

DEUTSCHE MORGENLÄNDISCHE GESELLSCHAFT



AGNES KORN

**A case for the accusative
Western Iranian pronominal clitics**

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

online-Publikation, März 2008

<http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:5-92620>
ISSN 1866-2943

A Case for the Accusative: Western Iranian Pronominal Clitics

Agnes Korn

I.

Most contemporary Western Iranian languages¹ make use of enclitic pronouns, which are also sometimes called suffixed pronouns or pronominal clitics.² These clitics are used as enclitic counterparts of the stressed pronouns in all functions of the oblique case, including possessive function³ and agent of ergative constructions (in those Ir. varieties that show ergative patterns).

The pronominal clitics for the sg. persons have usually been derived from the Old Ir. enclitic pronouns used for the genitive and dative case,⁴ so e.g. the New Persian clitics *-am*, *-at*, *-aš* are from OIr. *-mai*, *-tai*, *-šai* (Table 1).

1. Derivation of New Persian pronominal clitics⁵

	NP clitics	< OIr. gen./dat. clitics
1st sg.	<i>-am</i>	<i>-mai</i>
2nd sg.	<i>-at</i>	<i>-tai</i>
3rd sg.	<i>-aš</i>	<i>-šai</i>
1st pl.	<i>-mān</i>	sg. forms + pl. suffix <i>-ān</i> (< OIr. gen.pl. ending <i>-ānām</i>)
2nd pl.	<i>-tān</i>	
3rd pl.	<i>-šān</i>	

The forms which the pronominal clitics take in the various languages have also been used as an isogloss to define the relationships within Western Iranian. More specifically, Western Ir. varieties have been grouped according to their form of the 3rd sg.

-
- 1 In this paper, Avestan and Sogdian are included for comparison, and to broaden the material basis for Old and Middle Iranian, although they are not Western Iranian languages. – I wish to thank Thomas Jügel (Frankfurt a.M.) for his careful reading of a previous version.
 - 2 No such clitics are found in Sangesari, Zazaki and Northern Kurdish (WINDFUHR 1975:462).
 - 3 In some WIr. varieties, it is not the pronominal clitics which are used in possessive function, but rather a form that derives from a combination with a preposition (OIr. *hača* "from, according to"), e.g. Northern Talyshi, Tati, Harzani, Semnani dialects and Zazaki (WINDFUHR 1975:462).
 - 4 There is a difference in case marking between nouns and full pronouns on the one hand and pronominal clitics on the other. While the former usually have a separate form each for the genitive and dative in old Indo-European languages, the latter have only one form for genitive and dative.
 - 5 Cf. e.g. RASTORGUEVA/MOLČANOVA (1981:82).

pronominal clitic (Table 2), derived either from OIr. *-hai*, or from *-šai*, which are "sandhi" variants of the OIr. 3rd sg. pronominal clitic, with *-šai* figuring in so-called "ruki" contexts (and *-hai* otherwise) in Avestan.⁶

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

	< gen./dat. <i>-hai</i>	< gen./dat. <i>-šai</i>
Middle Ir.		Middle Persian, Parthian
New Ir.	Kurdish, Xori, Kohrudi, Harzani, Balochi, Bashkardi, Bandar Abbasi	New Persian, remaining New Western Iranian

The derivation of the clitics from the OIr. genitive/dative form is confirmed by the fact that the full pronouns likewise derive from the corresponding OIr. genitive forms, as e.g. in Middle Persian (Table 3):

3. Derivation of Middle Persian pronouns (oblique or only form)⁷

	MP	< OP genitive	cf. Young Avestan genitives
1st sg.	<i>man</i>	<i>manā</i>	<i>mana</i>
2nd sg.	<i>tau</i>		<i>tauua</i>
1st pl.	<i>amā(h)</i>	<i>amāxam</i>	<i>ahmākəm</i>
2nd pl.	<i>ašmā(h)</i>		<i>xšmākəm</i>

Similarly, the oblique case markers of the nouns have been assumed to go back to the OIr. genitive ending (Table 4). So one may say that the MP oblique forms of nouns and pronouns collectively derive from the corresponding OIr. genitive forms and endings.

