

VERBS AND PREVERBS IN THE AYYĀTKĀR Ī ZARĒRĀN

BY

BO UTAS

Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies, Copenhagen

In a contribution to the previous volume of this journal¹ entitled "Verbal forms and ideograms in the Middle Persian inscriptions" (cited as "Verbal forms" below) I have studied the use of phonetic complements to verbal ideograms in inscriptional Middle Persian. Turning now to Book Pahlavi for a similar investigation, difficulties arising from the nature of the text material at once strike the eye. The unreliability of the transmitted manuscript material, to a great extent depending on what W. B. Henning once, in despair, called "the notorious sloppiness of the copyists",² and the uncertainty as regards time of composition are the principle obstacles, which we can hardly ever hope to get around.

The text chosen for this investigation, the *Ayyātkār ī Zarērān* (hereafter *AZ*) or the "Memoir of the Zarēr family", has a special position in Pahlavi literature. It is one of the few surviving secular works, being a verse fragment of an old Iranian epic cycle. In a recent article, "On the composition of the *Ayyātkār ī Zarērān*" (cited as "Composition" below),³ I have described the main compositional characteristics of this text which stands astride the gap between fragmentary passages of the Avesta and the "1000 verses" of *Šāh-nāmah* composed by Daqīqī. The conclusion of that article was, in short, that the text of *AZ*, as we have it,

¹ *Acta Orientalia* 36 (1974), pp. 83–112.

² *BSOAS* 13(1949–50), p. 641.

³ *Monumentum H. S. Nyberg*, Tehran-Liège (*Acta Iranica*) 1975, vol. II, pp. 399–418.

is a slightly abridged version of a verse composition from Sasanian times. But for some prose passages in the summarizing introduction, it is mainly narrated in present tense, with much of the original verse shining through. The poetical properties of the text will be touched upon below in the cases where they are of importance for the analysis of the verbal forms.

In that same article the textual situation of *AZ* is described as well as philological treatments of it by W. Geiger,⁴ Th. Nöldeke,⁵ A. Pagliaro,⁶ E. Benveniste,⁷ and H. S. Nyberg.⁸ All textual material, however, goes back to one single source, Jamasp-Asana's Codex MK, dated 691 A.Y. = 1322 A.D., published in his famous *Pahlavi Texts* (II, Bombay 1913), pp. 1-17. Unfortunately, this important manuscript was badly worm-eaten already at the end of the last century.⁹ Obviously many of its readings had to be restored with the aid of the MS designated JJ by Jamasp-Asana. This MS was copied from MK in 1136 A.Y. = 1767 A.D. Possibly MK was in a somewhat better shape at that time. In spite of the existence of a critical apparatus, it is difficult to see from the edition in *Pahlavi Texts* where there are lacunae in MK and the readings in the edition depend solely on JJ or, possibly, on emendations by Jamasp-Asana or others. Here below, the text of MK, as far as it is possible to reconstruct it from *Pahlavi Texts* (including critical apparatus), is always considered the basis for the investigation. Readings and interpretations of Jamasp-Asana are quoted as JA and those pertaining to Pagliaro, Benveniste and Nyberg in the works mentioned above are referred to with the name of the respective scholar. The text itself is quoted with reference to the paragraph numbers in *Pahlavi Texts*.¹⁰

⁴ *Sitzungsber. d. philos.-philol. u. hist. Cl. d. k. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.*, II:1, 1890, pp. 43-84.

⁵ *ZDMG* 46(1892), pp. 136-145.

⁶ *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Cl. di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, VI: I, 1925, pp. 550-604.

⁷ *Journal Asiatique* 220 (1932), pp. 245-293.

⁸ *A manual of Pahlavi*, I, Wiesbaden 1964, pp. 18-30.

⁹ Cf. Geiger, *op. cit.*, pp. 43f.

¹⁰ The introductory section, without paragraph number, and the colophon, with separate paragraph numbers, are not discussed. On the system of transcription, see "Verbal forms", p. 85, and "Composition", p. 400.

Verbal forms in AZ according to orthographical representation
(without emendations; auxiliaries counted separately)

Total number of forms	581	100%	
Forms written phonetically	143		25%
Forms written with ideogram	438	100%	75%
with complement -yt ¹¹	178	40%	31%
with complement -t	56	13%	10%
with complement -d	51	12%	9%
with complement -m ¹²	44	10%	8%
with complement -x ₁	29	7%	5%
with complement zero	22	5%	4%
with complement -'y	17	4%	3%
with complement -ym	13	3%	2%
with complement -'t	9	2%	1½%
with complement -/s/tn ¹	8	2%	1½%
with complement -st	3	(½)%	(0)%
with complement -x ₂	3	(½)%	(0)%
with complement -'	2	(½)%	(0)%
with complement -yh	2	(½)%	(0)%
with complement -'h	1	(0)%	(0)%

A comparison with the table on verbal forms in inscriptional Middle Persian published previously ("Verbal forms", p. 86) shows that the proportions of verbs written phonetically and with ideogram, respectively, are practically the same and that this also applies to verbal ideograms with complement-m. The other more frequent complements are not comparable, mainly because of the systematic differences¹³ and differences in the character of the text.

Compound verbal forms

There are 29 compound verbal forms, all of them written with at least one verbal ideogram.

¹¹ Excl. ḤWHyt 76, which obviously stands for pron. *ēl*.

¹² Excl. ḤWHm 26, 76, 96, which obviously stand for adv. *ham*.

¹³ Cf. "Verbal forms", pp. 110-112; note especially the difference in frequency of ideograms with complement zero.

I. Past participle + forms of *h-*:

A. Proper 3rd plur. preterites of intransitive verbs: *andar-šut-hēnd* 8, *bē-raft-hēnd* 22, *āmat-hēnd* 26.

B. Secondary (young) 3rd plur. preterites of transitive verbs: *burt-hēnd* 8, *bē-dāt-hēnd* 8, *kart-hēnd* 33 (these should most probably be emended to the regular past participles: *burt*, *bē-dāt* and *kart*; compare the use of *bē-patigrift* and *burt*, but *bē-raft-hēnd*, in a parallel passage in § 22).¹⁴

C. 1st sing. preterites of intransitive verbs: *nē-zāt-ham* 40, *zāt-ham* 40, *šut-ham* 88 (here most probably belong three emended forms in § 40: *bē-murt-+ham*, *būt-+ham* and *ōpast-+ham*; see below p. 102).

D. A number of 2nd/3rd sing. preterite indicative, subjunctive or optative forms;¹⁵ 2nd sing. ind.: (*ōzat*) *apakand-hē(h)* 85, *āmat-hē(h)* 107; 3rd sing. subj.: *x^uart-hā* 52, *apakand-hā* 52; § 40 has five forms written with *ḤWH*ʔy, and two of these are probably 3rd sing. opt.: *nē-pursīt-hē(h)*, *pursīt-hē(h)*, but the three others must be mistakes for 1st sing. forms (the complete context is quoted below, p. 102).

II. Past participle + forms of *bav-*:¹⁶

A. 3rd plur. passive of an intransitive verb: *murt bavēnd* 49, 68.

B. 3rd sing. future (expressed through subjunctive) passive of a transitive verb: *zat bavāt* 21.

III. Past participle + forms of *ēstātan/ēst-*:

A. 3rd sing. perfect of verbs of change (with present sense): *ākust ēstēt* 34, *zāt ēstēt* 68, *nē-x^uast ēstēt* 80, 107, *višuft ēstēt* 86.

B. 3rd sing. pluperfect of transitive verbs (with simple past sense): *nipišt ēstāt* 10, *kart ēstāt* 74, 100 (the two latter forms, however, are probably interpolations, since they are meaningless in the context and also seem to destroy the metre: §§ 74, 100 . . . | *u-š vīdrāfš ī yātūk apar-nišīnēt* | *u stanēt hān +frāš ī apasūtāk* | *ī dēvān andar dōšāx^u pat hēšm* | *u zahr-distāk pat āp ī banjāk* |

¹⁴ Cf. also Nyberg, *Manual* II, p. 283 (7.6).

¹⁵ For further discussion of the endings written -ʔy, -ʔh and -ʔ, see below pp. 101–106.

¹⁶ *guft nē-bavēt* 52 and *guft bavēt* 53 do not belong here, as they are composed of two syntactically separated elements.

(*kart ēstāt*) *u frāc ō dāst stanēt*, "and Vidrafš, the sorcerer, mounts it and grasps that spear on which a spell [has been] cast by the devils in hell through Wrath and [which has been] poisoned with hemp juice, and he wields [it] with [his] hand").

Prefixed verbal forms

In AZ 124 of the verbal forms are prefixed in the widest sense of that word, including particles, negations (also when separated from the verb by other elements) and preverbs. The verbal element is written with ideogram in 88 of these cases (71%, i.e. about the normal proportion). These forms have up to three prefixes: "full" preverb¹⁷ + *bē-* + *nē-/mā-*.

I. Negation:

A. There are 56 cases of pref. *nē-*, 8 with verbs in past tense and 42 with verbs in present tense. It would be too cumbersome to list them here, but it should be noticed that when *nē-* occurs with a "full" preverb alone, it stands before that preverb (*nē-apar-āxēzēt* 54, 58; *nē-apāč-nikērēt* 54, 56, 58, 60; the one case of the reverse order, *apāč-nē-mānēt* 98, is probably a mistake for *apāč-bē-nē-mānēt*, as it is written in the parallel in § 112), but together with both a "full" preverb and *bē-* it stands nearest to the verb (*apāč-bē-nē-pāyēt* 72; *apāč-bē-nē-mānēt* 112; *apāč-bē-nē-šavēnd* 66).

B. There are six occurrences of the prohibitive *mā-* (in four cases separated from the verb). 'L 'ZLWN: *mā-šav* 80 is a sing. imperative, and so the pseudo-verb *āvar* in § 51 must be considered: 'L drwdst LPMH (for LPNMH = LPNH): *mā drugist āvar*, "may you not fare well". BR' 'L NTLWNyt: *bē-mā-pāyēt* 24 is probably plur. imperative (if not 3rd sing. pres. ind.). But the three parallel instances of 'L . . . YḤMTWNd w . . . YKTLWNd in §§ 81, 87 and 108 are somewhat uncertain. Could they be unmarked 3rd plur. subjunctives in *-ānd*, as suggested by Nyberg in *Manual* II (s.v. *mā*)? If it can be established that *mā-* may be followed also by indicative forms, these forms are rather ordinary 3rd plur. indicatives (*rasēnd*, *ōzanēnd*).

¹⁷ I.e. a preverb with a lexical function.

