PAHLAVĪ hapax legomena

'wlyt', 'wlytk' and 'wlytk'

(PAHLAVICA XIV)

Gikyō Ōtō*

The Škend-gumānīg Wizār (ŠGW), XIII, 1-3 reads:

diṭ aṣar anbaṣānī u zaspā-gaṣaṇī i naxustīn niṣṣā / vaṣ ṣāt xvanānd /
vaṣ hamōin padāṃ ham-dāesta hānd ku yasaṭ pa xvanāst o Mūṣāe
dāt.

This Pāzand text was translated into Sanskrit thus:

dvitiyam ca upari mithovirodhinyam kutsitavāci pūrvavagamikānām / ye
svatantram ākāryante / ete sarve 'pi tena ekamatāh santi yat iajataḥ
svahastena likhitam Mūṣāya dadau //

And secondly, on the inconsistent faulty statement of the first books
which are called svatantra ('independent, free'), they are all too of
one accord in this that God gave it written by his own hand to
Moses.

But such translation inspires no confidence. Jean de Menasce (1902-1973)
translated it correctly except for the word ṣāt: 'De nouveau, au sujet des
contradictions et des absurdes (+zeṣāt) discours de la première Écriture qu’ils
appellent la *Loi, et sur laquelle tous s’accordent à dire que Dieu l’a écrite
de propre main et l’a donnée à Moïse.'(1) However, his interpretation of
ṣāt needs to be revised in the light of the compound haraziṣ ‘that from
which everything arises, the origin of all’ (ŠGW XV, 53). He pointed out in
foot note 2 (p. 182) that “ṣāt: 〈libre,noble〉 est sans doute une fausse lecture;
on peut songer à tūrāt (ar. taurāt) ou, plus probablement à oraitāk 〈loi〉
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(aram. et syr. ōraitā) comme en DkM(2) 253,19; 257,8; 299,15." Pāz. āzāt is a false reading for Pāz. *āzāt/Pahl.*āzād of ḥayyāt, usually interpreted as Pāz. āzāt / Pahl. āzād 'svatantra, free, noble' or as Pāz. āzād[a] / Pahl. ābād 'sunivāsa, prosperous'. Such āzād (*hača-ata- (hača 'from'+-ata- (hypocolistic suffix)) is difficult to translate, but obviously as '(Book of) Derivation' refers to Genesis. It is a matter for regret that this word of capital importance for deciding the character, even the very title, of 'la première Écriture (the first Book)', has not fully been deciphered. If it was not invented to avoid using Zoroastrian bun dahisn 'primal creation', it seems to have been preferred based on some unknown Syriac or Arabic term morphologically similar to it. The textually ungrounded connection with ōraitā 'Law or the Törāh of Moses' is hardly acceptable, and so also is Jacob Neusner's(3) tentative emendation of it to *ahat who proposed that *ahat as derivative of Iranian base ah- ‘to throw, shoot’ might come to have a semantic connection with törāh basically from Sem. yrh ‘to throw, shoot’. In fact, SGW, XIII and XIV criticize Judaism mainly in reference to Genesis, not to the Pentateuch in general. The above text may therefore be restored to archaic Pahlavi and translated thus:

\[did abar hanbasānih ud +zēfān gōwišnīh i naxustēn nibēg i-ā azād xwānēnd u-ā hāmōyēn padiš hām-dādestān hēnd kū yazād pad xwēs dast nibišt ů Mūšē dād\]

Next, concerning the contradiction and the vile statement of the First Book which they call Azād '(Book of) Derivation' and about which they are all of the same opinion that God wrote (it) by his own hand (and) gave to Moses.

As for azād, though it may have been coined by the author of ŠGW, another reading azad seems the more probable, although the meaning implied remains the same.

I shall return later to this ŠGW passage but now let us turn to the above quoted three words with their respective places: A) 'wlyt' (DkM 253, 19), B) 'wil'yt'k (ibid. 257, 8) and C) 'w'lytk' (ibid. 299,15), which occur to my knowledge nowhere else and were interpreted by de Menasce respectively as A) ōraitā, B) ōraitāk and C)'ōraitak, all meaning according to him 'la Loi, Törāh'. Precise observation however will reveal them different from one
another, especially the last not even remotely similar to the other two in its beginning 'wlyt- and ending -tk'. I have interpreted this word C) as awalidag 'occupied, possessed, fascinated', derivative of Old Persian *a-varô/-a-varô- (cf. OInd. a-var- 'to occupy, possess').(4) DkM 299, 14-16: '1pad im 10 däm zyân andarz i padîrag 10 Jam dâm süd andarz awalidag nibêg bun +hard +ud +andar Uriëlîm dâstân framîd 'Fascinated by these creature-damaging 10 precepts in opposition to Jam's creature-benefiting 10 precepts, he (Dahâg) inaugurated a scripture and ordered to deposit (it) in Jerusalem.'(5) Here 1pad im 10 däm zyân andarz .... awalidag 'fascinated by these creature-damaging 10 precepts ....' constitutes a participial construction. It is a matter for regret that such construction seems not to have been recognized whence ensues insufficient interpretation of several passages, for instance, Arda Wirâb Nâmag (AWN): ud 'ên dên etyûn hamâg Abestag ud Zand 〈i〉 1abar 〈i〉 gêw postîhâ i wirastag 〈pad 〈i〉 ab i 〈i〉 zarr nibistag 〈i〉 andar Staxr 〈i〉 Pâbagân 〈pad 〈i〉 diz 〈i〉 〈i〉 +Nibist 〈i〉 nibêd 〈i〉 estêd .... 〈oy 〈i〉 1abar 〈i〉 awurd ud 〈i〉 bê söxt î And this Dên that is both the Abestag and Zand which, having been written (nibistag) with gold water on prepared cowhide, had been deposited in Staxr i Pâbagân in the Fortress of Writing, he (Alexander) took away and burnt.'(6) ; 〈tâ 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i〉 〈i>
And with the evil religion and the non-law from dews, because of the deception by (their) deceit, first, was pleased the creature-diminishing Dahāg, and he (himself) composed the 'wl'yt'k, the basic scripture of Judaism .... (such is) revealed (from the Good Religion).

