

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

*Analecta Orientalia Memoriae Alexandri Csoma de Körös Dicata*. Edendo Operi præfuit L. Ligeti. Volumen I. Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica V. Budapestini, MCMXLII (-MCMXLVII). Sumptibus Academiae Litterarum Hungaricæ et Societatis a Csoma de Körös nominatæ.

It was originally the intention of the Budapest Körösi Csoma Society to commemorate the centenary of the death (11th April, 1942) of their great countryman, from whom the Society takes its name, by the issue of two memorial volumes. At the end of the war only 70 copies of the first volume had been saved from the flames, and as too many years had since elapsed, the Society, as Ligeti explains in the epilogue of the first volume, gave up the idea of issuing a second volume which would have contained the articles of the foreign collaborators.

The present first volume contains in addition to the aforesaid epilogue written in Latin and L. Ligeti's Latin preface dedicated to a biography of A. Csoma de Körös, eight articles of which we can only give here a brief summary of contents.

(1) O. Szemerényi, *Beiträge zur hethitischen Grammatik* (pp. 7-16). (a) The Hethitic adverbs in *-anda* represent a mixture of at least two formations which were originally fundamentally different. In the first class is the adverbial use of acc.pl.nt. of participial roots, in the second class fundamental linguistic adverbs which had been developed in general into a regular threefold system: *-a*, *-an*, *-anda*. — (b) The continuation of the liquidæ sonantes. Some typical examples show that the liquidæ sonantes *r* and *l* which otherwise show the same development in all Indo-European languages, develop in Hethitic an *u*-vowel, thus becoming *ur*, *ul*.

(2) J. Harmatta, *Das Volk der Sadagaren* (pp. 17-28). Contrary to Marquart, who explained the name *Sadagarii* mentioned in Jordanes (*Gestica* 265) as a composite from the Turkish *saday* "quiver" + *är*, *ir* "man" and thus declared the Sadagars to be Turks, Harmatta considers the name as Iranian. He does not, however, explain it like Vasmer as a *bahuvrīhi satagārya* "inhabitants of the hundred mountains", but interprets it as a pl. *sadagari* < \**satagarayah* to sg. \**satagari*- "die die hundert Berge (oder Hügel) [bewohnenden Menschen]". According to the testimony of the Pseudo-Julianus (letter of Emperor Julianus to Basileios the Great) the Sadagars inhabited in the 4th century A.D. the Danube region. As in the report they are mentioned together with the Goths, the habit at can only be a "land of the hundred hills" in Lesser Scythia, *i.e.*, in the Dobruja. This land is indeed mentioned twice by Skylitzes-Kedrenos in connection with the war of the Petchenegs against Constantine X Monomachus (1042-1053) as situated in the Dobruja, known by the native inhabitants as *Ἐκστὸν Βουνὸί* "hundred hills" and which received according to Harmatta probably in

the 4th century A.D. the name *sadagari* from the Iranian neighbours who possibly also called themselves by this name. Presumably these Sadagars belonged to the Rhoxolani, i.e., the Iranian Sarmatians, who in their flight from the Goths invading Great Wallachia and Moldavia were almost completely annihilated by the latter, and of whom only a small portion found a place of refuge in the "land of the hundred hills" in the Dobruja.

(3) Louis J. Nagy, *Tibetan Books and Manuscripts of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences* (pp. 29-56). Before A. Csoma de Kőrös undertook his last fatal voyage, he left with his friend the Rev. S. C. Malan, at that time Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society in Calcutta, his Tibetan prints and manuscripts. Of these works, which he gave to the Royal Hungarian Academy of Sciences at Budapest, Malan published a catalogue (*JRAS.*, XV, 1884, p. 494) which, however, has a number of errors (and also the xylographs mentioned by von Nagy under Nos. 23 and 24 are missing). The catalogue now presented by J. Nagy represents a completely new compilation. It contains, arranged under 38 Nos., the descriptions, sometimes detailed descriptions, of 14 MSS. (Nos. 1-10) of which 5 in *dbu-med* script (Nos. 1, 2, 5, 7, 9) and 28 xylographs (Nos. 11-38), with carefully indicated references, notes and an attached index of the 38 titles.

(4) J. Németh, *Probleme der türkischen Urzeit* (pp. 57-102). The article, which consists of four sections, is partly (I, III, IV) a new edition of previous publications in Hungarian language. Parts I, III and IV appeared in 1934 in the *Festschrift* for Albert von Berzeviczy (Turkish in the translation of Şerif Bastav in *Ülkü* XV, 1940), Part II 1928 in *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* (Nyk = "Phylogological communications") XLVII.

To prove the opinion which he had already expressed in 1917 in a lecture in Budapest "dass die Urheimat der türkischen Völker in der westlichen Hälfte Asiens, von der Altai-Gegend bis zu den Gebieten östlich vom Ural-Gebirge zu suchen sei" the author recapitulates in the first place the different theories propounded by his predecessors.

As it has not yet been possible to prove as yet the existence of original Chinese elements in the Turkish languages, everything points to the fact that the original home of the Turks is more likely to be sought in the west than in the east of Asia. Philological examination of the essential affinity with Ural languages and with Altai languages leads J. Németh to the conclusion that there were original relationships many thousands of years before the present era, but that nothing points to the assumption of "einer in einer bestimmtem Periode der Vorzeit und in einer bestimmten Urheimat gesprochenen Ursprache". But the relations of old with Indo-European languages, possibly even with Korean, permit the conception of a continuous chain of language connections of all these peoples—"von den Indogermanen bis zu den Tungusen, ja selbst bis zu den Koreanern"—stretching from Eastern Europe to Eastern Asia and which by and large has retained until to-day its original geographical situation.

(5) F. v. Laszlo, *Die Tokuz-Oguz und die Köktürken* (pp. 103-109). Contrary to the opinion of Barthold, upheld also by Marquart and others, that the Tokuz-Oguz were identical with the Kök Türks, the author assumes them to be a Turkish people originating from one of the ethnica groups of the T'ie-lo, inhabiting the region to the north of the Kök Türks. Conquered by Ältäriş qayan (about 685 A.D.) in the political sense they

became Kök Türks, but after the fall of the Kök Turkish Empire (745) they belonged to the Empire of the Uigurs.

(6) G. Györffy, *Autour du Codex Cumanicus* (pp. 110-137). Through a new and thorough examination of the Codex Cumanicus (Cod. Marc. Lat. DXLIX) G. Györffy comes to the following definite conclusions:

The original of the Latin-Persian-Cuman Vocabulary was compiled in the Crimea in the years 1294 and 1295, probably at Solhat, for the use of Italian colonists. A first copy must have been made in the year 1303 in the monastery of St. John near Sarai. The specimen which we to-day possess is a complete transcript of the 1303 copy and dates from the years 1330 to 1340. The religious texts translated from the Latin into Cuman were inserted in the 40's of the 14th century by German Franciscans in one of the missionary monasteries of Southern Russia. Both parts of the Codex came into the possession of the German monks towards the middle of the same century. They filled up the space with glosses, annotations and Cuman riddles and bound both books together. Finally the Codex again became the property of Italian merchants, who added Persian-Cuman glosses. The last known owner was Antonio Ziuale (Zinale). The Codex reached Venice, where it is still preserved, in the second half of the 14th century.

Attention is drawn to Györffy's explanation of the gloss  $\begin{matrix} jirēci \\ korkūci \end{matrix} \rangle ksi$  on p. 57, v<sup>o</sup> of the Codex, 11.30 and 31, as it certainly hits the truth: *jir[m]i[n]ci* < \**yigirminci* "twentieth"; *korku[n]ci* = *tü. qırqınçı* "fortieth"; *ksi* (not = *tü. kışi* "man", but) = X, letter, which in the middle ages was pronounced "ksi" (= Gr. Ξ ξ). In the original there was in Roman figures after *jirminci* XX and after *korkunci* XXXX, which the copyist who did not understand the six X bracketed together and then wrote after it the word *ksi*.

(7) T. Halasi Kun, *Monuments de la langue tatare de Kazan* (pp. 138-155). The language of the Tatars of Kazan belonging to the Kipchak Turks is not unimportant already from the historical point of view. For before its appearance these Tatars inhabited roughly the same territory which was once the focal point of the Volga Bulgars, and for many years in trade and intercourse they played an important role in the surrounding world. Until now there were hardly any documents which permitted a thorough analysis of the language. The author adds to the two already known Yarliks of 1424 and 1523 a further one discovered by him in 1938 in the archives of the Topkapı Sarayı at Istanbul of which he has published the text with translation and critical notes. It is a diplomatic yarlik, addressed in the year 1466 by Mahmūd, son of the Ulūğ Muhammad Hān, founder of the Khanate of Kazan, to Sultan Mehmet II. To this are added two further yarliks, not direct from Kazan, but from the vicinity of Sarai (which is not far from Kazan), but linguistically and historically related to the Kazan Documents. They date from the years 1465/66 and 1477.

(8) J. Eckmann, *Mirzā Mehdīs Darstellung der tschagataischen Sprache* (pp. 156-222). As the Grammar of Mirzā Mehdī in the form in which it appears in the edition of E. D. Ross (Bibl. Ind. No. 1225, Calcutta, 1910), is hardly useable, Eckmann has regrouped the grammatical material and where necessary completed it from the quotations. His method of representation follows the following scheme:  
Phonetics: vowels, semi-vowels, consonants.

Morphology: noun, adjective, numerals, pronouns, prepositions, adverbs, interjections, verbs.

Formation of words: Denominalia and Deverbalia, mutual influence of Chagatai and Persian languages, foreign words.

Vocabulary of the Chagatai words in the grammatical text and in the quotations.

W. BARUCH

(Translated from the German MS.) *The Editor*

Louis Ligeti, *Catalogue du Kanjur Mongol Imprimé*, Vol. I, *Catalogue*. Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica, t. III. Budapest, 1942-44. Société Kőrösi Csoma; in-8°, 345 pages.

This first volume has been expected for quite a considerable time even though it did not become available until 1949, and until the second volume comes out it is only possible to speak of it to a limited extent. As Miss Lalou has stated in her brief account (*J.A.*, 1949, p. 351), the author has undertaken with commendable courage to reconstitute the material of this second volume which was destroyed during the siege of Budapest; so it is to be hoped that the complete work will soon be available for Mongolists and Buddhologists.

