

# Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft

Im Auftrag der Gesellschaft herausgegeben von  
Florian C. Reiter  
unter Mitwirkung von  
Christian Bauer, Werner Diem, Lutz Edzard, Annette Hagedorn,  
Herrmann Jungraithmayr, Jens Peter Laut,  
Walter Slaje und Michael Streck

Band 158  
2008



Harrassowitz Verlag



### **Vorstand der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft e.V. (DMG)**

1. Vorsitzender und Beauftragter für die DMG-Bibliothek: Prof. Dr. Stefan Leder, Orientalwissenschaftliches Zentrum, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Mühlweg 15, 06099 Halle (Saale), E-Mail: leder@orientphil.uni-halle.de; 2. Vorsitzender: Manfred Hake, Südasien-Institut, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Im Neuenheimer Feld 330, 69120 Heidelberg, E-Mail: mhake@sai.uni-heidelberg.de; 1. Geschäftsführer: Prof. Dr. Jens Peter Laut, Orientalisches Seminar, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Werthmannplatz 3, 79085 Freiburg i. Br., E-Mail: Jens.Peter.Laut@orient.uni-freiburg.de; 2. Geschäftsführer und Schriftleiter der ZDMG: Prof. Dr. Florian C. Reiter, Sinologie, Humboldt-Universität Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, E-Mail: florian.c.reiter@rz.hu-berlin.de; Schatzmeister: Andreas Pohlus, Institut für Indologie und Südasienwissenschaften, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Emil-Abderhalden-Str. 9, 06099 Halle (Saale), E-Mail: pohlus@indologie.uni-halle.de; Beisitzer: Prof. Dr. Heidrun Brückner, Indologie, Universität Würzburg, Am Hubland, 97074 Würzburg, E-Mail: Heidrun.Brueckner@mail.uni-wuerzburg.de; Prof. Dr. Dymitr Ibriszimow, Lehrstuhl Afrikanistik II, Universität Bayreuth, 95440 Bayreuth, Tel. 0921/55 35 81; Prof. Dr. Ulrich Marzolph, Enzyklopädie des Märchens, Friedländer Weg 2, 37085 Göttingen; Dr. Anja Pistor-Hatam, Weidenweg 16, 52074 Aachen

**Homepage der DMG:** <http://www.dmg-web.de>

**Redaktion der ZDMG** (verantwortlich): Prof. Dr. Florian C. Reiter (s. o.)

**Erscheinungsweise:** Jährlich 2 Hefte

**Bezugsbedingungen:** Jahresabonnement € 84,-, Einzelheft € 43,50,-, jeweils zuzüglich Versandkosten. Ein Abonnement gilt, falls nicht befristet bestellt, zur Fortsetzung bis auf Widerruf. Kündigungen müssen bis zum Ablauf eines Jahres erfolgen. Mitglieder der DMG erhalten die Zeitschrift für den Mitgliedsbeitrag (€ 60,- p. a.). **Bestellungen** an den Harrassowitz Verlag (s. u.) oder über jede Buchhandlung.

**Anträge auf Eintritt in die DMG** an den 1. Geschäftsführer, Prof. Dr. Jens Peter Laut (s. o.), **Anschriftenänderungen** an den Schatzmeister der DMG, Andreas Pohlus (s. o.).

**Fachartikel und Rezensionen:** Autorenrichtlinien (style sheet) liegen dem Jahresinhaltsverzeichnis in Heft 2 bei und können von der Homepage der DMG (s. o.) heruntergeladen werden. Es ist erforderlich, Beiträge für die ZDMG als Datei und als Papierausdruck einzureichen.

Rezensionsexemplare werden von den Mitherausgebern angefordert. Rezensionangebote an die Schriftleitung werden entsprechend weitergeleitet. Für unaufgefordert eingesandte Rezensionsexemplare besteht weder ein Recht auf Besprechung noch auf Rücksendung. Wenn erwünscht, wird eine Replik veröffentlicht, jedoch keine Gegenreplik.

Der Redaktion angebotene Beiträge dürfen nicht bereits veröffentlicht sein oder gleichzeitig veröffentlicht werden. Wiederabdrucke erfordern die Zustimmung der Herausgeber. Die ZDMG ist ein *refereed journal*. Die Autoren sind für die wissenschaftlichen Aussagen und Meinungen in ihren Beiträgen ausschließlich selbst verantwortlich.

### **Herstellung und Vertrieb der ZDMG**

Satz und Layout: Claudius Naumann, Ernst-Thälmann-Str. 79, 14532 Kleinmachnow, E-Mail: claudius.naumann@snafu.de

Verlag: Harrassowitz Verlag, 65174 Wiesbaden, Fax: 06 11-53 09 99, E-Mail: verlag@harrassowitz.de, <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft e.V., 2008

Die Zeitschrift einschließlich aller ihrer Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung der DMG unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen jeder Art, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und für die Einspeicherung in elektronische Systeme.

Druck und Verarbeitung: AZ Druck und Datentechnik, Kempten (Allgäu)

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier

Printed in Germany

ISSN 0341-0137

# INHALT

## des 158. Bandes der Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft

### Nachrufe

- Heinz Bechert (1932–2005). Von JENS-UWE HARTMANN . . . . . 1  
Klaus Rüping (1940–2005). Von ANNETTE MEUTHRATH . . . . . 9

### Aufsätze

- BALDI, SERGIO/HERRMANN JUNGRAITHMAYR: Mots d'origine arabe en mubi (Tchad) 25  
DIEFENBACH, THILO: Zu ausgewählten *yuefu*-Balladen der Sechzehn Staaten  
(304–439) und der Nördlichen Wei-Dynastie (386–534) . . . . . 139  
EADE, J. C.: Computers vs Tables, Billard vs Golzio: Two New Date-Lists of the  
Inscriptions of Kamboja . . . . . 73  
HEIRMAN, ANN: Where is the Probationer in the Chinese Buddhist Nunneries?. . . 105  
KIENAST, BURKHART: Zu den zweikonsonantigen Verben im Akkadischen . . . . . 17  
KIYOTAKA YOSHIMIZU: The Intention of Expression (*vivakṣā*), the Expounding  
(*vyākhyā*) of a Text, and the Authorlessness of the Veda . . . . . 51  
NAUMANN, WOLFRAM: Catalpa oder Betula? Zum Bogenmotiv in  
der altjapanischen Literatur . . . . . 379  
NISHIWAKI TSUNEKI: Besuche in Berlin – Verdienste eines japanischen Gelehrten  
aus der Zeit vor dem 2. Weltkrieg . . . . . 389  
PAT-EL, NA'AMA/ALEXANDER TREIGER: On Adnominalization of Prepositional  
Phrases and Adverbs in Semitic . . . . . 265  
VAN SKYHAWK, HUGH: Cleansing and Renewing the Field for Another Year:  
Processions between Holy Places as Networks of Reflexivity . . . . . 353  
SLAJE, WALTER: Geschichte *schreiben*: Vier historiographische Prologe  
aus Kaschmir . . . . . 317  
WAGNER, EWALD: Neues zur arabischen Stilistik. . . . . 39  
WALRAVENS, HARTMUT: Ein Besuch in Sianfu [Xian] im Juni 1934.  
Beobachtungen von Ernst Boerschmann . . . . . 401  
WEINREICH, MATTHIAS: Two Varieties of Domaakí. . . . . 299  
WEIPERT, REINHARD: Ein neues enzyklopädisches Handbuch der arabischen  
Sprachwissenschaft . . . . . 283  
WIERINGA, EDWIN: Eine Handschrift der javanischen *Panji Jayalengkara-Angrèni*-  
Erzählung in Frankfurt/Main . . . . . 371

### Bücherbesprechungen

- AKIKO MOTOYOSHI SUMI: *Description in Classical Arabic Poetry. Waṣf, Ekphrasis,  
and Interarts Theory*. Von ALI A. HUSSEIN . . . . . 443

