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1.0 Introduction

One of the most commonly used grammatical marker in modern Persian is the Direct Object Marker rā. Even though greatly reduced in form and its grammatical function has changed over time, we can clearly trace the history of this postposition back to a time when it was first recorded as rādiy in the Behistun Inscription, 2500 years ago, by king Darius.

Around the same time the Achaemenid kings were recording their language, which we now refer to as Old Persian, Saka (Scythian) tribes speaking a language that was very close to Old Persian, began to penetrate the Pamir region. Amongst the inventory of their lexicon there was a word similar in form and function to the Old Persian rādiy. We don’t know for sure, though, if this was the case; what we know is that in some modern Pamir languages there exists a postposition similar in form and function to the Old Persian postposition rādiy. The Shughni postposition -ard / -rad can be claimed to be the ultimate representative, in modern times, of the proto-form ones used by the Saka tribes.

In the case of Persian rā we have written evidence, which directly links it to Old Persian rādyiy and ultimately to Proto-Iranian *rādi. In the case of Shughni -ard/-rad no such record exists and, therefore, there is an ambiguity as to whether this form is a direct descendent of Proto-Iranian *rādi, *arda-, or even the contamination these two forms suggested by some scholars. In this paper I will rely on evidence from Persian to support the claim that Shughni -ard/-rad goes back to the P.Ir. form *rādi and not *arda-.

In section 2.0 we will begin with an overview of the historical development of Persian rā. In section 3.0 Shughni -ard and related forms in Pamir languages will be covered. The main point of this section is to compare and then relate the Wakhi postposition -ərk to Shughni -ard. Section 4.0 will discuss the semantics and syntactic distribution of Shughni -ard. In this section we will introduce the term ‘Distributive Location’. In 5.0 Persian rā and Shughni -ard will be compared. In section 6.0 we will review the Iranian *rādi in a broader historical context, and section 7.0 will end this paper with a brief conclusion.
2.0 From Old Persian rādyi to New Persian rā

We begin with the development of Proto-Iranian *rādi in Persian, where written evidence exists for all the stages of that language. According to scholars of Iranian languages the Proto-Iranian *rādi functioned as a postposition and had the general sense of cause and effect, purpose, and to some extent conveyed Dative functions’ (Edelman 2002: 153).

The Old Persian rādyi, first attested in the Behistun Inscription, also functioned as a postposition and had a general sense of “on account of, for the sake of” (Kent 1950: 205). The Old Persian rādyi is mostly found in the construction avahya=rādyi “for this [reason]” (Hewson, J. and V. Bubenik 2006: 139).

In Middle Persian the O.P. rādyi undergoes phonological changes and develops into the form rād. Syntactically the M.P. postposition rād is said to have acquired Accusative/Dative case function. The passage in (1) exemplifies the use of rād in Middle Persian.

(1) u pāpak rād hēč frazand... nē būt
    and Pāpak=DAT/ACC any son not was
    “And Pāpak had no son”

Middle Persian rād undergoes further phonological changes, initially developing into rāy, rā in classical Persian period and then into rā in modern Persian (Edelman 2002: 153). In fact, in colloquial Persian it is completely reduced to a single sound after consonants; ‘a’ in Kabuli and ‘o’ in Tehrani speeches (Fatemi 2013: 5, for Tehrani only). The most common use of the postposition rā in modern Persian is (Definite) Direct Object Marker (DOM). The sentences in (2) and (3) capture the colloquial and literal uses of rā.

(2) kitāb-a / kitāb-ā-ra da kujā māndī? (Colloquial Kabuli Farsi)
    book-DOM / book-PL-DOM in/on where put

(3) kitāb-rā / kitāb-hā-rā dar kujā māndī (=guzāštī)? (Literal Persian/Dari)
    book-DOM / book-PL-DOM in/on where put

    Where did you leave the book(s)?

