

SOME COMMENTS ON A PARALLEL TEXT IN DARI, TOJIKI AND FARSI

SUMMARY

An analysis of multilingual texts is an important tool in linguistic research. It is particularly valuable in the case of dead and forgotten languages, however, this is certainly not the only situation, in which this method is of use. In the present article, translations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into Dari, Farsi and Tojiki are analyzed. Historically, the three idioms are derived from one source, however, their present status is worth discussing, especially when considering the relationship between Tojiki and Farsi. The analysis presented in the article is focused primarily on differences in the lexica, phraseology, morphology and syntax.

DARI, FARSI AND TOJIKI

Dari, Farsi and Tojiki are three closely related idioms that belong to a vast continuum of varieties of Persian. Farsi (henceforth FA) and Tojiki (TJ) form the opposite extremities of this continuum, while the dialects of Afghanistan (i.e. Dari (DA) in particular) have an intermediary position.¹

Historically, the three idioms are derived from one source, however, their present status is worth discussing, especially when considering the relationship between Tojiki and Farsi. As Perry notes, the emergence of spoken TJ as a separate ethnolect started around the 16th century, although the common literary standard was preserved well into the modern times.²

¹ Perry 2005, p. 1.

² Ibid.

Whether or not the twentieth century concluded the process of the emancipation of TJ as an independent language is a question that cannot be solved in this short article. We may only note that the problem is not restricted to the field of linguistics as is the case with all the language vs. dialects controversies. This is why we will use terms like ‘idiom’ or ‘ethnolect’ instead of ‘language’ or ‘dialect.’

THE ANALYSED TEXTS

An analysis of multilingual texts is an important tool used when studying languages, particularly those that are forgotten. However, reading texts in dead and forgotten languages is not the only situation, in which an analysis of multilingual texts may be of use. We shall hopefully see that it can reveal interesting facts in relation to idioms which are still spoken and are well known.

The texts we will analyse are three translations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). Of course, focusing on variants of one original text has certain drawbacks – it is difficult to distinguish between typical phenomena of a given idiom and the forms preferred by a particular translator, etc. On the other hand, the possibility of analysing texts which – because of their juridical or semi-juridical nature – are translated in a most precise manner is an opportunity not to be ignored. Certainly it is a good starting point for a comparison with other examples of parallel texts.

The translations of the UDHR are available on the website of the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (<http://www.ohchr.org>). They are provided by the following institutions:

- Dari – the Cooperation Centre for Afghanistan and UNDP/UNOCHA (Pakistan),
- Farsi – the United Nations Information Centre (Iran),
- Tojiki – the Presidential Apparatus of the Republic of Tajikistan.

DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES DISCUSSED

The author would like to focus on a number of problems at various levels of language system.

PHONOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES

Generally, the regular phonological differences between the three idioms are well known and well described in the literature on the subject. However, the author would like to highlight certain secondary differences appearing as a result of different external influences on the three ethnolects.

There is a common phenomenon that has numerous examples, like TJ бомба /bomba/: FA بمب /bomb/,³ DA بم /bam/.⁴ While all these forms may be traced back to the Greek βόμβος 'a sound, noise, etc.'⁵, the final part of the TJ form clearly betrays Russian as an intermediary, while in the case of FA this role has been taken by French.⁶ The pronunciation of the DA form, in its turn, clearly indicates English was the vehicular language at some stage.

However, in the analyzed text we find only one clear example of this sort, an adjective, the TJ демократӣ /demokrati/, DA دموکراتیک /demōkrātik/ & FA دموکراتیک /demokrātik/. The origin of all these forms may be traced back to the Greek δημοκρατία, however, they are not a part of the common lexical heritage, which is proved by the violation of the typical FA: TJ correspondences (FA /ā/: TJ /o/, etc.). They were all transferred into the respective idioms via a different vehicular language. In the case of FA it might have been French (democratique).⁷ The TJ form is a suffixal derivative of the form демократ /demokrat/, most probably borrowed from Russian.

