

CHAPTER TWO: THE FINGER

0. This chapter will deal with the Ir. words for ‘finger’, grouped according to their iconomastic type, and inside these groupings, according to their etymons.

Historical linguists classify FINGER among the concepts for which no ‘common’ IE word did exist. Iconymastic regularities suggest that words for ‘finger’ in IE languages had in most cases CROOKEDNESS, POINTEDNESS, EXTREMITY, etc. as their original concept sources.³² This means that the shape of the finger represents the most predictable motivation for its designation.

In Iranian, several terms for ‘finger’ are connected to the concepts of CROOKEDNESS (§ 1) or STRAIGHTNESS (§ 2). The finger’s shape is responsible for a recurrent associative pattern that equates this part of the body with a reed, a shoot, a thorn or other small and straight things, belonging to the botanic domain. Several figurative expressions have been produced in this way, whose transparency, however, has in most cases gone lost (§ 3).

The collocation of the fingers in the human body frame is a salient feature, which has favoured the recourse to conceptual associations based on contiguity (and in a few cases metaphorical mapping), with the semantic extension to ‘finger’ of terms originally referring to ‘five fingers / hand’, ‘knuckle joint’, ‘nail’, ‘paw’, etc. (§ 4).

Few Ir. terms for ‘finger’ result from a conceptualization process where SMALLNESS appears to be the source concept (§ 5). Some might be explained as the result of the metaphorical mapping FINGERS = HUMAN BEINGS, with a kindred relationship attributed to them (§ 6).

Terms for ‘finger’ evoking one of the many functions people attribute to this part of the body are very few in Iranian (§ 7). Borrowings from non-Ir. languages are not rare (§ 8).

Retracing the iconym underlying each term proved to be a difficult task. Many of the proposals advanced in this chapter are to be considered as mere conjectures; a number of problems in interpretation (both on etymological and iconological bases) still remain to be solved. Isolated terms, which I was not able to classify, are collected at the end of this chapter (§ 9).

³² Cf. BUCK 1949: 239–240; BONFANTE 1939: 206–207.

1.1. To the notion of CROOKEDNESS point Prs. *angošt* ‘finger’ and its several cognates, attested in Old- (Av. *angušta-*), Middle- (MPrs. *angust/št*, Man. Prth. *angušt*, Sgd. *angušt*, Khot. *haṃguṣṭa-*³³) and New Iranian. They are commonly referred to the IE base **ank/g-* ‘to bend’ (IEW 45–46); as for the *-st-* suffixation (cf. e.g. **pṛk^wsti-* > Engl. *fist*), which «appears in other words pertaining to the hand and its parts», see SCHWARTZ 1992: 424.

Prs. *angošt* and cognates have their IA counterparts; here belongs Skt. *aṅguṣṭhā-* ‘thumb, big toe’ with its modern outcomes (cf. EWA I: 49, CDIAL 137).

In Avestan, *angušta-* is not the usual word for ‘finger’ (see below, § 2). Taking into consideration its actual attestations (BARTHOLOMAE 1904), scholars argued that Av. *angušta-* would convey the meaning ‘finger’ only in compounds; otherwise it would mean ‘toe’. One would be led to conclude that Av. *angušta-* has undergone a semantic change, reducing its range to the specialized sense of ‘toe’, with the old sense ‘finger’ still preserved in frozen compounds.³⁴ This is also what MAYRHOFER assumes, when in EWA I, s.v. *aṅguṣṭhā-* ‘Daumen’, he quotes Av. *angušta-* ‘Zehe’. The scanty occurrences of this word in the Avestan corpus do not allow to confirm that *angušta-* means specifically ‘toe’. On the contrary, the relevant passages in which it means unequivocally ‘toe’ (four times in *Vd.* 8.70–71), where the reference to the body lower limbs is beyond discussion, induce to think that Av. *angušta-* simply means ‘digit’, just as MPrs. *angust*, Prs. *angošt*, etc. do.

The following list shows the large diffusion of the *angošt*-type forms in modern Iranian:

Prs. *angošt*, Taj. *angust*, Badaxš. *angüšt*, Madagl. *angüšt*, Tāti (Apšeron) *ængyšt* (GRJUNBERG 1963: 117), Birj. *ongoš(t)*, Qāi. *engoš*, TrbHayd. *angušt*, Šir. *angošt*, Esf.Prs. *angoš(d)*, Šuš. *angos*, Ham. *engošt*, *ongušt*, Bxt. *angust* (LORIMER 1922), *angušt* (VAHMAN – ASATRIAN 1987), Lo. (Bālā-Gar.) *añušt*, Mamas. *aṅgaxšt* (ANONBY 2003: 186), Zarq. *angošt*, Bast. *āngošt*, Lār. *angošt*;

SulKrd. *emust*, SouthKrd. *angus(t)*, *amust*, Krmnš. *angušt*, Sin. *angus*, Gor. *angušt*, Awr. *angusa*, Zā. *engišt* (TODD 1985), (Çermik-Siverek and Palu-Bingöl) *gišt* (PAUL 1998),³⁵

³³ Also spelt *hagaṣṭa*; cf. BAILEY 1979: 442a and 439b.

³⁴ In fact, as R. SCHMITT has kindly pointed out to me, only an Av. compound containing *angušta-* is attested (*darəγō-angušta-* *Yt.* 17.11).

³⁵ See also below, p. 86.

Āmor. *ešgonda* (°ĀDELXĀNI 2000), *ongošta* (MOQDAM 1949: 33),³⁶ Kah. *engošt*, Āšt. *engošt*, Vfs. *ængosde* (*ængoste* MOQDAM 1949: 33), Biz. *angöš*, Yzd. *angošt*, Kāšāni *unguss*, Mah. *uñgušt*, Ardest. *engušt*, Del. *angošda*, *ayngošdae*, Ār.-Bidg. *əgüš*, Esf.-JPrs *ongoθ*, Xuns. *ongoss*, Xur. *āngos*, Abiā. *angöšt*, Siv. *gūs* (LECOQ 1979 *gos*),³⁷ Kerm., ZorKerm. *engošt*, Nāi. *engošt* (besides *engoli*) (LECOQ 2002), Farizandi *aŋgošt*, Keš. *aŋguš* (*aŋgušt* KRAHNKE 1976: 227), Mei. *əngošt*, Nohuji *engust*, Qohr. *enüšt* (*angüšt*), Soi *ängüšt*, Gz. *engušt*, Voniš. *uŋguss*, Bohr. *engüš*, Abd. *angušt* (ŽUKOVSKIJ 1922: 110), Sed. *uŋguss*, Tarqi *angust*, Yarandi *angošt*, Nat. *əŋgošt*, *oŋgošt* (CHRISTENSEN 1930: 289);³⁸

Māz. (West.) *angis*, (East.) *angus*, (°Ali Ābād) *angust* (SOTUDE 1962), IrĀz. *āngišt* (KĀRENG 1954), (Ešt.) *angušta* (YARSHATER 1969: 58), (Sagz.) *angušte*, (Ebr., Xoi.) *angušta*, (Čā.) *anguš(t)a*, (Harz.) *ungüšt*, Gil. *angušt*, Tāl. *angušta*, (Māsule) *angišt* (LAZARD 1979), (Māsāl) *angušta* (NAWATA 1982: 108), Srx. *engošt*, Semn. *angošt(a)*, Šahm. *angošt*, Sang. *angošt*, Lāsg. *engošt*, Aft. *engošt*, Qasr. *angušd*;

Pšt. *gúta*, *gwáta*, *angüšt* (< Prs.), Wan. *nəgút*, *nogút*, Dzadr. *gwáta*, Yŋn. *angüšt*, Örm. *aŋgušt*, (MORGENSTIERNE 1932b) *n^uŋgušt*, Par. *aŋgušt*, *yošt* (*yušt* IIFL-I),³⁹ Sgl. *iŋgüt*, Išk. *iŋgit* (*iŋgišt* IIFL-II), Ydy. *oguščo*, Mnj. *agūška* (*āguškyo* IIFL-II), Šŋn. *angišt*, Bart., Xuf., Oroš., Roš., Baĵ. *ingašt* (EVŠG), Yzy. *ŋ^wašt*, Sariq. *i/iŋgašt*, *i/ūgašt*, etc.

As it clearly appears at first glance, cognates of Prs. *angošt* are widespread almost everywhere in Iranian, though not in a uniform way. In Kurdish, the *angošt*-forms differentiate Central and Southern Kurdish, where they are actually used, from Northern Kurdish, where they are not.⁴⁰ The common Bal. word for ‘finger’ is not an *angošt*-type one, even if Bal. speakers from

³⁶ The two sources differ (the former giving a form with metathesis). A derivative of this word is Āmor. *angošdak* ‘tonsils’ (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964).

³⁷ For Siv. *gos* ‘index finger’ see below, p. 131.

³⁸ A good collection of *angošt*-type forms in the Central dialects is in KRAHNKE 1976: 227.

³⁹ MORGENSTIERNE (IIFL I: 257 f.) points to the same etymological connection, though, he adds, «Av. *vīstasti*- “span” would also have resulted in Par. **yušt*».

⁴⁰ KURDOEV 1960 marks *engüšt* as “Southern Kurdish”; AMĪRXAN 1992 gives *embust* as meaning ‘Fingerbreite; Spannweite zwischen Daumen und Mittelfinger’. Cf. however *emust* ‘Finger’ in OMAR 1992.

the Lāšār (Iran) and Kang (Afghanistan) areas⁴¹ do say *angušt* for ‘finger’, taking it directly from (Afγ)Persian. I found no confirmation of Bal. *gutā* (or *gut* + obl. marker?), recorded in the sentence *anguštrī āī-gutā diyant* (“they put a ring on his finger”) and reported as Balochi Makrāni in GRIERSON 1921: 381. This form has also been quoted by MORGENSTIERNE in EVP s.v. *gūta* («lw? But also Bal. *īt* ‘brick’, *phut* ‘back’ with *t* < *št*»). Moreover, one should always consider that some forms which do exist in a given language, and are recorded by lexicographers, may be not central in the lexicon of that language, or may be restricted to specific linguistic registers, while other words, sometimes not recorded by lexicographers, may be preferred in everyday life. According to PURHOSEYNI (1991), for instance, Prs. speakers of Kermān preferably call the finger *nāxun* (see below, p. 84) rather than *angošt*, which PURHOSEYNI also records in his Kerm. dictionary.

Without entering into the merits of the complicated problem of an adequate selection of distinctive features for a new classification of Western Iranian, I would like to draw attention to the well known phenomenon of palatalization loss in the cluster *-št-* (no. 14 in TEDESCO 1921, illustrated with the couple *rāšt* : *rāst*), generally taken as a Persian, and then SWIr., feature. Though in more recent approaches to Ir. dialectology (see LECOQ 1989b or WINDFUHR 1995) this trait is no more taken into consideration, Prs. *angošt* still continues to be quoted as a “NWIr. lw.”. From the *angošt*-list provided above, it clearly emerges that the *-st-* forms (both with cluster maintained, and reduction of the cluster with loss of the final dental) are not a peculiarity of the so-called Southern varieties, as one would expect it: they occur in Kurdish and Gorāni, in a few Central dialects and in Māzandarāni. Inside the Persic group, only Baxtiāri has both *-st-* and *-št-* forms, just as Middle Persian had.

From the **ang*-base to which Prs. *angošt* belongs, several Ir. words pertaining to the anatomical domain derive. See Khot. *amga-* ‘limb’, Lir.-Dayl. *ang* ‘finger joint’ (LIRĀVI 2001: 217), to which, for IA, Skt. *aṅgá-* ‘body limb’ (EWA, I: 48) may be added.

Derivatives (with or without prothetic *h-*) and connected forms are: Khot. *haṅgari* ‘part of the body’, EBal. *angwā(h)* ‘limb, member’ (MIṬHĀ – SURAT 1970), Birj. *engam* ‘limb’, IrĀz. (Xoi.) *angela* ‘arm’, (Čā.) *angala* ‘sleeve’ (YARSHATER 1969: 35), Tafr. *angīna* ‘elbow’ (ADIB TUSI 1963–

⁴¹ See also *angušt* in ELFENBEIN 1990-I: 45 (20), in a poem written by Nūr Muhammad Bāmpušfī (the district of Bāmpušf is located southwest of Sarāwān, in Persian Balochistan).

1964), Krd. (Mahâb.) *hangil* ‘armpit’, Lo. *hangel* ‘armpit, shoulder’, (Bālā-Gar.) *hañal* ‘armpit’, Naqusāni *angila* ‘sleeve’ (DARUDIĀN 1986), etc. A detailed discussion of this lexical group is postponed to another occasion. What concerns us for now is that here also belong the words that will be treated in the next paragraph.

1.2. Prs. *angol* (with *angolak*, *angulak*) derives from **ang-*, just as *angošt* does.⁴² It does not mean ‘finger’, not, at least, in the current Prs. use, though FF gives it simply as ‘finger [*angošt*, *asba* ^ç]’. It rather means ‘a slight touch with the finger’ (HAIM 1992a, ĀRYĀNPUR KĀŠĀNI 1979, etc.), that kind of touch which may produce ‘excitation, chatouillement’ (LAZARD 1990a s.v. *angolak*). To put it briefly, nowadays *angol* is used in Persian with the meaning of ‘fingering’, i.e. (1) handling or touching with the fingers in many senses, but generally with a slight negative implication (*angošt zadan*) or (2) putting one’s finger into (*angošt kardan*), like to put finger into one’s nose, into one’s mouth, etc. To this latter sense is related an obscene sense (‘to stuff the finger up the bottom’), current in Persian (mainly with *angolak*) and in many other Ir. languages and mostly recorded in the relevant dictionaries.

It is however reasonable to think that the original meaning of this Prs. *l*-derivative form was ‘finger’; it is surely ‘finger’ in a 12th c. text, the *Muġmal al-tawārīx*, whose author was probably native to the region of Hamadān (LAZARD 1963: 119). There, Ardašēr is depicted as being *dirāz-angul* (‘long fingered’).⁴³ It still retains the meaning ‘finger’ in Fārs: cf. Dav. *angol*, Sarv. *angol*, Kāz. *angol*, etc. BEHRUZI (1969) attributes two senses to Šir. *angol*: (1) ‘finger’, and (2) ‘finger when inserted somewhere, like into the nose, etc.’. For the Baxtiāri area, ANONBY (2003: 187) gives ČLang *angoli*;⁴⁴ moving southwards one finds Buš. *angol* and Lir-Dil. *angûl*. Birĵ. *angol* ‘(1) finger; (2) to put one’s finger into someone’s bottom’ has been recorded in the Birĵ. glossary of Mollā ‘Ali Ašraf Sabuhi (19th c.) and is probably out of date; nowadays Birĵ. speakers currently use *ongoš(t)* ‘finger’. In Sistāni and Minābi, *angol* is the name of the middle finger; on the common conceptual shift FINGER → MIDDLE FINGER, see below, p. 140.

⁴² For Skt. *aṅgūri-*, *aṅgūli-* ‘finger, toe’ and its several IA cognates see EWA I: 49 and CDIAL 135.

