The category of gender in the Pamir languages
(*Категория рода в памирских языках*)
By Dodkhudo Karamshoev
Published in 1978 (by Дониш, Dushanbe)
Translated by Clinton Parker, 2023

Contents:

Introduction

§1. The category of grammatical gender, inherent in Old Iranian languages (Avestan, Old Persian) and some Middle Iranian languages (Khotanese, Sogdian, Khwarezmian), has been lost in the majority of modern Iranian languages and dialects – both in the Western group (Tajiki, Persian, Baluchi, Talysh) and the Eastern group (Ossetian, Yaghnobi, and some Pamir languages, including Ishkashimi, Wakhi, and Sarikoli) – but is found in Kurdish and Southern Tati dialects, Pashto, and the following Pamir languages: Munji, Yazghulami, and all languages of the Shughni-Rushani group with the exception of Sarikoli, namely Shughni proper and its Bajuwi dialect, in Rushani and its Khufi dialect, and in Bartangi and Roshorvi.

The study of gender in the Pamir languages allows us to reconstruct the gender forms and the means of expressing gender distinctions which have been inherited from ancient languages and to examine their interactions with the forms and means for expressing gender which have arisen later in the Pamir group. The analysis of the category of gender in the Pamir languages, including its expression and function, reveals such essential facts as the complete loss of gender distinction in certain languages (Wakhi, Ishkashimi, Sarikoli), and in others, the preservation of gender forms only in the form of relics – namely, (i) in the oblique forms of singular demonstrative pronouns, (ii) in certain groups of nouns (Yazghulami, Yidgha), and (iii) the preservation of gender distinction in nouns, pronouns, and past and perfect verb stems (Munji and the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group). Despite the fact that gender distinctions exist in most Shughni-Rushani languages and in Munji, the category of gender has been completely lost in Sarikoli, which belongs to the Shughni-Rushani group, and in Yidgha, which is a dialect closely related to Munji.

Munji stands out among the other Pamir languages as the one which has retained the most robust system for the morphological expression of grammatical gender – gender in Munji is expressed in the endings of nouns, adjectives, and participles (sources: Zarubin, Grunberg, Sokolova, Efimov). The masculine ending in Munji, as a rule, ends in either a consonant (though more often the cluster *-əy*) or in the vowel *o* (e.g., *miǩ* ‘day’, *pūr* ‘son’, *yārəy* ‘flour’, *miro* ‘sun’, *xṣ̌iro* ‘milk, *nərawəy* ‘black’, etc. Nouns and adjectives ending in the feminine have an ending *-a* (*-ə*), *-ɣa* (*-ɣə*): *fríɣa* ‘flea’ (cf. Sh. *firêɣ̌dz*), *nərawɣa* ‘black (f.)’, *nyāstəɣa* – feminine participle from *niǩ-, nyost-* ‘sit’.

The greater productivity of the morphological expression of gender in Munji in comparison with the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group can be illustrated in the following list, which shows a number of words which are common between both groups of languages (both native and borrowed words), but which are distinct in the Shughni-Rushani group in that they do not distinguish gender.

MUNJI (M.)	**MUNJI (F.)**	**SHUGHNI**	**GLOSS**
līw	*lī̆wa*	*ðew(in)*	crazy
ləra	*ləráɣa*	*ðar*	far
odam	*odáma*	*odam*	person
ošiq	*ošiqa*	*ošiq*	lover
savz	*sávza*	*sāvdz*	green

xoli	*xolíɣa*	*xoli*	empty
vrēri	*vrēriɣə*	*xêr*	relative
wərəy	*wárɣə*	*wārg*	lamb
yōɣī	*yoɣíɣa*	*yoɣi*	wild

There are many such examples.

However, in the closely related Yidgha dialect of Munji, as attested by G. Morgenstierne, there are only remnants of gender-distinguishing forms, and these are only found in a few series of words (Morgenstierne 1938: 121).

In Yazghulami, relics of the gender system are found, as was already mentioned, in the oblique forms of third-person singular demonstrative pronouns (masc. *way, day*, fem. *im, dim*). Such relics are also found in a limited number of nouns and in some word-forming (derivational) models (Edelman 1966: 39; Sokolova 1967: 109-110).

The category of grammatical gender in the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group merits special attention, not only as regards the means in which gender is expressed, but also, and especially, with respect to grammatical and lexical meaning of the category of gender. This work is dedicated to the analysis of the collection of problems connected to grammatical gender in the Shughni-Rushani group.

Because the manifestation of grammatical gender in Munji and in Yazghulami, which is historically related to the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group, is of a different nature, materials from these languages are used only in a few cases.

§2. The meanings associated with the terms ‘language’, ‘dialect’, ‘subdialect’, etc., in general and in comparative-historical linguistics, are of course not the same. Researchers who examine unwritten Pamir languages are hesitant to use any such terms to categorize different linguistic varieties, due, first and foremost, to the conditionality of these terms and, second, to the lack of a literary language in the Shughni-Rushani group (a role which has already been filled by Tajiki, which belongs to another group – Western Iranian). Hence, in the literature on Pamir languages, we find the terms “languages”, “dialects”, or even “language-dialects” of the Shughni-Rushani group together with the “Shughni-Rushani (language) group”.

In the present time, when the synchronic description of the phonetics and grammar of all Pamir languages has been realized, including the varieties of the Shughni-Rushani group, and once the fundamental outlines of their dialectal interrelations have been identified (see Sokolova 1963:71-80; Karamshoev 1970:71-80), then we can try to distinguish between terms like “language”, “dialect”, “subdialect” etc., as they are applied to this group of linguistic varieties.

It seems to me that in terms of diachrony and the general classification of Shughni-Rushani languages, the use of the term "dialect" to refer to each of the language varieties (Shughni, Rushani, Bartangi, Roshorvi, Sarikoli) should not be controversial, as their common origin from a Proto-Shughni-Rushani language can be considered firmly established (Sokolova 1967:124). The «crossed» term 'language-dialect' seems unpropitious to us.

In analyzing the modern status of the Shughni-Rushani group and in distinguishing its dialectal interrelations of the linguistic varieties which constitute it, it is useful to consider at least the following criteria:

a) the degree of mutual intelligibility between the speakers of the different varieties;
b) the social and territorial significance of each of the varieties;
c) the interrelation and influence of the varieties on one another;
d) the awareness of speakers regarding their belonging to a particular linguistic group.

Based on these criteria, we can propose the following groupings: the Shughni language together with the Bajuvi and Shahdara dialects (the latter including the Barvozi dialect); the Bartangi language with the Basid dialect; the Roshorvi language; the Rushani language with the Khufi dialect; and the Sarikoli language (within which there are dialectal distinctions).[1] It should be borne in mind, however, that because precise information regarding the dialectal division of the Shughni and Rushani varieties spoken in Afghan Badakhshan has not yet come to light, the divisions given above are relevant only for those languages and dialects spoken in Soviet Badakhshan.

On the relations among these languages and dialects the following can be noted. The closeness of the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group is such that mutual comprehension can be easily achieved, though the degrees to which each is mutual understood with the others are not equal. Thus, Sarikoli, which is geographically removed from the remaining languages of the group and which possesses it own unique features in phonetics (e.g. the lack of phonemic length distinction in vowels), in grammatical structure (e.g. the loss of grammatical gender), and in the lexicon (e.g. Uyghur borrowings), is less easily understood by Shughni-speakers than Rushani and Bartangi. Rushani, Khufi, Bartangi, and Roshorvi have a series of features which are not present in Shughni, but these discrepancies are less marked than the discrepancies they show with Sarikoli.

In assessing the interrelations and influence among Pamir languages on one another, and particularly as regards the Shughni-Rushani group, it should be taken into account that the languages with the most native speakers and which occupy the most territory exert significant influence on the closely related "small languages".[2]

The Shughni language stands out for its position not only with respect to the other languages of the group, but also with respect to the other languages of the Pamir. Although the literary language

[1] On the dialectal characteristics of the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group, see the following works: Zarubin 1930, 1937; Sokolova 1953: 121-139, 1963: 71-80, 1966: 326-397; Pakhalina 1966: 3, 1969:12-49; Karamshoev 1963:262-285, 1970: 71-80; Karamkhudoev 1973:281-285.
[2] Approximate figures for the number of native speakers are given by Sokolova (1953:84; 1966:362); see also Dyakov 1931; Oranskij 1960:336).

and *lingua franca* for all Pamir-speaking peoples of Badakhshan has long been Tajik (likely, since the 11th or 12th centuries),[3] Shughni retains authority as the principal Pamir language in everyday usage. Shughni is spoken by many Wakhi, Ishkashimi, and Yazghulami peoples (Dodykhudoev 1975:12). The aspiration to master the Shughni «norm» has been observed among speakers of closely related variants (Shahdara, Bajuwi, Khufi, Rushani, Bartangi, and Roshorvi). This aspiration can be explained by the fact that the administrative center of the province, the city of Khorugh, is located in the center of Shughnan, and is where speakers of all languages of the Pamir go to work and study. The influence of the Shughni norm is particularly tangible in the Shahdara and Bajuwi dialects; it can be noted that the features which distinguish these dialects from Shughni proper are less evident in the speech of young Shahdara and Bajuwi speakers than in the speech of older speakers, which evidently points toward the tendency toward the uptake of such smaller dialects by Shughni proper.

A similar influence is exerted by Rushani on the Khufi dialect. Less tangible is the influence of Rushani on Bartangi and Roshorvi, which are close to it not only geographically, but also in structure. Roshorvi also receives influence from Shughni.

All of this leads to the infiltration and proliferation of features which are inherent to the "larger" variety into the "smaller" varieties, a phenomenon which can also sometimes be seen in the manifestation of the category of gender.

§3. In works which have researched the grammatical structure of the Shughni-Rushani group, there have been different, sometimes contradictory points of view expressed regarding the character of the manifestation and means of expressing the category of gender and its place within the structure of the languages in question. This is explained, evidently, not only by the fact that the category of gender has been insufficiently studied, but also by the fact that there are different approaches to analyzing linguistic data.

The judgments of the authors in question regarding the category of gender are based, in general, on the analysis of the material of any one language. However, because the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group (except for Sarikoli) display significant closeness in the means through which grammatical gender is expressed, the conclusions which have been drawn have been transferred to the entire group as a whole. The following two points of view are the clearest:

1) The category of gender is considered a relic. Such an opinion was expressed in research on the grammatical structure of the Bartangi language: "the category of gender in this language, in some respects, is a relict phenomenon. (Karamkhudoev 1973:60)" We find a similar conclusion in the very interestingly designed similar work on the typology of Iranian languages, as here this view is projected onto all the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group: "in a rudimentary way the category of gender can be seen in the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group. (Efimov 1975:7)"

[3] The Tajik language and the Tajik dialects of Badakhshan , as well as their interaction with Pamir languages, is the subject of a number of works by A.Z. Rozenfeld (1956; 1963; 1971). On the influence of Tajiki in the area of folklore and literature, see Kramshoev 1974,Boldyrev 1948, 1976; Iskandarov 1973; Shanbezoda 1958.

2. The category of gender is considered to be one of the most important categories in the structure of these languages, and is considered to have a complex set of means for expression which are heterogeneous in nature and expressed in different places in the system of each language. These means are connected to all of the fundamental levels of linguistic structure (phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexico-semantic). By no means does this category exhibit signs of dying out and is not a relic; on the contrary, it continues to be expressed in all fundamental classes of words. From a historical linguistic point of view, the category of gender in the Shughni-Rushani group combines features which have been inherited from ancient times, but with clearly new formations which point to the vitality of this category. In this regard, special attention is deserved by the following: borrowed words have grammatical gender (words from Tajik, Arabic, Turkic, and and Russian); gender distinction exists in onomatopoeic words (and, more widely, figurative words); the expression of gender occurs through productive word-forming means. All of this, in our view, unambiguously attests to the multidimensional manifestation of the category of gender and, at the same time, points to its vitality in the modern languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group. This is the view adopted by the present author. Some of the positions of this idea were expressed by Sokolova : " In the place of lost morphological means for expressing gender, the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group have developed syntactic means for expressing gender on nouns and adjectives. The relevance of gender in the Shughni group is supported by its special grammatical meaning, which is connected to the notions of generality versus individualness (Sokolova 1973:184)."

Research into the category of gender in the Shughni-Rushani group is connected to the history of the study of the languages and dialects of this group as a whole.[4] We will focus primarily on those works which directly deal with the category of gender.

The first mentions of the presence of grammatical gender are found in the works of R. Shaw (1877), K.G. Zaleman (1895), and V. Geiger (1898). More detailed information can be found in the works of I.I. Zarubin on Roshorvi and Bartangi (Zarubin 1930; 1937).

In 1939 the work of L. A. Xetagurov appears, entitled *The category of Gender in Iranian Languages* (Xetagurov 1939). The section of this work dedicated to the analysis of gender in the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group is quite short (pp. 69-73, 81) and is based on the earlier materials published V. Geiger on the Shughni language (with some considerable inaccuracies in the transcription of words), by Zarubin on Roshorvi, and some materials brought by the author himself (information sent by Shughni-speakers who were studying in Leningrad in the 1930s). The author did not have access to materials from other languages and dialects. It should be mentioned that in the materials used by Xetagurov, mistakes in the specification of gender in words

[4] The history of the Pamir languages, in part, and of the Shughni-Rushani group is rather well illuminated in the works of Soviet Iranicists: those of Sokolova; Grunberg 1962:118-132; Dodykhudoev 1962:2-13; Edelman 1964:128-133; Ratorgueva 1967:171-190; Pakhalina 1969:13-16; Oranskij 1974: 174-186; Edelman 1976b; Karamshoev 1975, 1977:126-133.

are not uncommon.[5] In the analysis of gender classification of inanimate nouns, the author comes to the following conclusion: "In the Shughni language we should mention separately cases in which some notion or another can be either masculine or feminine, depending upon the gender specification of its object as masculine or feminine. Thus, if one is speaking, for instance, of the eyes of a man, then 'eye' must also be masculine, and on the other hand, if one is speaking of the eye of a woman, then 'eye' must be feminine (Xetagurov 1939:81)" Later, he brings in examples such as the following: *wThie ɣūnǰ darōz vud* 'his hair was long' and *wam ɣūnǰ darōz vad* 'her hair was long', and ultimately he gives a list of 19 words which, in his opinion, "like the words mentioned earlier, depending on whom they belong to, can be either feminine or masculine (Xetagurov 1939:81)."

Let it be clear, however, that the gender specification of all nouns, without exception, never depends on the gender distinction of the object to which they belong: *ɣūnǰ* (m.) should be masculine in both examples given by Xetagurov. His example in which it is accompanied by the feminine form of the verb *be* (*vad*) must be a mistake. Other examples in need of correction include *wiz* 'load' which should also be masculine (and this word should also be spelled *wīz*). The words *ðendōn* (should be *ðindůn* 'tooth') and *cem* 'eye' are also masculine. Thus, rather than the example *wam wiz lap wazmin vad*, we should have *wam wīz lap wazmin vud* 'she had a large load'.

The work of L. A. Xetagurov was the first essay on the analysis of the category in the Shughni-Rushani group and which was also done taking into account the history of this category in Iranian languages more generally.

§4. In the study of the category of gender, the lexicographic recording of words as belonging to their corresponding gender is very important, both those which inflect for gender (nouns, verb stems, and some other classes of words: *kut/kat* 'short'; *sut/sat* 'went', as well as those which belong to a particular gender (e.g. *meθ* (f.) 'sun' and *ðorg* (m.) 'stick; wood'; etc.).

It should be noted that the gender classification of nouns in existing lexicographical works cannot be considered satisfactory. The resolution of this matter is made more difficult by the following: the fact that the lexicons of these languages have not been studied in full, the lack of full dictionaries with the necessary reliable phraseology for gender classification, and the general complexity of the topic and the fact that it has not been fully worked out in descriptive monographs. The recording of the gender classification for inanimate nouns in the existing published dictionaries is inconsistent in nature and supports continuing mistakes in the recording of gender classification for specific words.

Among the lexicographical works which have been published recently, the most important is Zarubin's (1960) *Shughni texts and dictionary*. The 'dictionary' (pp. 85-288) is the fullest collection of Shughni lexical items done to this date with the corresponding lexical interpretation of words and their meanings, as well as the grammatical characteristics of each word.

[5] These mistakes are likely connected to an uncritical attitude of the language informant to the specification of gender forms.

In addition to words which inflect for gender, the dictionary also provides the gender specification for inanimate nouns. However, the gender specification for nouns even in this dictionary either is not shown or is not correct. In order to appreciate this, let's take as examples words that become with the letter "T". Here, the gender specification for many nouns has been represented accurately and does not cause doubt:

***taq(q)ānak* (f.)** 'multicolored woodpecker'[6]
***tilifůn* (f.)** 'telephone'
***tūti* (f.)** 'parrot'
***tundur* (m.)** 'thunder'

However, a number of words have been left without indication of their gender specification. Thus, the following words, though they belong to the feminine gender, have been left without a specification:

taɣor 'wooden vessel'
talxā 'bitterness'
tambůn 'pants'
tavār 'axe'
***tāk* (i)** 'string (on a dressing gown)'
***tāk* (ii)** 'trap (for birds)'
tānǐ̄jak 'spider'
têɣ 'razor'
tilig, talig 'saddle blanket'
tirāng 'girth, cinch'
tīvdak 'fly'
torx̌(ak) 'adze (tool)'
tosč 'wooden plate, bowl'
toqi '(traditional hat)'
tukmā 'button'
. . . and some others.

In the same way, many masculine nouns are recorded in the dictionary without their corresponding symbol:

tafax̌ 'steam; fog'
tamoki 'tobacco'
tanukā, tanukčā 'tin'
tarbuz 'watermelon'
taxtā 'board; plank'
tayoq 'stick; cane'
têr-misfār 'sunflower'
tufč 'saliva'

[6] This same word (evidently, of a onomatopoeic character), with the same gender specification, is also used with the meaning 'small-caliber rifle' (Sh. *dam xu taqānak mu-rd dāk* 'give me your small-caliber rifle'.

tult 'rag'
etc.

We also find cases in which the gender specification of a word is incorrect. Thus, the feminine noun *tobistůn* ‘summer’ is designated as masculine, and at the same time, the other nouns for times of year, which are also feminine, are left without a gender specification: *tīramo* ‘fall’*, bu(h)or* ‘spring’, *zimistůn* ‘winter’.

In addition, the phenomenon of homonyms and synonyms was completely untouched in the dictionary. Thus, for instance, take the words *tāx* (f.) ‘mountain; cliff’; *tor* 'thread'. In reality, the word *tāx* (m.) has the meaning ‘cliff’ (as with its synonym *kū*, also masculine), but its homonym *tāx* (f.) has the meaning ‘stone’ (as with its synonym *žīr*, also feminine). Cf. Shughni *yā wiðič wam tāx-tīr nost* ‘that bird sat on that (f.) stone’. Similarly, *tor* (m.) has the meaning ‘thread, string' (e.g. *tor ziduxt* ‘the string ripped’), but *tor* (f.) has the meaning ‘tar’ (musical instrument) – e.g. *dam tor mu-rd dāk* ‘give me that (f.) tar’.

In the work of A. K. Pisarchik *Rushanskie teksty* (in the section ‘Dictionary-Wordlist’, pp. 55-88), in the vast majority of cases, the category of gender is represented correctly (Pisarchik 1954). The author strives for the solid indication of gender specification of nouns – not only for feminine gender (as we find in the works of some Pamiricists – see, e.g. Sokolova 1950, 1960), but also for masculine gender (e.g.: *xaxpā* (f.) 'soup from pea and millet flour'; *biyabon* (m.) 'desert'; *bůb* ‘grandfather’). In addition, the corresponding indications are given for nouns indicating people which, depending on the natural sex of the person, can be either masculine or feminine: *amro* (m/f) ‘fellow traveler’; *amsoyā* (m/f) ‘neighbor’; *kūr* (m/f) 'blind’; *xēr* (m/f) ‘relative’; etc.

However, due to the small amount of material and similar lack of phraseological stock, a few mistakes in the categorization of nouns by gender are understandable. For some nouns, a gender specification is never given at all: feminine nouns *garð* 'quail’, *sifc* 'small bead', *xac* ‘water’, *tasmā* ‘strap, belt’, *tirang* 'cinch'; and masculine nouns *darð* ‘pain, sickness’, *sivd* ‘shoulder’. The following nouns are mistakenly specified as masculine: *tambon* 'trousers’, *tuvrā* '(travel) bag’, *axar* 'dogrose', *māk* 'neck', *garðān* 'neck'.[7] On the other hand, some nouns which are masculine are mistakenly listed as feminine (*cīl* ‘(feminine) bedspread’, *kāfx* 'leather shoes').[8]

The borrowed form *dal* (< Tj. *dil*) ‘heart’ is masculine (Pisarchik: 1954: 61), but the Rushani equivalent *zōrð* ‘heart’ is not listed with a specified gender (Pisarchik 1954: 88). We note that *zōrð* in all languages of the group, when used with its anatomical meaning, is feminine (Ru. *um*

[7] These words are listed as feminine by V.S. Sokolova (see Sokolova 1959 and corresponding dictionary-like works). The verification done by the author for the gender of these nouns confirms that they belong to the feminine not only in Rushani, but also in Shughni, Bajuwi, and Khufi: cf. Rushani *dum tuvrā mú-ri dāk*, Sh. *dam tuvrā mu-rd dāk* ‘give me that bag’; Ru. *yā wiðič um axár-ti nāst* ‘that bird sat on that dogrose’ (Rushani *dum, um*, Sh. *dam, wam* – feminine oblique forms of demonstrative pronouns).
[8] A number of these nouns have the correct gender specification in Sokolova (1959).

x̌oǰ zōrð-i kud xūg; Sh. *wam x̌īǰ zorð=i kud xūd* ‘a dog ate that bull’s heart’. However, the word *zorð* with the figurative meaning ‘heart, soul’ as well as other abstract meanings is masculine (Ru. *mu zōrð az tā virux̌t*; Sh. *mu zorð as tu virux̌t* 'my heart has (cooled off?) for you.’

A more accurate representation of the gender specifications of inanimate nouns can be found in V.S. Sokolova’s works on Rushani and Khufi (Sokolova 1959) and on Bartangi (Sokolova 1960). The author leaves masculine nouns without any symbol, which seems to be completely logical; for more on this, see the introduction to the section “Dictionary”: “words without any symbol belong to masculine gender in all instances of their usage (Sokolova 1959:108).” This does not include «the grammatical gender of nouns which represent a person, or also for many of those which represent domesticated animals, as in these cases gender is either clear from the meaning of the word (e.g. *puc* ‘son’, *x̌oǰ* ‘bull’, *žōw* ‘cow’), or it changes (in words indicating a person) depending on the situational usage of the word: *way cayidzgār qīw* ‘call that harvester (m.)’, *um cayidzgār qīw* ‘call that harvester (f.)’ (Sokolova 1959:108).

Regarding inanimate nouns, as well as the names of animals, birds, and insects which belong to the feminine gender, all of these are marked with the symbol (ж.). Of particular value is the conclusion reached by V.S. Sokolova regarding the grammatical content of the category of gender, which she made through her analysis of Rushani and Khufi: “feminine gender indicates only single/individual nouns, while general (category) and collective nouns are indicated by masculine gender (Sokolova 1959:108).”

The lexicographic interpretation of the category of gender in Bartangi, given in another work of Sokolova’s (1960:67-68), is build on the same principle described above.

The gender specifications in the etymological dictionary of the Norwegian linguist G. Morgenstierne (1974) are based, in large part, on materials published by Soviet Pamiricists. The errors committed by the latter regarding the specification of gender in nouns penetrated into the dictionary of Morgenstierne. Thus, the masculine noun *bůn* ‘beard’, as is the case with Zarubin, has been listed by Morgenstierne as a feminine noun; in the work of Sokolova it does not have a symbol, which indicates that it belongs to the masculine gender (Zarubin 1960:118; Sokolova 1959:146; Morgenstierne 1974:19).

The nature of the manifestation of grammatical gender in the languages and dialects in question convinces us that from a lexicographical standpoint it is entirely possible, with the help of corresponding syntactic constructions, to identify the gender specification for nouns, including, notably, inanimate nouns. In the compiling of my «Shughni-Russian Dictionary», [9]an attempt was made for the first time on the basis of ample material on the three linguistic varieties (Shughni proper and its Bajuwi and Shahdara dialects) to establish the gender specification for all nouns without exception (in addition to recording the gender-distinguishing forms of adjectives, verbs, onomatopoeic words, and pronouns).[10] The gender specifications of inanimate nouns is given consistently in this dictionary, with dialectal differences in gender also mentioned (e.g.: *zůn* ‘knee’ (m.); *ɣêv* ‘mouth’ (f.); *boɣ* ‘garden’ Sh. (m.), Bj. (f.); *marůb* ‘cream’ Sh. (f.), Bj. (m.), etc.). Possible variations in gender are also given: *rayůn* ‘region’ (m./f.), etc.

[9] D. Karamshoev, *Shughni-Russian Dictionary*. (Publications specs).
[10] The methodology used for the elaboration of gender specifications in this dictionary are found in its Introduction.

For certain nouns, for which the feminine gender indicates a singular object and the masculine indicates a collective meaning, the base gender is given as feminine (e.g. Sh. *žīr* (f.) ‘stone’, *mūn* (f.) ‘apple, etc.).

My dictionary constitutes the first attempt to consistently mark the special lexical content of grammatical gender. This special content leads to the emergence of homonyms, and, in particular, while the word with one meaning belongs to feminine gender, the word with the other meaning belongs to masculine gender. This is duly reflected in the word entries; for instance: *soat* 1) (f.) watch; 2) (m.) time; *dalyā* 1) (m.) fried crushed grain, 2) (f.) name of a soup from flour; *důr* 1) (f.) ‘a box for grain’; 2) (m.) 'belly; womb'; etc. The gender specification for inanimate nouns is shown through corresponding syntactic measures (e.g., verbs, demonstrative pronouns, articles, adjectives).

§5. The study of the category of gender in the process of describing the grammatical systems of the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group has led to significant results both in the recording of previously unknown forms of expressing gender, and also in their interpretation. The importance of reliable and authentic materials which have been gathered in the area in which the language or dialect is spoken and transcribed with a phonological transcription system, must be emphasized.

The Bajuwi dialect of the Shughni language was the first to be described (Karamshoev 1963). The section of this work which is dedicated to the analysis of gender is a recording of all nouns and adjectives which distinguish gender (Karamshoev 1963:94-102, 104-106, 151, 156-160).

The conclusion made by V.S. Sokolova from her material on Rushani and Khufi regarding the grammatical meaning of gender was confirmed by the data from Bajuwi.

The identification of gender in nouns was done in the context of their semantics: grammatical meanings based on the gender of inanimate nouns were verified using syntactic constructions which reveal the gender specification of nouns. From the analysis of gender-distinguishing verbs, it was established that gender is distinguished only in past and perfect stems and only in verbs which have an intransitive meaning (Karamshoev 1963:96-97, 164).

The category of gender was analyzed based on material from Rushani in work by M. Fayzov (1966:18-27, 34-36). Fayzov was successful in analyzing a large number of gender-distinguishing nouns and adjectives which were either previously unknown or were incorrectly recorded in the scientific literature. The analysis of materials in this work is done in the same way and almost in the same order as in the description of gender in Bajuwi. It differs primarily in that the expression of gender in verbal stems in Rushani is not looked at in detail. In his analysis of the expression of gender in nouns and adjectives, the author arrives at the following conclusion: “On the noun itself, gender may be distinguished via the quality of the vowel in the stem. For the masculine gender we commonly see the vowels *u, ū, ů, o*; for the feminine gender we commonly see *a, ā, i, ī, ō, ē*. (Fayzov 1966:18). After this, a list is given with all the attested groups of nouns and adjectives (which are common to all the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group of this type: *guǰ–giǰ* (kid goat (m–f), *čuǩ–čaǩ* (rooster-chicken), *šog–šēg* (calf of a cow, m–f), *vůrǰ, vêrdz* ‘horse (m–f)’. At first glance, it may seem that the author only considers these and similar correlates which

distinguish gender, and in the example given above the reasoning is acceptable, although *ī* as a marker of feminine gender is doubtful (the examples indicated by Fayzov with *ī* cannot be considered evidence, as gender in these examples is differentiated by the consonant of the suffixal element and not only *ī*: cf. the following masculine examples: *virodīǰ* 'step-brother'; *pidīǰ*//*pidīdz* 'step-father' and the following feminine examples: *yaxīdz* 'step-sister', *mōdīdz* 'step-mother', etc.).

p. 20

The analysis provided by Fayzov regarding nouns which are not associated with a distinction in sex convinces us that the division of Rushani vowels into masculine and feminine markers is clearly extendable to those nouns which do not distinguish gender. This is most clearly worded with respect to borrowed nouns: "Words which have been borrowed from Tajik, Russian, or other languages are used in a rule-based manner in Rushani, whereby words which contain a stem vowel *u, ū, ů,* or *o* are masculine, and words which contain a stem vowel *a, ā, ē, ō* are feminine (Fayzov 1966:25)." Here, there is no reference to the vowels *i* or *ī*, though this is seemingly accidental, as we find examples of the following type: *šinīl* (Ru. шинель 'military uniform'), *vilispēt* 'bicycle', *kitōb* 'book', all of which are feminine. It remains unclear, however, how to connect this division of vowels into masculine and feminine markers with words which have two or more syllables, and which have in their stems differing vowels: cf. the following examples given by the author for feminine gender: *kilūb* 'club', *istūl* 'chair' (this word is also associated with masculine gender), *karōwūt* (< Ru. кровать 'bed'), *pūstīn* 'fur coat' (should belong to masculine), *kōnstitūciya* 'constitution', *kurpačā* 'blanket', *kastūm* (< Ru. костюм 'suit'), *pāspurt* 'passport', *qōnūn* 'law' (Fayzov 1966:25).

The clear inconsistency in gender classification of this kind for nouns, as can already by noted by the examples given above, lies in the fact that root vowels, although they do play a definite role in the gender specification for nouns, are not the markers of gender in either native words, or – even more so – in borrowed words. We can present many examples which show that the distribution of vowels given above with respect to gender specification in Rushani (as in the other languages of the Shughni-Rushani group) is not absolute. Nouns with root vowels *u, ū, ů, o* can also belong to the feminine gender: cf. *xurn* 'crow', *vurut* 'willow', *tūd* 'mulberry tree', *kamzūl* 'camisole (man's jacket)', *sūmka* 'bag', *nů̄š* 'apricot tree', *sūg* 'tale', *qūl* 'lakae', *xoǰ* 'mother-in-law', and many others.

Likewise, a number of masculine nouns have as their stem vowel *a, ā, i, ī, ō,* or *ē* (which are characterized by Fayzov as markers of feminine gender). A number of nouns with these vowels recorded by Fayzov are masculine: *yaða* 'boy', *wawn* 'sheep's wool', *ðāws* 'goat wool', *paxtā* 'cotton', *taxtā* 'board', *salā* 'turban', *nāð* 'reed', *garðanband* 'scarf, shawl', *yāwǰ* 'flour', *pid* 'father', *pixōnay* 'forehead', *xičērn* 'elbow', *cīl* 'woman's headscarf', *zinirc* 'sponge', *wōǰ* 'hay', pēx '(a local boot)', etc.

The gender specification of these nouns can be seen only syntactically – in combinations with adjectives, vowels, and demonstrative pronouns which distinguish gender. For instance: Ru. *kat*

sūg, Sh. *kat sůg* ‘short story’; Ru. *rāšt xurn*, Sh. *rōšt xūrn* ‘red crow’ (cf. masc. Ru. *rošt*, Sh. *rūšt*); Ru. *yāwǰ tis sut*, Sh. *yoǰǰ tis sut* ‘the flour spilled’.

Therefore, the stem vowel is not the only – and often not even the primary – means for distinguishing gender in nouns. Only upon taking into consideration external characteristics (the nature of the vowels; for compound nouns also the gender of the second component) and the lexical meaning of the word is it possible to clarify the gender specification of a word.

Grammatical gender in Bartangi is examined in the monograph of N. Karamkhudoev (1973:50-62, 141, 165-169). Structurally, the section on gender does not differ greatly from the two works mentioned above, but the analysis of the material is done in more depth here. Thus, in connection with the analysis of transitive and intransitive verbs, the author focuses on the expression of gender in intransitive verbs (Karamkhudoev 1973:149-150).

Materials on the Roshorvi language were first produced by Zarubin in the 1930s (see Zarubin 1930), after which there was an extended hiatus up until the publication in 1976 of KH. Kurbanov’s monograph. The description of gender in this work is of great scientific value. The section on gender in this work includes all classes of nouns and adjectives which distinguish gender, as well as a description of vowels involved in gender marking in past and perfect tenses (Kurbanov 1976:57-58, 62-64). The lexical and syntactical means of expressing gender in nouns is also summarized (Kurbanov 1976:59-60).

In 1974, T. Bakhtibekov defended his thesis on *Grammar of the Shughni Language*. A look at the manuscript of this dissertation reveals that the section on grammatical gender is rather short and can be useful primarily in that it gives examples from the Shahdara variety (Bakhtibekov 1974).

The synchronic description of the grammatical system of the Khufi dialect was recently carried out by S. Mirzouddinova (with this work, all languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group have a monograph dedicated to them). Judging by the manuscript of this work, regarding an investigation into the category of gender, the author limits herself to the recording of gender-distinguishing forms, which are largely identical with those of Rushani.

§6. On the whole, it can be concluded that the completion of these monographs describing the grammatical systems of the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group has led to the accumulation of a significant amount of authentic and reliable materials and to the study of specific grammatical categories, including gender. In this way, a solid foundation has been laid for the subsequent research into different questions in the grammar of the Shughni-Rushani languages. The first syntheses in the field of comparative research in questions of phonetics, lexicon, and grammar (including gender) were done by V.S. Sokolova in connection with the establishment of genetic relations between Yazghulami, Munji, and the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group (Sokolova 1967; 1973). The category of gender in her works is discussed in general terms and is used primarily as evidence for the close relation between the languages compared by the author (Sokolova 1967: 18, 109-110; 1973:180-190).

Another summary of the topic can be found in a special section on the category of gender in Iranian languages in the second volume of the *Essays in Historical-Typological Research in Iranian Languages*. However, the analysis of gender in the Shughni-Rushani group in this work is allotted only a bit of space (Efimov 1975:72-75, 110, 454-455).

§7. The present work is the first comparative analysis of gender in the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group.

Research on gender in this work is carried out in two main aspects:

a) analysis of the form and means of expressing gender;
b) analysis of the meaning and content of gender.

The analysis of the means of expression for grammatical gender includes the following:

1) the comprehensive recording of all formants and lexemes which distinguish gender.

2) investigation into the tools and models which distinguish gender (gender-distinguishing vowels in noun stems, verb stems, primary and denominal suffixes, and gender-distinguishing components of complex nouns and adjectives);

3) the identification (via the analysis of gender in verbs) of opposing intransitive and transitive (causative) verbs which distinguish gender;

4) the analysis of lexico-semantic means of expressing gender;

5) a discussion of the interrelations of the languages and dialects in question, and the establishment of commonalities and distinctions regarding the expression of gender.

Research into the content of the category of gender has the following goals:[11]

1) the analysis of the grammatical meaning of gender in the expression of collectiveness and abstractness vs. individuality and concreteness;

2) Analysis of the lexico-grammatical content of the category of gender in nouns which are synonyms and homonyms.

More specific tasks of the research will be laid out in their corresponding sections.

The research here is carried out primarily from a synchronic perspective; however, in cases where synchronic comparison does not allow us to see the regular development or regular correspondence of gender markings among the languages in question, then diachronic data are brought in for analysis (because Pamir languages are unwritten, such data can often only be established via the comparative-historical study of other Iranian languages). When this occurs, tables with

[11] This part of the research will be published in the future.

etymological data are typically brought in. The etymologies generally come from the works of V.S. Sokolova (1967) and G. Morgenstierne (1974). References to the literature are only given when the etymology of a particular word is controversial, or when a word is borrowed from another source. Avestan and Old Persian forms are given in the dictionary of Khr. Bartolomé (1904) and in the work of R. Kent (1953).

§8. Sources for this work are the following:

1) the published material which was described above (§§3-5);
2) new material gathered by the author (with the topic of gender specifically in mind).

Regarding the published material, the following remark can be added: because these materials were gathered and published with the goal of studying the overall system of a particular language, many of the specific features of the category of gender may naturally have remained outside the purview of the researcher; hence, in describing the grammar of a given dialect or language, the detailed analysis of each category – including grammatical gender – was of course not a task of paramount importance. For this reason, from the very beginning, it was our goal to verify the published materials in each linguistic environment and to gather new materials on the languages and dialects in question in the places where they are spoken within the Soviet Pamir. With respect to Roshorvi, materials were also gathered in the Vakhsh Valley, in the Kumsangir Region of the Tajik SSR, where native speakers of this language resettled (along with the native speakers of other Pamir languages) in the 1950s.

An unevenness of sorts can be seen in the collection of materials on the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group, which can be explained by differences in the extent to which their vocabularies have been studied and the duration of the work on linguistic data. On the one hand, for the Shughni language and its Bajuwi dialect, the collection and verification of materials with the goal of creating a large Shughni dictionary was undertaken by me from the year 1960 and continued until the year 1975. For the other languages of the group (Rushani, Khufi, Bartangi, Roshorvi), the collection of materials took place relatively late, from 1970 to 1975. For these reasons, the Shughni and Bajuwi materials are used as reference and support while making comparisons. In cases where Shughni and Bajuwi do not make a particular gender distinction, data is taken from a language or dialect where the gender distinction in question is observed with sufficient clarity and consistency.

§9. In the subsequent portions of this work, forms which are common to all languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group are marked with a common sign Sh.-R. Gr., or are left without a symbol (i.e., in all languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group, except Sarikoli). In cases where there are discrepancies among languages and dialects, corresponding indications are given which link a form to its dialect or language (see the List of Abbreviations).

In this work, I use the conventional transcription system for works on Iranian languages – the so-called "International Iranian Transcription" (see Edelman 1963a:5). Stress is only indicated in those cases in which it does not fall on the final syllable of the word. The sources for material on ancient Iranian languages were given above (§7). For in-text references, only the last name of the author and the year of publication are given (along with relevant page numbers of paragraphs). A full list of sources with bibliographic information is given at the end of the work.

The author is sincerely grateful to V.S. Sokolova for her advice and consultations throughout the process of this research, to A.L. Grunberg, V. A. (Livshic?), I. M. Steblin-Kamenskij, R. Kh. Dodykhudoev, Kh. Kurbanov, R. Gaffarov for valuable remarks on the work, and also to A. V. Yashchenko and R. B. Potapova for their technical assistance in the preparation of the manuscript.

Morphological Expression of Gender

§10. In ancient Iranian languages, as is well known, the stem of words expressed not only a lexical meaning, but also carried a grammatical load as well. Grammatical gender (masc., fem., neut.) in ancient Iranian languages was primarily expressed in the type of stem found in the noun itself. Thus, nouns with a final *-a* belonged to the masculine and neuter genders and were formally distinct from the stems of feminine nouns. Take, for instance, the following masculine nouns:

Av., OP: ***baga-*** 'God'
Av., OP: ***aspa-*** 'horse'
Av. ***zasta-***, OP ***dasta-*** 'hand'
Av. ***yasna-*** 'offering, sacrifice'
Av. ***puθra-***, OP ***puça*** 'son'

and the following neuter nouns:

Av. ***vastra-*** 'clothing'
Av. ***xšaθra***, OP ***xšaça*** 'kingdom'
OP ***vardana-*** 'city'
etc.

Nouns ending in *-ā, i,* and *ī* belonged to the feminine gender and generally stood in opposition to masculine and neuter nouns. The following are feminine nouns:

Av. ***savā*** 'use, benefit'
Av. ***haēnā***; OP. ***hainā*** 'army'
OP ***framānā*** 'order'
OP ***stūnā-*** 'column, pillar'
OP ***taumā-*** 'generation, family'

OP ***xšaθrī-*** ‘woman’
Av., OP ***būmī*** ‘land’
Av, OP ***asi-*** 'share, lot'
Av, OP ***āxšti-*** ‘world’
OP ***šiyati*** ‘happiness, freedom’
etc.

Nonetheless, “the middle and new periods in the history of Iranian languages are characterized by a gradual transition from a multifaceted approach to inflection within the system of each part of speech toward a single-type approach, and from a system in which grammatical forms had multiple variations to one in which they were more standardized (Rastorgueva 1975:114).” The exact same thing can be said about the development of gender-distinguishing forms of ancient stems. Thus, the stem-distinguishing feminine suffix *-ā* of nouns and adjectives lost its gender-distinguishing capability over the course of the development of Iranian languages, and the masculine and neuter suffix *-a* fused with the case ending, and thus a “leveling occurred in nominal inflection wherein the stem types *-a* and *-ā* merged. And ultimately, in the latter stages of the development of these languages, a full generalization occurred, whereby all stems were formed on the *a-* declension. This universal process – in one way or another – is reflected in all of the Iranian languages without exception (Rastorgueva 195:123).”

The same fate was had by the feminine marker *-i* (*-ī*): “Whereas in Avestan, the position of nouns ending in *-ī* as bearers of the feminine gender meaning is rather strong, in Old Persian it has already weakened to a minimum (Efimov 1975:37).” In later times, certain feminine nouns ending in *-ī* are sometimes found in the *a*-class (thus, *būmī-* ‘land’ alongside *būmā-*).

§11. In the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group, the historical gender differentiation has only a partial and indirect reflex through the so-called umlaut – that is, the alternation in stem vowels under the influence of ancient Iranian gender endings.

As a result, under the influence of the ancient feminine endings, similar *a*-umlaut and *i*-umlaut gender alternations have arisen and established themselves. The umlauted vowels of the feminine gender generally oppose the historical stem-final neutral vowels *-*a* and *-*u*,[12] which were typical of the masculine gender. Hence, the process of formation and solidification of such gender-distinguishing stem-vowel alternations in the Shughni-Rushani languages was not limited to only nouns and adjectives.

On the basis of the historical participles ending in *-*ta* (m.) and *-*tā* (f.), the models of gender-distinguishing vowel alternations also arose in intransitive verb forms in the past tense (past and perfect stems). The penetration of gender-distinguishing vowel alternations into the area of onomatopoeic and figurative words is possibly an innovation. In quantitative terms, gender-distinguishing vowels are more widespread in words that agree with nouns than in actual nouns themselves. The result is a rather interesting picture: although the source of these gender alternations in vowels was initially words of nominal and adjectival origin, in the present time we

[12] According to Sokolova (1967:25), neutral position corresponds to a stem ending in a consonant or in the vowels *-*a* or *-*u*.

find that only a small number of nouns and adjectives preserve gender distinction in the languages in question. The gender-distinguishing models of nouns were borrowed precisely by non-nominal parts of speech and have received a wider distribution in them. From a formal perspective, all gender-distinguishing parts of speech (nouns, adjectives, verbs, and onomatopoeic words) all have an identical structure of vowels.

The expression of gender in nouns (by virtue of the reasons listed above) by agreeing parts of speech – adjectives, pronouns, past and perfect verb stems, and onomatopoeic words – is essentially a syntactic means and for this reason should be examined in the section *Syntactic expression of gender*, but because the morphological structure of gender models in all parts of speech (with the exception of oblique forms of demonstrative pronouns) is generally the same, it seems best to describe the gender distinctions of the different parts of speech in the current section.

§12. For the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group, syntactic means for expressing gender are the most universal and widely distributed. However, morphological means for expressing gender still play a definite role in the gender distinction of words, in and in some cases we can even observe a tendency toward the development of new morphological markers for distinguishing gender.

The current section includes a description of all attested words which exhibit gender distinction. The investigation of materials takes place on a fundamentally synchronic level. The diachronic analysis of gender-distinguishing units is used only occasionally and is intended primarily to demonstrate the emergence of gender-distinguishing morphological elements and the establishment of the peculiarities of the development of the category of gender.

