc.	accusative
Av.	Avestan
Bal.	Balochi
dat.	dative
f.	feminine
gen.	genitive
Ir.	Iranian
m.	masculine
MP	Middle Persian
n.	neuter
NP	New Persian
OAv.	Old Avestan
obl.	oblique case
OInd.	Old Indic
OIr.	Old Iranian
OP	Old Persian
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
pl.	plural
sg.	singular
V	any vowel
WIr.	Western Iranian
YAv.	Young Avestan

References / Sources

- BARANZEHI, Adam Nader 2003: "The Sarawani Dialect of Balochi and Persian Influence on It." In: JAHANI / KORN, pp. 75–111.
- BARKER, Muhammad A., and Aqil Khan MENGAL 1969: *A Course in Baluchi*. Montreal: McGill University, 2 vol.
- BARTHOLOMAE, Christian 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- BLAU, Joyce 1980: *Manuel de kurde. Dialecte Sorani*. Paris: Klincksieck.

- BRANDENSTEIN, Wilhelm, and Manfred MAYRHOFER 1964: *Handbuch des Altpersischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- CABOLOV, Ruslan L. 1978: *Očerki istoričeskoj morfologii kurdsckogo jazyka*. Moscow: Nauka.
- CLI = SCHMITT, Rüdiger (ed.) 1989: *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- DURKIN-MEISTERERNST, Desmond 2000: "Erfind Mani die manichäische Schrift?" In: Ronald E. EMMERICK, Werner SUNDERMANN and Peter ZIEME (eds.): *Studia Manichaica IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 161–178.
- EMĀDĪ, Neẓām 2005: *Gūyeš-e korūš*. Shiraz: Entešārāt-e āvand-andīše 1384 h.š.
- EMMERICK, Ronald E., and Prods O. SKJÆRVØ 1987: *Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese II* [Veröffentlichungen der Iranischen Kommission 17]. Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- FARRELL, Tim 1990: *Basic Balochi. An Introductory Course* [Baluchistan Monograph Series 1]. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- FORTSON, Benjamin 2004: *Indo-European Language and Culture: an introduction*. Malden, MA, etc.: Blackwell.
- GEIGER, Wilhelm 1901: "Kleinere Dialekte und Dialektgruppen." In: GEIGER / KUHN vol. 2, pp. 287–423.
- GEIGER, Wilhelm, and Ernst KUHN (eds.) 1895–1901: *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie I*. Strassburg: Trübner, 2 vol.
- GERSEVITCH, Ilya 1942: "On the Sogdian Vessantara Jātaka." In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 97–101 (= *Philologia Iranica*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, pp. 1–5).
- 1954: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GILBERTSON, George W. 1923: *The Balochi Language. A Grammar and Manual*. Hertford: Austin & Sons.
- GRIERSON, George A. 1921: "Balōchī." In: *Linguistic Survey of India X: Specimens of Languages of the Eranian Family*. Calcutta: Superintendent Gov. Print., pp. 327–451.
- HOFFMANN, Karl, and Bernhard FORSSMAN 1996: *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre* [Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 84]. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- HORN, Paul 1901: "Neupersische Schriftsprache." In: GEIGER / KUHN vol. 2, pp. 1–200.
- JAHANI, Carina, and Agnes KORN (eds.) 2003: *The Baloch and Their Neighbours: Ethnic and Linguistic Contact in Balochistan in Historical and Modern Times*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, Gert 2000: "Mittelpersisch." In: Bernhard FORSSMAN and Robert PLATH (eds.): *Indo-irisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, pp. 191–229.
- KORN, Agnes 2003: "Balochi and the Concept of North-West Iranian." In: JAHANI / KORN, pp. 49–60.
- 2005a: *Towards a Historical Grammar of Balochi. Studies in Balochi Historical Phonology and Vocabulary* [Beiträge zur Iranistik 26]. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 2005b: "Das Nominalsystem des Balochi, mittelpersisch betrachtet." In: Günter SCHWEIGER (ed.): *Indogermanica: Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag*. Tübingen: VWT-Verlag, pp. 289–302.
- KUPFER, Katharina 2002: *Die Demonstrativpronomina im Rigveda* [Europäische Hochschulschriften: Linguistik 244]. Frankfurt a.M. etc.: Peter Lang.
- LECOQ, Pierre 1989a: "Le classement des langues irano-ariennes occidentales." In: Charles-Henri DE FOUCHÉCOUR and Philippe GIGNOUX (eds.): *Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard* [Studia Iranica Cahier 7]. Paris, pp. 247–264.
- 1989b: "Les dialectes caspiens et les dialectes du nord-ouest de l'Iran." In: CLI, pp. 296–312.
- 1989c: "Les dialectes du centre de l'Iran." In: CLI, pp. 313–326.
- MACKENZIE, D. Neil 1961: *Kurdish Dialect Studies I* [London Oriental Series 9]. London: Oxford University Press.
- 1961a: "The Origins of Kurdish." In: *Transactions of the Philological Society*, pp. 68–86 (= *Iranica Diversa II*, pp. 369–387).
- 1978: "Shapur's shooting." In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 41, pp. 499–511 (= *Iranica Diversa I*, pp. 73–81).
- MAHAMEDĪ, Hamid 1979: "On the Verbal System in Three Iranian Dialects of Fars." In: *Studia Iranica* 8, pp. 277–297.