ANETSHOFER, HELGA: <i>Temporale Satzverbindungen in altosmanischen Prosatexten. Mit einer Teiledition aus Behcetü'l-Hadâ'iq (1303 und 1429), Muqaddime-i Quṭbeddīn (1433) und Ferec ba'de ṣ-ṣidde (1451).</i> Von WOLFGANG-E. SCHARLIPP . . . . .	472
ARIES, WOLF D./RÜSTEM ÜLKER (Hrsg.): <i>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Alfred Delp und Said Nursi.</i> Von MARTIN RIEXINGER . . . . .	191
AVERROÈS (Ibn Ruṣd): <i>Commentaire moyen à la Rhétorique d'Aristote.</i> Introduction générale, édition critique du texte arabe, traduction française, commentaire et tables par MAROUN AOUAD. Von JOSEF VAN ESS . . . . .	173
BAUER, THOMAS/ULRIKE STEHLI-WERBECK (Hrsg.): <i>Alltagsleben und materielle Kultur in der arabischen Sprache und Literatur.</i> Von KATHRIN MÜLLER . . . . .	174
BITTIGAU, KARL RUDOLF: <i>Mongolische Grammatik.</i> Von CLAUS SCHÖNIG . . . . .	241
BLAIR, SHEILA S.: <i>Islamic Calligraphy.</i> Von KARIN RÜHRDANZ . . . . .	419
BOESCHOTEN, HENDRIK/HEIDI STEIN (Hrsg.): <i>Einheit und Vielfalt in der türkischen Welt. Materialien der 5. Deutschen Turkologenkonzferenz Universität Mainz, 4.–7. Oktober 2002.</i> Von VOLKER ADAM . . . . .	478
BOHAS, GEORGES: <i>Les bgdkpt en syriaque selon Bar Zo'bi.</i> Von LUTZ EDZARD . . . . .	427
BORDREUIL, PIERRE/DENNIS PARDEE: <i>Manuel d'ougaritique I. Grammaire; Fac-Similés.</i> Von HERBERT NIEHR . . . . .	437
BORG, ALEXANDER: <i>A Comparative Dictionary of Cypriot Maronite Arabic (Arabic–English).</i> Von LUTZ EDZARD . . . . .	162
BRENDEMOEN, BERNT: <i>The Turkish Dialects of Trabzon.</i> Von CLAUS SCHÖNIG . . . . .	199
BRENER, ANN: <i>Isaac ibn Khalfūn: A Wandering Hebrew Poet of the Eleventh Century.</i> Von ARIE SCHIPPERS . . . . .	170
BRUNNER, RAINER: <i>Islamic Ecumenism in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.</i> Von IGNACY NASALSKI . . . . .	185
ÇIKAR, JUTTA R. M.: <i>Fortschritt durch Wissen. Osmanisch-türkische Enzyklopädien der Jahre 1870–1936.</i> Von VOLKER ADAM . . . . .	200
<i>Clay Sanskrit Library.</i> Von JÜRGEN HANNEDER . . . . .	496
DALE, STEPHEN F.: <i>The Garden of the Eight Paradises. Bābur and the Culture of Empire in Central Asia, Afghanistan and India (1483–1530).</i> Von HEIKE FRANKE . . . . .	218
DAMMANN, ERNST: <i>70 Jahre erlebte Afrikanistik.</i> Von HERRMANN JUNGRAITHMAYR . . . . .	155
DAMMANN, ERNST: <i>Menschen an meinem Lebensweg.</i> Von HERRMANN JUNGRAITHMAYR . . . . .	155
DAS, RAHUL PETER: <i>The Origin of the Life of a Human Being. Conception and the Female according to Ancient Indian Medical and Sexological Literature.</i> Von OLIVER HELLWIG . . . . .	504
DEL OLMO LETE, GREGORIO/JOAQUÍN SANMARTÍN: <i>A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition.</i> Von JOSEF TROPPER . . . . .	432
<i>Der Koran.</i> Übersetzt und eingeleitet von HANS ZIRKER. Von NICOLAI SINAI . . . . .	180
DORPMÜLLER, SABINE: <i>Religiöse Magie im „Buch der probaten Mittel“. Analyse, kritische Edition und Übersetzung des Kitāb al-Muğarrabāt von Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf as-Sanūsī (gest. um 895/1490).</i> Von CARSTEN SCHLIWSKI . . . . .	178
EHLERS, GERHARD: <i>Die Śāradā-Handschriften der Sammlung Janert der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preussischer Kulturbesitz.</i> Von KATRIN EINICKE . . . . .	212
EPKENHANS, TIM: <i>Moral und Disziplin. Seyyed Ḥasan Taqīzāde und die Konstruktion eines „progressiven Selbst“ in der frühen iranischen Moderne.</i> Von BIANCA DEVOS . . . . .	488

ERBIL, LEYLÂ: <i>Eine seltsame Frau</i> . Von KARIN SCHWEISSGUT . . . . .	479
FANG WEIGUI: <i>Selbstreflexion in der Zeit des Erwachens und des Widerstands</i> . <i>Moderne chinesische Literatur 1919–1949</i> . Von HANS KÜHNER . . . . .	245
FARTACEK, GEBHARD: <i>Pilgerstätten in der syrischen Peripherie. Eine ethnologische Studie zur kognitiven Konstruktion sakraler Plätze und deren Praxisrelevanz</i> . Von WERNER ARNOLD . . . . .	178
FIERRO, MARIBEL (ed.): <i>Judíos y musulmanes en al-Andalus y el Magreb. Contactos intelectuales</i> . Von ARIE SCHIPPERS . . . . .	182
GIBB, H. A. R. (Übers.): <i>The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. A.D. 1325–1354</i> . Translated with revisions and notes from the Arabic text edited by C. DEFRÈMERY and B. R. SANGUINETTI. Vol. IV. The translation completed with annotations by C. F. BECKINGHAM. Von BERND RADTKE . . . . .	452
GOODALL, DOMINIC et al.: <i>The Pañcāvaranastava of Aghoraśivācārya: A Twelfth- Century South Indian Prescription for the Visualization of Sadāśiva and His Retinue. An Annotated Critical Edition</i> . Von GUDRUN BÜHNEMANN . . . . .	494
HASSELBACH, REBECCA: <i>Sargonic Akkadian. A Historical and Comparative Study of the Syllabic Texts</i> . Von JOACHIM OELSNER . . . . .	430
HEIDEMANN, STEFAN: <i>Die Renaissance der Städte in Nordsyrien und Nord- mesopotamien: Städtische Entwicklung und wirtschaftliche Bedingungen in ar-Raqqa und Harrān von der Zeit der beduinischen Vorherrschaft bis zu den Seldschuken</i> . Von STEFAN WINTER . . . . .	453
HOLES, CLIVE: <i>Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions, and Varieties</i> . Von WERNER ARNOLD . . . . .	441
HOLLANDER, ISAAC: <i>Jews and Muslims in Lower Yemen</i> . Von CHRISTINA WEBER. . . . .	189
HURGRONJE, C. SNOUCK: <i>Mekka in the latter part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Daily life, customs and learning. The Moslims of the East-Indian Archipelago</i> . Von EDWIN WIERINGA . . . . .	515
JACQUES, CLAUDE/SUZANNE HELD: <i>Angkor</i> . Von KARL-HEINZ GOLZIO . . . . .	241
JAYAWARDENA-MOSER, PREMALATHA: <i>Grundwortschatz Singhalesisch–Deutsch</i> . <i>Mit grammatischer Übersicht</i> . Von MUDAGAMUWE MAITHRIMURTHI . . . . .	209
JOHANSON, LARS: <i>Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contacts</i> . Von CLAUS SCHÖNIG . . . . .	197
JONGELING, KAREL/ROBERT KERR: <i>Late Punic Epigraphy</i> . Von WOLFGANG RÖLLIG . . . . .	156
KENNEDY, HUGH (Hrsg.): <i>An Historical Atlas of Islam / Atlas Historique de l’Islam</i> . Von ALBRECHT FUESS . . . . .	458
KOSKIKALLIO, PETTERI (Hrsg.): <i>Epics, Khilas, and Purāṇas: Continuities and Ruptures. Proceedings of the Third Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas September 2002</i> . Von ANDREAS BIGGER . . . . .	495
KÜÇÜK, HÜLYA: <i>The Role of the Bektāshīs in Turkey’s National Struggle</i> . <i>A Historical and Critical Study</i> . Von MARKUS DRESSLER. . . . .	473
KULKE, HERMANN: <i>Indische Geschichte bis 1750</i> . Von ANNETTE SCHMIEDCHEN . . . . .	214
KUT, GÜNAY: <i>Supplementary Catalogue of Turkish Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library</i> . Von MARK KIRCHNER . . . . .	472
LEDER, STEFAN/BERNHARD STRECK (Hrsg.): <i>Shifts and Drifts in Nomad-Sedentary Relations</i> . Von EVA ORTHMANN. . . . .	490
LI GUO: <i>Commerce, Culture, and Community in a Red Sea Port in the Thirteenth Century. The Arabic Documents from Quseir</i> . Von WERNER DIEM . . . . .	164
McAULIFFE, JANE DAMMEN (Hrsg.): <i>Encyclopaedia of the Qur’ān. Volume Three: J–O</i> . Von JAAKKO HÄMEEN-ANTTILA . . . . .	459

MERKELBACH, REINHOLD/JOSEF STAUBER (Hrsg.): <i>Jenseits des Euphrat. Griechische Inschriften. Ein epigraphisches Lesebuch.</i> Von RÜDIGER SCHMITT. . . . .	158
MYLIUS, KLAUS: <i>Wörterbuch des kanonischen Jinitismus.</i> Von KORNELIUS KRÜPELMANN . . . . .	230
NABHOLZ-KARTASCHOFF, MARIE-LOUISE/AXEL LANGER: <i>Pfauen, Blüten &amp; Zypressen. Persische Textilien der Qajarenzeit (1788–1925).</i> Von REINGARD NEUMANN .	204
NEUSNER, JACOB (Hrsg.): <i>The Law of Agriculture in the Mishnah and the Tosefta. Translation, Commentary, Theology.</i> Von CARSTEN SCHLIWSKI . . . . .	456
NEWID, MEHR ALI: <i>Der schiitische Islam in Bildern. Rituale und Heilige.</i> Von ULRICH MARZOLPH . . . . .	421
NORMAN, KENNETH R.: <i>A Philological Approach to Buddhism.</i> Von JOWITA KRAMER . . . . .	228
OLIVELLE, PATRICK: <i>Five Discourses on Worldly Wisdom by Vishnusharman.</i> Von JÜRGEN HANNEDER . . . . .	224
ORTHMANN, EVA: <i>Stamm und Macht. Die arabischen Stämme im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert der Hiğra.</i> Von WERNER DIEM . . . . .	449
ÖZDALGA, ELIZABETH (Hrsg.): <i>Late Ottoman Society.</i> Von WOLFGANG-E. SCHARLIPP	202
POWERS, PAUL R.: <i>Intent in Islamic Law. Motive and Meaning in Medieval Sunnī Fiqh.</i> Von RÜDIGER LOHLKER . . . . .	464
PROUDFOOT, IAN: <i>Old Muslim calendars of Southeast Asia.</i> Von EDWIN WIERINGA .	512
PYE, MICHAEL: <i>Skilful Means. A Concept in Mahayana Buddhism.</i> Von OLIVER FREIBERGER. . . . .	221
QUADE-REUTTER, KARIN: „... denn sie haben einen unvollkommenen Verstand“ – <i>Herrschaftliche Damen im Großraum Iran in der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit (ca. 1250–1507).</i> Von WOLFGANG-E. SCHARLIPP. . . . .	487
REINFANDT, LUCIAN: <i>Mamlukische Sultansstiftungen des 9./15. Jahrhunderts. Nach den Urkunden der Stifter al-Ašraf Īnāl und al-Muʿayyad Aḥmad Ibn Īnāl.</i> Von ALBRECHT FUESS . . . . .	465
ROESLER, ULRIKE/JAYANDRA SONI (Hrsg.): <i>Aspects of the Female in Indian Culture.</i> Von JOHANNES BELTZ . . . . .	510
RUBIN, AARON D.: <i>Studies in Semitic Grammaticalization.</i> Von LUTZ EDZARD . . .	159
RYUGEN TANEMURA: <i>Kuladatta's Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of Selected Chapters.</i> Von GUDRUN BÜHNEMANN . . .	502
SCHULZE, FRITZ: <i>Abstammung und Islamisierung als Motive der Herrschaftslegitimation in der traditionellen malaiischen Geschichtsschreibung.</i> Von MONIKA ARNEZ . . . . .	513
SCHWEISSGUT, KARIN: <i>Fremdheitserfahrungen. Untersuchungen zur Prosa türkischer Schriftstellerinnen von 1980 bis 2000.</i> Von WOLFGANG-E. SCHARLIPP . . . . .	481
SCHWIEGER, PETER: <i>Tibetische Handschriften und Blockdrucke.</i> Von ULRIKE ROESLER. . . . .	235
SEIDENSTICKER, TILMAN: <i>Arabische Handschriften. Reihe B: Teil 4: Die arabischen Handschriften Cod. Ms. arab. 136 bis 180 der Niedersächsischen Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen.</i> Von BEATE WIESMÜLLER. . . . .	448
SEMET, ABLET: <i>Lexikalische Untersuchungen zur uigurischen Xuanzang-Biographie.</i> Von KLAUS RÖHRBORN. . . . .	196
SHINGO EINOŌ/JUN TAKASHIMA (Hrsg.): <i>From Material to Deity – Indian Rituals of Consecration.</i> Von AXEL MICHAELS . . . . .	508

