

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 20.3, 2010: 542-546.

Reviewed by Habib Borjian, Columbia University, New York

ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE IRANIAN VERB. By JOHNNY CHEUNG, (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, ed. Alexander Lubotsky, 2). pp. xxiv, 600. Leiden and Boston, Brill, 2007.

Compilation of this dictionary was carried out within the Indo-European Etymological Dictionary research project at the Department of Comparative Indo-European Linguistics at Leiden University. The project, supervised by Alexander Lubotsky and Robert Beekes, aims to produce an online dictionary containing all words in the Indo-European languages that can be traced back to the proto-language (PIE). Dictionaries on the following branch family of languages have been published to date: Albanian, Anatolian, Armenian, Baltic, Celtic, Germanic, Greek, Indo-Aryan, Iranian, Italic, Slavic, Tocharian.

The volume on Iranian under review consists of a dictionary (pp. 1-475), references (476-504), indices (505-588), and an English-Iranian glossary (589-600). It is the first complete etymological dictionary of Iranian and attempts to give a critical survey of all the verb roots that may have existed in proto-Iranian (PIr.) as deduced from the attested Iranian descendants as well as the Sanskrit and PIE evidence. This is occasionally accompanied by an analysis of the morphology and assessment of pedigree. Notwithstanding those reconstructed PIr. roots which are formed in the Indo-Iranian era or even after the split thereof, many Iranian verbs do show PIE provenance. The dictionary's lemmata are PIr. roots arranged in Roman alphabetical order. Each root is followed by a gloss, a list of derivatives in the dead and living Iranian languages, the Sanskrit and PIE roots and a selective list of IE cognates, and references. In many cases, Cheung has inserted his comments and suggestions within the entry.

Indices embrace 84 Iranian, 55 other IE, and 13 non-IE languages. The Iranian idioms are divided into Old Iranian (OIr.), Middle Iranian (MIr.), New West Iranian (NWIr.), and New East Iranian (NEIr.), as follows.

OIr.: Avestan, Old Persian (inscriptions, from Elamite texts).

MIr.: Middle Persian (Manichean, Zoroastrian, Monumental), Parthian (Manichean, Monumental), Khotanese and Tumshuqese, Sogdian (proper, Manichean, Buddhist, Christian), Choresmian, Bactrian, Sarmatian.

NWIr. (62 languages): New Persian (Classical, Tajik), Balochi (Eastern, unspecified), Kurdish (Kurmanji, Sorani, other and unsp.), Zaza, Awromani, Gurani (Kandula, etc.), Lori (Bakhtiari, other and unsp.), Tati (specified by the village), Central Dialects (31 languages), Gilaki (general, Rashti), Māzandarāni (general, Velātru'i, Shamirzādi), Talysh (without any distinction among the dialects), Komisenian (Aftari, Lasgerdi, Sangesari, Semnani, Sorkha'i), Southern (Bashkardi, Kumzari), Sivandi, and Khorasani and Sistani (NP dialects).¹

NEIr.: Ossetic (Iron, Digor), Pashto (4 dialects), Pamir (12 languages), Yidgha, Munji, Yaghnobi, Parachi, Ormuri.²

Cheung's compilation provides an opportunity to investigate the quantity of linguistic material and scholarship available in Iranian. By my rough reckoning, based on the number of columns in the four-column pages of Indices, there are more than 14,000 lexical items (verb stems and nominals) cited in the Dictionary, of which more than 11,000 are Iranian. The quantity of cited items varies substantially for Iranian idioms, as shown in the table below. Sogdian

¹ Cheung's grouping is slightly different.

² The last two languages are treated as neither West nor East Iranian.

ranks first with some 1,250 registered items, comparing with only 114 tallied for Old Persian. Apparently, the amount of material presented for dead languages is primarily a function of the survival of texts in a particular language. Living languages, on the other hand, are better represented when they are documented and studied more thoroughly; hence, Ossetic ranks highest among the New Iranian because of the monumental etymological work of Vasilij Abaev (as well as Cheung's own scholarship on the language). Māzandarāni, the fifth Iranian language in terms of the number of speakers, is highly under-represented by having merely three lexical items. Nor we do find any item from the millennium-old history of the latter. Another absent New Iranian is the extinct language of Gorgān, on which little scholarship is on hand.