Stems and formants (i.e. morphological elements) used to distinguish gender (nouns, verbs, demonstrative pronouns, suffixes), are examined both from a formal perspective (structural) and from a functional perspective. At the same time, during the analysis of gender-distinguishing intransitive verbs, an attempt is made to expressly and specifically to illuminate questions of the interconnection and interdependence of the category of gender and (in)transitivity. And in the examination of the structure of gender-distinguishing underived (simple?) and denominal suffixes, I likewise deal with questions of their origin, development, and function.

Gender-distinguishing vowels in nouns and adjectives

§13. The vowel alternations in a series of nouns and qualitative adjectives is one of the morphological means for expressing the category of gender. In nouns, the expression of gender via such vowel alternations is observed only in a small quantity of words. Gender distinction of this kind is also found in a number of animate nouns, and thus in these cases both grammatical gender and natural sex can be seen on the noun (e.g., Sh.-Ru. Gr. *čuǔ~čaǔ* ‘chicken~rooster’).

Gender alternations in nouns themselves is therefore not only grammatical, but also lexical. Regarding gender-distinguishing vowels in adjectives, their nature is of a more grammatical kind (cf. Sh.-Bj. *kut moθ* 'short stick' (m.) and *kat sůg* 'short story' (f.)).

From a formal perspective, gender-distinguishing vowels in nouns and adjectives, in the vast majority of cases, have identical models, and for this reason it is best to examine them in a single section (see also Karamshoev 1975:24-40).

There are four basic types of vowel alternations used for distinguishing gender in nouns and adjectives.

§14. First type: **Masc. *u* / Fem. *a*** . All languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group are united in having this type of vowel alternation. In total, there are nineteen pairs of words which show this vowel alternation, of which sixteen are qualitative adjectives and three are animate nouns:[13]

a) Adjectives

	MASC.	**FEM.**	**GLOSS**
✓	*gund*	*gand*	dull; blunt (of an object)
✗	*gut*	*gat*	tired; numb?
✗	*žimut*	*žimat*	undersized; short
✓	*žurn*	*žarn* (old)	round
✗	*kur*	*kar*	crop-eared
✓	*kurc*	*karc*	deep
✓	*kut*	*kat*	short
✗	Sh.-Bj *muxč* R-B-Rv *muxš*	Sh.-Bj. *maxč* R-B-Rv *maxš*	crop-eared
✓	*tuǩp*	*taǩp*	sour
✓	Sh. *dzul*	*dzal*	small
✗	*čuk*	*čak*	lying (down?)
✗	*čung*	*čang*	bent; stooped
✓	*šut*	*šat*	lame; limping

[13] Note: In this table and the ones below, the first column containing check marks and X marks indicates whether, according to a young consultant (approx.. 25 years of age), these words still distinguish gender in the modern language. This information is to be taken with a grain of salt, of course, as it comes from a single consultant from the city of Khorugh, but it may nonetheless serve as a useful reference point.

b) Nouns

✗	*bakul*	*bakal*	bull calf // heifer
✗ (cf. wirdzin)	Rv. *wurǰ*	Rv. *warǰan*[14]	wolf // she-wolf

From a historical perspective, this type of vocalization is the reflex of ancient Iranian **u, *ū* in neutral position and in *a*-umlaut position.

As can be seen from the examples above, there is not much discrepancy regarding the presence of words with this type of vocalization in the languages and dialects of the group. In Bartangi we find the adjective *pulx* (m.), *palx* (f.) 'with a white spot on the forehead (of a goat)'. This form does not exist in the other languages. The adjective meaning 'small' in Shughni, Bartangi, and Roshorvi is nearly identical (Sh., Bt.-Rv. *dzul* (m.) and Sh. *dzal*, Bt-Rv. *dzil* (f.)). However, in Rushani, Khufi, and Bajuwi, we find the word *bucik* (m.), *bicik* (f.) used for this meaning. As a nominal suffix with the meaning 'cub (of an animal)', nonetheless, we find the forms *-buc(ik)* (m.) and *-bic(ik)*, this form exists in all languages of the group.

§15. Second type: *u/ū* (m.) ~ *i* (f.). This alternation is also found in all languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group. In all, seven pairs of words are found with this type of vowel alternation:

	MASC. – *U* (*Ʊ*)[15]	**FEM. – *I***	**GLOSS**
✗	*bung*	*bing*	donkey foal
✓	*buc*	*bic*	young of an animal
✓	Sh.-Bj. *wūrǰ* R-Kh-Bt *wurǰ*	Sh-Bj, R-Kh. Bt. *wirdzin*	wolf
✓	*guǰ*	*giǰ*	baby goat
✓	*kud*	*kid*	dog
✓	*puš* (not used often)[16]	*piš*	cat
	Bj., Ru.-Kh. *bucik*	Bj.-Ru.-Kh. *bicik*	small

As can be seen from the list above, six pairs of words are animate nouns and only a single pair (*bucik~bicik*) are adjectives. Note, however, that the adjective *bucik~bicik* also has its origin as a noun (cf. *puc* 'son' and *buc* 'cub (of an animal)'. (See §192-202.)

[14] In the other languages this example involves another type of alternation (see below – second type). It is seen in this example that for Roshorvi – unlike the other languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group – the vowel-alternation involving *a*, which is usually more widespread in perfect stems, is becoming more universal.
[15] The sound in parentheses indicates different deviations from the basic type of vowel correspondence.
[16] cf. *kud at puš* 'cats and dogs'

Historically, this gender alternation is the reflex of **u*, **ū* in neutral position and in *i*-umlaut position.

§16. Third type. This type is characterized by the presence of five variants of vowel alternations. The variation here is explained primarily by the diversity of correspondences in the vowels of the different languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group, as a result of which, in particular, Rushani-Khufi short *o* and Bartangi-Roshorvi long *ō* correspond to multiple different Shughni vowels.[17]

Let's have a look at each of the five variants of vowel alternations. The correspondences of gender distinctions by language are the following.

First variant:
Msc: Sh.-Bj. *ī* ~ Ru.-Kh *o* ~ Bt. ~ Rv. *ȫ* //
Fem: Sh.-Ru. Gr. *ā* ~ Bt.-Rv. also *ē* (examples from here on are given in the table)

As can be seen from Table I below, in Rushani and Khufi, the adjective *šuvdi* 'younger' and *xaydi* 'older' have lost their gender distinction as a result of the loss of the final *-r*.[18] In Rushani, Bartangi, and Roshorvi, we find a few cases in which a word may have two possible feminine forms – one with *ā* and one with *ē* (e.g. *šal*//*šel* 'cripple (person)').

Table 1

MASC.				**FEM.**	**GLOSS**
	SHUGHNI	**RUSHANI**	**BARTANGI**		
✓	*tērgīl* safedgīl/-gāl OK 'white-haired' (maybe *-gāl* used with men too)	*tērgol*	*tōrgȫl*	Sh.-Bj. *tērgāl* R-X *tērgāl* Bt.-Rv *tōrgāl*	blackhaired
	pīk	*pok*	–[19]	Sh.-Bj., R-Kh. *pāk*	white (of a ram)
	Sh. *fištīr* Bj. *fišdīr*	*šuvdi*	*šafdȫr*	Sh., Bj. *fištār* // *fišdār* R-X *šuvdi* B-Rv *šafdār*	younger

[17] On the different correspondences in the vowel system of the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group, see Sokolova 1953:131-135; Murav'eva 1976:125-132.
[18] The loss of final *-r* in Rushani and Khufi in postpositions and suffixes is to some extent regular: compare Ru.-Kh. *-ti*, Sh.-Bj. *-tīr*, Bt.-Rv. *-tȫr* – postposition meaning '(on) top' (Av. *tarə-*); Ru.-Kh. *-andi* vs. Sh. *-andīr*, Bj. *-indīr*, Bt.-Rv. *-indēr* – postposition meaning 'in(side)' (Av. *antar-*).
[19] This form is not attested in Bartangi or Roshorvi.

	xalīǰ	*xaloǰ*	*xalo̤ǰ*	*xalāǰ*, Ru. also *xalēdz*	bulge-eyed
✓	*xidīr* (xidār not used?)	*xaydi*	*xaydo̤r*	Sh.-Bj. *xidār* R-X *xaydi* B-Rv *xaydār*	older
✓	*xīɣ̌*	*xoɣ̌*	*xo̤ɣ̌*	*xāɣ̌*	sweet
✓	*cīx̌*	*cox̌*	*co̤x̌*	*cāx̌*	bitter
✓	*šīl*, *šul*	*šol*	*šo̤l*	Sh. *šāl*, Bj. *šal* R-X-B-Rv *šal, šēl*	cripple (person)
	šipīk (only *šipīk*)	*šipok*	Bt. *šipo̤k* Rv. *čapōk*	Sh.-Bj, R-Kh-Bt. *šipāk* Rv. *čapak*	flat(tened); something that's not normally flat but has been made so
	Sh. *qimīr* Bj. *qamīr*	*kamor*	*kamo̤r*	Sh.-Bj. *qamār* R-X, B-Rv *kamār*	white-bellied?

§17. Second variant:
Msc.: Sh.-Bj. *ɛ̄* ~ Ru.-Kh. *o* ~ Bt.-Rv. *o̤*
Fem.: Sh.- Ru. Gr. *ā* (Ru.-Kh., Bt.-Rv. also *ē*)

This gender-distinguishing vowel alternation is only found for three adjectives in positions before the uvular *x* and the velar *x̌*, where in Shughni and Bajuwi we get the vowel *ɛ̃*, and in the remaining languages the vowels are the same as the first variant. In the feminine forms, as with the first variant, in Rushani, Khufi, Bartangi, and Roshorvi, parallel forms with *ē* are permitted alongside those with *ē* (for examples see Table II).

Table 2

MASC.				**FEM.**	**GLOSS**
	Shughni	**Rushani**	**Bartangi**		
	gulnɛ̄x	Kh. *gulnēx*[20]	–	*gulnāx*	(with a white spot on the forehead)

[20] The vowel in this Khufi word arose in all likelihood via influence from Shughni. In Rushani, Bartangi, and Roshorvi the word does not exist.

✓	*xinēx̌* // Sh. also *xanēx̌*	*xanox̌*	*xanȫx̌*	Sh. *xanāx̌* // *xināx̌* R-X-Bt-Rv *xanāx̌* Bj. also *xināx̌*	‘’; *or* ‘bald? white-headed?’ //annoying
✓	*čēxt* (čāxt only – e.g. *čāxt thorg*)	*čoxt*	*čȫxt*	Sh-Bj, R-X-Bt-Rv *čāxt* Bt-Rv also *čēxt*	crooked; curved

However, it should be noted that we find a widening (lowering) of vowels under the influence of uvular and velar consonants in Shughni and Bajuwi, unlike the other languages of the group, and words with this vowel may either belong to the masculine or feminine gender. In rare cases, we find discrepancies in the gender specification for words of this type among the different languages of the group: Sh.-Bj. *tɛ̄ɣ* (f.) ~ R-Kh-B-Rv *tīɣ* (f.) ‘razor’; Sh.-Bj. *mɛ̄x* (m.) ~ R-Kh-B-Rv *mīx* (m./f.) ‘nail'; Sh.-Bj. *pɛ̄x* (m.)~ R-Kh-B-Rv *pēx* 'boot’; Sh.-Bj. *sɛ̄x* (m.); Bt. *sīx* (f.); Ru. *sīx, sēx* 'needle’; etc.

§18. Third variant:
Msc.: Sh.-Bj. *u* ~ Ru.-Kh. *o* ~ Bt.-Rv. *u(ȫ)*
Fem.: Sh.-Bj. *a* ~ R-Kh-Bt-Rv *a* (*ē*)

This type of vowel pattern is observed predominantly in adjectives. There are fifteen pairs of word with this vowel alternation, some of which are given in Table III.

Table 3

MASC.				**FEM.**	**GLOSS**
	Shughni	**Rushani**	**Bartangi**		
✓	*buq*	*boq*	*bȫq*	*baq,* X-B-Rv also *bēq*	hilly; convex
✓	*žibuq* (polite) cf. *buf/baf* (impolite)	*žiboq*	*žibuq*	*žibaq*, R-X also *žibēq*	stocky; heavyset
✓	*pup* (actually 'fluffy'	*pop*	*pup*	*pap*	cut; trimmed
✓	*x̌ipux* (e.g. color of an object)	*x̌ipox*	*x̌ipux*	*x̌ipax*	bright white; light
✓	*ciluq* // *dziluq*	*ciloq* // *ziloq*	*ciluq* // *dziluq*	*cilaq* // *dzilaq* R-X also *cilēq, dzilēq*	sticking out

✓	*cuq*	*coq*	*cuq*	S-Bj *caq* R-X *cēq*	sticking out
✗	*filux*	*filox*	*filö̆x*	S-Bj *filax* R-X, B-Rv *filēx*	bright red

As can be seen in Table III, the tendency for Rushani and Khufi, as well as Bartangi and Roshorvi, to have a parallel feminine form with the vowel *ē* (alongside the form with *a*) is more pronounced here. In addition, in Bartangi and Roshorvi, in the masculine form, rather than the expected *ö̆*, we often see short *u*. Only in the Rushani language and its Khufi dialect is the short vowel *o* preserved for the masculine gender (which often corresponds to Bartangi-Roshorvi *ö̆*).

§19. Fourth variant.
Msc.: Sh.-Bj. *ū* (Bj. also *u*) ~ Ru.-Kh. *u, ū, ů* ~ Bt.-Rv. *u, ö̆*
Fem.: Sh.-Bj. *ō/ā* ~ R.-Kh. *ā* (Kh. also *ō*) ~ Bt.-Rv. *ā, ō* (Rv. also *a*).

Examples of this variant are given in Table 4.

Table 4

MASC.				**FEM.**	**GLOSS**
	Shughni-Baj.	**Rushani**	**Bartangi**	**Fem.**	
✗	*vūyd*	*vuyd*	Bt. *vūyd* Rv. *vōyd*	Sh. *vōyd* R. *vāyd* Bt. *vōyd*	evil spirit; witch
✓(only m.)	*vūy̆dz*	*vūz*	–	Sh.-Bt. *vōy̆dz* R. *vōwz*, Kh. – Bt., Rv. –	long
✗	Sh. *wirūx̆t*	–	–	*wirōx̆*	with a white spot on the forehead (of a goat)
✗	Sh. *žindūrv* Bj. *žindūry*	*žindūry* R. *žindiry*	*žindūry*	Sh. *žindārv* Bj. *žindāry* R.-X. *žindiry* Bt.-Rv. *žindāry*	werefolf / greedy
✓ (mainly xirs)	*yūrx̆*	*yūrx̆*	*yūrx̆*	All *yūrx̆*, but Rv. *yirx̆an*	bear
✗	*rūrv*	*rurv*	*rūrv*	Sh. *rōrv* R *rāsrv*, X *rōrv*	with a white spot on the

				Bt.-Rv. *rōrv*	forehead (of a bull, cow)
X (m. only, but she's heard rošt)	*rūšt*	R. *rōšt* X. *rüšt*	*rö̈št*	Sh. *rōšt* R. *rāšt*, X *röšt* Bt. *rāšt*	red
m. only	Sh. *čūɣ̌* Bj. *čūw*	*čů̊w*	*čo̊̈w*	Sh. *čāɣ̌*, Bj. *čāw* R-X *čāw* B-Rv *čāw*	multicolored; striped

As can be seen from Table 4, among the different languages and dialects we observe different kinds of inconsistencies in the vowels in question, involving both the presence or absence of a particular gender-distinguishing pair in a particular language or dialect, as well as the specific vowels used when a form is present. Thus, for instance, the word Sh.-Bj., Bt. *vūyd*, R-Kh. *vuyd* (m.) // Sh.-Bj.-Bt. *vōyd*, Ru. *vāyd* 'witch; evil spirit' does not formally distinguish gender in Roshorvi, where a single form (*vōyd*)[21] is used for both genders, and conversely, the word Sh.-Bj., Ru., Bt. *yūrx̌* 'bear (m./f/)' has a second, gender-distinguishing form only in Roshorvi: *yirx̌an* 'she-bear'.

§20. The following can be said regarding the correspondence of the languages and dialects in the realization of gender via vowel alternations: in this (fourth) variant, all languages and dialects, with the exception of Rushani, have identical vowels in the feminine gender and nearly identical vowels in the masculine gender.

The presence of the vowel *ō* in the the feminine gender of some words in Shughni, Bajuwi, Khufi, Bartangi, and Roshorvi – as seen in the examples from Table 4 above – can be explained by the fact that these vowels were in a position before two consonants and underwent the same effect from this phonetic position (compare the analogous changes in the vowels of verbs): Sh.-Bj., Bt-Rv. *wirōvd*, Ru. *wirāvd* 'stood (f.)' and its masculine form Sh.-Bj., Bt.-Rv. *wirūvd*, Ru. *wiruvd* 'stood (m.)', and so on).

As can be seen from Table 4, in some cases, in the masculine form we find the vowel *u* rather than the expected *ī*; in Rushani and Khufi we find *ū* rather than the expected short *o*; and in Bartangi we find *o̊̈*, as would be expected for this position. All of this is connected to the position of the root vowel before historical **š*, which has as its reflex Sh. *ɣ̌* and *w* in the other languages of the group (compare Sh. *xōx̌*, Bj. *xōw*, Ru.-Kh. *xů̊w*, Bt.-Rv. *xo̊̈w* 'six'; Av. *xšwaš*-).

[21] Roshorvi has preserved the feminine form in this particular case.

§21. Fifth variant.
Msc.: Sh.-Bj. *ī* ~ Ru.-Kh. *o* ~ Bt.-Rv. *ȫ*
Fem.: Sh.-Bj. *ī* ~ Ru.-Kh. *ē* (Kh. *æ*) ~ Bt.-Rv. *ē*

Here, as can be seen, gender is not distinguished in Shughni or its Bajuwi dialect. This fact has a clear historical explanation: the gender distinction in this variant is the result of the reflex of historical **a* in neutral position and in *i*-umlaut position. In Shughni and Bajuwi, **a* has as its reflex *ī* in both positions, while in Rushani and Khufi, as well as Bartangi and Roshorvi, it has its reflex *o, ȫ* -- neut. position, masc. // *ē* (Kh. *æ*) – *i*-umlaut position, feminine.

Table 5

MASC.					**FEM.**			
	Sh.	Ru.	Bt.	Gloss	Sh.	Ru.	Bt.	Gloss
	–	*ažor*	*ažȫr*	lamb (m.)	–	*ažēr*	*ažēr*	lamb (f.)
✗	*bīg*	*bog*	*bȫg*	small clay pot	*bīg*	*bēg*	*bēg*	large clay pot
✗	*gīš*	*gošˇ*	*gȫš*	pimply; spotty (m.)	*gīš*	*gēš*	*gēš*	pimply; spotty (f.)
✓	*θīk*	*θok*	*θȫk*	stutterer; stuttering (m.)	*θīk*	*θēk*	*θēk*	stutterer; stuttering (f.)
✗	*kīl*	*kol*	*kȫl*	hornless (m.)	*kīl*	*kēl*	*kēl*	hornless (f.)
✗ (sĭlak)	*līš*	*lošˇ*	*lȫš*	naked (m.)	*līš*	*lēš*	*lēš*	naked (f.)
	–	*mandol*	*mandȫl*	cut; trimmed (m.)	–	*mandēl*	Bt. *mandēl*, Rv. *mandȫl*	cut; trimmed (f.)
✗	*cīg*	*cog*	*cȫg*	newborn (m.)	*cāg*	*cēg*	*cēg, cāg*	newborn (f.)
✓	*šīg*	*šog*	*šȫg*	bull calf	*šīg*	*šēg*	*šēg*	heifer

From Table 5 it can be seen that the form *mandȫl* and a few others in Roshorvi are the same for both genders (this particular word is not found in Shughni or Bajuwi); all words of this kind, as can be seen in the examples, do not formally undergo a change to mark gender. For instance, Sh.-Bj. *kīl bučāg*; R-X *kol bučāg*; B-Rv *kȫl bučāg* 'hornless billy goat'; Sh-Bj *kīl vaz*; R-X *kēl vaz*, B-Rv *kēl vaz* 'hornless she-goat'. It can be proposed, however, that gender distinction via vowel alternations of this type took place in earlier stages of Shughni and Bajuwi. Compare Sh. *cīg šīg* 'small calf' but *cāg žow* 'milk cow', 'cow who has given birth'. These multifaceted vowel correspondence are summarized in Table 6:

Table 6

Var.	Gender	Sh.	Ru.	Bt.
1	**m.**	*ī*	*o*	*ȫ*
	f.	*ā*	*ā*	*ā*
2	**m.**	*ɛ̄*	*o*	*ȫ*
	f.	*ā*	*ā(ē)*	*ā(ē)*
3	**m.**	*u*	*o*	*u(ȫ)*
	f.	*a*	*a(ē)*	*a(ē)*
4	**m.**	*ū(u)*	*u(ū)*	*u(ȫ)*
	f.	*ā, ō*	*ā*	*ā(ō)*
5	**m.**	*ī*	*o*	*ȫ*
	f.	–	*ē* (Kh. *æ*)	*ē*

As can be seen in Table 6, the variation in these vowels is found primarily in the masculine gender, where all vowels are different historical reflexes of ancient Iranian **a* in neutral position. In the feminine gender, all languages and dialects coincide in their reflex of **a* in *a*-umlaut position (all have *ā, a*), though in Rushani, Khufi, Bartangi, and Roshorvi, **a* can have a parallel form through *i*-umlaut vocalization, which is more clearly and consistently observed in the fifth variant, where in Shughni and Bajuwi gender distinction does not occur at all.

§22. The correspondences Sh-Bj *ī* // R-X *o* // B-Rv *ȫ*, as has already been noted, is a regular pattern. This vowel pattern is found in a large group of inanimate nouns which do not have a feminine pair. It should be emphasized that long *ī* in Shughni and Bajuwi acts as a marker of masculine gender in cases where it has the corresponding *o* in Rushani-Khufi and *ȫ* in Bartangi-Roshorvi. Examples:

Shughni-Bajuwi	Rushani-Khufi	Bartangi-Roshorvi	Gloss
pīð	*poð*	*pȫð*	‘track, footprint’
čīd	*čod*	*čȫd*	‘house’
xīr	*xor*	*xȫr*	‘sun’
tīr	*tor*	*tȫr*	‘top’

In Rushani and Khufi, the vowel *o*, and in Bartangi and Roshorvi, the vowel *ȫ*, is primarily associated with words in the masculine gender. Shughni *ī* may act as a marker of masculine gender primarily when it corresponds with those Rushani-Khufi and Bartangi-Roshorvi vowels mentioned above.

It should be added, however, that in cases where the semantics of a noun fulfills the role of determining the gender of a noun, the gender-distinguishing significance of this type of vocalization disappears. As a result, this type of vocalization, which is generally typical for masculine nouns, can also be found in feminine nouns. And, on the other hand, masculine nouns can contain *a*- or *i*-like vocalization, which are generally found in feminine nouns. Compare, for

instance, the following feminine nouns: Sh-Bj *xīx̌*, R-X *xox̌*, B-Rv *xö̤x̌* 'mother-in-law'; Sh-Bj *tūð*, R-X, B-Rv *tūd* 'mulberry tree'; Sh-Bj *xūrn*, R-X *xurn*. The following nouns are masculine: Sh. *tāt*, Bj, R-X *pid* 'father'; Sh-Ru. Gr. *nāð* 'reed'; Sh-Bj *ðox̌c*; R-X *ðāws* 'goat wool'; Sh.-Bj. *cēl*, R-X *cīl* 'woman's headscarf'.

When all of the languages and dialects in question coincide in their usage of the vowel *ī* -- i.e. when a given word has this stem vowel in all languages and dialects in the group – the word is likely to be feminine. For instance, the following are all feminine nouns: Sh.-Ru. Gr. *čīn* 'break, rupture'; *čīni* 'small bowl', *rīm* 'poplar'; Sh.-Bj. *vīn*, Ru. *vayn* 'bush with red berries'; etc.

In general, the correspondences among the languages and dialects of the third type, as described here, are characterized by the consistent expression of masculine gender in Rushani and Khufi with short *o*, and in Bartangi and Roshorvi with long *ō̤*. In Shughni and Bajuwi such gender-distinguishing markers are non-existent, and a single Rushani-Khufi *o* and Bartangi-Roshorvi *ō̤* may correspond to four different Shughni-Bajuwi vowels (*ī, ɛ̄, u, ū*), as exhibited in Table 7.

(Table 7)

§23. Fourth type:

Msc.: Sh.-Bj., B-Rv *ō* ~ R-X *ů*
Fem.: Sh.-Bj *ɛ̄* ~ R-X, B-Rv *ē*
The number of words with this type of variation is not very high. Examples are given in Table 8.

Table 8

	Masc.				**Fem.**			
	Sh.	**Ru.**	**Bt.**	**Gloss**	**Sh.**	**Ru.**	**Bt.**	**Gloss**
✓	*vōrǰ*	*vů̄rǰ*	*vōrǰ*	horse (m.)	*vɛ̄rdz*	*vērdz*	*vērdz*	horse (f.)
✓	*nibōs*	*nabů̄s*	*nabōs*	grandson	*nibɛ̄s*	*nabēs*	*nabēs*	granddaughter
(m. only)	*pōðviyōǰ*	*padviyů̄ǰ*	–	barefoot (m.)	*pōðviyēdz*	*padviyēdz*; *paðēdz*	–	barefoot (f.)
✗	*cēmfɛ̄rtak*	*camfů̄rak*	–	flirtatious (m.)	*cēmfɛ̄rtak*	*camfērak*	–	flirtatious (f.)

The differences in vowels here are the result of the differing reflexes of **ā*, which are dependent on the following two phonetic positions: (i) in neutral position long **ā* for masculine gender results in Sh., Bt., Rv. *ō*, and in Ru., Kh. *ů*[22] (e.g. *bāraka-* > Sh.-Bj-B-Rv *vōrǰ*, R-X *vů̄rǰ*); (ii) in *i*-umlaut position**ā* became a marker of feminine gender as a front vowel (e.g. *bārači-* > Sh.-Bj. *vērdz*, R-X-B-Rv *vērdz*).

[22] This vowel pattern in Rushani is also found in the past stems of three verbs: Ru. *ðů̄d* 'fell' (f. *ðōd*)*; x̌ů̄vd* 'fell asleep' (f. *x̌ōvd*); *x̌iců̄d* 'froze' (f. *x̌icod*).

Bartangi and Roshorvi, as we can see, fully coincide with Shughni with respect to the vowels used for the masculine gender, and fully coincide with Rushani and Khufi regarding the vowels used for the feminine gender. Thus, the vowel **ā* in neutral position resulted in the same reflexes for Shughni, Bartangi, and Roshorvi.

The type discussed here also occurs in a series of words which do not have gender distinction:

Shughni-Bajuwi	Bartangi-Roshorvi	Rushani-Khufi	Gloss
ðōrg	*ðōrg*	*ðůrk*	'piece of wood, stick' (Av. *daru-*)
yōc	*yōc*	*yůc*	'fire' (**aθra-*)
pōθ	*pōθ*	*půθ*	'bullet' (**pāθa-*)
vidōǰ	*vidōǰ*	*vidůǰ*	'irrigation' (**abi-tāka*)

These words are masculine (cf. Sh-Bj *yōc wizud*, R-X *yůc wizud* 'the fire went out' – *wizud* (m.), *wizad* (f.)).

§24. All of the vowel alternations given above, as well as their variants, are shown in Table 9.

Masculine				**Feminine**		
Type (Variant)	**Sh-Bj**	**Ru.-Kh.**	**Bt-Rv**	**Sh.-Bj.**	**Ru.-Kh.**	**Bt.-Rv.**
I	*u*	*u*	*u*	*a*	*a*	*a*
II	*u(ū)*	*u*	*u*	*i*	*i*	*i*
III: (i)	*ī*	*o*	*ȫ*	*ā*	*ā(ē)*	*ā(ē)*
(ii)	*ɛ̄*	*o*	*ȫ*	*ā*	*ā(ē)*	*ā(ē)*
(iii)	*u*	*o*	*ū(ȫ)*	*a*	*a(ē)*	*a(ē)*
(iv)	*ū*	*u(ů,ū)*	*u, ȫ*	*ō, ā*	*ā*	*ā, ō*
(v)	*ī*	*o*	*ȫ*	*ī*	*ē* (Kh. *æ*)	*ē* (Rv. *ā*)
IV	*ō*	*ů*	*ō*	*ɛ̄*	*ē*	*ē*

The reflex of Iranian **ā* in Shughni and Rushani as *ɛ̄* and *ē*, respectively, is more regular; in Bartangi and Roshorvi, in this case, we generally get long *ō*. Nouns with this type of correspondence – barring any semantic impediments – belong to the feminine gender:

Sh.-Bj. ***mēst*** ~ R-X ***mēst*** ~ Bt. Rv. ***mōst*** 'month; moon' (**māsti-*, OP *māh-*, Av. *mah-*);
Sh.-Bj. ***wɛ̄ð***, R.-X. ***wēð***, Bt.-Rv. ***wōð*** 'canal; channel' (**wāði-*, Av. *waⁱði-*);

Sh.Bj. ***pēð***, R. ***pēð***, X. ***pæð***, Bt. ***pə̈ə̈ð***[23] ‘trap’ (**pādya-*);
Sh.-Bj. ***sēr***; R-X ***sēr***, Bt.-Rv. ***sōr*** 'threshing of grain on the ground’ (**sārya-*, cf. Av. *sar-*);
Sh.-Bj. ***nēdz***, R-X ***nēdz***, Bt-Rv ***nōdz*** ‘nose’ (**nāh(y)a-či-*; cf. Yaghnobi *nayz*, Sogdian *nuc*);
etc.

As can be seen from the table, almost all vowels of each language or dialect participate in gender differentiation. An exception involves the Shughni language and its Bajuwi dialect, where only a single vowel *ē* (from ten vowel phonemes) does not partake; in Rushani and Khufi two (of ten) – *ī, ō* -- do not partake; and in Bartangi and Roshorvi one vowel (of ten) – *ī* – does not partake.

§25. The relations between these languages regarding the correspondences of vowel patterns which are used in distinguishing gender are rather diverse. The following general scheme is provided to identify and pinpoint the details in the correspondences in vowel alternations of masculine and feminine gender for each language variety.

Table: Shughni vowel correspondence types in nouns and adjectives

TYPE	VOWELS	EX.	M. VOWEL ORIGIN	F. VOWEL ORIGIN
I	*u~a*	*kut~kat* 'short'	**u,ū* in neut. position	**u, ū* in a-umlaut position
II	*u~i*	*kud~kid* ‘dog’	**u, ū* in neut. position (**kuta-*)	**u, ū* in i-umlaut position (**kuti-*)
IIIa	*ī~ā*	*xīɣ̌~xāɣ̌* ‘sweet’	**a* in neutral position (**xᵛarəz*)	**a* in a-umlaut position
IIIb	*ê~ā*	*čêxt~čāxt* ‘stooped’	**a* in neutral position (pre-uvular)	**a* in a-umlaut position
IIIc	*u~a*	*buq~baq* ‘convex’	**u/ū* in neutral position	**u/ū* in a-umlaut position
IIId (1)	*ū~ā*	*čūɣ̌~čāɣ̌* ‘multicolored’	**a* in neut. position (preceding Ir. **š*)	**a* in a-umlaut condition
IIId (2)	*ū~ō*	*rūšt~rōšt* ‘red’	**a* in neut. position (preceding 2 consonants)	**a* in a-umlaut position (preceding 2 consonants)
IIIe	*ī~ī*	*līš~līš* ‘naked’	**a* in neutral position	**a* in i-umlaut position
IV	*ō~ê*	*vōrǰ~vêrdz* ‘horse’	**ā* in neut. position	**ā* in i-umlaut position

(Tables can also be made here from information on Rushani-Khufi and Bartangi-Roshorvi, but I have not done this yet.)

[23] This deviation from the other languages in Bartangi is still not fully clear. It is possible that the vowel *ə̈ə̈* instead of the expected *ō* arose under the influence of the vocalization model of the following homonyms: Bt. *pə̈ə̈ð*, R-X *poð*, Sh-Bt. *pīð* ‘track, trace’; Bt. *pə̈ə̈ð*, R-X- *poð*, Sh.-Bj. *pīð* 'time; instance’. However, it should be noted that this word coincides in all languages in belonging to the feminine gender (despite the fact that the vowel *ə̈ə̈* is more typical in Bartangi of masculine gender), which again might be explained by the influence of semantic series of words, as nouns of this semantic and thematic area primarily belong to the feminine gender: cf. Sh.-Ru. Gr. *tāk* 'snare for birds’; Sh.-Bj. *dům*, R-X, Bt-Rv *dōm* ‘trap’; Sh. *qapqūn*, Bj. *qapqēn*, R-X *qanqayn* ‘(bear) trap; leg trap’; etc.

From this scheme, we can make the following conclusion: the uniting aspect for all languages is the correspondence in which *u* is the masculine vowel and *a/i* is the feminine vowel. However, in Rushani, before two consonants, the masculine vowel *u* corresponds to feminine *ā* (Ru. *rurv//rārv* 'light red'). In this case, Bartangi differs from Rushani and joins with Shughni (Sh.-Bj., Bt-Rv *rūrv//rōrv*). Rushani and Khufi differ from the other languages in the position where masculine gender is signaled by *ů*, for which in Bartangi, Roshorvi, and Shughni we get *ō* (R-X *vůrǰ*, S-Bj, Bt-Rv *vōrǰ* 'horse (m.)').

§26. The synchronic correspondences for gender-distinguishing vowel alternations are shown for all the Shughni-Rushani languages in Table 10.

(Table 10)

As is clear from this table, the masculine vowels used in Shughni and Bajuwi show a greater variation in quality than those of the other languages (in particular, masculine vowels in Shughni and Bajuwi are both rounded and unrounded).

In Rushani, Khufi, Bartangi, and Roshorvi, there is a narrower system of gender distinction; in the masculine vowels, we see a relatively smaller quantity of vowels, and here we only find rounded vowels (in Rushani-Khufi 3 vowels, and in Bartangi-Roshorvi 4).

However, it should be highlighted that Rushani-Khufi *o* and Bartangi-Roshorvi *ȫ* have a very wide distribution. These are the most universal sign for masculine gender in these languages, and they correspond to three different vowels in Shughni (cf. R-X *xoў* 'sweet', *boq* 'convex', *čoxt* 'crooked' // Bt.-Rv. *xȫx̌*, *bȫq*, *čōxt* // Sh.-Ru. *xīў*, *buq, čêxt*).

§27. In the following summarizing table (Table 11a), we can see the historical correspondences for each type of vowel correspondence and each variant in all languages of the group.

(I have already incorporated this information into the table above.)

From this table, we can draw the conclusion that in the development and establishment of gender-distinguishing vowel alternations in the Shughni-Rushani group, a large role was played by two pairs of Old Iranian vowels: **a,ā* and **u,ū*. In neutral position, they have as their reflexes the markers of masculine gender, and in a- and i-umlaut position they became the sources for feminine vocalization.

§28. In Table 11b, some examples are given for the etymology of each type and variant. As is clear from this table, the interrelation between the languages and dialects in the reflexes of historical **a,ā,* **u, ū* took on an independent character, which is demonstrated by the formation in each language and dialect of a distinct gender-distinguishing vowel alternation pattern. This is primarily the case for Iranian **a,ā*, which gave in the Shughni-Rushani group the most diverse

pattern of vowels for masculine gender (cf. the fourth type of vowel alternations above for **ā*, and the third type with its five different variants for **a*). Strong similarities – and in two cases fully identical patterns – are found in two cases: i) in the reflex of Old Iranian **u,ū*, and b) in the feminine gender (see the first and second types of vowel alternations).

p. 50

Table 11b

ETYMOLOGY	TYPE	GEN.	SH.-BJ.	RU.-KH.	BT.-RV.	GLOSS
**kr̥ŭ̆ă̆-*	I	M	*čuŭ*	*čuŭ*	*čuŭ*	rooster
		F	*čaŭ*	*čaŭ*	*čaŭ*	chicken
cf. Av. *kərəsa-* 'scrawny'	I	M	*kurc*	*kurc*	*kurc*	deep; sunken
	I	F	*karc*	*karc*	*karc*	
Av. *arša-*	I	M	*yūrŭ*	*yūrŭ*	*yūrŭ*	bear
	I	F	*yūrŭ*	*yūrŭ*	Bt. *yūrŭ*; Rv. *yirŭan*	she-bear
**garθ-(a)na-*	I	M	*žurn*	*žurn*	*žurn*	spherical
	I	F	*žarn*	*žarn*	*žarn*	
**tr̥fša-*	I	M	*tuŭp*	*tuŭp*	*tuŭp*	sour
	I	F	*taŭp*	*taŭp*	*taŭp*	
Av. *kuta(ka)-*	I	M	*kut*	*kut*	*kut*	short
	I	F	*kat*	*kat*	*kat*	
**kuta-*	II	M	*kud*	*kud*	*kud*	dog (m.)
**kuti-*	II	F	*kid*	*kid*	*kid*	dog (f.)
p.51						
Av. *vəhrka-* (m.); *vr̥čī-* (f.)	II	M	*wūrǰ*	*wūrǰ*	*wūrǰ*	wolf
	II	F	*wirdzin*	*wirdzin*	Bt. *wirdzin* Rv. *warǰan*	she-wolf

**hwarza-*, Av. *xᵛarez-(išta)-*	IIIa	M	*xīў*	*xoў*	*xö̤ў*	sweet
	IIIa	F	*xāў*	*xāў*	*xāў*	
**traxta-*< **taxra-*; cf. Persian *talx*	IIIa	M	*cīx̌*	*cox̌*	*cö̤x̌*	bitter
	IIIa	F	*cāx̌*	*cāx̌*	*cāx̌*	
**hwanastra-*, **axša-?*	IIIb	M	*xinêx̌*	*xanox̌*	*xanö̤x̌*	bald?, white-headed?
	IIIb	F	*xināx̌*	*xanāx̌*	*xanāx̌*	
PIE √*pū* ?	IIIc	M	*pup*	*pop*	*pup*	trimmed; cropped
	IIIc	F	*pap*	*pap*	*pap*	
**kaša-*	IIId	M	Sh. *čūў*; Bj. *čūw*	*čūw*	*čö̤w*	multicolored
	IIId	F	*čāў*, Bt. *čāw*	*čāw*	*čāw*	
**rurð-*, **ruvr-* or **rudra-*, whence Av. *raoiðita* reddish	IIId	M	*rūrv*	*rurv*	*rūrv*	‘light red’
	IIId	F	*rōrv*	Ru. *rārv*, Kh. *rōrv*	*rōrv*	
Av. *baxta-*	IIId	M	*vūyd*	*vuyd*	Bt. *vūyd*	evil spirt (m.)
	IIId	F	*vōyd*	*vāyd*	Bt. *vōyd*	evil spirit (f.)
**(a)xaku-?*	IIIe	M	*šīg*	*šog*	*šö̤g*	calf (m.)
	IIIe	F	*šīg*	*šēg*	*šēg*	calf (f.)
p. 52						
**a-gara-*	IIIe	M	-	*ažor*	*ažö̤r*	lamb (m.)
	IIIe	F	-	Ru. *ažēr*, Kh. *ažær*	*ažēr*	lamb (f.)
**bāraka-* (m.)	IV	M	*vōrǰ*	*vůrǰ*	*vōrǰ*	steed
**bāračі-*	IV	F	*vêrdz*	*vērdz*	*vērdz*	mare

**napāsa-* (m.); Av. *napāt-*	IV	M	*nibōs*	*nabů̊s*	Bt. *nabōs*[24]	grandson
**napāsī-* (f.)	IV	F	*nibês*	*nabēs*	Bt. *nabēs*	granddaughter

§29. In the end, the following general conclusions can be made about gender-distinguishing vowel alternations in nouns and adjectives.

> **I.** Three root vowels are associated with the more or less universal masculine-gender marker: ***u*** – common to all languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group; ***o*** – only for Rushani and Khufi; and ***ö̊*** -- only for Bartangi and Roshorvi.

Regarding the type of vocalization used for marking the feminine gender, all languages and dialects are rather close to one another. In some cases we see the exact same usage of *ō* in all languages and dialects except for Rushani (i.e. Shughni, Bajuwi, Khufi, Bartangi, Roshorvi). This exact same vowel is also common to Shughni-Bajuwi and Bartangi-Roshorvi in marking the masculine gender: cf. Sh.-Bj., Bt.-Rv. *ō* < **ā*, where in this case we find *ů̊* in Rushani and Khufi.

> **II.** Regarding the vocalization used to mark feminine gender, there is a difference between nouns and adjectives, namely that we find *a*-like marking in adjectives, where as we more commonly find *i*-like marking for nouns.
>
> **III.** For the vocalization used in distinguishing genders, we can distinguish the following three fundamental types:

LANGUAGE	MASCULINE	FEMININE
Shughni-Bajuwi	*u, ū, ê, ī, ō*	*a, ā, i, ō, ê*
Rushani-Khufi	*u, ū, o, ů̊*	*a, ā, i, ē*
Bartangi-Roshorvi	*u, ū, ö̊, ō*	*a, ā, i, ē, ō*

> **IV.** This system for distinguishing gender is used primarily for animate nouns. Unlike nouns, however, adjectives which change form to mark gender may be used in a syntactic connection (i.e. agreement) with both animate and inanimate nouns alike.

§30. In addition to the regular gender-distinguishing vowel alternations, we also observe a number of deviations from the correspondences examined above. Thus, for example, in Rushani and its Khufi dialect, there is a word documented with the masculine vowel *ō*, which is not characteristic of Rushani or Khufi: R-X *šōy* 'beau; dandy' and *šay* 'belle; woman of fashion'. Examples: Ru. *ik-im ɣaða dōyim šōy nōɣd* 'this boy always goes around with class'; *tů̊-t šōy sut* 'you became a beau'; *tů̊t šay sat* 'you became a belle' (Sokolova 1959:253). In the other

[24] In Roshorvi, this word does not change for gender: *nabōs* 'grandson/granddaughter'.

languages of the group, this word is used without gender distinction in the form *šay*: cf. Sh. *wi puc dōyim-aθ šay vud* ‘his son was always a dandy’; Sh. *wi rizīn dōyim-aθ šay vad* ‘his daughter was always a belle’. This form is widely used as the nominal component of complex verbs: Sh.-Bj. *šay čīdow*, R-X *šay ðēdōw* 'to dress up; beautify'; cf. Sh. *yi ɣinik kiẋt niwēnc šay-at, yi mardīnā kiẋt pōtx̌ō šay xu, dam sūr anǰēn* ‘a woman makes the bride beautiful, and a man does the king up, and they do the wedding'.

The etymology of *šōy* and *šay* is still not fully established (see Morgenstierne 1938: 541; 1974: 80). The form *šay* is also recorded for other Pamir languages and dialects of Tajik: Sr., Ish, Wkh. *šay* with the same meaning “smart; dandy (m./f.)’; Tj. (Karatag?) *šay* 'good' (Uspenskaya 1956: 57).

Without going into the details of etymological interpretation, it can generally be considered that these forms, as well as other structurally and semantically similar lexemes of the type *šo(h)* ‘king’, *x̌ā* ‘ruler’, and the formants *šō, x̌ō, x̌ā* as parts of masculine given names (see §208), are clearly connected to Proto-Iranian **xšāya-* ‘ruler’, and have received influence in their distribution and usage from Tajik-Persian *šoh, šah* ‘king; ruler’ over different periods of time. The form *šay*, which is common to all Pamir languages, in Rushani and Khufi was adopted as the feminine correlate (which was naturally promoted by the model of *a*-vocalization in feminine words), and this led to the appearance of a masculine form *šoy* ‘beau; dandy’, in which the uncharacteristic *ō*-vocalization for masculine gender (we would have expected *ů, u,* or *ū*) became established via analogy with the borrowed Tajik form which is common to all Pamir languages – namely, Tj. *šo(h)*, which is semantically connected to designating the rank and title of a man and is widely used as a component of men’s names.