In his "Rapport préliminaire d'un voyage d'exploitation fait en Mongolie chinoise 1928-1931" (Budapest, 1933), L. Ligeti had given a brief account of the Mongolian Kanjur (p. 48 sq.), translated from the Tibetan and printed in Peking under K'ang-hi, referring also to the most important problems connected therewith, and drawing particular attention to the fact that it comprised 108 (and not 115) volumes.

In this first volume the author gives the title in general threefold—Mongolian, Sanskrit, Tibetan—of 1161 Mongolian translations in a duplicate enumeration, one of which is consecutive and the other one is separate for each of the 108 volumes, often adding the number of paragraphs, sections and chapters, and in addition to the title also the colophon, if any. In one instance Ligeti has incurred an error in the numeration. In Eldeb XXIX it should read No. 1071(11) instead of (10) and so on for the following numbers. Furthermore, of the iconographic drawings of the double groups at the beginning and of the fivefold groups at the end of each volume he gives the corresponding designations. The work ends with four indexes: Mongolian, Chinese, Tibetan, Manchu. Of the Mongolian Index Ligeti gives a short extract from the introduction—the part concerning the history of Buddhism in China, Tibet and Mongolia, as well as the complete list of the compilers of the Kanjur.

Thus the first volume alone is in itself an invaluable asset.

In compiling his catalogue Ligeti has closely followed the Catalogue (Öt.) of the Peking printed edition of the Tibetan Kanjur (P) published by the Ötani Daigaku Library, but he also quotes in individual instances the Catalogue, compiled by von Beckh, of the manuscript Kanjur (K) in Berlin which is closely related to ed. P. Öt. has a different numeration from Ligeti, but comparison shows an almost complete concordance in the number of titles. Mlle Lalou (*loc. cit.*) assumes that the Tantra section alone has in the Mongolian version 16 titles more than Öt. But in fact it is only 6 titles (Nos. 154, 155, 188, 189, 392, 442). No. 187 probably corresponds with

Öt. No. 184 (= Beckh, p. 103, 10). But in this section Öt. No. 711 is missing. Furthermore there are two further titles in the Mongolian Section Sūtra, Nos. 951 and 959. Thus as a whole the Mongolian Kanjur has eight titles more than P. But in all cases these seem to be duplicates the existence of which does not affect judgment of the relation of the Mongolian Kanjur to P.

Neither is it of any significance that here and there differences are found in the sequence. For although Mlle Lalou for instance finds two discrepancies in the section of Ratnakūta: 809 and 810 on the one hand, 836 and 837 on the other hand, which corresponding with Derge, Narthang, Kumbum and Taisho No. 310, follow each other contrary to P and K (there 810, 809 and 837, 836) so on the other hand in the Sūtra section for instance the *dānānīśamsa-nirdeśa* (No. 938) precedes the *dānapāramitā* (No. 939), contrary to all the Tibetan editions.

An examination of the colophons shows that the statements concerning the Tibetan translation are a literal translation from the Tibetan. Often Ligeti only gives this part of the colophon as an extract. As, however, his text is written continuously and without annotations, one unfortunately never sees where these omissions have occurred. Two instances will explain this.

In the colophon of No. 1 (1) it is said that Blo-gros rtan-pa translated and edited the work. Then it goes on: *erten-ü tedeger yeke kelemürčün ber : ene dandr-a-yi orčiyulun bügüde-dür aldarsiyulju amui-j-a* : "those former great translators have distinguished themselves in the translation of this Tantra." Thus that part of the colophon is missing in which the paṇḍit Kamalagupta and the locava Rin-chen bzañ-po are named as earlier translators.

No. 1103(2) has only the Mongolian title *siluyun onul-tu kemegdekü sudur*. The corresponding titles tib.skr. are missing in the original. This is, however, the famous *dsanś blun*, "Der Weise und der Thor" edited by I. J. Schmidt with a German translation. The Mongolian Peking printed edition in my possession has on the front of the first page only the title *eldeb üliger-ün dalai kemegdekü sudur orusiba*: under which title it is also generally known. Then on the reverse there are the reverential formula *na-mo buddha-ya na-mo dharma-ya na-mo sanggha-ya*, and the sub-title given by Ligeti.

In Ligeti the colophon is on p. 297. His reading *dayan-u(?)*, line 29 of the colophon shows that his copy is identical with mine. For also in my text this word (which I read *diyan-u*) is badly printed. In the xylographic edition after *üliger-iyer* (1.25) follow five lines which are missing in Ligeti although they are not unimportant: *üliger-ün dalai bičijü sayiluyusan küčün-iyer : ečige eke terigüten jiryuyan jüil amitan-u tusa-yin tula : erkin süsiğ-tü elge biči kemen duraduysan-dur : egenegde bičigeči inu Lušiba sumun bičijü bütügebei*: Also after the end 1.32 follow a further 17 lines.

Also for the part of the colophon given by Ligeti the following essentially divergent readings are found: 1.1 *šaky-a-muni-y-a* (L. *°muni-a* gives the impression of a Mongolian vocative instead of the wrongly formed dative *muniya* for *munaye*); 1.2 *mami-ba* (L. *aliba*); L. *tebčju* read *°ju*; 1.3 *onuyusan* (L. *oluyusan*); 1.5 *burqan-i* (L. *-a*); 1.7 *sün dalai* (L. *sün-ü dalai*); 1.10 *mayad irejü* (L. *mayad-iyar erijü*); 1.14 *rasiyan-u* (L. *-i*); 1.19 *toyuluyusan* (L. *tegüs toyuluyusan*); *mayu* (L. *mayui*); 1.20 *nom-tu* (L. *-tur*); 1.22 *kelen-iyer* (L. *keleber*); 1.28 *ulus-tur anu* (L. *ulus-tur*); 1.29 *tenggelig* (L. *tenggerlig*); 1.30 *bayiyulbai* (L. *bayiyulju*); *duvaja* (L. *dhvaja!*); 1.32 *nasuda* (L. *asida*).

Inaccurate transcription of Sanskrit words can naturally give rise to

serious errors. Such cases can be found in various places in the catalogue; but often these are false writings which have been taken over by the author from Öt. or from von Beckh. Here, too, two instances will be given.

In No. 2 (2) the Sanskrit title reads in accordance with Beckh (p. 72b, 2) *śekoddeśa*, in Öt. No. 3 on the contrary *śekhoddēśa*. Both Beckh and Öt. add the note that their copy has *sekoddeśa*; cf. No. 6 (6) *śekaprakriyā* = Beckh (p. 73b, 6), Öt. *śekaprakriya*. Beckh (*loc. cit.*, note. 2) declares that *seka* is impossible and forms *śeka* as a synonym of *śakti*, <  $\sqrt{\text{śak}}$ . But Mongolian *abisig* shows perfectly that Tib. *dban* does not here have the meaning "strength", but as often elsewhere stands for *dban bskur-ba*. And this proves that the original reading *seka* <  $\sqrt{\text{śic}}$  is right and must be regarded as the abbreviated form of *abhiśeka* imitated by the Tib. translators.

A similar case is offered by No. 46(20) *śmāśāni-ālamkāra*. According to Beckh (p. 80a, n.4) K has *śmāśāni-al<sup>0</sup>*, according to Öt. (p. 14, n.2) P, however, has *śmāśāni-al<sup>0</sup>*. In accordance with Tib. (Mong.) Beckh rightly corrects this to *śmāśānālamkāra*, whence Öt. makes (No. 47) *śmāśānālamkāra*; but cf. No. 56(30).

A further source of error in interpretation is due to the fact that Ligeti has taken over from Öt. the disturbing hyphens without principle even in regard to declined Sanskrit forms. Cf. 1(1); 116(2); 117(3); 136(7); 168(4); etc.

Here belong also the many cases of an *Anusvāra* in the final sound, where often not given in P and K. As this is always a Nom.sg.neutr. the hyphen has to be omitted. Cf. Nos. 11(11); 14(3); 57(31); 70(1); etc. Occasionally in these cases also Ligeti omits the hyphen; cf. 987(11); 990(3); etc.

On the other hand one finds a number of cases where there should have been a separation and there is none: 67(41) Nom. sg. masc. *rājo ma<sup>0</sup>* (Here the whole title is not correct. Instead of *catuṣpīṭha* (In P there is according to Öt. p. 19, n. 6 *catuṣvīṭha*!) read *catuḥpīṭha* and instead of *rājomantramśa* read *rājo mantramśa*); 797(1) Gen., read *tathāgatasya vyūha*; 968 (12) Instr. read *ṣpādādīnā vi<sup>0</sup>*; etc.

The inaccurate transcription of Sanskrit words, and also forms such as 33(7) *mālī* instead of *male* (Galig *e*) belong here, misleads Ligeti quite frequently to put pseudo-Sanskrit words instead of pure Mongolian. Thus he writes in No. 7(7) = 8(8) misled by Skr. *jāla*, in the corresponding place of the Mongolian title *jālī* instead of pure Mongolian *jālī* = Tib. *sgyu-ma*. So it should also be in 63(37) (not *jālī*, but) *jālī qubilyan* = Tib. *sgyu-'phrul* = Skr. *māyā*. In 10(10) there is, also in the Mongolian title the here quite senseless pseudo-Skr. form *dharm-a-tu*; Skr. *pañjarā*, Tib. *gur* show that *term-e-tū* is to be written.

Nor does this fully exhaust the cases to be observed by the critic. I refer only to the following:

DIRECT ERRORS: Skr. 11(11) *rājātipati* instead of *rājādhipati*; 378(4) *ekādeśa* instead of *ekādaśa*; 785(5) *śāmsā* instead of *śamsā*; 857(2) *saṅghati* instead of *saṅghāti*; 942(6) *pratīhārya* instead of *prātīhārya*; 975(19) *karmāvāraṇa* instead of *karmāvarana*; etc.

Tibet. 32(6) *gsuñs* (in *sku gsuñs thugs*) instead of *gsuñ*; 67(4) *bzi ba'i* instead of *bzi-pa'i*; 152(14) *bdun pa* instead of *bdun*; 440(32) *rgyad* instead of *rgyud*; 970(4) *phren ba* instead of *phren-ba-la*; etc. Also omissions, e.g.,

906(8) *chos-pa-bdun-pa* = Skr., Mong.; and additions, e.g., 862(2) *gšegs pa žes bya ba* as compared with P, K *gšegs-pa'i they-pa* = Mong.

