

SOGDIAN GRAMMATICAL NOTE

KEIGOU NODA

Nagoya University

In his reputable grammar of Manichean Sogdian,¹⁾ Professor Gershevitch defines the formation of the (periphrastic) intransitive preterite as follows (§861):

The Intransitive Preterite, which formally coincides with the (nonperiphrastic) Passive Preterite, is formed by adding the past stem inflectional forms of **ah-* and *an-* 'to be', except in the 3rd Sg., where no ending is used with heavy stems, while light stems take the ending *-y*.

Gershevitch's examples of intransitive verbs are completely satisfactory. Here are some additional examples from the VJ:

406—7 *ckn'c ZY "γt'yš* 'Where do you come from?'

408—9 *cmn 100 'βs'nx z'yh 'PZY "γt'ym* 'I came from a hundred miles away.'

1—2 *wyš' ... p'rZY γr'nh 'krt'ym* 'Rejoice! ... because I have become pregnant.'

However, the examples of transitive verbs leave some doubt. Before examining them, it is to be noted that the (periphrastic) transitive preterite is generally formed by the past stem +*δ'r-* 'to keep' (§877f.). Examples from the VJ are:

3 *'py'rkh γwβnw wytw δ'r'm* 'Last night I dreamed a dream'

421—3 *rty ZKw 'sp'ytk wγwšw 'nswr'y r'cβrt pyδ'n γwt'w 'wy pr'mnty δβ'r δβ'rt δ'r'm* 'Le roi des éléphants, Rājvart, blanc, aux six choses inappréciables, j'en ai fait don à des brahmanes.' (Benveniste's translation)

567—8 *rty my 'γw 'BY' γwt'w γrmy'n 'krtw δ'rt* 'My father the king punished me.'

In addition to the last example, the following example is found in the VJ.

502 *p'rZY 'wyn 'BY' γwt'w γrmy'n 'krt'ym* (similarly 61df., 942)

Judging from the context this must express the same content as 567—8. But there is a difference in the case of 'BY' 'father': nominative at 567—8 vs. oblique at 502. The former is active, while the latter is called passive by Gershevitch (§1051). The following gives a juxtaposition of VJ 2 and 502 with appropriate alterations.

Oblique	Nominative	Verb (Past stem)	Auxiliary
	'zw	yr'nñ 'krt-	'ym
	I	pregnant become	am
'wyn 'BY'	'zw	yrmy'n 'krt-	'ym
the father	I	punished	am

Here the subject of the intransitive sentence appears as the object in the transitive sentence. This relationship is traditionally called ergativity²⁾ and is already familiar from OP *mana ima krtam (in ima taya mana krtam) 'I have done/did this', Pahl. *kū-m draxtē bē dād kē 4 azg pađiš būd* 'I saw a tree which had four branches.'³⁾ Gershevitch incorrectly characterizes VJ 502 as passive. However, the passive agent is usually expressed in Sogdian not by the simple oblique case but by the prepositions *pr* or **haca*. For example,

BBBb 12f. *pr "zy nβndyh 'nxstyy 'ktym* 'wenn ich von Zügel der Gier gereizt ... worden bin' (Henning's tr.)

VJ 5bf. *rty mc 'γw 'BY' L' "z'yr't L' ZY šy ZKh prm'nñ 'nywy'ty* 'by me my father will not be hurt; nor his order infringed' (Gershevitch's tr., §541)

Thus, it seems likely that the ergative construction existed in Sogdian. Since modern eastern Iranian languages make wide use of this construction, it is no wonder that we should find it in Sogdian, an eastern middle Iranian language.

With this fact in mind let us return to the above definition (§861) and examine the examples of transitive verbs one by one.

