

UDC 811.222/223:81'367.627

## ON THE CHANGES OF QUANTITATIVE NUMERALS 11–19 IN CAUCASIAN PERSIAN (TAT) AND NORTHERN TALYSHI

*A. Tonoyan*

PhD (Linguistics), Associate Professor  
Yerevan State University, Faculty of Oriental Studies  
Institute of Oriental Studies, NAS of the Republic of Armenia  
1, Alex Manoogian Str., Yerevan, 0025, Republic of Armenia  
[artyom.tonoyan@ysu.am](mailto:artyom.tonoyan@ysu.am)  
ORCID: 0000-0002-8740-730X

*H. Avchyan*

PhD (Linguistics), Associate Professor  
Yerevan State University, Faculty of Oriental Studies  
1, Alex Manoogian Str., Yerevan, 0025, Republic of Armenia  
[hakob.avchyan@ysu.am](mailto:hakob.avchyan@ysu.am)  
ORCID: 0000-0002-5764-2640

Two of the Western Iranian languages spoken in the territory of the current Azerbaijan Republic, Caucasian Persian (Tat) and the Northern Talyshi, belonging to the southwestern and northwestern branches of Iranian languages, respectively, have many common phonetic and grammatical features. These commonalities are due to the genetic relationship between them (indigenous Iranian heritage), as well as the language contacts and interactions between them, presumably during a certain historical period. In addition, there is another important circumstance that has led to the conditioning of some of these commonalities, namely the superstrative influence of the Azerbaijani language, which has acquired the status of a dominant language in the region during the last century. Although the influence of the Azerbaijani language on the Caucasian Persian and its influence on the Northern

© 2023 A. Tonoyan and H. Avchyan; Published by the A. Yu. Krymskyi Institute of Oriental Studies, NAS of Ukraine on behalf of *The Oriental Studies*. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

Talyshi have been investigated as separate topics by some researchers, similar changes in these languages caused by the influence of the “dominant” language have not been studied till now. This work is an attempt to fill this gap and also to create a precedent for further examination of some grammatical commonalities between the two languages from this point of view. The presented article is a case study on the ongoing change in the composition of the series of quantitative numerals 11–19. It aims to highlight the reasons for this change in the two Iranian languages by examining the languages using the comparative-typological method. Given that both Caucasian Persian and Northern Talyshi are classified as endangered languages by UNESCO [Moseley 2010, *map 11–12*], the study of the prominence of these languages, the influence of the non-native dominant language on them, their strength, and the rate of displacement of native forms is very crucial and perhaps one of the most important tasks of modern Iranian dialectology and Iranian linguistics.

**Keywords:** Quantitative numerals, Caucasian Persian, Tat, Northern Talyshi, superstrative influence, language contact, Kurdish, Zazaki, Dimli, Turco-Iranica

## Introduction

Caucasian Persian (Tat) is a southwestern Iranian language [Gryunberg 1961a, 106–114] that is spoken in various parts of historical Shirvan<sup>1</sup> (the Absheron Peninsula, as well as Khizi, Siyazan, Shabran, Quba, Khachmaz, Shamakhi, and Ismayilli administrative regions). Northern Talyshi is a northwestern Iranian language [Pireyko 1991, 91–175] that is spoken mainly in the five southern administrative regions of Azerbaijan (Lenkoran, Lerik, Astara, Masali,

<sup>1</sup> The term *Caucasian Persian* defines the group of Southwestern Iranian dialects spoken in the historical Shirvan area, which are best known in the field of Iranian linguistics and dialectology in two different ways: *Muslim-Tat language* (Russian: *мусульманско-татский язык*) and *Christian-Tat language* (Russian: *язык татов-христиан*) or *Armeno-Tat language* (Russian: *армяно-татский язык*). *Juhuri*, which is spoken in the northern border of historical Shirvan and in the areas north of it, is better known to Iranologists as the *Judeo-Tat language*. Although this language belongs to the southwestern group of Iranian languages and shares common phonetic, grammatical, and lexical features with Caucasian Persian, in professional literature, it is considered as one of the two separate dialects of one common Tat language, the northern one. The southern dialect of it is identical to the language defined by the term *Caucasian Persian* [Tonoyan 2021, 167–168].

Yardımlı) and partly also in the administrative regions of Bilasuvar and Jalilabad. These two languages have been under the dominant influence of the Azerbaijani language for the past hundred years. This strong influence has led to several changes in the phonetic system, vocabulary, and grammatical system of these Iranian languages. Although various scholars have addressed this issue of Azerbaijani influence on both Caucasian Persian [Gryunberg 1961b, 11–23; 1963, 112–114; Sokolova 1953, 131–135; Schmitt 1994, 16–17; Windfuhr 2006, 261, Tonoyan 2015, 3–12] and Northern Talyshi [Sokolova 1953; Miller 1953, 129; Schulze 2000, 26; Pireyko 1991, 133], the similarity in the grammatical and typological changes in Caucasian Persian and Northern Talyshi caused by the influence of Azerbaijani and the continuity of that process remains unexplored. Given that both Caucasian Persian and Northern Talyshi are highly endangered [Moseley 2010, *map 11–12*]<sup>2</sup>, documenting and studying different aspects of these languages seems to have practical importance for Iranian linguistics and dialectology.

A similar example is the change of the series of quantitative numerals 11–19 in both languages. In Caucasian Persian, there was an almost complete loss of the historically inherited type of composition and a transition to a new type of composition. In Northern Talyshi formation of a new type occurred, which is now used together with the existing historical native type of composition. From a sociolinguistics point of view, this newly formed type will most likely push out the historically inherited type of the series in the future.

