

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE LITTLE FINGER

1. The salient feature of the little finger which has mostly influenced naming processes in languages all over the world is its small size. A few examples of this natural, elementary pattern are in VEENKER 1981: 371–372. Many others could easily be added to them.

All the Iranian little finger names stress this physical characteristics, no special function being ascribed to this finger. However, smallness may be emphasized adopting alternative lexical strategies. It is possible, for example, to simply describe the finger as small, or “the small(est)”, and in this case the various idioms differ as regards the specific terms for ‘small’ they contain. It is possible to grant to this finger the status of a child. Among all the fingers, it is the most natural to conceive as the youngest, the last born. The languages adopting a DIGIT = HUMAN BEING equation very frequently present the LITTLE FINGER = CHILD equation; for some instances see BROWN – WITKOSKI 1981: 602 (Table 4). But since most of the Iranian terms used in expressions for ‘little finger’ cover both the sense of ‘small’ and that of ‘baby, small child’, it is hardly ever possible to discriminate between the two different strategies. For this reason, the labels depicting the little finger as the small(est) finger or the young(est) “child-finger” are gathered together in §§ 1.1–15 below, grouped according to their etymological affiliation.

1.1. The standard Persian name of the little finger is *angošt-e kučak*, with *kučak* ‘small, little, young’, an adjective of very common usage, already documented in Middle Persian; cf. MPrs. *kūč(ak)* ‘small’.

To Prs. *kučak* and *kučulu* ‘small, tiny, little child, etc.’, many similar Ir. forms are connected. Apart from colloquial Prs., Esf.Prs. *kučik* ‘small’, *kučuli*, *quzuli* ‘tiny, minute’, AfyPrs. (Kāb.) *kočak* (BAU 2003), Haz. *kejlak* ‘short’, etc., (sure or possible) cognates are found (1) in the whole Lori and Fārs area (Bxt. *kučir*, (ČLang) *kučik*, *kočir*, Lo. *koček*, (Bālā-Gar.) *kučik*, Šušt. *kočok*, Ban. *kuček*, Mosq., Rič., Baliā., Birov., Hay., Dāreng., Dežg. *kučik*, Gorgn. *koček*, Kal. (Lor) *kočok*, Nud., Pāp., Gorgn., Knd. *koškak*; Kāz., Mās. *kuškak*; Mamas. *koškolu*, Dašt., Dādenj. *kočik*, Buš. *kučil*, Dav. *xu:jak*; *xu:jmalek*); (2) in Central dialects (Gz. *kučūlī*, Anār. *kučču* (LECOQ 2002) ‘small’, Sirj. *kočku* ‘very small’, ZorYzd. *kūčīl*); (3) in Caspian and North-Iran dialects (Gil. *kuči*, *kučtə*, *kuštə*, *kuštay*, *kučə*, *kučik*, *kučikə*, Damāv. *kočik*, Māz. (Sār.) *kučik*, *kučīnā*, *kučīnāk*, IrĀz. *kičik* (NAVĀBI 1992), (Sagz.) *qižil*, Tāl. *gaǰ*, IrĀz. *geč*

(ABDOLI 2001: 244)); (4) in the Kurdish and Zāzā areas (KurmKrd. *qicik* ‘small, little’, SouthKrd. *kučkok*, *kička*, *gučik*, *gičik*, *gičko*, *gička*, *gičkoka* ‘small’, *qičik*, *qič*, *gičkoła*, *gičkała* ‘small, tiny’, *qinjik* ‘a little’, *xujok* ‘very small’), Zā. (Šeyxān) *qiž*, (Kulp) *qij*, (Varto) *qičkēk* ‘small, young’, (Çernik) *qeček* ‘child’ (see also HADANK 1932: 296). Note also Prs. *kič* ‘small, tiny’, *kič-kič* ‘scattered’ (a dial. term?). Connected forms are found in EIr. as well; cf. Pšt. *kučnáy* ‘small; little’, *kučótay*, *kəčótay* ‘tiny, small’, Oss. *gyccyl*, (Dig.) *gicil* ‘small’.

As far as the names of the little finger are concerned, besides Prs. *angošt-e kučak*, one may quote Šir. *kelenje kučike* (XADIŠ 2000), Mās. *penje-y kočku*, Birov. *penje-y kučeku*, Hay., Dādenj., Rič. *penje-y kučku*, Mamas. *kelič-e košku*, Kal. (Tāj.), Nud., Pāp., Mosq., Kal. (Lor) *penje-y košku*, Dāreng. *penje-y kučik*, Dežg. *penje-y kučeku*, Ban. *penje-y kuček*, SouthKrd. *qala kučk*, Zā. *engišta qij* (TODD 1985), Bxt. *keliče (angošt) kučire* (my own data), Gil. *kuči anguš(əy)* (PĀYANDE 1987, s.v. *angoštān-e dast*), *kučəłə anguš* (SOTUDE 1963), Qasr. *angušd kučikak*, Sed. *uŋgulī-kičī/kučulī*, Buš. *kičul(uk)*, Lir.-Dayl. *kičul* (LIRAVI 2001: 272), Dašt. *kičluk*, *kičiluk*, *kičluk*, ZorYzd. *angušt-i kūčulōg*, Gz. *əŋgolī-kučulī*, and in EIr., Pšt. *káča gúta/gwáta*, *xáča gúta*, *xačəy gúta*, *xačəy mačəy gúta* (also *kíča gúta* in RAVERTY 1860 s.v. *gúta* ‘h’), *kučnáy gwáta*, *kačəy gwáta* (QALANDAR MOMAND – SHE-RAYI 1994), Wan. *xəčəkangut*, (ELFENBEIN 1984) *xəčəy mučəy* and Dzadr. *xčənkəy*.

Pšt. *xačəy mačəy gúta* and Wan. *xəčəy mučəy* are instances of the Ir. echo-compound, or alliterative compound type, where the second element is devoid of meaning and repeat approximately the first element with the change of its first consonant (generally with an *m*-sound), as is the case with Prs. *bačče-mačče* ‘a mere boy’ (STEINGASS 1963), also used as a pragmatically marked reference to a plurality of children. Other instances are mentioned above and below in this book (see e.g. Bal. *čūncī mačūncī* ‘little finger’, § 5 below). Pšt. *xačəy mačəy gúta* might help understand Pšt. *xamáča gúta* ‘little finger’. According to RAVERTY 1860, Pšt. *xamáča* means ‘puny, petty, short’, but this word seems to be only used in collocation with words for ‘finger’ and ‘rib’ in lexicalized phrases meaning ‘little finger’ and ‘short ribs’ (*xamáča puštáy*). My suggestion is considering *xamáča* as a ‘contracted’ form of an echo-compound, based on *xáča* ‘small’.²⁶¹

²⁶¹ ASLANOV (1966) does not provide a Russian equivalent of *xamáča*; he quotes (s.v.) the two lexicalized phrases containing *xamáča* which have been mentioned above.

1.2. Prs. *kučak* and cognates have been connected to an Ir. base **kau-/ku-* ‘young, small’, which may be envisaged in several words for ‘small’ in Prs. and other Ir. languages, and explained as < **kau-ča-ka-* (literature in SZEMERÉNYI 1977: 15). There is a more or less general agreement on this derivation, and there is no reason to challenge it. However, I would like to stress that the syllabic structure of Prs. *kučak* goes perfectly well with the sound symbolic patterns evocative of the concept of SMALLNESS, we find in other words for ‘small’, as can be easily verified looking at many of the terms gathered in the following paragraphs.²⁶² Sound symbolism is a much productive, not-arbitrary naming process which links associations of vowels and consonants with the human perception of size, shape, material consistency, movement, sound (onomatopoeia), etc.²⁶³ It may also provide a good explanation for the very large lexical cluster to which Bal. *čuk* ‘child’ belongs. Discussing Khot. *cakvaka-* ‘boy’, MAGGI (1997a: 64–67 and 1997b) quotes Bal. *čuk* and some relevant items (in EIr. and WIr., IA and Dravidian), which present a “similarity” with the Khot. term. MAGGI’s list could easily be enlarged: cf. e.g. Haz. *čvqʌj*, *čvqʌj* ‘small, little’, AfyPrs. *čukāčukī*, *čukāpukī* ‘a little’ (ŠĀLČI 1991), Sist. *čok*, *čokak* ‘a little’ and many others. In Krd., besides the *čuk/čûk* forms quoted by MAGGI, *čik*-forms are also found: cf. e.g. SouthKrd. *čik*, *čikê* ‘a little’. A nasal insertion seems also possible: cf. AfyPrs. *čungī* ‘small’ (ŠĀLČI 1991), which reminds Bal. *čunkī* ‘little finger’ (see below). MAGGI, who also quotes a few examples in languages other than Iranian, like e.g. It. *cucciolo*, states that «their similarity, and on the other hand, [...] the general lack of precise phonological correspondences» would lead «to the conclusion that the words under consideration are onomatopoeic formations that have arisen and evolved independently, at least in part, in the various languages» (1997a: 66).²⁶⁴ However, while it is certainly true that the iconicity based on sound symbolism often

²⁶² Note that ABAEV (IESOJ) explains Oss. *gyccyl* ‘small’ as belonging to child language («“detskim” slovom»).

²⁶³ An interdisciplinary collection of studies on this much productive device is HINTON – NICHOLS – OHALA 1994. A comprehensive examination of how it affects the Iranian lexicon is still a desideratum. At a first sight, it seems reasonable to state that affricate segments (palato-alveolar [tʃ] – [dʒ] and also alveo-dental [ts] – [dz] in EIr., possibly preceded or followed by high frequency vowels) may concur to evoke SMALLNESS, being frequently found in words meaning ‘small’ and/or ‘child’ and/or ‘small of animals’.

²⁶⁴ Though admitting a relationship between Khot. *čākvaka-* and Wx. *cuk* ‘small’, TREMBLAY (2000: 193) prefers envisaging a popular borrowing from an Indian language, on account of the direct resemblance of the Khot. word with Skt. *cikva-* ‘baby elephant’.

appears to have a universal character, I still think that the prevalence of specific sound patterns as contrasted with other possible ones in a given linguistic area (as large as may be, and irrespective of the localization of an irradiation centre) may be recognized as a shared areal feature.

Derivatives from *čuk* ‘child’ occur in the following Bal. idioms: *čukī lan-kuk* (mainly SBal.: Karachi, Dašt, Kasarkand), *čukki čangul* (Irānšahr), *čuk-kol* (Sarāwān), *čunkī* (Turbat) ‘little finger’. To them, KurmKrd. *t’ilīya ç’ūk* ‘pinkie, little finger’ is connected.

