



**ЯЗЫКИ НАРОДОВ ЗАРУБЕЖНЫХ СТРАН (С УКАЗАНИЕМ КОНКРЕТНОГО ЯЗЫКА ИЛИ ГРУППЫ ЯЗЫКОВ)/LANGUAGES OF PEOPLES OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES (INDICATING A SPECIFIC LANGUAGE OR GROUP OF LANGUAGES)**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2026.76.2> EDN: RMTVOW

**ON THE SOGDIAN NOUNS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON UIGHUR LANGUAGE**

Research article

**Muzappar Abdurusul<sup>1,\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> ORCID : 0009-0009-3270-5746;

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing, China

\* Corresponding author (oglumish[at]163.com)

**Abstract**

A noun is a grammatical category that denotes the name of an entity or concept. In the context of language contact, the initial phase of lexical borrowing typically involves the replication of nouns. Sogdian, an Eastern Middle Iranian language, served as a model language and exerted significant influence on the surrounding languages of its time, including Old Uighur. Therefore, a detailed re-examination and classification of Sogdian nouns hold substantial academic value and help to understand the copy words in the replica languages. Adopting the classification approach of Tohti (2012), this paper categorizes Sogdian nouns into seven types and discusses some words which were borrowed into Old Uighur. When incorporated into syntactic structures, Sogdian nouns undergo highly complex inflections in terms of gender, number, and case, contingent upon the distinctions between heavy and light stems, as well as the masculine, neuter, and feminine genders. This complexity often obscures the underlying stem forms of nouns within sentences. To address this challenge, the present study first extracts noun stems from diverse textual sources and subsequently endeavors to classify them. The inflectional patterns of gender, number, and case, as well as the formation and derivation of nouns, must be discussed separately.

**Keywords:** Sogdian Language, Noun, Classification, Replication, Noun Types.

**О СОГДИЙСКИХ СУЩЕСТВИТЕЛЬНЫХ И ИХ ВЛИЯНИИ НА УЙГУРСКИЙ ЯЗЫК**

Научная статья

**Музаппар Абдурусул<sup>1,\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> ORCID : 0009-0009-3270-5746;

<sup>1</sup> Китайская академия общественных наук, Пекин, Китай

\* Корреспондирующий автор (oglumish[at]163.com)

**Аннотация**

Существительное — это грамматическая категория, обозначающая название предмета или понятия. В контексте языкового контакта начальная фаза лексического заимствования обычно включает в себя копирование существительных. Согдийский язык, относящийся к восточно-среднеиранской группе, служил образцом и оказывал значительное влияние на окружающие языки того времени, в том числе на древнеуйгурский. Поэтому детальное переосмысление и классификация согдийских существительных имеют существенную научную ценность и помогают понять заимствованные слова в копирующих языках. Используя классификационный подход Тохти (2012), в данной статье согдийские существительные разделены на семь типов и рассмотрены некоторые слова, заимствованные в древнеуйгурский язык. При включении в синтаксические конструкции согдийские существительные подвергаются весьма сложным флективным изменениям по роду, числу и падежу, зависящим от различий между тяжелыми и легкими корнями, а также от мужского, среднего и женского родов. Данная сложность часто затрудняет распознавание основных форм корней существительных в предложениях. Для решения данной проблемы в настоящем исследовании сначала извлекаются корни существительных из различных текстовых источников, а затем предпринимается попытка их классификации. Необходимо отдельно рассмотреть модели склонения по роду, числу и падежу, а также формирование и словообразование существительных.

**Ключевые слова:** согдийский язык, существительное, классификация, повторение, типы существительных.

**Introduction**

Nouns constitute an essential and fundamental category of words in any language, playing a crucial role in the grammatical structure and semantic expression of linguistic systems. When engaging in the study of a language's grammar, nouns and their derivatives are typically the first lexical categories encountered, serving as the foundational elements for syntactic and semantic analysis. The definition of nouns exhibits considerable consistency across languages. According to contemporary linguistic scholarship, a noun is a lexical category that denotes the name of an entity or concept. The term 'entity' here is employed in a broad grammatical sense, encompassing referents that address questions such as 'who', 'what', and 'where', among others. This broad definition allows for the inclusion of both tangible objects and abstract concepts within the noun category.

The classification of lexical categories, including nouns, can be approached from both traditional and formal grammatical perspectives. As noted by [2, P. 333], the term 'noun' (N) has historically been defined in grammatical classification as 'the name of a person, thing, or place'. However, the ambiguity surrounding the concepts of 'name' and 'thing'—for instance, whether an abstract notion like 'beauty' can be considered a 'thing'—has prompted a shift in linguistic descriptions. Modern



analyses now focus on formal and functional criteria derived from syntax and morphology to define this lexical category more precisely. In linguistic terms, nouns are characterized by specific morphological and syntactic properties. Morphologically, nouns typically exhibit certain inflectional patterns, such as case or number, which reflect their grammatical relationships within a sentence. Syntactically, nouns have a distinct distribution; for example, they may follow prepositions but not modal verbs. Additionally, nouns perform specific syntactic functions, such as serving as the subject or object of a sentence.

Nouns are typically categorized into two principal subtypes: common nouns and proper nouns. Common nouns signify general classes of entities, whereas proper nouns designate specific individuals or entities. The analysis of nouns extends beyond their basic classification to encompass several morphological and syntactic features, including number (singular or plural), gender (masculine, feminine, or neuter), case (nominative, accusative, genitive, etc.), and countability (whether they can be counted or are uncountable). Collectively, these characteristics facilitate a nuanced understanding and systematic classification of nouns within linguistic frameworks. However, the presence and application of these features are not uniform across all languages. For instance, Sogdian nouns exhibit gender, number, and case distinctions, and these categories are also applicable to adjectives, pronouns, verbal adjectives, verbal nouns, and other related lexical categories. In contrast, Old Uighur nouns possess only number and case distinctions, lacking gender distinctions entirely. This variability underscores the necessity for a language-specific approach to grammatical analysis, as each language organizes its grammatical features in distinct ways.

Sogdian, as a prominent member of the Eastern Middle Iranian language family [4, P. 1216-1229], [7], exerted a profound influence on genetically unrelated languages of its time, including Old Uighur. This influence is evident in the lexical borrowings and transmissions that occurred through Sogdian as a medium. Today, numerous words in both ancient and contemporary languages can be traced back to Sogdian, either directly or indirectly. For example:

Sogdian *xutēn*<*xwt*'yn> 'queen', from Old Iranian *xwataunib* [7, P. 440], replicated in Old Uighur as *qatun/xatun* 'queen'.