SHINJI IDO: <i>Agglutinative Information. A Study of Turkish Incomplete Sentences.</i> VON MARK KIRCHNER . . . . .	472
SIEVERT, HENNING: <i>Der Herrscherwechsel im Mamlukensultanat. Historische und historiographische Untersuchungen zu Abū Ḥāmid al-Qudsī und Ibn Taġribirdī.</i> VON ALBRECHT FUESS. . . . .	468
<i>Studia Aethiopica. In Honour of Siegbert Uhlig on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday.</i> Hrsg. von VERENA BÖLL/DENIS NOSNITSIN/THOMAS RAVE/WOLBERT SMIDT/EUGENIA SOKOLINSKAIA. VON TATIANA KRYUCHKOVA und VICTOR PORKHOMOVSKY . . . . .	425
SUMIKAZU YODA: <i>The Arabic Dialect of the Jews of Tripoli (Libya).</i> VON WERNER DIEM . . . . .	438
SWEETMAN, WILL: <i>Mapping Hinduism: ‚Hinduism‘ and the study of Indian religions, 1600–1776.</i> VON HEINZ WERNER WESSLER . . . . .	233
<i>The Living and the Dead in Islam. Studies in Arabic Epitaphs. Vol. I: WERNER DIEM: Epitaphs as Texts. XXIV, 633 S. Vol. II: MARCO SCHÖLLER: Epitaphs in Context.</i> VON KATHRIN MÜLLER . . . . .	460
TIKKANEN, BERTIL/HEINRICH HETTRICH (Hrsg.): <i>Themes and Tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics.</i> VON RÜDIGER SCHMITT . . . . .	483
VASUDEVA, SOMADEVA: <i>The Yoga of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra. Chapters 1–4, 7, 11–17. Critical Edition, Translation &amp; Notes.</i> VON MARION RASTELLI . . . . .	213
<i>Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka. Festgabe für Adelheid Mette.</i> Hrsg. von CHRISTINE CHOJNACKI, JENS-UWE HARTMANN und VOLKER M. TSCHANNERL. VON JÜRGEN HANNEDER . . . . .	500
VOGELANG, KAI: <i>Geschichte als Problem. Entstehung, Formen und Funktionen von Geschichtsschreibung im Alten China.</i> VON MATTHIAS HAHN . . . . .	516
WAGNER, EWALD: <i>Harar. Annotierte Bibliographie zum Schrifttum über die Stadt und den Islam in Südostäthiopien.</i> VON TATIANA KRYUCHKOVA . . . . .	424
WALRAVENS, HARTMUT (Hrsg.): <i>Joseph Franz Rock (1884–1962). Tagebuch der Reise von Chieng Mai nach Yunnan, 1921–1922. Briefwechsel mit C. S. Sargent, University of Washington, Johannes Schubert und Robert Koc.</i> VON HANS KÜHNER . . . . .	519
WALTHER, WIEBKE: <i>Kleine Geschichte der arabischen Literatur von der vorislamischen Zeit bis zur Gegenwart.</i> VON JAAKKO HÄMEEN-ANTTILA . . . . .	441
WERNER, HEINRICH: <i>Zur jensisejisch-indianischen Urverwandtschaft.</i> VON CLAUD SCHÖNIG . . . . .	193
WHITFIELD, SUSAN/URSULA SIMS-WILLIAMS (Hrsg.): <i>The Silk Road. Trade, Travel, War and Faith.</i> VON RÜDIGER SCHMITT . . . . .	207
WILEY, KRISTI L.: <i>Historical Dictionary of Jainism.</i> VON WILLEM BOLLÉE . . . . .	506
YAKUP, ABDURISHID: <i>Diṣastvustik. Eine altuigurische Bearbeitung einer Legende aus dem Catuspariṣat-sūtra.</i> VON WOLFGANG-E. SCHARLIPP . . . . .	471

### Geschäftsberichte

Bericht über die Allgemeine Versammlung der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft am 26. September 2007 in Freiburg im Breisgau . . . . .	251
Bericht über die Allgemeine Versammlung der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft am 4. Mai 2008 in Würzburg . . . . .	521

## Two Varieties of Ȧomaakí

By MATTHIAS WEINREICH, Skopje

Ȧomaakí (Ȧo.) is the language of the Ȧóoma, a small ethnic minority scattered in extended family groups among larger communities in Northern Pakistan. By the members of their host communities these groups are commonly regarded as outsiders.<sup>1</sup> In former times the Ȧóoma were traditionally working as blacksmiths, musicians and craftsmen. Nowadays they are also engaged in a variety of other professions. In almost all places of their settlement the Ȧóoma have long since given up their original mother tongue in favour of the surrounding Dardic Shina. Only in the Burushaski speaking area, in the former principalities of Nager and Hunza (Gilgit District, Northern Areas of Pakistan), has Ȧo. survived until the present day.

From a historical point of view Ȧo. is a language of the North Indian Plains, affiliated to the Central Group of NIA languages (BUDDRUS 1983).<sup>2</sup> However, due to its long-standing separation from its place of origin and (still on-going and ever increasing) intense contacts with other languages Ȧo. has lost or transformed many of its Central Group related features. This now places the language in many aspects much closer to its Dardic neighbours than to its Midland cousins.

Presently Ȧo. counts less than 350 (mostly elderly) speakers – approx. 300 of them related to Hunza; around 40 related to Nager<sup>3</sup> – and is thus to be

---

<sup>1</sup> During his studies in Hunza LORIMER (1939, p. 7) was told that the ancestors of the Ȧóoma had come from Kashmir via Baltistan. A family history recorded by me in Nager also mentions a migration from Kashmir, but through Afghanistan, the Darel Valley and Gilgit. The German ethno-musicologist A. SCHMID (1997, pp. 54–76) quotes a number of Hunza genealogies which suggest that the Ȧóoma had been arriving to the Burushaski speaking area over an extended period of time, as individuals or in small groups via Baltistan, Gilgit, Darel, Tangir, Punyal and even Kashghar.

<sup>2</sup> The language name is based on the self appellation of the speakers, which in its turn is connected to OIA *Ȧōmba*- “man of low caste living by singing and music” (T. 5570) > NIA “musician, craftsman, low caste person”. Another name used by some speakers when referring to their mother tongue is *Ȧomaá*, in analogy to Sh. *šīṇáá* “language of the Šīṇ-people”.

<sup>3</sup> The numbers for Nager were obtained by my language consultants in autumn 2004; in spring 1995 I had still estimated 40–50 speakers (WEINREICH 1999, p. 212). The numbers for Hunza Ȧomaakí speakers are a projection (counting 7–8 members per household)



considered a highly endangered language. Nevertheless, until now linguistic science did not pay much attention to Ḍo. GRIERSON's *Linguistic Survey of India* does not mention it at all. The first and still the most extensive study available is D.L.R. LORIMER's *The Ḍumāki Language* (1939). This pioneering work, based on the author's field studies carried out in 1935 in Hunza, provides a richly illustrated overall view of the basic morphological structure and the lexicon of the language. LORIMER's work also supplied the Ḍo. material for TURNER's *IA Dictionary* (1966–1971) and FUSSMAN's *Atlas* (1972).

Almost 50 years later, in 1982, G. BUDDRUS conducted detailed field research in Gilgit, assisted by a language consultant from the speakers' Hunza community. As a result of his studies he published three papers, which mostly dealt with selected aspects of the language's phonology and lexicon (BUDDRUS 1983, 1984, 1986).

A basic word list elicited from a Hunza Ḍo. speaker was published by P.C. BACKSTROM (1992) in addition to his report on Ḍo. in volume 2 of the *Sociolinguistic Survey of Northern Pakistan*.

In autumn 1995 B. TIKKANEN worked with several language consultants in Hunza. Preliminary results of this study he published in form of a hand-out: *Domaki: an endangered archaic Central IA language in Karakorum* illustrating a lecture held by him on the 12<sup>th</sup> of December 1995 at Oslo University. The hand-out contains a short outline of the language's phonology and morphology as well as some dialogues and phrase samples (TIKKANEN 1996). A larger collection of phrase samples was kindly put by Mr. TIKKANEN at my disposal through a letter dated 2<sup>nd</sup> of June 1999 (TIKKANEN 1999).