4. Derivation of MP and Parthian nominal endings⁸

	direct	oblique	< OIr. genitive endings
sg.	-∅	-ē > -∅	< <i>-ahya</i>
pl.	-∅	-ān > pl. suffix	< <i>-ānām</i>

6 The derivation of Middle and New Ir. 3rd sg. clitics from the sandhi variants of the OIr. clitic has commonly been assumed, see e.g. MACKENZIE (1961a:83), Sims-Williams (in EMMERICK/SKJÆRVØ 1987:74), WINDFUHR (1996:365).

7 Cf. e.g. RASTORGUEVA/MOLČANOVA (1981:81).

8 Cf. e.g. RASTORGUEVA/MOLČANOVA (1981:58).

II.

However, in addition to the pronominal clitics going back to the OIr. gen./dat., some Middle Ir. languages have forms deriving from the OIr. accusative forms, for instance Sogdian (Table 5).

5. Derivation of Sogdian pronominal clitics

	forms ⁹	derivation
1st sg.	-m(y)	< gen./dat. *-mai (also < acc. *-mā?)
2nd sg.	gen./dat. -t(y)	< *-tai (Nicholas Sims-Williams, p.c.)
	acc./abl. -f-, -β-	< acc. *-θwā, abl. *θwad (SIMS-WILLIAMS 2004:542)
3rd sg.	gen./dat. -š(y)	< gen./dat. *-šai
	acc. -šw	-š + nominal ending
1st pl.	-mn	
	acc. also -n'	
2nd pl.	-tn,	
	-fn, -βn	
3rd pl.	-šn	

The presence of such forms in Middle Iranian opens up the possibility that some pronominal clitics which have not been explained convincingly so far could perhaps derive from OIr. acc. case forms. The acc. forms of the OIr. pronominal clitics are found in the first column in Table 6 (p. 4).

III.

We will first turn to the 2nd sg. clitic, for which we observed two different forms in Sogdian. Most New WIr. languages show a 2nd sg. pronominal clitic -at as does NP, but some varieties have other forms. Among these are the clitics found in some Sorani dialects of the Sulaimaniya region (Table 7, p. 4).

For the Sorani 2nd sg. clitic -u, a derivation from the OIr. gen./dat. -tai does not 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

9 GERSHEVITCH (1954:202-205), SIMS-WILLIAMS (1985:227, 233, 238). The variation -f- vs. -β- in the 2nd sg. acc./abl. form depends on the script employed (the Manichean and Buddhist texts have -f-, texts in Sogdian script -β-).

seen in the Sorani numeral "four", which is *čwār* (cf. Av. *čaθβārō*), suggesting a regular change of OIr. *θu* > *w/ u* in Sorani. The more common variant for the 2nd sg. clitic in Sorani is *-(i)t*. Unless *-(i)t* has been borrowed from Persian, Sorani dialects would preserve reflexes of two different OIr. clitics as does Sogdian.

6. Pronominal clitics in Old Iranian and Old Indic¹⁰

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

7. Pronominal clitics in Sorani (Sulaimaniya region)

	MACKENZIE (1961:76-77)	CABOLOV (1978:27)	derivation
1st sg.	<i>-(i)m</i>	<i>-ō</i>	<i>-im</i> < gen./dat. <i>-mai</i> (and/or acc. <i>-mā</i> ?)
2nd sg.	<i>-u</i> , <i>-(i)t</i>	<i>-u</i>	< acc. <i>*-θwā</i> ? < gen./dat. <i>-tai</i>
3rd sg.	<i>-ī</i>	<i>-ē</i>	< gen./dat. <i>-hai</i> ? < gen./dat. <i>*-Vhai</i> <i>-ī</i> < acc. <i>*-(h)īm</i> ? ¹¹
1st pl.	<i>-(i)n</i> , <i>-mān</i>	<i>-(i)n</i>	
2nd pl.	<i>-ū</i> , <i>-tān</i>	<i>-ū</i>	
3rd pl.	<i>-yān</i>	unattested	

10 Forms without language label apply both to Avestan and Old Persian. 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).