II. The prefix *bē-*:

The 43 forms (30 written with verbal ideogram) prefixed with *bē-* are of special interest, since the uses of this prefix have not yet been fully clarified.¹⁸ In 7 cases *bē-* is followed by a past tense, in 31 cases by a present indicative form, in three cases by an imperative form and in two cases by an infinitive.¹⁹ It would be most appropriate to classify these forms according to the functions of the prefix *bē-*: a verbal particle with solely grammatical functions or a full preverb with lexical and possibly also grammatical functions. The line between a grammatical and a lexical use is, however, often quite difficult to draw. A tentative classification follows.

A. Verbal particle followed by past tense:

§ 8 *u andar-šut-hēnd u[-šān] ō vištāsp-šāh namāč burt(-hēnd, interpol.?) u fravartak bē-dāt(-hēnd, interpol.?)* § 9 *avrāhīm . . .*, "And they entered and paid homage to Vištāsp-šāh and delivered the letter. Avrāhīm . . . ; § 22 *avrāhīm ī dipīvarān mahīst fravartak bē-āvašt u vīdrafš yātūk u nāmṣ^uāst ī hazārān fravartak bē-patigrift u ō vištāsp-šāh namāč burt bē-raft-hēnd*, "Avrāhīm, the chief secretary, sealed the letter, and Vīdrafš, the sorcerer, and Nāmṣ^uāst Hazārān received the letter and paid homage to Vištāsp-šāh, [whereupon] they left"; the context of § 40 *bē-murt-+ham* is quoted below (p. 102). In these five cases *bē-* is not used generally to denote "the perfective aspect", as suggested by Nyberg in *Manual* II (p. 46b). It is used only in a selected number of perfective cases, obviously in order to stress the result of the action, perhaps especially when there is a change from one agent to another.²⁰

¹⁸ Cf. the recent attempt by G. Widengren in *Mémorial J. de Menasce*, 1974, pp. 360–366, on the whole based on the exposition by H. S. Nyberg, *Hilfsbuch des Pehlevi*, II, s.v. *bē*; see now Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v. *bē*. See additional note, pp. 109–10.

¹⁹ The contrast to the situation in the Middle Persian inscriptions is striking: only one instance of pref. *bē-* may be listed for KKZ and KNRb, BR' YNSBWN: *bē-stat* in KKZ 13; cf. "Verbal forms", p. 87.

²⁰ This does not agree with the conclusion of Widengren, *op. cit.*, pp. 365–366, that *bē-* with past tense denotes durative or repeated action. There is always some uncertainty involved in general conclusions drawn from selected passages quoted from works of diverse character. But it must also be admitted that the material

B. Verbal particle followed by present indicative:

§ 66 *gōbēt jāmāsp bitaxš kū 100 u 30 uēvak bēvar xyōn hač bunak bē-āyēnd ka ēv-bār āyēnd* (u, pleon.) *hēč zīvandak apāč-bē-nē-šavēnd*²¹ *bē hān ī ēvak arjāsp ī xyōnān x^uatāy*, "Says Jāmāsp, the Bitaxš: '1,310,000 Xyōns will come forth from the camp; when once they come, no one will go back (i.e. survive) but Arjāsp, the ruler of the Xyōns, alone'"; § 72 . . . *adak nē dagr-zamān bavēt ka hač amāh xyōnān hēč zīvandak apāč-bē-nē-pāyēt* (L'WHL BR' L' p'dt), "then it will not be long when (i.e. before) no one of us Xyōns will remain alive" (cf. § 98 . . . *adak nē dagr-zamān bavēt* (ī) *ka hač amāh xyōnān hēč zīvandak apāč-nē-mānēt* (L'WHL L' KTLWNyt)); § 112 *adak nē dagr-zamān bavēt ka hač ōy-šān xyōnān hēč zīvandak apāč-bē-nē-mānēt* (L'WHL BR' L' KTLWNyt) *bē hān ī ēvak arjāsp ī xyōnān x^uatāy*, "then it is not long when (i.e. before) no one of these Xyōns remains alive but Arjāsp, the ruler of the Xyōns, alone". In these sentences *bē-* certainly functions as a perfective prefix which with the present indicative gives a future sense (in *bē-āyēnd* 66 it is, however, primarily a full preverb; see below), and it may be noticed that, in contradiction to what is stated by Nyberg (*Manual* II, s.v. *bē*) *bē-* in this use is not abrogated by other preverbs or negations. In § 112, however, a future sense is not quite in accord with the context. There the forms *bavēt* and *apāč-bē-nē-mānēt* are probably kept as an epic formula, this being the third occurrence of this passage in the text; the form *apāč-bē-nē-pāyēt* (p'dt) 72 is probably a secondary variant for original *apāč-bē-nē-mānēt* (KTLWNyt)²² and *apāč-nē-mānēt* (KTLWNyt) 98 likewise, through a secondary loss of *bē-* (BR').

§ 62 . . . *čē man diz-ē ī rōdēn bē-frāmā[yē]m kartan u hān diz dar-band hān ī āsēnēn bē-framāyēm kartan ōy-šān pūsarān u brātārān u vispuhrakān andar hān diz [bē-]framāyēm*²³ *nišāstan*, "because I shall order a fortress of copper to be made, and for this fortress I shall order an iron gate to be made; I shall order

for an appreciation of the use of *bē-* with verbs in past tense in AZ is rather insufficient.

²¹ 'ZLWNd, plur. assimilation from previous sentence.

²² Cf. the closely resembling ideogram for *pātan*: NTLWN, e.g. this text § 84.

²³ *kartan u*, secondary addition; cf. § 63 quoted below.

these sons and brothers and princes to be placed in that fortress"; § 63 *gōbēt jāmāsp bītaxš kū hakar diz-ē ī rōdēn bē-framāyē(h) kartan hān-ič ī dar-band āsēnēn bē-framāyē(h) kartan ōy-šān pūsarān u brātārān [u] vispuhrakān ī tō rāmšahr kai-vištāsp-šāh andar hān diz bē-framāyē(h) nišāstan pas hān and dušman hač šahr apāč-dāšt[an]* (§ 64) *kē tuwān*, "Says Jāmāsp, the Bītaxš: 'If you *will* order a fortress of copper to be made [and] also *order* an iron gate to be made for it [and] *order* these your sons and brothers [and] princes, O champion of peace Kai-Vištāsp-Šāh, to be placed in that fortress, then who is able to repel all those enemies from the realm?'"'. In comparison with other cases of *framāy-* + infinitive in this text (§§ 15, 23, 25, 43, 44, 83, 91) these five (after emendation six) cases obviously display a use of *bē-* to stress a future sense.

§ 25 . . . *u hakar nē ka āyēt hān gāl*²⁴ *apāk x^uēš-tan bē-nē-āvarēt ānōd pat dār apar framāyēm kartan*, "and if you do not come, [if] you *will not bring* that retinue with you, there I shall order you to be put up on the gallows (*pat . . . apar*, circumposition)"; § 32 . . . *+viyān*²⁵ *kun tāy ērān-ič +viyān kunēnd tāy amāh-ič bē-dānēm kū šap hast aivāp rōč*, "pitch [your] tent, so that the Iranians also pitch [their] tents and so that we *shall know* if it is night or day". In the first of these cases (§ 25) it is far from certain if *bē-* really is to be considered a particle,²⁶ but if it is, it clearly stresses the future sense (in comparison to *āyēt* in the same clause and *framāyēm* in the apodosis). In the second case (§ 32) *bē-* appears after *tāy* in a future or modal sense in the way in which it is regularly used in later Persian. Such use is, however, not regular in this text, as can be seen already from *tāy . . . kunēnd* in the same sentence. In the types of sentences exemplified above the use of the particle *bē-* with present indicative forms of transitive and intransitive verbs seems to be a facultative device to stress a future sense or imply an act of will.

C. Verbal particle followed by imperative:

bē-mā-pāyēt 24 (cf. above, p. 79), *bē-māl* 41, *bē-apkan* 104.

²⁴ See Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v.

²⁵ Cf. Henning, *BSOAS* 10 (1942), p. 951, n. 1.

²⁶ Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v. *āvurtan*, obviously takes it as a full preverb.

Here *bē-* is obviously used for extra emphasis ("peremptory"),²⁷ but it should be noticed that in the great majority of cases in this text the imperatives stand without *bē-* (sing. forms: *kun* 16, 32; *gōb* 67, 114; *šav* 67, 80, 114). From this point of view the occurrence of *bē-* together with *mā-* in the possible example in § 24 seems pleonastic.

D. Verbal particle followed by infinitive:

bē-tāxtan nē-dānam, "I don't know how to ride", and *bē-vistan nē-dānam*, "I don't know how to shoot", both in § 101. Here *bē-* seems to have an emphasising or "resultative" function.²⁸

E. Preverb followed by past tense:

§ 33 *pas zarēr hač vartēn bērōn bē-āmat u +viyān kart u ērān +viyān kart(-hēnd, interpol.?) u gart [u] dūt bē-nišast star u māh pat asmān paitāk būt*, "Then Zarēr came forth from the chariot and pitched [his] tent, and the Iranians pitched [their] tents, and the dust [and] smoke settled; the stars and the moon appeared in the sky". The meaning of *bē-* as a full (lexical) preverb has been defined by Nyberg as "off, out, away, forth, esp. with vbs. designating a motion or a change of place or of condition" (*Manual* II, *bē* 2.a.).²⁹ This is how it is used in the two cases in § 33. The use of *bē-* together with *hač* ... */bērōn/* is typical (see below under present tense), and the lexical function of *bē-* in *bē-nišast* is shown by the present equivalent *bē-nišīnēt* in § 75 (cf. below).

F. Preverb followed by present indicative:

§ 86 ... *bē nūn čīgōn kunam čē hakar hač asp bē-nišīnam u tō pītar sar andar kanār kunam u-t xāk hač grīv bē-kunam (u) pas sapukihā apāč ō asp nišastan nē-tuvān*, "But how shall I act now? Because if I dismount from the horse and take you, father, with the head to the side and take out the earth from [your] throat, then I shall not be able to mount the horse again quickly"; § 105

²⁷ Nyberg, *Manual* II, p. 46b; Widengren, *op. cit.*, pp. 361-362.

²⁸ Nyberg, *Manual* II, p. 46b, rejects the possibility of reading *bē-* as a particle before infinitives; not so Widengren, *op. cit.*, p. 362.

