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1. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Arabic loanwords, filtered through literary New Persian, form the most important nonnative component of the lexicons of all the languages of Muslim countries and communities from Edirne to Calcutta and from Abadan to Alma Ata. In some styles of literary Persian and Turkish earlier in this century their frequency of occurrence exceeded fifty percent, and even after vigorous attempts at expulsion by purist language-reformers in Turkey, Iran, and Soviet Muslim Asia, they have remained as numerous and essential an element of the cultural and intellectual vocabulary of the region as the Latin and Gallo-Latin inventory of Western European languages.

Yet apart from trivial etymological lists (generally without even phonological correspondences) they have been little studied. The questions of routes and chronology of borrowing, degree of assimilation, and semantic change, have been approached so far only in a few language-specific monographs.1 Admittedly the problems confronting a more comprehensive study are formidable, and too numerous to mention here. However, there is one morphologically identifiable class of Arabic loanwords in all these languages, a maximum of some 1500 items in which a universal formal dichotomy corresponding to the chronological and/or semantic history of individual loans offers some opportunity to compare loan reflexes through time and across languages. These are nouns originally with the Arabic feminine ending /at/ or /a/ which are definitively induced into Persian, thence into Turkish, etc., as either /-at/ or /-a/ with an invariant orthography.2

So far I have undertaken comprehensive investigations only into the Persian inventory of these loanwords, since early and Classical New Persian (tenth to sixteenth centuries) was the medium of transmission of Arabic loans to all the relevant languages, and Persian itself exhibits an impressive number of the chronological and semantic shifts to be illustrated. However, samples from the other major literary languages of the area show some interesting deviations, statistically and in detail, from the
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Persian "norm." The principal languages of Soviet Central Asia, Turkic Uzbek and Iranian Tajik, exhibit at least one unique case of shift (Jama, Table 2, no. 2; see below, Section 6) and several cases of shift or absence of shift that are shared with other languages but run counter to Persian.

In order to throw these into relief and to attempt some explanations, eighteen of the most striking examples of this system of derivational morphology at work are tabulated here for eight of the literary languages in which most of them occur: Urdu of northwestern India and Pakistan, modern Persian of Iran (Pârsî), Dari (or Kâbîlî, i.e., Persian of Afghanistan), Tajik (Tojikî, Persian of Central Asia), Uzbek, Tatar, and Azerbaijan (three Turkic languages of the Soviet Union), and Turkish of the Republic of Turkey (the descendant of Ottoman Turkish). These are ranged in approximate conformity with their geographical and cultural contiguity: Dari forms part of both the east-west continuum between Persian and Tajik and the north-south continuum from Tajik to the Indo-Persian of the Urdu lexicon; Tajik and Uzbek have been adjacent and even intermingled speech communities for at least 500 years, with a high degree of bilingualism; Tatar was until recent decades geoculturally contiguous with both the Central Asian Turkophone area and Ottoman Turkish; Azerbaijan is linguistically adjacent to Turkey, and culturally-historically contiguous with Iran. The main lexical differentials I shall attempt to highlight are four: (1) between Tajik and Uzbek, (2) between the Tajik-Uzbek continuum and the rest, (3) between the four Turkic languages and the rest, (4) between Persian, as the immediate source of all these loans, and the rest.

All the words to be examined here were originally assimilated in -at in Persian, regardless of whether they subsequently "split" (evolved a doublet in -a) or "shifted" to -a, and of whether this change occurred before or after they were borrowed into another language. Table 1 shows eight doublets, i.e., loanwords currently assimilated in both -at and -a forms and showing a significant lexical distinction between these reflexes in the majority of listed languages. Table 2 shows ten words that have shifted from an original (Persian) -at to -a in two or more of the languages; in a minority of cases, doublets may occur. The entries in Tables 1 and 2 are to be understood as follows: Occurrences of the -at reflex (the original and unmarked form) are indicated by a blank, reflexes in -a are indicated by "a," and the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Notes 1. Also 'holiday.' 2. Also 'cavalry (troop)'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>'circumference'</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>'limit, extremity'</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>'limit, extremity'</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>'message, tract, dissertation'</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>'Wilhelmsburg'</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>'Suti, brotherhood, Sarian'</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>'Way, habit, method'</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>'Suti, brotherhood, Sarian'</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>'reference, appeal'</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>'Suti, brotherhood, Sarian'</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes 1. Also 'holiday.' 2. Also 'cavalry (troop).'
absence of a reflex by a dash. Each column entry is double, to allow for the occurrence of both reflexes for a given meaning (indicated by a blank followed by "a"). A double blank thus indicates that only -at is recorded for that particular word in that lexical slot, "aa" that only -a is recorded. Blanks in parenthesis indicate an archaic or otherwise marginal occurrence in -at. An entry "a" in Table 2 marks the occurrence of both -at and -a reflexes, distributed apparently in systematic accordance with the semantic and other criteria to be identified below—i.e., these words are to be regarded as doublets in the particular language. For example, in Table 2, no. 10, only the variant tšora occurs in Urdu and Tatar, only the form išorat in Turkish, both išorat and tšora in Dari, Tajik and Uzbek (apparently in free distribution) and in Persian and Azerbaijani (but with the systematically distinct distribution išorat: allusion, act of indicating) vs. both tšora +N 'an indication, note, sign' and išora +V (Pers esfe kardan, Az išorâlmak 'to indicate, note'