11 Cf. CABOLOV (1978:26): 3rd sg. clitic "< Av. *hīm*, *hē*".

The Sorani 3rd sg. clitic is also markedly different from the NP one. It has been derived from OIr. *-hai*. A development of OIr. *-hai* > Sorani \bar{i} or \bar{e} is indeed quite possible because \bar{i} and \bar{e} are also the result of similar sequences in the verbal ending of the 2nd sg. (possibly < *-ayahi* or *-ahi*). There is a problem, however, in that the OIr. verbal ending is a polysyllabic element while a derivation of \bar{i} or \bar{e} 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 \bar{i} or \bar{e} while OIr. *-mai* gives *-m* (and *-tai*, *-šai* give *-t*, *-š* in otherwise rather closely related NIr. languages). One could assume that *-h-* was lost in a sequence *V+-hai* (the vowel of which would have been *a* in most instances) and the vowels contracted.

This would surely be a possibility for Sorani, but it would not be likely for other Ir. varieties that show \bar{i} for the 3rd sg. For instance, and in contrast to what was noted in the isogloss Table 2, the Balochi 3rd sg. clitics (see Table 8, p. 6) include one of the form \bar{i} , and \bar{i} is not a regular outcome of OIr. sequences like **-ahai*, *-ayahi* or *-ahya*, all of which give \bar{e} or *-ay* in the verbal ending of the 2nd sg. and other contexts.¹²

So we need another explanation here, and this could be seen in the derivation from one of the OIr. acc. clitics, maybe Av. *-īm*, *-hīm*. Here, the word-final consonant might perhaps have prevented the syllable from being lost altogether, and the \bar{i} might have been preserved. If this is correct for Balochi, it could be an alternative assumption also for the derivation of Sorani etc. \bar{i} .

IV.

At this point, it is also worthwhile to look at the plural clitics. In Table 1, we saw that the NP plural clitics are derived from the singular ones by way of adding the pluralising \bar{an} . Most NIr. varieties have this type of plural clitics, showing \bar{an} in various pronunciations. However, none of the Balochi plural clitics shows this suffix, and neither do all the Sorani ones.

Another interesting example of a plural clitic not based on the sg. one is the 3rd pl. in the Tati dialect of Harzand (Table 9, p. 7). Harzandi has two sets of clitics depending on the function, one for agents of ergative constructions, the other one for the remaining

12 Pace MACKENZIE (1961a:83), who would derive Bal. \bar{i} from OIr. *-hai*. OIr. *-ai-* and *-aya-* yield Bal. \bar{e} while the OIr. gen.sg. *-ahya* gives Bal. *-ay*, \bar{e} (KORN 2005:107-108). The \bar{i} used as gen. ending on personal names in some Western Bal. dialects is likely to be the adjective suffix \bar{i} (cf. KORN 2005a:293).

functions. The 3rd pl. object clitic is *-i* in an asymmetrical system with the other pl. persons showing the pluralising suffix (1st pl. *-mun*, 2nd pl. *-lun*). The 3rd pl. *-ī* might perhaps be compared to Av. *-īš*, *-hīš* (the pl. corresponding to the sg. *-īm*), or even to *-īm* itself, since it is used for both sg. and pl. in Vedic. This could perhaps have applied also to the OIr. variety that Harzandi goes back to.¹³

There is a similar situation in the central plateau dialect Abyanei (Table 10, p. 7). Abyanei shows an interesting contrast between the obligatory *-i*¹⁴ in the 1st pl. *-mi*, 2nd pl. *-yi*, and the optional *-i* in the 3rd plural. More importantly, the 3rd pl. is not derived from the 3rd sg. either (its unambiguous marking the 3rd pl. may be the reason for the optionality of the *-i*). This might indicate that the 3rd pl. clitic has an origin other than *-š* plus *-ān*, so maybe a form as seen in OP acc.pl. *-šīš* or dat./gen.pl. *-šām*.