⁴³ See quotation in DEHX, s.v. As R. SCHMITT has kindly pointed out to me, the expression *dirāz angul* referred to *Ardašēr* (*Artaxerxes*) could also be an equivalent of *dirāz dast* (*Longimanus*).

⁴⁴ According to SARLAK (2002), the word for ‘finger’ in ČLang Bxt. is *kelek*; see below, p. 63.

To find a more compact diffusion of *l*-derivatives from *ang*-forms, we have to look at the Central dialects. KRAHNKE (1976: 227–228 and Map V – 33) has demonstrated how the diffusion of these forms reinforces the northern/southern differentiation inside the whole Central area investigated by the author, already outlined by other isoglosses. A homogeneous presence of the *angol*-type characterizes the southern part, while the northern is mostly characterized by the *angošt*-type.

One may quote Nāi. *engoli*, Anār. *engili*, Varz. *angoli*, Gz. *ēṅgolī*, *ēṅgulī*, Kuhp. *eṅgulī*, Kāšāni *engulī* (MORGENSTIERNE 1932a: 40), ZorKerm./Yzd. *angol*, Sed. *uṅgulī*, Kafr. *eṅgulī*, Zefr. *uṅgūlī*, Nat. *eṅgulī*, Abčuyeyi *anguli* (KRAHNKE 1976: 227), etc.

To these forms, one should add Esf.Prs. *anguli* recorded as ‘finger’ and ‘to finger’ in DĀDMĀN 1976.

Isolated *l*-forms are found here and there in different dialectal areas, cf. Māz. *engel*, quoted by MORGENSTIERNE 1932a: 40, with most probability taken from CHODŹKO 1842: 581.⁴⁵ ELFENBEIN 1990-II⁴⁶ cites Bal. *angul* (seemingly taking it from MORGENSTIERNE *ibid.*; Noške), a form for which I found no confirmation in my interviews with Bal. speakers native to different dialectal areas. It is quite possible, however, that *angul* is (was?) used somewhere in Balochistan (under IA influence? cf. Khetr. *aṅal*, Sir. *aṅgal*).⁴⁷ From a Bal. speaker from Nasirābād I recorded *angrī*, *angurī* ‘finger’, a clear IA loanword, possibly related to Si. *āguri*.

In EIr., *l*-forms for ‘finger’ are Oss. *ængwylʒ* (Dig. *ængulʒæ*) and Wx. *yanglæk*, *yangl*: see respectively IESQJ and STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999 SV., with etymological references.

2. The common Av. term for ‘finger’ (and ‘toe’) is *ərəzu-*, a word for which only an isolated correspondence in the Oss. anatomical lexicon (Oss. *wyrz*, Dig. *urz* ‘finger-tip’) has been suggested so far.⁴⁸ The identification of

⁴⁵ CHODŹKO quotes Māz. *engel* ‘finger’ commenting the line *še keše engeli kude*. At page 581 we read: «*engeli* from انگل “a finger, (whence *enghel*, a ring),” literally, this word means “the scratching with fingers”». I found no attestation of this word in the Māz. dictionaries at my disposal.

⁴⁶ However, it does not occur in any of the texts of the *Anthology*.

⁴⁷ That Bal. *angul* could be considered as a lw. from IA has been questioned by MORGENSTIERNE (1932a: 40) and KORN (2005: 293).

⁴⁸ STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ (1999: 459 s.v. Wx. *wrzg(ə)* ‘right (of hand)’) connects some EIr. words for ‘right’ (see already IIFL II: 192) with Av. *ərəzu-* ‘straight, right’ (BAR-THOLOMAE 1904 ¹*ərəzu-*), without further comments.

the salient feature of this body part responsible for this Av. denomination is debated. The hypothesis most frequently quoted in the literature (BARTHOLOMAE 1904, IEW, BUCK 1949: 40, etc.) rests on the ability of fingers to stay upright: Av. *ərəzu-* (YAv. ³*ərəzav-* in BARTHOLOMAE 1904) would be a nominalization of the adjective *ərəzu-*, attested in Gathic with the meaning of ‘gerade, richtig, recht’ (¹*ərəzav-* in BARTHOLOMAE 1904), and would consequently belong to IE **reǵ-* ‘straight’ (IEW 854). This derivation has been strongly challenged by ABAEV (IESOJ s.v. *wyrz*): according to him, peculiar features of a finger are mobility and disposition to bend, and not capacity to be straight. ABAEV suggests a derivation from an IE base **uer-ǵh-* / *ureǵh-* ‘to turn’ (IEW 1154–1155); according to his proposal, the Av. term for ‘finger’ would evoke one of the many actions commonly performed by the fingers, which would be prototypically perceived as “claspers”, and would join the other Ir. words for ‘finger’ which find their motivation in specific functions attributed to fingers (§ 7). The quasi-isolation of Av. *ərəzu-* ‘finger’ inside Iranian makes it more difficult to take a stand and to accept one hypothesis rather than another, and it is also possible that ABAEV is right in rejecting the previous proposal.⁴⁹ What could be contested to ABAEV on the semantic level, however, is the reason of his refusal: if it is true that the fingers are highly flexible elements, it is just as true that they can be kept straight; in fact, many of the “actions” performed by the fingers are realized by straightening one or more fingers.

3. The shape the fingers assume when they are kept straight have favoured the creation of words for ‘finger’ which equate them to reeds, sprouts, branches, etc. However, the direction of the metaphorical association may also be inverted; clear instances are Taj. *panja* ‘leaf; branch’, IrĀz. *penja* ‘blade of grass poking up from the ground’ (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964), etc.⁵⁰

Among the motivations underlying words for ‘finger’, this is one of the most privileged. Fingers depicted as twigs, boughs, etc. are also found in Sanskrit; see for example *karasākhā-* ‘finger’ (< *kará-* ‘hand’ + *śākhā-* ‘branch’; Lex., CDIAL 2801), *kará-pallava-* ‘finger’ (< *kará-* + *pallava-* ‘sprout, twig’; CDIAL 7969), *śáryā-* ‘cane, shaft, arrow; finger’, *śalākā-*

⁴⁹ ABAEV’s etymological suggestion for Av. *ərəzu-* is considered untenable by R. SCHMITT (p.c.): to accept it, one should admit an unjustified loss of initial **v-*.

⁵⁰ On the *panje*-type words for ‘finger’ (FIVE → FIVE FINGERS → FINGER) see § 4.1 below.

‘any small stake or stick; finger’, etc. Evidence of the presence of this iconomastic type in Iranian will be produced in what follows.⁵¹

3.1. Although *angušt* is well established in literary Tajik, speakers of several Taj. dialects prefer using other labels for ‘finger’. In South-East Tajikistan (Kara-Tegin and Darvāz), they use *lik*, in Badaxšān and Vanj, *likak*, *likək* (ROZENFEL'D 1982); cf. also Badaxš. *lakük*, *likik*, Madagl. *lakik* in LORIMER 1922. Here possibly belongs the Bal. general term for ‘finger’, *lankuk* (variants: Noške *lunkuk*, Sarāwān *lankutk*, Mirjāve (COLETTI 1981) *langotk*, SBal. (SAYAD HASHMI 2000) *lakkuk*), spread all over Western and Southern Balochi,⁵² in connection of which MORGENSTIERNE (1932a: 40) mentions Gypsy Prs. *lekik* and Kumz. *linkit*. ELFENBEIN (1992: 252) submits a different explanation: *lankuk* «must ultimately belong» to *angul*, «through some form such as **lankul*».⁵³

Dial. Taj. *likak*, Gypsy Prs. *lekik*, Kumz. *linkit* and Bal. *lankuk* might be somehow connected with a set of adjectives, meaning ‘straight, erect, upright’, among which there are AfyPrs. *lek*, *leq*, Birj. *lek*, Sist. *lakk*, SBal. *lik*,⁵⁴ Pšt. (also Dzadr.) *lak* (‘stiff, standing, rigid, unbending’). Here might also belong Pšt. *lakáy* ‘tail of animal or bird’, Örm. *likīē* ‘tail’ (MORGENSTIERNE 1932b), and probably Haz. *lak* ‘erection, membrum virile’ (DULLING 1973).

The *lek*-‘straight’ adjectival set, mostly spread in the Iranian East, could be associated to another lexical set, more compactly diffused in the Iranian West (particularly in Kurdish, Gorāni and Lori), including words meaning

⁵¹ Possibly, one has to interpret in this perspective the Prs. expression *qolzom-e panj-šāx* ‘palm of the hand and the fingers of a munificent man’ (FF).

⁵² The current EBal. word for ‘finger’ is *murdān(ag)*; see below, § 7.1.

⁵³ STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ agrees on this point, as stated by ELFENBEIN.

⁵⁴ SAYAD HASHMI 2000. The real diffusion of Bal. *lik(k)* inside SBal. escapes me. SAYAD HASHMI 2000 mostly provides Makrāni/Coastal lexicon, but with many inconsistencies. MAYER (1910, s.v. *to erect*) marks *lik kanaga* as “South Balochi”. Cf. also *lik kanaga* ‘to erect, to cause to stand’ in PIERCE 1875. An occurrence of *likk* is found in ELFENBEIN 1983a: 24(20), in a version of the well known story of Leyla and Maġnun (*yak roĉe ātk yak dārburre, dīt-ī ki yak dāre lik-in* ‘one day a woodcutter came, he saw that a tree-trunk is standing’); the dialect of the ms. should be a Coastal one, as also assumed by ELFENBEIN (ibid.: 3). Bal. *likk* is also present in AYYUBI 2002 (SBal. of Iran, *lekk* ‘erect, firm’). A Bal. speaker from Turbat (Pakistani Makrān) told me that he does not use *likk* in this sense; however, he provided me with the derivative *likkū* ‘on tiptoe’. On the other hand, the verbal compound *likk kapag* ‘to climb’ is well known and used everywhere in Balochi.

‘shooting, bough, twig’⁵⁵ or the like. These are: KurmKrd. *liq* (RIZGAR 1993), Sul. *lik*, *liq*, SouthKrd. *leq*, *liq*, *lik*, *like*, (Mahâb.) *lik*, *liq*, (Garr.) *lâq e dâr* ‘branch’, Lak. *ġik* (‘sprout’), Gor. (Kand.) *lâq*, Bxt. *lek* (see also *lik* ‘ear of corn’ in LORIMER 1922),⁵⁶ *lak* ‘shoot, twig, blade of grass’ (LORIMER 1955: 100), Mamas. *lighghâ* ‘Baumast’, *laghâ* ‘Ast’ (MANN 1910), Gavk. *laya* ‘branch’, Dav., Dahl., Knd., Mäs. *laya*, Kâz., Kuz. *laye* ‘bough’ (SA-LĀMI 2004: 126–127), Tāl. *lok* ‘petite branche’ (MILLER 1930), etc.

3.2. The mental association (PART OF) FINGER = REED probably motivates a group of Ir. words used as general terms for ‘finger’, which may be related to Prs. *kelk* ‘hollow reed’ (a “rare” word in Prs., according to LAZARD 1990a). Such a connection has already been suggested by different scholars, among which MONCHI-ZADEH (1990: 106) for Xor. *klīk* and CABOLOV (2001) for Krd. *kilk* ‘finger’. Cognates of Prs. *kelk* are also used in the Ir. body lexicon as a denomination of ‘tail’ (mainly in Kurdish and Gorāni).

The *kelk*-type words for ‘finger’ are mostly found in Central and Southern Kurdish (as contrasted with Northern Kurdish, where *kilk* is ‘tail’), Gorāni and Lori clusters, in Lārestāni and Eastern Persian: cf. SulKrd. *kilk*, SouthKrd. *kilk* ‘finger; tail; reed’, (Krmnš.) *kelek*, (Garr.) *kelīk*, (Sennai) *kelk* etc. (CHRISTENSEN – BARR 1939: 305–306 with further references) ‘finger’,⁵⁷ Lak. *keġek*, Gor. (Kand.) *kilk* ‘Finger’, *kilikâ* ‘Zehe’, (Gahw.) *kilik* (HADANK 1930: 259–260; see there for further references), (Talahed.) *kelek*, Arāk. *kelek*, Āvarz. *kelek*, Šušt. *kelek*, Lo. *kelek*, (Bālā-Gar.) *killik* (also ‘stick’), Dezf. *kelek* (EMĀM 2000: 97), Bxt. (ČLang) *kelek*,⁵⁸ (Pāgač) *kelik*, all meaning ‘finger’. In Fārs, one finds *kelek* in (Krd.) Koruni. In SE and NE Iran, the presence of the *kelk*-type ‘finger’ is assured by Lārest. *kelik*, Farām. *kelik* ‘finger’ and Xor. *kalīk*, TrbHayd. *kelik* (see also *keliki* ‘finger-ring’),

⁵⁵ I tentatively suggest correlating them with the large group of IA words, mostly meaning ‘club, stock’, gathered in CDIAL (10875 and Add.) s.v. *lakuṭa-*; cf. also KEWA III: 84–85; EWA II: 472.

⁵⁶ The hypothesis advanced by VAHMAN – ASATRIAN (1987), connecting Bxt. *lik*, *lek* to Prs. *lik* ‘a measure for corn or dates’, seems improbable to me (unless there is some connection between the denomination of the measuring instrument and segments of reeds or the like).

⁵⁷ For a dialectal differentiation of this word (*kilg*: Kalhori of Šāhbād, Mandili, Badra, Šerwāni, Malikšây, Xânaqin, Ilām, Qasiri, surrounding of Sahana; *kilġ* Warmzyâr; *kilk* Kirmânšâh, Bilawar, Kordali, Bijâr) see FATTAH 2000: 862, 865, 869, 872, 875, 878, 882, 885, 888, 891, 895, 898, 902, 905.

⁵⁸ According to ANONBY 2003: 187, ‘finger’ in ČLang Bxt. is *aygoli*.

respectively. AfyPrs. *kelk* (Kāb. *kelk*) entered as a loanword the Parāči lexicon; at the time when MORGENSTIERNE was writing the *Addenda and Corrigenda* to the first volume of *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages* (1972), *kelk* turned out to be the usual word for ‘finger’ among the Parāči young people.

This *kelk*-group is plausibly related to another lexical set we will call conventionally *kelič*-group; however, some lexical contamination should have intervened, as it will also be suggested below, p. 170.⁵⁹ A different (in my opinion, unacceptable) etymology was advanced by EILERS (1988: 315), who analysed Krd. *kelič* as the result of a “Kürzung” process (< *anguli-* + *ēč*), very similar to that which has generated Siv. *gūs* ‘finger’.

Several dialectal variants are found in the Baxtiāri linguistic cluster. Besides the above mentioned *kelik* in the village of Pāgač and in ČLang, one may note Bxt. *kelič* (XASRAVI 1989), HafLang *kolidž* (ANONBY 2003: 186); see also (Lo.) Mamas. *kelič* ‘finger’, BoirAhm. *kilits*, Kuh Giluye *tselidz* (ANONBY 2003: 186), Baliā. *kelič* (also ‘little finger’). Isolated among the Central dialects appear Abiānei, with *kalič* as an alternative to *angöšt* ‘finger’, and Bādrudi, with *kojilu* ‘finger’, a variant with metathesis of the *kelič*-type.

