

vallée du Qunduz-âb. Plusieurs *tarkhân* apparaissent dans les documents de Rôb, mais en l'état actuel du déchiffrement il ne semble pas qu'on puisse les associer spécifiquement au Kadagistân ni à Warlughan.

Il y a par ailleurs quelques mots à dire sur le sens premier de Kadagistân, « lieu de la maison (royale) ». L'on ne peut s'empêcher de penser que c'est précisément ici que se trouvaient deux grands temples patronnés par la dynastie kouchane : Surkh Kotal et Rabatak. Les Kouchans avaient-ils possédé ici des domaines familiaux ? Cette région était-elle restée un fisc de la couronne ? On concevrait alors que Khusrô Anushervân y ait installé un *ôstândâr*, avant que plus tard une principauté hephtalite ne l'occupe.

Avec ces dernières considérations, il pourra sembler que je me suis laissé entraîner assez loin du fonds documentaire lui-même, mais tel était bien le but que s'assignait ce travail exemplaire : susciter des recherches. Il y en aura d'autres. Les documents publiés et analysés par R.G. bouleversent profondément des pans entiers de l'histoire sassanide : géographie administrative certes, mais aussi géographie historique, histoire politique, militaire et économique, et jusqu'au vocabulaire de la propagande dynastique.

Frantz GRENET
(CNRS - EPHE, Paris)

HUYSE, Philip, *Le y final dans les inscriptions moyen-perses et la loi rythmique proto-moyen-perse*, [Studia Iranica. Cahier 29], Paris : Association pour l'Avancement des études iraniennes, 2003, 112p., index, bibliographie. Distribution : Peeters Press [ISBN : 2-910640-15-9].

In this book Ph. Huyse examines a much discussed topic in the history of Iranian linguistics: the origin and function of the final *-y* (from now on referred to as *-y#*) in Inscriptional Middle Persian (IMP). As Henning pointed out (*Mitteliranisch Hanb. Orientalistik* I.4.1, Leiden-Köln 1958: 129), the final stroke of the Book-Pahlavi, from a palaeographical point of view, is the direct outcome of IMP *-y#*. The use of the final stroke was definitely explained by Belardi (in *Fs. Humbach*, München 1986: 11 *sqq.*): it is used to mark the end of words ending with letters not joined to the left, thus requiring a special marker to indicate that the word finishes there. Nonetheless, the sign *-y#* in the Sasanian inscriptions does not fit into this distribution.

According to Andreas ("Ambara", *Panlys* 1/2, 1790 ff.), *-y#* represents *-ē*, which is the ancient ending gen.sg. *-ahīa* turned into a universal case form. Although Hübschmann had argued against the hypothesis (*Indogermanische Forschungen*. Anzenger 10, 1989: 18-41), which states that *-ē* resulted from the old gen.sg. ending *-ahīa*, and that there is no trace of such an *-ē* neither in Armenian nor in Syrian loanwords (now we could add: nor in Manichaean Middle Persian), Andreas' suggestion was very well received. Meillet accepted it (*Journal Asiatique* 15, 1900: 257), but believed that the outcome of *-ahīa* was *a-ē*.

