АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК СССР
ИНСТИТУТ НАРОДОВ АЗИИ

ПЕРЕДНЕАЗИАТСКИЙ СБОРНИК

II

ДЕШИФРОВКА И ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЯ ПИСЬМЕННОСТЕЙ ДРЕВНЕГО ВОСТОКА

ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО «НАУКА»
Главная редакция восточной литературы
Москва 1966

SUMMARIES

A. A. Vaiman

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE DECIPHERMENT OF PROTO-SUMERIAN WRITING

A. Main Tasks and Methods

1 a. Identification of certain signs as variants of one sign, separately for the pictograms of the Early Phase (Uruk IV) and of the Later Phase (Uruk III/II and Jemdet Nasr). The identification is based on the regularity in the variations of certain elements of the signs, and on the similarity of the signs themselves, if supported by the recurrence of the variants in combinations with other recurring signs in several analogous contexts. It is evident, that the fewer unidentified variants there are left, the further has the decipherment progressed.

1 b. Identification of the pictograms of the Early Phase with those of the Later Phase, and drawing up of a comparative list of pictograms for both phases. The identification is based on the similarity of the signs, taking always into consideration the systematic character of their schematization.

2. Identification of the pictograms with the cuneiform signs descended from them. The identification is based on the similarity of the pictograms with the earlist cuneiform signs, taking always into consideration the systematic character of their schematization from pictography to the cuneiform script. In some cases, a *biscript*, or a pictographic and a cuneiform version of the same text, can be made use of. The identifications must be supported by the context.

3 a. Disclosure of the sense values of individual signs and sign-combinations; translation of phrases and texts. This is the final goal of the decipherment.

3 b. Approximate interpretation of the meanings of individual signs, sign-combinations, phrases, and texts.

The precise sense value of the pictograms can in many cases be disclosed by basing their interpretation on their cuneiform equivalents. If a given pictogram is identified with a known

cuneiform sign, then among the values of the cuneiform sign one or more may also be the meaning of the pictogram; which of them, if any, is to be found out from the context. However, this method does not always lead to a positive result. There is a possibility that the value or one of the values of the pictogram has not been preserved among the values of the corresponding cuneiform sign, or the pictogram may have gone out of use before developing into a cuneiform sign (there are possibly more than a hundred pictograms of this class). Finally, the discovery of the value of each individual sign may not lead to the disclosure of the meaning of a sign-combination. In all such cases the decipherment should be based on the context alone, using in favourable cases the information of the design used for the pictogram in question.

An important step in the dicipherment is an approximate interpretation of individual signs, sign-combinations, and whole texts. An approximate interpretation is here understood in the sense of an interpretation presenting the meaning only in a very general way. Thus, if the context shows that a given pictogram denotes some kind of domestic animal without further definition, or that a given sign-combination denotes a profession, or that a given document is a payment receipt, this will be termed approximate interpretation. In some cases no clear border-line between disclosure of the value and approximate interpretation can be drawn.

4. Defining the language of the texts. The pictographic writing may have been invented by a people other than the Sumerians. The fact that the cuneiform script has developed from the pictographic writing may be explained as a result of borrowing of a system of signs by the Sumerians, some of the original values of the signs having been preserved. This was the opinion of F. Thureau-Dangin. The existence in the pictographic texts of pairs of homonyms identical in meaning with pairs of homonyms existing in Sumerian language would be a proof that the pictographic texts are Sumerian.

For the decipherment itself, the language of the pictographic texts is hardly relevant, the interpretation of the pictograms not being based on the sound of the words in question or of grammatical forms. But the solution of this problem is important for the history of the Sumerians.

B. Preliminary Results

1. In the sign-lists of A. Falkenstein and S. Langdon, about 1090 different pictograms are listed for both phases. Identifica-

tion of variants has allowed us to diminish this number by one fourth, and to draw up a list of only about 800 different signs.

2. The same scholars have identified about 170 pictograms with cuneiform signs. In our list about 250 pictograms have been identified.

3. In the editions of A. Falkenstein and S. Langdon there are no glossaries which could show the number of pictograms, the value of which have been disclosed by them (with the exception of signs for figures). We have been able to identify and to interpret some additional signs for figures belonging to the system of capacity measures, and also signs for figures expressing specially the capacity of emmer, the days of the month, the months of the year, etc.