The aim of this article is twofold: first, to identify and highlight the linguistic phenomenon under examination, and second, to understand the direction of ongoing structural changes.

### **Historical background (comparative-historical aspect)**

For the quantitative numbers of the series 11–19, the Indo-European languages, with some exceptions for the numbers 11 and 12, have a structural type of composition in which the word *ten* is placed after the numbers 1–9 (cf. English: *thirteen, fourteen, fifteen* etc., German: *dreizehn, vierzehn, fünfzehn*, etc., Ukrainian: *тринадцять, чотирнадцять, п'ятнадцять* etc., French: *treize, quatorze, quinze* etc., Old Armenian: *երեքսուսան, չորեքսուսան, հինգսուսան* etc., Old Greek: *τρεῖσκαίδεκα, τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα, πεντεκαίδεκα* etc., Latin: *tredecim,*

<sup>2</sup> See also [Häberl (in press), 15, 50].

*quattuordecim, quīndecim* etc.)<sup>3</sup>. As Iranian languages are also Indo-European languages, they too use the same type of structure. Among the Middle Iranian languages, both Middle Persian, which is continued by Caucasian Persian as a Southwestern Iranian language, and Parthian, which is continued by Talyshi as a Northwestern Iranian language in the new Iranian linguistic period, show forms specific to the main Indo-European, including Iranian structural type for series 11–19 (see **Table 1**).

The structural type of composition used in Middle Persian is continued in New and Modern Persian (cf. *yāzdah* “eleven”, *davāzdah* “twelve”, *sīzdah* “thirteen”, *čahārdah* “fourteen”, *pānzdah* “fifteen”, *šānzdah* “sixteen”, *hefdah* “seventeen”, *hejdah* “eighteen”, *nūzdah* “nineteen”). Likewise, in the new northwestern Iranian or so-called Parthian-type languages such as Kurdish [Kurdojev 1961, 37]<sup>4</sup>, Balochi [Jahani & Korn 2009, 658], Gilaki [Rastorguyeva 1971, 84] and elsewhere, the preservation of the so-called pure Iranian forms of the numerals is still under discussion.

**Table 1.** *Quantitative Numerals 11–19 in Parthian and Middle Persian*

	MIDDLE PERSIAN <sup>5</sup>	<	OLD IRANIAN <sup>6</sup>	>	PARTHIAN <sup>7</sup>
11	<i>yāzdah</i>	<	* <i>aiwan–dasa–</i>	>	<i>ēwandas</i>
12	<i>dwāzdah</i>	<	* <i>dwadasa</i>	>	<i>dwādes</i>
13	<i>sēzdah</i>	<	* <i>θridasa</i>	>	unattested
14	<i>čahārdah</i>	<	* <i>čaθrudasa</i>	>	<i>čafārđas</i>
15	<i>pānzdah</i>	<	* <i>pančadasa</i>	>	unattested
16	<i>šāzdah</i>	<	* <i>xšwaž–dasa</i>	>	unattested
17	<i>hafīdah</i>	<	* <i>haptadasa</i>	>	unattested
18	<i>haštdah</i>	<	* <i>aštadasa</i>	>	unattested
19	<i>nōzdah</i>	<	* <i>nauuadasa</i>	>	unattested

<sup>3</sup> Although Robert S. P. Beekes notes that, “*The numerals from ‘eleven’ to ‘nineteen’ are formed in a number of different ways, so that reconstruction of the PIE terms is not possible*” [Beeks 1995: 213], in all the four languages cited for comparison (Sanskrit, Old Church Slavonic, Lithuanian, and Ancient Armenian) for the numerals 11–19, the word *ten* is placed after the numbers 1–9 [Beeks 1995, 214].

<sup>4</sup> Karabakh Kurdish is an exception among the Kurdish dialects, in which the numerals of the series 11–19 have a different form of composition, not specific to Iranian languages and Kurdish [Vil’chevskiy 1938, 67–76].

<sup>5</sup> For Middle Persian and Parthian numerals see accordingly [Schmitt 1994, 13; Durkin-Meisterenst 2014, 220].

<sup>6</sup> For Old Iranian (reconstructed) forms see [Emmerick 1992, 301–305; Schmitt 1994, 13].

<sup>7</sup> For Parthian numerals see: [Durkin-Meisterenst 2014, 218].

### **The Numerals 11–19 in Caucasian Persian and Northern Talyshi (change and transformation)**

Among the dialects of the Caucasian Persian language, the historical type of the composition mentioned is preserved only in the Suraxani dialect, spoken in Absheron Peninsula (see **Table 2**). In the remaining dialects, such as the dialects of Quba, Shamakhi, and Lahij, there are recorded forms that deviate from the inherited Iranian forms of composition of the series. In these dialects, the word “ten” does not follow the numbers 1–9, but comes as a prefix (see **Table 2**). An interesting exception to this style is the number “twelve” in the Lahij dialect, *duzdah / duzdahto* (cf. New Persian: *davāzdah*), which should be considered here as lexical archaism and evidence of the fact that in these dialects, the series 11–19 had earlier native Iranian appearance and today’s forms, in which the word *ten* precedes 1–9. This is the result of secondary development and change.