§31. The use of masculine words that contain a vocalization that is atypical for masculine nouns (in this case *ō*, *a, ā, ī*) is not accidental. It is observed not only in indigenous words, but also in words which have been borrowed directly from Tajik or via Tajik from another language (e.g. Arabic, Turkic). This provides clear testimony of the unfoundedness of the opinion that the gender specification of nouns depends solely upon their root vowels (§5). The following words serve as examples here:

MASCULINE	FEMININE
Sh.-Bj. *gōwambů̊n*; R.-X. *gōwambōn* ‘fat; fatty; swollen’	Sh.-Bj., R.-X. *gōwambēn*
Ru. *šilaq* 'swollen; unfocused'	Ru. *šilēq*
Ru. *ǰiq* ‘wrinkled’	Ru. *ǰēq* ‘wrinkled’
Bj. *ōšiqbōz* ‘in love’	Bj. *ōšiqbêz*
Rv. *žilȫq-dzām* ‘pop-eyed’	Rv. *žilȫq-dzēm*

Rv. *kata-dzām* ‘big-eyed’	Rv. *kata-dzēm*

Also of note here is the fact that many nouns which inflect for gender have only become established in individual languages and dialects. Thus, in Shughni and Bajuwi, the vast majority of the nouns presented in the table above are used without gender distinction: *ǰêq*, Bj. *ǰiq* ‘wrinkled’ (m./f.); Sh.-Bj. *šilin-šilaq*, *šilin-šilāy* 'sloppy; unfocused (m./f.). The second component of complex words Sh.-Bj. *-dzēm* (from *cēm*); R-X , Bt. *-dzām* (*cām* ‘eye’) has become established with an atypical *a*-vocalization for masculine gender and with *e*-vocalization for feminine gender: cf. Rv. *katadzām* ‘big-eyed (m.)’, *katadzēm* ‘big-eyed (f.)’, but Sh.-Bj. *kata-dzēm* (m./f.); R-X, Bt. *katadzām* (m/f).

§32. Deviations from the standard types of gender-distinguishing vowel alternations are also seen in a number of proper masculine and feminine names taken from Tajik. Here, the borrowed form with the vowel *a* became the masculine form, and the feminine form has a long *ā*.

	MASCULINE NAMES	**FEMININE NAMES**
(masc. only)	*Safar*	*Safār*
as parts of a name (Ozodbaxt – m.; Nekbāxt – f.)	*Baxt*	*Bāxt*
Dawlatšo – m. Dawlatmo – f.	*Dawlat*, Sh. also *Dů̊lat*	*Dawlāt*, Sh. also *Dů̊lāt*
✓	*Baxt-dawlat*, Sh. also *Baxt-dů̊lat*	*Dawlat-bāx(t),* Sh. also *Dů̊lat-bāx(t)*, also Sh.-Ru. Gr. *Sangin-bāx(t)*
	Sh.-Bj. *Nēk-baxt;* Ru-Kh, B-Rv *Nīk-baxt*	Sh.-Bj. *Nēk-bāx(t)*, *Nik-bāx(t)*, Ru-Kh, B-Rv *Nīk-bāx(t)*, *Nik-bāx(t)*, also Sh.-Ru. Gr. *Nazar-bāx(t)*

§33. In some proper names also borrowed from Tajiki, the component Sh.-Bj. *-bů̊n*, R-X, B-Rv *-bōn* with the meaning ‘protector’ (from Tajik *bonī kardan* ‘protect’), serves as the masculine marker in male names (the appearance of *ů̊* in the place of *ō* in Shughni and Bajuwi is a regular process before *n*). In feminine names, the component *-bēn* is used in all languages:

	MASCULINE NAMES	**FEMININE NAMES**
✗	Sh-Bj *Yēlbů̊n*; R-X, B-Rv Yilbōn (lit. 'protector of the pasture')	Sh.-Bj. *Yēlbēn* R-X, B-Rv *Yilbēn*
✗	Sh-Bj *J̌ōybů̊n*, R-X, B-Rv *J̌ōybōn* 'evil spirit?' (lit. 'protector of place’)	*J̌ōybēn*

According to Kh. Kurbanov, in Roshorvi, the Tajik proper name *Gulrēz* (from Tajik *gul* 'flower' and *rez-*, pres. stem of *rextan* 'pour'), gains *ī* vocalization when used as a feminine name: *Gurīz* (Kurbanov 1976:58).

§34. The correspondence of vowels used in masculine and feminine words examined in §§30-33 gives a rather varied picture, which can be illustrated through the following schema:

(M~F)

a~ā	(Safar~Safār)
ā~ē	(kata-dzām~kata-dzēm)
ō~a	(šōy~šay)
ō(ů)-ē	(Gowambōn, Sh. Gowambů̄n~Gowambēn)
i~ē	(ǰiq~jēq)

Thus, if the original form (i.e. the masculine form) contains *a-* or *i*-vocalization, then in the formation of the feminine form we get either *ē* (e.g. Ru. *šilaq* 'sloppy', f. *šilēq*) or long *ā* (*Safar* (m.), *Safār* (f.)). And if the masculine form has *ā* vocalization, then the feminine form gets *ē* (*katadzām* m., *katadzēm* f.).

§35. On the whole, given the data in §§30-33, we can make the following conclusions.

I. Words with a vowel which is not characteristic of masculine gender (in this case *a, ō, i*) can be interpreted as masculine when a second feminine form, and thereby gender distinction in the word, is created. Although the corresponding masculine and feminine forms may be close in form to one another, they are never exactly the same, and therefore gender distinction is secured (see, for instance, the proper names *Safar* and *Safār*).

II. The masculine form maintains the appearance of the original form of the word (as with many other formants of masculine gender, e.g. *-buc* from *puc*, Sh.-Bj. *-gīl* from *kīl*, R-X *-gol* from *kol*, B-Rv *-gӧl* from *kӧl*. Feminine forms, for their part, are formed on the basis of existing gender-distinguishing vowel models, generally through *a-* or *i-* vocalization, which is especially clearly demonstrated in borrowed words. Particular closeness in form of gender-distinguishing words, if it occurs, is generally in borrowed words.

III. The names examined in §§30-33 attest to the productiveness of the morphological means of distinguishing gender, as borrowed words, in addition to indigenous words, also show gender distinction.

The expression of gender in verbs

§36. In the expression of gender in the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group, a large role is played by the verb, as there is no regular gender-distinguishing marker in nouns themselves. The differentiation of gender in past and perfect stems was already established in the previous century by R. Shaw (1878) and K. G. Zaleman, and was later studied in more detail by Zarubin (1930; 1937; 1960).

Monographs which described the individual languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group have allowed for the recording of new verbs which distinguish gender. This, along with new, previously unavailable materials which have been gathered by me for the express purpose of analyzing gender, allows us in the present time to analyze the expression of gender in verbs in a broad comparative manner and to identify the relation of gender-distinguishing forms of verbs to other forms which are not related to gender inflection.

§37. As noted by V. A. Efimov, gender distinction in verb forms is "a clear innovation in the Middle and Modern Iranian languages", because gender as a grammatical category was alien to the ancient Iranian verb (Efimov 1975:451). The (eventual) appearance of gender opposition in verbs is closely related to the use in ancient Iranian languages of deverbal nouns – participles of the present and past tense ending in *-*nt*-, the perfect form *-*vah*-, medial forms *-*mna*-, *-*ānа*-, and especially participles ending in *-*(a)tă̆*, which were widely used in predicative functions. The past participle ending in *-*ta*- changed for gender in the following way: forms ending in *-*ta*- were used for masculine gender, and forms ending in *-*tā*- were used for feminine gender.

The expression of gender in the verbal system of the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group is carried out, as it is in nouns and adjectives, via internal inflection on the basis of *a*- and *i*-umlaut for feminine gender and *u*-like umlaut for masculine gender. In the perfect, in addition to this internal vowel change, additional suffixal elements are also used: *-ǰ,č* < -(*a)ka* for masculine gender and *-dz, -c* < **(a)čī* for feminine gender.

§38. The new type of gender inflection – recorded here by me – found in onomatopoeic and figurative verbs, when compared to the more typical gender distinction in verbs, attests to the use of new syntactic means for the expression of the category of gender, and also of the widening of the sphere in which gender distinction by vowels is used (gender-distinguishing alternations have spread to present-tense and infinitive stems, in addition to the past and perfect stems in which they were originally found). This gives us reason to believe that the process of development for expressing grammatical gender is dynamic and ongoing, and, moreover, that the category of gender has a firm hold in the verbal systems of these languages.

The comparative analysis of gender-distinguishing verb stems with those which do not distinguish gender reveals that gender-distinguishing verbs form a special class of words within the verbal system. For this reason, I do not limit myself here to the mere description of verbs which distinguish gender, but rather make an attempt to identify the specific characteristic features of this class of verbs and, at the same time, to identify its relation to other classes of words. I also examine

other verbal forms (in particular, causatives) which do not have gender distinction, but which are in one way or another connected to gender-distinguishing verbs.

§39. A specific feature in the gender distinction of verbs is that it only happens in intransitive verbs. This phenomenon reveals a close interrelation and intersectionality between the category of gender and the category of intransitivity/transitivity.

Based on this, I try to examine the expression of gender in verbs in a rather wide context – beginning with the analysis of gender-distinguishing forms and ending with intransitive-transitive pairs of verbs, particularly where the transitive verb is causative in nature.

Indeed, nearly all verbs which distinguish gender have an opposing causative form. The existence of this opposing causative form is dictated by the fact that a rather large number of verbs have a single (masculine) stem[25] which expresses both transitivity and intransitivity (see §§97, III), where the feminine form is used only in the intransitive sense. In this way a kind of ambiguity is generated for the masculine stem (cf. Sh.-Bj. *ziduxt, ziduxč* 'tore off (tr.) OR 'came off (intr.) (m.)' and *zidaxt, zidixc* 'came off (f.) – intransitive only'. The use of a separate, clearly causative form easily eliminates this ambiguity and, at the same time, strengthens the opposition between the transitive and intransitive forms (cf. Sh.-Bj. *zidêrð-, zidêrðd*, pf. *zidêrðǰ*, inf. *zidêrðdow* 'tear off (tr.)' and *zidarð-*, *ziduxt/zidaxt* (m/f), perf. *ziduxč/zidixc*, inf. *zidixtow* 'tear off (intr.)'.

With the goal of elucidating the interrelations of the two classes of verbs which are opposed by semantics and by form, in what follows, the causative/transitive pair (which does not distinguish gender) is given alongside intransitive verbs which inflect for gender.

§40. Gender-distinguishing verbs set themselves apart from other verbs as a special class via specific features which are inherent to them. It is useful here to enumerate here the fundamental features which are inherent to this class of verbs:

> **I)** gender (re-)vocalization in past and perfect stems (compare the verb *virixtow*: masc. past *viruxt*, pf. *viruxč*, fem. *viraxt*, *virixc* 'break' with the non-gender-distinguishing transitive verb with past stem *žiruxt* and perfect stem *žiruxč* 'sting; bite;
>
> **II)** gender alternations in consonants (in addition to stem vowels) at the end of perfect masculine and feminine stems (cf. msc. *viruxč*, f. *virixc* and the non-inflecting verb *ziruxč* – m/f).;

[25] The term "voice inseparability of verbs", as far as I am aware, was first used by V.S. Sokolova in her comparative research on the verbal system of the Shughni-Yazghulami and Munji groups (Sokolova 1973:137-138).

III) the use of the feminine past and perfect forms as the plural forms and the lack of such a form in transitive verbs (cf. *viraxť, virixc* – f., and *viraxť-ēn*, *virixc-ēn* ‘broke’, and *ziruxť-ēn, ziruxč-ēn* ‘bit (pl.’));

IV) the presence of a special plural form for gender-distinguishing verbs (along with the feminine form), and the lack of such a form in transitive verbs (cf. Sh. *viraxč-ēn//virixc-ēn* ‘broken (pl.), and *žiruxč-ēn* ‘bit (pl.)’;

V) the presence of a causative pair for the majority of verbs which distinguish gender.

In all this, we need to mention the following exceptions:

i) the presence of a causative form occurs also for some verbs which do not distinguish gender (cf. Sh.-Bj. *nêў-: nêўd*; Sh.-Bj, R-X. *naўēn-: naўēnt*; Bt.-Rv. *naўōn-:naўōnt* ‘turn (tr.)’; Sh.-Bj. *nōў-:nêўd*, Ru.-Kh.. Bt.-Rv. *nōў-: nēўd* ‘turn (intr.); roam';

ii) gender distinction is not found in all intransitive verbs. A certain number of semantically intransitive verbs do not change their forms to distinguish gender. Examples include the following:

Ex. 1: Sh.-Ru. *wārv-:wīrvd*; R. *wārv-:wirvd*; X. *wārv:wīrvd*, with the 3sg. form Sh.-Bj. *wōrvd*, R-X *wārvd, warvd*; perf. stem Sh.-Bj. *wīrvў* R. *wirvў*, X. *wīrvj* ‘boil’;
cf. also this verb's causative form: Sh.-Bj. *wêrv-:wêrvd* or *warvēn-:warvēnt*l R.-X. *warvēn-:warvēnt*, perf. Sh.-Bj. *wêrvў, warvēnč*, R.-X. *warvēnč* ‘boil (intr.)’

Ex. 2: Sh.-Bj. *wāz-:wīxť*, R-X *wāz-:wāxť*, with 3sg. forms Sh.-Bj. *wōzd*, R-X *wāzd*, perf. Sh.-Bj. *wixč*, R-X *wāxč* 'bathe; swim'
cf. also this verb's causative form, Sh.-Bj. *wêz-:wêzd*, perf. *wēzў* 'to dip; submerge (in water)’.

On the whole, verbs which inflect for gender are a special class of verbs, which structurally and semantically oppose the other subgroup of verbs which does not inflect for gender.

From all that has been set forth above, we get the task for this section – the detailed description of gender-distinguishing (re-)vocalization in a comparative manner, and when necessary also from a historical perspective, with the goal of establishing the regular correspondences of gender-distinguishing vowel alternations. The section also aims to identify the commonalities, differences, and deviations among the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group.

The expression of the category of gender in the verb system can be traced back to the old gender-distinguishing suffixes of the past participles ending in *-*ta*- (masc.) and *-*tā*- (fem.), though the subsequent development of gender distinction in verbs, as in nouns and adjectives, took place in Pamir languages based on the so-called umlaut (re-)vocalization.

Gender (re-)vocalization in past stems

§41. The carrier of gender distinction in past stems is the alternation of stem vowels. Verbal gender-distinction (re-)vocalization is fundamentally analogous to that of nouns and adjectives. The types of (re-)vocalization are almost the exact same as those in nouns and adjectives. However, in certain cases a distinction is observed between the gender vowel alternations in nouns/adjectives and those in verbs, particularly when it comes to perfect stems, in which the category of gender is expressed by an alternation in the final consonant (in addition to the stem vowel). In what follows, corresponding tables are provided for each type of gender-distinguishing vowel alternation; in these tables, past-tense stems which distinguish gender are given along with a translation.

In total, five types (along with variants) of vowel alternations are distinguished based on the root vowels used in gender distinction in verbs, and also based on the distinctions of the languages and dialects with respect to the realization of gender-distinguishing vocalization.

§42. First type: *u~a*.

This type of gender alternation is the most universal and widespread grammatical means of expressing gender – both in nouns/adjectives as well as in verbs. The vitality for this model of gender-distinguishing vowel alternation is attested to by the fact that the model *u~a* has a wide distribution also in onomatopoeic and figurative words.

The model *u~a* stands out among the other types of gender-distinguishing vowel alternations in that it occurs in all the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group. Discrepancies among these languages and dialects regarding the realization of this model is very insignificant.

All verbs which distinguish gender with the model *u~a* fall into two subgroups regarding the structure of their stems: (i) stems with one final consonant (of the type *pud~pad* ‘rotted’; and (ii) stems with two final consonants (of the type *tuxt~taxt* 'fought; struggled’).

Verbs of the first group are shown in Table 12, and verbs of the second group are shown in Table 14.

In order to show the historical origin of these gender-distinguishing forms, each verb, where possible, is accompanied by etymological data in the form of the masculine historical past participle ending in *-*ta*- and the root with neutral grade vocalization (e.g. *-*būta*-, √*bav* for the verb *vud~vad* ‘was’; **šuta*- √*šav* for the verb *sut~sat* ‘went; became’; **puta-,* √*pav* for the verb *pud~pad* ‘rotted’. The feminine form of these ancient Iranian participles is not shown in these tables. It is formed with the same suffix as in the masculine, but a long *ā*, hence *-*tā*-, as in **būtā*- > *vad*; **šūtā* > *sat*; **putā*- > *pad*). In some cases (primarily when there is no established and reliable proto-form for a given participle), an attested form in the present is given instead.

§43. From the verbs given in Table 12, we can make the following conclusions. The vocalization *u~a* occurs in all languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group.

Table 12

	LANGUAGE	MASC. FORM	FEM. FORM	GLOSS	HISTORICAL ORIGIN
	Sh.-Ru. Gr.	***sut***	***sat***	become; go	Av. *šuta-*, √*š(y)av*
	Sh-Bj, X, B-Rv	***vud***	***vad***	be	Av. *būta-*, √*bav*
	R.	***vid***	***vid***		
	Sh.-Ru. Gr.	***pud***	***pad***	rot	**puta-*, Av. *puya-*, √*pav*
✓	Sh.-Ru. Gr.	***firud***	***firad***	rinse (intr.)	**fruta-*, Av. caus. *frāvaya-*, √*frav*
	Sh.-Ru. Gr.	***θud***	***θad***	burn (intr.)	**θuta-*, √θav
?	Sh.-Ru. Gr.	***pišud***	***pišad***	amuse, comfort oneself	**pati-xuta, pati-xawa, xāwa-, xāwaya-*
yoc wiizud sivet wizad	Sh.-Ru. Gr.	***wizud***	***wizad***	go out (of a fire)	**vi-zuta-*, cf. PIE **gheu-* ; Sgd. *wuz'w-*, √zav
✓	Sh.-Ru. Gr.	***sirud***	***sirad***	become separated	**us-ravaya-*
caus. only	Sh.	***birud***	***birad***	to become weaned (stop suckling)	**apa-rābaya-*?

However, in two cases a discrepancy is observed:

i) the verb meaning 'be', which distinguishes gender in the vast majority of languages and plays a large role in determining the gender category of nouns (subjects), does not inflect for gender in Rushani (cf. Ru. *yā čuruk čod xīz vid*; Sh. *yu čōrik čīd xēz vud* 'that man was at the house'; Ru. y*ā ɣanak ar tagōv vid*, Sh. *yā ɣinik ar tagōv vad* 'that woman was down below'). Nonetheless, this verb does inflect for gender in the perfect in Rushani (masc. *viǰ*, fem. *vic*).

ii) The verb *birud* 'stop suckling' (f. *birad*) is found only in Shughni. In the other languages, the verb *sirud* 'become separated' (f. *sirad*) is used for this meaning (cf. Ru. *yā*

ɣaðabuc as bač sirud ‘that (m.) child stopped suckling (lit. ‘came off the breast)’; Ru. *yā ɣācbic az bač sirad*; Sh. *yā ɣācbic as biš sirad* ‘that (f.) girl stopped suckling’.)[26]

From a historical perspective, the gender-distinguishing model *u~a* in the verbs given above (in Table 12) is the reflex of ancient Iranian **u, ū* from roots with the sonorant **v(w)*. In neutral position, **u,ū* has as its reflex the masculine vocalization (**šuta-* > *sut*; **būta-* > *vud*), and in *a*-umlaut position it has as its reflex the feminine vocalization (**šutā-* > *sat*; **būtā-* > *vad*).

Still one more verb falls into this type, but this verb has an unclear etymology: Sh.-Ru. *ziban-:zibud* (f. *zibad*) ‘jump’. Two possible proto-forms are proposed for this verb: **hača-pat-*, *√pat* (Sokolova 1967, §107 in example 46 on p. 36), and **uz-wan-* (Morgenstierne 1974:107). As can be seen, in this case, the gender (re-)vocalization *u~a*, unlike the other verbs presented above in Table 12, is the reflex of historical **a*, rather than **u,ū*.

Below, in Tables 13, 15, 19, 22, and 25, I offer a comparison of the gender-distinguishing verbs with their corresponding causative forms.

§44. Gender opposition in the verbal system is manifested in the following three aspects;

(i) in the opposition of masculine and feminine forms within a single verb: *sut~sat*;

(ii) in the opposition of gender-distinguishing verbs and their transitive, non-gender-distinguishing counterpart verbs: Sh.-Bj., R-X *pišud~pišad* ‘became separated’ with causative pairs Sh.-Bj. *pišêwd*, R-X *pišēwt, pišēwd* ‘tear off (tr.)’;

(iii) in the opposition of two classes of verbs – intransitive, gender-distinguishing verbs on the one hand, and transitive, non-gender-distinguishing verbs on the other hand (both causatives and other transitive verbs).

These facts attest to the notion that the development and activation of the class of causatives and intransitive verbs is intimately connected to the independence of gender-distinguishing forms as a special class of verbs with intransitive semantics. Each gender-distinguishing form is opposed formally and semantically by a causative pair or another verb with transitive meaning. Precisely because of this, it is worthwhile to conclude the analysis of each type of (re-)vocalization in gender-distinguishing forms with a look at their causative pairs.

[26] The verb *sirāw-:sirud* (f. *sirad*), with the meaning ‘become detached, separated’ is found in all languages of the Shughni-Rushani group (cf. Sh. *miɣīǰ as mōl-and sirud*; R. *mawoǰ as mōl-and sirud* ‘the ram became separated from the flock of sheep’). In passing, we may note that the hypothesis of G. Morgenstierne (1974: 20) regarding the etymological connection between Sh. *birāw-:birud* (f. *birad*) and the verb Sh.-Bj. *rāv-:rīvd*, Ru. *rāv-:rivd* ‘suck(le)’ is further reinforced by the Bartangi variant: *birāv-:birēvd* ‘suckle’.

The sonorant *-w* (in the verb *birāw-*) in the place of the expected *-v* (the expected form is *birāv*) may have arisen much later by anology with the verbs presented in Table 12 (of the type Sh.-Bj. *pišāw-*, R-X *pišīw-*; *pišud~pišad* ‘amuse oneself’; Sh.-Bj. *θāw*, R-X *θēw-*; Sh.-Ru. Gr. *θud~θad* ‘burn’).

§45. In ancient Iranian languages, especially in the Avestan language, verb stems with *-aya-* "predominantly had a meaning of intensity and transitivity. For this reason, they became established as containing a meaning of intensity alongside other transitive stems of the same root, and it gained a causative meaning alongside intransitive stems." For instance: BARA- 'bring', BĀRAYA-, intensive of BARA-; TARSA- 'fear (intr.)', causative TRĀṢAYA- 'frighten; scare'. However, in general, causative forms in *-aya-* in the ancient Iranian languages did not develop greatly and did not become a kind of 'general form' (Sokolov 1961:87).

In the Pamir languages, especially in Munji and in the Shughni-Rushani group, causative verbs became very productive. In the Shughni-Rushani group, the intensive development of causative verbs is closely connected to gender-distinguishing intransitive verbs. The question of causative verbs has been treated broadly both in monographic descriptions of the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group (Karamshoev 1963: 165-167, 295-297; Fayzov 1966: 119-120; Karamkhudoev 1973: 147-148; Kurbanov 1976: 129-130), as well as in the study of the Shughni-Rushani group from comparative and comparative-historical perspectives (Sokolova 1973, §§98-106). The views of researchers of the Shughni-Rushani group have not always been aligned regarding the internal structure of causative verbs and their identification as a separate class from other verbs. Thus, for instance, N. Karamkhudoev and M. Fayzov consider present causatives to be only forms with the suffixes *-ēn, -ōn* (Karamkhudoev 1973: 148; Fayzov 1966: 119). It has been demonstrated, however, that these suffixes are later formations (Sokolova 1973: 138), and that they are more common in Western Iranian languages (Pirejko 1975: 330). Eastern Iranian causative verbs – including the causative verbs of the Shughni-Rushani group – have a different internal vocalization and can be traced back to ancient Iranian stems with *-aya* of the type: Sh.-Bj. *pêw-*, R-X *pēw* 'cause to rot; ferment' (**pāvaya-*, √*pav*) – the causative of the gender-distinguishing verb Sh.-Bj., R-X *pud* (*puta-*) ~ *pad* (**putā-*) 'rot; ferment (intr.)'.

§46. This type of analysis of causative verbs is not directly included in this work, and the analysis provided below has one aim: to demonstrate the opposition between intransitive, gender-distinguishing verbs and their causative (transitive), non-gender-distinguishing counterparts. For the opposition of the two classes of verbs just mentioned, I use primarily materials from Shughni and Bajuwi, as they are more rich in causative forms, which is considered to be a kind of archaism.

Only in the absence of a particular causative form in Shughni or Bajuwi do I make reference to data from the other languages of the group. For each of the types of gender-distinguishing vowel alternations discussed below, a table is provided in which each such verb is listed with its corresponding causative. In these tables, only the translation for the causative verb is provided, as the meaning of the gender-distinguishing intransitive verb will have already been given in the preceding tables.

As is clear from Table 13, almost every gender-distinguishing verb has a causative counterpart. Thus, of ten gender-distinguishing verbs, eight have causative forms and only two (*sut~sat, vud~vad*) do not have a corresponding causative. The intransitive gender-distinguishing verb *sittow* (*sut~sat*) 'become/go'is opposed by the auxiliary verb *čīdow* (*kin-:čūd*), which has a

transitive meaning[27] (cf. Sh. *mōšīn wērůn sat* 'the car broke down' ~ *mōšīn=at wērůn čūd* 'you caused the car to break down'). In the end, only the verb *vidow* remains without an opposing causative form.

Table 13

MASCULINE	FEMININE	CAUSATIVE	GLOSS
pud	*pad*	*pêw-:pêwt*	'ferment; cause to rot'
pišud	*pišad*	*pišêw-:pišêwt*	'entertain; amuse'
firud	*firad*	*firêw-:firêwt*	'rinse'
θud	*θad*	*θêw-:θêwt*	burn (tr.)
wizud	*wizad*	*wizêw-:wizêwt*	put out (fire)
sirud	*sirad*	*sirêw-:sirêwt*	tear off; separate
Sh. birud	*birad*	*birêw-:birêwt*	to wean (tr.)
Sh.-Bj. zibud	*zibad*	*zibēn-:zibēnt*	cause to jump

§47. Causative forms which oppose gender-distinguishing verbs fall into two groups based on their form:

> **(i)** forms with a (strong) internal vocalization: Sh.-Bj. *ê*, R-X *ē*, which historically can be traced back to the ancient Iranian stem in *-aya-*, of the type Sh.-Bj. *sirêw-:sirêwd*, R-X *sirēw-:sirēwt* (**us-rawaya*) 'separate; tear off', which opposes Sh.-Bj., R-X *sirud~sirad* 'come off; detach'; Sh.-Bj. *wizêw-:wizêwd*, R-X *wizēw-:wizēwt* (**wazaya-*?) 'put out (fire)', which opposes the intransitive verb *wizud~wizad* (found in both languages);
>
> **(ii)** forms with the causative suffix Sh.-Bj., R-X *-ēn*, B-Rv. *-ōn*, of the type S-B, R-X *zibēn-:zibēnt*, B-Rv *zibōn-:zibōnt* 'to cause to jump', which opposes the verb *zibud~zibad* 'jump', which is found in all languages.

In rare cases, causative stems may have different vowels, for instance: Sh.-Bj. *ů̊*, R-X *ū*, as in Sh-Bj *ɣibů̊x̌-:ɣibů̊x̌t*, R-X *ɣibūx̌-:ɣibūx̌t* 'to narrow, taper (tr.)', which opposes *ɣibux̌t~ɣibax̌t* 'narrowed; tapered (intr.)', found in both languages.

The fundamental causative marker above is strong *i*-umlaut vocalization, which in Shughni and Bajuwi has as its reflex the lax vowel *ê*, and in Rushani and Khufi as tense *ē*. In Bartangi and Roshorvi, we get the vowels *ā, ō*.[28] (Compare Sh.-Bj. *θêw-:θêwd*, R-X *θēw-, θēwd*, Bt.-Rv. *θāw-*

[27] The auxiliary verb *kin-:čūd*, R-X *kin-:čūg* in Rushani undergoes gender distinction in its intransitive meaning (see §64).

[28] In Bartangi, as noted by V.S. Sokolova, strong vocalization as a marker of causative verbs has become weakened, because *ō* is found in intransitive verb stems: Bt. *sōr-:sōrt* 'follow'; *wōx̌-:wōx̌t* 'fall' – cf. Sh.-Bj. *sêr-:sêrt*, *wōx̌-:wōx̌t* (Sokolova 1973:116 et seq.).

θāwd ‘burn (tr.)’, which is the causative of Sh.-Bj. *θāw-:θud~θad*, R-X, B-Rv *θīw-:θud~θad* ‘burn (intr.)’).

The causative vocalization in Shughni and Bajuwi *ê* narrows to *ē* before *-n* and *-m* and is preserved as such in causative suffixal elements[29] (Sh-Bj, R-X *warvēn-:warvēnt*, B-Rv *warvōn-:warvōnt* ‘boil (tr.); Sh-Bj, R-X, Bt *niðēmb-:niðēmt* 'stick (tr.)’. In some verbs, the formant *-ēn* is directly included in the structure of verb stems and thereby supplies a transitive meaning to the verb (Sh.-Bj., R-X *divēn-:divēnt*, and Bt.-Rv. *divōn-:divōnt* ‘blow'; Sh.-Bj., R-X *piǰēn-:piǰēnt* ‘to string’; *biǰēn-:biǰēnt* 'to shake (a tree for fruit)’; Bj.-R-X *sipēn-:sipēnt* ‘draw; scoop’ – cf. Bt-Rv *sipōn-:sipōnt*).

§48. The second group of gender-distinguishing verbs differs synchronically from the type discussed above and exhibited in Table 12 in that there is a final consonant cluster *-x̌t* in the past stem rather than *-d*. In these cases, the model of (re-)vocalization *u~a* is unchanged only in Shughni and Bajuwi. In the other languages, in the feminine gender we sometimes get long *ā*. This model of gender-distinguishing vocalization is given below, with examples shown in Table 14:

Masculine			**Feminine**		
Sh-Bj	**R-X**	**Bt-Rv**	**Sh-Bj**	**R-X**	**Bt-Rv**
u	*u*	*u(ȫ)*	*a*	*a(ā)*	*a(ā)*

Historically, this type of gender vocalization is the reflex of two original sources:

(i) vocalization from a root with the sonorant *r*, of the type *tṛd*, √*tard*: *zidux̌t* (**hača-tarda-*) ‘came off (m.)’, fem. *zidax̌t* (**hača-tardā*) ‘came off (f.)’;

(ii) *a*-vocalization from roots of the type √*vaz*, as in Sh.Bj. *riwux̌t* (**vašta-*) ‘flew off (m.)’, *riwax̌t* ‘flew off (f.)’ (**vaštā-*, Av. *vaštā-*).

Table 14

Language	**Masc.**	**Fem.**	**Gloss**	**Historical source**
Sh-Bj	*riwux̌t*	*riwax̌t*	flew off	**fra-vaz*, Av. *vašta-*, √*vaz*
R-X	*rawux̌t*	*rawāx̌t*		
Bt-Rv	*rawȫx̌t*	*rawāx̌t*		

[29] On causative suffixes in the Shughni-Rushani group, see Sokolova 1973. §§151-155.

Sh-Ru Gr.	*tuxt*	*taxt*	fight ; struggle	cf. Skt. *ṭṛdha-, √tard*
Sh-Ru Gr.	*zidux̌t*	*zidax̌t*	tear off ; come off	from the same *√tard* with the prefix **hača-*, i.e. **hača-tard-*
Sh-Bj	*arux̌t*	*arax̌t*	to go up; rear up	**fra-rašta*, *√raz*, **ā-raz-*
R-X	*arux̌t*	*arāx̌t*		
B-Rv	*arux̌t*	*arax̌t*		
Sh.-Ru. Gr.	*ziyux̌t*	*ziyax̌t*	dry up; burn out	Av. *hušata-*; *√haoš*, **uz-hušta*
Sh.	*nixux̌t*	*nixax̌t*	collapse	Av. *karət-*, Skt. *kṛ̊ntati-*, *kartati-*, *√kart*?
Bj.-X	*rixux̌t*	*rixax̌t*	collapse	possibly the same *√kart* as above
R, Bt-Rv	*raxux̌t*	*raxax̌t*		
p. 72				
Sh.	*pirxux̌t*	*pirxax̌t*	to get sick; get worse (of person with a sickness)	possibly the same *√kart* as above
R.	*parxux̌t; paraxux̌t*	*parxax̌t, paraxax̌t, paraxāx̌t*		
X, Bt-Rv	*paraxux̌t*	*paraxax̌t*		
Sh-Bj	*parux̌t*	*parax̌t*	rise up; splash	possibly from *√vart*
R.	*parux̌t*	*parāx̌t*[30]		
Sh-Bj	*parwux̌t*	*parwax̌t*[31]	capsize; turnover	Av. *varəta-*, cf. Skt. *vartati-*, *√vart*
Bt-Rv	*parwux̌t; parwo̊̄x̌t*	*parwāx̌t*		

[30] In Bartangi and Roshorvi , the verb *rawo̊̄x̌t/rawāx̌t* is used with this meaning – e.g. Rv. *x̌ac pa mun rawāx̌t* (lit. 'the water splashed on me.').
[31] In Rushani and Khufi this verb is not attested.

R-X, Bt-Rv	*warwuǩt*	*warwaǩt*	roll from side to side?[32]	
p. 73				
Sh., Ru.	*ɣibuǩt*	*ɣibaǩt*[33]	narrow; shrink in size	

To this type we can also add a verb with unclear etymology: Sh.-Ru. group *viruǩt~viraǩt* 'break' (according to Sokolova 1967:60, this verb comes from **brišta-*, but according to Morgenstierne 1974:85, from **braša-*; cf. Av. *bray-* 'cut' and √*raēš*.

The masculine vocalization in the past stem is the reflex of the stem vowel **a* in neutral position: *riwuǩt* 'flew off' (**vašta-*); *a*-umlaut position gives the feminine vocalization: *riwaǩt* 'flew off (f.)' (**vaštā-*).

Based on analogy with this type, the borrowed Tajik verb *ǩikuft~ǩikaft* 'bloom; blossom' (found in all Sh.-Ru. languages) was adapted to have gender distinction.[34]

§49. From the data in Table 14, we can note the following: In the masculine gender, Shughni, Bajuwi, Rushani, and Khufi are identical, as all of them have the vowel *u* in all verbs. Bartangi and Roshorvi, while preserving this vocalization in the majority of cases, in some cases it also allows the vowel *o̤* (Bt.-Rv. *rawo̤ǩt* 'flew off (m.)', but Sh.-Bj. *riwuǩt*, R-X *rawuǩt*; Bt-Rv *aro̤ǩt* 'went up (m.)', but Sh-Bj, R-X *aruǩt*; in one verb we observe the parallel usage of *u/o̤* (Bt-Rv *oaruǩt//parwo̤ǩt* 'capsize' – cf. Sh-Bj *parwuǩt*).

Shughni and Bajuwi stand out as preserving (short) *a*-vocalization in all verbs. The short vowel *a* is likewise used in the vast majority of verbs in the other languages – Rushani, Khufi, Bartangi, and Roshorvi. However, it should be noted that in these languages, in rare cases, we find long *ā* in some of these verbs – which was historically the basic marker of feminine gender: cf. R-X, Bt-Rv *rawāǩt* (**vaštā-*) 'flew off (f.)', Bt.-Rv *parwāǩt* 'capsized (f.)', Ru. *paraxāǩt // paraxaǩt* 'got sick (f.)'.

§50. The causative verbs which oppose the gender-distinguishing verbs shown in Table 14 are exhibited in Table 15. Of all the gender-distinguishing verbs in Table 14, only two do not have an

[32] In Shughni, the non-gender-distinguishing verb *pačwarθt* is used in this meaning 'swing from side to side; suffer from insomnia'. However, the causative form of *warwuǩt~warwaǩt* – is attested in all of these languages: Sh.-Bj. *warwêǩ-ːwarwêǩt*, R-X, B-Rv *warwēǩ*, *warwēǩt*.

[33] In Roshorvi this verb is not attested. This verb is of unclear etymology but from its outward appearance falls within this group, although its causative form is somewhat different than those of the other verbs in this group (see Table 15). Compare Sh-Bj *ɣibů̊ǩ-ːɣibů̊ǩt*, R-X, Bt-Rv *ɣibūǩ-ːɣibūǩt* 'to narrow (tr.)'.

[34] This verb is mentioned by V.S. Sokolova as a borrowing of the Tajik verb *šukuftan* 'to bloom' (Sokolova 1967, §107). G. Morgenstierne has some doubts about the borrowing of this verb (Morgenstierne 1974:102).

opposing transitive verb (i) Sh.-Bj., R-X *aruxt*, (f. Sh-Bj *araxt*, R-X *arāxt*), Bt-Rv *arə̈xt~araxt* 'rear up'; (ii) Sh-Bj, R-X *paruxt* (f. Sh-Bj *paraxt*, R-X *parāxt* 'rise up; splash'. The other verbs in Table 14 all have an opposing transitive form, giving us a clear opposition between gender-distinguishing intransitive verbs and transitive causative verbs (see Table 15).

Table 15 (all from Sh-Bj, unless otherwise specified)

MASCULINE	**FEMININE**	**CAUS. STEM**	**CAUS. GLOSS**
riwuxt	*riwaxt*	*riwêz-:riwêzd;* Bj. *riwazēn-:riwazēnt*	cause to fly off
tuxt	*taxt*	*tarðēn-:tarðēnt*	pit against one another
ziduxt	*zidaxt*	*zidêrð-:zidêrðd*	tear off
ziyuxt	*ziyaxt*	*ziyêy̆-:ziyêy̆d;* Bj. *ziyêw-:ziyêwd,* *ziyawēn-:ziyawēnt*[35]	cause to dry up
Sh. *nixuxt*	*nixaxt*	Sh. *nixêrθ-:nixêrθt*	bring down; cause to fall
Bj. *rixux*	*rixaxt*	Bj. *rixêr-:rixêrθt,* *rixarθēn-:rixarθēnt*	bring down; cause to fall
parxuxt	*parxaxt*	*parxêr-:parxêrθt(?);* *parxarθēn-:parxarθēnt*	cause to get sick
warwuxt	*warwaxt*	*warwêx-:warwêxt*	cause to capsize; turn over
ɣibuxt	*ɣibaxt*	*ɣibů̯x-:ɣibů̯xt*	to narrow; taper; shirnk (tr.)
viruxt	*viraxt*	*viray̆-:viruxt*; Bj. *viraw-viruxt*	break

As can be seen in Table 15, the causative verbs here are not very different in their formation from the verbs in Table 13. The most fundamental outward sign for causatives is still the *i*-like vocalization through *ê* (Sh-Bj), *ē* (R-X, B-Rv) (cf. Sh. *nixêxtow*, Bj. *rixêxtow*, R, Bt-Rv *raxēx-:raxēxt*, X *rixēx-:rixēxt* with their gender-distinguishing counterparts, e.g. Sh. *nixixtow*). Another model for causative forms is via the suffix Sh.-Bj., R-X, *-ēn,* Bt-Rv *-ōn*.

p. 75

(Table 15) is on p. 75.

For this model, cf. Sh-Bj, R-X *tarðēn-:tarðēnt*, Bt-Rv *tarðōn-:tarðōnt* 'to pit against one another' and their gender-distinguishing counterparts Sh.-Ru. Gr. *tuxt~taxt* 'fought; struggled'. Additionally, there is a causative verb among this group with the following root vowel: Sh-Bj *ů̯*, R-X, B-Rv *ū* (Sh-Bj *ɣibů̯x-: ɣibů̯xt*; R-X, B-Rv *ɣibūx-:ɣibūxt* 'narrow; shrink', and their gender-distinguishing intransitive counterpart *ɣibuxt~ɣibaxt* – common to all languages of the group).

[35] In Shughni this form is not attested.

The gender-distinguishing verb *viruxt~viraxt*, common to all languages of the group, does not have a transitive counterpart based on this same model, but rather a causative counterpart which has the same present and past stem as the intransitive form. Grammatically, these are two verbs which oppose one another in transitivity, and in which the third-singular present form of each verb is different (in R-X the basic present stems are also different in each verb). Cf.: the intransitive verb, pres. stem Sh. *viraў-*, Bj., R-X *viraw-*, past stem Sh.-Ru. Gr. *viruxt~viraxt*, 3sg. pres. Sh-Bj *virōўd*, R-X *virawt, virawd* 'break (intr.)'. The transitive form is as follows: Sh. *viraў-*, Bj. *viraw*, Sh.-Bj. *virīўd*, R. *virint*, X. *virīnt* 'break (tr.)'.

As can be seen in Table 15, in the Bajuwi dialect, the causative form with the suffix *-ēn-* is more commonly used than in Shughni (cf. Sh.-Bj. *riwêz-:riwêzd*, also Bj. *riwazēn-*, *riwazēnt* 'cause to fly off').

§51. Ultimately, all languages and dialects of the group are quite close with respect to the use of the *u~a* model in gender-distinguishing verbs, and in many cases their forms are identical. This identicalness can be explained by the already established pattern that the short vowels *u, a, i* in all languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group are realized the same (Sokolova 1953: 126-128). For this reason, the gender-distinguishing vowel models *u~a* and *i~a* are common to all languages and dialects of the group. It can also be mentioned that when a vowel which is specific to a particular language or dialect (e.g. R-X *o*, X *æ*) participates in gender distinction, such a vowel will of course correspond to other vowels in the other languages of the group, and, consequently, we observe regular discrepancies among languages.

Regarding the use of long vowels which participate in gender distinction in verbs (as well as in nouns), we see similarities among these languages. Cross-linguistic gender correspondences have a rule-based character and do not go beyond the fundamental system of correspondences in the vowel systems of these languages. The types of gender-distinguishing verbs examined below convincingly attest to the pattern-based correspondences in gender (re-)vocalization in the languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group.

§52. The second type of gender-distinguishing vocalization has the following two variants with respect to how it is realized in the languages and dialects of the group.

First variant: Sh-Bj ***ī~ā***; R-X ***o~ā***, Bt-Rv ***ö̈~ā***

The first variant is characterized by an identical feminine vowel *ā* in all languages and dialects of the group, but by the significant divergence in all languages with respect to the masculine vowel, where all language groups have their own vocalization model.

This vocalization model has a wide distribution in nouns (see §§16-23), but in verbs it includes only a relatively limited number of words (only five attested verbs). Gender vocalization here, in comparison with nouns, is rather clear and without special deviations.

Gender-distinguishing stems which follow this model of vocalization are given in Table 16.