As it appears from the above, until the very end of the last century Ḍo. related publications were exclusively based on language material collected from speakers pertaining to the Hunza community. However, LORIMER (1939, p. 6) had already been well aware of the fact that Ḍo. was also to be found on the other side of the Hunza river, in the principality of Nager. From the statistics available to him he quotes "a village, 'Dumyal' with 18 households or a population of 80 souls" and notes: "The Ḍom of Hunza and Nager are regarded by themselves and by others as one people. They both speak Ḍumaki, and they intermarry." Also BACKSTROM mentions the existence of a Ḍóoma village in Nager and observes: "None of the Doma questionnaire respondents [all of them belonging to the Hunza commu-

---

based on an enquiry in the village Mominabad in September 2002. At that time I was told that there were around 40 households in Hunza, Danyor and Gilgit in which at least one family member would still speak Ḍo. The data given by KREUTZMANN (2005, p. 10) for 1991 under the heading "Domaaki" for the Yasin and Punyal Valleys (305 and 188 persons respectively) relates to the socio-ethnic background of the respondents, not to their actual language use.

nity – M. W.] reported that there is any dialect variation in any of the locations where Domaaki is presently spoken” (1992, p. 78; p. 81, n. 5). At the same time, neither LORIMER, BACKSTROM, nor any of the other mentioned researchers had the possibility to compare his notes on Hunza Ḍo. with the language of the Ḍóoma from Nager.

In the years 1992 to 1995 I was given the opportunity to work as a member of the German-Pakistani “Culture Area Karakoram” research project, based in Gilgit Town, capital of the Northern Areas. Although engaged mostly with the study of the local Pashto speakers’ community, my interest was also directed towards other languages spoken in the region. In spring 1995 I had the good fortune and the great pleasure to be introduced to Mr. SHABAN ALI NAGERI, a ca. 30-year-old mother tongue Ḍo. speaker, born in Sikandera-bad (Nager). At the age of 15 he had moved from his native valley to Gilgit and since then had worked as a car electrician and welder. SHABAN ALI, who besides Ḍo. was also fluent in Shina, Burushaski and Urdu, turned out to be a connoisseur and tireless promoter of his mother tongue as well as an excellent language consultant. With his help I could record a number of Nager Ḍo. texts and go through the Hunza Ḍo. material published by LORIMER and BUDDRUS. In the years to follow, first during a privately founded field research in Gilgit and Nager in 1996–1997 (this time exclusively devoted to Ḍomaakí), and then, in the course of a professional sojourn in Islamabad from 2002 until 2005, I was able to continue my Ḍo. studies with the help of SHABAN ALI and with members of his extended family who assisted me in cross checking the existing material and enlarging my text collection.<sup>4</sup>

The language material collected over these years enabled me to draft a short grammatical outline of Ḍo. which is forthcoming in volume 16 of the *Jazyki Mira* series. Owing to the focus of my field work this study is exclusively devoted to Nager Ḍo. But how close is this variety to its Hunza counterpart? “It’s just the same thing!”, – my Nager language consultants would always insist, and thus indirectly confirm the above quoted opinion from BACKSTROM’s questionnaire respondents. Indeed, observing Ḍo. speakers from both valleys exchanging simple phrases one could easily arrive at the conclusion that their language is almost identical. However, a more detailed comparison of both Ḍo. varieties reveals an impressive number of systematic differences on morphological, syntactical and lexical level. These differences may not disturb the speakers too much in their basic communication (if

<sup>4</sup> I would like to take this opportunity to thank all members of the Nager Ḍóoma community involved into my linguistic inquiries for their continuous help and hospitality. Moreover, I want to express my special gratitude to DADO PHAZAL ALI, his grand-nephew ABBAS ALI and, of course, to my dear friend SHABAN ALI for their long-standing support and truly endless patience in providing answers to all my strange questions.

needed they can anyway always switch to Burushaski and/or Shina), but an analysis of them might help to shed some light on the more recent historical development of Ḍo., especially on its interaction with the various languages it had been and still is in close contact with. To facilitate further studies in this direction I hereunder list and illustrate some characteristic differences between Nager and Hunza Ḍomaakí, which in my opinion allow these varieties to be regarded as two distinctive dialects, Ḍo.(Ng.) and Ḍo.(Hz.)<sup>5</sup>

## 1. Nouns

1.1. In Ḍo.(Ng.) nouns ending in accented -á can have their Nominative plural form in -é as well as in -aṅa, e.g. NOM.SG *kaulá* m. “liver”, NOM.PL *kaulé* and *kauláaṅa*; NOM.SG *meewá* m. “fruit”, NOM.PL *meewé* and *meewáaṅa*.

In Ḍo.(Hz.) the Nominative plural of these nouns shows only the suffix -é, e.g. NOM.SG *kaula* “liver”, NOM.PL *kaule*; NOM.SG *bərpa* m. “popular”, NOM.PL *bərpe* (LORIMER 1939, p. 28; see also TIKKANEN 1996, p. 2).

1.2. In Ḍo.(Ng.) nouns ending in unaccented -o can have their Nominative plural form in -e as well as in -uṅa, e.g. NOM.SG *jóto* m. “chick; boy”, NOM.PL *jóte* and *jótuna*; NOM.SG *čhúmo* m. “fish”, NOM.PL *čhúme* and *čhúmuṅa*.

In Ḍo.(Hz.) the Nominative plural of these nouns shows only the suffix -e, e.g. NOM.SG *jóto* m. “boy”, NOM.PL *jóte* (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 2); NOM.SG *čhumo* “fish”, NOM.PL *čhume*; NOM.SG *bačoʔto* m. “calf”, NOM.PL *bačoʔte* (LORIMER 1939, p. 28).

1.3. Ḍo.(Ng.) has no separate form for a Dative case. Its function is fulfilled by the Oblique case which is marked with the suffixes SG -(a)s / PL -(e)č, e.g. *manišán jóis héi munín* “The man said this to the woman: ...”; *píya-maayáa mas búuši danée che. Emilí búut qhoš huyí* “(My) parents have given me a cat. Emily was very happy”; *ayáa kámek son apnés leei, e gaayí* “Having taken some gold for herself, she went off.”; *jumuṭi badšáaye makáaneč jáas* “Tomorrow (I) will go to the residence of the king”; *tu káa jáa cháai? ek kóokis, badšáan iréga čha* “‘Where are you going?’ ‘To any-

<sup>5</sup> As I did not make recordings with Ḍo. speakers of Hunza myself, I will be referring for all matters concerning this dialect to the afore mentioned studies of LORIMER, BUDRUS and TIKKANEN. In all quotations the original transcription of the respective author will be used. The abbreviations employed in the following description are: SG – singular, PL – plural, NOM – Nominative, OBL – Oblique, GEN – Genitive, ERGIN – Ergative-Instrumental, INEIL – Inessive-Illative, VS – verb stem, PFV – Perfective, IPFV – Imperfective; Sh. – Shina, Bur. – Burushaski, Kho. – Khowar, Pers. – Persian, Urd. – Urdu.

one, – answers the king”; *badšáan peeyéc qáo guwaaín* “The king called for (his) sons”; *meelí wapás zakáaiŋa deenás geyí* “The wife left in order to return the scale”; *thaa-héi waqtás qháa* “until this time”; *es baldéna çái raaní, šapíka girín* “Cooking three ibexes for him, (he) prepared a meal”; *es róše huyé* “(They) got angry with him”.

In Đo.(Hz.) the Dative and the Allative function of a noun is marked by a case suffix unknown to Đo.(Ng), SG *-(a)šu* / PL *-(e)ču*, e.g. *ekaari bandáare(e) mášu muninée čhe* (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 6) “Some people have told me (that) ...”; *ko-šu de’s* “To whom shall (I) give (it)?” (LORIMER 1939, p. 82); *apanéšu le’in* “(He) took (it) for himself” (LORIMER 1939, p. 81); *dukáa-nei damón apanéi garášu giá čháaka* (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 6) “The shopkeeper had gone home (lit.: to his own house)”; *ešu qau ε’r* “call (to) him” (LORIMER 1939, p. 78); *tušu nuxsa’našu ni a’nim čhi’s* (LORIMER 1939, p. 62) “I have not brought you (here) in order to do you harm”; *óčešu qháa tumé meé šaagírta čhóotaka* “Until today you were my students” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 4). The Đo.(Hz.) Oblique case is, as in Đo.(Ng.), marked with SG *-(a)s* / PL *-(e)č*, e.g. *gow’as pinæin* “He mounted on the horse” (LORIMER 1939, p. 49); *nur’as a’šiq huya’* “He fell in love with his beauty” (LORIMER 1939, p. 50); *toblaqas ten’in* “He shot (s.th.) with the gun” (LORIMER 1939, p. 50); *mas ko’t a’ya čha* “He has come with me” (LORIMER 1939, p. 69); *eŋée ekekíč téeŋe čhe* “They beat each other” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 2).

1.4. In Đo.(Ng.) the plural of the Inessive-Illative case always ends in *-(e)ma*, e.g. *boriŋema aná baaiŋ* “He put (them) into the sacks”; *ačí šiŋéma čhiŋée yuúlgisek girnée čhéeka* “Up in the (ibex’s) horns the birds had built a nest”; *sanéi tom čúuniŋema aná bilzí, e miníin jaaí, čhaarúna gáti huyá čha son* “The golden tree melted in the (burning) firewood, flowed down (and) the gold gathered in the ashes”; *thaa-háai dustakéma mée namá dubaará šapíka níkhaa čhis* “I will not eat from these dishes for a second time”.

Differently from that, Đo.(Hz.) has normally the Inessive-Illative plural case suffix *-(e)mei*, which is not to be found in Đo.(Ng.), e.g. *éka dúka garémei háai báaš iréŋe čhe* “In just a few houses they speak this language”; *eŋémei aná lukí beethá* “Having sat down hiding among them ...”; *júpemei but díša náa, basémei díša bùút čhíi* “In the jeeps there is not much space, in the buses there is a lot of space” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 2). Đo.(Hz.) also has the Inessive-Illative plural case suffix *-(e)ma*. However, it is used only occasionally, e.g. *kísek ta kísek thi phuláarema kísek čhi-čhaŋ irí* “Picking something here and there among the flowers” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 2).

