FORMATION OF VERBAL LOGOGRAPHMS (ARAMAEOGRAMS) IN PARTHIAN*

Seiro HARUTA**

1. Introduction

Inscriptional Parthian is different from Inscriptional Middle Persian: each has its own writing system. In general this has been well recognized; however, logograms (Aramaegrams)(1) in the two languages have often been discussed together in a mixed way; e.g., by Kutscher [1970: 393-399] and partly even by Henning [1958: 33-37].

Brunner [1977: 197-198, 267-272] and then Skjaervø [1983b: 137-139] abandoned this attitude; they described the verbal logograms in Parthian separately from those in Middle Persian throughout. Skjaervø successfully classified those in Sasanian Parthian into three groups according to tense markers(2) and showed the paradigm of phonetic complements, representing personal endings, attested in Sasanian inscriptions.

However, there remains an unsettled question: Are there general rules for the formation of a Parthian verbal logogram when both a root and a stem (e.g., pə'āl) of Aramaic are given? It is the purpose of this paper to suggest that the answer to the question is, with many exceptions, affirmative.

2. Sources

Below are the inscriptions/documents containing Parthian verbal logograms. ‘Verbal logograms’ here include logograms verbal in Aramaic, but non-verbal in Parthian (see, e.g., NTRtstr(3) and RMY under the List).

---
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Arsacid Parthian (see also Appendix)
- Awroman Parchment No. 3 (AW3): Перихаин 1983: 72-73.(4)
- The bilingual (+Gk.) inscription of Valagaš IV on a bronze statue found at Seleucia (VS): Morano 1990.(5)

Sasanian Parthian
- The bilingual (+MPers.) inscription of Šābuhr I at Hajjiabad (SH): MacKenzie 1978.(6)
- The bilingual (+MPers.) inscription of Šābuhr I at Tang-e Borāq (STBq): ibid.

In this paper, however, I will not discuss verbal logograms in letter (exercise) texts, which contain stereotyped salutation formulae, because the logograms in these seem somewhat different from those in the other Parthian texts. These texts are as follows:

The limited number of published documents of this type hinders us from investigating them further.(9) Hence I have put the verbal logograms of these texts only in the List, where the letter L following a text number, e.g., DE12L, indicates that the text belongs among the letter (exercise) texts.

3. Methods

To answer the question posed in the Introduction, I used the following
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methods:
1. I classified the verbal logograms into nine groups according to the types of Aramaic roots from which the logograms derive: that is, strong, I', Iy, II'/w, III'/y, III', II=III, uncertain, and the verb 'to be'. Doubly weak roots were treated twice; for example, √’ty is both in I' and in III'/y.
2. Then I distributed the logograms in each group according to their Aramaic stems: pa’al, pa‘el, haf’el, and hitpa‘el (only 1 ex.). In other words, I drew the ‘paradigms’.
3. Examining the ‘paradigms’, I chose the standard form for each stem in each root group when there was enough data.

The above method is in principle identical to Herzfeld’s [1924: 52-59], though his attempt was frustrated by the scanty material then available.

In addition, I have classified Inscriptional Parthian into Nisa Parthian (‘Nisa’ in the ‘paradigms’), the other Arsacid Parthian (‘oAr’), and Sasanian Parthian (‘Sa’), so that we do not overlook the historical changes in the forms of logograms.

I will restrict myself in this paper to the forms of the ‘bodies’—unchanged parts—of verbal logograms; these will give sufficient data for my purpose. I will not discuss the other parts of logograms, that is, ‘ endings’ and phonetic complements; a detailed syntactical analysis of these in Sasanian Parthian can be found in Skjaervø’s studies [Humbach—Skjaervø 1978-1983; Skjaervø 1989].

One may object to my disregarding -W, an ‘ending’ of logograms, by pointing out Skjaervø’s assumption that -W originated from the Aramaic elements expressing the present or future tenses; e.g., the copula (h)ū [Skjaervø 1986]. However, his assumption, based only on the material of Sasanian Parthian, is incorrect because of the following reason: Although -W in Sasanian Parthian, indeed, serves as a present tense marker, the function of -W in Arsacid Parthian remains quite obscure. As Brunner [1977: 197-198] pointed out, -W in some texts surely represents the past participle, not the present stem. An example is HŠKHW in Nisa 194/4, 1105 (74)/4-5, and 1556 (867int)/1-2:

HŠKHW B ḤWT’ ZNH W ptšyḥt ‘L ĤRN ḤWT’
/ vindāt andar xum im ut patšext ŏ any xum/(11)
‘Discovered in jar- this and poured into another jar.’
This shows that the usage of -W in Sasanian Parthian does not date back to the Nisa texts; thus, Skjaervø's assumption loses its justification.

I think that the origin of -W is irrelevant to the formation of 'bodies', and that -W simply derived from the plural ending of the imperative or the perfect. More detailed information on the subject will be available only with the full publication of the Nisa ostraca so far unearthed.

Although the other ending, -H, drops when logograms ending in it are used as past stems, I regard -H as a part of 'bodies' because in some instances it is relevant to the root.

In the next chapter I will show the 'paradigms', assumed standard forms, and provide notes on exceptional or remarkable forms.