δβ'rt 'was given' (§865) It is attested at VJ 1478f.; *mn' γrβy "z'wn δβ'r δβ'rt wβyw γzny ...* 'by me, during many lives, treasures, etc. were given as gifts'. (Gershevitch's tr.) Gershevitch regards this as passive, but as seen above, *mc* rather than *mn'* is expected as the agent of the 'true' passive. This sentence can be simplified to *mn'* (obl.)—*γzny*(nom.)—*δβ'r δβ'rt*(verb), which is clearly ergative while *δβ'rt* is nothing but a past stem.

ptβr'wt, ptβr'wt 'is remembered' (§865) As the context is not available, a proper evaluation cannot be made.

ptšmyrt 'is considered' (§865) The context is as follows: *γwnxw pwny'n msy'tr ptšmyrt ZKZY ...* (TSP 2.24f.) 'plus grand encore est estimé le mérite de celui qui ...' (Benveniste's tr.) In spite of his translation 'is considered', this too is regarded

by Gershevitch as the preterite. But it is hard to call this a preterite from the context. Benveniste also translates this in the present. In my opinion this should belong with the present passive like *ptšmyrty* in TSP 7.49 (§706).

fnyštyšłt 'you have been deceived' (§867) This example is taken from ST II 30.42f.: *cqn' pyd'r wmn' fnyštyšłt' pr šm'wn sng γy wyzrw dyn ny pyrt'sq ...* '... weshalb seid ihr so verdorben durch Simon Petrus und glaubt nicht (an) die wahre Religion.' (Müller-Lentz's tr.) Here, as the agent is expressed by *pr*, this is clearly passive. But is it not possible to regard this as fusion of *fnyšty+*'*yšłt*', namely Gershevitch's present perfect?

ptškw't'nt 'they were addressed' (§870) Ancient Letter 3.8 reads: '*HRZYm ptškw't'nt ZKy 'yps'r* 'and I addressed the '*yps'rs*'⁵⁾ This is a clear case of the ergative construction in which the number of the object (*ZKy 'yps'r*) is marked on the verb (*ptškw't'-nt*).

Byrt "th 'should have been obtained' (§873) This appears in: *γwnx w'tδ'r ZKZY šy ZKh pwt'y'kh tym L' Byrt "th* 'L'être qui n'a pas encore obtenu le lakṣaṇa de buddhatā ... (TSP 2.172f., Benveniste's tr.) Here *šy* can be the agent of the relative clause, and thus the sentence will be ergative.

ptxwšłt (sic) 'will have been heard' (§873) The context is not available but perhaps the same as *ptškw't'nt* above.

'krty γ'y 'had been made' (§876) This occurs in: *p'rZY ZKh wytt'r 'kw ZY 'wyh t'yw"ky βγγ'r 'krty γ'y* 'elle se rendit là où un vihāra avait été élevé aux enfants' (VJ 1116f., Benveniste's tr.) From the context this sentence is passive. But it cannot easily be decided whether '*krty* in this sentence is a past stem or an *aka*-participle. While in §860, Gershevitch terms '*krty* in '*krty wmt* (SCE 475) an *aku*-participle, here he regards it as a past stem. I should like to regard this example as belonging with §859(a).

'nškrty γ'y 'had been collected' (§876) This is the last example Gershevitch gives. It is attested in the VJ 1017f.: *rty šy 'γw myδ'kw 'nškrty wmt wyspznk'n ZY γrβY 'sprym'k yw'r ZY tym ZKh n'r'kh L' 'nškrty γ'y rty ZKh pr n'r'kh sn' ...* 'Elle avait cueilli des fruits de toutes sortes et beaucoup de fleurs, mais elle n'avait pas encore cueilli de grenades. Alors elle monta à un grenadier, ...' (Benveniste's tr.) Here *šy 'γw myδ'kw 'nškrty wmt* can be looked upon as ergative, but the lack of the agent in '*nškrty γ'y* makes an interpretation difficult. Two solutions offer

themselves. One is that it is the same as *'krty γ'y* above(=passive). The other is that it is an ergative construction in which *šy* is omitted to avoid unnecessary repetition. Benveniste seems to side with the latter as can be seen from his translation. But the former solution seems preferable to me, because ergative constructions with past stem/*aka*-participle+*γ'y* do not seem to exist in Sogdian.

Next the examples in §860 will be discussed. The Manichean ones can be considered as passive, but it is doubtful whether those of Bud. Sogdian are passive or not.