²⁹ Cf. Henning, "Verbum des Mittelpersischen", *ZII* 9, pp. 231-232, on Manichaean Middle Persian *ba*.

u bastvar +fraš hač dast bē-apakanēt . . ., "And Bastvar throws away the spear out of [his] hand"; § 61 . . . *sōkand x^uaram kū zīvandak xyōn +hēč bē-nē-hīlam hač hān razm*, "I swear that I shall not leave any Xyōn alive from that battle"; § 48 twice *hačiš bārak/-ič/ bē-barēnd*, "They will take [his] steed away from him"; the context of *hač bunak bē-āyēnd*, "they will come forth from the camp", in § 66 was quoted above (p. 81). All these instances, where *bē-* occurs together with prepositional expressions *hač . . .*, are obvious examples of *bē-* as a full preverb with the meaning "off, forth", etc. There is no general evidence here that this preverb simultaneously has a perfectivizing or other grammatical function, but in the case of *bē-āyēnd* 66 the general context is such that a perfective particle *bē-* would be expected as well. The lexical use in a way conceals the perfective function (*bē-bē- → bē-*). Possible, but less likely, is a double function of *bē-* in the two forms *bē-barēnd* in § 48.

§ 75 *u-š hač nihān hač pas frāč-dvārēt (šavēt, gloss?) u zarēr rād hačadar ī kamar-band u hačapar ī kustik pat pušt bē-zanēt u pat dīl bē-vitārēt u bē ō damīk apakanēt u pas bē-nišīnēt hān parrišn ī kamānān u vāng ī nēv-marīān*, "And from where he [was] hiding from him he rushes forth from behind and, [grabbing] Zarēr under the belt and over the kustik, strikes him in the back and penetrates to the heart and flings him to the ground; and then that twanging of the bows and clamour of the valiant men abate"; § 105 . . . *pat pušt bē-vitārēt*, "penetrates to the back"; § 97 . . . *pat zanēh bē-daham*, "I give away in marriage"; § 111 . . . *spāh ī ērān pat bastvar bē-hilēt (ŠBKWN_{x1}, see below)*, "he leaves the army of the Iranians to Bastvar". In these examples *bē-* refers back to prepositional expressions *pat . . .* (not so *bē-nišīnēt* 75; see below) and functions as a full preverb. This use may be compared to the construction of *bē* with the preposition *ō*, very common also in this text: *bē ō asmān šavēt* 29, *bē ō dōšax^u šavēt* 29, *bē [ō] damīk apakand-hā* 52, *bē ō damīk apakanēt* 75, 105, *bē ō bastvar dahēt* 82, *bē ō dašt apakanēt* 111. Semantically these two uses of *bē* are exactly parallel, but it seems less appropriate to me to consider *bē* in the expression *bē ō* as a qualifier of the following verb than of the preposition *ō*.³⁰ However, the

³⁰ Otherwise Widengren, *op. cit.*, p. 361.

following constructions should be noted: *hač* . . . /*bērōn*/³¹ *bē-* + verb (cf. *hač* . . . *frāč* + verb, e.g. § 75, quoted above), *pat* . . . *bē-* + verb, but *bē ō* . . . + verb (cf. *frāč ō* . . . + verb, below).

§ 12 *hakar ēn dēn bē-nē-hilēt*, "if you don't abandon this religion"; § 18 *ēn dēn . . . bē-nē-hilēm*, "we shall not abandon this religion . . ."; § 68 *ēn . . . dēn . . . bē-nē-hilam*, "I shall not abandon this religion . . .". In these three cases *bē-* primarily seems to have a lexical function, although it is also possible to take it as a prefix emphasising future and/or act of will.

The context of *bē-nišīnēt* 75 was quoted above; the modification of the meaning through the preverb is clear: "abates", "settles down" (as in the past form *bē-nišast* 33, above p. 83). A quite different effect of *bē-* as preverb is found in the expression *vāng bē-kunēt*, "it (the horse) cries out (i.e. neighs)" 102. In § 106 *u-š BR' wcyt hān mōk ī spēt*, "and on/from him he takes away those white shoes", the verb has been read *bē vazēt* (Pagliaro and Benveniste) or *bē vičīt* (Nyberg). *Vazēt* is better in so far as it makes it possible to read a present form which accords with the context, but *vazītan* is generally an intransitive verb ("move", "blow"). Could the preverb *bē-* change an intransitive verb into a transitive? For the present there is hardly any certain evidence for that, and in the case under discussion there are also other possibilities: *defective scriptum* for *vāzēt* (caus. of *vazītan*) or *vēčēt* (pres. of *vēxtan*, "detach" etc.). Lexical uses of *bē-* are also to be found in the following cases: § 29 (*u*) *kārvān ī ērān(-šahr) ētōn bē-ēstēnd . . .*,³² "the troops of the Iranians appear³³ so . . ."; § 30 . . . *vitarg ētōn bē-brīnēnd apāk [sumb?] āp bē-š[ē]pend*,³⁴ "they make their passage³⁵ so, they stir up water with [the hoofs?]"

III. Other preverbs:

In this text the preverbs *andar-* (BYN), *apāk-* (LWTH), *apar-* (MDM, 'pl) *apāč-* (L'WHL, 'p'c) and *frāč-* (pr'c) are used in lexical functions, and on the present material it is not possible

³¹ Cf. above p. 83 on § 33.

³² Cf. "Composition", p. 402.

³³ Cf. Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v. *ēstālan*.

³⁴ Cf. "Composition", p. 402.

³⁵ Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v. *brītan*: "to break up a road (by marching on it)".

to discern if they have some other function (perfectivizing etc.) distinguishable from the lexical.

A. Three examples of *andar-* + past tense: *andarōn andar-šut* 5, 14; *andar-šut-hend* 8; the cases of *andar ō pēš...* + verb 6, 7 and *andar ō...* + verb 70 are not counted here (cf. above on *bē ō*).³⁶

B. One example of *apāk-* + past tense: *apāk-būt* 69,³⁷ and one example of *apāk-* + present indicative: *apāk-dārēnd* 6 (the *apāk* earlier in the sentence is pleonastic).

C. One example of *apar-* + past tense: *apar-nišast* 100,³⁸ nine examples (two emended) of *apar-* + present indicative: *apar-rasēm* 12 (in future sense but parallel forms are not prefixed), *apar-āxēzēt* 62, *nē-apar-āxēzēt* 54, [56], 58, [60], *apar-nišinēt* 74, 83, 92, and five examples (one emended) of *apar-* + imperative: *apar-āxēzēt* 53, 55, 57, 59, [61]. The expression *apar ō pād/pai ēstāt* [9], 73, 99 is not counted here (cf. above on *bē ō*).³⁹

D. Nine examples of *apāč-* + present indicative: *apāč-šavēnd* 65, *apāč-vēžēt* 70, *apāč-bē-nē-mānēt* 72 (emended from *-pāyēt*, above p. 81), 98 (*-bē-* restored, above p. 81), 112, *nē-apāč-nikērēt* 54, 56, 58, 60, and one example of *apāč* + infinitive (with *tuvān*): *apāč-dāšt[an]* 63. A great number of cases of *apāč* + *ō* + noun + verb can be noted (§§ 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 67, 86, [113]), but they are not taken into account here (cf. above on *bē ō*).⁴⁰

E. Ten examples of *frāč-* + present indicative: *frāč-zanēt* 70, *frāč-dvārēt* 75, *frāč-šavēt* 100, *frāč-hilēt* (ŠBKWN_{x₁}) 83, 88, 94, 106, 110, *frāč-patūrēt* (MKBLWN_{x₁}) 103, 106.⁴¹ The frequent occurrence in these examples of the ligature endings -x₁ and x₂ (see below) is remarkable. There are also a number of cases of *frāč ō* + noun + verb in this text (§§ 74 bis, 79, 100 bis, 101 bis, 102) not taken into account here (cf. above on *bē ō*), but it is interesting to notice that the ending x₁ also occurs once among them: *frāč ō dast stanēt* (YNSBWN_{x₁}) 100, but *frāč ō dast stanēt* (YNSBWN_{yt}) 74.

³⁶ Cf. Henning, "Verbum", p. 231.

³⁷ For compositional reasons this *būt* may be considered a secondary addition; see "Composition", p. 414.

³⁸ Possibly a mistake for the present form *-nišinēt*; see "Composition", p. 415.

³⁹ Cf. Henning, "Verbum", p. 230.

⁴⁰ Cf. Henning, "Verbum", p. 231.

⁴¹ Cf. Henning, "Verbum", p. 232.

Verbal ideograms with complement -yt (-yt¹) and corresponding forms written phonetically

The text of AZ relates past events. Still verbal endings normally referring to present forms are in great majority. Thus there are 178 ideograms with -yt as against 56 with complement -t. To some extent this may be explained through the occurrence of much direct discourse (especially in §§ 1–68), but this can in no way account completely for the predominance of present forms.⁴² In my previous paper "On the composition of the *Ayyātkār ī Zarērān*" I have demonstrated that the text of AZ must be considered to be narrated in *praesens historicum*, except for the main part of the introductory section (§§ 1–34). The following analysis will be based on that supposition. Thus ideograms with complement -yt will be considered to represent 3rd sing. present indicative, 2nd plur. present indicative and plur. imperative forms. One possible exception is Y'TW¹Nyt in § 4 which seems to be a corruption of ŠDRWNyt: *frēstīt* (with -šān in the beginning of the paragraph as its agent).⁴³ The 178 ideograms with complement -yt and the corresponding forms written phonetically, 52 in number (23% of all forms in -yt), may be listed in the following way:

A. 3rd sing. present indicative forms in direct discourse (partly with future sense):

BYDWNyt: *kunēt* 48 bis

ḤDWNyt: *gīrēt* 67

ZLWNyt: *šavēt* 64 ter (first: -¹yt), 71, 77 (-¹yt), 97

B'YḤWNyt: *α^uāhēt* 77, 96

(HWHyt 76: pron. *ēt*)

ḤZYTW¹Nyt: *vēnēt* 48 (*nē-*)

KTLWNyt: *mānēt* 98 (*apāč-[bē-]nē-*; cf. above p. 81)

MDMH¹yt: *sahēt* 11, 15, 41, 43, 53 (-yt¹), 55 (-yt¹), 57, 59, 61 (-yt¹), 89

PSKW¹Nyt: *brīnēt* 67

⁴² H. S. Nyberg touched upon these problems in his "Grammatical survey" in *Manual II*, p. 283, § 7.6.

⁴³ Cf. "Composition", p. 401.