To Bxt. *kelič*, one should connect Šir. *kelenj* ‘finger (usually little finger)’ (XADIŠ 2000),⁶⁰ Šir-JPrs. *kerenj*, recorded in MORGENSTIERNE 1960: 130 (where also Arazin *čelenga* ‘finger’ is quoted - with question mark), isle of Qešm *kelinč* ‘finger’ (NURBAXŠ 1990), and, proceeding eastwards along the coast, Rod. *kelenč*, *kolenč*, Horm., Min. *kelenj*,⁶¹ Fin. *kelenč* and SBšk. (Garu) *kelenč*.⁶² Add here also Bast. *kelenj pā* ‘to tiptoe’, as well as Zaq. *kelenjak* ‘cockspur’.

It is not clear whether Šir-JPrs. *kerenj* has something to do with Šir. *xeren-ǰ(āl)* ‘claw’, Kāz. *xerenj* ‘nail’ (BEHRUZI 2002), Fišarvi *xerenj* (in the idiom

⁵⁹ Xuns. *kelij* ‘dry stalk of goat’s thorn’, Zaq. *keleng* ‘twig (for fire)’, Buš. *keleng*, *kelenge* ‘branch of tree, stalk of grass’, etc. prove that the *kelič*-group and the *kelk*-group share the same transfer possibilities (body domain ↔ botanical domain).

⁶⁰ According to BEHRUZI (1969), Šir. *kelenj* is only ‘little finger’ (see also below, p. 169); according to XAZDUZ (2002: 133) it means ‘finger’. That this word is also used as a general term for ‘finger’ is assured by the following expression: *folāni kelenje kučikeye man ham nemišavad* ‘So-and-so is not up to the standard of my little finger’, where *kučike* ‘little’ modifies *kelenj* ‘finger’ (XADIŠ 2000).

⁶¹ According to SKJÆRVØ (1975), Min. *kelenj* usually means ‘nail’; on the possible conceptual shift FINGER ↔ NAIL, cf. also below, p. 84. The usage of *kelenč* as ‘nail’, however, is not confirmed by the data collected by BARBERA (2004), where *penj* is ‘nail’ and *kelenč* is ‘finger’.

⁶² This word is contained in an unpublished lexical list collected by G. BARBERA, who kindly put his material at my disposal.

xerenjalubeko ‘give a scratch with the point of your fingers’, EQTEDĀRI 1963: 75), Dav. *xerenj* ‘claw, talon’, Buš. *xerenj* ‘to scratch’. The similarity of the forms *kelenj/kerenj*: *xerenj* may only be apparent and casual; it seems however likely that some blending has occurred.⁶³

There are two words for ‘finger’ in Farāmarzi: *kelik* (mentioned above) and *kenjel*. The latter could belong to the *kelič*-group (with a metathesis and a nasal insertion). Moving westwards along the coast, we find Buš. *kelang* ‘finger’.

Both the *kelk*-group and the *kelič*-group will be reconsidered below (Chapter seven: The little finger).

3.3. Dial. Taj. *čilik* (Darvāz, Kara-Tegin: ROZENFEL’D 1982: 203)⁶⁴ and possibly Arazin *čelenga* ‘finger’⁶⁵ could be associated to a bulk of Ir. words for twigs, pieces of wood, sticks, wooden chips etc., among which one may mention Sang. *čelkê*, Semn. *čelki*, Šahm. *čilekâ*, Lāsg. *čile*, Srx. *čilik* ‘chopped wood; small pieces of wood’, Māz. (Āmol.) *čele* ‘branch’, *čeli* ‘thin branch’, *čelekâ* ‘wood chips resulting from cutting a tree with a hatchet’ (with *čelke* metaphorically meaning ‘small change’), Tāl. *čila* ‘dry and thin branches used as a fuel’ (ABDOLI 2001), Aft. *čile* ‘small pieces of wood’, *čelle* ‘branch’, Damāv. *čel* ‘thorn’, *čelke* ‘fragment of anything’, *čilak* ‘small piece of dry wood’; IrĀz. (Tākest.) *čela* ‘staff’ (YARSHATER 1969: 58), KurmKrd. *čilak*, *čelak* ‘thin cudgel’ (*čil* ‘branch; twig’, *čil* ‘sprout, stalk’ KURDOEV 1960; *čilo* ‘branches (cut with leaves to feed animals)’ RIZGAR 1993), SouthKrd. *čil*, *čalang* ‘branch’, *čilka* (with metathesis, *čikla*), *čilik* ‘short and thin branch of tree’, (Krmnš.) *čileg* ‘firewood’, Sul. *čil* ‘branch’, *čilke* ‘twig, kindling’, Šir. *čileh* ‘small pieces of wood; thin branch’, Gavk. *čilak* ‘dry, thin branch’, Somy. *čiläk* ‘Stöckchen’ (MANN 1909), Sarv. *čilæ* ‘small and thin pieces of wood’, etc. However, Taj. *čilik* and cognates,

⁶³ Šir. *xerenj(āl)* etc. might share with Šir *xenjāl* (XADIŠ 2000), *xenj* (XAZDUZ 2002: 229), Lār. *xenj* ‘scratch’ (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964), Fin. *xenj* ‘nail, claw’ a phonosymbolic origin. Worth noting is also Šir. *kelenjār*, *kerenjāl* ‘crab’ (XADIŠ 2000; see also Dašt. *kerenjāl*), with *r/l* alternation and dissimilation, which could have something to do with our *kelenj/kerenj*.

⁶⁴ See also KALBĀSI 1995 and MOSALMĀNIĀN QOBĀDIĀNI 1997: 32. Taj. *čilik* seems to be currently used in Yaḡnobi as well; it appears in many sentences quoted in MIRZOZODA 2008 (both in the Yaḡn. examples and in their Taj. translations).

⁶⁵ Arazin *čelenga* has been connected to Šir-JPrs. *kerenj* by MORGENTIERNE (1960: 130); see above p. 64.

among which Prs. *čelk* ‘little finger’,⁶⁶ could also be explained in a different way; see below p. 89.

To (dial.) Taj. *čilik*, ORANSKIJ (1983: 123) doubtfully connects *čimčiloq* / *čimčaloq*, a word for ‘finger’ used in Jugi (*jugi*), one of the Tajik-based argots; for a different explanation see below, p. 172.

3.4. Kurm. Kurdish has two different words for ‘finger’: *pêçî* (see § 4.5.) and *tîlî* (variants: *telî*, *tillî*, *tîlik*). One also finds *tîlî* ‘finger’ in the Krd. dialect spoken in Jabal Sinjār (Irāq; cf. BLAU 1975) and *til* in the dialects of Başqale and Zaxo. According to AWRANG (1969), *til* ‘finger’ is a Zā. word. A cognate word (or a lw.?) is also found in the Lori area: cf. Mamas. *tilu* ‘finger’ (ANONBY 2003: 186), to which one may add Lo. *kalak-e tîla* ‘little finger’ (see below, p. 171). The origin of this Krd. word is not clear. JABA – JUSTI (1879, s.v. *tilou* ‘doigt’) mention a few words from Ugric and Caucasian linguistic areas, which sound similar to the Krd. one. I suggest regarding it as an original figurative expression motivated by a metaphorical mapping and connecting it to a bulk of Ir. words for thorns, stalks, spikes, twigs etc., as is the case with Prs. *kelk*.

Consider the following: SouthKrd. *til* ‘stalk of grass’, KurmKrd. *tîla* ‘branch’, *têla* ‘stock; rod; tree’ (KURDOEV 1960), Lak. *tîl* ‘offshoot; sapling just planted in the ground’, Zā. (Çermik) *telî*, (Palu) *telu* ‘thorn, bone(splinter)’, Lo. *til* ‘sapling just planted in the ground’, (Bālā-Gar.) *tîl* ‘cutting, twig’, Xuns. *tîla* ‘shoot; young tree’, Siv. *tîl* ‘thorn’,⁶⁷ Māz. *tali*, (Sār.) *tali*, *talū*, Šahm. *tali*, Šahr. *telu* ‘thorn’, Tāl. *telə* ‘sapling of a fruit tree’, etc. Ruhi Anārjāni, the author of a very important document (*Resāle*) written in Ir. Āzari, which goes back to the 16th/17th c., used IrĀz. *til* ‘sapling’ in the metaphorical sense of ‘male genital organ’ (REZĀZĀDE MALEK 1973). In the Birjāndi dialect as it was spoken in the 19th c. and recorded by Mollā ‘Ali Ašraf Sabuhi, *tel* was used with the sense of ‘chopped straw, sweeping’; nowadays Birj. *tel* means ‘refuse, dross’.

⁶⁶ See below, p. 170.

⁶⁷ EILERS (1988) suggested deriving Siv. *tîl* ‘Dorn’ from *tîγ* [« < *tîγ* (phl. *tēγ*) + deminutivem -*al*? Np. *tîγāl* “(Tier-) Lager, Nest” ← “Dorngestrüpp”»], most probably because he was not aware of the large diffusion of the *tîl*-‘thorn’ type. HEJĀZĪ KENĀRĪ 1995 interprets Māz. *tali* as the result of an improbable composition (*ta-* [< Prs. *tîγ*, Phl. *tex*] + *-li* [< Phl. *lwtk* ‘naked’]).

Prs. dictionaries record *talu* ‘thorn’ (see DEHX for references). This word has no entry in FF, and is possibly a “dialectal” (< Māz. ?) term. In EIr., we find Pšt. *tīláy* ‘shaft of arrow, stalks of corn after separating the heads’.

Bal. *tīlī* ‘stalk of wheat; match of box’ only belongs to the EBal. lexicon (MAYER 1910, GILBERTSON 1925, MIṬHĀ – SURAT 1970). EBal. *tīlī* has been borrowed from IA; cf. Si. *tīlī* ‘a thin stalk of wheat; a match’, Sir. *tīlá* ‘the final ends of reed of jungle grass etc.; a straw of wheat’; *tīlí* ‘(1) the same as *tīlá*, but shorter bits; (2) a match; (3) a twig held in left hand of drummer, on the bottom’ and also Ur./Hi. *tīlī*, *tīlī*, *tulī* ‘a wooden or iron bar or wire (as of a bird-cage, etc.); the calf (of the leg)’.⁶⁸ One could add here Bal. *tiling* (MIṬHĀ – SURAT 1970), *tilkuk* (RAZZAQ – BUKSH – FARRELL 2001) ‘peg, wooden pin’, *tilk* ‘piece of wood with pointed ends, etc.’ (SAYAD HASHMI 2000), and perhaps also SBal. *ḏīl* ‘small stick, reed’ (RAZZAQ – BUKSH – FARRELL 2001), *ḏīl*, *ḏīllung* ‘long and thin object, like the stalk of a plant or a reed’, if the alternance *t/ṭ/d/ḏ* is convincingly explained. As metaphoric transfers into the anatomical domain, one may quote Bal. *ḏīl* ‘(human) body; stature of a person’; *daste ḏīl* ‘forearm bone’, *pāde ḏīllung* (SAYAD HASHMI 2000), *tīlling* (Turbat)⁶⁹ ‘shin-bone’. Bal. *ḏīl* matches with Br. *ḏīl* ‘body’ (Bal. Pšt. Si., cf. ROSSI 1979: 181).

Bal. *tāl* ‘branch; stalk of wheat; matchstick’ and Pšt. *tāl* ‘branch’ are probably borrowed from IA, as well,⁷⁰ cf. the IA words collected in CDIAL 5546. Here might also belong Lārest. *tāl* ‘limb, stature; height of a tree’. It is not clear if there is any direct etymological connection between an Iir. **tāla-/dāla-* type group and the Iir. lexical group, to which e.g. Krd. *til*, Ur./Hi. *tīlī*, *tīlī*, etc. would belong.⁷¹ In any case, contamination should have occurred between the outcomes of the two bases, with cross-borrowings both in and across Ir. and IA.

We may assume the existence of an areal lexical cluster crossing the borders of two or more linguistic families, referring to segments of trees/plants and metaphorically to body parts. I do not intend to dwell too much on this matter here. Suffice it to mention Oss. *tala* ‘sapling; branch, etc.’, which ABAEV (IESOJ) derives from Turk. *tal* (also *dal*) ‘sapling; branch; stick’ and

⁶⁸ Br. *tīlī* ‘splinter, stalk, spike’ has been borrowed from Bal. or directly from an IA language; cf. ROSSI 1979: 1330.

⁶⁹ I recorded *tīlling* from a single Bal. speaker native to Turbat; this word, however, was unknown to other Bal. speakers from the same dialectal area, which I consulted in search of a confirmation.

⁷⁰ Cf. NEVP, s.v.

⁷¹ Some of the IA words collected in CDIAL 5904 could also be associated here.

relates to several Caucasian words as well.⁷² The documentation provided by ABAEV may be enlarged and include the Ir. and IA forms quoted above, or at least a part of them.

3.5. Besides *kilk*, *angust* and *qamk* (see above pp. 56, 63 and below p. 84), another word for ‘finger’ in Central and Southern Kurdish is *pil/pîlk*.⁷³ It seems to be the usual word for ‘finger’ at Suleymania. This Krd. word is not isolated in Iranian; cognates are attested elsewhere, even if discontinuously. In order to sketch out a possible lexical family, it will be useful to consider the semantic range covered by the Krd. lexical set to which *pil/pîlk* belongs.

HAZĀR (1990) provides the following separate entries: (a) *pîlk* ‘finger’; (b) *pil* ‘hand; finger; thin offshoot of a tree; shinbone’; (c) *pal* ‘limb (any arm and leg); wing of a bird; branch; thorn; arm (hand and arm)’; (d) *pîl* ‘shoulder; limb (arm/leg)’; (e) *palik* ‘branch’; (f) *balak* ‘shinbone’; see also *sarpîl* ‘shoulder’, *pâwpil* ‘leg from the foot to the knee’. Worth mentioning in BĀBĀN 1982 are: *palân*, *pilân* ‘bone’ (s.v. *ostoxān*), *pêša-u-pilânî badan* ‘skeleton’ (s.v. *askalat*). Beside *pil/pîlk* quoted above, WAHBY – EDMONDS (1966) also provide *pel* ‘arm, limb, wing, branch’; see also (Sul. etc. dialects) *das-û-pil* ‘hand and fingers’ in MACKENZIE 1961: 140. DARVIŠĀN (1996) gives Krmnš. *pal* ‘arm; branch of a tree’ and the compounds *pal-o-pâ* ‘foot and heel [*pâ-o-pâšneye pâ*]’, *pâw pal* ‘legs [*par-o-pâ*]’; effort [*dast-o-pâ*]’; *das-o-pel*, *das-o-peleng* ‘hand [*dast-o-panje*]’. SAFIZĀDE (2001) mentions *pil* ‘finger’, but also ‘little finger’, *pêl* ‘shoulder’, *pal* (Gor. ‘wing of bird’) ‘arm, arm from the elbow to the shoulder; piece; limb; body part’. For Kurmancî, CHYET 2003 provides *pil* (also *pil*) ‘arm (from shoulder to wrist); shoulder, shoulder blade’, *pî* ‘shoulder blade’; KURDOEV 1960 has *pel* ‘shank/leg’, *pîl* ‘shoulder blade; arm (from shoulder to wrist)’; RIZGAR 1993 has *pîl*, *pî* ‘shoulder blade’. However, *pîl* ‘shoulder blade’ may belong to another lexical group, which I will deal with elsewhere, and should be detached from here.

