

Ilya GERSHEVITCH

**AN OLD PERSIAN WAITING FOR GODOT**

(*Miscellanea di studi linguistici in onore  
di Walter Belardi, Roma, 1994*)

1. It was but natural for Bartholomae in 1904 to surmise from the context that in DB 28 OP *č-i-t-a* meant 'for so long': *Dadršiš č-i-t-a mām amānayæ<sup>1</sup> Arminiyai UNTIL<sup>2</sup>* 'Dadrši for so long waited for me in Armenia UNTIL'. The surmise ceased however to be tenable from the moment Weissbach in 1911 pointed out (see n. 26 below) that in the similar passage of DB 25 (quoted below, § 15), where in the Old Persian version *č-i-t-a* although expected, is not to be seen, the Elamite version has *aški inni huttaš* 'he/they did not do anything', with no visible counterpart to it in Old Persian. For, the same three Elamite words, although in their turn absent as counterpart to the *č-i-t-a* seen in DB 30 (quoted below, § 14), correspond to *č-i-t-a* in the Elamite version of DB 28: *Daturšiš aški inni huttaš un zatiš UNTIL*, lit. 'Dadrši anything not he-did forme he-waited UNTIL'. From DB 28 we thus learn firstly, that *č-i-t-a mām amānayæ* meant 'he did nothing but wait for me', and secondly, that *aški inni huttaš* is an Elamogram of *č-i-t-a*, and not a translation of this Old Persian word into Elamite. The second conclusion is as inescapable as the first, because the three Elamite words constitute a finite clause whose verb stands in the same 3rd sg. preterite as El. *zatiš*, counterpart to the OP 3rd sg. impf. *amānayæ*, while *č-i-t-a* cannot be the 3rd sg. impf. of any OP verb, unequipped as it is with the initial *a* required by any OP imperfect for augment. Moreover, to say that *aški inni huttaš* 'translates' *č-i-t-a* would be absurd, as undoubtedly the only correct 'translation' of *aški inni huttaš* into OP was *\*čišči<sup>3</sup> nai akunavæ*, just as into Aramaic it could not but have been *mnd<sup>c</sup>m l<sup>oc</sup>b(y)d<sup>t</sup>*. These are in fact the Aramaic words, followed by 'he/they waited for me', which in the Aramaic version of DB 28 correspond to OP *č-i-t-a* and to El. *aški inni huttaš*. The same three Aramaic words also correspond to OP *č-i-t-a* in DB 30, where the Elamite version lacks the expected *aški inni huttaš*, and to El. *aški inni huttaš* in DB 25, where the OP version lacks the expected *č-i-t-a*.

2. Since what we have seen proves *aški inni huttaš* to be the Elamogram of *č-i-t-a*, i.e. whenever an Elamographer under dictation heard *č-i-t-a* he wrote *aški inni* plus the appropriate form of the verb *hutta-*,<sup>5</sup> the Elamite language evidently lacked a single word corresponding exactly in meaning and use to OP *č-i-t-a*, wherefore in Elamography the cue for representing it was taken from the ordinary Elamite way of translating (as distinct from elamographing) not *č-i-t-a* by itself, but phrases whose verb was governed by it. The Elamogram assures us that the translating sentence was in Elamite a paraphrase beginning with *aški inni huttaš* 'he did not do anything'. At the Elamite words following within the unattested paraphrase we can only guess, but their gist is sure, in the given example, to have been 'other than wait'. If next we ask why the words or word meaning 'other than' were in Elamography (as distinct from a paraphrasing translation) omitted, the answer can only be: so as to forestall at 'play-back'<sup>6</sup> the emergence in Persian of the paraphrase literally translated from the Elamite, instead of the *č-i-t-a amānayæ* paraphrased by it. Such a precaution, drilled into scribes in scribal schools, would be easy enough for scribes to remember to apply under dictation, as soon as they heard a *č-i-t-a*. Compared with them, scribes at play-back were at a disadvantage. Unless they noticed the deliberate omission of 'other than', there would be nothing to stop them from playing back an *aški inni hutta-* in verbatim translation. The slip-up, we shall see (§ 19), was apt to happen, without our having to think on its account any the less highly of its culprits' elamographic accomplishments. Negative warnings consisting in omission, are notoriously less eye-catching than positive ones spelled out.<sup>7</sup>

3. If an Elamo-Persian bilingual, trained in Elamography, cannot be blamed for such a slip-up, how much less can one blame an Elamo-Aramaic bilingual translating from a text not Elamite but elamographed, for taking the absence of 'other than' at face value and writing, in Aramaic, 'did nothing, waited'. We could blame him only if there were reasons to think that no Elamo-Aramaic bilingual however much worth his salt, would have been entrusted with the responsible task of translating the Behistun Inscription unless he were known to be versed in addition in the highly technical skill of Elamography. But what reason can there be for so thinking, especially as, whether one likes it or not, the Aramaic 'did nothing' tallies with the Elamograph, and not with the Persograph from which one might think that the Aramaic version (and the Babylonian, see presently) was translated. There is of course no need to assume that our Elamo-Aramaic bilingual was so ill-acquainted with the Persian language that he would not have understood a Persian native telling him '*č-i-t-a amānayæ*'. He was simply not in the habit, a

habit which he could have acquired only through relentless drill, of thinking in Persian while looking at Elamite. We need not even suppose him not to have suspected that odd as it looks, the comma he mentally registered between 'he/they did nothing' and 'he/they waited', might stand for 'other than'. He may well have suspected this and decided, because he could not be certain of it, that his safest course lay in a calque. By a calque he would conveniently divest himself of responsibility for a queerness of expression, which he took the Elamograph to assure him had been the king's own.

4. To assess the agreement of the Aramaic translation with the Elamograph otherwise, one would have to take the omission of 'other than' for a peculiarity of idiomatic speech genuinely Aramaic. That two languages genetically so unrelated as Aramaic and Elamite should independently have taken to so remarkable an elision, strains belief, and that even to Elamite the elision was not native is clear from *č-i-t-a's* having become elamographable only through it. In addition, the unauthenticity of 'anything did not do, waited' in Aramaic transpires from the Babylonian version, which states at the end of DB 28: 'Dardarshu an expedition<sup>8</sup> did not do, they waited for me UNTIL'. This wording suffices to show that the Babylonian was translated from the Aramaic, and not vice versa. On general grounds one would always have thought that this was so, were it not for the extant fragments of the Aramaic version belonging to a late fifth century copy, wherefore their inclusion of the count of prisoners and killed, absent on the rock from both the Elamograph and the Persograph, was naturally thought to stem from the Babylonian version which on the rock gives it for each battle. This distribution of the count-figures does however not contradict our inference from DB 28 that the earliest translation of Darius's narrative, inevitably (we may now specify) made from the Elamograph, was into Aramaic. The distribution merely places our inference in a chronological setting not heretofore considered.