Table 16

LANGUAGE	MASC.	FEM.	GLOSS	ORIGIN
Sh.	*naxfīd*	*naxfād*	fall out; be pulled out	**niš-fata-*, √*fan*
Bj.	*narfīd, naxfīd*	*narfād, naxfād*		
R-X	*nawfod*	*nawfād*		
B-Rv	*nawfö̤d*	*nawfād*		
Sh-Bj	*sifīd*	*sifād*	rise	**us-patta-*, √*pat*
R-X	*sifod*	*sifād*		
Bt-Rv	*sifö̤d*	*sifād*		
Sh-Bj	*naɣ̌jīd*	*naɣ̌jād*	pass	**niž-gata-* or **niž-gasa-*
R-X	*nawžod*	*nawžād*		
Bt-Rv	*nawžö̤d*	*nawžād*	cross	
Sh-Bj	*pêxt*	*pêxt*	cook (intr.); ripen	**paxta-*, Av. *pača-*; √*pak*
R-X	*poxt*	*pāxt*		
B-Rv	*pö̤xt*	*pāxt*		
Sh-Bj	*viwīd*	*viwād*	refuse, renounce, take offence?	
R-X	*viwīd*	*viwād*		
Bt-Rv	*viwīd*	*viwād*		

§53. As is clear from Table 16, the different masculine vocalization in each language has a regular pattern, which goes back to a single source – namely ancient Iranian **a*. Thus, from a diachronic perspective, all languages share a single origin for the masculine vocalization. The difference in masculine vocalization in the modern languages is connected to their differing reflexes of Iranian **a* in neutral position, which resulted in the masculine vocalization: Sh. *naxfīd, nixfīd*, Bj. *narfīd*, R-X *nawfod*, B-Rv *nawfö̤d* 'fell out; became dislocated (m.)' (**niš-fata*); R-X *poxt*, Bt-Rv *pö̤xt* 'cooked (intr.); ripened' (**paxta-*).

The *a*-umlaut position gave a single result everywhere, and for this reason we get the same feminine vocalization in all languages and dialects of the group: Sh. *naxfād, nixfād*; Bj. *narfād*, R-X, Bt-Rv *nawfād* (**niš-fatā*), R-X, B-Rv *pāxt* (**paxtā-*).

(All of Table 16 is on p. 78.)

As can be seen from Table 16, in Shughni and Rushani the verb *pis-:pêxt* ‘cook (intr.); ripen’ does not have gender distinction. In this case, we get the masculine form preserved, which is apparently via analogy with gender-distinguishing adjectives of the kind Sh.-Bj. *čêxt~čāxt*, R-X *čoxt~čāxt*, B-Rv *čö̤xt~čāxt* ‘crooked, curved’.

§54. Second variant: Sh.-Bj. *ū~ō*, X *ū~ō*, R. *o~ā*, B-Rv *ö̤~ā*

Verbs which have this model of vocalization are given in Table 17:

Table 17

LANGUAGE	MASC.	FEM.	GLOSS	ORIGIN
Sh.-Bj.	*nūst*	*nōst*	sit	**ni-hasta*, Av. *hiða-*, √*had*
X.	*nūst*	*nōst*		
R.	*nost*	*nāst*		
Bt-Rv	*nö̤st*	*nāst*		
Sh-Bj	*pirūst*	*pirōst*	tear (intr.)	**pati-rasta-*,[36] Av. *rada-*, √*rad*
X.	*parūst*	*parōst*		
R.	*parost*	*parāst*		
Bt-Rv	*parö̤st*	*parāst*		
Sh-Bj	*ricūst*	*ricōst*	flee	**us-rasta-*, √*rad*[37]
X.	*racūst*	*racōst*		
R.	*racost*	*racāst*		
Bt-Rv	*racōst*	*racāst*		

This variant, unlike the first variant, has masculine vocalization *ū* for Shughni, Bajuwi, and Khufi, and the same as the first variant for the other languages. Regarding the feminine vocalization, the languages are also divided into two groups: Rushani, Bartangi, and Roshorvi preserve *ā*, as in the first variant, and Shughni, Bajuwi, and Khufi have long *ō*.

[36] The etymology of this verb is controversial (see Sokolova 1967: 26; Morgenstierne 1974: 59).
[37] The root *rad* is reconstructed by V.S. Sokolova on the basis of its correspondence with this verb in Yazgulami: *rað-:růst* and Wakhi *rəð-:rən* (Sokolova 1967: 26, ex. 9); on Morgenstierne's objection to this etymology, see Morgenstierne 1974: 66.

As can be seen from the etymologies given in Table 17, the discrepancies in gender vocalization here is connected not only to umlaut, but also to the position of the vowel in question before two consonants (but not before uvulars, as this regularly leads to vowel lowering): in Shughni, Bajuwi, and Khufi, *a*-umlaut position before to vowels leads to raising (*ā* > *ō*), as in Sh.-Bj *ricōst*, X. *racōst*, but R., Bt-Rv. *racāst* 'fled (f.)' (**us-rastā*-).

Neutral position gives the masculine vocalization, where we see that in Shughni and Bajuwi we have *ū* rather than *ī*, and in Khufi rather than the expected *o* we get *ū*. In Rushani, Bartangi, and Roshorvi no changes occur (cf. Sh.-Bj. *ricūst*, Kh. *racūst*, but R. *racost*, Bt-Rv *racȍst* 'fled (m.)' (**us-rasta*-).

The use in this vocalization model of Shn-Bj. *ū* rather than *ī* (as in the first variant) to some degree may attest to the tendency in Shughni and Bajuwi toward the leveling of gender-distinguishing vowel models based on the more widely found *u*-like model.

(All of Table 17 is on p. 80.)

§55. On the whole, for this second type of gender-distinguishing vowel alternations in verbs, the Shughni-Rushani languages have two types of masculine vocalization: First variant – *ī, o, ȍ*, Second variant – *ū, o, ȍ*); in the feminine form there are likewise two variants – first variant *ā*, second variant *ō, ā*). Table 18 summarizes:

Table 18

Variant	Sh-Bj.		Kh.		Ru.		Bt-Rv.	
	MASC	FEM	MASC	FEM	MASC	FEM	MASC	FEM
I	*ī*	*ā*	*o*	*ā*	*o*	*ā*	*ȍ*	*ā*
II	*ū*	*ō*	*ū*	*ō*	*o*	*ā*	*ȍ*	*ā*

As can be seen from Table 18, in the second variant Khufi differs from the closely related Rushani variety and is fully identical to Shughni and Bajuwi. The expression of feminine gender via *ō* here is a relatively new development, as the fundamental and older way of showing feminine gender is through the vowel *ā*. Thus, Rushani, Bartangi, and Roshorvi in this case show a certain archaism in having *ā* as a feminine marker.

§56. All gender-distinguishing verbs here, with the exception of *viwīd~viwād* 'reject; renounce' have a non-gender-distinguishing transitive verb counterpart. The causative forms of the verbs shown in Tables 16 and 17 are shown in Table 19.

The following verb, which distinguishes gender in Rushani, Khufi, Bartangi, and Roshorvi, does not have a corresponding causative formation: Sh.-Ru. Gr. *pis-*: R-X *poxt*, Bt-Rv. *pöxt*, Sh-Bj. *pêxt* 'cooked; ripened', with feminine forms R-X, B-Rv *pāxt*, Sh-Bj. *pêxt*, 3sg. present Sh.-Ru. Gr. *pist*; perf. masc. R-X *poxč*, R., B-Rv *pöxč*, Sh-Bj. *pêxč*, fem perf. Bt-Rv. *pēxč*, X. *pæxc*, Sh-Bj. *pêxč*. However, this verb does have an opposing transitive verb, which in the past tense and perfect is identical to the intransitive form (masculine?), but which has a distinct 3-sg. present form Sh.-Bj. *pīdz-* 'cook (tr.)'.

Table 19 (all forms are Sh-Bj. unless otherwise specified)

PAST M.	PAST F.	CAUSATIVE STEM	CAUSATIVE GLOSS
Sh. *naxfīd*	*naxfīd*	*naxfēn-:naxfēnt*	remove; pull out
nixfīd	*nixfād*	*nixfēn-:nixfēnt*	
Bj. *narfīd*	*narfād*	*narfēn-:narfēnt*	
naɣjīd	*naɣjād*	*naɣdzimb-:naɣdzimt*	take across; pass (tr.)
sifīd	*sifād*	*sifēn-:sifēnt*	take up; cause to rise
nūst	*nōst*	*nêð-:nêðd*	set; plant
pirūst	*pirōst*	*pirēnd-:pirēnt*	sever
ricūst	*ricōst*	*ricêθ-:ricêθt*; Bj. *ricaθēn-:ricaθēnt*	to cause to flee; chase off

Thus, our two classes of verbs – gender-distinguishing intransitive versus non-gender-distinguishing causative, is carried out consistently here as well.

§57. Third type: The third type of gender-vowel alternation, as with a series of verbs with the model *u~a*, diachronically can be traced back to **a*.

Synchronically, this type of verbs is characterized by the cluster *-vd* in the past stem, and also by an identical masculine vowel in all languages except Rushani and by a similar feminine vowel in many of them. As with the group above, two variants can eb separated within this third type.

First variant: Sh.: ***ū~ō*,** Bj. ***ū~ō(ā)*,** X. ***ū~ā(ō)*,** R. ***u~ā*,** Bt-Rv. ***ū~ā***

This model occurs in a total of seven verbs which are shown in Table 20. The distinguishing characteristic of this group of verbs, in addition to their vowels, is the fact that they end in the consonant cluster *-vd*, which largely contributes to their distinct vowel pattern.

Table 20

LANG.	MASC.	FEM.	GLOSS	ORIGIN
Sh.	*biðūvd*	*biðōvd*	shut (e.g. of eyes)	**upa-dapta-*, cf. Av. *dapta-*, √*dap*
Bj.	*biðūvd*	*biðāvd*		
X.	*biðūvd*	*biðāvd*		
Bt.-Rv.	*biðūve*	*biðāvd*		
Sh.	*niðūvd*	*niðōvd*	stick, adhere	**ni-dapta-*, cf. Av. *dapta*, √*dap*
Bj.	*niðūvd*	*niðāvd*, *niðōvd*		
Kh.	*niðūvd*	*niðāvd*, *niðōvd*		
Bt.-Rv.	*niðūvd*	*niðāvd*		
Sh.	*piðūvd*	*piðāvd*	ignite ; light (of a fire)?; stick; adhere?	**pati-dafsa-* or **pati-dufsa*, Av. *dapta-*, √*dap*
Bj.	*piðūvd*	*piðāvd, piðōvd*		
X.	*piðūvd, paðūvd*	*piðāvd, paðāvd*	infect ; contaminate	
Ru.	*paðuvd*	*paðāvd*		
Sh.-Bj.	*wirūvd*	*wirōvd*	stand	(**ava-*, **vi-*), *rapta-*, √*rap* or √*rab*, Av. *rap-*
X.	*wirūvd*	*wirōvd*		
Bt.-Rv.	*wirūvd*	*wirāvd, wirōvd*		
Ru.	*wiruvd*	*wirāvd*		
Sh.	*anǰūvd*	*anǰōvd*	begin (of tribal skirmishes)	**han-kafsa,* √*kap*
Bj.	*inǰūvd*	*inǰōvd*		
X.	*inǰūvd*	*inǰōvd*		
Ru.	*inǰivd*	*inǰivd*		
Bt.-Rv.	*inǰivd*	*inǰivd*		
Sh.	*sitūvd*	*sitōvd*	fry ; roast (intr.)	**us-tafsa- ;* **us-tapta*, √*tap*

Bj.	*sitūvd*	*sitāvd,* *sitōvd*		
X.	*sitūvd*	*sitāvd*		
Bt.-Rv.	*sitūvd*	*sitāvd*		
Ru.	*situvd,* *sitāvd*	*sitāvd*		
Sh.	*cirūvd*	*cirōvd*	burn ; sting	
Bj.	*cirūvd*	*cirāvd,* *cirōvd*		
X.	*cirūvd*	*cirāvd*		
Bt.-Rv.	*cirūvd*	*cirāvd*		
Ru.	*ciruvd,* *cirāvd*	*cirāvd*		

As can be seen in Table 20, all of these verbs are of the same type. Among them, three verbs (*biðīvdow, niðīvdow, piðīvdow*) can be traced back to a single historical source.[38]

(Table 20 is on pages 84-85; part of fn. 37 is also on p. 84).

The masculine vocalization is derived from Proto-Iranian **a* before *vd*. In all languages except Rushani the result is *ū*; in Rushani it is short *u*. This discrepancy is not random. In Rushani, unlike the other languages and dialects of the group, the position before *vd* does not cause vowels to lengthen, even in non-gender-distinguishing words: cf. Ru. *sivd* 'shoulder', but Sh.-Bj., X. *sīvd*, and Ru. *tivd* 'mosquito', but Sh.-Bj., X. *tūvd*; Ru. *x̌uvd* 'milk', but Sh.-Bj., X. *x̌ūvd*; etc.

The *a*-umlaut position gives the feminine vowels (**upa-daptā* > Sh. *biðōvd*, remaining languages *biðāvd* 'shut', etc.). Here, the correspondence between languages and dialects change drastically. The long vowel *ā* – the ancient marker of feminine gender – is preserved in Rushani, Bartangi, and Roshorvi. In Shughni we find the raising of this vowel *ā* > *ō*. In Bajuwi and Khufi this narrowing takes place in two verbs (Bj., X. *wirōvd* 'stood (f.)', *inǰōvd* 'began (f.)'). In

[38] G. Morgenstierne derives Sh. *biðafc- :biðovd* from **upa-dufsa* on the basis of a similar verb in Yaghnobi, Sogdian, and Persian, but he does not exclude the possibility of an *a*-vocalization form of this verb: **dafsa-* (Morgenstierne 1974: 18). The connection of this verb with *niðīvdow* is well-founded. We can also add a few nouns and adjectives to this same source: Sh.-Bj. masc. *ðufcak*, Yz. *ðofc* 'a thorn sticking to one's clothes' or 'annoying; insolent' and *piðafcak* 'infectious; contagious (of a sickness)'. Thus, because the verb *niðīvdow* can be traced back to Avestan participle *dapta-* (Sokolova 1967: 26), we can also trace back the two previously mentioned nouns back to this same source, which are similar to it both in form and in content. The intiial elements *bi-*, *ni-*, *pi-* can be derived from different ancient prefixes (possibly *ni* < *ni- and *pi-, bi-* < **apa-, *upa-*, etc.).

the other cases, we observe the parallel usage of *ā/ō*, which attests to an emerging tendency in these languages toward the adoption of *ō*-vocalization instead of *ā*-. The emergence of *ō* in Bajuwi and Khufi could be connected to influence from Shughni, although this question needs further investigation and refinement.

§59. Another special characteristic lies in the relative weakness of gender fixation in this group of verbs, which is reflected in the fact that feminine verbs stems with *ā* vocalization can be used also with masculine subjects:[39] *sitāvd* 'fried (intr.)'; *niðāvd* 'stuck', *biðāvd, paðāvd* 'shut', *cirāvd* 'burnt'.

In sentences with a masculine subject – whether animate or inanimate – the masculine form of these verbs can easily substituted for the feminine form. Examples: Ru. *yā gūx̌t sitāvd//situvd* 'the meat fried' (*gūx̌t* is masc.); Bj. *wi bōb lů̊vd: mu ɣ̌in mōd xu, waz-im wim avēn cirūvd* (//*cirāvd; sitūvd//sitāvd*) 'his grandfather said: my wife died and I grieved for her'.

Regarding *ō* in Shughni, although it apparently arose rather late as a marker of the feminine gender, the gender opposition with masculine stems is upheld consistently and without many deviations. As can be seen in Table 20, the equivalent of Sh. *anǰīvdow* in Rushani, Bartangi, and Roshorvi) has *i*-like vocalization and does not undergo gender distinction: R, Bt.-Rv. *inǰivd* 'began (of tribal skirimishes)'. On the other hand, there is a separate verb which is outwardly similar the verb mentioned above but which does not undergo gender distinction in Shughni or Bajuwi: Sh.-Bj. *wižifc*, Sh. *wižafc-ːwižīvd*, Ru. *wižafs-ːwižīvd*, in Derzud *wižuvd*, f. *wižāvd*'; X. *wižafc-ː wižīvd*, f. *wižāvd//wižōvd*, Bt. *wižafc-ːwižīvd*, f. *wižāvd* 'to return'; cf. the causative: Sh.-Bj. *wižāb-ːwižīvd*, R.-X, Bt. *wižīb-ːwižīpt* 'return (tr.)'.

§60. To this variant – i.e. with the cluster *vd* in the past stem – we can add the verb, we can add the verb meaning 'sleep', which distinguishes gender and is different in each language in the following way (on this type of vocalization, see §67): masc. Ru.-Kh. *x̌ů̊vd*, Bt. *ax̌ōvd*, Sh.-Bj., Rv. *x̌ōvd*; fem. R-X. *x̌ōvd*, Bt. *ax̌āvd*, Sh.-Bj. *x̌ōvd*. As we can see, this verb does not inflect for gender in Shughni, Bajuwi, or Roshorvi (*x̌ōvd* 'slept – m./f.'). In the other languages, gender distinction in this verb takes place in a separate manner than the verbs discussed above (masc. R-X. *ū*, Bt. *ō*; fem. R-X. *ō*, Bt. *ā*), a manner which is characteristic for the type of verbs discussed below (see §67). It is easy to see here that the masculine vocalization (R-X *ů̊*, Bt. *ō*) is analogous to the nominal model (cf. R-X *vů̊rǰ*, Sh-Bj, Bt-Rv. *vōrǰ* 'horse; steed'). The feminine vowel in Bartangi, namely *ā* (*ax̌āvd*), is in all likelihood a new development and could have arisen via analogy with the feminine forms of the verbs in Table 20 (of the type *biðāvd* 'shut', *wirāvd* 'stood', etc.).[40]

§61. Second variant: Sh.-Bj**. *ū~ō***; Kh. ***ū~ō***; Bt. ***ū~ō***; Rv. ***ū(u)~ō***; Ru. ***u(ů̊)~ā***

[39] This deviation was also observed by Sokolova for the Rushani verbs *situvd~sitāvd*, *niðuvd~niðāvd*, where the masculine form is used by the older generation, but the feminine form is that which dominates and is found in everyday speech (Sokolova 1967: 26, ex. 10).
[40] Sokolova (1967: 41, ex. 60) is of the same opinion.

Verbs with this variant of gender-distinguishing vowel correspondences are given in Table 21. The characteristic feature of this group of verbs is that they have the cluster *-yd* in their final position (from **-ɣd-* < **-xt-*). The sonorant **y* is the reflex of historical **k/č* (Sokolova 1967: §29, 162). In Rushani, Bartangi, and Roshorvi, in one verb we get *-w-* instead of *y*, and in this verb gender distinction does not occur in these languages: Ru., Bt., Rv. *indawd* 'got up (m./f.)', but Sh. *andūyd~andōyd*, Bj., *indūyd~indōyd*.

Table 21

LANG.	MASC.	FEM.	GLOSS	ORIGIN
Sh.-Bj.	*tūyd*	*tōyd*	go; leave	**taýda-*, (ГОЯШ §29); **taxta-* (EVSh 82); Av. √*tak*
Kh.	*tuyd*	*tōyd*		
Bt.-Rv.	*tūyd*	*tōyd*		
Ru.	*tuyd*	*tāyd*		
Sh.	*andūyd*	*andōyd*	get up	**ham-tača(ya)*, √*tak* (ГОЯШ 37, cf. EVSh 14), Av. √*tak*, *tāčaya-*
Bj.	*indūyd*	*indōyd*		
Kh.	*induyd*	*indōyd*		
Bt.-Rv.	*indawd*	*indawd*		
Ru.	*indawd*	*indawd*		
Sh.-Bj.	*naxtūyd*	*naxtōyd*	go out	**niš-tačta-* (EVSh 52); √*tak*, Av. *tāčaya-*; could also be **niš-taxta* or **niš-taɣda*
Kh.	*nixtuyd, naxtuyd*	*nixtōyd, naxtōyd*		
Bt.	*naxtūyd, nixtūyd*	*naxtōyd, nixtōyd*		
Rv.	*naxtuyd*	*naxtōyd*		
Ru.	*nixtuyd*	*nixtāyd*		
Sh.	*aɣ̌ūyd*	*aɣ̌ōyd*	lie (down)	**ā-(hi)šačyā-, *-šāčaya-* (EVSh 13; cf. ГОЯШ §27; Av. *ā-šay-*
Bj.	*awūyd*	*awōyd*		
Kh.	*awuyd*	*awōyd*		

Bt.-Rv.	*awūyd*	*awōyd*		
Ru.	*awuyd*	*awāyd*		

As can be seen in Table 21, historical **a* in neutral position became masculine vocalization in two forms: Sh.-Bj., Bt.-Rv. *ū* and R-X. *u* (**taxta-* > Sh.-Bj., Bt.-Rv. *tūyd*; R-X. *tuyd*). In this variant, we can see that Khufi is like Rushani, whereas Bartangi and Roshorvi, unlike the first variant discussed above, behave like Shughni. The Roshorvi form *naxtuyd* 'left (m.)' should perhaps be considered the result of influence from Rushani.

The *a*-umlaut position gives the feminine vocalization, in which Rushani, as in the first variant, has long *ā*, where has the remaining languages and dialects have *ō* (cf. **taxtā-* > Sh.-Bj., X., Bt.-Rv. *tōyd*, Ru. *tāyd* 'left (f.)').

(All of Table 21 is on p. 89).

§62. The fundamental source for *ō*-vocalization in feminine verbs is the same as in nouns and adjectives (cf. *vūyd~vōyd* 'evil spirit'; *rūšt~rōšt* 'red'; etc.). This type of vocalization received a wide distribution primarily in Shughni verbs.

The fact that we get a root *ō* (fem.) in all languages except Rushani (and also a masculine *ū*) can be partially explained by the position of the vowel (in this case *ō* < **a*) before two consonants, where Khufi, Bartangi, and Roshorvi are often different from their closely related neighbor Rushani, and are instead closer to Shughni. We see the same pattern in other areas of the lexicon as well (cf. Sh.-Bj., Kh., Bt-Rv. *wūrǰ*, Ru. *wurǰ* 'wolf'). Because *ō*-vocalization has a wide distribution across languages (it is found in all the languages of the group, except Rushani), it shouldn't be considered entirely the result of influence of Shughni on the other languages of the group which also have *ō* (see Sokolova 1967, §43, ex. 39). The influence of Shughni might be considered a strengthening factor, but certainly not the only source for the wide distribution of *ō*.

As can be seen from Table 21, the verb with the meaning 'get up' has only a single non-gender-distinguishing form in Rushani, Roshorvi, and Bartangi (cf. Ru. *yā čuruk indawd*, but Sh. *yu čorik andūyd* 'that man got up'; Ru. *yā ǰanak indawd* but Sh. *yā ǰinik andōyd* 'that woman got up.'). In this case, the *a* vowel indicates that Rushani, Bartangi, and Roshorvi have preserved the feminine form and lost the masculine form.

The following verb can be considered structurally similar to the verbs of this type, though its etymology is unclear: Sh.-Bj. *riwūyd~riwōyd*, Bt-Rv. *rawūd~rawōd*, Ru. *rawů(y)d~rawō(y)d*, Kh. *rawūd~rawōd* 'to get hungry; to grow tired because of hunger'.

Ultimately, we can say that each gender can be expressed by two vowels in this variant: masc. *ū* (Sh.-Bj., Bt.-Rv.), *u* (Ru.-X.), and feminine *ō* (Sh.-Bj., X., Bt.-Rv.), *ā* (Ru.).

§63. The verbs in Tables 20 and 21 – namely those of Type 3 – also have causative forms, which are shown in Table 22. Here, both the Shughni and Bajuwi dialects are given. Only when a causative form is absent in Shughni and Rushani are data from other languages given.

Table 22

FEM.	**MASC.**	**CAUSATIVE**	**CAUS. GLOSS**
Sh. *andūyd*, Bj. *indūyd*	*andōyd,* *indōyd*	*andů̊dz-:andů̊dzd,* *indů̊dz-:indů̊dzd*	cause to get up
Sh. *aɣ̌ūyd,* Bj. *awūyd*	*aɣ̌ōyd,* *awōyd*	*aɣ̌êz-:aɣ̌êzd,* *awaysēn-:awaysēnt*	lay down to sleep (tr.)
Sh. *biðūvd,* Bj. *biðūvd*	*biðōvd,* *biðāvd*	*biðēmb-:biðēmt*	shut (tr.)
Sh. *cirūvd,* Bj. *cirūvd*	*cirōvd,* *cirāvd*	*cirēmb-:cirēmt*	(cause to) burn, sting
Sh. *anǰūvd*, Bj. *inǰūvd*	*anǰōvd,* *inǰōvd*	*anǰāv-:anǰūvd,* *inǰāv-:inǰūvd*	grab, grasp
Sh. *niðūvd*, Bj. *niðūvd*	*niðōvd,* *niðāvd*	*niðēmb-:niðēmt*	stick (tr.)
Sh. *piðūvd*, Bj. *piðūvd*	*piðāvd,* *piðāvd*	*piðēmb-:piðēmt*	connect; hitch
Sh. *riwūyd*, Bj. *riwūyd*	*riwōyd,* *riwōyd*	Bj. *riwaysēn-* *:riwaysēnt;*	cause to go hungry
Bj. *rivūd*	*rivōd*	*rivêr-:rivêrt*	cause to give milk
Sh. *sitūvd*, Bj. *sitūvd*	*sitōvd,* *sitāvd*	*sitêb-: sitêpt*	roast; fry (tr.)
Sh.-Bj. *tūyd*, X. *tuyd*	*tōyd,* *tōyd*	-, *tayēn- :tayēnt*	to take away
Sh.-Bj. *wirūvd*,	*wirōvd*	*wirēmb-:wirēmt*	leave standing
Sh. *x̌ōvd*, Bj. *(a)x̌ōvd*	*x̌ōvd,* *ax̌āvd*	Bj. *x̌afcēn-:x̌afcēnt*	lay down to sleep (tr.)

We note only a few things here. The verb *tūyd~tōyd* ‘go; leave’ only has a causative form in Khufi, which is formed with the suffix *-ēn*, hence *tayēn-:tayēnt* ‘take away’. In the other languages, the opposing transitive verb with a similar meaning is Sh. *yōs-:yōd* (3sg. *yêst*), Bt. *ayōs-:ayōd* (3sg. *ayōst*). Cf. Kh. *wux̌ tayēnt*; Sh. *wux̌ (//rēn) yêst*, Bj. *wux̌ yêst* ‘go crazy’. For instance: Kh. *dōnd lap tīvd yast idid, wux̌ tayēnt* ‘there are so many mosquitoes that a person goes crazy!’

The gender-distinguishing verb Sh. *anǰafc-*, Bt. *inǰafc-*, Sh. *anǰūvd*, Bj. *inǰūvd*, perf. *anǰūvǰ~anǰīvdz*; Bj. *inǰūvǰ~inǰīvdz*; inf. Sh. *anǰafctow*, Bj. *inǰafctow* 'begin' does not have an opposing causative form with typical causative formation. However, it is opposed by a verb with a similar form: *anǰāv-:anǰūvd* (3sg. *anǰīvd*), inf. *anǰīvdow* 'grab; grasp'.

The intransitive verb with the meaning 'sleep' is opposed in Bajuwi by the causative form *x̌afcēn-:x̌afcēnt* 'lay down to sleep (tr.)'. In the other languages of the group, this causative meaning is done a different way: in Shughni with the verb *aɣ̌êz-:aɣ̌êzd* 'lay down to sleep (tr.)', which simultaneously opposes the intransitive verb *aɣ̌as-:aɣ̌ūyd~aɣ̌ōyd*. In Rushani, the verb *x̌ů̊vd~x̌ōvd* 'slept' is opposed by the verb *niway-:niwid* 'lay down to sleep (tr.)'; and in Bartangi it is opposed by *indzūv-:indzūvd* with the same meaning. In Bajuwi, *indzů̊v-:indzů̊vd* (together with *x̌afcēn-:x̌afcēnt*) has the same meaning.

(All of Table 22 is on p. 92.)

The gender-distinguishing verb Sh. *nax̌tīdōw* does not have a corresponding causative form in any of these languages. However, the verb Sh.-Bj. *ziwêð-:ziwōst*, R-X. *ziwēð-:ziwů̊st*; Bt.-Rv. *ziwōð-:ziwōst* 'take out; pull out' is commonly used with this causative meaning.

Thus, most gender-distinguishing intransitive verbs have a corresponding causative verb of the same root. However, this is not always the case, and when a corresponding causative verb does not exist for a given gender-distinguishing intransitive verb, then a different verb stem (sometimes of a different root) is used in its place.

§64. Fourth type: *ū~ō*

The fourth type of gender vowel alternation is common to all languages and dialects, where the masculine vowel is *ū*, and the feminine vowel is *ō*. This model is found in only four verbs (see Table 28).

Table 28

LANG.	MASC.	FEM.	GLOSS	ORIGIN
Sh.-Bj.	*mūd*	*mōd*	die	**mr̥ta-*, √*mar*, Av. *mirya-:mərəta-*
R-X., Bt-Rv.	*mūg*	*mōg*		
Sh.	*pirmūd*	*pirmōd*	wither; shrivel (of plants)	**pari-mrta-*; √*mar*

Bj.	*parmūd*	*parmōd*		
R-X, Bt.	*parmūg*	*parmōg*		
Rv.	*parmūg*	*parmūg*		
Sh.-Bj.	*rivūd*	*rivōd*	to flow/drip down (of milk during milking)	**fra-barya-*; **fra-bāraya-*, √*bar*; Av. *bairya-*:*bərəta-*
R-X., Bt	*ravūg*	*ravōg*		
Rv.	*ravūg*	*ravūg*		

Historically speaking, this type of vowel alternation is the reflex of **ṛ* and **ar*.[41] However, regarding the reflex of **rt*, the languages of the group fall into two categories: a) in Shughni and Bajuwi, the cluster **rt* becomes *d*, and b) in the remaining languages, **rt* becomes *g*. This discrepancy is seen in many words, both nouns and verbs, and regardless of whether they distinguish gender or not: cf. the following:

Avestan *bərəta-* > Sh.-Bj. *vūd*; R-X., Bt-Rv. *vūg* 'brought';

Avestan *pərəta-* > Sh. *pūd*; R-X, Bt-Rv. *pūg* 'ford';

Avestan *karəta-* > Sh.-Bj. *čêd*, R-X, Bt-Rv. *čēg* 'knife', etc.

(All of Table 23 is on p. 94.)

Historically, neutral position in all languages results in the same masculine vowel *ū* (cf. **mṛta-* > Sh.-Bj. *mūd*, R-X, Bt-Rv. *mūg*). And the *a*-umlaut position results in an identical vowel in all languages, namely *ō*: **mṛtā-* > Sh.-Bj. *mōd*, R-X, Bt-Rv. *mōg*.

We can also add the verb Sh. *čīdow*, which is structurally similar to this type of verb and has the meaning 'do', or in some cases 'be done'. In all languages of the group the present stem of this verb is *kin-*; the past stem is Sh.-Bj. *čūd*; Bt.-Rv. *čūg*; R-X. masc. *čūg* < *kṛta-*, Av. *kərəta-*, √*kar*; fem. *čōg* < **kṛtā-*.

[41] Regarding the reflex of **ṛ* and **ar* in Iranian and Pamir languages, see Morgenstierne 1970; Edelman 1963b; §§81-90, 141-147; Dodykhudoev 1962:38-46.

This verb, as is well known, generally belongs to the class of transitive verbs; however, when used as an intransitive auxiliary verb (‘be done’; ‘become’), it shows gender distinction in Rushani and Khufi. In the rest of the languages there is no gender distinction in this verb. Compare the following:

(i) Ru. *yā čurik mawz* ***čūg***; Sh. *yu čorik maǩdzů̊nǰ* ***čūd*** 'that man got hungry’
(ii) Ru. *yā ǩanak mawz* ***čōg***; Sh. *yā ǩinik maǩdzêndz* ***čūd*** ‘that woman got hungry’

When used in its transitive meaning, however, in all languages of the group, including Rushani and Khufi, this verb does not distinguish gender. Compare the following:

(i) Ru. *yā ǩanak day búrǰ-i safēd* ***čūg***; Sh. *yā ǩinik di búrǰ-i safēd* ***čūd*** ‘that woman whitewashed that wall.’
(ii) Ru. *yā čurik day búrǰ-i safēd* ***čūg***; Sh. *yu čorik di búrǰ-i safēd* ***čūd*** ‘that man whitewashed the wall.’

It should also be mentioned that Roshorvi, unlike the other languages of the group, in the majority of cases does not distinguish gender in verbs of this type. Thus, Roshorvi only distinguishes gender in one out of four verbs (*mūg~mōg* ‘died’).

§65. The use here of *ū~ō* gender distinction in Rushani merits special clarification. In nouns, the gender distinction examined here, as a rule, has the model *u~o/ā* (cf. Ru. *rurv~rārv* ‘light red’, but Sh.-Bj., Bt-Rv. *rūrv~rōrv*; R. *rōšt~rāšt* but Sh.-Bj., Kh. *rūšt~rōšt* ‘red’). We find the same type of alternation even in some verb stems: Ru. *nost~nāst* ‘sat’, but Sh,.-Bj., X. *nūst~nōst*; Ru. *tuyd~tāyd*, but Sh-Bj., Bt-Rv. *tūyd~tōyd* ‘left’. These facts suggest that the use of *ū~ō* as a gender-distinguishing model is generally not typical for Rushani. The appearance of *ū* as a marker of masculine gender in Rushani, as it is in the other languages, is closely connected to the fact that it is the reflex of **r̥* and **ar*. The reflexes of **r̥*, **ar* are identical in these languages in the vast majority of cases. As noted by V.S. Sokolova, “originally this was a kind of diphthong of the type *vw* and *ey*, which in Sarikoli was preserved in the form of *ɛw* and *ɛy*, but in the other languages were contracted into the corresponding monophthongs” (Sokolova 1967: §85); compare **karta-* > Sh.-Bj. *čūd*, R-X, Bt-Rv *čūg*, Sr. *čɛwg*; Av. *mərəta-* > Sh.-Bj. *mūd*, R-X., Bt-Rv. *mūg*, Sr. *mɛwg* ‘died’. This type of correspondence is found among these languages even in words which do not distinguish gender: cf. Sh.-Bj. *vūd*, R-X., Bt-Rv. *vūg*, Sr. *vɛyg* ‘brought’; Sh., Bj. *pūd*, R-X, Bt.-Rv. *pūg*, Sr. *pɛwg* ‘ford’, etc.

The infiltration and solidification of *ō* as a feminine marker in Rushani here is apparently connected to influence from the surrounding languages, in particular Shughni, where *ō* has a widespread distribution.

§66. Another special characteristic of this group of verbs regards their (in many cases, lack of) corresponding causative forms. Thus, for instance, the verb *čīdow* and its corresponding verbs in other languages of the group has no causative form in any language. This is obviously connected to the fact that this verb is transitive in its semantics and is opposed by another, inherently intransitive auxiliary verb, namely *sittow*. Compare, for instance, *iǰrō sittow* 'be carried out, fulfilled' vs. *iǰrō čīdow* 'carry out, fulfill'.

The verb meaning 'die' only has a corresponding causative form in Bartangi, which is formed with the suffix *-ōn(t):* Bt. *mirōn:mirōnt*. This verb is interpreted as an intransitive verb with the meaning 'play dead; be lazy' (Karamkhudoev 1973: 147). However, what is important here is the fact that it clearly formally opposes the verb meaning 'die'. Regarding its semantics, I believe that its original meaning must have been 'kill'. However, this meaning was not retained because of the fact that the verb meaning 'die' is opposed in all languages by another verb, namely Sh. *zīdow* (*zīn-:zīd*) and its equivalent in the other varieties. For this reason, there was no need to retain this formally causative verb which opposes the verb meaning 'die'.

For the other two verbs – namely those meaning 'wither, shrivel (of plants)' and 'flow; drip (of milk)', there are no attested causative forms.

§67. Fifth Type: Sh.-Bj. *ō~ō*; R-X. *ů̯~ō*, Bt-Rv. *ō~ā(ō)*

This type is found in all languages and has a rather small distribution (it is found in a total of only three verbs). Shughni and Bajuwi do not distinguish gender in this type, though the other languages and dialects of the group do (except Roshorvi).

Verbs with this type of vocalization are given in Table 24.

Table 24

LANG	MASC.	FEM.	GLOSS	ORIGIN
R-X.	*ðů̯d*	*ðōd*	fall; hit	*dāta-, √dā, Av. *daya-*
Bt-Rv.	*ðōd*	*ðōd*		
Sh.-Bj.	*ðōd*	*ðōd*		
R-X.	*x̌iců̯d*	*xicōd*	freeze	**šč̌āta-*
Bt.	*x̌icōd*	*x̌icād*		
Rv.	*x̌icōd*	*x̌icōd*		
Sh.-Bj.	*x̌icōd*	*x̌icōd*		
R-X.	–	*zōd*	give birth	**zāta-*, Av. *zaya-:zāta-*
Bt-Rv.	–	*zōd*		
Sh.-Bj.	–	*zōd*		

This type of vowel pattern is historically derived from Ancient Iranian *$\bar{a}$. Neutral position gives the masculine vowels: $\breve{u}$ in Rushani, -$\bar{o}$ in Bartangi;[42] Shughni, Bajuwi, and Roshorvi have non-gender-distinguishing $\bar{o}$: *$d\bar{a}ta$- > R-X. $\eth\breve{u}d$, Bt.-Rv., Sh.-Bj. $\eth\bar{o}d$ ‘fell; hit’; *$\check{s}\check{c}ata$- > R-X. $\check{x}ic\breve{u}d$, Bt-Rv., Sh-Bj. $\check{x}ic\bar{o}d$ ‘froze’.

The *a*-umlaut position results in Rushani and Khufi $\bar{o}$, in two Bartangi verbs also $\bar{o}$ (in one $\bar{a}$). In the remaining languages and dialects the same non-gender-distinguishing vowel $\bar{o}$ is used in the feminine: *$d\bar{a}t\bar{a}$- > R-X., Bt-Rv., Sh-Bj. $\eth\bar{o}d$ ‘fell; hit (f.)’; *$\check{s}\check{c}at\bar{a}$- > R-X. $\check{x}ic\bar{o}d$, Bt. $\check{x}ic\bar{a}d$, Rv., Sh.-Bj. $\check{x}ic\bar{o}d$ ‘froze (f.)’.

The vowel $\bar{a}$ in the Bartangi feminine form $\check{x}ic\bar{a}d$ ‘froze’ is apparently the result of analogy with forms of the type R-X., Bt-Rv. *nawžād*, Sh.-Bj. *naǰǰād* ‘passed’; Bt.-Rv., Ru. *wirāvd* ‘stood (f.)’, etc.[43]

(All of Table 24 is on p. 98.)

Of the three verbs given in Table 24, two are opposed by causative forms (Table 25). The verb with the meaning ‘fall; hit’, which in Rushani and Khufi distinguishes gender, in all languages and dialects has an identical causative past stem.

Table 25

INTRANSITIVE		**CAUSATIVE/TRANSITIVE**	
PRES:PAST; PERF.	**3SG**	**PRES:PAST**	**3SG**
R-X. *ðay-:ðŭd~ðōd; ðŭǰ~ðēc*	Ru. *ðayt*, X. *ðayd*	*ðāð-:ðŭd; ðŭǰ*	R. *ðiðd*, X. *ðit*
Bt. *ði-:ðōd*; *ðōǰ~ðēc*	*ðit*	*ðāð-:ðōd; ðōǰ*	*ðēd*
Rv. *ðay-:ðōd*; *ðōč~ðēc*	*ðayd*	*ðāð-:ðōd; ðōč*	*ðēd*
Sh.-Bj. *ði-ðōd*; *ðōðǰ~ðêc*	*ðēd*	*ðāð-:ðōd*; *ðōðǰ*; ‘give; hit’ Bt. *ðiyōn-:ðiyōnt* ‘make go; send forth (of ships?)’	*ðīd*
R.-X. *x̌icay-:x̌icŭd~x̌icōd*; *xicŭǰ~x̌icēc*	*x̌icayd*	*x̌icēw-:x̌icēwt*	*x̌icēwt*

[42] This type of vowel alternation is also found in the verb R-X. *x̌ŭvd*, Bt. *x̌ōvd* ‘slept (m.)’, R-X. *x̌ōvd*, Bt. *ax̌āvd* ‘slept (f.)’ – see §70.

[43] The same opinion is expressed by V.S. Sokolova regarding the Bartangi feminine form *ax̌āvd* ‘slept’ (Sokolova 1967: 41, ex. 60).

Bt. *x̌icī-:x̌icōd~x̌icād*; *x̌icōǰ~x̌icēc*	*x̌icid*	*x̌icawōn:x̌icawōnt*	*x̌icawōnt*
Rv. *x̌icay-:x̌icōd;* *x̌icōč~x̌icēc*	*x̌icayt*		
Sh.-Bj. *x̌ici-:x̌icōd;* *x̌icōðǰ~x̌icêc* ‘freeze (intr.)’	*x̌icēd*	*x̌icêw-:x̌icêwt* ‘freeze (tr.)’	*x̌icêwt*

Because the transitive verb with the meaning ‘give’ is formally identical in its past stem with the masculine form of the intransitive verb meaning ‘fall; hit’, and also because gender distinction in the past tense of the intransitive verb takes place only in Rushani and Khufi, the relevant forms of these two verbs are given for all languages and dialect in Table 25.

As can be seen, Rushani and its Khufi dialect, with respect to this type of gender distinction, stand out among the other languages of the group in that they most consistently show masculine gender (through *ů*) versus feminine gender (through *ō*). However, in the perfect, the intransitive verb in question undergoes gender distinction in all of the languages and dialects of the group.

(All of Table 25 is on p. 99.)

§68. The various changes and variations of the original feminine-gender marker *a/ā* speaks to the incomplete process of development for *a*-vocalization. In order to support this, we can look at experimental data on vowel length. Thus, in materials on the Bajuwi dialect, it is observed that long *ā* and its short variant *a* stand out among the other vowels in their variability in length and their ability to deviate from normal ranges. Upon comparing these two vowels not only to each other, but also to the other short and long vowels, the following distinguishing characteristic appears (see Karamshoev 1963: §30, 41, 49, 51: Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11): in monosyllabic words, and particularly before two consonants, the vowels *a/ā* stand out for their significant duration. The typical length of *ā*, when surrounded by voiced sounds and before two consonants was 27-31 (centi-seconds?), whereas the range for the other vowels in this environment was 22-25. Surrounded by voiceless sounds, the typical length for *ā* was 22-27, whereas for the other vowels it was 17-21. It is interesting that the vowels *a* and *ā*, when appearing in the second syllable of a polysyllabic word (when the first syllable has a long *ā*), show a tendency to shorten. In order to confirm this observation, the duration was measured for *ā*, *a* in two separate conditions: in the second syllable of a word, when (i) the first syllable contains *ā*, and (ii) when the first syllable contains a different vowel. Below examples and their relevant measurements are given:

1) First syllable contains *ā*:

kāl-dā́rð
'headache'
16.6 (4)[44]
–
18-16

dākam 'we give'
12.2 (14)
13-11
15-9

2) First syllable contains another vowel:

qīč-dā́rð
'stomachache'
21.4 (10)
23-22
24-17

dītam 'we hit'
15.7 (15)
17-15
17-13

An *ā* in the second syllable, as can be seen from the data, has two distinct durations. Thus, the presence in one of these syllables of long *ā* is an unfavorable condition for preserving the length of *ā*.

For short *a* in the second syllable, the influence of long *ā* in the first syllable is also clearly visible:

1) *qābar*
'grave'
8.0 (5)
12-8

[44] The duration of the second (final) vowel is given here in the following order: on the first line, first the average duration is given; in parentheses the number of measurements which gave the average is given; on the second line, a typical or normal duration for this vowel is given; on the last line, the limits of the measurements are given.

2) *pő́r=at (ðod)*
'you forded (a river)'
14.0 (5)
15-14

Thus, the shortening of the vowels *ā/a* in final position when there is a long *ā* present in the first syllable is a regular process which attests to the instability of these vowels. The instability of *ā* and *a* is more clearly demonstrated in word formations as a result of which long *ā* becomes short *a* (cf. Sh.-Bj. *gandā* 'foolish; bad' > *gandagi* 'foolishness'; *ɣiðā* 'boy' > *ɣiðayēn* 'boys'; *dāx̌t* 'steppe'; *dax̌ti* 'steppe (adj.)'. Other scenarios lead to short *a* becoming long *ā*: (cf. Sh.-Bj. *tama* 'you (pl.)' > *tamā-m wīnt* 'I saw you'.