Yzy. *cəgagi γ^wašt* ‘little finger’ contains *cəgag* ‘small, little’. According to SKÖLD (1936: 186), both *ts²gagi ɣašt* and (with comparative) *tsəgagtar ɣašt* ‘small finger’ are in use. Wx. *zəqīq yəngəl* ‘little finger’ (LORIMER 1958) contrasts with *zəq yəngəl* ‘ring finger’ (lit. ‘the small finger’),²⁶⁵ in that it describes the former as smaller than the latter (Wx. *zəqīq* ‘little, small, smaller than *zəq*’). In fact, it is always possible to make graded assessments in measure evaluation.

As *l*-extensions of bases that could be linked to Bal. *čuk*, all meaning ‘small, little’, ‘child’ or the like, the following may be considered: SouthKrd. *čikola*, *čikala*, *čikoluka*, *čikoloka*, etc. ‘small’, *čikolāna* ‘very small’, Mahāb. *čikōla* ‘small’, Šuš. *jeqe* ‘little child’ (FĀZELI 2004), Bxt. (ČLang) *jeqela*, (Pāgač) *jeqe* ‘boy’, IrĀz. (Ebr.) *jeqel*, (Čā.) *zeqela* ‘small’, Gil. *ja ɣal*, *jeqel* ‘baby, small child’ (*jaqalə* PĀYANDE 1987, s.v. *bačče* and *čakāl* ‘small, tiny’ SOTUDE 1963), (Māč.) *jaγ^l* ‘child’, Damāv. (echo-compound) *jeqel beqel* ‘(many) small children’, Tāl. *ǰək(ə)la* (*čoxla* in Astar), Xor. (Mašhad) *jeqeli* ‘small (i.e. having small limbs, of human beings); small child’ (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964), TrbHayd. *jeqeli* ‘small’ and *zoqula* ‘small child’, Zand (Tafreš area) *ǰiqil* (MOQDAM 1949: 27), Qm. *zeqe* ‘small child’, Esf.Prs. *jejele* ‘a little man’, Buš. *jejele* ‘boy’, Lārest. *čikala* ‘chick; nestling’ (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964), Farām. *čikal(u)* ‘chick’, etc. These terms outline a compact band stretching from West Iran (Kurdish and Baxtiāri areas), and North Iran up to Xorāsān, but similar forms are also in use along the Southern Iranian belt. Possibly, a Sgd. antecedent is recorded in the Prs.-Sgd. glossary fragment M 425, where in V/3, in connection with Man. MPrs. *qwdk* (*kōdak* ‘small’), the Sgd. characters <cy> is readable. MORANO (2005: 219–220) suggests emending it as *cy* [*lyh*], and his suggestion seems quite convincing.

As little finger names, one may quote Mukri *qāmīk ī čkōlah* (CHRISTENSEN – BARR 1939: 305) and Gil. *čakale anguš*, with the metathesized variant *čalake-anguš*. Similarly, in EIr. we find Wx. *ǰəqlay yənglək* ‘little

²⁶⁵ See above, p. 147.

finger' from *ʒəqlay*, *cəqlay* 'small, little'.²⁶⁶ According to LORIMER 1958, Wx. *tsiklai* is both 'finger' and 'little finger'.

1.3. It is not clear whether KurmKrd. *piç'ûk*, *biç'ûk* 'small, little; child' is connected to Prs. *bačče* 'child' and its several cognates. As for Krd., CABOLOV 2001 points to an older **čû-* 'small'. He suggests separating the Krd. word from the *bačče*-lexical set, for which in IES0J (s.v. *biccew* 'child') an etymology based on a common Ir., Caucasian, IA substratum is proposed.

The situation is much entangled and CABOLOV's explanation appears unconvincing. For Kurdish one may quote KurmKrd. *buçuk*, *biçuk*, *biçik*, *biç'ûk*, *biç'ûçik*, *piç'ûk* 'small; child', *piçek*, *bîç'ek* 'a little', Sul. *pich* 'small quantity', *pichûk*, *bichûk* 'little, small', *beç* 'young, child', SouthKrd. *bučk*, *bučka*, *bička*, *bičuk*, *bičûk*, *pičuk*, *bičučk*, *bičkok*, *bičola*, *pičkol*, *bičkol*, etc. 'small', *bučân*, *bučkalâna*, *bičkalâna*, *bičkolâna*, *bičkaļa*, *pičkala* 'very small', *pêçika* 'a newborn baby', Krmnš. *beč* 'any small thing'. To these Krd. forms, add Zā. *pičêke* 'a little', Gor. (Talahed.) *büček* 'small', Māz. (Āmol.) *peçik* 'very small', Ardest. *paçi* 'a little', Dav. *peča* 'a little; a tiny fragment; a small quantity of a thing', Kor. *biček* 'small', Lārest. *peçi* 'a little' (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964) and many others, among which Šuš. *bačila* and Buš. *bočil* 'chick'. See also (Gypsy) Zand *büčok* 'small' (MOQDAM 1949: 80). An isolated, connected form is found in the Tajik dialect of the Kulyāb valley; cf. *piči* 'a little' in ROZENFEL'D 1982. I would also include in this set the word *pyš* 'a little' occurring in a Geniza fragment written with Hebrew characters in an Iranian dialect, probably Northern or Central (SHAKED 1988: 225).

Krd. forms belonging to the *piç'ûk*/*pičuk* set occur in the following names of the little finger: KurmKrd. *telîya pečûk* (*tilîya biçuk*), SulKrd. *emusty pichûk*, Kor. *kelek-e biček*, Gor. (Talahed.) *kelek büčkala*. In Sivandi, *pîčeke* 'little finger' has been recorded by ANDREAS and quoted by EILERS 1988 and LECOQ 1979.²⁶⁷

As for EIr., I would quote here Baĵ. *bicik ingaxt*, with Baĵ. *bicik* connected to Roš. and Xuf. *buc* (m.), *bic* (f.) 'baby, small child', etc. Differently, MORGENSTIERNE (EVŠG) relates Šyn., Xuf., Roš., Baĵ., Oroš. *-buc* (m.), *-bic* (f.) 'child, young (of animal)' to Šyn., Xuf., Roš., Baĵ., Oroš. *puc*, *Zyz. poc* etc. 'son', and consequently to Av. *puθra-*. May we think here of a contamination between forms with different etymologies? In fact, Ir. **θr* > Šyn.

²⁶⁶ See also STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ 1999 s.v.

²⁶⁷ LECOQ lists it among the words appeared in previous publications, which have not been confirmed by his informants (1979: 200).

c does not account for all Šyn. *c*. Throughout EVŠG, the cases of Šyn. *c-* / *-c-* / *-c* < **θr*, which may be considered as sure, i.e. substantiated by attestations in other Ir. languages, as is case with *puc* ‘son’, *pōc* ‘time’, *yōc* ‘fire’, and not hypothesized, often with many doubts by MORGENSTIERNE himself, are very few. The other cases are mostly well explained with the fact that Šyn. *c* often corresponds to *č* in other Ir. languages. In my view, MORGENSTIERNE’s statement as regards *ceg* ‘child, suckling’, that «If genuine ŠGr-Y word *c-* < **θr-*, but poss. a migratory word, cf. CDIAL 4781 s.v. *cikka*³-» is open to question.²⁶⁸ One should probably not think that all the Šuyni words starting with *c-*, which cannot be derived from **θr-* (like for example Šyn. *cōm* ‘eye’), have to be considered as not “genuine” Šuyni words.

1.4 Tāl. *munjilə*, *munjla*, *mužla*, *mužil*, *mu(n)jila* *angištə* ‘little finger’ may be hardly separated from Tāl. *miža* ‘small’, which ABDOLI (2001: 171) ascribes to child language.

Mnj. *mlemčigha* ‘little finger’ is in some way reminiscent of Tāl. *munjilə*; if the two forms are actually related is doubtful.

To Tāl. *miža* ‘small’ are connected Māz. (Āmol.) *mičkak* ‘very small’, Dav. *mu:žak* ‘small; having small limbs’, and probably also Yyn. *muččonak*, *muččunak* ‘small’ (MIRZOZODA 2008).

1.5. Ār.-Bidg. *əgüšvėjij*, Bohr. *engüst vüjija*, Abiā. *angöšta vüjüčče* ‘little finger’ contain an adjectival base for ‘small’ with several cognates in Central dialects. They are Vfs. *vija*, *vijila* (MOQDAM 1949), *viljæ* (STILO 2004), Qm. *vezele*, Biz. *vejij* (*vejijä* in MAZRA^cTI *et al.* 1995), Ār.-Bidg. *vėjij*, Abiā. *vüjüč*, Qohr. *vüjja* (also ‘cadet’), *vüjüj*, Jawš. *vučul*, Mei. *vi:šli*, Vajguni *vi:šl*, *vi:šla* (SHAKIBI GUILANI – QOLIZADE VAZVANI 1990), Mah. (Vārān) *višl* (MAJIDI 1975: 63), etc. all meaning ‘small’.

1.6. Siv. *gusse čilū* (ŽUKOVSKIJ 1922: 110) ‘little finger’ is a lexicalized phrase containing the adjective *čilū* ‘small’; cf. also Siv. *čilkunū*, *čilekunū*, *čilukunū*, *čilikunū* ‘very young, young(-er/est)’, «an ,absoluter Komparativ’» (EILERS 1988). According to EILERS, Siv. *čil-* is a «Kürzung (..) aus (np.) *kū-čilū*». I disagree with this explanation. By the way, it is worth noting that the ending *-(u)nū*, intensifying in this word the notion of SMALLNESS or imply-

²⁶⁸ See also above p. 151 and fn. 263.

ing a comparison in the evaluation, is also found in Lārestāni; cf. Lārest. *kaidenū* ‘smaller’, from *kaidū* ‘small, little’, for which see below p. 161.

Siv. *čilū* has counterparts both in WIr. and EIr. In WIr., one may cite Semn. *čili čili* ‘very small’, Māz. *čelik* ‘baby; little, young; small’ (Sār. *čilik*, AliĀb. *čelik*), IrĀz. (ADIB TUSI 1992: no. 1180) *čelik* ‘small’, *čelêin* ‘newborn baby; small and fragile’, Tāl. *čilaza* ‘child, infant’ (ABDOLI 2001), Damāv. *čelka*, KurmKrd. *čelik* ‘young of bird’ (RIZGAR 1993 *čēlik* ‘young animal [kitten, puppy, chick etc.]’), SouthKrd. *čēla* ‘child’, Zā. *čēlik* ‘young animal’, Dašt. *čel zan* ‘little woman’, *čel merd* ‘little man’, Bast. *čilāki* ‘(small) chick’, Her. *čel mardak* ‘very short man’ etc. In EIr., cognates to Siv. *čilū* are mostly found in the Šuyni group: cf. Šyn. *žul*, *žulik(ik)*, fem. *žal*, *žalik(ik)* ‘small; little, young’, Sariq. *žil*, *žil* etc.²⁶⁹

Siv. *gusse čilū* may be compared with Biz. *čelīk*, perhaps also IrĀz. *žuli* (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964), Šyn. *žalik(ik) angixt* (ZARUBIN 1960), Sariq. *žilag-in-gaxt*, *žilaq-ingaxt*, Yzy. *čalyagī* (GAUTHIOT 1916), all meaning ‘little finger’.