Marijan Molé (1924–1963)(11) interpreted A) 'wlyt' as oraita (orātā is probably a misprint) 'la Thora' and B) 'wl'yt'k as orātāk 'la Thora' while de Menasce(12) translated both words as 'la Oraytā' to which Oraytā he added 'la Tōrāh',(13) To my knowledge his interpretation of the final k in B) 'wl'yt'k is found nowhere else. By both scholars, the problematic words are fundamentally identified with Aramaic מִצְוָה oraitā 'law' or Moses' Torah. Be that as it may, the words A) and B) obviously refer to one and the same thing and their spelling apparently justifies the reading oraitā in spite of the medial alef in 'wl'yt'. Indeed, we have examples: in the papyri from Elephantine the word mryhm/marehom 'their lord' and in the Frahang i Pahlawig the word mruhy/märūhē 'his lord' which is 'turned' or 'uzwarized' as 'xwday 'lord', both having no alef; while on the other hand we have in the said papyri mr’y/mār-i 'my lord' which also makes its appearance in Inscriptional Pahlavi uzwarized as ‘xwaday ‘lord’. From this linguistic fact, we can derive the fascinating is the explanation that the alef in mr’y is nothing but an indicator of the basic form mr’/mārē and has no connection with actual pronunciation.(14) This explanation may also be applied to 'ain standing in place of alef in Inscriptional and Book Pahlavi l’ysh/reš-eh 'his head' in contrast to Inscriptional Parthian ryś'/rešā ‘the head’, both with the ideogram for Western Middle Iranian sar ‘head’. l’yś- with 'ain only refers to its basic form *ra’s and has nothing to do with the actual pronunciation. If we are justified to apply this argument to B) 'wl'yt'k with medial alef, 'wl'yt' - seems to be another spelling for A) 'wlyt', the alef concerned only with indicating the 3rd radical consonant of the base *wl' (cf. Arab. valiya ‘to be near’).

If so, could all the problems concerning the two words be settled? The answer comes from the final -k of 'wl'yt'k, subjected thus far to no particular treatment, although it reveals to us the fact that 'wl'yt'k had Middle Persian equivalent ending in -ak/-ag, and accordingly that 'wlyt' too was uzwarized in spite of its lacking -k.
The MP word for ‘law’ is expressed by dād or dādestān; the former has no Aramaic ideogram whereas the latter is expressed by d’t(y)st’n or Aram. dyn’/dinā. Therefore ‘wlyt’ is not uzwarized as dādestān. Even if we may assume that ‘wlyt’ was uzwarized as dād, such assumption meets with difficulty that ‘wl’yt’k would accordingly have been uzwarized as dādag, which is attested nowhere in the meaning ‘law’.

It is then necessary for uzwarization to undergo further consideration. In our opinion, a key to solving the problem can be supplied by SGW, XIII, 1-2 quoted above where the Genesis is referred to by naxustīn niğaš yāš ‘azāt xānānd (naxustēn nibēg i-s ‘azād xwānend) ‘the First Book which they call Azād (‘(Book of) Derivation’ or ‘Genesis’). In accordance with it, A) ‘wlyt’ may be read as awwalītā (اوولیت). As for B) ‘wl’yt’k, the medial alef as I have pointed out, is solely an indicator of basic form, having no connection with actual pronunciation, and therefore ‘wl’ is aulā ‘first, origin’ and the whole ‘wl’yt’k may be interpreted as awwalītā+k. aulā becomes awwal- when it is accompanied by a suffix, which is here -i(t), the feminine derivative forms (-iṭā being its status determinatus).\(^{(15)}\)

Aramaic aulā was uzwarized as fradom ‘first’ so that A) awwalītā cannot have been uzwarized as fradom and accordingly B) awwalītā-k not as fradomag. I should like therefore to propose the respective uzwarizations 1naxust and 1naxustag. Now, in my translation of the Ğenbard passages given above (pp. 38-39), put ‘First (Book) (awwalītā/1naxust)’ and ‘First (Book) (awwalītā-k/1naxustag)’ respectively in place of “wlyt” and “wl’yt’k’.