8. Pronominal clitics in Balochi

	forms ¹⁵	derivation
1st sg.	<i>-um</i> , <i>-un</i> , <i>-ā̃</i> , <i>-ū̃</i>	< gen./dat. <i>*-mai</i> (and acc. <i>*-mā?</i>) ← verb ¹⁶
2nd sg.	<i>-it</i> , <i>-ē</i>	< gen./dat. <i>*-tai</i> ← verb
3rd sg.	<i>-iš</i> , <i>-ī</i> , <i>-ē</i>	< gen./dat. <i>*-šai</i> (or acc. <i>*-šīm?</i>) < acc. <i>*-(h)īm?</i> ← demonstrative pronoun <i>ē</i> < <i>*ahya?</i>
1st pl.	<i>-in</i> , <i>-ēn</i> , <i>-ā̃</i> , <i>-ū̃</i>	< gen./dat. <i>*-nah</i> ¹⁷ ← verb
2nd pl.	<i>-ō</i> , <i>-iš</i>	< gen./dat. <i>*-uāh</i> ¹³ ← 3rd pl.?
3rd pl.	<i>-iš</i> , <i>-ēš</i> , <i>-ē</i>	< acc. <i>*-šīš</i> (cf. OP), or <i>*-šīm?</i> ← demonstrative pronoun <i>ēš</i> < <i>*aišām?</i> ← 3rd sg.?

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

14 *-ān* evidently corresponds to *-i* in Abyanei. If the 3rd pl. *-š(i)* were borrowed from Persian, one would expect a 2nd pl. *-ti* (or *-di*) as well.

15 GRIERSON (1921:344), GILBERTSON (1923:71, 117-118), FARRELL (1990:54), NAWATA (1981:13), BARKER/MENGAL (1969/I:243-244), BARANZEHI (2003:86), YŪSEFIYĀN (1992:54).

16 Cf. LECOQ (1989:257): "emprunté aux désinences?"

17 LECOQ (1989:257).

9. Pronominal clitics in Harzandi Tati¹⁸

	agent clitic	derivation	other functions	derivation
1st	<i>-ma</i>		<i>-īm</i>	
2nd	<i>-la</i>	< <i>-tai</i>	<i>-īr</i>	
3rd	<i>-ǰa</i>	< <i>-šai</i> (via <i>-ž</i>)	<i>-ī</i>	< acc. <i>-(h)īm?</i>
1st	<i>-muna</i>		<i>-mun</i>	from sg.
2nd	<i>-luna</i>	from sg.	<i>-lun</i>	
3rd	<i>-ǰuna</i>		<i>-i</i>	(! not † <i>-iun</i> or † <i>-ǰun</i>); cf. Av. <i>-(h)īš</i> , or < <i>-īm</i>

10. Agent clitics in Abyanei

	forms ¹⁹	derivation
1st sg.	<i>-m</i>	
2nd sg.	<i>-d</i>	
3rd sg.	<i>-i, -y</i>	
1st pl.	<i>-mi</i>	from sg.
2nd pl.	<i>-yi</i>	
3rd pl.	<i>-š(i)</i>	< acc. * <i>-šīš</i> , gen./dat. * <i>šām?</i>

The Bashkardi varieties are also interesting in this context, as is Koroshi, a Balochi dialect spoken in Fars province (Table 11): the 3rd sg. clitics of North Bashkardi include a variant *-i* while the pl. is *-šōn* or *-šūn*, matching the other pl. clitics. The fact that the North Bashkardi 3rd pl. clitic does not match the 3rd sg. one may hint to 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.