On the basis of this instability of *a/ā*, we can conclude that not only a quantitative change (*a>ā; ā>a*), but also a qualitative change took place, which, in particular, let do the raising of *ā* to *ō*. This process – a kind of umlaut – led to the following two interrelated results:

a) to quantitative deviations in *a*-vocalization based upon duration;
b) to qualitative change in the vowel (i.e. *ā* > *ō*).

From another angle, we can assume that the weakening of the gender-distinguishing significance of long *ā* led to the subsequent development and standardization of feminine vocalization with short *a*, which became generalized for all languages and dialects of the group, and which in Roshorvi became the predominant marker of feminine gender, supplanting *i*-vocalization.

§69. The synchronic and historical analysis of the correspondences between ancient Iranian **ā, *a* and Shughni-Rushani *ō*, as well as Rushani-Khufi *ů̊*, allows to delineate – and to an extent, elaborate upon – the double purpose of root *ō*, which acts in some cases as a feminine marker, and in other cases is used as a marker of masculine gender. The comparison of the numerous data here – both of verbs and of nouns – attests to the homonymic nature of *ō* at the current stage of these languages. This is most clearly observable in Shughni and Bajuwi, and somewhat less clear in Khufi, Roshorvi, and Bartangi. Cross-linguistic lines of correspondences allow us to make conclusions regarding *ō* in the following sequence:

1. *ō* as a marker of feminine gender. The fundamental source of this *ō* is Iranian **ā, *r̥* in *a*-umlaut position and before two consonants. Before one consonant, Iranian **ā, r̥* in all languages and dialects underwent raising, and as a result we get *ō* in all languages: **dātā* > Sh.-Ru. *ðōd* 'fell; hit (f.)'; *mərtā-* > Sh.-Bj. *mōd*, R-X., Bt.-Rv. *mōg* 'died (f.)'. The use of the vowel *ō* as a feminine-gender marker became solidified, apparently, rather late. Because in Rushani we see relative conservatism regarding the reflexes of **a, ā*, the emergence of *ō* in Rushani can be considered a result of influence from the surrounding languages, primarily Shughni.

Before two consonants, Ancient Iranian **a* in *a*-umlaut position in Rushani is preserved as long *ā*, and in the remaining languages here we also get raising from *ā* to *ō*: **taxtā* > **taɣdā-* > Ru. *tāyd*, Sh.-Bj., Kh., Bt.-Rv. *tōyd* 'left (f.)'; *raptā-* > Ru. *wirāvd*, Sh.-Bj., Bt-Rv. *wirōvd* 'stood (f.)'.

In this case (i.e. before two consonants), we might say that Rushani exhibits a kind of archaism, which continues to reflect the most ancient form of *a*-vocalization.

> **2. *ō* as a marker of masculine gender.** The origin of this *ō* is also Ancient Iranian **ā, *a*, but in neutral position. In this case, the separation of *ō* as a masculine marker, along with historical correspondences, is easily made possible in the Rushani-Khufi linguistic sphere, where Ancient Iranian **ā* has as its reflex *ů* (in the other languages *ō*). Compare **dāta-* > R-X. *ðůd*, Sh.-Bj., Bt-Rv. *ðōd* 'fell (m.)'; **x̌apta-* > R-X *x̌ůvd*, Sh.-Bj., Rv. *x̌ōvd* 'slept (m.)'. The correspondence between Ancent Iranian **ā* and R-X. *ů* // Sh.-Bj. *ō* is also found in nouns: **bāraka-* < R-X. *vůrǰ*, other languages *vōrǰ* 'steed'; **nāpat* > R-X. *nabůs*, Sh.-Bj. *nibōs*, Bt. *nabōs* 'grandson'; **kāra-* > R-X. *čůr*, Sh.-Bj., Bt-Rv. *čōr* 'man'; etc.

In the end, the homonymic nature of *ō* in each language creates an unfavorable environment for gender distinction. Each language, with the goal of removing this homonymic phenomenon, makes use of different means, and for this reason we see such significant differences in gender markings among these languages.

§70. The facts attest to the notion that in each language group there occurred a kind of reorganization of gender marking, which had as its impetus the homonymic nature of *ō*. This reorganization can be boiled down to the following:

> 1. In Rushani and Khufi, the vowel *ů* gained widespread distribution as a marker of masculine gender, and the vowel *ō* became more restricted to words with feminine gender (cf. R-X. *x̌ůvd* 'slept (m.)', *vůrǰ* 'steed', *ðůrk* 'stick'; etc.).
>
> 2. In Bartangi, on the other hand, we find a tendency toward the use of *ō* as a masculine marker, and for this reason a need arose in several cases for the re-formation of the feminine marker based on *a*-vocalization (cf. *ax̌ōvd~ax̌āvd* 'slept'). However, this kind of re-formation is seen only in individual cases, and we can say that the homonymic nature of *ō* is still preserved (cf. the following masculine noun Sh.-Bj., Bt-Rvs. *vōrǰ*, *ðōrg*).
>
> 3. In Shughni, Bajuwi, and Roshorvi, the gender distinction mentioned above (*ů~ō*) is lacking altogether, and for this reason the homonymic nature of *ō* is fully preserved (cf. *x̌ōvd* 'slept m/f').

Therefore, the *ō*-vocalization in Rushani, although it can be considered a new formation (the older vocalization being *ā*), is nonetheless associated with feminine gender.

The strength of *ō* as a marker of feminine gender in Rushani and Khufi is supported by the fact that it is opposed by masculine *ů*, a vowel which in Bartangi and Roshorvi is lacking altogether, and which in Shughni and Bajuwi, though found rather frequently, does not have any role in gender distinction.[45]

If we consider the correspondence Sh-Bj, Bt-Rv *ō* ~ R-X *ů*, then the homonymic nature and ambiguity of *ō* disappears to a certain extent, and oblique means appear for determining the gender of *ō* in the languages other than Rushani-Khufi: *ō* in Shughni, Bajuwi, Bartangi, and Roshorvi, when corresponding with Rushani-Khufi *ů*, is found in masculine words. This occurs in both animate and inanimate nouns (for animate nouns: R-X *vůrǰ*, other languages, *vōrǰ* 'horse'; R-X *bůb*, Sh-Bj., B-Rv *bōb* 'grandfather'; for inanimate nouns: R-X *ðůrk*, other languages *ðōrg* 'log'; R-X *půθ*, Sh-Bj, Bt-Rv. *pōθ* 'bullet').

All this goes to say that the vowel *ů* plays a significant role in the system of gender vowel alternations in Rushani and Khufi, and also has a role as an oblique means of determining the gender of words in the other languages. However, it should also be noted here that semantic grounds (and the existence of synonyms) also play a role in the gender correspondences of inanimate nouns containing *ō* (Sh-Bj, B-Rv), which show the correspondence *ů~ō* in Ru-Kh.

§71. On whether we can consider non-gender-distinguishing stems in *o* (e.g. *ðod*) to be a remnant of the Old Iranian feminine participle. It is noted that there are very few recorded stems of verbs which have no gender-distinguishing forms in any of the Shughni-Rushani languages that have the vowel *o*. Examples:

VERB	PST STEM	GLOSS
birêx̌tow	*birox̌t*	drink
zinêdow	*zinod*	wash
ziwêstow	*ziwost*	take away
zêx̌tow	*zox̌t*	take
parðêdow	*parðod*	sell
yêdow	*yod*	take
rimêdow	*rimod*	command

It is noted also that when gender-marking is lost, it is typically the masculine form which is preserved while the feminine form is lost.

[45] The distribution of *ů* in Rushani and Khufi is sharply distinct than in Shughni and Bajuwi. Compare: Sh., Bj. *vůr*, remaining languages *vūr* 'brown'l Sh.-Bj. *wůn*, R. *wāwn*, Bt-Rv, X. *wōwn* 'wool'; Sh. *mūn*, Bj. *můn*, R. *māwn*, Bt-Rv, X. *mōwn* 'apple'. We find *ů* in Shughni and Bajuwi regularly before nasals *-m* and *-n*, even in borrowed words: Sh.-Bj. *ǰůn*, R-X, Bt-Rv. *ǰōn* 'spirit'; Sh-Bj. *nům*, R-X., Bt-Rv. *nōm* 'name'.

§72. The relation of the Shughni-Rushani languages to each other with respect to gender-distinguishing vowel patterns generally parallels the situations in nouns and adjectives. Nonetheless, in gender-distinguishing verbs there are a few special characteristics, and in some cases significant differences.

One of the biggest differences is the fact that we get *i*-like vocalization in the feminine forms of a number of nouns (of the type *bic*, *kid*, *piš*, etc.). But this type of vocalizations in lacking in past-tense verb stems. Hence, there are two types of vocalization with short vowels in nouns: *u~a* and *u~i*; however, only the former type is found in past-tense verb stems.

The rest of this section summarizes gender-distinguishing vowel alternations in past-tense verb stems.

§73. (Table 26 summarizes these vowel alternations.) On the basis of the Table 26, we can make the following conclusions:

> **(i)** Gender distinction via short vowels, both in nouns and verbs, is a common and uniting feature of all the Shughni-Rushani languages. The model *u~a* should be considered the most universal and predominant type of vowel alternation, not only in verbs, but also in other parts of speech (in adjectives, onomatopoeic words, and in figurative words).
>
> **(ii)** With regard to the use of long vowels in gender-distinguishing verb stems, there are significant differences among the Shughni-Rushani languages. However, all correspondences are regular from the point of view of the historical development of vowels and the influence of phonetic factors.
>
> **(iii)** The most common type of gender differentiation in verbs which uses long vowels is that in which the Shughni masculine vowel is *ī*.

The remainder of this section gives a few more conclusions. Table 27 on page 113 is a helpful illustration of gender-distinguishing vowel correspondences across Shughni-Rushani languages.

§74. More generalizations on gender-distinguishing vowel correspondences across languages.

Gender in perfect stems

§75. A large group of intransitive verbs distinguishes gender in the perfect. In quantitative terms, there are many more gender-distinguishing forms in perfect stems than in past stems, a fact which ca be explained by the two following factors. First, all verbs which inflect for gender in their past stems also inflect for gender in the perfect. And second, the number of gender-distinguishing perfect forms have corresponding past forms which do not distinguish gender. For instance in the Shughni verbs *biǐeðǰ~biǐec* 'swell' (pst. stem *biǐed*); *piðiðǰ~piðic* 'go out (of a fire)' (pst. stem *piðid*).

§76. From a synchronic point of view, the following distinctions can be made regarding the form of past and perfect stems:

> **(i)** To distinguish gender in the perfect, along with stem-internal vowel alternations (which are the only means by which gender is distinguished in past stems), we also get final-consonant distinctions in *-č/-ǰ* (m.) versus *-c/-dz* (f.). Compare, for instance, Shughni *tūyǰ* '(has) gone (m.)' vs. *tīc* '(has) gone (f.)'. This verb has the past stems *tūyd* (m.) and *toyd* (f.).
>
> **(ii)** In perfect stems, unlike in past stems, verbs which distinguish gender have a special form for the plural. Compare, for instance, the masculine perfect stem *viruǩč*, its feminine counterpart *viriǩc*, and the plural form *viraǩč*. This verb has the past masculine form *viruǩt* and a single form *viraǩt* for the feminine/plural past stem. As a rule, the feminine form of past stems is also used to agree with plural subjects. Nonetheless, the perfect plural form is neutral with respect to gender.[46] Compare for instance *wāð čīni-yen=en viraǩč* (*čīni* 'bowl' – f.) and *wāð wūs-en=en viraǩč* (*wūs* 'beam' – m.).
>
> **(iii)** The feminine vowels of the perfect differ from those of past stems. But there is some similarity with respect to the masculine vowels of past and perfect stems. Hence, the analysis above on the different types of vowels for masculine gender in past stems can to some extent be extended to the masculine vowels of the perfect. In the discussion that follows, close attention will be given to the examination of the vowels of the feminine perfect and to the elucidation of the specific characteristics which distinguish feminine perfect vowels from feminine past vowels.

[46] The same situation is found in Bartangi, despite the dubious analysis of Karamkhudoev (1973: 168-169), who indicates that gender is distinguished in both the plural and singular in Bartangi.

§77. From a historical point of view, the perfect stem of the Shughni-Rushani languages, as well as the other Pamir languages, continues the old secondary participle with the addition of the suffixes *-*ka*- (m.) and -*či*- (f.). In the Shughni-Rushani languages, the suffix -*ka*- ultimately became -*č*, -*ǰ*, which is the general perfect marker of non-gender-distinguishing perfect forms and the marker for masculine gender in gender-distinguishing forms. The suffix -*či*-, for its part, ultimately became -*c*, -*dz*. The suffixal element *-*t* (from *-*ta*) assimilated to the affricates (Sokolova 1967; §35, 44, 50; 1973: §131-150).

Together with the relevant vowel alternations, the formants -*č/-ǰ* (m.) and -*c/-dz* (f.) became the primary means for distinguishing gender in intransitive perfect forms.

§78. In general, the perfect forms reflect three types of vocalization, which are historically connected to three positions: masculine gender is connected to neutral position; feminine gender is connected to *i*-umlaut position, and the plural form is connected to *a*-umlaut. Deviations from this pattern are infrequent and they are primarily found in the Roshorvi language, where in feminine perfect stems *a*-vocalization predominates over *i*-vocalization.

Unlike in past stems, where the feminine form was fully syncretic for feminine and plural, in the perfect, gender-distinguishing verbs have preserved a separate plural form, which historically can be traced back to the plural form of the participle with the suffix *-*ka*- (of the type *$paxt(a)k\bar{a} > p\bar{a}x\check{c}$). Plural perfect forms are provided below for comparison, along with the relevant gender-distinguishing past stem.

The isolation and analysis of the types of gender-distinguishing vowel alternations in the perfect is generally realized by the same principles which were applied when looking at the gender-distinguishing forms of nouns, adjectives, and past stems.

§79. Type 1: *u~i* (cf. past stems *u~a*)

This is the most widespread and predominant type of gender-distinguishing vowel alternation. This type exists in all languages of the group. There are two variants:

Variant 1: *u~i* from the historical clusters in which **rt, *rd* before **t* resulted in *x̌*. In these cases, the vowel from **r* (or **ar*?) always remained a short vowel (Sokolova 1967:60).

§80. Variant 2 includes forms (in Table 29, p. 119) which in the Bajuwi dialect regularly differ from the other languages of the group. In particular, in the Bajuwi masculine and plural perfect we get *ū* and *o*, respectively, while in the other languages we do not get the lengthening of the vowels and have instead *u* and *a* respectively. Compare Bj. *sūðǰ* (m.) with Sh. *suðǰ* and Bj. *soðǰ* with Sh. *saðǰ*. Rushani/Khufi and Bartangi/Roshorvi have *saǰ* and *sač*.

§81. From Table 29 (p. 119), we can see that the suffixal elements of the perfect differ by language in the following way: in Shughni and Bajuwi the final consonant *-d-* of the past stem is preserved the masculine and plural perfect forms as *ð*. In the remaining languages, this consonant is lost.

Table 29 (Shughni forms only)

MASC.	FEM.	PL.	GLOSS
viruxčˇ	*virixc*	*viraxčˇ*	broken
ziduxčˇ	*zidixc*	*zidaxčˇ*	come off; torn off
ziyuxčˇ	*ziyixc*	*ziyaxčˇ*	to dry out (of crops)
pirxuxčˇ	*pirxixc*	*pirxaxčˇ*	to get sick (again)
aruxčˇ	*arixc*	*araxčˇ*	to rear up?
nixuxčˇ	*nixixc*	*nixaxčˇ*	collapse
tuxčˇ	*tixc*	*taxčˇ*	fight; scuffle
riwuxčˇ	*riwixc*	*riwaxčˇ*	fly off
With *-ð-*			
vuðˇ	*vic*	*vaðˇ*	been
wizuðˇ	*wizic*	*wizaðˇ*	gone out (of a fire)
θuðˇ	*θic*	*θaðˇ*	burnt
zibuðˇ	*zibic*	*zibaðˇ*	jumped
siruðˇ	*siric*	*siraðˇ*	become separated
suðˇ	*sic*	*saðˇ*	gone; become
firuðˇ	*firic*	*firaðˇ*	(been) rinsed

With this first type we get the following picture:

MASC. PERF	FEM PERF	PL PERF.	MASC. PAST	FEM. PAST
u	*i*	*a*	*u*	*a*

To sum up, there are three types of vocalization in the perfect here: masculine *u* comes from **a* in neutral position; feminine *i* comes from **a* in *i*-umlaut position, and plural *a* comes from **a* in *a*-umlaut position.

§82. Second type: Sh. *ū~ī~o* (cf. past stems. *ū~o*)

There are two variants of this type depending on the correlations of vowels across languages, but for Shughni the realization is the same in both variants. Examples are given below:

MASC.	FEM.	PL.	GLOSS
ažūy̌ˇ	*ažīy̌dz*	*ažoy̌ˇ*	get wet
andūyˇ	*andīc*	*andoyˇ*	get up
ay̌ūyˇ	*ay̌īc*	*ay̌oyˇ*	lie down

tūyǰ	*tīc*	*toyǰ*	leave
naxtūyǰ	*naxtīc*	*naxtoyǰ*	exit
muɣǰ	*mīɣdz*	*moɣǰ*	die

p. 125

This page is a summary. An interesting note is that there is a common tendency in these languages to level the perfect feminine form by analogy with the past feminine form (in terms of vowel alternation). It would be as if we started to get *vac* in Shughni instead of *vic*, via analogy with *vad*.

§83. The second variant here involves a gender-distinguishing vowel before *v*. In Shughni the result is the same: *ū~ī~o*. Examples are given below:

MASC.	**FEM.**	**PL.**	**GLOSS**
anǰūvǰ	*anǰīvdz*	*anǰovǰ*	begin (of tribal conflicts)
biðūvǰ	*biðīvdz*	*biðovǰ*	close (of eyes, mouth)
cirūvǰ	*cirīvdz*	*cirovǰ*	sting; burn
niðūvǰ	*niðīvdz*	*niðovǰ*	stick
piðūǰv	*piðīvdz*	*piðovǰ*	hook onto; stick to
sitūvǰ	*sitīvdz*	*sitovǰ*	fry

p. 130

§85. The third type of vowel alternations in the perfect has four variants and generally parallels the corresponding alternations for nouns and adjectives and past stems.

First variant: *ī~ī~ā/o*

Examples are given below. It can be seen that for the masculine and feminine perfect forms in this variant, gender is not distinguished by the vowel, but rather only by the final consonant.

MASC.	**FEM.**	**PL.**	**GLOSS**
naxfīðǰ	*naxfīc*	*naxfāðǰ*	fall out; be pulled out
naɣǰīðǰ	*naɣǰīc*	*naɣǰāðǰ*	cross
sifīðǰ	*sifīc*	*sifāðǰ*	go up

Note that the corresponding past stems of these verbs do distinguish gender via the vowel, as the feminine vowel in the past stems falls in *a*-umlaut position, which gives rise to *ā*. Here, however, **a* in neutral position (for the masculine form) and **a* in *i*-umlaut position (for the feminine form) both give rise to *ī*. The plural form differs in that the **a* is in *a*-umlaut position and therefore gives rise to *ā*.

§86. Second variant: *ū~ī~o*

Examples below:

MASC.	**FEM.**	**PL.**	**GLOSS**
nūsč	*nīsc*	*nosč*	sat
pirūsč	*pirīsc*	*pirosč*	break off
ricūsč	*ricīsc*	*ricosč*	fled

This seems to be **a* in neutral position before two consonants (> *ū*); in *i*-umlaut position (before two consonants, but the result is the same whether one or two consonants are present) (> *ī*); and in **a*-umlaut position before two consonants (> *o*). For instance, *nīstow* comes from **ni-hasta*, so we would get *ni-hasta-ka* > *nūsč*; *ni-hasta-či* > *nīsc*; and *ni-hasta-kā* > *nosč*.

§87. Third variant: the verb *pêxtow*, which in Shughni (and Bajuwi) does not change for gender.

§88. Fourth type: *o~ê~o*

This type of vowel alternation is limited in its distribution; there are only three attested verbs that have it. They are:

MASC.	**FEM.**	**PL.**	**GLOSS**
ðoðǰ	*ðêc*	*ðoðǰ*	fell; become
x̌icoðǰ	*xicêc*	*x̌icoðǰ*	frozen
x̌ovǰ	*x̌êvdz*	*x̌ovǰ*	slept

Note that the past stems of these verbs do not distinguish gender: they have the vowel *o* throughout (*x̌ovd, x̌icod, ðod* can all be masculine or feminine). It would make sense if this were the reflex of **ā*. Compare for instance *vorǰ* < **bāraka* and *vêrdz* < *bārači*. And **ā* in *ā* umlaut position results in *o*, as in *ðorg* < *dāru-*.

§89. A special group of perfect forms does not use vowel alternations to distinguish gender, but rather only consonant alternations. As a rule, this group of verbs does not distinguish gender in their past stems. Examples are below:

MASC.	**FEM.**	**PL.**	**GLOSS**
biɣe*ðǰ*	biɣec	biɣe*ðǰ*	swell; distend
pi*ðiðǰ*	pi*ðic*	pi*ðiðǰ*	catch fire
sikixč	sikixc	sikixč	convalesce; survive
tixč	tixc	tixč	stink
x̌icefč	x̌icefc	x̌icefč	burst
angixč	?	?	get stuck; get caught
be*ðǰ*	?	?	disappear; get lost
de*ðǰ*	?	?	enter

Note also that the masculine perfect forms of these verbs are identical to their plural perfect forms. The other languages of the group have more distinctions in this group of verbs than Shughni.

§90. The following conclusions can be made based on the information and analyses above:

> **(i)** The double expression of gender (vowel *and* consonant alternations) is a special feature of perfect stems. The type of vowel alternation is identical between masculine perfect stems and masculine past stems, nouns, adjectives, and onomatopoeic words.
>
> **(ii)** Feminine perfect stems, unlike feminine past stems (which show *a*-vocalization), have *i*-vocalization and thus are similar to this same model of nouns, which is particularly characteristic of Shughni and Bajuwi.
>
> **(iii)** Gender alternations in consonants *-č/-ǰ* (m.) and *-c/-dz* (f.) are an additional means of distinguishing gender in the perfect. The masculine formants are also used in the perfect stems of verbs which do not distinguish gender.
>
> **(iv)** In some cases, gender-distinguishing vowel alternations are not present and gender is distinguished only on the basis of the stem-final consonant.

§91. This section is about Roshorvi and the fact that gender-distinguishing consonants do not really have a significant role in this language. This process is not complete, however, and Karamshoev makes an interesting note on the parallel usage of two forms, one with the masculine consonant and one with the feminine consonant. He also makes an interesting note that the changes in the perfect stems of Roshorvi must have started not long ago, as the forms

given by Zarubin (1930:105-107) are by and large the same as in the other languages of the group.

Gender-distinguishing perfect stems in passive constructions

§92. The gender-distinguishing forms of the perfect, which have intransitive semantics, also distinguish gender in the formation of the past participle, which is formed with the suffix *-in* (Bt. *-īn*). Plural forms are also used here.

Because the use of the past participle is significantly more widespread than, say, the present participle, we can say that the past participle has a significant role in determining the gender of nouns. The past participle shows agreement in gender in all its functions: (i) as an **attributive adjective** (*tūyǰin čorik* 'a man who is gone'; *tīcin ɣinik* 'a woman who is gone'; as a **predicate** (*yā dek viriχcin (vad)* 'that pot is/was broken'; and (iii) as a **subject** (without a noun) – *tūyǰin=at mūɣǰin=en yīwaθ* 'those who have gone and those who have died are the same' (saying).

The most common of these functions is its attributive usage. In this function, it has the same role as an adjective. Syntactically, it behaves as an adjective, as it always precedes the noun it modifies. With masculine modified nouns, the masculine perfect form is used to form the participle (cf. *θuðǰin garðā* 'burnt bread'; *pirmūɣǰin gul* 'withered flower', but *θicin pakol* 'scorched tyubeteika; and *pirmīɣdzin šitorθk* 'withered rhubarb').

Here, it should be mentioned that the participle of 'voice-ambivalent verbs' (нерасчленённые в залоговом отношении глаголы = labile infinitives) can be ambiguous out of context.[47] Thus, for instance, *viruχčin ðorg* can mean either a piece of wood which has broken all by itself or one which has been broken by someone. Similarly, *viriχcin čīni* 'broken teacup' can mean a teacup that has been broken by someone or one which has broken all by itself.

In the literature on the Shughni-Rushani group, inaccurate translations have sometimes been used, for instance by translating *viriχcin soat* as 'сломанные часы' (Fayzov 1966:127). This gives the impression that gender distinction occurs also with the participles of transitive verbs.

Examples of participles are given below:

Masc.	**Fem.**	**Pl.**	**Gloss**
tūyǰin	*tīcin*	*toyǰin*	gone

[47] On voice-ambivalent verbs, see Sections 100-105 of this work, as well as Section 126 in Sokolova 1967.

nūsčin	*nīscin*	*nosčin*	sat
θuðǰin	*θicin*	*θaðǰin*	burnt
mūɣǰin	*mīɣdzin*	*moɣǰin*	dead
viruxčin	*virix̌cin*	*viraxčin*	broken

§93. The analysis of participial forms which distinguish gender indicates that gender inflection occurs only in intransitive meanings. Transitive participles, as well as past and perfect stems, do not distinguish gender. In non-ambivalent? (нерасчленённые) participles (and indeed in past and perfect stems), to show the transitive action of the subject (both for masculine and feminine genders and sexes), only the masculine-like stem is used. This is illustrated in the following sentence:

dam yi payola=yi mu yax viruxč=at mam yīw=i mu viro viruxč. Wuz=ta wam xu yax viruxčin čust kinum=at mu viro lāk wam xu viruxčin payola xubaθ soz kix̌t.

'My sister broke one cup, and my brother broke this other one. I'll fix the one my sister broke, but (I'll have) my brother fix the one he broke by himself.'

§94. These passive constructions are formed with the help of the auxiliary verb *vidow* 'be', which also distinguishes gender in the past and perfect. Hence, when it is used with intransitive verbs which distinguish gender in their participles, gender is shown twice. Compare, for instance, *yu wūrǰ ziduxčin vud* 'that wolf was scraggly (lit. fallen out?)'; *wi tukmā zidix̌cin vad* 'his button was torn off'; *wāð vāx̌en=en zidaxčin (//zidix̌cin) vad.* 'the ropes were (frayed?)'.

§95. A peculiar manifestation of gender-distinguishing perfect stems is observed in their use in the pluperfect tense, which is formed with the perfect stem and the suffix *-at*, e.g. *tūyǰat* 'already gone (m.)', *tīcat* (f.)'.

In Bartangi and Roshorvi this same construction is formed not with the suffix *-at*, but rather with the use of the auxiliary verb *vidow*, as in *tūyǰ vud* or *tīc vad*.

§96. In combination with the auxiliary verb *sittow* 'become', the following peculiarity is observed with perfect stems: gender is only distinguished on the auxiliary verb and not in the participle, which always has a form identical to the masculine. Here, the suffix *-ak* – rather than *-in* – attaches to the participle. For instance: *yu yoc wizuðǰak* 'the fire went out'; *yā cirow wizuðǰak sat* 'the lamp went out'; *yu půstīn wirūyǰak sut* 'that fur coat tore'; *ya gilīm wirūyǰak sat* 'that robe tore'.

In rare cases with feminine gender we get a the suffix *-ak* on the plural stem (e.g. *yā yed nosčak sat* ‘the bridge came down'.

The feminine form may be used in constructions without the suffix *-ak*, as in Bj. *wi ɣêv ačaθ biðīvdz na-sat* ‘his mouth did not open at all’.

The relationship of gender to (in)transitivity

§97. Gender distinction in the Shughni-Rushani languages occurs only within the system of intransitive verbs, while transitive verbs display indifference to gender distinction. For this reason, it is very important to clarify the interrelation and intersectionality between the category of gender and that of transitivity.

A look at the data on the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group shows that the opposition between gender-distinguishing verbs with intransitive semantics and non-gender-distinguishing transitive verbs is regular. Additionally, a large number of simplex transitive past stems (non-gender-distinguishing) and intransitive (gender-distinguishing) verbs has been preserved. A description of these verbs follows.

The issue of the formation and development of transitive and intransitive verbs was dealt with specifically by V.S. Sokolova (1973: §§46-155) in connection with the establishment of genetic relations between Munji and the Shughni-Rushani group. As regards the revelation of the relationship between grammatical gender and (in)transitivity, this issue was first examined by Karamshoev (1963: §§124, 250, 280, 269) in his description of the Bajuwi dialect. Here, it was established specifically that gender distinction occurs only in verbs with intransitive semantics. The same question was also looked into by Karamkhudoev (1973: 142-147) in his examination of transitive and intransitive verbs in Bartangi. The accumulation of materials (both those which have been published and those which were collected for the specific purpose of looking at this topic), allow us to take a broader approach to examining the interconnection and intersectionality between grammatical gender and transitivity.

In the preceding sections, when looking at each type and variant of gender-distinguishing vowel alternation in past and perfect stems, an attempt was made to contrast with gender-distinguishing verbs their transitive (causative) counterparts. In this way, I showed the existence of two classes of verbs and their opposition to one another: gender-distinguishing intransitive verbs, on the one hand, and non-gender-distinguishing causative verbs, on the other (§§45-68).

It is not fully agreed upon whether in the history of the Pamir languages – and of the Shughni-Rushani group, in particular – transitive verbs distinguished gender. Nonetheless, researchers of the Pamir languages have looked at this problem in relation to other questions: the historical development of vowels, the establishment and classification of genetic relations among the languages, etc.). There are two generally opposing views here:

> **(i)** The distinction of gender in the verbal system of the Shughni-Rushani languages, which today is found only with intransitive verbs, was historically carried out also with transitive verbs. This point of view was expressed by D.I. Edelman (1973: 177-178) in her work dedicated to the examination and establishment of the relative chronology of a series of phonetic and morphological phenomena in the Shughni-Rushani group and Yazghulami.

A similar view has been put forth by T.N. Pakhalina (1975:70) in the section of her monograph in which she attempts to establish the historical gender specification of past-tense stems in Wakhi, which have lost the ability to distinguish gender. All the verbs indicated by Pakhalina in the categories "feminine stems" and "masculine stems" are transitive, which amounts to her acknowledgment that gender was historically distinguished in past-tense transitive stems.

> **(ii)** The distinction of gender in the verbal systems of the Shughni-Rushani group has always been as it is today: an integral (and unique) characteristic of intransitive verbs. This point of view was expressed in the research of V.S. Sokolova (1973: §§121-130) on transitive and intransitive verbs of the group.

The analysis I put forth here lends support for the legitimacy of the second view.

§98. Comparative-historical research on this question indicates that the development of transitive and intransitive verbs, including their structural and semantic opposition to one another in all modern Iranian languages including Pamir languages, is an innovation. In the words of L.A. Pirejko (1975:312): "the category of (in)transitivity did not have a unified means of morphosyntactic expression in the Old Iranian languages." I agree with the conclusion that "the development in Iranian languages of morphosyntactic markers of the verbal category of (in)transitivity – which generally has a lexical-syntactic status in Indo-European languages – is connected precisely with the development of syntactic changes based primarily on perfect participles and analytical (periphrastic) verb forms in the later stages of Iranian. (Pirejko 1975:312)"

§99. In the Pamir languages, the category of (in)transitivity acquired grammatical significance both with respect to ergative constructions in certain languages, as well as in the opposition of gender-distinguishing and non-gender-distinguishing verbs. The formal opposition of transitivity/intransitivity in verb forms of the present tense is connected to the ancient *präsens?* (презенс) forms – in particular, *-*aya*-, a formant of transitive and causatives, and *-*ya*-, *-*s*-, which were markers of intransitivity. In the Shughni-Rushani languages, there is a considerable number of intransitive verbs which have -*s* in the present tense and transitive verbs which have -*n(d)* or -*m(b)*. There are also a number of verbs with transitive vocalization which can be traced back to *-*aya*- (see Sokolova 1973: §§92-131).

The formation of gendered forms and the opposition of (in)transitivity in the past tense is connected to its rise in nominal constructions – namely from combinations of deverbal nouns, including participles in *-*ta*-, *-*taka*- (masc.) and *-*tā*-, **tačī* (fem.) used with a copula or enclitic pronouns. The subsequent development of the formal opposition of (in)transitivity in past and perfect stems can be characterized, on the one hand, by the strengthening of forms inherited form older stages of Iranian and Indo-European, and on the other, by the formation and activation of new means of expressing transitivity. An additional (new) means of expressing the opposition between intransitive and transitive verbs is the presence of gender-distinction in the system of intransitive verbs and the lack of gender-distinction in transitive verbs. In other words,

gender distinction in intransitive verbs became a direct morphological means indicating intransitivity, and the lack of gender distinction is an indirect but still "significant means of expressing transitivity and at the same time an additional means (in addition to context) for the activation of transitive verbs (Sokolova 1973: §128)."

The opposition between gender-distinguishing intransitive verbs and non-gender-distinguishing transitive verbs is carried out quite consistently. This is attested to by the interconnectedness of non-gender-distinguishing causative forms and their corresponding gender-distinguishing intransitive counterparts (§§45-68), as well as by pairs of verbs with past and perfect stems which are ambivalent for voice. The latter are discussed below.

Transitive and intransitive verbs with voice-ambivalent past and perfect stems

§100. Because the formation and establishment of transitive and intransitive past and perfect verb forms is a relatively late development, it's necessary to consider simplex (monomorphemic) transitive and intransitive stems as a grammatical archaism. The preservation of a group of transitive and intransitive verbs with identical past stems (as well as perfect and infinitive stems) is of particular interest from the point of view of the functioning of grammatical gender, since the appearance of gender on the verb is tightly interwoven with the categories of voice, transitivity, and intransitivity. A detailed analysis of this group of verbs can in some ways facilitate the answering of other questions, not only in morphology (particularly the interaction and intersectionality between gender, transitivity, intransitivity, and the means of their expression), but also in syntax (the expression of the gender of the subject and its agreement on the predicate, as well as the presence or absence of object control).

§101. There are about twenty attested pairs of transitive (non-gender-distinguishing) and intransitive (gender-distinguishing) verbs which share a single past stem. These are given in the following table:

INTRANSITIVE STEMS				**TRANSITIVE STEMS**		
PAST		**PRESENT**	**GLOSS**	**PAST**	**PRESENT**	**GLOSS**
M	**F**					
anǰūvd	*anǰovd*	*anjafc-*	begin (of a sickness; lit. 'to take hold')	*anǰūvd*	*anǰāv-*	hold; grab; seize

viruxt	*viraxt*	*viraɣ-*	break	*viruxt*	*viraɣ-*	break
*ðod**	*ðod*	*ði(y)-*	fall; end up	*ðod*	*ðāð-*	hit; give
*pêxt**	*pêxt*	*(pis-?)*	cook; bake	*pêxt*	*pidz-*	cook
ziduxt	*zidaxt*	*zidarð-*	tear off (intr.)	*ziduxt*	*zidêrð-; zidarð-*	tear off (tr.)
ziyuxt	*ziyaxt*	*ziyaɣ-*	wither; dry up	*ziyuxt*	*ziyêɣ-*	dry (tr.)
θud	*θad*	*θāw-*	burn (up)	*θud*	*θêw-*	burn (tr.)
wizud	*wizad*	*wizāw-*	die out (fire)	*wizud*	*wizêw-*	extinguish
firud	*firad*	*firāw-*	rinse (intr.)	*firud*	*firêw-*	rinse
pišud	*pišad*	*pišāw-*	amuse oneself	*pišud*	*pišêw-*	entertain
sirud	*sirad*	*sirāw-*	to detach oneself (from suckling)	*sirud*	*sirêw-*	to detach (from suckling)
wirūyd	*wiroyd*	*wirāws-*	rip (of a garment)	*wirūyd*	*wirūdz-*	rip
*wižīvd**	*wižīvd*	*wižifc-*	return	*wižīvd*	*wižeb-*	return (tr.)
nixuxt	*nixaxt*	*nixarθ-*	collapse; fall apart	*nixuxt*	*nixêrθ-; nixêx̌-*	destroy

*Indicates a verb which doesn't distinguish gender in its past stems in Shughni, but does in other languages.

As can be seen from this table, in each pair, the masculine past and perfect stems of the intransitive verb has the same form as the past and perfect stem of its transitive counterpart.

The verbs of this group are noteworthy not only for their syncretism in certain forms, but also for their lack of syncretism in other forms. Thus, as a rule, these verbs share identical past, perfect, and infinitive stems, which may lead to ambiguity without a proper context.[48] This is exhibited in the table below:

[48] In the dictionaries which have been published for the Shughni-Rushani group, the ambiguity in these forms has not always been recognized and properly indicated. In some cases, simplex (monomorphemic) verbs of this type were interpreted either as only transitive or only intransitive. See, for instance, Zarubin (1960:284), who translates *zidarð-:ziduxt* as 'be torn off (intr.)' and for the transitive sense of this verb lists only the causative *zidarðen:zidarðent*, even though the first (non-causative) form is used also in the transitive sense. Examples: *tu=t di*

PAST	PERF.	INF.	GLOSS
viruxt	*viruxč*	*virixtow*	break
zidux̌t	*zidux̌č*	*zidix̌tow*	be pulled off; come off
firud	*firuðǰ*	*firidow*	be rinsed

One form is found in the majority of languages which uses not only an identical past and perfect stem, but also an identical present stem: Sh. *viraɣ̌-*. Though in Rushani and Khufi we have different transitive and intransitive stems.

p. 155

§102. This section sums up labile infinitives. It is noted that in the present stems of these verbs, the vowel is distinguished via strong (and/vs.?) causative vocalization. Karamshoev makes the following distinction. In five pairs of verbs, the non-gender-distinguishing intransitive form is opposed by non-causative vocalization in the present stem. These are: *anǰafc-* vs. *anǰāv-*, *viraɣ̌-; ði-* vs. *ðāð-, pis-* vs. *pidz-, wirāws-* vs. *wirůdz-*. The remaining verbs are opposed by causative vocalization, as in *wizāw-* vs. *wizêw-*.

The fact that we get opposing present forms without the typical causative vowel would indicate that the formal distinction between transitive and intransitive in present stems took place considerably earlier than in past stems.

Note further that even *virix̌tow*, whose transitive and intransitive forms share a single present stem, is different in the third singular: *viroɣ̌d* (intr.) vs. *virīɣ̌d* (tr.).

Another verb *piðidow* 'ignite' does not distinguish gender in its past stem but does in its perfect. Thus, we get in Shughni *piðud* (past stem – m. or f.) and *piðuðǰ* (prf, m.), *piðic* (prf., f.).

§103. In the verbs discussed in this section, the formal means of distinguishing transitive verbs from their intransitive counterparts turned out to be insufficient for creating a grammatical opposition between the two. This failure can be explained first and foremost via the fact that the past and perfect stems are monomorphemic and have identical transitive and intransitive forms. The restructuring of simplex (monomorphemic) verbs became necessary and even inevitable because the process of developing a system which distinguished transitive verbs from gender-distinguishing intransitive verbs required the full morphologization of intransitive simplex verbs, as all of the remaining gender-distinguishing verbs were already opposed by a causative form. This must have sped up the process of creating differing forms for transitive and intransitive

wūrɣ̌ zidux̌t 'you frayed the thread'. Nonetheless, in the third-singular present form the transitive/intransitive versions of this verb have distinct forms: *zidorðd* (intr.); *zidīrðd* (tr.).

stems. (This is my best shot at a translation of this section, which seems important but which I don't really understand.)

§104. Because the opposition of gender-distinguishing intransitive verbs and non-gender-distinguishing transitive verbs (and causative pairs) is regular, new causative forms have been formed seemingly to create more consistent morphological oppositions and to eliminate ambiguity. These causative forms, unlike the non-causative transitive forms which share identical stems with their intransitive counterparts, do not share any identical stems with their intransitive counterparts. These causative stems are used in parallel with simplex (monomorphemic) transitive verbs. Hence, we get two forms for a number of transitive verbs with causative-like meanings: one with clearly causative morphology and one which is monomorphemic and bears more resemblance to the intransitive verb. This phenomenon is exhibited in the table below:

INTRANSITIVE STEMS			**TRANSITIVE STEMS**		
PAST	**PRESENT**	**GLOSS**	**SIMPLEX**	**CAUSATIVE**	**GLOSS**
ziduǔt	*zidaǎt*	be torn off	*ziduǔt*	*zidêrðd; zidarðent*	pull off; tear off
ziyuǔt	*ziyaǎt*	dry up; wither	*ziyuǔt*	*ziyêy̆d*	dry (tr.)
θud	*θad*	burn (up)	*θud*	*θêwd*	burn (tr.)
wizud	*wizad*	go out (of a fire)	*wizud*	*wizêwd*	extinguish
pišud	*pišad*	amuse oneself	*pišud*	*pišêwd*	entertain
firud	*firad*	be rinsed	*firud*	*firêwd*	rinse
sirud	*sirad*	become separated	*sirud*	*sirêwd*	separate (tr.)

Note that this table does not include the present stems of these verbs, as these were included in the preceding table. The two stems in the "transitive" column represent forms which "co-exist" and represent the same transitive meaning. More explicitly, these forms represent the transitive form which is identical to the masculine intransitive form, as well as a newly created causative form. The past stem is also identical to the third-singular present form (*zidêrðd* = 3sg.pres or pst).

§105. The following conclusions can be made along with the table above:

> **(i)** The simplex transitive and causative transitive forms co-exist. That is, they can be said to be represent an incomplete process in which transitive stems take on formal opposition to intransitive stems via causative morphology.
>
> **(ii)** A fundamental point intersectionality between (in)transitivity and (non-)gender distinction is the forming of transitive verbs with causative formants and their opposition to intransitive gender-distinguishing verbs. It is not hard to predict the further activization of transitive verbs with causative morphology and their eventual supplanting simplex transitive forms. This notion is supported by the fact that for the majority of simplex verbs, the causative present stem is the one that is most often used, as it has effectively supplanted the simplex form (see two tables above, which shows that many of these verbs have causative *ê* in their present stem).

§106. As is clear from the description of gender-distinguishing intransitive verbs, and also of their transitive and causative counterparts, and as is attested by the analysis of simplex monomorphemic stems, the functionality of grammatical gender in the verbal system is closely connected to the categories of voice and (in)transitivity. Because only intransitive verbs show gender distinction, we get a clear interaction of two categories: intransitivity and grammatical gender. These two categories go hand in hand in their opposition to transitivity. Hence, we effectively have two opposing categories: grammatical gender and intransitivity as one category and transitivity as the other.

§107. More summary.

§108. On the basis of the analysis of the interaction of (in)transitivity and grammatical gender in the verbal system of the Shughni-Rushani languages, it is possible to look at – and to some extent clarify – the uneven development of the system of causative and transitive verbs across the Pamir languages more generally. The facts discussed here indicate that the semantic and formal development of transitive verbs, and especially causative verbs, is allowed for precisely by their opposition to a separate class of verbs which distinguishes gender. Hence, the development of the category of (in)transitivity depends in large part on the existence and vitality of grammatical gender.

§109. Materials from other Pamir languages can also provide evidence for the intersectionality of the formal development of transitive (causative) verbs and the category of gender. In this regard, of special interest is the uneven, but at times autonomous development of causative forms in

other Pamir languages. It is of special interest to examine this phenomenon in relation to whether the language(s) in question possess or lack a system of grammatical gender. It is noteworthy that the deterioration of gender-distinguishing forms and the eventual loss of the category of gender is not conducive to the existence of the category of transitivity and the formal organization of causative forms. Telling examples come from the data of Sarikoli, Yazghulami, and Yidgha. In Sarikoli, which belongs to the Shughni-Rushani group, grammatical gender has been fully eliminated as a result of the loss of gender-distinguishing models.[49] At the same time, Sarikoli stands out among the other languages of the group in that it lacks a clear morphological opposition for transitive (causative) and intransitive verbs, as transitive verbs have lost their old markers (Sokolova 1973: §119).

