ПЕРЕДНЕАЗИАТСКИЙ СБОРНИК

IV

ДРЕВНЯЯ
И СРЕДНЕВЕКОВАЯ
ИСТОРИЯ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ
СТРАН ПЕРЕДНЕГО И СРЕДНЕГО ВОСТОКА

I.M.Diakonoff

ON HETEROGRAPHY AND ITS PLACE
IN THE HISTORY OF WRITING

The most ancient case of heterography is the Akkadi-
an cuneiform writing. It is important also for the Ira-
nian scholars, not only because it had certain influence
on the Aramaic-Iranian heterography (E.Ebeling), but al-
so, because the development of sumerographic spellings
in the Akkadian writing furnishes an important parallel
to the development of the spellings in the Iranian wri-
ting system.
˜In the primitive and early ancient societies, when means
for logical (deductive) abstraction were but poorly de-
veloped, generalizations (necessary for any thinking pro-
cess) were supplied by tropes, i.e., by metonymic or me-
taphorical associations. It is well known that this was
the origin of myths, but it is not commonly understood
that the generalizations needed for practical life were
also necessarily achieved through metonymies. This was,
inter alia, the only way to create the first writing sys-
tem, as a new semiotic system aimed at transferring in-
formation not directly but across time and space. There-
fore Sumerian writing emerged originally as a purely
mnemonic system, where each figurative sign could either
express the word denoting the depicted object, or any
other word which denoted a notion connected by a metony-
mical associations with the picture of the object. The
field of association of any one sign was limited only
by the field of associations of some other sign. The
associations may have been by contiguity, by the rela-
tion of object with its action, and also by other meto-
nymical ties, among others, by sound association (homo-
phony). I.J.Gelb's "phonetic principle" is not to be
regarded as a separate invention, but as one of the ty-
pes of natural metonymic associations. It was exactly
this type of association which made it possible to use
the signs in a rebus sense and that in its turn made it
possible to introduce into written information such ma-
terial as auxiliary words, affixes, foreign proper na-
mes, etc. So long as Sumerian was a living language, the
scribes did not attach great importance to a precise
reproduction of the flow of speech, including the sys-
tem of phonology and morphology; just so such linguistic
information was introduced as was necessary for the read-
er of a more or less standard text to reproduce its
sense (but not the exact linguistic form).

No specific reason can be suggested for the fact that
Sumerians did invent writing or their own, while the
Akkadians did not. An ideographic writing (implying by
this term a system where each sign corresponds not ne-
cessarily to one certain word, but usually to a whole
field of metonymically associated ideas), is in prin-
ciple not a reproduction of any individual language; the
native language of the scribes is revealed only by the
specific use of homophonic associations denoting auxi-
liary words and homonyms: 1. (WOMAN + SEAT-WIFE) + SKIN
is 'his wife' in Akkadian, but 2. (WOMAN + SEAT-WIFE) +
+ VESSEL FOR OIL is 'his wife' in Sumerian (1. 'aṭṭat-su,
SU being one of the values of the sign 'skin', but 2.
d a m.a n i, NI being one of the values of the sign 'vessel
for oil'. Also the order of signs may correspond to the
syntax either of the one or the other language; however,
in the early period little importance was attached to
the reproduction of syntax.

Writing in Sumerian was more prestigious; Akkadian-
speaking scribes had to learn by rote tremendous *farhang*-
type lists of terms in their Sumerian form. Akkadian
syllabic writing made up of phonetic values of the signs,
with few actual sumerograms, had been used along with Su-
merian writing in the Old Akkadian period but did not
become popular; in the Old Babylonian this method of
writing was used in private letters, but in official and
legal documents a scribe was required to write the whole
text, if possible, in Sumerian, in spite of the fact
that it was no longer a spoken language. However, the
text was, no doubt, rendered in Akkadian for the benefit
of the parties and witnesses in a legal deed, and of
higher standing officials in the case of administrative
documents. There is some evidence, although rather scant,
showing that the scribes, among themselves, continued to
pronounce the text in Sumerian. But phrases which the
scribe did not remember in Sumerian or that were not
included in the curriculum of studying lexicological
texts (farhangs) were nevertheless written in Akkadi-
an, and even the Sumerian standard formulas were incr-
easingly rendered with flagrant errors. It is probable
that such texts were read by the scribes themselves as a
mixture of Sumerian and Akkadian words (although trans-
lated orally into Akkadian for official use). To mend
the situation the *Ana ittišu* manual was composed, inclu-
ding rare legal and administrative expressions, even
such as belonged usually to oral transactions. It was,
however, too late, and after the destruction of the
southern Mesopotamian é-d u b-b a's in Samsuiluna's time
(second half of the 18th century B.C.), Akkadian wri-
ting more and more replaced Sumerian; however, frequent
words and formulaic expressions continued to be written