Sogdian *indaku*<'yntk'k> 'India', from Old Iranian (*h*)*induka* [7]. In Old Uighur, it is spelled as 'yntk'k and read as *änätäk* [22, P. 107]. Old Uighur replicated the orthographic form rather than the phonetic pronunciation. This form was subsequently borrowed into Mongolian and Tibetan languages.

Sogdian *mūš*<*mwš*> 'mouse' [7, P. 222], this word has common Indo-European etymology, cf. English *mouse*, Latin *mus*. Its derivation *mūškič*<*mwškyč*> 'wild cat' [7, P. 222] may originally mean 'an animal which catches mice', This word evolved into *muš(u)kič/miškič* 'wild cat' in Old Uighur, contemporary Uighur *müšük* 'cat'.

Many lexical items, though absent from historical documentation, but are still alive in the vernacular of contemporary speakers. For instance, the contemporary Uighur dialectal word *gin* 'hatred, enmity' can be traced back to the Sogdian term *kēn*<*kyn(h)*> 'hatred, vengeance' [7, P. 203]. Additionally, the contemporary Uighur word *gugut/gügüt* 'Sulfur, match', is likely derived from the Sogdian word *yuqat*<*ywqt*> 'Sulfur' [7, P. 174]. These examples demonstrate how certain lexical items, despite being absent from historical documentation, have endured through oral transmission and persistent usage. Further exploration reveals numerous such words that are often mistakenly considered indigenous to contemporary languages. For example, the root noun *čät-* in the contemporary Uighur verb *čätnä-* 'to be harmed by an evil eye', lacks a clear semantic origin within the Uighur lexicon. However, comparison with the Sogdian term *čētē*<*cytyy*> 'ghost, spirit' [7, P. 133], provides a plausible etymological connection. Such words were likely borrowed into Uighur at an early stage, subsequently evolved, and eventually spread to other languages, becoming integral components of their basic vocabularies.

Nouns represent a highly replicable lexical category, and the transfer of vocabulary between languages often begins with the borrowing of nouns. This phenomenon underscores the importance of examining the structural characteristics of nouns in languages that have undergone extensive contact. This study not only introduces the characteristics and typology of Sogdian nouns but also aids in identifying loanwords in Altaic and other related languages. By examining the morphological and semantic properties of Sogdian nouns, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of linguistic contact and lexical diffusion in the broader context of historical and comparative linguistics.

While the Sogdian noun has been extensively documented in seminal works such as those by [5] and [1, P. 69-79], these foundational studies, despite their invaluable contributions to the field, were not specifically designed to address the intricacies of the Sogdian noun morphology and syntax in a comprehensive manner. Moreover, given their historical context, these works predate the advent of contemporary linguistic frameworks and thus do not benefit from the theoretical advancements and methodological rigor that characterize modern linguistic research. More recent work on Sogdian grammar includes explicit but short overviews, such as that by Yoshida [23, P. 279-335], and also dictionaries such as [17].

In addition to these limitations, it is important to note that the Sogdian language, as a critical component of the broader Iranian linguistic family, has been subject to significant scholarly attention. However, much of this research has focused on broader historical, cultural, or comparative aspects rather than delving deeply into the specific grammatical features of the Sogdian noun system. As a result, there remains a notable gap in the literature regarding a detailed, contemporary analysis of the Sogdian noun within a unified linguistic framework.

To address this gap and contribute to the ongoing discourse on Sogdian linguistics, the present paper adopts a focused and systematic approach. Specifically, it concentrates exclusively on the Sogdian noun, aiming to provide a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of its structure, inflectional patterns, and syntactic behavior. By employing a descriptive methodology grounded in modern linguistic theory, this study seeks to elucidate the complexities of the Sogdian noun system through rigorous empirical analysis and theoretical interpretation. This approach not only fills the existing gap in the literature but also offers a fresh perspective that leverages contemporary linguistic tools and frameworks to advance our understanding of this historically significant language.

### Nouns and Their Types

All languages possess an open class of nouns, which typically comprises thousands of members and is perpetually expanding. These nouns can be categorized into two primary types: concrete and abstract. Concrete nouns refer to tangible



entities, such as ‘girl’, ‘tiger’, ‘hill’, ‘stone’, ‘water’, and ‘head’. In contrast, abstract nouns denote intangible concepts, such as ‘beauty’ and ‘hunger’. Many abstract nouns are derived from adjectives (e.g., ‘ugliness’ from ‘ugly’) or verbs (e.g., ‘thought’ from ‘think’). However, in some languages, these abstract concepts are expressed exclusively through adjectives and verbs, rather than as standalone nouns [3, P. 52].

In the Sogdian language, a rich lexical inventory exists to denote both concrete and abstract entities. Some of these nouns are derived from other word classes, while others are considered basic lexical items.

The morphological structure of Sogdian words is characterized by a combination of ‘stem’ and ‘ending’. Typically, the ‘ending’ encodes grammatical features such as case and number for nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and verbal nouns, as well as person endings for verbs. By removing the inflectional ‘ending’ from nouns, verbs, and other word classes, the underlying ‘stem’ is revealed. Stress in Sogdian generally falls on the first long vowel within the initial syllable. If the ‘stem’ contains a long vowel, stress is assigned to the ‘stem’. Conversely, if the ‘stem’ lacks a long vowel, stress falls on the ‘ending’, regardless of whether the ‘ending’ itself contains a long vowel. This stress pattern divides all Sogdian words into two categories: heavy stem words and light stem words. This bipartite system, known as the ‘rhythmic law’ of Sogdian, governs the inflection, conjugation, and formation of all words. For nouns, this law influences the realization of number and case forms, as well as their composition and derivation. In Sogdian, nouns rarely appear in their uninflected or stem forms within sentences. Even the nominative case, which often exhibits zero realization in many languages, possesses distinct endings. Additionally, nouns exhibit different inflectional patterns based on their gender (feminine, neuter, or masculine). Therefore, before engaging in a detailed analysis of Sogdian nouns, it is essential to first extract their stem forms. For example:

fəšyāwəs<fšy’ws> ‘gentleman’ [15, P. 94], xətu<xṭw> ‘judge’, martiy<mrṭy> ‘man’, ark<’rk> ‘work’, mərəyārt<mrṭy’rt> ‘pearl’ [15, P. 95], wīnā<wyn> ‘lute’ [15, P. 96], zēr<zyrn> ‘gold’ [15, P. 95], rəwān<rw’n> ‘soul’ [15, P. 97], xutāw<xwt’w> ‘king’ (M178), žəwān<žw’n> ‘life’ (M178), pəčkwēr<pčqwyr> ‘fear’ (M178), βəriy<βry> ‘air’ (M178), δumb<δwmp> ‘tail’, zāy<z’y> ‘earth’, kirm<kym> ‘worm, snake’ [18, P. 28], pəkārt<pk’rt> ‘trap’ [18, P. 29], wistāw <wyst’w> ‘oath’ (Tii D66) etc.