Later on, Henning expressed doubts about the possibility that $-y\#$ represents the result of the older case ending $-ahja$ and expressed his conviction that it had become a mere graphic ornament without any phonetic value. Only Back, the author of the most exhaustive study on $-y\#$ before Huysse, attempted to restore a phonetic value to the $-y\#$, searching for its origin and for the causes of its distribution in the vocabulary of the Sasanid inscriptions (*Die sassanidischen Staatsinschriften*, Téhéran-Liège 1978). As Back rejects the existence of a nominal system with a *casus rectus* and a *casus obliquus* in Middle Persian, he also does not believe $-y\#$ to be the continuation of a former gen.sg. ending $-ahja$. According to him, $-y\#$ represents the result of every ending in a vowel \pm consonant, and its phonetic value is $-\emptyset$.¹ Yet Back also puts the distribution of $-y\#$ in relation to accent and rhythm, and this is the greatest merit of his explanation. He proposes that there was a complicated “Rythmus-Gesetz” in Middle Persian, which he reconstructed starting from a slightly modified version of the three accent types proposed by Gauthiot (*Mémoires de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 20 [1918], 11): 1. $*s\acute{a}ka :: *s\acute{a}kahja$; 2. $*nam\acute{a}ca :: nam\acute{a}cahja$; 3. $\acute{i}azata :: *i\acute{a}zatahja$. In principle, he introduced a number of secondary distinctions to Gauthiot’s type 3 (in Back’s terminology: 2a and 2b) based on whether the posttonic vowel is syncopated or not. Once posttonic vowels are syncopated, all nouns in Middle Persian would have become paroxytone except for Back’s type 2b, where no syncopation occurred. By analogy with the rest, also the words of the accentuation type 2b would also have put the accent on the penultimate syllable. It is at this point that the “rhythmical law” operates: $-y\#$ remains after a penultima with etymological short vowel (this means also in type 2a $*r\acute{a}yan\emptyset > *r\acute{a}y\emptyset > *r\acute{o}n\emptyset$) and is dropped after a long vowel. This idea of Back surely represents an important progress in the study of $-y\#$, but it still contains some difficulties. The book under review can be considered as an attempt to resolve the problems left unsolved by Back’s proposal.

Nonetheless, Ph. Huysse begins with a completely new and exhaustive study of the entire vocabulary attested in the Middle Persian Sasanian inscriptions. Simply by collecting and organising all the material, he is already able to draw some illuminating conclusions. Firstly, it can be stated that $-y\#$ has altered its function and has become parallel to the final stroke of the Book Pahlavi in the later inscriptions (since the 4th or early 5th century) and is used under similar conditions. Secondly, in the earlier inscriptions a certain distribution of $-y\#$ in nouns becomes apparent: it appears in all monosyllabic words, and in polysyllabic words only after short vowels. This description of the distribution resembles that of Back (*op.cit.* 44), according to whom $-y\#$ appears everywhere except in accentual type 3 (with a long vowel in the penultima: $\acute{o}g\acute{o}n < *\acute{a}wag\acute{o}n-\emptyset$). Actually, the basic differences between Back and Huysse concern the origin of $-y\#$ and the explanation of the mechanism of its distribution. For Back, $-y\#$ represents every final sequence of the

¹ A similar position seems to implicitly defend Klingenschmitt (in *Indoarisch, Iranisch und Indogermanistik*, Wiesbaden 2000: 194) when he derives IMP *gwpty* from $*gufti < *guft\acute{a}h$. The same explanation has been suggested by de Vaan (*The Avestan vowels*, Amsterdam-New York 2003: 449) to explain some n.sg. in $-\emptyset$ in the Yašt.

structure vowel ± consonant. For Huyse, it is the mute rest of an ancient bisyllabic ending like that of gen.sg. **-ahja* > **-ě* (among other possibilities).

Back was not able to derive *-y#* from the old gen.sg. ending because he did not believe that Late Old Persian still had a case system. For this period, he only accepts a distinction between singular and plural in the nominal declination. But Huyse correctly points out (p. 58 ff) that not only in Late Old Persian, but also in Inscriptional Middle Persian (P.O. Skjaervø, *Studia Iranica* 12, 47 ff. and 151 ff.), Manichaean (N. Sims-Williams, *Studia Iranica* 10, 165 ff.) and even in the Pahlavi translation of the Avesta (A. Cantera, *Studia Iranica* 28, 173 ff.) there are traces of a system with two cases: *rectus* and *obliquus*. Huyse believes that the latter became generalized as a result of the function as subject in the passive preterit constructions of the *manā kartam* type. Huyse's view is supported by the very fact that the survival of a reflex of endings in a vowel with or without consonant can hardly be assumed in Middle Persian, since there are traces of the dropping or at least weakening of the final syllables even in Old Persian (R. Schmitt, *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum* 60) already at the time of the inscriptions of Artaxerxes III. But Huyse neglects a small formal problem already pointed out by Back. In Gauthiot's type 3 there is a paradigmatic accent shift between the *rectus* and the *obliquus*. Yet despite the supposition that it is the *obliquus* which becomes generalized in the majority of the forms where the position of the accent can still be traced, it is the accent of the *rectus* which we find. So, for instance, **ráyanah* should present a regular syncope **ráyah* in the *rectus*, but not in the *obliquus* **rauánahja*. Nonetheless the attested form *rōn* is syncopated. If we accept Huyse's hypothesis this can only be explained through some analogical assimilation, as Back is also compelled to conclude (*op.cit.* 43 f.).