It could also be possible that the words for ‘finger’, such as Taj. *čilik*, which have been treated above, p. 65 and for which a connection to words for twigs, pieces of wood etc., has been suggested, would in fact belong here.

1.5. Prs. lexicographers record many expressions for ‘little finger’, some of which are not in use anymore, or have dialectal or other specific connotations. In any case, they are not in use in Standard Persian of Iran. Among these, there is *angošt-e xord(ak)*, *angošt-e xordin*, *xord angošt* (DEHX), to which one may link Taj. *angušt-i xurd* (also *čilik-i-xurd(i)* KALBĀSI 1995, *panja-i xurda* MIRZOZODA 2008, s.v. *naxna*), Šahm. *xord-engošt*, Abd. *penje-y xordek* (*xurdek* in ŽUKOVSKIJ 1922: 110), Dorun. *penje-y xorkak*, Somṛ. *penje-y xordu*, Ir.Bal. (Irānšahr) *urdūkē anguš* ‘little finger’.

Prs. *xord* (superl. *xordin*) is recorded in dictionaries as ‘small, minute; young; broken to pieces; change (money)’; its derivative *xorde* means ‘bit, fragment; anything small; dust etc.’. Variants in informal registers are *xurd* and *xurde*; to colloquial Persian also belongs *xert*, which is only found in idioms like *xert-o-pert*, *xert-o-xurt* (NAJAFI 1999) ‘trumpery’. For Eastern Persian, one may quote AfyPrs. *xord* ‘small; young’ (BAU 2003), Xor. *xurd* ‘small; a little’, Madagl. *xerd* ‘small’, *xerdūna* ‘kid’, *xertik* ‘small, little’,

²⁶⁹ In EVŠG, s.v. (Yzy.) *čal-dūr* ‘younger’, MORGENSTIERNE doubtfully suggests a connection with the IA words assembled in CDIAL 4911; see also CDIAL 4877. I think there are good reasons to speak of an areal lexical family even in this case.

Sist. *xurd* ‘small’, *xurda* ‘dust taken from the tomb of a saint, which, rubbed on body or eaten, is used as a remedy against illness; kid and lambs; change (of money)’. The *xord*-type adjectives have a large diffusion in Fārs, as well; cf. Dav. *xord*, *xordek*, *xordelek*, Dahl., Abd. *xordek*, Kāz., Kuz. *xord*, etc. (SALĀMI 2004: 174–177, s.vv. *kučak* and *riz*), Pāp. *xord* ‘tiny’, Somṽ. *xord* ‘small’ (SALĀMI 2005: 176–178, s.vv. *kučak* and *riz*), Dorun. *xorkak* ‘small’ (SALĀMI 2006: 189, s.v. *kučak*), etc.

Prs. *xord* and *xorde* directly continue Phl. *xwurd* ‘small, little, minute; of no value’ and *xwurdag* ‘something small; particle; detail’, both unrecorded in Man. MPrs. Cognates to Prs. *xord* and *xorde* are numberless all over WIr. and EIr. and are also found as loanwords in Armenian and Caucasian languages (GIPPERT 2009). They differ as to the meaning they convey and their status inside the lexicon of the relevant languages. In some varieties, *xord*-forms are used as current adjectives for ‘small’, with a dimensional value, sometimes conveying the sense of ‘child’ or ‘small domestic animal’; in some other varieties they are not so commonly used, having the restricted sense of ‘minute, tiny; crushed’, or being used as nominals to denote different kinds of very small and/or insignificant things.

In WIr., cognates to Prs. *xord* are KurmKrd. *xort* ‘young; young man, youth’, *hūr* ‘small, petty (change); tiny, fine, minute’, *xirt* ‘three-year-old ram, male sheep’, SorKrd. *wurd* ‘small (esp. of children under ten years old); precise, attentive’, SouthKrd. *xurd*, *urd*, *urt*, *ur*, *hur* ‘small, minute; orderly and intelligent person’, *xirt* ‘trumpery’, *wird* ‘small, tiny’, *wirda* ‘lambs and kids; trumpery; a little bit’, etc., Gor. (Kand.) *wird*, *wirdā* ‘in pieces, crumbled’, *wirdiklā* ‘child’, (Awr.) *wurd* ‘small, fine’, Zā. *werdī* ‘small’ (Çermik-Siverek dial. area; PAUL 1998: 212), (Kur) *hōrdi*, *wurdi* ‘small, in pieces’, (Biṽ.) *wārdi* ‘small’, Bxt. (ČLang) *xird*, *hird* ‘small’, Lak. *hirdaru* ‘small; generally, the smallest child in a family’, Lo. *hird* ‘small, minute’, *hirdela* ‘very small’, *hirderu* ‘all the children of a family’.

In North and Central Iran one finds IrĀz. (Ker.) *herden* ‘child, baby’, Tāl. *xerdan*, IrĀz. *xerde*, (Langarāni) *hrdan* ‘baby’ (ABDOLI 2001: 184–185), Šahm. *xord*, *xordenak* ‘small’, Sang. *xwrd* ‘small’, *xerte* ‘small’ (AZAMI – WINDFUHR 1972), Māz. (Sār.) *xurd*, Qasr. *xurda* ‘small’ (DEYHIM 2005: 31), Vfs. *hur*d ‘small, tiny, broken up’, Kah. *xurde*, Jawš. *hyrd* ‘small’, Abiā. *hūr*d ‘crumb’, *ūrda* ‘a little’, Biz. *xōrd* ‘small, tiny’, *xūrda* ‘small, tiny; a little’, Anār. *xurde* ‘small’ (LECOQ 2002), Nāi. *xird* ‘small, tiny’, *xirde* ‘in pieces’ (LECOQ 2002), Qohr. *hūr*, Tār. *hūrt*, Varz. *hirde* ‘small, tiny’, Del. *xeurd*, *xeud* ‘small, little’, Xuns. *hūrt* ‘(short and) small’ (EILERS 1976), Siv. *ferd* ‘small’, etc.

Cognates to Prs. *xord* are also found in Balochi: cf. WBal. *hūrt*, *hūrd*, *xūrt*, (*h*)*urta(g)* ‘crushed, ground; small, tiny; small domestic animals’, *hūr-dag* ‘material taken from a Pir’s tomb and rubbed on body, or eaten etc. as a protection against evil’²⁷⁰ (ELFENBEIN 1990-II), SBal. (*h*)*īrt*, *īrdag* (also *hūrt*) ‘small, delicate; thin; fine, powdery; crumbs, powder, pieces; kids and lambs’ (SAYAD HASHMI 2000), EBal *hūr-θ* ‘thin, fine; small’, *hūrθen whaškī* ‘small game’ (MAYER 1909:171), etc. Bal. speakers from different areas of Iran tend to use (*h*)*urd*, (*h*)*urt*, (*h*)*urdūk* (my own data; *hord* ‘small, young’ in AYYUBI 2002) as an usual word for ‘small’ in many senses, in collocation with words denoting any kinds of referents having smaller dimensions as compared with other objects of the same category (such as mountains, trees, chairs, books, noses, human beings, etc.).

Among the small things which may be denominated with *xord*-type words, there are the small bones (Prs. *xorde ostoxān* [LAZARD 1990a, ĀRYĀNPUR KĀŠĀNI 1979] ‘group of small bones’), in particular those composing hands and feet (Prs. *xord(e-ye) dast* ‘wrist’, *xorde ostoxān-e dast* ‘carpus’; *xorde ostoxān-e pā* ‘tarsus’, Sang. *xūrdæ* ‘knuckles’ AZAMI – WINDFUHR 1972, SouthKrd. *xirtka*, *xirtik* ‘joints of hands and feet’), or those of the ankle (Dav. *xordakun* ‘malleolus’, Prs. *xord-gāh* ‘pastern of a quadruped’, SulKrd. *xirtke*, *xirke* ‘ankle-joint, pastern-joint’). A Bal. speaker from Noške, gave me *ūrtband* as ‘knuckle-joints’; he was probably influenced by Brahui, his mother tongue (cf. Br. *xūrt band* ‘wrist, ankle’ < Ir., but from which language?; ROSSI 1979: F100). The oldest attestation of this usage is in Phl.; cf. *xwurdag* ‘(horse’s) pastern’, e.g. in *GrBd.* 24.13.

To the *xord*-group belongs Par. *γurōk*²⁷¹ ‘child’ according to MORGENSTIERNE (IIFL-I: 257, EVP: 92 Par. *γurōk* < **wṛta*-: Prs. *xurd* < **hwṛta*-), who also suggests connecting here Pšt. *wor*, *wur*, *wər* ‘small; tiny; short; insignificant’ (EVP s.v. *wur*, *wōr*, but more cautiously in NEVP < ***wṛta*-?). TREMBLAY (2005: 183) has contested this connection, but his derivation of the Pšt. word (< **baratā*- ‘dout il faut s’occuper’, with an early syncopation of the middle vowel) seems unconvincing, at least from the semantic/conceptual point of view.

²⁷⁰ There is no reason to resort to «NP *xwar*-», as in ELFENBEIN 1990-II; the material which is rubbed on the body is ‘earth, dust’, i.e. a thing with a fair chance of being named “the pulverised”. I take the opportunity to remark that the possible direct origin of Br. *xurda*, *xwarda* ‘dust taken from the shrine of a saint’ and *xūrda* ‘lamb’ is Sistāni (cf. ROSSI 1979: H 741, H743).

²⁷¹ According to KIEFFER, Par. *γ(o)ṛók*, *γ(o)ṛök* ‘enfant’ is a word well understood, but never used spontaneously, by his Par. informants (1979: 261).

On the etymology of Prs. *xord* and its numberless cognates all over WIr. and (possibly) EIr., no agreement has been reached. Among the hypotheses advanced so far, one may quote that in HORN 1893 (\sqrt{qert} - ‘schneiden’, suggested by NÖLDEKE but contested by HÜBSCHMANN 1895: 57); MORGENSTIERNE 1937: 347 (< **hw-ṛta*- ‘well-ground’); NYBERG 1931: 134 («t-Erweiterung zu $\chi\bar{o}r$ » ‘deep’); EILERS 1957: 335 (< PIr. **x^war*- ‘to eat, to consume’); CIPRIANO 1998: 252 (< Av. *x^wara*- ‘wound, sore’, < IE **swVr*- ‘to wound’, already in DE LAGARDE, disputed by HORN), where a semantic connection with Prs. *x^wār* ‘despised, wretched’ is envisaged. EILERS’ “eaten”-hypothesis is old; it had already been basketed by HORN, in view of the u-vocalism of the MPrs. form (as contrasted to the “regular” *xwa^o* of *xwardan* ‘to eat’). Recently, GIPPERT (2009: 137–138) has resumed this etymology, reconstructing a form **xwṛta*-, which «may well represent the original past participle “eaten” of the root **xwar*-». As a support to this derivation, he mentions semantic parallels from Germanic (Engl. *bit*, Germ. *Bisschen*, from a verb meaning ‘to bite’).