In Yazghulami, like Sarikoli, verbs do not distinguish gender (in this language, gender distinction is preserved primarily in the oblique forms of demonstrative pronouns). At the same time, Yazghulami is characterized by the deterioration of old morphological markers of transitivity and causativity. "In Sarikoli and Yazghulami, where causative vocalization eventually took on *a*-vocalization, we cannot say that causative verbs have a distinct causative vocalization. (Sokolova 1973: §101)."

In Yidgha, according to G. Morgenstierne, transitive and intransitive conjugation models in the present tense have already lost their opposition to one another. It is also not the norm anymore in this language to have past-tense subjects in the oblique case. Moreover, the distinct endings for transitive and intransitive verbs in the past tense has been completely lost. Moreover, in Yidgha (unlike closely related Munji), there is virtually no more grammatical gender (Morgenstierne 1930: 110-121; Sokolova 1973: §58, 92).

Judging by the examples of Sarikoli, Yazghulami, and Yidgha, it can be concluded that the loss of grammatical gender entails the weakening and deterioration of the old formal markers of transitivity in the past tense, as well as the weakening of the opposition of verbs via the transitive/intransitive marker. The reason for such an interaction of between the category of gender and the category of transitivity, it seems to me, lies in the special oppositional character of the two classes of verbs – gender-distinguishing intransitive, on the one hand, and non-gender-distinguishing transitive, on the other.

In Ishkashimi and Wakhi, neither of which have grammatical gender, the system of transitive and causative forms in the past tense is not distinguished on clear morphological lines (see Pakhalina 1959; 1975; Grunberg; Steblin-Kamenskij 1976: 593, 615-618).

With respect to the distinction of gender in the verbal system, the Munji language represents an isolated example: inflected verb forms, in particular past and perfect stems, do not distinguish gender. However, nominal parts of speech – namely nouns, adjectives, pronouns, participles, and numerals – have a clear and consistent system of gender distinction via the help of endings and suffixes (see Grunberg 1972: §14-15, 17, 19-20, 31, 40, 45, 134). In this regard, we can postulate that because the category of gender is regularly and consistently expressed in nominals

[49] Both internal and external factors contributed to the loss of gender in Shughni. Regarding external factors, we can name its geographic isolation from the other Shughni-Rushani languages and its presence within the sphere of influence of Uyghur, which does not have grammatical gender (Karamshoev 1976: 221-222).

themselves, the need did not arise to project models of gender distinction onto verbal stems. It is indicative, nonetheless, that Munji, having rich and clear morphological means for expressing gender distinctions on nouns, at the same time stands out for its development of a system of transitive and causative forms and their opposition to intransitive stems in the past tense. "The fuller and more consistent unification of causative verbs into a single grammatical class in Munji is caused by the situation wherein they have received a special conjugation ("Conjugation 1"), which has developed in opposition to the other conjugation ("Conjugation 2"), which is used for intransitive verbs. (Sokolova 1973: §103)"

§110. In connection with the analysis of (in)transitivity in these languages, of particular interest is the question of the interaction between grammatical gender and the so-called "ergative" construction in Rushani, Khufi, and Bartangi. In this construction, used with transitive verbs that do not distinguish gender, the subject is in the oblique case and its gender may be marked if an oblique pronoun is used. Take for instance the following example from Rushani: *day mu na-wzent* 'he didn't recognize me'; *dum mu na-wzent* 'she didn't recognize me'. In Shughni, Bajuwi, and Roshorvi, this type of ergative construction in which the subject is in the oblique case has not been preserved. In these languages, a direct subject is used with both intransitive and transitive verbs: Sh. *yid my na-wzent* 's/he didn't recognize me'. Hence, thanks to their preservation of this ergative construction, Rushani, Khufi, and Bartangi have kept an additional means of distinguishing the gender of the subject, namely via the use of oblique pronominal forms when using transitive, non-gender-distinguishing verbs. This is in addition to the marking of subjects' gender in intransitive gender-distinguishing verbs, which is found in all Shughni-Rushani languages except Sarikoli. Thus, the preservation of the oblique (ergative) construction in Rushani, Khufi, and Bartangi can be seen as a factor which facilitates the strengthening and preservation of grammatical gender in these languages,[50] while the lack of such a construction in the other languages – Shughni, Bajuwi, and Roshorvi, as an unfavorable factor in the functionality of grammatical gender.

§111. The conclusion above is by and large supported by the materials of the languages in question. It is apparent from the preceding sections that Rushani, Khufi, and Bartangi have preserved the oblique-subject construction have at the same time possess a greater degree of gender-distinguishing formants than Shughni, Bajuwi, or Roshorvi. It is worth noting that Roshorvi is quite close to Bartangi and differs from it primarily in that it lacks the ergative construction which Bartangi has preserved.[51] Nonetheless, in Roshorvi, unlike Bartangi, a weakening of gender differentiation is observed. And it is observed not only in the weakness of grammatical means for distinguishing gender, but also in the lack of firm fixation of nouns to a particular gender.[52] Shughni and Bajuwi, for their part, dispose of a smaller number of gender-

[50] The instability of the category of gender in Yazghulami, despite the presence of the ergative construction, is apparently a result of the deterioration of gender vocalization as well as the influence of Tajik (Karamshoev 1975b). In any case, it is telling that in Yazghulami, of all parts of speech, only oblique forms of personal pronouns have preserved regular gender distinction (masc. *day, way* and fem. *im, dim*).

[51] Because of the commonalities in their phonetic and grammatical systems, Roshorvi has been considered a dialect of Bartangi in a number of works on the Pamir languages (see notably Sokolova 1967: 41).

[52] On deviations in the grammatical specification of inanimate nouns in Roshorvi, see Kurbanov 1976: 62.

distinguishing morphological formants, which is apparent primarily in the system of gender-distinguishing derivational suffixes.

We should note here another relatively important opportunity to distinguish the gender of a subject: in the third-person singular direct demonstrative pronouns of the distal degree. This occurs only in Shughni and Bajuwi: *yu* (m.) and *yā* (f.). It doesn't occur in any of the other languages of the group, for which we get a single form *yā* for both genders. Nonetheless, in Rushani, Khufi, and Bartangi, as was already mentioned, we find the ability to distinguish the gender of subjects in the past tense via gender-distinguishing oblique pronouns. For instance: Ru. *way az mu pawst* 'he asked me' and *um az mu pawst* 'she asked me'. Only a single language – Roshorvi – has not preserved the ability to show the gender of a subject via demonstrative pronouns (neither direct nor oblique).

Ultimately, the functionality of grammatical gender is closely connected not only to transitive and causative forms, but also to the oblique (ergative) construction.

§112. As we conclude this section, this is an ideal time to return to the question posed at the beginning of this discussion, namely whether transitive verbs historically distinguished gender in the Pamir languages. The fact that we see such a clear and consistent distinction between transitive verbs, which distinguish gender, and intransitive verbs, which do not distinguish gender, would suggest that the answer to this question is "no". If we posit that transitive verbs historically distinguished gender, then this would mean that there was a lack of opposition and therefore a dissolution of gender distinction in the system of intransitive verbs. The nature of the appearance of the category of (in)transitivity apparently inhibited the spreading of gender-distinguishing models into the system of transitive verbs from the very start of its infiltration into the verbal system. Moreover, if gender distinction were historically a characteristic of transitive verbs as well, then it should be expected to have remained somewhere in at least some relic form. Even those verbs which are historically transitive, in the rare cases that they distinguish gender, become intransitive (cf. Rushani *mawz čūg* '(he) became hungry' and *mawz čōg* '(she) became hungry'. Thus, gender distinction has been and remains a characteristic of intransitive verbs.

In the end, it should be noted that the question regarding the rise of grammatical gender in the verbal system and its interaction with (in)transitivity requires further and broader research. The answers to this question may be found with detailed comparative analysis involving other Iranian languages which possess gender distinction. As an example take the fact that in Sogdian we find gender distinction in analytic (periphrastic) verb forms in the active voice only with intransitive verbs and primarily with forms of the intransitive perfect. These forms are formed on the bases of the participle in *-te-* (from Proto-Iranian **-taka-*) and past-tense verb stems (Iskhakov 1972: 24). In modern Iranian languages (dialects of Kurdish, Pashto, etc.), there is apparently no

connection between gender-disitnguishing verb stems and (in)transitive semantics (Kurdoev 1957:44-51; Bakaev 1973:93-103; Dvoryankov 1960: 47-49; Efimov 1975:452-456).

The expression of gender in onomatopoeic words

§113. Gender distinction in onomatopoeic and figurative words (in form and provenance) is of particular interest, as this phenomenon is apparently specific to the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group. It is deserving of a comprehensive and detailed analysis but has nonetheless not been looked at in any detail.

The expression of gender in onomatopoeic words was first recognized in the description of Bajuwi. However, it has not been allotted sufficient attention in other monographs on languages in the Shughni-Rushani group. The new materials I have gathered for the purpose of this work allow us to undertake a more detailed analysis of different groups of onomatopoeic words. Of particular interest is the phenomenon of gender-distinguishing morphology in onomatopoeic words, a phenomenon which has not attracted the attention of researchers until now. Gender distinction in onomatopoeic words, as far as I am aware, is not found in other ancient or modern Iranian languages, nor even in other Indo-European languages. Hence, it should be considered an innovation within the Pamir languages which has come about due to language-internal rules of the languages in question.

The rise and spread of gender-distinguishing vowel alternations in this group of words does not have a long history and finds itself in the process of development. Gender distinction in onomatopoeic words occurs somewhat differently than in nouns and verbs which distinguish gender and forms a more unified model of sound alternations which distinguish gender. The models of vowel alternations in onomatopoeic words, along with their description, is given in below with their relevant subdivisions. Onomatopoeic and figurative words which distinguish gender, with regard to their structure, can be divided into the following groups:

> **(i)** Words which are formed with the suffixes *-ast*, *-at*.[53] In some cases, these suffixes are interchangeable (cf. Sh. *furx̌ast, furx̌at* (m.), *farx̌ast, farx̌at* ‘momentaneous; fast’);
>
> **(ii)** Words which are formed via reduplication of the entire stem. In Ryshani, Khufi, and Bartangi, this reduplication is often done with the help of a linking element *-a-* (Sh. *čul-čul* (m.), *čal-čal* 'murmur; gurgling’; cf. R-X. *čol-a-čol* and *čal-a-čal*).

In general, the gender alternations which take place in onomatopoeic and figurative words are analogous to those that take place in other classes of words (i.e. in nouns and verbs).

[53] On the function and etymology of this suffix in other Iranian languages, see Abaev 1958: 91; Rozenfeld 1971: 28. 80; and Fazylov 1958: 39-40.

§114. The vowel alternation *u~a* (m.~f.) is in most cases common to all languages of the group. However, in Rushani and Khufi the masculine forms in some cases contain short *o*. Moreover, in words which are formed via reduplication, as was mentioned above, in Rushani, Khufi, and Bartangi we often find the linking element *-a-*.

The alternation *u~a* is found both in words with the suffixes *-ast/-at* and in words which are formed via reduplication.

In the majority of cases, the same onomatopoeic and figurative words may be formed either with the aforementioned suffixes or via reduplication. In both cases the word in question will exhibit the same meaning; nuances in meaning may be found in different contexts.

Syntactically, these words are used most often with an adverbial function as an adverbial modifier: Sh. *furx̌ast sut tar boɣ* 'he quickly went to the garden'; Ru. *yā kiyon tat-tap woxť* 'that pear fell with a bang. (Fayzov 1966:19).

But the use of these words in other syntactic functions – as subjects, objects, modifiers, or predicates – is also possible. Compare: Sh. *x̌ac čal-čal wev tar ɣůɣ̌ yat* 'the burbling of the water reached their ears'; Ru. *um mošīn paθ-paθ čo xo wizad* 'the car rattled and then turned off'. (Fayzov 1966:19).

Because onomatopoeic words are used as adverbial modifiers and can also be used as words of other categories, multiple translations are provided. In the first place, a translation corresponding to the adverbial use of the word is provided, and in the second place, a translation is provided for the other part(s) of speech in which the word can be used. Another couple notes are in order: (i) the meaning of forms with the suffix *-ast* (more rarely *-at*) are generally the same in meaning as forms which have been created via reduplication. In these cases, a single translation is given for both forms. If the meaning is different for each form, this is noted.

§115. First type: *u~a*

Examples are given in the table below:

TYPE	MASC.	FEM.	GLOSS
SFX.	*curast, curat*	*carast, carat*	rustling
RED.	*cur-cur*	*car-car*	
SFX.	*curx̌ast, curx̌at*	*carx̌ast, carx̌at*	with a crack; fast
RED.	*curx̌-curx̌*	*carx̌-carx̌*	
SFX.	*čulast*	*čalast*	burble; gurgle (of water); burbling, gurgling (adv.)
RED.	*čul-čul*	*čal-čal*	
SFX.	*dungast*	*dangast*	banging (of metal)

RED.	*dung-dung*	*dang-dang*	
SFX.	*buɣast*	*baɣast*	vibration; buzzing
RED.	*buɣ-buɣ*	*baɣ-baɣ*	
SFX.	*furast, furat*	*farast, farat*	continuously; spinning
RED.	(None)	(None)	
SFX.	*furx̌ast, furx̌at*	*farx̌ast, farx̌at*	instantaneously; quickly
RED.	*furx̌-furx̌*	*farx̌-farx̌*	
SFX.	*fux̌ast*	*fax̌ast*	with a sigh; sigh; uninterrupted
RED.	*fux̌-fux̌*	*fax̌-fax̌*	
SFX.	*gurast, gurat*	*garast, garat*	quickly, continuously, one after another
RED.	*gur-gur*	*gar-gar*	
SFX.	*ɣurast*	*ɣarast*	crashing; with a crash; crash
RED.	*ɣur-ɣur*	*ɣar-ɣar*	
SFX.	*purθast, šipurθast*	*parθast, šiparθast*	rustling; the noise of a birds wings, etc.
RED.	*purθ-purθ; sipurθ-šipurθ*	*parθ-parθ; šiparθ-šiparθ*	
SFX.	*putast*	*patast*	whisper; with a whisper
	put-put	*pat-pat*	
SFX.	*qutast*	*qatast*	cackling
RED.	*qut-qut*	*qat-qat*	
SFX.	*qumbast*	*qambast*	gurgling; with a gurgle
RED.	*qumb-qumb*	*qamb-qamb*	
SFX.	*šitupast*	*šitapast*	crack; bang; noise; with a bang (of a fall)
RED.	*šitup-šitup*	*šitap-šitap*	
SFX.	*šiqutast*	*šiqatast*	whistling; whistle (when swallowing something)
RED.	*šiqut-šiqut*	*šiqat-šiqat*	
SFX.	*θupast*	*θapast*	noise (from a quick movement)
RED.	*θup-θup*	*θap-θap*	

SFX.	*ǎuwast*	*ǎawast*	quickly; instantly
RED.	*ǎuw-ǎuw*	*ǎaw-ǎaw*	

§116. Second type: *ů~ā*

This vowel alternation does not have a very wide distribution. Examples are given in the table below:

TYPE	**MASC.**	**FEM.**	**GLOSS**
SFX.	*bůɣast*	*bāɣast*	bleating; mooing
RED.	*bůɣ-bůɣ*	*bāɣ-bāɣ*	
SFX.	*wůɣast*	*wāɣast*	mooing; crying
RED.	*wůɣ-wůɣ*	*wāɣ-wāɣ*	
SFX.	*ǎipūxast*	*ǎipaxast*	bang; with a bang (of a gun)
RED.	*ǎipůx-ǎipůx*	*ǎipax-ǎipax*	

In some cases we get *ů~a* in most of the languages of the group. Examples are given in the table below:

TYPE	**MASC.**	**FEM.**	**GLOSS**
SFX.	*důngast*	*dangast*	with a crash; stamping; crash; footfall
RED.	*důng-důng*	*dang-dang*	
SFX.	*qůmbast*	*qambast*	same as *důngast*
RED.	*qůmb-qůmb*	*qamb-qamb*	
SFX.	*ǎiqůmbast*	*ǎiqambast*	with a bang; bang (shot or explosion)
RED.	*ǎiqůmb-ǎiqůmb*	*ǎiqamb-ǎiqamb*	

§118. We can see that in some cases there is a difference in meaning between masculine and feminine forms. As a result, gender distinction in these cases is weakened and sometimes even disappears altogether. Such cases are shown in the table below:

TYPE	**MASC.**	**FEM.**	**GLOSS**

SFX.	*wůɣast*	*wāɣast*	mooing (of a cow) (masc.)
RED.	*wůɣ-wůɣ*	*wāɣ-wāɣ*	cry (of fright)
SFX.	*bůɣast*	*bāɣast*	mooing (of a cow) (m.)
RED.	*bůɣ-bůɣ*	*bāɣ-bāɣ*	bleating (of a sheep) (f.)
SFX.	*pulast*	*palast*	burning (of a fire)
RED.	*pul-pul*	*pal-pal*	glitter; sparkle

Such semantic distinctions in gender-distinguishing correlates is observed also in onomatopoeic verbs (see §§121-128). Such semantic discrepancies in these gender-distinguishing correlates generally weakens gender distinction and sometimes leads to its disappearance.

Characteristics of the expression of gender in onomatopoeic verbs

§119. On the basis of stem-internal vowel alternations it is easy to discern and establish the gender specification of a large number of onomatopoeic and figurative verbs. The goal of this section is to provide an analysis which classifies these pairs of verbs into groups. This task has not been undertaken of yet by other researchers. In the literature there has been only a few onomatopoeic words which have been recorded, and there has been no indication of their gender specification. Thus, for instance, in Zarubin's (1960) *Shughni Texts and Dictionary*, which contains the most comprehensive Shughni dictionary, there are no more than ten such words listed. In fact there are only four pairs, which means eight total verbs. These are listed below in the same way they were interpreted by Zarubin:

(i) *farx:farxt* 'wheeze; snore'; 3sg. *farxt*, prf. *farxč*, inf. *farxtow* (p. 140)
furx:furxt 'wheeze' (p. 140)

(ii) *faǩ-:faǩt* 'breeth heavily; suffocate' (p. 141)
fuǩ-; fuǩt – same as *faǩ-:faǩt* (p. 143)

(iii) *fas-:fast* 'blow one's nose'; 3sg. *fast*; prf. *fasč*; inf. *Fastow* (p. 141)
fus-:fist 'to breathe in through the nose'; 3sg. *fust*; prf. *fusč*; inf. *fustow* (p. 143)

(iv) *taq-:taqt* 'to tap; rap', 3sg. *taqt*; prf. *taqč*; inf. *taqtow* (p. 239)
tuq-:tuqt – same as *taq-:taqt* (p. 249)

The question regarding the expression of gender in onomatopoeic verbs has bot been treated in monographic descriptions of the Shughni-Rushani languages. In the materials I have collected, however, there are about 40 pairs of such verbs. Each pair consists of two forms which are

distinct from one another via their stem-internal vowels. In some cases, there is also a semantic difference. In total, then, we get 80 such verbs of this onomatopoeic and figurative type which in some way or another distinguish gender and can be divided into masculine or feminine.

§120. Onomatopoeic and figurative verbs which distinguish gender stand out from other gender-distinguishing verbs in the following ways:

(i) Gender distinction takes place not only in the past and perfect stems (as with other verbs) but also in the present stem and the infinitive. This allows for a greater range of agreement relationships – not only with subjects, but also with grammatical objects and modifiers. Cf.: Sh. *wuz=um x̌ac čaltow žīwǰ* 'I love the gurgling of the water (f.)'; Ru. *x̌uvd ca čolt, az-ta x̌anum* 'if the milk (m.) (bubbles?), I'll hear it'.

(ii) In some cases, gendered variants of onomatopoeic verbs in Shughni have distinct meanings, which suggests the weakening of gender distinction.

(iii) In onomatopoeic verbs there are deviations observed in which masculine forms can be used with feminine subjects and feminine forms with masculine subjects: cf. Sh. *yu kud ɣurθt (//ɣarθt*) 'the dog barks'; *yā kid ɣarθt (ɣurθt)* 'that dog barks'. This kind of variation occurs in fast and careless speech. In the normal style of speech gender agreement in these verbs remains normal: *yu kud ɣurθt; yā kid ɣarθt*.

§121. Regarding their structure, two variants can be distinguished based on the vowel alternations used:

First type: *u~a* (m.~f.)

This type has a wide distribution. Moreover, gender distinction with this type of alternation is realized rather clearly and consistently; there is not much crisscrossing of agreement in these forms. Verbs of this type are listed below in the following sequence: *pres.:past*; perfect; infinitive.

GEN.	**VERB**	**GLOSS**
M	*cur-:curt; curč; curtow*	rustle; drizzle
F	*car-:cart; carč; cartow*	
M	*čul-:čult; čulč; čultow*	babble; murmur (of water)
F	*čal-:čalt; čalč; čaltow*	
M	*dzung-:dzungt; dzungč; dzungtow*	click

F	*dzang-:dzangt; dzangč; dzangtow*	
M	*dzur-:dzurt; dzurč; dzurtow*	exhale (with a whistle)
F	*dzar-:dzart; dzarč; dzartow*	
M	*duq-:duqt; duqč; duqtow*	shake; tremble; swing; trot
F	*daq-:daqt; daqč; daqtow*	
M	*duqen-:duqent; duqenč; duqentow*	swing; make tremble (tr.)
F	*daqen-:daqent; daqenč; daqentow*	
M	*ɣurθ-:ɣurθt; ɣurθč; ɣurθtow*	bark
F	*ɣarθ-:ɣarθt; ɣarθč; ɣarθtow*	
M	*ɣur-:ɣurt; ɣurč; ɣurtow*	rattle; rumble
F	*ɣar-:ɣart; ɣarč; ɣartow*	
M	*qut-:qut(t); qutč; qut(t)ow*	cackle
F	*qat-:qat(t); qatč; qat(t)ow*	
M	*fuq- :fuqt ; fuqč ; fuqtow*	oink; grunt; weep
F	*faq- :faqt ; faqč ; faqtow*	
M	*fux̌- :fux̌t ; fux̌č ; fux̌tow*	breathe (deeply and continuously)
F	*fax̌- :fax̌t ; fax̌č ; fax̌tow*	
M	*fut- :fut(t); futč ; fu(t)tow*	whisper
F	*fat- :fat(t); fatč ; fa(t)tow*	
M	*kur-:kurt; kurč; kurtow*	rattle; clatter
F	*kar-:kart; karč; kartow*	
M	*luc-:luct; lucč; luctow*	to tremble (from fatness?)
F	*lac-:lact; lacč; lactow*	
M	*pul-:pult; pulč; pultow*	burn (dimly, imperceptibly
F	*pal-:palt; palč; paltow*	
M	*purx-:purxt; purxč; purxtow*	spray (water out of the mouth)
F	*parx-:parxt; parxč; parxtow*	
M	*tung-:tungt; tungč; tungtow*	chime; clink (on a metal object)
F	*tang-:tangt; tangč; tangtow*	
M	*tuq-:tuqt; tuqč; tuqtow*	knock; rap

F	*taq-:taqt; taqč; taqtow*	
M	*tur-:turt; turč; turtow*	rattle; crackle
F	*tar-:tart; tarč; tartow*	
M	*tup-:tupt; tupč; tuptow*	trample
F	*tap-:tapt; tapč; taptow*	
M	*žiwul-:žiwult; žiwulč; žiwultow*	sparkle; twinkle
F	*žiwal-:žiwalt; žiwalč; žiwaltow*	

§122. The following can be noted regarding the forms listed above:

(i) The majority of gender-distinguishing onomatopoeic words express the action or state of an animate (masculine or feminine) noun: cf. Sh. *yu x̌īǰ lap fux̌t*, lit. 'that bull is breathing heavily'; *yā žow lap fax̌t*, 'that cow is breathing heavily').

(ii) Some onomatopoeic verbs are used with inanimate nouns, which attests to the purely grammatical function of these forms. Thanks to the compatibility of onomatopoeic verbs with inanimate nouns, the latter receive a syntactic expression (the gender specification of animate nouns is not particularly troublesome, as the semantics of the noun itself makes it easy to know). The following verbs are most often used with inanimate nouns: *žiwultow*/žiwaltow 'sparkle'; *pultow/paltow* 'burn (dimly)'; *čultow/čaltow* 'babble; murmur (of water)'. Example: Sh. *yoc pult* 'the fire is slightly burning'.

(iii) In rare cases gender distinction is used in transitive and even causative verbs: *purxtow/parxtow* 'spray (water out of the mouth); *duqentow/daqentow* 'swing; make tremble'. Examples: *mu bob půstard rūɣan purxt* 'my grandfather sprayed the skin with oil'; *a ɣāc, x̌ac murd mā-parx* 'girl, don't splash water on me'; *vorǰ wi lap=i duqent xu yu mot sut* 'the horse bounced him around a lot and he got tired'; *wi nān lůd: wuz=ta tu pis xuyaθ na-daqenum* 'his mom said: "I'm not going to drag you along with me.'

This phenomenon can be considered an innovation in the inflected verb forms of the Shughni-Rushani languages.

Nonetheless, these facts cannot be a basis for arguing that transitive verbs have historically distinguished gender. The conclusions I came to in the preceding section regarding the lack of gender distinction in transitive verbs (both historically and synchronically) stand firm.

§123. The second type of vowel alternations, in addition to using different vowels among different languages, is also distinct from the first type discussed above in that the gender distinction here is weaker and less consistent. Both feminine and masculine forms can be used with either feminine or masculine nouns.

Nonetheless, it can be said that the rule whereby verbs containing the masculine *u*-like vowel are generally used with masculine nouns, and verbs containing the feminine *a*-like vowel agree with feminine nouns. This type of gender distinction has two variants.

§124. First variant: Sh. *ů~a*

In the examples given below (in the book, but not here), the masculine variant is accompanied by (//fem.), and the feminine variant is accompanied by (//masc.) to indicate that these forms may in some cases be used with the other gender.

GEN.	**VERB**	**GLOSS**
M	*fůq-:fůqt; fůqč; fůqtow*	snort; grunt (of a yak)
F	*faq-:faqt; faqč; faqtow*	snort; cry softly
M	xipůx-:xipůxt; xipůxč; xipůxtow	crash; clatter
F	xipax-:xipaxt; xipaxč; xipaxtow	
M	ɣůr-:ɣůrt; ɣůrč; ɣůrtow	clatter; shoot with a bang
F	ɣar-:ɣart; ɣarč; ɣartow	bark
M	qůrš-:qůršt; qůršč; qůrštow	snore
F	qarš-:qaršt; qaršč; qarštow	

§125. The data in the table indicate that the languages of the group differ only in their masculine vowels. in most cases, we get Rushani, Bartangi, and Roshorvi coinciding with *ū*, Khufi has a short *o*, and Shughni and Rushani have *ů*. Only in one case do we get the vowel *i* (*fiqtow*). Hence, we can posit here that this vowel pattern – *ů, ū, o* – in onomatopoeic words has come about via analogy with the typical models of gender vocalization. Moreover, we can speculate that the broad use of the vowels *u, ů, ū, o* as a marker of masculine gender in onomatopoeic words (and perhaps also in other classes of words) was favored by the following fact which has already been noted by many linguists: the *u*-like sound in many languages (in particular Semitic) may act as a symbol of the deep voice of a representative of the masculine sex (often, however, animals and birds) and is therefore used in masculine words indicating a large size (on this topic see Espersen 1922:1; Pizani 1956:95; Abaev 1958:269, a.o.).

§126. Second variant: *ů~ā/ê*

This variant differs from this first variant in that the feminine form has a long *ā* and that the *i*-like vowel *ê* is also accepted. Examples are given below:

GEN.	VERB	GLOSS
M	*bůɣ-:bůɣd; bůɣǰ; bůɣdow*	moo; bellow (often of a bull)
F	*bāɣ-:bāɣd; bāɣǰ; bāɣdow;* *bêɣ-:bêɣd; bêɣǰ; bêɣdow*	bleat; bellow (often of a sheep)
M	*wůɣ-:wůɣd; wůɣǰ; wůɣdow*	moo; bellow (often of a cow)
F	*wāɣ-:wāɣd; wāɣǰ; wāɣdow;* *wêɣ-:wêɣd; wêɣǰ; wêɣdow*	weep; cry

§127. As can be seen from these examples, the semantic discrepancy between each gendered form is quite clear. Thus, for instance, the form *bůɣdow* is typically translated as ‘moo; bellow’. It can be used in a figurative sense as 'yell', however: *aða bās bāɣ* ‘quit shouting, boy’. The semantic area of the feminine version of this verb *bāɣdow* is very narrow; it is used exclusively with sheep: *yā maǰ bāɣd* ‘that sheep is bleating’. The same can be said of the verb *wůɣdow*/*wāɣdow*. The masculine form is identical in meaning to the previous verb. However, their feminine forms have distinct meanings, as *wāɣdow* mean ‘to cry’. Another verb can be added to this class: *lůqtow/laqtow*, which also has separate meanings in the masculine and feminine forms. Its masculine form means to 'chirp', 'sing', e.g. of a partridge. The feminine form, however, means 'to be dragged' or 'to swing'.

Differences in semantics between masculine and feminine forms are also found in the following verb: *fustow/fastow.* The masculine form of this verb means 'to dart quickly' or breathe out with one's nose'; the feminine form means ‘to blow one’s nose’ or ‘to sneeze’.

§128. Ultimately, we can say that the weakening of gender specifications for these verbs also entails discrepancies in their semantics, which may ultimately lead to the formation of new verbs which are not used with a specific gender. In other words, when the gender specification of a pair of verbs weakens, we get the (re-)lexification of each of the gendered forms. A similar phenomenon is also taking place with certain nouns whose gender specification is already hackneyed and can only be determined syntactically: cf. *ǔuc* ‘bullion; liquid’ and *ǔac* ‘water’.

Hence, the gender specification of a pair of words who share gender-distinguishing vowel alternations is closely connected to their semantics. A lack of semantic distinction in such a pair of words generally signifies their steadfast gender specification and generally facilitates the normal functioning of the category of gender.

§129. In cases where there is a lack of gender alternation and opposing forms, we can sometimes find which gender a verb belongs too (primarily via the type of vowel in the stem).

The data on these languages suggest that when the formal means of distinguishing gender fall away, it is the masculine form which takes hold and continues to exist, while the feminine form loses its status and gradually falls out of use. As an example, we can use the verb *ɣurў-:ɣurўd* 'whine; whimper (of a dog)'. As we can see that this word has *u*-vocalization, we can posit that it belongs(/ed) to the masculine gender. The feminine form is much less used: *ɣarў-:ɣarўd*, and the form with *u*-vocalization is used also with feminine nouns: e.g. *yā palāng ɣurўd* 'the leopard whines' // *yu kud ɣurўd* 'the dog whimpers'.

Moreover, it should be noted that a certain class of verbs is connected to a certain gender because of semantic considerations in connection with how the natural world works. Thus, for instance the verb *zod:zêc* 'give birth') is feminine. This type of verb may not have a masculine counterpart at all.

§130. As an example of a verb which has maintained its feminine form, we can use the verb *qāɣdow* 'caw'. The fact that the feminine form has been preserved can be explained by the fact that this verb is closely linked to actions of nouns which belong to the feminine gender: e.g. *ўāž* 'jackdaw' and *xūrn* 'crow' (both of which are feminine). Examples: *yā ўāž riwozd=at qāɣd* 'that jackdaw flies off and crows'; *wam xūrn ay kin, bās qāɣd* 'chase that crow away so it stops cawing'.

The same can be said of the verb *marўdow* 'purr', which is used predominantly with the feminine noun *piš* 'cat': *yā tu piš ar čīz ca lap marўd* 'you're cat is always purring (at something // for some reason)'.

It should also be kept in mind that an *a*-like vowel in a stem which doesn't have a corresponding masculine form doesn't necessarily mean that the feminine form has been preserved. In some cases, it is more likely to be the result of the imitation of a sound which sounds like *a*, as in *māwtow* 'meow'; *čaqtow* 'chirp; bark' (of a marmot); and *waqtow* 'sing; chirp' (of a partridge); etc.

In the plural of onomatopoeic, gender-distinguishing verbs, the feminine form is often used predominantly. Hence, in these cases, the forms are similar to and even identical to typical gender-distinguishing verbs: *wāð wam ўinik sifcen žiwal-en* 'that woman's beads are sparkling'.

But onomatopoeic, gender-distinguishing verbs differ from typical gender-distinguishing verbs in that they also allow the use of the masculine form with plurals (in the present?): *wāð bačgalā divuyen-ti taqen (// tuqen)* 'those boys are knocking on the doors'.

§131. We can summarize the characteristics of onomatopoeic gender-distinguishing verbs in the following way:

(i) The fundamental model of vowel alternations in these words is *u~a*.

(ii) The vast majority of these words express the actions and states of animate nouns.

(iii) In rare cases, we get gender distinction in transitive verbs of this kind. This is an innovation.

(iv) Gender is distinguished in these verbs not only in past and perfect stems – as in typical gender-distinguishing verbs – but also in present and infinitive stems. This allows gender to be shown not only for subjects, but also for objects and adjuncts. For instance: *wi ɣiðā fuǩtow=um ǩud* 'I heard that boy breathing loudly'; *wam ɣāc faǩtow=um ǩud* 'I heard that girl breathing loudly'.

(v) In some cases, there is a semantic distinction between the masculine and feminine forms of these verbs. In these cases, we can say that the gender distinction is becoming weakened and each of these words is becoming a separate lexeme with its own semantic specifications.

Conclusions about the expression of fender in nouns, verbs, and onomatopoeic words

§132. Table 49 (p. 187) summarizes the type of vowel alternations used to distinguish gender in all parts of words where it is distinguished: nouns, adjectives, past and perfect stems, and onomatopoeic adverbs and verbs.

Nouns

ALT.	IR. VOWEL	M. POS.	F. POS.	EXAMPLE	GLOSS	ETYMOLOGY
u~a	*u, ū?	NP?	a-umlaut?	*čuǩ~čaǩ*	rooster/ chicken	?
u~i	*u, ū	NP	i-umlaut	*kud~kid*	dog (m~f)	**kuta-*; **kuti-*
ū~i	*u, ū	NP (before 2 consonants)	i-umlaut	*wūrǰ~wirdzin*	wolf	Av. *vəhrka-*

ū~o	*a	NP (before 2 consonants)	a-umlaut (before 2 consonants)	*vūyd~voyd*	evil spirit	?
o~ê	*ā	NP	i-umlaut	*vorǰ~vêrdz*	horse	**bāraka-*; **bārači*
ī~ī*	*a	NP	i-umlaut	*šīg*	bull	?

Adjectives

ALT.	IR. VOWEL	M. POS.	F. POS.	EXAMPLE	GLOSS	ETYMOLOGY
u~a	*u, ū	NP	a-umlaut	*kut~kat*	short	?
ī~ā	*a	NP	a-umlaut	*xīǰ~xāǰ*	sweet	x(v)arəz(išta)
ê~ā	*a	NP (before uvular)	a-umlaut	*čêxt~čāxt*	crooked; curved	?
ū~o	*a	NP (before 2 consonants)	a-umlaut (before 2 consonants)	*vūǰdz~voǰdz*	long	?
ī~ī	*a	NP	i-umlaut	*līš~līš*	naked	?

Past Stems

ALT.	IR. VOWEL	M. POS.	F. POS.	EXAMPLE	GLOSS	ETYMOLOGY
u~a	*u, ū	NP	a-umlaut	*vud~vad*	was	*būta-, *būtā-
ī~ā	*a	NP	a-umlaut	*naǰǰīd~naǰǰād*	passed	*niž-gata(ā)
ū~o	*a	NP (before 2 consonants)	a-umlaut (before 2 consonants)	*tūyd~toyd*	*taxta-	*taxta(ā)
o~o	*ā	NP	a-umlaut	*ǰicod~ǰicod*	froze	*ščāta(ā)

Perf. Stems

ALT.	IR. VOWEL	M. POS.	F. POS.	EXAMPLE	GLOSS	ETYMOLOGY
u~i	*u, ū	NP	i-umlaut	*puðǰ~pic*	rotten	*puta-(a)ka; *puta-či
ū~ī	*a	NP (before 2 consonants)	i-umlaut (before 2 consonants)	*nūšč~nīsc*	sat	ni-hasta(ka) ni-hasta(či)
o~ê	*ā	NP	i-umlaut	*x̌icoðǰ*	x̌icêc	*šč̄āta-ka *sč̄ātači

We can make the following fundamental conclusions:

(i) Gender-distinguishing models which were historically based on the ***endings*** of nominals (including nouns, adjectives, and participles in *-*ta*-), came to be based on ***internal parts*** of gender-distinguishing words in the modern Shughni-Rushani languages – not only on nouns and adjectives, but also in verb stems. This came about due to the deterioration of stressed gender endings as well as the restructuring of the verbal system whereby erstwhile participial forms came to be used as inflected, tensed verb stems. In doing so, the system of gender-distinguishing vowels developed and refined itself on the basis of what was once a model used strictly for nominal parts of speech. Ultimately, in the modern languages, we find what is essentially the same system used for both nominal and non-nominal gender-distinguishing parts of speech.

(ii) If we don't count individual deviations in gender vowel alternations which have come about via different phonetic positions and differences in the vowel systems of individual languages in the group, then a fairly tight-knit, orderly system of vowels participating in gender distinction reveals itself. In particular, for masculine gender we typically get *u*-like vowels, in which the following are included:

a. *u* itself, which is the most widespread and found in all languages of the group.

b. *ū*, which is found in all languages in the word *mūd/mūg* 'died'

c. R-X, B-Rv *ō*, which regularly correspond to Sh. *ī, ê*

d. R-X *ů*, which corresponds to *ō* in the other languages.

Historically speaking, masculine vocalization is the result of Iranian vowels in neutral position. The development of *u*-like vowels in this position was also facilitated by sound symbolism (§124).

(iii) Feminine markers in all categories of words which distinguish gender are *a*- and *i*-like vowels. This includes:

> **a.** *a*, which is quite common among all languages of the group and is found a wide variety of words.
>
> **b.** *ā*, which is found in all languages of the group, but which is found with particular consistency in Rushani.
>
> **c.** *o*, which has come about via the narrowing of *a, ā*, but in some cases this narrowing does not occur in Rushani – cf. Ru. *wirāvd* 'stood', Sh.-Bh., Kh., Bt-Rv. *wirōvd*).

(iv) *i*-like vowels are characteristic for a series of nouns and is widely distributed in perfect stems, but in Roshorvi there is a tendency toward the leveling of perfect stems based on the *a*-vocalization of past stems.

(v) Synchronically, masculine gender is associated with rounded vowels (and via its association with Ru-Kh *o*, Bt-Rv *ȫ*, also Sh. unrounded *ī, ê*. And with the feminine we typically find unrounded vowels (*a, ā, (<ō), i, ī, ē*, Sh., Bj. *ê*.

(vi) On the basis of these gender-distinguishing models of vowel alternations, in some cases it is possible to identify the gender specification of non-gender-distinguishing nouns. However, this is not always a reliable way of doing things. In general, it can be said that finding the gender of a noun can be done based on two main factors: (i) the noun's stem vowel (i.e. the word form) and (ii) its semantics.

Expression of grammatical gender in demonstrative pronouns

§133. The loss of case and gender endings on common nouns in the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group has led to the wide usage of demonstrative pronouns to distinguish the grammatical gender and case of nouns. With the weakening of their «demonstrative» meaning, all forms (both direct and oblique) have transitioned into a series of definite articles and also mark the number (singular and plural) and gender (fem. and masc.) of nouns. Thus, "the combination of nouns (which in these languages have lost their inflectional declension) with demonstrative pronouns/articles which change to show case is effectively equal in function to the analogous case system (Rastorgueva 1975:180)."

Because gender distinction is not fully realized on all nouns, adjectives, and verbs – and in fact only shows up on a rather small number of words in each of these parts of speech – demonstrative pronouns have the role of universal gender marker. We can use these as a way to distinguish the gender of nouns accurately. Demonstrative pronouns distinguish gender both when they are used without the noun they stand for (i.e. as third-person pronouns) as well as in their role as definite articles along with a noun. We can also see via demonstrative pronouns the grammatical gender of a words which have multiple meanings and may be either masculine or feminine depending on their semantics: *yā x̌āb naɣ̌jād* 'that night passed' and *mi x̌āb-aθ=at tar kā rawůn*. 'Where are you going in this darkness?".

Demonstrative pronouns, in particular in their oblique forms, have remained rather conservative in that they are still used to show case, grammatical gender, and three degrees of distance in time and space. We can see this also in Yazghulami, which has lost formal gender distinction on other classes of words (nouns, adjectives, and verbs) but still retains gender distinction in its oblique demonstrative pronouns (Edelman 1966:40). In Sarikoli, even though grammatical gender has been completely lost, the oblique forms of demonstrative pronouns which once distinguished gender have been preserved (Pakhalina 1969:28). By the fact that three deictic degrees are preserved in the Shughni-Rushani languages' demonstrative pronoun systems, these languages are similar to a number of ancient and modern languages which have preserved this system – not only Indo-Iranian, but also other Indo-European languages. Bygone languages which had this system were Khwarezmian and Sogdian; modern languages include Pashto and Dardic. On this, see Freyman 1951:43-47; Bogolyubov 1960:4-5; Livshic 1956:122; Dvornyakov 1960:44-45; Edelman 1976a; Brugman 1904; Siyoyev 1972: 165-195).

A synchronic description of the demonstrative pronouns in each of the Shughni-Rushani languages has been carried out in individual descriptive monographs (see Karamshoev 1963: 118-127; Fayzov 1966: 64-75; Pakhalina 1966: 33-36; Karamkhudoev 1973: 111-116).

These pronouns have been examined from a diachronic in the works of G. Morgenstierne and D.I. Edelman (Morgenstierne 1942; 1974; Pakhalina 1966: 33-36; see also Efimov 1975: 110).

The purpose of this section is to analyze the structure and functionality of only those demonstrative pronouns which distinguish gender. All forms of demonstrative pronouns from the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group are given in Table 50. These demonstrative pronouns often combine with the prefixal augmentative particle (*i*)*k*- and with the diminutive suffix -*ik*. Hence, with these combinations, the number of demonstrative pronoun forms is doubled. It should be noted, furthermore, that the formation of complex demonstrative forms via the aforementioned suffix and prefix entails not only a structural change, but also a functional division within the system of demonstrative pronouns. In particular, forms with the prepositional augmentative particle *(i)k*- are generally used with demonstrative pronouns in their demonstrative functions (i.e. together with an overt noun).[54]

Table 50

DEGREE	CASE	GENDER	FORM	ETYMOLOGY
Distal	Dir.	M	*yu*	Proto-Ir. **ava*, Av. *aom* > **awah-, *awam* > *yu*
Distal	Dir.	F.	*yā*	**avā-* > *yā*
Distal	Obl.	M.	*wi*	
Distal	Obl.	F.	*wam*	
Medial	Dir.	M/F	*yid*	Proto-Ir. **(a)ita*, Av. *aetem*; F. *(a)itā-*
Medial	Obl.	M.	*di*	
Medial	Obl.	F.	*dam*	
Proximal	Dir.	M/F	*yam*	Proto-Ir. **-ima-*; Av. *iməm*; **imā* (f.)
Proximal	Obl.	M.	*mi*	
Proximal	Obl.	F.	*mam*	

[54] An analogous phenomenon has been noted within the Wakhi system of demonstrative pronouns with the augmentative particle *a*- (see Grunberg and Steblin-Kaminsky: 1976: 570, 652).

Forms created via the augmentative prefixal particle include:

ik-am

k-id

k-u // ik-u

In combinations with the diminutive suffix *–(y)ik*, all of these pronouns are used only independently in a pronominal function: Sh. *yu-yik mu na-wīnt* 'he doesn't see me'; *yā-ik toyd* 'she left'.