**Table 2.** *Quantitative Numerals 11–19 in Caucasian Persian (Tat) dialects*

	<b>Suraxani dialect<sup>8</sup></b> (Absheron)	<b>Madrassa dialect<sup>9</sup></b> (Shamakhi)	<b>Lahij dialect<sup>10</sup></b> (Ismayilli)	<b>Qonaqkend dialect<sup>11</sup></b> (Quba)
11	<i>yonzā</i>	<i>daiyek</i>	<i>dahyek // dahyekto</i>	<i>dāyak</i>
12	<i>donzā</i>	<i>daidū</i>	<i>duzdah // duzdahto</i>	<i>dādū</i>
13	<i>sinza</i>	<i>daisa</i>	<i>dahsā // dahsāto</i>	<i>dāse</i>
14	<i>čārda daičār</i>	<i>daičār</i>	<i>dahčor // dahčorto</i>	<i>dāčar</i>
15	<i>ponzā</i>	<i>daipanj</i>	<i>dahpānj // dahpānjto</i>	<i>dāpanj</i>
16	<i>šonzā</i>	<i>daišeš</i>	<i>dahšeš // dahšešto</i>	<i>dāšeš</i>
17	<i>hövda daihaft</i>	<i>daihaft</i>	<i>dahhaft // dahhaftto</i>	<i>dāhaf</i>
18	<i>ijda daihašt</i>	<i>daihašt</i>	<i>dahhašt // dahhaštto</i>	<i>dāhašt</i>
19	<i>nonzā dainüv</i>	<i>dainüv</i>	<i>dahnih // dahnihito</i>	<i>dānū</i>

This usage is almost identical in the Talyshi language with only one difference being that if in any dialect of the Caucasian Persian language, the simultaneous presence and use of two types of composition of the numerals of the 11–19 series is not attested, then in the northern dialects of the Talyshi language, there is such a reality. In Boris Miller’s famous study of Northern Talyshi, which, although published in 1953, is based on the materials written during his fieldwork in Lankarān in 1925 [Miller 1953, 3], only one form of composition is recorded for the numerals under study, the so-called “native Iranian”

<sup>8</sup> See: [Mammadova 2017, 76].

<sup>9</sup> See: [Ġalt‘axčyan 1970, 99].

<sup>10</sup> See: [Hüseynova 2002, 83].

<sup>11</sup> See: [Hacıyev 1971, 67].

type of composition (see **Table 3**). However, new research on the Northern Talyshi language, conducted mainly in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, records the emergence of the so-called “non-Iranian” type and parallel usage with forms belonging to the “native Iranian” type. Moreover, this ongoing grammatical change is applicable for the entire distribution area of the Northern Talyshi language (see **Table 3**), the southern border of which is the ‘Anbarāni dialect spoken in Iran [Avchyan 2016, 72–73]. The spread of this phenomenon stops where the zone of the strong influence of Persian begins (see **Table 3**). The central and southern dialects of Talyshi indicate that the direction of this ongoing structural change should be evaluated from north to south. The last mentioned circumstance also reduces the possibility of finding a solution to the problem in grammatical analogy, particularly the possibility that the reason for the change in the native forms of the series 11–19 may be the influence of the series 21–99, wherein the inherited Iranian form of composition of the words “20”, “30”, “40” etc. precedes the unit (cf. Persian: *bīstōdō* “twenty–two”, Talyshi: *vīsti penj* “twenty–five”, Caucasian Persian: *sī–čār* “thirty–four”, etc.).

**Table 3.** *Quantitative Numerals 11–19 in Talyshi dialects*

	Northern Talyshi (Lankarāni dialect)		Northern Talyshi (‘Anbarāni dialect) <sup>12</sup>		Central Talyshi (Asālemi dialect) <sup>13</sup>	Southern Talyshi (Fūmani dialect) <sup>14</sup>
	Iranian forms <sup>15</sup>	Non–Iranian forms <sup>16</sup>	Iranian forms	Non–Iranian forms	Iranian forms <sup>17</sup>	Iranian forms <sup>18</sup>
11	<i>yonza</i>	<i>dāvi i</i>	<i>yonza</i>	<i>davii</i>	<i>yānza</i>	<i>yonza</i>
12	<i>donza</i>	<i>dāvi di</i>	<i>donza</i>	<i>davidi</i>	<i>dānza</i>	<i>donza</i>

<sup>12</sup> See: [Avchyan 2016, 72–73].

<sup>13</sup> See: [Yarshater 1996, 91; Reḡāyatī 2011; 43].

<sup>14</sup> The provided data were collected from Yāser Karamzādeh, a native speaker of Southern Talyshi who resides in the village of Ālyān (Gīlān, Fuman district).

<sup>15</sup> See: [Miller 1953, 128; Abboszoda 2019, 67].

<sup>16</sup> See: [Abboszoda 2019, 67; Avchyan & Voskanian 2022, 52].

<sup>17</sup> Only the Iranian type is recorded in the Central dialect of Talyshi, and no example of the non-Iranian type has been found in this dialect yet.

<sup>18</sup> Similar to the Central dialect of Talyshi, the Southern dialect also exclusively features the Iranian type without any examples of the non-Iranian type found.

13	<i>senza</i>	<i>dāvī se</i>	<i>sinza</i>	<i>davise</i>	<i>sinza</i>	<i>sinza</i>
14	<i>čorda</i>	<i>dāvī čo</i>	<i>čurda</i>	<i>davičur</i>	<i>čārda</i>	<i>čārda</i>
15	<i>ponza</i>	<i>dāvī penj</i>	<i>punza</i>	<i>davipenj</i>	<i>pānza</i>	<i>pūnza</i>
16	<i>šonza</i>	<i>dāvī šaš</i>	<i>šunza</i>	<i>davišāš</i>	<i>šānza</i>	<i>šūnza</i>
17	<i>hāvda</i>	<i>dāvī hāft</i>	<i>hāvda</i>	<i>davihāft</i>	<i>havd'a</i>	<i>hifda</i>
18	<i>hažda</i>	<i>dāvī hašt</i>	<i>hažda</i>	<i>davihašt</i>	<i>hažd'a</i>	<i>hažda // hižda</i>
19	<i>nonza</i>	<i>dāvī nav</i>	<i>nonza</i>	<i>davinav</i>	<i>n'uzd'a</i>	<i>nizda</i>

### **Identifying the origin of changes and transformations in Caucasian Persian and Northern Talyshi (areal linguistics and typological aspect)**

The examination of similar changes in the Caucasian Persian and Talyshi languages and the search for their causes cannot be limited only to the framework of historical-comparative linguistics. This is because, as mentioned above, for the composition of this series of numerals in inherited Iranian, the word *ten* is postposed, just as it is preserved in today's modern Persian language. Therefore, in a certain sense, the reason for this change should be sought from the historical and current contacts of the given languages or from the linguistic formulation in the context of areal linguistics and areal typology.

