

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
Papers read before the Philological Society—	
Anticipation of Normal Sound-Changes in Indo-Aryan. By Professor R. L. Turner, M.C., M.A., Litt.D. . . . .	1
The Pontic Dialect of Modern Greek in Asia Minor and Russia. By Professor R. M. Dawkins, M.A. . . . .	15
The Value of the Period Dictionaries. By Professor Sir William A. Craigie, M.A., LL.D., D.Litt. . . . .	53
Burushaski and its Alien Neighbours: Problems in Linguistic Contagion. By Lieut.-Col. D. L. R. Lorimer, C.I.E. . . . .	63
Has the Chinese Language Parts of Speech? By Walter Simon, Ph.D. . . . .	99
English Place-names and English Philology. By Sir Allen Mawer, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A. . . . .	120
Summaries of Papers read before the Philological Society—	
The Importance of the Study of Anglo-Norman. By Professor Mildred K. Pope, M.A., Doc. Univ. Paris	134
An Examination of the Validity of Certain Current Phonetic Ideas. By R. T. Butlin, B.A. . . . .	137
The Philological Society's Balance-sheets, 1936 . . . . .	138
Annual Report for 1936 . . . . .	140
List of Members, corrected to July, 1937. . . . .	i-viii

[Reprinted from the PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY'S TRANSACTIONS,  
1937, pp. 63-98.]

## BURUSHASKI AND ITS ALIEN NEIGHBOURS : PROBLEMS IN LINGUISTIC CONTAGION.

By Lieut.-Col. D. L. R. LORIMER, C.I.E.

[Read at a meeting of the Philological Society on Friday, 4th December, 1936.]

### INTRODUCTION.

THE hero of our piece is that linguistic waif, Burushaski, of unknown origin and antecedents. I shall begin by describing briefly the physical character of its habitat and the linguistic scenery and fauna by which it is surrounded.

The tract of country stretching from Ladakh on the east to Chitral on the west is one of the most mountainous and rugged parts of the earth's surface. Its eastern half is occupied by the stupendous parallel ranges of the Karakoram, which rise into some of the highest peaks in the world: Mount Godwin Austen or K 2, second only to Everest, Gasherbrum, Masherbrum, Rakaposhi, and scores of others unnamed. Westwards the Karakoram passes into the Hindukush (these are geographers' labels), in general lower and less congested, but still capable of throwing up a Tirichmir (25,426 feet).

This wall of mountains, supported by lesser parallel ranges, divides the world of Central Asia from the world of India. It is crossed by few practicable routes, and these are used only occasionally by small parties of hardy traders or pilgrims.

The country itself is poor in natural resources and has practically no commodities on which to base a foreign trade, so that the amount of habitual intercourse with its neighbours is very small.

Internal lateral communications are only less difficult than the transit communications. Formerly some amount of intercourse was carried on between Baltistan and Hunza Nagir, but a complete barrier has now been interposed by increased glaciation. Westwards a natural route is provided by the valleys of the Hunza and Gilgit Rivers, which has been made easy by the construction of roads since the British occupation

in the end of the nineteenth century ; but a north and south range cuts off Chitral from Gilgit and is only crossable by a few passes, the lowest of which is 12,000 feet and for months lies deep in snow.

A bird's-eye view of the Karakoram country would show it to be almost entirely occupied by snow-covered mountains, glaciers, craggy declivities, and precipices. Habitation is only possible in the trenches which have been carved through it by the glacier-fed rivers, and chiefly in the lower reaches of these. To the west the mountain ridges lie farther apart and the trenches open out into what may fairly be called valleys, but the habitable, and still more the inhabited, portion of these remain small. To the traveller, or even the inhabitant, it is the tracks following the river courses and the occasional oases of cultivation, supplemented by a limited area of high-lying grazing grounds, that constitute the country.

Constrained by the nature of the country, the scanty population is scattered about in small separate communities in the main valleys, or in still greater isolation up the side gorges.

Society originally developed, it would seem, in small self-contained republics. Such may still be seen in Chilas and in the territories of Darel and Tangir in Yaghistan.

In the northern districts the units are larger, which is probably due to the nature of the terrain, and in part to the needs and ambitions of the ruling families, largely of foreign origin, who at various times have succeeded in establishing and maintaining sway in them.

Viewed from the standpoint of language, these conditions mean a minimum of external influence and a maximum of domestic differentiation. Mountains of the nature and on the scale of the Karakoram and Hindukush act as barriers to people living outside them, and as sheltering walls to the population established within. They are not likely to be constantly overrun by migratory or military hordes. Foreign penetration will usually be gradual and on a small scale.

In this tract considered as a whole and without regard to internal physical barriers, it is therefore not surprising that

we should find a considerable assemblage of linguistic groups, representing partial penetration by different stocks, of which each group consists again of a number of allied languages or dialects.

On the east we have Tibetan in its Ladakhi, Purik, and Balti forms. Next to the west, Burushaski, for present purposes our centre point, harbouring within it the small enclave of Indo-Aryan *Ḍumāki*. Continuing to the west, the Ishkoman valley, Wakhi-speaking in the north and Khowār and Shina-speaking in the south. Then in Yasin a Burushaski dialect (*Werchikwār*) with Khowār superimposed on it. Along the south of all this series extends the Indo-Aryan Shina. Moving again to the west we find Khowār occupying Ghizer and Chitral, with the Kohistani languages to the south, and the Kafir languages to the south-west of it. North of the series Burushaski to Kafiri extend the Iranian Pamiri languages of which only the eastern members, Serikuli and Wakhi, need be named here. Again, beyond these, taking Burushaski as the centre, we find a further outer circle of major languages. To the east, Tibetan; to the north, Turki; to the north-west and west, Tajiki and Badakhshani Persian; south of the latter and continuing eastwards, Pashtu; then Lahnda, and then Kashmiri.<sup>1</sup>

Burushaski, however, is in no position to take cognizance of most of the languages in either of these series. She is in permanent contact with only Shina and Wakhi. Beyond that

<sup>1</sup> The following contractions are used in this article:—

Bu.	Burushaski	(buruʃ'ʌski)	P., Pers.	Persian	
Ḍ.	Ḍumāki	(Ḍum'a'ki)	Sh.	Shinā	(ʃin'a')
H.	Hindustāni		Werch.	Werchikwār	(better : w'ərāikw'a'r)
Hz.	Hunza	(h'unza)			
Kho.	Khowar	(khow'a'r)	Wkh.	Wakhi	(w'ʌxi)
Ng.	Nagir	(n'ʌgɪr, n'ʌgər)			

The exact pronunciation of some names written in full has been left undefined. It is assumed that everyone is familiar with the commoner ones: Ladākh, Chitrāl, Kāfir, Bāltistān, etc., and most of the rest are unimportant for present purposes. I will only note here: *bericho* = b'eričo, *Serikul* = sərikul, *Shèn* = ʃɛ'n (or ʃɛ'n ?), *Wakhan* = wʌx'a'n, *Yasin* = yasin or yasin, *Yashkun* = yʌʃku'n.

she has the slightest of casual contact with Serikuli, as the Hunzukuts occasionally go to Serikul to procure felts by barter. Surprisingly, however, Burushaski harbours a linguistic stranger at her very hearth. In both Hunza and Nagir, in the midst of the Burushaski-speaking population, exist small alien colonies speaking an Indo-Aryan language. These are the Bericho, who are the professional blacksmiths and musicians to the joint communities. They call themselves *Doma* and their language *Dumāki*, and they are doubtless of the same stock as the *Doms* of Gilgit; the combination of name and function must further denote some connection with the *Doms* of India. Tradition represents them as comparatively recent immigrants from Baltistan, whither they had earlier made their way from Kashmir.

Their ultimate origin in that quarter is supported by the fact that their verb "to be" is of the distinctive form found in Kashmiri and in two or three of the minor languages to the south of it. Their entrance from Baltistan presents no improbability. Though at the present day direct communication between Baltistan and Hunza-Nagir is impossible, that state of affairs has not always existed. Tradition affirms the existence of practicable routes and of some amount of intercourse, not only some hundreds of years ago, but also in comparatively recent times. Apart from these local traditions, Professor F. W. Thomas deduces from Tibetan records that there were open communications between Baltistan and Nagir in the eighth century A.D. Finally Colonel Schomberg has now found indications of the closing of certain routes giving access from Baltistan to Hunza by the advance of glaciers in recent years. We thus have evidence of some amount of intercourse between Hunza-Nagir and Baltistan, which must have brought the Balti and Burushaski languages into touch with each other.