4. Formation of the Verbal Logograms

a. Strong Roots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>root</th>
<th>pa'al</th>
<th>pa‘el haf‘el</th>
<th>root</th>
<th>pa'al</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nisa</td>
<td>zbn</td>
<td>MZBN</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>ktb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>npq</td>
<td>NPQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ktš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ntn</td>
<td>YNTN</td>
<td></td>
<td>nṯr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'bd</td>
<td>'BD</td>
<td></td>
<td>npl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>škḥ</td>
<td>HŠKH</td>
<td></td>
<td>ntn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oAr</td>
<td>zbn</td>
<td>ZBN</td>
<td>'bd</td>
<td>'BD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ktš</td>
<td>KTŠ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y'BDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rdp</td>
<td>MRDP</td>
<td>qṭl</td>
<td>QTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>ḫsn</td>
<td>ḨHSN</td>
<td>šbq</td>
<td>ŠBQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kdb</td>
<td>MKDB</td>
<td>šḥḥ</td>
<td>ŠLḤ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This 'paradigm' suggests that there exists a standard form for each stem: P'L for the pa‘al, MP'L for the pa‘el, and HP'L for the haf‘el. M- serves as a pa‘el marker; H- as a haf‘el marker.

The term 'marker' reflects the following assumptions:
1. Parthian scribes who established these standard forms at first had thought it necessary to distinguish in spelling the two or three forms derived from the same root but of different stems; for example, the pa‘al of √zbn means 'to buy' whereas the pa‘el means 'to sell'. In other words, they had a
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specific need for the 'stem markers'.

2. Then they sought a form appropriate to represent each stem and adopted for the pa‘al the 'root' form, for the pa‘el its active participle, and for the haf‘el its imperative (or the 3.sg. of its perfect). We can easily explain why they employed the active participle for the pa‘el, If they had chosen the perfect, imperfect, or imperative for the pa‘el, the form would have been identical in spelling to the corresponding form of the pa‘al—according to the orthography of Aramaic in those periods (see, for example, the paradigms of Biblical Aramaic [Rosenthal 1963 : 60-61]). The active participle mp'l (pa‘el), however, is quite different in spelling from p'l (pa‘al); thus, MP'L could clearly distinguish the pa‘el stem.\(^{15}\)

The following are exceptional or remarkable forms:

YNTN: This form is from the impf. 3.sg. The complementary use of the verbs 'to give' (\(\sqrt{\text{ntn}}\) for impf. and \(\sqrt{\text{yhb}}\) forpf., ptpl., and impv.) was developed in some Aramaic dialects, e.g., in Syriac. Thus we can explain why YNTN was preferred to *NTN. However, this does not account for the reason why *YHB was not used.

KTYB: This form is probably from the Aram. pass. ptpl. I cannot see why it was preferred to *KTB.

NTR: The reason for the change \(\text{\textbf{\textit{}}}>T\) remains uncertain.

Y‘BDY: This form is from the impf. 3.sg. \(y'bd\). I assume that it was invented by the Parthian scribes who disliked one logogram ('BD) representing two or more verbs of Parthian.\(^{16}\) Even if this is the case, we can hardly judge when this invention happened: before the Nisa texts or just before the Sasanian period? Also uncertain is the origin of the last -Y; cf. III'.

b. I’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>root</th>
<th>pa‘al</th>
<th>haf‘el</th>
<th></th>
<th>root</th>
<th>pa‘al</th>
<th>haf‘el</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nisa</td>
<td>'ty</td>
<td>'TY</td>
<td>HYTY</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>'bd</td>
<td>HWBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oAr</td>
<td>'ḥd</td>
<td>'ḤD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'zl</td>
<td>'ZL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'kl</td>
<td>'KL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'ḥd</td>
<td>'ḤD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'ty</td>
<td>HYT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'sr</td>
<td>'SR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard form for the pa‘al of this type seems the same as that of
the strong verbs. In Aramaic, the haf'el imperative/perfect of I' usually begins with hw- ('>w'), but √'ty changes to hyty. For √'ty, see also III'/y.

c. Iy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Pa'al</th>
<th>Haf'el</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>yd'</td>
<td>YD'H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ytb</td>
<td>YTYB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the -Y in HWD'Y, see III'. The other forms seem irregular:

YD'H: The expected form is *YD', from which *YD't, the form with the phonetic complement -t, could derive. Then from *YD't, through analogy with the IIIy forms (see below) like YB'H/YB't, YD'H could be formed.

YTYB: 'to sit';(17) to set'. The reading and the original root of this logogram have not yet been established. Among three possible readings (Y'RyB-, Y'rYB- and YTYB-) [Skjærov 1983b: 65-66], Skjærov preferred Y'RyB- which derives from √'rb 'to go down, set (of the sun)', with this unconvincing reason: 'such a verb [√'rb] could acquire the more general meaning of “to set down, to settle”' [Skjærov 1983b: 66]. However, considering YTYBWN, the Middle Persian logogram corresponding to the Parthian logogram concerned, I agree with Herzfeld [1924: 201, 203], who preferred YTYB <√ ytb 'to sit'. For the change t>T/t, see 'TYQ/'tyq (<'tyq) in the Nisa ostraca and in some Official Aramaic texts [Kutscher 1970: 367].(18) The pa'il-like form probably resulted from the reinterpretation of Y- as a prefix.

d. II'/w

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Pa'al</th>
<th>Haf'el</th>
<th>Hitpa‘el</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nisa</td>
<td>kw1</td>
<td>Q'YL</td>
<td>YTKYN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kwn</td>
<td>QYM</td>
<td>HQ'YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qwm</td>
<td>HRYM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Š'l</td>
<td>Š'YL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oAr</td>
<td>qwm</td>
<td>HQ'YM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>qwm</td>
<td>QYM</td>
<td>HQ'YM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very characteristic are the pa'al forms in the Nisa texts: they are
neither from perfects nor imperatives but from active participles with the later spelling -'Y-.