If one analyses all the senses recorded by the different Krd. dictionaries for the forms quoted above, one may easily recognize a conceptual homogeneity: they refer to spindle-shaped objects like young branches, etc., which

⁷² As far as Khot. *tîla-* (‘tree, shrub’ in BAILEY 1979, quoted in IESQJ) is concerned, it has been convincingly demonstrated that it is «merely the expected Prakritic form of Sanskrit *taila* ‘oil’» (EMMERICK 1982).

⁷³ SAFIZĀDE 2001 labels *pîlk* ‘finger’ as “Kurmānji”; however, the documentation at my disposal does not confirm it.

may be equated to the human upper and lower limbs: the arm, the hand, the finger, the leg.

Outside the Kurdish area, we find the following words: Lo. *pal* ‘ear of corn, branch of tree’, Xuns. *pelāra* ‘vine shoot’, Box. *palang* ‘young, small twigs of a tree’ (ŠĀLČI 1991), Sist. *pal* ‘ear (of corn); branch of a tree’ (AFŠĀR SISTĀNI 1986), *plung* ‘small heap [*xarman-e kučak va mohaqqar*] (of barley, corn or even fodder), either threshed or not threshed’, Gil. *pil* ‘thorns of rice or corn ear’ (PĀYANDE 1987: 635), etc. We could add here a few words for ‘stick’ or similar objects, such as Prs. *pel*, Nāi. *pel* ‘the piece of wood which is struck in the game of tip-cat (in Prs. *alak dulak*)’, IrĀz.-Tāl. *pel* ‘wooden crowbar’ (ABDOLI 2001), Kerm. *pal* ‘shepherd stick’, etc. All or some of them might belong to the lexical family under discussion.

As far as the anatomical lexicon is concerned, worth noting is a word for ‘finger’ found in Fārs, which could be related to Krd. *pil/pilk*. This is Dav. *peleng* (SALĀMI 2002), *piling* (SALĀMI 2004: 64), Šir. *peleng*, Kāz. *piling* ‘finger’. In his list of IrĀz. words occurring in written texts, ADIB TUSI (1992) quotes *pal* ‘arm’ (no. 1904) cross-referring to *pel* ‘small stick used to play *alak dulak*’ (no. 1554). In the Māz. variety spoken in Āmol, *pele* is ‘arm [*baḡal*]’.

Šir. *peleng* also occurs in the idioms *peleng zadan* ‘to finger’ and *sar-e peleng budan* ‘to be happy’ (see also Zarf. *sar-e peleng (bidan)* ‘(to be) happy’). In Širāzi, one also finds *pel* in *pel* (also *pelpel*) *zadan* ‘to struggle [*dast-o-pā zadan*]’ (XAZDUZ 2002: 72–73) and in the copulative compound *dast-o-pel* ‘hand/arm’. In his repertoire of Colloquial Persian, MONTEIL (1954) mentions *pal* ‘main; doigt’ as an argot form (*lāti*) found in the expression *dast-o-pal* ‘les mains’ (from Sādeq Hedāyat); however, he considers this argot expression as a variant of Coll.Prs. *dast-o-bāl* ‘arms and legs (of human beings)’. In NAJAFI 1999, *dast-o-pal*, equivalent in meaning to *dast-o-par*, is given as ‘arms (of human beings)’, and by extension, ‘arms and legs; arms and face’; see also Dašt. *des-e pel* ‘hands and face’ (*des-e pelete bušur* ‘wash your hands and your face’), Buš. *dast-o-pal* ‘struggle [*dast-o-pā*]’, Xuns. *das-peleng* ‘medium, means’ (AŠRAF ALKETĀBI 1983: 442), which can be connected with Krmnš. *das-o-pel(eng)* etc. cited above. Further compounds, probably also containing *pel*-forms, are Badaxš. *pišpila* ‘palm of the hand’ (ŠĀLČI 1991), Bxt. (ČLang) *palmačča* ‘hand, fingers and palm of the hand’, Bxt. *par peleng* ‘finger tip’, Prs. *pal-o-pā* ‘foot’, Lo. *pelepiz* ‘calf of the leg; leg (thigh and shank) [*par-o-pāče*]’. I would not exclude the possibility of reconsidering Prs. *pel* ‘heel’, which HENNING (1939: 98), «on account of its *l* from *d*», explained as an Eastern (Sogdian) lw. in New Per-

sian, having replaced a «genuine Prs. *pai*», and reinterpret it as a form of our *pal-/pil*-family.

It is quite easy to understand how words for ‘snap of the fingers’ or ‘filip’ can derive from words originally meaning ‘finger’ or ‘part of a finger’. From SouthKrd. *pîlk* derives *pîlke* ‘fillip’. Similarly, one finds Šir. *pelengak*, Zaraq. *peleng(ak)*, Sarv. *peleng*, Buš. *peleng(ak)* (and its metathesized variant *pengalak*), Lārest. (Lār., Ger.) *pelenga*, Fin. *pelenga*, Bast. *pelenjo āškāstāi* ‘fillip; snap of finger’. See also Prs. *pelengak* ‘sound of fingers’. Should one add here Farām. *pelek* ‘to lick one’s own fingers [*angošt lisidan*]’?

To conclude, I will mention Bal. *palk* ‘forearm’, which I recorded from a Bal. speaker native to Noške. Since Bal. *palk* ‘forearm’ has not been confirmed by any other Bal. speakers, and available dictionaries and glossaries do not record it, one could suspect that its presence in my informant’s idiolect was due to an interference with Brahui, his mother-tongue (in fact, he is bilingual). While Bal. *palk* is recorded as ‘sheet of metal or wood (used as door shutter); keel’, Br. *palk* means (1) ‘plank’ and (2) ‘pipe-bone of the forearm’. ROSSI (1979: A276) inserts Br. *palk* in his list A, containing Br. borrowings from Balochi. But if the sense ‘plank’ is common to both Br. *palk* and Bal. *palk* (‘sheet of wood or metal’; see ELFENBEIN 1990-II, BARKER – MENGAL 1969, SAYAD HASHMI 2000), how would Brahui have developed the meaning ‘pipe-bone of the forearm’, not attested in Balochi?⁷⁴ Marw Bal. *palk* also means ‘piece’ and the iterative expression *palk palk* is used to say ‘in pieces, in splinters’ (ELFENBEIN 1963; see e.g. Marw Bal. *dār palk palk int* ‘the wood is in pieces’); cf. SouthKrd. *pal* ‘piece’ (SAFIZĀDE 2001) above and perhaps (with a different formative) Bard. *pilāšk pilāšk* ‘to bits (mainly said of dried wood to be burnt)’. A semantic development ‘plank’ → ‘piece’ (or *vice versa*) is however not obvious, nor is easy to link ‘plank’ and ‘(pipe-bone of the) forearm’. In any case, if Br. *palk* ‘pipe-bone of the forearm’ is Iranian,⁷⁵ as I assume, one should perhaps search outside Balochi to find its source. This matter, however, is beyond the scope of the present work.

3.6. At first sight, Ygn. *pax* ‘finger’ appears isolated in Iranian. Besides *pax*, we find its side-form (a derivative?) *páxa* ‘the five fingers/the palm’

⁷⁴ See also Skt. *phálaka-* ‘board’, on whose etymology there is no agreement; cf. CDIAL 9053, EWA II: 202 (where the attribution to PHAL ‘to burst’ remains as dubious as it was in KEWA II). TURNER and MAYRHOFER do not refer to any Ir. forms.

⁷⁵ After the inclusion of Br. *palk* in a Dr. group ← IA proposed in DBIA 257, which justifies its exclusion from DED², this word has been not commented any more.

(ANDREEV – PEŠČEREVA 1957), ‘the four fingers, thumb excluded’ (XROMOV 1972), *paxxa* ‘the five fingers’ (MIRZOZODA 2008). The semantic relationship between *pax* and *páxa* is unclear to me; I cannot understand why *paxa* would convey in itself the notion of plurality, referring to all the fingers of a hand, as the Russian and English definitions provided by ANDREEV – PEŠČEREVA, XROMOV and MIRZOZODA let think. On the other side, the entry *paxxa* ‘finger’ in MIRZOZODA – QOSIMI 1995, the Taj. equivalents (namely, *angušt, lelak, panja*) and the Yḡn. examples provided by MIRZOZODA 2008 (see for instance *awi uxš paxxayi ast* ‘he has six fingers’, s.v. *paxxa*), the Yḡn. names of individual fingers containing *páxa*, for which see below, all run counter this assumption.

At my knowledge, no proposal has been advanced so far to etymologize Yḡn. *pax(a)*. In what follows I will try to suggest, even if with many reservations, possible connections with other Ir. words on the basis of predictable conceptualization patterns.

In Av. *Vd.* (9.14) one finds the adjectival compound *nava-pixa-* ‘mit neuen Knoten’ (BARTHOLOMAE 1904), describing a peculiar feature of a stick used in ritual functions. In correspondence with it, the Phl. translation has ‘9 *pixag*’. Since 9 *pixag* is glossed with ‘9 *grēh*’, one might deduce that *pixag* was not recognized as a current term at the time of the translation and/or commentary: it required therefore further explanation. It could be, e.g., an Av. word in Phl. garb (and in this case the existence in Middle Persian of a word sounding *pixag* and meaning ‘knot’ would be excluded), or it could be an areally (or otherwise) connoted word. In fact, a graphic sequence which may be read *pixag* occurs several times in different Phl. texts, always in the phrase *pad pixag šustan*, and always in connection with ceremonies of purification. But the reading and therefore the interpretation of this sequence remains disputable and no general agreement has been reached so far.

The reading *pyxk* (‘[the stick of nine] knots’) advanced by TAVADIA in the *Šāyest nē-šāyest* for a word «always written p aak, as if *pēšak*» (1930: 9–10 [13]) has been challenged by HENNING (1937: 92), who suggests reading *pyšk* and translating ‘membrum’, with reference to Sgd. *pyšyy* ‘id.’⁷⁶ For the

⁷⁶ In Man. Sgd. one finds the graphic variants *pyšyy* and *pyš'k*; see also Buddh. Sgd. *'stkpys'y* ‘(bony) limb’. Here belong SouthKrd. *pēše*, Awr. *peša* [= Sinnai], Biz. *pīšā* (MAZRA'ATI *et al.* 1995), Dav. *pešek* ‘bone’ and Bast. *pešāk*, Farām. *pešak* ‘wrist’. Though with many reservations, one is tempted to connect here also Sgd. *pyšnw* (reading not compelling), occurring in the list of body limbs edited in SUNDERMANN 2002: 143, for which SUNDERMANN, just as a guess, suggests translating ‘forearm’, «as beside ‘(upper) arm’ and ‘elbow’ a word for ‘forearm’ may be expected» (ibid., fn. 63). In that list the word for

subsequent interpretations of the relevant passages, HENNING's siding has been crucial but not decisive, having been accepted by some scholars and rejected by others. Criticism is in TĀVUSI 1986: 143, while MAZDĀPUR (1990: 52 n. 53) lists the reasons which should lead to prefer the reading *pēšag* 'membrum'. According to KAPADIA (1953: 464), our Phl. word, which he reads *pīšak*, «originally means a Knot in a stick and it implies, as a part of the whole, the particular religious ceremonial of washing or purification, after pollution, more especially after contact with a dead body. The chief implement in this purificatory ablution is a *pīšak*, a stick of nine knots, to which a ladle of lead or iron is attached to pour out *gomēz* (sanctified urine of a bull) on the contaminated person. The idiom [...] (pa-pīšak-šōstan) refers to this *Barasnum* ceremony». A detailed description of the same instrument is given by KOTWAL (1969) in his *Supplementary texts to the Šāyest nē-šāyest*: «a nine knotted stick, technically called *naw-girē*; among the Parsis a *kostīg* is tied with nine knots round a bamboo stick to which a leaden spoon is attached. *Nīrang*, *āb* and *xāk* (fine gravel) are poured during the *barašnūm* ceremony». There, the name of the instrument is given as *pixag*, and not *pē/išag* (see *Glossary*, s.v. *pixag*). KOTWAL's transliteration of the word (*pyyhk*; XII.27⁷⁷) rests on the fact that the signs HENNING reads š may be read *yh* as well; according to GIGNOUX (1984: 184 n. 1), *pyyhk*, which he proposes as a different reading of the sequence previously read *pyšk* ('occupation, business') in the *Ardā Wīrāz Nāmag*, ch. 38, is «une graphie défective mais usuelle pour *pyhk*, *pyxg* 'noeud', abréviation pour *nō-pixag* (= av. *nava-pixəm*) : '(bâton) à neuf noeuds' utilisé dans la cérémonie

'wrist' is also lacking; but how to explain the final *-nw* ? In the same dialectal area of Bast. and Farām. (SE Iran), *pešak* appears to have developed the meaning of 'muscle'; cf. Lārest. (Lār., Ger.) *pešak-pā* 'calf of the leg' and *pešake-das* 'biceps' [unless the latter lexicaled phrase should not be analyzed as containing the word for 'cat']. As for the actual status of MPrs. *pēšag* 'limb', note the asterisk marking as doubtful the headword **pēšag* 'limb, member, part' in MACKENZIE 1971; cf. also KAPADIA 1953: 464. Whatever may be the state of affairs in Pahlavi, which is (if any) the relationship between the lexical group for 'limb' of Sgd. *pišē*, Krd. *pēše*, etc. and Av. *pištra-*, MPrs. *pēšag*, Prs. *piše* 'profession, caste', etc. ? The close analogy between the human body and the social body, both made up by different parts, is repeatedly stressed in the Phl. literature (see for example GIGNOUX – TAFAZZOLI 1993: 169, 18). May we recognize here a metaphorical extension from a source SOCIETY to a target BODY? Or should we envisage a connection between the anatomical *piše*-group and Zarg. *piše* 'hollow cane', for which see below, p. 73?

⁷⁷ The quoted passage proves that our Phl. word denotes an instrument, and not a generic body limb which has to be purified; the usage of the *pixag* avoids the contamination of the bowl containing *āb* and *gōmēz*.

du *baršnūm*. Le mot désigne par extension la cérémonie elle-même». GIGNOUX' stance on this matter is also adopted by VAHMAN (1986: 254; see there for further literature). It could be added however that a few modern "dialectal" words for 'reed' might support HENNING's reading <pyšk> (but not his translation); e.g. Zarq. *piše* 'hollow cane, also used as a device in medical practice'.