1.5. In Đo.(Ng.) the plural suffix of the Elative is *-(e)mo*, e.g. *boriŋemo son le* “Take the gold out of the sacks”; *apenéi garémo níkhilá* “Come out of your houses!”

Ḑo.(Hz.) has the Elative plural suffix *-(e)meyo*, which is unknown to Ḑo.(Ng.), e.g. *garémeyo aayóom* “We came from the houses”; *basémeyo bandá nikhiléye čhe* (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 2) “People were coming out from the buses”.

1.6. In Ḑo.(Ng.) the suffix *-(e)ini* (< GEN.SG *-(e)i* + *-ni?*) denotes a movement “along (side), through something”, e.g. *déo Gurzuméi kunuwéini aná éka pána čhi* “There is a way (leading) through Dew Gurzum’s intestine”; *siníi iléini mun hanéga čháaka* “(He) was going along the shore of the river”; *asmáneini báar kísek áaga čha* “Something is moving [lit.: coming] through the sky”; *haldénak daaréini aná leeiaayá* “(The dog) brought an ibex (right) through the door”; *jáaṭa paṇéini báar peyí čhúika* “(His) hair had grown until [lit.: alongside] (his) legs”.

In contemporary Ḑo.(Hz.) this suffix does not seem anymore in active use. Neither BUDDRUSS nor TIKKANEN listed it in their published material. However, LORIMER (1939, p. 128) still has *mada'le asmane'ni hanega čha'ka* “He was wandering about up in heaven”. Besides this, the suffix is preserved in both dialects in certain adverbial forms, e.g. Ḑo.(Ng.) *hagéini* “in front”; Ḑo.(Hz.) *minéeni* “below, underneath” (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 4, 1999, p. 3).

## 2. Pronouns

2.1. In Ḑo.(Ng.) the Genitive plural form of the personal pronoun is *eṇéye*, e.g. *eṇéye gára giltáana čhe* “Their houses are in Gilgit”; *eṇéye pána phaṭákoì darásmo nikhilégi čhúika* “Their path passed by the door of the bold man’s (house)”.

In Ḑo.(Hz.) the same Genitive plural form now is *éye*, e.g. *éye póo ruuzí u kamaanée u aís* “Earning my daily allowance from them I came” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 17). However, LORIMER still has *'eṇ'ene / eṇ'eṇe* besides *eṇe / eṇe'i*, e.g. *eṇ'eṇe bir'sa čha* “(It) is their land” (LORIMER 1939, p. 76f., 145).

2.2. Differently from Ḑo.(Hz.) the Ḑo.(Ng.) dialect does not possess the demonstrative pronouns *aṣéi* (m.) / *aṣáai* (f.) “this one here” and *uṣéi* (m.) / *uṣáai* (f.) “that one there”.

In Ḑo.(Hz.) these pronouns are used as synonyms to *thaa-héi* (m.) / *thaa-háai* (f.) “this one here” and *tuun-héi* (m.) / *tuun-háai* (f.) “that one there” (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 3; BUDDRUSS 1983, p. 18). These pairs are also present in Ḑo.(Ng.)

2.3. In Ḑo.(Ng.) the Oblique form of the reciprocal pronoun *ekek-* is *ekékeč*, e.g. *namá ekékeč saláam-kaláam girnée* “Then (they) greeted each other”.

In Ȧo.(Hz.) the Oblique form of the same pronoun is *ekekíc*, e.g. *eyée ekekíc ténye che* “They beat each other” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 2).

### 3. Postpositions

3.1. Ȧo.(Ng.) is using the postposition *mini(i)n* (through Oblique case) “under (direction / place)”, e.g. *héi lúuzumei tomás miniín háai bóot apú gir* “Lift up this flat stone under this corall tree!”; *kaṭúa leeí, lolóṭiri, čarakás miniín deeí, béeš* “Take the dress, fold (it) and having placed (it) under (your) bottom remain seated (on it)!”

Ȧo.(Hz.) does not have this postposition. It employs instead the forms *minéeni*, *mune’ni* (connected through OBL or through OBL + *-mo*) and *mun* (through OBL + *-mo*), e.g. *khṭas mune’ni lu’ka* “He hid underneath the bed” (LORIMER 1939, p. 192); *mi’zasmo mune’ni* “underneath the table” (LORIMER 1939, p. 192); *mi ’zasmo mun* “under the table” (LORIMER 1939, p. 191).

3.2. In Ȧo.(Ng.) the postposition *káaro(o) / kaaróo* “for the sake of; because of” connects with the preceding word through the Oblique case suffix, e.g. *badšáan mazdúureč kóot pučás káaro makáanuṅ dularowaain* “The king let the workers build a castle for his son”; *u sitáar bašaanás karóo áas* “I will come to play the lute”.

In Ȧo.(Hz.) the same postposition connects through the Genitive case suffix, e.g. *te ka’ryo tabaei krom iras* “I’ll do this (job) for you” (LORIMER 1939, p. 69); *ašéi phutún bijaalinái kaaróo pōi biš rupiá jáaṅe che* “It costs one hundred rupees to send this parcel”; *Sostéi kaaró bas káajeko láam* “Where can we catch the bus for Sost?” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 3).

3.3. To express the meaning “from the possession of (somebody); from (someone)” Ȧo.(Ng.) attaches the suffix *-mo* to the Oblique case form of the respective noun, e.g. *eyécmo zakáaiṅa áan* “Bring the scales from them!”; *namá badšáasmo gayá* “So (he) departed from the king”; *tumáa mámasmo boḍuní čhís-e gir* “Tell (me), was I born of your mother?”

In similar situations Ȧo.(Hz.) uses the postposition *po(o)* (connected through OBL or NOM or GEN), which is unknown to Ȧo.(Ng.), e.g. *ko’s po* “from whom” (LORIMER 1939, p. 70); *havi’po le* “Take it from him, from her” (LORIMER 1939, p. 69); *zulúm iri paadšáa póo qharč lei* “Taking forcefully the expenses from the king ...”; *éṅe póo ruuzí u kamaanée u aís* “Earning my daily allowance from them I came” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 3). Only with pronouns Ȧo.(Hz.) can, similarly to Ȧo.(Ng.), also use OBL + *-mo*, e.g. *másmo leín* (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 3) “(He/She) took (it) from me”.

## 4. Numerals

For the formation of ordinal numbers Ḑo.(Ng.) is adding the suffix *-múuŋo* to the respective cardinal number, e.g. *çaimúuŋo* “the third” (> *çái* “three”). The ordinal number suffix in Ḑo.(Hz.) is *-yáno* (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 4).

## 5. Verbs

5.1. In Ḑo.(Ng.) the Present tense form of the copula *čh-* as well as the Perfective forms of all other verbs have the 1<sup>st</sup> person plural agreement suffix *-óo*, e.g. *u-o-meeli dúi čhóo* “I and my wife, (we) are (only) two”; *šap-nemáaz irám čhóo*, *phariyáat irám čhóo* “(We) are offering prayer, (we) are lamenting”; *atéikis ásei šuriyaár dakhóo* “Until now (we) have seen (only) his happiness”; *raajaákika tuméc kísek-ta níguwaayoo čhóo* “(Until now) (we) did not impose any forced labour on you”; *amé giltáas geyóo čhóoka* “We had gone to Gilgit”.

In Ḑo.(Hz.) the respective agreement suffix is *-óom*, e.g. *amée ekekíc dekhám čhóom* (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 3); “We are seeing each other”; *amé šooné čhóom* “We are fine”; *amé nigraaní irám čhóom* “We are supervising”; *amé gáti iri gióom* “We went together” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 3).

5.2. In Ḑo.(Ng.) the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular / plural and the 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular / plural of the Past tense form of the copula *čh-* are *čhí(i)ska / čhóoka* resp. *čháaika / čhóotka*, e.g. *báapo u Nagerés gai čhúiska* “Yesterday I had gone to Nager”; *amée tu tatáqiri, sínís bayóo čhóoka, tu ki huí aayáai* “(But) we had smashed you and thrown (you) into the river, how did you re-appear?”; *tée mas badšaa irée čháaika* “You (SG) had made me king”; *tumée mée dóono martásmo mún baayóo čhóotka* “You (PL) had thrown my bull from the cliff”.

In Ḑo.(Hz.) the corresponding forms are *čhúsaka / čhóomaka* resp. *čháayaka / čhóotaka*, e.g. *dukáanašu gai čhúsaka* (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 6) “(I) had gone to the shop”; *teé taqht harám čhóomaka hal teé baqht harám čhóomaka* “Have (we) been usurping your throne, or have (we) been stealing your luck?” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 3); *tu káa giáa čháayaka* (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 6) “Where had you (SG) gone to?”; *óčešu qháa tumé meé šaagírta čhóotaka* “Until today you (PL) were my students” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 4).

5.3. In Ḑo.(Ng.) the Optative is formed according to the scheme: “VS + Optative suffix *-(w)ónta*”. The Optative paradigm only includes a form for the 3<sup>rd</sup> person; no formal distinction is made between singular and plural, e.g. *khodáan tus ša girónta* “May God protect you!”; *eŋ jangalás jónta* “May they go to the forest!”.

In Ḑo.(Hz.) the Optative is also limited to the 3<sup>rd</sup> person. However, a formal distinction is made between singular: “VS + *-(w)óta*”; and plural: “VS + *-(w)on(ta)*”, e.g. *ε ta awo'ta* “Let him come here”; *εγε tus to'n* “May they strike you!” (LORIMER 1939, pp. 105, 106); *honta* (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 4) “May they be (e.g. lucky)”.

5.4. Ḑo.(Ng.) has a Switch-reference converb in *-(i)néebel*, which is formed according to the scheme “VS + *-(i)néebel*”, e.g. *girinéebel* “while doing” (< *gir-* “to do, to make”); *muninéebel* “while speaking” (< *mun-* “to speak”).