5. As soon as the Persograph made from the Elamograph was added on the rock to the latter, a postscript to both (DB 70) was additionally incised, proclaiming that their narrative had meanwhile been circulated throughout the empire on parchment and on clay, i.e. in Aramaic translation<sup>9</sup>. The circulation by then of the *original* Aramaic translation (see § 7), supplies for it a terminus ante quem. The translation cannot have been made later than during the protracted time when the Persograph was being first, worked out on clay from the Elamograph, next, read out to Darius for approval, next, turned into a clean copy (see § 11), and finally, carved into the rock. Is it then at all likely that the Aramaic translation that was circulated, contained what the Persograph simul-

taneously being prepared for publication does *not* contain, the count of rebels killed or captured in each battle? Should we not rather think that a Babylonian translation, likewise as yet devoid of count-figures, was commissioned *and* recorded on clay at the same time, as part and parcel of one single, ambitious plan: to have on the rock, in addition to the Elamograph already there standing, its Persograph as well as a Babylonian translation, and to circulate an Aramaic translation as soon as possible, hence perhaps even before the time-consuming process had reached completion, of first working out the Persograph on clay and next copying it into the rock.

6. So realistic a time-table cannot be brushed aside lightly, especially as to reach it we started from DB 28. It is impossible that an Aramaean translating from the Babylonian what he took to be the king's own words, would have rendered 'did not do an expedition' (see § 4) by 'did not do anything'. The converse, by contrast, is not impossible in terms of substance, as unlike 'anything' of 'an expedition', 'an expedition' is of 'anything' in the context of DB 28 an accurate enough explanation. In terms of circumstances, however, it is from the above time-table that the converse derives encouraging support. By it the *original* Babylonian translation will have been ready, on clay, by the time the Persograph was ready on clay, both devoid of count-figures. The Persograph went straight into the rock. The Babylonian had to wait for the completion of not only the carving of the Persograph but also the *recarving* of the Elamograph, since not before could the unwelcome decision have been reached that, there being no space left for it on the façade of the rock, it would have to be carved into an overhang. While the Babylonian on clay thus lay in abeyance, the count-figures became available, and a Babylonian editor will have been appointed to insert them, each pair of figures after the battle to which it pertained.

7. Insertions at so many points of the text would require a drastic overhaul of the Babylonian tablets to be handed to the stonemason, so drastic in fact as to be achievable only by writing out the whole text afresh. The need to do so, combined with the need to reread the original translation carefully for identification of battles matching the figures, provided the editor with a unique opportunity to 'improve' here and there on the received wording of the original Babylonian translation, in consultation perhaps with someone knowledgeable in high position. It is such an 'improvement' which we may recognize in the Babylonian 'an expedition' where the Aramaic has the Elamograph's 'anything'. 'Improvement' involves innovation; and what *can* it have been on which, after the Aramaic had been circulated, the words 'did not do an expedition' represented in DB 28 an innovation, if not the *Babylonian* word for 'any-

thing'? The inclusion, therefore, of the count-figures in the late fifth century copy of the Aramaic version, need point to no more than that at some stage the *original* Aramaic translation from which the *original* Babylonian translation was made, was collated with the *revised* Babylonian. From the latter it is possible that a few minor 'improvements', additional to the provision of count-figures, were taken over by the Aramaean reviser of the *original* Aramaic. That the Babylonian editor's replacement of the original *Babylonian* 'anything' with 'an expedition' is not among them, is for us a piece of good fortune. Had it been, we should be the poorer of valuable confirmation that not only does the Aramaic stem from the Elamograph, but the Babylonian stems from the Aramaic<sup>10</sup>.

8. The reader will now appreciate why in § 4 we declared the Babylonian wording to confirm the linguistic unauthenticity in Aramaic of the wording 'did not do anything, waited'. Were this wording not unauthentic in Babylonian, the Babylonian editor<sup>11</sup> would have understood that it meant 'did not do anything other than wait'. His trying to 'improve' on it by replacing the 'anything' Darius never said with 'an expedition' likewise not uttered by the king, shows that as a means of expressing 'he but waited' the wording was alien to his own, Babylonian language. Was it then less alien to the likewise Semitic, Aramaic language? If not, why did the original Babylonian translator, who surely knew Aramaic well, translate it in a manner inviting, as soon as a chance of reconsideration arose, the lop-sided editorial 'improvement' we have seen?

9. Of DB 28 all we are left to deal with is the absence from the Elamograph of the Persograph's 'in Armenia' (see § 1), before we pick up from the end of § 1 the two DB passages which, although parallel to DB 28, show serious discrepancies between the four versions. Preliminarily however, to prepare the reader for our treatment of discrepancies, we may in four paragraphs (§§ 9-12) remind him<sup>12</sup>, adding refinements pertinent to the time-table proposed in § 5, of the vicissitudes of DB's textual transmission as they emerge from the Elamograph's erstwhile aloneness on the rock, before the plan was conceived which we described in § 5. That aloneness reflects a time when as yet no means had been found, or at least been sufficiently developed, for presenting in phonetically written Persian so long an inscription. The carving on rock of this first Elamograph of Darius's narrative, was the work of a stonemason who copied from clay-tablets the text's Elamite signs. Each time he went up the mountain for a day's work, it stands to reason that no more tablets would be put in his satchel than he could be expected to copy during the day, and that all the tablets would be of a small size convenient for him to handle in

addition to hammer and chisel. There is no telling whether as he finished copying each tablet, he put it back into his satchel or threw it away. But the possibility will have been guarded against, that by some accident a tablet might get smashed before he had copied or finished copying it. He would then have no option but to return to the foot of the mountain, so as to collect from a spare-set kept there, a dead accurate copy of the small tablet he had lost. Of what, though, had the lost tablet itself, and therefore all the small tablets packed into his satchel each morning, been a copy? Surely of nothing less than the precious master-text jealously guarded in archive at Susa, the only record in existence of many hours of speech that from the king's lips had tumbled straight into the clay where the scribe fixed it. Of the master-text's clay the tablets cannot but have been as large in size as manageable, for the scribe to remain free to concentrate wholly on the flow of the king's words. There can be no doubt that access to the master-text would be granted only when nothing short of it would do, and only under strict supervision. Access was of course granted for copying the large tablets onto the successively numbered small tablets needed by the stone-mason. But as soon as the small-size set was ready, the master-text will again have been locked up. It makes no sense to allow also the spare-set to have been copied straight from the master-text. For not only would this have prolonged the exposure of the latter to danger, but if ever the stone-mason should require a duplicate, it was essential, high up on the rock, that its beginning and its end tally exactly with those of the tablet he had lost. To attend to this prerequisite while recopying the master-text, would have been ridiculous. This is why we may take it for certain that the text of the spare-set was a copy not immediately of the master-text, but of the text copied from the master-text for the stone-mason to copy into the rock.

10. In practice it is unlikely that up on the mountain mishaps happened often, or that the spare-set would lose some of its links through the stone-mason's *not* having been instructed to bring back duplicates of lost tablets. Hence a complete spare-set will have been left over from the carving of the first Elamograph on the rock, which to judge from what the Persepolis tablets have taught us of Achaemenian bureaucratic practice, would as a matter of routine have gone into archive. To have kept the spare-set would become a cause of relief and satisfaction, when not long afterwards the execution of the plan we described in § 5 was taken in hand. For from that moment onward there would be hurry, Darius, eager to see Mount Behistun covered and the empire flooded with the written narrative of his exploits, leaving no peace to those in charge of operations. The available spare-set could straightway be handed either to the

converter, for conversion into phonetically written Persian, or to the translator, for translation into Aramaic. Whichever of the two men received the spare-set, could begin working on it at once, there being no need to waste time on first copying it, as neither man would be taking its tablets up any mountain. But a copy taking time to be made, will have had to be supplied to the one of the two who was *not* given the spare-set for instant inception of work on it. That permission would be given to copy the master-text afresh for this purpose, seems obvious. Which of the two men, though, would be kept waiting for it? Surely not the one who foreseeable would take much longer over the task assigned to him than the other. By far the easier of the two tasks was the translation into Aramaic. Thus even before we reach the confirmation we shall find in § 17, we have reason for *a priori* supposing that the spare-set went to the converter. His task will in fact have taken him so long to accomplish, that by the time the Persograph was ready to be carved into the rock, not only will the master-text have been copied afresh, the copy have been translated into Aramaic, and copies of the Aramaic have been circulated throughout the lands, but also a Babylonian translation could easily have been ready on clay, made from the Aramaic. From here onward we are back at what we said in §§ 5-7, to which all that needs adding is that the *re-carving* of the Elamograph (see § 6) will have been done from the tablets of the spare-set, available for fresh use after the converter had done with them. We add this only by way of explanation as to why the second Elamograph on the rock, carved after the Persograph was carved into it, does not seem to differ in the least from the admittedly by now largely illegible earlier one (cf. below, n. 16).

11. Lastly we may remind readers (see the beginning of § 9) of the textual history of the Persograph on the rock. It too was copied into the rock by a stone-mason, from clay-tablets inscribed this time by the converter, of which again a duplicate spare-set may have been made by way of precaution. Their text was the final clean copy of a draft on clay the converter had laboriously prepared, scanning the copy handed to him of the Elamograph (see § 10), or else listening to its being slowly played back to him by an Elamographist assistant. Of that draft a clean copy had to be made by the converter for the stone-mason, because on the occasion when he read it out to Darius for approval, the king introduced a number of changes<sup>13</sup>. These should in principle be identifiable as Darius's own by discrepancy between the Persograph and the Elamograph, as is well illustrated by DB 25 (see §§ 15-19). Any such intervention by Darius, since it took place at the last minute, will not show up in the by then already published, i.e. circulated, original Aramaic translation, and will show up in the Babylonian translation only if a second thought, having oc-

curred to Darius while he was listening to the convertor, struck him as sufficiently important to warrant his personal intervention also in the Babylonian. This was the case for example with the religious quandary of DB 62<sup>14</sup>, but not for example with the slip-up he had incurred in DB 41<sup>15</sup>.

12. Elsewhere, if in minor discrepancies relating to clarity of expression the Babylonian agrees with the Persograph against the Elamograph, the reason may be simply that a given improvement of expression had occurred to the editor of the original Babylonian (see § 7) independently of Darius's having thought of it while he was listening to the convertor. But discrepancies between Persograph and Elamograph where the translations, or one of them, agree with the former, need not invariably be due to afterthought on anybody's part. The extant Aramaic is certainly the outcome of several occasions on which the text was copied, and the revised Babylonian on the rock will just like the other two versions on the rock have been carved from small clay-tablets which themselves were copies made from the Babylonian editor's final clean copy. Hence the hazard of lapses of attention on the part of copyists, extends into an area lying well beyond that which we have attempted to outline in respect of the Elamite and the Persian versions.

13. Bearing in mind the above considerations on textual transmission, which we regard as supplementary to, even if somewhat corrective of, those offered by Greenfield and Porten at p. 16, and by von Voigtlander at pp. 7 sq., we now turn to the discrepancies referred to at the beginning of § 9. First 'in Armenia', in DB 28, on view in the Persograph, but not in the Elamograph<sup>16</sup> and not in either the Aramaic or the Babylonian version. What more obvious explanation of this discrepancy can there be, but that at dictation Darius, having said just before in DB 28, and already in DB 27 and DB 26, that Dadrši was in Armenia, did not think of repeating this after 'he waited', but bethought himself when weeks later he heard the sentence read out by the convertor?

14. It is from DB 30 that we learn what the scribe would have done under dictation in DB 28, had the king said 'waited in Armenia'. He would have translated this, writing with inversion natural in Elamite<sup>17</sup>, 'in Armenia waited'. DB 30 reads in the four versions as follows:

OP: *vaumisæ č-i-t-a mām amānayæ arminiyai UNTIL*

El: *maumišša harminuya.p ikki zatiš UNTIL*

Aram. (p. 30): Va[umi]sa anything [not did. He was w]aiting for me [

Bab. (line 57, pp. 27 and 57): Vaumisa another<sup>18</sup> expedition not did. In Urartu<sup>19</sup> they were waiting for me UNTIL

At play-back Elamographers, familiar also with the word-order natural to Persian, would in Persian get it right irrespective of whether or not the scribe from whose hand they were reading had chosen to invert it. However, the four words preceding UNTIL in the Elamograph on the rock, leave OP *č-i-t-a* and *mām* unaccounted for. They would only be accounted for if in the Elamograph we saw, with inversion,

*\*maumišša aški inni huttaš un harminuya.p ikki zatiš UNTIL,*

which is why it cannot be fortuitous that precisely this Elamite wording, and no other, accounts also for the two Semitic translations combined.<sup>20</sup> One is thus forced to conclude that here a haplography was incurred at copying, due perhaps to the right-hand portion of the Elamite *har*-sign having the same shape as the Elamite *aš*-sign. Within our reconstruction of the text-transmission (§§ 9-12) the only possible culprit will be the stone-mason. Curtailment for whatever reason of the above Elamite sequence by *him*, will allow it to have remained intact in the spare-set as well as in the second copy of the master-text, and thereby account for its transpiring intact from both the Persograph and the translations<sup>21</sup>.

15. Even more instructive, and in our view virtually settling the case argued in this tribute to Walter Belardi, is the discrepancy affecting DB 25. The four versions give its end as follows:

OP: *kāræ hayæ mana ka(m)pa(n)dæ nāmā dahyāuš mādai avada mām amānayæ UNTIL* ‘my army, Kampanda by name a district in Media, there it waited for me UNTIL’

EL: *taššup appa unina aški inni huttaš dāyauš kampandaš hiše mada.pe ikki hami zatiš UNTIL* ‘my troops anything not they did, a district Kampanda its name in Media, there they waited UNTIL’

Aram. (p. 24): [my troops in Media any]thing not d[id]. They were [wai]ting for me [there in] Kampanda [in] Media [UNTIL ...]

Bab. (line 47, pp. 24 and 57): Vidarna another expedition against Media not did. In Kampada in Media there they waited for me UNTIL.

The 3rd person verbal form meaning ‘waited’ is in both Old Persian and Elamite a single one for the singular and plural. Its subject is ‘my army’, elamographed by the El. pluralis tantum ‘my troops’. The troops are ‘my’, but because, as stated earlier in DB 25, they are under the command of ‘a Persian, Vidarna by name, my servant’<sup>22</sup> the Babylonian editor, by way of ‘improvement’ (see § 7), replaced them with ‘Vidarna’ as initial subject<sup>23</sup>. The crux, however, of

the discrepancy of the four versions, lies in the absence of the expected *č-i-t-a* from the Persograph.

16. It does not take long to realize that by the rule of inversion we saw in § 14, and considering that the Persograph's *mām* is represented in both translations but not in the Elamograph, what Darius said at dictation must have been

*\*kāræ hayæ mana č-i-t-a mām amānayæ mā dai, ka(m)pa(n)dæ nāmā dahyāuš mā dai, avada amānayse UNTIL,*

which sequence the scribe will have correctly recorded as

*\*taššup appa unina aški inni huttaš un mada.pe ikki zatiš dāyauš kam-pandaš hiše mada.pe ikki hami zatiš UNTIL.*

Translated from this Elamite wording, the Aramaic and the Babylonian read as we have learned to expect that they should read. The Elamograph on the rock, however, quoted in § 15, is clearly the outcome of the eyes of someone copying our reconstructed Elamograph having jumped from the final *iš*-sign of *huttaš* (*hu-ud-da-iš*)<sup>24</sup> to the final *iš*-sign of the first of the two *zatiš* (*za-ti-iš*).

17. The culprit was not, this time, the stone-mason (contrast § 14). The stone-mason engraved accurately enough what he saw on the small tablet copied by the culprit from the master-text. Of that tablet a duplicate formed part of the spare-set (see the middle of § 9) which in § 10 we said was given to either the convertor or the Aramaean translator, whichever of the two was not given it being given a copy made afresh from the master-text. In § 10 we left open (save for an *a priori* assumption) the question as to which of the two men was given which of the two copies. The answer now stares us in the face: only a copy made *afresh* from the master-text could have supplied the elamographic sequence (reconstructed by us in § 16) underlying the Aramaic translation (and the 'improved' Babylonian) quoted in § 15; the convertor therefore worked from the spare-set, whose Elamite wording coincided with that on the rock (likewise quoted in § 15). By this answer the culprit was the first-ever scribe to copy the master-text, onto small tablets of which the duplicate spare-set went to the convertor.

18. In now turning to the convertor himself, we must not overrate the fact that in the Elamograph of the Behistun Inscription the phrase *aški inni huttaš* occurs for the first time at DB 25. The convertor, although primarily an expert in phonetic orthography, was by no means ill-trained in the technicalities of Elamography. He knew very well the rule of our §2, witness his identification

of the phrase as Elamogram of *č-i-t-a* in DB 28 (see §§1 and 4), the passage from which we in fact extracted the rule. Admittedly in that passage it would have been hard for a knowledgeable Elamographer to go wrong, as in it the phrase is followed immediately by *un zatiš*. However the convertor did not slip up in DB 30 either, and this not only because DB 28 had by then alerted him to *č-i-t-a*, but also because of his presumably almost instinctive awareness of the inversion required within the Elamite sequence as reconstructed by us from the Aramaic translation (see § 14). Why then did he slip up in DB 25? That no previous occurrence of *č-i-t-a* had alerted him is a mitigating factor, but we may be sure that he would have spurned pleading it. He *will* have thought of *č-i-t-a*, he *will* have considered inversion. But while the inversion within our reconstructed Elamite of § 14 affected, as surely was usual, a but one-word geographical designation, ‘Armenia’, in DB 25 (see § 15) the geographical designation that would have been affected by inversion consisted of a whole five words, ‘a-district Kampanda<sup>25</sup> its-name in-Media there’.

19. The Persian outcome of so unbalanced an inversion the convertor, probably rightly, did not think the king would have used. By accordingly abstaining from inversion, as would have been all right only if *aški inni huttaš* did *not* stand for *č-i-t-a*, the convertor can be seen to have left himself no option but to persograph the phrase as *\*čišči nai akunavæ*, in the draft he was going to read out to the king. Naturally, had DB 25 followed upon DB 28 and DB 30, instead of preceding them, he would have known better. ‘Have you taken leave of your senses?’, we seem to hear Darius snap at him. ‘Me, the king, proclaiming *my* army to have done nothing! Strike out this rubbish. And stick in a *mām* after *avada!*’ Dumbfounded, the convertor dared not explain to the despot our rules of §§ 2 and 14. And the despot, who in the course of the convertor’s recitation had in his turn been presented with DB 25 before DB 28 could have refreshed his memory, forgot in his indignation that his *mām* had been preceded by *č-i-t-a*.

20. We are at last free to turn to *č-i-t-a* itself, having learned from the preceding pages that its meaning is obtainable from the Elamogram *aški inni huttaš* ‘nothing he-did’, by replacing its ‘he-did’ with ‘but’. This new insight puts out of the running the only two explanations that have so far found adherents. The earlier is Bartholomae’s (col. 585), who, normalizing the spelling as *čitā*, saw in the first syllable the stem of the In.-Ir. interrogative pronoun *ki-/či-*, translated the word ‘for so long’, and suggested that this meaning evolved from a question: ‘He waited; for how long? Until...’. Szemerényi, drawing on Benveniste’s previous identification of Parthian *čid* (spelled *cyd*) ‘always’ with the

Digoron durative particle *cid*, derived both from Bartholomae's *čitā*, translating the latter accordingly 'always, all the while', a meaning which he describes as 'indefinite'. For the tail-end of the word neither scholar offered a meaning.

21. In the tail-end, though, must lie the 'but' of the 'nothing but' we have ascertained. What in *č-i-t-a* precedes the 'but' must be a word conveying the sense of 'nothing'. It is not unusual for the interrogative neuter singular pronoun 'what?' to be used in this sense. Suffice it to refer to English 'what does it matter' or 'what do I care'. Bartholomae was therefore right in making for the interrogative, and not the indefinite sense of *ki-/či-*, but what in 1904 he was in no position to see,<sup>26</sup> is that the pronoun is contradicted by the tail-end's 'but', wherefore in *č-i-t-a* there must lie not its stem, but its concrete nom.-acc. sg. neuter, corresponding to the *aški inni* 'anything not' = 'nothing' of *č-i-t-a*'s Elamogram. That neuter occurs by itself in Avestan as both *čit* (with *-t* from an original sandhi-alternation *-d/t*) and *čim*, in Vedic only as *kim*. Since of the two sandhi-variants *d* and *t* it is *d* one expects in Old Indo-Iranian juxtaposition with a following vowel, the word for 'but' we are seeking in *č-i-t-a* cannot consist of no more than the final *ā*, but must be the final *tā*, in other words, the OP spelling represents not /čitā/, but /čin-tā/ from \**čim-tā*.

22. Of the demonstrative pronoun *a-* the every-day neuter sing. abl. was *ahmāt* in Avestan, *asmād/t* in Vedic. But the older ablative, long ousted from the paradigm, was *ād/t*, just as of the dem. pron. *ta-*, the original ablative *tād/t* was ousted by *tasmād/t*. The two prehistoric ablatives survived only as adverbial fossils meaning 'thus, then', *tād/t* only in Vedic, *ād/t* in both Vedic and, spelled *āat*, Avestan, where however *āat* in addition actually meant 'but'.<sup>27</sup> The ablative, whose post-vocalic word-final *-d/t* was lost in OP, denotes apartness by definition. Originally therefore \**čim tād/t* will have meant 'nothing but *this*'. As tail-end, however, of the OP juxtaposition *čintā*, *-tā* will by the sixth century have long ceased to be identifiable with the ablative, defunct in Iranian, of its own demonstrative stem. This explains the retention by *-tā* of no more than the disjunctive notion expressed in English by 'but'.

23. The eclipse of demonstrative emphasis began in the present idiom already in Indo-Iranian times. For now that with defunct ablatival *tād/t* the word for 'nothing but' stands identified in Old Iranian, one cannot help recognizing it, with defunct ablatival *ād/t*, in two verses of Book IV of the Rigveda. One is *kim ād āmatraṇi sakhyāni sākhibhyaḥ kadā nū te bhrātrām pra bravāma* (23.6), where Geldner, taking *ād* for the usual 'dann', was forced to translate *pra bravāma* twice: 'Dürfen wir dann deine Freundschaft ein Gefäß für die Freun-

de nennen? Wann dürfen wir wohl von deiner Bruderschaft öffentlich sprechen?’ No such awkwardness has to be put up with, if on the strength of OP *čintā* one takes the two lines for a single interrogative sentence: ‘When (*kadā*) may we proclaim (thy) friendship, thy brotherhood, as nothing but (this, namely) a vessel for friends?’. The other verse (30.7), *kim ād utāsi vrtrahan māghavan manyumáttamaḥ átrāha dānum ātiraḥ*, was translated by Geldner ‘Und bist du auch noch der Grimmigste, du freigebiger Vrtratöter? D a m a l s unterdrücktest du den Dānu’. Here, even if one grants Geldner the ‘auch noch’ he in vol. I, p. 458 defends in a footnote, his emphasis on ‘damals’ would lose nothing in justification by a ‘nothing but’: ‘And art thou still a nothing but (this, namely) the fiercest, O liberal Vrtra-slayer? On *that* occasion you (in your capacity of ‘nothing but the fiercest’) overcame the Dānu’. Our parenthesis ‘(this, namely)’ is intended to illustrate the liability we argued in § 22, of demonstrative emphasis to slip away in such contexts from the consciousness of speakers.

24. Curiosity is however aroused by two facts which it is hard to think would not lead to a kind of cross-fertilization. On the one hand to Ved. *kim ād* there would in OP correspond a *\*čim ā* just as there would to OP *čintā* a *\*kim*   *tād* in Vedic, i.e. within Indo-Iranian a variation is discernible in the choice of demonstrative stem juxtaposed to the neuter nom.-acc. sing. of *ki-/či-*. On the other hand the original, pronominal ending *-d/t* of that neuter, surviving in Av. *čit* (and in Lat. *quid*), was but secondarily replaced in Indo-Iranian times with the nominal ending *-m*, a replacement which in Old Iranian remained optional down to historical times. Should one not expect, therefore, that at least in Iranian the ablative demonstratives *tād/t* and *ād/t* would combine for expression of ‘nothing but’ not only with *čim*, but also with *čid/t*? With *tād/t* the outcome would be *\*čistā* in Avestan, *\*čistā* in Old Persian, from either of which a Later Iranian *\*čist* might be expected, meaning ‘nothing but’. With *ād/t* the outcome would be *\*čidā* in Avestan, *\*čidā* in Old Persian, giving rise in both Parthian and Digoron to a word *\*čid* meaning ‘nothing but’. Should then the actually existing *čid* of Parthian and Digoron, on account of which Szemerényi argued that Bartholomae’s OP *čitā* meant ‘always’, not on the contrary have evolved its meaning from that of ‘nothing but’ of its Old Iranian ancestor, which then in Old Persian, with lost final dental, would have been *\*čidā*, a predictable variant of the /*čintā*/ we have elicited from *č-i-t-a*?<sup>28</sup> In Digoron, where *cid* has been reduced to no more than a durative particle, there is no way of testing the answer to this question. Parthian *čid*, however, is not wholly refractory to testing.

25. It is only because in a native glossary the meaning of *cyd* is given in Sogdian as *r'mnd* (Henning, 1940, p. 36, (23) ), that Henning translated *cyd* by 'stets, immer' at most of its occurrences in the edition of Parthian fragments he published in 1934. Not however in Fragment *b*, lines 7-9 (p. 854), where he used 'gerade',<sup>29</sup> or in Fragment *g*, lines 115-118 (p. 872), where he used 'gar'.<sup>30</sup> He was there evidently aiming at subtler aptness than 'immer' or 'stets' are capable of providing. This aim can be achieved just as incisively by translating in Fragment *b* 'speak to him with nothing but kindness', and in Fragment *g* 'so that everywhere thou doest nothing but beg'. 'Nothing but' suits in fact *cyd* in most contexts more revealingly than 'always'.