It is interesting also to note that not only do the Hunza Royal Family claim to have come into the country from Baltistan, but that the *Burūsho* modestly attribute the origin of all their material culture to that country. If behind this

belief there lies any modicum of fact, we might expect to find traces of linguistic contact. As, however, there is no suggestion that the Burūsho themselves came from Baltistan, the most that could be looked for would be the borrowing of some vocabulary.

There remains one other contact to be mentioned and dismissed. Before the British occupation, but in recent times, the Qirghiz used to raid or trespass into Northern Hunza, which had then probably an even scantier population than it has now. In the circumstances there is no reason to expect any considerable linguistic results. We may be contented with the existence of one Turki name, Yagh Tash, "oil-stone", attaching to a stone near Misgar which is said to sweat oil.

When I first conceived the idea of this paper, I thought I should be able to point to a number of phenomena existing in Burushaski and one or other of its neighbours which could be attributed only to adoption by one from the other, as independent derivation from a common origin was ruled out. I now feel less confidence and would represent my aim as a quest rather than a demonstration.

*Primâ facie* the situation seems promising. In Burushaski you have a distinctive language with no demonstrated affinities, which has probably existed *in situ* from time immemorial, surrounded by languages which are certainly not related to it, and which may be presumed to have supplanted it over a wide area. This probably means the intimate contact of this language with its supplanters throughout a considerable period, which might reasonably be expected to have left permanent traces in the latter, perhaps in both. Stated otherwise, we should have one or more intrusive languages showing evidence of the influence of a substratum language, which still survives as a living, independent language outside their sphere. The situation is not unlike that in Ireland, where English first intruded into Erse, then dominated it, and ultimately almost entirely supplanted it, but in the process, as is well known, caught some of its tricks of expression.

Can this theory be supported by demonstrable facts ?

The easiest way to compare languages is to compare their vocabularies ; but mere words are at all times extremely current coin. They can pass on indefinitely from mouth to mouth and from language to language, in the first instance through very casual contact of the speakers, and later with no direct contact between the original emitter and the eventual receiver. Without a knowledge of the circumstances and date of transmission, and of the history of the languages concerned, little can be deduced from them. I do not therefore propose in this paper to deal with borrowed vocabulary, and will dispense with any consideration of the sources from which isolated words might have been acquired, such as travelling traders, the Dogra garrison of Gilgit, the Indian Administrative Staff, and the bazars in Gilgit, Gupis, etc., with their foreign shopkeepers. Nor shall I inquire into ordinary adult bilingualism which exists to some extent throughout Gilgit, but the effect of which lies chiefly inside the sphere of vocabulary.

Few of these bilinguists have Burushaski as their acquired language—it is too difficult and too unremunerative—and Burushaski-speakers who travel and work abroad learn Hindustani, but do not, I think, waste their time on the minor languages of their neighbours. In any case women are not usually found among the ranks of the bilingual, so the mothers are not teachers of foreign languages in the home.

If mere words are easily and casually acquired, adoptions in the spheres of phonetics, morphology, syntax, and idiom can only be the result of very intimate contact. I would hazard the suggestion that in illiterate societies they can in the main originate only from bilingualism in early life, which again will normally result only from mixed marriages or from life in an inter-mixed community. It seems to me that a child whose parents were by origin hetero-lingual could make a synthesis of language and methods of thought as no adult could, and that the synthesis so created would

to some extent be inherited, when the time came, by its offspring.

Are there any traces of such syntheses in Burushaski and its neighbours? Or has each remained resistant to the other, outside the sphere of vocabulary? What, from this point of view, are the possibilities?

I have earlier said that in countries which are difficult of access and penetration, and which in any case offer little reward to an invader, foreign intrusion will be rare and where it takes place will usually be gradual and on a small scale. In the Gilgit area there does, however, seem to have been one large process of invasion by Shina-speakers, probably continuing over a considerable period, which led to the introduction and dissemination of the Shina language, until it covered the area of the Indus Valley upwards from the North of Swat, the Gilgit Valley, Astor, Gurez, and the country to the south-east as far as Dah and Hanu in Ladakh.

It seems probable that previous to this the language of the Gilgit region was Burushaski, and that the original population speaking that language became partly fused with the Shina-speaking invaders and in any case suffered linguistic defeat and themselves became Shina-speakers. Over the Shina area it seems reasonable to postulate a period of mixed population, with some intermarriage of the two linguistic stocks and consequently some bilingualism in the home. The original existence of two peoples seems to be reflected in the two main castes into which Shina-speakers are divided: Shins and Yashkuns, the Shins claiming social superiority, the Yashkuns affirming that they formerly supplied the ruling family in Gilgit.

Shin domination, however, failed to extend to the remoter and less accessible parts of the country, Upper Hunza-Nagir and Yasin, where the Burushaski language has survived and set a limit to the extension of Shina. Shina-speakers, however, penetrated up the Hunza River into what is naturally and politically Hunza and Nagir and form the bulk of the population of the lower parts of those states. They are called Shèn



(i.e. *Shīn*) and reckon themselves such in the wider sense of the term (including both Shins and Yashkuns), and appear to be a different people from the *Burūsho* (Burushaski-speakers) who, however, intermarry with them. The *Shèn* men can probably all speak Burushaski. This Shina-speaking population is more numerous and more important in Nagir than in Hunza, and it is probably to its presence that Nagir Burushaski owes the large proportion of distinctively Shina words that characterize it, rather than to direct relations with the Shin centre in Gilgit.

I do not, however, believe that the intercourse and actual intermarriage that take place at the present day between the *Burūsho* and the *Shèn*, is of sufficient extent or influence to affect the structure of either language as spoken by the main bodies of the two linguistic communities, though it is possible that the Shina and Burushaski spoken within the *Shèn* communities may each show the influence of the other. As far as I know, no study has been made of the speech of the inhabitants, and especially of the children, in any of the *Shèn* villages, such as Ghulmit and Hindi.

Wakhi has also, probably for a considerable time, been in geographical contact with Burushaski. At the present day Wakhi-speakers like Shina-speakers are a section of the body politic of Hunza. The small population of the North of Hunza is largely Wakhi, and Wakhi is the predominant speech in the main valley from Galmit (20 miles above Baltit) upwards, and in the Chupūrsan Valley. Again the almost isolated Valley of *Shīmshāl* is populated by people who talk a form of Wakhi. Ethnologically these people present an interesting problem and their language would be worth examination; but for present purposes people and language lie outside the picture.

The Wakhis of Hunza have undoubtedly at some time filtered in from Wakhan over the Irshad Pass to occupy the high-lying valleys which present few attractions to the *Burūsho* of mid-Hunza. There is in general, I believe, little intercourse between the *Burūsho* and the Wakhis and

intermarriage is rare. The Burūsho settlements in Upper Hunza live almost entirely in separate villages. I have found little evidence that either language has exercised any influence on the structure or idiom of the other. They share a certain number of words. So far as these are not common Persian, Wakhi is the principal borrower.

Having now examined the situation as it is at the present day and speculated on the probabilities of the past, we are in a position to say that the only one of its neighbours with which Burushaski is likely to have been in intimate contact for a prolonged period, is Shina. It is therefore in Burushaski and Shina that we may look with the best hope for signs of any deep-going influence, whether reciprocal or unilateral.

From the Burushaski-Dumāki relationship, in view of its believed recent origin, the social inferiority and fewness of Dumāki-speakers, and the alleged fact that the Doma women do not speak Burushaski, we cannot expect much. Dumāki is not likely to have potently affected Burushaski, while it would be surprising if it had itself acquired from Burushaski grammatical forms or linguistic technique, though it might have adopted words and idioms.