+ŠDRWNyt: *frēstēt* 67 (emended from Y'TWNYt; cf. parallel in § 113, also emended)
 Y'TWNYt: *āyēt* 4 (possibly to be emended to *frēstīt*; see above),
 36 ter, 48 ter, 76 (*nē-*), (67 emend. to +ŠDRWNyt)
 YḤSNNyt: *dārēt* 38 (*nē-*), 95
 YḤWWNYt: *bavēt* 39, 41, 52 (*nē-*), 53, 72 (*nē . . .*), 98 (*nē . . .*)
 YK'YMWNYt: *ēstēt* 68 (*zāt~*), 80 (*nē-x^uast~*), 86 (*višuft~*), 90
 (-yt^l), 107 (*nē-x^uast~*)
 YKTLWNYt: *ōzanēt* 48 ter, 64 ter, 90, 97
 YMR[R]WNYt: *gōbēt* 67
 YMYTWNYt: *mūrēt* 39
 d'lyt: *dārēt* 38, 95
 dcyt: *dažēt* 67 (thus Nyberg; Pagliaro: *gazēt*, Benveniste: *gažēt*
 +kwḥsy: *kōxšēt* 71 (thus JA; MK: kwšyt), 97
 kwšyt: *kōšēt* 71
 p'dt: *pāyēt* 72 (*apāč-bē-nē-*; probably mistake for *mānēt*, cf. above
 p. 81)
 š'dt: *šāyēt* 53 bis, 62
 t'pyt: *tāpēt* 48 ter
 wškwpyt: *viškōfēt* 37 bis (first: -yt^l)
 zywy: *zīvēt* 39

B. 3rd sing. present indicative forms in narration of past events
 (including expected present forms in subordinate clauses):

'BYDWNyt: *kunēt* 70, 71, 74, 100, 102 (*bē-*)⁴⁴
 'ḤDWNyt: *gīrēt* 51,⁴⁵ 113
 'ŠMH^lyt: *āšnavēt* 102
 'ZLWNYt: *šavēt* 29 bis, 55, 57 (-^lyt), 59, 61 (-^lyt), 74, 75 (probably
 a gloss; cf. above p. 84), 100 bis (second: *frāč-*), 102 bis, 111
 B'YḤWNYt: *x^uāhēt* 35, 62
 ḤZYTWNYt: *vēnēt* 70, 74, 83, 100, 111

⁴⁴ The addition containing this form in the end of § 110 and the beginning of § 111 made by JA and later editors is not necessary.

⁴⁵ Nyberg, *Manual* II, p. 283, 7.6, finds this form perplexing, considering the -š first in the § which he takes as the agent of this 'ḤDWNyt, but it seems that this difficulty is easily solved by regarding the first part of the § as a nominal clause: *u-š* (indir. obj.) *pat hōy dast kār*, "and he has the knife in [his] left hand".

- KDMWNyt: *āxēzēt* 62 (*apar-*)
 KTLWNyt: *mānēt* 112 (*apāč-bē-nē-*; cf. above p. 81)
 LMYTWNyt: *apakanēt* 75, 105 bis (first: *bē-*), 111
 MḤYTWNyt: *zanēt* 70 (*frāč-*), 75 (*bē-*), 105, 111
 NTLWNyt: *pāyēt* 84 (*nē . . .*)
 PSKWNyt: *brīnēt* 113
 +ŠDRWNyt: *frēstēt* 113 (emended from Y'TWNyt; parallel in § 67, also emended)
 (Y'TWNyt 113, see +ŠDRWNyt above)
 YḤBWNyt: *dahēt* 92, 106
 YḤMTWNyt: *rasēt* 83, 88, 106, 110
 YḤSNNyt: *dārēt* 106
 YḤWWNyt: *bavēt* 3 (mistake for *būt?*; cf. "Composition", p. 401), 31 (*nē-*), 70 ter, 112 (*nē . . .*)
 YK'YMWNyt: *ēstēt* 28 (-lyt), 34 (-lyt; *ākust~*)
 YKTLWNyt: *ōzanēt* 70, 83, 94, 106
 YMLLWNyt: *gōbēt* 45, 63, 80, 88, [101] (emended from MK: YMLLW, worm eaten?)
 YMR[R]WNyt: *gōbēt* 35, 40, 42 (-RR-), 43, 51, 53, 55, 57, 61, 62, 65, 66, 68, 71, 73, 76, 79, 82, 84, 90, 92, 95, 109, 114
 YNSBWNyt: *stanēt* 74
 YTYBWNyt: *nišīnēt* 35, 62, 69 bis, 74 (*apar-*), 75 (*bē-*), 83 (*apar-*), 92 (*apar-*), [100] (*apar-*; JA: YTYBWNst; emended by Pagliaro and Nyberg to YTYBWNyt; cf. also "Composition", p. 415), 106
 'dyb'lyt: *aggārēt* 74 (*nē-*), 100 (*nē-*)
 'ḥycyt: *āxēzēt* 54 (*nē-apar-*), 56 (*nē-[apar-]*), 58 (*nē-apar-*), 60 (*nē-[apar-]*) (the two missing preverbs *apar-* may be restored through the parallel passages; cf. above p. 86)
 'wptyt: *ōftēt* 70
 +dcyt: *dažēt* 70 (probable emendation; Pagliaro and Benveniste read *yazāt*, "god", and Nyberg *yazēt*, "god"; cf. "Composition", p. 414)
 dwb'lyt: *dvārēt* 74, 75 (*frāč-*), 100
 gwpyt: *gōbēt* 59
 nkylyt: *nikērēt* 54 (*nē-apāč-*), 56 (*nē-apāč-*), 58 (*nē-apāč-*), 60 (*nē-apāč-*)
 plm'dt: *framāyēt* 44, 83, 91

spwcyt: *spōžēt* 111 bis
 swcyt: *sōčēt* 113
 š'dt: *šāyēt* 30 (*nē-*)
 wcyt: *v[ē]čēt?* 106 (*bē-*; cf. above p. 85)
 wt'lyt: *vitārēt* 75 (*bē-*), 105 (*bē-*)
 wycyt: *vēžēt* 70 (*apāč-*), 103
 znyt: *zanēt* 88, 111

C. 2nd plur. present indicative forms (direct discourse):

ḤZYTNyt: *vēnēt* 20
 ŠBKWNyt: *hilēt* 12 (*bē-nē-*)
 Y'TWNYt: *āyēt* 20, 25 bis (second: *nē . . .*)
 YD'YTNyt: *dānēt* 36, 80 (*nē-*; JA and later editors emend: -'y)
 YḤSNNyt: *dārēt* 10 (*nē . . .*)⁴⁶
 YḤWWNyt: *bavēt* 11, 12 (*nē-*)
 YḤYTYWNyt: *āvarēt* 25 (*bē-nē-*)
 YMR[R]WNYt: *gōbēt* 41 (-yt^l)

D. Plural imperative forms:

'BYDWNyt: *kunēt* 25
 Š'TH^lyt: *x^uarēt* 41
 KDMWNyt: *āxēzēt* 53 (*apar-*)
 NTLWNyt: *pāyēt* 24 (*bē-mā-*; perhaps rather 3rd sing., cf. above pp. 79, 83).
 ŠBKWNyt: *hilēt* 11, 89
 YḤBWNyt: *dahēt* 82
 YTYBWNyt: *nišīnēt* 53, 55, 57, 59, 61
 'ḥycyt: *āxēzēt* 55 (*apar-*), 57 (*apar-*), 59 (*apar-*), 61 ([*apar-*]; cf. above p. 86)
 s'cyt: *sāčēt* 73, 79, 99
 plm'dt: *framāyēt* 43

⁴⁶ JA and Nyberg add the preverb *apāč-* for better sense, but considering the parallel expressions in §§ 12, 18 and 68 (see above p. 85) an emendation to the similar ideogram ŠBKWN seems more likely. The preceding l'd could then be a corruption of BR'; thus ⁺*bē-hilēt*.

Verbal ideograms with complement -/s/t (-t^l) and corresponding forms written phonetically

The 56 forms written with verbal ideogram and complement -t in this text obviously represent past participles. Considering the first section (§§ 1–34) to be narrated in past tense (except for the end of § 26–§ 31 and § 34) and the rest of the text in present tense (cf. “Composition”, *passim*), this satisfies the context completely in all cases but three: L’ YĤBWNT 79 (possibly a case of secondary form assimilation; cf. “Composition” p. 415) and LWTH YĤWNT and YĤWWNT, both 69 (probably interpolations; cf. “Composition”, p. 414). YTYBWNTst occurs three times, once certainly as a past participle (33), once probably a mistake for -yt (100) and once for -stn^l (44). Of the 46 past participles written phonetically (45%)⁴⁷ three forms present difficulties in the context: ’šnw̄t: *āšnūt* and ’wpst: *ōpast*, both 50 (the first in a subordinate clause and the second an assimilation?; cf. “Composition”, p. 412), and gwpt: *guft* 99 (secondary form assimilation?; cf. “Composition”, p. 415).

BYDWNT: *kart* 33

ŠTH^{lt}: *x^uart* 42 (mistake for *x^uaram*; thus JA and later editors), 52 (-*hā*)

ZLWNT: *šut* 5 (*andar-*), 8 (*andar-~hēnd*), 14 (*andar-*), 88 (-*ham*)

HTYMWNT: *āvašt* 22 (*bē-*)

HZYTWNT: *dīt* 67, 88, 89, 114

KLYTWNT: *x^uānd* 9

LMYTWNT: *apakand* 52 (-*hā*), 85 (-*hē(h)*)

MHYTWNT: *zat* 26

MKBLWNT: *patigrift* 10, 68

PSKWNT: *brīt* 52 (-t^l)

SGYTWNT: *raft* 22 (*bē-~hēnd*)

Y’TWNT: *āmat* 5, 26 (-*hēnd*), 33 (*bē-*), 107 (-*hē(h)*)

YBLWNT: *burt* 8 (-Y; -*hēnd*), 22

YĤBWNT: *dāt* 8 (*bē-~hēnd*), 16, 32, 79 (*nē-*; possibly mistake for *dahēnd*, cf. above), 82

⁴⁷ This unusually high percentage is due to the general tendency to write the past participles of *kartan* and *guftan* phonetically.