A. Falkenstein mentions, in connection with some other problems, his translation of some phrases in the pictographic documents, e. g. "54 bulls (and) cows", "bread (and) beer (for) one day" [the correct translation is "(for) one month"], "(until) the rise of Venus", "(until) the setting of Venus" etc. But no text has been translated completely. Nevertheless, A. Falkenstein's results were most important, allowing him to define the type of the pictographic writing, and to lay open a way towards its further decipherment. Unfortunately, most of the signs not denoting objects of counting were supposed to stand for proper names, which made the prospects of decipherment seem doubtful.

Continuing the decipherment, we were able to disclose, in context, the value of most of the pictograms identified with cuneiform signs; moreover, some 10 pictograms which had fallen into disuse before the development of the cuneiform writing have also been interpreted. As a result, about 70 to 100 pictographic texts have become translateable. The first step was the approximate interpretation and, later, translation of a group of texts of the Later Phase which were known to contain information on the area of some fields. Among the titles of officials to whom these fields were allotted, the sign-combination TÚG.DI (cf. PI 100 below) was discovered to recur in the Early Phase school text ATU 340, partly duplicated by the archaic cuneiform school text VAT 9130. Together with the sign-combination TÚG. DI, several other combinations with TÚG are listed in these texts; by analogy with TÚG.DI, which is a title or profession as proved by PI 100 a.o., all the other combinations with TÚG and a number of other compound ideograms in VAT 9130 could also be interpreted as titles or professions. We had now a considerable list of professions at our disposal,

and these could now easily be identified in several pictographic texts.

4. The following pairs of homonyms have been identified in the pictographic texts: GÍG 'black' for GIG 'wheat'; GI 'cane' for GI_4 'to return'; MAŠ probably 'divide' for MÁŠ 'gazelle'. This seems to prove definitely that the pictographic texts were written by Sumerians.

C. Historical Data

Some data on the social hierarchy in Sumer of the IVth millennium B. C. seem to have been produced. The population was probably divided into nobles, TÚG (men wearing clothes? Cf. the seal-designs; fem. SAL.TÚG = NIN), and common men, NITAḪ. Three categories of officials of different rank, the GAL, the ATU 298—300, and the NUN, have been identified, as well as minor officials called SAG; each SAG had two men under him, and received four times as much silver or copper as the latter (Early Phase).

In the Later Phase documents the highest social position belonged to the EN, and, after him, to the EN.SAL, the merchant (GAL.ŠAB), the DI-lord (the wearer of clothes-DI, TÚG.DI), the PA.ŠUL, and the diviner (IŠIB). They had big estates at their disposal — about 1800 hectares in all, exactly two-thirds pertaining to the EN, and the rest to the other five.

Much information can be gleaned on the earliest agriculture, stock breeding, and industries, as well as on the beginnings of mathematics, accounting etc. The study of the system of writing itself, our only reliable example of the ideo-pictographic method of conveyance of thought, is also of importance.

D. Samples of Translation

In this article, the prospects of further decipherment, as well as examples of identification of sign variants are discussed. Two samples of transcribed and translated texts follow (in this summary given in translation only, see transcription on pp. 13—14).

ATU 15:

2 gazelles (of) the Di-lady (the feminine wearer of clothes-DI) (to) the butcher of (the city) of Uruk.

PI 100:

Obv.

1	a. (To) the merchant:	[2]90 GAR long, [1]
	b.	100 GAR broad, [1]
	c.	16 BÙR (of) field,
	d.	12 IKU (field) extra.
2	a. (To) the chief of the ŠUL:	312 GAR long,
	b.	90 GAR broad,
	c.	15 BÙR (of) field,
	d.	16 7/10 IKU (field) extra.
3	a. (To) the wearer of clothes-DI:	290 GAR long,
	b.	93 GAR broad,
	c.	15 BÙR (of) field.
4	a. (To) the diviner:	290 GAR long,
	b.	62 GAR broad,
	c.	10 BÙR 2/10 IKU (of field)
5	a. (To) the EN.SAL:	300 GAR long,
		110 GAR broad,
		18 BÙR (of) field,
		1 BÙR 2 IKU (field extra).

Rev.

I. 1. 154 BÙR, the field (of) the EN,
2. 77 BÙR, the 'long land',
3. 1 BÙR 17 IKU, extra land.

II. 1 Laid down (?) (by) the temple (?): 233 BÙR 17 IKU, field [of... (?)]

A complete edition of Proto-Sumerian pictographic texts is being prepared; it will be possible to publish at least a part of the texts in transliteration and translation.