With Werchikwār, the Yasin dialect of Burushaski, the present-day position is quite different. Incidentally it may be remarked that Werchikwār is the Khowār name for the language. The speakers of it themselves call it Burushaski. Werchikwār is the language of the indigenous population of Yasin, but for the past 150 or 200 years Khowār has been the speech of their rulers. The household language of practically the whole of the 8,084 inhabitants is Werchikwār. Only some 336 speak Shina and some 230 speak Khowār in their homes. About one-third of the population are bilingual, talking Khowār as a second language; this is probably to be taken as applying chiefly to the male population. This is a very notable result to have been produced merely by the presence of a foreign ruling caste without any considerable intrusion of alien stock. Unfortunately I have not yet been able to master my Werchikwār and Khowār material

sufficiently to make a thorough comparison possible. It would entail not only comparing Werchikwār with Yasini Khowār, but Werchikwār with Eastern Burushaski and Yasini Khowār with Chitrali Khowār.

A further study which ought to be carried out, but for which I do not possess the material, is the comparison of the speech of the Shina-speaking Doms of Bijyot with the other dialects of Shina.

The contacts of Werchikwār with Shina, apart from that spoken by the Doms, is through the marketing centre of Gupis and the neighbouring population of Kuh. On the north, contact with Wakhi is only through minor trafficking with the few Wakhis who enter the Upper Yārkhun Valley in Chitral from the Oxus Valley to graze their flocks in summer. This part of the Yārkhun Valley is separated from Yasin by a high mountain range, the only route over which is by the Dorkhan glacier pass, 15,470 feet high.

As regards the relation between Werchikwār and Eastern Burushaski it is my impression that where the speech of Hunza differs from that of Nagir, Werchikwār agrees with the latter rather than the former.

Passing from these general remarks on the situation we may now turn to the consideration of the linguistic phenomena :—

1. It should be said at once that no trace of the most striking features of Burushaski, such as its "gender" system and the use of pronoun-prefixes, is to be found in any of its neighbours.

#### PHONOLOGY.

2. To begin with Phonology I would say that there is a general similarity of phonology in all the languages under consideration. All, for instance, possess series of cerebrals and voiceless aspirates.

Bu., Sh., Wkh., and Kho. have all cerebral  $t$   $ḍ$   $ḥ$   $j$  ( $ž$ ) and  $š$ . On the other hand Bu. alone has the curious medial and final  $y$  sound (which is also heard as a kind of  $r$   $l$   $y$  and  $ž$ ).

Shina has failed to take this over in words which it appears to have borrowed from Bu., e.g. :—

	Bu.	Sh.
<b>bɔyʊm</b>	<i>mare</i>	<b>bɑ·m</b>
<b>bɛpɔy</b>	<i>yak</i>	<b>bɛ·pɔ</b>
<b>ćo·yo</b>	<i>testicle</i>	<b>ćō·</b>
<b>dɔy</b>	<i>fat</i>	<b>dæi</b>
<b>gʊyɔl</b>	<i>thin bread</i>	<b>gɔ·li</b>
<b>hɛra·y, (hɛra·ž)</b>	<i>grazing camp</i>	<b>hɛræi</b>
<b>khɔy</b>	<i>strand, beach</i>	<b>khæi</b>
<b>khɔy</b>	<i>hook, stirrup</i>	<b>khā·</b>
<b>mɔyo</b>	<i>fine (penalty)</i>	<b>ma·o</b>
<b>tɔyɔy</b>	<i>mud</i>	<b>tɔga</b>
<b>Nɔmɔy</b>	<i>Nomal</i>	<b>Nomɔl</b>
<b>Pū.a·y</b>	<i>Punial</i>	<b>Pū·ya·</b>

So far as I know, none of these words—except of course the proper names—occur in the other languages under reference.

In D. I thought I heard the **y**-sound in two or three non-Bu. words: **nila·yo** (Sh. **nila·o**, *forehead*), **di.o·ya** (*grandson*), **ɔko·y**, pl. **ɔka·ya** (*walnut*). Bu. **y** was found in **pu·yo**, but appeared to have been replaced by D. **y** in **ćo·ya** and **bɔyʊm**.

3. The case of **y** in Bu. and Sh. is typical of this region. Each language has some sounds or habits which it has failed to put over on its neighbours. There is a general tendency for final stops, spirants, and fricatives to be devoiced, but only Shina extends the principle of devoicing finals to vowels and **l**, cf. **nišj** and **ɔsuɭ**.

4. All the surrounding languages, including D., possess the spirants **x** and **y**, but Sh. only admits these sounds in loan-words. It is interesting to note that there is individual difference in the pronunciation of **x** and **y** in Bu. extending finally to **kh** or **q** and **g**. Thus:—

Bu. initial **x**- : **\*x**- **ˠx** : **kh**-, **q**<sup>(h)</sup>-  
 initial **y**- : **ˠy** : **g**-

Nagir Bu. tends to have *g* in place of Hz. *ɣ*.

This runs parallel with the series which is shared by Bu. and Sh. :—

ph- : ʰf- : f-

(I have very rarely recorded ʰf- in Kho. or Wkh.)

5. Both Bu. and Sh. have -ŋ- occurring finally and between vowels. Sh. also has -ŋg-.

Wkh. and Kho. have, I think, only -ŋg-.

Wkh. shares its *θ*, *ð*, *ʃ* and *ʝ* only with its Pamiri brethren, except that Kho. has less pronounced forms of *ʃ* and *ʝ*.

6. Kho. has a peculiar *l*, which appears also in Werch. and, I think, in Western Sh. This would therefore appear to be a sound which has been diffused to some extent, but has not reached Gilgit or Hunza-Nagir.

7. The conditions in which Bu., as a matter of routine, changes initial voiced into initial and medial voiceless consonants, and sometimes changes *x* to medial *q* and aspirates to medial non-aspirates, are not reproduced in the other languages.

8. All that emerges from this is that in a few points Bu. and Sh. stand nearer to each other than either does to Kho. or Wkh.

### THE NOUN.

9. Number :—Nouns of the *y* category in Burushaski form their plurals by the addition of a suffix -*an*-, -*n*-, or longer forms ending in -*an*-, -*in*-. It is probably only a coincidence that in Balti nouns ending in a vowel mostly form their plural by adding -*ng*-, while in D. we have plural endings in -*n*-, -*in*-, -*na*-, -*on*-, and -*irin*-.

More significant is the use of a suffix denoting singleness or unity. Used with a singular noun or noun-equivalent, it denotes one individual, and corresponds very much to our "indefinite article". Used with a plural noun, it indicates that a number of individuals are considered as constituting a unity or group. This phenomenon is, as far as I know, peculiar to Bu., Sh., and D. In all cases in the singular

the suffix is a recognizable form of the word for "one", and more often than not the noun is preceded by the ordinary form of "one". In the plural in Sh. the same form of suffix is used; in D. it is not recorded; while in Bu. a totally different suffix is found, which somewhat resembles the Sh. general suffix. The same suffix is used with Adjectives used pronominally or predicatively, Indefinite and Interrogative Pronouns, Numerals, and the Passive Participles of verbs; also in Bu. with the Noun-Agent, while in Sh. it serves to form one type of Noun-Agent. Case suffixes may be subjoined to these suffixes of singleness.

The numeral "one" in the languages concerned is:—

Bu.	Sh.	D.
han,	ek	m. ek, f. eka

(for human beings, hin).

The suffixes are:—

sg. (all genders) -an	-ek, -ak	-ak(a), -ek(a)
pl. (all genders) -ik	as for sg.	—

Examples:—

<i>man</i>	hi'r	manu'jo	mani'š
<i>there was a man</i>	(hin) hi'r-an	(ek) manu'jo-'k	ek mani'š-ek
	bam	asul	ča'ka
<i>to a man</i>	(hin) hi'r-an-ər	(ek) manu'ju-'k-εt	cf. čhom-ek- išu (in)to a skin
<i>men</i>	hi'r-i		
<i>a party of men</i>	hir-'i-'k		

Sh.

<i>game animal</i>	mae.i.a'r-o
<i>game animals</i>	mae.ia'r-ε
<i>a game animal</i>	mae.i.a'r-u-'k
<i>a herd of game animals</i>	mae.i.a'r-ε-'k

In Bu. where, as occasionally happens, the simple form of

a noun or pronoun has a plural significance, *-an* is used to mark the sg. and *-ik* to emphasize the plural :—

<b>sis</b>	<i>people, persons, and person</i>
<b>sis-an</b>	<i>a person</i>
<b>sis-ik</b>	<i>persons, people</i>

Bu.

