

# Shughni Distributive Location Marker

*-ard / -rad*

Soorgul Sakai; Independent Researcher

August 2018

**Keywords:** Proto-Iranian *\*rādi*, Old Persian *rādiy*, New Persian *râ*, Shughni *-ard*, Wakhi *-ark*

## 1.0 Introduction

One of the most commonly used grammatical marker in modern Persian is the Direct Object Marker *râ*. 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 *râ* we have written evidence, which directly links it to Old Persian *rādiy* 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 *râ*. 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 *-ark* 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 *râ* 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 *rādiy* to New Persian *râ*

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 *rādiy* is mostly found in the construction *avahya=rādiy* “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 *rāð*. Syntactically the M.P. postposition *rāð* is said to have acquired Accusative/Dative case function. The passage in (1) exemplifies the use of *rāð* in Middle Persian.

- (1) u pāpak rāð hēč frazand... nē būt (Hewson, J. and V. Bubenik 2006: 139)  
and Pāpak=DAT/ACC any son not was  
“And Pāpak had no son”

Middle Persian *rāð* undergoes further phonological changes, initially developing into *rāy*, *rā* in classical Persian period and then into *râ* 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 *râ* in modern Persian is (Definite) Direct Object Marker (DOM). The sentences in (2) and (3) capture the colloquial and literal uses of *râ*.

- (2) kitâb-a / kitâb-â-ra da kujâ mândî? (Colloquial Kabuli Farsi)  
book-DOM /book-PL-DOM in/on where put

- (3) kitâb-râ / kitâb-hâ-râ dar kujâ mândî (=guzâštî)? (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. *rāð* > Class.P. *rā(y)* > N.P. *râ* (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 *arəða* (Sokolova 1967: 39). In fact, George Morgenstierne citing Sokolova, refutes any connection between Shughni *-(ar)d* and P.Ir. *\*rādi*. He specifically points out that “<*arəða-*, in spite of irregular *-rd*, and not... *\*rādi*” should be the proto-form of Shughni postposition *-(a)rd* (Morgenstierne 1974: 66).

In the Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages Avestan *arəða-* 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. *arəða*, but could there be a contamination of *\*arda-* and *\*rādi*” 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 *\*rādi*, 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 *-ark* 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

Bajuwi: *-ird*, *-rd*, *-ri*, *-rid* (Bakhtibekov 1979: 68)

Rushani, Bartangi: *-ri*, Sarikuli: *-ri*, *-ir* [<*-ird*, *-rid*] (Sokolova 1967: 39)

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 *\*rādi*. 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. *\*rādi*. In fact, from semantics and syntactic point of view Shughni *-ard* follows the O.P *\*rādiy* and M.P. *rāð* 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. *\*rādi* into modern Shughni *-ard*, *-rd*, *-ra* and *-rad*? Well, we know (unstressed) endings are commonly dropped in Iranian languages (Shughni 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular ending *-ti* > *-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 māš xēz taraf naŷŷīs* ‘move to our right side’ but loses its stress when used as postposition with the basic meaning of ‘side’ as in *as māš-xez naŷŷīs* ‘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  $\acute{e} > \bar{e} > e > **\emptyset > ** \emptyset$ . Therefore; *\*rādi* > *\*rād* > *\*rad* > Sh. *-rad* > *-rd*. (In fact, the meaning and perhaps function of P.Ir. *arda-* 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 *-ər(k)/-(r)ək* (Bashir 2009: 829, Pakhalina 1975: 106). When comparing Wakhi D/G marker *-ər(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 *-ər(k)*, *-(r)ək* with Shughni *-(a)rd* /*-ra(d)*, Steblina-Kamensky perhaps being the only exception (Setblina-Kamensky 1999: 452). Steblina-Kamensky, in his Etymological Dictionary of Wakhi, notes that R. B. Shaw has compared the Wakhi postposition *-ərək* 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 *-ərək* 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 *-ərək* 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* (*čīdōw*) ‘to give/to place, let down, let go’ < \*\**dād*- < \*\**dāda*-. Compare this with the Old Iranian verb *dada<sup>1</sup>tī* ‘they give/place’ (Skjærvø 2009: 68). Shughni *lāk* (*čīdōw*) ‘to place’ could have been borrowed from a substrata language where  $l < \delta < d$ ; 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-ər̄k wəz(ī)-yā?* (Wakhi)  
year-ADP come-Interrotative particle=yā

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

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

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

*xīr-nīst-ard tar yī šār 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 dəʔdəv-ər̄k tyʂa pas!* (Wakhi)  
my daughters-ADP provision cook

*mu rizīnēn-ard tuḫā pīz!*  
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 *-ark* 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. *\*rādi*.