Q'YL: The meaning ‘to measure, account for’ is clear. Thus the logogram no doubt derived from the root √kwl, though I cannot find a reason for the change k>Q.

Q'YM: While this logogram and QYM probably represent different verbs, it is uncertain whether Q'YM and HQ'YM stand for the same verb(s).

HQ'YM: This is an artificial form resulting from adding H- to Q'YM.

I cannot judge which form is standard, the ‘orthodox’ HRYM or the artificial HQ'YM.

e. III/y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>root</th>
<th>po'al</th>
<th>haf'el</th>
<th>root</th>
<th>po'al</th>
<th>pa&quot;el</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nisa</td>
<td>'ty</td>
<td>TY</td>
<td>HYTY</td>
<td>b'y</td>
<td>Y'B'H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qr'</td>
<td>QRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hzy</td>
<td>HZY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oAr</td>
<td>'ty</td>
<td>HYT</td>
<td></td>
<td>mť'</td>
<td>YMT'H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bny</td>
<td>BNY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sgy</td>
<td>MSGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rmy</td>
<td>RMY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šby</td>
<td>YŠBH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>'ty</td>
<td>TYH</td>
<td>HYTY</td>
<td>rmy</td>
<td>RMY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bny</td>
<td>BNY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šd'</td>
<td>ŠDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šty</td>
<td>ŠTY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard form of the po'al ends in -Y. Some logograms, however, adopt the impf.3.sg.: YB'H, YŠBH, and YMT'H. In the first two cases, employing imperfects is probably relevant to the meanings of the verbs: ‘to seek’ and ‘to wish.’

HYTY: The latter -Y sometimes drops when the phonetic complement -t is attached. This may have resulted from the analogy with the alternation -W/t; however, this does not account for the reason why the same analogical process occurs on no other III'/y logograms.

'TYH: I cannot explain why the ‘ending’ -H is attached to the logogram; why not -W?

YMT'H: The reason for adopting the irregular -H is uncertain.

MSGY: This is from the act.ptpl.m.sg. of the pa"el (unless this logogram alone adopts its infinitive for the po'al), though up to now we have generally thought that no pa"el of √sgy could be attested in Official Aramaic. See
Beyer 1984: 644; and von Soden 1968: 266.

\[ 'STY : \langle 'st \text{ (pf. 3.sg. or impv. m.sg., not ptpl.)}. \text{ This Aramaic verb takes a prosthetic vowel.} \]

\[ \text{f. III}^c \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{root} & \text{pa'el} & \text{haf'el} \\
\text{Sa} & \text{yd'} & \text{YD'H} & \text{HW'D'Y} \\
\text{šm'} & \text{'ŠM'Y} \\
\end{array}
\]

The standard forms, if they exist, seem to end in -'Y, though the origin of -Y remains uncertain. For YD'H, see Iy.

\[ 'ŠM'Y : \text{This is from the impf. 1.sg. One may expect that 'I hear' occurred frequently in letters/reports and thus explain why the 1.sg. was preferred. In some Official Aramaic letters, however, we find šm't 'I have heard', not 'šm' (e.g., in Cowley 1923: Nos 40, 41).} \]

\[ \text{g. II=III} \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{root} & \text{pa'el} & \text{pa'el} & \text{haf'el} \\
\text{Nisa} & \text{gdd} & \text{GDY} & \text{HN'L} \\
\text{Sa} & \text{mll} & \text{YMLL} \\
\end{array}
\]

GDY : GDYt occurs hapax in an uncertain context. If this logogram can be traced back to the root \( \sqrt{\text{gdd}} \), the form may derive through \( \sqrt{\text{gdy}} \), \langle\sqrt{\text{gdd}},(20)\rangle or the -Y may be relevant to that in the III' logograms.

HN'L : This is from the impv. m.sg. or the pf. 3.sg.

YMLL : This is from the impf. 3.sg. In geminate verbs, the impf. 3. sg. of the pa'el differs in spelling from that of the pa'al. Thus there was no need to attach the pa'el marker M- to the logograms of this type.

\[ \text{h. Uncertain Roots} \]

\[ \text{YHYT/YHYT (Nisa) : This logogram probably means either 'to bring in', or 'to intend, prepare'. However, the root from which the logogram derives is uncertain; } \sqrt{\text{hw}t} \text{ and } \sqrt{\text{nht}} \text{ are candidates for it (see Përîkhanian 1969, with earlier suggestions).} \]
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KTY (Sa and Letter): KTYt or KTYT. This logogram occurs twice: once in a very uncertain context (NPi 12), the other time in a letter (DE12L). In the former, this word may be a non-verbal logogram; in the latter, it probably means ‘firm, strong’ [Harmatta 1957: 285] (as an adjective). This meaning suggests that the logogram originates from the root √qtt [Gignoux 1972: 55 n.74].(21) If this is the case, the form of this logogram is similar to GDY (KTYt) or derives from the po'îl (KTYT).

i. The Verb ‘To Be’

Nisa  ’YT(Y),  ’YT
HWH

’YT(Y): /ast/‘(there) is’. Alternatively it may be ‘part’, a noun homophonous to the verb ‘is’, as proposed by Péríkhanian [1969: 13–14].