I. T. Kaneva

CONJUGATION OF THE SUMERIAN VERB

(According to the Data of the Heroic Epics)

This article is based on all contexts containing a finite verbal form in five Sumerian epic texts; "Gilgameš and Agga", "Gilgameš and the *ḫuluppu*-tree", „Gilgameš and the Mountain of the Immortal", "Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta" and "The Death of Gilgameš".

[1] Instead of the usual UŠ and SAG we meet here a vertical and a horizontal line which we transcribe as $UŠ_p$ and SAG_p. The index $_p$ denotes that the sign in question exists in pictographic texts only, and corresponds in value but not in form to the cuneiform sign thus transcribed.

The contexts have shown that in the language of these epics there did exist a difference between the conjugation of transitive and intransitive verbs, in accordance with the theory of A. Poebel and A. Falkenstein, and contrary to the theories of R. Jestin, E. Sollberger, and V. Christian.

The intransitive verb had only one paradigm of conjugation. The *-ed-*forms are not a separate aspect (tense) of the intransitive verb: (1) An intransitive verb without the suffix *-ed* may just as well express the imperfective aspect (Praesens-Futurum); (2) with the transitive verb, the suffix *-ed-* occurs both in the perfective aspect (Praeteritum) and in the imperfective aspect (Praesens-Futurum), and thus is not connected with the expression of aspects (tenses).

The subject of an intransitive verb is always expressed by suffixes only (zero suffix in the 3rd p. Sg.). There are in the texts under discussion 32 cases of the 3rd p. Sg. of the intransitive verb; in two cases only the verbal form has a suffix *-e* which should be interpreted as *-e(d)*. The 3rd p. Pl. is documented by 8 cases with the suffix *-eš*.

Intransitive paradigm:

Sg.	1st p.	*-en*	Pl.	1st p.	*-e(n)den*
	2nd p.	*-en*		2nd p.	?
	3rd p.	-(zero)		3rd p.	*-eš*

According to A. Poebel, the intransitive verbs began in the Post-Sumerian period to be conjugated according to the transitive paradigm. For the heroic epic texts this is corroborated only in the case of some verbs of motion[1] (*zi*, *ús*, *búr*, e_{11}, *tu(r)*, *kar*); vacillating for the verbs *du*, *te*, gi_4, *gur*, *è*, *nigin*). In this class of verbs the prefix *-n-* seems to serve as a formal sign of the transitive type of conjugation. In Neo-Sumerian texts these verbs were still conjugated according to the intransitive paradigm, the change probably being due to influence of Akkadian where several verbs of motion govern the Accusative.

In regard to the transitive verbs, the material of the heroic epics has corroborated the theory of A. Poebel and A. Falkenstein which suggests the existence of two paradigms of the transitive conjugation: the imperfective aspect (Praesens-Futurum), and the perfective aspect (Praeteritum). Both the subject and the object

[1] The composite intransitive verbs with the nominal part formally serving as the direct object are, naturally enough, conjugated according to the transitive paradigm.

could find their expression in the transitive verbal forms. The paradigm of the affixes of the subject coincides completely with that suggested by A. Poebel and A. Falkenstein:

Transitive paradigm (affixes of the subject):

Praesens-Futurum

Sg. 1st p.	*-e(n)*	Pl. 1st p.	*-e(n)de(n)*
2nd p.	*-e(n)*	2nd p.	*-e(n)ze(n)*
3rd p.	*-e*	3rd p.	*-ene, -e*

Praeteritum

Sg. 1st p.	?	Pl. 1st p.	?
2nd p.	*-e-*	2nd p.	?
3rd p.	*-n-*	3rd p.	*-n-...-eš*
socially-active			(or *-b-* with
3rd p.	*-b-*		a collective
socially-passive			plural)

The material of the epics has contributed much to the solution of the difficult problem of the expression of the object in the transitive verbal forms. The object finds a different expression in each of the two aspects (tenses), namely:

Transitive paradigm (affixes of the object)

Praesens-Futurum

Sg. 1st p.	?	Pl. 1st p.	?
2nd p.	*-e-*[2]	2nd p.	?
3rd p.	*-n-(-b-)*[3]		
socially-active			
3rd p.	*-b-(-n-)*[4]	3rd p.	*-b-(-n-)*[5]
socially-passive			

Praeteritum

Sg. 1st p.	*-en*[6]	Pl. 1st p.	?
2nd p.	*-(en?)*	2nd p.	?
3rd p.	-(zero)[7]		
socially-active			
3rd p.	-(zero)[7]	3rd p.	*-eš*, -(zero)[8]
socially-passive			

[2] 1 case.
[3] *-n-*: 8 cases, *-b-*: 3 dubious cases.
[4] *-b-*: 76 cases, *-n-*: ca. 20 cases.
[5] *-b-*: 1 case, *-n-*: 2 cases.
[6] 11 cases.
[7] Object socially active: suffix -(zero) 14 cases, object socially passive: suffix -(zero) 186 cases.
[8] *-eš*: 5 cases, (zero): 8 cases.