26. Does it then follow that also Sogd. *rāmand* means 'nothing but'? Broadly speaking the answer is almost affirmative, but only because the word's original meaning predisposed it to serving in this sense. The *SCE* passage, for instance, in which a husband and wife are said to be quarrelling *rāmand* (line 435), almost cries out for a rendering 'they do nothing but quarrel'. Elsewhere, too, it does not take long to convince oneself that 'nothing but' suits most contexts of *rāmand* at least as well as does 'always', and sometimes better. 'Always' is in any case not the translation which the brilliant first editor of the *SCE*, Gauthiot, offered of *rāmand*. He rendered the word by 'sans cesse', a phrase, that is, which by its negative turn is not very remote from 'nothing but'. In their *Grammaire* neither Gauthiot nor Benveniste followed up this translation etymologically. By now, however, it has become impossible not to do so, as meanwhile, in 1948, Henning at p. 313 adduced as parallel to a Sogdian cosmogonical passage containing *rāmand*, a Middle Persian cosmogonical passage in which to *rāmand* there corresponds the MPers. hapax *an-aspēn*, as read by Henning.<sup>31</sup> His etymology of it was 'not resting', to the MPers. verb *asp-*, in Manichean *hsp-*, 'to rest'. It would seem unresourceful not to apply this prescription also to *rāmand* 'sans cesse', by deriving the Sogdian word from OIran. \**a-rāmanta-*, a thematicized compound of privative *a-* and the present participle of *rām-* 'to rest'.

27. The gloss quoted in § 25 assures us that in the cosmogonical context just referred to the Superior Wheel, which in Middle Persian was turning *ana-spēn* and in Sogdian *rāmand*, would in Parthian have been turning *čid*. In all three languages the wheel 'but turned', ceaselessly. Just so ceaselessly would Dadrši in DB 28 (see § 1) have been waiting for Godot, at a loss but for waiting, had not Darius released him, by his UNTIL, from not doing anything *else*.

28. Summary. Old Iranian used *čīn-tā(d/t)* and *\*čīd-ā(d/t)*, and Vedic used *kim ād*, lit. ‘what but (this)?’, for ‘nothing but’. The proof lies in the Elamogram of OP *č-i-t-a*, which reveals in addition that the original Aramaic translation of the Behistun Inscription, the one alluded to in DB 70, was made from the Elamograph, and the original Babylonian translation, from the original Aramaic. The original Babylonian translation suffered editorial revision before it went to the rock. The original Aramaic translation was subsequently collated with the revised Babylonian, from which, however, apart from the casualty figures (themselves still later perhaps here and there corrected), it took over only a few minor changes. The clay from which the first Elamograph on the rock was copied, was a copy of the master-text. Before it was copied into the rock, a spare-copy was made of it. That spare-copy was used for conversion of *its* Elamite into phonetically written Persian, where after it was from *it* that the second Elamograph was carved into the rock. The original Aramaic was a translation made not from it, but from an independent, fresh copy of the master-text.<sup>32</sup>

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The reasons why it is more accurate to normalize the spelling *a-m-a-n-y* as *amānayē* than as *amānaya* (and below, § 15, the spellings *m-n-a* and *y a-v-d-a* as *mana* and *avada* than as *manā* and *avadā*) were explained by the present author in 1988. It is true that *amānaya* does not mislead the reader on the OP *spelling*, provided that the editor invariably normalizes, as Schmitt still does, the word-final *a*-sign as *-ā*. But there never was a tenable reason for thus inducing innocent readers to think that the ancient Persians actually *said* /manā/, /avadā/, /utā/, etc. for ‘of me’, ‘there’, ‘and’, etc. The support for this notion, sought by Karl Hoffmann in the OP word-final spellings *-i-y*, *-u-v* (allegedly representing a lengthening of word-final *-i*, *-u* to *-ī*, *-ū*), is invalidated by spellings like *m-i-y*, *h-u-v*, which would then have to stand for *\*/māi/*, *\*/haū/*.

<sup>2</sup> UNTIL is used throughout this article as an abbreviation of ‘until I arrived in Media’, irrespective of the language in which this phrase of Darius's is found couched.

<sup>3</sup> Or *\*čīscī*, see item (6) of n. 12 below, at p. 132.

<sup>4</sup> On Aram. *čbyd* beside *čbd* for ‘he did’ see Greenfield and Porten, p. 31, n. 17.

<sup>5</sup> Corresponding to *huttaš zatiš* (after *aški inni*) for OP ‘he but waited’ (which will have served also for the OP imperative ‘do but wait’), Elamographers will have written *\*huttašni zatišni* for OP ‘let him but wait’, *\*huttamanka zatimanka* for OP ‘I am but waiting’, *\*huttanra zatinra* for OP ‘he will but wait’, etc. (see Hallock, ‘The finite verb in Achaemenid Elamite’, *JNES*, 1959, 1-19), in other words scribes writing under Persian dictation will have taken their cue for the conjugal form of the verb *hutta-*, from that of the verb preceded in OP by *č-i-t-a*.

<sup>6</sup> I.e. at utterance or silent reading in Persian language of words as they succeeded each other in elamographed form on a clay-tablet or other inscribed material.

<sup>7</sup> Note that even if Elamite syntax should have required, as does English, the verb depending on the omitted 'other than' to stand in the infinitive (or other uninflected form), this would only in exceptional syntactic contexts have furnished Elamographers at play-back with a positive warning, additional to the negative one supplied by the absence of 'other than'. For as we saw in n. 5, the Elamographer writing under dictation was bound to place that verb in the same conjugational form as he had heard the dictating Persian employ for its Persian counterpart (the 3rd sg./pl. preterite in the case of *amānayaē = zatiš*).

<sup>8</sup> von Voigtlander prints (p. 57, line 53) 'another expedition', but the word for 'other' occurs in the Babylonian of only DB 25 and DB 30.

<sup>9</sup> That the parchment was inscribed in Aramaic seems obvious, and may be thought true also of the clay, see item (3) of n. 12, at p. 107 with n. 27. If on the other hand the clay was inscribed in Babylonian, this would in no way weaken the above argument.

<sup>10</sup> The alternative to either Semitic version having been translated from the other would be that, independently of each other, both stem directly from the Elamograph. This possibility would suit our present purpose just as well, but for assurance would need to be tested on a much wider range of DB passages than the three from which we are seeking guidance on *č-i-t-a*. The guidance we are obtaining, on the other hand, actually discourages us from taking seriously von Voigtlander's interesting suggestion (at her p. 7) that two, or even three scribes were simultaneously taking down, each in his own language, Darius's Persian dictation.

<sup>11</sup> It does not matter for our purpose whether or not he was the same man as earlier on had translated the inscription. At that earlier moment the translator's reaction to what he saw in Aramaic, will have been the same as still earlier had been the Aramaean translator's reaction to what he saw in the Elamograph (see the end of § 3).