LEXICAL AND PHRASEOLOGICAL PARALLELS AND DIFFERENCES

Analysing the vocabulary used in by three variants in the translation of the UDHR we see that there is a considerable degree of correspondence between the FA and DA texts. In fact, there are only a limited number of cases in which the DA variant uses a different lexical item than the FA variant. Some of the differences between the DA and FA variants appear systematically, e.g. the form احدی /ahádi/

³ Rubinčik 1970, vol. 1, p. 219.

⁴ Kiseleva and Mikolayčik 1978, p. 122.

⁵ Groves 1844, p. 116; Černyh 1999, p. 103.

⁶ Omid 1373 HŠ, p. 280.

⁷ Omid 1373 HŠ, p. 610.

(in this instance meaning ‘no one’), frequent in the FA text but never found in the DA version in which it is always substituted with هیچکس /heč-kas/ (see Art. 4, 5, 9, 15.2 etc.). However, such a correspondence is not so consistent in other cases, for instance, the FA phrase در مقابل بیکاری /dar moqābel-e bikāri/ ‘facing unemployment’, finds a parallel in the DA در برابر بیکاری /dar barābar-e bēkāri/ (Art. 23.1). Nevertheless, the form مقابل /moqābel/ is used freely elsewhere in the DA text, often consistently with the FA variant, e.g. FA/DA در مقابل کار مساوی /dar moqābel-e kār-e mosāvi/ ‘in the case of equal work’ (Art. 23.2).

Sometimes a form appears in FA with a different counterpart in DA yet elsewhere the situation is reversed: the form is used in the DA text, but a different FA lexical item is employed, e.g. the verbal element of a compound verb نمودن /namudan (nomudan)/: In the FA text we find the verb تصمیم نمودن /tasmim namudan/ ‘to make a decision, to decide’, which is the counterpart of the DA تصمیم گرفتن /tasmim gereftan/ (Art. 10). However, in the Art. 13.1 we find the FA اختیار کردن /extiyār kardan/ and the DA اختیار نمودن /extiyār namudan (nomudan)/ both meaning ‘to chose’.

Generally speaking, DA vocabulary contains certain lexical items either unknown in FA or with a difference in meaning between the two idioms.⁸ The reverse is also true in that some specifically-FA lexemes exist, which are not used in DA. However, there are hardly any convincing examples of these phenomena in the analyzed texts. Rather the contrary, for even though some differences are to be observed throughout the whole text, the reason for this seems to be preference than real differences between the vocabulary of the two idioms, e.g. the form احدی /ahād-i/, which is always substituted in the DA text by هیچکس /heč-kas/ (see above), is attested in DA lexicography⁹ and the FA ذیحق /zi-haqq/ ‘having the right to sth, deserving sth’ is not unknown in DA.¹⁰ Similarly, none of the specifically DA forms in the text in question is alien to Persian (FA) vocabulary, e.g. جرم /jorm/¹¹ (Art. 11.1), مستحق /mostahaqq/¹²

What we see are minor discrepancies in the semantics of certain forms, e.g. the DA counterpart of the FA مرخصی /moraxxasi/ ‘leave of absence’¹³ is رخصتی /roxsati/.¹⁴ A parallel FA form does exist, however, it seems to only have an adjectival meaning.¹⁵

⁸ Dorofeyeva 1960, p. 64.

⁹ Kiseleva and Mikolayčik 1978, p. 28.

¹⁰ Kiseleva and Mikolayčik 1978, p. 391.

¹¹ Rubinčik 1970, vol. 1, p. 434.

¹² Rubinčik 1970, vol. 2, p. 503.

¹³ Rubinčik 1970, vol. 2, p. 491.

¹⁴ Kiseleva and Mikolayčik 1978, p. 400.

¹⁵ Dehxodā online [2014–02–11].