SCE 475 *ZKZY šy 'γw 10 wkry 'βyz'krtyh 'krty wm't* '(there was a man) by whom the ten kinds of misdeed had been committed' (MacKenzie's tr.)

VJ 1017 *'nškr't'y wm't* see above

VJ 438f. *rty 'γw 'wn'kw zyrny'n'k 'sprγm'k 'kyty šy cun mγδβy ZKw 'βš'm'k βyrt'y wm't rty šw ZKn pr''mn δβ'r δ'βr* 'et cette fleur d'or qu'il avais reçue du ministre en cadeau d'adieu, il en fit don au brahmane' (Benveniste's tr.)

The use of *šy* is characteristic in the above three examples. It is certainly possible that *šy* in each modifies a certain noun as genitive, but the basic structure, e.g. *šy* (obl.)—*'γw mγδ'kw* (nom.)—*'nškr't'y wm't* indicates the ergative construction. Note in particular that *ZKw* in *ZKw 'βš'm'k* (in the third example) speaks against the concept that the ergative sentence is passive. If *šy...ZKw 'βš'm'k βyrt'y wm't* is passive, *'βš'm'k* (which stands in apposition to the passive subject) would surely be marked not by *ZKw* but by *ZK*. Could this be dismissed as merely a scribal error? Rather, it is reasonable to assume that this sentence is an ergative construction where *ZK 'βš'm'k* was transformed to *ZKw 'βš'm'k* due to the ergative being a form of the active. Another important fact to be noticed here is that the verb is not a past stem but an *aka*-participle. This can be explained by assuming that the past stem was replaced by the *aka*-participle and the latter required an auxiliary owing to its being adjectival. This process is strongly reminiscent of the history of New Persian.

Following are some additional examples of ergative constructions in Bud. texts.

SCE 1 *m'd ZYmy ptywšty* 'Thus have I heard' (similarly TSP 5.2)

MacKenzie, following Gershevitch considers this as the passive preterite (Glossary, s. v. *pt'γ'wš*), but as we have seen Gershevitch's so-called 'non-periphrastic passive

preterite' is non-existent. Here *ptγwšty* is simply a variant of the past stem *ptγwšt*.

VJ 626—7 *rtγ my 'γw 'BY' šβ'y γwβw yp'kβr'k 'krty* 'I made my father, king Šivī angry.'

Dhy 391 *rtγ styw 'wyn šm'ryn'k ZK prn n" βy'rt "t* 'although the one considering may not (yet) have attained the stage (of bodhi)' (MacKenzie's tr.)

Dhu 292 *rttny ZNH ... ZKZYmn 'ny'wr L' βyrt 'st rtyšw nwr βy'ymn* 'this ... jewel that was unobtainable for us before and we now acquire' (MacKenzie's tr.)

MacKenzie records *-mn βyrt 'st* as 1pl. perf. and reasonably adds a question mark (Glossary s. v. *βyr-*). But once an ergative construction is recognized here, the sentence will be apparent. *βyrt* is simply a past stem, but the addition of *'st* seems to be rather exceptional.

Intox. 17—18 *rtγ nyw'nty cwn nury ZK pωδ'y r'δh γrβ't'y βwt* 'the path of enlightenment will henceforth be grasped by him.' (MacKenzie's tr.)

This is given as an example of the periphrastic passive in §830. However, I think this too follows the general pattern of the ergative construction.

Vim. 49—50 *ZNH rγ'nt ZKZYšn 'γw wyspw wkry γr'nš n'stk βwt* 'the śrāvakas for whom all kinds of bond have been destroyed ...' (MacKenzie's tr.)

Gershevitch, having paid attention only to *n'stk βwt*, includes this in the periphrastic passive. But as argued previously, the passive agent cannot be expressed only by the simple oblique case. Furthermore, MacKenzie's translation gives one an impression that the agents who did the destroying are not *rγ'nt* but someone else. The corresponding Tibetan and Chinese versions are: (Tib.) (Equally) over the Listeners who have broken the fetters ..., (Chin.) Arhats who have broken the fetters (are powerless)⁵. From these it is clear that the agents are śrāvakas themselves and not someone else. I believe that the Sogdian version, although not correctly rendered by MacKenzie's translation, rightly expresses the same content by the ergative construction, as the Tibetan and Chinese versions.