The fundamental rationale of the different assimilation is what I shall call "schematic" semantic distinction: by this, -at affiliates refer to abstract mass nouns, especially quality nouns (Table 1, no. 6, first line, kšorat 'adequacy') and action nouns (Table 1, no. 3, first line, tšorat 'act of aiding, assisting'), while the -a affiliates refer to concrete and/or count nouns, including specialized verbal derivatives such as instance nouns (Table 2, no. 4, Tajik, Uzbek and Tatar hikōja 'tale, story') and product nouns (Table 1, no. 3, tšora 'subsidiary, stipend'). Diachronically speaking, there has been a selective loss of final -/ (attested to differing degrees in the languages involved), i.e., a shift from the -at series to the -a series; this can be seen in many cases to correspond to a semantic extension or mutation from abstract/mass to concrete/count (cf. tšora and hikōja, both originally action nouns in -at which evolved specialized count-noun meanings). In some cases (ca. 40-50 of the total inventory) both reflexes of a loan are found in the lexicon of a particular language. These "doubles" generally preserve either both sides of a semantic extension (as in tšora(t)) or different stylistic registers resulting, apparently, from an incomplete diachronic shift (as in Tajik and Uzbek ršn(t), Table 2, no. 9). Where one of the reflexes is preferred for the "reverbalization," i.e., the combination of an action noun loan with an auxiliary verb, indicated as +V in the tables, the differential criterion may be classed as syntactic.

When syntactic or stylistic factors appear, singly or in combination, to determine the ultimate affiliation of a word, the result usually still conforms to the basic semantic distinction abstract vs. concrete/mass. vs. count, in which case it will be designated a "schematic" split (in the case of doublets) or shift (in the case of single migrants). Where it does not, i.e., where the -at/-a affiliation appears to run counter to the semantic scheme or where the scheme is not applicable, such a doublet split will be designated "pragmatic" and a shift by a single migrant as "arbitrary." We may conveniently examine the entries in each table in accordance with the criterion that seems uppermost in determining their affiliation: schematic semantics, syntax, pragmatic differentiation of homonyms, arbitrary shift, and stylistic differences.

2. SCHEMATIC SEMANTICS

The pair ršolat and ršola (Table 1, no. 4) provide a Persian resolution of what is in Arabic a derivational homonym, i.e., a coincidence of surface form (ršila) in two different morphological formulae of the root RSU 'send'. The quality noun ršolat 'Prophetic' mission, apostlehood, as a cultic term usually referring to the status of Muhammad as the Prophet of Islam, is common to the lexicons of all "Islamic" languages at a high stylistic register. It does not appear in the modern dictionaries of Uzbek, Tatar or Azerbaijani because of the (ideal) secularization of Soviet intellectual discourse; but in practice there is no reason why it should not be used by a Muslim scholar whose native language is one of these, any less than it would be used (as recognized in the Tajik dictionary) by a Tajik-speaking ršol of Bukhara. The concrete Count noun ršola, denoting various kinds of missive or document, is well established in virtually all the central Islamic languages over a broad stylistic register. The metonym 'cavalry' in Urdu derives apparently from a backformation of ršolat or ršola, 'holder of a ršola, i.e., of a written commission as a cavalry officer.'