The differences between TJ on the one hand and FA/DA on the other are much more significant, and, most importantly, much more frequent. In some cases, different lexical items were chosen in the TJ text, even though the words used in the FA/DA texts exist in TJ, and the TJ form is often also attested in FA/DA, e.g.:

- FA/DA *دارا بودن* /dārā budan/: TJ *соҳиб будан* (Art. 1); cf. FA/DA *صاحب بودن* /sāheb budan/,¹⁶ TJ *доро будан* /doro budan/;¹⁷
- FA/DA *دفاع* /defāʾ/: TJ *ҳимоя* /himoya/ (Art. 11.1); cf. FA/DA *حمایت، حمايت* /hemāyat, hemāye (hemāya)/,¹⁸ TJ *дифоъ* /difoʾ/;¹⁹
- FA/DA *موقع* /mowqeʾ (mawqeʾ)/: TJ *вақт* /vaqt/ (Art. 11.2); cf. FA/DA *وقت* /vaqt/,²⁰ TJ *мавқеъ* /mavqeʾ/.²¹

In these cases, either form could have been used in all the three texts. Indeed, as has been demonstrated with the DA:FA differences, in one passage TJ may use a different form from that of FA/DA, but elsewhere the same word is used in all the three ethnolects. An example is the case of *دفاع*: *ҳимоя* (see above), and *حمایت* /hemāyat/ = *ҳимоя* /himoya/ in Art. 23.1.

Another interesting case of a somewhat intermediary nature is found in examples where FA/DA and TJ use different but closely related lexemes, particularly those of Arabic origin. See e.g. FA/DA *مسابی* /masāʾi/ ‘striving’: TJ *саъй* /saʾy/ ‘a try’ (Art. 22).

There are also some examples of TJ forms that are attested in the other two idioms, but rarely used in them. This is the case with the TJ *оила* (and the derived adj. *оилавӣ* – see Art. 12, 16, 23, 25). There is a form *عائله* /āʾele/ (variant: *عائله* /āyele/) in FA,²² however, this is extremely rare when compared to *خانواده* /xānevāde/.²³ On the other hand, in TJ *оила* is the most frequently used word for ‘family’. A special case is the phenomenon of complex forms (compounds etc.), the base elements of which are attested in all three idioms, with the actual form, however, attested only in one idiom (or in extremely rare instances in the other ones). A good example is provided by a form like *асоснокӣ* /asosnoki/ ‘validity’

¹⁶ Āryānpur 1382 HŠ, vol. 2, p. 1620.

¹⁷ Bertel’s 1954, p. 136.

¹⁸ Rubinčik 1970, vol. 1, p. 518; Kiseleva and Mikolayčik 1978, pp. 307–308.

¹⁹ Bertel’s 1954, p. 133.

²⁰ Rubinčik 1970, vol. 2, p. 705; Kiseleva and Mikolayčik 1978, p. 724.

²¹ Bertel’s 1954, p. 209.

²² Rubinčik 1970, vol. 2, p. 174.

²³ An Internet Google search within the .ir domain produces about 19,000,000 results for *خانواده* (Google search, keyword: خانواده, domain: .ir, date: 2014–02–14), while the results of the analogous searches for *عائله* and *عائله* are below 136,000 (Google search, keyword: عائله, domain: .ir, date: 2014–02–14; Google search, keyword: عائله, domain: .ir, date: 2014–02–14).

in Art. 10 (the noun /asos/ with the adjectival suffix /-nok/ → /asosnok/ plus the abstract suffix /-i/). The compound ғуломфурӯшӣ /ḡulomfurūši/ ‘slave trade’ (Art. 4) may serve as another example (see word-formation below).

Moreover, there are some forms in the TJ text which are not only absent from the FA and DA translations, but are also practically unknown in these idioms. Some of the forms are unsurprisingly borrowings from (or via) Russian, e.g.:

- FA/DA شخصیت حقوقی /šaxsiyyat-e hoquqi/ ‘being recognized as a person before the law’: TJ субъекти ҳуқуқӣ /subyeckt-i huquqi/ (Art. 6);
- FA/DA قانون اساسی /qānun-e asāsi/ ‘constitution’: TJ конституция /konstitutsiya/ (Art. 8);
- FA/DA دادگاه /dādḡāh/, محکمه /mahkame (DA mahkama)/ (pl. محاکم /mahākem/) ‘court of law’: TJ суд /sud/ (pl. судҳо /sudho/) (Art. 8, 10, 11).