18 LECOQ (1989a:302-303).

19 LECOQ (1989b:318).

11. Pronominal clitics in Bashkardi²⁰ and Koroshi²¹

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

It is interesting that all WIr. varieties whose plural clitics are not based on the singular ones have 3rd sg. clitics $-ī$, sometimes also $-ē$, but none of these variants has only $-š$.²²

12. Plural clitic patterns in New Iranian

varieties with pl. clitics other than "sg. + $-ān$ "		3rd sg. clitic
Sorani (Table 7)	1st+2nd pl.	$-ī$, $-ē$
Harzandi, Abyanei (Table 9, 10)	3rd pl.	$-ī$
Koroshi (Table 11)	1st-3rd pl.	$-i$
South Bashkardi (Table 10)	1st-3rd pl.	$-i$, $-e$, $-h$
Balochi (Table 8)	1st-3rd pl.	$-ī$, $-ē$, $-iš$

V.

Table 13 summarises the assumptions made above, grouping New Western Ir. varieties according to the 2nd sg., 3rd sg. and 3rd pl. pronominal clitics. The first noteworthy point is that in contrast to all other New WIr. varieties, some Sorani dialects appear to show a 2nd sg. clitic derived from the OIr. accusative one. Sorani might also show a 3rd sg. clitic deriving from the OIr. accusative, and here, it is joined by several other varieties, among these Balochi, Koroshi and Bashkardi, for which the derivation from something like $-īm$ or $-hīm$ appears even more certain than for Sorani.

20 SKJÆRVØ (1989:366).

21 SALĀMĪ (2005:44). The data given by MAHAMEDĪ 1979 differ a bit from these: 1st sg. $-əm$, 2nd sg. $-ət$, 1st pl. $-ən$ (p. 287), 2nd pl. $-ət$ (sic) (p. 287, 288, 295) / $-o$ (p. 296, twice), 3rd pl. $-əš$ (p. 287). All instances of $-ə$ (thus on pp. 287, 288, 296 middle) are replaced by $-e$ on p. 295, 296 bottom.

22 The reverse does not apply: there are NIr. varieties with 3rd sg. clitic $-ī$ whose pl. clitics are built on the sg. ones, among these standard Sorani (BLAU 1988:55) and several Fars dialects (cf. SALĀMĪ 2005:43, 198ff.).

These varieties also have a 3rd pl. clitic that may well derive from the OIr. accusative one, which renders the derivation of the corresponding sg. even more probable. It is not quite clear which OIr. form is the one that the contemporary clitics derive from, it could be either *-(h)īš* or *-šīš* or even *-šām*, from which one *-š* would have been preserved. Another acc. clitic may be the origin of the Harzandi 3rd pl. *-i*, maybe the same form that the singular derives from, since in Vedic the clitic *-īm* is unspecified for number, which might also have applied to the OIr. dialect that Harzandi goes back to.

The possible derivation of some pronominal clitics from the accusative protoforms has certain consequences for the grouping of WIr. languages (Table 13).

13. New suggestion for an isogloss which groups New Western Ir. languages according to some pronominal clitics

2nd sg.	< acc. <i>-šūā</i>	< gen./dat. <i>-tai</i>	
NIr. varieties	Sorani (Sulaimaniya)	other New Iranian	
3rd sg.	< acc. <i>-(h)īm</i>	< gen./dat. <i>/-hai/</i>	gen./dat. <i>/-šai/</i>
NIr. varieties	probably: <i>-ī</i> in Balochi, Koroshi, Bashkardi; maybe: <i>-ī</i> in Sorani, Harzandi, Abyanei	<i>-ē</i> in Sorani, Balochi, Bashkardi (and others)	<i>-ja</i> in Harzandi, <i>-h</i> in Bashkardi; <i>-(i)š</i> in Balochi, NP and remaining New Ir.
3rd pl.	< acc. <i>-šīš</i> or gen./dat. <i>-šām</i>	< acc. <i>-(h)īm</i> or <i>-hīš</i>	based on sg. + <i>/-ān/</i>
NIr. varieties	<i>-(i)š</i> in Balochi, Koroshi, South Bashkardi; Abyanei <i>-š(i)</i>	Harzandi <i>-i</i>	remaining New Iranian

While one Ir. variety seen in isolation does not seem to say much, taken together they present an interesting picture, in sum preserving a remarkable variety of OIr. pronominal clitics, and also indicating that it is not only the 3rd sg. clitic which may yield interesting results for the grouping of Western Iranian.