as heterographic insertions in the Akkadian syllabically written texts; one of the reasons, apart from scribal tradition, was that such writings required less space on the tablet.

Heterographic spellings helped to preserve the mnemonic approach to the writing system; it continued to be a semiotic system which, although it *was* now aimed to reproduce another semiotic system, viz., the language, did not aim to reproduce each linguistic element by one constant and immutable corresponding element of the writing system. Even when using the syllabic signs alone, a word (or part of it) could always be reproduced in writing in several different ways.

What happened in Iran in the middle of the 1st millennium B.C. had many analogies with the above described process. When the Medes and Persians, who had no writing system of their own, had to create an extensive state administration, there was a necessity for written fixation of its transactions. It is obvious that numerous cadres of trained scribes and administrators were needed, who could be found only among speakers of languages foreign to the Iranians. Of course, another outway could be for the Iranians to create a writing of their own and to train their own scribes, but the problem required an urgent solution, and the Aramaic scribes answered the need. However, an attempt to create a writing for the Iranians was actually made.

In another paper I presented a table of all grammatological peculiarities of the so-called "Old Persian" cuneiform script to find typological analogies in other writing systems that could be known to the Medes and Persians, and from where they could borrow for the creation of their own system of writing. It appeared that there are analogies with Akkadian, Aramaic, and — most interestingly — especially with the Urartian system; but no specific 'isogrammatemes' could be found with Elamite, in spite of the fact that Elamite writing is known to have been in official use in Persis as well as in Elam itself. Urartian writing being extinct by the beginning of the 6th century B.C., the only possible conclusion could be that the alleged "Old Persian" writing was created by the Medes, neighbours and contemporaries of the Urartians. Note that the Persians themselves called their writing 'Aryan', i.e. Iranian in a general way, not specifically 'Persian'. There is also good reason to believe that Darius I, apart from being a tyrant, was illiterate in any language, and thus could not be the inventor of the "Old Persian" writing, a notable scholarly achievement. The language of the "Old Persian" inscriptions is not specifically Persian in all particulars, and reminds one of the Assyrian inscrip-

tions of Assurnāṣirapal and Shalmaneser III, written,
like all other Assyrian royal inscriptions, in "Jungba-
bylonisch" but with very numerous Assyrianisms in pho-
netics and especially in morphology, and even with who-
le passages written completely in the Assyrian dialect.

However, an urgent creation of administrative cadres
able to write in Iranian was too strenuous a task, and
it was never realized. But the Aramaic imperial chancel-
leries were also, no doubt, a Median creation; the Per-
sian kings long continued to rely on Elamophone scribes
and administrators — mostly, no doubt, on Persians train-
ed in Elamite writing. The Aramaic chancellery actu-
ally already existed in Assyria and Northern Mesopota-
mia, which went to Media after the division of the Assy-
rian heritage between Cyaxares and Nebuchadnezzar II. Af-
ter conquering Babylonia and Syria, the Persian kings
could not introduce there their traditional official
Elamite scribal offices, since no one understood Elamite
here, but used the Aramaic offices which were al-
ready in existence.

During the period of the Achaemenian empire there
were enough native Aramaeans to keep up the official
scribal tradition; however, cases of introduction of Ira-
nian phrases into the Aramaic text are known (e.g., in
the Aršama letters). As to the situation in post-Achae-
menian times, it is best compared with the situation in
the OB period, when the language of the schools and of-
fices, viz., the Sumerian, was already a dead one, and
all scribes were speakers of Akkadian. Thus also in Ni-
sa of the 1st-2nd centuries A.D. all scribes, to judge
by their names, were Iranians; and to judge by the texts,
they had no active knowledge of Aramaic, apart from the
set of standard administrative formulae, which were lear-
ned by rote at school. Whenever a scribe knew the Ara-
maic *Wortlaut* of an administrative formula, he used it,
and that was in 99,9 per cent of the practical cases.
When he did not, or had forgotten it, he wrote in his
own language using the same Aramaic letter-signs. It is
quite probable that he still was termed, and called him-
self, an "Aramaic scribe", just as a Babylonian scribe
was a "Sumerian" once he knew how to use the heterog-
raphic (Sumerian) spellings.