Cases of the pattern *i-b-R* for the interrelation "he (socially-active) — him (socially-passive)" in the Praeteritum seem to be an archaism, as also cases of the Praesens-Futurum with prefix *-n-* when the object is in the 3rd person of the socially-passive class, or with prefix *-b-* when the object is in the 3rd person of the socially-active class.

The paradigm of the object-prefixes in the Praesens-Futurum is duplicated by the forms of the *ga*-mood.

Cases when the affix of the object is absent in the verbal form are regarded by the author as due to historical orthography, because they are to be explained by phonetic laws no longer in action at the period under discussion.

I. M. Dunajevskaja

THE LENINGRAD FRAGMENT OF A HITTITE HIEROGLYPHIC INSCRIPTION (CIH XXIII C)

The fragment of a HH inscription, CIH XXIII C, characterized in 1903 by A. H. Sayce as a "Hittite inscription on a monument found in Merash" and supposed to be lost, is since 1938 preserved in the State Hermitage Museum (No. 18589). The provenance of the fragment from Mar'ash is by no means sure, while paleographically the inscription reminds one of Carchemish.

The drawing in L. Messerschmidt's edition does not reproduce precisely the contours of the fragment, nor the precise shape of the characters. The later editions by A. H. Sayce and P. Meriggi are made from a squeeze and in mirrored reproduction, as has already been remarked by H. Th. Bossert; the contours of the stone and the shape of some of the characters are inadequately reproduced.

The fragment includes two lines with 33 characters, 18 in the first line (1 sign badly damaged), and 15 in the second (5 signs badly damaged). The signs are placed in columns to be read from top to bottom, in the first line — from right to left, in the second — from left to right; in the second line only a couple of signs are preserved from each column.

According to E. Laroche's principles of transcription, the first line reads: *...-à-ī 45-la-ī* ^{79}*na-na-s(a)*$_5$*-r(a)-ī-ha 24-ī-s 22-la + i-ta*. The following preliminary translation is suggested: "...wrath to the (adjective) brothers and sisters was declared".

In seeking for a join with the Leningrad fragment, the fragments of inscriptions from the Carchemish sculptures (possibly

from a lion-sculpture) should probably be taken into consideration.

A. G. Perikhanian

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE ARMENIAN SCRIPT

The fact that Aramaic was for a long time used in the chancelleries of Ancient Armenia, and particularly that the Northern Mesopotamian variety (cf. the inscription from Garni) of the Aramaic script had been adapted there, throws new light upon the problem of the invention of the Armenian alphabet by Mesrop Maštoc in the late 4th century A. D. (or in the very beginning of the 5th century). The information on this event yielded by the Armenian sources, as well as an analysis of the system of the characters of the Armenian alphabet, leave no doubt as to the fact that this alphabet is not a produce of an evolutionary process. It must have been invented at the end of the 4th century A. D. by a person who reproduced the principles of Greek phonetic writing and, in his classification of phonemes, as well as in his concept of the relation between a phoneme and a letter, followed the Greek theory (more particularly, the «Ars Grammatica» of Dionysius Thrax), while using as his 'working model' for the forms of the characters of the new alphabet a sample of the Northern Mesopotamian variety of the Aramaic script current in Armenia in the Pre-Christian period. The parallel materials of the alphabets of the neighbouring nations, the Georgians and the Albanians, show their intimate connection with the Armenian alphabet in all their main features.

I. M. Diakonoff, V. A. Livshitz

NEW DOCUMENTS FROM OLD NISA

By the year 1957 the Parthian archives from Old Nisa numbered more than 2000 ostraca. The majority of these documents were discovered during the excavation of nine wine storage-houses in "Mihrdātkirt Fortress" (*Mtrdtkrt BYRT'*). This name is used in the documents for the site now called Old Nisa. The excavation of the pit situated to the north of the wine storage-houses was started in 1959 and continued throughout the seasons of 1960 and 1961. It yielded 458 documents (whole

ostraca and pieces) and several thousands of uninscribed sherds. The documents from the pit are dated in the period from 100 to 208 of the Arsacid era. As it seems, about 40 B. C. (208 of the Arsacid era) a thorough cleaning was undertaken in the wine cellars of Mihrdātkirt, and lots of broken vessels and primary registration documents were swept out of the storage-houses. There is every reason to suppose that such "clean-ups" were made more than once, and that more heaps of ostraca can be found in the neighbourhood of the wine storage-houses.