In conclusion I suggest that the ergative construction existed in Sogdian as in Western Middle Iranian. The construction in the extant texts seems to be residual

and no more productive. As stated above, the (periphrastic) preterite of transitive verbs is usually construed with the past stem+ $\delta'r-$. At first sight the ergative construction and the periphrasis with $\delta'r-$ appear to have nothing to do with each other. However, if we assume that originally the periphrastic preterite (perfect) was formed by the ergative construction and that later the transitive preterite was replaced by the expression with $\delta'r-$, the relationship becomes clear enough. The change can be schematized as follows:

Intr.	'zw	"γt-	'ym		'zw	"γt-	'ym		
	I	come	am		I	come	am	'I have come/came'	
Tr.	šy	'zw	βyrt-	'ym	⇒	'γw	my	βyrt-	δ'rt
	him	I	found	am		he	me	found	has 'he has found/found me'

This process of replacement must have taken place because of the awkwardness of the ergative construction in the Sogdian verbal system where all other tenses (present, imperfect, etc.) are construed 'accusatively'. The same 'accusativization' is well known in the change from MP *u-m ēn kard* to NP *man īn (rā) kard-am*. Finally it should be remembered that, as was shown by Benveniste,⁷⁾ the Iranian ergative construction is a possessive construction, that is, the change from *šy 'zw βyrt-'ym* to *'γw my βyrt δ'rt* in the long run represents despite morphological discrepancies⁸⁾ involved the same thing.

Notes

- 1) I. Gershevitch, *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*, Oxford, 1954.
- 2) The most recent and excellent treatment of ergative is to be seen in, R. M. W. Dixon, 'Ergativity', *Language* 55, 1979, 59—138.
- 3) I am fully aware of Cardona's argument that *ima taya mana krtam* is not ergative but passive (*Language* 46, 1970, 1—12). But this is untenable. I hope to discuss this problem elsewhere.
- 4) *Zand ī Wahman Yašt* I.2(=DH 231r2).
- 5) The context with its translation is due to Dr. Sims-Williams.
- 6) See (tr.) E. Lamotte (English by Sara Boin), *The Teaching of Vimalakirti*, London, 1976, 179f.
- 7) BSL 48, 1952, 52—62.
- 8) I am most grateful to Dr. Sims-Williams who read an earlier version of this article very critically and to P. E. Szatrawski.

Abbreviations

BBB=W. B. Henning, *Ein Manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*, 1935 (repr. in his *Selected Papers* I, 1977)

- BSTBL=ed. D. N. MacKenzie, *The Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library*, Acta Iranica 10, 1976
 Dhu.=in BSTBL
 Dhy.=in BSTBL
 Intox.=in BSTBL
 SCE=ed. D. N. MacKenzie, *The 'Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian*, 1970
 ST II=ed. F. W. K. Müller-W. Lentz, *Sogdische Texte II*, 1934
 TSP=ed. E. Benveniste, *Textes sogdiens*, 1940
 VJ=ed. E. Benveniste, *Vessantara Jātaka*, 1946

ソグド語文法ノート

野 田 恵 剛

古代ペルシア語、中世ペルシア語に ergative 構文が存在したことはすでに知られているが、本稿ではこれが方言系統を異にするソグド語にも存在したことを指摘した。ただソグド語の現存するテキストにおいてはそのあらわれ方はむしろ痕跡的である。これがかつて広く存在したであろうことは、かつては(回説的)過去(または完了)がもっぱら ergative 構文で形成され、のちに他動詞については δ'r-'to have' による表現によってかわられたと仮定することによって推定できる。ergative 構文が δ'r- 構文によってかわられる過程は accusativization と考えられ、その原因は active (accusative) 的に形成される他のテンスへの類推に求めることができる。Benveniste によってつとに指摘されたようにイラン語の ergative 構文は所有構文であり、ergative 構文から δ'r- 構文への変化は、形態上の相違をこえて本質的には同じものであることは注目すべきである。