HWH: This is used as a preterite verb, a preterite auxiliary verb, and with uncertain function:
1) ZYLQDMN HTM' HWH ḥwrybrn, ‘(on) which there had previously been a seal by stewards (cupbearers)’ (Nisa 2319(483), etc.).
2) ZYLQDMN L' Q'YLt HWH, ‘which had not previously been measured’ (Nisa 2314(314+447), etc.).
3) MNNPSH tyrydt mzn 'sppty HWH (Nisa 1646(525), etc.)—I cannot understand the meaning and function of this HWH.

Sa  ’YT /ast/ 3.sg. ind. ‘(there) is’.
   ḪWY-, ḪWYH- /ah-/ ‘to be’.
   ḪWYN 3.pl.indic. ‘(they) are’.
   ḪWH /aház/? ‘was’, ḪWHD /ahād/? ‘is, (should be)’ (see notes 30 and 31).
   YḪWH-/YḪWt /bav-/būd/ ‘to be, become’.
   YḪYH- /bav-/.

For the verb ‘to be’ in Sasanian Parthian, see Skjaervø 1983a: 85, 98–99; and 1983b: 24–25.

5. Conclusions

These ‘paradigms’ suggest the following:
1. The standard forms of each root group are based on those of the strong root type: P*L for the po'al, MP*L for the pa'el, and HP*L for the haf'el.
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2. The forms for some stems of some root groups show irregularities (e.g., the pa'el of II'/w in the Nisa texts).
3. Certain individual verbal logograms also show irregularities (e.g., YNTN, YD'H).

Further, to study the establishment of logograms, we should not forget the following additional conclusions:

1. The ‘bodies’ of verbal logograms in the Nisa ostraca seem to differ little from those in Sasanian Parthian texts. This suggests that the formation of verbal logograms had already been established before the Nisa texts were written.
2. At the same time, we can find in the Nisa ostraca forms reflecting later Aramaic spelling: Q'YM, Š'YL, and so on. This leads us to assume that these forms were established not long before the Nisa texts.

List of Verbal Logograms

Verbal logograms are entered under their ‘bodies’ in Aramaic alphabetical order, followed by their meanings, corresponding verbs in Manichaean Parthian (present stem/past stem), Aramaic roots, and attested forms in texts.

'ZL go šw-/šwd √'zl || 'ZLt NPi 18.
'H'D take gyrw-/gryft √'hd || 'H'DW VS 8. 'H'Dt ŠKZ 5, 12; NPi 6.
'Y'TY (there) is(26) √'ytty || 'Y'T Nisa 2314(447+314)/2; 2315(556)/2; 2316(1409)/3; 2319(483)/1; 2321(526)/2; 2322(661)/2; 2323(676)/2; (458)/1.
'Y'TY Nisa 1520(1222)/5; 1522(658)/6; 1523(1379)/8; 1524(1318+1406)/6; 1525(277)/6; 2563(798)/6; 2564(211)/3; 2653L(N210)/6; NPi 24, 30, 39.
'S'R bind bnd-/bst √'sr || 'SRW NPi 25. 'SRt NPi 2, 25.
'S'M'Y hear 'šn'-/'šnwd √šm' || 'Š'M'YWd NPi 11. 'Š'M'YWnt NPi 8, 16, 20.
'S'TY swear wxr-/wxrd(28) √'sty || 'Š'TYWnt NPi 11, 25?
'T'Y come 's-/'gd √'ty || 'TYHnt NPi 13?, 21, 43. 'TYHt NPi 17. 'TYt Nisa 2699(N105)/1; ŠKZ 3, 4, 9; NPi 7; GD8.
'B'NY build dys-/dyšt √bny || 'BNYt AS 3; ŠH 9, 11.
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**HWH** be (was/were?) √ hwy || **HWH** Nisa 1646(525)/2; 1647(675)/3; 1648(672)/3; 1649(916)/3; 2314(447+314)/2; 2315(556)/2; 2316(1409)/3; 2319(483)/1; 2321(526)/1; 2322(661)/1; 2323(676)/1; 2324(621int)/3; 2644aL (N287)/7(bis), 8; 2653L(N210)/5; 2658L(54)/4.

**HYTY** bring w'y/-w'st?(29) √'ty || **H** (abbreviation for HYTY) Nisa 2593(2167)/passim; 2596(2119)/passim; 2601(1169)/passim. **HYTY** Nisa passim. **HYTW** Nisa 345(792+1084)/7; 1043(1673a)/5.

**HWŠR** (I) send frš'-/fršwd √ yšr || **HWŠRT** Nisa 2644aL(N287)/2; 2653L(N210)/5; 2658L(54)/2.

**HN'L** bring in 'wr-/'wr'd √'ll || **HN'ŁW** Nisa 297/6; 506/2; 670/4; 789/6; 852(689ext)/3; 1020(2042)/4; 1231(1416)/5; 1428(1740)/5; 1522(658)/3; 1535(493)/6; 2673(257)/1, 4. **HN'Lt** Nisa passim.