The documents excavated in 1959—1961 include all types of formulas known from former finds [cf.: И. М. Дьяконов, В. А. Лившиц, *Документы из Нисы I в. до н. э. Предварительные итоги работы* (М., 1960); id., *Парфянское царское хозяйство в Нисе I века до н. э. Образцы документов* (ВДИ, 1960, № 2), p. 16 sq.].

New documents of these series supplement the evidence on the structure of the estates (*BN'*) whence the wine was delivered and on the character of the tax- or income collection. Registration documents of standard formula contain some postcripts and notes referring to the time when the wine was stored in the cellars. In the new documents some unknown postcripts of this kind containing both heterograms and Iranian writings were found, as for instance *YTKYNt* (var. *YTKYNW*) *'L 'SQW* "prepared for heating" *'wšyḫt* "poured off" (cf. *ptš*(*y*)*ḫt*, *ptš*(*y*)*ḫtk* "poured from... to..." in a similar context).

In the documents registering the 'voluntary' delivery of wine (*MN NPŠH* "from himself") there are some new Parthian terms, among them the word *'sb'r* "cavalry man, *eques*" (as a representative of a certain group of nobles). Of interest is the Persian form of this word probably indicating a tradition dating from the Empire of the Achaemenids.

In the Parthian times 'satrap' (*ḫštrp*) probably meant 'governor of a small area'. In this connection the short formula documents Nov. 41 and Nov. 76 mentioning *ḫštrpn* (Pl.) are significant: *ŠNT I C XX XX X III III MN 'rtbnwkn MN ḫštrpn* "The year 156 (= 92 B.C.). From *Artabānukān*, from the satraps".

Among the finds there are some new unknown labels of quite another kind: Nov. 441: *ḤWT' twsk 'wš*[*yḫt 'L*]... "Empty *khum*. Pour[ed off from... to]..."; Nov. 27: *ḤMR 'TYQ ḤTM' ḫwrybrn* "Old wine. Seal of the cup-bearers". We find also different types of scribes' training exercises and rough copies of requests for the distribution of wine, almost wholly presented in Aramaic heterograms: Nov. 362: *MR'N Š'YLW ḤMR k II*... "Our lord demands (so much) *k.* of wine".

Two new documents contain memoranda on the enthronisation of a new king. In their structure these documents are similar to the previously published № 1760 (cf. *Документы из Нисы*, pp. 20, 113). The genealogy is derived from Arsaces, founder of the dynasty, through Friapatius (Parth. *Pryptk*), son of Artabanus I. The poorly preserved Nov. 306 dated in the year 170 of the Arsacid era probably contains the genealogy of Sanatrukes who ruled the country about 78—69 B. C. In Nov. 307 only the two first lines are preserved: $_1$*ŠNT I C XX XX XX XX 'ršk MLK'* $_2$*[B]RY np ZY pryptk* $_{3-4}$ *[BRY 'ḤY BRY ZY 'ršk?]* "The year 180. King Arsaces, great-grandson of Friapatius, [son of Arsaces' nephew ?]". Most probably the king in question is Phraates III, son of Sanatrukes, who is supposed to have ruled about 69—58 B. C.

Of major interest are the documents dealing with the delivery, distribution and storage of victuals intended for the people working at the wine storage-houses and at the office of the *maδustāns*. Besides the previously known registers indicating the delivery of flour (*SMYD* or abbrevation *S*) and including the names of the bearers, abbreviated designations for capacity measures (*Ḥ*=Aram. *ḥōphān*, *H*=Aram. *hîn*, '=Hebr. *'ēphā*, pointed out by Prof. J. Harmatta), and sometimes the total amount of flour delivered, we find documents mentioning the distribution of oil (*MŠḤ'*) and a label to a vessel with sesame (*ŠMŠMN*).

In the delivery lists the bearers are usually called only by their names but in summary registers of delivery we sometimes find titles of officials responsible for the delivery of wine to the *maδustāns*. The new documents of this group present, for instance, the title "accounter" (*'hmrkr*). The amount of wine registered in inventory lists permits a suggestion concerning the extent of the deliveries to the crown storage-houses and the capacity of the *maδustāns* of Mihrdātkirt. Thus, Nov. 164 seems to mention the delivery of 6351 (*III III ILP III C XX XX X I*) *mari* of old wine (1 *mari* probably equals 11 litres). Nov. 100+Nov. 91, dated in the year 172 of the Arsacid era (76 B. C.), states that 2933 *mari* of wine were brought to the king's treasury-house (*'LGNZ' MLK'*). In this document the designation for 200 (consisting of two 'hundred' signs one above the other, *II ILP III* $\frac{C}{C}$ *III C XX X II I*) occurs, as far as we know, for the first time.

Inventory lists and registers, some of them dated not only by the year but by the month and even the day, make it possible to restore most of the Parthian calendar terms. The following

names of months are represented in the documents from Nisa: *prwrtyn* (1), *'rtywhšt* (2), *hrwtt* (3), *ẖštrywr* (6), *'trw* (9), *whwmn* (11); names of days: *hrwtt* (6), *hmrtt* (7), *dtš* (8, 15. 22), *'trw* (9), *'phwny* (10), *hw'r* (11), *m'h* (12), *tyry* (13), *gwyrh* (14), *mtry* (16), *srwš* (17), *r'm* (21). This list is not only the most complete for Arsacid Parthia, but is also the oldest among the known lists of the Zoroastrian (the so called Avestan) calendar for all Iranian regions.

The names of the days are most fully represented in Nov. 280, containing two series of wine deliveries during at least ten days. The first part of the document mentions the delivery by a certain *Wpry* who brought 151 *mari* 1 *k.* of wine during 3 days (some wine — 4 *mari* 1 *k.* — was spilled on the way to the storage-house, the fact being noted in the text as *'wpst*, literally "fell" or "was dropped"). In the first part there is also a statement that the delivery by the *tgmdr*, "the chiefs of the *tagmas*" (with Parthian names) was made on the 10th (*'phwny*) and 12th (*m'h*) days. The title *tagm(a)dār* which here appears in Iranian languages for the first time, consists of two parts. The first component, *tagma* seems to be borrowed from Greek (τάγμα), while the second is the Parthian *-dār* "commanding, governing". In Roman times the word τάγμα which originally meant "fighting formation, detachment of a troop" was used to denote "legion". It can with great probability be suggested that the *tagmadārs* in Nov. 280 were chiefs of detachments and at the same time heads of settlements of the Romans who were taken prisoners at Carrhae and, according to the evidence of Roman historians (*Plin., NHVI*, 47; cf. *Vell. Paterc. II*, 82; *Flor. II*, 20, 4), were sent to Margiana to defend the eastern borders of the Parthian Empire.

The second part of the document mentions at least 9 daily deliveries of wine making up, in total, more than 500 *mari*. The wine was brought by one *Spōsak* (*Spwsk*) bearing the title *āturšpat*^{i} (*'twršpty*) and no doubt connected with the temple management (cf. *'yzn* "temple" in several documents from Nisa).

Most of the names of days in Nov. 280 occur in forms which are in accordance with what we khow of the historical phonetics of the Parthian language. From the viewpoint of spelling, the forms *hw'r* (-'- for short *-a-*) and *'trw* (=*āhrō?*) are noteworthy. The name of the 10th day — *'phwny* — seems to reproduce **āpāxunī* and should probably be derived from Gen. Pl. **āpam wahwīnām* (whence **āpāxwīn*, and, through metathesis **āpāxwanī*, *āpāxunī?*).

The name of the 14th day — *gwyrh* — which can neither be phonetically derived from **gauš* (or **gaušahe*) nor from the

Avestan *gəuš urunō* "(day) of the Soul of the Bull", requires some special explanation. Perhaps it should be interpreted as a pseudo-historical spelling of the Avestan *gəuš* where *-yrh* represents the Avestan voiceless *r̥* and is a graphemic prototype for the sign *š*$_3$ of the Avestan *vulgata* (for Parth. *gwyrh*, but *srwš*, *dtš*, cf. the absence of any distinct regularity in the usage of *š*$_3$ < *r̥t* instead of *š*$_1$<*š* or *š*$_2$<*š́*).

The assumption that *gwyrh* is a pseudo-historical spelling used instead of **gwš* presupposes that the *written* text of at least some parts of the Avesta existed in Eastern Parthia as early as the 1st century B. C.