<sup>12</sup> The following are the present author's previous writings on Elamography. (1) Preface (pp. 1-9) to Richard T. Hallock, *The Evidence of the Persepolis Tablets* (reprinted without the Preface in Volume Two of *The Cambridge History of Iran*, 1985), Middle East Centre, Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1971. – (2) 'The Alloglottography of Old Persian', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1979, 114-190. – (3) 'Diakonoff on Writing, with an appendix by Darius', Studies in honour of I.M. Diakonoff, *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East* (ed. J.N. Postgate *et al.*), Warminster, 1982, 99-109. – (4) 'Extrapolation of Old Persian from Elamite', *Kunst, Kultur und Geschichte der Achämenidenzeit und ihr Fortleben* (ed. H. Koch and D.N. MacKenzie), Berlin, 1983, 51-56. – (5) 'Literacy in Transition from the Anshanian to the Achaemenian Period', *Societas Iranologica Europaea, Actes du Symposium de Fribourg-en-Brisgau, 22-24 Mai 1985*, *Studia Iranica*, Cahier 5, Paris, 1987, 49-57. – (6) 'The Old Persian lisp', *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies*, Turin, 7-11 September 1987 (ed. Gherardo Gnoli and Antonio Panaino), Rome, 1990, 115-133.

<sup>13</sup> Anticipating this possibility the convertor will have left on his clay-draft sufficient blank space for insertions, conceivably in ink, between lines and between words.

<sup>14</sup> While remaining satisfied that at DB 62 the phrase ‘the other gods that are’, occurring only in the Elamograph and the Persograph, represents Darius’s Zarathustra-inspired definition of the Aməša Spəntas, see *JNES*, 1964, 17, I withdraw the unfortunate assumption made there, that the Elamograph’s preceding description of Ahuramazdāh as ‘the god of the Iranians’, found in neither the Persograph nor the Babylonian (the Aramaic of DB 62 is missing), represents ‘an explanation added to the name of the god by the Elamite translator’. The description can only have been Darius’s own, slipped from his tongue in a moment of filial patriotism at dictation (wherefore his elamographing scribe duly recorded it), but deleted by Darius himself on his getting it back from the convertor, for two reasons: one, that to Iranian readers the description would have been too obvious for words, the other, that to foreigners it would have been a description politically inexpedient. It was too late to remove it from the Elamograph and the Aramaic translation already published, but the king thought it well worth seeing personally to its removal from the Babylonian, of which the translation in clay was still due to be carved. That was very likely the occasion when the king will have been told of and questioned about ‘the other gods that are’ standing in the (original) Babylonian translation, wherefore we may attribute to him personally also the decision that, Babylonians knowing in any case nothing about the Aməša Spəntas, he would only endear himself to them by reducing the phrase to ‘all the gods’ (see *art. cit.* pp. 34 sq., App. VII [noting that the Babylonian has turned out to have no *sanūtum*]). Thus even the exceptionally serious, and therefore correspondingly instructive discrepancies on view in DB 62, do not invalidate our conclusion that the Babylonian derives not from the Persograph, but via the Aramaic from the Elamograph.

<sup>15</sup> Darius’s wording recorded by the Elamographer at the beginning of DB 41 was likewise a slip of the tongue, as the Persograph shows him to have realized when he got it back from the convertor. We catch him wincing at having gratuitously admitted that the Persian troops he dispatched to Media along with loyal Medes, were ‘the few that had not revolted from me’ (thus in El., Aram. and Bab.). Had he not winced, we should not instead see in the Persograph ‘the Persian troops and the Median who were with me’. If the king did not bother to order this change to be made also in the Babylonian, this will have been partly because of the gossip which his doing so would have been sure to unleash, and mainly because it was Persians he did not wish to read that only few Persians had not revolted from him. Little did he anticipate that if ever any Persians wanted to read the inscription, they would be able to do so only by having it played back to them from either the Elamograph or the Aramaic, or indeed from the Babylonian! Two more points relating to DB 41 may here be made in passing, arising from Greenfield and Porten’s note concerning line 40 of the Aramaic (pp. 38-39 top, and plate IV). One is that *wmdy* ‘and Media’ needs emendation to *bmdy* ‘to Media’, witness the El. (see Cameron, *JCS*, 1960, 66a), OP and Babylonian. The other is that the Bab. counterpart ‘the rebellious (Persian army)’ to the Aram. ‘the rest (of the Persian army)’ translating the Elamogram of OP ‘the other (Persian army)’, is ‘strange’ only if one does not accept our conclusion in § 7, by which the Babylonian editor, faced in the *original* Babylonian translation with the Bab. word for ‘the other’ or ‘the rest of, and wondering what exactly was meant by it, would have *replaced* it with

‘the rebellious’ after consulting a dignitary in the know. The editor’s ‘rebellious’ is certainly an ‘improvement’ on the term ‘other’ disconcertingly used by Darius, and its precision fully justifies von Voigtlander’s calling the king ‘clever’. But rather than ‘boasting’ about his cleverness, Darius seems merely to have overlooked, both at dictation and at play-back, that his ‘other’, obvious to him, would obscure his cleverness to others.

<sup>16</sup> And not even in the Elamograph which at first stood alone on the rock, where it so happens that the words *inni huttaš un zatiš UNTIL* of DB 28 are still legible (see Cameron, *JCS*, 1960, p. 61 b). Cf. § 10, end.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. e.g. DB 24 *hau udapatata mā dai* ‘he revolted in Media’, elamographed *hupiri mada.pe ikki imaka*.

<sup>18</sup> See above, § 4 with n. 8.

<sup>19</sup> On Bab. *Urartu/Uraštu*, Aram. *’rṭ* for OP *Arminiya* cf. Greenfield and Porten, p. 60.

<sup>20</sup> There can be no doubt that the lacuna after ‘for me’ in the (translated) Aramaic quoted above, is to be restored as ‘[in Urartu UNTIL]’. As to the ‘expedition’ in the Babylonian, see § 7 above.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. the haplography perpetrated on the rock, this time by the carver of the Persograph, in DB 32. In drawing attention to it at pp. 124 sq. of item (2) in n. 12 above, I was not yet aware that the Babylonian does have, in line 61, the ‘heads’ (*SAG*) mentioned in the Elamograph but not in the Persograph (the Aramaic, which will therefore also have had them, is here missing). The Babylonian editor (see § 7), having been supplied with ‘a total of 47’ (be-headed noblemen), replaced with it Darius’s less precise ‘all together’, the *kappaka* (i.e. OP *\*hangmatā*) of the Elamograph, which in literal Babylonian rendering will have faced him in the *original* Babylonian translation.

<sup>22</sup> OP *Vidarnæ nāmæ Pārsæ, mana ba(n)dakæ*. Schmitt states (p. 50) that *bandaka-* does not denote a ‘subject, servant’, but rather a ‘vassal, (feudal) tenant’. Although one is free to graft on Darius European medievalistic terminology, the fact is that already in Old Persian the ancestor of Middle Persian and Middle Parthian *bandag* ‘servant’ meant ‘servant’, as Hallock’s painstaking analysis of the use made of the term’s Elamogram *libar* in Persepolis tablets, has confirmed beyond doubt, see his pp. 39, 354 (‘servant boys’), 720 sq. Note too, that where the Persograph at DB 7 says of countries that ‘they were my servants’ (Schmitt ‘vassals’), the Elamograph Elamitically says they did me service’ (i.e. ‘they served me’), a genuine Elamite paraphrase as alien to Old Persian, and therefore as safely reconvertible into ‘they were my servants’ at play-back, as was for instance ‘I do kingship’ into ‘I am king’ (*DB* 5 and passim). It follows that contrary to general opinion the present Vidarna was merely a namesake of the nobleman Vidarna (the Hydarnes of Herodotus) one of the Six, to whom Darius refers, in keeping with the etiquette he observes towards noblemen, by name *and patronym* (*DB* 68), and whose seal Hallock surmised (*CHI* 2, 591 = p. 13 of item (1) in n. 12 above) was still used in the 23rd year of Darius. That the Six were no ‘servants’ is made clear by Herodotus III 84.