To Av. *pixa*-⁷⁸ and Phl. *pixag* belong Khwar. *pyxk* 'node' (HENNING 1956: 436)⁷⁹ and, in the body lexical domain, Man. Prth. *pw(x)g* 'joint (of the body)' (HENNING 1937: 87), occurring twice in the Manichaean hymn *Angad Rōšnān* in syntagmatic connection with the word for 'digit': *angušt puxag* (l. 11a) "joints of [my] toes" and *harwēn puxag čē dast ud angušt* (l. 12a) "each joint of [my] hands and of [my] fingers" (BOYCE 1954: 122-123). The Sgd. translation accompanying the Prth. text of this last verse reads *'rtmy s't dšty 'ty 'ngwšty pyxt* (ibid., fn. 4).⁸⁰ As already dubitatively suggested by BENVENISTE (1940: 229: «*pyy* peut-être av. *pixa* «*nœud* »»), the same Sgd. word could also be found in P14, l. 26. Unfortunately, the text is badly damaged; it is certain, however, that the topic of the relevant passage is about fingers and their movements. I would add here even Prs. *pekk* 'joint of fingers or toes',⁸¹ as well as Rod. *pik* 'to stretch one's own finger towards someone else as a gesture of mockery'.

The pl. ending *-t* of Man. Sgd. *pyxt* in the line quoted above points to a heavy stem; *-y-* should represent a long vowel.⁸² Connecting Sgl. *pēx*, Ydy. *pīx* 'span from thumb to index-finger' (< **paixa-*) to Av. *pixa-* 'knot, joint in a reed', MORGENSTIERNE (IIFL-II: 242) postulated two different protoforms with vocalic alternation. Should we reconsider Phl. *pyyhk*, interpreting it not as «une graphie défective» (GIGNOUX), but as a variant of *pyhk/pyxk* with a long vowel?

⁷⁸ To this Av. word TREMBLAY (2005: 180) doubtfully refers Pšt. *pax* 'scab' ("Etym. unknown" in EVP; absent in NEVP).

⁷⁹ See also *byxk*, *byxyk* "Knoten (im Schilfrohr; Zwinge (?), an der Lanze)" in BENZING – TARAF 1983, where a reference to Prs. *bēx* 'id.' is also made (but Prs. *bix* [*bēx*] means "root, bottom" and should be kept apart).

⁸⁰ According to SIMS-WILLIAMS (1983: 44), *pw(x)-ty*, quoted in HENNING 1937: 87, «appears to be a superseded reading of this same form».

⁸¹ EILERS (1979-II: 717) suggests a connection between Prs. *pekk* and the form *pākk* occurring in the Gz. syntagmatic compound *pākk-o-pōlū* 'Rippen und Kreuz', also found in Prs. (*pakk-o-pahlu*) and in several dialects («Dabei ist *pākk* eventuell identisch mit np. *pik* 'Gelenk'»). I would rather consider Gz. *pākk-o-pōlū* as the result of a special and very productive Ir. lexical device which produces alliterative compounds of the type *Cak-*(*o*-)C. (where C represents any initial consonant); see FILIPPONE 2006: 370.

⁸² Cf. Sgd. *pīx* in GHARIB 1995.

The mental association between JOINT OF THE BODY and JOINT OF A PLANT (with ‘joint’ I mean not only the place where two parts [bones or vegetal segments] meet, but also the part or space included between two articulations, knots or nodes) does not require much explanation, being a cognitive salient and privileged conceptualization path; several instances may be quoted of single Ir. words denoting (at a synchronic or a diachronic level) both the knuckles (or the phalanxes) of fingers and the knots in a stalk; I will mention in what follows just some of them.

Cognates of MPrs. *grēh*, quoted above as a gloss to the alleged MPrs. *pixag*, are Prs. *gereh* ‘knot, as in a thread or on wood, etc.; knuckle; articulation’, Kāz. *gere*, Yzd-JPrs. *gere* ‘joint’, Dašt. *gerend-e pinje*, Dežg. *gerend-e penja*, Zarg. *geren e angošt* ‘finger joint’, Krd. *girê* ‘knot; knot/joint of a reed; joint of a finger’ (South.Krd. HAŽĀR 1990, Kurm. KURDOEV 1960; see also CABOLOV 2001 with etymological notes), KurmKrd. also *geh* ‘finger joint’, etc. Derivatives from the same root, also belonging to the anatomical lexicon, are MPrs. *gračag*, Man. Prth. *grēhčag* (SUNDERMANN 2003: 220), Krd. *girêčik* (South.Krd. HAŽĀR 1990, Kurm. RIZGAR 1993), ZorYzd. *grænj*, *græng* (MAZDĀPUR 1995 s.v. *band*) ‘joint, knuckle’.

Bal. *bog* (EBal. *boy*) ‘joint; finger knuckle; vertebra’ (MAYER 1910; EL-FENBEIN 1990-II, etc.)⁸³ belongs to both the botanic and the anatomical domain; the same senses have been recorded for Jir.-Kahn. *bûg*, *bûy*. The Bal. compound *gulbog* (with *gul* ‘flower’), occurring in a SBal. version of the epic ballad on the death of Dodā of the Gorgej tribe, labelled in BARKER – MENGAL’s *Glossary* as ‘literary in Raxšāni’ (1969 II: 290, l. 39), is a poetical term for ‘finger’. A further instance of the metaphorical connection KNOT IN STALK = JOINT is provided by MORGENSTIERNE (IIFL-II: 242), who, in order to justify the proposed connection between Sgl. *pēx*, Ydy. *pīx* and Av. *pixa-*, quotes Skt. (RV) *pārvan-* ‘knot; joint’ and its outcomes in modern IA (see also CDIAL 7947; EWA II: 99f.).

There is a group of words denoting the stubble, i.e. the pointed, dry stalks of corn and barley remaining on the ground after the harvest, which could be associated to Av. *pixa-* and cognates. These are: Xor. (Kelidar) *pīx* (ŠĀLČI 1991), (TrbHayd.) *pux*, *puxal*, (Her.) *puxa* ‘chaff’, (dial.) Taj. *paxol* (Karategin) ‘straw’, (Badaxš.) ‘rush, reed’ (ROZENFEL’D 1982), Haz. *paxal* ‘straw’, Sist. *paxāl*,⁸⁴ Birj. *paxal*, ‘reaped corn and barley’, Qāi. *pexel* ‘stalks of corn and barley’, Yγn. (also dial. Taj.) *pīx*, *pīnx* ‘splinter’, *pīx* ‘thorn, a thorny plant’ (MIRZOZODA 2008). At first sight, it seems that this lexical

⁸³ Cf. also Br. *bog* ‘joint in sugarcane, cereals, etc.’.

⁸⁴ See also Sist. *paxali* ‘stubble-field’ (RAXŠĀNI 1981: 113).

cluster has a prevalent diffusion in Eastern Persian, though traces of it are also found in the Central Plateau dialect area and in Southern Iran;⁸⁵ cf. Zar. *pəxal*, Sirj. *pexal* ‘what remains of the stalks of corn after harvesting’, Kerm. *pexal* ‘scraps of paper and straw; rubbish on the water’, Jir.-Kahn. *paxal* ‘rubbish’.⁸⁶ To this group, another may be associated, denoting pointed protuberances in animal bodies, such as AfγPrs. *pīx*, Išk. *pex* ‘spur of bird’, Birj. *paxol* ‘paw of cat or dog’. Sist. *pix* is said of human teeth, when they are reminiscent of a dog’s teeth, or when they are ground with angry, while *pixol* means ‘nail, in particular the nail of animals like cats’. In the West of the Ir. plateau, one finds Tehr. *pax zadan* (*kardan*) ‘to scratch (of a piece of wood, iron or similar thing)’ (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964) and Dašt. *čang-o pexel* ‘fighting with claw; scratching someone’s face and head’.

All this considered, I think that assuming Yγn. *pax* ‘finger’ as the result of a metaphoric process (with SEGMENT OF A VEGETABLE as the source and SEGMENT OF A FINGER as the target), and a subsequent metonymic extension (→ FINGER), is a guess we could hazard.

3.7. Ar. *qašab*, whose primary meaning is ‘cane, reed’, if used with reference to the human body, denotes all hollow channels or tubular bones, like windpipe, trachea, or shinbone; speaking of a finger (*qašab-ul-išba* ^ϕ), it refers to its phalanges. Similarly, Prs. *qasab*, a well integrated Ar. loanword, is used to refer to different parts of the human body, in particular the hollow ones, like bones and veins (‘windpipe; the bones of the fingers; finger; lachrymal ducts’ STEINGASS 1963).⁸⁷ The sense of ‘finger’, given by STEINGASS beside that of ‘bones of the finger’, is probably due to a misunderstanding or to an occasional metonymic extension.

4.1. Engl. *finger* and its Germanic cognates are prevalently explained as derived from the notion FIVE (IE **penk^we* ‘five’ > **penk^w-ro-* ‘finger’). The ‘five’-etymology (first advanced by F. BOPP) still remains the most ac-

⁸⁵ If (Fārs) Dav. *pifāl* ‘straw, sweeping’ does belong here, it should be added to the rather long list of words with $x > f$ in Iranian. That $x, xw > f$ is a natural phonetic change, largely found outside Iranian as well, has already been stated (see e.g. EILERS 1988: 59 f.) but the subject is still to be treated in its complexity.

⁸⁶ See also Kerm. *pexeli*, Zar. *pəxəli*, etc. ‘stubble-field’. Possibly, the notion CHOPPED STRAW is associated to RUBBISH and successively, to DIRT, as proved by Kerm. *pexal o pexāl* ‘bird droppings’, Abiā. *paqal* ‘donkey manure’, etc.

⁸⁷ See also *qasabe* ‘reed; bone’, *qasabe-ye kobrā* ‘tibia’, *qasabatorrie* ‘windpipe’, *qasabe-ye soqrā* ‘fibula’, the last two labelled as “ancien” by LAZARD 1990a.

cepted, though alternative etymologies have been advanced. The ‘five’-etymology supporters are listed in HOPTAM 2000: 77 (and n. 1), 86–87, together with the other etymologies put forward to that date.⁸⁸

In any case, relationship or even identity between words for ‘five’ and those for ‘hand’ have been observed in several languages.⁸⁹ For this association both directions are possible.

MPrs. *panʃag* is an *-aka-derivative from *panʃ* ‘five’; it denotes the human hand/foot (and by extension the animal paw/claw), pointing to the five fingers as a whole. The same senses are conveyed by Prs. *panʃe*, which may denote the whole hand (*panʃe-ye dast*, including the palm, from the wrist to the fingertips), the foot (*panʃe-ye pā*), or the five fingers (or toes), perceived as expanded or tightly curled up into a clenched fist.⁹⁰ Prs. *xamse* ‘five; the five fingers, the hand’ is an Ar. loanword (cf. Ar. *xamsa* ‘five’), sharing the same conceptual motivation.

Cognates of Prs. *panʃe* are widespread in Iranian; however, all these forms (Par. *peñja*, *penja*, *panja* ‘the five fingers of the hand; paw’, *peñja-e pāika* ‘the five fingers of the foot’, Wx. *panjā* ‘wrist; the five fingers of the hand’, Pšt. *panjā* ‘the hand; the five fingers, the palm; the foot; claw, paw’, Yγn. *pánja* ‘the five fingers’ (also ‘middle finger’), Šγn. *panjā* ‘the five fingers of the hand and the five toes of the foot’, Yzγ. *panja* ‘palm of the hand with open fingers’) etc. are loanwords from Persian/Tajik. Of course, *panʃe*-forms may display areal phonetic peculiarities, such as voicing of initial *p* in some Central dialects (cf. Esf-JPrs. *banʃe*, Varz. *banʃe* [‘patte du chat’], etc., in accordance with the voicing of initial *p* in words for ‘five’ and derivatives (cf. Ard. *bān* ‘5’, *bāje* ‘50’, Tār. *banj* ‘5’, *banjā* ‘50’, etc.), or loss of internal nasal, like SouthKrd. *pēñj*, Lārest. *pej* (for which see below). Single forms may present semantic peculiarities, as Del. *paynʃae*, which means ‘the five fingers’, but also ‘glove’ and ‘everything in number of five’.

Besides the many *-aka-derivatives of words for ‘five’, such as MPrs. *panʃag*, Prs. *panʃe*, Bal. *panja(g)*,⁹¹ etc., there are also -ā/o/ul-formations

⁸⁸ Among these, there is HOPTAM’s personal etymology, with Engl. *finger* and cognates tentatively (and to my opinion, not convincingly enough) explained as belonging to a sound-symbolic lexical group (*f*- or *fl*-words, denoting a to and fro movement).

⁸⁹ See also above, p. 43.

⁹⁰ No mention will be done here of the several semantic extensions grounded on metaphorical associations in domains other than the body domain.

⁹¹ In ELFENBEIN 1983a: 146, read *panja* instead of *panjaw* (-w is a labial glide preceding the obl. marker -ā in *panjawā*). The meaning ‘hand’ is preferable to ‘fist’ (proposed by

that in most cases designate an animal body part ('claw, paw') and imply an ironic or derogatory attitude if referred to human beings. These are: (colloquial) Prs. *pañjul* 'paw of cat or the like' (FF, NAJAFI 1999),⁹² Esf. Prs. *pañgāl*, Šir. *penjāl*, Zarg. *pañgāl*, *penjāl*, Xor. *pañgāl*,⁹³ Birj. *pañgol*, *pañgul*, TrbHayd. *pañgal*, Her. *pañjōl*, Šušt. *pañgul*, Lo. *pañgāl*, Nāi. *pañjul* ('the fingers of the hand, often used in a derogatory sense'), Del. *pañjūlae* (also 'the five fingers'), Qm. *pañjule*, Kerm. *pañgol* ('paw; human nails when they are long (used as a joke or an insult)'), Abiā. *pañjula*, Yzd. *pañgol*, Xur. *pañjul*, Rāv. *pañjol*, Bard. *pañgor*, *pañgur*, Sirj. *pañgor*, Damāv. *pañqāl*, Šahr. *pañgāl*, Māz. (Sār.) *pañjul*, *pañgōl*, KurmKrd. *pañcerok* (and by metathesis *pañcerok* RIZGAR 1993), etc.

The usage of these *l*-derivatives in connection with the human body does not always (or everywhere) imply a negative attitude of the speaker towards his/her addressee. AfyPrs. *pañjāl* and Biz. *pañjule* (MAZRA^cTI *et al.* 1995), for instance, has the same semantic implications as Prs. *pañje*, which is both 'human hand' and 'paw'. According to SAFIZĀDE 2001, SouthKrd. *pañjula* means 'the hand with the five fingers, from the wrist to the fingertips',⁹⁴ while Bxt. *pañgal* refers to 'the five fingers stuck together and kept outstretched, prepared to receive something'; see also ČLang *pañga*, *pañgāl* 'paw; hand; the five fingers'.