Sh.

## Adjectives :—

*a good one*      šu.a.'n      mišt-u'k

Bu.

Sh.

D.

## Pronouns :—

<i>who ? (sg.)</i>	mēn-an ?	ko'uk ?	ko'k ?
<i>what ?</i>	bēs-an ?	—	kis-ek ?
	pl. bēs-ik		
<i>how much ?</i>	be'rum-an ?	—	kate'y-ek
<i>anyone</i>	mēn-an	ko'uk	ko'k <sup>1</sup>
<i>anything</i>	bēs-an	jek-ek	—
<i>a certain amount</i>	be'rum-an	kača'k-ek	—

Bu.

Sh.

## Numerals :—

<i>ten</i>	to'rum-o	dæi
<i>a "ten"</i>	to'rum(-u)-an	dæi-ek
<i>a score</i>	a'ltər-an	bi'-ek
<i>a couple of</i>	a'lto tha-(Δ)n	du šal-Δk
<i>hundred</i>		

## Passive Participles of transitive verbs :—

	Bu.	Sh.	
<i>said</i>	senum	ræit-o	
<i>the thing said</i>	senum-an	ræitu'k	
<i>the bread that</i> <i>remained over</i>	dyu'Δsum-an (šapik)	cf. ā'ṭi hanu'k	<i>the bones that</i> <i>there are</i>
<i>the earth that</i> <i>there was</i>	tik bitsum-an		

<sup>1</sup> The apparently parallel forms Hindustani **kaī ek** "some", and Welsh Gypsy **kek** "any one" (pl.), are, however, to be noted.

It is curious that both in Bu. and Sh. this suffix used with the Passive Participle apparently loses its sense of singleness and indefiniteness and becomes definite: "The thing said by so and so."

Cf., however, Sh. *parudik čaga thama ? Shall I tell a story I have heard ?*

10. The Noun-Agent:—

*doer.* Bu. *εταβ-αν* a *doer*, pl. *εταβο*, Sh. *θε·εκ* pl. *θε·εν-εκ* (*θε* and *θε·εν* are the 3rd sg. and pl. of the Fut.-Pres. of the Sh. verb "to do").

11. Genders:—There is no analogy between the system of gender in Bu. and that in the other languages.

12. Cases:—In Bu., D., Sh., and Balti case forms are produced by adding suffixes, which in some instances also exist independently as adverbs; and other relationships of nouns are expressed by postpositions.

Kho. and Wkh. also have case-suffixes and postpositions.

Wkh. alone has also prepositions.

It is impossible here to carry out a detailed comparison of the forms and of the methods of expressing particular relations in these various languages. Only a few points can be noted.

All these languages agree in having a genitive suffix consisting of a single vowel.

Bu., D., Sh., and Balti have a special Transitive Nominative, i.e. the subject of a past tense, and sometimes also of a present tense (excepting Sh.), of a transitive verb takes a special suffix, though the construction in Bu., Sh., and D is not Agential. In Bu. and Ladakhi Tibetan this suffix is the same as that of the genitive, viz. *-ε* and *-i* respectively. In Sh. it is *-εε*, *-ε*, and in Balti Tibetan *-si*, while in D. it is *-αν*.

Wkh. uses both an active and passive agential construction with the past tenses of transitive verbs.

13. By a rather curious semantic development in Bu., D., and sometimes in Kho., the suffix or postposition which essentially means "on", "upon" is used to denote the instrument "with" which something is done. This does



not hold in Sh. The origin of all the suffixes concerned can be traced to words meaning "up", "above", "on top of":—

Bu.	D.	Sh.	Kho.
<b>yAṭɛ</b> <i>up</i>	<b>Atsi</b> <i>up</i>	<b>Ajɛ</b> <i>up</i>	<b>so'r</b> <i>head,</i> <i>loc. so'ra on top</i>

Suffix = "on", "upon".

<b>-Aṭɛ</b>	<b>-As, (-Aṭs)</b> <sup>1</sup>	<b>-ɛ-'j, -i-'j,</b> <b>-i-'č</b>	<b>-o so'ra,</b> (also instrum. <b>-ɛn</b> )
-------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---

In Sh. and Kho. the first vowel is the inflectional ending of the genitive or general oblique of the noun.

Examples:—

Eng. "He sat on the throne."

Bu.	<b>tAxt-Aṭɛ</b> <i>huru'timi</i>
D.	<b>tAxt-As</b> <i>be'ta</i>
Sh.	<b>tAxt-ɛj</b> <i>be'to</i>
Kho.	<b>tAxt-o</b> <i>so'ra ni'sistæi</i>

Eng. "He shot (him) with a gun."

Bu.	<b>tob'Aq-Aṭɛ</b> <i>dɛlimi</i>
D.	<b>tob'Aq-As</b> <i>tɛni'n</i>
(Sh.	<b>kAṭa'ro gini šidɛ'gu</b> <i>he struck him with a knife)</i>
(Kho.	<b>thu.'ɛk-o so'ra ma'ristæi (?)</b> <i>he killed (it) with a gun (?)</i> <b>thu.'ɛk-ɛn præi (?)</b> <i>he shot (it) with a gun (?)</i>

(Sh. does not normally use the suffix **-ɛj, -ij** to indicate

<sup>1</sup> It should be admitted at once that the derivation of **-As** from **Atsi** is extremely questionable. In D. **-As** fulfils a number of functions; it acts as a Trans. Nom., Accus., and Instrum. suffix, and seems to appear in the Dat. suffix **-Ašū** (← **-As** + **iū**?). It would be natural to identify it with the Acc. and Gen. Obl. masc. suffix **-es** of Western Gypsy, which is referable to Skr. **-a-sya**, Prk. **-a-ssa** (consisting of the stem vowel of the noun plus the Gen. suffix). This would exclude the derivation of **-As** from **Atsi**. On the other hand, **-Aṭs**, which replaces **-As** in the Plur. of the Personal Pronouns in which the final vowel is accented (e.g. **Aṃ'ɛ** "we", **Aṃ'ɛts** "us"), cannot well be derived from **-a-sya**.

instrument, but the suffixes **-gi**, **-ge**, and the participle **gini** "taking". Cf., however, **wai.i han-ij**, § 27.)

14. Proceeding from these locative suffixes denoting "on", "upon", we come to what is perhaps the most significant illustration of linguistic contagion which I have to offer. This is the composition of the normal ablative suffix with nouns in Bu., D., and Sh. Kho., being in the happy possession of a perfectly orthodox Indo-Aryan ablative suffix, does not appear in this connection.

Two facts have first to be noted:—

(1) Bu., D., and Sh. have certain extremely simple ablative endings found exclusively in adverbs, with occasional exceptions in Bu. These are:—

Bu.	<b>-um</b>	which is also an adj. ending.
	<b>-mo</b>	probably a derivative from the latter appears to be usually adverbial and adjectival in force, but sometimes abl., as in <b>den-mo den</b>    <b>den-tsum den</b> <i>year by year</i> .
D.	<b>-o</b>	
	<b>-mo</b>	is an adj. ending, but has once been recorded where it is apparently an abl. suffix ( <b>a'ya-mo</b> <i>after he came, when he has come</i> : <b>a'ya</b> <i>he came</i> ).
Sh.	<b>-o</b>	
	<b>-no</b>	

(2) The Bu. suffix **-Atε** is used where "on" means "on top of" in a vertical scale.

"on" meaning more generally "in contact with", "on the surface of" is rendered by another suffix, **-tεε**,

e.g. **Pañcutε khəru buṭ bim** *there were many lice on P.*

Combining these two sets of endings we get:—

Bu.	D.	Sh.
<b>-tεε + um</b>	<b>-As + (m)o</b>	<b>-ε + 'j + o</b>
↓	↓	↓
<b>-tsum</b>	<b>-Asmo</b>	<b>-εjo</b>

which are the ordinary ablative endings with nouns and

which all represent an original meaning "from on", "from being in contact with".