In my view, however, many *xord*-cognates cannot be explained on the basis of GIPPERT’s suggestion, though it is always possible to think to lexical contamination and overlapping, with the subsequent alteration of the expected phonetic changes, and I still consider MORGENSTIERNE’s etymology as more reliable. The PULVERISED, CRUSHED → SMALL conceptual derivation represents an iconomastic type: see for instance Khot. *ñāḍa*- ‘small’ (if < **ni-arta*- ‘ground down’, as in BAILEY 1979; 22, 116), Skt. *kṣudrā*- ‘small, tiny’ (EWA I: 434, CDIAL 3712) and a few other semantic parallels in BUCK 1949: 880–881. One could also add here Taj. *mayda*, for which see below, § 1.14.

In his attempt to explain Badaxš. *xetārik* ‘small, little’, which occurs in the lexicalized phrase *lakük/likik i xetārik* ‘little finger’, LORIMER (1922: 178) points to a doubtful derivation from an attested *xertārik*, having probably Prs. *xord*, Madagl. *xerd* ‘small’, *xertik* ‘small, little’ in mind. At present no final words can be said on the matter.

1.6. Prs. *angošt-e keh* and *angošt-e kehin(e)* ‘little finger’ contain *keh* and *kehin*, respectively the old comparative and superlative forms from an adjectival base not attested as such in Persian. We find it in Avestan (YAv. *kasu*- ‘small, little’), in Sogdian (*kəs*, *kas* <’ks-, ks-> ‘thin’), in Bactrian (*касоко*, *косоко* ‘little, a little, slightly’, < **kasu-ka*- SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000), in Man. Parthian (*kasišt* <qsyšt, ksyšt>), as far as old Ir. languages are concerned. As for MPrs., the Phl. writing <ks, ksyst> hides the actual pronunciation. Taking into account the Man. MPrs. spelling <kyh, qyh> and

following the lines of MACKENZIE's transcription, I will conventionally quote the Phl. word as *keh* 'small(er), less(er), young(er)' (and *kehist* 'smallest'), exactly as I have done with Phl. <ms, msyst> (see above, p. 96).

Apart from Prs. *keh*, reflexes in Modern Iranian of Ir. **kasu-* are numerous and mainly spread in Central dialects, dialects of North and Caspian area, in Balochi and in a few EIr. languages. See Anār. *kas*, Ardest. *kēs*, *kēs(s)u*, Nāi. *kas*, Tār. *kas*, Varz. *kas*, Xur. *kēsu*, ZorYzd. *kas*, *kasūg*, *kasōg*, Yzd-JPrs. *ka-sok*, Keš. *kas*, Zefr. *kas*, Āšt. *kastar*, *kassar*, Āmor. *kūsdarak*, Vonuš. *kessar*, Xuns. *kissar*, Ham-JPrs. *kāsār*, Hanj. *kasla*, Sang., Semn., Lāsg., *kasin*, Srx. *kesin*, all meaning 'small', Sang. *kasinu* 'smaller' (*kas* in AZAMI – WINDFUHR 1972), etc.²⁷² See also Bal. *kasān* 'small' and, for EIr., Pšt. *kāšr*, *kāšar*, *kīšar*, Oss. *k'äst'ār* 'younger; cadet'.

That Av. (gen.) *kasištahe arəzvō* (BARTHOLOMAE 1904 'des kleinsten Fingers'), with the corresponding Phl. expression *kehist angust* (*Vd.* 6.10) could be taken as the name of the little finger, has been suggested above, p. 96. In the Phl. documentation, one also finds *keh angust* 'little finger/toe' in *GrBd.* VII.10²⁷³ and *WZ* 22.9 (*angust-ē homānāg keh* "comme un doigt, le plus petit", GIGNOUX – TAFAZZOLI 1993). Here also belong Aft. *kasin engošt*, Semn. *kasin angōšt(a)*, Sang. *kas angōštu*, Tāl. (Kargānrudi) *gəsa angəšta* (D. GUIZZO p.c.), Zefr. *üngülī kasa*, Nat. *engulī kas*, Gz. *ēngolī-kās(e)*, ZorYzd. *angušt-i kasōg*, Bal. *kasānē lankuk* (Karachi and Nal)²⁷⁴ and *kastarē lankuk* (from a Bal. speaker living in Oman), Oss. *kæstær ængwylʒ* (my own data) or *kæstær k'ūx*.

MORGENSTIERNE quotes (dial.) Pšt. *kašnai gwəta* 'little finger' in EVP, s.v. *kašr*. Due to a misinterpretation of the abbreviation 'B' in EVP (= Twayer Khan from Bangash), which does not refer to a Bal. but to a Pšt. informant, PSTRUSIŃSKA (1974: 170 and 1985–1986, where *kašnai*: is a misprint) mentions a non-existent Bal. *kašnai gūta* 'little finger'. PSTRUSIŃSKA (1974: 169) underlines that Pšt. *kāšar* 'younger' and *māšar* 'older' may only be used with reference to human beings. This means that, if Pšt. *kašnai* in *kašnai gwəta* is actually related to Pšt. *kāšar*, this thumb name should be considered as a figurative expression. However, it is by no means certain that Pšt. *kašnai* and *kāšar* do have some relationship. The former is not mentioned in NEVP, nor in other etymological repertoires (see DE CHIARA 2008: 495). An alternative hypothesis, kindly suggested to me by M. DE CHIARA,

²⁷² See also STILO 2007: 96 (and Table 2).

²⁷³ In this passage, *keh angust* is actually 'little toe' (since at the death of Gayōmard, the Evil Spirit first touches the little toe of his right leg).

²⁷⁴ On Bal. *kasānen* [*laŋkuk*] 'forefinger' (MORGENSTIERNE 1932a: 40) see above, p. 131.

is considering Pšt. *kašnəi* as a dialectal variant of Pšt. *kučnáy* ‘small’, for which see above, § 1.1.

1.7. The Khot. label for ‘little finger’, *kaṇaiska*, is in some way related to Skt. *kaniṣṭhā-* ‘id.’, fem. of *kaniṣṭhā-* ‘(RV) youngest, (Lex.) younger brother’ (CDIAL 2718, 2719, with modern IA outcomes). To it, one may add Skt. (Lex.) *kanyasā-* and (Lex.) *kanīnī-*, *kanīnakā-*, *kanīnikā-* ‘little finger’ (fem. of respectively *kanyasa-* ‘younger’ and *kanīna-* ‘young, youthful’ (CDIAL 2735, 2736); see also EWA I: 297–298.

Khot. *kaṇaiska* ‘little finger’ is homophonous with the Khot. name of the famous Kushan king, Kanishka. Scholars have long since referred both to the Ir. base **kan-* (IE **ken-* ‘to come forth freshly’, IEW 1959: 563–564), from which words linked to the notion of YOUTH / SMALLNESS have developed; see BAILEY 1945: 21–22. The name of the king has been interpreted as the ‘most youthful in vigour’ by BAILEY 1954: 146. According to HENNING (1965: 82–84), should be analysed as **kaništa-ka-*, a Bactr. *-ka-*-derivative from a superlative degree. EILERS 1970 pointed at an Ir. *-št-* > *-šk-* development. Taking into account the dental *-s-*, EMMERICK (1993: 53) challenged the assumed ‘superlative’ nature of this word: «*kaṇaiska* “little finger” cannot derive from **kaništa-ka-* (comparing **kaništa-* with the Old Indian superlative *kaniṣṭhā-*) because **šta-ka-* would almost certainly have resulted in *-ška-* in Khotanese». For EMMERICK, therefore, the Khot. name of the little finger may only be explained assuming an original **kaniča-ka-* > **kaniska-*, which subsequently «was blended with **kaṇaiška-* < Bactrian *κανησκο* with the consequence that both resulted in *kaṇaiska-* in Khotanese». While EMMERICK’s position is well founded on the phonological level, the semantic arguments he adduces in support of his analysis («There is of course no reason why the “little finger” (Modern Persian *angošt-e kuček*) need be named as the “littlest”») may be questioned on account, at least, of Skt. *kaniṣṭhā-* ‘little finger’.

In many Ir. languages, the Ir. base **kan-* has developed derivative nouns with the specialized sense of ‘girl’; cf. Prs. *kaniz* ‘girl, female slave’ and its several cognates. Outcomes of **kan-* have been collected in etymological dictionaries; see BAILEY 1979, s.v. *kaṇaiska* and IESOJ, s.v. *k’annəg*. As belonging to **kan-*, with a semantic range going from ‘small’ (in many senses) to ‘short’, besides Oss. *k’annəg* ‘small’, I would quote KurmKrd. *kin* ‘short (of stature)’,²⁷⁵ possibly Sang. *qenar* ‘small’ (AZAMI – WINDFUHR 1972) and

²⁷⁵ So also CHYET 2003, quoting CABOLOV 1976: 11; a different understanding is in CABOLOV 2001 s.v. [*< *OIr. kuntaka-*].

Farām. *kengel*, Bast. *kengli* ‘small’; see also Buš. *kengelewoy* ‘smallness’. Bast. *kengli* occurs in the lexicalized phrase *angošt kengli*, which is the Bast. name of the little finger.

In Prs. dictionaries, Prs. *kanj* is mostly recorded as ‘uvula’ (DEHX; see also LAZARD 1990a). However, in STEINGASS 1963 s.v., one also finds *kanj* ‘the little toe’ (from *Nezāmolatba*). If not a misfiling, one may assume in this case a metaphorical association inside the body term terminology, with the little toe (also finger?) equated to the uvula. Since most denominations of the uvula emphasize the smallness of this part, it could also be possible that *kanj* ‘uvula’ is to be referred to the **kan*-group for ‘young, small, etc.’.

With reference to Khot. *kaṇaiska*, BAILEY (1979) also quotes Mnj. *kandāra* and *kandir āguškīgā* ‘little finger’. See also Mnj. *kāmdār agūška* (GRJUNBERG 1972) and *kuhnd-r āguškīgā* (MORGENSTIERNE 1966, from BADAXŠI 1960: 75).