In Ḑo.(Hz.) the form of the same suffix is *-(i)néebelo*, e.g. *aanéebelo* “while arriving” (< *aa-* “to come, to arrive”); *huinéebelo* “while becoming” (< *hu-* “to be(come)”); TIKKANEN 1996, pp. 5, 6).

5.5. Another Switch-reference converb in Ḑo.(Ng.) has the suffix *-(i)náño / -(i)námo* and is formed according to the scheme “VS + *-(i)náño / -(i)námo*”, e.g. *jaanáño* “while going” (< *jaa-* “to go”); *çodínámo* “while striking” (< *çod-* “to hit, to strike”). The verb stem used is always the one which is employed for the formation of the Imperfective base.

In Ḑo.(Hz.) this Switch-reference converb can be constructed in the same way, e.g. *ja'nλño* “in the time of going” (< *jaa-* “to go”) (LORIMER 1939, p. 113). Besides this, in Ḑo.(Hz.) it can also be formed according to the scheme “VS + *-(i)áño*”; e.g. *te'λño* “while beating” (< *tee-* “to strike”) (LORIMER 1939, p. 113); *aayáño* “while arriving” (< *aa-* “to come, to arrive”); *huyáño* “while becoming” (< *hu-* “to be(come)”); TIKKANEN 1996, pp. 5, 6). Sometimes the verb stem used in this scheme is the one employed for the formation of the Perfective base, e.g. *moyλño* “while dying” (< *mariná / mu-* “to die”) (LORIMER 1939, p. 112), *nathλño* “while loosing” (< *našina / nath-* “to be lost, to disappear”) (LORIMER 1939, p. 112).

5.6. In Ḑo.(Ng.) the Infinitive of the verb “to do, to make” is *giriná*; the verb stem used for the formation of the Imperfective and the Perfective base is *gir-*.

In Ḑo.(Hz.) the respective forms are *iriná / ir-* (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 5). However, in fast speech and in compound verbs also Ḑo.(Ng.) tends towards the *iriná / ir-* form, e.g. *sikúim irna* “to scheme, to plan” (< *sikúim* “scheme, plan”); *čas ir(i)na* “to pull out” (← Bur. *čas -t-* “do.”).

5.7. In Ḑo.(Ng.) the verb *(g)iriná / (g)ir-* “to do, to make” has two causative forms: 1) *(g)uraaná / (g)uráa-*, e.g. PFV.3SG *(g)uraain*, IPFV.1SG *(g)uraas*; and 2) *(g)uwaaná / (g)uwáa-*, PFV.3SG *(g)uwaain*, IPFV.1SG *(g)uwaas*.

In Ḑo.(Hz.) the causative form of the same verb is *iraaná / iráa-* (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 5), e.g. PFV.3PL *ir'a'nε*, PFV.3SG *ir'e'iy* (LORIMER 1939, p. 146).



5.8. In order to express the meaning “to appear, to show up” Ḑo.(Ng.) employs the construction: *dekhulóo jaaná* (< Passive participle of *dekhul-* [connected to *dekhiná* “to look, to see (trans.)”, *dekhulaaná* “to show (caus.)”] + *jaaná* / *jaa-* “to go”), e.g. *har haptéi ek dafá améc dakholóo ja* “(You) (have to) show up in front of us once every week!”

Ḑo.(Hz.) is using for the same purpose the primary verb *\*dikh(i)looná* / *dikh(i)l-*, e.g. *tu irü k(r)om bùút ša dikhilóoga čha. u irím k(r)om atéyek ša náa* “The work you have done seems very good. The work I have done is not as good.” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 4).

5.9. In Ḑo.(Ng.) “to urinate” is expressed through the compound verb *múuç deená* (< *múuç* m. “urine” + *deená* “to give”). Ḑo.(Hz.) employs the primary verb *muuçiná* (BUDDRUS 1983, p. 17).

## 6. Adverbs

Ḑo.(Ng.) is using the adverbs *miní(i)n* “down (place / direction)” and *miniino* “upwards, from down; (in adjectival sense) lower ...”, e.g. *sanéi tom čúuniņema aná bilzí, e miniün jaaí, čhaarúna gáti buyá čha son* “The golden tree melted in the (burning) firewood, flowed down (and) the gold gathered in the ashes”; *ek dóos geyá miniün sinü ilás* “One day (he) went down to the river bank”; *meniino ek čüsek aši halizá huí láam buyá čha* “From below (the ashes) something was shining yellowish”; *miniino oōto* “lower lip”.

Ḑo.(Hz.) does not seem to possess these adverbs. Instead it uses *minéeni*, *munéeni* and *munášu* “down (place / direction)” as well as *minéenio* “upwards, from down; (in adjectival sense) lower ...”, e.g. *u minéeni jáa čhús* “I am going down (the valley or downhill)” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 4); *mune’ni sinino* (LORIMER 1939, p. 192) “from the river down below”; *yáa munášu yáa apú* “Either down or up the valley” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 4); *khḗtas minano nikhḗta* “He came out from under the bed” (LORIMER 1939, p. 192); *minéenio oōto* “lower lip” (BUDDRUS 1984, p. 17).

## 7. Syntax

7.1. In Ḑo.(Ng.) the subject (agens) of a sentence with a transitive verb is always marked with the Ergative-Instumental case suffix, e.g. *tée díya mée giḏáa čhis* “I am asking for your daughter”; *tée u níbijaaaràai* “Don’t you scare me!”; *manišán máaye puçéi jagrá nišaaín* “The man settled the argument between mother and son”; *amée móos čukulóo* “We will cut the meat

into pieces”; *tumée mée pen qoşuláagut náa mas dóo* “Before you (PL) will break my pen, give it (back) to me!”; *mée borí şek giráas* “I will fill up the sack”; *tée khaţúwa taás báai* “Put the cloths into the sun (for drying)!”; *bi-raarée níki gírnée* “The brothers said: ‘No!’”.

Đo.(Hz.) tends to use in these cases the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular in its Nominative form, e.g. *tu iríi k(r)om búút şa dikhilóoga čha. U irím k(r)om atéyek şa náa* “The work you (SG) have done seems very good. The work I have done is not as good.” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 4); *u suunáak dekhím* (BUDDRUS 1984, p. 21) “I had [lit.: saw] a dream”; *u bras kháa čhiis* (BUDDRUS 1984, p. 21) “I am eating rice”.

## 8. Vocabulary

Both dialects can also be distinguished by a number of varying words and word forms, e.g.<sup>6</sup>:

8.1. Đo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *baríš* m. “year”, NOM.PL *baríša*, GEN.PL *barişéye*; besides NOM.SG *baríša* m., NOM.PL *barişóy*, GEN.PL *barişóye* ↔ Đo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *baríša* “do.”, NOM.PL *barişoy* (11). – T. 11392.2; Sh. *baríš* m.

8.2. Đo.(Ng.) *čéedoos* “after tomorrow” (< *čái* “three” + *dóos* m. “day”) ↔ Đo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *čéedo* “do.” (12). LORIMER 1939, p. 159 still has *čēēdōs*. – T. 5994, 6333; Sh. (Gurez) *čīđi* “day after tomorrow”.

8.3. Đo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *bizoón* f. “rainbow”, NOM.PL *bizoóna* ↔ Đo.(Hz.) *búizoi bizoóni* f. “do.” (13). – Sh. *bizoón* f. “rainbow”, *béezi* f. “fine weather; sunshine during rain”; T. 12052.

8.4. Đo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *khaşa* f. “mouth”, NOM.PL *khaşóy*, GEN.SG *khaşéi* ↔ Đo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *khaşá* f. “do.” (23).

8.5. Đo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *phúla* m. “ashes”, NOM.PL *phúle* and *phulóy* ↔ Đo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *phulá* m. “do.”, NOM.PL *phulé* (26). – cf. BUDDRUS 1986.

<sup>6</sup> Where not specially indicated the Đo.(Hz.) samples are taken from BUDDRUS 1984 and referred to by the numbers in brackets. In most cases the same number also indicates their respective place in FUSSMAN 1972. References to TURNER’s IA Dictionary (abbreviated as: T.) as well as to Burushaski (BERGER 1998), Shina (if not marked otherwise BAILEY 1924) and to other languages are given as help for orientation in the material, not as statements about the immediate origin of the respective Đo. word.

8.6. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *búuši* f. “cat”, NOM.PL *búušiŋa*. – Sh. *búuši* f.; Bur. *buš*; T. 8298. ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *phitíiši* f. “do.” (30), *pitiší* “do.” (TIKKANEN 1999, p. 4). In Ḑo.(Ng.) *phitíiši* is used as the name of a fairy.

8.7. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *bambulaá* m. “tomcat”, NOM.PL *bambulaáŋa*, GEN.PL *bambulaáŋeŋe* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *bambuláay* m. “do.” (30). – Sh. *bambulaá* m. (RADLOFF 1999, p. 118); Bur.(Ng.) *bambulá* m.

8.8. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *looyá riil* m. “brass” (< *looyá* “red (m.)”; *riil* m. “brass, bronze, copper”) ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) *looyá halizá* m. “brass” (40). – Sh. *lóolyo riil* m. “bronze, copper”, *halízo* “yellow (m.)”, *halízo riil* m. “brass”; T. 11135, 10752, 13990.

8.9. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *támlam* m. “lightning”, NOM.PL *támlama*, GEN.SG *támlamei*. – Bur.(Ng.) *támlam* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *bíçuş* m. “do.” (45). – Sh. *bíçuş* m.; Bur. *bíçuş*.

8.10. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *phóok* m. “shoulder”, NOM.PL *pháaka*, GEN.SG *phaakéi*; besides *phaaká* m., NOM.PL *phaaké*, GEN.SG *phaakéi* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *phaaká* “do.”, NOM.PL *phaaké* (51). – T. 13839, 13840.