It is well known since H.H.Schaeder, that the offi-
cial texts were written in Aramaic but read in Iranian
for the benefit of the administrative bosses. It is pro-
bable that the scribes read the texts among themselves
as the texts stood, i.e. pronouncing the heterogramms
without translating it into Iranian (a procedure used
by the Parsees even in modern times). I suspect that
even the scribes themselves could not answer the ques-
tion, at what moment their writings ceased to be Aramaic
and began to be an Iranian heterographic script.

It is to be supposed, that also in the Elamite chancellery in Persis there existed a custom to render the Elamite written texts, for the benefit of the higher officials, in Persian; however, it seems to me that the situation here differed somewhat from the case of the Aramaic chancelleries. The Sumerians and Akkadians used the *same* system of signs for both languages, and the use of heterography did not involve changing from one writing system to another; the same was the case of Aramaic and Iranian writing. However, the Elamites used not only another *language* that the one their administrators spoke, but also their *writing* was entirely different from any writing ever used for Iranian languages.

The development of Iranian heterographic writing on the base of Aramaic writing went through the following stages: (1) the text was written by bilingual scribes in Aramaic and was interpreted (not precisely translated) for the benefit of the higher officials; (2) for certain standard, stable, recurring Aramaic formulas there had developed certain standard, stable oral translations into Iranian; (3) when the scribes (by this time purely Iranian in most cases) became accustomed to render all that was contained in standard Aramaic formulas by certain standard, commonly known oral Iranian formulas, there emerged a situation when any *standard* text could be read either in an Aramaic or in an Iranian rendering (not necessarily in a literal translation). At this stage the scribe, whenever he did not know or remember the Aramaic equivalent in question, could introduce words and phrases in his own language, using the same Aramaic script; (4) at the last stage the text became Iranian heterographic, which at first meant that all of the text (Aramaic with Iranian inclusions) would be *read* in Iranian; but later, when the scribes had to grapple with nonstandard texts, it meant that the text was also *written* in Iranian, retaining Aramaic spellings for the more current words and phrases. The grid of easy identifiable Aramaic heterograms gave the reader at once a general notion of the contents of the text and helped to identify the contiguous non-vocalized Iranian words. Anyone who knows cuneiform, knows that heterograms, far from hampering easy reading, actually are of a great help to the reader.

Elamite scribes were in a different position. Even being Iranophone in daily life, they could not, in the development of heterographic writing, get further than point (2). It is well known that Elamite transcriptions of Iranisms are based on a very complicated system of reflexes, so that even a trained Iranian scholar has a difficulty to identify the glosses. While the Aramaic scribal tradition could by very gradual steps evolve into the Iranian heterographic tradition, such was not

the case with the Elamite writing. The Elamite offices,
even if their texts were interpreted in Iranian for the
higher officials, could exist only so long as there were
scribes who could write in Elamite. I do not believe
that Elamite scribes could at any time be equal to the
task of compiling a big non-standard text, making it up
from details (like in Meccano) exclusively from loan-
translations from Persian: stages (3) and (4) could not
develop here.

Some ideas about the meaning of DBh §70 are also for-
mulated in this paper, in the light of the above.

I.T.Kaneva

NOTES ON SUMERIAN GRAMMAR II

The paper is devoted to the analysis of the syntacti-
cal functions and values of the Sumerian nouns n i, z i,
n í-t e when used as pronominal words.

The nouns n í and n í-t e with the ergative morph
are used as attributes of the subject, the pronominal
suffix agreeing with the subject. The sense is reflex-
ive ("self" — "I myself, you yourself, he himself"
etc.).