Indeed, it seems that not even the 3rd sg. clitics in Western Iranian do quite fit into the pattern outlined by Table 2. Several varieties show more than one clitic, as does Sogdian, and there are more than two options that they choose from.

Abbreviations:

abl.	ablative	m.	masculine	OIr.	Old Iranian
acc.	accusative	MP	Middle Persian	OP	Old Persian
Av.	Avestan	n.	neuter	pl.	plural
Bal.	Balochi	NIr.	New Iranian	sg.	singular
dat.	dative	NP	New Persian	V	any vowel
f.	feminine	OAv.	Old Avestan	WIr.	Western Iranian
gen.	genitive	obl.	oblique case	YAv.	Young Avestan
Ir.	Iranian				

References / Sources:

- BARANZEHI, Adam Nader 2003: "The Sarawani Dialect of Balochi and Persian Influence on It".
In: Carina JAHANI, and Agnes KORN (eds.) 2003: *The Baloch and Their Neighbours: Ethnic and Linguistic Contact in Balochistan in Historical and Modern Times*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, pp. 75-111
- BARKER, Muhammad A., and Aqil Khan MENGAL 1969: *A Course in Baluchi*. Montreal: McGill University, 2 vol.
- 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: *Očerk istoričeskoj morfologii kurdsogo jazyka*. Moscow: Nauka
- CLI = SCHMITT, Rüdiger (ed.) 1989: *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert
- EMMERICK, Ronald E., and Prods O. SKJÆRVØ 1987: *Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese II* [Veröffentlichungen der Iranischen Kommission 17]. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
- FARRELL, Tim 1990: *Basic Balochi. An Introductory Course* [Baluchistan Monograph Series 1]. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale
- GERSHEVITCH, Ilya 1954: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. 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
- KORN, Agnes 2005: *Towards a Historical Grammar of Balochi. Studies in Balochi Historical Phonology and Vocabulary* [Beiträge zur Iranistik 26]. Wiesbaden: Reichert

- 2005a: "Das Nominalsystem des Balochi, mitteliranisch betrachtet". In: Günter SCHWEIGER (ed.): *Indogermanica: Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag*. Taimering: VWT-Verlag, pp. 289-302
- LECOQ, Pierre 1989: "Le classement des langues irano-ariennes occidentales". In: Charles-Henri DE FOUCHÉCOUR, Philippe GIGNOUX (eds.) 1989: *Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard [Studia Iranica Cahier 7]*. Paris, pp. 247-264
- 1989a: "Les dialectes caspiens et les dialectes du nord-ouest de l'Iran". In: *CLI*, pp. 296-312
- 1989b: "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)
- MAHAMEDI, Hamid 1979: "On the Verbal System in Three Iranian Dialects of Fars". In: *Studia Iranica* 8, pp. 277-297
- 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: Sredneiranskie jazyki*. Moscow, pp. 6-146
- SALĀMĪ, ʿAbdolnabī 2005: "Barrasī-ye eǰmālī-ye gūyeš-e korošī". In: *Gūyeš-šenāsī / Dialectology* I/3 (1383 h.š.), pp. 39-56
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 1985: *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C2 [Berliner Turfantexte 12]*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag
- 2004: "The Parthian abstract suffix *-yfi*". 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
- 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
- 1996: "Dialectology". In: *Encyclopædia Iranica* 7, pp. 363-370
- YŪSEFIYĀN, Pākzād 1992: *Zabān-e balūčī (gūyeš-e lāšārī): gorūh-e esmī, feʿlī va qeidī*. (Unpublished MA thesis, University of Tehran) 1371 h.š.

Agnes Korn

Universität Frankfurt, Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft

PF 11 19 32, D - 60054 Frankfurt

a.korn@em.uni-frankfurt.de

8th April 2008