YHWWNt: *būt* 13, 14, 33, 40 (-+ham), 51, 69 bis (first: *apāk-*;
both *būt* possibly interpolations, cf. above), 82, 114

YKTLWNt: *ōzat* 76, 81 bis, 85 (adj., + *apakand-hē(h)*), 87 bis,
108 ter

YKTYBWNt: *nipišt* 1

YLYDWNt: *zāt* 40 bis (first: *nē-~-ham*; second -ham)

YMYTWNt: *murt* 40 (*bē-~-+ham*), 45, 49 (*~bavēnd*), 68
(*~bavēnd*)

YTYBWNt: *nišāst* 33 (*bē-*), (44, mistake for inf.), (100, mistake
for -yt)

’kwst: *ākust* 34 (*~ēstēt*)

’mwšt: *āmušt* 84 ter (thus Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v.; Pagliaro and
Benveniste: *hamvašt*; cf. also below p. 103)

’šnwt: *āšnūt* 10, 13, 50 (cf. above)

’wpst: *ōpast* 40 (-+ham), 50 (perhaps mistake for *ōftēt*; cf.
above)

d’t: *dāt* 23

dyt: *dīt* 14

gwpt: *guft* 5, 7, 15, 52, 53, 99 (possibly mistake for *gōbēt*, with
-š as indir. obj., “to him”; cf. above)

hwst: *x^uast* 80 (*nē-~ēstēt*), 86, 107 (*nē-~ēstēt*)

k’myst: *kāmist* 85

krt: *kart* 33 (-t^l; -hēnd), 74 (*~ēstāt*; interpolation?, cf. above p.
78), 94, 95 (-t^l), 100 (*~ēstāt*; interpolation?, cf. above p. 78),
101, 109

kwšt: *kušt* 87

mt: *mat* 2, 26, 45 (*nē-*)

npšt: *nipišt* 10 (*~ēstāt*)

nšst: *nišast* 86

plmwt: *framūt* 17

ptglpt: *patigrift* 1, 22 (*bē-*)

pwrst: *pursit* 40 bis (first: *nē-~-hē(h)*; second: -hē(h))

wnd’t: *vindāt* 31 (*nē-*; possibly mistake for *vindēt*, cf. the context
in “Composition”, p. 402)

wšwpt: *višuft* 86 (*~ēstēt*)

zt: *zat* 21 (*~bavāt*), 81 (-t^l; mistake for *ōzat*?; cf. §§ 87, 108)

z’t: *zāt* 45 bis (first: *nē-*), 48, 68 (*~ēstēt*)

**Verbal ideograms with complement -d and corresponding
forms written phonetically**

There are 51 forms written with verbal ideogram and complement -d. These forms occur in direct discourse or in the passages assumed to be narrated in *praesens historicum* (end of § 26–§31, §§ 34–114), apart from six examples of HWHd after past participle (of which three probably are interpolations). They certainly represent 3rd plur. present indicative forms in -ēnd, with the possible exception of YHMTWNd and YKTLWNd after *mā* in §§ 81, 87 and 108 (cf. above p. 79). In many cases they are preceded by a subject in the old nominative plural without ending, e.g. in §§ 26–31.⁴⁸ There is no reason to believe that the complement -d anywhere in this text is related to the old imperfect passive in -iy, as seems to be the case in some passages in the Middle Persian inscriptions.⁴⁹ As for the eight forms written phonetically (14% of all 3rd plur. present indicatives), they end in -ynd in five cases and in -nd in three.

'SLWNd: *bandēnd* 34

'BYDWNd: *kunēnd* 26, 27, 32

'ZLWNd: *šavēnd* 30, 65 (*apāč-*), 66 (*apāč-bē-nē-*)

B'YHWNd: *x^vāhēnd* 47

HŠKHWNd: *vīndēnd* 47 (*nē-*)

HWHd: *hēnd* 8 ter (first: *andar-šut-*; second: *burt-*; third: *bē-dāt-*; second and third *hēnd* are probably interpolations, cf. above p. 78), 22 (*bē-raft-*), 26 (*āmat-*), 33 (*kart-*; *hēnd* probably interpolation, cf. above p. 78)

HZYTWNd: *vēnēnd* 107

KLYTWNd: *x^vānēnd* 1

MHYTWNd: *zanēnd* 34

PSKWNd: *brīnēnd* 30 (*bē-*)

SGYTWNd: *ravēnd* 27 bis, 47

Y'TWNd: *āyēnd* 47, 65 bis, 66 bis (first: *bē-*)

YD'YTWNd: *dānēnd* 114

YBLWNd: *barēnd* 48 bis (both: *bē-*), 81 (*Y-*), 87 (*Y-*), 108

⁴⁸ Cf. "Composition", p. 401–402.

⁴⁹ KKZ 2–10; cf. "Verbal forms", pp. 102–105.

YHMTWNd: *rasēnd* 62 (*nē-*), 81 (*mā . . .*),⁵⁰ 87 (*mā . . .*),⁵⁰ 108 (*mā . . .*)⁵⁰

YHNSNd: *dārēnd* 6 bis (first: *apāk-*)

YHWWNd: *bavēnd* 46, 49 (*murt~*), 68 (*murt~*)

YKTLWNd: *ōzanēnd* 81 (*mā . . .*),⁵⁰ 87 (*mā . . .*)⁵⁰ 108 (*mā . . .*)⁵⁰.

YK'YMWNd: *ēstēnd* 29 (*bē-*)

YMR[R]WNd: *gōbēnd* 6, 107

YMYTWNd: *mīrēnd* 65

YTYBWNd: *nišīnēnd* 31

YZBHWNd: *yazēnd* 24

blymynd: *+brāmēnd* 107 (thus MK; JA and later editors; bl'mynd)

lwnd: *rav[ē]nd* 27 (late substitution for SGYTWNd?)

p'hlycynd: *pahrēčēnd* 24

ptkwpynd: *patkōfēnd* 46

pzdynd: *pazdēnd* 26

s'cnd: *sāč[ē]nd* 74, 100

špynd: *+šēpēnd* 30 (*bē-*; Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v.; Pagliaro: *šōwēnd*; Benveniste: *šōpēnd*)

Verbal ideograms with complements -m and -ym and corresponding forms written phonetically

Is it possible to distinguish clearly between 1st sing. and 1st plur. present indicative forms in this text? The opposition sing. -am: plur. -ēm, based on a secondary differentiation of thematic and -aya-class endings, may seem to be realized here, but the material is not quite unambiguous. Of the 44 cases of verbal ideogram with complement -m all refer to a singular subject, but in 12 cases this singular subject is a king, Vištāsp or Arjāsp, and in those cases a *pluralis maiestatis* would also be possible. Likewise the one form with ending -m written phonetically (znm 41, parallel: MHYTWNm 42) could be taken as a *pluralis maiestatis*.

The 13 cases of verbal ideogram with complement -ym, on the other hand, generally refer to a subject which could be conceived as plural or *pluralis maiestatis* (especially in the letters exchanged between the kings, §§ 10–12, 17–21), and likewise the nine forms

⁵⁰ Or. subj. in -ānd? Cf. above p. 79.

ending in -ym written phonetically. It is noticeable that forms in -ym occur in a consistent way only in the first section (§§ 1–34),⁵¹ assumed to be a late abbreviation of the original text, and that there are no forms in -m in that section. The few forms in -ym occurring in the second section (§§ 35–68) stand in no consistent relation to the more frequent forms in -m; thus in § 32 King Vištāsp says: . . . *tāy amāh-ič* BR' YD'YTWNym, and in § 35: *man* YD'YTWNym; in § 41 Vištāsp is requested by Jāmāsp to say: -t L' znm u L' YKTLWNm u *nē-č pat dēpahṛ* YḤSNNym, and in § 42 Vištāsp actually says: . . . -t L' MḤYTWNm u L' YKTLWNm u *nē tō-ič pat dēpahṛ* YḤSNNm. In the third section (§§ 69–114) there are no forms in -ym.

On the whole, it must be said that it is not possible to distinguish with certainty between 1st sing. and 1st plur. forms here. However, an instability in the use of numbers is noticeable also in the 2nd person, although its singular and plural endings are clearly separated; thus § 36 *ēn-ič* YD'YTWNyt and, in complete parallel, §§ 37, 38 and 39 *ēn-ič* YD'YTWN'y. Considering these circumstances and the lack of further internal evidence, in the tentative list below forms with ending written -m will be interpreted as ending in -am and taken to represent the 1st sing. and forms with ending written -ym will be interpreted as ending in -ēm and taken to represent the 1st plur.

A. 1st sing. present indicative:

BYDWNm: *kunam* 72, 86 ter (third: *bē-*), 98, 101

ŠTH¹m: *x^uaram* [42] (emendation of ŠTH¹t, see above p. 91), 61

ZLWNm: *šavam* 55, 57, 59, 61, 73, 79, 89, 99 ([^c]-)

B'YḤWNm: *x^uāham* 89

ḤWHm: *ham* 40 bis (first: *nē-zāt-*; second: *zāt-*; and in the same paragraph three more -*ham*, emended from ḤWH'y, all in compound forms), 88 (*šut-*), (26, 76 and 96: adv. *ham*)

ḤZYTWNm: *vēnam* 79 bis

MḤYTWNm: *zanam* 42 (*nē-*)

ŠBKWNm: *hilam* 61 (*bē-nē-*)

YD'YTWNm: *dānam* 101 bis (both: *nē-*)

⁵¹ An exception may be seen in § 15 . . . *man* (i.e. Zarēr) *ēn fravartak passax^u plm'dym kartan*.

YḤBWNm: *daham* 71, 77, 78, 97 (*bē-*)
 YḤMTWNm: *rasam* 109
 YḤSNNm: *dāram* 42 (*nē . . .*), 76, 96, 101 bis
 YKTLWNm: *ōzanam* 41 (*nē-*), 42 (*nē-*) 55, 57, 59
 YMR[R]WNm: *gōbam* 40, 79, 109
 YTYBWNm: *nišīnam* 86 (*bē-*)
 znm: *zanam* 41 (*nē-*)

B. 1st plur. present indicative:

‘BYDWNym: *kunēm* 12
 ‘ŠTH¹ym: *x^uarēm* 12, 18 (possibly to be emended to *āvarēm*, as suggested by Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v. *āvar*)
 ḤZYTWNym: *vēnēm* 20
 ŠBKWNym: *hilēm* 18 bis (first: *nē . . .*; second: *bē-nē-*)
 Y’TWNym: *āyēm* 20
 YD‘YTWNym: *dānēm* 32 (*bē*), 35
 YḤBWNym: *dahēm* 11
 YḤMTWNym: *rasēm* 12 (*apar-*)
 YḤSNNym: *dārēm* 41 (*nē . . .*)
 YḤWWNym: *bavēm* 18 (*nē-*)
 nm’dym: *namāyēm* 21
 plm’dym: *framāyēm* 12, 15, 25, 62 ter (first: *bē-*, MK: plm’m, but JA and later editors: plm’dym; second: *bē*; third: [*bē-*])
 plstym: *paristēm* 11
 swcym: *sōčēm* 12

Verbal ideograms with complements -x₁ and -x₂

The interpretation of the two ligature complements -x₁ (written like the Pahlavi ideogram BYN for *andar*) and -x₂ (resembling Avestan *q*) is a well-established enigma in Pahlavi studies. In his Middle Persian grammar C. Salemann left “this crux for later investigations”,⁵² and Chr. Bartholomae avoided the difficulty by simply declaring that -x₁ (and by implication -x₂) may designate any verbal form.⁵³ In the first volume of his *Hilfsbuch des Pehlevi*

⁵² *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, I: 1, 1895, p. 313.

