Oswald SZEMERÉNYI

FOUR OLD IRANIAN ETHNIC NAMES: SCYTHIAN – SKUDRA – SOGDIAN – SAKA

(Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 1980)

Caro amico Vittore Pisani octogenario
sed cruda cui uiridisque senectus
D. D. D. autor

1.1. The Scythians make their first appearance in the 8th century B.C. in the South of Russia. According to some they had been living there from time immemorial[1]. But already Herodotus reported (IV 11) a version, according to which „the nomadic tribes of Scythians who lived in Asia, being hard pressed by the Massagetae, were forced across the Araxes into Kimmeria (what is now Scythia is said to have been once inhabited by Kimmerians)", and most modern historians would agree that the Scythians arrived from Asia, fleeing before other westward pressing nomads and perhaps even before that protracted period of exceptional drought which according to Ellsworth Huntington set in around the year 800 B.C. and triggered off the westward movement of the barbarians[2]. This does not, of itself, decide the question whether their original homeland was in Asia or in Europe; in the latter case, we have to assume that they belonged to those Iranian tribes whose ancestors had migrated from Southern Russia to the steppes East of the Caspian and the Aral Sea, and who returned to Europe in the afore-mentioned circumstances[3].

1.1.1. The immediate consequence of the invasion was the subjugation, or at least constant harassment, of the local population, the Iranian tribes of the *Kimmerians*[4]. Escaping the intolerable pressure, part (?) of them crossed the Caucasus and invaded Urartu. The Assyrian king Sargon (722–704) learns from intelligence reports in 714 B.C. that Urartu had suffered a serious defeat at the hands of the *Kimmerians*. Under Sennacherib (703–681) they turn West and destroy the Phrygian kingdom (696?), but around 679 B.C., under their king Teušpa, they suffer a crushing defeat from Esarhaddon's army. The next major encounter brings them face to face with Gyges, king of Lydia (687–652), who

is defeated by them and killed in battle (652). The Kimmerian chieftain Kobos, of execrable cruelty, was, in the time of King Madyes (see presently), crushed by the Scythians, and this was the last to be heard of them in Anatolia[4a].

1.1.2. Although, according to Herodotus (I 103), „the *Scythians* had entered Asia in pursuit of the Kimmerians whom they had expelled from Europe", the first mention of them is made there almost half-a-century after the appearance of the Kimmerians. Under Esarhaddon (681–669) a barbarian chieftain, *Bartatua* (675–645?) by name, sued for the hand of a Ninevite princess. He is doubtless identical with Herodotus' Πρωτοθύης, father of the Scythian king Μαδύης (645–615?). He, like *Išpakai* of the *Ašguzai* people, an ally of the Manna, has to be placed in Sakasene, off the SW corner of the Caspian[4b]. From here the Scythians turned westward, and, as mentioned already, under Madyes defeated the Kimmerian chieftain Kobos.

Between 630–620 B. C. the Scythians pillaged Syria, Palestine, and even the North of Egypt, but then were bought off by Psammetichus and returned to Anatolia.

After the fall of Ninive (612 B.C.), Nabopolassar, king of Babylonia, pursued the last Assyrian king, Aššuruballit (612–609), and defeated him at Harran – in alliance with some Scythian forces, apparently from Cappadocia. But soon the Medes gained the upper hand, and the Scythians were forced to withdraw to Western Anatolia where they were finally crushed around 585 B. C.

1.2. As can be seen, Kimmerians and Scythians were less than a century and a half south of the Causasus. During that relatively short period they were known to the local population, in particular to the Assyrians, as *Gimirrai(a)* and *Aškuzai, Askuzāi,* or *Iškuzāi, Iškuza,* respectively. The former is quite clearly the Biblical *Gomer* and the Greek Κιμμέριοι, but there can be little doubt that the latter also appears in the Old Testament, albeit in the corrupt form *Ašhkenaz,* found at Genesis 10, 3, and Jeremiah 51, 27. The former passage is interesting inasmuch as it establishes a father-son relation between the two peoples:

„And the sons of Gomer: Ashkenaz, and Riphath, and Togarmah".

But Jeremiah proves the identity in a different way. For the injunction

„summon the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni, and Ashkenaz"

shows that Ashkenaz is in close connection with Ararat = Urartu, and Minni, a people which we have met above (1.1.2.) as the allies of the Ašguzai. It is clear that the corruption occurred in the scribal, not the oral tradition: the historically

obscure ethnic 'škwz was in its written form changed to 'šknz, an easily understandable change seeing that in the development of Hebrew script the two letters were very similar in many variants of the script[5]. That the term *Ashkenazim* has come to mean ‚Polish-German Jews', in contrast to *Sephardim* ‚Spanish or Portuguese Jews' is a highly interesting semantic development but not relevant to our problem.

1.3. Seeing that the Near East had the distinctive names *Gimirrai(a)* and *Askuzai* for Kimmerians and Scythians, the question arises whether the Iranians themselves knew these names.

As is known, Herodotus (VII 64) roundly declares: οἱ γὰρ Πέρσοι πάντας τοὺς Σκύθας καλέουσι Σάκας, „Sacae is the name the Persians give to all Scythian tribes". But here we must ask at once whether this statement is based on reliable information or whether it is an unjustified extrapolation from the fact that the Achaemenids only knew Sakas?!

1.3.1. For this question a passage of Darius' Bisutun inscription is of the greatest importance. In column V of that inscription a report is given (V 21–30) of an expedition against the Saka[6], ‚wearing the pointed hat', who lived near a *draya*; their chieftain *Skunxa* was captured, and figures as the tenth on the Bisutun rock after a long row of rebellious adversaries of Darius, with a truly impressive pointed hat on his head. The territory of these Saka people was annexed.

Now Herodotus, as is known, also reports (IV 1, 83–98, 118–144) a vast expedition against the Scythians which took his army across the Bosporus and the Danube at least to the Dniester. But owing to the scorched earth tactics of the Scythians the campaign was broken off, and the army returned the way it had come, empty-handed, and certainly without adding a province to the Empire.

Historians have long tried to solve the riddle whether the Persian account refers to the same expedition as the Greek or not. Thus, e.g., A. HERRMANN argued (1933) that the Persian account referred to the fourth or fifth year of Darius (517 or 516 B.C.) and therefore could not be identical with the Greek account which referred to 512 B.C. The former commemorated an expedition against the Asiatic *Sakā tigra-xaudā,* the latter a campaign against the *Sakā paradraya* in the Crimea[7].

The same view, except for changes in the chronology, has been repeatedly advanced by W. HINZ. The *draya* is the river Oxus (modern Amū Daryā)[8], where Darius defeated the Saka tigraxauda; this happened in 519 B.C., while the campaign against the Scythians took place in 513 B.C.[9].

But the opposite view has not been without supporters either. Thus, e.g., HERZFELD maintained on various occasions that DB V referred to the Scythian

campaign which took place in the Black Sea region in 512; the *Saka para draya* were accordingly to be placed in and near the Danube delta[10].

However, the most forcefully presented version of this thesis has been given by the American historian J. M. BALCER. In a paper entitled „The date of Herodotus IV. 1 – Darius' Scythian expedition"[11], he first tried to show that the so-called Tabula Capitolina which (II 22–25) links the assassination of the tyrant Hipparchos with Darius' Scythian campaign across the Kimmerian (!) Bosporos, and dates both to a year 528 = 513 B.C, "contains too many historical errors in col. II to be considered a sound document" (p. 103), although with reference to the death of Hipparchos, where the correct date, 514 B.C, is known, the Tabula is only one year out. Balcer also attempted to demonstrate (p. 116) that "the four ancient sources (Bisitun, Herodotus, Ktesias, and Polyaenos) do preserve in parallel reports the events of Darius' reign from 522 to 518 B.C.", and since the Saka campaign reported in DB V, now known to be dated to 519 B.C.[12], in his view can only refer to the Western Sakas, he ended up with the conclusion (p. 131) that "every indication points to one [!] Scythian expedition in 519 into Europe".

In a thorough review of the evidence J. HARMATTA convincingly showed that Balcer's thesis, in the meantime hailed by CAMERON[13] as definitively proved, is quite simply untenable[14]. His main (Iranian) argument (p. 21f.) is the observation that in DB V 24 the reading *parašim,* KENT's emendation accepted almost unanimously[15], is at variance with the facts. For, as is reported by Kent (OP 133 ad 23–4), Cameron read, i.e. saw on the rock, $+ r^a x^a + a$[. Harmatta maintains therefore (pp. 22f.) that in DB V 22–28 it was reported that Darius arrived at a river (not at the Black Sea), crossed it, and beat Skunxa's Sakas! The river was also named, for the signs quoted above are to be read as *A]raxšā,* another name of the River Oxus.

The relevant passage is therefore to be read as follows

23   yadiy abiy dray a a-

24 vārasam araxšā nāma rauta avā hadā visa viyatara-

25 yam.

In concluding our discussion of Darius' campaign against the (Eastern) Sakas it is perhaps worth mentioning – since it seems to have gone unnoticed – that Herodotus (I 201–214) credits Cyrus the Great (559–529 B.C.) with a similar exploit against the Massagetae; his report is couched in surprisingly similar terms:

"(201) After the conquest of Assyria, Cyrus' next desire was to subdue the Massagetae, whose country lies far to the eastward beyond the Araxes... What the Araxes is like is not clear – some say it is bigger than the Danube, others that it is not so big..."

"(205) At this time Tomyris was queen of the Massagetae, having succeeded to the throne on her husband's death. Cyrus sent to her and pretended to sue for her hand in marriage; but he was met with a refusal... Cyrus, therefore, ... turned to open force, and advancing to the Araxes began his assault upon the Massagetae by bridging the river for his men to cross and constructing upperworks on the ferry boats". Shortly after (208) Cyrus "crossed the river with his army".

Seeing that the campaign of Cyrus took place in 529 B.C, and Darius' in 519 B.C., that is barely ten years later, the question arises whether the two events are causally connected? Did Darius wish to avenge the death of Cyrus who had been killed in battle by the Massagetae? Or is it conceivable that Herodotus' report is a projection onto Cyrus of Darius' feat? But this is surely ruled out by the fact that Cyrus' expedition is reported by Strabo also (XI, 8, 6), both probably deriving from Hekataios[16].

1.3.2. Whatever the explanation of this curious coincidence, there can be little doubt that DB V reports a campaign of the Persians against the Eastern Sakas. The report, which calls these people Saka, is therefore of no use when it comes to deciding whether the Persians knew some other name for the (Western) Scythians.

Unfortunately, there is no Persian record of Darius' campaign (reported by Herodotus and others) against the (Western) Scythians. But there are several lists which enumerate the provinces or peoples of the empire[17], and it has often been suggested that they might be of help in our inquiry. For our purposes they can be evaluated as follows.

(1) In the Bisutun inscription (1, 16f.; 2, 8; 5, 21–31 ; DBk 2) *Saka* quite clearly always denotes the *Eastern Scythians.*

(2) In one of the Persepolis inscriptions (DPe) the list contains after the central provinces and Egypt the following:

12 Armina, Katpatuka, Sparda, Ya-
13 unā tyaiy uškahyā utā tya-
14 iy drayahyā utā dahyāva t-
15 yā para draya, Asagarta, Parθava, Zra
16 ka

and then the other Eastern provinces, amongst them also *Hi(n)duš, Ga(n)dāra, Sakā, Maka.*

As can be seen, after the Asianic peoples we find mentioned the Ionians of the land (i. e. Asia Minor) and the sea (i. e. the islanders) and *lands overseas,* followed by Eastern peoples only. The most natural construction to put on *the lands overseas* would, of course, be to regard them as lands on the Balkans, perhaps even mainland Greece. It is certainly unfounded in the context to iden-

tify them with the (Western) Scythians[18], simply because in another, late, inscription (DNa 28–9) *Sakā tyaiy paradraya* are named; for, with the same logic, we might argue that they are to be taken for *Yaunā tyaiy paradraya* because they are named in *two* inscriptions (DSe and XPh, see presently). But even if the (Western) Scythians were meant, we could not determine what form their name had – which is the only important question from our point of view[19].

(3) In Darius' Susa inscription concerning the Restoration of Order in the Empire, KENT gives (DSe 21–30) a list which is "restored by retranslation from the Akkadian version". According to his text, after the central and eastern provinces (including the Eastern *Sakā haumavargā* and *Sakā tigraxaudā*) come

27 Armina, Katpatuka, Sparda, Yaun-
28 ā tyaiy drayahyā utā tyai
29 y paradraya, Skudra...

In other words, in this part of the list, we have the same sequence as in (2) above, except that the Ionians of Asia Minor seem to have been overlooked (or omitted), and the 'lands overseas' are resolved into 'Ionians across the sea' and Skudra, or possibly into 'people (not Ioanians!) across the sea and Skudra'.

But a quite novel situation has arisen through the recent appearance of some further fragments of this inscription. According to the editor[20], the passage should now be reconstituted as follows:

27 Armina, Katpatuka, Sparda, Yaunā
28 tyaiy drayahyā, Sakā tyaiy
29 paradraya, Skudra, Yaunā tyaiy
30 paradraya, Karkā. θātiy Dāra...

But it is worth pointing out that even now only (29) *Yaunā,* and (30) *θātiy* are attested. To be sure, the Akkadian version presents (Steve, p. 23):

20 [^{māt}Sa-]parda ^{māt}Ya[m]ana šá ina A.A.BA [^{māt}Gimirri šá]
21 ina nibirtum ^{nār}marratum ašbu' ^{māt}Iskudur ^{māt}[Yamana]
22 ^{māt}Karsa,

that is to say Sparda, Ionians in the sea, [Saka?) across the saltwater, Skudra, [Ionia?], Karka. The Ionians are the second time not specified at all, and quite possibly Gimirri and Yamana should be interverted so that the sequence would be

Sparda, Ionians of the islands, Ionians overseas,
Skudra, [? Saka?], Karka.