15. I do not know whether similar compound endings with this significance occur as the normal ablative endings elsewhere; they certainly do not in the other neighbouring languages, Balti, Wkh., and Kho., nor, so far as I know, in the languages of the outer circle, earlier referred to. It seems reasonable therefore to suppose that this curious phenomenon, occurring in three languages, one of which is unrelated to the others, which have all been in close contact, was the invention of one and spread to the others by contagion. Again, it seems probable that it originated in Bu. which regularly adds an abl. **-um** to a number of other suffixes:—

<b>-alε,</b>	<b>-alum</b>	<b>-ulo,</b>	<b>-ulum</b>
<b>-aʔε,</b>	<b>-aʔum</b>	<b>*-apaći,</b>	<b>*-apaćim</b> (postposition)

to which Sh., as far as I know, shows no parallel.<sup>1</sup>

The position of D., however, is not clear. One would not have thought that it had been long enough in contact with Bu. to pick up such intimate devices from it. On the other hand it carries the principle further than Sh. and converts two other case-endings (of adverbial origin) into ablatives:—

<b>-ana</b>	"in"	<b>-ano</b>	"from in"
<b>-pa</b>	"beside,"	<b>-po</b>	"from the possession of"
	"to (a person),"		"from beside"
	"in the possession of s.o."		

At any rate it seems unlikely that Sh. should have been influenced by D̄umāki, the language of a people who must always have been numerically and socially inferior. D., however, owes a considerable element in its vocabulary, including its numerals, to Sh., so that we must presume contact at some time.

The close relation between the ablative and the adjectival ending in both Bu. and D. is probably not accidental:—

Bu. <b>-um</b> and <b>-mo</b>	D. <b>-o</b> and <b>-mo</b>
-------------------------------	-----------------------------

<sup>1</sup> In Hindustāni, however, the ablative suffix is also added to certain other case suffixes: **-mē-se** from *in*, **-par-se** from *on*.

16. Before leaving the subject of case endings, it may be worth while to point out the identity in form of the Bu. dative suffix *-ər* with the dative suffix of Wkh. and the Sh. locative suffix. The last is easily accounted for; it is the Sh. adverb *aru*, *aru* "in", "inside", and the final vowel is sometimes preserved in the suffix.

The Wkh. dat. *-ər* is considered by Geiger to be the vowel of the oblique case plus *-r* ← O.P. *radīy*, cf. Mn.P. *-rā*.

#### PRONOUNS.

17. Leaving the Noun and passing over the Adjective, which seems to offer no illustration of undue influence by one language on another, we come to the Pronouns. The Personal Pronouns call for no remark. It is probably only a coincidence that the 3rd sg. fem. in Tibetan and the 3rd sg. fem. Pronominal Prefix in Bu., which is also used as an independent pronoun in Werch., are both the monosyllable *mu*.

We may pause for a moment at the Reciprocal Pronouns to mention that Bu., Sh., and Balti express the idea by the use of the numeral "one" reduplicated. D. probably does so too:—

Bu.	<i>hin hin, hihin, hinin</i>	Sh.	<i>ek- ek-</i>	Balti	<i>čik- čik-</i>
	<i>han han, hahan, hanan</i>				

Kho. employs an extended form of the numeral: *iwa'li iwa'li*. Cf. also Wkh. *yu' . . . yu' the one . . . the other*.

In Bu. only the last element is inflected. In Sh. and Balti the first element where necessary takes the Transitive Nominative suffix. In Bu. and Sh. the verb is put in the plural, and in Sh. the second element usually takes plural inflection.

If there are these differences in treatment, there is still an essential resemblance which marks these languages off from Hindustani, Persian, and Pashtu, which, it will be remembered, employ expressions containing the word for "other", while Wkh. has a special word (*aləma'n, haləma'n*).

18. It is not perhaps surprising that Bu., D., Sh., Kho., and Wkh. each use the same forms as Interrogative and

Indefinite Pronouns, but one or two minor points deserve mention.

In Bu. the simple form **mən** “who?” or “anyone” is plural. To make it singular the suffix of singleness **-ən** is added to it:—

<b>mən ba'n?</b>	<i>who are they?</i>
<b>mənən bæi?</b>	<i>who is he?</i>

In Sh. the corresponding simple form **ko?** is singular. It has a regular plural **ke**. Nevertheless **ko** is commonly used with a plural verb. It can, however, be made definitely singular by the addition of the suffix **-ək**:—

<b>ko ne.i watən</b> (pl.)	<i>no one has come</i>
<b>tu ko'uk hano?</b>	<i>who art thou?</i>

19. In Bu., when the Indefinite Pronouns are used with the negative, the particle **ke** is added immediately after the pronoun. Similarly in Sh. the particle **ga** is usually added. Each is the normal word for “and”, “also” in its respective language. In D. the particle **ta** is added:—

Bu. <b>mənən ke apəi</b>	
Sh. <b>ko' ga niš</b>	
D. <b>ko'k ta na',</b>	
	and (probably pl.) <b>ko' ta na'</b>

(Cf., however, H. **ko'i bhi' ne hæi**, where **bhi'**, the equivalent of **ke** and **ga**, only emphasizes the simple statement **ko'i ne hæi**, *there is no one*).

20. Again, the effect of Indefinite Relatives is obtained by using the simple form of the pronoun (or in Sh. with **-ga** added to it), placing in Bu. **ke**, and in Sh. **to**, after the verb. **ke** and **to** in this position serve for “if” and “when”. In D. there is reason to think that the particle **ta** is similarly used with similar effect:—

Bu. **khine mənən bæi ke . . .** *whoever this is . . .*

Sh. **kese ge ka't han to . . .** *whose ever the wood is, give it to him*

Cf. D. **kabe aya ta . . .** *whenever he comes (lit. came)*

These constructions (§§ 19 and 20) do not find parallels in Kho and Wkh.

21. None of the languages under reference possesses a simple Relative Pronoun. The methods by which Bu. and Sh. supply the want seem to be very similar, but this is too complicated a subject to go into here.

22. The Numerals :—The Numeral Systems in these languages (Bu., D., Sh., Kho., Wkh., and Balti) have this feature in common that 20, the score, is used as the base of all the numbers between 21 and 99. For instance, 51 is rendered by 2-20-(and)11.

Individually the Bu. numbers are totally different from the others which, except Balti, are derived from Aryan forms. D. curiously has no word for 100 which it expresses as 5-20 *po'i bi's*. 500 is 5-5-20.

#### THE VERB.

23. Unlike Balti, the Bu. Verb possesses almost all the main features that characterize the verb in the Indo-Aryan languages, though in detail it stands entirely independent. The Transitive verb has no true Passive conjugation, but it possesses a Passive Participle which, allied with the verb substantive, can be made to fulfil some of the functions of the Passive Voice. There are moods and the familiar tenses, and there are inflectional endings distinguishing number, person, and gender, just as in, say, Sh.

On the other hand Bu. makes an extensive use of Pronominal Prefixes with its verbs, and by their means is able to represent action as affecting an indirect object, and also to convert Intransitive Verbs into Transitives, and Transitive Verbs into Causatives. Of this system there is no trace in any of the other languages under discussion.

24. There are, however, some methods in handling the verb which are shared by Bu. and Sh., and to a less extent by Kho. and D.

In Bu. the same form is used

(i) as the Infinitive,



26. Another point is the use of case suffixes with parts of verbs. This is to be expected with the Infinitive and perhaps the Static Participle, which is also to be regarded as a Verbal Noun, but it is peculiar that in the bulk of uses the result aimed at and attained is the indication of a time relationship. More unusual is the suffixing of case endings to finite parts of verbs and to verbal bases.

I will here illustrate one use of the Infinitive.

In Bu. narrative it is very common to begin a sentence with the Dative of the Infinitive of the verb of the preceding sentence, and then proceed with the next episode. This has a temporal significance and conjunctive force:—

“A. did this. On his doing it, B. died.”

Bu. *etas to do*

A. *gute etimi. etasər B. i'rimi.*

In Sh. we find the same use of the Infinitive, but with the locative suffix, which it will be remembered is also *-ər*:—

Sh. *tho'riki to do*

A.'s *anu ko'm the'gu. tho'rikər B. mu'o.*

In Kho. we find the same usage, a form of the Infinitive being used which may be regarded as the General Oblique:—

Kho. *ko'rik to do*

A. *hæia ko'rmo arə'r. ko'riko B. 'obritai.*

It is to be noted that with this construction the subject of the second finite verb is normally different from that of the first. Where the subject is the same, the Conjunctive Participle is used. The Dative Infinitive does not necessarily repeat a preceding verb.