⁵³ *Zur Kenntnis der mittelpersischen Mundarten*, II, 1917, p. 22, n. 1.

(1928), H. S. Nyberg made a bold attempt to go beyond such vague statements, suggesting both endings to be developments of -yh (not -yh!) and to designate, when correctly used, either the ending -ēh (from old imperative medium sing. and plur.) or the ending -ēndēh (a periphrastic secondary present optative).⁵⁴

As one could expect, Nyberg's interpretation came in for a great deal of criticism. J. C. Tavastia, in his review in *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* (vol. 7, 1929), rejected Nyberg's conclusions and proposed -x₁ to be developed from -yt and -x₂ possibly from -ynd, both, however, in actual usage expressing arbitrary endings (p. 276). W. Henning, on the other hand, was originally inclined to accept Nyberg's ideas, at least to a certain extent.⁵⁵ He could not accept the periphrastic optative in -ēndēh but wanted to read -ēh, generally, for both -x₁ and -x₂ and to interpret this -ēh as 3rd sing. optative and 2nd sing. (but not plur.!) imperative. Later Henning abandoned this position. In 1936 K. Barr published a thorough discussion of this problem in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* (vol. 8, pp. 391-403). Taking some ligatures occurring at the end of lines in a fragment of a Pahlavi *frahang* found in Turfan (TM 195) as the starting point, he came to the conclusion that -x₁ basically represents -yt and x₂ -t¹ (or -tn), with a possibility that a second ligature, -ynd, has coalesced into -x₂, and that this accords well with the usage in Book Pahlavi texts (supported by examples from, *inter alia*, *Ayyātkār ī Zarērān*). He does not completely exclude the possibility of reading -x₁ as an optative in -ē(h) (in which case through a ligature of -yh, not -yh), but on the whole he rejects not only Nyberg's interpretation -ēndēh but also his -ēh.

Nyberg was not late in replying to his critics. In an article with the title "Contribution à l'histoire de la flexion verbale en iranien",⁵⁶ he vigorously defended the existence of a present optative in -ēndēh also in the south-western language, but all the same he declared "once and for all" that he had abandoned the reading -x₁/x₂: -ēndēh (p. 69). Suggesting different readings of the ligatures in the Turfan *frahang*, he also unconditionally rejected

⁵⁴ *Hilfsbuch*, I, Einleitung, pp. 13-19.

⁵⁵ Rev. of *Hilfsbuch* in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 197(1935): 1, pp. 6-8.

⁵⁶ *Le Monde Oriental* 31(1937, publ. 1944), pp. 63-86.

Barr's arguments for the readings $-x_1$: -yt, $-x_2$: -t^l (-tn) and maintained $-ēh$ ("the old optative") as the principal reading of both $-x_1$ and $-x_2$ (pp. 68–73). It was now Henning's turn to reply—which he did in an excursus on "The Parthian ending $-ēndē(h)$ " appearing together with his article "Two Manichaean magical texts", in the *BSOAS* 12 (1947–48). There he withdrew his support of Nyberg's analysis of $-x_1$ and $-x_2$ as -yh with which he had—"ill-advisedly", as he writes (p. 58)—concurred in the above-mentioned review, and he argued sharply against the possibility of a Pahlavi (south-western) form in $-ēndē(h)$. In spite of this renewed criticism, Nyberg seems to have retained his modified opinion (as in "Contribution") also in his *Manual of Pahlavi*, I–II (1964–74). In *Manual* I (pp. 135–136) he only enumerates the actual functions of $-x_1$ and $-x_2$ which he has found in the texts (for endings $-ēh$, $-ēt$, $-ēnd$ and past participle in $-t$), but in *Manual* II, s.v. *hištan*, he *en passant* repeats his main theory: " $\underline{\text{ŠBKWN}}$ - x_1 and $-x_2$ are to be read *hilēh* (as originally all forms in $-x_1$ and $-x_2$ of all verbs signified $-ēh$)". On the other hand, his paragraph (5.7) on these endings in the "Grammatical survey" in *Manual* II (p. 281), which certainly was the last thing he wrote on the subject, is somewhat more cautious.⁵⁷

The question of the interpretation of the verbal endings $-x_1$ and $-x_2$ is an intricate matter, and it is not possible, within the frame of this article, to give a full representation of the many arguments hitherto put forward, to say nothing of a reappraisal of the whole problem. Still I would like to mention that the analysis given by Barr in the above-mentioned article seems essentially correct to me. From a graphical point of view, the explanation of $-x_1$ as a ligature of -yt and of $-x_2$ as a ligature of -t^l (-tn) is quite satisfactory, given the well-known circumstance that the sign for t is often found confused with the cursive combination of the two signs yn (dn, etc.); thus $\underline{\text{byn}} \sim \text{yt}$, i.e. $\underline{\text{BYN}} \sim x_1$.⁵⁸

The 29 cases of verbal ideogram with complement $-x_1$ found

⁵⁷ There Nyberg persists in the (in my opinion unlikely) explanation: "they [i.e. $-x_1$ and $-x_2$] contain the Aram. letter $Hē$ |H|, probably preceded by a |Y|: -YH".

⁵⁸ On the nature of the similarity between $-x_2$ and Av. a, see Barr, *BSO[A]S* 8, p. 394, n. 1.

in AZ certainly support this solution in toto, since they all may be interpreted as either of the 3rd sing. present indicative and plur. imperative, both ending in *-ēt*.⁵⁹ In 23 instances verbal ideogram + *-x₁* represents the 3rd sing. present indicative in *-ēt*, as can be ascertained through a great number of directly parallel forms with complement *-yt*: *wn*'s *'BYDWN_{x₁}* w *YKTLWNyt* 48~*wn*'s *'BYDWNyt* /w/ *YKTLWNyt* 48 bis; *nk*'s *'BYDWN_{x₁}* w *YMR[R]-WNyt* 76, 95, 101 (*YMLLW[Nyt]*)~*nk*'s *'BYDWNyt* w *YMR[R]-WNyt* 71; *pr*'c *'L YDH YNSBWN_{x₁}* 100~*pr*'c *'L YDH YNSBW-Nyt* 74; *dwšmn* *YKTLWN_{x₁}* 110~*dwšmn* *YKTLWNyt* 83, 106. Some of these examples, in which a verb ending in *-x₁* stands in close coordination with a finite verbal form, might suggest the possibility of interpreting *-x₁* as the ending of a present participle. Here the participle in *-ān* (the old middle pres. part. in *-āna-*; New Persian *-ān*)⁶⁰ is near at hand, and such an ending would even be graphically acceptable through an imagined development *-ʾn*→*byn*→*-x₁*. But with regard to the majority of the contexts here and the available external evidence, I think that this possibility must be ruled out.

The six examples of plur. imperatives in *-ēt* are somewhat more uncertain, perhaps owing to the fact that there is a certain confusion in the use of sing. and plur. imperatives, also when they are expressed by unambiguous endings.⁶¹ It is thus possible to list the verbal ideograms with complement *-x₁* in the following way:

A. 3rd sing. present indicative:

'BYDWN_{x₁}: *kunēt* 48, 51, 76, 92, 94, 95 bis, 101, 104, 106
MKBLWN_{x₁}: *patīrēt* 103 (*frāc-*), 106 (*frāč-*)
ŠBKWN_{x₁}: *hilēt* 83 (*frāč-*), 88 (*frāč-*), 94 (*frāč-*), 106 (*frāč-*), 110 (*frāč-*), 111 (*bē-*)
YNSBWN_{x₁}: *stanēt* 74, 100 bis, 105
YKTLWN_{x₁}: *ōzanēt* 110

⁵⁹ This was already pointed out by Barr, *BSO[AS]* 8, p. 395.

⁶⁰ On Middle Persian participle in *-ān*, see Henning, "Verbum", *ZII* 9, p. 252, and Salemann, *GIPh* I: 1, p. 306.

⁶¹ Cf. Nyberg, *Manual* II, p. 281, 5.7.

B. Plur. imperative:

'BYDWN_{x₁}: *kunēt* 24

ŠBKWN_{x₁}: *hilēt* 6, 7, 90

YBLWN_{x₁}: *barēt* 41

YNSBWN_{x₁}: *stanēt* 104 (JA and later editors: YNSBWN)

The forms with complement -x₂ are unfortunately too few in this text to allow of any systematic conclusion. It is, however, possible to explain the apparent confusion by the hypothesis of an original correspondence -x₂: -t^l. The three forms are as follows:

MKBLWN_{x₂}: *patigrift* 2 (thus according to the context). A secondary interpretation *patīrēt*, through confusion with -x₁, seems to have given the assimilated form YHWWNyt: *bavēt* in the next sentence.

'BYDWN_{x₂}: *kunēt*? 24 (probably plur. imperative in analogy with the preceding 'BYDWN_{x₁}: misused through contamination with -x₁).

'BYDWN_{x₂}: *kunēt*? 104 (MK: -x₂; JJ: -x₁; JA and later editors: zero). The two preceding imperatives in this sentence are BR' LMYTWN (complement zero in all sources) and YNSBWN_{x₁} (complement zero in JA and later editions), and the formal confusion is probably again due to a contamination of -x₁ and -x₂. Possibly all three forms ended in -x₁ originally, although the subject, *Zarēr*, is most easily conceived in the singular.

The problems involved in the interpretations of -x₁ and -x₂ are, of course, not solved by this. I do not think, however, that the method of choosing examples from the extensive Book Pahlavi literature more or less at random can be very effective in producing definite results. Reliable data should rather be expected from studies of the complete system of representation of verbal forms in carefully selected and established texts (i.e. including textological analysis of the manuscript material). There are also questions related to other problems than the actual endings: why are these ligatures only found together with ideograms—and a very restricted set of ideograms at that (besides those quoted above generally only 'ZLWN: *šutan* and DB/Y/LWN: *nītan/nayītan*)? If they are originally identical with -yt/-t^l, how is it that such simple and frequent endings have to be replaced—and

only occasionally? Because they are remnants of "end-of-line flourishes"? And is it only a coincidence that these ligatures are especially frequent in connection with the preverb *frāč-* in this text (see above p. 86)?