Mong., e.g., 16(5) *ögelikei* instead of *ögüleki*, etc.

ERRORS TAKEN OVER FROM ÖT.: 24(7) *dhārāni* instead of e.g., 176(8) *dhārāni*; 20(3) *acinta* instead of *acintya*; 379(5) *mukhadasiḥka* instead of *mukhadasiḥka* (for *mukhaidkādaśa*); 97(17) *vinodanā-nāma* instead of *vinoda-nāma*; 100(2) *dharmānaya* instead of *naya* (P *dharmāner*, K *nera*); etc.

OMISSIONS IN SANSKRIT TITLES: 88(2) has *para* instead of *parama*; 146(8) *nāma* is missing (= Tib., Mong.); 327(38) has *garbha* instead of *kha-garbha* (= Tib., Mong.); 820(9) *grhapati* is missing (= Tib., Mong.); 830(2) *parivarta* is missing (= Tib., Mong.); 917(4) *cinti* is missing (= Tib., Mong., cf. 916,3); etc.

ADDITIONS NOT BELONGING TO THE SANSKRIT TITLE: 28(2) *śrībhadrā*; 31(5) *sama* in *mahākhā-* (instead of *kha*) *sama*; 337(18) *yāna* in *mahāyānasūtra*; 811(4) *grhapati*; etc.

Here and there are to be found considerable differences of the Mongolian title from Skr., Tib. To give only one instance, in No. 19(2) of the Sanskrit title *śrīmahāsambharodaya-tantrarāja-nāma*. Instead of *sambharodaya*, Tib. *bde-mchog 'byuñ-ba* the Mong. title has *cakra sambra* (read *sambar*; cf. 29(3) *kürdün-ü sanvar*). Very probably the divergent Mongolian title has occurred owing to the fact that in this Tantra the Heruka- and the Vajravārahītantra follow, which like the Cakrasambhara-tantra have as their content the cultus of the union of Heruka with his *śakti*. In No. 20(3) it should rightly be *abhyudaya* (instead of *adbhuta*) and Tib. *khrag-thuñ* (instead of *khregs-thuñ*). In No. 21(4) the initial *khyā* of the Sanskrit title should be deleted, which evidently stands for Tib. *kye* and has got into the title through the following *vajra* (Hevajra).

This is not the place to go into the principles used by Ligeti in the transliteration of certain Mongolian words. However, it is necessary to mention the abundance of confused and inconsistent orthography in the text of the iconographic drawings:

*niryūca quriyangyui* (p. 165) instead of *niyūca q.*; *yabala* (p. 8) instead of *gabala* (p. 180), Skr. *kapāla*; *yaṣar-ün jirūken* (p. 211; read *-un*); *bajar-bidarāni* (p. 111) instead of *b.-bidārāni*, Skr. *vajravīdārāni*; *bugra-kala* beside *qar-a bagr-a* (p. 173); *baradhvaja* (p. 315) instead of *bharadvaja* Skr. *bharadvāja*; *qomsim bodhi-satvva* (p. 92, etc.) instead of *qongsim bodhisadu-a*, Chin. *kuan-shi-yin*; *dīpankar-a* (p. 169) beside *dibanggar-a* (p. 269), Skr. *dīpankara*; *kubhir-a* (p. 101) instead of *kubera* (p. 211); *mañjuśrī-včir* (p. 11) instead of *mañju-včir*; *mahāsītavani* (p. 76) instead of Skr. *śītavati*; *sarasuvati* (p. 174) beside *sirasvati* (p. 184); *kyi včir* (p. 94) beside *kyei včir* (No. 9), Skr. *hevajra*; *yaman-taka* (p. 211) beside *yamandaga* (p. 165), Skr. *yamāntaka*; *abinca* (p. 287) instead of Skr. *abhiñña*; etc.

Further: *varāhi* (p. 6), *varāhi* (p. 28), *varahi* (p. 169), *varaki* (p. 120), Skr. *varāhi*, *vārāhi*; — *ḍākini* (p. 115), *dākini* (p. 52), *dakini* (p. 47); — *dakarāja* (p. 172), *ḍakirāja* (p. 55), *dakirāja* (p. 41), *ḍagirāja* (p. 345); — *niladanta* (p. 41), *niladanta* (p. 55), *niladanta* (p. 119); — *samantabhadra* (p. 260), *samantabadr-a* (p. 249), *samanda-badr-a* (p. 246); — *beng ma-hā-kāla* (p. 43), *bing ma-hā-kāla* (p. 170), *bengce m.* (p. 92), *bigcan m.* (p. 170); etc.

Besides the negative, Ligeti's catalogue, of course, has much that is positive and it would be unfair not to stress this.

In No. 921(8) e.g., the reading *kṣemaṅkara* is interesting, in accordance with Narthang und Derge, whereas in P and K there is *saṅkara*. Already Pelliot (*T'oung-pao*, 1914, p. 225 sq.) has with reference to this Sūtra insisted that *kṣemaṅkara* is the only right reading. But now *akṣemangari* in the Mong. title gives the final confirmation.

Further the catalogue contains a series of Sanskrit titles which are neither in P nor in K. Nos. 327(38)-332(43), e.g., are missing in P and K, but are given in Derge and Narthang. Unsupported titles are, for instance, in Nos. 92(6), 139(1), 375(1), 466(4), 467(5), 709(123), 892(3) where at the end of the title instead of "rekhā after Tib., Mong., *lipi* or *akṣara* would be expected; etc., etc.

Finally, the Mongolian titles often afford the possibility of correcting confused Sanskrit titles, which was not previously possible on the basis of Tibetan alone.

No. 362(7), e.g., has the Sanskrit title, missing in Öt. (No. 375) and Beckh (p. 122a, 73), *preta-iduta-nāma-dhāraṇī*. The title appears written the same way again No. 718(132). Also Öt. (No. 702, note) has it, but reading *ituda* instead of *iduta*. The Mongolian script, of course, admits of both readings. As the diacritic marks are missing one might also read *nituda*, *niduta*, *niduda*. All this, of course, does not make sense. In 362(73) the Tibetan title is 'jur-gegs šes bya-ba'i gzuṅs, but the Mongolian is *birid kemegdekü toytal tarni; birid* < < Skr. *preta* corresponds to Tib. *yi-d(v)ags*, which is missing here, as conversely Mong. the translation of Tib. 'jur-gegs. In 718(132) there is, however, Tib. *yi-dags 'jur-gegs* and the corresponding Mong. *janggiran türidügi birid* "the in swallowing (of food) impeded Preta". This points to an original Tib. *ni-ru-da*. For the right form in Skr. can only be *niruddha*; cf. Mahāvastu I, 28, 1.5 . . . . . *adrākṣit pretalokasmim pretām . . . sanniruddhakaṅthām*.

In No. 1021(3) the whole title has become confused: *aryaghanjābhri-caphulukarmāvaraṇasodhaya-buddharakurabhūha-n.-m.s.* In Beckh, p. 56b,3 the title is missing. Öt. No. 930 has *ghanajā, karma-avina*. With the help of the Mongolian the title can now be rebuilt: *ārya-ghrṇāja-mahābhimo-kṣaphullakarmavaraṇasodhāya buddharacitavyūha*.

Finally, it is interesting to mention here the often quoted title in Bru-ža, which Ligeti has under No. 461(4); cf. Öt. No. 452, Beckh, p. 133b, 2; cf. also B. Laufer, *Die Bru-ža Sprache, etc.* T'oung-pao, 1908, p. 7), which identifies the Bru-ža region with Dardistān-Gilgit. F. W. K. Müller (in A. H. Francke, *A Document from Turfan in Tibetan Script, but unknown language* (SPAW., 1927, XII, p. 129, No.4; cf. F. W. Thomas, *JRAS.*, 1928, pp. 633, 634, and "Nam" London, 1948, pp. 117 and 162, note) had altered the general reading according to the print of 1410 as follows: hon pan-ril-til-pi-bu-pi-til-ti-ta-siṅ-un-ub-haṅ-paṅ-ril-ub-pi-su-baṅ-ri-že-hal-pai-ma-kyān-kui-daṅ-roṅ-ti. The Mongolian Kanjur gives the title in a more readable form: *ho na banril tilbibu bitil tita sid(!) 'un 'ub haṅ baṅ ril 'ub bisu banri že hal ba'i ma kiṅ ku yi daṅ roṅ ti*.

W. BARUCH

(Translated from the German MS.) *The Editor*

Louis Ligeti, *Le Subhāṣitaratnanidhi Mongol, un Document du Moyen Mongol. Partie 1re. Le manuscrit tibéto-mongol en reproduction phototypique avec une introduction. Bibliotheca Hungarica, t. VI. Budapest, 1948. Société Kőrösi Csoma; in-8°.*

As Ligeti mentions in the introduction, covering xiii pages, to the phototypic reproduction of the manuscript, the second volume will contain the Tibetan and Mongolian text in romanised transcription, as well as a French translation, taking into account the European translations from the Tibetan which have been published since Csoma de Kőrös.

If the literary value of the *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* written in Tibetan is of low order—Ligeti estimates the creative endowment of the author, the celebrated Sa-skyā paṇḍita (with religious name Skr. Ānandadhvaśribhadra and not °dhvāja<sup>0</sup>, Ligeti, p. viii) as being practically nil—the manuscript which certainly dates back to the 14th century, contained in a Mongolian translation done by a certain Sonom gar-a, is of high scientific value. It is true that, like the MS.Q561 preserved in the Leningrad University Library, the Budapest MS. is only a copy probably made at the beginning of the 17th century, but like the Leningrad one with which it does not correspond in all respects it has a large number of orthographic, morphological and lexical peculiarities which are characteristic of Middle Mongolian. N. Poppe in his article, *Contributions to the knowledge of the Old Mongolian written language* (A.M.I., p. 668 sq.) has quoted several such instances from the MS.Q561 obtained from the Volga Kalmucks, to which Ligeti in his "Rapport préliminaire" (Budapest, 1933, p. 59) adds a few more from the MS. from the Xarčins.