Pronominalized z i, n í and n í-t e can also be used
as the direct object: (1) the suffixed pronoun being in
agreement with the subject; the words in question ex-
press a subject which is at the same time the object of
the action. In these constructions the suffixed pronoun
may also be absent (implied); (2) the suffixed pronoun
being in agreement with the object (or absent): "don't
steal anything, you'll be killed yourself", etc.

n í and n í-t e can also be used as an oblique object
(with the morphs of the locative-terminative, the loca-
tive, and the instrumental-ablative). With the locati-
ve-terminative the sense is 'for oneself' (replacing a
dative). With the locative and the instrumental-ablative
the expression has an adverbial sense ("of himself",
"by himself", "on his own").

n í and n í-t e with a suffixed pronoun can also
function as a postpositive attribute in the genitive.

V.A.Jakobson

NOTES ON THE COURT PROCEDURE AT LARSAM

Cuneiform documents concerning law-suits are rather
rare. This results from the very nature of ancient court
procedure, the last being competitive and oral. The `

transition to a procedure based on an official investigation may in some sense be regarded as a borderline between the Antiquity and the Middle Ages. In the present paper some extant documents concerning law-suits from Larsam are discussed.

The author comes to the conclusion that there always existed in ancient Mesopotamia only one instance of justice, be it city-court, temple-court or king's court. Whenever a necessity of "the god's judgement" arose, the case was transferred to a temple. The court's decision was definitive and not subject to any appeal. This is to be emphasised specially, because the notion of

the Mesopotamian king being the supreme judge is now a kind of axiom. But this notion rests only on the *communis opinio doctorum* and is not corroborated by texts. Among the thousands of letters to Mesopotamian kings there are no letters containing any appeal against a court's verdict. And there does not exist even a single letter from any kind cancelling any court's decision.

Nevertheless, the absence of the notion of prescriptive right allowed to resume already resolved cases some time later.

In this paper the translations of the texts TCL X, 34; YOS VIII, 66, 150; TCL X, 139; TCL XI, 243, 245; YOS VIII, 1 are given.

N.B.Jankowska

SCRIBES AND INTERPRETERS AT ARRAPHE

The paper is based on the prosopography of the princes' archive which was found in a suburb of Nuzi (Yorghan-tepe, 15 km to the south-west of Kirkuk); material from other archives are also made use of. The time is confined to the three last generations of Arraphe (the third, fourth and fifth). The documents of the princes' archive were compiled by at least 45 scribes, half of whom belonged to the two clans of scribes — that of ApalSin and that of InbAdad, beginning with the grandsons of the founders. Only five of the scribes, however, worked exclusively for that archive, while the others compiled documents also for other clients. Nearly half of the scribes were individual experts in the scribal art not belonging to the clans of scribes. However, the calligraphic unity of the scribal hands and a tendency toward standardization of the formulas shows that the education and work of the scribes was coordinated, probably by the clan of the royal scribe ApalSin.

Among the *dramatis personae* whom we encounter in the archive are IthiTešub, king of Arraphe, and nine princes. Of these the by far most important are HišmiTešub and his son ŠilwiTešub. The latter is usually represented by stewards *(šakin bīti, šaknu,* Hurr. *šellintannu).* One of them was an adopted son of a debtor, Hašuar son of Šimigari, another, PaiTešub, was the son of the prince by a slave-girl. The stewards also could act on their own.

The amount of the expenditures of grain in the economy of ŠilwiTešub and the number of his men is comparable to those in the extended family communes (e.g., that of TukkiTilla — cf. H IX 43 and PAS 1, 3). The clan of Apal-Sin, judging from the number of his grand- and great-grandsons who were scribes and acted simultaneously, must have included not less than two hundred members. (A minimum ratio of women and children to the number of working males is presumed). Of the same order of magnitude was the village of Maršaili, the father of Šehal-Tešub the scribe and Duldugga the interpreter. But the incomes of these economies differed considerably.

The scribes and interpreters did not belong to the well-to-do citizens of Arraphe. This is shown by the fact that the commune of Maršaili had systematically to recur to collective loans of grain; individual members also borrowed grain for interest and with mutual communal guarantee. Indenture is a unique occurence. This is the case of the scribe Šilahi son of ŠilwiTešub (a namesake of the prince). Also unique is the self-pledging of a scribe, as in the case of Attilammu who was a non-resident alien *(hapīru).* Such forms of guarantee for loans, which are evidence of considerable differences in the living standard of scribes, are characteristic of the scribes living outside of the big clans.