In any case, once again, if the (Western) Scythians were mentioned at all, we have no evidence to show how they were named in the inscription.

(4) With Darius' list in the Naqš-i-Rustam inscription (DNa) we have at last firm ground under our feet. After the main central and eastern provinces (including the Sakā haumavargā and tigraxaudā) we find

28 Katpatuka, Sparda, Yauna, Sakā tyaiy [pa-]

29 radraya, Skudra, Yaunā takabarā, Put[ā]y-

30 ā, Kūšiyā, Mačiyā, Karkā,

that is, after the Ionians of Asia Minor, there come the Sakā across the sea, the Sku-dra, the petasos-wearing Ionians, Libyans, Ethiopians, men of Maka, Carians.

This time we seem to have clear evidence that the (Western) Scythians were (also? see **3.4.**) named *Sakā*.

(5) Xerxes' daiva-inscription at Persepolis (XPh) presents a very full list comprising thirty[21] peoples of the realm, although in a very disorganised kind of fashion: after Arachosia comes Armenia, after Hinduš Katpatuka, etc.[22]. Of the peoples relevant to our inquiry the following are named:

23   Yaunā tya[iy] drayahiyā dā-

24 rayatiy utā tyaiy paradrava dārayat-

25 iy, Mačiyā, Arabāya, Gadāra, Hiduš,

26 Katpatuka, Dahā, Sakā haumavargā, Sakā

27 tigraxaudā, Skudrā, Ākaufačiyā,

28 Putāyā, Karkā, Kūšiya. θātiy...

As can be seen, in our area two kinds of Ionians are named, and the Skudrā. There is *no mention of Sakā paradraya*.

(6) The throne-bearer labels at Persepolis (A?P), ascribed to Artaxerxes II (405–359 B. C.) or III (359–338 B. C.)[23], also add up to an (almost) complete list of thirty peoples (KENT, *OP* 155f.). Relevant are:

14 iyam Sakā haumavargā

15 iyam Sakā tigraxa[udā]

23 iyam Yaunā

24 iyam Sakā paradraiya

25 iyam Skudra

26 iyam Yauna takabarā.

Here again, the Western Scythians seem clearly attested as *Sakā parad-raiya*.

1 3.3. The name of the *Saka* occurs in a few more inscriptions.

(7) In a Persepolis inscription Darius gives a comprehensive description of the magnitude of his realm (DPh 5–8):

5   hačā Sakaibiš tyaiy para

6 Sugdam amata yātā ā Kūšā,

7 hačā Hidauv amata yātā ā Spa

8 rdā

"from the Scythians who are beyond Sogdiana, from there unto Ethiopia; from Sind – from there unto Sardes".

The reference is clearly to the *Eastern Sakas*.

(8) In an inscription of Hamadan (DH 4–6), we find a verbatim repeated description of the realm.

(9) The discovery at Susa on 24th December, 1972, of an "over-life-size stone statue of Darius the Great", brought not only "the first large-scale fragment of a free-standing Achaemenian statue", "an example of a hitherto unknown Egyptianizing type of Achaemenian royal sculpture; and an important new document for the study of Persian dress", but also, on the two lateral faces of the large rectangular base, two rows of kneeling persons, personifying 2 x 12 = 24 peoples of the empire, with their names written in hieroglyphic Egyptian in a cartouche under each figure[24]. This hieroglyphic "list of provinces" had been known before from fragments of four stelae erected on Darius' orders on his own Suez Canal connecting the Red Sea and the Nile. But the new Susa find presents for the first time a complete copy of the list[25].

From our point of view, the important fact is that after the heartlands and the Eastern provinces the list names

12 Les Saka des marais et les Saka des plaines
13 Babylone
14 L'Arménie
15 Sardes
16 La Cappadoce
17 Skudra.

Before this discovery it was thought that the *Saka of the marshes* and the *Saka of the plains* might correspond to the division into *tigraxauda* and *haumavarga*[26]. But BALCER opined[27] that "the Scythians of the Eastern plains-steppe regions... are the Amyrgian [= haumavarga] *Saka... The Scythians of the marshes... may well be the Scythians* dwelling in the marshes *of lake Maiotis*" [my Italics, OSz.], although he had noted (fn. 84) that, according to POSENER, "la position du no. 12 à la fin du groupe des pays orientaux interdit de voir dans SK PH□[= Saka of the marshes] la Scythie au nord de la mer Noir".

An even more radical transposition was about the same time advocated by CAMERON[28]: "Despite the evident intention of the scribe to indicate that two Sakas were here being indicated, I submit that the evidence to prove that these are the two north-eastern Saka is inconclusive". And when we consider that "the lands beyond the Sea" in DPe [our no. (2) above] "become none other than 'the Ionians who are beyond the Sea' of DSe (also XPh) [our nos. (3) and (5)] and the '*Saka* who are beyond the Sea' of DNa [our no. (4)] ... then the Saka of the Suez inscriptions must in all probability be the *Scythians in Europe*". [My Italics, OSz.]

But in spite of this forceful argumentation, within a year or so Cameron managed to achieve a complete volte-face[29]. In 1975 he just as emphatically

declared that the assumption that the hieroglyphic Saka might be "the Western or European Saka" – his own previous suggestion – "would be erroneous, as another Egyptian text demonstrates conclusively". This text is of course the inscription on the Darius statue, and it leads to the following ingenious suggestion. No. 12 in the hieroglyphic list has so far been read as SK PḤ SK T , that is as naming two groups of Sakas. But, says Cameron, "it now appears that No. 12 had best be rendered as SK PḤ SKT, and translated as 'the Saka who are in back of (encroaching on) the Sogdian land' ", *skt ,* here being merely a variant of *skdy* 'Sogdia', listed under no. 7.

The upshot of this hieroglyphic interlude is then, whether we accept POSENER'S argument or CAMERON'S interpretation, that the hieroglyphic list does not mention the European Scythians.

1.3.4. Summing up, we can say that of the nine inscriptions discussed in this section only two, i. e. (4) and (6), refer by name to the Western Scythians, and that in the form *Sakā tyaiy paradraya* and *Saka paradraiya* respectively.

1.4. Even though the relevant evidence is thus reduced to two occurrences, that would seem to be sufficient to corroborate Herodotus' statement that the Persians called all Scythians Saka. But this at once poses the question: where did the Assyrian and Hebrew sources get the name *aškuza/iškuza* from? The obvious answer is, at least for the Assyrians: from the invading Scythians themselves. Whereupon a further question arises: is there any evidence that this name was known in other (non-Persian) areas also?

1.4.1. The answer to this question seems fairly clear. Since the variation in the initial vowel in *aškuza/iškuza* points to a prothetic vowel – which no doubt did not exist in the source language – that is to say the name was simply *škuza,* it is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that this name is connected with, is in fact identical with the Greek name Σκὺθης. The Greek name was known already to Hesiod (*circa* 700 B.C.), cf. the line quoted by Eratosthenes in Strabo 7, 3, 7:

Αἰθίοπάς τε Λίβυς τὲ ἰδέ Σκύθας ἱππημολγούς.

This is important inasmuch as, the Ionic-Attic change *u>ü* being datable around 600 B.C, the form Σκύθης (and not Σκούθης or Σκόθης) can still reflect a source-form with *u*[30].

But what could be the Iranian form that was borrowed into Assyrian (and from there into Hebrew) as *(a)škuza* and into Greek as Σκύθης.

It was at first thought that the Iranian form was **Skuča*[31], and it is undeniable that in early Greek renderings of Iranian names Greek θ can represent Iranian *č,* cf. ᾽Ασπαθίνης = OP *Aspačanā,* Τείσπης = OP *Čišpiš.* But it is no less true that in Akkadian transcriptions Iranian *č* appears as *š,* possibly also *s▢* but not as z, and the same applies to Aramaic loanwards (which is relevant for

105

Hebr. *'škwz)*[32]. And the phonetically impossible prototype **Skuča* was by no means improved by ascribing to it the meaning 'scalp hunter[33].

Another suggestion would trace the name of the Scythians to Iran. **Skuθa-,* interpreted as derived from IE **skeu-* 'perceive, observe, watch', and meaning 'gardeur(s) (de troupeaux)'[34]. But here again the existence of the Near Eastern forms is ignored, and they are incompatible with the suggested Iranian form.

1.4.2. As I pointed out over thirty years ago, the two loan-forms *skut^h-* and *skuz-* demand a prototype in which the final consonant was voiced (to explain *z)* and not an occlusive (to explain the Greek aspirate), or, to put it in a positive form, it was a voiced spirant; this means that the Iranian prototype required by the two loan-forms was **Skuða-*[35].

That the Greeks rendered a foreign spirant with an aspirate is particularly well-known from the cases in which an Iranian *f* is represented by a Greek φ, i. e. *p^h*; cf. the numerous names with Iranian *farnah-* rendered in Greek by φαρν- or φέρνης sim. Likewise, an Iranian *p* was rendered by *θ*, cf. such names as Πάρθος. That languages which do not possess spirants but do have aspirates are bound to use these as substitutes is very clearly exemplified by Skt. *vardhanam* 'town' also, which was borrowed from Iran. **vṛdana-*. But in the case of a voiced spirant, a Greek speaker had to resort to a less straightforward kind of substitution because he did not possess these sounds in the first half of the first millennium B. C. A simple *δ* for the foreign *ð* was inadequate, seeing that even a foreign *d* (in initial position) was often rendered by *t,* cf. the name of the river Don: Iran. *Dānuš* but Greek Τάν-αις (from **Dānaw-ī-s?).* To approximate the voiced spirant of the original, the voiceless aspirate had to be used, and that is what led to Σκύθης.

That in the Semitic languages the foreign voiced spirant *ð* was rendered by *z* was for their system also quite natural since at that time – in the early seventh century B.C. – the intervocalic spirantization (the so-called begadkefat-rule) had not begun yet[36].

1.4.3. Having established that the Iranian prototype, borrowed independently[37] by Assyrians and Greeks, was **Skuða-,* we must now ask whether this name can be interpreted. As we have seen, scalp hunter or 'shepherd' have been suggested but on insufficient grounds, and with complete disregard for what we know about the Scythians.

What struck the Greeks most about these nomadic people was their incredibly rapid movements – they rode from early childhood – and their superb accomplishments as archers. Both qualities are summed up in a passage of Herodotus where it is said (VI 112) that, at Marathon, "the Athenians advanced at a run towards the enemy, not less than a mile away. The Persians, seeing the

attack developing at the double, prepared to meet it confidently enough, for it seemed to them suicidal madness for the Athenians to risk an assault with so small a force – at the double, too, and with no support from either cavalry or archers" (: ὁρῶντες αὐτοὺς ἐόντας ὀλίγους, καὶ τούτους δρόμῳ ἐπειγομένους οὔτε ἵππου ὑπαρχούσης σφι οὔτε τοξευμάτων).

The same combined observation is expressed by Herodotus in another passage (IV 46) where he explains how the Scythians managed to ensure their own preservation: "A people without fortified towns, living, as the Scythians do, in waggons which they take with them wherever they go, accustomed, one and all, to fight *on horseback with bows and arrows,* and dependent for their food not upon agriculture but upon their cattle: how can such a people fail to defeat the attempt of an invader not only to subdue them, but even to make contact with them?" The words italicized (by me) are a laborious rendering of Herodotus' felicitous single word: ἱπποτοξόται, an admirable summing up of the essential Scythian warrior.

That Scythians could not be thought of without bows and arrows is, last not least, confirmed by the well-known fact that the Athenian police force was known as Σκύθαι or Τοξόται, the two terms obviously being interchangeable because identical in their denotatum[38].

This characterization of the Scythians found in the literary sources is borne out by the archaeological finds. It is a commonplace to say that: "Die eigentliche Waffe... für diese... Reiter waren Pfeil und Bogen"[39], or, with greater precision, that: "Das Reitervolk der Skythen kennzeichnet die Bewaffnung mit zusammengesetztem Reflexbogen und Pfeilen, die 'östliche' dreiflügelige Spitze haben"[40]. No wonder their weaponry made impression and spread far and wide. As the Soviet archaeologist B. B. PIOTROVSKY states, in the 7th c. B. C. we find in the Near East "bronze arrow-heads of a characteristic form, ... differing from the usual Near Eastern arrow-heads but with regard to their form identical with the Scythian ones; ... it is very likely that these bronze arrow-heads came to the Near East together with the Kimmerians and Scythians in the 7th century". We are also well informed about the spread of this armament: "In the course of the 7th–6th centuries B.C., the 'Scythian' arrows rapidly spread in Transcaucasia, Asia Minor, Babylon and Assyria, Syria and Palestine, Iran and Central Asia where finds of bronze arrow-heads of the Scythian type have been made"[41].

These findings of the archaeologist are corroborated by cuneiform records of the sixth century B. C. A document of 541 B. C, originating from the temple archive of Eanna in Uruk, lists amongst others "200 Kimmerian reed arrows, 180 of them with bronze tips, 1 Kimmerian bow", and "20 reed arrows, 12 with arrow-heads, 1 Kimmerian bow", and another document of 541, like-

wise from Uruk, mentions, in detailing the equipment of eight archers, spears, daggers, shields, Akkadian bows, and "56 Akkadian arrows, 26 of them with iron tips, and 116 Kimmerian arrows, 46 of them with iron tips"[42].

It must, of course, be borne in mind that *Kimmerian,* Akkadian *gimirraia,* in the Akkadian of this period, as later in the Achaemenid inscriptions, no longer means Kimmerian proper but simply Scythian.

1.4.4. If, thus, the main characteristic of the Scythian is, for Greeks as much as for the various peoples of the Near East, that he is a superb archer, then the comparatist will at once see that the name *Skuða,* or simply *Skuda,* is closely related to a well-known Germanic group.

It may be recalled first that a Germanic *n*-stem **skutjan-* (m.) is attested by OE *scytta* 'a shooter, an archer; Sagittarius', ON *skyti* 'a marksman, shooter, archer', OHG *scuzzo* '(modern Germ.) Schütze'.

This noun is derived from the amply attested verb **skeutan,* cf. OE *scēotan* 'shoot, cast a missile; move an object rapidly, push; (intr.) move rapidly, dart, rush'; ON *skjóta* 'shoot (with a weapon), push or shove quickly; (intr.) shoot, start, move'; OHG *sciozan* 'iaculari, sagittare, ferire; (>mod.) schiessen'. This verb is not attested in Wulfila's Gothic but it is recorded for Crimean Gothic as *schieten* 'sagittam mittere'.

From the intransitive use of the verb we have the adjective **skeuta-,* cf. ON *skjótr* 'swift, fleet', OE *scēot* 'quick, ready', no doubt a late formation.

This Germanic group naturally presupposes an IE root **skeud-* which is without doubt attested in Lithuanian *skudrùs* 'swift', and Skt. *čod(ay)ati* 'drive, incite', possibly also in OSlav *kydati* 'throw'. Furthermore, it is very likely that IE **sk⎿eu-* 'throw, shoot; push' in Lithu. *šáuti* 'shoot (with a weapon)' and OS *sovati* 'push, shove' is the basis of our **skeud-* also[43].

Proto-Iranian **Skuda-,* later **Skuða-,* thus represents a nomen agentis formed with the thematic suffix -o- from the nil-grade of the IE root **skeud-,* i.e. IE **skud-o-* 'shooter, archer'.

This interpretation was, as far as I can see, first given implicitly by JUSTI : "Das Volk, welches die Hellenen mit dem skythischen Worte Skythen (SCHÜTZEN, ἱπποτοξόται Hdt.) benannten... "[44]. It was taken up (or rediscovered?) by Vasmer but with a curious proviso: the suggestion "liesse sich aber nur halten, wenn in einer Nachbarsprache, etwa im Thrakischen, so ein Wort nachgewiesen würde"[45] – as if Thracian could have a decisive vote in the matter. It was then revived by myself on two occasions, and provided with, I believe, a solid foundation. It is now also accepted by Abajev, even if with a surprising twist[46], and, at least formally, by DJAKONOV and GRANTOVSKIJ (see fn. 36). It can only be hoped that the arguments advanced above (and below) will lead to its being generally accepted. It is intrinsically convincing, and gains

further support from the name of the Saxons: Gmc. *Sahsō,* from *sahsa-* 'knife, sword', described the members of this tribe as 'provided with a sword, bearing a sword'.

1.4.5. But at this juncture a further point has to be taken into account. To add to our confusion, as it were, Herodotus not only reports, as we have seen, that with the Persians all Scythians went by the name Saka, but also (IV 6) that all Scythians are amongst themselves known under the comprehensive name *Skolotai* – after their king's name –, and it is only the Greeks who call them Scythians (: σύμπασι δὲ εἶναι οὔνομα Σκολότους, τοῦ βασιλέος ἐπωνυμίην. Σκύθας δὲ Ἕλληνες οὐνόμασαν).

The king, from whom the *Skolotai* are here said to have their name, is not named by Herodotus. But further on in Book IV Herodotus gives a detailed account of King Σκύλης (IV 76f., esp. 78). He was the son of Ariapeithes, king of the Scythians, and, upon the death of his father, succeeded to the throne.

Now it is obvious that *Skules* and *Skolotai* are closely linked, especially if we bear in mind that in Σκύλης the first vowel cannot have been *ü* since the Iranian-speaking Scythians did not have that sound, and that the *o* of *Skolotai* cannot have been the Scythian sound either since it was unknown to their vowel system. Obviously, both names had an Iranian *u,* i.e. sounded *Skula-* and *Skulata* respectively; particularly important is in this context the name of King *Scolopitus,* preserved for us by Iustinus, since, although its second component can hardly be *pitā* 'father', it is clear that its first part represents *Skula-*[47].

1.4.6. This means that the Greeks' and Assyrians' name for the Scythians represents an Iranian *Skuda* while the Scythians called themselves *Skula.* Do we have to assume, then, that these two names have nothing to do with each other[48], or is there some other way out of this dilemma?

In answer to this question we must first note that *l* in *Skula* cannot be original, i. e. cannot represent IE *l* because this had changed to *r* in Iranian. To be sure, in Sarmatian, that is certainly after the third century B.C., *l* developed from an earlier cluster *ry,* cf. the name of the *Alani* from *aryānām* or *aryāna–* (i. e. *ary->al-)* or ῎Ηλμανος from *aryaman-* 'mate' (i. e. *ary->ēl-*), or by the sequence *fri–* developing into (*f*)*li-*[49].

But in Scythian, in Herodotus' time, such changes are unknown. On the other hand, the fact that the descendants of Kolaxais, the Scythian kings, are called *Paralatai* (Hdt. IV 6), and this corresponds to Avestan *para-δāta-* 'voran, an die Spitze gestellt', proves that intervocalic -*d*- (or -*δ*-), at least in some parts of the Scythian linguistic territory had changed by Herodotus' time to *l.*

This shows that a form *Skula-* of Herodotus' time must be traced to an earlier *Skuda.* In other words, the apparent contrast between fifth-century B. C. *Skula* and *Skuda* disappears, both continue an early *Skuda*[50]. The relation of the

two forms is a matter of chronology and geography: when the Greeks first met the Scythians (8th or 7th century B.C.?), they heard the form *Skuða- from which they formed their own Σκύθης, as the Assyrians formed their own *aškuz-*; when, some time later, they penetrated further inland, they heard the innovated *Skula-,* which they represented as Σκύλης or Σκολό-ται.

2. It would appear, then, that the Persians knew only the name Saka, even for the Western Scythians, but their predecessors in empire-building, the Assyrians, and the Greeks, both of whom made contact with these Scythians before the Persians, had knowledge of an indigenous term *Skuda.*

But this simple (or simplified) picture may stand in need of correction as is suggested by the following observations.

2.1. As we have seen, in various province lists, in which Ionians and/or Sakas are mentioned, there is also mention of a people or region called *Skudra.*

(1) Thus, in one of Darius' Susa inscriptions, DSe – cf. **1.3.2.** (3) above – Kent restores the following sequence:

Sardes – Ionians of the sea and those across the sea – *Skudra –*

Libyans – Ethiopians – Carians,

while Steve has:

Sardes – Ionians of the sea – Saka overseas – *Skudra –*

Ionians across the sea – Carians.

Although most of these ethnic names are not preserved but restored (mainly with the help of DNa), the name of the Skudra is attested in the Akkadian version.

(2) The new province list on the base of the Darius-statue – cf. **1.3.3.** (9) above – makes no mention of the Western Scythians, nor, for that matter, of Ionians of any kind (!), but does list the Skudra, although in a surprising sequence:

Sardes – Cappadocia – *Skudra* – Syria (?) – Arabia – Egypt – Libya.

(3) Darius' Naqš-i-Rustam list – see **1.3.2.** (4) above – gives Sardes – Ionians – Saka across the sea – *Skudra* – Petasos-Wearing Ionians.

(4) Xerxes' list in the daiva-inscription – cf. **1.3.2.** (5) above – has the sequence

Sardes – Egypt – Ionians of the sea and those across the sea –

... Sakā h. – Sakā t. – *Skudrā* – men of Akaufaka...

The Western Scythians are not mentioned but the Skudrā are named.

(5) Of the throne-bearers in A?P – cf. **1.3.2.** (6) above – the following are of interest (21–26):

Cappadocian – Sardian – Ionian – Saka

across the sea – *Skudrian* – Petasos-Wearing Ionian.

Here the Skudra are clearly associated with the Western Scythians.

2.2. As can be seen, the Skudra are (for the time being) mentioned in five lists. In two – nos. (3) and (5) above – they appear together with Ionians and Western Scythians; in one – no. (4) – they are in the company of Ionians but the Western Scythians are not mentioned; in one – no. (2) – they appear on their own, i. e. unaccompanied by either Ionians or Western Scythians; finally, in one – no. (1) – the position is (at present?) unclear, we cannot be sure that the Skudra were accompanied by the Ionians only, and not by the Western Scythians also.

But, all in all, the evidence definitely suggests that the Skudra were closely associated with Ionians and Western Scythians, and therefore that they were somewhere on the Balkans.

JUSTI seems to have been the first to suggest that the Skudra lived in Macedonia[51]. According to KENT Skudra is probably Thrace and Macedonia[52], and this view seems to be shared by all modern authors.

But Justi's idea is based solely on the assonance of the place name *Skydra* (Σκύδρα) in the Macedonian province Eordaia, and is historically and politically an absurdity. Skydra was and always remained an unimportant little village. When the Macedonians[53], coming from the South-West, moved into the mountainous region of Eordaia, they first occupied Aigai, later known as Edessa, which became the seat of their kings and the centre of the growing nation. The capital was first transferred to Pella by King Archelaos (413–399 B.C.). When King Amyntas I in 513 acknowledged the suzerainty of Darius the Great, he was still residing in Aigai. In these circumstances there was absolutely no reason why the Persians should at any time – whether during the Scythian campaign or their march down to Marathon – name their new province – incorporating, in the main, Thrace (?) – after a paltry little place like Skydra. Throughout their empire they never wavered in their practice of naming their provinces after well-known tribes or after even better known towns.

2.3. After establishing this negative point, we can now turn to a positive aspect of the matter, which seems to have gone unnoticed so far.

To immortalize his memory, and the greatness of his achievements, Darius the Great ordered that the peoples of his empire, represented by throne-bearers in relief, should adorn his tomb at Naqš-i-Rustam. Thirty throne-bearers became the standard complement even for the tombs of his successors, and like rare plants and animals in our arboreta and museums, they were provided with little labels (engraved in cuneiform signs, of course) to identify their nationality. They are now most easily accessible in Walser's *Die Völkerschaften* [see fn. 10], cf. esp. pp. 51 f., and Falttafel No. 1.

What interests us here is that the figures are presented almost naturalistically, with every detail of their apparel, weapons, and coiffure carefully ob-

served. Nevertheless, not infrequently several figures display the same dress and equipment, which is no doubt what happened in real life also in neighbouring areas. Walser (pp.55f.) distinguishes eight types, and gives the following description of type IV:

„Langärmeliger, eng anliegender, gegürteter Leibrock, über der Brust ausgeschnitten, unten frackartig abgerundet, an den inneren Rändern Borten, vielleicht Pelzfutter anzeigend; lange und weite Hosen, an den Knöcheln geschnüt; auf dem Kopf Baschlik mit Spitze und Ohrenklappen; Akinakes“.

The representatives of this type, which Walser simply labels „Sogder-Skythen“, are as follows:

7. Sogdians
8. X^v̄ārazmians
14. Saka haumavarga
15. Saka tigraxauda
24. Saka paradraya
25. Skudra.

2.4. The reliefs thus reveal that the *Skudra* belong with the Sakas and Sogdians. Since for the Western Sakas (Scythians) we could establish that they designated themselves as *Skuda,* there can be no doubt that the *Skudra* were related to them, not only in their dress but also in their name! In other words, *Skudra* is *Skud-ra,* a derivative of the name of the Scythians. Cf. Av. *suxra*–'red' from **suk-* (see 3.6. (c) (1) below); *bāzu-ra-* from *bazu-* 'arm', Khot. *maysda-ra-* 'nipple' from **mazda-.*

2.5. With this linguistic interpretation of their name we get for the first time a clear indication as to where to look for their habitat. It was obviously not in the mountainous regions of Eordaia but essentially on the Western coast of the Black Sea, north of Byzantium, i. e. from the point where Darius set up two stelae to commemorate the size of his armies (Hdt. IV 87), probably up to the Danube-delta, which, as is stated by Herodotus (IV 99), was the line separating the Skuda, the Western Scythians. How far inland the province extended cannot, of course, be determined, but there can be little doubt that it came to the empire as a result of the Scythian campaign of 514/513 B.C. The province of the Skudra, thus, was essentially European Turkey and the Eastern part of modern Bulgaria, that part of the Eastern Balkans which on maps of the ancient world goes by the name of Thracia[54]; in all probability it did not include any part of Macedonia[55].

3. *Sogdiana,* the Greek and Latin name of the province known to Achaemenid Iran as *Sug(u)da,* was, broadly speaking, situated between the rivers Oxus (= Amū-daryā) and Iaxartes (= Sīr-darya). Its most important town was

Marakanda/Samarkand. About the Sogdians of the Achaemenid era Greek historians report interestingly, about their appearance the reliefs discussed above (2.3.) inform us graphically. Of their language nothing is known directly, but I have suggested recently[56] that the river Oxus, ancient *Vaxšu,* might represent **Baxšu,* from **bag-* 'run, flow' (cf. Khotanese *bas⬜ʂ⬜ä̆* 'rivers'), with an early change, familiar from East Iranian, of *b-* to *v-*[57]. This would give us one piece of evidence about Ancient Sogdian but not enough of course to see more clearly the characteristic features of this Eastern dialect in ancient times.

3.1. This unsatisfactory situation underwent a dramatic change in the early years of our century. Until then only the Sogdian names of the months, recorded by the Arab polyhistor Al Bīrūnī (ca. 1000 A. D.), had been known. But the flood of documents pouring in from Central Asia revealed a number of Middle Iranian dialects, and ANDREAS was able to state as early as 1904 that among the manuscript fragments found in Turfan there was a large number written, not in a „Pehlevi-Dialekt" as it had been named by F. W. K. MÜLLER, but in (Middle) Sogdian[58]. And a few years later, in 1908, Andreas was able to pinpoint two dialect features characteristic of Sogdian($\theta r > š$, $h > \chi$)[59], and two years later yet another, i. e. the development of δ to l in part of the Sogdian area[60]. The latter is of especial interest for our problem inasmuch as Andreas shows that the change occurred in the adjective *Sūlīk* 'Sogdian' from **Suγδīk* as well, a form which is recorded not only in Western Iranian sources but, as *Su-li,* also in the report of the Chinese pilgrim Hüan-Tsang who passed through Sogdiana in 630 A. D. We now know that Chinese sources guarantee the development to *Sūlī* as early as 400 A. D.[61]. But earlier attempts to find this name in Khotanese sources which present the forms *sūlī,* instr. sg. *sūlīna,* nom. pl. *sūly-a,* have proved erroneous; they present an appellative *sūlī* 'scribe, secretary' borrowed from Chinese[62]. The antecedent of Iranian *sūl-* appears in Man. MPe *swγlyy*[63]*,* while the variant with preserved *d* is seen in Kāšγarī's *suγdaq,* in the form *(s)wt'yk = sūdīk* 'Sogdian' recorded in a Sogdian list of nations, in Pahl. *suvdīk* (? or just *sūdīk*?), and in Armenian *Sōdikʻ*[64].

3.2. Even more important is the fact that in the Sogdian documents the following formations have turned up[65]:

(1) *swγδyk* 'Sogdian' from **suγδiyaka-;*

(2) *swγδyk'nw* 'Sogdians' (in Ancient Letter II 9)[66] from **suγδiya-kānām;*

(3) Manich. *(s)wγδy'w, swγδ'yw* 'in Sogdian, *Sogdice',* from **suγδi-yāw-*[67];

(4) *sγwδyk* 'Sogdian', from **sγuδiyaka-* with metathesis from **suγ-δiyaka-;*

(5) *sγwδy'w* (*zβ'k*)[68] 'Sogdian (language)';

(6) *sγwδy'n'k (np'yk)* 'Sogdian (writings, literature)' from **sγuδiyā-naka-*.

Of particular interest is that in the Ancient Letters (early fourth century A. D.? or end of second century A. D.?[69]) the only form found is *swγδyk-,* while in later documents the metathetic form *sγwδ-* is the norm. One can even say, with HENNING[70], that the standard spelling is *sγwδyk-.* Thus in the only body of documents from Sogdiana itself, i. e. in the documents found on Mount Muγ at Khairabad, north of Dušanbe, the capital of Tadžikistan, and some 120 kms east of Samarkand, the ruler of Sogdiana, Dēwāštīč (first half of the 8th century A. D.), is addressed or describes himself as follows[71]:

(a) MN *sγwδyk* MLK' *δyw'štyč*[72]

'from Dēwāštič, the Sogdian king'

(b) *sγwδyk* MLK' *sm'rknδč* MR'Y *δyw'štyč*

'Dēwāštič, king of the Sogdians, lord of Samarkand'

(c) *'t βγw γwβw* RB*čh 'nwth sγwδyk'* MLK' *sm'rknδč* MR'Y *δyw'štyč*

'to Dēwāštič, (our) master (and) ruler, (our) mighty protection, king of the Sogdians, lord of Samarkand'.

This formula occurs twice in this form, though in one and the same document[74], but, with some orthographic variations and the replacement of 'Sogdian' by

<div align="center">

sγwδγ'nk,

</div>

it appears twice more, again in the same document[75]; for the antecedent of this form cf. no. (6) above.

In the face of this consistent spelling *sγwδ-* it is unexpected, to say the least, that once even *sγwδ'k* should appear in this eighth-century corpus[76]. But if it is real, it signals the tenacious survival of an old form encountered under nos. 1–3 above, and kept alive by Kāšγarī also (see **3.1.** above).

3.3. These facts suggest that the name of the Sogdians originally was *suγδa -,* which later was metathetized to *sγuδa-.* And this sequence is borne out by the forms known from Old Iranian.

Pride of place goes of course to the Achaemenid inscriptions which are firmly anchored in time. They present three variant spellings:

(1) s^a-*u*-g^u-*u*-d^a = *Suguda*

(2) s^a-*u*-g^u-d^a = *Suguda*

(3) s^a-*u*-g^a-d^a = *Sugda*

All three appear already in Darius' time, cf.

> *Suguda* in DB 1, 16; DNa 23; DSf 38;
>
> *Sug^uda* in DPe 16;
>
> *Sugda* in DPh 6; DH 5; XPh 21.

It is interesting that the 'short' form invariably appears in the Elamite and Akkadian versions (*šu-ug-da* and *su-ug-du* respectively), and in Greek Σόγδοι,

Σογδιᾱνή. And the same short variant is the only form known to the other branch of Old Iranian. In Avestan literature we find

(1) *suɣδō · šayana-* 'die Wohnung der Sogdianer bildend, wo die S. wohnen', qualifying *Gava* in Vidēvdāt 1.4.;

(2) *suxδəm* (interpolated?) in the Miθra-yašt (stz. 14), to be read as *suɣδəm*?[77]

No. (1) presents no special difficulties, it is in all likelihood simply a tatpuruṣa-compound, used as an adjective or in apposition[78]. But no. (2) is not as clear, it would seem, either formally *(xδ?)* or contextually. It occurs at the end of stanza 14:

mourum hārōyum gaomča suxδəm xᵛāirizəmča.

BARTHOLOMAE wanted to see "in *gava-* einen anderen Namen des Landes [sc. Sogdiana], der vielleicht von der Hauptstadt stammt, und in *suxδəmča...* eine Glosse"[79]. BENVENISTE allowed himself to be guided by the octosyllabic metre of the first half of the stanza, and restored

margum haraivam gavamča
suxδəmča Xᵛāirizəmča,

concluding that the metrical and grammatical defects of his last line proved that it was a late interpolation[80]. But this did not, of course, account for the presence of both *gava* and *suxδ-*[81]. Both objections could be met in CHRISTENSEN'S view[82] by reading:

Sugdanām χuvārazmīmča,

but is it really credible that a clear gen. pl. *sugdanām* should have been lost and that the name of Khwārezm, always with an initial *xᵛ-,* should (by 'dilatation'?) have become **χuvārazmī-*?[83] Unfortunately, the latest interpretation does not seem to have brought a final solution either: the assumption that we have here groups of two names each, consisting "of a name of a region followed by an ethnical adjective"[84], is based on nothing, and contradicts all our information on provincial lists.

3.4. In spite of these textual difficulties it is indisputable that both Old Persian and Avestan know the name of the area in question as *Sugda,* and that Old Persian offers a variant *Suguda.*

It has been argued recently that the relation of the two OP forms should be seen in the light of the epigraphic evidence[85]. In other words, since the Bisutun-inscription and many other inscriptions of Darius present *Suguda,* and *Sugda* appears only in DPh 6, DH 5, and in Xerxes' daiva-inscription (XPh 21), we should conclude that *Suguda* is the earlier form, confined to the last two decades of the sixth century, while *Sugda* is to be dated later. But the rashness of this conclusion is shown by the fact, mentioned already (see 3.3. above), that both the Elamite and the Akkadian version only have the form *Sugda.* For it is

now established beyond any doubt that the Elamite version of the Bisutun in-scription was the first to be carved into the rock surface[86]. And this evidence is supported by the Greek form.

There can be no doubt that the form first received, that is the Sogdian form, was *Sugda,* its change to *Suguda* was an adaptation to Persian speech habits carried out in the Persis, at the royal court. The anaptyxis involved, the resolution of the 'outlandish' cluster $^u gd$ (or $\gamma\delta$ see below) to $^u gud,$ is known from the sequence *duru-* also which arose by anaptyxis from *dru-,* and was noted in our case very early[87]. The coexistence of the two forms in the Bisutun-inscription and elsewhere is obviously due to sociolinguistic reasons, that is represents upper- and lower-class variants, which later were normalized in fa-vour of the Sogdian pronunciation.

3.5. Having established that the Old Sogdian form was *Suγda-,* taken over into Old Persian as *Sugda* and, with anaptyxis, *Suguda,* we may now turn to the question of origin.

As far as I can see, and although it might seem to verge on the incredible, the first attempt to interpret the name[88] was made by the veteran Ossetic spe-cialist V. I. Abaev in 1949. In his study on the Scythian language ABAEV sug-gested[89] that the name of Sogd(iana), contained in Σουγδαία, name of a settle-ment in the Crimea [founded in 212 A. D.!], showed a very precocious voicing of *k* and *t,* inasmuch as it derived from **sukta-,* surviving as *suγd-* in Ossetic (Digor) *suğdæg* 'clean, holy', whereas voicing normally occurred much later, in the second – third centuries A.D. This suggestion was repeated in 1972, and is now also recorded in the latest volume (1979) of Abaev's *magnum opus*[90]. This most detailed version specifies that the voicing occurred in the early group *xt>γd,* not in the single voiceless stops, and that the name obviously meant 'clean, hallowed', with reference to country or town.

(2) Exactly the same interpretation, but without mention of Abaev's name, has recently been advanced by HARMATTA[91]. The only point worth notic-ing is that he is well aware that the (Middle) Sogdian form of the name, *swγδ-,* is at variance with the Sogdian form of the PPP **suxta-,* i.e. *swγt,* but, he opines (p. 5): "It would, however, be overhasty to conclude that the phonemic forms of the two words were different or that they can be traced back to differ-ent Proto-Iranian antecedents"...; "the spelling *swγδ-* can be regarded as phonet-ic and *swγt-* as etymological"; he also thinks that, since *t* often alternates with *δ* in Sogdian orthography, this *t* marked *δ* in *swγt-* also. "Therefore, it cannot be doubted that" *Suγda* derives from **suxta-* 'burnt', and Sogd. *'wswγt* 'pure', Osset. *suğdæg* 'saint' suggest a semantic filiation *burnt→pure→ saint* in the North Iranian languages, "rooted in the Pre-Zoroastrian fire cult of the North

Iranians". As to the meaning, which "may strike us as curious at first", he refers the reader to *Holy Land* and Σουγδαία in the Crimea.

(3) An altogether different, and less self-assured, attempt was made by W. EILERS a few years ago[92] when he tried to fit the name *Sugda* into the broader framework of country names based on river names (cf. Senegal, Kongo, Colorado, Illinois, Mississipi, Missouri, etc.): "Wir möchten meinen, daß vielleicht auch die *Sogdiane* auf solch einen ursprünglichen Flußnamen zurückgeht. In ap. *Sug(u)da* haben wir möglicherweise die Ausgangsform des heutigen Fluß- und Stadtnamens *Soχ* vor uns... *Soχ* (mit enttonter Media[93] für -γ) heißt jener Fluß, der jetzt in den großen Ferghana-Kanal mündet. *Was der Name bedeutet, ist schwer zu sagen*[94]. Man denkt beim Auslaut *-da* von *Suguda* an indische Flußnamen wie *Gōdā (Gōdāvarī)* f. 'Rinder gebend'. Aber dann müßte *su-* 'gut' statt iranisch *hu-* entweder aus altarischer Zeit erhalten geblieben sein oder auf damals dort ansässige Inder zurückgehen. *Also eine fragwürdige Erklärung*"[94].

3.6. Of the several attempts reviewed the last one seems the least helpful. It presupposes the primacy of the trisyllabic form *Suguda,* and, what is more, it is forced to see in this a purely Indian (or archaic Aryan) formation, an assumption for which in this Iranian heartland there is not even a shred of evidence. And even if we are willing to ignore the difference in vowel-grade *(guda:gōdā),* we cannot ignore the fact that both *Gōdā,* allegedly another name of the river in the Deccan known as *Gōdāvarī*[90]*,* and *Suguda* are unattested in India, and the latter, if real, a compositional oddity presenting three members[96]. And is 'cow-giving' an apt name of rivers?

But the explanation from the PPP *suxta-* of *sauk-* 'burn' is also untenable, and that for several reasons.

(a) The assumption that an early cluster *xt* could become *γd* in Sogdian as early as (the middle of?) the sixth century B.C., is not supported by a single piece of evidence. In fact, the admission (by Abaev) that the voicing of intervocalic (!) voiceless stops is not earlier than the second and/or third centuries A.D., rules out, even for isolated cases, its occurrence seven or eight centuries before. The name Σουγδαία is useless as evidence since the town was founded in 212 A. D., and the alleged example of an early change *k>g,* i. e. Herodotus' Μασσαγέται, explained by Abaev from **manu-sāka-ta,* cannot outweigh Darius' *Saka.*

I would also add here that if, as I tried to show, the preconsonantal stops developed into the homorganic spirants under Semitic, more precisely Aramaic, influence, then it must be noted that the change of Proto-Iranian **sukta-* to **suxta-* was carried out around and after 600 B.C.[97], and in Sogdian even with

some delay so that there would not be enough time before 520 B. C. for a further change to *suɣda-*.

(b) The equation of *Sug(u)da* with the PPP *suxta-* is, however, not only on chronological grounds erroneous, it is also demonstrably false in terms of the Sogdian phonological system. For it implies phonetic and/or phonological assumptions which are untenable.

(1) It is alleged that (Middle) Sogdian *swɣδ-* 'Sogdian(a)' and *swɣt* 'burnt' do not represent different phonetic and phonological forms. This is proved in the following manner[98]:

"In general a continuation *d* of the *-t-* in the past participle is presumed. In the spelling of many words, however, the *-t-* alternates with *-δ-*. This phenomenon points to the fact that it marked *-δ-* in reality".

But this argument is simply an egregious misreading of what Gershevitch clearly stated in the following terms (*o.c.* [fn. 64], § 268): "Instead of, or alternating with, *t* from OIr. *t,* some words have Manichaean *δ*, Christian *d,* in postvocalic position or after *r*. This presumably indicates a pronunciation *d,* cf. *d* from *t* in Khwārezmian and Ossetic".

In other words, the alternation of *t/δ* is found, not "in the spelling of many words", but only in *some, and, what is much more relevant, it is found only in postvocalic position or after r,* and not after consonants in general as would be required for H's argument. Moreover, Gershevitch's *δ* is not the spirant, as postulated by H., but the stop *d* as Gershevitch states in so many words.

To clinch this point, it will be enough to stress that the Sogdian scribes were never in any doubt as to how the respective words had to be spelt: the ethnic is always spelt *swɣδ-* or *sɣwδ-,* with *δ*, while the PPP is written *swɣt-,* '*wswɣt,* and even, with analogical *x*[99], '*wswxt,* but always with *t*. If the two forms had denoted the same entity, it would have been a miracle if the scribes could always have kept a straight line between the two possibilities of writing.

(2) The particular argument concerning *swɣδ* is buttressed with some general considerations. "It would be overhasty to conclude that the phonemic forms of the two words were different" [see **3.5. (2)** above]; "In Sogdian *d* could exist at the most as an allophone (*e.g.* in the sound group *-nd-*) and in certain cases it could eventually alternate with *δ*. This was the case possibly also in the cluster *-ɣδ-* ~ *-ɣd-*"[100].

But this argument ignores the basic structure of the Sogdian phonological system which, for obvious reasons, was not presented in Gershevitch's admirable work[101] but is now, *lege artis,* established by B.Gharib[102].

The relevant part of the consonantal system of Sogdian, that is the obstruents, show the following structure (p. 45):

```
p    t         č    k
[b   d         ǰ    g]
 f   θ    s    š    x
 β   δ    z    ž    γ
```

The fricatives *β δ γ* reflect OIran. *b d g* "which have become spirants in all positions, except after nasal and a voiced sibilant" (p. 53). The voiced stops *b d ǰ g* "are predictable... They behave as allophonic variants, sometimes of voiceless stops, sometimes of voiced spirants" (p. 56).

This means that, in the Middle Sogdian obstruent system, the voiced stops are not phonemic; only the voiceless stops and the voiced and voiceless spirants are phonemic. But the voiceless stop phonemes include as allophones voiced stop phones, and these can be allophones of voiced spirant phonemes as well. This is, of course, the well-known problem of (the infringement of) the biuniqueness principle, exemplified by German [rāt] as the singular of *Räte* and *Räder,* or [bunt] as the singular of *bunte* and *Bunde,* or [rayDər] in some American dialects, representing both *writer* and *rider*[103].

This kind of phonemic overlapping is illustrated by the Sogdian phone *d,* which can be the allophone of /t/ or /ð/, but this does not mean that the phoneme /t/ can alternate with, that is to say have as its allophone, *δ*. The PPP *swγt* is phonetically [suγd] with a final phoneme /t/[104], while *swγδ* is phonetically [suγδ] with a final phoneme /ð/. No Sogdian could mistake either for the other.

(c) In addition to these phonetic / phonological points, there are also semantic obstacles in the way of the proposed derivation.

(1) It is assumed, without further ado, that the semantic trajectory starting from *burnt* reached, via *clean,* the final point *holy* by the mid-sixth century B.C. at the latest! And yet the facts clearly show that Old Iranian everywhere had the original meaning *burning / burnt* only; cf. also *suxra-* 'red' (of fire). The stage *purify* and adj. *clean* was reached in Middle Iranian times, cf. Khotanese *suraa-* 'clean', *va-sūj-* 'purify' (from *ava-sauč-*); Sogdian *pswč-* 'purify', *'wswγt* 'pure'. And the stage *holy* seems to be only found in Modern Ossetic *suǧdæg* 'clean, holy', for the town-name Σουγδαία is surely simply 'Sogdian'[105].

(2) It is further assumed that 'holy' was applied to a town or land – again without any attempt to prove this assumption. And yet, Cameron issued a warning several years ago which ought to be heeded: "I am no longer convinced that they [: the lists] are lists of provinces or administrative satrapies...; the Great Kings... are enumerating not lands, but various groups of people whom they thought worthy of specific mention"[106].

This is particularly clear in the throne-bearer labels of A?P (see **1.3.2. (6)** above) and in the cartouches of the new Suez inscription (see **1.3.3. (9)** above). In A?P the following throne-bearers are named by derivative ethnics for the first time: *Uvārazmiya, Kūšāya, Gandāraya, θataguiya, Putāya, Mačiya, Harauvatiya, Hinduya,* i. e. nine out of thirty. In eleven cases the ethnic was used as the name of the province from the start, cf. *Pārsa, Māda, Ū(v]ǰa, Parθava, Saka, Arabāya, Mudrāya, Katpatuka, Yauna, Skudra, Karka.* The Assyrian throne-bearer is named *Aθuriya,* i. e. by a derivative from the province name *Aθurā,* as he is already in Darius' inscriptions. In fact, of the twenty-six names preserved in A?P, twenty-five are adjectival ethnics!

Sug(u)da does not appear in the extant labels of A?P but it is quite clear from the Greek Σόγδοι that it was used as an ethnic, not as the name of a country. This is corroborated by Avestan *Gavam yam Suγδa-šayanam* 'Gava, the settlement of the Sogdians'. And it needs no lenghty demonstration that the inhabitants, erring humans, could not be labelled saints.

3.7. The sum total of these positive and negative considerations irresistibly leads to a new solution.

Since, as we have seen, the (Middle) Sogdian form was a phonetic *Suγδ-,* we must ask whether this enables us to make a definite statement about the sound shape of this name in Old Sogdian, more precisely in early Achaemenid times when the Old Persian inscriptions present the forms *Suguda, Sugda.*

3.7.1. We can, first of all, make an extremely important statement about the cluster *gd.*

Purely theoretically, we could assume that *gd* represents original *g-d,* that is a root ending in *g* or *k* and a suffix *d,* IE *d* or *dh.* But, on inspection, we find that an Aryan suffix *-d(h)a-* is extremely rare[107].

One of the best attested instances is Avest. *mīž-da-* 'meed, reward': Ind. *mīḍha-,* Gk. μισθός, IE **miz-dho-.*

More doubtful cases are

Avest. *myazda-* 'Offering of food': Ind. *miyedha-* 'sacrificial oblation';
Aryan **m(i)yaz-dha-?*
Ind. *meda–* 'fat, marrow': Iran. **mazda-* 'food' (?).

But not only are these types rare, they also seem to represent formations with IE **dhē-* 'set, put' and **dō-* 'give', which are unsuited for *Sugda-.* And the same applies to the root-part *sug-* whether that be original **sug-* or assimilated **suk-.*

The difficulties would be just as great if we tried to trace *Sugda-* to a theoretically also possible Aryan **sugh-ta-* which by Bartholomae's law would have become **sugdha-,* Iranian **sugda-.* But there is no Aryan root **sugh-,* and, if there had been one, the result, in Iranian, would have been phonetic

sugda-, cf. Sogdian δwγt, Avest. *dugǝdar-* from **dugh-tar-* (by metathesis from **dhug-tar-*[108]).

But the basic fault with all these explanations is the fact that they all operate with a stop cluster *-gd-* whereas we have found that the Sogdian form had the spirant cluster *-γδ-*.

3.7.2. If, then, we have to start from an Old Sogdian *Suγδa-,* then it becomes clear at once that such a form, with two spirants, presupposes an earlier form, in which the second spirant at least was between vowels so that it was spirantized in early times, see **3.6.** (b) (2) and **1.4.2.** above.

This still admits of two possibilities concerning the first obstruent in the cluster. One is that it represents an original *g* which became *γ* so that the original form was **Suguda-,* and this became **Suγuδa-* and was then syncopated to **Suγδa-*. The other is that the first obstruent started life as *k,* and the original **Sukuda-* developed into **Sukuδa-,* and by syncope into **Sukδa-,* in which the preconsonantal *k* had to become the spirant *x,* and eventually the voiced *γ,* the resulting form being ** Suγδa-*.

It is clear that **Suguda* is not amenable to an appropriate interpretation in Iranian. On the other hand, **Sukuda* offers just as clearly *the right solution:* it is nothing else but the anaptyctic form of the Pontic *Skuda*[109]. By a curious interplay of dialectal idiosyncrasies, the anaptyctic **Sukuda* was in Sogdian again syncopated to *Suγδa,* whereas in Old Persian this form was taken over (with stops) as *Sugda,* and then given, at least for a short time, an anaptyctic variant *Suguda*[110].

3.8. These results are of great interest, not only to the linguist, but also to the historian. For they show that at first all the North Iranian tribes of the steppe region, from Central Asia to the Pontic region, had one common name, i.e. *Skuda-* 'archer'. More precisely, this was, to begin with, the name of the North Iranian nomadic tribes between the Caspian and, say, Lake Balkhash until early in the first millennium B.C. the forces adumbrated at the beginning of our discussions drove these tribes in ever increasing numbers on a westward trek.

This expansion led to a linguistic differentiation. In the Pontic region the name *Skuda* developed by the mid-first millennium B. C. to *Skula*. In the East, at least between the Oxus and Iaxartes, the same name developed into *Suγδa*. The Achaemenids adopted this name in the form *Sug(u)da* but restricted its use to a well-defined geographical area of their realm. Nomads of the same general linguistic and cultural type beyond the Sogdians were designated as *Saka*. And when, in the course of their westward drive to and into Anatolia, the Achaemenids reached and then crossed the Bosporus and moving north met tribes of much the same linguistic and cultural habits as the Sakas known to them in the

East, they called them also Sakas. This nomenclature was, not surprisingly, adopted by the Elamite scribes of the court (*:šá-ak-qa*), but the Akkadian interpreters, harking back to bygone ages, retained or revived the old name *Gimi(r)-ri,* that is the name of the invaders from the North who preceded the Scythians proper on the Northern outskirts of the Assyrian realm. The Greeks, on the other hand, viewed the steppe world from their own end: for them all steppe nomads were Scythians since they were the first specimens of these curious beings whom they had met.

This broad use of one and the same ethnic for a large area is paralleled in earlier times, roughly in the mid-second millennium B. C, by the rapid spread to all Indo-Iranian tribes (and no others!) of the new name *arya* 'Aryan'[111].

4. But this broad use of the term *Saka* prompts the question whether its meaning can be discovered. Attempts to answer this question have not been wanting.

4.1. One of the earliest seems to have been the interpretation of the name as 'dog'. It was advanced by H. SKÖLD[112] who thought that *Ispakai* of the *Ašguzai* people, mentioned during Esarhaddon's reign (681–669 B.C., see **1.1.2.** above), was not a prince but a people, *Ispakai* representing the oldest form of the name of the Saka, i. e. **Spaka.* In the period between Esarhaddon and Darius I in the Khotanese language *sp* developed into *śś,* and so the name became *Śaka* (as in Sanskrit), and was received into Old Persian, with sound substitution, as *Saka.*

But, unfortunately, the Khotanese form of 'dog' was not **spaka* but *śvān-* or *śśuvān-*[113]. And, in any case, if IE *k̑w* had developed into *sp,* this could never have gone to *śś* but would have been preserved as *sp,* so that phonetically the explanation is unacceptable. Moreover, Akkadologists unanimously take *Ispakai* to be the name of a prince, and not of a people, another serious obstacle.

4.2. Another animal, this time the deer, was found in the name of the Saka by ABAJEV in 1949 [114]. He compared *Saka* (misprinted as *sāka* 'Scythian') with Ossetic *sag* 'hart' from **sāka-,* connected with the large group of IE words meaning 'branch' (Ind. *šākhā,* Lithu. *šakà),* 'plough' (Russ. *soxa,* Goth, *hōha),* 'fork' (Lithu. *šaké).* But the derivation presupposes a vrddhi-formation from **sak-* 'fork' (cf. NPers. *šāx* 'branch; antlers'!), so that **sāka-* would be 'provided with antlers, deer', whereas *Saka-,* with its normal-grade vocalism, could not have had this meaning.

4.3. In the meantime, a quite different suggestion had been put forward by A. CHRISTENSEN[115]. Discussing Ahura Mazdā's statement in the Vidēvdāt (1.4.) that he created as the second-best country in the world Gava, home of the Sogdians, while Ahra Manyu, the destructive, created as a scourge of the land, *sakaitī,* the very destructive (*sakaitīm yąm... pouru. mahrkəm),* Christensen first

argued that the reading *skaitīm,* adopted by Geldner and Bartholomae, was unacceptable because the metre required *sakaitīm:*

> ahya patyāram frākr̥ntat
> ahrō manyuš purumarkō
> sakatīm yām purumarkām.

Then, rejecting the traditional interpretation of *skaitī* as 'locust', he suggested that *Sakaitī* was 'le peuple des Saces', so that the passage quoted was to be translated as:

"Comme opposition Ahra Manyu le très destructeur y a produit le peuple très destructeur des Saces" (p.77).

This surprising combination of *Saka with Sakaitī* was justified by reference to *Harā-Haraitī:* "*Harā* est le nom d'une montagne et *Haratī* la dénomination du massif dont *Harā* est le point le plus saillant" (p. 65).

But the reference to *Harā-Haraitī* does not throw light on the relation of *Saka* and *Sakaitī,* on the contrary. However, in the case of *Harā-Haraitī* there is a chance of glimpsing the nature of their relation. For *Haraitī* surely is reminiscent of the type seen in *bərəzaitī,* i. e. suggests a formative *-ṇtī.* And, beside this feminine formation, a masculine in *–ā,* from IE *-ōn,* would be expected, represented not only by Greek φέρων, but also by OP *tunuvā,* and perhaps also by the Slavic participles in *-y,* e.g. OCS *vedy* 'leading'[116]. And this analysis is completed by Bailey's discovery that *harā* is formed on a root *har-* 'to rise', seen in Ossetic *xærd* 'ascent', Sogdian (Buddh.) *γr-,* (Christ.) *xr-* 'go', etc. But this root is not to be identified with IE **ser-* 'flow' in Ind. *sarati, sisarti,* etc. – a semantically impossible combination[117] – but with a root found in the Anatolian group, i. e.

Hitt. *sēr* 'aloft', *sarā* [sra] 'up'
Luw. *sarri* [sri] 'aloft', *sarra* [sra] 'up'
Lycian *hri* 'above' from **sri*
Phrygian ὀρου 'above' from **sor-ō*[118].

This means that an IE verbal root **ser-* 'to rise' gave Iranian *harā* and *haratī* 'rising, elevation, mount(ain)', the first no doubt in concord with *gari-* m. 'hill', the second perhaps after a feminine **br̥z-* 'high, height, hill', identical with OIrish *brí,* gen. *breg,* and Germanic *burg-,* variant of (German) *Berg.* But the masc. *harā* was naturally attracted into the *-ā-* class, and became a feminine, more or less a variant of *haratī,* cf. Av. *harayå bərəzō* and *haraiθyå bərəzō.*

But if, thus, we have succeeded in clarifying the relation of *Harā* to *Haraitī,* our results have contributed nothing to our understanding of the interrelation of *Saka* and *Sakatī.* In fact, the implausibility of a people being named as the plague of Gava in the Vidēvdāt-passage counsels against adopting this

view. Much to be preferred is the suggestion that *skaitī* (sic) survives in Buddh. Sogdian *'skt* 'thorn', Christ. Sogd. *sqt'* 'tares', Parthian *'skd* 'thorns'[119], which, I have suggested[120], is a Semitic loan-word in Iranian.

4.4. An interpretation based on the verbal root of Ind. *šak-nōmi* 'I can, am able to' was first advocated by MARKWART in 1930[121] (: "eine ehrenvolle Bezeichnung"!), and has in recent years won the wholehearted support of Sir Harold BAILEY[122]. But the argument advanced is most perplexing: "since 'men' as a tribal name is well attested..., a likely conjecture is that *saka-* is the adjective from *sak-* 'be powerful, skilful' (attested in the Rigvedic *su-šáka-*) used as an epithet of 'men'." Perplexing because it is a pure *non sequitur*. Even if it is conceded that 'men' is often used as a tribal name – as is certainly the case[123] – it doesn't follow that an epitheton used with it can just as naturally be used as a tribal name. What is more, it is only in Indian that *šak-* shows the meaning 'to be able, strong'. In Iranian, the corresponding root *sak-* 'sich verstehen auf, im Gedächtnis behalten; understand', *ā-sak-* 'memorize', Khotanese *sāj-* 'to learn', Buddh. Sogd. *'βs''č, 'βs'γt* 'to teach' (from **fra-sāčaya-*)[124], etc., are so consistently centred on the semantic field of knowing, teaching that we must conclude that the Indian 'be able, strong' must be secondary, and with this the possibility of an Iranian *saka-* 'powerful' disappears.

4.5. If, then, 'dog', 'deer', 'powerful', all seem equally unavailing, we are once again thrown back on the basic question: what was it that seemed, or still seems, characteristic of the Saka tribes? We know of course that certain tribes had special names, e.g. *tigraxauda-, haumavarga-,* but they were all called *Saka,* in fact, for the Achaemenids all peoples north of the settled areas were Saka.

The answer is succinctly put by GERSHEVITCH: "Xᵛaniraθa is the 'land of settled dwelling, etc.', as opposed to the Northern Steppes where life was nomadic"[125]. Even more terse is BAILEY'S statement: the Saka, known to Achaemenids and Greeks in the 6th century B.C., "lived as nomads to the east beyond Suguda"[126]. More detailed is the picture limned by FRYE: "In Central Asia, outside of the oases, lived nomads called generically 'Saka' by the Persians. It was probably their mode of life rather than any ethnic or linguistic features which differentiated them from their settled neighbours, the Sogdians, and Khwarezmians and others; ... one may suppose that the Sakas-Scythians were undifferentiated by the settled people of the Near East as later the various Turkic peoples were considered to be 'Turks'"[127].

This picture naturally draws on the statements of the ancients. Strabo describes (XI, 8, 1) that travelling east we find Bactria and Sogdiane, and, last, the nomad Scythians (= Sakas): εἶθ' ἡ Βακτριανή ἐστι καὶ ἡ Σογδιανή, τελευταῖοι δὲ Σκύθαι νομάδες. The Scythians east of the Caspian are all in their

great majority nomads (XI, 8, 2): ἅπαντες δ᾽ ὡς ἐπὶ το πολὺ νομάδες. But in accord with Darius (DPh 5–6), Strabo also specifically mentions the Saka who live beyond Sogdiana (XI, 11, 2): the Iaxartes separates the Sogdians and the nomads (οὗτος δὲ καὶ τοὺς Σογδίους ὁρίζει καὶ τοὺς νομάδας).

In view of these clear pointers, it would seem reasonable to assume that *Saka* is 'nomad'. I first made this suggestion a good many years ago[128] but the evidence has since increased tremendously. At that time I submitted that Saka was an adjective/agent noun derived from the Iranian root **sak-* 'go, flow, run' found in the morphologically not very clear OP *θakatā,* preserved in the date formulae as Parthian *sxt* and Sogdian *sγty'*; in Lithu. *šokti* 'jump', and Ind. *ša-kat☐ăm* 'wagon'; Saka therefore meant 'running, swift' or 'vagrant, nomadic'.

Today, our Iranian material is not confined to Bartholomae's root *²sak-*'(zeitlich) vorübergehen, verstreichen', nor to this meaning alone. Thanks to GERSHEVITCH's perspicacity we now see that *²sak-* is the basis of the following derivative groups[129]:

(1) 'pass' in Pahl. *sač-* 'pass away', Sanglechi *šəxs-* 'pass over', Parth. *'wsxt* 'descend', and the group of OP *θakatā;*

(2) 'pass'→ 'be suitable, fitting' (cf. Germ. *passen,* Greek καθήκει, προσήκει) in Parth. *sčyd* 'it is fitting'=MPe. *szyd,* NPers. *sazad,* Sogd. *s'čt, s'št;*

(3) Causative 'make suitable, prepare; adorn, arrange', cf. Parth. *s'č-, ps'č-/psxt-, nys'ž-* 'prepare, arrange', *MPe. ps'z-/ps'xt-, hs'z-/hs'xt-* 'to prepare', NPers. *sāxtan* 'prepare, manufacture'; Sogd. *pts'č-/ptsγt-* 'adorn, arrange', *pts'k* 'order, arrangement', *'ns'č/'ns'γt-* 'to join, fix'; Arm. *patšač* 'suitable'.

We can sum up these findings by saying that Iran. *²sak-* originally meant 'go, roam', then developed the specialized senses 'pass' (of time), 'behove', 'be fitting', and, through the causative, 'make fitting, prepare, arrange, produce'[130].

It seems obvious, then, that *Saka* is the 'roamer, wanderer', the 'vagrant nomad'[131].

5. Our results can thus be summed up as follows.

(1) The name of the Scythians can with the help of the external and internal data (Greek Σκύθης, Assyrian *aškuz* on the one hand, Scythian *Skules, Skolotai* on the other) be restored as *Skuda.* It was formed from the IE root **skeud-* 'propel, shoot', well-known from the Germanic languages (Engl. *shoot,* etc.), so that *Skuda* had the meaning 'shooter, archer', in accord with the information handed down about this people.

(2) The *Skudra,* a people named between the Greeks of Asia Minor and the mainland, and the Western Scythians, are usually identified with the Mace-

donians and/or Thracians. But the Achaemenidian throne-bearer reliefs reveal that their dress and armament was identical with that of Walser's "Sogdo-Scythian" group. They were, therefore, part of this ethnic group, that is also Iranians, and their name *Skudra* a derivative of *Skuda,* name of the Scythians.

(3) The name of the Sogdians, OP *Sug(u)da,* has in recent years been explained as being identical with the Sogdian word *swγt* = [suγd], originally 'burnt', but in later times also 'clean' and 'holy', so that *Sugda* was the 'Holy Land'. It can be shown, however, that this explanation is unacceptable on phonological and semantic grounds. On the other hand, the fact that the true name of the Sogdians, not of their country, was [suγδ] demands an antecedent with a vowel between the consonants, that is **Suγiδa* or **Sukuδa*. There can be no doubt that the latter gives the correct solution, since it is nothing else but the anaptyctic form of the Pontic *Skuda.*

This is of the greatest importance to the historian. For it reveals that at first all North Iranian tribes of the steppe region had one common indigenous name, i. e. *Skuda* 'archer'. In the Pontus region the name developed by the middle of the first millennium into *Skula,* preserved in the Greeks' Σκύλης, Σκολόται. In Sogdian, on the other hand, it went to *Suγ(u)δa,* taken over by the Achaemenids as *Sugda.*

(4) *Saka,* used by the Achaemenids as a generic term for all Northern nomads (in lieu of the earlier *Skuda*), cannot have meant 'dog', or 'stag', or 'powerful'. In agreement with the general characterization of these peoples as nomads, their name can only be traced to the now well established root *sak-* 'go, roam', so that *Saka* meant the 'wanderer', 'vagrant nomad'.

ADDENDA

adfn. 4: W.P. SCHMID, in: Handbuch der Geschichte Russlands (Hrsg. M. Hellmann), Lfg. 2, 1978, pp. 108f.; R. WERNER, ibid. p. 124 fn. 1, pp. 143f.

ad fn.4b:W.P. SCHMID, *o.c.* [fn.4], p. 110; R.WERNER, ibid. pp. 122–152.

INDEX

(+ = in several other places)

[1] Cf., e.g., JUSTI, *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie* Π/2, Strassburg 1904, p. 441; ABAJEV, *Skifo-jevropejskije izoglossy,* Moscow 1965, pp. 123f.

[2] TAMARA TALBOT RICE, *Die Skythen,* Köln 1957, p.38; J. A. H. POTRATZ, *Die Skythen in Südrussland,* Basel 1963, p. 10; G. SCHRAMM, *Nordpontische Ströme,* Göttingen 1973, pp. 24, 51. – The translations from Herodotus are taken from Aubrey de Selincourt's version in the Penguin Classics.

[3] On the original homeland of the Indo-Iranians see SZEMERÉNYI, Sprachtypologie, funktionelle Belastung und die Entwicklung indogermanischer Lautsysteme (*Acta Iranica* 12 [1977], pp. 339–393), pp. 378f.; R. GHIRSHMAN, *L'Iran et la migration des indo-aryens et des iraniens,* Leiden 1977, esp. p.45f. On the views of BURROW, and especially his linguistic arguments based on *daiva* and *Vakṣu* (name of the river Oxus), see SZEMERÉNYI, o.c., p. 381f.

[4] For the following see E. CAVAIGNAC, À propos du debut de l'histoire des Mèdes, *JA* 249 (1961), pp. 153–162; R. D. BARNETT, in: *CAH*[3] II/2, Cambridge 1975, pp. 425f., and quite recently also KAMMENHUBER, *RLAss* V/7–8, 1980, pp. 594–596. [See Addendum p. 46].

[4a] According to the new results of M. COGAN & H. TADMOR, *Orientalia* 46, 1977, pp.65–85, and SPALINGER, The date of the death of Gyges, *JAOS* 98, 1977, pp. 400–408, and especially p. 408, the death of Gyges is to be dated 644 B.C.; it was brought about by the Kimmerians led by Lygdamis; Lygdamis died 640; a second sack of Sardis (but not of the citadel) by the allies of the Kimmerians, led by Kobos, took place in 637; they were driven out of Asia Minor by the Scythians (their first mention!) who a few years later (633/632) penetrated as far as Palestine.

[4b] Cf. RÖLLIG, *RLAss* V/3–i, 1977, p. 193. [See Addendum p. 46]

[5] See, e.g., J. FRIEDRICH, *Geschichte der Schrift,* Heidelberg 1966, plate 122.

[6] I have shown (*Acta Iranica* 5 = *Monumentum Nyberg* II, Liège 1975, pp. 346–350) that, at the beginning of this report (lines 21–22), *abiy Sakām pasā ...* does not present an otherwise unknown Sakā ʿSaka-land' but is an unusual spelling (or misspelling), based on sandhi, of the m. acc. pl. *Sakān.*

[7] A. HERRMANN, *Die Saken und der Skythenzug des Dareios,* Fs. L.Oppenheim, Berlin 1933, pp. 157–169.

[8] This already HINZ, *ZDMG* 93 (1939), p. 365f.; *AMI* 5 (1972), p. 251.

[9] See HINZ, *Darius und die Perser,* Baden-Baden 1976, pp. 182, 199f. – On Soviet scholars who also placed the scene of the Saka-campaign in Asia, see I. M. ORANSKIJ, in: *Istorija iranskogo gosudarstva i kul'tury,* Moscow 1971, pp. 42-44.

[10] Cf. HERZFELD, *Iran in the Ancient East,* New York 1941, plate LXXIX; *The Persian empire,* Wiesbaden 1968, pp.290f. See also G. WALSER, *Die Völkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis,* Berlin 1966, p. 85.

[11] See BALCER, *HSCP* 76 (1972), pp. 99–132.

[12] On the dating of the various parts and the various versions of the Bisutun inscription see L. TRÜMPELMANN, Zur Entsteφhungsgeschichte des Monuments Dareios' I. von Bisutun und zur Datierung der Einführung der altpersischen Schrift, *AA* 1967, pp. 281–298, esp. 294, 297 (campaign 520/519, report 518 B.C.); and most recently J. WIESEHÖFER, *Der Aufstand Gaumātas und die Anfänge Dareios I.*, Bonn 1978, pp. 12f., 42, 226f., 229.