Wherever we can still trace an accent alternation between *rectus* and *obliquus* within the nominal paradigm in the singular of Middle Persian, the accent always falls on the penultimate syllable of the stem in the *obliquus*. This can be seen in the example initially adduced by Klingenschmidt (*op.cit.* 212; cf. Gauthiot *op.cit.*, 3) and then reproduced by Huyse (p. 58) concerning the different ways of treating *nāiyakah* → **nēhk* → *nēk* face to *nāiyákahja* > **nēhak* > **nēahk* > *nyahk* > *nyk*, or in the well-known case of **iázatah* > MMP *yzd iázad* face to MP *izad* < *izad* < **iázatahja* (Gauthiot *op.cit.*, 1; cf. Klingenschmitt, *op.cit.* 198). According to this, there were two inflectional forms in the singular at the time, a *rectus* and an *obliquus*, the accent shifting in the stems with a short penultimate vowel: **ástag* < **ástakah* :: **astágě* < **astákahja*, but not in the stems with a long antepenultima, e.g. in the secondary **ruuánah* > **ruuán* :: **ruuánahja* > *ruuáně*.² At this point, we can assume that in most of the cases of the type **ástakah* :: **astákahja* the accent would analogically remain in one and the same position. The generalized solution would be that of the *rectus* (**ástag* :: *ástagə*), because its pattern was the most frequent in Proto-Middle Persian, as in the thematic stems it was the same for all cases except gen.sg. and loc.sg. In the words with syncope, the generalization of the accent of the *rectus* is evident. So the alternance **pávanah* >

² Accent type 2 of Gauthiot.

pahán :: **paθánahja* > **pahn* was solved in favour of *páθ(a)na* :: *páθ(a)nē*;³ the same happens with **zárítah* > *zard* :: **zarítahja* > ***zaríde* of which only *zard* remains.

In favour of Back's explanation speaks the fact that, according to it, all Middle Persian nouns should become oxytone, and this is actually what we find in Modern Persian. According to Huyse's explanation, we have oxytone and paroxytone words in Middle Persian. Then we have to explain the evolution of the accentuation to the situation in Modern Persian.

Coming back to the distribution of -y#, both authors actually consider the distribution a result of some rhythmical law, yet the laws proposed by the two differ. For Back, -a# is always posttonic and its survival or dropping depends only on the quantity of the final syllable. For Huyse, the occurrence of -y# depends not only on the quantity of the preceding syllable, but also on whether it is posttonic or not. At the time of redaction of most ancient inscriptions it no longer reflected any phonetic reality, but retained the traces of a former linguistic reality where the old *obliquus* ending had become generalized as the universal ending, and had been dropped only in a posttonic position in polysyllabic words.

So Huyse's suggestion exhibits some important differences to that of Back, but their coincidence is larger than their divergence. For both of them, -y# is the trace of an old ending and was thus originally restricted to nouns. Both offer a similar analysis of the distributional conditionings and explain the distribution as a result of some rhythmical regularity comparable to the "Rhythmus-Gesetz" in Sogdian. Besides the differences already mentioned, they also differ in their chronology. Huyse places all these processes in a Proto-Middle Persian phase, which seems more probable than the late Old Persian dating of Back.

This work of Huyse definitely confirms that the use of -y# is not arbitrary, that it has a direct relation to the quantity of the preceding syllable and probably also with the word accent. Its most visible contribution is the careful treatment of exceptions, for which Huyse offers mostly plausible solutions. In many cases he solves brilliantly detailed problems.