Two semantically close items in Table 2, nos. 7 and 8, show a shift to -a that was arguably motivated by an extension of the original mass-noun abstracts 'expanses' and 'extent' to include count noun instances of areal and linear measurement. In Tajik, as in Persian, mašqat has not shifted at all, whereas in Uzbek, as in Turkish, it has shifted completely;
masofat and masofa are both found in Tajik, i.e., in the word is apparently in a transitional phase between the unshifted -at of Persian and the -a reflex of Uzbek (and Turkish). In each case the reflex in Dari is one step ahead of Tajik in degree of shift.

In Table 2, no. 9, riwāna(t), riwāna(t), originally from the action noun to the count noun of instance or product, 'bribe.' Here, however, Persian alone has completed the shift to -a, while the western Turkic dialects, in common with Urdu, retain -at, and the three Central Asian languages are vacillating or in transition.

Returning to Table 1, no. 3 iona(t) 'aiding,' assistance and the reverbalization iona(t) dodan 'to
aid, subsidize' contrast fully with iona 'subsidy, stipend' only in Tajik and Dari. Uzbek has lost the action noun sense, and in Persian and Azerbaijani the -a reflex appears to be in the process of generalization over the whole semantic range, as indeed has already happened in the neighboring Turkic languages. In this example, semantic nuance and syntactic configuration inextricably share the input: iona(t), whether as an action noun absolute or in a reverbalization, does not normally construct with suffixes or modifiers, while the specialized count-noun derivative iona may be further qualified, as, e.g., iona(ho) 'stipends' or iona(wu) 'a pittance.'

3. SYNTAX

In Table 2, no. 3, the reflexes riwa(t) (as found in Urdu, Persian, Turkish and Azerbaijani) and riwāja (as in Uzbek and Tatar) are semantically indistinguishable as lexical items. Both reflexes occur in Dari and Tajik. If we examine actual usage in Tajik, it turns out that the -at reflex is preferred as an action noun absolute or in a nominalized verb, whereas the -a reflex is preferred for the reverbalization:

(1) riwa(t) intisomī mehmān 'the maintenance of labor
discipline'
(2) intisomī mehnāt rīva(k)ārdan 'they maintained
labor discipline' (Kazim and Uspehskaja 1954:
s.v. riwa(t).)

This use of -a for the reverbalization runs counter to the tendency noted in iona(t), at least as concerns the Persian dialects. It is, however, a widespread feature of action noun loans of this type (cf. Table 2, nos. 1, 4, 5, and 6), and may perhaps be seen as a second intermediate stage in a diachronic process of shift which may be sketched as (1) primitive -at for all purposes, (2) -a for count-noun specializations only, (3) -a additionally for reverbalizations, (4) -a for all purposes (see below, Section 5).

In Persian, likewise, tīrāt (Table 2, no. 10) is used for the action noun 'indicating, alluding,' vs. tīrāt karan 'to show, indicate.' The specialized count-noun 'sign, indication, note' likewise shows the -a reflex only. The same distribution is observed for no. 4 hikōja(t), in Tajik and Uzbek (and essentially in Tatar; but see below, Section 6): the -a reflex forms the base for nominal derivatives and compounds (Tj hikōjakun 'storytelling,' hikōjaq 'narrative [adj.], Tj and Uz hikōjančiwa 'storyteller') and is preferred for reverbalization (Tj hikōja karan, Uz hikōja qilmoq 'to tell, narrate'). No. 1, rīwojat(t), shows -a in reverbalization in the only two languages, Uzbek and Tatar, where it has shifted—or rather, evolved a doublet, since in both rīwoja is the noun meaning 'story, tale' while rīwoja is also the semantically specialized noun 'version, recension' (cf. below, Section 6).

In Table 1, no. 1, tīratab is in each language a component of a verbal idiom of the form:

(X + ablative) tīratab BE 'to be expressive of
X,' i.e., 'to consist of X'

(Persian dialects as—tīratab budān, Turkish—dan tīratab (bielmek, Urdu—se 'ebārāt hona). The count noun of instance or product, 'expression, idiom, phrase,' is consistently differentiated as tīrā in all the Turkic languages and Tajik, intermittently (or nascently?) in Dari, but not in Persian or Urdu.