Here the use of the Dative in Bu. and the Locative in Sh. is interesting. In Bu. the Locative Infinitive would give the sense of “at the actual time of doing”. More generally the temporal value of the Locative is “within a certain period”, i.e. “during” or “in the course of a certain period”.

Point of time is indicated in Bu. and usually in Sh. by



the Dative, but in Sh. the Locative in *-ər* is also found with this meaning.

Is it possible that Sh. has been influenced towards this usage by the fact that its Locative ending happens to be the same as the Bu. Dative ending ?

For instance, we find the parallelism :—

Bu. <i>te·ruman-ər</i>	<i>at so much</i>
Sh. <i>ḷča·k-ər</i>	<i>in so much</i>

both meaning “ at that point ”, “ thereupon ”, and introducing the next action in a narrative.

27. I now pass to the use of case suffixes with finite parts of the verb and with the verbal base.

In Bu. we have :—

<i>senabaṭe</i> ← <i>senā ba + ḷṭe</i>	<i>I have said + on = on my saying</i>
<i>dibaṭe</i> ← <i>di bæi + ḷṭe</i>	<i>he has come + on = on his coming</i>

(Perhaps in both cases *-ba-* represents *ba* the verbal base.)

*buṭṭ guntsiṅ həraṅulo o·manitsum* (← *o·mani + tsum, o·mani*  
*they have not become, -tsum abl. suffix) = after many days*  
*had not passed*

In the following the suffix is probably added direct to the Verbal Base :—

<i>ja ḷsqanṭe</i>	<i>by the slaying of me</i>
<i>meltalik traṅ etṭe</i>	<i>on our dividing it up</i>

In Sh. we similarly find :—

<i>Yu·suf mu·o</i>	<i>Joseph died</i>
<i>Yu·suf mu·ojo fatu</i>	<i>after Joseph died</i>
<i>tu ga</i>	<i>you went</i>
<i>tu ga·ejo fatu</i>	<i>after you went</i>
<i>dunya·t duli·li</i>	<i>the world came into being</i>
<i>dunya·t duli·lijo ana khye·n</i>	<i>from the creation of the world up</i>
<i>bo·siṅ</i>	<i>to the present</i>

Again, in the following **han-** and **nuš** are probably to be regarded as Verbal Bases :—

Sh. <b>lel han(u)</b>	<i>it is known</i>
<b>maṭ lel hanij</b>	<i>on its being known to me, i.e. with my knowledge</i>
<b>lel nuš</b>	<i>it is not known</i>
<b>ma, or maṭ, lel nušij</b>	<i>on its not being known to me, i.e. without my knowledge</i>
<b>wai han-ij</b>	<i>with the water there is</i>

28. There is one tense in the conjugation of the Verb in Bu. and Sh. which is perhaps the result of borrowing by one from the other. This tense is found in the Apodosis of conditional sentences where English has :—

“(I) would . . .” or “(I) would have . . .”, but it also has other uses.

In Bu. it consists of the Present Base of the Verb plus certain participial endings **-am**, **-um**, etc., which form the basis of those of the Future, followed by the particle **tse**. In Werch. it is the same, but the particle is **tsek**, **tsik**, **tsike**.

In Sh. it consists of the Future tense of the verb followed by the particle (Gilgiti) **sik**, (Puniāli) **eskai**. In Chilasi, Astori, and Gurezi Shina, however, this particle is replaced by **bele**.

It seems probable that the Bu. **tse**, **tsek** are the same word as the **sik**, **eskai** of Northern Shina.

29. The method of stating conditions is somewhat similar in Bu., Sh., and D., and essentially consists in the placing of a particle after the verb of the Protasis. As this may produce the sense of “when” as well as “if”, **agər** or **axəna** (Sh. and Bu.) may also be placed at the beginning of the clause. In Bu. the subjoined particle is **ke**, in Sh. **to**, and in D. **ta** :—

Bu. (**axəna**) in di'mi **ke** . . . *if he came, i.e. if he should come*

Sh. (**axəna**) ro wato to . . .

D. (**agər**) tahæi krom iri' ta . . . *if you did, were to do, this . . .*

In Kho. **agər ki . . .** and in Wkh. **agər kε . . .** is placed at the beginning of the "if"-clause, and there is no subjoined particle.

The resemblance of the Sh. **to**, D. **ta** to H. **to** will be remarked, but the H. **to**, as also the Pashtu **no**, seems to belong to the apodosis, not the protasis.

30. A few more points belonging to the Verb may be mentioned.

The nature of the Causatives of Transitive Verbs is somewhat different in Bu. from what it is in Sh. and Kho.

In Bu. you cause s.o. to do s.t.

In Sh. and Kho. you cause s.t. to be done (if necessary by the instrumentality of s.o.).

Nevertheless there is one point in which these languages seem to approach each other, though I must admit that the position is very obscure.

In Bu. you say :—

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (i) <b>gičam</b>                                | <i>I shall put down, etc.</i>                        |
| (ii) <b>šληλιčiq go'šər go'gičam</b>            | <i>I'll put chains on your neck<br/>(for you)</i>    |
| (iii) <b>u'ŋ haɣurətɛ tili.ɛŋ<br/>go:əgičam</b> | <i>I'll make you put the saddle<br/>on the horse</i> |

Now in Sh. we have :—

- |                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| <b>šuqa bano'iki</b>   | <i>to put on the choga</i>             |
| <b>šuqa banaro'iki</b> | <i>to cause the choga to be put on</i> |

but

**šuqa rəsət banarɛ** seems to mean *put thou a choga on him*, rather than *cause it to be put on him*.

And in Kho. :—

- |                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>di'k to give</b>               | <b>pretam</b> <i>I gave</i>                |
| <b>de'ik to cause to be given</b> | <b>de'itam</b> <i>I caused to be given</i> |

but

**həroʦɛ ya'd de'itam** *I reminded him*

It seems to me that both Sh. and Kho. use their Causative forms to function in the same way as the Bu. 2nd form which

resembles a Causative, but actually denotes the doing of an action in such a way as to affect a third party.

31. In both Sh. and Kho. the Verb "to be able" is identical with the verb "to exist", "to become". The dependent verb is in Sh. put in the simple Infinitive, and in Kho. in the Oblique form of the Infinitive:—

Sh. **anu kom tho'rk bomus** *I am able to do this*

Kho. **hæria kormo ko'riko boman** *I am able to do this*

Now in Nagiri Bu. there is an independent verb **ulanas**, **ulæi-**, meaning "to be able", which appears also, in a slightly different form (**lan-**, **læi-**), in Werch. This verb is not used in Hunza and its place is taken by **\*-amanas** (also known to Werch.), which in form is the transitive of **\*-manas** *to exist, become*.

Is this a case where Hz. Bu. has got an idea from Shina ?

32. Both Bu. and Sh. create compound verbal expressions by using a noun or adjective with some elementary verb, when a suitable simple verb is lacking in the language. No doubt this is a very common linguistic artifice, but it is not a marked feature in Kho. or Wkh. Wkh. forms compounds with the verb "to make", but in Kho. even these are not very common.

It may be to the point here to mention a few cases in which Bu. and Sh., and sometimes Wkh., agree in making a rather surprising choice of subsidiary verb.

To express the commencement of a state, or the onset of an emotion, the verb "to come" is used where the person or thing concerned is regarded as passive. This is fairly natural and parallels can be quoted from other languages, e.g. H. and Pers.

Both Bu. and Sh., however, and sometimes Wkh. are able to regard the person (or thing) concerned as active, not passive, as in English we say "he summoned up his courage", or "all the sympathy he could muster", and in this case they employ the verb "to bring"<sup>1</sup>:—

<sup>1</sup> It should be said that Bu. forms no causatives of the verbs "to come" and "to go", but uses the verbs "to bring" and "to send" to express the notions concerned.