Grain rations to scribes in the princes' economy, just as was the case in the palace, were minimal: 1 *qû* (ca. 0,75 1) per day, 30 *qû* per month, 20 *qû* in war-time. Wool for clothing was dealt out once a year. These rations were not calculated for maintaining the scribes' families. The scribes working for the palace belonged to the category of "palace slaves", but such were not numerous. In the country as a whole predominant were the independent town scribes, who also constituted the majority of the scribes working for the princes. It seems that the scribes had to serve by turns in the places where court was held, as e.g. in the city gates, where they appear together with a physician, a shepherd and a carpenter. Four of the scribes — brothers, from the clan of ApalSin, served their turn as judges (JEN 155). But in contradistinction to the weavers, the potters and the trade agents, who worked for the market, the scribes had no 'tower' *(dimtu)* of their own; ownership of a tower was a question of prestige.

The term for "interpreter" in Arraphe was different from the usual Akkadian one: instead of *targumannu* we encounter the form *targumazu/zi*. This can be explained from Hurrian: the suffix *-annu* was equivalent to Hurr. *-anni*, a suffix used, *inter alia*, for a profession. Here it is replaced by another Hurrian suffix, *-zzi (Akkadized -zu), expressing an inherent property (cf. *aštuzzi* "feminine"). Actually, the *targumazi* in Arraphe are too numerous to be regarded as professional interpreters; they are rather men who are bilingual and *able* to act as interpreters when needed. In one case we learn that an interpreter belonged to the same family as a scribe. The scribes in Arraphe were bilingual by definition, since they wrote in Akkadian for a Hurrian speaking population. A foreigner *(ubaru)* was assigned as interpreter (HA XXIII 55:5). Two army interpreters are mentioned together with 9 physicians and 3 singers *(nuāru,* here probably incantation priests). They are called *targumazu etennu,* probably not "individual" interpreters — thus CAD and AHw — but "chief interpreters" (in H XV 52,71). The interpreters are mentioned among the servants of the royal following but not listed by name individually. A total mobilization of people able to serve as interpreters revealed 33 such persons among the household *(nišē bīti)* and 25 among the palace slaves (H XV 64). The interpreters were assigned to officers and charioteers for personal service (H XV 311 et al.).

Except for the texts mentioned above, the *nuāru* constitute a separate group belonging to the harem. Most of the singers are women *(nuārātu),* including Mitannians and Akkadians. In contradistinction to some of the scribes and interpreters they belong to the household *(nišē bīti),* not to the palace slaves.

M.A.Dandamayev

THE NEO-BABYLONIAN *URĀŠU*

Not one of the meanings suggested by Assyriologists for the word *urāšu* fits the Neo-Babylonian texts. It seems that *urāšu* designated shift services for the fulfilment of state and community obligations (the construction and maintenance of irrigation works, roads, and the like). The shift workers enlisted for these services were called LÚ *urāšu.* Usually rich people paid off their state and communal duties in money, hiring other persons.

I.Sh.Shiffman

THE PHOENICIAN CULT OF THE MALE ʿAṮṮAR
IN GRAECO-ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

Analysed are the texts Macrob., Saturn. 3,8,2-3; He-
sych. s.v. Aphroditus; Catull., 68,51; Sud., s.v. Aphro-
dite; Lyd., De Mens.4,14; Schol.B (L), Hom. 11.,2,820.
    The Cyprian Aphrodite (of the 3 originally Phoeni-
cian — Amathūs) is thought to have been masculinized,
reflecting in her image one of the pre-Greek goddesses
who either had an unimportant male spouse, or united in
herself the female and male essences. This deity is pro-
bably ʿAṯṯar.
    From Philo of Byblus (as retold by Eusebius, Praep.
ev.1,10,31) we know of a Phoenician deity called Zeus
Demarūs (an identification with the god Adōd with the
help of Gruppe's emendation is unnecessary). The author
regards the name Demarūs as Phoehician, etymologized
from *dmr* 'to destroy', which can be regarded as semanti-
cally parallel to ʿrz 'destroy, be awful', used as a con-
stant epithet of the god ʿtr in Ugarit. Being the son of
Uranus and father of Heracles/Melqart by Asteria ("wife
of ʿAṯṯar" according to Herodian.5,5,4, she was identi-
cal with the Carthaginian Urania, i.e. Tinnīt); Demarūs
is probably identical with the Ugaritic Aṯṯar.
    Some additional arguments are brought in favor of the
hypothesis stated above.