TJ forms unknown to DA and FA that are not of Russian origin are scarce in the text. The word бадарға /badarḡa/ ‘banition’ (Art. 9) may be provided as an example.

Finally, we should highlight that there are examples of DA–TJ parallels in opposition to the forms used in FA, even if this is not a very common phenomenon. Examples include the FA احدى /ahādi/: DA هیچکس /heč-kas/: TJ ҳеч кас /hej-kas/ (Art. 4, 5, 9 etc.); FA مخفی /maxfi/: DA پنهانی /penhāni/: TJ пинҳонӣ /pinhoni/ (Art. 21.3). In the case of the previously discussed pair, the FA مرخصی /moraxxasi/: DA رخصتی /rox sati/, TJ follows DA, i.e. uses the form рӯхсатӣ /ruxsati/ (Art. 24).

In some cases the semantic differences between the FA/DA and TJ variants may be very subtle indeed and be best described as a variation in the typical usage of a form. For example, the FA phrase آموزش و پرورش /āmuzeš-o-parvareš/ is used in the text as a parallel to the TJ таҳсил /tahsil/. The etymological counterpart of the latter form in FA is تحصیل /tahsil/, which, theoretically, may bear the general meaning of ‘(receiving) education.’²⁴ However, in modern FA تحصیل is typically used when referring to university level education.²⁵

The TJ form қаноатбахш /qano’at-baxš/ ‘satisfactory’ (Art. 23.3) is known in DA as قناعتبخش /qanā’at-baxš/²⁶ but it is not attested in the consulted FA

²⁴ Rubinčik 1970, vol. 1, pp. 354–355; Āryānpur Kāšāni and Āryānpur Kāšāni 1375 HŠ, p. 280.

²⁵ An Internet search revealed that of the first 100 hits containing the form تحصیل only about 3 referred to education in general, a further 2 were open to dispute. In all the remaining instances, تحصیل was used to denote university education (Google search, keyword: تحصیل, date: 2014–02–18).

²⁶ Kiseleva and Mikolayčik 1978, p. 566.

dictionaries. An online search reveals that it is used mostly in Afghan or Afghanistan-related materials on the Internet.²⁷

If we try to classify the lexical corpus of both FA/DA and TJ, we find that in the first two varieties of Persian (which are considered together, because of the high degree of parallelity in the FA and DA variants), over 57% of the words used are of Iranian origin, while about 42% are of Semitic, mainly Arabic origin (words with other origins that came into FA/DA via Arabic, like قانون, which is of Greek origin, are included). The proportions are very similar in the case of the TJ text – 60% : 39%, although the TJ text uses slightly more lexical items of Iranian origin than the FA/DA texts. However, the difference is not very significant, and might change if a different methodology in counting was employed. This statistical result does not invalidate the fact that in certain cases TJ may use an Arabic word, where FA and DA would employ a native lexeme, e.g. Art. 27.1: FA/DA زندگی /zendegi/ (in the phrase زندگی فرهنگی /zendegi-ye farhangi/ ‘cultural life’) as opposed to the TJ ҳаёт /hayot/ ‘life’ (ҳаёти фарҳангӣ /hayot-i farhangi/).

What makes the TJ translation significantly different from the FA/DA text is the existence of a further small group, namely borrowings from Russian (about 0.4%). These words are, in the analysed text, restricted only one field of vocabulary – they are all legal/administrative words, like those mentioned above. These are either words of Slavonic origin, e.g. суд /sud/ ‘court of justice’ (Art. 8–11, 29), or are in fact internationalisms for which Russian served only as a vehicular language on their way to TJ, e.g. конституция /konstitutsiya/ ‘constitution’ (Art. 8), субъект /subyekt/ ‘subject’ (Art. 6).

MORPHOLOGICAL PARALLELS AND DIFFERENCES

Again, differences between the FA and DA variants are scarce, while they both differ significantly from the TJ text.

Minor differences that may be found between the FA and DA translations are:

- Variations in the use of indefiniteness markers, e.g. FA در جریان یک دعوی /dar jarayān-e yek da’vā-ye omumi/ and DA در جریان دعوی عمومی /dar jar(a)yān-e da’wā-ye omumi/ (Art. 11.1), FA هر شخصی /har šaxsi/:

²⁷ Google search, keyword: قناعت بخش, date: 2014-02-17.