Iranian language	Percent
Pamirs group	13.2
Central Dialects (CDs)	11.2
Sogdian	10.1
Middle Persian (MP)	9.0
Ossetian	8.4
Khotanese	6.4
Choresmian	5.2
New Persian (NP)	5.2
Avestan	4.8
Parthian	4.4
Kurdish	3.2
other	18.9
total	100.0

New Persian, the *lingua franca* of the Persianate world, is under-represented for two reasons: lack of a comprehensive etymological dictionary for Persian and its relatively low inventory of simple verbs. Among the nearly 650 lexical items listed for Persian in its index, my laborious count up showed 299 verb stems. This number attests to quite an exhaustive compilation on the part of Cheung,

when compared to my own unpublished data. Thus, the under-representation of Persian is due to nominal derivatives, which run probably an order of magnitude as many as what is cited in the *Dictionary*.

As the volume is geared towards bridging between the Iranian and Indo-European scholarship, some adjustments have been made by Chung in his presentation of the PIr. phonology. It includes the introduction of the single laryngeal /*H/ in PIr. to stand for a merger of the three original laryngeal phonemes in PIE. Though applied somewhat hypothetically, this choice also warrants explanation of some sound changes within the Iranian stage that could only be influenced from a laryngeal in PIr. Consequently, the Iranian *ī* and *ū* are shown as the inherited /*iH/ and /*uH/, respectively. Cheung's inventory of the PIr. phonemes, however, lacks the sibilant pair *ś and *ž (from PIE *k and *g^(h) respectively), necessary to explain the subsequent Old Iranian splits that distinguish SW Ir. from the rest of the family, i.e. PIr. *ś > Ir. *s*, SW Ir. *θ* (> *h*) and PIr. *ž > Ir. *z*, SW Ir. *d*. For example, PIE *g *enH*₃- 'to recognize, know' > PIr. *žanH- (*zanH² in Cheung) > Ir. *zān*-, SW Ir. *dān*-.

The list of references shows that Cheung has painstakingly examined all the relevant publications, from which he has drawn the immense data one finds in his *Dictionary*. Originally in various scripts, the materials appear in Roman letters with the necessary diacritical marks (except for Bactrian whose original Greek orthography is retained). Persian words are correctly rendered into the standard transliteration-transcription system for Classical Persian, save the illogical use of *-h* for the orthographic symbol ʰ that signifies the final short vowel *-a*. As for the idioms without a writing system, the author has followed the tradition of duplicating his source. Accordingly, one finds various transcription systems within the same entry. For instance, the Roman letter *j* was meant to be read differently by the earlier French, German, and English collectors of Iranian dialects who had their own way of transcription. While it is often impossible for the average user of the *Dictionary* to verify the sound value of such symbol, it would have done no harm had the compiler had normalized the system of consonants for the lesser known dialects. Of course little can be

done about the documented vowel letters, which are not as important in etymology anyway.

After these more general remarks, the following paragraphs will discuss the contents of Cheung's book in some detail. Consider the following roots and some of their derivatives in the Central Dialects (CDs).

***gam**¹ 'to come' (< PIE *g^wem- 'to go; come'): Qohr[udi] *moda/tt-*, Soi *-mad-*, *-med-*, *-mud-* (supplet. *at-*)

***Hai** 'to go' (< PIE *H₁ei-): (+ *ati- ?) Ab[u]z[aydābādi], Ard. *t-*, Fariz[andi] *-t-*, Kh[u]r[i] *tī(ā)-*, Qohr. *-tt-* 'to come'

***bar** 'to bring, carry' (< PIE *b^her-): Jow[shaqāni] *bam-ā:rt/a-ta:r-*, Meim[a'i] *bem-t-/a-tar-* (infl. [?] caus[ative] of ***tarH**¹ ['to cross over']?).