SCHWARTZ (1992: 424ff.) has explained Prs. *pañg* 'cluster of dates' as «the regular outcome of PIE **ponk^wo-*», with the meaning 'pertaining to the hand' (the proposal would reconcile Prs. *pañg* with Pol. *pañk* and Russ. *pañk* 'bundle, etc.'). In fact, given the close link between HAND and PART OF TREE, one might also directly assume, at least for Iranian, a lexical innovation based on a semantic change ('hand' → 'bundle, etc.', with subsequent phonetic differentiations).⁹⁵ To Prs. *pañg* 'bundle', one may add the follow-

ELFENBEIN in the *Glossary*; see e.g. *ibid.*: 102–103 (l. 66) *do sad muhr kutag-iš pañjawā wāz* «two hundred mohrs he put in his open hand»).

⁹² Other Prs. dictionaries only record the sense of 'scratch, scraping'.

⁹³ MONCHI-ZADEH (1990: no. 422) explains the internal -g- (instead of -j-) in this group of words as resulting from a contamination with *pañg* 'Stock, Rute'. Why not an analogical change based on *čang(āl)*?

⁹⁴ HAŽĀR 1990 cites this word with the meaning of 'delicate and small hand'.

⁹⁵ Cognates of Prs. *pañg* in the same botanic sense are largely recorded in Iranian. As far as we are concerned here, the question of the original meaning of **penk^w-* is negligible (both '5' → 'hand' → subsequent extensions, and 'hand' → subsequent extensions [including 'hand' → '5'] are pathways fitting well our reasoning), though the hypothesis of an original meaning 'hand' remains attractive, indeed.

ing: Bxt. *peng*, *pang*,⁹⁶ Lārest. (Gerāši) *pej*, Ār.-Bidg. *pə:ǰ*, having the same meaning as Prs. *panje* ('the hand, the five fingers'). Farām. *penj* and Bal. *panč* are recorded with the meaning of 'fist';⁹⁷ Sarv. *penj*, Mās. *penj* (SALĀMI 2004: 153) and Zaraq. *penj* belong to the dimensional domain and refer to the quantity which a hand may grasp ('handful'). One could also add Lārest. *pengi* 'small quantity of anything' (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964).

Šir. *penj* is given as 'fingers of the hand' in XADIŠ 2000 (as opposed to *penje* 'fingers and toes', but this differentiation seems to be contingent on the lexicographer's interpretation) and as 'claw, talon' in BEHRUZI 1969; 'claw, talon' is also the meaning of Zā. *penc* (TODD 1985),⁹⁸ Šuš. *pang*, Buš. *penj*, Lir.-Dayl. *penj* (LIRĀVI 2001: 251). A metonymical association is responsible for the sense acquired by Sist. *peng*, which is a denomination for 'the high part of the back' (from which *pengi* 'a load born on the shoulder' derives).

In the dialects spoken in Hormoz, Rodān and Fin, *penj* is 'nail'; the same meaning is conveyed by SBšk. (Garu) *penc*, NBšk. (Senderk, Angohrān) *penc*⁹⁹ and Bal. *pinč*, which I recorded from Bal. speakers native to southern Ir. Balochistan and from a Baloch living in Oman (native to Pakistani Makrān). In particular, according to a Bal. speaker from Kasrākand, *pinč* denotes that part of the fingernail which grows disjunct from the flesh, *i.e.*, the part which has to be periodically cut. This latter sense reminds the 'long nail' of Kerm. *pangol*. Bal. *pinč* 'nail' is also recorded in AYYUBI 2002 (*penc*, labelled Makrāni), SAYAD HASHMI 2000 and ZAND MOQADDAM 1991: 380. This set of words for 'nail' also include KurmKrd. *pencik* 'Fingernagel' (OMAR 1992).

From SAYAD HASHMI 2000 we learn that Bal. *pinč* 'nail' is "erroneously" used "in many places" with the meaning of 'finger'. This information finds no confirmation in the data I have collected; however, there is no reason to question it. An alleged Bal. *pinč* 'finger' would find its collocation side by side with many cognate words used with (or *also* with) this sense and widespread in Central and Southern Kurdish, in some Lori areas, in Central dialects and in South Iran (Fārs and Lārestān), as well as in some Eastern varieties of Persian.

⁹⁶ See also Bxt. *pang*, *panj* 'talons' in LORIMER 1922.

⁹⁷ Cf. *panč* in SAYAD HASHMI 2000 ('the five fingers bent in order to punch someone') and (Sarāwāni and Lāšāri) *penc* 'wrist [Prs. *moč*]' in a handwritten draft (letters *alef–jim*) of an (Ir.)Bal. dictionary compiled by ABDUL HAMID and kindly put by the author at disposal of the *Balochi Comparative Etymological Dictionary Project* directed by A.V. ROSSI at the University of Naples L'Orientale – ISIAO Rome.

⁹⁸ Cf. also Siverek *pānj* in HADANK 1932: 163.

⁹⁹ From G. BARBERA'S unpublished material. According to BARBERA (2004), even in Mināb the word for 'nail' is *penj*; see also above, fn. 61.

These are: SouthKrd. *panj* (SAFIZĀDE 2001), *panja* (also ‘the five fingers with the palm of the hand; paw’), SorKrd. *pence*, SulKrd. *pence* (also ‘hand, paw’),¹⁰⁰ Abd. *penje*, *penjeri* (ŽUKOVSKIJ 1922: 110), Anār. *penja*, Frv. *penje*, Siv. *penje* (LECOQ 1979), Xur. *penja*, Ardest. *banji* (*bonji* in BAILEY 1933–1935: 773), Tār. *banja*, Keš. *banja*, Šuš. *panje* (also ‘the five fingers’), BoirAhm. *penja*,¹⁰¹ Mamas., Dāreng., Dorun., Kal. (Lor), Nud., Somy., Ban., Pāp., Dusir., Rič., Gorgn., Mosq., Kuz. *penja*, Kal. (Tāj.) *penjar*, Kurdšuli *penje* (MORGENSTIERNE 1960: 133),¹⁰² Gavk. *penja*, Dav. *pinja*, Zaraq. *penje* (‘finger or toe’), Mās., Kuz., Dahl., Knd., Baliā. *penja*, Kāz. *penje*,¹⁰³ Dežg., Birov., Hay., Dādenj. *penje*, Buš. *penje*, Lir.-Dayl. *pinje*, Dašt. *pinje* and proceeding eastwards, Xonji *penja*, Lār. *penja* (KAMIOKA – RAHBAR – HAMIDI 1986). In Koroši, the Bal. dialect spoken in Fārs, one also finds *penja* ‘finger’.

While in literary Tajik *panja* denotes the hand (or the foot) as a whole (i.e. the five fingers and the palm, or the five toes and the sole), in Southern Tajik *panja* also means ‘finger’ (ROZENFEL’D 1982; Badaxš. *panja* ‘the open hand; finger, first finger’); see also Kāb. *painja* ‘les 5 doigts, doigt’ (FARHĀDI 1955: 102) and Sist. *penjol* ‘finger’. Loanwords (from some Eastern Persian variety) are Par. *panjâ* (IIFL-I), Yγn. *pánja*, which, besides ‘the five fingers’, also means ‘middle finger’,¹⁰⁴ as well as *pānjāla* ‘finger’ recorded in a Turkish dialect spoken in North-Eastern Xorāsān (Langar) (DOERFER – HESCHE 1993: 171).

Once the consciousness of the original link between the notion FIVE and words meaning ‘finger’ (passing through HAND) went lost, new denominations for ‘hand’ were created, as is shown by (dial.) Taj. *panj-panja* ‘palm’ (← ‘the five fingers’) (ROZENFEL’D 1982) or Buš. *panj penje* ‘the five fingers’. These two expressions are lexical innovations corresponding in meaning to Prs. *panje*. However, *panj penje* may be used with the meaning ‘the five fingers’ even in Persian, as attested by the following expression occurring in ŠĀMLU 2000: 1011: *panj penje-at rā ʿasal koni dahān (-e folāni) begozāri, angoštā-yat rā az bix mikonad* ‘should you dip your five fingers

¹⁰⁰ The *panje*-type ‘finger’ seems to be a lexical feature of the Central/South. Krd. area; see however *pence* ‘finger’ in OMAR 1992 (Kurmançî).

¹⁰¹ According to ANONBY (2003: 186), ‘finger’ in BoirAhm. is *k’ilitis*.

¹⁰² Kurdšuli is the name of a small tribe speaking a Lori dialect, to which MORGENSTIERNE (1960: 133–134) devoted a few notes.

¹⁰³ ‘Forefinger’ according to BEHRUZI 2002; cf. below, p. 131.

¹⁰⁴ See below p. 140.

in the honey and put them into so-and-so's mouth, he would pull them up by the roots" (said in order to underline so-and-so's ungratefulness).¹⁰⁵

4.2. The semantic range of Prs. *panje* and cognates, discussed in the preceding paragraph, presents many analogies with that of Prs. *čang* and derivatives/cognates, though the original notion on which the latter lexical cluster relies is seemingly quite different.

Prs. *čang* denotes anything hooked or bent (like hooks or similar objects); in the anatomical domain, it is 'claw of wild beast, talon of bird' and, in human beings, 'fingers somewhat crooked' or 'expanded hand'. The usage of *čang* for 'hand' is peculiar to the informal register (so LAZARD 1990a) and/or evocative of the idea of violence and rudeness (NAJAFI 1999); the instances collected in DEHX show that *čang* was already current in this sense in classical Persian poetry. Among *čang*-derivatives, *čangāl* is nowadays mostly used as the name of the pronged tool with which one eats food, i.e., the fork, or any other instruments with a similar form. It also denotes body parts like paws, talons, claws; therefore, *čangāl* (and similarly *čange*, *čangol*, *čangale*, etc.) is used with a specific reference to animals, in particular birds of prey, even if there is no shortage of examples in classical poetry (see some of them in DEHX) implying reference to human beings. This also happens with AfyPrs *čangāl*. According to NAJAFI 1999, when using Prs. *čangul* as 'hand, fist', the speaker wants to display his/her negative attitude (even contempt) towards the referent. In Tajik, one finds *čang* 'hand with crooked fingers', *čangol* 'hand', while *čangal*, *čangul* is reserved to predatory animals and birds of prey.

Prs. *čang* (with its derivatives), generally derived from IE **keng-*, **kenk-* 'hook' (IEW 537–538, mainly based on Germ. and Slav., apparently not IA), has several cognates in New Iranian, which belong to different semantic domains. Leaving out the senses of 'claw, talon' or 'paw', found virtually everywhere and attested in Ir. since ancient times (see Av. *°čingha-* in *Yt.* 5.113 *pæšō-čingha-* 'with spread claws'), I will focus in what follows on the human body lexicon only.

¹⁰⁵ BROWN (2005: 526–529) describes and comments (also including a useful map) the two ways in which languages may lexically treat the human finger and the hand: 1. identity (a single word denotes both 'hand' and 'finger' and/or 'fingers'); 2. differentiation (one word denotes 'hand' and another, different word denotes 'finger'). In consideration of *angošt* and *panje*, we may say that Persian represents a good example of both types.

A metaphorical mapping has produced words for '(human) nail' starting from *čang*-words for '(animal) nail': cf. (IrĀz.) Rudbār *čangāl* (LAZARD 1990b), Lo. *čangāl* (also 'hand'), Birj. *čangol*. The transfer from PAW to HAND and/or THE FIVE FINGERS OF THE HAND is quite common; beside Prs., cf. Birj. *čang* 'hand and fingers', *čangal*, *čangol* 'hand; claw', Gor. *čang*, *čangal* 'griffe (au sens figuré: main)' (MOKRI 1966), SouthKrd. *čing* 'the hand including all the fingers' (SAFIZĀDE 2001), Lo. *čangāl* (also 'nail'), Buš. *čang* 'the palm of the hand and the fingers', Fin. *čengāl* 'hand', *čangol* 'fist', Siv. *čäng* 'fist', Māz. (AliĀb.) *čangāl* 'hand, from the wrist to the fingertips', (Tabari) *čangāl* 'palm of the hand' (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964), etc. In EIr., *čang*-forms with an explicit reference to the hand or the totality of fingers are all (East.)Prs. loanwords; cf. Pšt. *čang*, *čangāl*, *čangūl* 'hand; the five fingers; claw, talon',¹⁰⁶ Yŋn. *čank* 'paw; hand', *čangol* 'claw of birds of pray; hand', Wx. *čangol* 'paw; the five fingers of the hand; hand; arm', Šŋn. *čāng* 'claw, paw; hand', etc.

The hollow of a hand, when its fingers are slightly bendy, works quite well as a container. There is a strong conceptual relation between a container and its content. Therefore several *čang*-forms are used as terms for weight measures. In DEHX, one finds *čang* and *čange* as synonyms of Prs. *mošt* and *daste* 'handful'. In Standard Persian of Iran, however, *čang* and *čange* 'handful' are not in use; *čang*-forms for 'handful' are found in the dialects of South Iran (Buš. *čang*, Dašt. *čang*, Lārest. (Xonji) *čang*, KAMIOKA – YAMADA 1979), in Eastern Persian (Sist. *čāng*, Her. *čang*), and in other Ir. languages as well; compare Krd. (Central, South.) *čing*, (Kurm.) *čeng*, Tāl. *čango*, *čangə*, Qasr. *čenga*, Gz. *čēŋg*, Nāi. *čeng* (*čeng-čenga* 'by handfuls'), Iran. Bal. (Makrān) *čangol* ('a handful of grass', AYYUBI 2002), Šŋn. *čangol*, Baĵ. *čingol*, etc.¹⁰⁷ Elsewhere we find further semantic specializations, with *čang*-forms referring to the content of any matter which can be held in two hands, i.e. a 'double handful'. This is the case with Birj. *čangal* ('hand, claw', but also 'two cupped hands' and 'quantity contained in two cupped hands'), Qāi. *čengel*, Kerm. *čangāl*, Gil. *čange* ('the quantity of harvested

¹⁰⁶ Pšt. *mangul* 'paw; talon' (also 'the five fingers, the hand including the five fingers' in RAVERTY 1860) is perhaps better explained as the (lexicalized ?) second element of an echo-compound (*čangul mangul*, with *m*-alternation), rather than as an outcome of **hamanguli-*, as proposed by MORGENSTIERNE in EVP, NEVP s.v. *grut*. This suggestion has already been advanced in DE CHIARA 2008 s.v. See also Xuns. *māngūl*, which «erscheint zunächst nur als Reimwort zu *šāngūl*», EILERS 1976 s.v.

¹⁰⁷ See also Hi. *čungī* 'a cess levied from grain-sellers etc. (being as much as a man can grasp in his hand)' (PLATTS 1930). Ir. lw.?

rice contained in two hands'), Bal. *čank* (ELFENBEIN 1990-II, SAYAD HASHMI 2000),¹⁰⁸ Sariq. *čangul*, etc., all of the meaning 'double handful'.