The words discussed above have been extracted in their stem forms; however, in actual textual contexts, they typically appear in inflected forms. This distinction highlights the importance of understanding both the underlying morphological structure and the surface realization of nouns in linguistic analysis. In traditional linguistic studies, nouns are commonly categorized into two primary types: common nouns and proper nouns. While this binary classification is straightforward and widely applied, it may not fully capture the complexity and diversity of noun types in certain languages. To address this limitation, Tohti [20, P. 130-131] proposed a more nuanced taxonomy for contemporary Uighur nouns, dividing them into noun prototypes, analogous nouns, common nouns, proper nouns, and generic nouns. His main reason is that certain kinds of nouns can have peculiar syntactic characteristics. This classification system is further refined by incorporating additional subcategories based on the syntactic and semantic characteristics of specific nouns. These subcategories include temporal nouns, locational nouns, nouns denoting body parts, and kinship terminologies. Such a detailed and context-specific classification framework enables a more comprehensive analysis of noun types and their functions within a language.

Building on this approach, the present study aims to classify and explore Sogdian nouns from multiple perspectives and novel angles. By applying Tohti’s extended classification system, this research seeks to provide a more detailed and nuanced understanding of the morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties of Sogdian nouns. This approach not only enriches our knowledge of the Sogdian language but also offers valuable insights into the broader linguistic phenomena of noun categorization and inflectional morphology.

### The Traditional Three Types

Nouns may be categorized based on their referential functions into three traditional types: common nouns, proper nouns, and generic nouns. Additionally, the concept of noun prototypes is introduced to describe the uninflected, original form of a noun, which exists prior to any morphological modification or combination with other linguistic components. In the context of Sogdian, nouns undergo morphological changes whenever they are incorporated into syntactic structures. Even when they appear to exhibit zero inflection, these nouns still bear implicit morphological markings. Consequently, the stem form of a Sogdian noun is virtually never encountered in its pristine state within a sentence. Instead, the forms of nouns that are extracted from sentences for analysis—whether common, proper, or generic—are already subject to some degree of inflectional modification.

#### 3.1. Common nouns

Common nouns are a fundamental lexical category that denotes general classes of entities or abstract concepts, rather than specific instances. These nouns provide a generic label for a category of objects, phenomena, or ideas, thereby facilitating the expression of generalizations and classifications within a language. Common nouns are essential for conveying broad semantic categories and are often contrasted with proper nouns, which refer to unique, specific entities. For example:

yər<yṛ> ‘mountain’ (M178), nērək/ nērē <nyrk> ‘male’ (m178), δβər<δβr> ‘door’ (M178), wāčərən<w’črn> ‘market’ (M178), səmān<sm’n> ‘sky’ (M178), mərəyārt<mrṭy’rt> ‘pearl’ [15, P. 96], āwəzē<’wzyy> ‘lake’ (M127), kəp<kp> ‘fish’ (M127), δām(ā)<δ’m(’)> ‘net’ (M127), xwākər <xw’qr> ‘merchant’ (Tii D66), xānā<x’n> ‘house’ (Tii D66), čētē<cyṭtyy> ‘ghost, spirit’ (Tii D66), xətu<xṭw> ‘judge’ (mərəz<mr’z> ‘worker’ [15, P. 95], fəšyāwəs<fšy’ws> ‘gentleman’ [15, P. 94], ark<’rq> ‘work’ [15, P. 95], əxšēβd<’xšyβt> ‘milk’, yišēp<yys’yph> ‘damage’ [18, P. 19].

The examination of the nouns listed above reveals several terms that appear in historical documents, thereby shedding light on the interactions between Turkic and Sogdian peoples. For instance, the name of the Turkic emperor who reigned from 595 to 604 CE was Niri Qaghan [21]. The etymology of his name, Niri, is derived from the Sogdian term nērək/nērē ‘male, man’, which serves as evidence of the earliest documented interactions between the Turkic and Sogdian communities. Additionally, the term mərəz <mr’z> ‘worker’, appears as maraz ‘hireling’ in the eleventh century magnum opus *Dīwān-u Luyāt at-Turk* [13,



P. 312]. This term underscores the socio-economic dimensions of Turkic-Sogdian relations during this period. These linguistic traces collectively highlight the depth and complexity of cultural and societal exchanges between these two groups.

### 3.2. Proper nouns

Proper nouns constitute a distinct category of nouns that function as unique identifiers for specific entities. These special names differentiate objects of one type from others and typically refer to the names of individuals, countries, regions, institutions, books, periodicals, ethnic groups, and other particular entities. In phonemic writing systems, the initial letter of a proper noun is conventionally capitalized to distinguish it from common nouns. However, in the transcription of older languages, proper nouns are often rendered in lowercase to adhere to historical orthographic conventions. For example:

*zərwā* βəγ<zrw> βγ> ‘Zurvan, Father of Greatness’ (M178), *ardāwān* māṭ<’rd’w’n m’ṭ> ‘Mother of the Righteous’ (M178), *xšēšpəṭ* βəγ<xšyšpṭ> βγ> ‘Splenditenens’ [11] (M178), *wēšpərkər* <wysprkr> ‘Spiritus Vivenis’ (M178), *səmānxšēθ* <sm’nxšyδ> ‘Rex Honoris’ [11] (M178), *ōdun* <’wδwn> ‘Khotan’ (DTS24), *aryān wēžən* <’ry’n wyjn> ‘aryanland’ [10, P. 69], *wəṛəydmāx* <wrytm’x> ‘wəṛəydmāx, personal name, lit. rising moon’, *nəwēmāx* <nwy-m’x> ‘nəwēmāx, personal name, lit. new moon’ [18, P. 34], *sām* <s’hm> ‘Sam, a giant’s name’, *māhāwāy* <m’h’w’y> ‘Mahaway, a giant’s name’ [10, P. 65], *šahmizāt* <šymyz’t> ‘Shahmizāt, a giant’s name’, *pātsām* <p’ts’ym> ‘Patsam, a giant’s name’ [10, P. 70]), *xurəsən* <xwrnsn> ‘east, eastside, lit. sunrise’, *xurtəxēz* <xwrxyz> ‘west, westside, lit. sunset’ [10, P. 69], *ādām* <’δ’m> ‘Adam’ [10, P. 70], *ahwāy* <’hw’y> ‘Eve’ (M129).