**HQ'YM** stand; place 'wyšt-/'wyšt'd; 'wyst-/'wyst'd √ qwm || **HQ'YMt** Nisa 1687(587)/5.

**HRYM** lead up? s'n-/s'n'd? √ rym || **HRYMt** Nisa 1687(587)/4.

**HŠKH** discover wynd-/wynd'd √škh || **HŠKW** Nisa 194/4; 644(N218)/6; 1104(74)/4; 1556(867int)/1.


**HWBD** destroy wyg'n-/wygnd √'bd || **HWBDWt** ŠKZ 4.

**HWY** show nm'y/-nm'd √'yd' || **HWYW** NPI 11.

**HW** was/were 'h'z(-?)(30) √ hwy || **HW** NPI 8, 18. **HWnt** NPI 6, 7, 15, 24, 27. || **HWd** should be/is 'h'd?(31) NPI 22, 31, 40.

**HWY** be 'h', h- √ hwy || **HWY**( NPI 25. **HWYnt** NPI 16.

**HWYm** ŠKZ 1, 3, 4, 9, 29; NPI 20. **HWYN** ŠKZ 3, 11, 22, 23; ŠH 15.

**HWYndy** ŠH 9, 10; NPI 32, 33, 35. **HWYnt** ŠH 11, 14; ŠTBq 14; NPI 29.

**HWyt** ŠKZ 29; NPI 3, 4, 5, 19, 34, 36, 37, 39; DE12L/3?

**HWŠR** (I) send frš'-/fršwd √ yšr || **HWŠRT** DE12L/1.

**HZY** see wyn-/yd √ hzy || **HZYW**( NPI 23. **HZYWm** NPI 8.

**HZyt** NPI 23.

**HHSN** have, hold d'r-/dyrd √ hšn || **HHSNW**( NPI 40. **HHSNWm** ŠKZ 1, 17. **HHSNWhnt** NPI 13. **HHSNt** ŠKZ 25(bis), 29. **HHSNtn** NPI 31, 34.

**HYTY** bring w'y/-w'st?(32) √'ty || **HYTY** NPI 25. **HYTYt** ŠKZ 11, 16; NPI 26. **HYTt** VS 10; NPI 34, 35, 39.

**HQ'YM** stand; place 'wyšt-/'wyšt'd; 'wyst-/'wyst'd √ qwm || **HQ'YMW** VS 11. **HQ'YMWd** ŠH 12; NPI 33, 35. **HQ'YMWnt** ŠKZ 22; NPI 9, 40.

**HQ'YMWt** ŠKZ 3(bis), 4(bis), 19; ŠH 7; NPI 5, 20, 37. **HQ'YMWtn** NPI Vol. XXVIII 1992
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‘BD do, make kr/-kyrd √‘bd||‘BDWd NPi 10, 24. ‘BDWm SKZ 2(bis); NPi 5, 17. ‘BDWn NPi 3. ‘BDWnt ŠKZ 17, 30; NPi 4. ‘BDWt NPi 34. ‘BDt Nisa 644(N218)/8; 1556(867int)/3; ŠKZ 3, 4(bis), 5, 11(bis), 12, 16, 17(bis), 29; NPi 1, 3, 10?, 15, 29, 32, 36. ‘BDtn NPi 11, 17.

Q’YL measure? √ kwl||Q’YLW Nisa 2312(73int)/6; 2324(621int)/6. Q’YLt Nisa 2250(70)/2; 2251(1486)/3; 2286(1213)/3; 2314(447+314)/2, 4; 2315(556)/2, 4; 2316(1409)/3, 6; 2321(526)/5; 2322(661)/4; 2323(676)/4; 2324(621int)/3; 2575(N394)/2; 2577(N164)/10.

Q’YM establish? √ qwm||Q’YMW Nisa 75/1?; 2676(884)/1.

QTL kill ’wn-/’wjd √ qtl||QTLt ŠKZ 4, 5.

QYM rise against ’xyz-/’x’st √ qwm||QYMt NPi 27.

QRY call xrw-/xrwstå(38) √ qr’||QRY Nisa passim; DE12L/3?

RMY throw ’bgn-/’bgnd √ rmy||RMY QD1/passim.(39) RMYt ŠH 7; ŠTBq 14.

Š’YL ask, demand pwrs-/pwrs’d √ š’l||Š’YLW Nisa 2643(N362ext)/1.

ŠBQ let hyrz-/hyrst √ š bq||ŠBQ Wd NPi 10.

ŠDY shoot wh-/ √ š’d’||ŠDYW ŠH 13; ŠTBq 15. ŠDytt ŠH 5, 6.

ŠLH send frš’w-/fršwd √ š’l||ŠLH Wd NPi 10. ŠLHWyt? NPi 21. ŠLHWm NPi 22, 27, 38.

Appendix: The Language of the Nisa Ostraca and Awroman Parchment No. 3

Here I will answer the following question: Are the Nisa ostraca and Awroman Parchment No. 3 really written in Parthian? One may well raise such a question because Beyer [1984: 43] considered their language to be Aramaic, and Sundermann [1989: 119-120] could not decide whether they were Aramaic or Parthian. First I will discuss the Nisa ostraca, then AW3.