In Pashto, Ossetic and Kurdish-Zāzā, *čang*-forms have developed the sense of 'arm' or 'part of arm'. Cf. Oss. *cong* 'arm',¹⁰⁹ KurmKrd. *çeng* 'arm (from the shoulder to the elbow); wing',¹¹⁰ Zā. (Čabaxčur) *čāñgil* 'Achsel, Schulter' (HADANK 1932: 363), Pšt. *cangál*, *cəngál*, *cangála*, *cəngála*, *sangál* 'elbow; the arm from the elbow to the wrist' (see also *cāng* 'wing of a bird'), Örm. *caŋgal* 'elbow' (MORGENSTIERNE 1932b). Whether the sense of 'arm' derives from the conceptual association with HAND, or the element perceived as crooked is rather the elbow, is still to be defined.

Pšt. *cangál* shares the sense of 'elbow' with co-radical words in other Ir. languages.¹¹¹ On account of Phl. *ārešnčand* ('lšnčnd) (M 6) and *čandārešn* (*čnd 'lšn*) (K 20) 'as much as an ell (elbow)', which glosses Av. *čīqkazauatō* in *Farhang-i Ōīm* iii, g. 5, HENNING (1945: 471 fn.3) corrected the reading of the odd Av. sequence and replaced it with *čīqkađauatō*, considered as a bad spelling of **čqkađavatō* 'of that which has an elbow, or forearm'. He reconstructs in this way an Av. form **čqkađa-* 'ell, elbow', otherwise unattested, from which Pšt. *cangál* would derive.¹¹² A different emendation has

¹⁰⁸ Br. *čank* 'double handful' is a lw. from Bal.

¹⁰⁹ Oss. *cong* is also 'branch', according to a universal cognitive model equating the human body, which in this case represents the source domain, with that of a tree. See also Pšt. *cāngə*, *cāng* 'branch of a tree', Örm. *cāŋə* 'branch'. Numberless examples could be added. I will limit myself to quoting Taj. *panja* 'branch'.

¹¹⁰ See also *biçeng*, *biçeng*, *piçeng* 'armpit'. For SouthKrd., HAŽĀR 1990 gives *čingil* 'arm / armpit [*baya*]'.
¹¹¹ I would challenge the connection of Xor. *zengeča*, *zīngīča* 'elbow' with Pšt. *cangál* suggested by MONCHI-ZADEH (1990: 206–207). Words for 'elbow' which may be considered as cognates to Xor. *zengeča* are found in Kermān dialects (Kerm. *zenče*, Bard. *zomče*, Rāv. *zamče*, Sirj. *zomče*) and in Tāleši (*dasi zīng*, PIREJKO 1976). In those linguistic areas, a *č-* > *z-* development may hardly be assumed, since the affricate *č* in initial position has a rather strong stability. Surely, any connection between Khot. *tcamgalai* (interpreted as *tcamgala* + *i* and translated 'his elbows' in BAILEY 1979) and Pšt. *cangál* is to be excluded. According to KUMAMOTO (1987a), on the basis of the text where *tcamgalai* occurs, the meaning 'elbow' is inadmissible; one should rather think to something like 'chains' instead.

¹¹² See also NEVP 17; DE CHIARA 2008 (< **čangada-*; with further references). To Pšt. *cangál*, one should also connect Pšt. *cang* 'flank, side'.

been proposed by KLINGENSCHMITT (1968: 64): **čīnkaḍauuatō*, gen. sing. or acc. pl. of Av. **čīnkaḍa-* (< OIr. **čankada-* ‘Armbeuge’).¹¹³

Br. *čangulī* ‘elbow’ has been considered as an «assimilated LW < Pš (rather than < Prs *čangul*, °*gal* ‘claw, hand’)» (NEVP 17). This assumption could be right; one cannot rule out, however, that *čangulī* has been borrowed from an Ir. language other than Pashto, having a *čang*-word for ‘elbow’ not known in the literature (ROSSI 1979: F28).¹¹⁴ Balochi should be excluded; there one finds *čāngot* ‘elbow’ (SAYAD HASHMI 2000, RAZZAQ – BUKSH – FARRELL 2001); see also *čangot* ‘elbow’ in (Bal.) Koroši.

But let’s come back to the core of our discussion, i.e. the Ir. terms for ‘finger’. Among the several glosses listed in DEHX s.v. *čangāl*, one reads: ‘anyone of the human fingers’,¹¹⁵ though no example illustrates this definition. To find a sure *čang*-type ‘finger’ we have to look to Sistāni, where we find *čongol*, the usual Sist. term for this part of the body.¹¹⁶ Sistāni has influenced Balochi, in particular the Bal. varieties spoken in Iran and in Marw (Turkmenistan); cf. Bal. *čangul*, *čangol* ‘finger’ in ELFENBEIN 1963, COLETTI 1981, FILIPPONE 2000–2003: 60–61; AYYUBI 2002 (Sarhaddi). To explain Bal. *čangul* ‘finger’, therefore, there is no reason to think to an Ur. loanword as suggested in KORN 2005: 293. Elsewhere in Balochi, *čangul* (also *čungal* RAZZAQ – BUKSH – FARRELL 2001) is used in the “usual” senses of ‘claw of birds, paw of cats (or similar animals)’ and ‘fork’. To Sist. *čongol* and Bal. *čangul*, one may add the following: *čungl* ‘finger’ in the Tajik variety spoken by the Fārsivāns of Turkmenistan (MAHMUDOV 2001: 47), IrĀz. (Ker.) *čengil* ‘finger’ (ZOKĀ 1954), Gil. *čungul* ‘the extremity of fingers or toes’. In Jiroft and Kahnuj, *čangol* means ‘the distance between the fingers or the toes’, entering therefore the measurement domain.

Xuns. *čongol* and Lo. *čangul* ‘pinch’ (RAHMĀNIĀN 2000: 83 fn. 1) also belong here.

¹¹³ I warmly thank R. SCHMITT for having brought to my notice KLINGENSCHMITT’s position on the matter. In a personal communication, SCHMITT has also stressed the soundness of KLINGENSCHMITT’s emendation (OIr. **cank°* > Av. **cink°*, not **caḱk*).

¹¹⁴ Note that *-ī*-derivatives in Ir. cognate words are also found elsewhere: cf. Aft. *čanguli*, Māz. (Sā.) *čangeli*, Ydy. *čigāli* etc. ‘claw, paw’.

¹¹⁵ See also ‘finger’ in STEINGASS 1963 s.v. *čangāl*.

¹¹⁶ In the *Qor’ān-e Qods*, the ms. containing a Qoran translation which for many aspects points to a Sistanic origin, <čngl> is only used with reference to animals: cf. (VI. 146) <hr xd’vnd čngly> (with *xudāvand* in the sense of ‘having’, common in Classic Persian) in correspondence to Ar. *kull qī-l-zufr*, ie. ‘all (animals) having claws’. Cf. RAVĀQI 1985: 80 and fn. 5 (<čngl> ‘undivided hoof [*som-e pā ke šekāfte nabāšad*]’).

4.3. Among the Ir. words discussed at § 4.1, directly or indirectly correlated with the notion FIVE, there are a few words for ‘nail’. For them, alternative associative paths may be assumed: FIVE → FIVE FINGERS → HAND → PAW, CLAW → NAIL, or FIVE → FIVE FINGERS / HAND → FINGER → NAIL.

The relationship between FINGER and NAIL is easily understandable on the basis of the nature and position of these body parts. The conceptual transfer may be bidirectional: words originally meaning ‘finger’ may acquire the meaning of ‘nail’ and *vice versa*, as it happened in the Central dialects, mainly in the Kermān area, where Kerm. *nāxun*, Rāv. *nāxūn*, Bard. *nāxun*, Zar. *nāxū*, Sirj. *nāxun*, Yzd. *nāxun*¹¹⁷ are the current term for ‘finger’ (cf. Prs. *nāxon*, *nāxun* and cognates ‘nail’). Here also belongs Sgl. *narxāk* ‘nail’, occurring in the lexicalized phrases *katta narxāk* ‘thumb’ (see below p. 103) and *pu-narxāk* ‘toe’ (IIFL-II, quoted with a question mark). Here should also belong Haz. *narxūn* ‘forefinger’ (if FOREFINGER ← FINGER ← NAIL; cf. below p. 131; a different explanation is given in DULLING 1973: «*xūn* probably stands for M. *xuruun* (= finger)»).

Bal. (Raxš.) *nāun*, (Keči) *nāxun*, *nākun* ‘fingerbreadth’ (← ‘fingernail’, ELFENBEIN 1992: 252) may be mentioned here. In a fieldwork conversation with a Bal. speaker from Nal (Xuzdār), I recorded *hor* (basically ‘finger’)¹¹⁸ used several times for ‘nail’. The same metonymical association is attested in the Turkish speaking area: in the Xorasanian Turk. dialect spoken at Xarw-e ‘Olyā, for instance, *durnağ* is ‘finger’ (DOERFER – HESCHE 1993: 127); cf. Turk. *dirnağ* ‘nail’. Similarly, in Zargari, a Romani dialect spoken in Zargar (near Qāzvin), *nāy* is both ‘nail’ and ‘finger’.¹¹⁹

4.4. The metonymical association KNUCKLE → FINGER motivates a word for ‘finger’ documented in South and Central Kurdish: *qamk* ‘finger, joint of finger’ (*qâmiq* ‘finger’ SAFIZĀDE 2001), Mahâb. *qâmq*, Mukri *khamök* (CHRISTENSEN – BARR 1939: 306) ‘finger’, Sul. *qamk* ‘thumb’ (*qamk-y pê* ‘big toe’),¹²⁰ Lo. *kāw-e pā* ‘toe of the foot’ (UNVALA 1958: 16).

These lexical forms belong to a very large WIr. family including words for different kinds of articulations (knucklebone, astragalus, wrist, elbow,

¹¹⁷ Information provided to me by H. REZĀI BĀĠBIDI, whom I thank for his usual kindness.

¹¹⁸ See below, p. 90.

¹¹⁹ For this information I am indebted to H. REZĀI BĀĠBIDI.

¹²⁰ On ‘finger’ → ‘thumb’ see below p. 117. According to CHRISTENSEN – BARR (1939: 306), however, Sul. *k’amouk* is ‘finger’.

ankle, heel, shinbone, knee, basin, etc.), as is the case with Prs. *qāb* ‘knucklebone’.¹²¹ As for the finger domain, in particular, the following terms are recorded as ‘finger-joint’: KurmKrd. *kab*, *k’ap* (*kaw* RIZGAR 1993), Lak. *qow kelek*, Knd., Pāp., Dusir. *qāb*, Mās., Birov., Kuz. *qāv*, Mamas. *qāb-e kelič*, Abd. *qāb-e penje*, Rič., Somy. *qāb-e penja*, Dav. *qāv-e pinje*, Mosq., Dādenj., Dāreng. *qāv-e penja*, Kal. (Tāj.) *qāb-e penjar*, Gorg. *qāb penja*, Nud. *qāv penja*, etc.

4.5. It has been stated above (§ 3.4) that Kurm. Kurdish has two terms for ‘finger’: *tilī* and *pêçî*. If and how these two terms differ in their semantic content is not clear; the data provided by different dictionaries do not coincide completely. RIZGAR (1993) gives *tilī* (also *tilik*) as ‘finger’ and ‘toe’ and *pêçî* as ‘toe’ and ‘finger’. He also lists s.v. *tilī* the names of the individual fingers (all designations containing the word *tilī*) and s.v. *pêçî* the names of the individual toes (all designations containing the word *pêçî*). From this fact alone, one would deduce that in Kurm. Kurdish, fingers and toes are distinct lexically, or at least, that there are distinct items basically meaning either ‘finger’ or ‘toe’, which, according to the context, may be opportunely determined by *dest* ‘hand’ or *pê* ‘feet’. KURDOEV (1960) agrees with RIZGAR (1993) as far as *tilī* is concerned, but *pêçî* is simply glossed ‘digit [*palec*]’. Similarly CHYET 2003 has *bêç’î* (also *bîçî*, *pêç’î*, *pîçî*) ‘finger, toe; fingertip’, given as a synonym of *tilī*. In OMAR 1992 *pîç* ‘Finger’ (*pîçî* ‘Fingerspitze’) contrasts with *bêçî* ‘Zehe’; in AMÎRXAN 1992 *pîç* is ‘Finger’; in LUCERI 2004 *tilī* is ‘dito della mano’ and *pêçî* ‘dito del piede’. However it is, should really exist a stable lexical differentiation in some Krd. areas between FINGER and TOE, there is no doubt that this has to be considered as a secondary, very recent differentiation, possibly justified by the linguistic pressure exerted on the Kurdish emigrants abroad by the languages of their new homelands.¹²²

As for SouthKrd. dictionaries, SAFIZĀDE 2001 gives *pîçî* as ‘finger (of the hand)’ while in HAŽĀR 1990, *pîçî* is recorded as ‘the last joint of a finger’. ADIB TUSI 1963–1964 has an entry *poččak* ‘digit [*angošt*]’ attributed to Kurdish.

¹²¹ For Prs. *qāb*, one cannot exclude some blending with Prs. *ka‘b* ‘anklebone’ (< Ar.).

¹²² See also above, p. 48. One cannot exclude that the association of *pêçî* to ‘toe’, seemingly operated by lexicographers, may have been influenced by the initial *pê*^o, which matches with *pê* ‘foot’.

To Krd. *pêçî/bêçî* belongs Zā. *bečik* ‘finger’ (*bēcak(a)* in VAHMAN – ASATRIAN 1990) and probably also Māz. (Kelār.) *meček* ‘finger’. PAUL (1998: 212) points out that Zā. *bečik* is a lexical feature of the Alevi dialectal area, as opposed to *gišt*, marking the Çermik-Siverek and Palu-Bingöl dialectal areas.

There is a Phl. word on which we should dwell a little. It is written <bck’>, a writing which implies at least two possible transcriptions, <c> being used for phonemic /č/ or /z/. The graphic ambiguity has given rise to the contrasting stances taken up by WILLIAMS (1990-I: 206–207, 1990-II: 97) and KOTWAL – KREYENBROEK (1995: 74–75) in reading two passages from the *Pahlavi Rivāyat accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg* and *Nērangistān* respectively, which convey almost identical contents: both give directions on the correct way to perform the Drōn ceremony. *PRDd.* 58.26 and *Nēr.* 10.47 describe the proper way in which the *barsom* should be held: one should take it from the right hand and place it in the left; one should not hold it raised or lowered; one should hold it forwards and «APš bck’ QDM BYN HNHTWNšn’». WILLIAMS’ transcription and translation of the passage is as follows: *u-š bazag abar andar nihišn* “and one should hold it above sin[?]”. Differently, KOTWAL – KREYENBROEK transcribe and translate: *u-š bačag abar andar nihišn* “and extend one’s fingers over it”. This was also the interpretation of the relevant *PRDd.* passage by JAMASP-ASA (1985: 341, 348; *u-š bačak apar andar nihišn* “and one shall place his fingers on it”).