Verbal ideograms with complements -yḥ, -'y, -'ḥ and -' and corresponding forms written phonetically

It is not always easy to distinguish the exact forms represented by a verbal ideogram and one of the complements shaped like -yḥ, -'y, -'ḥ or -' (and corresponding forms written phonetically). Doubtlessly, all these variously shaped endings designate 2nd and 3rd sing. present indicative, subjunctive and optative forms, but is it possible to assign a definite reading to each shape?

In this text only the few cases of ending -yḥ (two written with ideogram, three phonetically) are unambiguous. They are certainly to be read as 2nd sing. present indicatives in -ē(h):

YD'YTWNyḥ: *dānē(h)* 107 (*nē-*)

YML[L]WNYḥ: *gōbē(h)* 62

plm'dyḥ: *framāyē(h)* 63 (*bē-*) ter (obviously sing., although King Vištāsp is the subject).

Nyberg suggests another such form in § 92, 'dyḥ: *ayēh* (ʿYŠ: *kas*, according to Pagliaro and Benveniste), supposed to be a Parthian 2nd sing. present indicative of "to be" (=Man. Parth. 'yy),⁶² but this interpretation seems unlikely.⁶³

The more numerous forms with ending shaped like -'y (17 with ideogram, one written phonetically) should primarily be considered 2nd sing. present subjunctives in -āy, which they probably are in one third of the cases. But they should, most probably, also be seen as a variant writing of -yḥ, thus representing 2nd sing. present indicatives in -ē(h) or 3rd sing. present optatives with the same ending. The textual basis for this conclusion is very narrow, but a careful evaluation of the contexts points in that direction.

⁶² *Manual* I, p. 175, "Parthian forms"; *Manual* II, s.v. *h-*, end.

⁶³ See below for a different suggestion; cf. also "Composition", p. 417.

Three passages are of special interest here: the first is Jāmāsp's introduction to his prophecy in § 40; the second is the beginning of the dirge of Bastvar at the sight of his dead father in §§ 84–85; the third is the magic formula uttered by Bastvar before setting out to take revenge in §§ 92–93. The text of these passages partly seems to be in some disorder. Here follows an attempt to arrange them in verses and to restore doubtful parts to something which *may* have been their original wording.

§ 40 <i>gōbēt jāmāsp bītāxš</i>	Says Jāmāsp, the Bītāxš:
<i>kū kāk ka mán hač mātár</i>	'Would that I by [my] mother
<i>nē-zāt-hám aivāp ka zāt-</i>	had not been born or [that] when
<i>hám</i>	I had been born
<i>pat x^uēš-bāxt pat rahikēh</i>	I had died in [my] youth through
<i>bē-murt-+hám⁶⁵</i>	[my] own fate ⁶⁴
<i>aivāp mūrū-ē būt-+hám⁶⁶</i>	or [that] I had been a bird
<i>ó drayāp ōpast-+hám⁶⁷</i>	[and] had fallen into the sea
<i>aivāp šmāh bagān</i>	or [that] by you, lord,
<i>ēn frāšn hač mán nē-pursit-</i>	this question had not been asked
<i>hē(h)⁶⁸</i>	from me; ⁶⁹
<i>bē ká-[t]ān pursit-hē(h)⁷⁰</i>	but when it has been asked by
	you,
<i>adák-im nē-kāmē(h)⁷¹</i>	then it would not be my desire
<i>bē ka rāst gōbām</i>	but that I tell the truth.'

⁶⁴ I.e. "by my own hand"; or "by disease"? Cf. the much discussed passage on the death of Kambyzes in the Bisutun inscription I, 43; refs. in Brandenstein-Mayrhofer, *Handbuch des Altpersischen*, 1964, pp. 149–150; also J. P. Asmussen, *Temenos* 3(1968), pp. 7–10.

⁶⁵ BR' YMYTWNT HWH'y; JA and Nyberg: HWHm; Pagliaro and Benveniste: *hom*.

⁶⁶ YHWWNT HWH'y; JA and Nyberg: HWHm; Pagliaro and Benveniste: *hom*.

⁶⁷ 'wpst HWH'y; JA and Nyberg: HWHm; Pagliaro and Benveniste: *hom*.

⁶⁸ L' pwrst HWH'y; Pagliaro and Benveniste: *hē*.

⁶⁹ The translation here, as often in this paper, uses passive construction only to render the surface structure of the Middle Persian, regardless of the fact that these Middle Persian constructions generally do not have a passive sense.

⁷⁰ pwrst HWH'y; Pagliaro and Benveniste: *hē*.

⁷¹ L' YCBH¹y; JA: YCBH¹m; Pagliaro and Benveniste: *kām hē*; Nyberg: *kāmāi*.

§ 84 . . .

*alāy +dārā(?)*⁷² *ī jān*
*+apazōn-it*⁷³ *kē āmušt*⁷⁴

'Woe, tree of a soul (?)!
 Who has destroyed the growth
 for you?

alāy varāz [ī] pitār
*+xōn-it*⁷⁵ *kē āmušt*

Woe, boar of a father!
 Who has destroyed the blood for
 you?

alāy sēn +ī murvāk
*bārāk-it kē āmušt*⁷⁶

Woe, Sēn of a bird (?)!
 Who has destroyed the steed for
 you?

§ 85 *ka-t hamē ētōn kāmīst*

*kū-m*⁷⁷ *apāk xyōnān*
*kārēčār kunāy*⁷⁸
*nūn ōzāt apakand-hē(h)*⁷⁹
andar +ēn rāzm čigōn
*agāh*⁸⁰

When your desire was always
 thus
 that for me you should fight with
 the Xyōns,
 now you are thrown down killed
 in this battle like a nobody.'

§ 92 . . .

*+nūn tīgr hač mán šavāy*⁸¹ 'Now, arrow, you shall go from me,
 [zūt?] *+parvāz +āvarāy(?)*⁸² you shall make [your] flight [swift?]
*pat har rāzm u pātrāzm tō*⁸³ in every attack and counter-attack you,

⁷² Thus Nyberg; cf. *Manual* II, s.v. *dārū*; MSS: šlw¹; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *dār*, "sostegno/soutien".

⁷³ MSS: 'pcndt; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *awzōn-at*; Nyberg: *+apazand-it* (in the index, *Manual* I; missing in the glossary).

⁷⁴ Thus Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v. *āmušt*; Bartholomae (*Zur Kenntnis der Mittel-iranischen Mundarten*, IV, p. 21, n. 2) and Pagliaro/Benveniste: *hamvašt*.

⁷⁵ MSS: ptlhwnd LK; Bartholomae (*op. cit.*, p. 23) and Pagliaro/Benveniste: *pītar xōn i tō*; Nyberg: *patrān i tō*.

⁷⁶ Cf. Bartholomae, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁷⁷ MSS: 'YKm; JA and Nyberg emend: 'YKt; corrected back to 'YKm by Nyberg, *Manual* II, p. 285; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *ku-m*.

⁷⁸ 'BYDWN'y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *kunēh*.

⁷⁹ LMYTWNt HWH'y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *awgand hē*.

⁸⁰ JJ: 'g's; originally in MK? If not, *akūc* may have been the original; *martōm* is probably a gloss in either case.

⁸¹ 'ZLWN'y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *šavēh*.

⁸² MSS: plwc 'wwl 'yyh; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *aparvēž apar kas*; Nyberg: *pērōz-āvar +ayēh*.

⁸³ MSS, JA and later editors: ZY LK.

*pērōz u vēh-pātrōč āvarāy*⁸⁴ victorious and resplendent, shall bring
*+nām*⁸⁵ [r] *yāvētān rōčān* fame of eternal days;
*dušmán murt āvarāy*⁸⁶ to the enemy you shall bring death!

§ 93 (u) *nūn bārāk u drāfš im* Now, horse and banner [of]
spáh this army,
*kār-um*⁸⁷ *tō framāyā-[y]*⁸⁸ you shall do [your] duty to me,
 ---⁸⁹ ---
*+nām-āvār +tō bavāy*⁹⁰ you shall be famous
*yat-ō*⁹¹ *rōc yāvēt* till day eternal
 ---⁸⁹ ---'

The above passages, if correctly interpreted, show the suggested threefold use of the ending looking like -'y. To some extent this coincides with the readings of the previous editors and to some extent it does not. As for the 2nd sing. subjunctive forms, my interpretation is in agreement with the notes of K. Barr in *BSO[A]S* (vol. 8, p. 402), where also the reading *dārāy* in § 109 is suggested. Of the few forms in -'y not contained in these passages, the three occurrences of YD'YTNW'y in §§ 37, 38 and 39, in complete parallel with YD'YTNWyt in § 36, are noticeable.⁹² There is only little reason to read a subjunctive in those cases. With reference to the common confusion between singular and plural forms in the 1st and 2nd persons, a 2nd sing. present indicative is by far the

⁸⁴ YHYTYWN'y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *āwarēh*.

⁸⁵ MSS, JA and later editors: ŠM YHYTYWN'y; the reversion of the word order suggested here is only one of many possible conjectures.

⁸⁶ YHYTYWN'y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *āwarēh*.

⁸⁷ MSS: 'ylnk 'lwm; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *ērānak sar-om*; Nyberg, *Manual I*, p. 27²², and *Manual II*, s.v. *kār*, gives the more satisfactory reading: *ērān kār-om*; *ērān* is probably a secondary addition.

⁸⁸ MSS and JA: plm'd'; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *framāyēh*; Nyberg, *Manual II*, s.v. *framūtān*: *framāyē*, imp. sing.; Barr, *BSO[A]S* 8, p. 402: "perhaps *framāyāy*".

⁸⁹ With regard to the balance and parallelism of the two stanzas, in § 92 and § 93 respectively, two lines seem to be missing in the latter.

⁹⁰ MSS and JA: n'm'wlt ZY bwp'y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: *nām-āvurt bowēh*; Nyberg: *nām-āvurt <[tāi] bavāi*.

⁹¹ Cf. Nyberg, *Manual II*, s.v. *yat-ō*; Henning, *BSOAS* 13, p. 643, n. 5; my own "Composition", p. 417.