I. The language of the Nisa ostraca is without doubt Parthian.

Until 1960, indeed, with the very limited material then available, there had been a serious debate about the language of the Nisa ostraca (at the moment I exclude letter exercise texts from Nisa). In 1960, however, Дьяконов—Липыш [1960a; 1960b], publishing over 200 texts, definitely showed that the language is not Aramaic but Parthian. They enumerated several types of evidence, a decisive one being that some verbal forms (past partici-
pies) are written phonetically in Parthian, such as \( \text{ph}(r)\text{s}t \) and \( \text{krtk} \). Another example is \( \text{pt}\text{sy}h\text{t} \) in Nisa 194/4, etc. (already cited in 3. Methods): 
HŠKHW BHWT' ZNH W pt\text{sy}h\text{t} 'L 'HRN HWT'.

No one has and surely no one will succeed in reading this phrase in Aramaic.

To avoid any misunderstanding caused by outdated articles on the language of the Nisa ostraca, we should keep in mind the following points:
1. All the articles before 1960 are outdated. Among them Hennning [1958: 27-28] proved to be correct in principle, but insufficient.
2. Altheim-Stiehl 1963, not quoting any text from Дьяконов—Лившиц 1960a or 1960b, was already outdated when it appeared.
3. Sznycer 1962 and Altheim—Stiehl 1970 proved nothing because they concealed many texts that they did not, and apparently could not, interpret as Aramaic; for example, texts including the \( \text{ph}(r)\text{s}t \), \( \text{krtk} \) and \( \text{pt}\text{sy}h\text{t} \) above were ignored by them.(40)
4. Articles referring only to the studies in 1-3 still remain at the pre-1960 stage.

As to the letter exercise texts from Nisa, also, there is no sign that these were read in Aramaic.

II. The language of the Awroman Parchment No. 3 is most likely Parthian.

Henning [1958: 28-30] stated that the language of the parchment is Parthian; Altheim—Stiehl [1954; 1970: 483-491] alleged that it is Aramaic. That the Nisa ostraca are written in Parthian greatly strengthens Henning's view and, similarly, weakens Altheim—Stiehl's. Moreover, the increasing amount of contemporary Aramaic, as reflected in Beyer 1984, seems to afford few data favourable to Altheim—Stiehl's allegation. Some examples follow:
1. In the parchment, the Nisa ostraca and the other Parthian documents, /puhr/ 'son' is represented by the logogram BRY, not BR, without exception. On the other hand, there seems to be no examples of bry in such use in contemporary Aramaic.(41)
2. Although Altheim—Stiehl attempted to interpret the \( \text{-W} \) of MZBNW and ZBNW in the parchment as a copula (\( \text{hū}>-\bar{u} \)) of Aramaic, there seem, again, to be no examples of such a use attested in Aramaic before A. D. 53 (the date of the parchment)—cf. Beyer 1984: 249, n. 1. In the Nisa ostraca (1st century B. C.), on the contrary, we can find many examples of \( \text{-W} \) such as YNTNW, YTKYNW, and Q'YLW.
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The Nippur documents (2nd century A.D.) so far published, one in Aramaic and the others in Parthian, present another type of evidence. In them we can easily discern the difference between the scripts of Aramaic and of Parthian [Lidzbarski 1984; Livshits 1977: 170 n. 19]. The scripts of the Arwroman parchment are identical to the Parthian ones.

Furthermore, and more crucially, Altheim—Stiehl’s translation of lines 4-5 [Altheim—Stiehl 1970: 491] would make little sense as part of a sales contract, even if their interpretation should commit no grammatical violation. They translated the sentence(s) ‘...hmw(42) ’klw qdmth šḥdyн ...’ as ‘... so haben besichtigt und vermessen in seiner Gegenwart die Zeugen ...’ Their translation causes us to raise two questions:
1. What was measured? Or why, in the sales contract, was the figure/size measured not written?
2. Who measured? Altheim—Stiehl thought it was witnesses; this is so unusual in such a contract that we can easily reject their translation. These questions remain unanswered as long as we stick to the interpretation of 'KLW as Aramaic.(43) Thus, I believe that there is no way out unless we take this 'KLW as the Parthian verb /*xwar-/xwart/ ‘to swear’. For my translation of this sentence, see note 27.

All the above considerations force us to agree with the two great Aramaists: Lidzbarski, who was ‘quite clear that it [the language of the parchment] is not Aramaic’ [apud Minns 1915: 63]; and Cowley [1919: 147], who stated, ‘The text is in Pahlavi’ (his Pahlavi is now Parthian).

Notes
(1) I prefer the term 'logogram' to 'ideogram' as many Assyriologists today do. ‘Aramaecogram’ will be used when compared with another logogram in another language, such as a Sumerogram in Akkadian. All the Aramaecograms in Parthian are thought to be read heterographically in Parthian; thus, we can also call them 'heterograms'.
(2) In this paper there occur some grammatical terms used both for Aramaic and for Parthian such as 'stem'. The terms for Parthian are represented in italics when they may cause confusion.
(3) Logograms are transliterated in capitals according to the common practice.
(4) See also Gignoux 1972; MacKenzie 1987; and note 27 in this paper.
(5) I wish to thank Dr Yutaka YOSHIDA, by courtesy of whom this article became available to me.
(6) There are several forged copies of this inscription, e.g., a plaque in the British Museum (BM 136772); see Shaked 1992.
(7) When quoting the Nisa texts I give their new numbers used in Diakonoff——
Livshits 1976—, and give in brackets the former numbers in Дьяконов—Лившиц 1960a, 1960b, and 1966 if the texts were published in them. In the latter case, the new numbers of the texts No. 996 onward, yet unpublished in Diakonoff—Livshits 1977 (Texts I), were obtained from the list in Diakonoff—Livshits 1977 (Texts I): 5-7.