The less convincing part of this study, in my opinion, is the third chapter, which is devoted to the problems of Iranian accentuation, as a previous condition to face the distribution of -y# presented in the second chapter. It would have sufficed to present the accent system of Middle Persian, and not what he calls "une étude approfondie de l'accentuation iranienne", since what he actually offers is no detailed description of the Iranian accent in the ancient and middle phases, nor a clear history of it, but a number of observations concerning individual aspects. For the Avestan period, his treatment is not very fortunate. I have not been able to decide whether the author contends that Avestan had a free accent similar to the Vedic and Proto-iranian one, or an accent governed by rules like the "three syllable rule". He mentions Meillet's hypothesis, supposing that the Avestan accent was similar to that of classical Latin, and he looks for some counterexamples as *pašto* (*w*)šəl "20", which goes back to **uisáti*-. Nowhere, however, does he affirm that we should postulate a free accent for Old Avestan. I believe Huyse could

³ Accent type 3 of Gauthiot.

easily have seen that not only Old Avestan, but also Young Avestan, exhibit the old mobile accent we know from Vedic. He collects (p. 50) various phonological processes which enable us to elucidate the Old Avestan position of the accent. But it must be noted that some of his arguments do not concern Old but merely Young Avestan. So the evolution of posttonic *-rt-* to *š* occurred in Young Avestan, not in Old Avestan, as shown, for instance, by such loanwords from O.Av. in Pahlavi as *'ltwhšt*, or the form *rtm* for Av. *ašəm* in the Sogdian *ašəm vohū* (A. Cantera, in *Fs. Schmid*, Costa Mesa, Ca., 2003: 250 ff.).⁴ The same applies to the *r > hr* before *k* and *p*, as can be seen in O. Av. *marəkaēca* face to Young Av. *mahrka-* (M. de Vaan, *op.cit.*, 597 ff.). That means that the free accent of the Indo-Iranian period was preserved not only in Old Avestan but at least in the initial period of Young Avestan.

Our information concerning the Old Persian accent is much less certain. Hoffmann (*Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, 638 f.) deduces from some Elamitic writings that the old free accent was still preserved in Darius' time. Huyse points out that at the end of the linguistic phase called Old Persian, especially in the inscriptions of Artaxerxes III, there are clear traces of a dropping of final syllables, which indicates a fixation of the accent position similar to the Latin or the late Indo-Aryan ones. For his purposes, specifically for the consequences of such accent processes on the nominal inflection, this last point is the most important, together with the evolution of the accent in Middle Persian: fixed on the penultima if it is long and on the preceding if it is short.⁵ Huyse provides the evolution from Latin to old French and the Bactrian case as typological parallel developments.

It would also have been interesting had Huyse expressed his own opinion on the later evolution of the accent system he proposes for Middle Persian until Modern Persian. Back's explanation of Middle Persian reconstructs a general nominal oxytony already at that stage, as in Modern Persian. Whereas, according to Huyse, we would still have oxytones and paroxytones, but he does not indicate when the step was taken to the Modern Persian system.

⁴ E. Pirart (*Journal Asiatique* 289, 2001: 87ff.) suggests that there is no relation between the evolution *-rt-* > *š* and the accent, but he is unable to point any other cause for the attested distribution.

⁵ As regards accentuation in Middle Persian, there is a detail Huyse seems to get confused about in my view. On p. 58 he follows Klingenschmitt (in *Indoarisch, Iranisch und Indogermanistik*, Wiesbaden 2000: 212), adducing some examples of accent shift, that is, of Gauthiot's accent type 3. Klingenschmitt considers such changes accent changes of the paradigm, just as Gauthiot did. Huyse, on the contrary, speaks of accent shift "en partie" paradigmatic, and it is difficult to imagine any other reason that could lead to such an accent shift. Maybe this "en partie" is due to a misinterpretation of *phl.*, *mmp.* *p'k* face to *prth.* *pw'k*. He actually derives *phl.*, *mmp.* *p'k* from **pāyakah*, o.ind. *pāvaká-*, but *parth.* *pw'k* from **payākah*. It is strange to reconstruct two different Proto-Iranian forms, differing not only in accent but also in the distribution of the long vowels. Actually the assumed equivalent of Proto-Iranian **pāyaka-* may be illusory. Ia. *pāvaká-* "klar machend, klar werdend" is metrically *pavāká-*, and the writing *pāvaká-* is analogical to the numerous forms with *-a-ka-* suffix (*Altindische Grammatik* II,2, 266). O.Ind. *pāvaka-* "fire" is only attested from the classical period onward. So it is better to derive both forms, as Klingenschmitt does (*op.cit.*, 212), from **payākah*. At this point, Klingenschmitt adduces this form simply as a parallel to the metathesis of **nēhāke* to **nēáhke*.