It is much likely that Mnj. *kandāra* belongs to the same group as Prs. *kam* ‘few, little’ (Av. *kamna-*, OP *kamna-*, etc.). This is the position of MORGENSTIERNE, who in IIFL-II quotes Mnj. *kandāra* (from GAUTHIOT 1916) s.v. *k’āmder*. The question however still remains open.

As far as Prs. *kamin* ‘little finger’ (STEINGASS 1963) is concerned, DEHX suggests considering it as a misspelling of *kehin* (*angošt*), for which see above, § 1.6.

1.8. Phl. *andak angust* ‘little finger’ (BAHĀR 1966: 83) contains the MPrs. adj./adv. *andak* ‘little; few’, continued in Prs. *andak* ‘little, few, small’ and its several cognates in Iranian.

1.9. Lār. *kaidenū* is the comp./superl. form²⁷⁶ of Lār.-Ger. *kaidū* ‘small’, (with an echo-iterative formation *kaidū maidū* ‘very small, tiny’). It occurs in the Lār. idiom *kelike-kaidenū* ‘little finger’.

Lār. *kaidū* has variants *kaū* and *keve* (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964). Here could also belong Farām. *gedi* ‘having a small growth [*kam rošd*]’; SouthKrd. *kada* ‘young boy; unacquainted’; Zā. (Siverek) *gidī* ‘klein’ (HADANK 1932: 156); Tāl. (Langorān) *gada* ‘small, minute’ (ABDOLI 2001: 205). Nothing can be said about possible connections with the group of MPrs. *kōdak* ‘young, small, baby’, Prs./Taj. *kudak* ‘child’, Yγn. *gudik*, *kudak* ‘small child; boy’, etc.

²⁷⁶ On the ending *-nū* see also above, p. 154.

1.10. In Sogdian, the little finger is named *rinčaku angušt* (SUNDERMANN 2002: 44 no. 59), a phrase containing *rinčaku*, from *rinčāk*, *rinčē* ‘child; small; little; light’; see also *rinčūk* ‘child; little; light’, *rinčīk* ‘small’.

Sgd. *rinčāk* ‘small’ has several Ir. cognates. However, to which Ir. words it should be connected remains debatable. On the one hand, there are scholars like HENNING (1945: 482 n. 5), GERSHEVITCH (1959: 215, 327) and EMERICK (1968: 10), who refer *rinčāk* etc. to Av. *raγu-* (Sgd. *ryncwk* < **ran-juka-*, cf. Av. *raγu-*, *rəñj-*), and consequently to the IIr. (and IE) words for ‘light’/‘swift’ (EWA II: 423–424; IEW 660–661 **leg^h-*, *leng^h-*). In Iranian, these are Av. *raγu-* ‘light; swift’ (comp. *rəñjō* [adv.]; superl. *rəñjīšta-* ‘swiftest’), Man. Prth. *ray* ‘quick; swift’, Khot. *rrajsga-* ‘swift, light (not heavy)’, Khwar. *rnc* ‘light (not heavy)’, Oss. *ræw*, *ræwæg* ‘light (of weight); swift’, Par. *rau*, *raw* ‘quickly’ (IIFL-I), Sariq. *rinžc* ‘light (of weight), fast (horse)’ (EVŠG), Wx. *ranjg* ‘swiftly; lightly’ (STEBLIN-KAMENSKY 1999: 459), Semn. *reyka* ‘swift’, Tāl. *rə(j)* ‘fast; swift’, Zā. (Siverek, Kur) *rau* ‘schnell’ (HADANK 1932: 165–166), to which one may add KurmKrd. *reve-rev* ‘swiftly’ and *lev* ‘swift, fast’ in Farāmarzi, a *r*- > *l*- dialect in South-East Iran.

On the other hand, there are scholars who apparently separate the ‘small’-line from the ‘light/swift’-line, and do not mention Sgd. *rinčāk* as belonging to the latter lexical set (ABAEV [IESOJ], MORGENSTIERNE [EVŠG], STEBLIN-KAMENSKY 1999). In this case, cognates of Sgd. *rinčāk* could only be Pšt. *rangáy*, Man. Prth. *rangas* ‘small, short; brief’. They would belong to the Ir. base **rang-* ‘to be small’ reconstructed by BAILEY (1979) in order to explain Khot. *pārajs-* ‘to decrease’, *ārraj-* ‘to diminish, shrink’.²⁷⁷ Of Pšt. *rangáy* ‘thin, scanty, shallow, slight, not dense’, MORGENSTIERNE states in EVP (s.v. *rōγ*) that it «is prob. not connected with *raghu-* etc., as words belonging to this group are not found in the sense of ‘small’ etc. (cf. Gr. ἐλακύς) in Indo-Ir.».²⁷⁸ In fact, there is a lot of IA words for ‘small’ which may be adduced here; cf. CDIAL 10896 Skt. *laghú-* (RV *raghú-*) ‘light’ (also Add.). What about Iranian? MORGENSTIERNE’s statement is disproved by several Ir. words, which may be added to Sgd. *rinčāk*, Pšt. *rangáy* (also *rangráy*), Prth. *rangas* and the Khot. verbs *pārajs-* and *ārraj-*. I will mention them in the following, without entering into details as far as phonetic and/or morphological peculiarities of any single word are concerned.^{277a} Šir. *renj*

²⁷⁷ BAILEY 1979 is partially inconsistent in that he mentions the ‘swift’-line s.v. *pārajs-* and *ārraj-*, where Sgd. *rinčāk* is also quoted, but not s.v. *rrajsga-* ‘swift’.

^{277a} Note the striking similarity between the Fārs dialect *renj*-type and Sgd. *rinčāk*.

²⁷⁸ This word has not been included in NEVP.

‘small, fine [*deraxt mive-ye renj-i dārad* “the tree has small fruits”]; handful [*yek renj-i gandom be man dād* “he gave me a handful of corn”]’, Kāz. *renj* ‘small, few; *yek renj-i gandom* ‘the quantity of corn that may be grasped by a hand; small quantity of corn’ (BEHRUZI 2002), Zaraq. *renj* ‘small, fine’, Dašt. *renj* ‘handful, the quantity of things like rice, grain, corn etc. which may be contained in a fist’, Abd. *renj*, Dav. *rinj*, Kal. (Lor) *renj* (SALĀMI 2004: 152–153), Ban., Rič., Kal. (Tāj.), Mosq. *renj* (SALĀMI 2005: 154–155), Dorun., Kor. *renj* (SALĀMI 2006: 163) ‘handful, fist’, Biz. *lek* ‘small quantity’ (MAZRA^{TI} *et al.* 1995; *semāvar i lek ow pi derā* “in the samovar there is a small quantity of water”), Bard. *riqu* ‘small and fine’, Fin. *rayg* ‘thin and scanty’, Jir.-Kahn. *reyenč* ‘meagre and emaciated person’, SulKrd. *rīwele* ‘very thin, skinny’. In Tāleši, *ruk* means ‘small’ in the dialects of Māsāl (NAWATA 1982: 116), Māsule (LAZARD 1979), Zide and Pare Sar (BAZIN 1981: 276). See also Lāhij. *rīk* ‘young boy’; Avarāzān *rikalū* ‘small plum’ (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964).

HAIM (1992b, s.v. *thin*, in the sense of ‘watery, runny’), gives *sabok* as an alternative to Prs. *ābaki*, *kam-māye*, *raqiq*. This means that the concept of LIGHTNESS may be associated in Prs. with that of SMALL DENSITY, offering a motivation for the following Ir. words: Semn., Sang. *row* ‘thin, liquid, tender’, SouthKrd. *rau* (BĀBĀN 1982, s.v. *ābaki*), KurmKrd. *ron* ‘dilute, fluid; liquid’, Āvarz. *rew* ‘soft, dilute’ (DEHGHAN 1970), Sirj. *row* ‘thin, watery (said of a soup thinner than usual)’, Zar. *rew* ‘thin, dilute’ as well as Zar. *laq*, Biz. *lāy* (MAZRA^{TI} *et al.* 1995), Ār.-Bidg. *lay*, *laq*, Bxt. *lay* etc. ‘loose’. I would add here Prs. *leh* ‘mashed, crushed’, Damāv. *req* ‘id.’, Bast. *la:h* ‘soft and broken up’, etc.

LIGHTNESS and QUICKNESS easily overlap: Prs. *sabok* ‘light’ has also been used in the literary language in the sense of ‘fast, swift’. LIGHTNESS and SMALLNESS overlap as well. We have seen some examples above. Witness to this conceptual association in Iranian is born by the semantic range acquired by *sevek*, *sevak* in (Tāj.) Kalāni (Fārs), meaning ‘short, small, fine’, which corresponds to Prs. *sabok* (and its several cognates). Actually, the name of the little finger in (Tājik) Kalāni is *penjar-e sevek*.²⁷⁹

1.11. BADAXŠI (1960: 75) gives *čīt ingit* as the little finger name in Iškāšmi and Sangleči. Sangl.. Išk. *čīt*, Sgl. *čət* ‘small’ have an IA origin; cf. **chōṭta* ‘small’ in CDIAL 5071. Sgl. *čət* is also mentioned by MORGENSTIERNE in IIFL-II: 519 with reference to Wx. *čuṭ car-* ‘to tear

²⁷⁹ ° *serek* in SALĀMI 2005: 67 has to be considered as a misprint.

asunder, to be torn'. Wx. *čut* is IA, as well; cf. CDIAL 4965, 4968–70, 5035, 5040, etc. I would also add here Bal. *čaṭ* 'scattered totally; dispersed interely; ruined, destroyed' (see also Br. *čaṭ* 'ruined; scattered').

Par. *čino*, *činō* 'small', which we find in the Par. idiom *angušt-e činō/činō yošt* 'little finger' is likewise IA by origin. It belongs to Skt. *cūrṇa*- and cognates (CDIAL 4889).

1.12. Ydy. *rīza oguščiko* 'small finger' is a lexicalized phrase containing the adjective *rīza* 'small', possibly a Prs. loanword. Prs. *rize* 'small, fine' has several cognates (in many cases, adapted borrowings from Prs.), which are spread almost everywhere in the Iranian plateau.

1.13 In *Gr.Bd.* (4.14-5.3), Ahriman's creation is described as it deserves, i.e., as terrible, rotten and ill-thinking. As least, so it appeared to Ohrmazd, when he saw it. On the contrary, Ohrmazd's creation appeared as vast, profound and intelligent to Ahriman, when he saw it.

In this passage there is a word (4.15) which has been interpreted in different ways. It is an adjective describing Ahriman's creation. NYBERG (1931: 162) reads it as «*nitak* etwa ,in der Tiefe befindlich, wohnend; nach unten gerichtet' [...] Altir. **ni-ta-ka-* zu *ni-*». BAILEY (1933: 2) reads instead *wadag* (*vatak*) and translates 'evil'.²⁸⁰ Given the adjective *was* 'much, many' used with regard to Ohrmazd's creation, I think that an epithet "small, of no value" for the Ahrimanic one would better fit the rhetorical structure of the text.