Regarding the Manichaean gods, Sundermann [19] examined the Iranian versions in detail.

Several proper names listed above contain references to Manichaean deities, highlighting the complex interplay between religious terminologies and cultural adaptations. For instance, the term *zərwā* in *zərwā* βəγ<zrw>βγ> ‘Zurvan, Father of Greatness’, originates from the Old Iranian Zoroastrian deity Zurvan. In Zoroastrianism, Zurvan is the supreme deity, conceptualized as the father of both Ahura Mazda (Ohrmazd), the god of goodness, and Angra Mainyu (Ahriman), the god of evil. This dualistic framework underscores the intricate theological debates surrounding the origins and nature of good and evil within the Zoroastrian tradition.

Central Asian Manichaeans adopted the term Zurvan to denote the God of light, thereby recontextualizing it within the Manichaean cosmology. This adaptation reflects the dynamic process of religious syncretism, wherein elements from one tradition are integrated into another while retaining some of their original characteristics. When the Old Uighurs converted to Manichaeism, they absorbed numerous Middle Persian, Parthian, and Sogdian Manichaean terms. Consequently, Zurvan evolved into *āzrua tājri* ‘Zurvan God’ in the Old Uighur language, exemplifying the linguistic and cultural transformations that occurred during the transmission of religious ideas across Central Asia. Other Manichaean terms, such as *xšēšpəṭ* and *wēšpərkər*, also frequently appear in Old Uighur texts. These terms not only enrich the lexicon of the Old Uighur language but also provide insights into the religious practices and beliefs of the Old Uighurs. Their prevalence suggests a deep integration of Manichaean concepts into the socio-religious fabric of the Old Uighur community, highlighting the extent to which religious terminologies can shape and reflect cultural identities [14, P. 71–72]. The term was subsequently adopted by Uighur Buddhists to denote the Buddhist deity *Brahma*. This usage was later transmitted to the Mongols, further expanding its linguistic and cultural dissemination.

### 3.3. Generic nouns

Generic nouns represent a lexical category that denotes a class or group of entities sharing a common characteristic. This category is particularly prevalent across all Altaic languages, where it serves as a productive means of expressing collective or generalized meanings. In the Uighur language, for instance, generic nouns are formed through several distinct morphological processes. Firstly, generic nouns can be created by pairing a rhyming component that begins with the consonant sounds ‘p’ or ‘m’. The rhyming component functions to broaden the semantic scope of the paired word. For example, *nan* ‘bread’~ *nan-pan* ‘bread and similar foodstuff’, *čay* ‘tea’~ *čay-pay* ‘tea and similar beverages’, *qoy* ‘sheep’~ *qoy-poy/qoy-moy* ‘sheep and related livestock’. When the noun starts with a vowel, the rhyming component is directly prefixed with ‘p’ or ‘m’. For instance, *öy* ‘home, house, family’~ *öy-pöy/öy-möy* ‘home and all family members’, *un* ‘flour’~ *un-pun* ‘flour and related sustenance’. In these constructions, the repeated word itself lacks independent meaning and serves solely to extend the semantic range of the initial noun. Secondly, generic nouns can also be formed by pairing two semantically related words. The resulting compound expresses a new, blended lexical meaning that encompasses the combined senses of the two constituent words. For example, *yüz* ‘face’+*köz* ‘eye’~ *yüz-köz* ‘face and eye (=upper part of the hole face)’, *qış* ‘winter’+ *yaz* ‘summer’~ *qış-yaz* ‘summer and winter (= throughout the year, all year long)’. In such constructions, the meaning of the preceding noun typically takes precedence, while the following noun serves to expand the overall semantic scope of the compound. While the first type of generic noun construction involving rhyming components is absent in Sogdian, the second type, involving the pairing of semantically related words, is quite abundant. For example:

*črāy əti* δ(/l)əmtēr <cr’γ ZY δmtyr> ‘lamp and torches’ (črāy ‘lamp’, δəmtēr/ləmtēr ‘lamp, torch’~ Greek. lampter) [11, P. 478], *nōm pəδək* <nwm pδkh> ‘law and rules’ (nōm ‘rule, law’, pəδək ‘law’) [18, P. 23].

In the Sogdian language, generic nouns may be constructed by combining two or three semantically related nouns through the conjunction *əti* <’ty; ZY> ‘and’. This syntactic process facilitates the creation of compound nouns that convey a collective or generalized meaning, thereby expanding the semantic range of the individual lexical items. For example:

*tāyət əti* δēmāβēnd <t’yt ZY δymβynt> ‘thieves and jugglers’ (tāyət ‘thieves’, δēmāβēnd ‘jugglers’) [11, P. 478], *andōxč əti* uxāsē <’ntwyc ZY wγ’sy> ‘sorrows and hardships’ (andōxč ‘sorrow’, uxāsē ‘hardship, difficulty’), *γəzni əti* βəγāw <yz-ny ZY βγ’w> ‘treasures and possessions’ (γəzn ‘treasure’, βəγāw ‘possession, richness’) [11, P. 480], *səmātē əti* rəštāwčər <sm’tyh ZY ršt’wc’r> ‘comfort and consolations’ (səmātē ‘comfort’, rəštāwčər ‘consolation’) [11, P. 483], *γəznu əti* γərāmē <yznw ZY yr’m’k> ‘treasures and wealth’ (γəzn ‘treasure’, γərāmē ‘wealth’) [11, P. 485–486], *tāw əti* zāwər <t’w’ty z’wr> ‘might and



power' (tāw 'might, power', zāwār 'strong') [10, P. 70], wīδβāy āti pərβār<wyδβ'γ ZY p'rβ'r> 'explanations and interpretations' (wīδβāy 'explanation', pərβār 'interpretation') [18, P. 22], sāk āti āwu pətšmār<s'kh ZY (ZKw)[ p'tšm'r]> 'numbers' (sāk 'number', pətšmār 'count') [18, P. 22], āzānd āti nīškārt āti xwēčkāwē <'z- 'nt ZY nškr(t)[ZY] xwyck'wy> 'parable, interpretation and explanation' (āzānd 'parable', nīškārt 'explanation', xwēčkāwē 'explanation') [18, P. 23].

In these constructions, each noun may be preceded by various grammatical elements such as definite articles, prepositions, negations, or other modifiers. These elements serve to further specify or contextualize the nouns within the compound structure. For example:

pər ɣərɸu dāy āti pər ɣərɸu βəntēt <pr ɣrβw δ'yh ZY pr ɣrβw βnt'yt> 'for the many maidservants and slaves' (dāy 'female slave', βəntēt 'slave', pər 'for, on, in'), pərɸu məzēxku xānē āti pər kətyāk <prw RBw ɣ'n'kh ZY pr kty'kh> 'for the great house and household' (xānē 'house', kətyāk 'house'), nē āspāxšt āti nē pərmānpətyōšē <L' 'sp'γšt ZY L' prm'nptɣwš'k>'(he finds) neither menial nor servant' (āspāxšt 'servant', pərmānpətyōšē 'obedient', nē 'no'), nē mərəz āti nē pəstkārē <L' m'r'z ZY L' pstk'r'k > '(he finds) neither hireling nor helper' (mərəz 'hireling, worker', pəstkārē 'helper, assistant') [11, P. 486].

### The New Four Types

In addition to the traditional classifications of nouns, recent linguistic analyses have identified four additional types that warrant separate categorization: temporal nouns, locational nouns, nouns denoting body parts, and kinship terminologies. These categories reflect specific semantic and functional characteristics that distinguish them from other types of nouns. In the Sogdian language, each of these newly defined types is represented by distinct lexical items and morphological patterns, thereby enriching the overall understanding of the language's nominal system.

#### 4.1. Temporal nouns

Temporal nouns are a specialized category of lexical items that specifically denote time-related concepts, including periods, durations, and temporal sequences. These nouns play a crucial role in expressing temporal references within linguistic structures, thereby facilitating the precise conveyance of time-related information. In the Sogdian language, temporal nouns are characterized by their unique morphological and syntactic properties, which distinguish them from other nominal categories. For example:

žəmnū<jmnw> 'time, hour' (M767iiR), rətu <rtw> 'ten seconds' (M767iiR), sūš <swš> 'minute' (M767iiR), mēθ<myδ> 'day' [11, P. 483], māk<m'x> 'month, moon' (M767iiR), sərδ<srδ> 'year' (M767iiR), āmēnē <'myny > 'summer' [11, P. 480-481], (ə)zāmē <'z-my/zm'k> 'winter' [11, P. 481], wərtē <wrty> 'spring' [9, P. 35], patyaz<ptyz> 'autumn' (M14), xazān<ɣ'nh> 'autumn' (Man.Lett), rōč<rcw> 'day (employed to name every day in a month)' (MDiii127), mākjəmnū <m'xjmnw> 'monday', mīhrjəmnū<myhrjmnw> 'sunday' [12, P. 154], ōrmazdjəmnū <wrmzjtjmnw> 'thursday' [9, P. 85], ādēnē<'dyn'(h)''dyng> 'friday', ēwšəmbəd<'ywšmbyd> 'sunday' [12, P. 149] (JRAS 149), āzē mēθ<'zyy myδ> 'yesterday' (Ac.Lett2.16, Hendate604), (ə)pəzēmēθ<'pzymyδ> 'the day before yesterday' (SW, rock insc indus valley 134), βām<b'm> 'morning' (BSTii 914, STi77), nēmmeθ<nymyδ(h)> 'noon, south' [9, P. 45], (ə)xšām<xš'm'/γš'm> 'evening' [4, P. 313], (ə)xšəp<xšp'> 'evening' [12, P. 151], βyārī <βy'ryy/βy'r'k> 'evening' [9, P. 39], pənjšəmbəd <pncšmbyd> 'thursday' [12, P. 149], frāk<βrk/βr'k/fr'k> 'tomorrow' [9, P. 39].

In Sogdian, the seven days of the week are expressed through a unique combination of specialized numerals and the temporal marker *šmbδ*. The numerals employed in this context are derived from a distinct set of characters that represent numerical values in both Sogdian and Manichaean texts. These characters, which function as specialized letters for numerical notation, are integral to the expression of temporal concepts in the language. This system allows for the precise enumeration and identification of each day within the weekly cycle. For example:

ēwšəmbəd<i šmbδ> 'sunday', (ə)dušəmbəd <ii šmbyd> 'monday' [12, P. 151], sēsəmbəd <iii šmbyd> 'tuesday' [12, P. 149], čətfāršəmbəd <iv-šmbδ> 'wednesday' [12, P. 151], šəmbəd<šmbδ/šmbδ> 'saturday' [12, P. 149].

In the Sogdian language, each day and month possesses a unique, specialized name that reflects its distinct temporal and cultural significance. Many of these names are derived from the names of Manichaean deities and celestial bodies, highlighting the influence of religious and astronomical concepts on the Sogdian temporal lexicon. This practice of naming days and months after deities and celestial objects was not only prevalent in Sogdian but also extended to other languages and cultures influenced by Manichaean traditions. Notably, some of these specialized temporal nouns were later borrowed by Old Uighur Manichaeans, who adopted and adapted these terms to fit their own linguistic and cultural contexts. This linguistic borrowing underscores the extensive cultural and religious interactions between the Sogdians and the Uighurs, as well as the broader transmission of Manichaean ideas and practices across Central Asia. For example:

kēwān<kyw'n> 'saturn; saturday' [9, P. 85], wšaynē<wšyn'h/wšynny> 'tuesday' [12, P. 149], wanxān<wnx'n> 'tuesday' [9, P. 85], xuwrōč/xwar rōč<xwr rwc> 'eleventh day of the month' [12, P. 153], šnāxnətič<šn'xntyc> 'fifth month of the year' [12, P. 149], ābuxrōč<'pwyrwc > 'tenth day of the month' [12, P. 153], βəykānīc <βyk'nyc> 'seventh month of the year' [12, P. 149], βuyč<βwyyc > 'ninth month of the year', āpānč/āβānč<'p'nc> 'eighth month of the year', āšdišci<'šdyšcy > 'eighth day of the month', āš rōc<'š rwc(yy)> 'ninth day of the month' [12, P. 153], dišci rōc <δšcy rwc> 'eighth and fifteenth day of the month', artātrōc <'rt't rwc> 'ninth day of the month', spəndārmətrōc <spnd'rmt rwc> 'fifth day of the month', tūš <tyš >'thirteenth day of the month' [12, P. 149], mīš-βōyīč <myš βwyyc> 'tenth month of the year' [12, P. 153], murtāt rōč<mwrt't rwc> 'seventh day of the month' [12, P. 149], xumnā rōc<xwmn'(h) rwc> 'second day of the month', xurmazdā rōc<xwrmzt' rwc> 'first day of the month' [12, P. 153], manspand rōc<mnspnd rwc> '29<sup>th</sup> day of the month', rəšn <ršn> '18<sup>th</sup> day of the month', zəmuxtuɣ<zmwxtwɣ> '28<sup>th</sup> day of the month', ɣušrōc <ɣwš rwc> '14<sup>th</sup> day of the month', wāt rōc<w't rwc> '22<sup>nd</sup> day of the month', nōgrōč <nwgrwc> 'Nowruz' [12, P. 151], xšēwərrōc <xšywr rwc > '4<sup>th</sup> day of the month', artāwəxšt rwc <'rt'wxwšt rwc> 'third day of the month' [12, P. 152], ɣāw sərδ<ɣ'w srδ> 'year of cow' [12, P. 154], əxšūmīč<'xšwmyc>'12<sup>th</sup> month of the year' [12, P. 149].

Manichaean missionaries introduced the names of the days of the week, following the Babylonian tradition, to the Sogdian and Uighur regions. The Sogdians, following this tradition, named the seven days of the week after the seven visible celestial



bodies. To these names, they appended the unique Babylonian term *šabbatu*, thereby creating a distinct nomenclature for the days of the week [6].

In Uighur Manichaean texts, the names for Sunday and Monday are consistent with their Sogdian counterparts, having been translated verbatim from the Sogdian language. For example:

- Sog. *mīhr žamanu*~ Uig. *kün tāngri kün*;
- Sog. *māx žamanu*~Uig. *ay tāngri kün*.

This consistency reflects the linguistic and cultural continuity between the two regions. Additionally, certain days within the month held special significance for Manichaeans. Consequently, the Uighur Manichaeans adopted the Sogdian names for these days to convey their unique religious and cultural importance. For example, the names of the days, as documented in Old Uighur manuscripts, are: *nawsrδyč* (*nau-sarδič*) ‘first day’, *psakyč* (*pasākič*) ‘fourth day’, *myšy* (*miši*) ‘16<sup>th</sup> day’, *srwš* (*srōš*) ‘17<sup>th</sup> day’, *zmwytwy* (*zamuxtūy*) ‘28<sup>th</sup> day’, *nyrn* (*niyrān*) ‘30<sup>th</sup> day’ [16].

#### 4.2. Locational nouns

Locational nouns (LNs) constitute a distinct lexical category that specifically denotes spatial aspects or orientations of objects. These nouns are characterized by their ability to convey positional information, often indicating the side, direction, or location relative to another entity. In many languages, locational nouns play a crucial role in spatial reference systems, providing a means to express spatial relationships with precision and clarity.

In the context of Sogdian, locational nouns are particularly significant due to their role in encoding spatial semantics. These nouns often derive from more general terms but acquire specialized meanings related to spatial orientation. For example:

*čendār* <*cyndr*> ‘inside’ (M178), *askī* <‘sky’> ‘upward’ [11, P. 473], *čādār* <‘c’δr> ‘below’ (M178), *βēk* <βyk > ‘outside’ [11, P. 478], *pātī* <pt’yccy> ‘in front of’ [11, P. 472], *kōs* <kws> ‘corner’ [15, P. 94], *pārsā* <prs> ‘side’ (M178). These nouns can combine with such postpositions as *sār* <s’r> ‘to..., toward...’ and *kiran* <kyr’n> ‘side’, e.g. *βēksār*, *pātīčīsār*, *askīsār*, *čendārsār* etc, by combining with *čīk* <cyk>, they express ‘of...’, will take on adjectival meaning, e.g. *βēkčīk*, *askičīk*, *čendārčīk* etc.

The postposition *sār*, which often combines with locational nouns, entered Chagataid Uighur, and still lives on as a suffix in contemporary Uighur language.

In certain grammatical traditions, locational nouns frequently function concurrently as locative adverbs. Therefore, most scholars don’t treat them as nouns. This dual characteristic endows such nouns with a unique status within the grammatical framework. This bicharacteristic, or dual functionality, distinguishes them from other nouns by allowing them to serve both nominal and adverbial roles, thereby enriching the syntactic flexibility of the language.

#### 4.3. Nouns denoting body parts

This category of nouns specifically refers to terms that designate various organs or anatomical structures of the human or animal body. These lexical items are essential for conveying precise information related to physiology, medicine, and everyday descriptions of bodily functions and appearances. In many languages, including Sogdian, such nouns often exhibit unique morphological and semantic characteristics, reflecting their specialized function within the lexicon. For example:

*δast* <δst> ‘hand’ [11, P. 475], *kučā* <k> <kwc’k> ‘mouth’ (SI5704, OC), *čāšm* <čšm> ‘eye’, *γwš* <γōš> ‘ear’, *nāns* <nns> ‘nose’, *kūcā* <kwc’> ‘mouth’ [9, P. 38], *tāmbār* <tnb’r/tmb’r/tnp’r> ‘body’ [18, P. 20], *rūf* <rwβ> ‘mouth’ (M117), *γərδ* <γrδ> ‘neck’ (M5030R4-9), *sār* <s’r> ‘head’ [18, P. 29], *p’δ* <pād> ‘foot’ (T ii D 66, ST472), *pād* <pδ> ‘foot, pace’ (T ii Toyoq, ST476), *nēnāk* <nyn’k> ‘pupilla’ [24, P. 74].

In the Sogdian Manichaean, certain terminologies are constructed from body parts, for example, the term *kūčēzəpārtyā* ‘the cleanliness of the mouth’, which is a compound of *kūčē* ‘mouth’ and *zəpārtyā* ‘cleanliness’. This formation strategy reflects a linguistic tendency to express abstract concepts through concrete, bodily references. In Old Uighur translations of Manichaean texts, this term is rendered as *ayiz ariyīn ārmāk*, where *ayiz* corresponds to ‘mouth,’ *ariyīn* to ‘cleanliness’, and *ārmāk* signifies ‘to be’. This translation not only preserves the semantic integrity of the Sogdian term but also demonstrates the linguistic and conceptual continuity between the two languages. Such terminological correspondences highlight the intricate processes of cultural and linguistic exchange along the Silk Roads, where religious concepts were adapted and recontextualized in different linguistic frameworks.

#### 4.4. Kinship terminologies

Kinship terminologies represent a specialized subset of nouns that specifically denote familial relationships and social bonds among individuals. These terms are crucial for expressing genealogical connections, social hierarchies, and cultural norms related to family structures. Kinship terminologies often exhibit intricate patterns of semantic specificity and cultural significance, reflecting the complex social dynamics and relational paradigms within a given linguistic community.

In the Sogdian language, kinship terms are particularly noteworthy for their precision and the nuanced distinctions they convey. These nouns not only identify biological relationships but also encode social roles and familial obligations, thereby serving as a linguistic reflection of Sogdian sociocultural values. For example:

*māzēč* *māt* <m’z-’ych m’th> ‘stepmother’ [11, P. 483], *δwyd* <δwyt> ‘daughter’, *zātē* <z’t’y> ‘son’ [11, P. 472], *zāmatē* <z’mty> ‘son-in-law’, *nəpēšən* <npyšn > ‘grandchild’ [11, P. 486], *uδw* <wδw> ‘wife’ [11, P. 480], *māt* <m’t> ‘mother’ [11, P. 483], *pātər* <ptr> ‘father’ [18, P. 35], *βrāt* <βr’t> ‘brother’ [18, P. 30], *widōč* <wydwč> ‘widow’ [8, P. 9].

#### Conclusion

Nouns constitute an essential lexical category in any language, serving as the fundamental building blocks for conveying meaning and structure within syntactic frameworks. In the Sogdian language, the morphological complexity of nouns is particularly noteworthy, as they undergo inflectional changes as soon as they are incorporated into a sentence. This feature makes it challenging to identify the stem forms of nouns directly from textual sources. Consequently, the analysis of Sogdian nouns necessitates a systematic approach, beginning with the extraction of stem forms from their inflected states in sentences, followed by classification according to established criteria.



All Sogdian words, including nouns, are categorized into two primary morphological types: heavy stems and light stems. This bipartite classification is based on the phonological and morphological properties of the word, influencing its inflectional behavior. Sogdian nouns exhibit a rich paradigm of grammatical features, including three genders (masculine, feminine, and neuter), three numbers (singular and plural and numerative forms. However, since the numerative behaves like a case, it could also be treated as such, see Yoshida [23, P. 288-289], and a complex system of case inflections, typically ranging from six to seven distinct forms for light stems. The intricate interplay of these categories endows Sogdian nouns with a high degree of expressive precision.

Due to the pervasive nature of these grammatical categories, they are not confined solely to nouns but also extend to other parts of speech, such as adjectives, pronouns, gerunds, and verbs. This extensive application of inflectional paradigms across multiple lexical categories necessitates a detailed and separate examination of each category to fully understand their morphological and syntactic functions within the Sogdian language.

### Финансирование

This article is supported by the following National Social Science Fund of China: "A Contrastive Grammar of Old Uighur and Sogdian" (20AYY023) and Chinese Academy of Social Sciences' Young Talent Training Program: "Old Uighur and Sogdian Documents Which Reflect Uighur-Sogdian Interactions".

### Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

### Рецензия

Все статьи проходят рецензирование. Но рецензент или автор статьи предпочли не публиковать рецензию к этой статье в открытом доступе. Рецензия может быть предоставлена компетентным органам по запросу.

### Funding

Эта статья подготовлена при поддержке Национального фонда общественных наук Китая «Сравнительная грамматика древнеуйгурского и согдийского языков» (20.02.2013) и программы обучения молодых талантов Китайской Академии общественных наук «Древнеуйгурские и согдийские документы, отражающие уйгурско-согдийские взаимодействия».

### Conflict of Interest

None declared.

### Review

All articles are peer-reviewed. But the reviewer or the author of the article chose not to publish a review of this article in the public domain. The review can be provided to the competent authorities upon request.

### Список литературы / References

1. Benveniste E. *Essai De Grammaire Sogdienne* / E. Benveniste. — Paris : Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1929. — 244 p.
2. Crystal D. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* / D. Crystal. — 6th edition. — Oxford : Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2008. — 529 p.
3. Dixon R.M.W. *Basic Linguistic Theory: Further Grammatical Topics* / R.M.W. Dixon. — Oxford; New York : Oxford University Press Inc., 2012. — Vol. 3. — 547 p.
4. Dresden M. *Sogdian Language and Literature* / M. Dresden // *The Cambridge History of Iran: Seleucid Parthian* / ed. by E. Yarshater. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1983. — P. 1216–1229.
5. Gershevitch I. *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian* / I. Gershevitch. — Oxford : Basil Blackwell, 1954. — 307 p.
6. Gharib B. *Hafte dar Irane Qadim* / B. Gharib // *Name Farhangestan*. — Tehran, 1977.
7. Gharib B. *Sogdian Dictionary (Sogdian-Persian-English)* / B. Gharib. — Tehran : Farhang Publications, 2004.
8. Hansen O. *Berliner sogdischer Texte Nr. 10, Ein soghdischer version der Georgpassion* / O. Hansen. — Berlin : Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1941.
9. Henning W.B. *Ein Manichäisches Bet-Und Beicht Buch* / W.B. Henning. — Berlin : Verlag der Akademie Der Wissenschaften, 1937. — 141 s.
10. Henning W.B. *The Book of the Giants* / W.B. Henning // *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. — 1943. — Vol. 11. — № 1. — P. 52–74.
11. Henning W.B. *Sogdian Tales* / W.B. Henning // *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. — 1945. — Vol. 11. — № 3. — P. 465–487.
12. Henning W.B. *The Manichæan Fasts* / W.B. Henning // *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*. — 1945b. — Vol. 77. — № 3–4. — P. 146–164. — DOI: 10.1017/S0035869X00099603.
13. Mahmūd al-Kāšyari. *Compendium of The Turkic Dialects (Dīwān-u Luṣṭ at-Turk)* / Mahmūd al-Kāšyari; ed. and transl. by R. Dankoff, J. Kelly. — Cambridge : Harvard University Printing Office, 1982. — Part I.
14. Muzappar A. *A Study on the Contact between Old Uighur and Sogdian, Tocharian Languages* / A. Muzappar. — Beijing : China Social Science Press, 2023.
15. Muzappar A. *The Story of the Pearl-borer: A Study on the Sogdian Manuscript in Manichean Script M135 in the Berlin Turfan Collection* / A. Muzappar // *Minority Languages of China*. — 2023. — № 1. — P. 90–105.
16. Niloufari F. *Türk Soğud Kültür Ve Dilinin Birbirine Etkisi* / F. Niloufari // *Soğud Türk Münasebetleri Sempozyomu*. — Istanbul, 2014.
17. Nicholas S.-W. *Dictionary of Manichæan Sogdian and Bactrian* / S.-W. Nicholas, D. Durkin-Meisteremst. — Turnhout : Brepols Publishers, 2012.
18. Sundermann W. *Ein manichäisch-sogdisches Parabelbuch* / W. Sundermann. — Berlin : Akademie Verlag, 1985. — 91 s.