§134. This section summarizes differences between each language in gender distinction in demonstrative pronouns.

Note that demonstrative pronouns can also occur with possessive adjectives, as in *yā tu nān=ta cawaxt yothd*. 'what time will your mom arrive?'

§135. This section is on the distinction in forms of oblique demonstrative pronouns among the languages of the group. What is common to all languages is that the distal, medial, and proximal forms begin with *w-*, *d-*, and *m-*, respectively. This is true form both singular forms (*wi/wam, di/dam, mi/mam*) and plural forms (*wāth/wev, dāth/dev, māth/mev*). These initial consonants go back to **ava-*, **aita-*, and **ima*, respectively. These go back to the Ancient Iranian genitive of the type **avahya- > wi* (Morgenstierne 1942: 259; Edelman 1976a: 94). Apparently, Rushani-Khufi have preserved a more ancient form than the other languages.

Among the languages of the group, we get three types of vocalization in the feminine form: *a* (Sh./Rv.), *i* (Bt./Bj.), and *u* (R-Kh., Bt.). The correspondences here (in comparison with the correspondences for the masculine forms?) change dramatically: Roshorvi coincides with Shughni; Bartangi in two instances coincides with Bajuwi (Bj., Bt. *mim, dim*), but in the distal degree coincides with Rushani and Khufi (Ru-Kh, Bt. *(w)um*). In Bajuwi, the feminine forms have the same vowel *i* as the in the masculine forms and differ from them only in that they have a final consonant *m* (cf. Bj. masc. *mi, di, wi*, fem. *mim, dim, wim*; Bt. *mim, dim (w)um*. How can

we explain such variety and inconsistency both in the vowels we find and in the correspondences we find among the languages of the group (i.e. the shared vowels between Shughni and Roshorvi and between Bartangi and Bajuwi? And how can we explain the uncharacteristic *u* vocalization for Rushani and Khufi, and in one case for Bartangi?

Inhibiting the solution to this problem is the fact that we still do not have reliable etymology for all oblique forms of demonstrative pronouns. Thus, for instance, the origin of the masculine and feminine oblique forms, without any particular specification in detail, has been connected to the direct-case forms of the three deictic degrees (Efimov 1975: 111). A more detailed analysis of the gender-distinguishing forms is put forth in the works of G. Morgenstierne and D.I. Edelman, although these authors do not agree with one another on the origin of the feminine form. For instance, Morgenstierne (1942:259) traces the feminine forms back to the ancient Iranian ablative masculine singular of the type **aita(h)amat*. Edelman, for her part, proposes a link between these forms and the accusative feminine of the type **aitām*, which, according to her (1976a: 94), "from the start was used in parallel with the masculine accusative form of the type **aitam*, and then afterward expanded its function to the general oblique, as the historical feminine genitive ultimately turned out to be too close in form the genitive masculine form."

In the examples given above, it's fairly easy to explain the forms with *a*-vocalization based on the *a*-umlaut conditions in ancient languages; however, it is not immediately clear how to derive the forms which contain *i*, as in Bj. *mim, dim*. These forms would require a separate proform with *i*-umlaut. For me, it is essential to explain the reasons for the unexpected differences between closely related varieties and unexpected commonalities between more distantly related varieties.

The fact that Shughni and Roshorvi share the vowel *a* in the feminine oblique forms is apparently not the result of the former's influence on the latter. (We would instead expect Roshorvi to be influenced by its more geographically and grammatically close neighbor Bartangi). The fact that we get forms with *a* in Roshorvi is more likely to be explained by the phenomenon in Roshorvi whereby *a*-vocalization is becoming standardized for many feminine forms in the languages, a phenomenon which initially took root in perfect feminine stems. (§§75-91), and subsequently spread to nouns (cf. also Rv. *warǰan* 'she-wolf' – *wurǰ* 'wolf', but Sh.-Bj. *wirdzin—wūrǰ*.

The fact that we get *i* in feminine oblique forms in both Bajuwi and Bartangi is not connected to either's influence on the other. It is more likely the result of the same reflex of *i*-umlaut in both. And the fact that we get the form *(w)um* in both Rushani and Bartangi, I consider to be the influence of Rushani. This is supported by the fact that we get two forms in Bartangi with *i* (*mim, dim*). If we take the Bartangi form *(w)um* to be native, then we are forced to say that *mim* and *dim* are borrowed. But it's not possible to find their source. The adoption of the Rushani form *(w)um* into Bartangi was facilitated by the fact that, unlike the two forms mentioned above – *mim* and *dim* – *(w)um* has a high frequency and is often used as a 3rd person personal pronoun.

§136. According to Karamshoev, demonstrative pronouns can be used with proper names: *wi Šoyik=um nur na-wīnt* ‘I didn’t see (that) Šoyik today’.

§137. He notes that there are some cases of ambiguity between a demonstrative pronoun’s deictic usage and its possessive usage (e.g. *di čīd čis* can mean either ‘look at this house’ or ‘look at his house’). This ambiguity disappears when there is a mismatch between the gender of the person and the gender of the noun.

§138. This section is about the ergative construction in other S-R languages. It notes that Roshorvi is the only language where the gender of subjects is not distinguished; it does not have gender-distinguishing direct forms of pronouns nor the ergative costruction.

Expression of grammatical gender in the demonstrative particle and the interrogative adverb

§139. In all languages of the Shughni-Rushani group, there is a demonstrative particle with a meaning similar to French *voila* and *voici* and to Russian вот and вон. It is formally and functionally similar to the direct forms of singular demonstrative pronouns. In Shughni and Bajuwi, the distal degree of this particle can inflect to show gender:

PROXIMAL	MEDIAL	DISTAL
yima	*yida*	*yuwu* (m.) // *yuwa* (f.)

Researchers have linked this form etymologically to the direct case of demonstrative pronouns – *yam, yid, yu/yā* (Karamkhudoev 1976: 237; Kurbanov 1976: 220). The lack of gender distinction in the vast majority of languages and its presence in Shughni and Bajuwi is apparently connected to the fact that these two varieties have gender-distinguishing direct distal demonstrative forms (*yu* ~ *yā*). The idea is that these forms would have influenced the distal demonstrative particles *yuwu* and *yuwa*. Examples: *yuwu* ‘there he/it is’; *yuwa* ‘there she/it is’; *yā žow yuwa* ‘there’s that cow’; *yu x̌īǰ yuwa* ‘there’s that bull’.

It should be noted, however, that gender distinction with these forms is somewhat unstable. In some instances – primarily in fast speech – we find the feminine form used with masculine nouns and vice versa (Karamshoev 1963: 236).

§140. The interrogative pronominal adverb with the general meaning 'where' also changes for gender:

M. *kačūd, kaču*

F. *kačād, kača*.

Examples: *tu viro kačūd?* 'where is your brother?'; *tu nān kačād? – yuwa yat* 'where is your mom? – there she comes.' Note that this is a strange vowel alternation. We don't get *ū~ā* anywhere else, I don't think.

Expression of grammatical gender in suffixation and compounding

§141. Gender-distinguishing (derivational?) suffixes, denominal gender-distinguishing formants, as well as components of compound words are all important morphological means for expressing gender in nouns and adjectives. We can for the most part consider these means to be productive. These means are used for both animate and inanimate nouns. It should be noted, however, that some suffixes – in particular those like Sh. *-oǰ*, *-êdz* are only used within a limited semantic realm. Others are used in a more wide distribution and may be used with either animate or inanimate nouns, such as Sh. *-eǰ*, *-edz*.

Other suffixes are found only in some languages, such as Bt. *-ə̈̄k, -ēk*; R-Kh. *-on*, Bt.-Rv. *-ə̈̄n/-ān*.

The type of vowel alternations found in these suffixes coincide with those alternations discussed in the previous sections. For this reason, this section is dedicated primarily to a functional analysis of how these gender-distinguishing suffixes.

The suffixes discussed here often appear together with an epenthetic glide, as in *–(y)eǰ* (Sh. *kurtayeǰ*, cf. R-Kh., Bt-Rv. *kurtayīǰ* (a cut of material for clothes?)

Expression of grammatical gender in derivational suffixes

§142. Gender-distinguishing derivational suffixes are used to form nouns, adjectives, and present participles. There is quite a bit of discrepancy in the languages of the group regarding these suffixes, in particular with respect to the presence or absence of a given suffix in a given language.
Common to all languages are the old gendered suffixes *-*aka* and *-*ačī*, which have as their reflexes *-ǰ/-č* and *-dz/-c*, respectively (Morgenstierne 1962: 160-165; Sokolova 1967: §§11, 32, 115, 173). These suffixes are used to distinguish gender in certain nouns as well as a large number of perfect stems. In the perfect, as has already been described in previous sections, these suffixes have merged entirely with the stem; as such, they can only be called suffixes in a historical sense. In most nouns, in some languages, these formants are productive, although in some words they have also been fused with the stem.

§143. The gender-distinguishing suffixes Sh. *-eǰ, -êdz* stand out among the other gender-distinguishing suffixes for their rather wide distribution. These are used in nouns denoting persons as well as inanimate nouns.

§144. The aforementioned suffixes *-eǰ, -edz* are used to create masculine and feminine terms, respectively, denoting familial relations. In Shughni, the gender specification of these suffixes is quite steadfast, but in the other languages, the corresponding suffixes *-īǰ* and *īdz* have a less strong gender specification, and each may be optionally used with a noun of the opposite gender. The fundamental meaning of this suffix when attaching to these words is to denote a non-blood or semi-blood relation. Examples are in the table below:

Masculine	**Gloss**	**Feminine**	**Gloss**
dodeǰ	stepfather	*nānedz*	stepmother
puceǰ	stepson	*rizīnedz*	stepdaughter
virodeǰ	stepbrother	*yaxedz*	stepsister
čoreǰ	fiancé; bridegroom	*ǰinedz*	fiancée; bride
bobeǰ	non-blood grandfather	*mūmedz*	non-blood grandmother

Some notes are made here about scholars' opinions about the fate of *-īǰ* and *-īdz* in other languages. It seems that in Rushani, it is the feminine form which is used more often than the masculine, while in Roshorvi the situation is reversed.

Karamshoev further makes the point here that while certain authors – namely Karamkhudoev in discussing Bartangi – have taken the parallel usage and mixing of these suffixes to be evidence

for the loss of gender in these languages, this may not be great evidence for such a conclusion. While it is true that the suffixes themselves may be losing their function of distinguishing gender, the semantics of the root word clearly preserves the gender meaning. The point is that while suffixes such as these may lose the ability to distinguish gender, there is no evidence that this contributes to or is a result of the loss of grammatical gender itself. This is supported by the notion that the words in question show no sign of losing their gender specification.

§145. It's interesting that it is in Shughni and Bajuwi, which are the varieties where gender-distinguishing suffixes are less productive, that these suffixes have best maintained their morphological ability to distinguish gender. This seeming incongruity may be explained by the fact that in Rushani, Khufi, and Bartangi, the plural forms of nouns denoting familial relations are formed with suffixes R-Kh. *-ērdz*, Bt. *-ērdz, -ārdz, -ōrdz* (f.) and *-orǰ* (m.). These are not found in Shughni. These formants do not distinguish gender and the formant *-ērdz* has almost completely supplanted *-ōrǰ*. (I don't understand this.)[55]

Karamshoev describes this phenomenon a bit further here and supports his reasoning regarding the correlations mentioned above.

§146. This same suffix is used to indicate where a person comes from. In Bartangi, this suffix is strictly gender-distinguishing in this usage: *-īǰ* and *-īdz*, but in the other languages, including Shughni, only a single form is used. Examples: *xůfeǰ* 'from Khuf'; *bartangeǰ* 'from Bartang'; *wanǰeǰ* 'from Vanj'. It seems that in some cases, the stem to which this suffix is modified may be somehow altered, such as by the shortening of its vowel or by its contraction (e.g. *waxůn* 'Wakhan' > *waxeǰ* 'from the Wakhan').

The formants *-eǰ, -edz* are widely used among nouns which do not have a gender distinction based on natural sex. Here, they play a bit different of a role in the establishment of a noun's gender. When used with inanimate objects, these forms do not create opposing gendered forms but nonetheless maintain their gender-distinguishing ability. Thus, words formed with *-eǰ* typically correspond to masculine, while words formed with *-edz* are typically associated with feminine gender. The sphere of usage of each of these words is different in the sense that the masculine formant is associated with one semantic group while the feminine with another, but they are similar in that they both form a word which denotes something with a specific purpose.

With the feminine formant, we typically get nouns denoting something associated with agriculture with a meaning on the order of 'plot or field used for sowing crops' or 'plot or field with some crop'. Note that it doesn't matter what gender the stem word is; the resulting word will be feminine. Below, for instance, *žindam* is masculine, while *maǰ* is feminine. Examples:

[55] The point is made here that in plural forms, nouns which distinguish gender maintain their gender distinction (cf. *čuǰen* 'roosters' and *čaǰen* 'hens'). But the plural markers themselves do not distinguish gender. Pashto is apparently the only modern Iranian language which has preserved gender distinction in the (direct-case) plural suffixes for nouns.

*žindam**edz***	‘field for sowing wheat’
*maǩ**edz***	‘field for sowing peas’
*pīnǰ**edz***	‘field for sowing millet’
*ɣorǰ**edz***	‘field for sowing alfalfa’
*čūšč**edz***	‘field for sowing barley’
etc.	

The fact that these words are associated with feminine gender can be explained by the following: words like *zimc, sêpc* ‘field; plot for crops’ are feminine, and because these words fall into the same semantic category, they have taken on the feminine marker.[56] This is most clearly demonstrated in the case of masculine nouns which, when used in the sense of ‘field for sowing X crop’ change to feminine gender. Hence: *žindam* ‘wheat (m.)’, *čūšč* ‘barley (m.)’; *xarbuzā* ‘melon (m.)’ may also be used as feminine nouns with the meaning ‘field for X crop’.

With all this, we should add that the feminine forms listed here (both with and without the suffix *-edz*) can be used as masculine nouns in cases where they are used as collective and general nouns. An example from Khufi: *kalxōz ɣarǰīdz qōq sut* ‘the Kolkhoz’ alfalfa field dried up’.

From this we can conclude that in cases when the semantics of a word acts as the primary factor determining a word’s semantic specification, morphological signs of gender (in this case *-edz*) is trumped by semantics and stops being the means for determining gender.

The word *půndedz* ‘small path’ needs its own explanation. This word, as we can see, is formed with the suffix *-edz*; however, my materials indicate that it is masculine (as is the word *půnd*).[57] Karamshoev notes that this word was recorded as feminine in Bartangi the early writings of Zarubin and in Sokolova’s (1960) work. He speculates that given the vowel in this word in the other languages of the group (*ō* and *ā*), as well as its compatibility with the suffix *-edz*, it is likely to have belonged to the feminine gender in earlier languages.

§148. Without any semantic complications, nouns which continue the old feminine suffix **-ači-* typically belong to the feminine gender (see §184).[58] This is the case both for nouns formed productively, as well as for frozen forms. In the case of frozen forms, the vowel in the suffix differs from language to language: Sh. *-īdz*, as in *zarīdz* ‘partridge’ (**zarači-*, cf. Ossetian present stem *zar-* ‘sing’) and in *paǩnīdz* ‘large pitcher’ (**pari-nīti-čī-*).

[56] Historically, the word *zimc* has the feminine suffix **-či-* (**zami-či*). It is interesting to note that in Yazghulami this same suffix has been preserved as a masculine marker for nouns which are historically feminine, both animate and inanimate (e.g. *nanéžg* ‘mothers’, *vəzéžg* ‘goats’; and *zəmčéžg* ‘plots of land’; *səfčéžg* ‘beads’). In the Shughni-Rushani languages, the words *sifc* and *zimc* are both feminine. According to V.S. Sokolova (1967: §167), the Yazghulami plural marker *-éžg* corresponds to the Shughni-Rushani suffix *-ērdz, -ōrǰ*.

[57] It’s also worth noting here that this word historically is masculine.

[58] On the history of the suffix **-či-* and its role in the formation of feminine nouns, see Morgenstierne 1973: 102-107.

The fact that this formant derives feminine nouns can also be seen when it attaches to present verb stems:

PRES. STEM (INF.)	**GLOSS**	**SUFFIXED FORM**	**GLOSS**
wiǐ- (*wiǐdow*)	unlock	*wiǐ**ītdz***	key
ǐeb- (*ǐīvdow*)	beat	*ǐab**ītdz***	stick
picêr- (*picêrt*)	stir (of hot food)	*picar**ītdz***	try; sample (of hot food)
šarθ- (šuǐt)	defecate	*šarðītdz*	butt

Additional forms *kirītdz* ‘chirp(ing); (name of a bird)’ and *tiwēc* ‘spoon’ are found in Bartangi (the former) and Bartangi and Rushani-Khufi (the letter).

Karamshoev makes another note here regarding the reason why these forms are feminine. He speculates that because, for instance *oš* (local food); *xuǐpā* ‘soup' and *amoč* (another type of soup) are feminine, words which are associated with these things, such as *picarītdz* are also formed as feminine (on the basis of a semantic grouping?). Similarly, the Bartangi word *tiwēc* ‘wooden spoon’ is associated with Sh. *čib*, *seǰib* (and the corresponding words in Bartangi), which are also feminine.

In this case, as we can see, lexical-semantic factors motivate morphological formation. In other words, according to Karamshoev, the fact that we find the feminine suffix on these words is motivated by their association with a semantic class of words which is feminine.

§149. There is no doubt that the suffix **-čī- (*-či-*), from a diachronic standpoint, played a large role in forming various feminine nouns from a variety of semantic classes. To some extent, it is the same today. In general, all nouns with the historical feminine suffix **-čī-* continue their respective feminine form and meaning. The final vowel *i* of this suffix is typically reflected in the *i*-like vocalization of the modern stem vowel, and the consonant **č* in the historical suffix has as its reflex *c* or *dz*. Hence, we have a double marker of feminine gender – the vowel and the consonant – not only in verb stems but also in nouns. On this model of both form (i.e. vowel and consonant) as well as belonging to feminine gender, we find both nouns with the historical suffix **-čī-* as well as nouns that simply ended in **-čī-*, without the suffix. In both cases, **-čī-* has as its reflex *-c* or *-dz* as a marker of feminine gender, which as an inseparable part of the stem. Below is a list of attested nouns with final *-c* and *-dz* (from **-čī-*) as well as their possible etymologies:

MODERN SHUGHNI	**GLOSS**	**ETYMOLOGY**
parðenc	doorlock	**pari-dānya-čī*
pêrdz	rib	**parsu-čī* or **pāračī*
sabêc	peapod	**sapaθri-* ?
sêpc	agricultural field	**sāpači*

zimc	field	**zami-čī-*
sêc	spleen	**syāwačī-*
sidz	needle	**sūčī-*
sifc	beads	Skt. *sūči-,* Av. *sūkā-*
ỳêdz	burning coal	
vic	aunt by blood	**bat(a)čī-*
vêrdz	mare	**bāra-čī-*
têdz	cornice (on a mountain)	**tačī-*
čidyīnc	nettle	**kata-guna-čī-* ?
coỳdz	awl (instrument for making holes)	**drafša-či-*; cf. Tj. *čaxs*
firêỳdz	flea	**frušā-čī-?*[59]
ɣiθc	hawthorn	**gūθa-čī-*
nêdz	nose	**nah(y)a-čī0*
wixkīmc	tow (an untwisted bundle of fibers)	cf. *wixkamb-* 'to sort out hair'
xixc	halva	**hwarštačī*
xitêrdz	star	**stāra-čī-*
kixêpc	magpie	**karšipta-čī-* ?

Thus, within the system of nouns, we can consider both stem vowel and the stem-final consonants *-c* and *-dz*, which continue feminine forms in **-či-*, to be markers of feminine gender. Although these nouns are not associated with feminine sex and do not have a masculine counterpart, they nonetheless have typically maintained their feminine gender. This can be shown syntactically: e.g. *sidz viraxt* 'the needle broke'; *dam coỳdz mā-binês* 'don't lose that awl'.

Nonetheless, not all nouns ending in *-c*, *-dz* belong to the feminine gender. Exceptions generally come from words which either go back to a historical (i.e. historically masculine noun?) or which continue a noun which historically feminine noun in **-čī-*, but which have become masculine due to semantic features. Examples include the following:

NOUN	**GLOSS**	**ETYMOLOGY**
piðūỳdz	(thread from goat wool)	*pati-dr̥za-
moỳdz	hunger	Av. *mərəzāna?*
roỳdz	ear (of a plant)	**rārza-
pīc	face	Av. *paitiša-*
poc	(something to do with cows?)	Av. *pāθra-*
kůỳdz	hole	**kaušačī-?*
xūdz	wind	cf. Khot. *khauśa-*

[59] Sokolova (1967: §67) links this word to Indo-European **plou-*, **blou-*, Skt. *pluši-* and posits for it two stages of change: **pluši- > friỳ- > fraỳ-* (which is the same for Pashto *wrəžə*). In the second stage, *fraỳ-* took on the suffix **-čī-*. Then i-umlaut took place and the stem vowel was lengthened: **frāči- > firêỳdz*.

čêridz	ploughing	*čêr-* ‘plow’; *-idz* (denominal suffix for action)

§150. The masculine suffix *-eǰ*, just like its feminine counterpart *-edz*/*-īdz*, also derives nouns to indicate the purpose of something. However, this suffix derives masculine nouns. The distribution of this suffix is much broader than for its feminine counterpart. There is no gender opposition here.

This suffix is widely used both with masculine nouns and with feminine nouns (i.e. it attaches to feminine nouns to create a masculine derived noun). Examples:

EXAMPLE	**GLOSS**
pêx	boot(s)
*pêx**eǰ***	leather prepared for making boots
bīr	bed / lower part
*bir**eǰ***	bedding
garðā	bread
*garða**yeǰ***	flour for making bread
kurtā	dress; shirt
*kurta**yeǰ***	material cut for making a dress
wūs	beam
*wūs**eǰ***	lumber used for making a beam
půstīn	fur coat
půstīneǰ	pelt used for a fur coat
divu / (divi?)	door
divuyeǰ	material for making a door
fanā	wedge?
fanayeǰ	stick? for making a wedge?

§151. It is interesting to note that this suffix can attach rather freely to feminine nouns, which derives a masculine noun. The reason for this wide compatibility of the masculine suffix *-eǰ* with feminine nouns apparently lies, on the one hand, in the very nature of masculine gender in Shughni – namely as a category for general concepts, and on the other, in the semantic function of this suffix as denoting the purpose of something. Hence, objects for which there is not a

name, but which are denoted by *-eǰ*, fall into the masculine category. When this suffix attaches to such feminine words as *oš* 'noodle dish'; *xuǔpā* 'jelly-like soup; kisel'; and *amoč* 'soup with dumplings', the result is associated with such masculine nouns as *yoǰǰ* 'flour' (cf. *yoǰǰ tis sut* 'the flour spilled'). For precisely this same reason, when this noun attaches to such feminine nouns as *torǔak* 'adze'; *tavār* 'hatchet'; and *čêd* 'knife', the masculine formant was used because each word containing this suffix is associated with a word which belongs to masculine gender, namely *sipin* 'iron'. The following table shows examples of words which belong to the feminine ender and which take the suffix *-ej* to form a derived masculine nouns:

WORD	**GLOSS**
vidīrm	broom (f.)
*vidīrm**eǰ***	plant used in the making of brooms
oš	noodle (rice?) dish
*oš**eǰ***	flour for noodles
amoč	soup with dumplings
*amoč**eǰ***	flour used for making dumplings
xuǔpā	porridge
*xuǔpa**yeǰ***	flour used for making porridge
sitan	column
*sitan**eǰ***	lumber for columns
čêd	knife
*čêd**eǰ***	iron used to make knives
torǔak	adze
*torǔak**eǰ***	iron used for making adzes
tambůn	pants
*tambůn**ej***	cut of material used for making pants
pisen	sharpening stone
*pisen**eǰ***	stone for preparing a sharpening stone

Hence, the fact that we get the masculine suffix *-eǰ* attaching to these nouns is a result of the combination of two factors: (i) the nature of masculine gender as a category denoting general concepts, and (ii) the association of the resulting noun with another noun which belongs to masculine gender. All nouns which contain the suffix *-eǰ* belong to the masculine gender: *mi ošeǰ xurd zet* 'get that osh flour for yourselves'; *yu tu sitaneǰ qoq suðǰ* 'your beam-making wood has dried'.

§152. In Bartangi, and more rarely in Roshorvi, this suffix is used in a similar way that the suffix *-and* is used in Shughni – namely, to form nouns and relational adjectives which denote (unnamed) products that are made from an animal, including meat, wool, fat, etc.). Thus, the following nouns (or relational adjectives) in Shughni ending in *-and*, can have the suffix *-eǰ* in Bartangi and Roshorvi:

WORD	GLOSS
buč	(male) goat
*buč**and***	goat meat; goat (adj.) – used with a noun, e.g. meat, fat, wool, pelt
vaz	(female) goat
*vaz**and***	goat meat; (female) goat (rel. adj.)
x̌īǰ	bull
*x̌īǰ**and***	beef; bull (rel. adj.)
žow	cow
*žow**and***	beef; cow (rel. adj.)
čux̌	rooster
*čux̌**and***	chicken meat; rooster (rel. adj.)
čax̌	hen
*čax̌**and***	chicken meat; hen (rel. adj.)
zarīdz	partridge
*zarīdz**and***	partridge meat
naxčīr	mountain goat
*naxčīr**and***	mountain goat meat; mountain goat (rel. adj.)

Words formed with *-and* are masculine. It is worth noting that the same factors described above regarding the nature of semantic gender and the association with masculine nouns are at play here. In particular, words such as *půst* ‘pelt’, *gūx̌t* ‘meat’, *x̌ūvd* ‘milk’, and *wůn* ‘wool’, are all masculine. However, (I think this what he’s saying), when these words are used as relational adjectives (with or without an explicit noun) and modifying a feminine noun, they agree as feminine. This means that semantic factors play what seem to be two opposing roles here: on the

one hand, they help solidify certain nouns as masculine, and on the other, they play a role in cases where such nouns (or relational adjectives) switch to feminine gender.

§153. Bartangi has a gender-distinguishing diminutive suffix *-ə̈̄k, -ēk*, which can attach to both nouns and adjectives. This suffix pair shows a similar lack of firmness in its gender specification. In particular, while the masculine suffix is only used with masculine nouns and adjectives, the feminine suffix can be used with either feminine or masculine nouns. Karamshoev provides a table of nouns used with this suffix. This lack of firmness is associated with the same factors which were proposed to underlie the lack of firmness in *-ījˇ / -īdz* in Bartangi – namely, that it is used primarily with animate nouns which are clearly semantically marked for gender via their natural sex.

§154. This suffix can also be used with animals, in which case there are no deviations – the feminine form is used only with feminine animals and masculine only with masculine animals. A table is provided with examples.

§155. The suffix is also used with non-gender-distinguishing inanimate nouns, in which case there are also no such deviations. Examples are provided.

§156. These diminutive suffixes are also used with personal pronouns.

§157. These suffixes can also be used as subjects which stand in place of a noun which is understood by both speakers. A table is provided with examples (of the type *green-SFX* = 'little green (one/thing)'.

§158. While for qualitative adjectives, gender is primarily distinguished via the stem vowel, in the case of relational adjectives the use of suffixes is more common.

Gender distinction via relational-adjective suffixes takes place primarily in Bartangi, Rushani, and Khufi. R-Kh. has the suffix *-ůnjˇ, -nůnjˇ* (m.) and *-endz* (f.), and Bartangi has a similar gender-distinguishing suffix, which is used to form relational adjectives denoting a period of time. This gender-distinguishing suffix corresponds to Shughni *-īnjˇ*, which does not distinguish gender. A table is provided with examples.

In some cases, relational adjectives are formed from qualitative adjectives via the addition of one of these gender-distinguishing formants. Examples are given which mean 'front (adj.)', 'back (adj.)', 'upper', and 'lower'.

A Shughni suffix which is formed using *-endz* is *miðendz* ‘middle (adj.)’, as in *yā miðendz yax čūd=i čor* ‘the middle sister got married.

§159. In these cases in Shughni, Bajuwi, and Roshorvi there is no gender distinction. The masculine form of this suffix has been preserved in these languages: Sh. *biyor(n)īnǰ* ‘yesterday’s’; *aǩībīnǰ* ‘the day before yesterday’s’; etc.

On the basis of relative adjectives which have preserved gender in Shughni, Bajuwi, and Roshorvi, we can establish that the feminine form had the same model (this doesn’t make sense to me).

Masculine	**Feminine**	**Gloss**
maǰdzůnǰ	*maǰdzendz*	hungry
xismůnǰ	*xismendz*	groom / bride
miðenǰ	*miðendz*	middle (child by age)
kāndůnč	*kāndenc*	half; incomplete

We can observe from the forms in this table that in some cases a gender-distinguishing forms exists in Shughni and Bajuwi but not in the other languages. Thus, for instance, in Rushani, Bartangi, and Khufi there is only the non-suffixed form *kāwn*, *kāmb* ‘half, partial', while in Shughni and Bajuwi we get the gender-distinguishing forms *kāndůnč* and *kāndenc*. Likewise, the word for ‘hunger’ in Bartangi and Roshorvi – *mōwz* – does not distinguish gender, but it does in Shughni.

Note that the nouns from which gender-distinguishing relational adjectives are formed sometimes change when the suffix is added – e.g. *moǰdz* ‘hunger’ > *maǰdzůnǰ* ‘hungry’; *miðenā* ‘middle’ > *miðenǰ* ‘middle (adj.)’. The word meaning ‘groom/bride’ is not used without this suffix (apparently these words go back to a merged combination of morphemes meaning literally ‘fallen into one's lot' (?).

§160. There is a gender distinguishing suffix *-anoǰ / -anēdz* in Rushani which forms relational adjectives. Examples are given here.

In the other languages, in general, only the masculine form is used. In Shughni we have the suffix *-inīǰ*, as in *xūninīǰ* 'bloody?'; *ǩacinīǰ* ‘wet with water’. These same forms can be used with either masculine or feminine nouns and hence do not distinguish gender.

§161. In Rushani and Khufi, a suffix indicating the purpose of receptacles has been preserved: *-ðon* (m.), *-ðēn* (f.). This suffix agrees with the gender of the type of receptacle, rather than the noun indicating what is stored inside: Kh. *ɣūzðōn bog (//kuzā)* `walnut jar' (*bog* = 'jar' (m.)); cf. *ɣūzðēn bēg* (// *pēlā*) 'bowl for walnuts' (*bēg* = 'bowl' (f.)'. Examples are given.

§162. Shughni has some frozen forms with a similar suffix *-tůn* or *-tēn*, which apparently shares a single etymological source with the suffixes discussed above in **-dāna-*. In Shughni, this is found in the word *wiǐten*, which denotes hay which is laid in a pyramid form on the house or next to it for feeding cows in the winter. In Bartangi and Roshorvi the form *wuǔtōn* means 'hayloft; hay shed'. The Yazghulami word *waǔtan* has the same meaning. Morgenstierne (1974: 95) reconstructs the proto-form **wāstra-dānya-* for these words.[60] Similar forms are found in Ishkashimi and Yidgha *ustīn* and *ůščeno*, respectively, which R. Dodykhudoev (1962: 33) links to the proto-form *wāstra-stana*. This word is important for the following reasons: a) in the second part of the word we find the old suffix with the meaning 'container', which has particularly clear reflexes in Bartangi, Roshorvi, and Yazghulami, where the word means 'shed for hay'; b) the existence of two forms with differing vocalizations (Sh.-Bj., R-X. *-tēn* (*i*-vocalization) but Yz. *-tan* (a-vocalization), which are markers of feminine gender, and also the masculine form in Bt-Rv. *-tōn*, which signals masculine gender. This indicates that this suffix had gender distinction in all languages of the Shughni-Rushani group, as well as Yazghulami. In particular, Sh.-Bj. *wiǐtēn*, R-Kh. *wuǔtēn*, and Yz. *waǔtan* continue the feminine form, while Bt-Rv. *wuǔtōn, wuǔtēn* continue both gendered forms. This is supported by the fact that form with *ē* in all languages of the group where it is found corresponds to feminine gender. In the Sarezian dialect, which is close to Roshorvi, moreover, we find the existence of both forms: *wuǔtōn*, which denotes a hay loft, and *wuǔtēn* which denotes hay which is lain in a pyramid form. Examples of each are given.

§163. A few further words can be added to this group, including Bj. *arðůn*, R-Kh. *arðōn*, Bt. *raðōn* 'hearth' (from **aθra-ðāna-* 'lit. 'fire holder?'; cf. Ru. *aθēr-ðōni* 'place for ashes'); Sh. *zidůn* 'granary; barn; place for storing grain' (**uz-dāna-*)[61]. Interestingly, the first forms, namely *arðůn* and its counterparts in the other languages differ in gender specification. Namely, Bj. *arðůn* is masculine, while R-Kh. *arðōn* and Bt. *raðōn* 'hearth' are feminine. This apparently has to do with the fact that the Shughni word meaning 'hearth', *kicor*, is masculine. However, the Shughni and Bajuwi word *zidůn* 'barn; granary', which contain the same suffixal element as Bajuwi *arðůn* (m.), belong to the feminine gender (as does the R-Kh. word *wērθ* with the meaning 'granary'). In this case, we can posit a two-fold intervention of Rushani on the gender specification for Shughni and Bajuwi *ziðůn*: a) the assimilation of the latter to the R-Kh. word

[60] On the basis of this proto-form, we can account for the different vocalizations via *i*-umlaut and *a*-umlaut. In Shughni, the proto-form would have been *dān(y)ī*, which would have led to ē in *-tēn*. In other languages, such as Yazghulami, we find *a*-vocalization as in *dān(y)ā-*.

[61] The etymology of this word is still controversial: Morgenstierne (1974: 107) links it to **uzdāna-*; Pakhalina (1975: 259) links both Wakhi *sədān* and Shughni *zidůn* to **sarna-dāna-*. What is uncontroversial is the fact that the second part of these words contain the suffix meaing 'container'.

wērθ; and b) the influence of R-Kh. *ō*-vocalization as a marker of feminine gender. We can underline here the notion that the lack of opposing, gender-distinguishing suffixal forms generally neutralizes the gender (specification?) of the remaining form. Thus, in Bartangi, Roshorvi, Shughni, and Bajuwi, the formants *-ðōn, -dōn* (Bt-Rv.) and Sh. *-důn* (Sh.-Bj.) are very much alive, but they are not gender-distinguishing. On this, see Karamkhudoev 1973: 197; Kurbanov 1976: 73. Compare, for instance, Sh. *gaðadůn* 'place for bread storage'; *wōx̌důn* 'storage place for hay'; *naswōrdůn* 'snuffbox'.

(Note that according to Karamshoev, there are two forms *wix̌ten* 'hay stacked as pyramid' and *wōx̌důn* 'granary'. This would mean that there are two forms linked to a single etymon, one with masculine vocalization and one with feminine vocalization.)

Ultimately, we can conclude that the preservation in Rushani and Khufi of gender-distinguishing formants *-ðōn/-ðēn* is ancient in origin and is an important archaism. Moreover, the frequent usage of *-ðon*, *-don, (-důn*) outside of a gendered position is apparently connected to contamination with the Tajik suffix *-dōn*.

§164. This section is on a gender-distinguishing suffix in Rushani, Khufi, and Roshorvi, of the type *-wů̈n* (m.) // *-wēn* (f.) in Rushani-Khufi and *-wȍ̈l* (m.) *-wēl* (f.) in Roshorvi. It forms nouns indicating that someone is dressed in a certain color, e.g. *tērwů̈n* 'dressed in black'.

§165. There are some adjectives with unproductive (gender-distinguishing?) suffixal elements. In Shughni we find the following: *-yoǰ/-yêdz* and *-dīr(-tīr)/ -dār(-tār)*. Examples are in the table below:

MASCULINE	**FEMININE**	**GLOSS**
*poðvi**yoǰ***	*poðvi**yêdz***	'barefoot'
*xi**dīr***	*xi**dār***	older
*fišt**īr***	*fištār*	middle (by age)
**dzul-di*	*dzaldi*	smaller

*In Bartangi, this adjective has a gender-distinguishing suffix.

§166. Of particular note are cases of lexicalization of gender-distinguishing formants. Thus, certain nouns continue to preserve only the morphological suffixal model of the masculine gender. In the feminine gender the suffix is not present, although the word itself belongs to the feminine gender and hence the gender specification of the two words can still be teased apart syntactically (see §184).

MASCULINE	FEMININE	GLOSS
miɣ̌ɪ̄ǰ	*maɣ̌*	ram / ewe
anzůmak	*andzem*	male/female lamb
x̌ůnči	*niwenc*	groom / bride
kiɣ̌ɪ̄ǰ	?	cleft; hole

Preserved feminine forms, where the masculine form lacks) include the following names of canyons within the Khuf Valley: *Xufēndz*; *Bašurvēndz, Ajirx̌ēndz, Axx̌ēc*.[62] These toponyms agree as feminine.

Expression of grammatical gender in participial suffixes and deverbal formants

§167. The topic of gender distinction in suffixes forming present participles has only been touched on briefly in monographs describing the Shughni-Rushani languages. On these, see Fayzov 1966: 131-132; Sokolova 1966: 381-382; Karamkhudoev 1974: 191-194; Karamshoev 1963: 174-175; Kurbanov 1976: 142-146).

Many issues regarding the formation of these participial forms have remained unsolved and controversial.

In particular, there is not a clear definition for the class of present verb stems from which gendered participles can be made. What are the functional characteristics of the gender-distinguishing forms R-Kh. *-ůč*, Bt. *-ōč* (m.) // *-ēc*, *-on* (f.); Bt.-Rv. *-ȫn* (m.) // *-ān* (f.)? Why is there so much discrepancy regarding the widespread presence of these forms in Bartangi, Rushani, Khufi, and Roshorvi, but their general lack in Shughni and Bajuwi? There is also an ongoing debate about what part of speech these words belong to.

This question was first asked and addressed by M. Fayzov in his description of Rushani, when the author got into a debate with Sokolova over the latter's definition of the gender-distinguishing formants *-ůč/-ēc* (R-Kh.)) as "suffixes which form present participles and (agent nouns?) from present verb stems. (Sokolova 1959: 270)" Fayzov, for his part, comes to the conclusion that "deverbal formations with *-ůč/-ůǰ* and *-ēc/-ēdz* in modern Rushani are agent nouns; the participial meaning in these words has been lost", and because of this they have completely lost their connection with verbs and transitioned into a class of nouns. (Fayzov 1966:

[62] These data are taken from the thesis work of N. Ofaridaeva, graduate of the Tajik National University. Her work is dedicated to the microtoponyms of Khuf. Their syntactic specification in the feminine gender was confirmed by examples recorded from a teacher in the same university, O. Bakiev.

132)" Other researchers did not pose this question regarding the categorical specification of these present participial forms but rather limited themselves to a short morphological characterization of the combination of verb stems with these suffixes.

A final solution to this issue can be attained only via a detailed investigation of finite verb forms in all languages and dialects of the Shughni-Rushani group. A comparative analysis of a large number of gender-distinguishing participial forms can to some extent help in this.

§168. A review of the many formations built on *-ů̊č / -ēc* (R-Kh.), *-ōč, -ēc* (Bt.); *-ōč* (Rv.), *-īǰ* (Sh.-Bj.) reveals that these forms generally have both a noun-like meaning (i.e. agent noun) as well as a verb-like meaning. Both meanings (nominal and verbal) are preserved in these form's independent (i.e. without a substantive noun) usage – as in Sh. *x̌oyīǰ* 'reading; reader', *niviš̌īǰ* 'writing; writer'; *vārīǰ* 'bringing; bearer' – as well as in combinations with substantive nouns – as in Sh. *kitob-x̌oyīǰ* 'reading a book; one who reads a/the book'.

In all this, it is worth reminding that the question at hand does not involve the transition of certain participial forms into a group of substantive nouns. The categorial transformation of different groups of words into others, including participial forms, is a common phenomenon and has been convincingly treated by N. Karamkhudoev (1973: 94-95, 194; see also sections 148, 166, and 184 of this work).

Here we are talking about participial formations which denote both agent nouns as well as the action itself. Their verbal features can be perceived both in their use as independent words, as well as in combination with substantive nouns, as in Sh. *buč-kiɣ̌īǰ* 'one who slaughters goats'; *sêwīǰ* 'one who grinds/crushes something // grinding/crushing', or in combination with nouns: *tamoki-sêwīǰ*, 'one who prepares chewing tobacco (*nas*) from dried tobacco leaves' *pix̌t-yānīǰ* 'one who prepares mulberry flour from dried mulberries' or 'crushing mulberries'.

These forms, as we can see, denote not only the agent noun, but also the action itself. For this reason, they can easily have a direct object. For this reason, we can say that these forms have not lost their connection with the verb stem. Their expression of an agent noun does not oppose, as it were, their expression of a verb-like meaning. Their nominal meaning is connected to the fact that almost all of these forms denote the action of a person. The gender-distinguishing endings, therefore, denote the person's gender/sex. Examples here come from Bartangi and Rushani-Khufi; e.g. R-Kh. *cayů̊č* (m.) *cayēc* 'one who harvests'.

Their verbal meaning, for its part, is in the notion that they: a) indicate an action; b) have transitive meanings and are therefore not indifferent to voice; and c) can combine with direct objects.

§169. The differing points of view and approaches to these forms are rooted in differing interpretations of another type of present participle also formed with present stems, but in this case with the help of the gender-distinguishing suffixes R.-Kh. *-on/-ān*, Bt.-Rv. *-ə̄n-ān*. (This suffix either does not exist or is not gender-distinguishing in Shughni.). Hence, the majority of researchers in their monographs on the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group have analyzed these forms as a second present participle (Karamshoev 1963: 175; Karamkhudoev 1974: 193; Kurbanov 1976: 143-144). However, M. Fayzov (1966: 36) interprets this participle as a type of adjectives and is therefore included in the section entitled "Adjectives". My research lends support to the point of view of M. Fayzov. The approach of other researchers to this type of participle can be justified primarily from a formal standpoint (i.e. the notion that they are formed from present verb stems?).

§170. With the goal of creating a wider and more reliable base for approaching this problem, I am providing nearly all the gender-distinguishing forms I have gathered.[63] The most commonly used forms with the suffix R-Kh. *-ə̆̊č* (more rarely *-ə̆̊ǰ*) / *-ēc* (more rarely *-ēdz*), Bt. *ōč* / *-ēc, -ēdz* are provided in Table 51; those formed with the suffix R-Kh. *-on*, Bt-Rv. *-ə̄n* / *-ān* are in Table 52.

p. 245

Table 51 continues to page 246.

§171. This section notes that many of these verbs undergo stem-vowel (qualitative and quantitative) changes in the formation of the present participle. It also notes that all verbs which take these suffixes are transitive and therefore oppose stems which take the passive suffix *-in*. In some cases, a typically intransitive verb such as *tīdow* combines with an object (e.g. road, as in 'road-go') to form one of these suffixes. These verbs can combine with direct objects to denote professions (of the type 'guitar player', 'goat slaughterer', etc.). In some cases, especially in cases where a profession is more common for one or the other gender, there may be no second pair (e.g. 'goat slaughter' does not have a feminine form). In these cases, the single form is used to denote a person of either sex.

§172. This section is on the interactions of vowel alternations in the different languages.

§173. This section discusses the use of these forms in attributive formations. It's interesting to note that the masculine form is often used in plural formations, even if they are modifying a feminine plural noun. Only in rare cases is the feminine form used with plural nouns.

[63] With appreciation I note that the vast majority of Roshorvi formations with the suffix *-ə̄n/-ān* were provided on the specialist on this language Kh. Kurbanov.

p. 250

In Shughni and Bajuwi this type of gender distinction does not exist; in all constructions similar to the ones exhibited here, the non-gender-distinguishing suffix *-ī̆ǰ* (which continues the masculine form of the suffix). Moreover, in Shughni, unlike in the other languages, the stem vowel in these present participles does not undergo any changes (cf. Sh. *wāfīǰ* 'weaver' from *wāf-* and *lůvīǰ* 'speaker' from *lův-*.