All in all, Ph. Huysse's study has great merit and has set new ground for the understanding of the use of -y# in inscriptions, following Back's way but with some important differences. He has also definitively clarified the relationship between this sign and the final stroke of the Book-Pahlavi.

Alberto CANTERA
(Universidad de Salamanca)

KEDDIE, Nikki, R., et MATTHEE, Rudi, édés, *Iran and the Surrounding World. Interactions in Culture and Cultural Politics*, University of Washington Press, Seattle - Londres 2002, 393p., Introduction, illustrations [ISBN 0-295-98206-3].

Cet ouvrage collectif comporte quinze articles écrits par des spécialistes d'aspects très divers de la culture iranienne (histoire, politique, littérature, diplomatie, religion, éducation, sociologie, religion, cinéma etc.). La chronologie s'étend de la période safavide (1501-1722) à nos jours, avec une priorité accordée au monde contemporain. En effet, près de la moitié du livre concerne la période commençant avec l'instauration de la République islamique en 1979.

Ces travaux examinent, dans une perspective historique, la place de l'Iran et de la culture iranienne dans le monde. En ce qui concerne les relations et les "interactions", les voisins immédiats (Russie, Turquie, Inde britannique), ainsi que les États-Unis (et le Japon), apparaissent davantage que l'Allemagne ou la France. L'analyse englobe aussi l'Égypte et les voisins de l'Est (Afghanistan, Pakistan, Inde). Dans certaines contributions, la priorité est accordée aux débats d'idées, le contexte historique étant parfois schématisé.

Précédée par une Introduction générale de Nikki Keddie, la matière, répartie entre études thématiques et celles s'inscrivant dans une chronologie précise, est divisée en cinq parties. La première partie (« *Overviews* ») regroupe trois articles :

1. Juan Cole, « Iranian Culture and South Asia, 1500-1900 ». Depuis son ouvrage intitulé *Roots of North Indian Shi'ism in Iran and Iraq* (Berkeley et Los Angeles, 1989), Juan Cole nous a fourni de nombreuses contributions. Il examine ici tout d'abord la place du persan dans l'Inde moghole. Langue de la cour, de l'administration, de nombreux poètes, historiographes, scribes, traducteurs etc., le persan (déjà bien implanté en Inde), connut alors un développement considérable. Selon l'auteur, il y avait alors en Inde probablement sept fois plus de « lecteurs de persan » qu'en Iran (p. 15). Son analyse porte ensuite plus particulièrement sur l'impact religieux de l'Iran sur l'Inde, notamment sur les États chiites du Deccan. Elle est suivie par un examen de la situation du chiisme dans l'État de Awadh (Oudh), successeur des Moghols, sous la dynastie Nishapuri (1722-1856). Une esquisse de la culture persane en Inde aux XVIII^e-XIX^e siècles est suivie d'une conclusion dans laquelle sont esquissés les aspects économiques, philosophiques, artistiques etc. Ce très bref article est basé sur des sources sérieuses. Signalons cependant deux oublis importants : M. Alam *et al.*, édés, *The Making of Indo-Persian Culture. Indian and French Studies*, Delhi (Manohar), 2000 ; B. Fragner, *Die*

Studia Iranica

EXTRAIT

Tome 35 - 2006 - fascicule 1

**PUBLIÉ PAR L'ASSOCIATION POUR
L'AVANCEMENT DES ÉTUDES IRANIENNES**

AVEC LE CONCOURS
DU CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE