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In a contribution to the previous volume of this journal\(^1\) entitled “Verbal forms and ideograms in the Middle Persian inscriptions” (cited as “Verbal forms” below) I have studied the use of phonetic complements to verbal ideograms in inscrptional Middle Persian. Turning now to Book Pahlavi for a similar investigation, difficulties arising from the nature of the text material at once strike the eye. The unreliability of the transmitted manuscript material, to a great extent depending on what W. B. Henning once, in despair, called “the notorious sloppiness of the copyists”,\(^2\) and the uncertainty as regards time of composition are the principle obstacles, which we can hardly ever hope to get around.

The text chosen for this investigation, the Ayyātkār Ī Zarērān (hereafter AZ) or the “Memoir of the Zarēr family”, has a special position in Pahlavi literature. It is one of the few surviving secular works, being a verse fragment of an old Iranian epic cycle. In a recent article, “On the composition of the Ayyātkār Ī Zarērān” (cited as “Composition” below),\(^3\) I have described the main compositional characteristics of this text which stands astride the gap between fragmentary passages of the Avesta and the “1000 verses” of Šāh-nāmah composed by Daqīqī. The conclusion of that article was, in short, that the text of AZ, as we have it,

---


is a slightly abridged version of a verse composition from Sasanian times. But for some prose passages in the summarizing introduction, it is mainly narrated in present tense, with much of the original verse shining through. The poetical properties of the text will be touched upon below in the cases where they are of importance for the analysis of the verbal forms.

In that same article the textual situation of AZ is described as well as philological treatments of it by W. Geiger, 4 Th. Nöldeke, 5 A. Pagliaro, 6 E. Benveniste, 7 and H. S. Nyberg. 8 All textual material, however, goes back to one single source, Jamasp-Asana's Codex MK, dated 691 A.Y. = 1322 A.D., published in his famous Pahlavi Texts (II, Bombay 1913), pp. 1–17. Unfortunately, this important manuscript was badly worm-eaten already at the end of the last century. 9 Obviously many of its readings had to be restored with the aid of the MS designated JJ by Jamasp-Asana. This MS was copied from MK in 1136 A.Y. = 1767 A.D. Possibly MK was in a somewhat better shape at that time. In spite of the existence of a critical apparatus, it is difficult to see from the edition in Pahlavi Texts where there are lacunae in MK and the readings in the edition depend solely on JJ or, possibly, on emendations by Jamasp-Asana or others. Here below, the text of MK, as far as it is possible to reconstruct it from Pahlavi Texts (excluding critical apparatus), is always considered the basis for the investigation. Readings and interpretations of Jamasp-Asana are quoted as JA and those pertaining to Pagliaro, Benveniste and Nyberg in the works mentioned above are referred to with the name of the respective scholar. The text itself is quoted with reference to the paragraph numbers in Pahlavi Texts. 10

5 ZDMG 46(1892), pp. 136–145.
7 Journal Asiatique 220 (1932), pp. 245–293.

10 The introductory section, without paragraph number, and the colophon, with separate paragraph numbers, are not discussed. On the system of transcription, see "Verbal forms", p. 85, and "Composition", p. 400.
**Verbal forms in AZ according to orthographical representation**
(without emendations; auxiliaries counted separately)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of forms</th>
<th>581</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forms written phonetically</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms written with ideogram</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –yt</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –t</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –d</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –m</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –x₁</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement zero</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –y</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –ym</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –t</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –/s/tn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –st</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(½)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –x₂</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(½)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(½)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –yḥ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(½)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with complement –ḥ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison with the table on verbal forms in inscriptional Middle Persian published previously ("Verbal forms", p. 86) shows that the proportions of verbs written phonetically and with ideogram, respectively, are practically the same and that this also applies to verbal ideograms with complement–m. The other more frequent complements are not comparable, mainly because of the systematic differences and differences in the character of the text.

**Compound verbal forms**

There are 29 compound verbal forms, all of them written with at least one verbal ideogram.

---

11 Excl. ḤWHyt 76, which obviously stands for pron. ět.
12 Excl. ḤWHm 26, 76, 96, which obviously stand for adv. ham.
13 Cf. "Verbal forms", pp. 110–112; note especially the difference in frequency of ideograms with complement zero.
I. Past particle + forms of ḥ−:
B. Secondary (young) 3rd plur. preterites of transitive verbs: burt-hēnd 8, bē-dāt-hēnd 8, kart-hēnd 33 (these should most probably be emended to the regular past participles: burt, bē-dāt and kart; compare the use of bē-patigrift and burt, but bē-raft-hēnd, in a parallel passage in § 22).
C. 1st sing. preterites of intransitive verbs: nē-zāt-ham 40, zāt-ham 40, šut-ham 88 (here most probably belong three emended forms in § 40: bē-murt-+ham, būt-+ham and āpast-+ham; see below p. 102).
D. A number of 2nd/3rd sing. preterite indicative, subjunctive or optative forms: 2nd sing. ind.: (ōzat) apakand-hē(h) 85, āmat-hē(h) 107; 3rd sing. subj.: xvart-hā 52, apakand-hā 52; § 40 has five forms written with HWH’y, and two of these are probably 3rd sing. opt.: nē-pursīt-hē(h), pursīt-hē(h), but the three others must be mistakes for 1st sing. forms (the complete context is quoted below, p. 102).

II. Past participle + forms of bau−:
A. 3rd plur. passive of an intransitive verb: murt bavēnd 49, 68.

III. Past participle + forms of ēstātan/ēst−:
A. 3rd sing. perfect of verbs of change (with present sense): ākust ēstēl 34, zāt ēstēl 68, nē-xwast ēstēl 80, 107, viṣuṣt ēstēl 86.
B. 3rd sing. pluperfect of transitive verbs (with simple past sense): nipiš ēstāl 10, kart ēstāl 74, 100 (the two latter forms, however, are probably interpolations, since they are meaningless in the context and also seem to destroy the metre: §§ 74, 100... | u-š viḍraʃ i yātāk apar-nišānēt | u stanēt ānān +frās i apasūtāk | i dēvān andar dōsāxu pat hēšim | u zahr-dīštāk pat āp ī banjāk |

\[\text{14 Cf. also Nyberg, Manual II, p. 283 (7.6).}\]
\[\text{15 For further discussion of the endings written ‘-y, -y’ and ‘-’, see below pp. 101–106.}\]
\[\text{16 guft nē-bauēt 52 and guft bauēt 53 do not belong here, as they are composed of two syntactically separated elements.}\]
(kart ēštāt) u frāc ó dāst stanēt, “and Vidrāš, the sorcerer, mounts it and grasps that spear on which a spell [has been] cast by the devils in hell through Wrath and [which has been] poisoned with hemp juice, and he wields [it] with [his] hand”).

**Prefixed verbal forms**

In AZ 124 of the verbal forms are prefixed in the widest sense of that word, including particles, negations (also when separated from the verb by other elements) and preverbs. The verbal element is written with ideogram in 88 of these cases (71%, i.e. about the normal proportion). These forms have up to three prefixes: “full” preverb\(^{17}\) + bē- + nē-/mā-.

I. Negation:

A. There are 56 cases of pref. nē-, 8 with verbs in past tense and 42 with verbs in present tense. It would be too cumbersome to list them here, but it should be noticed that when nē- occurs with a “full” preverb alone, it stands before that preverb (nē-apar-āxēzēt 54, 58; nē-apāc-nikērēt 54, 56, 58, 60; the one case of the reverse order, apāc-nē-mānēt 98, is probably a mistake for apāc-bē-nē-mānēt, as it is written in the parallel in § 112), but together with both a “full” preverb and bē- it stands nearest to the verb (apāc-bē-nē-pāyēt 72; apāc-bē-nē-mānēt 112; apāc-bē-nē-šavēnd 66).

B. There are six occurrences of the prohibitive mā- (in four cases separated from the verb). 'L 'ZLWN: mā-šav 80 is a sing. imperative, and so the pseudo-verb āvar in § 51 must be considered: 'L drwāst LPMH (for LPNMH = LPNH): mā drujist āvar, “may you not fare well”. BR 'L NTLWNyt: bē-mā-pāyēt 24 is probably plur. imperative (if not 3rd sing. pres. ind.). But the three parallel instances of 'L . . . YHMTWNd w . . . YKTLWNd in §§ 81, 87 and 108 are somewhat uncertain. Could they be unmarked 3rd plur. subjunctives in -ānd, as suggested by Nyberg in Manual II (s.v. mā)? If it can be established that mā- may be followed also by indicative forms, these forms are rather ordinary 3rd plur. indicatives (rasēnd, őzanēnd).

\(^{17}\) I.e. a preverb with a lexical function.
II. The prefix *bē-*:

The 43 forms (30 written with verbal ideogram) prefixed with *bē-* are of special interest, since the uses of this prefix have not yet been fully clarified. In 7 cases *bē-* is followed by a past tense, in 31 cases by a present indicative form, in three cases by an imperative form and in two cases by an infinitive. It would be most appropriate to classify these forms according to the functions of the prefix *bē-*: a verbal particle with solely grammatical functions or a full preverb with lexical and possibly also grammatical functions. The line between a grammatical and a lexical use is, however, often quite difficult to draw. A tentative classification follows.

A. Verbal particle followed by past tense:

§ 8 u andar-šut-hēnd u[-šān]  ď vištāsp-šāh namāč burt(-hēnd, interpol.? ) u fravarṭak bē-dāl(-hēnd, interpol.? ) § 9 avrāhīm . . .

"And they entered and paid homage to Vištāsp-šāh and delivered the letter. Avrāhīm . . . ; § 22 avrāhīm ī dipūvarān mahist fravarṭak bē-āvaši u vidrašī yātūk u nāmūxūāst ī hazārān fravarṭak bē-patigift u ď vištāsp-šāh namāč burt bē-raft-hēnd, "Avrāhīm, the chief secretary, sealed the letter, and Vidrašī, the sorcerer, and Nāmūxūāst Hazārān received the letter and paid homage to Vištāsp-šāh, [whereupon] they left"; the context of § 40 bē-murt-hām is quoted below (p. 102). In these five cases *bē-* is not used generally to denote "the perfective aspect", as suggested by Nyberg in Manual II (p. 46 b). It is used only in a selected number of perfective cases, obviously in order to stress the result of the action, perhaps especially when there is a change from one agent to another.}

---

18 Cf. the recent attempt by G. Widengren in Mémorial J. de Menasce, 1974, pp. 360-366, on the whole based on the exposition by H. S. Nyberg, Hilfsbuch des Pehlevi, II, s.v. bē; see now Nyberg, Manual II, s.v. bē. See additional note, pp. 109-10.

19 The contrast to the situation in the Middle Persian inscriptions is striking: only one instance of pref. *bē-* may be listed for KKZ and KNRb, BR’ YNSBWN: *bē-stat* in KKZ 13; cf. "Verbal forms", p. 87.

20 This does not agree with the conclusion of Widengren, op. cit., pp. 365-366, that *bē-* with past tense denotes durative or repeated action. There is always some uncertainty involved in general conclusions drawn from selected passages quoted from works of diverse character. But it must also be admitted that the material
B. Verbal particle followed by present indicative:

§ 66 gōbēt jāmāsp bitaxš kā 100 u 30 uēvak bēvar xyōn hač bunak bē-āyēnd ka ēv-bār āyēnd (u, pleon.) hēc zīwandak apāc-bē-nē-
śavēndb21 bē hān ī ēvak arjāsp ī xyōnān xvātāy, "Says Jāmāsp, the
Bitaxš: '1,310,000 Xyōns will come forth from the camp;
when once they come, no one will go back (i.e. survive) but Arjāsp,
the ruler of the Xyōns, alone'’; § 72 . . . adak nē dagr-zamān
bavēl ka hač amāh xyōnān hēc zīwandak apāc-bē-nē-pāyēl (L’WHL
BR’ L’ p’dtl), "then it will not be long when (i.e. before) no one
of us Xyōns will remain alive" (cf. § 98 . . . adak nē dagr-zamān
bavēl (ī) ka hač amāh xyōnān hēc zīwandak apāc-nē-mānēl (L’WHL
L’ KTLWNyt)); § 112 adak nē dagr-zamān bavēl ka hač ōy-sān
xyōnān hēc zīwandak apāc-bē-nē-mānēl (L’WHL BR’ L’ KTLWNyt)
bē hān ī ēvak arjāsp ī xyōnān xvātāy, "then it is not long when
(i.e. before) no one of these Xyōns remains alive but Arjāsp,
the ruler of the Xyōns, alone". In these sentences bē- certainly
functions as a perfective prefix which with the present indicative
gives a future sense (in bē-āyēnd 66 it is, however, primarily a
full preverb; see below), and it may be noticed that, in contra-
diction to what is stated by Nyberg (Manual II, s.v. bē) bē- in
this use is not abrogated by other preverbs or negations. In § 112,
however, a future sense is not quite in accord with the context.
There the forms bavēl and apāc-bē-nē-mānēl are probably kept
as an epic formula, this being the third occurrence of this passage
in the text; the form apāc-bē-nē-pāyēl (p’dtl) 72 is probably a se-
condary variant for original apāc-bē-nē-mānēl (KTLWNyt)b22 and
apāc-nē-mānēl (KTLWNyt) 98 likewise, through a secondary loss of
bē- (BR’).

§ 62 . . . ēv man diz-ē l rōdēn bē-frāmā[yē]m kartan u hān diz
dar-band hān ī āsēnēn bē-frāmāyēm kartan ōy-sān pusarān u
brātārān u vispuhrakān andar hān diz [bē-]frāmāyēmb23 nišāstan,
"because I shall order a fortress of copper to be made, and for
this fortress I shall order an iron gate to be made; I shall order

for an appreciation of the use of bē- with verbs in past tense in AZ is rather in-
sufficient.

b21 'ZLWNd, plur. assimilation from previous sentence.
b22 Cf. the closely resembling ideogram for pātān: NTLWN, e.g. this text § 84.
b23 kartan u, secondary addition; cf. § 63 quoted below.
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these sons and brothers and princes to be placed in that fortress’;
§ 63 gōbēl jāmāsp bitaxš kū hakar diz-e 1 rōdēn bē-framāyē(h)
kartan hān-i ī dar-band āsēnēn bē-framāyē(h) kartan āy-sān
pusarān u brētārān [u] vispuhrākān ī 1ō rāmsahr kai-vištāsp-sāh
andar hān diz bē-framāyē(h) ništāstan pas hān and duštān hāc
šahr apāc-dāšt[an] (§ 64) kē tuwān, ‘Says Jāmāsp, the Bitaxš:
‘If you will order a fortress of copper to be made [and] also order
an iron gate to be made for it [and] order these your sons and
brothers [and] princes, O champion of peace Kai-Vištāsp-Sāh,
to be placed in that fortress, then who is able to repel all those
enemies from the realm?’’. In comparison with other cases of
framāy- + infinitive in this text (§§ 15, 23, 25, 43, 44, 83, 91)
these five (after emendation six) cases obviously display a use
of bē- to stress a future sense.

§ 25 . . . u hakar nē ka āyēl hān gāl24 apāk xu‘ēz- tan bē-nē-āvārēt
ānōd pat dār apar framāyēm kartan, “and if you do not come,
[if] you will not bring that retinue with you, there I shall order
you to be put up on the gallows (pat . . . apar, circumposition)’’;
§ 32 . . . 4viyān25 kun tāy ērān-i ī 4viyān kunēnd tāy amāh-iē
bē-dānēm kū šap hast aivāp rōč, “pitch [your] tent, so that the
Iranians also pitch [their] tents and so that we shall know if it
is night or day’. In the first of these cases (§ 25) it is far from
certain if bē- really is to be considered a particle,26 but if it is,
it clearly stresses the future sense (in comparison to āyēl in the
same clause and framāyēm in the apodosis). In the second case
(§ 32) bē- appears after tāy in a future or modal sense in the way
in which it is regularly used in later Persian. Such use is, however,
not regular in this text, as can be seen already from tāy . . .
kunēnd in the same sentence. In the types of sentences exem-
plified above the use of the particle bē- with present indicative
forms of transitive and intransitive verbs seems to be a
facultative device to stress a future sense or imply an act of will.

C. Verbal particle followed by imperative:

bē-mā-pāyēl 24 (cf. above, p. 79), bē-māl 41, bē-apakan 104.

24 See Nyberg, Manual II, s.v.
26 Nyberg, Manual II, s.v. āwurtan, obviously takes it as a full preverb.
Here bē- is obviously used for extra emphasis ("peremptory"),
but it should be noticed that in the great majority of cases in this
text the imperatives stand without bē- (sing. forms: kun 16, 32;
gōb 67, 114; šav 67, 80, 114). From this point of view the occurrence
of bē- together with mā- in the possible example in § 24
seems pleonastic.

D. Verbal particle followed by infinitive:

bē-tāxtan nē-dānam, "I don't know how to ride", and bē-vīstan
nē-dānam, "I don't know how to shoot", both in § 101. Here bē-
seems to have an emphasising or "resultative" function.²⁸

E. Preverb followed by past tense:

§ 33 pas zarēr hač varṭēn bērōn bē-ūmat u +vīyān kart u ērān
+vīyān kart(-hēnd, interpol.) u gart [u] dūt bē-nīšast star u māh
pat asmān paitāk būt, "Then Zarēr came forth from the chariot
and pitched [his] tent, and the Iranians pitched [their] tents, and
the dust [and] smoke settled; the stars and the moon appeared in
the sky". The meaning of bē- as a full (lexical) preverb has been
defined by Nyberg as "off, out, away, forth, esp. with vbs. de-
signating a motion or a change of place or of condition" (Manual
II, bē 2.a.).²⁹ This is how it is used in the two cases in § 33. The
use of bē- together with hač ... /bērōn/ is typical (see below
under present tense), and the lexical function of bē- in bē-nīšast is
shown by the present equivalent bē-nīšinēl in § 75 (cf. below).

F. Preverb followed by present indicative:

§ 86 ... bē nūn čīgōn kunam čē hakar hač asp bē-nīšinām u tō
pītar sar andar kanār kunam u-t xāk hač grū bē-kunam (u) pas
sapukihā apāč ē asp nišastan nē-tuōn, "But how shall I act now?
Because if I dismount from the horse and take you, father, with
the head to the side and take out the earth from [your] throat,
then I shall not be able to mount the horse again quickly"; § 105

²⁸ Nyberg, Manual II, p. 46b, rejects the possibility of reading bē- as a particle
before infinitives; not so Widengren, op. cit., p. 362.
²⁹ Cf. Henning, "Verbsum des Mittelpersischen", ZII 9, pp. 231–232, on Mani-
chean Middle Persian ba.
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u bastvar +fraš hač dast bē-apakanēt . . ., “And Bastvar throws away the spear out of [his] hand”;

§ 61 . . . sōkand xuvaram kū zivandak xyōn +hēc bē-ne-hilam hač hān razm, “I swear that I shall not leave any XYōN alive from that battle”; § 48 twice hačē bārak-[ič] bē-barēnd, “They will take [his] steed away from him”; the context of hač bunak bē-āyēnd, “they will come forth from the camp”, in § 66 was quoted above (p. 81). All these instances, where bē- occurs together with prepositional expressions hač . . ., are obvious examples of bē- as a full preverb with the meaning “off, forth”, etc. There is no general evidence here that this preverb simultaneously has a perfectivizing or other grammatical function, but in the case of bē-āyēnd 66 the general context is such that a perfective particle bē- would be expected as well. The lexical use in a way conceals the perfective function (bē-bē- → bē-). Possible, but less likely, is a double function of bē- in the two forms bē-barēnd in § 48.

§ 75 u-s hač nīhān hač pas frāc-duvērēt (śavēt, gloss?) u zarēr rād hačadar i kamar-band u hačapar i kustik pat pušt bē-zanēt u pat āl bē-vitērēt u bē o damik apakanēt u pas bē-niśēnēt hān parriśn i kamanān u vāŋg i nēv-martān, “And from where he [was] hiding from him he rushes forth from behind and, [grabbing] Zarēr under the belt and over the kustik, strikes him in the back and penetrates to the heart and flings him to the ground; and then that twanging of the bows and glamour of the valiant men abate”; § 105 . . . pat pušt bē-vitērēt, “penetrates to the back”; § 97 . . . pat zanēh bē-dahām, “I give away in marriage”; § 111 . . . spāh i ērān pat bastvar bē-hilēt (ŠBKWNx1, see below), “he leaves the army of the Iranians to Bastvar”. In these examples bē- refers back to prepositional expressions pat . . . (not so bē-niśēnēt 75; see below) and functions as a full preverb. This use may be compared to the construction of bē with the preposition ḍ, very common also in this text: bē ḍ amān šavēt 29, bē ḍ ḍāsaxa šavēt 29, bē [ō] damik apakand-hā 52, bē ḍ damik apakanēt 75, 105, bē ḍ bastvar dahēt 82, bē ḍ dašt apakanēt 111. Semantically these two uses of bē are exactly parallel, but it seems less appropriate to me to consider bē in the expression bē ḍ as a qualifier of the following verb than of the preposition ḍ.30 However, the

30 Otherwise Widengren, op. cit., p. 361.
following constructions should be noted: 

31 hač ... /bērōn/ + verb (cf. hač ... frāč + verb, e.g. § 75, quoted above), pat ... bē- + verb, but bē ȯ ... + verb (cf. frāč ȯ ... + verb, below). 

§ 12 hakar ēn dēn bē-ne-hilēt, “if you don’t abandon this religion”; § 18 ēn dēn ... bē-ne-hilēm, “we shall not abandon this religion ...”; § 68 ēn ... dēn ... bē-ne-hilam, “I shall not abandon this religion ...”. In these three cases bē- primarily seems to have a lexical function, although it is also possible to take it as a prefix emphasising future and/or act of will.

The context of bē-niṣīnēt 75 was quoted above; the modification of the meaning through the preverb is clear: “abates”, “settles down” (as in the past form bē-niṣast 33, above p. 83). A quite different effect of bē- as preverb is found in the expression wāng bē-kunēt, “it (the horse) cries out (i.e. neighs)” 102. In § 106 u-š BR1 wcty hān mōk i spēt, “and on/from him he takes away those white shoes”, the verb has been read bē vazēt (Pagliaro and Benveniste) or bē vičēt (Nyberg). Vazēt is better in so far as it makes it possible to read a present form which accords with the context, but vazēn is generally an intransitive verb (“move”, “blow”). Could the preverb bē- change an intransitive verb into a transitive? For the present there is hardly any certain evidence for that, and in the case under discussion there are also other possibilities: defective scriptum for vazēt (caus. of vazēn) or vēčēt (pres. of vēxtan, “detach” etc.). Lexical uses of bē- are also to be found in the following cases: § 29 (u) kārvān i ērān(-šahr) ēlōn bē-ēstōnd ...32 “the troops of the Iranians appear so ...”; § 30 ... vitarg ēlōn bē-brinēnd apāk [samb?] āp bē-[e]pend,34 “they make their passage so, they stir up water with [the hoofs?]”.

III. Other preverbs:

In this text the preverbs andar- (BYN), apāk- (LWTH), apar- (MDM, ’pl) apāč- (L’WHL, ’p’c) and frāč- (pr’c) are used in lexical functions, and on the present material it is not possible

---

31 Cf. above p. 83 on § 33.
33 Cf. Nyberg, Manual II, s.v. ēstān.
34 Cf. “Composition”, p. 402.
35 Nyberg, Manual II, s.v. brītan: “to break up a road (by marching on it)”. 
to discern if they have some other function (perfectivizing etc.) distinguishable from the lexical.

A. Three examples of andar- + past tense: andarōn andar-šat 5, 14; andar-šat-hend 8; the cases of andar ə pēš . . . + verb 6, 7 and andar ə . . . + verb 70 are not counted here (cf. above on bē ə).36

B. One example of apāk- + past tense: apāk-būt 69,37 and one example of apāk- + present indicative: apāk-dārēnd 6 (the apāk earlier in the sentence is pleonastic).

C. One example of apar- + past tense: apar-nišast 100,38 nine examples (two emended) of apar- + present indicative: apar-rasēm 12 (in future sense but parallel forms are not prefixed), apar-āxezēt 62, nē-apar-āxezēt 54, [56], 58, [60], apar-nūšnēt 74, 83, 92, and five examples (one emended) of apar- + imperative: apar-āxezēt 53, 55, 57, 59, [61]. The expression apar ə pād/pai ėštāt [9], 73, 99 is not counted here (cf. above on bē ə).39

D. Nine examples of apāč- + present indicative: apāč-šavēnd 65, apāč-bēzēt 70, apāč-bē-ñe-mānēt 72 (emended from -pāyēt, above p. 81), 98 (-bē- restored, above p. 81), 112, nē-apāč-nikērēt 54, 56, 58, 60, and one example of apāč + infinitive (with tuwān): apāč-

dāšl[an] 63. A great number of cases of apāč + ə + noun + verb can be noted (§§ 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 67, 86, [113]), but they are not taken into account here (cf. above on bē ə).40

E. Ten examples of frāč- + present indicative: frāč-zenēt 70, frāč-dvērēt 75, frāč-šavēt 100, frāč-hišēt (ŠBKWNx1) 83, 88, 94, 106, 110, frāč-patīrēt (MKBLVNx1) 103, 106.41 The frequent occurrence in these examples of the ligature endings -x₁ and x₂ (see below) is remarkable. There are also a number of cases of frāč ə + noun + verb in this text (§§ 74 bis, 79, 100 bis, 101 bis, 102) not taken into account here (cf. above on bē ə), but it is interesting to notice that the ending x₁ also occurs once among them: frāč ə dast stanēt (YNSBWNx1) 100, but frāč ə dast stanēt (YNSBWNyt) 74.

37 For compositional reasons this būt may be considered a secondary addition; see "Composition", p. 414.
38 Possibly a mistake for the present form -nišnēt; see "Composition", p. 415.
Verbal ideograms with complement -yt (-yt\textsuperscript{i}) and corresponding forms written phonetically

The text of AZ relates past events. Still verbal endings normally referring to present forms are in great majority. Thus there are 178 ideograms with -yt as against 56 with complement -t. To some extent this may be explained through the occurrence of much direct discourse (especially in §§ 1–68), but this can in no way account completely for the predominance of present forms.\textsuperscript{42} In my previous paper “On the composition of the Ayyātkār ī Zarērān” I have demonstrated that the text of AZ must be considered to be narrated in præsens historicum, except for the main part of the introductory section ( §§ 1–34). The following analysis will be based on that supposition. Thus ideograms with complement -yt will be considered to represent 3rd sing. present indicative, 2nd plur. present indicative and plur. imperative forms. One possible exception is Y'TWNyt in § 4 which seems to be a corruption of ŠDRWNyt: frēstēl (with -šn in the beginning of the paragraph as its agent).\textsuperscript{43} The 178 ideograms with complement -yt and the corresponding forms written phonetically, 52 in number (23% of all forms in -yt), may be listed in the following way:

A. 3rd sing. present indicative forms in direct discourse (partly with future sense):

\begin{itemize}
  \item ‘BYDWNYt: kunēt 48 bis
  \item 'HDWNYt: gērēt 67
  \item ’ZLWNyt: šavēt 64 ter (first: -'yt), 71, 77 (-'yt), 97
  \item B 'YHWNYt: xuahēt 77, 96
  \item (HHWyt 76: pron. ēt)
  \item HZYTWNYt: vēnēt 48 (nē-)
  \item KTLWNyt: mānēt 98 (apāč-[bē-]nē-; cf. above p. 81)
  \item MDMH\textsuperscript{i}yt: sahēt 11, 15, 41, 43, 53 (-yt\textsuperscript{i}), 55 (-yt\textsuperscript{i}), 57, 59, 61 (-yt\textsuperscript{i}), 89
  \item PSKWNyt: brēnēt 67
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{42} H. S. Nyberg touched upon these problems in his “Grammatical survey” in Manual II, p. 283, § 7.6.

\textsuperscript{43} Cf. “Composition”, p. 401.
+ŠDRWNYt: frēstēl 67 (emended from Y'TWNyt; cf. parallel in § 113, also emended)

Y'TWNyt: āgēl 4 (possibly to be emended to frēstit; see above),
36 ter, 48 ter, 76 (nē-), (67 emend. to +ŠDRWNYt)

YHSNNT: dārēl 38 (nē-), 95

YHWWNYt: bavēl 39, 41, 52 (nē-), 53, 72 (nē . . .), 98 (nē . . .)

YKYMWNYt: ēstēl 68 (zāl~), 80 (nē-x̂uast~), 66 (viśult~), 90
(-yt1), 107 (nē-x̂uast~)

YKTLWNYt: ēzanēl 48 ter, 64 ter, 90, 97

YMR[R]WNYt: gōbēl 67

YMYTWNYt: mīrēl 39

d'lyt: dārēl 38, 95
dcylt: dażēl 67 (thus Nyberg; Pagliaro: gazēl, Benveniste: gażēl
+kwhyst: kōxēl 71 (thus JA; MK: kwhyst), 97
kwyst: kōsēl 71

p'dt: pāgēl 72 (apāē-bē-nē-; probably mistake for mānē, cf. above
 p. 81)
š'dt: šāgēl 53 bis, 62

f'ptyt: lāpēl 48 ter
wškwpyt: viškōsēl 37 bis (first: -yt1)
zywyt: zīvēl 39

B. 3rd sing. present indicative forms in narration of past events
(including expected present forms in subordinate clauses):

'BYDWNYt: kunēl 70, 71, 74, 100, 102 (bē-)44

'HDWNYt: gīrēl 51,45 113

'SHM'yt: āśnavēl 102

'ZLWNYt: šavēl 29 bis, 55, 57 (-1yt), 59, 61 (-1yt), 74, 75 (probably
 a gloss; cf. above p. 84), 100 bis (second: frāē-), 102 bis, 111

B*YHWWNYt: x̂uāhēl 35, 62

HŻYTWNYt: vēnēl 70, 74, 83, 100, 111

44 The addition containing this form in the end of § 110 and the beginning of
§ 111 made by JA and later editors is not necessary.

45 Nyberg, Manual II, p. 283, 7.6, finds this form perplexing, considering the
-š first in the § which he takes as the agent of this 'HDWNYt, but it seems that
this difficulty is easily solved by regarding the first part of the § as a nominal
clause: u-š (indir. obj.) pat hōy dast kārt, "and he has the knife in [his] left hand".
KDMWNyt: āxēzēt 62 (apar-)
KTLWNyt: mānēt112 (apāc-bē-nē--; cf. above p. 81)
LMYTWNyt: apakanēt 75, 105 bis (first: bē-), 111
MHYTWNyt: zanēt 70 (frāc-), 75 (bē-), 105, 111
NTLWNyt: pāyēl 84 (nē . . . )
PSKWNyt: bānēt 113
+ŠDRWNyt: frēstēt 113 (emended from Y'TWNyt; parallel in § 67, also emended)
(Y'TWNyt 113, see +ŠDRWNyt above)
YHBWNyt: dahēt 92, 106
YHMTWNyt: rasēt 83, 88, 106, 110
YHSNNyt: dārēt 106
YHWWNyt: bavēt 3 (mistake for būt?; cf. “Composition”, p. 401), 31 (nē-), 70 ter, 112 (nē . . . )
YK'YMWNyt: ūsēt 28 (-lyt; ūkust~)
YKTLWNyt: dzanēt 70, 83, 94, 106
YMLLLWNyt: gōbēt 45, 63, 80, 88, [101] (emended from MK: YMLLW, worm eaten?)
YMR[R]WNyt: gōbēt 35, 40, 42 (-RR-), 43, 51, 53, 55, 57, 61, 62, 65, 66, 68, 71, 73, 76, 79, 82, 84, 90, 92, 95, 109, 114
YNSBWYNyt: stanēt 74
YTYBWNyt: nišīnēt 35, 62, 69 bis, 74 (apar-), 75 (bē-), 83 (apar-), 92 (apar-), [100] (apar--; JA: YTYBWNst; emended by Pagliaro and Nyberg to YTYBWNyt; cf. also “Composition”, p. 415), 106

'dyb'lyt: ayyārēt 74 (nē-), 100 (nē-)
'ḥycyt: āxēzēt 54 (nē-apar-), 56 (nē-[apar-]), 58 (nē-apar-), 60 (nē-[apar-]) (the two missing preverbs apar- may be restored through the parallel passages; cf. above p. 86)
'wpyt: ūfēt 70
'ḍcyt: dažēt 70 (probable emendation; Pagliaro and Benveniste read yazat, “god”, and Nyberg yazēt, “god”; cf. “Composition”, p. 414)
dwb'lyt: dvārēt 74, 75 (frāc-), 100
gwpyt: gōbēt 59
nklyt: nikrēt 54 (nē-apāc-), 56 (nē-apāc-), 58 (nē-apāc-), 60 (nē-apāc-)
plm'dt: framāyēt 44, 83, 91
spw cyt: spōžēl 111 bis
sw cyt: sōčēl 113
š’d’t: šāyēl 30 (nē-)
w cyt: w[ē]žēl? 106 (bē-; cf. above p. 85)
w’t lyt: wîlārēl 75 (bē-), 105 (bē-)
w’y cyt: vēžēl 70 (apēč-), 103
znyt: zanēl 88, 111

C. 2nd plur. present indicative forms (direct discourse):

ḤZYTWNyt: vēnēl 20
ŠBKWNyt: hilēl 12 (bē-nē-)
YṬWNyt: ăyēl 20, 25 bis (second: nē . . .)
YD’YTNyt: dānēl 36, 80 (nē-; JA and later editors emend: z’y)
YHSNYNyt: dărēl 10 (nē . . .)\(^{46}\)
YHWWNyt: bāvēl 11, 12 (nē-)
YḤTYYWNYt: āvārēl 25 (bē-nē-)
YMR[R]WNyt: gōbēl 41 (-yl\(^{1}\))

D. Plural imperative forms:

‘BYDWNyt: kunēl 25
ŠTH\(^{1}\)yt: xwārēl 41
KDMWNyt: ăxēzēl 53 (apar-)
NTLWNyt: pāyēl 24 (bē-mā-; perhaps rather 3rd sing., cf. above
pp. 79, 83).
ŠBKWNyt: hilēl 11, 89
YHBWNyt: dāhēl 82
YTYBWNyt: nišīnēl 53, 55, 57, 59, 61

ḥyycyt: ăxēzēl 55 (apar-), 57 (apar-), 59 (apar-), 61 ([apar-];
cf. above p. 86)
s’y cyt: sāčēl 73, 79, 99
plm’dt: framağēl 43

\(^{46}\) JA and Nyberg add the preverb apē- for better sense, but considering
the parallel expressions in §§12, 18 and 68 (see above p. 85) an emendation to
the similar ideogram ŠBKWN seems more likely. The preceding I’d could then be a
corruption of BR'; thus +bē-hilēl.
Verbal ideograms with complement -/s/t (-t') and corresponding forms written phonetically

The 56 forms written with verbal ideogram and complement -t in this text obviously represent past participles. Considering the first section (§§ 1–34) to be narrated in past tense (except for the end of § 26–§ 31 and § 34) and the rest of the text in present tense (cf. "Composition", passim), this satisfies the context completely in all cases but three: L YHBWNt 79 (possibly a case of secondary form assimilation; cf. "Composition" p. 415) and LWTH YHW-WNt and YHWWNt, both 69 (probably interpolations; cf. "Composition", p. 414). YTYBWNst occurs three times, once certainly as a past participle (33), once probably a mistake for -yt (100) and once for -stn (44). Of the 46 past participles written phonetically (45%)47 three forms present difficulties in the context: šnwt: āšnūt and ṣwpst: ṣpast, both 50 (the first in a subordinate clause and the second an assimilation?; cf. "Composition", p. 412), and gwpt: guft 99 (secondary form assimilation?; cf. "Composition", p. 415).

BYDWNt: kart 33
ṢTHt: x'art 42 (mistake for x'aram; thus JA and later editors), 52 (-hā)
'ZLWNt: šut 5 (andar-), 8 (andar—hān), 14 (andar-), 88 (-ham)
HTYMWNt: ḍvašt 22 (bē-)
HZYTWNt: dīt 67, 88, 89, 114
KLYTWNt: x'ānd 9
LMYTWNt: apakand 52 (-hā), 85 (-hē(h))
MḤYTWNt: zat 26
MKBLWNt: patigrift 10, 68
PSKWNt: būt 52 (-t')
SGYTWNt: rāft 22 (bē—hān)
Y'TWNt: āmat 5, 26 (-hān), 33 (bē-), 107 (-hē(h))
YBLWNt: burt 8 (-Y; -hān), 22
YHBWNt: dāt 8 (bē—hān), 16, 32, 79 (nē-; possibly mistake for dahān, cf. above), 82

47 This unusually high percentage is due to the general tendency to write the past participles of kartan and guftan phonetically.
YHWWNt: būt 13, 14, 33, 40 (±ham), 51, 69 bis (first: apāk-; both būt possibly interpolations, cf. above), 82, 114
YKTLWNt: ōzat 76, 81 bis, 85 (adj., + apakand-hē(h)), 87 bis, 108 ter
YKTYBWNT: nipiṯ 1
YLYDWNT: zūt 40 bis (first: nē-~ham; second -ham)
YMYTWNt: murt 40 (bē-~+ham), 45, 49 (~bavēnd), 68 (~bavēnd)
TYTYBWNT: niṣāst 33 (bē-), (44, mistake for inf.), (100, mistake for -yt)

¹kwst: ḫusṭ 34 (~ēstēl)
¹mwst: ḫusṭ 84 ter (thus Nyberg, Manual II, s.v.; Pagliaro and Benveniste: hamaṣṭ; cf. also below p. 103)
³snwṭ: ḫnūṭ 10, 13, 50 (cf. above)
³wpst: ṭopast 40 (±ham), 50 (perhaps mistake for ṯīṭēt; cf. above)
d’t: dāt 23
dyt: dīt 14
gwpt: guft 5, 7, 15, 52, 53, 99 (possibly mistake for gōbēl, with -š as indir. obj., “to him”; cf. above)
hwst: xʾwaṣṭ 80 (nē-~ēstēl), 86, 107 (nē-~ēstēl)
kʾmyṣṭ: kāmīṣṭ 85
krt: kart 33 (-t¹; -hēnd), 74 (~ēstāt; interpolation?, cf. above p. 78), 94, 95 (-t¹), 100 (~ēstāt; interpolation?, cf. above p. 78), 101, 109
kwšt: kusṭ 87
mt: mat 2, 26, 45 (nē-)
npšt: nipišt 10 (~ēstāt)
nšt: niṣaṣṭ 86
plmt: framāṭ 17
ptglpt: patigriṭ 1, 22 (bē-)
pwrsyt: pursṭ 40 bis (first: nē-~hē(h); second: -hē(h))
wnd’t: vīndaṭ 31 (nē-; possibly mistake for vīndaṭ, cf. the context in “Composition”, p. 402)
wšwpt: viṣṣuṭ 86 (~ēstēl)
zt: zaṭ 21 (~bavāṭ), 81 (-t¹; mistake for ōzat?; cf. §§ 87, 108)
z’t: zāt 45 bis (first: nē-), 48, 68 (~ēstēl)
Verbal ideograms with complement -d and corresponding forms written phonetically

There are 51 forms written with verbal ideogram and complement -d. These forms occur in direct discourse or in the passages assumed to be narrated in praesens historicum (end of § 26–§31, §§ 34–114), apart from six examples of ḤWHd after past participle (of which three probably are interpolations). They certainly represent 3rd plur. present indicative forms in -ēnd, with the possible exception of YHMTWNd and YKTLWNd after mā in §§ 81, 87 and 108 (cf. above p. 79). In many cases they are preceded by a subject in the old nominative plural without ending, e.g. in §§ 26–31.48 There is no reason to believe that the complement -d anywhere in this text is related to the old imperfect passive in -iy, as seems to be the case in some passages in the Middle Persian inscriptions.49 As for the eight forms written phonetically (14% of all 3rd plur. present indicatives), they end in -ynd in five cases and in -nd in three.

'SLWNd: bandēnd 34
'BYDWNd: kunēnd 26, 27, 32
'ZLWNd: šavēnd 30, 65 (apāč-), 66 (apāč-bē-nē-)
B'YḤWNd: xūñāhēnd 47
ḤŠKHWNd: vindēnd 47 (nē-)
ḤWHd: hēnd 8 ter (first: andar-šut-; second: burt-; third: bē-dāt-; second and third hēnd are probably interpolations, cf. above p. 78), 22 (bē-raft-), 26 (āmat-), 33 (kar-t-; hēnd probably inter- polation, cf. above p. 78)
ḤZYTWNd: vēnēnd 107
KLYTWNd: xvuānēnd 1
MHYTWNd: zanēnd 34
PSKWNd: brînēnd 30 (bē-)
SGYTWNd: ravēnd 27 bis, 47
Y'TWNd: āgēnd 47, 65 bis, 66 bis (first: bē-)
YD'YTWNd: dānēnd 114
YBLWNd: barend 48 bis (both: bē-), 81 (Y-), 87 (Y-), 108

Verbal ideograms with complements -m and -ym and corresponding forms written phonetically

Is it possible to distinguish clearly between 1st sing. and 1st plur. present indicative forms in this text? The opposition sing. -am: plur. -ēm, based on a secondary differentiation of thematic and -aya-class endings, may seem to be realized here, but the material is not quite unambiguous. Of the 44 cases of verbal ideogram with complement -m all refer to a singular subject, but in 12 cases this singular subject is a king, Viśtāsp or Arjāsp, and in those cases a pluralis maiestatis would also be possible. Likewise the one form with ending -m written phonetically (znm 41, parallel: MḤYTWNm 42) could be taken as a pluralis maiestatis.

The 13 cases of verbal ideogram with complement -ym, on the other hand, generally refer to a subject which could be conceived as plural or pluralis maiestatis (especially in the letters exchanged between the kings, §§ 10–12, 17–21), and likewise the nine forms

---

60 Or. subj. in -ānd? Cf. above p. 79.
ending in -ym written phonetically. It is noticeable that forms in -ym occur in a consistent way only in the first section (§§ 1–34), assumed to be a late abbreviation of the original text, and that there are no forms in -m in that section. The few forms in -ym occurring in the second section (§§ 35–68) stand in no consistent relation to the more frequent forms in -m; thus in § 32 King Vištāsp says: ... tāy amāh-ič BR' YD'YTNym, and in § 35: man YD'YTNym; in § 41 Vištāsp is requested by Jāmāsp to say: -t L' Zm u L' YKTLWNm u nē-č pat dēpahr YHSNNym, and in § 42 Vištāsp actually says: ... -t L' MHYTNm u L' YKTLWNm u nē tō-ič pat dēpahr YHSNNm. In the third section (§§ 69–114) there are no forms in -ym.

On the whole, it must be said that it is not possible to distinguish with certainty between 1st sing. and 1st plur. forms here. However, an instability in the use of numbers is noticeable also in the 2nd person, although its singular and plural endings are clearly separated; thus § 36 ēn-ič YD'YTWNyt and, in complete parallel, §§ 37, 38 and 39 ēn-ič YD'YTWN'y. Considering these circumstances and the lack of further internal evidence, in the tentative list below forms with ending written -m will be interpreted as ending in -am and taken to represent the 1st sing. and forms with ending written -ym will be interpreted as ending in -ēm and taken to represent the 1st plur.

A. 1st sing. present indicative:

BYDWNm: kunam 72, 86 ter (third: bē-), 98, 101
ŠTH'm: xʷaram [42] (emendation of ŠTH't, see above p. 91), 61
ZLWNm: šavam 55, 57, 59, 61, 73, 79, 89, 99 ([`]-)
B’YHWNm: xʷāham 89
HWNm: ham 40 bis (first: nē-zāt-; second: zāt-; and in the same paragraph three more +ham, emended from HWN'y, all in compound forms), 88 (šūt-), (26, 76 and 96: adv. ham)
HZYTWNm: vēnam 79 bis
MHYTWNm: zanam 42 (nē-)
ŠBKWNm: hilam 61 (bē-nē-)
YD’YTWNm: dānam 101 bis (both: nē-)

61 An exception may be seen in § 15 ... man (i.e. Zarēr) in fravariav passav plm'dym kartan.
YHBNWm: daham 71, 77, 78, 97 (בֶּ-)
YHMWNm: rasam 109
YHSNnm: dāram 42 (נֶ...), 76, 96, 101 bis
YKTLWNm: ēzanam 41 (נֶ-), 42 (נֶ-), 55, 57, 59
YM[R]WNm: gōbam 40, 79, 109
YTBYWNm: nīśānum 86 (בֶּ-)

zm: zanam 41 (נֶ-)

B. 1st plur. present indicative:

׳BYDWNym: kūnēm 12
ŠTH'ym: xwarēm 12, 18 (possibly to be emended to āvarēm, as
suggested by Nyberg, Manual II, s.v. āvar)
HZYTWNym: vēnēm 20
ŠBKWNym: hilēm 18 bis (first: nē...; second: bē-nē-)
Y'TWNym: ūyēm 20
Y'DYTWNym: dānēm 32 (בֶ), 35
YHBNWm: dāhēm 11
YHMWNm: rasēm 12 (apar-)
YHSNNym: dārēm 41 (nē...)
YHWWNym: baqēm 18 (נֶ-)

nm'dym: namāyēm 21
plm'dym: framāyēm 12, 15, 25, 62 ter (first: bē-, MK: plm'm,
but JA and later editors: plm'dym; second: bē; third: [bē-])
plstym: paristēm 11
swcym: sōqēm 12

**Verbal ideograms with complements -x₁ and -x₂**

The interpretation of the two ligature complements -x₁ (written
like the Pahlavi ideogram BYN for andar) and -x₂ (resembling
Avestan q) is a well-established enigma in Pahlavi studies. In his
Middle Persian grammar C. Salemann left “this crux for later
investigations”, and Chr. Bartholomae avoided the difficulty by
simply declaring that -x₁ (and by implication -x₂) may designate
any verbal form. In the first volume of his *Hilfsbuch des Pehlevi

---

52 *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, I: 1, 1895, p. 313.
(1928), H. S. Nyberg made a bold attempt to go beyond such vague statements, suggesting both endings to be developments of -yh (not -yhl) and to designate, when correctly used, either the ending -ēh (from old imperative medium sing. and plur.) or the ending -ēndēh (a periphrastic secondary present optative).  

As one could expect, Nyberg’s interpretation came in for a great deal of criticism. J. C. Tavadia, in his review in Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik (vol. 7, 1929), rejected Nyberg’s conclusions and proposed -x₁ to be developed from -yt and -x₂ possibly from -ynd, both, however, in actual usage expressing arbitrary endings (p. 276). W. Henning, on the other hand, was originally inclined to accept Nyberg’s ideas, at least to a certain extent. He could not accept the periphrastic optative in -ēndēh but wanted to read -ēh, generally, for both -x₁ and -x₂ and to interpret this -ēh as 3rd sing. optative and 2nd sing. (but not plur.) imperative. Later Henning abandoned this position. In 1936 K. Barr published a thorough discussion of this problem in the Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies (vol. 8, pp. 391–403). Taking some ligatures occurring at the end of lines in a fragment of a Pahlavi frahang found in Turfan (TM 195) as the starting point, he came to the conclusion that -x₁ basically represents -yt and x₂ -t₁ (or -tn), with a possibility that a second ligature, -ynd, has coalesced into -x₂, and that this accords well with the usage in Book Pahlavi texts (supported by examples from, inter alia, Ayyātkār i Zarērān). He does not completely exclude the possibility of reading -x₁ as an optative in -ē(h) (in which case through a ligature of -yh, not -yh), but on the whole he rejects not only Nyberg’s interpretation -ēndēh but also his -ēh.

Nyberg was not late in replying to his critics. In an article with the title “Contribution à l’histoire de la flexion verbale en iranien”, he vigorously defended the existence of a present optative in -ēndēh also in the south-western language, but all the same he declared “once and for all” that he had abandoned the reading -x₁/-x₂: -ēndēh (p. 69). Suggesting different readings of the ligatures in the Turfan frahang, he also unconditionally rejected

54 Hilfsbuch, I, Einleitung, pp. 13–19.
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Barr's arguments for the readings -x₁: -yt, -x₂: -t₁ (-tn) and maintained -ēh ("the old optative") as the principal reading of both -x₁ and -x₂ (pp. 68–73). It was now Henning's turn to reply—which he did in an excursus on "The Parthian ending -ēndē(h)" appearing together with his article "Two Manichaean magical texts", in the BSOAS 12 (1947–48). There he withdrew his support of Nyberg's analysis of -x₁ and -x₂ as -yh with which he had—"ill-advisedly", as he writes (p. 58)—concurring in the above-mentioned review, and he argued sharply against the possibility of a Pahlavi (south-western) form in -ēndē(h). In spite of this renewed criticism, Nyberg seems to have retained his modified opinion (as in "Contribution") also in his Manual of Pahlavi, I–II (1964–74). In Manual I (pp. 135–136) he only enumerates the actual functions of -x₁ and -x₂ which he has found in the texts (for endings -ēh, -ēl, -ēnd and past participle in -t₁), but in Manual II, s.v. hištān, he en passant repeats his main theory: "ŠBKWN-x₁ and -x₂ are to be read hilēh (as originally all forms in -x₁ and -x₂ of all verbs signified -ēh)". On the other hand, his paragraph (5.7) on these endings in the "Grammatical survey" in Manual II (p. 281), which certainly was the last thing he wrote on the subject, is somewhat more cautious.⁶⁷

The question of the interpretation of the verbal endings -x₁ and -x₂ is an intricate matter, and it is not possible, within the frame of this article, to give a full representation of the many arguments hiterto put forward, to say nothing of a reappraisal of the whole problem. Still I would like to mention that the analysis given by Barr in the above-mentioned article seems essentially correct to me. From a graphical point of view, the explanation of -x₁ as a ligature of -yt and of -x₂ as a ligature of -t₁ (-tn) is quite satisfactory, given the well-known circumstance that the sign for t is often found confused with the cursive combination of the two signs yn (dn, etc.); thus byn~yt, i.e. BYN~x₁.⁶⁸

The 29 cases of verbal ideogram with complement -x₁ found

---

⁶⁷ There Nyberg persists in the (in my opinion unlikely) explanation: "they [i.e. -x₁ and -x₂] contain the Aram. letter Hē [H], probably preceded by a Y: -YH".

⁶⁸ On the nature of the similarity between -x₂ and Av. a, see Barr, BSO[A]S 8, p. 394, n. 1.
in AZ certainly support this solution in toto, since they all may be interpreted as either of the 3rd sing. present indicative and plur. imperative, both ending in -ēt. In 23 instances verbal ideogram + -x₁ represents the 3rd sing. present indicative in -ēt, as can be ascertained through a great number of directly parallel forms with complement -yt: wn’s ‘BYDWNᵲ₁ w YKTLWNᵲ₄ 48~wn’s ‘BYDWNᵲ₄ /w/ YKTLWNᵲ₄ 48 bis; nk’s ‘BYDWNᵲ₁ w YMR[R]-WNᵲ₄ 76, 95, 101 (YMLLW[NY₄t])~nk’s ‘BYDWNᵲ₄ w YMR[R]-WNᵲ₄ 71; pr’c ‘L YDH YNSBWᵲ₄ 100~pr’c ‘L YDH YNSBW-NY₄t 74; dwšmn YKTLWNᵲ₁ 110~dwšmn YKTLWNᵲ₄ 83, 106. Some of these examples, in which a verb ending in -x₁ stands in close coordination with a finite verbal form, might suggest the possibility of interpreting -x₁ as the ending of a present participle. Here the participle in -ān (the old middle pres. part. in -āna-; New Persian -ān) is near at hand, and such an ending would even be graphically acceptable through an imagined development ‘n→bn→x₁. But with regard to the majority of the contexts here and the available external evidence, I think that this possibility must be ruled out.

The six examples of plur. imperatives in -ēt are somewhat more uncertain, perhaps owing to the fact that there is a certain confusion in the use of sing. and plur. imperatives, also when they are expressed by unambiguous endings. It is thus possible to list the verbal ideograms with complement -x₁ in the following way:

A. 3rd sing. present indicative:

‘BYDWNᵲ₁: kunēt 48, 51, 76, 92, 94, 95 bis, 101, 104, 106
MKBLWNᵲ₁: patīrēt 103 (frāc-), 106 (frāc-)
ŠbkWNᵲ₁: hilēt 83 (frāc-), 88 (frāc-), 94 (frāc-), 106 (frāc-), 110 (frāc-), 111 (bē-)
YNSBWᵲ₁: stanēt 74, 100 bis, 105
YKTLWNᵲ₁: ōzanēt 110

This was already pointed out by Barr, BSO[4]S 8, p. 395.


B. Plur. imperative:

BYDWNx₃: kunēl 24
ŠBKWNx₁: hilēl 6, 7, 90
YBLWNx₁: barēl 41
YNSBWNx₁: stanēl 104 (JA and later editors: YNSBWN)

The forms with complement -x₂ are unfortunately too few in this text to allow of any systematic conclusion. It is, however, possible to explain the apparent confusion by the hypothesis of an original correspondence -x₃: -t¹. The three forms are as follows:

MKBLWNx₂: patigriš 2 (thus according to the context). A secondary interpretation patišēl, through confusion with -x₁, seems to have given the assimilated form YHWXN₁: bavēl in the next sentence.

BYDWNx₂: kunēl? 24 (probably plur. imperative in analogy with the preceding BYDWNx₁: misused through contamination with -x₁).

BYDWNx₂: kunēl? 104 (MK: -x₂; JJ: -x₁; JA and later editors: zero). The two preceding imperatives in this sentence are BR’ LMYTWN (complement zero in all sources) and YNSBWNx₁ (complement zero in JA and later editions), and the formal confusion is probably again due to a contamination of -x₁ and -x₂. Possibly all three forms ended in -x₁ originally, although the subject, Zarēr, is most easily conceived in the singular.

The problems involved in the interpretations of -x₁ and -x₂ are, of course, not solved by this. I do not think, however, that the method of choosing examples from the extensive Book Pahlavi literature more or less at random can be very effective in producing definite results. Reliable data should rather be expected from studies of the complete system of representation of verbal forms in carefully selected and established texts (i.e. including textological analysis of the manuscript material). There are also questions related to other problems than the actual endings: why are these ligatures only found together with ideograms—and a very restricted set of ideograms at that (besides those quoted above generally only ‘ZLWN: šutan and DB/Y/LWN: nītan/ nayītan)? If they are originally identical with -yt/-t¹, how is it that such simple and frequent endings have to be replaced—and
only occasionally? Because they are remnants of "end-of-line flourishes"? And is it only a coincidence that these ligatures are especially frequent in connection with the preverb frāč- in this text (see above p. 86)?

Verbal ideograms with complements -yḥ, -'y, -'ḥ and -' and corresponding forms written phonetically

It is not always easy to distinguish the exact forms represented by a verbal ideogram and one of the complements shaped like -yḥ, -'y, -'ḥ or -' (and corresponding forms written phonetically). Doubtlessly, all these variously shaped endings designate 2nd and 3rd sing. present indicative, subjunctive and optative forms, but is it possible to assign a definite reading to each shape?

In this text only the few cases of ending -yḥ (two written with ideogram, three phonetically) are unambiguous. They are certainly to be read as 2nd sing. present indicatives in -ē(h):

YDYTWNyḥ: dānē(h) 107 (nē-)
YML[L]WNyḥ: gōbē(h) 62

plm'dyḥ: frāmāyē(h) 63 (bē-) ter (obviously sing., although King Vištāsp is the subject).

Nyberg suggests another such form in § 92, 'dyḥ: ayēh ('YŚ: kas, according to Pagliaro and Benveniste), supposed to be a Parthian 2nd sing. present indicative of "to be" (=Man. Parth. 'yy), but this interpretation seems unlikely.

The more numerous forms with ending shaped like -'y (17 with ideogram, one written phonetically) should primarily be considered 2nd sing. present subjunctives in -āy, which they probably are in one third of the cases. But they should, most probably, also be seen as a variant writing of -yḥ, thus representing 2nd sing. present indicatives in -ē(h) or 3rd sing. present optatives with the same ending. The textual basis for this conclusion is very narrow, but a careful evaluation of the contexts points in that direction.

---

62 Manual I, p. 175, “Parthian forms”; Manual II, s.v. h, end.
63 See below for a different suggestion; cf. also “Composition”, p. 417.
Three passages are of special interest here: the first is Jāmāsp’s introduction to his prophecy in § 40; the second is the beginning of the dirge of Bastvar at the sight of his dead father in §§ 84–85; the third is the magic formula uttered by Bastvar before setting out to take revenge in §§ 92–93. The text of these passages partly seems to be in some disorder. Here follows an attempt to arrange them in verses and to restore doubtful parts to something which may have been their original wording.

§ 40 gōbēt jāmāsp bitāxš
   kā kāč ka mān hač mātār
   nē-zāt-hām aivāp ka zāt-hām
   pat x′ē-š-bāxt pat rāhikhē
   bē-murt.+hām
   aivāp mūr-vē būt.+hām
   ō drayāp ḥāst.+hām
   aivāp šmāh bagān
   ūn frāsn hač mān nē-pursūt-ē(h)
   bē kā-[t]ān pursūt-ē[h(h)]
   adāk-im nē-kāmē(h)
   bē ka rāst gōbām

Says Jāmāsp, the Bitāxš:
‘Would that I by [my] mother
had not been born or [that] when
I had been born
I had died in [my] youth through [my] own fate
or [that] I had been a bird
[and] had fallen into the sea
or [that] by you, lord,
this question had not been asked from me;
but when it has been asked by you,
then it would not be my desire
but that I tell the truth.’

---

64 I.e. "by my own hand"; or "by disease"? Cf. the much discussed passage on the death of Kambyses in the Bisutun inscription I, 43; refs. in Brandenstein-Mayrhofer, Handbuch des Altpersischen, 1964, pp. 149–150; also J. P. Asmussen, Temenos 3 (1968), pp. 7–10.
65 BR' YMYTWNT HWH'y; JA and Nyberg: HWHm; Pagliaro and Benveniste: hom.
66 YHWYNT HWH'y; JA and Nyberg: HWHm; Pagliaro and Benveniste: hom.
67 'wpst HWH'y; JA and Nyberg: HWHm; Pagliaro and Benveniste: hom.
68 L' pwrsty HWH'y; Pagliaro and Benveniste: hē.
69 The translation here, as often in this paper, uses passive construction only to render the surface structure of the Middle Persian, regardless of the fact that these Middle Persian constructions generally do not have a passive sense.
70 pwrsty HWH'y; Pagliaro and Benveniste: hē.
71 L' YCBH'y; JA: YCBH'm; Pagliaro and Benveniste: kām hē; Nyberg: kāmdī.
§ 84...

_aláy +dárá (?)[22] i ján_  
_apazón-ilit[23] ké ámušt[24]_  

‘Woe, tree of a soul (?)!  
Who has destroyed the growth  
for you?

_aláy varáž [i] pitár_  
+xón-ilit[25] ké ámušt_  

Woe, boar of a father!  
Who has destroyed the blood for  
you?

_aláy sén +i murvák_  
_bárák-ilit ké ámušt[26]_  

Woe, Sén of a bird (?)!  
Who has destroyed the steed for  
you?

§ 85 ka-t hamé étón kámíst

_kuš-m[27] apák xyóñán_  
_kárècáár kunúy[28]_  

_nán őzát apakand-hé(h)[29]_  
_andar +ên rácum čigón_  
_agáh[30]_  

When your desire was always  
thus  
that for me you should fight with  
the Xyóns,  
now you are thrown down killed  
in this battle like a nobody.’

§ 92...

+nún tigr hač mán šaváý[31]  
‘Now, arrow, you shall go from me,  
[zút] +parváž +âvaráy (?)[32]  
you shall make [your] flight [swift?]  
in every attack and counter-attack you,

pat har rácum u pátázm tó[33]  

[22] Thus Nyberg; cf. Manual II, s.v. dárá; MSS: šiw[1]; Pagliaro/Benveniste: dár,  
“sostegno/soutien”.
[23] MSS: ‘pndt; Pagliaro/Benveniste: awzón-st; Nyberg: +apažand-ilt (in the  
index, Manual I; missing in the glossary).
[24] Thus Nyberg, Manual II, s.v. ámušt; Bartholomae (Zur Kenntnis der Mittel-
iranischen Mundarten, IV, p. 21, n. 2) and Pagliaro/Benveniste: hanvást.
[25] MSS: plthwnd LK; Bartholomae (op. cit., p. 23) and Pagliaro/Benveniste:  
pilar xón to lò; Nyberg: potdán i lò.
[27] MSS: ‘YKm; JA and Nyberg emend: ‘YKt; corrected back to ‘YKm by  
[28] ‘BYDWN’y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: kunêh.
[29] LMYTWNT ÏWH’y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: awgand hê.
[30] JJ: ‘g’s; originally in MK? If not, akêc may have been the original; martóm  
is probably a gloss in either case.
[31] ‘ZLWN’y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: šavth.
[32] MSS: plcw ‘wwl ’yyh; Pagliaro/Benveniste: apavêt apar kas; Nyberg:  
péróz-âvar +âyêt.
[33] MSS, JA and later editors: ZY L.K.
pērōz u vēh-pātrōc āvarāy
+ nām [r] yāvetān rōcān
duštān mūrt āvarāy
victorious and resplendent, shall bring
fame of eternal days;
to the enemy you shall bring death!

§ 93 (u) nūn bārāk u drāfš im
spāh
kār-un tō framāyā-[y]
you shall do [your] duty to me,
– – –
+nām-āvār + tō bāvāy
yalt-ō rōc yāvēt
you shall be famous
till day eternal
– – –

The above passages, if correctly interpreted, show the suggested threelfold use of the ending looking like -y. To some extent this coincides with the readings of the previous editors and to some extent it does not. As for the 2nd sing. subjunctive forms, my interpretation is in agreement with the notes of K. Barr in BSO[AJ]S (vol. 8, p. 402), where also the reading dārāy in § 109 is suggested. Of the few forms in -y not contained in these passages, the three occurrences of YD'YTWN'y in §§ 37, 38 and 39, in complete parallel with YD'YTWNyt in § 36, are noticeable. There is only little reason to read a subjunctive in those cases. With reference to the common confusion between singular and plural forms in the 1st and 2nd persons, a 2nd sing. present indicative is by far the

84 YHYTYWN'y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: āwarēh.
85 MSS, JA and later editors: ŠM YHYTYWN'y; the reversion of the word order suggested here is only one of many possible conjectures.
86 YHYTYWN'y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: āwarēh.
87 MSS: 'ylnk 'ıwvm; Pagliaro/Benveniste: ērānāk sar-ōm; Nyberg, Manual I, p. 274; and Manual II, s.v. kār, gives the more satisfactory reading: ērān kār-om; ērān is probably a secondary addition.
89 With regard to the balance and parallelism of the two stanzas, in § 92 and § 93 respectively, two lines seem to be missing in the latter.
90 MSS and JA: n'm'wlty ZY bwp'y; Pagliaro/Benveniste: nām-āwurt bōwēh; Nyberg: nām-āurūt (tāt) băwāt.
92 For the complete context, see “Composition”, pp. 407–408.
most likely. Thus the following interpretations of verbal forms ending in -'y may be suggested:

A. 2nd sing. present subjunctive (often used as an imperative):\(^{93}\)

'BYDWN'y: kunāy 85 (an indicative in -ē(h) also has some possibility, but a vowel-rhyme with the last line seems desirable)

'ZLWN'y: šāvāy 92

YḤSNN'y: dārāy 109

YḤYTWN'y: āvarāy 92 bis

'wwl'yyḥ: āvarāy 92 (cf. text restitution above; the two extra final letters are perhaps due to a confusion with the ending transcribed DŠ/HḤ by Henning, BSOAS 12, pp. 58–65)

bwp'y: bāvāy 93

plm'd[y] framāyā[y] 93 (restitution for the sake of the rhyme; cf. Barr, op. cit., p. 402)

B. 2nd sing. present indicative:

ḤHW'y (for -yḥ): hē(h) 80 (preceded by tō but followed by plur. ind. in MSS: YD'YTWNYt, emended by JA and later editors to YD'YTWN'y), 85 (cf. context above; factual, no reason to read subj.), 107 (factual, only slight reason to read subj.; parallel: L' YD'YTWNYḥ)

YD'YTWN'y (for -yḥ): dānē(h) 37, 38, 39 (cf. above)

C. 3rd sing. present optative:

ḤHW'y (for -yḥ): hē(h) 40 bis (cf. context above; considering the construction with agent, šmāh bagān and -[l]ān, a 3rd sing. opt. is to be expected, as the indicative would be expressed by the simple past participle; according to the context, the three preceding forms ḤHW'y must be emended to ḤWHm)

YCBH¹'y (for -yḥ): kāmē(h) 40 (a 3rd sing. modal form is to be expected) (BR¹, end of 18, is suggested by Nyberg\(^{94}\) to be “a wrong ideogram for bēh, opt. of bātan”, but in the context it seems quite unnecessary to read anything but the ordinary adversative conjunction).

\(^{93}\) Cf. Barr, op. cit., p. 402.

\(^{94}\) Manual II, s.v. bē, end.
There are only two cases of complement -ḥ. The latter appears in § 35: man dānēm kū tō ... šnāsak ḤWHʾḥ, “I know that you ... are knowing ...”.95 and is likely to be a mistake for the ordinary 2nd sing. present indicative ending -ḥḥ: -ē(h), although a subjunctive in -āḥ/ā/-āy (?) is conceivable. The two cases of complement -ḥ occur in § 52: bē ka-m ... sōkand xᵛarī ḤWHʾ adak-im ... sar brīt bē [ō] damān ḤWHʾ, “but [for the fact] that an oath was sworn by me ... , (then) by me ... [your] head would have been cut off [and] flung on the ground.”96 According to the context ḤWHʾ should denote a 3rd sing. present form. The indicative would have been left unwritten, and the optative seems little likely in the context. There remains the interpretation ḤWHʾ: hā, 3rd sing. subjunctive, the regular form of which is hāt. The possible existence in Book Pahlavi of a “Parthian” 3rd sing. subjunctive in -ā/-āḥ is somewhat controversial, but considering the Classical New Persian -ā in forms like guflā,97 it seems that such a modal auxiliary must have been in use at least in some late stage of Middle Persian. There is, however, not sufficient material in this text for a contribution to that discussion. Thus the following interpretations are listed tentatively:

ḥWHʾḥ: *ḥē(h) 35 (2nd sing. pres. ind.)
ḤWHʾ: hā 52 bis (3rd sing. pres. subj.)

(plmʾdʾ, probably a mistake for framāyāy; see above!)

Verbal ideogram with complement zero and corresponding forms written phonetically

There are no special problems involved in the interpretation of the 22 verbal ideograms with complement zero found in this text. Twelve of them, including the pseudo-verb āvar (LPMH

95 For the full context, see “Composition”, p. 407.
96 The second ḤWHʾ modifies both brīt and apakand.
for LPNMH = LPNH), are sing. imperatives, all but BR’ LMYTWN 104 in completely clear contexts. There are also two phonetically written sing. imperatives. Ten cases of ideogram with complement zero consist of the special ideograms for 3rd sing. present indicative of “to be”. They are listed separately below together with the impersonal pseudo-verb tuwān, always written phonetically.

A. Sing. imperative:

‘BYDWN: kun 16, 32
‘ZLWN: šav 67, 80 (mā-), 114
LMYTWN: apakan 104 (bē-)
LPMH (for LPNH): āvar 51, 101 bis
YMLLLWN: göb (101, see above complement -yt, B.), 114
YMR[R]WN: göb 67
m’il: māl 41 (bē-)
plm’y: framāy 23

B. 3rd sing. present indicative:

‘YT: (h)ast 32 (-T’), 71, 77, 79 (-T’), 95, 97
LYT: nēśt 5, 71, 77, 97
twbn: tuwān 64, 86 (-n; nē-)

Verbal ideogram with complements -tn' and -stn' and corresponding forms written phonetically

There are 9 infinitives written with ideogram and 13 written phonetically in AZ. The unusually high proportion of phonetical forms is due to the general practice of writing kartan, “to do”, phonetically.

‘STH4tn1: xwaartan 30
YHWWNtn1: būtan 53 bis
YTYBWNtn1: nišālan 62, 63

---

YTYBWNstn¹: nišāstan 43 (-št¹n'), [44] (MSS?, JA: YTYBWNst; emended by Benveniste and Nyberg to full inf.; cf. parallel in 43), 86
ŠDYTWNstn¹: vištan 101 (bē-)

krt¹n¹: kartan 15, 17, 23, 25, 62 ter (third kartan is probably an interpolation; cf. above p. 81), 63 bis, 83, 91.
tähl¹n¹: täxtan 101 (bē-)

dšt(n¹): dašt[an] 63 (MSS?, JA: dšt; a mistake is possibly due to the false separation of contents between §§ 63 and 64; dašt[an] obviously belongs to the following kē tūwān, as in the text of Nyberg; a use of the so-called “infinitivus apocopatus” with tūwān, as in later language, is unlikely here; cf. nišaстан nē-tūwān 86)

These 22 infinitives are all governed by finite verbs, 15 by forms of framātan/framāy-, three by šāyēt, two by dānam and two by tūwān.

**Verbal ideogram with complement -št and a corresponding form written phonetically**

The ending -št is the regular complement for 3rd sing. present subjunctive forms. In AZ there is only one such form written with ideogram and one written phonetically. In a majority of the cases complement -št is here used with the ideogram YK′YMWN, generally denoting the past participle ēstāt. The functions of this form are, however, at times somewhat uncertain in the temporal context, both when it is used independently and as an auxiliary. Those cases will be noted in the list below.

A. 3rd sing. present subjunctive:

YḤWWNšt: bavāt (or bāt?) 21 (with a past participle for future passive)

bšt: bāt 62 (somewhat uncertain context; Pagliaro/Benveniste emend the preceding LKWM to LNH: amāh)
B. Past participle:

YK'YMWN't: ēstāt 9, 10, 73,99 74 (kart~),100 79,99 99,99 100 (kart~),100 10299

Table of actual (certain and conjectural) verbal forms in AZ
regardless of orthographical representation
(auxiliaries counted separately)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of forms101</th>
<th>ideographic</th>
<th>phonetic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>570</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
<td>(75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1st sing. pres. ind. in -am | 49 | 9% | 48 (98%) | 1 (2%) |
| 2nd sing. pres. ind. in -ē(h) | 12 | 2% | 9 (75%) | 3 (25%) |
| 3rd sing. pres. ind. in -ēt (zero) | 237 | 42% | 186 (78%) | 51 (22%) |
| 1st plur. pres. ind. in -ēm | 22 | 4% | 13 (59%) | 9 (41%) |
| 2nd plur. pres. ind. in -ēt | 12 | 2% | 12 (100%) | 0 |
| 3rd plur. pres. ind. in -ēnd | 57 | 10% | 49 (86%) | 8 (14%) |
| 2nd sing. pres. subj. in -āy | 8 | 1% | 5 (62%) | 3 (38%) |
| 3rd sing. pres. subj. in -āt | 2 | (0%) | 1 | 1 |
| 3rd sing. pres. subj. in -ā | 2 | (0%) | 2 | 0 |
| 3rd sing. pres. opt. in -ē(h) | 3 | (1%) | 3 | 0 |
| Sing. imperative (ending zero) | 13 | 2% | 11 (85%) | 2 (15%) |
| Plur. imperative in -ēt | 28 | 5% | 20 (71%) | 8 (29%) |
| Past participle in -ṭ̣/d | 104 | 18% | 62 (60%) | 42 (40%) |
| Infinitive in -an | 21 | 4% | 9 (43%) | 12 (57%) |

99 Used as "present perfect", i.e. "has stood up" → "stands", or possibly a mistake for ēstāt; cf. "Composition", p. 415.
100 Probably an interpolation; cf. above p. 78.
101 Excl. the probable interpolations 'ZJ.WNyt 75, ḤWHd 8 bis, 33, YḤWWNt 69 bis, YK'YMWN't 74, 100, krt 74, 100, and krtn1 62 (third occurrence).

ADDITIONAL NOTE

Since the completion of the above article, there has appeared an important study on the preverb bē, namely "Le préverbe moyen-perse bē/ba", a contribution by Gilbert Lazard to the Monumentum H. S. Nyberg (II, 1975, pp. 1–13). Investigating all occurrences of a series of verbs with and without prev. bē in the texts found in Nyberg's Hilfs-
buch des Pehlevi (I, 1928), Lazard has endeavoured to show that there are, generally, differences in semantic value between forms of the same verb with and without \( \text{b\(e \)} \). His results may be taken as an abrogation of the tentative classification of \( \text{b\(e \)} \) as “full preverb” and “verbal particle” given above (pp. 80–85). There are, however, so many difficulties and uncertainties involved in the interpretation of the uses of this \( \text{b\(e \)}/ba \) that a verdict may have to await the result of further investigations, preferably along strictly methodic lines like those of G. Lazard and with a differentiation of chronologic and thematic strata.

In another contribution to the *Monumentum H. S. Nyberg* (II, pp. 419–456), Geo Widengren returns to the question of the prev. \( \text{b\(e \)} \) (pp. 449–451), treated by him also in the *Mémorial J. de Menasce* (cf. references above, pp. 80 ff.). In his long analysis of the Iranistic works of H. S. Nyberg he also touches upon some of the other problems discussed above, e.g. the interpretation of the ligature endings \(-x_e\) and \(-x_s\) (pp. 436–437, 448).