§174. The participial formations (though, functionally, these are deverbal adjectives) from present stems, with the addition of the gender-distinguishing suffixes R-Kh. *-on/-ān*, Bt-Rv. *-ǒn/-ān*, have a very wide distribution and are important means for distinguishing the gender of nouns in their attributive-adjectival usage as well as their substantive usage. The fundamental meaning of this suffix is to indicate a constant action (as if it were an always-present feature) of someone/something. This type of participle is formed from both transitive and intransitive verbs. Examples are given in Table 52, which takes up pages 251 and 252.

§175. A few notes are made here:

> (i) present stem vowels undergo changes in this type of participle
> (ii) they are compatible with transitive and intransitive verbs
> (iii) In some cases, these suffixes are compatible with the same present stems used with the suffixes discussed in the previous sections. (Examples of this are given in a table on p. 253)

Moreover, these suffixes behave more as adjectives than the previously discussed suffixes. A couple more facts attest to this:

> (iv) the majority of these forms are compatible with the comparative suffix *-di* (and hence adjective-like in this way).
> (v) the feminine form of this type of participle is used with plural forms (unlike the suffixes discussed above).

§176. In Roshorvi, the suffix *-ǒ̈n, -ān* is much more common than this suffix, and therefore there is sometimes ambiguity, e.g. *ðāðǒ̈n* can be either 'giving' or 'prone to giving'.

More about these suffixes in Roshorvi and Bartangi.

p. 255

§177. A comparison of the frequency of participles in Roshorvi and R-Kh. The Roshorvi suffix *-ǒ̈n, -ān* has a very wide distribution and is used even with borrowed verbs. This, according to

Karamshoev, is connected to the fact Roshorvi is undergoing the "standardization" (neutralization?) of gender-distinguishing forms.

§178. For Shughni, this type of participle is also not common. In Bajuwi, forms with *-īn* (m.) / *-ān* (f.) exist but are very rare. (e.g. Bj. *ðāðīn* 'combative' // *ðāðān* (f.); *wāɣīn // wāɣān* '(prone to) crying'). The existence of these forms are certainly the result of influence from neighboring Khufi and Rushani. In general, participial constructions of this find in Shughni and Bajuwi are formed with a single, non-gender-distinguishing suffix *-ījˇ* (e.g. *wāɣījˇ* 'crying', *ðāðījˇ* 'combative', etc.).

§179. In connection with the presence of gender-distinguishing participial suffixes in Rushani, Khufi, Bartangi, and Roshorvi, on the one hand, and their absence in Shughni and Bartangi on the other, two questions arise:

> **1)** How to explain such discrepancy across these languages?; and
>
> **2)** Can this lack of gender distinction in Shughni and Bajuwi participles be considered an example of the emerging tendency for these varieties toward the weakening and loss of the category of gender?

Because in Shughni and Bajuwi the gender of the actor (i.e. subject) is regularly indicated via the direct demonstrative pronouns *yu/yā*, the need to use a morphological means on the participle to distinguish gender is reduced. The presence of gender-distinguishing participial suffixes in the other languages of the group is likely connected to the fact that these languages lack gender-distinguishing direct demonstrative pronouns. In general, we can say that gender is distinguished in all languages of the group but that it is done differently in each. In some languages, morphological-suffixal means are used, while in others syntactic means are used. A nice table of examples is used here to illustrate the point that gender is distinguished in Shughni-Bajuwi differently than corresponding examples from the other languages.

In all of these examples, in all languages of the group, gender is distinguished in some way. Hence, there is no reason to point toward the loss of gender in any of them.

Nonetheless, it should be noted that the syntactic method of distinguishing gender (i.e. via demonstrative pronouns) is a relatively late phenomenon and its generalization is largely connected to the weakening of morphological means for distinguishing gender. The presence of suffixal (morphological) means for distinguishing gender should certainly be viewed as an archaism.

§180. Bartangi stands out among the other languages of the group in having a special gender-distinguishing suffix *-ə̄jˇ* (m.) / *-ēdz* (f.). On this, see also Sokolova 1960: 139; 1966: 382; Karamkhudoev 1974: 192. Using this suffix, two semantically distinct types of participles are formed in Bartangi.

The first type denotes a person acting with a nuance of intention, wish, or obligation (e.g. *ciyēdz* ‘intending to harvest’, etc.) Example sentences are given here.

Here, the masculine form is used also with plural nouns.

§181. The second type of participial form denotes the purpose of an object or tool, with the help of which one can perform some action. The combination of the masculine suffix *-ə̄ǰ* with a present stem indicates the belonging of an unnamed but implied object to masculine gender, while the marker *-ēdz* is associated with feminine nouns. Examples are given here, such as *incivə̄ǰ* // *incivēdz* ‘thing for sewing’.

Because these forms are used with transitive verbs, they often appear with direct objects, such as in *rə̄st-ginə̄ǰ* // *rāst-ginēdz* ‘something used to make something red’. Other examples are provided, including example sentences.

§182. There is no exact formation corresponding to the Bartangi suffixes described above in the other languages of the group. According to Kurbanov (1976: 145), gender distinction with these suffixes is not common in Roshorvi, but the masculine form is used for both meanings used above (i.e. intention to do something and a tool used to do something).

In Shughni , the suffix (*m*)*ējǰ*, which is found with a few short infinitive forms, corresponds formally and functionally to Bt-Rv. *-ə̄ǰ*. Examples include *tīd-mejǰ* ‘intending to leave’; *nīst-mejǰ* ‘intending to sit’.

§183. Of particular note are the extensive cases of lexicalization of gendered participial suffixes and the substantification of participial forms (see §148, 166). In some cases, the formal and semantic opposition of nouns with participial origin has been preserved. In R-Kh. *sawoǰ* (m.) denotes a round stone used for grinding tobacco, while the feminine form *sawēdz* means ‘a flat stone used to grind something’ (cf. Sh. *sêwīǰ*).

It is more common for substantivized participial forms to be preserved without gender opposition. Here, we can look at the following names of objects which have participial origin and which belong to masculine gender both in form and in semantics: Sh. *wiǩkirīǰ* ‘stoker (lit. that with which they search’); *senīǰ* (cf. *sentow*) ‘a wooden lever for lifting a millstone’ (lit. ‘that with which they lift’); *buč-kiɣīǰ* ‘a beam between two columns used to slaughter small animals (e.g. goats)’ (lit. ‘that with which they kill goats)’.

§184. Participles formed with feminine formants can also be substantivized. Examples are given from the other languages in the group.

§185. Noteworthy are examples in which a noun of participial origin formally continues one gender, but syntactically (and semantically) belongs to the other. Thus, for instance, the R-Kh. word *ðayān* 'precipitation' (from *ðiy-*, *ðay-* 'fall') has the feminine suffix *-ān* but belongs to the masculine gender. The same example is present for Bajuwi. In Bartangi this word is *ðiyōč*, which contains the masculine suffix. The transition of this word (in all languages) to masculine gender may have been facilitated by synonyms which belong to masculine gender, such as Sh. *žiniǰ* 'snow' and the borrowed word (from Tajik) *borůn* 'rain'.

§186. In all languages which have gender-distinguishing participial forms used to indicate the action of a person, the present stems of two commonly used verbs *xār-* 'eat' and *vār-* 'bring' can be used to show gender distinction and form a group of participial like words from substantive nouns. These forms take their vowels from models based on nouns. Thus, for instance, for Bajuwi, we get *-xōr* (m.) // *-xêr* (f.) and *-vōr* (m.) // *-vêr* (f.).

This type of vocalization is that found, for instance, in *vorǰ~vêrdz*. These gendered formants are not characteristic for Shughni, but they are used sometimes in Bartangi, which is a result of the influence of the languages which neighbor it. Note, however, that Bartangi uses its own gender-distinguishing vowels in these formants.

§187. Examples are given of the formant based on *-xār*. Semantically, this type of gender-distinguishing form is synonymous with the full participial form from the verb meaning 'eat', and it can be considered a truncated version of this participle.

§188. In Bartangi, in rare cases we observe the use of gender-distinguishing forms, but gender-distinguishing pairs are not used.

Moreover, pairs of forms in this dialect which retain gender-distinguishing models of vowels are semantically distinct from one another. The masculine form can be used also to indicate nouns of the feminine gender. Compare for instance Bj. *žindam-xōr* 'eating or using wheat (m. or f.)'; *x̌ūvd-xōr* 'using or drinking milk' and *x̌ūvd-xêr* 'milk-giving goat or sheep, which is separated from the herd and kept in the village for the summer'. These same examples exist for Bartangi-Roshorvi and Rushani-Khufi.

§189. The formant from *vīdow* 'bring' is similar in both its compatibility and meaning to that from *xīdow*. Examples are given for Bartangi-Roshorvi and Rushani-Khufi.

Other details of these formants are given in this section.

§190. In Shughni (and Bajuwi), these formations are done either with non-gender distinguishing formants *-xōr* and *-vōr*, or with the participial form of these verbs with the suffix *-ījˇ*: Sh.-Bj. *x̌ac-vor* or *x̌ac-vārījˇ* ‘bringing water // one who brings water’; *woxˇ-xōr, woxˇ-xārījˇ* ‘eating grass // herbivorous'; etc.

Denominal gender-distinguishing formants

§191. The transition of content words into function words, and also the transition of (meaningful?) words into morphological markers of gender, the analysis of this process, the elucidation of the reasons behind this transformation, as well as the description and specification of the semantic and grammatical workload of individual linguistic units, are all of great interest. The goal of this section is to attempt, using already published materials as well as data I have gathered, to examine the expression of gender in the languages of the Shughni-Rushani group via meaningful formants and to show the structural and semantic development of each of these gender-distinguishing elements.

As the materials indicate, three parts of speech – nouns, adjectives, and verb stems – are sources for gender-distinguishing formants.

As a result of the transition of lexical units into gender-distinguishing markers, as well as their subsequent grammaticization, a number of phonetic and semantic changes take place which affect both the first component as well as the second (i.e. the suffixal element). In particular, the vowels of the denominal suffix undergo gender alternations, and the initial consonant undergoes voicing when this kind of word formation takes place:[64] Sh. *rūšt-ǰūˇ* 'reddish-brown?’ (m.), *rošt-ǰāˇ* (f.); *čuxˇbuc* ‘chick (m.)’, *čaxˇbic* ‘chick (f.)’.

Some forms (such as *buc, bic*, for instance) may go on to gain their independence in their voiced version, both in usage and in meaning.

§192. Among gender-distinguishing formants a special place is held by the word *puc* (common to the Shughni-Rushani group), which goes back to ancient Iranian **puθra-* ‘son’. This lexeme

[64] The voicing of initial voiceless consonants of the second part of the compound word is a regular phenomenon and does not depend on a preceding voiced sound. Compare, for instance, Sh. *woxˇ-dzow* ‘haymaking' (from *cow* 'mowing'; *x̌ičīf-bůst* 'marmot pelt' (from *půst* ‘skin’); *tūð-bix̌t* ‘mulberry flour’ (*pix̌t* – flour).

is found in all languages and dialects of the Pamir group with relatively close phonetic and semantic variants: (i) as ‘son’ in the Shughni-Rushani group (plural *pacen*); Sarikoli *рыс*; Yz. *poc* (pl. *pacen, pacaθ*); Wakhi *pətr*, Mnj. *pūr*; (ii) as 'young (of an animal)’ in the Shughni-Rushani group as *buc* (pl. *bucen, bacen*); Yz. *bəc* (pl. *bəcaθ*); (iii) as ‘ovary (plant)’ or ‘small fruit / sapling / bud’ in the Shughni-Rushani group as *buc*, Yz. *boc*, *bəcək*, Wakhi *bəc*.

The gender-distinguishing forms *buc* (m.) and *bic* (f.), in addition to the meaning of ‘animal young’, are also used with people, as in the following examples: *a buc, tu=yat as-kā yat* ‘hey little son (kid), where did you come from?’; *a bic, či rizīn=at tu?* ‘hey little daughter (girl), whose daughter are you?’ The word *buc* took on such nuances as ‘child’ and ‘young male animal’, and this facilitated the rise of a special form *bic* for opposing *buc* in gender. A feminine form of this word appears, at first glance, to have existed even in ancient languages (cf. Skt. *putrī* ‘daughter’; *putra-* ‘son’). This explanation is brought forth by a letter to me from D. I. Edelman).

As it turns out, however, the word *bic* does not have its origin in **puθrī*. Rather, the pair *buc//bic* is a rather new development, as the transition of content words into markers of gender (in this case **puθra-* > puc > *-buc*, and with *i*-umlaut to *bic*) began and became solidified much later, namely after the loss of unstressed syllables located after the stressed syllable (there is likely a better name for this in linguistics, but I couldn’t immediately find it).

The internal changes of denominal formants took place under the influence of already established models gender alternation (of the type *u ~ i, ā, a*) which had a wide distribution in different types of words (nouns, adjectives, and verb stems).

§193. In Rushani, Khufi, and Bajuwi, this noun took on an additional semantic sense, as it used as an adjective meaning ‘small’. (often with the suffix *-ik*). The lack of this meaning in Shughni, Bartangi, and Roshorvi is explained by the presence in the latter languages of an adjective with the same meaning and with analogous gender distinction and suffixation:[65] R-Kh., Bj. *buc(ik)*, Sh., Bt-Rv. *dzul(ik)*; and *bic(ik),* Sh. *dzal(ik)*, Bt-Rv. *dzilikik*.

Gender-distinguishing adjectives are widely used with both animate and inanimate nouns. Examples from different languages are given here.

§194. The rise and solidification of the gender-distinguishing formants *-buc* and *-bic* in Shughni, Bartangi, and Roshorvi was facilitated, in my opinion, by the two following factors: (i) the presence in these languages of the substantive *buc//bic*, which meant ‘young (of an animal)’ or ‘bud’, and (ii) the influence of Rushani, where the adjective *bucik//bicik* ‘small’ was already commonly used.

[65] A discrepancy is found only the feminine vocalization, which is easily explained historically: the feminine form in Shughni has *a*-umlaut: *dzal* (just as in *čaǩ* and *čuǩ* ‘rooster’ and *sut~sat* ‘limping’). In Bartangi and Roshorvi, this form has *i*-umlaut (as in *giǰ~guǰ* ‘small goat, m~f’). Bajuwi, as we can see, has two parallel forms from each vocalization i//a: *bicik//bacik*. However, the *a*-umlaut form is used much less and has possibly arisen via influence from Shughni *dzalik*.

Thus, the reflex of Old Iranian *puθra* has taken on a very wide application in all languages of the group. A schema is provided here of the step-by-step lexico-semantic and grammatical development, as well as the reinterpretation of Old Iranian *puθra-* in the Shughni-Rushani languages.

§195. This section talks about how widely used *-buc/-bic* is in the Shughni-Rushani languages.

§196. This section outlines the types of nouns which take these suffixes and gives examples.

(a) Animals:
zarīdzbuc // zarīdzbic
kurabuc // kurabic 'foal'
wārgbuc // wārgbic 'lamb'

(b) Human familial relations:
xêrbuc // *xêrbic* 'little nephew/niece'
pitišbuc // pitišbic 'little cousin'

(c) With humans indicating 'son or daughter of X type of person'
wuǔyorbuc // wuǔyorbic 'son of a **sharp(-minded)** person'
zindabuc // zindabic 'son of a **quick-witted** person'
jůnbuc // jůnbic 'favorite; sweetheart'
kůrbuc // kůrbic 'son of a **blind** person'
kambaxtbuc // kambaxtbic 'son of an **unhappy** person'
nosoyaǔbuc // nosoyaǔbic 'son of an **uneasy/anxious** person'

(d) With toponyms indicating 'a person from X' or 'son/daughter of a person from X'
xůfejbuc // *xůfejbic* 'son of a Khufian / Khufian'
riǔenbuc // riǔenbic 'son of a Rushanian // Rushani'
qaryizbuc // qaryizbic 'son of a Kyrgyz // Kyrgyz'

§197. These suffixes are sometimes used with the diminutive *-ik* to express endearment.

§198. These suffixes can also be used with inanimate nouns, and they can also take the diminutive *-ak* in these cases.

WORD	**GLOSS**
MASC.	
kulčabuc(ak)	‘little bread’ (лепешечка)
kurtabuc(ak)	‘little shirt’ (рубашечка)
wiðorbuc(ak)	‘little hill’ (холмик)
abribuc(ak)	‘little cloud’ (облачко)
kūbuc(ak), tāxbuc(ak)	‘little mountain’
bīgbuc(ak)	'little jug' (кувшинчик)
cimūdbuc(ak)	'little basket' (корзиночка)
FEM.	
žīrbic(ak)	little stone
bīgbic(ak)	'little (already small jug)'
čībbic(ak)	'little spoon' (ложечка)
dekbic(ak)	'little pot' (котелок)
čakālbic(ak), zimcbic(ak)	‘little plot of land’ (маленький участок земли)
istolbic(ak)	‘little chair’ (столик)
půstinbucik	‘dear little fur coat’
kurtabucik	‘dear little shirt’
pakolbicik	‘dear little tyubeteika’
x̌iterdzbicik	‘dear little star’

An interesting note here is that when one wants to emphasize the small size of something, rather than the endearment, then *-ak* is preferred over *-ik*. Hence, *půstinbucak* is a small fur coat, rather than a fur coat that is dear to someone.

§199. This section simply says that the suffixes *-buc, -bic* are compatible with the plural morpheme *-en*. Examples are given.

In cases where there is no lexical distinction between masculine and feminine for a given word indicating an animate being (e.g. *wiðič*), and when there is no need to indicate the specific sex of an animal, the masculine is typically used for plural forms: *wiðičbucen* ‘little birds’; *kix̌êpcbucen* ‘little magpies’; *pūrgbucen* ‘little mice’. Note that *wiðič* and *kix̌êpc* are feminine, while *pūrg* is masculine.

§200. In the case of inanimate nouns, however, the gender marking is preserved on this suffix; hence with masculine nouns *kurtabucen, moθbucen* ‘little canes’*, ðorgbucen; tāxbucen; půstinbucen; kaltakbucen* ‘little rods’. And with feminine nouns: *wedbicen* 'willow sapling' (*wed* 'willow'); *wêbbicen* 'little sheaf (of grain)'; *wolčbicen* ‘little furrows'; *čax̌mabicen* ‘little springs’; *žīrbicen* ‘little stones’.

§201. The gender-distinguishing workload and the sphere of distribution of the formants *-buc* and *-bic* are not the same. The formant *-buc* is more frequent and more productive. In cases where there is no need to distinguish gender, the form *-buc(en)* is generally used. This kind of indifference to gender distinction is typically observed with nouns used in a general sense: *čaxbuc(en)* 'chicks'; *zarīdzbuc(en)* 'partridges'; *cicubuc(en)* 'snowbird young'; *bačgalabuc(en)* 'little kids'; *rīmbuc(en)* 'poplar saplings'.

In Shughni speech, in each of these cases both the plural and the singular may be used:

*sāwām zarīdzbuc**en** xurd anǰāvām* or
sāwām zarīdzbuc anǰāvām.
'let's go get some baby partiridges'

yu rīmbuc fukaθ qoq suðǰ or
wāð rīmbucen fukaθ qoq saðǰ
'all of those poplar saplings dried up

In these cases, the optionality of the plural marker comes from the semantics of the noun, which by itself indicates generality.

§202. There is an interesting phenomenon whereby the masculine suffix *-buc* attaches to feminine nouns, such as in *ɣācbuc* 'little girl'. It seems to me (Karamshoev) that here the suffix *-buc* is not fulfilling any gender-distinguishing role, but rather an expressive and endearing role. However, even in these cases, agreement with pronouns and verbs is feminine (e.g. Bj. *k-ā mu rizīn-buc*). Examples are given here from other Shughni-Rushani languages as well.

According to Karmashoev, *-buc* and *-bic* started out showing the gender (i.e. natural sex) of animate nouns and then subsequently developed the ability to be used with inanimate nouns as well.

§203. Another gender-distinguishing suffix whose structure and semantic development is *kīl~kāl*, which has the general meaning 'head'.

The question is still open as to whether both of these forms go back to a single historical etymon or, alternatively, as G. Morgenstierne (1974: 40) proposes, the word *kāl* is borrowed and adapted from Tajik *kal(l)a*. A detailed examination of their synchronic semantics, as well as their function and sphere of compatibility and usage could help shed light on this etymological question.

§204. The commonality and difference between these two lexemes is as follows:

> **(a)** as substantive nouns they are both masculine, which can be seen in the following examples: ***di*** *xu* ***kāl*** *zini* ‘wash your head’; *wi-nd ɣulā* ***kīl vud*** ‘he had a big head’; and
>
> **(b)** they are both synonyms and are used with the meaning ‘head; hair’.

Nonetheless, these two lexemes differ from one another stylistically, in their frequency, in their compatibility with other words, and also in their grammatical purpose. The word *kāl* with the meaning ‘head’ is used primarily with people, while the word *kīl* is used primarily with animals (cf. *mu kāl dārð kiẋt* ‘my head hurts’; *yā žīr ðod wi x̌īǰ kīl-and* ‘the stone hit the bull in the head’; *kīl-at polčak* ‘(animal) head and legs’. The word *kāl* is often used with an adverbial and postpositional meaning, in which case it has no gender specification: *kāl-and=um turd lůvǰ-at* ‘I told you at the beginning’; Bj. *kāl as baōr-at yu yat* ‘at the beginning of spring he came’. In its compound and postpositional usage, the initial *k* of *kāl* can become voiced: Sh. *sut tar wam wêð-gāl* ‘he went to the end of the stream’; *pi zimc kāl ɣal xist* 'at the top part of the plot of land it is still damp’.

On the basis of the substantive noun *kīl* ‘head’, an adjective has come about with the meaning ‘hornless’. This adjective distinguishes gender in many Shughni-Rushani languages, but not in Shughni or Bajuwi. Cf. Rushani *kol~kēl*. Examples of its usage in Shughni: *kīl x̌īǰ* / *miɣ̌īǰ* ‘hornless bull/ram’ or *kīl žow* ‘hornless cow’.

§205. In connection with this, there is a contentious and unresolved question regarding the origin of the formation of the gender-distinguishing formants *gīl~gāl*. Researchers of the Shughni-Rushani group, including the present author, have maintained the view that these formants arose from analogy with identical gender-distinguishing vocalization in other words, namely Sh. *ī~ā* (Karamshoev 1963: 95; Fayzov 1966: 18; Karamkhudoev 1973: 62; Kurbanov 1976: 63).

It is undisputed that the masculine formant in question arose from the word *kīl*, but did it arise from the noun or the adjective? The notion that the feminine formant *-gāl* would have arisen from the word *kāl* is difficult to posit because of the logically incongruous idea that *kāl*, a masculine word, would give rise to a feminine formant.

The original source of the masculine formant *-gīl* should be considered the noun rather than the adjective, for the primary reason that the feminine formant *-gāl* does not have a direct etymological link with *kāl* (if we connect the origin of the gender formants with the aforementioned gender-distinguishing adjective, then the development could have occurred in roughly the following way: the adjective *kīl* gave rise to *-gīl*, and the feminine formant *-gāl* in Shughni would have arisen from *kīl, kāl.* Here, however, we would expect in other languages of the group, namely Rushani-Khufi and Bartangi-Roshorvi, *-gēl* rather than *-gāl*). Because we get *-gāl* (and not *-gēl*), in addition to the fact that the semantics of this formant are a bit distorted – the adjective means ‘hornless’, while the formant means ‘head’ – it is a more readily defendable proposal that the suffix arose from the noun and not the adjective.

The feminine marker, for its part, arose via analogy with the *a*-umlaut gender-distinguishing model, of the type we see in *xidār* (masc. *xidīr*) ‘older’ and *cāў* (masc. *cīў*) ‘bitter’.

§206. The formant in question attaches to a few qualitative adjectives and forms gender-distinguishing adjectives. In these cases, it is the only means of distinguishing gender in these adjectives:

MASCULINE	**FEMININE**	**GLOSS**
têrgīl	*têrgāl*	‘black-haired’
zīrdgīl	*zīrdgāl*	‘red-headed’
safedgīl	*safedgāl*	‘gray-haired; old woman’

In the plural, gender-distinction does not take place and only the feminine form is used: *zīrdgāl bučāken* ‘yellow-headed (male) baby goats’; *zīrdgāl vazen* ‘yellow-headed female baby goats’

The formant *-gāl* is also used as a denominal postpositional element (suffix), as in *tāxgāl* ‘the end of the stone; the top of a mountain’ *wêðgāl* ‘end of the stream’.

§207. Some conclusions about these two denominal gender-distinguishing formants *buc~bic* and *gīl~gāl*.

> **(i)** *buc(ik)* and *bic(ik)* are used much more frequently than *gīl~gāl* and it is used to express more grammatical functions (e.g. diminutive, endearment, etc.). It also tends to preserve its gender distinction in the plural, unlike most other formants.
>
> **(ii)** *gīl~gāl* forms a narrow class of words (semantically speaking)

§208. The transition of content words into (function) markers which distinguish gender can be considered an ongoing process. This process of transformation can be seen even in borrowed words and grammatical units.

For instance, the masculine components *šo, x̌o, x̌ā* (from Tajik *šoh, šah*, ‘king’) *bek, bayg* (from Turkic *bek* ‘ruler’) are commonly used in masculine names, and feminine components *mo* (from Tajik *moh*, *mah*, Old Iranian *māh-* ‘month, moon’), *begim* (from Turkic *begim* ‘госпожа’). The adaptation of these forms took place in different periods, as a result of which there are a number of different phonetic and semantic variants which have developed from a single source, not only in proper names but also in their independent usages (see also §30.); compare Shughni *x̌o* ‘spiritual person’ with *x̌ā* ‘ruler’ (pl. *x̌ayen*). The word *bek* with the meaning ‘ruler’ in all languages of the group was taken on without change, but in all languages of the group except Shughni it appears as *bayg* when it functions as the component of a proper name (cf. R-Kh., Bt-Rv. *Nazarbayg* but Sh. *Nazarbek*).

The wide distribution and steadfast gender specification of the component *mo* (from Tajik *moh* ‘month’; ‘moon) among feminine nouns was apparently facilitated by the fact that the indigenous synonym component *mêst* ‘moon’ belongs to the feminine gender both historically and synchronically (from **masti*-; Khotanese *māstä*-; Skt. *mās*-). This is seen for instance in the example *mêst nost* ‘the moon went down’.

All of these components are active in the formation of masculine and feminine nouns.

§209. Some examples of names formed with these components:

MASCULINE	**FEMININE**
Aǰabšo	*Aǰabmo*
Dawlatšo	*Dawlatmo*
Nazaršo	*Nazarmo*
Niyozšo	*Niyozmo*
Sayidšo (also Sayīdšo)	*Sayidmo (also Sayīdmo)*
Parpišo	*Parpimo*
Qurbůnšo	*Qurbůnmo*
Šodawlat	*Modawlat*
Šoǰůn	*Mojůn*

p. 280

§ 210. The following are examples of names with the formant *bek* (m.) // *begim* (f.).

MASCULINE	**FEMININE**
Awobek	*Awobegim*

Amůnbek	*Amůnbegim*
Baxtibek	*Baxtibegim*
Watanbek	*Watanbegim*
Dawlatbek	*Dawlatbegim*
Yorbek	*Yorbegim*
Lālbek	*Lālbegim*
Marodbek	*Marodbegim*
Nazarbek	*Nazarbegim*
Ozodbek	*Ozod(a)begim*
Rawšanbek	*Rawšanbegim*
Sayidbek	*Sayidbegim*
Siltůnbek	*Siltůnbegim*
Šobek	*Šobegim*
Xoǰabek // Xūǰabek	*Xoǰabegim*
Qiryizbek // Qaryizbek	*Qiryizbegim // Qaryizbegim*

§211. Since the Soviet period, gender-distinguishing morphemes borrowed from Russian have been used in last names, namely the suffixes *(y)uf, -(y)ev* (m.) // *-y(uvā), (y)evā, (y)ivā* (f.). Examples: *Māmadšoyuf* // *Māmadšoyivā*; *Sayidbekuf* // *Sayidbekuva.*

For us the reinterpretation of these borrowed suffixes is important: they are used to mean ‘son’ and ‘daughter’ and can serve to distinguish the gender of a person even when one does not know the person’s first name. The following examples are telling: *ku lův, tu=t či-yuva?* ‘whose daughter are you?’; *wuz as-kā fāmum yu či-yuf?* ‘how should I know whose son he is?’.

As we can see, borrowed formants are easily assimilated to distinguish gender.

§212. Some gender-distinguishing qualitative adjectives are used in making complex (multi-morphemic or compound?) words and reserve their function of gender distinction in complex nouns and adjectives.

The qualitative adjective with the meaning ‘varied; striped’ (see Table 54 below) stands out among other gender-distinguishing words of this class because it is significantly grammaticized and can be seen as a specifier of gender within complex adjectives. This formant can attach to almost all words denoting a color. It stands out also because of its position in complex adjectives: it is always preceded by another adjective[66] with which it combines. It is not permitted for the two elements to be switched. The grammaticization of this formant is further attested to be the regular voicing of the initial consonant *č* to *ǰ*.

Independent Adjective		**Combining formant**	
Masc.	**Fem.**	**Masc.**	**Fem.**
čūў	*čāў*	*-ǰūў*	*-ǰāў*

§213. According to my data, this form is found in eight adjectives. If the preceding component (i.e. the main content adjective) distinguishes gender, then the masculine form of this adjective is used with the masculine formant, and the feminine form of the adjective is used with the feminine formant. Examples:

Masculine	**Feminine**	**Gloss**
čūў-mil-ǰūў	*čāў-mil-ǰāў*	multicoloured; striped
vůr-ǰūў	*vůr-ǰāў*	grayish brown (checkered)
têr-ǰūў	*têr-ǰāў*	black-checkered?
zīrd-ǰūў	*zīrd-ǰāў*	yellow-checkered?
safe-ǰūў	*safe-ǰāў*	white-checkered?
x̌īn-ǰūў	*x̌īn-ǰāў*	(dark-)blue-checkered?
rūšt-ǰūў	*rošt-ǰāў*	red-checkered?
sāvz-ǰūў	*sāvz-ǰāў*	green-checkered?

[66] However, in combinations with nouns, this adjective, like all others, comes before the noun. Compate, for instance *čāў-dūð* ‘a type of mulberry with (striped?) color’; *čūў-bošā* ‘type of bird’.

qimīr-ǰūɣ	*qamār-ǰāɣ*	with a red stripe on the stomach?

In the plural, the feminine form is used predominantly, although the use of the masculine form is also permitted. Examples are given with the plural. Note that the examples primarily involve animals.

§214. In some of these adjectives, for masculine plural adjectives the masculine form is the one used predominantly. Examples of this are given. For others, the feminine form is the one consistently used in the plural. Examples of this type are given.

Expression of gender in compound nouns

§215. The gender specification of compound nouns and adjectives is virtually unstudied. An analysis of materials has shown that while the gender specification of simplex nominals is based on stem vowels and semantic characteristics, the gender specification of compound nouns is connected to the placement?, order?, and the gender-distinguishing ability? of its sub-components. However, gender-distinguishing complex adjectives distinguish gender exclusively via their gender-distinguishing components – e.g. *kut-ðum* 'short-tailed (m.)' and *kat-ðum* 'short-tailed' (f.). On the other hand, the gender of compound nouns may be distinguished by components which do not inflect morphologically for gender, in addition being reflected by components which do inflect for gender.

Since gender-distinguishing qualitative adjectives outnumber gender-distinguishing nouns, a similar inequality in quantity is observed in compound words. Gender-distinguishing monomorphemic adjectives play a relatively large role in the formation of compound nouns. Additionally, any gender-distinguishing compound adjective can generally stand in the place of a noun (or be present while the noun is elided).

§216. The following model is particularly productive for the formation of compound adjectives:

> *gender-distinguishing ADJ* + *non-gender-distinguishing* NOUN
> OR
> *gender-distinguishing ADJ* + *non-gender-distinguishing non-nominal word*

Hence, it is the preceding component – i.e. the adjective – which plays the gender-distinguishing role. The following are the most commonly used gender-distinguishing adjectives in forming compound adjectives:

rūšt~rošt ‘red
buq~baq ‘complex’
žurn~žarn ‘round

p. 285

Examples:

MASCULINE	**FEMININE**	**GLOSS**
rūš(t)-toqi	*roš(t)-toqi*	'in a red tyubeteika'
rūšt-bīc	*rošt-bīc*	red-faced (*bīc* < *pīc*)
rūšt-kurtā	*rošt-kurtā*	wearing a red shirt
rūšt-pūx̌	*rošt-pūx̌*	wearing red (*-pūx̌* < Tj. *půš-(idan*), ‘wear’)
rūšt-pāli	*rošt-pāli*	red-striped; red-sided (*pāli* ‘side’
rūšt-nůl	*rošt-nůl*	'red-beaked' (*nůl* 'beak')
rūšt-sit	*rošt-sit*	'red-dirt(ed)' *sit* ‘earth; dirt’
rūšt-nêdz	*rošt-nêdz*	‘red-nosed’
rūšt-dzem	*rošt-dzem*	‘red-eyed’ (*dzem* < *cem* ‘eye’)
buq-nêdz	*baq-nêdz*	pug-nosed; big-nosed
buq-mīð	*baq-mīð*	hunch-backed (*mīð* ‘waist; small of the back'
buq-nůl	*baq-nůl*	blunt-beaked
žurn-bīc	*žarn-bīc*	round-faced

§217. In rare cases we find compound nouns formed from a nominal or adjectival component plus a gender-distinguishing past or perfect stem.

Examples:

MASCULINE	**FEMININE**	**GLOSS**
mīð-zidux̌č	*mīð-zidix̌c*	with a hurt/injured back // lazy
x̌up-ðoðǰin	*x̌up-ðêcin*	with a head bent down // stocky

§218. In Roshorvi, in some cases we find that the (typically) non-gender-distinguishing nominal portion of a compound noun undergoes gender-distinction (via vowel-alternations). Examples are given (e.g. *kata-dzām*, *kata-dzem* m~f).

And in some cases, the vowel model by which an adjective distinguishes gender changes in compound forms (e.g. Rv. *kut~kat* but *kut-ðum* (m.) and *kit-ðum* (f.)).

This all supports the notion that the development of gender is going down a unique path in Roshorvi.

§219. Gender-distinguishing compound adjectives of the type discussed here agree in gender with the noun they modify. That is, they inflect to show the gender of the noun in question. Examples: *kut-ðum x̌ĭ̌* 'short-tailed bull'; *rūšt-sit wiðor* 'red-earth hill'; *kat-ðum žow* 'short-tailed cow'; *rošt-sit zimc* 'red-earth field'.

When an overt noun is absent, the adjective still shows the gender of the implied noun: *yu rūšt-pūx̌ čāy wev xez vud* 'who was next to the one (m.) wearing red'; *yā rošt-pūx̌ ida di ɣ̌in* 'the one (f.) wearing red is his wife'.

Some gendered formants are used in the names of objects (often animate beings), as in *rūšt-ðumak*, *rošt-ðumak* (names of kinds of birds).

Moreover, non-gender-distinguishing adjectives, in addition to gender-distinguishing adjectives, may attach to nominals to form compound adjectives: *vůr-bīc miɣ̌ĭ̌* 'brown-faced ram', *vůr-bīc maɣ̌* 'brown-faced sheep'; *zīrd-pūx̌ mardinā* 'man wearing yellow'; *zīrd-pūx̌ kaxoy* 'woman wearing red'.

§220. Of particular interest is the appearance of gender in the system of compound nouns. It can be said that compound nouns are most often formed from non-gender-distinguishing components. The few gender-distinguishing nouns at play here can be divided into two groups.

§221. The first group is formed based on the model of the compound adjectives examined above. This group is formally different in that while gender-distinguishing compound have two forms (masculine and femiine), in this case there is only a single form.

Compounding takes place with the addition of a noun to an adjective which agrees with it in gender:

cāx̌-mūn	'a type of apple with a sour taste'
cāx̌-noš	'a type of apricot with a bitter kernel'
xāɣ̌-noš	'a type of apricot with a sweet kernel'

§222. The second type of compound noun is that in which only the second component distinguishes gender. Moreover, for those nouns here which denote animals, it is possible to have gender-distinguishing pairs. Examples:

MASCULINE	FEMININE	GLOSS
x̌oy-buš	*x̌oy-biš*	'wild cat (m/f)'[67]
naxčīr-guǰ	*naxčīr giǰ*	wild sheep young (m/f)
naxčīr-buč	*naxčīr-vaz*	'' ''
xux̌gow-x̌īǰ	*xux̌gow-žow*	male/female yak
*xux̌gow-šīg**	*xux̌gow-šīg*	'' ''

*This form distinguishes gender in the other languages.

There are also cases in other languages in which both components distinguish gender, as in R-Kh. *šor-bung*, *šār-bing* 'donkey foal (m~f)'.

§223. For inanimate compound nouns there are no gender-distinguishing pairs. As a rule, masculine nouns combine with masculine formants, and feminine nouns with feminine formants. Examples here are given from R-Kh. and Bt-Rv.

§224. Of particular interest is the gender specification of compound nouns formed from non-gender-distinguishing parts. It is important here to identify the grammatical workload of each component when it comes to their gender specification and to investigate patterns not only in their gender specification, but also in the compatibility of their components. Compound nouns may be formed from two nouns where each noun belongs to the same gender, as in *x̌ičīf-bůst* 'marmot pelt', where both components are masculine. Or alternatively each component may belong to separate genders, as in *pulk-žīr* 'anvil made of stone', where *pulk* 'large hammer' is masculine and *žīr* is feminine. The gender of the compound word, for its part, depends on the gender of the latter component. Hence, *x̌ičīf-bůst* is masculine, while *pulk-žīr* is feminine: *yu x̌ičīf-bůst cuɣ sut* 'that marmot pelt ripped'; *yā pulk-žīr viraxt* 'that anvil broke'.

§225. As indicated above, compound nouns formed from combinations of masculine and feminine nouns are typically masculine if the second component noun is masculine:

[67] This word is traditionally translated in this way, though it literally means 'rock cat'. There is reason to believe that this is not a wild car, but rather a badger, since in local Tajik dialects this animal is called *gurkovuk, gurkan* 'one that digs graves' (cf. W.B. Henning. Zoroaster. Oxford: 1951, p. 23).

MASCULINE	GLOSS
maǎ-ǰūšč	mix of peas and barley (*maǎ* 'pea' is feminine and *čūšč* 'barley' is masculine
ǎar-bun	dog-rose root (*ǎar* 'dogrose' is feminine and *bun* 'root' is masculine)
θīr-ǰůn, *θīr-ǰand*	space for dumping ashes and garbage (*θīr* 'ash' is masculine and *ǰůn, ǰand* 'place' is masculine)
maǎ-dzow	pea harvest (*maǎ* is feminine and *cow, cayidz* are masculine)
woǎ-dzow	hay harvest (*woǎ* is masculine)
(a)nor-bůst	pomegranate skin (*anor* 'pomegranate' is feminine, *půst* 'skin, peel' is masculine

§226. The significance of the gender of the final component (in this case masculine gender) is so strong that even in cases where the feminine form of a gender-distinguishing noun (e.g. *kid*) is present as the first component of the compound noun, the compound noun retains its masculine gender specification. Hence, even in these cases, the compound noun still agrees as a masculine noun. Examples:

MASCULINE	FEMININE
giǰ-bůst	female baby goat skin (*půst* 'skin' is masculine)
žow-bůst	cow skin
ǎīǰ-bůst	bull skin
buč-bůst	(male) goat skin
vaz-bůst	(female) goat skin

All of the nouns above agree in masculine gender: e.g. *di giǰ-bůst mu-rd dāk* 'give me that (female) goat skin'.

§227. In the same way as we have seen above with masculine gender, compound nouns whose second component is feminine are also feminine, independent of the gender of the first component. Some examples where both components are feminine and hence the compound is feminine:

MASCULINE	FEMININE
noš-xuǔpā	‘porridge with apricots’ – both *noš* and *xuǔpā* are feminine
koči-xuǔpā	thick (flour) kisel
almos-žīr	quartz (*almos* ‘diamond’ is feminine)
čoy-ǔac	water for tea (*čoy* ‘tea’ is feminine)
ðůɣ-ǔarvo	porridge with buttermilk (*ðůɣ* ‘buttermilk’ is feminine)

§228. Compounds whose first component is masculine and whose second component is feminine are also feminine. Examples:

MASCULINE	FEMININE
būn-ǔarvo	flour broth (*būn* ‘flour’ is masculine; *ǔarvo* ‘broth’ is feminine)
pūrg-wiðič	'sparrow' (*pūrg* 'mouse' is masculine; *wiðič* ‘bird’ is feminine)
xidorǰ-žīr	millstone (*xidorǰ* 'mill' is masculine)
ǔūvd-xuǔpā	milk kisel/porridge (*ǔūvd* is masculine)
ðust-ǔac	water for washing hands (*ðust* is masculine)
kāl-xêǔt	a tub for washing one’s head (*kāl* is masculine; *xêǔt* ‘tub’ is feminine)

These nouns agree in the feminine: e.g. *ar dam kāl-xêǔt=ta pūǔok mis ziniyen* ‘in this head-washing tub they also wash clothes'.

§229. Compound nouns formed from adjectives plus nouns also may belong to either masculine or feminine gender depending on the gender specification of the second component. Examples:

MASCULINE	FEMININE
sāvdz-woǔ ‘hay’	*têr-čoy* ‘black/green tea’
zimār-woǔ ‘straw / adobe’	*têr-cirow* 'chip; splinter' (lit. black candle)

Examples: *parwos māš-and sāvdz woǔ lap vud-at zimār-wuǔ dūs vud* ‘last year we had a lot of hay and little straw’.

Thus, the second component of compound nouns is that which governs the gender specification in these nouns. This is analogous to the use of suffixes in word formation, which also play a significant role in the gender specification of nouns.

§230. We can make the following conclusions about gender in multi-morphemic nouns formed with suffixation and compounding:

(i) Suffixation is a productive system of distinguishing gender in the system of nouns and adjectives.

(ii) Regarding the use of indigenous suffixes, there are quite a few differences among the individual languages of the Shughni-Rushani group, primarily with regard to whether a given suffix is present (or gender-distinguishing) in a language or not. For instance, the suffixes *-ӧ̈k* // *-ēk* and *-ӧ̈ǰ/ēdz* are present in Bartangi but not the other languages?. Also, R-Kh. *-on,* Bt.-Rv. *-ӧ̈n* // *-ān* and Ru-Kh. *-ů̊č*, Bt. *-ōč, -ēc* are either fully absent or not gender-distinguishing in Shughni. For instance, compare Kh. *nawon* 'prone to crying'. fem. *nawān*, Bt-Rv. *nawӧ̈n, nawān* with the single non-gender-distinguishing form in Shughni *nāwīǰ*. The same can be said for the Shughni form *wāf̣ǰ* 'weaver'. Hence, we can say that there is a relatively greater morphological capability for gender distinction in R-Kh., Bt.-Rv. in comparison with Shughni. However, we should not forget about the fact that Shughni has gender-distinguishing direct demonstrative pronouns *yu/yā*, which are absent in the other languages.

(iii) All languages of the group pretty much coincide with respect to the use of denominal gender-distinguishing formants. This attests to the relatively late development of these components.

p. 295

(iv) The transition of content lexemes into gender-distinguishing grammatical markers can be considered an ongoing process. Denominal and deverbal formants (of the type *-buc/-bic, -gīl/-gāl, -ǰūў/-ǰāў,* R-X. *-xůr/-xēr*) play a significant role in the gender distinction of nouns and adjectives. The second component is that which determines the gender specification of a compound noun. In my opinion, this process whereby content words turn into gender markers may replenish the number of gender-distinguishing formants in the languages.