Bu.	ja jak di'mi	(" my pity came ")	<i>I felt pity</i>
	jak dusu'yam	(" I brought pity ")	
Sh.	jak wale'gas	( " " )	
	jak aṭe'gas	( " " )	
Wkh.	(žu) rahm wezda	(" my pity came ")	
	rahm-əm w'ozəmd	(" I brought pity ")	
Bu.	amo's di'mi	(" my anger came ")	<i>I became angry</i>
	amo's dusu'yam	(" I brought anger ")	
Sh.	mai.i ro'š wa'n	(" my anger came ")	
	ro'š wale'gas	(" I brought anger ")	
	ro'š aṭe'gas	( " " )	
Wkh.	(žu) qa'r wezda	(" my anger came ")	
	qa'r-əm w'ozəmd	(" I brought anger ")	
Bu.	amo's da'atsimi	(" he made me bring my anger ")	<i>he made me angry</i>
Bu.	bi'ri juči bi	(" boiling comes ")	v.i. <i>to boil</i>
	bi'ri ditsas	(" to bring boiling ")	v.i. <i>to boil</i>
	bi'ri de'etsas	(" to make it bring boiling ")	v.t. <i>to boil</i>
Sh.	bi're wa'n	(" boiling comes ")	v.i. <i>to boil</i>
	bi're wəro'iki	(" to make boiling come ")	v.t. <i>to boil</i>
Bu.	ja daŋ jučila	(" my sleep is coming ")	<i>I am going to sleep</i>
	daŋ dusu'yam	(" I brought sleep ")	<i>I went to sleep</i>
	(Cf. causative daŋ d*-atsas	" to make bring sleep ")	
Sh.	mai.i ni'r wa'n	(" my sleep is coming ")	<i>I am going to sleep</i>
	ni'r wale'gas	(" I brought sleep ")	<i>I went to sleep</i>
Wkh.	(žu) yinu'k w'izit	(" my sleep is coming ")	<i>I am going to sleep</i>

Also :—

Bu.	daŋtse ni'yam	(" I went on sleep ")	<i>I went to sleep</i>
Sh.	ni'rij gas	" "	
	ni'rij asus	(" I was on sleep ")	

The Verb "to go" is used in one or two expressions:—

Bu.	çat ni'as	v.i. to crack
Sh.	çhat bujo'iki	
Kho.	tre'z bik	
Wkh.	pa'y rečen	
Bu.	malalq ni'as	v.i. to fall over.
Sh.	malak bujo'iki	

33. I will now give a few illustrations of analogies in linguistic technique and idioms presented by Bu. and its neighbours, chiefly Sh.

Reduplication of the non-verbal element of a compound verbal expression is a common practice in Bu. It appears to suggest continuously repeated action. In existing examples the original word is of the form of consonant + vowel + consonant, and when reduplicated it is usual to drop the final consonant of the first element of the reduplication. Examples of similar reduplication occur also in Sh., but usually without the excision of the consonant:—

Bu.	lam mana's	Sh.	lam bo'iki	to shine
	lalam mana's		lalam bo'iki	to sparkle, glitter

This reduplication is not, I think, found in the other neighbouring languages, and is so much more common in Bu. than in Sh. that we may assume that it is native to Bu.

34. In Bu., Sh., Wkh., Kho., and Balti a question is marked by a final **-a** added to the verb. In Bu. and Sh., where two alternative questions are combined in one sentence, the **-a** is added only to the verb of the first clause. One example of this has also been recorded in Wkh.:—

Bu.	çhertse du'yam-a le, bu'wertse du'yam?	<i>Shall I hold on to the cliff, or shall I hold on to the watermelon?</i>
Sh.	aš wa'm-a, loštai.eket wa'm?	<i>Shall I come to-day, or shall I come to-morrow?</i>
Wkh.	č'i'zi tey-a, heč č'i'zi na'st?	<i>Is there anything, or is there nothing? But this is a solitary doubtful example.</i>

In the only specimen in Kho. at present available **-a** is added to both verbs: **hamit tulfar asil asu'ni-a, kača asu'ni-a?** *Are these mule-horse hybrids of good breed, or are they of poor breed?*

35. In Sh. it is a common practice to add after certain simple Adverbs of Manner the Past Participle Active of the verb "to do" or the verb "to be". The Adverb is in fact often an Adjective. The Participle of the verb "to do" is used when the verb of the sentence is transitive, that of the verb "to be" when it is intransitive.

In Bu. what appears to be the Past Participle Active of the verb "to do" is used after certain Adverbs of Place when the sense is "towards". These Adverbs cannot be regarded as Adjectives or Nouns. In Kho. there are a few examples of a comparable nature<sup>1</sup> :—

Bu.	<i>i'lji back, behind</i>	<b>i'lji ne backwards</b>
Kho.	<b>Δci back, behind</b>	<b>Δci ko'ri backwards</b>
Sh.	<b>lo'ko be wa</b>	<i>come quickly</i>
	<b>čut be wa</b>	<i>come slowly</i>
	<b>lo'ko the wal'ε</b>	<i>bring (it) quickly</i>
	<b>čut the wal'ε</b>	<i>bring (it) slowly</i>
	<b>mišto, mištuk (noun?)</b>	<i>good</i>
	<b>mišto be pərujəna?</b>	<i>does he hear well?</i>
	<b>gute'i ko'm mištuk the</b>	<i>she carried on the business of the</i>
	<b>čelər'in</b>	<i>house well</i>
	<b>Δnu a'dε the fat the</b>	<i>leave it thus</i>
	<b>šat the</b>	} <b>čot the</b> <i>hit hard</i>
	<b>ku'ri the</b>	
Kho.	<b>kiča?</b>	<i>how?</i>
	<b>kiča ko'ri?</b>	
	<b>kiča bi'ti</b>	
Sh.	<b>kyo?</b>	<i>how?</i>
	<b>kyε the?</b>	
	<b>kyε be?</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Bu. **ne**, Sh. **the**, Kho. **ko'ri** *having done, doing*; Sh. **be**, Kho. **bi'ti** *having become, being*.

36. Another small point is the optional use in Bu. and Sh. of the Ablative of verbal nouns and nouns denoting time without any reinforcement to denote "after" an action, "after," "at the end of" a period of time.

So in Bu. we have :—

hu'něo sa'-tsum            *after 9 months*  
 xurts lan manum-tsum    *after the dust had passed away*

And in Sh. :—

kača'k dez-εjo            *after some days*

and I think also with the Infinitive, though fatu "after" is usually expressed :—

do'rkεjo čē'i čakuju fatu . . . *three days after giving . . .*

and in D. :—

he bađun-asmō ba'r nikhi'ta    *from the time that he had been born,*  
 na'ka                                *he had not come out*

In all cases the appropriate postposition or adverb "after" may be added.

37. In Bu. and Sh. we have also the use of the Future (= Present) plus the "when"-particle as a formula in the case where a person "goes" or "looks" and sees a certain phenomenon :—

Bu.    bəre'imi ke bađulo a'lto    *when he looked, (he saw that) there*  
          yumo'rij bitsa                *were two holes in the hide*

Sh.    čakæi to Zura Xa'tu'n    *when he looked, (he saw that) Z.*  
          su'yin                                *Kh. was asleep*

čakæi to gutər jama'at    *when he looked, (he saw that) his*  
          niš                                        *wife was (lit. is) not in the*  
     *house*

Kho. šo'i bi ki lo'li'r i de'u    *when he drew near and looked, (he*  
          asu'r                                        *saw that) there was a dēv*

(In all the above the verb in the first clause is in the Future-Present tense, and the verb in the second clause is in the Present tense.)



38. The following are a few specimens of similarity of idiom which can scarcely be attributed to coincidence. As in what precedes, the bulk of the comparisons are between Bu. and Sh. This probably indicates the actual situation, but allowance has to be made for the fact that I am not very familiar with my Kho. material nor with my Wkh. (which is much less extensive), and that I have very little Dumāki:—

Bu. \*-as ; D. (bāri) ya' ; Wkh. pɛzuw ; *heart*

Bu. \*-aso ; D. ču'ni ya' ; Wkh. pɛzuw ; *kidney*

(In Wkh. pɛzuw seems sometimes to be used for "kidney" as well as "heart", which is its normal meaning.)