[13] G. CAMERON, Darius the Great and his Scythian (Saka) campaign, *Monumentum Nyberg* I, Liège 1975, pp.77–88, esp. pp.79, 87.

[14] J. HARMATTA, Darius' expedition against the Sakā Tigraxaudā, *AAH* 24 (1976), pp. 15–24.

[15] An exception is HINZ, *AMI* 5 (1972), p. 246, but his *d]rah[tā* is, for Old Persian, hardly acceptable.

[16] See for this and other problems F. LASSERRE in the Budé edition of *Strabo* (Paris 1975), pp. 86 with fn. 1–2, and notes complémentaires ad p. 86, 87.

[17] Cf. KENT, The lists of provinces, *JNES* 2 (1943), pp.302–306; KENT, OP, pp.56–57; WALSER, *o.c.* [fn. 10], pp. 27f.; BALCER, *o.c.* [fn. 11], pp. 123f.; GIGNOUX, in: HARMATTA (ed.), *Prolegomena to the sources on the history of pre-Islamic Central Asia,* Budapest 1979, pp. 138–139.

[18] This was done by CAMERON, *JNES* 2 (1943), pp.307f.; BALCER, *o.e.,* p. 123.

[19] I. N. KHLOPIN, Zur DPe-Inschrift ZZ. 13–15, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 4 (1973), pp. 113–119, argued (esp. p. 118) that the current reading (1114–15) *utā dahyāva tyā para draya,* due to Cameron (see fn. 18), was erroneous, and that we should return to the earlier reading and interpretation: *dahyāva tyā parauvaya* 'the lands (which are) in the East', introducing the thirteen Eastern provinces then enumerated. Khlopin's main argument is that Cameron's reading introduces an unusual phrase; but the reading advocated by him is also unique! If, however, his reading should prove right, the linguistic problem is easily solved. Khlopin reads *para uvaya,* admitting (p. 119) that *uvaya* "sich anscheinend nicht erklären läßt". But we would have to read *parauviya* (not *paruvaiy* as *AiWb* 871), i.e. fem. pl. *parviyah* of *par(u)va-*'eastern', required by the fem. *dahyu-*.

[20] See STEVE, *StIr* 3 (1974), pp.8f., esp. 13 and 24f. – MAYRHOFER, *Supplement zur Sammlung der altpersischen Inschriften,* Vienna 1978, p. 14, reports the new finds but without mentioning that Steve restores (28) *Sakā tyaiy*!

[21] KENT, 1943 [fn. 17], p. 303, gets 31 peoples by counting 3 groups of Ionians but this cannot be right. Cf. WALSER, *o. c.* [fn. 10], p.39.

[22] Cf. WALSER, *o. c.* [fn. 10], pp. 39f.

[23] The labels are, in contrast to Kent's hesitation, attributed to Artaxerxes II by WALSER, *o. c.* [fn. 10], p. 52, but to Artaxerxes III? at p. 34.

[24] For general information see M. KERVRAN, *JA* 260 (1973), pp. 235f.; on the statue, D. STRONACH, *ibid.* pp. 240f. (from whom the quotes in the text are taken); on the Egyptian list of provinces, J. YOYOTTE, *ibid.,* pp. 258f. For the OP text see also MAYRHOFER, *o. c.* [fn. 20], pp. 15f.

[25] For the earlier texts, edited with a translation and commentary by G. POSENER (Le Caire, 1936), see WALSER, *o. c.* [fn. 10], pp. 31 f. – YOYOTTE, *o. c,* 258 fn. 6, notes that: "Les reliefs de la base permettront de préciser ou de modifier les conclusions formulées par G. Walser... (1966)" but I don't know of any such treatment, although it might obviously bring important results.

[26] This was Posener's view, cf. WALSER, *o. c.* [fn. 10], p. 32 fn. 16.

[27] See BALCER, o.e. [fn. 11], p. 127.

[28] Cf. CAMERON, The Persian satrapies and related matters, *JNES* 32 (1973), pp.47–56, esp. p. 55 fn.48.

[29] See CAMERON, *o. c.* [fn. 13], pp. 84–85.

[30] For the Hesiod passage see the recent edition (1970) in the Oxford Classical Texts, p. 159, fr. 150, 1. 15; for the change of *u* to Ionic-Attic *ü* see SZEMERÉNYI, *The Attic ῾Rückverwandlung*', Gedenkschrift für W. Brandenstein, Innsbruck 1968, pp. 148J, 155.

[31] See MARKWART, *Philologus* Supplementband X (1905), p. 112; followed by HERZFELD, e.g. *AMI* 1 (1929), p. 104 fn. 1. I ignore here the attempt of V. MILLER (*Jazyk Osetin,* Moscow 1962, p. 76, § 50, 7), accepted by ALTHEIM-STIEHL, *o. c.* [fn. 55], p. 635, to explain Σκύθαι as the Hellenized form of the plural **sku-tæ* from singular *saka*; even the borrowed form could not have lost the first-syllable vowel at that early date, and the suggestion does not account for Near Eastern *z*.

[32] For the problems of these sound correspondences cf. EILERS, *ZDMG* 94 (1940), p. 215 fn. 1 ; BELARDI, *Ricerche Linguistiche* 2 (1960), pp. 177f.; TELEGDI, *JA* 226 (1935), p.205.

[33] This was suggested by MARKWART, *Caucasica* 6/1 (1930), pp. 58f.

[34] Cf. VAN WINDEKENS, *BzN* 1 (1949), pp. l0lf.

[35] This was first suggested by me (in Hungarian) in: *Magyar Nyelv* 43 (1947), pp. ll3f.; and a few years later (in English) in: *ZDMG* 101 (1951) pp. 214f.

[36] See SZEMERÉNYI, *Acta Iranica* 12 (1977), pp. 367f. – It is gratifying to see that this argument and the basic form **Skuða*- have subsequently been discovered (or taken over from me?) by Soviet scholars. Cf. E. A. GRANTOVSKIJ, *Rannjaja istorija iranskix plemen perednej Azii,* Moscow 1970, p. 89, who depends on I. M. DJAKONOV, *Istorija Midii,* Moscow 1956, pp. 242f. (whose work became available only after completion of this paper).

[37] It is quite unjustifiable to claim an Assyrian source for the Greek form as is, tentatively, suggested by H.KOTHE, *Klio* 51 (1969), p. 75.

[38] Cf. H. BELLEN, in: *Der Kleine Pauly* 5, Stuttgart 1979, p. 242.

[39] See POTRATZ, *o. c.* [fn. 2], p. 22.

[40] Cf. K. J. NARR, in: *Abriss der Vorgeschichte,* Munich (Oldenbourg) 1957, p. 69.

[41] The quotations are taken from M. A. DANDAMAJEV, in: HARMATTA (ed.), *Prolegomena* [fn. 17], p. 106.

[42] See E. SALONEN, *Die Waffen der alten Mesopotamier,* Helsinki 1965, pp. 117 f.; DANDAMAJEV, *o. c.,* pp. 99f.

[43] Cf. POKORNY, *IEW,* pp. 954f. – For the Balto-Slav group with initial *š/s* see SZEMERÉNYI, *ZDMG* 101 (1951), p.215; C. S. STANG, *Lexikalische Sonderübereinstimmungen zwischen dem Slawischen, Baltischen und Germanischen,* Oslo 1972, pp. 57f., 84f.

[44] JUSTI, *o.c.* [fn. 1], p.441. – I see from J. W. Blakesley's note in his Herodotus edition, vol.1, London 1854, p. 440 that this had already been advanced before his time.

[45] VASMER, *Untersuchungen über die ältesten Wohnsitze der Slaven I. Die Iranier in Südrußland,* Leipzig 1923, p. 16, reprinted in VASMER, *Schriften zur slavischen Altertumskunde und Namenkunde,* I, Berlin 1971, p. 119.

[46] ABAJEV, *o.c.* [fn. 1], p.25, but *skut* is regarded by him as a name imposed on the Scythians by their old Germanic neighbours. But this could not account for *aškuz!*

[47] See GRANTOVSKU, *o.c.* [fn. 36], p. 89 fn. 15. For the king's name in Iustinus see MARKWART, *o.c.* [fn. 31], pp. 78f.; on the second part VASMER*, o. c.* [fn. 45 (1971)], p. 150. – From our point of view it is unimportant whether -*ta* in *Skolotai* is a plural morpheme or not, and this point will not be discussed; but cf. CHRISTENSEN, *o.c.* [fn. 82], p. 68; BAILEY, *TPS* (1945), p. 25f.; ABAJEV, *o.c.* [fn. 89], 1949, pp. 218f.; SIMS–WILLIAMS, *BSOAS* 42, 1979, pp. 337–346.

[48] This is Kothe's view, *o. c.* [fn. 37], p. 75: "Die Skoloten haben sich selbst niemals als Σκύθαι bezeichnet, sondern sie wurden lediglich von den Griechen mit diesem aus ganz anderer... Quelle stammenden Namen belegt".

[49] Cf. HARMATTA, *Studies in the history and language of the Sarmatians,* Szeged 1970, pp. 77f., 81, 89f.

[50] See SZEMERÉNYI, *o.c.* [fn.35], pp. 116f. and 217f. respectively; GRANTOVSKIJ, *o.c.* [fn. 36], p.89 fn. 15.

[51] Cf. JUSTI, *o.c.* [fn. l], p. 455.

[52] See KENT, *JNES* 2 (1943), p. 305; *OP,* p. 210.

[53] For the following see H. VOLKMANN, in: *Der Kleine Pauly* 3, Stuttgart 1979, pp. 914f.

[54] See, e.g., H. BENGTSON–V. MILOJČIC, *Großer Historischer Weltatlas,* I: *Vorgeschichte und Altertum,* Munich 1963, maps 12b, 13a, 20b.

[55] This conclusion would gain positive support if the recent identification of the *Yaunā takabarā* as Macedons proved to be correct, cf. WALSER, *o. c.* [fn. 10], 47; F.ALTHEIM–R. STIEHL,– *Geschichte Mittelasiens im Altertum,* Berlin 1970, pp. 398f.

[56] See SZEMERÉNYI, *o.c.* [fn. 3], pp. 381 f.

[57] GERSHEVITCH, *TPS* (1969), 168–9, had suggested that *haumavarga* could represent **hauma-barga* 'haoma-praiser', which would represent the same change in internal position, but in the meantime he has abandoned this interpretation, see *Mémorial Jean de Menasce,* Louvain 1974, pp.56, 72f. – Can the Old Iranian source of the μαγοφονία, i. e. **magu-žati-,* found by HENNING (*JRAS* 1944, p. 135) in Sogdian *mwγzt,* be regarded as Old Sogdian? Would it not in that case appear as *mwγzč?* On the question whether the 'murder of the Magi' originated with Darius the Great or Alexander the Great, see also ALTHEIM-STIEHL, *o.c.* [fn. 55], pp. 32, 62.

[58] See ANDREAS ap. MÜLLER, *Handschriften-Reste in Estrangelo-Schrift aus Turfan,* II (*APAW* [1904], Anhang, pp. 1–117), p. 111. Cf. MÜLLER, Neutestamentliche Bruchstücke in soghdischer Sprache (*SPAW* [1907], pp. 260–270), p.260, fn. 2: "Die Bezeichnung dieser Sprache als "soghdisch" geht auf ANDREAS zurück..., der seinerzeit darüber in der Göttinger Akademie berichtet hat".

[59] See MÜLLER, *Uigurica* (= *APAW* 1908/2), p. 3, fn. 2: "Nach mündlicher Mitteilung von Andreas gründet sich die Feststellung der Sprache auf zwei für das Soghdische charakteristische Lauteigentümlichkeiten, die sich aus der genaueren Betrachtung der soghdischen Sprachreste bei Bērūnī ergeben", i.e. the two given in the text.

[60] ANDREAS, Zwei soghdische Exkurse (*SPAW* 1910), pp. 307f. For later references see SZEMERÉNYI, *Sprache* 12 (1967), pp. 220f., and cf. V. A. LIVSHITZ, in: *W. B. Henning Memorial Volume,* London 1970, pp. 261 f.; GHARIB, *o.c.* [fn. 102], p. 62.

[61] See PELLIOT, *JA* 224 (1934), p.36, fn.2.

[62] Cf. BAILEY, *JRAS* 1939, p.89, but see now the new interpretation of BAILEY, *Khotanese Texts* IV, Cambridge 1961, p. 59.

[63] Cf. HENNING, *BBB,* 1937, p. 32, 1.462.

[M] For these forms see ANDREAS, *o.c.* [fn.60], p. 309; BAILEY, *BSOS* 6 (1932), pp. 948f.; HENNING, *Sogdica,* London 1940, p. 9; GERSHEVITCH, *A Grammar of Manichaean Sogdian,* Oxford 1954, § 996.

[65] See GERSHEVITCH, *o.c.,* §§ 421, 977, 1040, 1076, 1230.

[66] Cf. H. REICHELT, *Die soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums* II, Heidelberg 1931, p. 54.