As the texts of the gnomic literature are not always easily understandable and often require a commentary—there are several such commentaries to the *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*, also in Mongolian translation—perhaps in his introduction Ligeti might have dealt more exhaustively with the Tibetan manuscript. Because unlike the Mongolian translation which in every respect gives the impression of great diligence, the Tibetan text shows a number of negligences, principally the omission of vowel signs, and copying errors which indicate that the copyist, certainly a Mongolian, only had a poor knowledge of the Tibetan language. Unfortunately, the complete Tibetan text (*OAZ.*, 1925) published by Campbell is not at present accessible to me. In any case comparing with the stanzas prepared by Csoma de Kőrös (*JASB.*, VII, Extra No. 1911), of which four stanzas 211-214 corresponding to the missing pages IX, 2 of the Budapest manuscript are to be taken off, of the remaining 230 stanzas only 16 tally fully with B. The greater part of the discrepancies consist of copying errors and variants; but there are also a number of differences of text, in which the Mongolian translation does not follow exclusively B., but also the reading offered by Csoma.

It is assumed that Ligeti intends to deal with these cases in the second volume of his work, which it is hoped will soon be published.

It is also desirable that the few manuscripts of the same period in Leningrad and London be made accessible in the same way to scholars.

W. BARUCH

(Translated from the German MS.) *The Editor*

George G. Cameron, *Persepolis Treasury Tablets*. Chicago, 1948. The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications, vol. LXV. Roy. 4to. xviii, 214 pp. and 46 plates.

The publication of a hundred odd tablets, mostly well preserved, which were recovered from the Treasury of the Achaemenids at Persepolis is a major event in the history of Old Iranian studies. Each tablet records payment to one or more persons for (usually) specified work performed at specified dates ranging from the 30th year of Darius (492 B.C.) to the 5th year of Artaxerxes I (459 B.C.). The tablets are written in Late Elamite, a language which is imperfectly understood even in the trilingual Achaemenian inscriptions. The formidable task of identifying the nature and settling unfamiliar details of Achaemenian records written in Elamite only, requires a combination of uncommon experience of Elamite and other ancient Mesopotamian documents, a solid knowledge of Old Iranian languages and history, great ingenuity, and sound judgment. George G. Cameron repeatedly shows these qualities in his accurate and critical presentation of ambiguous material. His readings can be checked in most cases on delightfully clear photographs. Translation and commentary usually distinguish between certitude, doubt, and mere guess.

The conspicuous immediate gain lies in the domain of Persian history. The mere existence and shape of the tablets tells an interesting tale of the method used in ordering and checking payment, on which C. has an ingenious, and, on the whole, convincing theory. The use of Elamite only, in the tablets, has led C. to another important inference: if in the heart of the Persian empire accounts were kept in the Elamite language, the Treasury personnel must have consisted of Elamites. The book contains an illuminating chapter on the detailed evidence which the tablets provide of a change, within the first half of the 5th century B.C., from payment in kind to a money economy. The impact of war on Persian home-life is well assessed: the jobs for which payment is recorded lie mostly within the range of building, ornamentation, and maintenance of royal properties at Persepolis and surroundings; C. shows the intimate relation between the drain on manpower of the Persian wars with Greece, and the building activity at Persepolis.

The religious evidence of the tablets does not seem to have been considered by the editor so carefully. With unusual assertiveness (pp. 6.101) C. equates the *ra-ti-ú-u-iš hu-ti-ra* who receives payment in tablet No. 11, with the Avestan *raēθwiškara-*,<sup>1</sup> taking the El. expression to be half LW, half translation of the hypothetical Old Persian equivalent of the Av. compound. It is to be hoped that future discussions of Old Persian religious problems will not, on the strength of this equation, take for granted the existence of *haoma*-priests at the court of Xerxes. In the first place the tablet contains nothing to show that the recipient of payment was a priest. Secondly, it is not at all certain that the El. word was borrowed from OPers. Thirdly *ra-ti-ú-u-iš* is hardly the form in which one would expect OPers. *\*raiθ(u)viš-* to turn up in Elamite. Such an OPers. form should rather

<sup>1</sup> The Zoroastrian *terminus technicus* for the priest who mixes the *haoma*-. Why, incidentally, does C. speak of the "*Rāspi*" (actually *Rāspi*) as the "modern descendant" of the Av. *raēθwiškara*? *Rāspi* cannot easily be derived from the Av. word either semantically or phonetically; Geldner, *Indo-Iranian Studies* . . . *Samānā*, 278, connected it with Skt *ṛvij*.

appear as *\*ra-a-tu-mi-iš* or *\*ra-(a)-at-mi-iš*.<sup>1</sup> Conversely *ra-ti-ú-u-iš*, if LW, suggests something like OPers. *\*rāt[θ]d(a)iyu-*, at any rate, an OPers. stem in *-u*. Though we may be at a loss to explain any OPers. word reconstructed on such a basis,<sup>2</sup> we need not, at this stage, assume an irregular spelling merely because the El. word vaguely reminds us of Av. *raēθwiš-*. Lastly, the archeological evidence which C. was prepared to use in support of his *haoma*-theory, is, in his own words, "of indecisive and even of questionable value".

On the religion of Darius and Xerxes C. holds that neither of them was Zoroastrian, but under Xerxes the Magi may have created the new "Zoroastrian" calendar for religious purposes. This view is based on reasonable, but inconclusive arguments which have often been advanced. The evidence of the tablets merely induces C. to add (p. 9, n.47) that whatever may have been the King's religion and religious calendar, the civil administration continued to use the old calendar of the Behistun inscription. In this way C. does not seem to be doing justice to one of the most important revelations of the tablets, this time, happily, indisputable, which comes to us through his own admirable industry and scholarship.

The problem should rather be put as follows. We cannot prove that Darius and Xerxes were not Zoroastrians, although there is much to be said in favour of this view. It has been argued against it, that Darius or Xerxes may have introduced the "Zoroastrian" calendar: whichever Achaemenian king can be shown to have done so, may reasonably be held to have adopted the religion which that calendar represents. In view of the silence maintained on the subject by ancient writers and inscriptions, the only way of making sure that either Darius or Xerxes had introduced a new calendar is by discovering official records dated in it and written under their rule. For if we are content to assume that the "Zoroastrian" calendar was merely used for religious purposes by certain communities, as C. does, we have no means of showing that the King shared, or even approved of the religion of those communities.

Here lies the significance of the Persepolis tablets. The scribes who wrote them sitting next door to the palaces of Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes I, were still dating official records in the old calendar system in 459 B.C. Surely this is most satisfactory proof that not even by that date had the "Zoroastrian" calendar, if it existed at all, acquired official status. It is true that the possibility that Darius and/or Xerxes were nevertheless Zoroastrians cannot yet be ruled out. But the lurking suspicion that the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the El. renderings of *-ai-* as *oa-a* (*da-a-ma = daiva-*), of *-āi-* as *oa-a* (*Sa-kur-ri-si-iš = θāigarci-*), of *-š(u)v-* as *oš-mo* or *šu-mo* (*š(i)-iš-maš* and *š(i)-šu-maš* "one-third" = *\*θišuwa-*, *ša-iš-šu-iš-maš*) "one-fourth" = *\*caθrušwa-*), of *-r(u)v-* as *or-mo* (*kam-bar-ma = Gaubarwa-*), of *-h(u)v-* as *u-mo* (*si-ik-ki-u-ma-ti-iš = Sikayauhvatis*), of *d(u)v-* as *du-um-mo* (*du-um-mar-ra* "door" = *duvara-*).

† The most common spellings of the word for "one fourth", *ša-aš-maš* and *ša-iš-šu-maš*, suggest that OPers. had a form *\*cašuwa-*, derived with haplogy from *\*caθrušwa-*; this would seem to indicate that *θ* sounded very much like *š* even to Persian ears.

<sup>2</sup> Benveniste, *J.A.*, 1936, 201, proposed to analyze Parth. *urdywn* "vehicle" as composed of *\*warta-* "chariot" and a derivative of *yu-* "to join". Although this interpretation is uncertain, the existence of such a compound would not be surprising. One might invent a similar compound with Av. *raθa-* "chariot", say *\*raθa-yu-*. A "cartwright", or "maker of chariot-shafts (or sim.)" receiving  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a shekel per month would bring tablet No. 11 in line with the other tablets.

dates contained in lost official documents might raise this possibility to a near-certainty, has been cleared. Thus the tablets throw new light on the chief problem among "what are perhaps the most important and the most puzzling problems in the religious history of the Near East".<sup>1</sup>

The case of *ra-ti-û-u-iš* shows how thankless the task is of identifying the numerous unknown words in the tablets if the context provides no clue to their meaning. The difficulty applies to genuine Elamite words and such as were borrowed from Old Persian alike. The present review is only to a small degree concerned with the genuine Elamite material, discussion of which must be left to experts. Our main concern lies with the identification of the Iranian words of the tablets. Here C. has achieved such satisfactory results as the recovery of the OPers. form of some fractions, and of OPers. \**dānaka-*, the *δανάκη* of late Greek authors. Many other identifications of common nouns and proper names seem plausible. But C. is not, and does not claim to be, an Iranianist. His outlook in this field rarely goes beyond Old Persian and Avestan, and when it does, not always successfully. Yet the preserved texts in the two oldest Iranian languages contain only a small portion of the Iranian vocabulary. The greater part is found in the Middle Iranian languages of Persia, Parthia, Sogdiana, Khotan, and in present-day Persian, Ossetic, and Pashto, to mention only the chief ones. The key to many riddles of the tablets is undoubtedly hidden somewhere in these sources; it is, therefore, essential that they should be brought into the discussion. Unfortunately a high degree of uncertainty is bound to remain with almost any proposed identification, until additional material turns up to corroborate or refute it. The following remarks on some of the words and problems presented by the tablets are written in full consciousness of the ambiguity of El. spellings, the insufficiency of factual evidence on the meaning of problem words, and the resulting doubtfulness of almost anything that is said about them.