- DA هر شخص /har šaxs/ (Art. 17.1). In general, FA seems to use such explicit markers rather more often;
- Differences in the prepositions used in certain phrases, e.g. FA مبتنى به جرم /mobtanā **be** jorm/: DA مبتنى بر جرم /mobtanā **bar** jorm/ (Art. 14.2);
 - In some cases DA seems to prefer an adjective instead of a related noun, e.g. FA اجتماع /ejtemā’/: DA اجتماعى /ejtemā’i/ (Art. 16.3, 17.1).

When considering the differences between FA/DA and TJ, first of all we have to say that no verbal forms specific to TJ, like durative tenses, auditive or participial forms were found. Modal verbs and particles appear in structures that are typical of literary language, and so they belong to the common heritage of the three idioms, e.g.:

- Онҳо (...) **бояд** бо якдигар муносибати бародарона **дошта бошанд** /onho (...) boyad bo yakdigar munosibat-i barodarona **došta bošand**/ (Art. 1);
- Тамбиқи ин ҳуқуқу озодиҳо ба ҳеҷ вайҷ **набойад** хилофи мақсаду усулҳои Созмони Милали Муттаҳид **бошад** /Tatbiq-i in huquq-u ozodiho ba hej vajh **naboyad** xilof-i maqsad-u usulho-i Sozmon-i Milal-i Muttahid **bošad**/ (Art. 29.3);
- Ақди никоҳ **метавонад** танҳо дар сурати ризоияти озодона ва пурраи ҳарду тараф (...) **баста шавад** /Aqd-i nikoh **metavonad** tanho dar surat-i rizoyat-i ozodona va purra-i har du taraf (...) **basta šavad**/ (Art. 16.2).

As we can see, verbs introduced by a modal particle (or a modal verb) are always conjugated in the present or past subjunctive. We find no traces of forms typical of spoken TJ, like *рафта метавонам* /rafta metawonam/ or *рафта метавонистам* /rafta metawonistam/.²⁸ Other specifically TJ verbal forms including the Present Progressive with the *истодан* auxiliary (*карда истодаам* /karda istodaam/),²⁹ the Past Conjectural (*кардагистам* /kardagistam/),³⁰ the Present Progressive Conjectural (*карда истодагистам* /karda istodagistam/),³¹ etc. are absent from the analyzed text, as well.

To sum up, there are differences in morphology between FA/DA on the one hand and TJ on the other. However, forms used in TJ are known in the other two idioms.

²⁸ Baizoyev and Hayward 2004, 104ff.

²⁹ Perry 2005, p. 224.

³⁰ Perry 2005, p. 244.

³¹ Perry 2005, p. 246.

WORD-FORMATIONAL PARALLELS AND DIFFERENCES

In general, word-formational mechanisms in the three idioms in question are the same. This, however, does not mean that there are no differences in the word-formational subsystem at all. Major differences (again, especially between FA/DA and TJ) are observed when these mechanisms are applied to given lexical items. In other words, some potential forms based on elements common to the three idioms may appear only in TJ and vice-versa. This was the case in previously mentioned forms, e.g. асонокӣ /asos-nok-i/ (Art. 10; NB with the suffix /-nok (-nāk)/ – see above) and ғуломфурӯшӣ /gulom-furūš-i/, a determinative compound with an abstract suffix.³² Again, both elements of the compound and the suffix exist in FA and DA as well. However, in these idioms, other forms are normally used when referring to the slave trade.