[67] These and similar adverbial forms in -*au* are found not only in Sogdian but also in Khotanese, Khwārazmian, and Ossetic, see GERSHEVITCH, *o.c.,* p. 249 ad § 1076. Nevertheless, they cannot be claimed to contain an "Eastern Iranian 'language suffix' -*au*-", since they are now also attested in Parthian, and that in a more original form, as a prepositional phrase; cf. *'w ywn'w 'wd frwm'w* 'in Greek and Latin', see SUNDERMANN, *MIO* 14 (1968), p. 400. It is therefore not certain that the formation is based on a derivative in -*āwan-,* that is the nominative -*āwā,* with loss of the -*ā* after a "heavy" stem, cf. GERSHEVITCH, *o.c.,* §§ 1076 and 484. Semantically, it would be more satisfactory to regard the type as an early coalescence ("Univerbierung") of, e.g., *suγδiyā wāxš 'Sogdian speech', cf. for *wāxš* 'word, speech; spirit', GERSHEVITCH, *o.c.,* § 958. The coexistence of this nominatival type with the inflected type exhibited by *zntw'čh 'mrγ'* 'singing bird' would be paralleled by Pers. *farrux* 'fortunate' from *farnahvā as against *farxunda* from **farnahvant-.* The doublets *parnāu 'old woman' and *parnuš 'old, senile' (see SZEMERÉNYI, *Studies in the Kinship Terminology of the IE languages,* Liège 1978, p. 58) are perhaps to be explained differently: 'old woman' points to *parnāywī (fem, of *parnāyuš*) which, with *āy* to *ā,* gave **parnāw,* and *parnuš* may be conflated from *parnāyuš and **watuša-,* i. e. from **parn(ā?)uša-.*

[68] See HENNING, *o. c.* [fn. 64], p. 61, 1. 25.

[69] See most recently HARMATTA, *o. c.* [fn. 17], pp. 156–165, esp. 159, 164f. (: date 196–197 A.D.).

[70] See HENNING, *o.c.* [fn. 64], p. 9.

[71] HENNING, *l.c.,* referred to Freiman's paper in the *Sogdijskij Sbornik* (Leningrad 1934). This work is inaccessible to me, but the relevant papers were reprinted in *Sogdijskije Dokumenty s gory Mug,* vol. I, Moscow 1962. The texts themselves were reprinted, often with an improved reading and/or interpretation, in vols II and III (Moscow 1962, 1963). I take this opportunity of expressing my deep gratitude to Prof. Olga Akhmanova of Moscow University who graciously sent me these precious volumes in the early days of 1965 when I was still working in London. – The references to these volumes will be simply to I, II, III.

[72] This formula is found eight times, cf. B 18, 1 and 20 (II 123); A 18, R 1 and 10 (II 132 = 111 69!); A 2, 1–2 and 8–9 (II 136); A3, 1 and 7 (II 138 = 111 68).

[73] This formula (with 'from' or 'to') is found five times, cf. I 2–3 (II 111, the very first document found in 1932!); A 2, 1–2 and 8–9 (II 137 = 111 67); A 16, 1–2 (II 139 = 111 70); B 4, R 1–2 (II 56).

[74] See Nov. 2, R 1–2 and 15–16 (II 104).

[75] See A 14, 1–2 and 32–33 (II 78).

[76] The form was given by Freiman in 1934 (see now I 23) as *sγwδyk* in what looks as the second part (from '*nwth* on) of formula (c). But the compilers of the glossary in II (p. 211) give *swγδ'k,* although, if I am not mistaken, they do not reprint the one-line fragment.

[77] This information is based on BARTHOLOMAE, *AiWb.,* p. 1582, but see the text further on.

[78] See J.DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN, *Les composés de l'Avesta,* Liège 1936, p. 151.

[79] BARTHOLOMAE, *AiWb.,* p. 509.

[80] BENVENISTE, *BSOS* 7 (1934), pp. 268f.

[81] Benveniste's subsequent suggestion [*BSOS* 9 (1938), pp. 505f.] that *gava-* in *gava-šayana–* was both a toponym and an ethnic, was incompatible with the clear local meaning in *Gōpat* 'Lord of Gava (= Sogdiana)', and is profitably replaced by Bailey's comparison of *gava-* with Ossetic (Iron) *qæw* 'village', *TPS* 1945, p. 14.

[82] A.CHRISTENSEN, *Le premier chapitre du Vendidad,* Copenhagen 1943, p.71.

[83] On the name of Khwārezm see now MAYRHOFER, *Hommages à M.Leroy,* Bruxelles 1980, p. 135, and earlier SZEMERÉNYI, *Sprache* 12 (1967), pp. 194–196.

[84] See GERSHEVITCH, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra,* Cambridge 1959, p. 174 ad 14[6].

[85] Cf. HARMATTA, *The origin of the name* Σόγδοι, *Acta Classica Universitatis Debreceniensis* 13 (1977), pp.3–6; an almost unchanged reprint of this appears in HARMATTA (ed.), *o.c.* [fn. 17], 1979, pp. 153–156.

[86] See CAMERON, *o. c*. [fn. 28], 1973, p. 51 ; and the references to TRÜMPELMANN and WIESEHÖFER [fn. 12].

[87] Cf. BARTHOLOMAE, *Grundriss* I/l, Strassburg 1896, p. 176; MEILLET, *MSL* 17 (1912), pp. 369f.; KENT, *OP,* p. 45; RISCH, *Asiatische Studien* 8 (1954), pp. 149f.

[88] But see fn. 109 below.

[89] ABAJEV, *Osetinskij jazyk i fol'klor,* I, Moscow–Leningrad 1949, pp. 211 and 183.

[90] ABAJEV, in: *Drevnij Vostok i Antičnyj Mir–Sbornik V. I. Abajev,* Moscow 1972, p. 35; *Istoriko-etimologičeskij slovar',* III, Leningrad 1979, pp. 188–189.

[91] See the papers cited in fn. 85.

[92] Cf. W. EILERS, Einige Prinzipien toponymischer Übertragung [*Onoma* 21 (1977), pp. 277–317], p. 289.

[93] Eilers means of course "unvoicing of the voiced spirant".

[94] My Italics, O. Sz.

[93] See MAYRHOFER, *EtWb.,* I, p. 347.

[96] The formally comparable RV *sugopā* is not of course tripartite but *sugopā* 'having a good keeper; being a good keeper'.

[97] See SZEMERÉNYI, *o.c.* [fn. 3], pp. 365f.

[98] See HARMATTA, *o.c.* [fn. 85], 1979, p. 155.

[99] GERSHEVITCH, *o.c.* [fn.64], § 56.

[100] See HARMATTA, *o.c.* [fn. 85], 1979, p. 156.

[101] Nor, rather more surprisingly, in M. DRESDEN'S survey of Middle Iranian (in: *Current Trends in Linguistics,* ed. T. A. SEBEOK, vol. 6, The Hague 1970, pp. 26–63), although in the conspectus (pp. 52f.) it is clearly-stated that *d* indicates [d] and [δ], and *t,* [t] and [d].

[102] B. GHARIB, *Analysis of the verbal system in the Sogdian language.* University of Pennsylvania Dissertation, University Microfilms Ann Arbor 1965.

[103] Cf. S. A. SCHANE, *Lg 44* (1968), pp.709–716; H. ESAU, The generality principle and the goals of phonological theory *(Linguistische Berichte* 28, 1973, pp: 1–22), p. 9; E. FISCHER-JORGENSEN, *Trends in phonological theory,* Copenhagen 1975, §§ 6.24, 6.40, 9.68, 9.69, 10.14; L. M. HYMAN, *Phonology – Theory and Analysis,* New York 1975, pp. 67f., 90f.; V. FROMKIN–R. RODMAN, *An introduction to language,* New York [2]1978, pp. 124f.

[104] In point of fact Gharib's definition stating that *p t k* remain "except after nasal and voiced sibilant" (p. 56) must be modified. In the light of the facts given by GERSHEVITCH, *o. c.* [fn. 64], §§ 268f., it is clear that *p t k* were voiced intervocally (*kadām* 'which' from *katāma-*) and after voiced spirants (*avd* 'seven' from *hafta, suγd* 'burnt' from *suxta*) as well. The latter question is well discussed by Gharib, pp. 86f.

[105] The pace of the development was faster in India (cf. Vedic *šuči-*'clean'; *šukra-, šukla-* 'light, bright, pure') but this does not affect the Iranian issue.

[106] See CAMERON, *o. c.* [fn. 28], p. 47, and *o. c.* [fn. 13], p. 84 fn. 23.

[107] See WACKERNAGEL–DEBRUNNER, *Ai.Gr.* II 2, pp.723, 725; and MAYRHOFER, *Et.Wb.,* s.vv.

[108] SZEMERÉNYI, *Kinship* [fn. 67], pp. 20f.

[109] This solution was outlined in a brief footnote in 1947, see SZEMERÉNYI, *o. c.* [fn. 35], p. 117, but omitted in the English version of 1951.

[110] In the light of these findings the parallelism between the Sogdian and Old Persian developments, stressed by HENNING, *BSOS* 9 (1938), p. 549, has to be slightly modified.

[111] See SZEMERÉNYI, *Kinship* [fn. 67], pp. 125–149.

[112] H. SKÖLD, Bulletin de la Société des Lettres, Lund, 1931–2, pp. 1–5. His view was taken up and defended by VAN WINDEKENS, *BzN* 1 (1949), pp. 98f. Cf. also W. BRANDENSTEIN, *Gedenkschrift P.Kretschmer*, I, Wiesbaden–Wien 1956, p. 58.

[113] BAILEY, *BSOAS* 13 (1951), p. 933, thought that Khotanese *švān-*represented a blend of *suv-* and *śv-*; cf. now BAILEY, *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*, Cambridge 1979, p. 405.

[114] See ABAJEV, *o.c.* [fn. 89], p. 179; ABAJEV, *o.c.* [fn. 90], III, pp. 12f.; 14f.

[115] See CHRISTENSEN, *o. c.* [fn. 82], pp. 11 f., 65.

[116] Cf. SZEMERÉNYI, *Einführung*, Darmstadt ²1980, pp.109, 152, 292, where it is shown that in most languages the old masculine *-ō(n)* was replaced by the clear ending *-on*(*t*)*s*.

[117] See BAILEY, *Dictionary* [fn. 113], pp.467, and especially 479f. – Differently GERSHEVITCH, *JNES* 23 (1964), p. 37 (: *har-* 'watch'); TRUBAČEV, *Etimologija* (1977), 1979, pp. 1 30f. (: *Harā* from **salā* 'flowing').

[118] Cf. GUSMANI, *AION-L* 4 (1962), pp.45f.; HEUBECK, *Orbis* 13 (1964), pp. 264–267 (adds Gk. ῥίον from **sriyom,* and? αἴρω from **sr̥-yō*); Čop, *IF* 75 (1971), p. 86.

[119] See HENNING, *BSOS* 9 (1937), p. 81; *BSOAS* II (1945), p. 475 with fh.3; 12 (1947), p.52, fn. 1; BENVENISTE, *JA* 243 (1955), pp.328, 335; GERSHEVITCH, *IF* 75 (1971), pp. 304–305.

[120] SZEMERÉNYI, *Orbis* 19 (1971), pp. 503–505, where (p. 505, fn. 2) also a comment on Christensen.

[121] MARKWART, *o.c.* [fn.33], p.56.

[122] BAILEY, *Languages of the Saka* (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/IV/I, Leiden 1958, pp. 131–154), p. 133.

[123] Cf, e.g., F. SOLMSEN–E. FRAENKEL, *Indogermanische Eigennamen,* Heidelberg 1922, pp. 95f. – A case in point is the name of the *Dahā,* in Achaemenid times mentioned only once in Xerxes' daiva-inscription *(XPh* 26), and, as long recognized (see, after Hillebrandt, KONOW, *Fs. Thomsen,* 1912, p. 97, and now BAILEY, *Dictionary,* p. 155), identical with Khot. *daha-* 'man, male', and connected with OP, Av. *dahyu-* 'land', Ind. *dasyu-* '(hostile) people', *dāsa-* 'enemy, slave' (and Gk. δοῦλος, Mycenaean *do-e-ro* from **dos-elos*?). Since the *Dacians* in Transylvania and Oltenia are thought to be of Thracian origin but massively overlaid by Iranian elements during a Scythian period in the 7th–4th centuries B.C. (see J.FITZ, in: *Der Kleine Pauly,* vol.1, 1979, pp. 1355f.; BENGTSON, *Grundriss der römischen Geschichte,* I, Munich 1967, p. 329), it seems reasonable to assume that their name *Dāka-*represents an earlier **Dāhaka-,* which, apart from the transposition of quantity, is identical with Av. *aži- dahāka-,* see BAILEY, *TPS* 1959, p. 111 ; BENVENISTE, *Mél. Renou,* 1968, p. 77, and, on some further problems, BELARDI, *The Pahlavi Book of the Righteous Viraz,* I, Rome 1979, pp. 23f; M. SCHWARTZ. Orientalia 49, 1980, p. 123f. – As is known, the simplex *Dāha-* (identical with Iranian *Dāha*) is also preserved in the form Δᾶος, *Dāuos*; the alternative

explanation from an alleged **dhāwos, *dhākos* 'wolf' (cf. A. VRACIU, *Limba Daco-Geţilor,* Timişoara 1980, pp.25, 175) is phonetically untenable since intervocalic *w* would have been kept, cf. the place-name element *-daua.*

[124] For the Iranian material see GERSHEVITCH, *o.c.* [fn. 84], pp. 257f.; D.WEBER, *Die Stellung der sog. Inchoativa im Mitteliranischen,* Diss. Göttingen 1970, p. 147.

[128] GERSHEVITCH, *o.c.* [fn.84], p. 176.

[126] BAILEY, *o.c.* [fn. 122], p. 132.

[127] R. N. FRYE, *The heritage of Persia,* London 1962,p. 43. In spite of this clear pointer, Frye is content with Bailey's 'powerful'.

[128] See SZEMERÉNYI, *o.c.* [fn. 35], 1951, p.212.

[129] See GERSHEVITCH, *o.c.* [fn. 84], pp. 257f., and cf. WEBER, *o.c.* [fn. 124], pp. 149, 195.

[130] On the question whether not only Lithu. *šokti* but also Slavic *skokъ* 'jump', etc., belong with Iran. *²sak–* which, in 1951, I answered in the negative, see now also STANG, *o. c.* [fn. 43], p. 86.

[131] LITVINSKIJ's paper on the name of the Saka, listed in *Sprache* 19 (1973), p. 232, no. 196, has remained inaccessible to me.