19. Sundermann W. Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos / W. Sundermann // *Altorientalische Forschungen*. — 1979. — Vol. 6. — S. 95–133.
20. Tohti L. A Reference Grammar of Modern Uighur / L. Tohti. — Beijing : China Social Science Press, 2012.
21. Vaissière É. De La. The Historical Context to the Khüis Tolgoi Inscription / É. De La Vaissière // *Journal Asiatique*. — 2018. — Vol. 306. — № 2. — P. 315–319.
22. Wilkens J. Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen (Altuigurisch-Deutsch-Türkisch) / J. Wilkens. — Göttingen : Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 2021. — 946 s.
23. Yoshida Y. Sogdian / Y. Yoshida // *The Iranian Languages* / ed. by G. Windfuhr. — London; New York, 2009. — P. 279–335.
24. Yoshida Y. Three Manichaean Sogdian Letters Unearthed in Bāzāklik, Turfan / Y. Yoshida. — Kyoto : Rinsen Book Co., 2019. — 278 p.

### Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Benveniste E. Essai De Grammaire Sogdienne [Essay on Sogdian Grammar] / E. Benveniste. — Paris : Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1929. — 244 p. [in French]
2. Crystal D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics / D. Crystal. — 6th edition. — Oxford : Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2008. — 529 p.
3. Dixon R.M.W. Basic Linguistic Theory: Further Grammatical Topics / R.M.W. Dixon. — Oxford; New York : Oxford University Press Inc., 2012. — Vol. 3. — 547 p.
4. Dresden M. Sogdian Language and Literature / M. Dresden // *The Cambridge History of Iran: Seleucid Parthian* / ed. by E. Yarshater. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1983. — P. 1216–1229.
5. Gershevitch I. A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian / I. Gershevitch. — Oxford : Basil Blackwell, 1954. — 307 p.
6. Gharib B. Hafte dar Irane Qadim / B. Gharib // *Name Farhangestan*. — Tehran, 1977.
7. Gharib B. Sogdian Dictionary (Sogdian-Persian-English) / B. Gharib. — Tehran : Farhang Publications, 2004.
8. Hansen O. Berliner sogdischer Texte Nr. 10, Ein soghdischer version der Georgpassion [Berlin Sogdian Texts No. 10, A Sogdian Version of the Passion of St. George] / O. Hansen. — Berlin : Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences, 1941. [in German]
9. Henning W.B. Ein Manichäisches Bet-Und Beicht Buch [A Manichaean Prayer and Confession Book] / W.B. Henning. — Berlin : Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences, 1937. — 141 p. [in German]
10. Henning W.B. The Book of the Giants / W.B. Henning // *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. — 1943. — Vol. 11. — № 1. — P. 52–74.
11. Henning W.B. Sogdian Tales / W.B. Henning // *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. — 1945. — Vol. 11. — № 3. — P. 465–487.
12. Henning W.B. The Manichæan Fasts / W.B. Henning // *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*. — 1945b. — Vol. 77. — № 3–4. — P. 146–164. — DOI: 10.1017/S0035869X00099603.
13. Mahmūd al-Kāšyari. Compendium of The Turkic Dialects (Dīwān-u Luyāt at-Turk) / Mahmūd al-Kāšyari; ed. and transl. by R. Dankoff, J. Kelly. — Cambridge : Harvard University Printing Office, 1982. — Part I.
14. Muzappar A. A Study on the Contact between Old Uighur and Sogdian, Tocharian Languages / A. Muzappar. — Beijing : China Social Science Press, 2023.
15. Muzappar A. The Story of the Pearl-borer: A Study on the Sogdian Manuscript in Manichean Script M135 in the Berlin Turfan Collection / A. Muzappar // *Minority Languages of China*. — 2023. — № 1. — P. 90–105.
16. Niloufari F. Türk Soğud Kültür Ve Dilinin Birbirine Etkisi [The Mutual Influence of Turkic and Sogdian Culture and Language] / F. Niloufari // *Soğud Türk Münasebetleri Sempozyomu* [Symposium on Sogdian-Turkic Relations]. — Istanbul, 2014. [in Turkish]
17. Nicholas S.-W. Dictionary of Manichaean Sogdian and Bactrian / S.-W. Nicholas, D. Durkin-Meisterernst. — Turnhout : Brepols Publishers, 2012.
18. Sundermann W. Ein manichäisch-sogdisches Parabelbuch [A Manichaean-Sogdian Parable Book] / W. Sundermann. — Berlin : Academia Publishing House, 1985. — 91 p. [in German]
19. Sundermann W. Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos [Names of Gods, Demons and Men in Iranian Versions of the Manichaean Myth] / W. Sundermann // *Altorientalische Forschungen* [Research into the Ancient Middle East]. — 1979. — Vol. 6. — P. 95–133. [in German]
20. Tohti L. A Reference Grammar of Modern Uighur / L. Tohti. — Beijing : China Social Science Press, 2012.
21. Vaissière É. De La. The Historical Context to the Khüis Tolgoi Inscription / É. De La Vaissière // *Journal Asiatique*. — 2018. — Vol. 306. — № 2. — P. 315–319.
22. Wilkens J. Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen (Altuigurisch-Deutsch-Türkisch) [Concise Dictionary of Old Uighur (Old Uighur-German-Turkish)] / J. Wilkens. — Göttingen : Publishing House of the Göttingen University, 2021. — 946 p. [in German]
23. Yoshida Y. Sogdian / Y. Yoshida // *The Iranian Languages* / ed. by G. Windfuhr. — London; New York, 2009. — P. 279–335.
24. Yoshida Y. Three Manichaean Sogdian Letters Unearthed in Bāzāklik, Turfan / Y. Yoshida. — Kyoto : Rinsen Book Co., 2019. — 278 p.