SYNTACTICAL PARALLELS AND DIFFERENCES

The parallelism of the syntax in the FA and DA variants is even greater than in their vocabulary. Even if single lexical items are changed, the structure of the text remains intact, e.g. FA بزهکاری /bezehkārī/ vs. DA جرم /jorm/ in FA هر کس که به بزهکاری متهم شده باشد .../: DA جرمی متهم شده باشد .../ (Art. 11.1). Only in certain isolated cases the changes in a lexical item result in further (syntactical) modifications, e.g. Art. 24:

FA	DA
هر کس حق استراحت و فراقت و تفریح دارد و بخصوص بمحدودیت معقول ساعات کار و مرخصی‌های ادواری با اخذ حقوق ذیحق میباشد.	هر کس حق استراحت و فراقت و تفریح دارد و به خصوص به محدودیت معقول ساعات کار و رخصتیهای ادواری مستحق اخذ حقوق است.
har kas haqq-e esterāhat va farāqat va tafrih dārad va bexosus mahdudiyat-e ma'qul-e sā'āt-e kār va moraxxasi-hā-ye edvāri bā axz-e hoquq zi-haqq mi-bāšad	har kas haqq-e esterāhat va ferāqat va tafrih dārad va be xosus be mahdudiyat-e ma'qul-e sā'āt-e kār va roxsati- hā-ye adwāri mostahaqq-e axz-e hoquq ast.

³² The compound ғуломфурӯш 'slave trader', structurally an intermediary form, is also attested – see Bertel's 1954, p. 480.

However, the differences between the syntax of the TJ and the FA/DA texts are numerous and significant. Only in certain instances does the syntax of the corresponding fragments show deep parallels, e.g. Art. 3 FA/DA هر کس حق دارد امنیت شخصی دارد /har kas haqq-e zendegi (DA zendagi), āzādi va amniyat-e šaxsi dārad/: TJ *ҳар як инсон ба ҳаёт, озодӣ ва дахлнопазирии шахсӣ ҳақ дорад* /har yak inson ba xayot, ozodi wa daxlnopaziri-i šaxsi haq dorad/. Syntactically these sentences are almost identical – both simple, with parallel lexical items having the same role in the sentence. The only difference is the fact that the indirect object is introduced by a preposition (*ба ҳаёт*) in TJ, while in the FA/DA variants it appears in the izofat phrase.

In most cases, however, the syntax of corresponding passages in FA/DA and TJ is entirely different. Usually, the syntax of the FA/DA sentences is more complicated than that of the TJ equivalents, e.g.:

- FA/DA هر کس حق آزادی عقیده و بیان دارد و حق مزبور شامل آنست که از داشتن عقاید خود بیم و اضطرابی نداشته باشد و در کسب اطلاعات و افکار و در اخذ و انتشار آن بتمام خود بیم و اضطرابی نداشته باشد و در کسب اطلاعات و افکار و در اخذ و انتشار آن بتمام خود بیم و اضطرابی نداشته باشد.: TJ *ҳар як инсон ба озодии ақида ва баёни озодонаи он ҳақ дорад; ин ҳуқуқ; бемамониат нигоҳ доштани ақидаи худ, озодона, бо ҳар восита ва сарфи назар аз сарҳадоти давлатӣ, ҷустуҷӯ, дастрасу интишор намудани маълумоту гояҳоро дар бар мегирад* (Art. 19). The FA/DA variant is a complicated sentence with two coordinate clauses and two nominal subordinate clauses referring to the second of the two mentioned coordinate clauses: 1-conj-2↓[3N.cl.(obj)-conj-4N.cl.(obj)]. In TJ, the corresponding fragment consists of two independent simple sentences;
- In Art. 18 the FA/DA variant consists of three separate sentences, all complex: a) 1↓[2N.cl.(obj)]; b) 1-conj-2; c) 1↓[2N.cl.(obj)]. On the other hand, in the TJ translation we find two separate sentences, both simple.

The reverse situation, i.e. a complex TJ sentence that corresponds to a simple sentence(s) in FA/DA is rare, but some examples may be provided, e.g.:

- FA هر شخصی منفرداً یا بطور اجتماع حق مالکیت دارد (SIMPLE): TJ *ҳар як инсон ҳақ дорад амволро чи шахсан ва чи якҷоя бо дигарон ихтиёрдорӣ намояд* (1↓[2N.cl.(obj)]) – Art. 17.1.