The anomalous presence of the /t/ in these derivatives is attributed by Cheung to either a suppletive stem or an old prefix, or the existence of a different root; apparently Cheung has drawn his data from Lecoq,³ who proposes two stems for each verb. However, diachronic analyses⁴ reveal that the /t/ belonged not to the stem but to the durative prefix *at-*, once common among most CDs. The full form manifests itself systematically only in the north-western group of the CDs, e.g. Mahallāti *at-keron* 'I do', *at-iyon* 'I come', Khonsāri *it-xusān* 'I hit', *it-ārān* 'I bring'. Some dialects have preserved the full form only before vowel-initial stems: Abyāna'i *et-özmar-ān* 'I count', but *e-kar-ān* 'I do'; Ardestāni *et-oroš-ō* 'I sell', but *e-ker-ō* 'I do'. There are also dialects which have retained the original *t* in a few verbs, most notably in 'bring' and 'come'. Similarly, Nā'ini present stem

³ Pierre Lecoq, *Recherches sur les dialectes kermaniens (Iran central)*, Acta Iranica 39, Belgium, 2002: 120, 122, 125, 131.

⁴ See Karl J. Krahnke, *Linguistic Relationships in Central Iran*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1976: 182-187.

vír t-os- ‘to get up’, cited under **staH* ‘to place, set; stand’ (< PIE **steH₂*), belongs to this category. And, to the same root belongs the Isfahani Jewish *ver-os** ‘stand up’, misplaced under **pat* ‘to fly, rise; (?) fall’ (< PIE *pet(H₁)-*).

A similar problem has arisen concerning nasalisation of the durative forms in the Caspian group: **bar* ‘to bring, carry’: “Sorkh[a’i] *-βord-*/ (supplet. *bé-n, bé-nn-* < **naiH¹* [‘to lead’]), Lasg[erdi] *-bard-*/ (supplet. pres. 1sg. *bī-n* < **naiH¹*) ‘to bring, carry (away, along)’. Then, with the prefix **ā-*, the same suppletive root is proposed for Sorkh. *a-ví-n-, a-ve-n-*, Lasg. *ö-ví-n,* and Sang[esari] *â-vā-n-* ‘to bring, lead’. However, we will find that no root other than **bar* underlies these forms, if the morphological rules that govern verb conjugation are considered. In the Komisenian group (the ring of dialects around Semnan), Mazandarani, Zaza, and some Tatic dialects, the present indicative forms have a nasal element (usually *-nn-*; integrated into the stem or the ending) which derives from the old participle **-ant-* < PIE **-ent-*. The stems in *-r* lose it when they come into contact with the durative marker; in Aftari, for example, the stem *ber-* gives *benni* ‘I carry’, and (g)*ir-* gives *veynen* (← **ve-ir-enn-en*) ‘they pick up’.⁵ Moreover, under the root **kar* ‘to do, make’ (< PIE **k^wer*), what is listed as the present subj. stems for Sang. *kan-*, Sorkh. *kæn-*, Lasg. *kan-* (p. 238) are actually based on the present indicative forms,⁶ which are likely to have been nasalized in the process of integration of the old past participle into the stem.⁷

**tau ?* ‘to throw, spread, sow’: If the Mazandarani present stems *da-partun-*, *da-p(ε)tun-* ‘throw’ (and the likes)⁸ are added to the rather limited inventory of the Ossetian, Choresmian, and Pamir forms listed by Cheung, then it may change his

⁵ H. Borjian, “The Komisenian Dialect of Aftar,” *Archiv Orientalní* 76/3, 2008: 379-416; see also idem, “Verb Phrase in the Dialect of Velātru,” in idem, *Motun-e Tabari / Tabari Texts*, Tehran, 2009: 265-287.

⁶ Arthur Christensen, *Contribution à la dialectologie Iranienne* II. Copenhagen, 1935: 117, 60-61.

⁷ See H. Borjian, “Tabarica II: Some Mazandarani Verbs,” *Iran and the Caucasus* 12/1, 2008: 73-82.

⁸ Ibid.

inference of a regional provenance for this root. Under the same root, (+ **apa-*) Ossetic Iron *ætawyn*, *æftud* ‘throw on, etc.’, Iron *æftyn*, *æftyd*, Dig. *æftun*, *æftud* ‘fall, etc.’ seem to be in closer agreement with NP *uft-/ōftād-*, derived from the aforementioned root **pat*.