The phonological development of P.Ir. *rādi down to modern colloquial Persian can be summarized as follows;

P.Ir. *rādi > O.P. rādiy > M.P. rād > Class.P. rā(y) > N.P. rā (Kabuli ra/a, Tehrani ro/o)
3.0 Shughni –ard and Related forms in Other Pamir Languages

The Shughni postposition –ard / -rad isn’t attested in any historical source and, therefore, scholars have relied on comparative methods to find an etymology for it. Sokolova, for instance, compares Shughni –(a)rd to Avestan arədə (Sokolova 1967: 39). In fact, George Morgenstierne citing Sokolova, refutes any connection between Shughni –(ar)d and P.Ir. *rādī. He specifically points out that “<arədə-, in spite of irregular –rd, and not… *rādī” should be the proto-form of Shughni postposition –(a)rd (Morgenstierne 1974: 66).

In the Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages Avestan arədə- is etymologized to P.Ir. *arda- ‘half; side’; adv./adj. ‘in half, half-’. Under the same entry Shughni –ard and related forms from other Pamir languages are included, but with an additional note specifying that only “… if they match Av. arədə, but could there be a contamination of *arda- and *rādī” in Shughni Group (Rastorgueva and Edelman 2000: 216-217). Thus, the fate of the Shughni postposition –(a)rd / -ra(d) lingers between the Proto-Iranian forms of *arda- and *rādī, or even the contamination of these two forms.

In this section of the paper the various forms in modern dialects and languages of the Pamir region, which are related to the Shughni postposition -ard, will be reviewed. I will then attempt to relate Shughni -ard and Wakhi -örk by proposing that the Wakhi form might have undergone a sporadic sound change. There is no need to compare all the forms within the Shughni Group, i.e. Rushani, Bartangi, Roshorvi, Sarikuli, and the dialects within these languages. They are ultimately driven from a common source. Even the Yazghulami postposition ra, undoubtedly, is related to Shughni –(a)rd both in form and function.

The following forms are attested in modern Shughni-Yazghulami Group. The multiplicity of forms in each language/dialect is due to phonological conditioning, which is noted for Shughni.

Shughni: -ard after consonants, -rd after vowels, -ra and –rad common after long vowels
Bajuyi: -ird, -rd, -ri, –rid (Bakhitbekov 1979: 68)
Yazgulami ra (Edelman 1971: 218)

Based on the forms given above, it is plausible to conclude that the Shughni form –rad has retained most of its prototypical form – if we agree this proto-form was *rādī. In contrast, were we deprived of the written evidence, it would be more difficult to justify that modern Persian rā, let alone its colloquial forms ra/a, ro/o, is the direct reflation of P.Ir. *rādī. In fact, from semantics and syntactic point of view Shughni –ard follows the O.P *rādīy and M.P. rād more closely than modern Persian rā does. This point will be covered in more detail in section 5.0.

How can we justify the phonological development of P.Ir. *rādī into modern Shughni -ard, -rd, -ra and -rad? Well, we know (unstressed) endings are commonly dropped in Iranian languages (Shughni 3rd person singular ending -tī > -t is a good example of this). Therefore, in the first
stage of its development *rādi > *rād. When *rād becomes a clitic postposition, at which point it loses any primary or secondary stress it might have, the long ā reduces to short a, giving as the form *rad. This development is still in progress in modern Shughni, where Locative words tend to become postpositions (filling the open holes for all kinds of deictic concepts) – first lose their stress, then their vowel length, and eventually could disappear because of phonological conditioning. An example of this is the word xēz ‘right side/hand’. When used in its full adverbial form it bears its stress as in as mās xēz taraf nażjis ‘move to our right side’ but loses its stress when used as postposition with the basic meaning of ‘side’ as in as mās-xēz nażjis ‘move to our side’. Thus, we have a long and stressed vowel in xēz, which has reduced to short e and eventually could possibly disappear ē>e>*ē>e>Ø. Therefore; *rādi > *rād > *rad > Sh. -rad > -rd. (In fact, the meaning and perhaps function of P.Ir. ard- and Avestan arəda- ‘side’ is realized in modern Shughni by the postposition -xēz ‘side’; and there isn’t any ambiguity between the meaning and function of -ard and -xēz.)

To further support our proposition that Shughni –ard /-rad is not a contamination of the P.Ir. *arda- and *rādi and that it is a direct development of *rādi, both in form and meaning, we will investigate the possibility that the reflexes of *rādi is widespread in the Pamir region. Contamination of *arda- and *rādi could not have occurred in all these languages systematically.

Let us consider the Wakhi Dative/Goal (D/G) case marker -or(k)/-(r)ək (Bashir 2009: 829, Pakhalina 1975: 106). When comparing Wakhi D/G marker -or(k)/-(r)ək with the Shughni postposition –(a)rd /-ra(d) we observe they are similar in form (as well in syntactic distribution shown below in (4-6)). Of course, there is a phonological difference between the two forms. The Wakhi form ends with ‘k’ while the Shughni form ends with ‘d’. This, in my view, is the reason why linguists hesitate to compare the Wakhi D/G case marker -or(k), -(r)ək with Shughni –(a)rd /ra(d), Stebline-Kamensky perhaps being the only exception (Setbline-Kamensky 1999: 452). Stebline-Kamensky, in his Etymological Dictionary of Wakhi, notes that R. B. Shaw has compared the Wakhi postposition -ork to the Dative ending –r in Khajuna (Dardic). Beside this, however, there are no other etymologies proposed for it and the only option remaining is to tentatively accept that Wakhi -ork goes back to the same proto-form that Shughni –ard does.

The proposition that a sporadic sound change, *d/*t > *g/*k, had occurred in Wakhi, which affected the postposition -ork shouldn’t surprise us. Such a sound change has occurred in other Pamir languages, especially within Shughni Group. Compare for example Shughni čēd and Rushani, Khufi, Roshorvi and Bartangi čēg < *kartiya- ‘knife’, Yazg. kāg ‘sword’ (Morgenstierne 1974: 25). The same is true for verbs such as Shughni čūd, Rushani čūg, and Yazghulami keg < *karta- ‘did’ (Edelman 2000: 250). Within Shughni proper we can still observe alternations between ‘k’ and ‘t’; kix vs. tix ‘dirty’ (child word), tultūntōw vs. kiltēntōw ‘to shake, to drag (like a rag)’, and talpak < ?kalpak < Uzbek qalpoq ‘hat’ (cf. Tajik telpak ‘hat’).
Although difficult to prove, yet worthy of mention, is the status of ‘k’ in the Shughni compound verbs dāk/lāk (cīdōw) ‘to give/to place, let down, let go’ < **dād- < **dāda-. Compare this with the Old Iranian verb dada’īt ‘they give/place’ (Skjærvø 2009: 68). Shughni lāk (cīdōw) ‘to place’ could have been borrowed from a substrata language where l<δ<d; Bactrian for instance has lado ‘gave; given’ <*dāta- (Rastorgueva and Edelman 2003: 434). But the difference in the initial sound of dāk and lāk could simply be an innovation within Shughni to differentiate between the two related words.

Let us now observe the similarities between the Shughni and Wakhi postpositions in the following sentences. The Wakhi sentences are exclusively taken from Pakhalina’s book ‘The Wakhi Language’ (Pakhalina 1975, 106). The original Russian translation of the Wakhi sentences are given in brackets. For now I will refer to the postpositions in both languages simply as ADP(osition).

(4) a) sōl-ərk wāz(t)-yā? (Wakhi)  
year-ADP come-Interrotative particle=yā

b) sōl-ga-rd  ta yadi-yō? (Shughni)  
year-next-ADP Future Particle=ta come-Interogative Particle=yō

Are you going to come next year?  
(на будущий год ты приедешь?)

(5) a) yīr-wīš-rək də yī šār ȳatay. (Wakhi)  
sun-set-ADP in a town reach

xīr-nīst-ard tar yi xār firīpt. (Shughni)  
sun-set-ADP to a town reach

By sunset he arrived in a town.  
(к заходу солнца он доехал до одного города.)

(6) a) ʒy δɔ'yəv-ərk ɬuşa pac! (Wakhi)  
my daughters-ADP provision cook

mu rizīnēn-ard tu xa pūj!  
my daughters-ADP provision cook

Make (cook) provisions for my daughters!  
(приготовь моим дочерям дорожный провиант!)
The claim that a sporadic *d/*t > *g/*k sound change in Wakhi is responsible for differences between the Shughni -ard and Wakhi -ərk to have any substance, we have to find other instances of such change within Wakhi. Never the less, the similarity in form and function between the Shughni and Wakhi postpositions forces us to think they might have been driven from a common source, i.e. *rådi.

4.0 The Semantics of Shughni –(a)rd

The various grammatical functions -ard realizes and the semantics associated with those functions are described in detail in T. Bakhtibekov’s book ‘Shughni Grammar’ (Bakhtibekov 1979, 68). In this paper I will not so much be concerned with the variety of surface level meanings attached to this postposition. Rather I will attempt to search for a deeper meaning associated with this postposition and propose a unified definition.

In general, the postposition –ard is defined as a marker of “indefinite location and time; direction, both ‘towards’ and ‘from’; addressee of speech” (Edelman and Dodykhudoeva 2009: 796), or an “approximate location and time; direction; addressee, etc.” (Bakhtibekov 1979, 68). The TIME component of the definition, in my view, surely others would agree, is conceptualized (in Shughni) as an instance of Location and therefore doesn’t need any elaboration. The sense of DIRECTION, proposed in the existing definitions, is carried by prepositions, which can be exemplified by the adverbial pronouns az-am-ard ‘from there’, and tar-am-ard ‘close to/by there’. The ‘addressee of speech’ can also be considered as an instance of Location. In fact, the most salient definition remaining to be considered in our existing sources is Location. I will propose a new concept and definition; one that specifically points to the Locative meaning of -ard and unifies all the surface semantic definitions associated with it. The term appears in the title of this paper as ‘Distributive Location’. The concept of ‘Distributive Location’ is borrowed from Jackendoff Ray’s book ‘Semantic Structures’. A general definition of this concept will be given after we have discussed our first construction involving -ard.

Syntactically the postposition -ard is mostly found in four types of constructions, which I have termed here as existential, intransitive, transitive and dative constructions. The type of construction -ard can appear in is largely dictated by the semantics associated with the Predicate and to some extent the Subject. I will use the abbreviation DLM (Distributive Location Marker) to refer to the function of -ard in all constructions. Let’s begin with the first and most basic one – existential.

(7) mu tât čîd-ard.
   my father home-DLM
   My father is (at) home.
The existential construction in (7) is composed of a Subject *mu tāt* ‘my father’ and the Predicate *čīd-ard* ‘at home’. The semantic interpretation of this construction can be generalized as; the Subject FATHER exists (or rather is located) at a Location called HOME. The two parameters, the Subject and the Location, must meet certain criterion for the -ard existential clauses to be plausible i) the Subject should be a single or an aggregation of animate beings, and ii) the Location encompasses all the space available under the broad term HOME. The meaning of this ‘all-encompassing space’ is captured by the postposition -ard. In existing definitions, which were mentioned earlier, the ‘all-encompassing space’ would be referred to as the ‘indefinite or approximate location’. I will refer to this ‘all-encompassing space’ as Distributive Location. Why is ‘indefinite location’ not the right term to define and describe the meaning of the postposition -ard? The reason is that Location is clearly specified and, therefore, can’t be indefinite at the same time. In the above construction the Location is specified and bound under the term HOME. All the unspecified space and sub-locations within this boundary should be treated equally. If we want to move our discussion beyond the concept of DISTRIBUTION we will certainly begin to invade the semantics and function of other Shughni postpositions such as -and(īr) ‘in, inside’, and -ti ‘on, on top of’.

The concept ‘Distributive Location’ is developed by Jackendoff in his Semantic Structures (Jackendoff 1990: 101). In sum what Jackendoff proposes is that there are “a small class of English prepositions such as all over, all along, and throughout” that when used in a clause “assert that the subject in some sense extends over the whole space subtended by the object of the preposition”. In our case, in (7), the role of the English preposition is played by the Shughni postposition -ard, the Object of the postposition is the location *čīd* ‘home’, and the Subject’s existence is distributed ‘all over’ that location.

From the existential construction, where the Subject is located/exists at a (Distributive) Location, we now move to a construction where LOCATION remains constant, but the Subject becomes mobile. Since intransitive verbs are involved in this type I refer to it as intransitive construction. (8a-b) are examples of the intransitive constructions.

(8) a) wam γāc pīc-ard yūʾk tīzd.
the girl face-DLM tear flow
Tear is flowing on the girl’s face. (Tears are flowing all over the girl’s face.)

b) yā γāc-i wi bōy-ard žēʾxt.
the gir-3SG the garden-DLM ran
The girl ran in/all over the garden.
The difference between the *existential construction* in (7) and the ones given in (8a-b) is the explicit introduction of intransitive verbs into the later. All the verbs used in this type of construction can be categorized as MOTION verbs, i.e. the Subject is active. In (8a) we have a construction that involves a small number of intransitive verbs such as tūdōw (ti(y) : tūyd/tōyd) ‘to go; to flow’, dēdōw (dī(y) : dēd 3SG : dōd) ‘to fall, pericpitate’ and čiktōw (čak : čikt) ‘to drip’. These verbs deal with the notion of ‘flow of water/liquid’ or ‘pericpitation’. Since the Subject in this type of construction has the property of ‘mass’ (like water) or aggregation (like grain, sand, or drops of rain), and has the potential to spread over a surface, the DLM is used to capture the notion of ‘spread and distribution’.

(8b) and (8a) are the same in all other respect, except for Subject, which is nonvolitional in (8a), yūĥk ‘tear’, but volitional in (8b), yā γāc ‘the girl’. The active and volitional Subject triggers the use of 3rd SG marker (in the past tenses).

At this point we have to tackle the verb’s transitivity as it becomes more relevant to our discussion. As seen in (8b) the Subject yā γāc ‘the girl’ carries the 3SG marker ‘-i’. The 3rd person singular marker is often described as ‘transitivity marker’ in Shughni. However, although a transitive clause must have this marker, it doesn’t exclusively mark transitivity. This marker should rightfully be referred to as ‘Active Agent Marker’ (AAM) because, as can be seen in the above examples, intransitive verbs conveying the concept of MOTION (and PRODUCTION) also carry this marker. Edelman and Yusufbekov (in Jazyki Mira III 2000: 236) mention the category of verbs that involve the notion of PRODUCTION (especially of sound such as pirštōw ‘to sneeze’, šintōw ‘to lough’) but they don’t include motion verbs into the category of verbs that carry the AAM.

The set of motion verbs, which are intransitive but carry the AAM include tēwdōw (tēw- : tēwd) ‘to wade’, nēyōdōw (nōy- : nēyδ) ‘to roam’, wīxtōw (wāz- : wīxt) ‘to swim’, žēxtōw (žōz- : žēxt) ‘to run’ fuzdōw (faz- : fizd) ‘to creep’, wuctōw (wuc- : wuct) ‘to budge, move’ etc. All these verbs can (or exclusively) appear in a construction that involves the Distributive Location Marker -ard.

We should be mindful that some of the verbs listed above are polysemic and, therefore, can be used both transitively and intransitively. The verb tēwdōw, for instance, is transitive when it means ‘to stir, mix’; yu čōrik-i wi šarīk tēwd ‘the man stirred/mixed the mortar’. When used intransitively, it means ‘to wade’ yu čōrik-i wi šarīk-ard tēwd ‘the man waded in the mortar’. The same can be said of nēyōδ ‘v.trans. to walk s.o. or s.th. about/around; v.intr. to roam, walk around’. An interesting verb, which supports the fact that purely intransitive verbs can carry the AAM, is the verb wīxtōw ‘to swim’; yu čōrik-i (wam šac-ard) wīxt ‘the man swam (in/all over the water)’. This verb has a transitive/causative counterpart wēzdōw ‘to help/teach/make s.o. swim’. Yet, because it is a motion verb and because the Subject is volitional, it carries the AAM ‘-i’. The notion of Distributive Location (*all over the water*) isn’t explicitly expressed with the intransitive verb ‘to swim’ but pragmatically understood that swimming is done in water.
The third type of construction involving Distributive Location is one in which transitive verbs are present and, therefore, the explicit presence of a Direct Object. This type of construction includes the use of Instrument. (9a) and (9b) are examples of transitive construction.

(9) a) yā γāc-i wam źir-ard ḵac ſipt.
   the/that girl-3SG the/that rock-DLM water spray
   The girl sprayed water on /all over the rock.

   b) yu čōriк-i ḵabĩʒ qati mu ěust-ard ḏōd.
   the man-3SG twig with my hand-DLM hit
   The man hit (all) over my hand with a twig.

In (9a) we have an active/mobile Subject acting upon an Object subtended by the DLM -ard. But in this case the Subject doesn’t directly interact with Object. Rather it causes another ENTITY to carry this action on its behalf. In other word the Subject transfers its will to the Direct Object, ḵac ‘water’ in (9a), and the the Instrument ḵabĩʒ ‘twig’ in (9b). The Direct Object then performs the same action in (9a-b) that the Subject performed in our previous constructions (8a-b). The main point to be conveyed here again is that while a construction changes due to addition or removal of arguments, the semantics of the Distributive Location doesn’t change at all.

The fourth, and perhaps the most used construction employing the DLM -ard, is what I refer to as dative construction. The dative construction is common because it involves the verbs dāk čīdōw ‘to give’ and lůvdōw ‘to tell’, which are used in everyday conversation. Both RECIPIENT and BENEFICIARY semantic roles are included under this type. Syntactically the Object subtended by the DLM -ard in this type of construction is equivalent to the Indirect Object. The Indirect Object mu-rd ‘to me’ in (10a), puc-ard ‘for son’ in (10b) and wēv-ard ‘to them’ in (10c) subtended by the DLM -(a)rd, can be thought of as being in Dative Case.

(10) a) mu tāt-i mu-rd mūn dāk čūd.
   my father me-DLM apple give do
   My father gave me an apple.

   b) xu puc-ard-um xāt nivišt.
   self son-DLM-1SG letter write
   I wrote a letter for/to my son.

   c) wēv-ard lū ḵumnē tar māš čīd yad-ēn.
   them-DLM say tomorrow to our house come-3PL
   Tell them to come to our house tomorrow.
In all four constructions we discussed so far, the semantics of the Object subtended by the Distributive Location Marker -ard remains constant. The Object, as it is referred to by Jackendoff, is simply a Location where the Subject or another (Direct) Object is distributed.

5.0 Comparing Persian rā and Shughni -ard

Having explored the semantics of the Shughni postposition -ard we are now in a position to compare it to the Persian Direct Object Marker rā. We will begin with the passage from Middle Persian, which was given in (1) repeated here as (11).

(11) u pāpak rāð hēč frazand... nē büt
    and Pāpak=DAT/ACC any son not was
    “And Pāpak had no son”

Let’s compare this to the following Shughni constructions in (12-14).

(12) čīd-ard yi-čāy-aθ na vud.
    home-DLM one-who-(aθ=exclusivity marker) not was
    There was nobody (at) home.

(13) at Pōpak-ard ačaθ puc rawō na vud.
    and Pāpak-for-DAT any son deserve not was
    And Pāpak didn’t deserve any son.

(14) at Pōpak-and ačaθ puc na vud.
    and Pāpak-POSSESSIVE any son not was
    And Pāpak had no son.

The Middle Persian postposition rāð in (11) is syntactically treated as a Dative/Accusative case marker, while semantically it can be thought of as a Locative postposition comparable to the Shughni -ard in (12). In (13) the postposition –ard is deliberately marked as for-Dative in to emphasize the fact that the Middle Persian construction in (11) is semantically closer to the Shughni existential construction in (12) rather than the dative construction in (13). Both, the Middle Persian construction in (11) and the Shughni in (12) have the basic sense of ‘X’ is/not located in ‘Y’, i.e. both convey the sense of POSSESSION. If we translate the Middle Persian passage in (11) to Shughni, which is given in (14), we will discover its POSSESSIVE sense. The Dative/Locative sense of the Middle Persian postposition rāð is largely lost in modern Persian, where its equivalent, rā, serves as Direct Object Marker.
The only instance where modern Persian rā and Shughni –ard converge semantically is in a construction where the Object subtended by rā in Persian is an explicit location such as jā(y) ‘place’, šahr ‘city, town’, etc. The semantics of rā in this type of construction could be claimed to have retained its original Locative meaning. In this case the Persian rā is referred to as Directional Object Marker instead of Direct Object Marker.

(15) hama jā-rā gašt-am. (Persian)
    all place-Dir.OM roam-1SG

(16) fuk jō-rd-um nēyd. (Shughni)
    all place-DLM-1SG roam

I roamed/walked all over the place.

Modern Persian interrogative adverb če-rā ‘why’ and Shughni čīz-ard (and its abbreviated form car) ‘why’ are other examples of correspondences in these languages. Also, a construction similar to the Old Persian avahya=rådiy ‘for this [reason]’ can be rendered in both Persian, baráy (în ke…) and in Shughni as dūnd-ard (îdê…) ‘for the reason (that…)’. In Shughni the concept of ‘purpose and reason’ is also realized with Infinitive + -ard; xīdōw-ard ‘eadable, allotted for the sake/purpose of eating’.

In Shughni the postposition –ard never marks Direct Object. Only in Yazghulami the postposition ra is used occasionally to mark Direct Object as in ná-de mó-ra ‘don’t beat me’ (Edelman 1971, 218).

The reason why –ard in Shughni never developed the sense of Direct Object marker is, perhaps, because Shughni retained its Direct-Oblique case system for a longer period, where the Oblique case was used as Direct Object marker (i.e. Accusative Case). Traces of the Oblique case, ending in –ev, can still be found in Shughni demonstrative pronouns mēv ‘these’, dēv ‘those’, wēv ‘those’. In fact, demonstrative pronouns are used in modern Shughni as determiners to mark Oblique case. Sarikuli has retained this Oblique case marker –ef into the modern times (Edelman, Yusufbekov 2000: 270).

6.0 Historical Context

A postposition similar in form and meaning to that of Old Persian *rådiy ‘for the sake of’ is also found in some Slavic languages; Old Church Slavonic (OCS) radi ‘for the sake of, because of’, Russian rādi (ради) ‘for the sake of’, etc. (Derksen 2008: 432).

Because Old Persian *rådiy and OCS radi are similar in form and function, and because the latter is only present in the South-East Slavic languages, there is the possibility that the Slavic
languages borrowed this term from Iranian. But some prominent scholars of Iranian languages argue against this. Professor Edelman, while pointing to the similarity in form and function between the two forms argues that Old Persian was already a dead language by the 4th century B.C, and that in Middle Persian the postposition sounded like rādō, which too could not be the source of OCS radi. She proposes a South Slavic etymology for for the OCS radi, which is given as *rādī ‘дело, работа (affair, work)’ (Edelman 2002: 155). Edelman, however, does not rule out the possibility that a crystallized form *rādi might have persisted in some Iranian language as expressed in the following remarks.

It isn’t ruled out, however, that in some Western Iranian language of the pre-Islamic era, the preservation of an already dead formula that retained the characteristics of *rādī—something like the colloquial type ‘for the sake of (that)’, or a sacred type ‘for the sake of God’, even though it is not recorded.

Following this remark, we can point out to the existence of a form in the Hazaragī dialect. In modern Persian barāy ‘for (the sake of)’ is, undoubtedly, a combination of the preposition ba ‘to’ and the classical Persian rāy. The Hazaragī version of this composite form is balde <*ba ‘to’+ some reflexes of *rādi, which might be a borrowing from a dialect of Persian spoken in the remote parts of Afghanistan up until the arrival of the Hazara people. The influence on the Hazaragī form, however, didn’t have to be from a Persian dialect. It could have as well been an Eastern Iranian language.

If such possibility existed that some Iranian languages had preserved the form and function of the Old Iranian *rādi for a longer period, could an Eastern Iranian dialect (Proto-Pamirian) have been one of them? If so, we can also consider the possibility that during the migrations of people from Central Asia to Eastern Europe, which mostly occurred before the formation of Old Church Slavonic (Proto-Bulgarian), the Iranian *rādi would have found its way to Europe.

7.0 Conclusion

The development of Proto-Iranian *rādi has an established history in Persian. We know from written sources what the form and function of this postposition was in each stage of the Persian language. In section 5.0 we compared the Shughni postposition -ard to Middle Persian rādō and New Persian rād. There we established that the further we go back in time the closer in form and function Shughni -ard gets to its Persian counterpart. This gives us an indication that Shughni -ard is driven from the same source that Old Persian rādiy is driven from, i.e. Proto-Iranian *rādi.
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