8.11. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *yaayá* m. “summer”, NOM.PL *yaayé*, GEN.SG *yaayéi*, INEIL.SG *yaayána* “in the summer”; besides NOM.SG *yaayé* m., NOM.PL *yaayéŋa*, INEIL.SG *yaayéna* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *yaayé* “do.”, GEN.SG *yaayéi*, INEIL.SG *yaayéna* (52).

8.12. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *tíir* m. “arrow”, NOM.PL *túra*, GEN.SG *túrei* and *tiiréi*. – Pers./Urd. *tír*; besides Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *kóon* m., NOM.PL *káana*, GEN.SG *kaanéi* and *koonéi* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *kóon* m. “do.”, NOM.PL *káana* (61). – T. 3023; Sh. *kóon* f.

8.13. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *biráaya* m. and *biróoi* m. “brother”; NOM.PL *biráara*, GEN.SG *biróoye* and *biroóye*; ERGIN.SG *birooín* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *biráaya* m. “do.”; NOM.PL *biráara* (63), GEN.SG *birooye* (LORIMER 1939, p. 154). – T. 9661; Gawar-Bati *blāya*; Pashai (Gulbahar) *brōi*; Tirahi *brāre* “brothers”.

8.14. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *tumóq* m. “rifle, pistol”, NOM.PL *tumáqa*, GEN.SG *tumaqéi*. – Bur.(Ng.) *tumáq*; Sh. *tu(r)mák* m. (BUDDRUS 1996, p. 49) ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *tubóq* m. “rifle”, NOM.PL *tubáqa* (66). – Bur.(Hz.) *tubáq*.

8.15. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *bičíl* m. “pomegranate”, NOM.PL *bičíla*, GEN.SG *bičiléi*. – Bur. *bičíl* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *daanú* “do.”, NOM.PL *daanúa* (68). – T. 6254; Sh. *dañuú* m.

8.16. Ḑo.(Ng.) *manúuko* m. “frog”, NOM.PL *manúukuŋ*, GEN.SG *manúuko*. – Sh. *maṇúuko* m.; T. 9746.2; besides Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *gúrkuç* m., NOM.PL *gúrkuça*, GEN.SG *gúrkuçei*. – Bur.(Ng.) *gúrquç* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *miník* m. “do.”, NOM.PL *miníka* (69). – T. 9746.2.

8.17. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *şiqáal* f. “wasp”, NOM.PL *şiqáala*; besides NOM.SG *şiqáal* f., NOM.PL *şiqáala* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *işqáara* f. “do.”, NOM.PL *işqaaróŋ* (70). – Bur.(Ng.) *şiqál*, Bur.(Hz.) *şiqár*; Sh. *işkáar* (BUDDRUS 1984, p. 16), *işkáara* (FUSSMAN 1972, p. 187) and *işkár* f.

8.18. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *hundekuná* m. “winter”, NOM.PL *hundekunáaŋa*, GEN.SG *hundekunái*; besides NOM.SG *hundá* m., NOM.PL *hundé*, GEN.SG *hundéi*; besides NOM.SG *hundé* m., NOM.PL *hundéeaŋa*, GEN.SG *hundéi*, INEIL.SG *hundéna* “in the winter” ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *hundé* “do.”, INEIL.SG *hundéna* (73). – T. 14164.

8.19. Ḑo.(Ng.) *açimóo* / *miniino* *õõto* m. “upper / lower lip” (< *açimóo* / *miniino* “from above / from below”; *õõto* m. “lip”) ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) *açimo* / *minéenio* *õõto* “upper / lower lip” (< *atsimo* “upper, pertaining to the upper side; from above”, *mun'e'ni.o* “pertaining to the lower side”, LORIMER 1939, pp. 144, 192) (81). – Sh. *õõtu* m. “lip; upper lip”; T. 2563.

8.20. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *khoṭ* m. “bed frame”, NOM.PL *kháta*, GEN.SG *khaṭéi* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *khaṭ* m. “bed”, NOM.PL *kháta* (82). – Sh. *khaṭ* m., *khaṭ* f. (BUDDRUS 1996, p. 45); T. 3781.

8.21. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG/PL *miniindeenáaŋa* “bedding” (< *mini(i)n* “down (place / direction)” + *deená* “to give”) ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *atside'ni* “upper-bedding” (LORIMER 1939, pp. 144) (< *açí* “up; up above” + *deená* “to give”).

8.22. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *çonç* f. “moon”, GEN.SG *çanzéi*; besides NOM.SG *cónça* f., GEN.SG *çonçéi*, INEIL.SG *çonçána* “in the moon” ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *çonç* f. “do.”, GEN.SG *çanzéi*, INEIL.SG *çanzána* (84). – cf. BUDDRUS 1983, p. 17.

8.23. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *áaino* m. “mirror”, NOM.PL *áainuŋa*, GEN.SG *áainui*; besides NOM.SG *áaina* f., NOM.PL *aainóŋ* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *ayína* f. “do.”, NOM.PL *ayinóŋ* (88). – Bur. *aúina*; Sh. *ayíno* m.; Pers./Urd. *āina*.

8.24. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *phúuŋi* f. “moustache”, NOM.PL *phúuŋiŋa*, GEN.SG *phúuŋii*. – Bur.(Ng.) *phúŋi*; Sh. NOM.SG *phuŋ* m., NOM.PL *phúŋe*; T. 9083 ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *salát* “do.”, NOM.PL *salatóŋ* (91). But LORIMER 1939, p. 203 has still *pf'uŋiŋa*. – Bur. NOM.SG/PL *salát*.

8.25. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *khakái* f. “walnut”, NOM.PL *khakaiŋ*. – Bur. *kha-kháayo*; Sh. *khakáái* (BERGER 1998, p. 250) and *khakāái* f.; besides Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *akhóo* m., NOM.PL *akhóowa* and *akhóoŋa*, GEN.SG *akhoowéi* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *akhóu* m. and *akhóoy* m. “do.”, NOM.PL *akháaya* (95). – T. 48; Sh. *açhóo* m. (BUDDRUS 1996, p. 40).

8.26. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *ač(h)* f. and *ač(h)a* f. “eye”, NOM.PL *ač(h)iŋ* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) *ač* f. “do.”, NOM.PL *ačhiŋ*, (98/9). – T. 43; Sh. *açhú* f.

8.27. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *čii* f. and *čiiya* f. “pine tree”, NOM.PL *čiiŋa*, GEN.SG *čiiye* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *čiiy* “do.” (110). – T. 4837; Sh. *čii(h)* f.

8.28. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *póo* m. “foot, leg”, NOM.PL *páaŋa* and *páa* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *póo* m. “do.”, NOM.PL *páa* (113). – T. 8056; Sh. *páa* m. “foot; leg of bed”.

8.29. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *bóot* f. “big, flat stone”, NOM.PL *baatúŋ*; besides NOM.SG *bóot* m., NOM.PL *báata* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *bóot* “do.”, NOM.PL *báata* (114). – Bur. *bat* “do.”; Sh. *baṭ* m. “(round) stone”; T. 11348.

8.30. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *giri* f. “big stone, boulder”, NOM.PL *giriŋa*, GEN.SG *girii*; besides NOM.SG *gúri* f., NOM.PL *gúriŋa*, GEN.SG *gúrii* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *gúri* f. “do.” (114). – T. 4161; Sh. *giri* f.

8.31. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *hangúṭ* m. “thumb”. – T. 137; Sh. *agúṭo* m.; besides Ḑo.(Ng.) *bađi agúla* f. (< *bađi* “big, large (f.)”; *agúla* f. “finger”) ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) *bári agúla* f. “do.” (119). – T. 11225; 135.

8.32. Ḑo.(Ng.) *čóúndei* “fourteen” ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) *čaundéi* “do.” (123). – Sh. *čoóndei* (BUDDRUS 1984, p. 20); T. 4605.

8.33. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *p(h)ačoó* m. “tail”, NOM.PL *p(h)ačoóŋa*, GEN.SG *p(h)ačoóye*. – Sh. *phačoó* m. (BUDDRUS 1996, p. 47), *phočoó* m.; T. 8249 ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *čipóoy* “do.”, NOM.PL *čipáaya* (127). – T. 4818.4?

8.34. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *ló(o)i* f. “fox”, NOM.PL *ló(o)iŋa* and *lóiŋ* and *lóoya*. – Sh.(Gilgit) *lōi* f., Sh.(Palas) *lóoi*; T. 11142 ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) *láač* “do.”, NOM.PL *laačíŋ* (131). – T. 11003.

8.35. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *suuná* m. “dream”, NOM.PL *suuné*; besides NOM.SG *suuné* m., NOM.PL *suunéena* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *suuná* m. “do.”, NOM.PL *suuné* (132). – T. 13481.

8.36. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *briyú(u)* m. “rice”, NOM.SG *briyuwéi*. – Bur.(Ng.) *briú*; Sh. *bríu*, *bryú* (BERGER 1998, p. 60) and *brīu*; T. 12233 ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *bras* “do.”, GEN.SG *braséi* (135/6). – Bur.(Hz.) *bras*.