The language that has been in closest contact with Caucasian Persian and Talyshi during the last hundred years in the territory of Azerbaijan is the Azerbaijani language. Azerbaijani holds the status of a “titular language” and therefore exerts an overwhelmingly superstrative influence on Caucasian Persian and a slightly milder influence on the more peripherally spread Northern Talyshi. In general, in the Altaic language family, including the Oghuz sub-branch, the type in which the word *ten* (Turk. *on*) has a preposition to the numbers 1–9 is native to the composition of the 11–19 series (see **Table 4**).

**Table 4.** *Quantitative Numerals 11–19 in Oğuz group of Turkic languages*

	<b>Turkish</b>	<b>Azerbaijani</b>	<b>Turkmen</b>
11	on bir	on bir	on bir
12	on iki	on iki	on
13	on üç	on üç	on
14	on dört	on dört	on dört
15	on beş	on beş	on bäs
16	on alti	on alti	on alty
17	on yedi	on yeddi	on ýedi
18	on sekiz	on säkkiz	on sekiz
19	on dokuz	on doqquz	on dokuz

Therefore, there is a high probability that the change in the composition of the numerals 11–19 in Caucasian Persian and Northern Talyshi, particularly the gradual expulsion of the native Iranian type and its replacement by a non-Iranian type, is the result of the superstrative influence of Azerbaijani, which is one of the Turkic languages. The reason for this change is the Azerbaijani language itself, as agreed by Schmitt for Juhuri, a language closely related to Caucasian Persian [Schmitt 1994, 15], Tonoyan for Caucasian Persian [Tonoyan 2015, 3–12] and Avchyan for the ‘Anbarāni dialect of Northern Talyshi [Avchyan 2016, 72–73]. These researchers have confirmed that the influence of the Azerbaijani language is the reason for the changes in the languages that they studied.

### **Other Cases**

The Iranian and non-Iranian languages that have been or are still in active contact with Turkic languages, particularly Turkish and Azerbaijani, speak in favor of looking for a solution to the problem in the domain of language contacts and interactions.

#### *Iranian languages*

An example of this is the northern Kurdish language (Kurmanji) spoken in Artsakh, which Vil’chevskiy called “the language of the Kurds of Karabakh” [Vil’chevskiy 1938, 69]. Vil’chevskiy conducted field work in Artsakh in 1931 to collect data for his research. According to him, in the language of Artsakh Kurds, both Iranian and non-Iranian forms were used simultaneously for the numerals 11–19 (see **Table 5**). By the 60s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the non-Iranian type had completely pushed out the native Iranian forms. Bakaev’s field material, collected in 1960–1962, documents the use of only one non-Iranian form in Artsakh Kurdish [Bakaev 1965, 112]. It is interesting that in some northern Kurdish dialects spoken in Turkey as well, there is a simultaneous use of two forms (Iranian and non-Iranian) for the numbers 11–19, which was reported by R. Schmitt [Schmitt 1994, 15].

Among the Iranian languages that are currently in contact with Turkic languages, Zazaki exhibits a similar phenomenon [Todd 2008, 34]. In Zazaki, which is spoken in the Dersim area, there is a parallel use of both Iranian and non-Iranian types of the number series in question (see **Table 5**).



**Table 5.** *Quantitative numerals 11–19 in some dialects of Kurdish and Zazaki (Dimli)*

Kurdish dialect of Artsakh		Some northern dialects of the Kurdish language (Turkey)		Zazaki or Dimli (Turkey)		
	Iranian forms <sup>19</sup>	Non–Iranian forms <sup>20</sup>	Iranian forms <sup>21</sup>	Non–Iranian forms <sup>22</sup>	Iranian forms <sup>23</sup>	Non–Iranian forms <sup>24</sup>
11	<i>yanzdäh</i>	<i>Əäv u yäk</i> <i>t'əw yäk</i>	<i>yāz(d)a</i> <i>yanzde(h)</i>	<i>dehyek</i>	<i>žondes</i>	<i>desújew</i>
12	<i>dvānzdäh</i>	<i>Əäv u du</i>	<i>dūāzda</i>	<i>dehdu</i>	<i>diwēs</i>	<i>desúdidi</i>
	<i>dānzdäh</i>	<i>[t'əw dö]</i>	<i>donzde(h)</i>			
13	<i>senzäh</i>	<i>Əäv u se</i>	<i>sēzda</i>	<i>dehsê</i>	<i>hīrēs</i>	<i>desúhiré</i>
	<i>sezdäh</i>	<i>t'əw se (/sa)</i>	<i>sêzde(h)</i>			
14	<i>tārdäh</i>	<i>Əäv u tār</i>	<i>čūārda</i>	<i>dehçar</i>	<i>čārēs</i>	<i>desúçe'har</i>
		<i>t'əw čār</i>	<i>çarde(h)</i>			
15	<i>pānzdäh</i>	<i>Əäv u pānj</i>	<i>pāzda</i>	<i>dehpênc</i>	<i>pānjēs</i>	<i>desúpanj</i>
		<i>[t'əw penj]</i>	<i>panzde(h)</i>			
16	<i>šānzdäh</i>	<i>Əäv u šäs</i>	<i>šāzda</i>	<i>dehşeş</i>	<i>šīyēs</i>	<i>desúşeş</i>
		<i>[t'əw şeş]</i>	<i>šanзде(h)</i>			
17	<i>hāv däh</i>	<i>Əäv u häfθ</i>	<i>hawda</i>	<i>dehhevt</i>	<i>hewtēs</i>	<i>desú'hewt</i>
		<i>[t'əw haft]</i>	<i>hivde(h)</i>			
18	<i>hıjdäh</i>	<i>Əäv u häšθ</i>	<i>hažda</i>	<i>devheyšt</i>	<i>hēštēs</i>	<i>desú'hešt</i>
		<i>[t'əw hašt]</i>	<i>hijde(h)</i>			
19	<i>nonzdäh</i>	<i>Əäv nehā</i>	<i>nōzda</i>	<i>devne(h)</i>	<i>[newēs]</i>	<i>desúnew</i>
	<i>noz däh</i>	<i>[t'əw nah]</i>	<i>nozde(h)</i>			