Although WILLIAMS’ statement (1990-II: 253) that «*bazag* “sin, evil” seems as likely a reading of MSS *bck’* as J-A’s *bačak* “fingers” or G-G’s **čang*»¹²³ cannot be challenged in theory, it is indisputable that here the meaning ‘sin’ appears not consistent (as WILLIAMS himself seems to be aware of, putting a question mark at the end of his translation of 58.26). Questioning WILLIAMS’ interpretation, KOTWAL – KREYENBROEK (1995: 75 fn. 205) read <bck’> as *bačag* ‘finger’, referring it to the form *bačag* used as a linear measure, and already known in the previous literature.

Phl. *bačag* (alternative spelling <bwcck’>; cf. *bochak*, *bûchak* KAPADIA 1953: 312, 325) occurs as ‘joint of a finger’; see e.g. the passage where instructions are given on the correct treatment of fingernail parings (*Vd.* 17, 7, ANKLESARIA 1949: 343), to be buried in a pit “as much deep as the top-most

¹²³ WILLIAMS 1990 uses J-A and G-G as the abbreviations for JAMASP-ASA 1985 and for an unpublished transcription and translation of *PRDd.* 58 by Ph. GIGNOUX and F. GRENET. However, Frantz GRENET has recently informed me that the two authors do not maintain any more their previous interpretation of this passage.

joint of the smallest finger [*kehist angust frāzdōm bačag*]. It is also used as a short linear measure (2 fingers breadth; = Gr. *κόνδυλος*; HENNING 1942: 235).

Phl. *bačag* translates YAv. *ṭbiši-* ‘finger joint’ as well as YAv. *baši-* (*FrO.*, Ch. XVI: ‘ein Längenmass’, BARTHOLOMAE 1904; ‘2 fingers breadth’, HENNING 1942: 235) occurring in *Nēr.* 108 (WAAG 1941: 106) in the YAv. compound *baši-drajanhō*. The interpretation of *baši-* in the *FrO.* remains doubtful: *baši-* is inserted in a list of words starting with *b-* and not semantically arranged. On account of the Phl. gloss <bcynk>, JAMASPII – HAUG (1867) suggested ‘cucumber’. REICHELDT (1901: 152) identified the word as the Av. *baši-* already found in *Nēr.*; however, he provided no explanation for its Phl. counterpart. According to HENNING (ibid.: fn. 6), one should consider Av. *ṭbiši-* and *baši-* as «mere spelling of the same word». To accept HENNING’s suggestion, however, one should assume that the spelling *ṭb-* (alternating with *b-*) could have developed “bizarrement”, as it was for *ṭkaēša-* < **kaiša-* (KELLENS 1989: 41), and not as the regular outcome of an original **du-* (as Gath. *daibiš* : YAv. *ṭbiš* = Ved. *dviṣ*). Alternatively, one could assume that the *b-*forms have derived from a “réfection”, as suggested by TREMBLAY (2005: 180), who connects here Wan. *wuzay* ‘petit empan (écartment entre le pouce et l’index)’ («pehl. *bck* **bazag* ‘condyle, phalange’ < **bazaka-*, probablement une réfection de *(*d*)*bazah-* < **d^hb^hēng^hos*, **d^hb^hṅg^hés-os*, cf. av. réc. *baši.drājanhō* N.108; cité *baši* F. 16, *ṭbišiš* V.6,10 [...] < **d^hb^hṅg^hs-i-*, *πάχος* ‘épaisseur’»).

HENNING’s suggestion has been rejected by SCHWARTZ (*apud* CHYET 2003 s.v. *bêç’î*), according to whom the «Pahl form, probably /bač(č)ak/, and the Kurdish form as well, likely represent diminutive formations in -č- to *baši-*», while «Av. *ṭbiši-* (glossed by Pahl *bck*) ‘joint (of a finger)’ should be a different word, since it cannot be reconciled phonically with the group *baši-/bck/bêç’î*. The form *ṭbiši-* would be from ProtoIE **duis* = ‘twice, in two’ (Av. *biž-uuat-*); the notion of ‘joint’ being bifurcation».

One could also assume that Av. *baši-* (and *ṭbiši-*?) is in fact not Avestan. Could it be a MPrs. word in Av. *garb*? I do not think so, given the small number of occurrences of *bačag* in Phl. texts and the nature of the texts in which it occurs. These Av. and Phl. forms could witness the existence of some similar word(s) denoting ‘(part of) finger’, and consequently used as a linear measure in some language(s) probably spoken somewhere in the WIr.

area. Modern outcomes would be Krd. *pêçî/bêçî*, Zā. *bečik* ‘finger’ and Bast. *angošt bačo*, Farām. *boča, bača* ‘thumb’ (see also below, p. 117).¹²⁴

What is the motivation underlying Krd. *pêçî/bêçî* etc.? The immediate preceding step could be a metonymical association KNUCKLE → FINGER, but the conceptualization path which has produced the word for ‘knuckle’ remains unclear.

5. Fingers are undoubtedly body elements of small dimension. This obvious realization is responsible for a few Ir. words for ‘finger’.

Since adjectives for ‘small’ are often used as nominals in the sense of ‘small child’, when we analyse terms for ‘finger’ or the names of individual fingers derived from, or related to a term meaning ‘small’, it is often difficult to state if the conceptual pattern involved in the denominative process is (1) the plain acknowledgement of a physical dimension; (2) a CHILD = FINGER equating process, like that which could be behind EBal. *čukī*, a derivative from *čuk* ‘child’ meaning ‘finger’ according to MAYER (1910 s.v.) and GILBERTSON (1925 s.v.).¹²⁵ We will repeatedly be faced with this problem in what follows. Here I will quote Xor. (Qā, Box.) *līlī* ‘finger’ (also ‘small; small child’; ŠĀLČI 1991) and Taj. *lela, lelak, lelik* ‘finger’ (*lelak, lelik* marked as “colloquial” in RAHIMI – USPENSKAJA 1954). EBal. *kūko*, ‘finger’ in MAYER 1910 and ‘little finger’ in HETU-RAM – DOUIE 1898, could be explained in this perspective as well; for further details see below p. 173.

Xor. *līlī* and Taj. *lela* are the result of a syllabic reduplication process, a lexical device with an ideophonic value, much productive in Iranian. As further instances of the *IVIV*-type, evoking the idea of smallness, one may quote Kerm. *lelu* ‘a small thing’, *lelānu* ‘very small (mostly said of little and meagre children)’ (ANJOM ŠOĀĀ 2002), Zar. *lilu* ‘very little’, Sirj. *lilāsku* ‘meagre and thin’, Bard. *lilaasku* ‘very small’, Jir.-Kahn. *lolūsk* ‘small’, *lal* ‘small of birds or animals’, Zarq. *lili* ‘small (also used as an endearing term for children)’, Avarz. *līla* ‘baby’ (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964), etc. A different explanation has been advanced by MONCHI-ZADEH (1990: no. 308), who connects Xor. *līlī* ‘finger’ to Xor. *klīk* ‘id.’, «mit Reduplikation und Ausfall beider *k*».

¹²⁴ Note also Tāl. *bijə, bujə, pijə* ‘hollow of the hand; handful’ and Khwar. *pck, bck* ‘palm of the hand’. Is it possible to envisage any connections of these latter words with our words for ‘(part of) finger’?

¹²⁵ On Bal. *čukī* ‘little finger’ see below, p. 152.

Similarly, one may consider *čimčiloq*, *čimčaloq* ‘finger’ used in (Taj.) Jugi¹²⁶, as an instance of a *čVčV*-pattern. Taj. speakers from Samarqand also use *čimčilok* ‘finger’ and MIRZOZODA (2008) records *činčilik* as a Yγn. alternative for ‘finger’ (but is ‘little finger’ in ANDREEV – PEŠČEREVA 1957). For further comments on *čimčilok* see below, p. 172.

SMALLNESS could also have been in some way responsible for dial. Taj. *čilik* ‘finger’ (Prs. *čelk* ‘little finger’) and the *kelk*-type group, for which different proposals have been advanced above, p. 65 and 63.

6. The universal attitude of human people to attribute to fingers a human nature, and perceive them as linked each other by kindred relationship, motivates the Prs. expression *dah xatani* ‘the ten fingers’ (DEHX with references), which depicts the fingers as *xatan*, a word (< Ar.) designating all the male relatives (father, brother etc.) of the bride. Similarly, EBal. *pādmindān* ‘toes’ (ELFENBEIN 1990-II) can easily be interpreted as ‘the daughters of the foot’, cf. EBal. *mind*, *minq* ‘girl’ (‘bitch’ elsewhere in Balochi). However, I found no confirmation of this Bal. expression in other sources and in the documentation collected in my fieldwork.

7.1. Balochi has a term for ‘finger’ with no equivalent in Iranian. This is *murdān*(*ay*), also *mordān*(*ay*), and, with metathesis, *murdayān*. It is commonly used in EBal. varieties, but generally understood everywhere and sometimes also used in poetry by speakers of WBal./SBal. in the form of *murdān*(*ag*), perceived as a literary term. According to ELFENBEIN (1992: 252), *murdān* has spread in all Bal. dialects, at least as a measurement expression (‘finger-breadth’).

The etymology advanced by GEIGER (1890–1891: 242) points to the old practice of bearing seal-rings (*mur*- < *muhr* ‘seal’) on one’s own fingers. The finger would be described as ‘siegelringtragend’, even if «die urspr. Bed. war offenbar ganz vergessen». The reconstructed Bal. **muhrdān* has been compared to Prs. *mohr-dār* ‘keeper of the seals’. From a morphological point of view, a comparison with Bal. *zardānag* ‘ring finger’, i.e. the ‘bearing gold finger’ (see below, p. 143), reinforces GEIGER’s assumption. ELFENBEIN (1990-II s.v.) points to a possible IA source, although untraced.

Note that Skt. *mudrasthāna*- denotes ‘the place (on the finger) for a seal-ring’.

¹²⁶ See above, p. 66.

7.2. Khwar. *'kwnd* ‘finger’ is isolated in Iranian. Possibly, it is related to (*'kwnd*- ‘to beat, pound’. If so, it says something of one of the actions the finger typically performs, i.e., beating on surfaces. A similar deverbal Khwar. formation could be seen in *wyn* ‘eye’ from *wyn*- ‘to see’.

8. Many words for ‘finger’ in Iranian are (more or less integrated) loans from non-Ir. languages. Some of them have been already mentioned above; cf. Prs. *qasab*, *xamse*, etc. A few others are given in the following.

Prs. *esba*^c, *asba*^c is a lw. from Ar. *išba*^c; for a collection of relevant Sem. forms see MILITAREV – KOGAN 2000: no. 256. The same Sem. root (*SB*^c) occurs in the logogram (?) accompanying Phl. *angušt* ‘finger’ in the *Frahang ī Pahlavīg* X, 31, reconstructed as ⁺W_SB^oTH in UTAS – NYBERG 1988: 77. The Pāzand writings *hučatpaman*, *hōjaptaman*, *hōčaptaman* (ORYĀN 1998: 163–164) clearly show how the Aramaic sequence was read in the Zoroastrian milieu of that time; HENNING (1958: 31 fn. 1) has reconstructed intermediate stages of a progressive alteration of the Aram. word which would have produced the ‘fanciful’ writing *hučatpaman*. The Pāzand spellings run into Persian traditional dictionaries, with the label ‘Zand and Pāzand’; cf. *aučat pamun* ‘finger, toe’ in STEINGASS 1963 and DEHX (with further references).

Prs. *banān*, *banāne*, recorded as ‘finger’ and ‘finger tip’, is a loanword from Ar. *banān* ‘finger, finger tip’.¹²⁷ As for Ar. *banān*, cf. Akk. *ubānu* ‘finger’ and the Sem. forms collected in MILITAREV – KOGAN 2000: no. 34.

Bal. *hor* is a Br. lw. commonly used by Bal. speakers living in areas where Baloch and Brahuis live in mixed communities (Noške, FILIPPONE 2000–2003: 61; Makrān, MORGENSTIERNE 1932a: 38). The Drav. etymology of Br. *hōr* (BRAY 1934) is doubtful (DED² 561).

Oss. *k'ūx/k'ox*, both ‘hand’ and ‘finger’, is Caucasian by origin (see IESOU for references).

Dial. Taj. *barmoq* and (Kassansai) *ilikča* ‘finger’ (RASTORGUEVA 1963) are both Uzbek loanwords (cf. DOERFER 1967: nos 36, 111, 112).

9. A few other terms for ‘finger’, whose motivation escapes my analysis, or with a doubtful status in the lexicon, will be mentioned in this final paragraph.

Krd. lexicographers record *tipil* ‘finger’. Its dialectal distribution is not clear. We find it in Kurmanji dictionaries, as CHYET 2003 (*tipil* [informant from Akrê]), OMAR 1992 (*tipil*, *tibilk*) and AMÎRXAN 1992 (*tipil*), but also in

¹²⁷ See also CHEBEL 1999: 85.

HAŽAR 1990 (*tibil*, *tipil*, *dipil* ‘finger’; *tapil* ‘fingerprint’). KURDOEV 1960 gives *tepil* as ‘extremity of limbs’; in JABA – JUSTI 1879 *tipil*, *tipilk* is ‘extrémités des doigts’.

Prs. lexicographers record *pilaste*, *filaste*, *bilaste* ‘finger’ (also ‘arm; cheek’), three phonetic variants to which Taj. *pilasta* ‘elephant’s tusk; forearm’ corresponds. This word, whose primary sense is ‘ivory’, has been traditionally interpreted as a lexical compound formed by *pil* ‘elephant’ and *aste* ‘bone’ (see DEHX).

Prs. *pilaste* is not a neuter designation of ‘finger’; it belongs to the language of poetry and, as suggested in FF and DEHX, evokes the image of ‘long, white fingers’, or any other parts of the body, such as the forearm or the cheeks, whose whiteness favours a mental association with ivory.¹²⁸

I have nothing to suggest as regards Prs. *aštu*, *oštu* ‘finger’, recorded in traditional dictionaries (but not in use in Modern Prs.); Prs. *qavāre* ‘fingers of the hand’ (DEHX, FF), ‘finger’ (STEINGASS 1963); Prs. *serešt* ‘toe’ (STEINGASS 1963); Haz. *āxo* ‘finger’ (lw.?).

Khot. *hōšq̄* occurs in a later text (*Siddhasārā*) in correspondence with Buddh. Skt. *āṅgūli-* and Tib. *sor* ‘finger’. The passages quoted by BAILEY (1979 s.v.) only confirm that it could be used as a linear measure. BAILEY suggests interpreting it as a ‘pointed limb’ (an original **fra-vaśya-* from **vaxš-* ‘be pointed’). It could also be possible that this Khot. word, differently from Skt. *āṅgūli-* and Tib. *sor*, was not primarily a body part term, and had nothing to do with fingers.

Bal. *mat* ‘finger’ in MAYER 1910 is questionable and probably a misprint; cf. Bal. *māti* ‘thumb’ below, p. 114.

¹²⁸ That “whiteness” is considered as one of the forearm’s salient features is also proved by the frequent association of this body part with silver or crystal in the Persian classical poetry; cf. ANUŠE 1997: 155.