If a Phl. form *nidag* (or *nitak*?) actually existed, it was certainly not much used in the extant texts. However, a nominal derivative *nidagīh* 'lowliness' could be retraced in *Dk.* VI (E 33, SHAKED 1979: 202–203).²⁸¹ This assumed Phl. *nidag* could be related to Phl. *nidom* 'least, smallest'. One could even recognize Modern WIr. cognates, in particular Bxt. (ČLang) *nita* 'small, fine' (also *niteluni* 'a little; small, fine', *niĵja* 'small'), Šuš. *nit* 'a little', SouthKrd. *niče* 'a little'.

In fact, one could also assume a contamination between different lexical sets conceived as conceptually close. Besides meaning 'a little', Šuš. *nit* also means 'louse'; see also SouthKrd. *nūt* 'very new; new-born louse', *notk*, *notke*, *notilk* 'new-born louse', KurmKrd. *nūtik*, Āvarz. *nitta*, Dav. *nizg*, Zarq. *nizg*, *nizgak*, Dašt. *netik*, *nitak*, *nečik*, Farām. *nitakoo*, etc. 'new-born

²⁸⁰ Same reading and interpretation in ANKLESARIA 1956: 7.

²⁸¹ For a possible, different reading and interpretation (*nīdagīh* 'submission', from 'being led'), see SHAKED 1979: 306–307.

louse'. Dašt. *netik*, *nitak*, *nečik* is also used as a reference element to emphasize smallness, as is proven by the following sentence: *čišeš mesle nitak-ye* "his eyes are similar to lice", i.e., "his eyes are very small".

Bxt. (ČLang) *nita* 'small, fine' occurs in the ČLang name of the little finger, which is *kelek nita*.

1.14. Taj. *mayda* is a common (literary and dialectal) word for 'small, little'. Though with minor semantic differences, this word is widespread in northern Tajik (see *mayda* 'small (of dimension); little (of tender age), minor; tiny, small (change, of money)' in RASTORGUEVA 1963) and southern Tajik (Kara-Tegin *maydkuk* 'small, tiny' ROZENFEL'D 1982, Badaxš. *mayda* 'child' ŠALČI 1991). The form *maydayak* 'very small, very tiny', a derivative of *mayda*, occurs in *čilik-i-maydayak* (KALBĀSI 1995), one of the Taj. labels for the little finger.

Yγn. *mayda(hak)* is a loanword from Tajik. It is a high-frequency word, often used with reference to children. It also occurs in the Yγn. name of the little finger: *maydá páxa* (XROMOV 1972), *maydahak čilik* (MIRZOZODA 2008, s.v. *naxna*).

Cognates of Taj. *mayda* are found elsewhere, though generally used in a restricted number of collocates. In Persian, *meyde* (DEHX, LAZARD 1990a) designates the superfine flour. The bread and a kind of sweet prepared with that quality flour bear the same name. In fact, it is not a 'common' word in Persian, and Persian speakers from Tehran I asked about argued that they have never heard it. In the Persian dialect of Širāz, *meydeh* means 'a rotten fruit, tending to melt'. Sist. *mēda* 'completely ground and softened' is mostly used with reference to flour-like elements, but is also used to describe very fine stitches in tailoring and a good furrow in ploughing the field. The Sist. phrasal verb *mēda kardā*, besides meaning 'to make something very soft', has also the figurative meaning of 'to beat someone and give him a thrashing'.

Prs. *meyde* probably entered the Balochi, Pashto and Parāči lexica; cf. Bal. *mayda* (EBal. *mayḍa*, *mayḍaw*) 'fine flour of a very good quality (SAYAD HASHMI 2000, MAYER 1910), 'fine-ground, milled' (ELFENBEIN 1990-II), Pšt. *maydá* 'finely ground flower; superfine flour; fine (of flour, of writing); small (change)', Par. *maida* 'crushed' (IIFL-I). Ur. *maida* 'fine (or the finest) flour or meal' and Si. *maydo* 'fine flour; powder, anything pulverised' seem at first sight Prs. loanwords.

Should one define the semantic core of this word, one could point to the notion of BEING CRUSHED/POWDERED, or BEING MINUTE or BEING SOFT.

From a cognitive point of view, all of these notions may be easily connected with the senses we have seen above for Prs. *meyde* and cognates. TrbHayd. *nerma* ‘small; a little of anything’, if compared with Prs. *narm* ‘soft’, bears another witness to the conceptual association between SOFTNESS and SMALLNESS.

Besides Par. *maida* ‘crushed’, MORGENSTIERNE (IIFL-I) also records Par. *marō* ‘soft’, and refers to Skt. *mṛdú-* ‘id.’ (see CDIAL 10292; EWA II: 372–373). KIEFFER (1979–1980 s.v.) rejects such a comparison and suggests considering Par. *marō* as «participe passé (= parf.) du v. *mar-* employé comme adj, plutôt que < *mṛdu* -». According to MORGENSTIERNE, Par. *mar-* ‘to rub’, Ōrm. *mar-* ‘to knead, grind’ are connected to Skt. *mṛd-* ‘to crush’; they are to be considered as loanwords on account of *-r-*. The same holds for Ōrm. *mār* ‘flour’. At any rate, Skt. *mṛdú-* ‘soft’ cannot be separated from Skt. *mṛd-* ‘to crush’ (EWA II: 386–387, MRAD).

On account of phonetic reasons, Prs. *meyde* could hardly be considered as a direct outcome from OIr. **mṛd-* ‘soft’, to which probably belong the proper names **Mṛdu-*, **Maṛduniya-* and **Maṛdunika-* (TAVERNIER 2007: 61, 253–254, with literature), transmitted through Elamite and Babylonian texts. However, the exit of what could have been an original *-rd-* could point to a loanword from an Indian language of a cognate word (and this fact justifies the consistent presence of *meyde* in Tajik [*mayda*] and not in Persian of Iran).

1.15. Qm. *kal angošt*, Sang. *kal angošt* (*kal-angošt-u* in AZAMI – WINDFUHR 1972), Lāsg. *qalqalin engošt*, probably Srx. *kil-engošt* and *kule-engošt*,²⁸² and, in Eastern Iranian, Par. *kel yošt* ‘little finger’ deserve a special attention.²⁸³

We have seen above (pp. 107 ff.) some Ir. *kal*-forms meaning ‘big’ (and by a semantic extension ‘male’), which concur in forming lexicalized phrases designating the thumb. Qm. *kal*, Sang. *kal* etc., occurring in denominations for the little finger, should obviously be something different, because a label depicting the little finger as a “big finger” would not be felt cognitively grounded and in no way accepted. Contrast as an associative principle is by far the less important among the associative principles involved in lexical change (BLANK 2001: 14). The only case we have met with so far is the EBal. idiom *šābāš murdānāy* ‘forefinger’ (see above, p. 123). No other instance I am able to put

²⁸² But see also below, fn. 168.

²⁸³ See also Roš. *khal-lakak* ‘ringfinger’, mentioned above p. 147.

forward, as far as Ir. designations of body parts relying on this principle. Therefore, it is better to go in search for something else.

Looking for it, we find a lexical element linking Fārs-Lārestān dialects and some dialects spoken in North Iran, which seems to come up with our expectations. In the coastal area south of Fārs, *kal* means ‘child, son’. This information is given by BEHRUZI (1969), who provides the following example: *in bačče kal-e ali-st* ‘this child is Ali’s son’, and confirmed by HAMIDI (2001), cf. Buš. *kal* (Tangestāni *kelak*) ‘child, son’, Dašt. *kelak, keleku*²⁸⁴ ‘boy, little boy’. See also Mās. *kālāk* ‘Sohn’ (MANN 1909), Kāz. *kalaku* ‘small son, boy’ (BEHRUZI 2002), Zarq. *kalaku, karaku*, used as a term of address for babies, Farām. *kalak* ‘child’ and Bast. *ka:la:k* ‘little child’, which find correspondences in Māz. *kel* ‘small, child’, *kele* ‘child’, Tāl. *kela* ‘daughter; girl’, IrĀz. *kille*, (Šā) *kila*, (GL) *kelleg*, (Xu) *kēla* ‘girl’ (ABDOLI 2001: 234).²⁸⁵ Ham. *kal* ‘youth, puberty’ could probably be added here. EILERS (1974: 330 n. 59a) mentions the forms *kalak* ‘Kleinigkeit, Unwichtiges’ and *kalaki* ‘leichtes Mädchen, Dirne’, both labelled by him as Persian.

Orm. *klān* ‘son’, *klanāk* ‘boy’, for which MORGENSTIERNE (IIFL-I: 398) suggested a doubtful connection with Krd. *kurr* ‘son’, could belong here. Note also *kaldukak* ‘child, son’ in the Taj. dial. spoken by the Čistānihā, living in Uzbekistan (MAHMUDOV 2001: 45). I am tempted to include here *kal-*, a sort of prefix for nominal derivation, used in a few Eastern Prs. varieties, viz. Sistāni and Birjāndi. This is “a prefix which gives the meaning of ‘similar to, along the lines of’, or ‘uncomplete’ or ‘half-’” (REZĀI 1998); see e.g. Birj. *kalexos(k)* ‘a bit dry, more or less dry’ and Sist. *kala koš* ‘half-killed’ (Sist. *kala* ‘half-’). The position of Buš. *kalil* ‘small’, used as a term of endearment for children, is doubtful; it could also be considered as an alteration of Prs. *qalil* ‘little, few, scanty’ (< Ar.).

²⁸⁴ Dašt. *keleku*, beside being a *u*-derivative from *kelak*, is also its determined form; therefore, it may be understood both as ‘boy’ and ‘that boy’.

²⁸⁵ Mās. *kālāk* is problematically quoted by CHRISTENSEN – BARR 1939 s.v. KrmnšKrd. *kālgā* ‘junger Faselstier, noch nicht Arbeit getan, zur Zucht’ («Ob Fārs M. *kālāk* ‚Sohn‘ [...] auch hinzugehört, ist fraglich»). This perplexity seems quite justified. In fact, there are different, deep-rooted groups of words in Iranian, phonetically similar to (and probably sometimes intersecting with) each other, which I think may be outlined as follows: (1) *kal*-words for ‘big/male’ we have seen above, including those referring to male (general adult; often horned) animals, such as bulls, buffalos or billy goats; (2) *kal*-words for ‘bald, bald-headed’ (see FILIPPONE 2006: 367 f.), including words referring to hornless animals, i.e. hornless goats or the like; (3) *kal*-words for ‘small’ (commented on in the main text).