In the case of Northwestern Iranian dialects, the same phenomenon is also found in Harzandi, one of the New Azari dialect islands

<sup>19</sup> See: [Vil'chevskiy 1938, 73].

<sup>20</sup> See: [Vil'chevskiy 1938, 73; Bakayev 1965, 112]. The examples given by Bakaev were limited to the numerals 11, 13 and 14. The authors of this lines also gave 13 and the numerals following 14, i.e. 15–19, according to the extracted pattern, using the [...] sign.

<sup>21</sup> The data were extracted from Schmitt's article, given according to Mukri and other dialects of Kurmanji [Schmitt 1994, 15].

<sup>22</sup> The examples, given under one general form for the Northern Kurdish dialects of Azerbaijan and Turkey, are taken from the work of R. Schmitt [1994, 15].

<sup>23</sup> See: [Paul 1998, 61].

<sup>24</sup> See: [Todd 2008, 54].

spoken in Iran, which should again be considered as a result of Turkic influence (cf. *doh-o-i* “eleven”, *doh-o-do* “twelve”, *doh-o-herē* “thirteen”, *doh-o-čō* “fourteen”, *doh-o-pinj* “fifteen”, *doh-o-šoš* “sixteen”, *doh-o-hoft* “seventeen”, *doh-o-hažda* “eighteen”, *doh-o-nov* “nineteen”)<sup>25</sup>. The Turkic language, which became dominant in Atropatene from the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries, had exactly the same influence on the local New Azari dialects as the Transcaucasian Turkish had on the Caucasian Persian and Northern Talysh languages.

It should be noted that although in some New Azari dialects, such as Harzandī and Karingānī, the transition to the Turkish type has occurred, in the case of Xalxālī, the Iranian type continues to be preserved [Āṣefī 2020, 30].

*Non-Iranian languages*

Two types of composition of the numerals 11–19 were used during different periods of the development of the Armenian and Greek languages. Both ancient Armenian and ancient Greek have used the forms of composition typical for Indo-European languages in which *ten* follows the numerals 1–9 (see **Table 6**). Whereas, in modern Greek (except for the numbers “eleven” and “twelve”) and modern Armenian, the second form of the composition of the series are used, in which the number *ten* precedes the numbers 1–9 (see **Table 6**).

**Table 6.** *Quantitative numerals 11–19 in Armenian and Greek languages*

	Armenian		Greek	
	Old Armenian	Modern Armenian	Old Greek	Modern Greek
11	metasan	tasnmek	ἕνδεκα	ένδεκα
12	erkotasan	tasnerku	δώδεκα	δώδεκα
13	erek‘tasan	tasnerek‘	τρεῖσκαίδεκα	δεκατρεῖς
14	čorek‘tasan	tasnčors	τετταρες καί δέκα	δεκατέσσαρες
15	hngetasan	tasnhing	πεντεκαίδεκα	δεκαπέντε
16	veštasan	tasnvec‘	έκκαίδεκα	δεκαέξ
17	ewt‘newtasn	tasnyot‘	έπτακαίδεκα	δεκαεπτά
18	ut‘ewtasn	tasnut‘	όκτωκαίδεκα	δεκαοκτώ
19	innewtasn	tasninə	έννεακαίδεκα	δεκαεννέα

<sup>25</sup> The assumption that this change is caused by the Turkish influence during the last few decades, is also evidenced by the data found in earlier researches, particularly in the 50s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in which some numerals in Harzandī show the Iranian archaic type of composition, i.e. *čōrda* “fourteen” [Kārang 1954, 51].

Theoretically, it can be assumed that these changes are due to the influence of language contacts. But the example of Armenian complicates this claim, as the change in Armenian began to take place in the 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> centuries itself<sup>26</sup>. This is also a period of qualitative change and transition in the history of the Armenian language and the beginning of Middle Armenian. The first Seljuk raids into Asia Minor took place only in the 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> centuries. There is no other linguistic basis, even insignificant, to assume that Armenian came into contact with the Turkic languages immediately from that period. The fact that there were no lexical borrowings, made grammatical copying, which is more complex and requires longer contact, tangible dominance of the source language for copying, etc.