<sup>23</sup> This is why Greenfield and Porten restore ‘Vidarna’ in the initial lacuna of the Aramaic quoted above, instead of our ‘my troops’.

<sup>24</sup> *huttaš* is in our passage spelled *hu-ud-da-iš* in DB 25 (King and Thompson, p. 116, top Une), but *hu-ut-taš* in DB 28 (King and Thompson, p. 119, line 36, sixth but last sign) as quoted in § 1 above.

<sup>25</sup> To judge from the Elamograph, it is only in Persian that the Median toponym known to the Babylonians and the Greeks by its Median form \**Kampada*, acquired a nasal before *d* by assimilation to the first syllable's nasalized vowel. If so, we may here have a compound with \**pada-* 'foot-hills'. The Aramaic spelling *hnbn* (see Greenfield and Porten, p. 25) may reflect dialectal Persian voicing of postnasal *p* and assimilation of *d* to *n* (as attested much later in Middle Persian, see Henning, *Mitteliranisch*, p. 98), although its *h* is surprising.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. § 1 above. The correspondence of *č-i-t-a* to El. 'he did nothing' was pointed out first only in 1911, by Weissbach, and even then, as it happens, only indirectly, in a note at p. 31 referring not to DB 28, where *č-i-t-a* duly shows up, but to DB 25, where it does not.

<sup>27</sup> See Wackernagel and Debrunner, p. 500, and Bartholomae, col. 305.

<sup>28</sup> The alternative that *č-i-t-a* arose only after word-final *-d/t* was lost in OP (in which case the spelling could indeed stand for /*či-tā*/) has little to commend itself. The *kim* of Rigvedic *kim ād* being an innovation on \**kid/t*, one would in Iranian expect \**čid/t ād/t*, and therefore \**čid/t tād/t* (bound already at the earliest OIran. stage to become \**čis-tād/t*), to have been not much younger, and perhaps even older, than \**čim ād/t* and \**čim tād/t* and above all, than the \**čid/t čid/t* out of which in OP *čiš-či* arose via *čis-či*.

<sup>29</sup> *ky 'w tw dybhr 'w'y'h* if someone bears thee anger *tw cyd pd wxšyfti 'd hw wy'wr* converse thou with him GERADE FREUNDLICH.

<sup>30</sup> *t'wg'n z'dg ky kyrd 'yy 'skwḥ* O Child of the Mighty that hast become poor *kw cyd byxšyḥ pd ḥrw wy'g'n* so that DU GAR BETTELN MUSST AN ALLEN ORTEN.

<sup>31</sup> The Sogdian runs: *'rty wy' c 'drcyq sm'ny* and in the lowest Firmament *βmn swmbnd* they bored a hole *'rty 'ww 'nxrwzn cywyδ m'qwc'nd* and suspended the zodiac from it *'ty ii βypšy p 'šynd w'stynd* and 2 godsons as watchers they positioned *w'nw 'ty 'skycyk cxrw r'mndy* END OF FRAGMENT so that the Superior Wheel continually [turn]. The Middle Persian runs: *'wd pd h'n 'y 'yrdwm 'sm'n* and in (*scil.* through the hole of) the lowest Firmament *'wl ''gwst* (the zodiac by them) was suspended above *'wš'n pd w'ng 'n'spyn grndydn r'y* and by them, for the sake of turning it ceaselessly at call, *nr w m'yg prystg dw 'br gwm'rd* two angels were set over (it), a male and a female. Henning's reading *'n'spyn* first appeared spelled out *apud* Mary Boyce, *Catalogue* (Berlin, 1960), p. 8 under 98. His etymology emerges from the translation he gave.

<sup>32</sup> The above article is an expanded version of a communication given orally at a one-day International Iranological Seminar convened by Sir Harold Bailey in Cambridge on 7 April 1989. On that occasion only the etymology of Parth. *cyd*, Dig. *cid* and OP *č-i-t-a* in the light of the latter's Elamogram was dealt with, succinctly, as well as that of Sogd. *rāmand*. There was no time to enter into the complexities of the discrepancies between DB 25, 28 and 30.

## REFERENCES

BARTHOLOMAE, Christian, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg, 1904.

CII: *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum*.

DB: The Behistun Inscription of Darius. Old Persian, Elamite and Babylonian: L.W. KING and R.C. THOMPSON, British Museum, London, 1907; F.H. WEISSBACH, *Die Keilschriften der Achaemeniden*, Leipzig, 1911. – Old Persian only: Roland G. KENT, *Old Persian*, New Haven, Connecticut, 1950; Rüdiger Schmitt in CII, London, 1991. – Babylonian only: Elizabeth N. von Voigtlander in CII, London, 1978. – Aramaic only: Jonas C. Greenfield and Bezalel Porten in CII, London, 1982.

GAUTHIOT, see *Grammaire* and SCE.

GELDNER, Karl Friedrich, *Der Rig-Veda*, 3 vols, Harvard University Press, London/Leipzig, 1951.

GRSHEVITCH, Ilya, 'Word-final 'a'-vowels in Old Persian', *East and West*, 38, 1988, 65-80. See also n. 12 above.

Grammaire: Robert GAUTHIOT, *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*, vol. i, 1914-1923; vol. ii (by E. Benveniste), 1928, Paris.

GREENFIELD and PORTEN, see DB.

HALLOCK, Richard T., *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, Chicago, 1969. See also above, n. 5 and item (1) of n. 12.

HENNING, W.B., 'Mitteliranische Manichaica, III', *SPAW*, 1934, 848-912; *Sogdica*, London, 1940; 'A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony', *BSOAS*, 12, 1948, 306-318.

SCE: R. Gauthiot, P. Pelliot, and E. Benveniste, *Le Sūtra des Causes et des Effets*, 3 vols, Paris, 1920-1928.

SCHMITT, see DB.

SZEMERENYI, Oswald, pp. 65-66 of 'Iranian Studies I', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 1959.

von VOIGTLANDER, see DB.

WACKERNAGEL, Jacob, and Debrunner, Albert, *Altindische Grammatik*, vol. III 2, Göttingen, 1930.

WEISSBACH, see DB.