*an-kur-rāk-kaš*

No. 36 refers to men, boys, women, and girls, who are <sup>GIS</sup>GĒŠTIN<sup>ids</sup> *û-ti-îp* *Locan-kur-rāk-kaš* *Persû-da-na* 'GIS'GĒŠTIN<sup>ids</sup> 'ku(?))-ti-ra(?)]' [*da-ma*]. C. translates "wine makers (in the place?) Ankurraka (whom) Otanes the wine bearer (?) sent", and comments: "*an-kur-rāk-kaš* which reappears in the genitive as *ha-an-kur-ra-qa.an* in No. 52 (on which cf. below, p. 136) together with Otanes, may be some such designation as "wine-press" rather than a place name." It is difficult, in reading this remark, not to think of NPers. *angūr* "grapes", Pahl. *angūr*, cf. Junker, *Frahang*, v<sup>1</sup>, Nyberg, *Texte z. mazd. Kalender*, p. 48 last line (*angūr hād razān* "grapes from vineyards", v. Henning, *BSOAS*, x, 97, n.1), Bartholomæ, *Mir. Mund.*, iv, 24<sup>7</sup>, *Ir Bd*, 116<sup>12</sup> (a reference which I owe to Professor Bailey), Pazand *angūr*; on the Persian dialect form *angūrδ*, NPers. *angurda* "a single grape", whence Yidya *agidro*, Munj. *aglero*, "grape" v. Morgenstierne, *IIFL*, ii, 81.188.

The proposed connection requires, of course, the assumption that El. *kur* (which is found to correspond to OPers. *kar/gar* and *kr/gr/xr*) in this case represents OPers. *k/gūr*. The El. spelling of the name of Cyrus as

<sup>1</sup> Arthur Darby Nock, *The Problem of Zoroaster*, *AJA.*, 1949, 272. On the date of the "Zoroastrian" calendar cf. on the one hand S. H. Taqizadeh, *Old Iranian Calendars*, 40 sqq. 57, on the other hand J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *Zoroastre*, 110.125.

*ku-raš*, does not support this assumption, but is hardly sufficient to establish a rule on this point. If we interpret El. (*ha-*)*an-kur-ra(k)-kaš* as representing an OPers. *-ka* derivative of \*(*h*)*ank/gūra* "grapes", its meaning may have been "wine-press", as C. suggests, or, conceivably, "vineyard".

It is a pity that even if the El. word should prove to be the replica of an OPers. cognate of *angūr*, it does not inform us on the two points which are essential for understanding its formation, to wit whether the initial was *a-* or *ha-*, and whether *n* was followed by *k* or *g*.

*ba-ši-qa-ra*, v. below, p. 139.

*ba-ti-ma-nu(-iš)*

The passages containing this word are conveniently collected on p. 158. In every case<sup>1</sup> the word is an attribute of boys. In two tablets it is amplified by the description *qa-ra-bat-ti-iš*, possibly "usher" (v. below, p. 144), in No. 63 it is followed by "who are *gal nu-iš-ki-îp*" (v. below, p. 143), in No. 72 by "who bear<sup>2</sup> [*ab(?)*]-*ba-ir*", in No. 48 by what C. translates as "who are accountable (?) (at [the place]) Partetash (?) to the woman Ammashishna of (the place) Kindarizza", in No. 59 by an obscure qualification.<sup>3</sup>

In C.'s opinion *ba-ti-ma-nu-iš* stands for OPers. \**patiy māniy(a)* "attached to the royal house (estate)". Neither the proposed form nor the meaning can be accepted unreservedly. Final El. *-nu(-iš)* in LWs points to OPers. *-ni-* of an *-i* stem,<sup>4</sup> and the existence of a prepositional compound with *māniya-*, on which v. below, pp. 140 sqq., is necessarily a matter of speculation. One may prefer to compare the El. word with existing compounds with *pati-*, e.g., NPers. *paimān* "measure", *paimāna* "cup, goblet, bowl". MPers. *pym'n*, Parth. *pdm'n*, Pahl. *ptm'n* is "measure", but Professor Bailey has shown me that *ptm'n* in *IrBd* 62<sup>6</sup>.136<sup>8</sup>, and *ptm'nyk* *ibid.* 63<sup>15</sup> (*IndBd* *ptm'nk*) may mean "cup". If we assume that OPers. \**patimāna-* or/and \**patimāni-* meant "cup", and recognise in the El. spelling a derivative \**pātīmāni-*, we shall refer it to the person connected with the cup, the cupbearer. A point in favour of this interpretation is that *ba-ti-ma-nu(-iš)* is only applied to boys.

One is thus prompted to inspect closely the one tablet (No. 77), where the recipients of payment, although exclusively boys, are not *ba-ti-ma-nu(-iš)*. The description in this case is *Pers[pu]-hu ap-pa am Loci-ia<sup>1</sup>-an.uk-ku<sup>5</sup> sik-qa-[ap(?)]* *Locba-ir-ša*, translated by C. as "boys who now upon the columned hall<sup>5</sup> are stationed (?) (at) Parsa". *sik-qa*, which C. discusses on pp. 112.193, translates both OPers. *van-* "to throw",<sup>6</sup> corresponding to

<sup>1</sup> Except in No. 81, where the reading is uncertain and the context altogether incomprehensible.

<sup>2</sup> According to C. "who are guarding(?) animals(?)". There is no reason to depart from the normal meaning of *ku-ti-* (cf. below, p. 143) for the sake of this passage, seeing that [*ab(?)*]-*ba-ir* is quite uncertain.

<sup>3</sup> *kur-riš* <sup>GIS</sup>(?) *šip(?)na*, according to C. "(drivers?) for the asses (which are) at the gateway(s)". The meaning suggested for *kur-riš* is a mere guess.

<sup>4</sup> I owe recognition of this point to Professor Henning, who also made me aware that *ba-ti-*, if correctly interpreted by C., represents an exceptional rendering of OPers. *pati-* (which is normally written *bat-ti-*); cf. below, p. 137 on *ham-ba-ti-ia-îp*.

<sup>5</sup> *ia-an* can have nothing to do with NPers. *aiwān* as C. thinks (p. 88), since the latter goes back to OPers. *apadāna-*, v. Henning, *TPS.*, 1944, 110 n.1.

<sup>6</sup> Professor Bailey has kindly imparted to me his discovery that this is the meaning of *van-*. The evidence is provided by Khot. *uysvan-* "to throw, scatter", and modern dialects, Yazdī *venōdvūn* (v. Bailey, *BSOS.*, viii, 344), Samnāni *bāvandan* "to throw", etc., v. references in Christensen, *Contributions*, i 58, ii 49.

Akk. *malū* "to fill", and OPers. *frasah-*, corresponding to Akk. *epēšu* "to erect". Moreover, in El. tablets flour and grain are mentioned as its object. OPers. *frasah-* has been explained by Benveniste as meaning "to throw, pile up by throwing". If a similar meaning is assumed for El. *sik-qa-* it is possible that this verb could be used for the action of "pouring". The boys mentioned in No. 77 might then have been "(wine-)pourers", i.e., cup-bearers, cf. Germ. *Schenk*.

*du-ma-kaš-be*

This plural of an unexplained word is applied to persons who are further described by what C. translates as "laborers (?)" on the columned hall" (No. 13). Why not assume an OPers. \**dāmaka-* "builder" or "carpenter"? Cf. Khot. *padim-* "to build", Gr. *δέμω*, etc. Before *ma* for OPers. *ma* or *va*, we find *u* for OPers. *a* in *aš-du-maš* "one eighth" for \**aštama-*, *nu-ma-u-maš* "one ninth" for \**navama-*, *tu-ru-ma-ir* (etc.) for *θūrāvā-hara-*.

*GIŠ<sub>3</sub>si-ip*

The interpretation offered of *kur-taš AN.BAR*<sup>idz</sup> *GIŠ<sub>3</sub>si-ip* in No. 23 as "the workmen (on) the iron door(s)", does not seem to rest on reliable ground, as comparison with No. 18 will show. In the latter tablet we read *kur-taš* (Pers *du<sup>1</sup>-um-mar-ra-kur-raš-be a-ak* AN.BAR<sup>idz</sup> *GIŠ<sub>3</sub>si-ip gal ma-ki-ip*, translated by C. as "workmen, doormakers and (makers of) iron door(s) (who are) earning wages", which seems syntactically hard even on Elamite. One does not see why *a-ak* "and" should not be taken seriously; *-ip* in *GIŠ<sub>3</sub>si-ip* could well be the personal plural ending, and what C. interpreted as the determinative *GIŠ* may be *iš* or *qa*.<sup>2</sup> Presumably the resulting *iš-si-ip* or *qa-si-ip* would merely constitute one more unknown Elamite word, yet clearly something like "iron- [forg(?)]ers" would suit the syntax of the passages in question (including No. 74) far better than "on iron door(s)".

*iš-ra-ša-qa-ra*

It was noted above, p. 134, that *an-kur-rak-kaš* has a variant *ha-an-kur-ra-qa* in No. 52. In reading this translation of this tablet we are surprised to find that within the five months which had elapsed since No. 36 was written, Otanes the wine-bearer had taken charge of an armament factory. He is now responsible for men, boys, women, and girls, who, acc. to C., are "workmen (Pers *kur-taš*), armorers (*iš-ra-ša-qa-ra*), who are accounted to (the place) Hankurraka in Narēši (Niriz)." In his analysis of *iš-ra-ša-qa-ra* as representing OPers. \**zrāza-kara-*, where he wants the first element to correspond to Av. *zrāda-* "armour", C. has committed the only serious transgression against Old Iranian phonology in his invaluable book. For while we may find either *d* or *z* in OPers. where Avestan has intervocalic *z*, one would never expect anything but OPers. *d* to correspond to Av. inter-

<sup>1</sup> *ū-iš-bar-na-iš-be*, appearing also as *ū-iš-pir-na-iš-be*, for which OPers. \**uz-barna-* is suggested (p. 103). The spellings rather point to an OPers. \**huš/sprna-*, cf. *ū-iš-da-na* = *Hystanes* (C., p. 169). The proper name *ū-iš-ba-ka*, for which C. has no explanation, very likely represents OPers. (Median) \**hu-spaka-* "having good dogs", cf. Parth. *špg*.

<sup>2</sup> In the notes to AN.BAR<sup>idz</sup> *GIŠ<sub>3</sub>si-ip* in No. 23 C. remarks: "GIŠ is written as *qa*". Cf. also p. 79 (on 33): "frequently *iš* (GIŠ) is written almost identically with *qa* and *ut*"; p. 91: "it is seldom possible to determine a difference between the *ut* and the *iš* signs"; p. 197: "the old perplexing problem—how clearly to distinguish between *qa*, *ut*, and *iš* (GIŠ)".

vocalic *š*. Since El. *š* cannot stand for OPers. *d* < OIr. *d*, the proposed explanation, which constitutes the only reason for bringing "armorers" into this tablet, cannot be accepted.

It may be suggested that the *iš-ra-ša-qa-ra* were engaged in a peaceful occupation connected with the production of wine; they may have been wine-pressers, wine-dressers, or vintagers,<sup>1</sup> according to what exactly *ha-an-kur-ra-qa.na* means. The word is, however, difficult to analyse. The assumption that *iš-ra-* represents OPers. *zra-* finds no confirmation in the El. rendering of OPers. *Zra<sup>ka</sup>* as *šir-ra-an-kaš*. Wherever else *iš-* occurs initially in the volume under review, C. has interpreted it as the determinative *GIŠ*. This determinative is found not only before words denoting wooden objects, but also before the ideogram for "wine" *GEŠTIN*, cf. also C., p. 70, n.6. It is used with an OPers. LW in *GIŠ<sub>3</sub>qa-at* "throne, place", cf. Herzfeld, *AltPers. Inschr.*, 179. If we read *GIŠ<sub>3</sub>ra-ša-*, and contemplate the possibility of *ra-ša* being Iranian, it is tempting to compare it with NPers. *raz* "vineyard, vine", Pahl. *raz* "vine", *razān* "vineyards" (v. above, p. 134), Avroman Doc. *-paš* "vineyard" (v. Tedesco, *JAOIS*, 1943, 151).

*kam-ba-ti-ia-ip*

In No. 5 an "administrator(?)" pays 113 *kam-ba-ti-ia-ip* (*-ip* being the personal plural ending) the considerable sum of 8 *karša* each by order of Darius himself. In this word C. recognises an OPers. \**gau-pati-* "cowherdsman". In view of the El. ending *ti-ia* one may prefer a derivative \**gaupati-ya-* "person attached to the \**gaupati-*", but it must be borne in mind that *ba-ti* is an irregular rendering of OPers. *pati-*, v. above, p. 135 n. 4. If nevertheless one is prepared to agree with C.'s interpretation of the form, the question arises whether the proposed meaning suits the context in which the word occurs.

One would not expect the Great King to take a personal interest in the payment of wages to herdsmen.<sup>2</sup> Tablets Nos. 50 and 61 show the normal procedure; there, "sheep-herders" receive minutely computed monthly wages (only 7½ shekels per man) for work performed at a specified date through ordinary Treasury channels. In No. 5, however, payment of lump sums is entrusted by the King to an "administrator(?)", the Treasury is not mentioned, no date is given. Moreover, the *kam-ba-ti-ia-ip* are described as "holding (?) *an-da-kaš*", a description which also occurs in No. 4, where by personal order of Darius an "administrator (?) distributes the large sum of 530 *karša* among 13 men with Persian names<sup>3</sup> "who among the Persians held *an-da-kaš*". We must also heed the implications of C.'s remark (p. 126, bottom, cf. also p. 3) that "excepting only tablets Nos. 4-8, which are outright grants of money at the order of the king", all documents down to the 7th year of Xerxes (479 B.C.) stipulate that the "equivalent" of the money specified is to be paid in sheep or wine. These considerations suggest that \**gau-pati-*, rather than denoting ordinary cowmen, is a title.

One naturally thinks of Pahl. *gōpat*, title of a chief in Sogdiana, of which Professor Bailey's latest explanation (*Asica, TPS*, 1945, 14) is "lord

<sup>1</sup> Note, however, that the tablet records payment for work performed from May 6 to June 3.

<sup>2</sup> On the King's intervention in the payment of *kur-taš gal ma-ki-ip* v. below, p. 141.

<sup>3</sup> Including a *maš-da-ia-aš-na* = *Mazdayasna-*, as recognised by C.

of the *gava(s)*”, viz. of the “village(s)” or “cattle-station(s)”. The possibility that *kam-ba-ti-ia-ip* represents the earliest evidence we have of such a title raises new problems. We are no longer safe in accepting an OIr. stem *gawa-* to correspond to Ossetic (Iron) *qæū*, (Digor) *γæū* “village”, but may require a stem *gaw-*. The Avestan forms could easily be derived from such a stem. The simplex occurs in *gāum* (var. *gāōm* [sic]) *yim suyδō.šayanəm* “the g. inhabited by Sogdians” *Vend.* i 4, and *mourum hārōyūm gaomča suxδəm* “the Haraivian Marw and the Sogdian<sup>1</sup> g.” *Yt* x 14; the compound form is seen, according to Bailey, *loc. cit.*, in *gavašayana-* and *gavašiti-*, which J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *Les composés de l’Avesta*, 20, proposed to analyse as *gav-ašō*. Avestan thus may show an Accusative *\*gaw-am* and a compound form *\*gaw-*, both identical with the corresponding forms of *gaw-* “cow”.

In Ossetic OIr. *gaw-* may survive in open syllable as *qæū*, *γæū* “village” (cf. Iron *γæū*, Dig. *γæū* “corn” < OIr. *yawa-*), in closed syllable as Iron *qu-*, Dig. *yo-* (*qug*, *γog* “cow”).<sup>2</sup> If we are prepared to analyse Digor *keyog* as from *\*katya-gau-ka-*, Ossetic will appear to have had *γog* also with the meaning of “settlement” (or sim.). *keyog* is according to Miller-Freiman’s Dictionary “a fenced farmstead, a farmstead with all its buildings and its courtyard”, according to Abayev, *Osetinskii yazyk i folklor*, i 454, “a farmstead, a house with outbuildings”. To Professor Bailey I owe reference to Digor *kekhokh* (sic), which John F. Baddeley, *The Rugged Flanks of Caucasus* ii 147, quoted from an account by Countess Uvarov of her discoveries at Maxčesk in Digoria. The relevant passage of this account (*Materialy po arxeologii Kavkaza*, viii (1900) 254) is as follows: “On a high, bare, rocky, inaccessible cliff, precipitous on all sides, are the ruins of an extensive castle; across the river [Aigamughi], at the same height, are towers and walls belonging to the same castle. This is the ancient home of the Abisalovs-“kubys” or “kexok” (sic) in Digor, that is to say, a fort”. *\*katya-* is attested in Buddh. Sogdian *kty’kδ’r’(y)* *Vim* 60, 127 “householder, *ghapati* (v. F. Weller, *Asia Major*, x 343, *Abh. Kunde d. Morg.* xxii 6, 47), possibly also in Ormuri *šiv* (v. G. Morgenstierne, *IIFL*, i 392), and the change of *katya-* > *ke-* has a parallel in a development which Professor Bailey suggested in Ossetic Seminars, that of *pati-āō* to Digor *feō*. Hence *keyog* may originally have meant “a settlement of houses”.<sup>3</sup>

The possible appearance of *\*gaupati(ya)-* in Persia in the 5th century B.C. brings into prominence Marquart’s connection (*Erānsāhr*, 29) of Av. *gava-* with Strabo’s *Γαβιανή*, *Γάβαι*, Ptolemy’s *Γαβαῖοι*, referring to a

<sup>1</sup> Thus Reichelt, *Avesta Reader*, Gloss., s.v., against Bartholomae’s, Lommel’s, and Schaefer’s (*ZDMG.*, 1942, 136) “Sogdiana”. Reichelt’s interpretation seems preferable, since *suxδəm* (*suyδəm*) as adjective would be parallel to “Haraivian”, and synonymous with *svyδō.šayanəm* in *Vend.* i 4. This interpretation lends some authority to the variants *sauxδəm*, *sauχδəm* as vrddhi forms of *suxδəm*.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Bailey points out Markwart’s derivation of Arm. *gugaz* “Kuhstreiber” from *\*gōg* (corresponding to Oss. *γog*) + *az-* “to drive” (*Caucasica* 6 (1930) 68). For *gugaz* Bedrossian’s Dictionary only gives “union of irregular troops”.

<sup>3</sup> Further connections of *\*gaw-* “settlement” remain uncertain. Darmesteter, *Zend Avesta*, ii, 7, had compared Av. *gava-* with Gothic *gaw* “Gau” (this would imply initial *\*gh*). To the latter Scheftelowitz added Arm. *gavar* “province, region, country” (cf. S. Feist, *Vergl. Wtb. d. got. Sprache*, 3rd. ed., s.v. *gaw*), without being able to account for *-at*. Professor Bailey considers that *-at* may be a loan from a Western Iranian representative of Oss. *arəən* “boundary, boundary mark”, cf. *vačar* “market” < *vāčarana-* (Sogd. *w’crn*, v. Henning, *BBB.*, s.v.).

district of Achaemenian Persis, probably Ispahān. On the strength of *Γάβαι* H. H. Schaefer, *ZDMG.*, 1942, 137, postulated an OPers. plural *\*gavā* as name of the district. This may have been the plural of the ethnic *\*gava-* derived from *\*gaw-*. If the *kam-ba-ti-ia(-ip)* = *\*gaupatiya-* were officials attached to the chief of *\*gav-*, the place names *bar-mi-iš-ša* and *mar-sa-iš-kaš* which occur in this tablet, may have to be looked for in the direction of Ispahān. [v. Addendum on a different view on *Γάβαι*].

#### *ku-pir-ri(-ia)-iš*

The men, women, boys, and girls who are thus described and for whom, in No. 54, a *ba-ši-qa-ra* (according to C. “tribute handler”) is responsible, are hardly “copperers”, as C. hesitatingly proposes, following a suggestion by Professor Kent. No word connected with Greek *κῦπριον* (etc.) has as yet been found in Indo-Iranian or Mesopotamian languages, cf. Walde, *Lat. Et. Wtb.*, 3rd ed., 313. On the other hand, the El. word strongly reminds one of NPers. *kurf* “pitch; a black stuff used by goldsmiths (cf. the verse quoted by Asadi s.v.)”, Syr. *kufrā* “pix, bitumen”, Assy. *kupru*, etc., cf. Hübschmann, *AG* 308. A possible use of pitch or tar at Persepolis may have been for treating timber so as to render it damp-proof. Such timber was required for building purposes and for making barrels (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *RE* s.v. *Pech*). It is conceivable that women, and even boys and girls could be employed for such work, which is not heavy. On the other hand, the specialised meaning of NPers. *kurf* leaves open the possibility that the *ku-pir-ri(-ia)-iš* were employed by goldsmiths (cf., on their activity at Persepolis, C., pp. 129 sq.).