Hrachya Acharyan, an outstanding specialist in the history of the Armenian language, gives a simple explanation to the problem, considering that the formation of the second form in Middle Armenian is related to the law of generalization (analogy). According to Acharyan, the change in Armenian occurred due to the influence of the numerals 21–99 [Ačaryan 1952, 249]. And what is more interesting is that Acharyan gives examples of the second type of usage in Armenian even from the pre-Middle Armenian period, which, however, are not found independently, but in formations with the numerals *hundred* and *thousand*, such as *hariwr tasn ew erku* “hundred and ten and two”, *hazar tasn ew ewt'n* “one thousand ten and seven” etc. [Ačaryan 1952, 249].

### **Conclusion**

The replacement of the native Iranian form of composition of the numerals of the 11–19 series with a new one has not yet been fully completed and is still in progress. Among the dialects of the Caucasian Persian language, only the Absheron dialect group (Suraxani dialect) has resisted this change, owing to the traditionally strong presence of the literary Persian language in that area until the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Unlike Talyshi, in which the process started much

---

<sup>26</sup> As examples can be mentioned *tasnewinn* “nineteen” attested in the writings of Hovhannes Sarkavag Imastaser (1045–1129), *tasn ew min* “eleven” attested in the *Chronicle* of Matthew of Edessa (11<sup>th</sup> century – 1144), as well as *tasnewčors* “fourteen” and *tasnewut* “eighteen” both used once in Mkhitar of Her’s (12<sup>th</sup> century) *jermanc' mxit'arowt'iw'n* [Łazaryan & Avetisyan 2009, 750].

later (probably late 20<sup>th</sup> century to early 21<sup>st</sup> century), in Caucasian Persian, it started earlier. This is indicated by the parallel existence of two types of composition of the numerals 11–19 and the use of old forms alongside new ones. In Caucasian Persian dialects spoken in Mountain Shirvan (Shamakhi, Ismayilli) and Quba, only new forms are used, which shows the completed state of grammatical change. The picture is different in the Talyshi language, where the process of this grammatical change is new and dynamic. The parallel existence of old and new forms is proof of the change. It will still take decades for the newly created form to gain dominance over the first one and finally be able to push it out of the language.

When discussing the issue from the standpoint of areal linguistics, it is obvious that similar changes are taking place in other Iranian languages that are in active contact with Turkic languages. Moreover, when speakers are bilingual, in addition to their native language, they also speak Turkish or some other Turkic language as a second language (see, for example, the examples of Zazaki and Kurdish in **Table 5**).

The reason for the discussed grammatical changes in the Caucasian Persian and Northern Talyshi languages, in all probability, is the strong superstrative influence of the Azerbaijani language as the new dominant language of the Eastern Transcaucasia (since the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century). This is also evidenced by the direction of the spread of this change – from north to south, stopping where the central and southern dialects of the Talyshi begin and, consequently, their protection by the dominant Iranian language environment.

## ЛІТЕРАТУРА

*Аббасзада Ф. Ф. Тольшэ Зывон (фонетикэ, морфологијэ, синтаксис). Минск, 2019.*

*Бакаев Ч. Х. Язык азербайджанских курдов. Москва, 1965.*

*Вильчевский О. Л. Вигезимальный счет в курдском // Памяти академика Н. Я. Марра / Ред. И. И. Мещанинов. Москва – Ленинград, 1938.*

*Грюнберг А. Ц. К вопросу о языковом взаимодействии (на материале языка североазербайджанских татов) // Краткие сообщения Института народов Азии. 1961. Вып. XL.*

Грюнберг А. Ц. О месте татского среди иранских языков // **Вопросы языкознания**. 1961. № 1.

Курдоев К. К. **Курдский язык**. Москва, 1961.

Миллер Б. В. **Талышский язык**. Москва, 1953.

Пуреико Л. А. Талышский язык. Диалекты Тати Ирана // **Основы иранского языкознания. Новоиранские языки: северо-западная группа I** / Ред. В. С. Расторгуева. Москва, 1991.

Расторгуева В. С. (отв. ред.) **Гилянский язык**. Москва, 1971.

Соколова В. С. **Очерки по фонетике иранских языков, I, белуджский, курдский, талышский, татский языки**. Москва – Ленинград, 1953.

Vazin M. **Le Tâlech. Une region ethnique au nord de l'Iran**. Tome II. Paris, 1980.

Beeks R. S. P. **Comparative Indo-European linguistics: an introduction**, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Amsterdam – Philadelphia, 1995.

Cahani K. & Korn A. Balochi // **The Iranian Languages** / Ed. G. L. Windfuhr. London – New York, 2009.

Durkin–Meisterenst D. **Grammatik des Westmitteliranischen (Parthisch und Mittelpersisch)**. Wien, 2014.

Emmerick R. E. Iranian [numerals] // **Indo-European numerals** / Ed. Gvozdanović J. Berlin – New York, 1992.

Насыев М. Ё. **Tat dilinin Qonaqkənd ləhcəsi**. Bakı, 1971.

Häberl Ch. G. (in press), Endangered Languages of the Middle East and North Africa // **Encyclopedia of the World's Endangered Languages** / Ed. Ch. Moseley. London-New York, available at: <https://www.academia.edu/27190965>.

Hüseynova G. Ё. **Lahic tatlarının dili**. Bakı, 2002.

Mammadova N. **Eléments de description et documentation du tat de l'Apshéron, langue iranienne d'Azerbaïdjan**. Diss. PhD. Paris, 2018.

Moseley Ch. (ed.) **Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger**, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Paris, 2010.

Paul L. **Zazaki: Grammatik und Versuch einer Dialektologie**. Wiesbaden, 1998.

Schmitt R. Die Zählreihe zwischen “10” und “20”, zum Beispiel im Iranischen // **Historische Sprachforschung**. 1994. Vol. 107/1.

Schulze W. M. **Northern Talysh**. München, 2000.