- MORGENSTIERNE, Georg 1960: "Stray Notes on Persian Dialects." In: *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 19, pp. 73–140.
- MOŠKALO, Vyačeslav V. 1991: "Beludžskij jazyk". In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija* 1. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 5–90.
- NAWATA, Tetsuo 1981: *Baluchi [Asian and African Grammatical Manuals 17b]*. Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- RASTORGUEVA, Vera S., and E. K. MOLČANOVA 1981: "Srednepersidskij jazyk." In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija: Sredneiranskije jazyki*. Moscow, pp. 6–146.
- SALĀMI, 'Abdonnabī 2004: *Ganjīne-ye gūyeš-šenāsī-ye fārs* 1. Tehran: Farhangestān-e zabān-o-adab-e fārsī 1383 h.š.
- 2005: "Barrasī-ye ejmālī-ye gūyeš-e korošī." In: *Gūyeš-šenāsī / Dialectology I/3* (1383 h.š.), pp. 39–56.
- SALEMANN, Carl 1901: "Mittelpersisch." In: GEIGER / KUHN vol. 1, pp. 249–332.
- SELCAN, Zülfü 1998: *Grammatik der Zaza-Sprache*. Berlin: Wissenschaft & Technik.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 1981: "Notes on Manichaean Middle Persian Morphology." In: *Studia Iranica* 10, pp. 165–176.
- 1985: *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C2 [Berliner Turfantexte 12]*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 1996: "Another Sogdian ideogram?" In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 94, pp. 161–166.
- 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. 539–547.
- SKJÆRVØ, Prods O. 1989: "Languages of Southeast Iran." In: *CLI*, pp. 363–369.
- TEDESCO, Paul 1921: "Dialektologie der mitteliranischen Turfantexte." In: *Monde Oriental* 15, pp. 184–258.
- DE VAAN, Michiel 2003: *The Avestan Vowels [Leiden Studies in Indo-European 12]*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.
- WINDFUHR, Gernot L. 1975: "Isoglosses: A Sketch on Persians and Parthians, Kurds and Medes." In: *Monumentum Henrik S. Nyberg II [Acta Iranica 5]*, pp. 457–472.
- 1989: "New West Iranian". In: *CLI*, pp. 251–262.
- 1996: "Dialectology." In: *Encyclopædia Iranica* VII, pp. 363–370.
- YARSHATER, Ehsan 1989: "Azerbaijan viii. The Iranian languages of Azerbaijan." In: *Encyclopædia Iranica* III, pp. 238–254.
- YŪSEFIYĀN, PākHzād 1992: *Zabān-e balūčī (gūyeš-e lāšārī): gorūh-e esmī, fe'īlī va qeidī*. (Unpublished MA thesis, University of Tehran) 1371 h.š.

Contents

<i>Editorial Note</i>	5
<i>Studies</i>	
<i>Ashk P. Dahlén</i> , Kingship and Religion in a Mediaeval <i>Fürstenspiegel</i> : The Case of the <i>Chahār Maqāla</i> of Nizāmī ‘Arūzī	9
<i>Mohammad Ghazanfari</i> and <i>Abdullah Sarani</i> , The Manifestation of Ideology in a Literary Translation	25
<i>Urban Hammar</i> , The Kālacakra Initiation by the Fourteenth Dalai Lama in Amaravati, January 2006	40
<i>Mahmoud Hassanabadi</i> , The Situation of Women in Sasanian Iran: Reflections on the Story of Bahrām Gōr and his Mistress	60
<i>Michael Reinhard Heß</i> , Aufreizende Verbote: Uşaklıgils <i>Aşk-ı Memnu</i> als Schlüssel zur ‚orientalischen‘ Liebe	69
<i>Ablahad Lahdo</i> , Some Remarks on Language Use and Arabic Dialects in Eastern Turkey	105
<i>Iranian Minority Languages</i> , ed. by Agnes Korn	
<i>Agnes Korn</i> , Introduction	117
<i>Farideh Okati</i> , <i>Abbas Ali Ahangar</i> and <i>Carina Jahani</i> , Fronting of /u/ in Iranian Sistani	120
<i>Saloumeh Gholami</i> , Ergativity in Bactrian	132
<i>Thomas Jügel</i> , Ergative Remnants in Sorani Kurdish?	142
<i>Agnes Korn</i> , Western Iranian Pronominal Clitics	159
<i>Antje Wendtland</i> , The Position of the Pamir Languages within East Iranian	172
<i>Book Reviews</i>	189
<i>List of Contributors</i>	203