Yu.B.Tsirkin

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF CARTHAGE

The history of Carthage can be subdivided into four
stages:
    I. From the foundation to the beginning of the 7th
century B.C. Carthage was a usual Phoenician colony,
economically mainly an intermediary in trade; there was
no agriculture, and the handicrafts were poorly develo-
ped. It was unique only in that it was not founded by
the Tyrus polity as such and was not included in the Ty-
rian empire. Carthage was founded as a monarchy, but af-
ter the death of Elissa it was probably organized on
republican lines.
    II. From the early 7th century B.C. the ties with the
metropolitan Phoenicia were weakened because of the As-
syrian conquest, and Carthage overtook the role of Ty-

rus in the contacts with other countries of the Mediterranean. A number of citizens of Tyrus might have migrated to Carthage, where old Canaanite traditions were being revived; the territory was extended, the city received its own *chora*, and agriculture including cultivation of olives and grapes, flourished. Carthaginian handicrafts and arts were being developed. Carthage started founding its own colonies, and at last a Carthaginian empire, embracing all the former Phoenician colonies in the Western Mediterranean and a number of indigenous territories, was created.

To this period belongs the formation of the characteristic socio-political system of Carthage — a "pyramid", at the top of which was the Carthaginian aristocracy, the upper part of the "people of Carthage", with slaves and other dependant groups of the population at the bottom. The slaves were used in different economical fields, also to an important degree in agriculure (cf. Var. de r.r.,1,17,3-7), but also in mining and in building projects. Between the two extremes were placed the metoeci, the "Sidonian men" and other groups of diminished rights, including the inhabitants of the conquered territories. The citizens of Carthage themselves were subdivided into "the mighty" and "the little ones", or "the plebs". However both groups were in an antagonistic relation to the rest of the dependant population.

Community property constituted the material base of the body political. This property appears in two forms: collective ownership (e.g., arsenals, docks etc.), and private ownership (land, handicraft shops, merchant shops).

The constitution, which received its final form after the fall of the Magonids, was republican. The supreme power and sovereignty was, as a matter of principle, vested in the popular assembly. The magistrates were elected, although only from aristocratic families. The army was mainly hired, but the citizens were not quite free from the obligation of military service. In fact, the Carthaginian community was what it is usual to term a *polis*.

III. The formation of the *polis* system in Carthage coincided in time with the formation of the Carthaginian empire. Thus, the second stage of the Carthaginian history corresponds to the period from the first half of the 7th to the middle of the 5th century B.C.

Greek influence starts with the 4th century B.C. Three directions of cultural development can now be traced in Carthage: the Graeco-Punic, the Greek (with only formal retention of Punic forms), and the traditional. The Greek cult of Demeter and Cora were introduced, and the cult of Dionysus influenced strongly the Phoenician cult of Shadrapa, resulting at last in their syncretism.

Greek influence is also felt in art, in philosophy, in
the creation of historiography, theoretical agronomy
etc. The reason for the popularity of Greek cultural
forms lies in the fact that they were well suited to the
polis socio-political structure. However, the scope of
this influence should not be overrated. For the third
stage of Carthaginian history a coexistence of two cul-
tures is typical, the first (traditional) oriented to-
wards the aristocracy, the second more towards the plebs.

    After the I Punic war Carthage was going through a
serious socio-political crisis which led to a certain
democratization inside the traditional political insti-
tutions. The defeat of Carthage in the II Punic war, in
spite of Hannibal's strategic genius, was partly due to
military reasons (too long communications), but chiefly
to the contradictory social development, encompassing
also the ruling aristocracy.

    IV. The last period began after the defeat of Car-
thage in the II Punic war. Carthage lost its empire. The
possibilities of exploitation of the non-Carthaginian
population fell to a minimum. Big groups of dependant
and half-dependant population escaped the control of the
Carthaginian aristocracy. The Carthaginian community be-
come a rank-and-file polis after having been the centre
of an empire. This was bound to lead to a still more
critical socio-political situation, the first signal
being Hannibal's reforms of 195 B.C.; the political
struggle of the 2nd century B.C. and the seizing of pow-
er by Hasdrubal can be viewed as an analogy to the
"younger tyranny" in Greece. Having become a *polis*, Car-
thage had to go through the crisis of the *polis*. In
Greece, this crisis was partly alleviated by the inclusion
of the Hellenic city-states into the Hellenistic system.
In Carthage it led to the fall of the republic and to
the rise of the Roman empire.