CONCLUSIONS

The level of similarity between the FA and DA texts is clear – these translations were not prepared independently. Differences in vocabulary between the FA and DA variants are rare (see above) and the level of correspondence is such, that statistically speaking it is impossible that the two texts were written independently. Morphological variations between the FA and DA versions may be observed, but their number is limited. This means that no parallels found between the FA and DA variants have any value, as they may result from this interdependence. However, any differences between the texts are, considering the situation, potentially even more meaningful. Nevertheless, the FA and DA variants are practically identical at all the levels of the language system.

The TJ text, on the other hand, must have been created, more or less, independently, even if the FA/DA translation was known to its author. This independence may be demonstrated not only lexically, but it is particularly clear when considering the syntax and morphology.

Of course, a comparison of the three variants of the UDHR is not enough to form any firm and general conclusions referring to the relationship between the three idioms in question. However, some observations may be made:

- A formal text in either DA or FA is acceptable to users of the other idiom with only minor changes, if any necessary;
- It is possible to create a formal text both in DA and TJ that uses no morphological phenomena specific to these idioms. Using computer terminology, we might say that it is possible to create a text retaining backward compatibility with Classical Persian in this regard. This is an important observation considering that spoken (even formal spoken) TJ has developed quite a considerable number of verbal forms entirely unknown to FA & DA speakers;
- All the three idioms show some discrepancy with regard to vocabulary. This is observable in isolated cases between FA & DA and is certainly much more significant in the case of FA & TJ (or DA & TJ);
- It seems that an analysis of parallel FA, DA and TJ texts is a promising field of research, especially in studying their status and mutual relationship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY³³

- The Cooperation Centre for Afghanistan and UNDP/UNOCHA, Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Dari, http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/prs1.pdf.
- The Presidential Apparatus of the Republic of Tojikiiistan, Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Tojiki, http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/pet.pdf.
- United Nations Information Centre (Iran), Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Farsi, http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/prs.pdf.
- Amid, H. (1373 HŠ). *Farhang-e Amid*, Tehrān, Mo'assese-ye Enteshārāt-e Amir Kabir.
- Āryānpur Kāšāni, A., Āryānpur Kāšāni, M. (1375 HŠ). *Farhang-e Fešorde-ye Fārsi be Englisi*. Tehrān, Mo'assese-ye Enteshārāt-e Amir Kabir.
- Āryānpur Kāšāni, M. (1382 HŠ). *Farhang-e Gostarde-ye Pišrow-e Āryānpur, Englisi-Fārsi*. Tehrān.
- Bertels, Ye.E. (ed.), (1954). *Tadžiksko-russkiy slovar'*. Moskva, Gosudarstvennoye Izdatel'stvo Inostrannyh i Nacyonal'nyh Slovarey.
- Comrie, B. (1981). *The Languages of the Soviet Union*. Cambridge–New York – etc, Cambridge University Press.
- Černyh, P.Ya. (1999). *Istoriko-etimologičeskiy slovar' sovremennovo russkovo yizyka*, vol. 1. Moskva.
- Dorofeyeva, L.N. (1960). *Yazyk Farsi-Kabuli*. Moskva, Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoy Literatury.
- Dehxodā, A. *Loqatnāme-ye Dehxodā*, <http://www.loghatnaameh.org>.
- Groves, J. (1844). *A Greek and English dictionary: comprising all the words in the writings of the most popular Greek authors; with the difficult inflections in them and in the Septuagint and New Testament*. Boston, J.H. Wilkins, R.B. Carter and B.B. Mussey.
- Kiseleva, L.N., Mikolayčik, V.I. (1978). *Dari-Russkiy slovar'*. Moskva, Russkiy Yizyk.
- Omid, H. (1373 HŠ). *Farhang-e Fārsi-ye Omid*. Tehrān. Mo'assese-ye Enteshārāt-e Amir Kabir.
- Perry, J.R. (2005). *A Tajik Persian Reference Grammar*. Leiden–Boston, Brill.
- Rubinčik, Y.A. (ed.), (1970). *Persidsko-Russkiy Slovar'*. Moskva, Izdatel'stvo Sovetskaya Enciklopediya.

³³ In the present article, Russian names and titles in the bibliography and citations are romanized using a simplified transcription (e.g. palatalization is not shown where predictable).