4. PRAGMATIC SPLITS

In the few cases where doublets do not conform to the semantic scheme or syntactic usage outlined above, the -a/-at dichotomy nevertheless usually serves to mark some semantic distinction. In Table 1, no. 2, goja(t) is arguably schematically differentiated, since gojaq 'limit, extremely' in all cases is used mainly predicatively or adverbially (e.g., Uz gojatd 'finally, extremely'), while goja 'end in view, goal' is a count noun in Azerbaijani and Turkish (though also occurring adverbially; Tg-gayesqīya 'with the aim of—it'), and preferred in these senses in Dari. Tatar goja(t), however, has the
additional count-noun sense 'holiday,' referring originally to the end of the fasting month of Ramadan.

In no. 5 irodat, where this reflex still occurs (most Turkic languages have lost it), bears the other-directed sense of 'devotion, admiration, sincere regard' (cf. the Persian adjectival compound erdātmand 'yours sincerely' as used to end a letter). The shifted form iroda 'will, resolution, intention, decree,' occurring in all languages except Tatar, shows a distinct egocentric aspect of the base meaning 'will, desire.' In no. 7, tariqa(t), the more abstract base meaning 'way, habit, method' (though admittedly a count noun of instance) has the -a ending, while the more specialized, concrete derivative 'Sufi brotherhood, dervish order' has the normally unmarked -at. (The absence of tarīqa from modern Tajik and Uzbek dictionaries, like that of rīsolt, results from ideological selectivity, not from a real gap in the lexicon.)

Particularly aberrant is no. 8, muroğja(t). In Persian, one action noun sense and its verbalization 'return, go back' is assimilated in -at, while a second, underlyingly transitive sense, 'making reference, appeal, having recourse,' which also produces a count noun of instance or product, ends in -a. Schematically, this is what one would expect. In all the other languages, however, the -at reflex bears the meaning 'reference, etc.' only, except for high-style occurrences of the intransitive sense 'return' in Urdu and (Ottoman) Turkish—and apparently also in Darf, with both reflexes (Kiseleva 1973: 56). The four Soviet languages are consistent in their use of -at and of the second meaning, especially as verbalized 'to appeal, exhort' and in the nominal compound muroğjaśnom 'appeal, exhortation'; extensive journalistic use of the latter, as a translation of Russian vozrassenie, has probably reinforced this selection. Apart from an appeal to pragmatic differentiation, I can offer no explanation for this apparently upside-down affiliation or for the exception of Persian.

5. ARBITRARY SHIFT

There is an observable tendency for certain action noun loans of this type to shift from -at to -a even when there has been no discernible semantic specialization. The words affected are generally tri- or quadrisyllabic and readily verbalize, and the process can be seen to have affected the Turkic languages, Tajik, and Darf more than Persian or Urdu.

The relevant items in Table 2 are no. 5 hīmoja 'protection, defense' (the action noun; not normally used as a count noun of instance or product, i.e., 'means of protection, type of defense'), and no. 6, tārbija 'training, education, upbringing,' in the case of every language except Persian and Urdu; rītja in the case of Darf (partially), Uzbek, and Tatar; and tōra in every case except Turkish (where tōret has not shifted) and Persian and Azerbaijani (where, as noted in Section 3 above, there is a systematic syntactic differentiation). To these may be added, from Table 1, iroda in Tajik, Uzbek, and Azerbaijani, where the -at reflex and its distinctive sense do not occur. Tallying these instances in accordance with the double-entry system of the two tables, we arrive at the following comparative index of arbitrary shift: Darf has seven, Uzbek and Tajik each have six, Azerbaijani has five, Turkish four, Urdu two, and Persian none. (As noted at the outset, we are dealing here with aberrations from the Persian norm; in eighteen other cases not noted here where Persian exhibits an apparently arbitrary shift, so do most of the other languages, except for Urdu. The ranking of that table is Tatar (10 points), Darf and Turkish (7), Persian (6), Tajik (5), Urdu (3); Uzbek and Azerbaijani did not feature in the experiment.)

6. STYLISTIC DIFFERENCES

Under this rubric, the Arabic feminine-ending loans are subjected to three sociolinguistic judgments: the register(s) of discourse in which a word or reflex occurs, the degree to which it has been assimilated into the vernacular, and (in the case of doublets) whether one part of its range of meanings is more "vernacular" than another. Such criteria are additionally applicable to several of the items tentatively pigeonholed under previous rubrics, and may help further to refine the rationale of their assimilation to the -at or -a series.