“Tribute handlers” are, of course, unlikely supervisors either of “copperers” or of “pitch or tar workers”. However, the proposed interpretation of *ba-ši-qa-ra* is not as “imperative” as C. thinks (p. 149), since Iranian compounds with *bāši-* do not otherwise show *-kara-* as second component, cf. Gr. *βαλκυράβαρ* (quoted by C.), Arm. *bašapan*, NPers. *bāšdār*, v. Hübschmann, *AG* 115, Sogdian *bwšbr* and *β’zkr’m* (v. Freiman, *Sbornik*, Doc. 35). If we assume that *ba-ši* either was a general word for “vessel”, or denoted a special kind of vessel, we could visualise a “maker of *ba-ši*” requiring the assistance of “*kurf*-workers” in turning out either wine-barrels or elaborate silver goblets and bowls. Etymologically such an interpretation may be justified by reference to Arm. *bašak* “goblet”, Targ. *bzyk* “acerra, scutella” (cf. Telegdi, *JA*, 1935, 234), Av. *raēθwiš.bafina-* “mixing vessel”.

#### *kur-taš*

The persons who receive payment are in most tablets described as *kur-taš* (always preceded by the “personal” determinative). C. translates this word as “worker”, and considers it to be a LW from an OPers. noun belonging to the base *kar-* “to make, do” (p. 41). This is quite possible, although one would not start from the Past Partc. *karta-*, as C. does, but rather from the noun of agent *\*kartar-* “maker”, of which the Nom. Sg. *\*kartā* could have been generalised in Elamite as *kur-taš*. One may compare Pahl. *wlckil’l* “peasant (agriculture-maker)”, Paz. *karđār* “maker” *ŠGV*, NPers. *kirdār* “work” (cf. Horn, *GIP* i<sup>2</sup> 184), and, as Professor Bailey points out, Arm. *čartar* “skilful, artisan, mechanic, artificer, master”, which Hübschmann, *AG* 189, perhaps unnecessarily separated from Av. (*frašō*.)*čartar-*.

The word *kur-taš* is usually<sup>1</sup> followed by various additional descriptions, such as "entitled to receive payment"<sup>2</sup> (Nos. 7.8.13.15.18), "artisans" (Nos. 33.34.35.43.51.69.70.71.79), "laboring (on) wood, making sculptures of the same" (17.18.20), "treasury workmen" (39.40.45.64.65.66.67), "beer tenders" (46), "of the land of the Hattians, Egyptians, and Ionians, who are entitled to receive payment"<sup>2</sup> (15.26), etc. When the total of persons receiving payment is given towards the end of a tablet, they are summed up either as "so many *kur-taš*", or as "so many RÜH (men)". The term *kur-taš* is applied both to men only, and to teams consisting of men and women (28.29), or of men, women, boys, and girls (37.42.46.50. etc.). It is not found in tablets referring to boys only (47.48.58.59.63.72 (where the total is given as 5 RÜH "men"). 77). Moreover, the word is not found in a number of tablets relating to individuals similar in type and occupation to those described in other tablets as *kur-taš*, cf. "wood-workers and relief(?) -makers" (No. 25), "wine bearers" (36), "men of the land of the Hattians" (22). The three tablets which refer to payment received by one man only (1.11.78) also do not contain the word *kur-taš*.

It is necessary to consider the contexts in which *kur-taš* occurs in the tablets before turning to what C. oddly fails to point out, namely, the occurrence of *kur-taš* (preceded by the "personal" determinative) in a much discussed passage of the Behistun inscription, El. i 49 = OPers. i 64 sq. (Akk. missing). Evidently C. considers this *kur-taš* to be a different word, for it is usually held to translate OPers. *māniya-* which C. (in discussing *ba-ti-ma-nu-iš*, v. above, p. 135) renders by "royal house (estate)". Apparently he accepts Foy's explanation of *kur-taš* as "Gebäutes", LW representing OPers. *karām*, ZDMG, 54, 347.

Even before the publication of the tablets, Foy's interpretation was open to serious doubts, since with such a meaning the word should have been preceded by the "place" determinative. Now that we know of the existence of a common El. word *kur-taš* regularly preceded by the "personal" determinative, it seems even less advisable to assume that the wrong determinative was used in the Behistun inscription; we should first require independent evidence that *kur-taš* could also mean "building" (or sim.).

In the Beh. passage El. Pers[*taš*]-*šu-ip.na lu-taš a-ak aš a-ak* Pers*kur-taš a-ak* [L<sup>ocu-el-ma-an-nu-i</sup>]p.ma corresponds to OPers. *kārahya abicariš gaiḫāmcā māniyamca viḫabišcā*, of which the latest authoritative translation, by Professor Kent in *Old Persian*, 120, is "(I restored) to the people the pastures and the herds, the household property and the houses (which Gaumata the Magian took away from them)". El. *a-ak* "and" occurring three times in the face of thrice OPers. *-cā* suggests that El. *lu-taš* = OPers. *abicariš*, El. *aš* = OPers. *gaiḫām*, El. *kur-taš* = OPers. *māniyam*. Unfortunately, with the exception of *kur-taš*, all six words are *hapax legomena* in the available material of the two languages respectively.

The Aramaic version of the Behistun inscription has preserved two words belonging to our passage, viz., *nksyhwm wbtjhwum* "their wealth and their houses". L. H. Gray, JAOS, 33 (1913) 282, first pointed out that the

<sup>1</sup> *kur-taš* seems to stand by itself only in No. 60 (where the word is half restored), and in the unclear context of the Fortification tablet quoted p. 52 n. 43 (which contains the only published occurrence of the plural *kur-taš-be*). On No. 23 v. above, p. 136.

<sup>2</sup> *gal ma-ki-ip*, v. below, p. 141, n. 2.

two Aram. words may correspond to OPers. *māniyamcā viḫabišcā*. He thus assigned to *māniya-* the meaning "wealth, property", more or less in agreement with Bartholomæ's rendering as "liegende Habe". Others have seen in *māniya-* a cognate of NPers. (etc.) *mān* "house", so that Herzfeld, *Altper. Inschr.* 51, could take the two Aram. words as corresponding to OPers. *gaiḫāmcā māniyamcā*. Unhappily we do not know whether the Aram. version used more than two words to translate the four OPers. ones. If *māniya-* meant something like "house", then *māniyamcā viḫabišcā* could well be rendered by Aram. *btyhwum*, and *nksyhwm* might correspond to *abicariš gaiḫāmcā*. On the other hand, if El. *kur-taš* renders OPers. *māniyam*, we should not expect, on the evidence of the tablets, that *māniya-* refers to (a) building(s); it would then appear to be translated by Aram. *nksyhwm*, rather than by *btyhwum*. Professor Bailey has put to me the view that *māniya-* as a derivative of \**māna-* "house", could refer both to household property and to household servants (cf. Greek *οικέτης*); on the assumption that in *kur-taš* a development of meaning from "worker, skilful person" to "servant" had taken place, the El. word might render one aspect of the assumed meaning of *māniya-*, while the Aram. word would approach the other, or include both.

It may be noted that the contexts of the tablets, while permitting the interpretation of *kur-taš* as "worker", do not require it. A more general meaning, such as "person(s), individual(s), people (French *gens*)"<sup>1</sup>, is equally applicable everywhere, and may seem preferable in Nos. 7 and 8. These belong to a small group of tablets recording payments which are made on the King's personal order by an "administrator (?)", cf. above, p. 137. The Great King may, of course, for reasons unknown to us, have intervened in the payment of workers, but he did not do so in those tablets in which the wording, independently of the presence or absence of the word *kur-taš*, makes it abundantly clear that the recipients of payment were workers. We have no reason for assuming that Nos. 7 and 8 constitute exceptions, unless we allow ourselves to be guided by the suggestion that *kur-taš* means "worker".<sup>2</sup> It is thus possible that the connotation of *kur-taš* was wider than C.'s interpretation leads one to expect.

On reading these remarks, Professor W. B. Henning was kind enough to send me the following contribution:

"*kur-taš* (the sign transliterated as *kur* normally transcribes OPers. *k(a)r* or *g(a)r*) is evidently the same word as the neo-Babylonian *luga-ar-du/di/da* discussed by W. Eilers, ZDMG, 90, 193 sqq. (and further in his book *Iranische Beamtennamen in der keilinschriftlichen Ueberlieferung* which is not accessible to me). This undoubtedly Persian word appears not only in Babylonian documents of the Achaemenian epoch, but also in Aramaic texts belonging to the same period. It occurs several times, spelt 𐤀𐤂𐤃 *gard-*, in the still unpublished Arsham letters. The spellings, *kur-taš*, *luga-ar-du*,

<sup>1</sup> A collective meaning seems preferable, since the word is not used in tablets referring to one man only.

<sup>2</sup> The fact that in the two tablets in question the *kur-taš* are described as *gal ma-ki-ip*, which C. translates as "earning wages", should not influence our judgement on the social position of the *kur-taš*. For it is precisely C.'s evaluation of their social position which induced him to use this formula instead of the more general one "entitled to receive payment", which is equally satisfactory in all passages; cf. C.'s remarks on pp. 51 sq. (v. also below, p. 143 on *ma-ki-*

etc., 𐎠𐎢𐎡, taken together, prove that the OPers. word was *garda-* (= OIr. *garda-* or *grda-*).

This explanation of *kur-taš* is supported by the occurrence of *kur-ta-pat-ti-iš* several times in the texts edited by Cameron (42, 5; 42a, 5; 53, 7), unrecognised by Cameron who arbitrarily substitutes a novel reading *sad* for the correct *kur* in this word (p. 79, No. 46). The Elamite form corresponds exactly to the Babylonian *ga-ar-du-pa-ta* (etc.), on which see Eilers, *loc. cit.*

The origin of OPers. *garda-* is to be sought in Av. *garāda*, Skt. *grha* "house"; *garda-* either equals Skt. *grha* (in the meaning "domestic servant") or is derived from it by *gūna* as Av. *vaēsa-* is derived from *vis-* (in that case cf. Skt. *grhya-* "domestic servant"). The etymology is in perfect agreement with the equation of *kur-taš* with OPers. *māniya-* "οικέτης", to which you have justly drawn attention.<sup>1</sup> [Professor Bailey has since noticed Tokharian *mānye manyanats* (Gen. Pl.) "für Sklaven und Sklavinnen" quoted by W. Krause, *Zeitschr. f. vgl. Sprachforschung*, 69 (1951), 187 evidently borrowed from Iranian.]