Todd T. L. **A Grammar of Dimili (also known as Zaza)**. Electronic pub., 2008. 1<sup>st</sup> pub. Ann Arbor, 1985. 2<sup>nd</sup> pub. Stockholm, 2002.

Tonoyan A. A. Some Remarks on the Origin of the Iranian Stratum of Caucasian Persian (Tati) Lexicon // **Bulletin of the Institute of Oriental Studies**. 2021. Vol. 1/1.

Windfuhr G. L. Language change and modeling modal axes: Irano-Turkic convergence // **Turkic-Iranian Contact Areas: historical and linguistic aspects** / Eds. Johanson L. & Bulut Ch. Wiesbaden, 2006.

Yarshatet E. H. The Taleshi of Asālem // **Studia Iranica**. 1996. Vol. 25.

Աճառյան Հ. Հ. Լիակատար քերականություն հայոց լեզվի, հատոր 1: Երևան, 1952:

Ավյան Հ. Հ. Թալիշերենի Անբարանի բարբառը (թեկնածուական ատենախոսություն): Երևան, 2016:

Ավյան Հ. Հ., Ոսկանյան Վ. Ս. Թալիշերենի դասագիրք: Երևան, 2022:

Ղազարյան Ռ. Ս., Ավետիսյան Հ. Ս. Միջին հայերենի բառարան: Երևան, 2009:

Ղալթախյան Ս. Բ. Մադրասացիների թաթերեն լեզուն (թեկնածուական ատենախոսություն): Երևան, 1970:

Տոնոյան Ա. Ա. Կովկասյան պարսկերենում թվականների կազմության որոշ առանձնահատկությունների շուրջ // Օրինատալիս: 2015, հատ. 16:

آصفی ن.، خاستگاه زبانی مهاجران هرزن (واکوی نظریهٔ هنینگ) // پژوهش های ایرانشناسی، سال ۹، شماره ۲، ۱۳۹۸.

کارنگ ع.، تاتی و هرزنی: دو لهجه از زبان باستان آذربایجان، تبریز، ۱۳۳۳.  
رضایتی ی.، زبان تالشی (توصیف گویش مرکزی)، چاپ دوم (ویرایش جدید)، رشت، ۱۳۹۰.

## REFERENCES

Abboszoda F. (2019), *Tolysha zyvon (fonetika, morfologiya, sintaksis)*, ed. by Abilov I., Medisont, Minsk. (In Talyshi).

Ačaryan H. (1952), *Liakatar k'erakanut 'yun hayoc' lezvi*, Vol. 1, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk Armyanskoy SSR, Yerevan. (In Armenian).

Åsefi N. (2020), *Xāstgāh-e zabānī-e mohājerān-e Harzan (vākā-vī-ye nazārīye-ye Henning)*, in *Pažūhešhā-ye Īrānšenāsī*, Vol. 9/2, Tehran, pp. 19–34. (In Persian).

Avchyan H. and Voskanyan V. (2022), *T'ališereni dasagirk'*, YSU Publishing House, Yerevan. (In Armenian).

Avchyan H. (2016), *T'ališereni Anbarani barbaṛə*, Ph.D. thesis defended at the Institute of Language after Hr. Acharyan NAS RA, Yerevan. (In Armenian).

Bakayev Ch. (1965), *Yazyk azerbaydzhanskikh kurdiv*, Nauka, Moscow. (In Russian).

Bazin M. (1980), *Le Tâlech. Une region ethnique au nord de l'Iran*, Tome II, Association pour la diffusion de la pensée française (ADPF), Paris.

Beeks R. (1995), *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: an introduction*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., John Benjamin's Publishing Company, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

Cahani K. and Korn A. (2009), “Balochi”, in Windfuhr G. (ed.), *The Iranian Languages*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 634–92.

Durkin-Meisterenst D. (2014), *Grammatik des Westmitteliranischen (Parthisch und Mittelpersisch)*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien.

Emmerick R. (1992), “Iranian [numerals]”, in Gvozdanović J. (ed.), *Indo-European numerals*, Vol. 57 in the series Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, pp. 289–345 (= Chapter 8).

Galt'axčyan S. (1970), *Madrasac'ineri t'at'eren lezun*, Ph.D. thesis defended at the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR, Sector of Oriental Studies. (In Armenian).

Grunberg A. (1961a), “O meste tatskogo sredi iranskikh yazykov”, in *Voprosy yazykoznaniya*, Vol. 1 (10), pp. 106–14. (In Russian).

Grunberg A. (1961b), “K voprosu o yazykovom vzaimodeystvii (na materiale yazyka severoazerbaydzhanskikh tatov)”, in *Kratkie soobshcheniya Instituta narodov Azii*, Vol. XL, Moscow, pp. 11–23. (In Russian).

Hacıyev M. (1971), *Tat dilinin Qonaqkənd ləhcəsi*, Elm, Bakı. (In Azerbaijani Turkish).

Häberl Ch. (in press), “Endangered Languages of the Middle East and North Africa”, in *Encyclopedia of the World's Endangered Languages*, ed. by Moseley Ch., Routledge, London-New York, Routledge, available at: <https://www.academia.edu/27190965>, pp. 1–63.

Hüseynova G. (2002), *Lahic tatlarının dili*, Nurlan, Bakı. (In Azerbaijani Turkish).

Kārang A. (1954), *Tātī va Harzanī, do lahja az zabān-e bāstān-e Āzarbāyjān*, Esma'il Va'ezpur, Tabriz. (In Persian).

Kurdoyev K. (1961), *Kurdskiy yazyk*, Izdatel'stvo vostochnoy literatury, Moscow. (In Russian).