All this considered, Sang. *kal angošt* etc. can be interpreted as “the small/young finger”, according to a recurrent iconomastic pattern.

It is not clear if we should consider the above mentioned *kal*-forms for ‘small’ as connected to Prs. *kal* ‘short’, recorded in traditional dictionaries (but not consistently; see DEHX). Prs. *kal* (see also Taj. *kalta* ‘docktailed’, Yŷn. *kalta* ‘short’ MIRZOZODA – QOSIMI 1995) could be a variant of Prs. *kol* ‘short’, which has several cognates widespread mainly in WIr. A good collection is in REZĀZĀDE MALEK 1973. One could also ascribe Srx. *kil-engošt* and *kule-engošt* (mentioned above, p. 166) to the *kol*-type and intend it as ‘the short finger’, on the basis of the same conceptualization pattern which has produced Knd. *penje-y kolulu* and Qasr. *kol angušd* ‘little finger’.

1.16. Dusir. *penje-y lošu* is one of the little finger names recorded in FĀrs. It contains an adj. base (Dusir. *loš* ‘small’), which appears quite isolated and requires further investigation.

2. Many (if not the majority) of the little finger names discussed at §§ 1.1–1.15, which for the sake of convenience we may simply refer to as the “small-finger” labels, are actually figurative expressions, which evoke the image of a finger conceptualized as a child. As we have seen above, to the little finger, mothers, fathers or brothers may also be attributed.

All this considered, Biz. *māmāčelik* (an alternative to *čelik* ‘little finger’) and Qohr. *māne kuliče* ‘little finger’, which may look like fitting names for the ring finger (see “the mother of the little finger” pattern above, p. 147), are difficult to explain. Once lost the consciousness of the original iconym, the name of a particular finger (in this case, the ring finger) could have been used for another finger. What is strange, however, is that both expressions appear still transparent in their structure; cf. Qohr. *māne*, Biz. *mama* ‘mother’. Possibly, we have to do here with the phenomenon common in Iranian (and elsewhere), according to which a same address term is used as a cross-reference term between two different generational levels (e.g., mother/father towards their children and *vice versa*). But this hypothesis seems not to be fully convincing.

Besides lucky little fingers, which can rely on mothers, there are also poor, “lacking parents” fingers, as is the case with Taj. *angušt-i yatimak*. The “orphan-finger” iconomastic pattern is also found in Osmanli Turk., see *öksüz parmak* ‘lit. le doigt sans mère’ (ERDAL 1981 : 124).²⁸⁶

²⁸⁶ Note, however, that in REDHOUSE 1968 *öksüz parmak* is ‘ring finger’.

3. The metonymical process FINGER → LITTLE FINGER is a very frequent associative process.²⁸⁷ There are languages in which a single word maintains its general meaning ('finger') and also acquires a specialized one ('little finger'). Instances in Iranian are Voniš. *uŋguss*,²⁸⁸ Kāz. *angol*, and SouthKrd. *pil* (recorded by SAFIZADE 2001 as 'finger' and 'little finger'). There are languages in which the word for 'little finger' shows a semasiological link with words for 'finger' in different but related languages. As for Iranian, compare Keš. *angulī* 'little finger', contrasting with *anguš* 'finger'.

To the *kelk*-group 'finger',²⁸⁹ the following labels for 'little finger' are connected: Prs. *kelik*, *kalik*, *kelek*, *kelikak*,²⁹⁰ Taj. *kilik*, Birj. *kalikk*, Mašh. *kelyk*, Qasr. *kelikak angušd*, Šuš. *kelek* ('finger; sometimes little finger'), Bxt. (Behdārvandi) *kelek* (SĀDEQI 2000: 61),²⁹¹ Par. *kilk yušt* (IIFL-I) with *kilk* to be compared with Par. *kelk* 'finger'.

Analogously, to the *kelič*-group 'finger',²⁹² one may connect the following labels for 'little finger': Prs. *keličak*, *kelanj(ak)*, Taj. *kiličak*, (Fārs dialects) Šir. *kelenj* (also 'finger'),²⁹³ Zaq. *kelenj*, Sarv. *kilič*, Gurkāni *keličak* (JA^ĀFARI DEHAQI 2002: 151), Kuz. *kālenjak*, Dahl. *penje-y keriček*, Gorgn. *penje-y kelič*, Gavk. *kelič*, Baliā. *kelič* (also 'finger'), KurmKrd. *qilič'k*, *qilincek*; *tiliya qilič'ke*, *qiličane*, *qilinceke* (also *qilican* RIZGAR 1993), SouthKrd. *qilič*, *qiličân*, *qilînj*, *qilînjâk* (EBRĀHIMPUR 1994b, s.v. *angošt*: *dipila qličî*; *qilînjik*), Zā. (Biĵaq) *qalânjik* (HADANK 1932: 218), Bxt. *kelič* (LORIMER 1922 *kulič*²⁹⁴), Šuš. *qālič*. In Central Iran, we find Rāv. *keličū*, Del. *yalīčae*, Xur. *kelēč* (*kleič* FARAHVAŠI 1976), Nāi. *engolī keličču* (LECOQ 2002 *kiliči*), Ār.-Bidg. *kēlij* (also 'small') and *əgūšklij*, Gz. *engolī kulūčī*, ZorYzd. (*angošt-i*) *kiličōg* (*angošt-e kiliči* AFŠĀR 1989), Yzd-JPrs. *kiliči*.

²⁸⁷ On 'finger' → 'little finger' in Turkish, see ERDAL 1981: 125.

²⁸⁸ But see above, p. 54.

²⁸⁹ Cf. above, pp. 63 f.

²⁹⁰ Prs. speakers from Tehran I consulted, recognized these Prs. words as belonging to the literary register, but only with the meaning of 'finger' (and not 'little finger').

²⁹¹ In his review to VAHMAN – ASATRIAN 1987, SĀDEQI (2000: 59–61) provides a list of discordances between the Bxt. words gathered by LORIMER and those personally collected by him from a (Behdārvandi) Bxt. speaker. Among them, note *kelek* 'little finger' instead of LORIMER's *kulič* 'id.'

²⁹² Cf. above, pp. 64 f.

²⁹³ See also above p. 64, fn. 60.

²⁹⁴ See also above, fn. 291.

To these forms, add Prs. *kāblej*, *kāblij*, *kāblič*, *kāluj*, *kāluč* (all unknown to Prs. speakers of Tehran I consulted) and Taj. *koblij*.

Note also Khwar. *k'lwj* 'little finger' (YÜCE – BENZING 1985).²⁹⁵ Bal. (?) *kābalošk* 'little finger', recorded by the author of an unpublished dictionary (NAGUMAN n.d; SouthBal.?) is in all probability a (Eastern) Prs. word adapted to Balochi.

In Kermān and adjacent areas, one finds Kerm. (*angošte/nāxune*) *kāčilu* or *kāčil*, Bard., Sirj. *kāčilu* and probably also *xajilek* which ŽUKOVSKIJ (1922: 110) provides as the name of the little finger in Abdui, a Krd. variety spoken in a small village in Fārs. This latter reminds SouthKrd. *qijilik* 'little finger'.

Should we consider this group of words as belonging to the *kal* ('small')-forms, instead of resorting to the *kelk*-type and consequently to the FINGER / LITTLE FINGER = STICK associative pattern we have suggested above? Mentioning Prs. *kalak* 'Kleinigkeit, Unwichtiges', EILERS (1974: 330 n. 59a) advances the hypothesis of its possible connection with Prs. *kelek*, *kelanj(ak)* 'little finger'. This sounds as possible, also in the light of Anār. *kiliču*, Ardest. *kiličči* 'very small', Varz. *keleču* 'small', Ār.-Bidg. *kēlij* 'small' (besides 'little finger'). Or should we rather presume that a metathesis has occurred in forms similar to Prs. *kučulu* (as doubtfully suggested by EILERS (1979) as regards Gz. *kulūčī* in *engolī kulūčī*)?

Frankly, I think it is very hard to take a clear stand on this issue, and probably many factors have combined to create this complicated situation. Large margins for doubts remain.

One may relate Biz. *čelīk*, Ygn. (Prs. lw.) *čīlīk* 'little finger' to dial. Taj. *čilik* 'finger' (see above p. 65). Lexicographers are somehow contradictory as far as Prs. *čelk* is concerned. The definitions gathered in DEHX sound as follows: 'little finger [*xenser*; *angošt-e kučak*]'; 'the finger of the hand which is between the middle finger [*angošt-e vasati*] and the ring finger [*benser*]';²⁹⁶ 'ring finger [*angošt-e benser*]'; and 'little finger [*kučaktarin angošt-e dast*]'. In FF *čelk* is recorded as 'middle finger; ring finger', in STEINGASS 1963 as 'little finger'. The word was unknown to Prs. speakers of Tehran I consulted on the matter.²⁹⁷

²⁹⁵ I thank Mauro MAGGI for having pointed out to me this Khwar. word.

²⁹⁶ Sic! *benser* is probably DEHXODĀ's oversight for *xenser*.

²⁹⁷ See also above, p. 155.

KurmKrd. *tīlī*, a figurative expression for ‘finger’ having its conceptual source in the botanical domain,²⁹⁸ finds a partial correspondence in Lo. *ka-lak-e tīla* (UNVALA 1958: 14) ‘little finger’. TurkĀz. *tīl*, seemingly a measure of length corresponding to a little finger ([*az nuk-e angōšt-e kučak tā kaf-e dast*]), could be an Ir. lw. belonging here.

4. Ordinary derivative suffixes conveying the notion of SMALLNESS, added to words for ‘finger’, change them into ‘little finger’. This happens in Persian, where *angošt* and *angol* have produced *angoštak* and *angolak* ‘little finger’, in Tajik, where *angušt* and *lela* ‘finger’ have become *anguštak* and *lelača* ‘little finger’, and in the Tajik dialect of Kara-Tegin, where *lik* ‘finger’ contrasts with *likak*, *likək* ‘little finger’ (ROZENFEL'D 1982). Šyn. *likak* (BADAXŠI 1960: 75), *lakak*, *lakak angixt*, Baš. *lakak ingaxt* ‘little finger’ are probably Taj. borrowings. In Kābuli, *kelkak* ‘little finger’ derives from *kelk* ‘finger’ (FARHĀDI 1955: 104). Similarly, Šir. *angolak*, Kāz. *angolak* (BEHRUZI 2002) and Lir.-Dil. *angūlak* ‘little finger’ derive from *angol/angūl* ‘finger’.

Haz. *čilkak* ‘little finger’ presupposes a *čil(i)k* ‘finger’, not recorded in the Haz. sources available to me (but documented in dial. Tajik). It could also be interpreted as a secondary derivation from Haz. (< Prs./Taj.) **čilk* ‘little finger’ (see Prs. *čelk* above p. 170).