(8) All these texts contain the stereotyped salutation formula:

\[ \text{MN (PN) 'L (PN) ŠLM WŠRT ŠGY HWŠRT L...} \]

'From (PN) to (PN), much peace and prosperity I send...'

It originates from a salutation formula of Official Aramaic. As for such formulae, I agree with Harmatta [1957: 298] when he says 'The constantly recurring Aramaic formulae were probably treated as single units,...' By considering the context, therefore, we should assume that HWŠRT here means 'I send', not 'sent' with the transliteration HWŠRt; the latter meaning and transliteration would be expected if this logogram occurred in other Parthian texts. Except for this formula, the logograms of DE12 may be treated as those in the other texts.

(9) Moreover, since these texts are very difficult to decipher, we should not consider their readings as established.

(10) I doubt whether -t in Arsacid Parthian, at least in the Nisa texts, represents a phonetic complement. If not, it belongs to the 'endings' of logograms (with the transliteration -T). If the latter is the case, we can find already in the Nisa documents many 'artificial' forms of logograms: YNTNT, YTKYNT, and so on. This can show the quite artificial development of Parthian logograms. However, whether -t or -T is correct is irrelevant to the forms of the 'bodies'; thus, I will not refer to the matter further and the transliteration -t will be given even in Arsacid Parthian.

(11) In this paper the transcription of Arsacid Parthian is based on that in Diakonoff—Livshits 1977 (Texts I); the transcription of Sasanian Parthian is based on that used for Manichaean Parthian.

(12) Cf. ZKM 'the same' in Nisa 258 (2150), etc., the form thought to derive from ≥ + 2nd. pl. poss. suffix.

(13) In this discussion I treat the letter h/H as h/H when the former originates from the latter. The letter h/H, except in the final position of logograms, changed to the letter h/H in AW3 and the later texts.

(14) Utas [1984: 63] reported that in Frahang i Pahlavig, written in Book Pahlavi (Zoroastrian Middle Persian), 'there are five verbal ideograms with initial M, suggesting Aram, participles, four of them are apparently pa“el forms'.

(15) Of course other interpretations of the standard forms are not wholly impossible; e.g., the standard forms may be active participles, though the form of the haf‘el would be exceptional; or they may be imperatives, though the form of the pa“el would be exceptional.

(16) However, we cannot assume a priori that one Aramaeogram is to represent one Parthian verb: cf. HQ‘YM (andYT¥B) in the List. In Akkadian and in Japanese (even today) we can find many instances where one logogram has two or more heterographic readings or where one verb is represented by two or more logograms.

(17) The intransitive use of YT¥B has not been attested yet. It is certain, however, that this logogram means 'to sit' besides 'to set', just as HQ‘YM means 'to stand'/'to place' and as Middle Persian YTYBWN means 'to sit'/'to set'.

(18) However, see also Beyer's explanation for the change 'tyq>'tyq [Beyer 1984: 420].

(19) I wish to thank Dr Yoshiyuki Takashina, who gave me this suggestion.
Dr Takashina kindly suggested this process to me.

Although I cannot explain the change $q > K$, there are several other unexplainable changes of consonants in logograms such as NTR- and Q'YL. Thus, one cannot deny the possibility that KTY derived from $\sqrt{qtt}$.

One should not confuse the establishment of Parthian logograms with the ultimate origin of heterographic reading/writing in Iranian.

Of course it is also indispensable to investigate non-verbal logograms (e.g., ZKM 'the same') and phonetically written Parthian words (where medial /ä/ is represented usually without '). For the development of the Parthian heterographic writing system, see also Harmatta's very interesting suggestion [Harmatta 1981].

On the other hand, such spellings as ZY and ZNH may appear to reflect Official Aramaic forms; however, the spelling z- in zy or znh was strictly preserved in Elymaean Aramaic, most texts of which belong to the first two centuries of our era. Thus I believe that the forms of the logograms reflect those of the Aramaic contemporary with the establishment of the logograms (probably in the second century B.C.), not of Official Aramaic. Besides, it is unnecessary to assume that non-/pseudo-Aramaic forms in logograms were introduced by Parthian scribes ignorant of Aramaic; we can hardly imagine that the Akkadian writing system was invented by scribes who had little knowledge of Sumerian. Those who realized that there was no need to stick to correct Aramaic when they wished to write in Parthian could employ these artificial forms. Similarly, the adoption of the 'ending' -W in Sasanian Parthian as a present tense marker may reflect the usage of the Aramaic of c. A.D. 200.

All these verbs are assumed; we should not a priori exclude other readings.

Alternatively, 'part' (noun); see The Verb 'To Be' above.

A verb homophonous to the verb 'to eat, drink'; for the verb 'to swear', see Schwarz 1989. Herzfeld [1924: 134–135] already proposed that this logogram means 'to swear'. I tentatively transliterate and translate ll. 4–5 of AW3 as follows: '...pyhwz ḫmy 'KLW QDMTH ŠHDYN...; '...they swore together no accusation, before the witnesses...', the former half of which probably means 'they swore together that no accusation should arise from either party'. For 'pyhwz 'without accusation', from the verb /*xwaz- 'to wish, seek' (YB'H), cf. New Persian xwahan 'plaintiff'. For the shape of the letter z in the final position, see prdyz in Nisa 740–757 [Diakonoff–Livshits 1977 (Plates II): pls. 280–286]. The reading 'pyhwn (from /*xwâh- 'to call') is also possible.