    Carthage is a society Oriental in its genesis but
analogous to the Graeco-Roman in its development.There-
in lies the especial interest of Carthaginian history.

                                                J.P.Weinberg

                MAN IN THE WORLD PICTURE OF THE CHRONIST.
                           HIS MENTALITY

    The mentality of contemporary man is a difficult e-
nough field for study, but the mentality of man   in former
times is a still more difficult field. However, the task
is not hopeless, and the mentality of ancient man can

be studied through the products of his activity, first
and foremost through the language.

The present paper is devoted to a lexico-statistical
analysis of words in the OT, relating to the sphere of
human mentality (cf. table in the text), with special
reference to the Books of Chronicles.

The degree of the reflection of mental phenomena in
the texts depends greatly upon the genre of the text in
question (the terminology in question is more detailed
and is used more frequently in the emotionally coloured
texts, such as the prophetical books, wisdom, etc., in
the more matter-of-fact historical books the terminolo-
gy in question is represented more scarcely and by a
smaller number of terms, with a tendency to lower the
amount of terms still further in the latter works).

Д.Н.МакКензи

НЕКОТОРЫЕ ИМЕНА ИЗ НИСЫ

В статье разбираются некоторые имена собственные из
архива парфянской канцелярии Нисы, издаваемого В.А.Лив-
шицем; предложены новые этимологии и исправлены некото-
рые старые.

Н.Симс-Уильямс

СОГДИЙСКОЕ *KW* И СЛАВЯНСКОЕ *КЪ*

Еще Э.Бенвенист указал на семантическую и синтакси-
ческую связь согдийского предлога *kw* и славянского пред-
лога *къ;* в то же время он отметил, что соответствие сог-
дийского *kw* и индоиранского *kam,* фонетически оправдан-
ное, в семантическом и синтаксическом отношении менее
надежно.

В 1969 г. Ф.Копечни предложил не связывать согд. *kw*
и слав. *къ* с индоир. *kam,* а возводить оба слова неза-
висимо к общему источнику — и.е. *$k^{w}u$ "где".

В славянских языках такое наречие не встречается, по-
этому его развитие в предлог должно относиться еще к до-
славянскому периоду; славянский материал, таким образом,
не может ни подтвердить, ни опровергнуть гипотезу Копеч-
ного. Однако в согдийском наряду с предлогом *kw* сущест-
вует и наречие *kw* "(там) где" (написание в обоих случа-
ях *'k'w, 'kw, k'w, kw, kw(w), qw*), написание с начальным але-

фом скорее предполагает прототип *kuwa* (др.-инд. *kvà*,
поздн. авест. *kva*).

Механизм перехода от значения "где" к значению "к"
показан на примере употребления хотанского наречия *ku*
"где, когда, если, поскольку, так что": "прийди где мой
дом" > "прийди к моему дому".

V.N.Toporov

INDO-IRANICA: TOWARDS A CONNECTION
OF THE GRAMMATICAL AND THE MYTHO-RITUALISTIC

The article consists of two essays: (1) On the con-
nection of Ind. *ṛtá-* '(cosmic) order' and the cojunction
Sogd. *rty, rty* 'and'; it is shown that the word denoting
'order' in the sense of 'conjunction and disjunction'
(in ritual) can also denote conjunction (and disjunc-
tion) in grammar; (2) On the reconstruction of the Indo-
Iranian **ka-* and **dhā-*texts. The author points out the
possibility of reconstructing common Indo-Iranian poetic
formulas, at least for short texts, or actually "joins"
which are used to fit together larger textual composi-
tions. The **ka-* & *dhā-*texts are determined (a) by an in-
stitutionalized syntactical scheme of the type "who &
set (created) & object", and (b), by their appertaining
to creation myths, i.e. to the nucleus of cosmogonical
and anthropological myths, used and actualized mainly in
the rituals of the yearly cycle. The author analyses one
Indian text (Atharvaveda X,2) and one Iranian text
(Yasna 44); it is stipulated that the reconstructed In-
do-Iranian text need not be *genetically connected* with the
two written texts in question. The author notes that not
only the elements *ka-* and *dhā-* themselves, but also the
objects of *dhā-* are common.