Table 2, no. 2 jamoat is a widespread term in all the Islamic languages for a social group, whether the Muslim (nowadays, national or ethnic) community at large, or a particular population or village, or a group gathered for a special occasion such as Friday prayers. Only in Tajik (jamo) and Uzbek (zamo) has it additionally evolved a specialized shifted form, with the pre-Soviet meaning of 'class, study group (at a madrasah)' (Bekča 1972:139) and the modern senses of 'village council' (Russian sel'soviet) and, by synecdoche, 'chairman of a sel'soviet.' The
semantic evolution is smooth and unexceptional, but the later senses are obviously more proper to the everyday spoken language than the literary reflex Jamat.

No. 4, hikojat, is susceptible to a similar judgment across the language spectrum. In Persian and Urdu, where it has not shifted, hekayat is a literary and even archaic word connoting a literary anecdote or parable, while the semantic slot for 'tale, story' is filled by one of several other words (e.g., the -a reflex of a feminine-ending loan, qeṣṣa). In all other languages, however, the shifted form hikoj is the everyday word for 'tale' and/or the modern literary genres 'short story' or 'novella'. The diachronic process of semantic and corresponding phonological shift is well documented by occurrences, in Ottoman Turkish, and in early modern Dari, Tajik, Uzbek, and Tatar literature, of the -at reflex in various senses; and especially in Tatar, where there are no fewer than three reflexes. These are iktijat 'tale; fairy-tale, cock-and-bull story,' istikjat 'narrative, anecdote, story' (characterized by the dictionary as "literary"), and istikja, the everyday and deverbizing reflex of this (as in Uzbek and Tajik). The first is shown by the greater degree of phonetic assimilation and semantic shift in a pejorative direction to be an early loan (pre-14th century, directly from Persian or via Ottoman). The last two are revealed by their phonology, shifted reflex, and neutral meaning to be more recent importations, perhaps via Uzbek in the 16th century (Scherner 1977:39).

The history of rivajat, already mentioned in Section 4, may be somewhat similar. In Uzbek and Tatar the -at reflex 'tale, story' bears the more vernacular sense, the -a reflex 'version, recension,' is the more literary, but is still the preferred form in the Tatar deverbization rivaja 'kula- to narrate, tell.' If this pattern corresponds to that of Ti ıkijat 'tale, etc.' vs. ıkija ıkäl- 'to tell,' then Ti rivajat too could be a relatively early loan, vernacularized like ıkijat before the sound shift began, and supplemented later by the more literary rivaja through Uzbek.

In Table 1, no. 6, the unshifted kifoja is a universal, relatively high-register Islamic word (one of its meanings is 'legal competence') in addition to being an abstract mass noun of quality. The shifted derivative kifoja, used predicatively or adverbially for 'sufficient, enough,' is more vernacular. In a similar pair, no. 2, goja(t) (see also under Section 4), the process is partly reversed: the shifted term, where available, is schematically true to its semantic evolution and lexicically more assimilated to boot (in Persian, ḡajat in both senses is literary or archaic); the unshifted ḡajat has thus been relegated to adverbial status, via apocope of a prepositional phrase, in a more literary register.

7. Conclusions

The -at/-a dichotomy thus appears to be sensitive to a hierarchical interplay of the five factors identified above, and probably to other more subtle interstitial motivations. Many -at loans assimilated at an early stage (by the 11th century) have never shifted in literary Persian, though as we have seen they may have shifted or split in other dialects or languages. The establishment of one reflex of a doublet pair in accordance with the semantic scheme may drive the other reflex into a convenient slot arbitrarily (cf. the discussion of kifoja and ḡajat in Section 6) or even counterintuitively (cf. ṭariqa 'way, etc.' > ṭariqa 'way, habit, method' (by the 12th century) and ṭariqa 'Sufi order' (by
the 14th century); (4) three- and four-syllable action nouns tend to assimilate arbitrarily in, or shift arbitrarily to, \(-\alpha\).

As concerns the differential assimilation at work in our language-specific inventories and across the language spectrum, we may (counting parenthetical entries, but not empty slots) extract the following statistics from our tables.

Tajik and Uzbek appear to justify our expectations of close similarity in treatment of these loans in the light of their cultural proximity and overlapping speech communities: taking both tables together, these languages show nine cases (50 percent) of identical treatment of Arabic etyma (ten, or 55.5 percent, if we eliminate the fictitious gap in the Uzbek lexicon in Table 1, no. 4). This is higher than the correspondences among the Persian dialects (six between Tajik and Darf, four between Tajik and Persian and between Darf and Persian), or between any of the Turkic dialects (eight between Turkish and Azerbaijani, six between Uzbek and Tatars and between Tatars and Azerbaijani, five between Uzbek and Azerbaijani, and four between Uzbek and Tatar).