A verb homophonous to the verb 'to eat, drink'; see n. 27.

See n. 32 below.

MacKenzie [1984] showed that Middle Persian HWYTN- corresponds to Parthian HWH-. Back [1986] proposed that HWYTN should be read as /anâd/ 'was (3. sg.)', and HWYTNd as /anând/ 'were (3. pl.)'. Back's reading completely fits the context (for its examples, see MacKenzie [1984]); thus, I agree with it. The Parthian equivalent of /anâd/ is /ahâz/; this reading for HWH also fits the context. On the other hand, since the 3. pl. of /ahâz/ is unattested so far in Manichaean Parthian, the reading for HWHnt remains uncertain, but it is probably either /*ahâzênd/ or */ahând/. For the origin of /ahâz/, see Gershevitch 1975: 204. As for the HWYTN-, the subjunctive-like endings of /anâd/ and /anând/ prompted me to assume that HWYTNn /anān/ in KKZ 1 stands not for subjunctive 'I should be' but simply for indicative 'I was'.

In NPi, the Middle Persian word(s) corresponding to HWHd is/are illegible. HWHd occurs three times, twice (NPi 22, 40) in subjunctive and once in indicative
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In the former, HWHd is probably read as /ahād/, 2. pl. or 3. sg. subjunctive, unless these letters are a part of [Y]HWHd /bāvād/ (cf. Skjaervø 1983b: 82, 118). HWHd in NPi 31 probably stands also for /ahād/, 3. sg. indicative; this usage of 'h’d is found in Text g/1 in Boyce 1975 (=KG 1929 in Sundermann 1981).

(32) This reading was suggested by Skjaervø [1983b: 94–95].
(33) For another, and expected meaning ‘sit’ nāyd-/nāst, see n. 17.
(35) An unpublished text to which only this logogram was referred in Дьяконов—Лившин 1966: 146, n. 36.
(36) Unpublished texts; see Diakonoff—Livshits 1976: 5.
(37) /pādistar/, derived from the past participle /pād/.
(38) It is also possible to read /nām/ ‘name’ (noun).
(39) An adjective qualifying flour; ‘crude grinding (grinded)’. The reading is uncertain; perhaps it is irrelevant to the verb 'bgn-'/bgnd.
(40) Cf. also Diakonoff—Livshits 1976: 2.
(41) brty in the bilingual inscription at Armazi (KAI 276 in Donner—Röllig 1962) cannot be an example because no one has proved that the inscription is written in Aramaic. Grelot [1958] tried to show, at most, that one can, not must, read the text in a very corrupt Aramaic; his attempt, I think, ended unsuccessfully. Texts the language of which may or may not be Aramaic, e.g., the Armazi inscription or the inscription(s) at Sevan, cannot be used as evidence to show that the language of another similar text is Aramaic. Moreover, we cannot compare PN brty zy PN in the Armazi inscription with PN BRY PN in Parthian because ·y in the former can be interpreted as the emphatic state, while ·Y in the latter cannot.

There exists no bry in the legends on the copper tetradrachms (grands modules) of the Elymaean kingdom. Augé’s misreading [Augé 1979: 100–101] was corrected by Alam [1986: 151, nn. 568 and 570] and more precisely by Haruta [1990: 144].

(42) From the photograph [Minns 1915: pl. 3], the word should be read as bmy, not bmy.
(43) √’kl ‘to eat’, of course, makes no sense.

References

34 ORIENT
FORMATION OF VERBAL LOGOGRAMS (ARAMAEOGAMS) IN PARTHIAN


Brunner, C. J., 1977: *A Syntax of Western Middle Iranian*, Delmar, N. Y.


Morano, E., 1990: Contributi all'interpretazione della bilingue greco-partica dell'Eracle


Периханян, А. Г., 1983: Общество и право Ирана в парфянский и сасанидский перио-

дь, Москва.


Schwartz, M., 1989: Pers. saungand xurdan, etc. ‘To take an oath’ (not *‘to drink
sulphur’), in *Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard*, eds. C. H. de Fouche-

Shaked, Sh., 1992: Spurious Epigraphy, in *Aspects of Iranian Culture, In honor of
Richard Nelson Frye*, eds. C. A. Bromberg, B. Goldman, P. O. Skjaervø, and


________, 1986: Verbs in Parthian and Middle Persian inscriptions, in *Studia Gramma-
tica Iranica, Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*, eds. R. Schmitt and P. O. Skjaervø,

________, 1989 Verbal Ideograms and the Imperfect in Middle Persian and Parthian, in
*Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard*, eds. C. H. de Fouche-

von Soden, W, 1968: Aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen und neu- und spätbaby-

Sundermann, W., 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts,*
Berlin: Türintexte 11, Berlin.

________, 1989: Parthisch, in *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, ed. R. Schmitt,
Wiesbaden, 114–137.


Utas, B., 1984: Verbal Ideograms in the Frahang i Pahlavik, in *Middle Iranian Studies*,

This paper is a part of results of my study supported by Grant-in-Aid for Encourage-
ment of Young Scientists, the Minstry of Education, Science and Culture of Japan.