⁹² For the complete context, see "Composition", pp. 407-408.

most likely. Thus the following interpretations of verbal forms ending in -'y may be suggested:

A. 2nd sing. present subjunctive (often used as an imperative):⁹³

BYDWN'y: *kunāy* 85 (an indicative in -ē(h) also has some possibility, but a vowel-rhyme with the last line seems desirable)

ZLWN'y: *šavāy* 92

YHSNN'y: *dārāy* 109

YHYTYWN'y: *āvarāy* 92 bis

'wwl'yḡh: +*āvarāy* 92 (cf. text restitution above; the two extra final letters are perhaps due to a confusion with the ending transcribed DŠ/HH by Henning, *BSOAS* 12, pp. 58–65)

bwp'y: *bavāy* 93

plm'd'[y] *framāyā[y]* 93 (restitution for the sake of the rhyme; cf. Barr, *op. cit.*, p. 402)

B. 2nd sing. present indicative:

HWH'y (for -yḡh): *hē(h)* 80 (preceded by *tō* but followed by plur. ind. in MSS: YD'YTWNyt, emended by JA and later editors to YD'YTWN'y), 85 (cf. context above; factual, no reason to read subj.), 107 (factual, only slight reason to read subj.; parallel: L' YD'YTWNyḡh)

YD'YTWN'y (for -yḡh): *dānē(h)* 37, 38, 39 (cf. above)

C. 3rd sing. present optative:

HWH'y (for -yḡh): *hē(h)* 40 bis (cf. context above; considering the construction with agent, *šmāh bagān* and -[t]ān, a 3rd sing. opt. is to be expected, as the indicative would be expressed by the simple past participle; according to the context, the three preceding forms HWH'y must be emended to HWHm)

YCBH'y (for -yḡh): *kāmē(h)* 40 (a 3rd sing. modal form is to be expected) (BR', end of 18, is suggested by Nyberg⁹⁴ to be "a wrong ideogram for *bēh*, opt. of *būtan*", but in the context it seems quite unnecessary to read anything but the ordinary adversative conjunction).

⁹³ Cf. Barr, *op. cit.*, p. 402.

⁹⁴ *Manual* II, s.v. *bē*, end.

There are only two cases of complement -' and one of complement -'h. The latter appears in § 35: *man dānēm kū tō . . . šnāsak* ḤWH'h, "I know that you . . . are knowing . . .".⁹⁵ and is likely to be a mistake for the ordinary 2nd sing. present indicative ending -yh: -ē(h), although a subjunctive in -āh/-ā/-āy (?) is conceivable. The two cases of complement -' occur in § 52: *bē ka-m . . . sōkand x^uart* ḤWH' *adak-im . . . sar brīt bē [ō] damīk apakand* ḤWH', "but [for the fact] that an oath was sworn by me . . . , (then) by me . . . [your] head would have been cut off [and] flung on the ground."⁹⁶ According to the context ḤWH' should denote a 3rd sing. present form. The indicative would have been left unwritten, and the optative seems little likely in the context. There remains the interpretation ḤWH': *hā*, 3rd sing. subjunctive, the regular form of which is *hāt*. The possible existence in Book Pahlavi of a "Parthian" 3rd sing. subjunctive in -ā/-āh is somewhat controversial, but considering the Classical New Persian -ā in forms like *guftā*,⁹⁷ it seems that such a modal auxiliary must have been in use at least in some late stage of Middle Persian. There is, however, not sufficient material in this text for a contribution to that discussion. Thus the following interpretations are listed tentatively:

ḤWH'h: +*hē(h)* 35 (2nd sing. pres. ind.)

ḤWH': *hā* 52 bis (3rd sing. pres. subj.)

(plm'd', probably a mistake for *framāyāy*; see above!)

Verbal ideogram with complement zero and corresponding forms written phonetically

There are no special problems involved in the interpretation of the 22 verbal ideograms with complement zero found in this text. Twelve of them, including the pseudo-verb *āvar* (LPMH

⁹⁵ For the full context, see "Composition", p. 407.

⁹⁶ The second ḤWH' modifies both *brīt* and *apakand*.

⁹⁷ Cf. Salemann-Shukovski, *Persische Grammatik*, 1889, p. 63; Jensen, *Neupersische Grammatik*, 1931, pp. 141, 150-151.

for LPNMH = LPNH),⁹⁸ are sing. imperatives, all but BR' LMYTWN 104 in completely clear contexts. There are also two phonetically written sing. imperatives. Ten cases of ideogram with complement zero consist of the special ideograms for 3rd sing. present indicative of "to be". They are listed separately below together with the impersonal pseudo-verb *tuvān*, always written phonetically.

A. Sing. imperative:

BYDWN: *kun* 16, 32

ZLWN: *šav* 67, 80 (*mā-*), 114

LMYTWN: *apakan* 104 (*bē-*)

LPMH (for LPNH): *āvar* 51, 101 bis

YMLLWN: *gōb* (101, see above complement -yt, B.), 114

YMR[R]WN: *gōb* 67

m'l: *māl* 41 (*bē-*)

plm'y: *framāy* 23

B. 3rd sing. present indicative:

YT: (*h*)*ast* 32 (-T'), 71, 77, 79 (-T'), 95, 97

L'YT: *nēst* 5, 71, 77, 97

twb'n: *tuvān* 64, 86 (-n'; *nē-*)

Verbal ideogram with complements -tn' and -stn' and corresponding forms written phonetically

There are 9 infinitives written with ideogram and 13 written phonetically in AZ. The unusually high proportion of phonetical forms is due to the general practice of writing *kartan*, "to do", phonetically.

ŠTH¹tn': *x^uartan* 30

YHWWNtn': *būtan* 53 bis

YTYBWNtn': *nišāstan* 62, 63

⁹⁸ Cf. Nyberg, *Symbolae phil. O. A. Danielsson oct. dic.*, Uppsala 1932, pp. 237-261, esp. p. 242.

YTYBWNstn^l: *nišāstan* 43 (-'stn^l), [44] (MSS?, JA: YTYBWNst; emended by Benveniste and Nyberg to full inf.; cf. parallel in 43), 86

ŠDYTWNstn^l: *vistan* 101 (*bē-*)

krtn^l: *kartan* 15, 17, 23, 25, 62 ter (third *kartan* is probably an interpolation; cf. above p. 81), 63 bis, 83, 91.

t'ḥtn^l: *tāxtan* 101 (*bē-*)

d'št(n^l): *dāšt[an]* 63 (MSS?, JA: d'št; a mistake is possibly due to the false separation of contents between §§ 63 and 64; *dāšt[an]* obviously belongs to the following *kē tuvān*, as in the text of Nyberg; a use of the so-called "infinitivus apocopatus" with *tuvān*, as in later language, is unlikely here; cf. *nišastan nē-tuvān* 86)

These 22 infinitives are all governed by finite verbs, 15 by forms of *framūtan/framāy-*, three by *šāyēt*, two by *dānam* and two by *tuvān*.

Verbal ideogram with complement -'t and a corresponding form written phonetically

The ending -'t is the regular complement for 3rd sing. present subjunctive forms. In *AZ* there is only one such form written with ideogram and one written phonetically. In a majority of the cases complement -'t is here used with the ideogram YK'YMWN, generally denoting the past participle *ēstāt*. The functions of this form are, however, at times somewhat uncertain in the temporal context, both when it is used independently and as an auxiliary. Those cases will be noted in the list below.

A. 3rd sing. present subjunctive:

YḤWWN't: *bavāt* (or *bāt?*) 21 (with a past participle for future passive)

b't: *bāt* 62 (somewhat uncertain context; Pagliaro/Benveniste emend the preceding LKWM to LNH: *amāh*)

B. Past participle:

YK'YMWN't: *ēstāt* 9, 10, 73,⁹⁹ 74 (*kart~*),¹⁰⁰ 79,⁹⁹ 99,⁹⁹ 100
 (*kart~*),¹⁰⁰ 102⁹⁹

Table of actual (certain and conjectural) verbal forms in AZ
regardless of orthographical representation
 (auxiliaries counted separately)

Total number of forms ¹⁰¹	ideographic phonetic			
	570	100%	430 (75%)	140 (25%)
1st sing. pres. ind. in <i>-am</i>	49	9%	48 (98%)	1 (2%)
2nd sing. pres. ind. in <i>-ē(h)</i>	12	2%	9 (75%)	3 (25%)
3rd sing. pres. ind. in <i>-ēt</i> (zero)	237	42%	186 (78%)	51 (22%)
1st plur. pres. ind. in <i>-ēm</i>	22	4%	13 (59%)	9 (41%)
2nd plur. pres. ind. in <i>-ēt</i>	12	2%	12 (100%)	0
3rd plur. pres. ind. in <i>-ēnd</i>	57	10%	49 (86%)	8 (14%)
2nd sing. pres. subj. in <i>-āy</i>	8	1%	5 (62%)	3 (38%)
3rd sing. pres. subj. in <i>-āt</i>	2	(0%)	1	1
3rd sing. pres. subj. in <i>-ā</i>	2	(0%)	2	0
3rd sing. pres. opt. in <i>-ē(h)</i>	3	(1%)	3	0
Sing. imperative (ending zero)	13	2%	11 (85%)	2 (15%)
Plur. imperative in <i>-ēt</i>	28	5%	20 (71%)	8 (29%)
Past participle in <i>-t/d</i>	104	18%	62 (60%)	42 (40%)
Infinitive in <i>-an</i>	21	4%	9 (43%)	12 (57%)

⁹⁹ Used as "present perfect", i.e. "has stood up" → "stands", or possibly a mistake for *ēstēt*; cf. "Composition", p. 415.

¹⁰⁰ Probably an interpolation; cf. above p. 78.

¹⁰¹ Excl. the probable interpolations 'ZLWNyt 75, HWHd 8 bis, 33, YHWWNt 69 bis, YK'YMWN't 74, 100, krt 74, 100, and krtn' 62 (third occurrence).

ADDITIONAL NOTE

Since the completion of the above article, there has appeared an important study on the preverb *bē*, namely "Le préverbe moyen-perse *bē/ba'*", a contribution by Gilbert Lazard to the *Monumentum H. S. Nyberg* (II, 1975, pp. 1-13). Investigating all occurrences of a series of verbs with and without prev. *bē* in the texts found in Nyberg's *Hilfs-*

buch des Pehlevi (I, 1928), Lazard has endeavoured to show that there are, generally, differences in semantic value between forms of the same verb with and without *bē*. His results may be taken as an abrogation of the tentative classification of *bē* as "full preverb" and "verbal particle" given above (pp. 80-85). There are, however, so many difficulties and uncertainties involved in the interpretation of the uses of this *bē/ba* that a verdict may have to await the result of further investigations, preferably along strictly methodic lines like those of G. Lazard and with a differentiation of chronologic and thematic strata.

In another contribution to the *Monumentum H. S. Nyberg* (II, pp. 419-456), Geo Widengren returns to the question of the prev. *bē* (pp. 449-451), treated by him also in the *Mémorial J. de Menasce* (cf. references above, pp. 80 ff.). In his long analysis of the Iranistic works of H. S. Nyberg he also touches upon some of the other problems discussed above, e.g. the interpretation of the ligature endings *-x₁* and *-x₂* (pp. 436-437, 448).