Out of a possible eighteen, Persian exhibits five series correspondences with Turkish and with Azerbaijani (only two of these identical in all three cases), one correspondence with Uzbek, and none with Tatars. Darf and Uzbek show four correspondences. It can be seen from the visual layout of Table 2 alone that Urdu shows a lesser degree of shift than any other language. The overall percentage of shift evinced by the items tabulated is as follows, in descending order: Uzbek 88 percent, Tatars 83 percent, Azerbaijani 71 percent, Tajik 63 percent, Turkish 57.5 percent, Darf 47.5 percent, Persian 33 percent, Urdu 19 percent. These figures do not of course refer to the total feminine-ending loan inventories of these languages, but merely to this selective inventory of aberrations from the Persian norm. They nevertheless reflect the same relatively greater propensity to shift among the Turkic languages that is suggested by a broader selection of loans (a maximum of 54 items for each of six of these languages). The results of this comparison (so far unpublished) are: Tatars 70 percent, Turkish 59 percent, Darf 54 percent, Tajik 53 percent, Persian 51 percent, Urdu 28 percent.

Bear in mind that the majority (perhaps as much as 90 percent) of the inventory in the central Islamic languages is assimilated in the same series

as in Persian, we may still hazard the following general observations from the patterns revealed by these few salient aberrations. Areal influences appear to play an important role, as witness the relatively high incidence of identical treatment of these loans by Persian, Azerbaijani, and Turkish on the one hand, and between Uzbek, Tajik, and Darf on the other. Geocultural proximity in most cases appears to outweigh genetic relationship (there are only four correspondences between Uzbek and Turkish, and between Tajik and Persian of Iran). This cannot entirely account for the high incidence of correspondence (twelve items) between Urdu and Persian, both of which are far more conservative of the -at series than any of their neighbors (with only 19 percent and 33 percent shift, respectively). The greater degree of conservatism in literary Urdu is probably to be explained by the fact that the main lexical source for this language in its period of efflorescence (17th-18th centuries) was Classical Persian of an earlier period (pre-15th century); many of the Arabic feminine-ending loans in this stratum had subsequently shifted in Persian, but were to remain frozen in the -at form in Urdu.

Conversely, it appears that many more of these loans shifted in Persian dialects outside Iran and in the neighboring Turkic languages than in Persian, following semantic and syntactic principles developed in and for Persian, but independently of contemporary Persian influence. Moreover, these languages have utilized the potential differential marking thus generated at least as creatively as has Persian, to produce doublets distinguishing semantic shift, syntactic structure, and especially stylistic register. Tajik and Uzbek in particular, though rooted in Classical Persian and Eastern Turkish, are in their current forms new and "honest" languages, revealing the phonological and lexical changes that in spoken usage have superseded the fossilized forms still found in the Arabic-script dictionaries and texts of some of their neighbors.

Persian, for long the prestigious and normative literary language of this whole cultural area, has tended to preserve the original induction forms of the feminine-ending loans in -at. Conversely, Turkic dialects, which for the past millennium have been the major spoken languages of the Persian-writing world, have been in the vanguard of vernacularization in the area—one symptom of which has evidently been the continuing shift from -at to -\(\alpha\). It is well known that literary Persian has strongly influenced the
lexicons of its Turkish neighbors and has been instrumental in raising them to literary status; in the light of the evidence above, it seems reasonable to suggest the converse, that Turkic vernaculars have similarly influenced adjacent dialects of spoken Persian—notably Tajik and Darf, which did not enjoy literary status until comparatively recently—and that a salient mark of this influence is the higher incidence of shift to the -a series among the Arabic feminine-ending loans in these dialects.

NOTES
1 E.g., Scherner (1977). All such studies, so far as I am aware, include Persian as well as Perso-Arabic loans in their scope.
2 These are listed as archetypes in the tables, i.e., as terminating in -a(s); individual reflexes are transliterated as -ø or -a in the text. For convenience, transliteration of the loanwords discussed is as from the modified Cyrillic of modern Tajik throughout, other orthographies being indicated only for language-specific examples.
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