#### *mar-qa-š/ša-na*

The OPers. form underlying this month-name for October-November is given by C. (p. 45, n. 11) as *\*varka-zana-* "wolf-men (month)". This explanation is somewhat unexpected. It is the result of an attempt to explore further possibilities inherent in El. *ma* in unknown OPers. LWs, the earlier interpretation as OPers. *ma* having been discarded. Pending discovery of the correct OPers. form we may bear in mind that El. *ma* also represents OPers. *huvā* (*huvā*), cf. *ma-ra-iš-mi-iš* = *huvārazmiš*, *ma-te-ši-iš* = *huvāda-caya-*, *ma-ak-iš-tar-ra* = *huvāzštara-*. Keeping an eye on the Sogdian month-name *xwryjnyc* (*γwryznych*) = Barčuq-Saka *ahverjana*, cf. Henning, *Orientalia*, viii (1939), 94, Konow, *SPAW*, 1935, 815, we may accordingly attempt to reconstruct an OPers. *\*hūwarka-jana-*. One is thus reminded of the connection established by W. B. Henning, *BSOAS*, xi, 728 sq., between Pahl. *xwarg* and Buddh. Sogd. *γwry* (occurring only twice) < *\*γwry* "embers". The former may go back to *\*hūwarka-*, the latter to *\*hūwarya-*. In agreement with the practical tenor of OPers. month-names, this may have been a month which in some way was connected with embers. We may remember that OPers. *āθriyādiya-*, the name of the month following upon *mar-qa-š/ša-na*, possibly contains *\*āθriya-* "ashes", v. Henning, *JRAS*, 1944, 134, n. 2.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The following note on *pat-ti-qa-maš* and *pir-ru-mu-iš-ša-ak* also comes from Professor Henning: The difficulty of distinguishing verbs from nouns is illustrated by these two words. The former is regarded as a verb by Cameron (pp. 96-7) and interpreted as "after it had been translated", on somewhat feeble grounds. To my mind it is clearly a noun, representing OPers. *patigāma-* "message, report" (Aram. 𐤓𐤓𐤁, Armen. *patgam*, etc.).

Contrariwise, the latter, in which Cameron (pp. 106-7) seeks an Old Iranian form is to my mind an Elamite verb *mu-iš-ša-* preceded by the Elamite adverb *pir-ru*. The verb (spelt *mu-šā-*, *mu-šā-*, *mu-iš-šā-*) occurs frequently in these tablets; it is translated as "account, record" by Cameron; that the forms preceded by *pir-ru* have verbal ending, (*mu-iš-šā-iš*, *mu-iš-šā-iš-ta*, *mu-iš-šā-ak*, *mu-šā-qa*, etc.) can scarcely be doubted. The adverb *pir-ru*, as Cameron himself points out (p. 107), occurs in the inscription of Bisutūn; perhaps it means "together". That it must be separated from *mu-iš-ša-* is proved by 30,11 *i pan-su-kaš KÜ.BABBAR* *idē pir-ru uk-ku* compared with 15,11 *i pan-su-kaš KÜ.BABBAR* *idē uk-ku pir-ru mu-iš-šā*.

<sup>2</sup> Or *\*āθriyā-* Fem., cf. the gender of Pashto *ira*, plural *ire*.

#### *mar-ri-iš*

When payment is made in kind, wine is invariably handed out at the rate of one *mar-ri-iš* for one shekel. C. translates the word as "jug" without offering comments. It is, at any rate, clear that *mar-ri-iš* does not in the tablets denote any jug, but refers to a jug of a well-defined and constant capacity, in other words, a measure. The comparison with the Persian LW in Greek *μάρις*, and with Arm. *mar*, a measure of capacity, naturally imposes itself. This connection, of course, excludes the etymology offered by Hübschmann, *AG* 192 (from *\*māθra-*). Unfortunately the capacity of the *μάρις/mar* as indicated in the sources (cf. Lagarde, *Ges. Abh.*, 196 sq.), varies between the *ἑξακότυλον* (= 1.22 litr.), the *χοεὺς* (= 3.275 litr.), *δύο ὑδριῶν* (= 8.18 litr.), *δέκα χόες ἀττικαί* (= 32.75 litr.), the *βάτος* (or *κάδος* = 32.75 litr.?), and the *μετρητής* (= 38.88 litr.).

#### *nu-da-nu (-iš)*

On this word C. remarks (p. 117) that the meaning "store-room"<sup>1</sup> seems to fit all occurrences known at present. In No. 19 it is preceded by *Loeqa-ap-nu-iš-ki.ma* "in the Treasury", in No. 56 by *Loekān-ša-iš* "treasure". As a LW it would suitably represent OPers. *\*nid/tāni-*. There is little doubt that we have here the oldest Iranian form corresponding to Khot. *nyanaa-* "treasure", MPers. *ny'n* "treasure or store",<sup>2</sup> Skt. *nidhāna* "treasure, hoard, store". The ending of OPers. *\*nidāni-* compares with that of Av. *yaošdāni-*, *gaostāni-*, *aspō.stāni-*, and *uštrō.stāni-*.

#### *nu-iš-ki*

No. 63 mentions *ba-ti-ma-nu-iš* boys (v. above, p. 135) *ak-qa-be gal nu-iš-ki-ip*. C. translates: "who (for) wages are tending (animals)." Apart from the fact that the animals are not to be seen, the syntax of this clause arouses misgivings. One expects *gal* to be the object of *nu-iš-ki*, a possibility which was no doubt discarded because this verb translates OPers. *pā-* "to protect, guard", as C. points out in a note on p. 100. The same note, however, also makes it clear that in El. *li-ip-te ku-uk-ti-ra*, corresponding to OPers. *vaθ'a-bara-*, a verb meaning "to protect" was used to translate OPers. *bara-*; for while *ku-ti-* means "to bear, bring", its reduplicated form *kukti-* alternates with *nu-iš-ki-* in translating OPers. *pā-* (v. C., p. 188, note on line 5). It would therefore seem possible that *gal nu-iš-ki-ip* is an El. calque of an OPers. compound (*payment*)-*bara-*. Since the meaning of such a compound ("payment-bearer", i.e., "person receiving payment") would not differ appreciably from that of the common *gal ma-ki-ip* (cf. above, p. 141, n. 2), the consideration that in the latter, *ma-ki-* may correspond to OPers. *bar-* should not be lost sight of in determining the exact meaning of this new El. verb (cf. p. 52).

<sup>1</sup> El. *am-ba-raš*, another word for "store-room", represents, of course, OPers. *\*ham-pāra-*, not, as C. has it, *\*ambara*.

<sup>2</sup> That this is the meaning of MPers. *ny'n* I learn from Professor Henning, who writes: In *Mir Man ii ny'n 'y zyndg'n* "Treasure of the Living" may be the MPers. title of Mani's well-known opus.—*M273 R* 21-22 *w'c'rg'n 'st'ydg' xwd'y 'y ny'n'n wzrg'n* "Blessed merchant, master of great treasures (stores)".—*M567*, 11 *gd'xwd'y . . . ky 'ny bw'n ny'n 'wd g[. . .]* "the Master of the House, whose store and treasure I hope to be" (soul talking), clearly inviting the restoration *g[nz]*.—I was wrong in *OLZ.*, 1934, 9, to demand *ny'ngr'n* for *M174 ii R* 5; the correct reading is *ny'ngd'n 'b'g [gnz] 'y yk zm'n; 'wd nyc 'šk[wh'n] 'y* "neither the Rich . . . nor the Poor . . ."

There is another compound where one might suspect that *nu-iš-ki* translates OPers. *bar-*, viz. *qa-ap-nu-iš-ki-ra*, plur. *\*ki-ip* (discussed on p. 100), synonym of *kan-ša-ba(r)-ra* "treasurer.<sup>1</sup> As the latter is a LW from OPers. *\*ganza-bara-* (cf. Hübschmann, *AG* 126, Bailey, *Asica* (TPS, 1945) 15), so the former may be a calque modelled on the same source. In this case the meaning "treasure" could be assigned to El. *qa-ap*. Beside the "personalised" forms in *-ra* and *-ip* there is *qa-ap-nu-iš-ki* "Treasury". Does this translate an OPers. *\*ganza-barana-*? Cf. Av. *zaoθrō.barana-* "(cup) containing libations", Sogd. *βwδβrn* "scent-holder", v. TPS, 1945, 146, and Benveniste, *ibid.* 70 sq. On the other hand, the OPers. compound of which *qa-ap-nu-iš-ki(-ra)* may be a calque need not have ended in *-bara(na)-*: Arm. *ganjapah*, Greek *γαζοφύλαξ*, *γαζοφυλάκιον* render it at least equally likely that *nu-iš-ki* in this case translates an OPers. second term of compound belonging to the base *pā-*.

*pat-ti-qa-maš* and *pir.ru-mu-iš-ša-ak* v. above, p. 142, n. 1.

*qa-ra-bat-ti-iš*

This word is used in Nos. 47 and 58 as an attribute of *ba-ti-ma-nu-iš* boys (v. above, p. 135). C. suggests "ass drivers" as a possible meaning. It may be more appropriate to compare Arm. *karapet* "fore-runner, precursor, out-rider, guide", which is also used as a name of St. John the Baptist. The denominative *karapetem* means "to precede, guide, conduct, announce". Hence the pages whom we surmised to have been employed as "cupbearers" may also have acted as "ushers".

*ú-iš-ba-ka* v. above, p. 136, n. 1.

ILYA GERSHEVITCH

<sup>1</sup> The relation between the *q[qa-ap-nu]-iš-ki-ip* "treasurers" paying out wages in No. 30, and the 1348 *kur-taš qa-ap-nu-iš-ki-ip* (acc. to C. "Treasury workmen") consisting of men, women, boys, and girls, who draw their meagre wages in No. 39 (cf. also Nos. 40.45.64.65.66.67), is not clear to me.