My treatment so far seems to make it fairly probable that DkM 299, 14-16 (quoted above) must have read 1pad 1im 10 dām zyan andarz āwalidag (‘wl’yt’k’ <1naxust (‘wlyt’)> nibēg bun +kard .... ‘Fascinated by these creature-damaging 10 precepts .... he (Dahāg) inaugurated the First Book ....’ The semblance of spelling must have led the copyist to identify a dittography wrongly. Another possibility however, that ‘wlyt’k (āwalidag) is itself an error for ‘wl’yt’k (awwalītā-k/1naxust) and that the original text read 1pad 1im 10 dām zyan andarz 1naxustag nibēg bun +kard .... ‘On (upon, by or with) these creature-damaging 10 precepts he inaugurated the First Book ....’, seems less probable, because the logical relationship between the evil precepts of Dahāg and his composition of the Genesis is not expressed by any verbal expression. Perhaps we need not even go thus far. The presence of āwalidag may be supported by the passage ud agdēn .... Dahāg dōşidan .... ‘And with
the evil religion .... was pleased .... Dahāg ....’ quoted above.
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king of kings, son of Īhrāmāz (II), in dispute with many kinds of different-beliefed
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dahig is derivative of OIr, *dahâ-/Av. dahâ-/OInd. dâmg- and dâsr-, v. t. and v. i. 'to instruct; to be instructed, learn, know' which meanings developed respectively in good and evil semantic directions, viz. 'to instruct' > 'to subdue' > 'to oppress' while 'to be instructed, learn, know' > 'to subdue (v. i.)' > 'to be obedient'. One may easily recognize this proposition dahig 'oppression, outrage' and OIr, dâhu-, lit. meaning 'who or what subdues, is governed, is obedient' (dâhu- and OInd, dâsyu-, dâsâ- m. are agent noun). So also Av. dasdar- m. 'instructor'; MP dastwâr (< *dâs-ti-bara-, lit. meaning 'instruction- or knowledge-bearer'; for various etymological propositions, see Maria Macuch, "Der dastwâr, "auctor", im sasanidischen Zivilprozeß", Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, Band 21/1988, p. 177, n. 2.); Av. dama- 'knowing (the manthrâ)' and OInd. dâsmâ- and dâsrâ-, basically 'knowing' and not 'wondrous'. See my article "On Yasna 32: 16 (Gathica XVI)", Acta Iranica 28 (A Green Leaf. Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen), 1988, pp. 8-11 (p. 9, 1. 8, instead of blasing read blazing!); and my Résumé '中期ペルシア語彙を発掘して (New Decipherment of Middle Persian lexiques)., Orienta, Vol. XXXI, No. 2/1988, p. 194. For various interpretations of 2160 thus far proposed, see Vahman, op. cit., p. 224, Comment 1: 9. Such a semantic double development may be found elsewhere as I already pointed out (see my article "Old Medo-Persian spâdhamaidâ-,", Orient, Vol. XIII/1977, pp. 15–19 where p. 19, 1. 2, instead of froms read forms!): from base OIr. spâ-/OPers. sâ- 'to throw', derive on the one hand spâda- 'raid (of enemy)' in spâdhamaidâ- f. 'suppression of the raid' and on the other Bookpahlavi khs/Manichaean Pahlavi khs=kahas 'canât' (OPers. *kaha-sâ- (OIr. *kaha-spâ-) 'that which throws, i. e. lets run (water) by digging, i. e. canât'; from base OIr. vaîg-/Av. vaîg- 'to throw', on the one hand Av. vōîmâ- f. 'overflow, flood; raid (of enemy)' and on the other Av. vaîjâh- m. 'irrigation' in Aîryana- Vaîjâh- Vanpîyâ Dûîtyayâ 'Iranian basin of (i. e. territory irrigated by) the River Varûhi (Weh Rîd), i. e. Zranka irrigated by the River Hîlmând'.

As for 1962, which has harassed scholars for over a century, I proposed (see the Résumé referred to above) to interpret it as nâyizag 'dice' (war nâyizag abgandan 'to cast the dice of ordeal'), from the vṛddhi derivative of base nî-/nay- 'to lead' with hypocolic suffix (*nîyâchaka- > *nâyîchaka- > nâyîchak/nâyizag), for which one may refer to OInd. naya- m. 'a kind of game and a sort of dice or men for playing it' (Monier Monier-Williams+others, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s. v.).
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(15) Stanislaw Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik mit Bibliographie, Chrestomathie und Glossar*, Leipzig 1975, 4. 3. 5. 2, f. and 5. 3. 8. 4. 1 where the author gives *hār* 'after, afterward' > *ahēr* 'future' (st. cstr.). It is regrettable that the author did not refer to the Aramaic ritual texts from Persepolis nor to the Aśokan Aramaic inscriptions from Afghanistan. At least some of them should have been incorporated in the 'Chrestomathie und Glossar'.
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