The heuristic importance of such reconstructions lies
in their anti-empirical character. The base for the re-
construction appears to be not so much a concrete text,
but a "cross-textual" text, derived from a number of
concrete texts; it is a typal text, which is reflected
in more than one concrete text, and hence is more reli-
able and controllable. A text of this kind appears as
multilaterally motivated, viz. by the structure of the
morphologo-syntactical scheme, as well as by the seman-
tic grid of the whole, with a clear-cut lexical filling
of the individual links, by genre characteristics, and,
last but not least, by its ties with the sphere of my-
tho-ritualistic realia.

T.Ja.Elizarenkova

ON THE ART OF THE VEDIC ṚṢI

The article is devoted to certain poetical devices of the ṛṣi's who created the hymns of the four Vedic *sam-hitās*. Along with archaisms, the author points out a manifold poetic experimentation, especially such as withdraws the mythological action from any temporal limitations. Here belongs a wide use of injunctives with their "memorative" function, lying outside of the temporal system, lists of mythological happenings in no way temporally correlated, epithets where it is often difficult to keep apart the attributive and the predicative functions, etc. Here lies also the nucleus of the future differentiation of the "verbal" and the "nominal" style, the latter having later experienced a profuse growth in Indian philosophical literature.

G.M.Bongard-Levin
and M.I.Vorobyeva-Desyatovskaya

A NEW TEXT OF THE FRAGMENT OF THE SANSKRIT "SUMUKHĀ-DHĀRAṆĪ"

A new variant of a fragment of the Sanskrit *Sumukhā-Dhāraṇī* from Central Asia is published, the first variant of the same having earlier been published by the authors and E.N.Tyomkin in IIJ,X,2-3 (1967). The new variant allows to get a better understanding of the text, which is published along with its Saka translation.

I.M.Steblin-Kamenskij

AFANASIJ NIKITIN IN INDIA

The author interprets certain Oriental glosses in Afanasij Nikitin's 'Wandering Beyond Three Seas", viz. *kozi* 'Cocos nucifera'; *tatna* 'Caryota urens L.', or 'Borassus flabelliformis' (cf. Engl. *toddy*), *tava* 'dhow'. The 'Wandering' is concluded by a prayer: it has thought that the text is 'a mixture of Persian, Arabic and Turkish, or 'a macaronic Oriental'. Actually it is the enumera-

tion of Allah's names *(al-asmā' al-ḥusnā)*. Of the 99 names
Afanasij Nikitin lists all the names after *bismi'llāh ar-
raḥmān ar-raḥīm* and down to the thirty-fourth name, without
serious mistakes in Arabic.

E.E.Kuzmina

ON SOME ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM
OF INDO-IRANIAN ORIGINS

   The author has collected comprehensive data on domes-
tication of the horse and cattle and on funeral and
other rituals from many dozens of sites belonging to
the different cultures of the Eurasian steppes dating from
the 4th — late 2nd millennium B.C. The author's conclu-
sions are:
   I. That the different cultures in question are gene-
tically connected; there are symptoms of cultural influ-
ences from the West and partly over the Caucasus but
none from the Ancient Near East or Iran;
   II. The horse was domesticated in the Eastern Europe-
an steppes not later than the 4th millennium B.C.; four-
wheeled and two-wheeled heavy chariots appear early,
but no warrior-riders are in evidence until the late
2nd millennium. The camel (Bactrianus) was domesticated
in Central Asia at a date considerably earlier than the
dromedary in the Near East;
   III. The rituals and the peculiarities of horse breed-
ing and horse- and camel-drawn vehicles correspond to
the common Indo-Iranian terminology, especially in the
Andronovo culture of Central Asia (2nd — earliest 1st
millennium B.C.). There is evidence of intrusions of the
Andronovo culture into Eastern Iran and Afghanistan, but
no evidence of intrusions in the opposite direction;
this is also shown by data of physical anthropology.
   Thus the population of the Eastern European steppes
was Indo-European beginning with the 4th millennium B.C.;
it moved eastward creating the Asiatic steppe Andronovo
culture, which,in the author's opinion, belonged cer-
tainly to the Indo-Iranians.