- 8.37. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *sáu* m. “sand”, GEN.SG *sa(u)wéi*. – Bur.(Hz. and Ng.) *sáo*, Bur.(Yasin) *sáu*. ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *baalí* f. “do.” (138). – T. 11580.
- 8.38. Ḑo.(Ng.) *ṣōōi* “sixteen”. – Sh. (Gilgit) *ṣoĩ* (BUDDRUS 1984, p. 21) and *ṣóoĩ* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) *ṣōwéi* “do.” (141). – Sh. (Kohistan) *ṣōōei* (BUDDRUS 1984, p. 21); T. 12812.
- 8.39. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *kirmá* m. “worm”, NOM.PL *kirmé*, GEN.SG *kirméi* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *kirmá* m. “snake”, NOM.PL *kirmé* (143). – T. 3438 // Ḑo.(Ng.) for “snake” is NOM.SG *jon* m., NOM.PL *jóna*, GEN.SG *jonéi*. – Sh. *jon* m.; T. 5110.
- 8.40. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *tóo* m. “sun”, NOM.PL *táaŋa*, OBL.SG *taás* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *tóo* m. “do.”, NOM.PL *táa*, OBL.SG *taás* (146). – T. 5767.
- 8.41. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *gúuwo* m. “heel”, NOM.PL *gúuwe*, GEN.SG *gúuwoi*. – T. 4479.1; besides Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *píni* f. “heel; leg from knee to ankle, calf; instep”, NOM.PL *píniŋa*, GEN.SG *píni* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *píni* “heel” (150); LORIMER 1939, p. 201 has *píni* “the lower leg”. – Bur. *píni* “menschliches Bein vom Knie bis zum Knöchel, Wade”; Sh: *píni* (BERGER 1998, p. 315); T. 8168.
- 8.42. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *bóbok* m. “buttock; thigh”, NOM.PL *bóboka*, GEN.SG *bóbokéi* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *bóbok* “calf” (150). – Bur.(Hz.) *bubóq*, Bur.(Yasin) *bobóq* “Fleischmasse, Hinterbacke, Wade”; Kho. *bubúq* (BERGER 1998, p. 60) // Ḑo.(Ng.) for “calf” is *píni* f.; see 8.41.
- 8.43. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *gíta* f. and *giṭ* f. “vagina”, NOM.PL *giṭóŋ*, GEN.SG *giṭéi*. – Bur.(Ng.) *giṭ* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *čut* “do.” (150). – T. 4860.
- 8.44. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *širooṭá* m. “head”, NOM.PL *širooṭé*, GEN.SG *širooṭéi*. – T. 12452 ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *chúṭo* m. “do.” (151). – Bur. *-chúṭi* “Gipfel (des Berges); Haarschopf der Hindus; Kopffedern der Vögel; Hahnenkamm” // In Ḑo.(Ng.) *ichúṭi* (f. or m.) denotes “(tuft of hair on the) top of the head”.
- 8.45. Ḑo.(Ng.) NOM.SG *kom* m. “work”, NOM.PL *káma*; GEN.SG *kaméi* ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) NOM.SG *krom* m. “do.” (153). – T. 2892; Sh. *k(r)om* m.
- 8.46. Ḑo.(Ng.) *čaagá* “bad (m.)” ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) *łča’ga* “do.” (LORIMER 1939, p. 139). – T. 4564.

8.47. Ḑo.(Ng.) *šóo* “one hundred” – T. 12278; besides *poi-búš* (< *póí* “five” + *búš* “twenty”) ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) *pōĩ búš* “do.” (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 4). – T. 7655, 11616.

8.48. Ḑo.(Ng.) *núu* and *nũũ* “nine” ↔ Ḑo.(Hz.) *náu* “do.” (TIKKANEN 1996, p. 4). – T. 6984; Sh. *náũ*.

As a postscript I would like to share some of my observations concerning the language situation of Nager Ḑomaakí. The village ‘Dumyal’ (Ḑo.(Ng.) *Ḑomyáal*) mentioned by LORIMER still exists. It is situated on the left side of the Nager river, slightly below Uyum Nager, the valley’s administrative centre. Like its counterpart Mominabad in Hunza Ḑomyaal is only inhabited by Ḑóoma. In autumn 2004 it comprised six households with less than 20 mostly elderly inhabitants. Nine years before that, in spring 1995, there had still been 20–25 villagers in seven households. At that time I was told that only 15 years ago (i.e. around 1980) more than 50 people were permanently residing in the village. Over the last decades, more and more younger Ḑo. speakers had been leaving Ḑomyaal for good in search of better employment opportunities. This may be the reason why the village gave, in stark contrast to its surrounding scenic beauty, the impression of a rather forlorn place. According to the villagers, all inhabitants of Ḑomyaal were proficient in Ḑo. as well as in Burushaski. On several occasions I could observe how even women and young children were switching in the middle of the conversation effortlessly between the two languages. The use of Ḑo. was strictly limited to conversations within their own community. On the appearance of non-Ḑo. speakers everybody present would automatically change into Burushaski.

In 2004 Ḑo.(Ng.) speaking families were also living in Rabat/Chalt (three households) as well as in Danyor (two households) and in Gilgit (four households).<sup>7</sup> All these families have their roots in Ḑomyaal. The ancestors of the Ḑóoma in Rabat had been settled in Chalt around 70 years ago by the Tham (ruler) of Nager, so that they would provide their services as blacksmiths to the local villagers. The families in Danyor and Gilgit are economic migrants who had moved to these places over the last decades.

<sup>7</sup> In 1995 Rabat still counted four and Gilgit five Ḑo.(Ng.) speaking households (WEINREICH 1999, p. 212). The disappearance of two entire households from our 2004 statistics is linked to the fact, that at the time of my first assessment only one elderly member of each of the household was still using Ḑo. on a daily basis. With the demise of these speakers the remaining family members switched completely to Shina. Other Nager Ḑóoma households where Ḑo. is not spoken anymore are to be found in Ashqurdas, Budalas, Ghulmet, Minapin, Pisan, Rabat, Sikanderabad, Sumayar (all in or belonging to Nager), Danyor und Gilgit.

Most members of the mentioned households knew Ḑo. as well as Shina and/or Burushaski. Some of the younger ones still understood Ḑo. but spoke only Shina. In all cases the use of Ḑo. was restricted to the family domain. In Rabat members of the older generation normally communicated with everybody in the family in their traditional mother tongue. The younger generation showed a preference for the use of Shina / Burushaski while talking to each other and to their children. In Danyor and Gilgit Ḑo. was only used by the elderly, mostly to talk to each other. Although most members of the younger generation were still able to understand Ḑo., for their active inter-familiar communication all of them had almost completely switched to Shina, even while talking to their parents.<sup>8</sup>

All in all, as for 2004 the total number of Ḑo.(Ng.) speakers could be estimated at around 40 persons, most of them older than 50 years of age. With the prominent exception of SHABAN ALI, nobody of the Ḑóoma I spoke to had anything positive to say about his or her mother tongue. On the contrary, especially younger speakers perceived Ḑo. as nothing else than an obstacle on the way to the desired full integration into their respective host community. For this reason most of the parents I met with had made the conscious choice not to speak Ḑo. to their children anymore, communicating with them instead in Shina or Burushaski.

The very limited size of the remaining speakers' community, its high percentage of elderly members and almost everybody's strongly negative attitude towards the use of their original mother tongue makes it quite probable that in one to two generations Domaakí – in form of both of its dialects – will cease to exist as a living language.

## References

- BACKSTROM, P.C. 1992: "Domaaki." In: P.C. BACKSTROM/C.F. RADLOFF (eds.): *Languages of Northern Areas. Sociolinguistic Survey of Northern Pakistan*. Islamabad, vol. 2, pp. 77–83; 293–295.
- BAILEY, T.G. 1924: *Grammar of the Shina Language, consisting of a full grammar, with texts and vocabularies of the main or Gilgiti dialect and briefer grammars (with vocabularies and texts) of the Kohistani, Guresi and Drasi dialects*. London.

<sup>8</sup> A similar picture of rapid language decline could also be observed in Hunza, where local community leaders have for years been actively encouraging the remaining Ḑo. speakers to discontinue the use of their traditional mother tongue in favour of Burushaski. As a result of this not entirely unpopular measure only a few children continued to speak the language of their parents. For more details on the language situation in Hunza as prevailing in the beginning of the 1990s, see BACKSTROM 1992.



- BERGER, H. 1998: *Die Burushaski-Sprache von Hunza und Nager*. Teil III: Wörterbuch. Wiesbaden.
- BUDDRUS, G. 1983: "Ḍomaaki čhot 'Ton'. Mit Beiträgen zur historischen Lautlehre." In: MSS 42, pp. 5–21.
- 1984: "Ḍomaakí-Nachträge zum Atlas der Dardsprachen." In: MSS 43, pp. 9–24.
- 1986: "Hindi *phūl*, Ḍomaakí *phulé*." In: MSS 47, pp. 71–77.
- 1996: "Shina-Rätsel." In: D. B. Kapp (ed.): *Nanvidhaikata. Festschrift für Hermann Berger*. Wiesbaden, pp. 29–54.
- FUSSMAN, G. 1972: *Atlas linguistique des parlers Dardes et Kafirs*. 2 volumes. Paris.
- KREUTZMANN, H. 2005: "Linguistic diversity in space and time: A survey in the Eastern Hindukush and Karakorum." In: *Himalayan Linguistics* 4, <http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/HimalayanLinguistics/articles/HLJ04.html>.
- LORIMER, D. L. R. 1939: *The Ḍumāki Language. Outlines of the Speech of the Doma, or Bērīcho, of Hunza*. Nijmegen.
- MASICA, C. P. 1991: *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge.
- RADLOFF, C. F. 1999: *Aspects of the sound system of Gilgiti Shina*. Islamabad (Studies in Languages of Northern Pakistan 4).
- SCHMID, A. 1997: *Die Dom zwischen sozialer Ohnmacht und kultureller Macht. Interkulturelle Beziehungen in Nordpakistan*. Stuttgart.
- TIKKANEN, B. 1996: *Domaki: an endangered archaic Central Indo-Aryan language in Karakorum. Some notes on its structure and development*. Hand-out illustrating a lecture at Oslo University, dated 12 December 1995 [rev. version 11 April 96]. 6 pp.
- 1999: Letter, dated 2 June 1999. 4 pages.
- TURNER, R. L. 1966–1971: *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages*. London.
- WEINREICH, M. 1999: "Der Ḍomaakí-Dialekt von Nager." In: StII 22, pp. 203–214.
- (forthcoming): "The Ḍomaakí language. An outline of its phonology, morphology and syntax." In: T. ORANSKAIA (ed.): *Jazyki Mira*. Vol. 16. Moskva.
- ZOLLER, C. P. 2005: *A Grammar and Dictionary of Indus Kohistani*. Volume 1: *Dictionary*. Berlin.