Bu. asaɬɛ bila ; Sh. mai hi'j han ; *it is on my heart, i.e. I remember*

Bu. \*-asaɬɛ \*-a'atas ; Sh. hi'j thəro'iki ; *to remind*

Bu. \*-asulo bala's ; Sh. hi'r po'iki ; *to fall into the mind, i.e. to be understood*

Bu. asku'r ; Sh. pfunəɾ('ɛ) ; Kho. ispru' ; Wkh. spreɣ ; *blossom, smallpox.* (So also, however, Turkish çiçak)

Bu. \*-aspalas ; Sh. našo'iki, naša'r (noun) ; D. našæina ; *to lose, banish, exile*

Bu. \*-ləin estaqayas ; Sh. ačhi ni'lo'iki ; *to hide, i.e. close the eye*

Bu. \*-ltumal etas ; Kho. ka'r kori'k ; *to make the ear, i.e. to listen.* (Cf. Sh. kon do'iki *to give ear* ; Wkh. yiš kaɬ- *to throw ear*, but also with goɣ- *to make*)

Bu. du'sas ; Sh. nikhæi.o'iki ; Kho. nisik ; Wkh. niwuz- ; *to come, go, out ; to go up on to, to climb ; to win in a game*

Bu. \*-walas, giyaiyas ; Sh. po'iki ; *to fall ; to lose (in a game)*

Bu. \*-ts.hu'yas ; Sh. həro'iki ; Kho. ali'k ; *to take away ; to marry*

Bu. \*-lji yər ; Sh. yər fatu ; *obsequies* (\*-lji = fatu after)

Bu. gaɬutso \*-manas ; Sh. čhi'lej bo'iki ; Kho. čelæia'n-sum bi'k ; *to be menstruating.* (gaɬu, čhi'le, čelæi clothes)

Bu. *mu'to i'*; Sh. *ten ak'i*; Kho. *hani'sa tan*; D. *mutuk apañ'ε*; *now itself, at this very time, now*

39. As already stated, I have eschewed considering individual words which may have been borrowed from, or by, Bu., but I will mention two verbs which appear both in Bu. and Sh. and which in Bu. display the characteristic pronominal prefix. Unless these can be proved to be of Indo-Aryan origin, it will be legitimate to assume that they are original to Bu. and have been borrowed by Sh.

They are :—

Bu. *-khač̣i.Δs	Sh. khač̣o'iki,	<i>to shut up cattle</i>
	Present Base khač̣-a'r-	<i>in a cattle-house</i>
Bu. *-kħəranas	Sh. kħərn-ijo'iki,	<i>to delay, be late</i>
	kħərn-a'r (noun).	

There is also :—

Bu. d'i'ntsiras	Sh. disəro'iki, ditsəro'iki	<i>v.t. to spread out,</i>
	(also, queried, dinširo'iki)	<i>to lay out</i>

40. I will mention only a couple of parallels which I happen to have noted in Werch. and Kho.

In Werch. the Dative suffix is *-a*, *-ya*. The Present Base of the Verb with this suffix is used to denote "aim" or "intention" (as in Bu.) and also as a connective in the same way as the Dative of the Infinitive in Bu. (§ 26).

In Kho. the Locative suffix is *-a* and there is a Present Participle in *-au*, the Locative of which is *-a'wa*, which is also used to express "intention", etc., and also "being in the course of doing s.t.". Thus we have :—

Kho. *mro'yan kuša'wa rak birai* *his intention was to kill ibex*

Cf. Werch. *u'lə tsəra'ya rai aiyəti* *he did not wish to go in*

Kho. *yal korika dom. yal kora'wa . . . bisa wəški dom* *I shall play polo. While playing polo I'll hit the ball towards you*

Kho. *boɣaw'a pəri.a'n ra'rdu* *as they were going away the Peris said . . .*

Cf. Werch. *han (to'ti) . . . yu'ri. yu'rəa i'a i'aya . . . seni* *one parrot died. On its dying (the man) said to his son . . .*

The Kho. and Werch. forms may not be on all fours morphologically or semantically, but the resemblance is sufficient to suggest a connection of some sort between them.

41. Werch. has an alternative form of Imperfect tense consisting of the Past Base of the Verb plus an auxiliary verb :—

Sg. 1 a'stam      2 a'stuma      3 m. a'stimi, etc.

Thus :—

et-a'stam	<i>I was doing</i>
et-a'stimi	<i>he was doing</i>
et-a'stemen	<i>they were doing</i>

As Bu. this a'stam is inexplicable. But there is a past tense of the Kho. verb "to be" which appears in various forms :—

a'sistam, a'sitam, and a'stam *I was*

Forms with a'st- have been chiefly recorded from Yasin. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that Werch. has borrowed this Kho. auxiliary.

#### CONCLUSION.

This concludes our examination of Burushaski and its neighbours. It is very incomplete, and it probably lacks proportion, as it has covered only the material that was readily available, and that differed widely for the various languages. Of Tibetan I have neither material nor knowledge of my own.

We started out with certain assumptions in regard to Burushaski and its neighbours, based on considerations of topography, physical conditions, and human relationships, and drew the conclusion that if Burushaski had played any part in moulding the languages by which it is now surrounded, or had in its turn been influenced by them, the languages most likely to have played a part in this, either actively or passively, were in the first place Shina and secondarily Wakhi and Dumāki. So far as Werchikwār was concerned, we found that whatever the conditions were in older times, recent history had made interplay between it and Khowār a fact to be reckoned with.

What is then the conclusion of the whole matter ?

I think we may safely say that in most of the principal aspects of language there are certain resemblances between Burushaski and Shina which cannot be ascribed to coincidence. They do not arise from actual transference of material, but from the application of the same principles and conceptions in handling the original and quite different stocks-in-trade of the two languages. The result is that having accepted certain equations of grammatical forms, e.g. the equivalence of the Burushaski Static Participle in certain of its uses to the Infinitive of Shina, and of specific words, it is possible to translate certain sentences from one language into the other by word for word substitution.

Most of these resemblances seem to be the result of the adoption by Shina of Burushaski methods and technique. An exception is perhaps the Burushaski *\*-AMANAS* "to be able."

A proportion of the same resemblances are also to be found in the small amount of *Ḍumāki* available. This, however, does not necessarily mean that *Ḍumāki* owes them directly to Burushaski. *Ḍumāki* has evidently at some point been in close contact with Shina and may have derived them from it. This would seem likely to be so in a radical matter like the composition of the Ablative suffix.

Resemblances between Wakhi and Burushaski are few and are chiefly questions of idiom, not affecting the fabric of the language.

From *Khawār* it has been possible to quote few parallels. Such as there are, are more likely to be due to adoption at second-hand through Shina, supposing in the given case Burushaski to have been the original source.

The only important feature that I have found Tibetan to share with Burushaski and Shina is the Transitive Nominative, but the passive Agential construction with the past tenses of Transitive verbs is of course known far afield—in Kashmir, India, and Persian dialects. As regards *Werchikwār* and *Khawār*, I have not been able, as yet, to make any thorough

comparison between the two languages, but two points of interest have been observed : one may represent a borrowing by Khowār from Werchikwār, the other almost certainly reveals the appropriation and adaptation to its own forms and needs by Werchikwār of a part of the Khowār verb "to be". This unblushing rape, failing evidence to the contrary, may be presumed to have taken place since the Kator and Khushwaqt Khowār-speaking families of Chitral established their dominion in Yasin and its neighbouring districts, probably not more than 200 years ago. It ought, however, to be noted that Khowār is the speech of the small and rather isolated population of Ghizer which lies to the west of Yasin.

Much still remains to be done, both on the lines of the present essay, and in the comparative study of the vocabularies of these various languages. I have here, for reasons given, abjured the consideration of obvious loan words ; but the examination by a competent philologist of the word-stock of the whole area would reveal what words cannot certainly be attributed to any of the recognized linguistic families, and for which of them a Burushaski origin may be claimed, in the light of the existing vocabulary of Burushaski so far as it is known. The number of the latter will probably be comparatively small.

The object of the present paper has only been to show what a spacious and pleasing playground this part of the world and its languages offer, both to the worker in the field and to the scholar in his study.