5. Syllabic iteration is a lexicalization device with an ideophonic value. Lexical items created reduplicating a syllable expressively evoke the feelings and emotions of people towards the relevant referents, implying a strong involvement of human perception. SMALLNESS is one of the concept which may be evoked by such a device.²⁹⁹ With reference to the little finger, we may quote Bal. *čūč*, (mostly EBal.) *čič*, *čīnč* and the several derivatives *čūčī*, *čūčū*, *čūčūk*, *čūčīk*, *čīčuk*, *čūčag*, *čūčkul*, *čīčkul*, *čičkur* (*lankuk*), *čūnčī mačūnčī*, *čīnčuk*, *čīnčuko*, *čīčako*, all variants (and/or derivatives) – with minor differences – of a common *čVč(V)* pattern.³⁰⁰ Br. *čičak*, *čičal*, *čič-hōr* are with a good probability borrowed directly from Bal. (cf. ROSSI 1979: F36), even if this lexical pattern for ‘little finger’ should be considered as an areal lexical feature. As regards IA, cf. Sir. *chīchī*, Si. *chīch*^a. Phonetic similarity is also shown by some Turk. labels, such as TurkĀz. *čečələ*, Kyrgyz *činčilaq*, Uzbek *žimžiloq*, *čimčaloq*

²⁹⁸ Cf. above p. 66.

²⁹⁹ A few examples are available in FILIPPONE 1995: 51 ff.

³⁰⁰ For a more detailed dialectal distribution of these forms see FILIPPONE 2000–2003: 69.

(ABDURAXMANOV 1954),³⁰¹ to which Yṛn. *čínčilak* ‘little finger’ (*čínčilik* ‘finger’ in MIRZOZODA 2008), Taj. *čimčilok* ‘finger’ could be related.³⁰²

The *čVč(V)/Ńj(V)* pattern for naming small things of different kinds seems to be highly productive and sometimes it is very difficult to say which is the primary sense among the many senses that a single term of this series might have.³⁰³ Instances of this pattern in Iranian are Xor. *čūča* ‘small; infant’, *čūčagak* ‘small, very small’, TrbHayd. *čuča* ‘small child’, Fārsivāni *čuč* ‘small of animal’ (MAHMUDOV 2001), Bal. *čūčag* ‘small; child, baby’ (SAYAD HASHMI 2000), Ir.Bal. (Sarhaddi) *čūčok* ‘chick’ (Ayyubi 2002), KurmKrd. *ç’uç’ik* ‘small, little; child’, *ç’iç’ik* ‘small amount, little bit’, etc., Prs. *juje* ‘chicken’, Bādr. *jj* ‘small’, Qm. *jjil* ‘small’, Tāl. *jjjli* ‘very small, minute, tiny’ (ABDOLI 2001) and many, many others. Several terms belonging to the body part lexicon have been produced by means of this lexical device. Besides little fingers, one also find nipples, parts of the female genital organs, uvulas, etc.; they will be treated in detail on another occasion.

A *tVt(V)*-pattern for ‘little finger’ links Gorāni, Southern/Central Kurdish and Lori. Cf. SorKrd. *pence tūta* (HAKIM – GAUTHIER 1993),³⁰⁴ *qamkî tūtele* (KURDOEV – JUSUPOVA 1983), SulKrd. *pencetūte*, SouthKrd. *angustî/kilka/panja tūta* (SAFIZĀDE 2001), (Krmnš.) *kelek tuta; tutela*, (Garr.) *kelik e tūtā*, Gor. (Gahw.) *kilik i tūtā*,³⁰⁵ (Talahed.) *kelek tūta*, Lak. *kelek tuita*, Lo. *kelek tita*, (Xorramābād) *tīta* (HASURI 1964: 24).

The *tVt(V)*-pattern similarly produces many Ir. designations for affectively connoted referents. A few instances are provided in FILIPPONE 1995: 54 ff.; to them add Zā. *tūt* ‘child’, Dav. *titi*, Dašt. *titi* ‘baby, small child’, Tehr. *titiš* ‘small’, Lo. *tita* ‘small and nice’ (ADIB TUSI 1963–1964), etc.

³⁰¹ As an instance of Turk. little finger labels styled «de nature expressive», ERDAL (1981: 122) quotes Old Turk. *çiçamuq* and suggests interpreting it as «un dérivé du verb qui se réfère à la décharge des excréments: évidemment, le créateur du terme a pensé à l’incontinence des petits enfants». However, one should remind that the sublexicon related to excrements, especially that used with/by children, is in all languages affected by expressive labels created by iterating syllables (cf. for example Engl. *whee-whee; pooh-pooh* etc.). Possibly, the Turk. terms for ‘little finger’ and ‘act of urinating’ share the same syllabic pattern, having no other conceptual connection.

³⁰² See also above, pp. 66, 89.

³⁰³ Cf. KORN 2005: 293 fn. 45 («*čūčū* etc. can be specialisations of *čūčag* “child, baby; tiny” [...] which might also be of onomatopoeic origin»).

³⁰⁴ S.v. *doigt* (petit doigt); *pencey tūne* ibid. s.v. *auriculaire* should be considered as a misprint.

³⁰⁵ So rightly emended by CHRISTENSEN – BARR (1939: 305) instead of *kilik-i sūtā* in HADANK 1930: 449.

According to MORGENSTIERNE (1932a: 40), EBal. *kūko*, recorded as ‘little finger’ in HETU RAM 1898 and as ‘finger’ in MAYER 1910, is a IA loanword; cf. Si. *kōkō* ‘small pin, nail’, to which also add AfγPrs. *kūka* ‘small pin’. Having found no confirmation of this Bal. word in my fieldwork, I am not in a position to say where and in what sense it is (or was) used. However, it seems reasonable enough to recall here Min. *kukal*, Bšk. *kukalu* ‘little finger’ (G. BARBERA p.c.), Fin. *kūkaley* ‘little finger’ (but also ‘the smallest child in a family’) and envisage a pattern *kVk(V)*, which may also explain Lār. *kokol* (*kakal* in ADIB TUSI 1963–1964) ‘small, tiny’, Pšt. *kokáy* ‘boy’³⁰⁶, etc.

One could perhaps interpret in this light even MPrs. *kūk* ‘small, short’, so far explained as < **kau-ka-*³⁰⁷. It may probably also be traced back in a proper name from Achaemenid time (see **Kūka-* ‘small, little’ in TAVERNIER 2007: 234). In EIr., one could add Ydγ. *kūk’a* ‘short’.

An iterative process, with an expressive value, also explains *guluguluhy penja*, the (isolated) Korš. name of the little finger.

7. The little finger’s position seems not to have played a significant role in the naming process. However, we may mention at least a couple of labels which find their motivation in this parameter. These are Prs. *angošt-e panjom* (DEHX), lit. ‘the fifth finger’ and Lāsg. *kenārin engošt*, which places emphasis on the side position of this finger, perceived as a ‘lateral finger’³⁰⁸.

As for Phl. *pas angust*, lit. ‘the behind-finger’, given as ‘little finger’ in ABRAMJAN 1965: 5 (*axar angušt*), a few comments have been offered above, p. 130.

8. A Prs. name for ‘little finger’, felt as fairly appropriate to a formal register, is *xenser*, *xensar*, also occurring in Tajik (*angušt-i xinsir*). This is an Ar. loanword; cf. Ar. *xinšir*, Syr. *ḥešra*, Mand. *hišra* etc., which belong to a Sem. base «connected or contaminated with Sem. **ḥšr* ‘to be short’» (MILITAREV – KOGAN 2000: no. 134).

9. There is still a couple of labels to be discussed, which appear to be isolated and/or very hard to classify.

³⁰⁶ «Cf. ‘rustic’ Urdu *khokha* m. ‘small’, particularly, ‘a little child, a boy’ [E]», NEVP.

³⁰⁷ On possible outcomes of the Ir. base **kau-* see also above, p. 151.

³⁰⁸ Compare Lāsg. *kenārin engošt* with Yzγ. *kəranai γ’ašt*, which, however, refers to both ‘forefinger’ and ‘ring finger’; see above p. 129.

SouthKrd. *mît* ‘little finger’ depicts this finger as a small protuberance. It is an “affective” word, whose cognates are used in the anatomical lexicon to designate the clytoris or similar small parts. Cf. SouthKrd. *mîtk*, *mîtkē*, *mîtol*, *mîtole*, Sist. *mitt*, Birj. *mott*, Bal. (Noške; SAYAD HASHMI 2000) *miṭṭ(ik)*, (Turbat) *mīčuk* ‘clytoris’ (‘uvula’ in Irānšahr, Sarāwāni). See also Br. *miṭṭ* ‘clitoris’ (ELFENBEIN 1983b).

Roš. *bilisak ingaṣt* and Baĵ. *bilīsak ingaṣt* could be grounded on a metaphorical association linking the finger with an entomological element, if *bilisak* is the same *bilisak* ‘dragonfly’ which we find in Rošanī. Roš. *l̥lisak ingaṣt* (SKÖLD 1936: 186) might be a misprinting or a mishearing of *bilisak ingaṣt*; however, it might also be a different, phonosymbolic name, based on syllabic iteration (*IVIV*-pattern).

Prs. *karišak* ‘little finger’, recorded by lexicographers but apparently unknown to Iranian Prs. speakers, could be a figurative label which equates the finger to a small, just hatched chick (see DEHX in two different headwords). If so, an analogy could be found in Turkish: see *serçe parmaq* ‘the little finger or the little toe’ with *serçe* ‘sparrow; any small bird’. One cannot exclude, however, that *karišak* in Prs. dictionaries results from a misspelling/misreading of other forms, such as *keličak*, etc.

For the following little finger names, I have no suggestion at all. They are: KurmKrd. *tilīya bašikan*; Dav. (*pinje-y*) *gârek*; Haz. *ašunan* (DULLING 1973); Tāti (Apšeron) *qilat* (GRJUNBERG 1963: 117).

Pashto and Kurdish seem to have in common a prefix-like element (*bar-*), which, prefixed to terms for ‘finger’, would produce names for the little finger. Cf. Pšt. *bargūta* (*bargwāta* QALANDAR MOMAND – SEHRAYI 1994) ‘little finger’, as contrasted to Pšt. *gūta* ‘finger’; KurmKrd. (*tilyâ*) *barkilîčk* ‘little finger’ (SAFIZĀDE 2001), as contrasted to the *kelič*-type ‘finger’. How could this be explained? Has Krd. *bar-* in *barkilîčk* something to do with Kal.-Adb. *bārī*, *berī* ‘etwas’, Mukri *birêk* ‘ein wenig’ etc. recorded (but defined “unklar”) by CHRISTENSEN – BARR (1939: 466)?