***Hanč** ? ‘to unsheathe, draw ?’: all Iranian cognates are marked by Cheung as uncertain, except (+ **ā-*) NP *āxtan/āz-* ‘to unsheathe, draw a sword’. However, the latter is actually a contraction of *āhixtan*, which is listed under ***Θanj** ‘to pull, draw’ (< PIE *teng^h-*). Under the latter root, the NWIr. citations could be extended significantly by adding the following (with semantic shifts: pull, draw > draw water > irrigate, sprinkle > drink): Aftari *anj-/a(n)t*, Semn. *enj-/ (h)et*, Sang. *inj-/ (h)et*, Khuri *henj-/heid* ~ *het* ‘pull’; Soi *henj-/het*, Gazi *enj-/enjā-* ‘irrigate, sprinkle’, Khiāraji (S. Tati) *hönj-/höt*; Isf. Jewish, Shirazi Pers. dialect *tanj-*, C. Tāti *(h)enj-/ (h)ent*, S. Talysh *hinj-/hint*, *xənj-/xənt* ‘drink’. To the same root may fit in Gorgāni *tanjāk* ‘elastic’,⁹ CDs *lonj* ‘mucus’, *lonje* ‘wick’ and the toponyms *Xunj* (village in Fars), *Hanjan* (in Kashan district), *Lenjān* (an intensely irrigated district of Isfahan), *Xulenjān* (village near Isfahan), and *Velenjak* (a suburb of Tehran), with the preverb *va-* and the nominal suffix *-ak*.

***gart** ‘to turn’ (pp. 110 f): Jowshaqāni *ba-m-gernā* (causative) ‘I made wander’, is incorrectly glossed as ‘to turn (a)round, change, alter, etc.’ Another citation from the same dialect would be *gerd-* ‘wander; search; (re)turn; become’.¹⁰ Moreover, Meima’i *bem-garn-* glossed as ‘to turn (a)round [etc.]’ and other similar forms have the element *-m-* ‘me’ in the ergative construction, and the causative marker *-n-* (cf. ***uart** ‘to turn’).

***Haxš**² ‘to guard, supervise’ (PIE **H₃ek^w-s-* ‘eye’) and ***sand** ‘to appear, seem (good)’ (< PIE *(*s*)*k end-*). To either of these roots may belong Gorgāni *say-*

⁹ See Donal Stilo in *Enc. Iranica* XIV: 107; H. Borjjan, “The extinct language of Gorgan,” *JAOS* 128/4, 2008: 681-707.

¹⁰ See H. Borjjan, “Dialect of Jowshaqan,” *Iran and the Caucasus* 14/1-2, 2010: §3.10.12.

‘look’ (in *basayi* ‘that you look’), Sedehi *a:s-* ‘look’, Maz. *hāršīan* ‘to look’ (pres. stem *eš-*). Cf. also the putative root **iaš ?* ‘to show, appear?’

**čap* ‘to seize, attack, stick’ (< PIE? **k(e)H₂p-*). To the cited list, one may add Tajik *čapak* ‘clap’, *kap-/kapid-*, NP dialect *qāp-/qāpid-* ‘snatch’, NP *časp-/čaft-* ‘stick’, *čeft* ‘lock’. Cf. NP *čafta* ‘curved, bent, a vaulted roof’ under **kamp* ‘to bend’. Note also that NP *čamidan* is glossed three ways: ‘to twist, bend’ (under **kamp*), ‘to walk proudly’ (under *čam ?* ‘to walk’), and (with reservation) ‘to drink wine’ (under **čiam* ‘to swallow’).

The following roots could be supplied with additional derivatives. **čak/g* ‘to strike, hit’: Modern NP *čakkoš* ‘hammer’, NP *čak* ‘slap’, Maz. *čakkə* ‘clap’. **had* ‘to sit, be seated’ (< PIE **sed-*): NP *nišās/xtan* (strong grade) ‘to seat, set’, *nišāsta* ‘starch’, *nišēman* ‘abode’, *nišēm* ‘nest’. **Harj* ‘to be worth’: NP *arj* ‘value’, CDs *arž-*. **tarH¹* ‘to cross over’: NP *guđaštan* ‘to pass’.

Undoubtedly there is much room for improvement in the *Dictionary*. Given the poor state of the research in New Iranian philology, when compared with other living IE languages, many pages of this work are yet to undergo various degrees of revisions. However, what is important for both the Indo-Europeanist and the Indo-Iranist is the fact that they now have a reliable, comprehensive compilation at hand to pursue their studies far more efficiently than before. This work should be appreciated as an efficient tool with the potential of executing a transition from an era of stagnation to an era of discovery in Iranistics.