Lazaryan R. and Avetisyan H. (2009), *Mijin hayereni ba'aran*, 2<sup>nd</sup> revised ed., YSU Publishing House Yerevan, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Vols. 1–2, 1987–1992 (Academy Press, Yerevan). (In Armenian).

Mammadova N. (2018), *Eléments de description et documentation du tat de l'Aps Héron, langue iranienne d'Azerbaïdjan*, Ph.D. thesis defended at the Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales (INALCO), Paris.

Miller B. (1953), *Talyshskiy yazyk*, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moscow. (In Russian).

Moseley Ch. (ed.) (2010), *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., UNESCO Publishing, Paris.

Paul L. (1998), *Zazaki: Grammatik und Versuch einer Dialektologie*, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden.

Pireyko L. (1991), "Talyshskiy yazyk. Dialekty Tati Irana", in Rastorguyeva V. (ed.), *Osnovy iranskogo yazykoznaneya. Novoiranskiye yazyki: severo-zapadnaya grupa*, chast' I, Nauka, Moscow. (In Russian).

Rastorguyeva V. (ed.) (1971), *Gilyanskiy yazyk*, Nauka, Moscow. (In Russian).

Redāyatī K. (2011), *Zabān-e Talešī (tousīf-e gūyeš-e markazī), čāp-e dovvom (vīrāyeš-e mojjaddad)*, Našr-e Īlyā, Rašt. (In Persian).

Schmitt R. (1994), "Die Zählreihe zwischen '10' und '20', zum Beispiel im Iranischen", in *Historische Sprachforschung*, Vol. 107/1, pp. 12–29.

Schulze W. (2000), *Northern Talysh*, Lincom Europa, München.

Sokolova V. (1953), *Ocherki po fonetike iranskikh yazykov, chast' I, beludzhskiy, kurdskiy, talyshskiy, tatskiy yazyki*, Moscow and Leningrad. (In Russian).

Todd T. L. (2008), *A Grammar of Dimilī (also known as Zaza)*, electronic pub., 1<sup>st</sup> pub. 1985 (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan), 2<sup>nd</sup> pub. 2002 (Stockholm, Iremen Förlag).



Tonoyan A. (2015), “Kovkasyan parskerenum t’vakanneri kazmutyan oroš aranjnahatkut’yunneri šurj”, in *Orientalia*, Vol. 16, Caucasian Centre for Iranian Studies, Yerevan, pp. 3–12. (In Armenian).

Tonoyan A. (2021), “Some Remarks on the Origin of the Iranian Stratum of Caucasian Persian (Tati) Lexicon”, in *Bulletin of the Institute of Oriental Studies*, Vol. 1/1, Varm Printing House, Yerevan, pp. 167–78. DOI: 10.52837/27382702–2021–34.1–167.

Vil’chevskiy O. (1938), “Vigezimal’nyy schyot v kurdskom”, in Meshchaninov I. (ed.), *Pamyati akademika N. Ya. Marra*, Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moscow and Leningrad, pp. 67–76. (In Russian).

Windfuhr G. (2006), “Language change and modeling modal axes: Irano-Turkic convergence”, in Johanson L. & Bulut Ch. (eds), *Turkic-Iranian Contact Areas: historical and linguistic aspects*, Turcologica, Vol. 62, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, pp. 252–82.

Yarshater E. (1996), “The Taleshi of Asālem”, in *Studia Iranica*, Vol. 25, pp. 83–113.

*A. Тоноян, Г. Авчян*

**ПРО ЗМІНИ КІЛЬКІСНИХ ЧИСЛІВНИКІВ 11–19  
У КАВКАЗЬКІЙ ПЕРСЬКІЙ (ТАТСЬКА)  
ТА ПІВНІЧНОТАЛИШСЬКІЙ МОВАХ**

Дві із західноіранських мов, поширених на території сучасної Азербайджанської Республіки, кавказька перська (тат) і північноталишська, що належать до південно-західної та північно-західної гілок іранських мов відповідно, мають багато спільних фонетичних і граматичних рис. Ці спільні риси зумовлені генетичним зв’язком між ними (корінна іранська спадщина), а також мовними контактами та взаємодією між ними, ймовірно, протягом певного історичного періоду. Крім того, існує ще одна важлива обставина, яка призвела до обумовлення деяких із цих спільних рис, а саме суперстративний вплив азербайджанської мови, яка набула статусу домінантної мови в регіоні протягом останнього століття. Хоча вплив азербайджанської мови на кавказьку перську мову та її вплив на північноталишську мову деякі дослідники досліджували як окремі теми, схожі зміни в кавказькій перській і талишській мовах, спричинені впливом “домінантної” мови, дотепер не досліджено. Пропонована робота є спробою заповнити цю прогалину, а також створити прецедент для подальшого вивчення деяких граматичних спільностей

між двома мовами з цієї точки зору. У цій статті розглядається зміна складу кількісних числівників 11–19, що відбувається. Стаття має на меті висвітлити причини цієї зміни в двох іранських мовах шляхом їх дослідження за допомогою порівняльно-типологічного методу. З огляду на те, що кавказька перська та північноталишська мови класифікуються ЮНЕСКО як мови, що перебувають під загрозою зникнення [Moseley 2010, *tap 11–12*], дослідження піддатливості цих мов, впливу на них нерідної домінантної мови, його сили та швидкості, витіснення рідних форм, є дуже важливим і, можливо, одним із найважливіших завдань сучасної іранської діалектології та іранської лінгвістики.

**Ключові слова:** кількісні числівники, кавказька перська мова, тат, північноталишська, суперстративний вплив, мовний контакт, курдська мова, зазакі, дімлі, тюрко-іраніка

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 12.12.2022*