#### 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 tāt čīd-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 yūčk 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 bōγ-ard žēxt.*

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’, *δēdōw* (*δi(y)-, δēd 3SG: δōd*) ‘to fall, percipitate’ and *čiktōw* (*čak-: čikt*) ‘to drip’. These verbs deal with the notion of ‘flow of water/liquid’ or ‘percipitation’. 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), *yūxk* ‘tear’, but volitional in (8b), *yā yāc* ‘the girl’. The active and volitional Subject triggers the use of 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 yāc* ‘the girl’ carries the 3SG marker ‘-i’. The 3<sup>rd</sup> 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’, *nēyđdōw* (*nōy- : nēyđ*) ‘to roam’, *wīxtōw* (*wāz- : wīxt*) ‘to swim’, *žēxtōw* (*žōz- : žēxt*) ‘to run’, *fuzdōw* (*faz- : fuzd*) ‘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 šarθk tēwd* ‘the man stirred/mixed the mortar’. When used intransitively, it means ‘to wade’ *yu čōrik-i wi šarθk-ard tēwd* ‘the man waded in the mortar’. The same can be said of *nēyđdōw* ‘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 xac-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 žīr-ard ḡac ḡīpt.  
the/that girl-3SG the/that rock-DLM water spray  
The girl sprayed water on /all over the rock.

b) yu čōrik-i ḡabīz qati mu δust-ard δōd.  
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, *ḡac* 'water' in (9a), and the the Instrument *ḡabīz* '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 *lūvdōw* '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 ḡumnē 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 *râ* 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 *râ*. 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 būt (Hewson, J. and V. Bubenik 2006: 139)  
 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, *râ*, serves as Direct Object Marker.

The only instance where modern Persian *râ* and Shughni *-ard* converge semantically is in a construction where the Object subtended by *râ* in Persian is an explicit location such as *ĵâ(y)* ‘place’, *šahr* ‘city, town’, etc. The semantics of *râ* in this type of construction could be claimed to have retained its original Locative meaning. In this case the Persian *râ* is referred to as Directional Object Marker instead of Direct Object Marker.

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

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

I roamed/walked all over the place.

Modern Persian interrogative adverb *če-râ* ‘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=rādiy* ‘for this [reason]’ can be rendered in both Persian, *barāy (īn ke...)* and in Shughni as *dūnd-ard (idē...)* ‘for the reason (that...)’. In Shughni the concept of ‘purpose and reason’ is also realized with Infinitive + *-ard*; *xīdōw-ard* ‘eatable, 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 *\*rādiy* ‘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 *\*rādiy* 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 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C, and that in Middle Persian the postposition sounded like *rāḏ*, 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 \**radь* ‘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.

Не исключено, правда, сохранение в каком-либо из иранских языков западного ареала в доисламскую эпоху уже омертвевшей формулы с сохранением облика \**rādi* – разговорной типа ‘того ради’ или сокращенной типа ‘Бога ради’, хотя она и не зафиксирована. (Edelman 2002: 156)

*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 \*rādi— 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*<sup>i</sup> ‘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 *rāḏ* and New Persian *rā*. 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*.

## **Bibliography**

- Bakhtibekov, T. 1979. Грамматикаи Забони Шугнонӣ (Shughni Grammar). Душанбе. Дониш.
- Bashir, E. 2009. 'Wakhi' in *The Iranian Languages*. London, New York. Routledge.
- Derksen, R. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden, Boston. Brill.
- Edelman, D.I. 1971. Язгулямско-Русский Словарь (Yazg pulami-Russian Dictionary). Москва. Наука.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. Иранские и Славянские Языки: Исторические отношения (Iranian and Slavic Languages: Historical Relations). Москва. Вост. лит. РАН.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. Этимологический словарь иранских языков т.4 (Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages v.4). Moscow. Вост. лит. РАН.
- Edelman, D.I. and Yusufbekov, Sh. P. 2000. 'Шугнанский Язык' в Языки мира: Иранские языки. III. Восточноиранские языки. Москва. Индрик.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Сарыкольский Язык' в Языки мира: Иранские языки. III. Восточноиранские языки. Москва. Индрик.
- Edelman, D.I. and Dodikhudoeva, L.R. 2009. 'Shughni' in *The Iranian Languages*. London, New York. Routledge.
- Hewson, J. and V. Bubenik, 2006, *From Case to Adposition: The Development of Configurational Syntax in Indo-European Languages*, Amsterdam; Philadelphia. J. Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Jackendoff, R. 1992. *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge, MIT Press.
- Kent, R.G. 1950, *Old Persian*, New Haven, American Oriental Society.
- Morgenstierne, G. 1974, *Etymological Vocabulary of the Shughni Group*, Wiesbaden.
- Pakhalina, T. N. 1975. Ваханский Язык (The Wakhi Language). Москва. Наука.
- Rastorgueva, V.S. and Edelman, D.I. 2000. Этимологический словарь иранских языков т.1 (Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages v.1). Moscow. Вост. лит. РАН.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. Этимологический словарь иранских языков т.2 (Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages v.2). Moscow. Вост. лит. РАН.
- Skjærvø, P. O. 2009. 'Old Iranian' in *The Iranian Languages*. London, New York. Routledge.
- Sokolova, V. S. 1967. Генетические отношения язгулямского языка и шугнанской языковой группы (Genetic Relationship of the Yazghulami Language and the Shughni Group of Languages). Ленинград. Наука.
- Stebline-Kamensky, I. M. 1999. Этимологический Словарь Ваханского Языка (Etymological Dictionary of the Wakhi Language). СПб. Востоковедение.