

# A Short Note on the So-called Conjugation IIm in Achaemenid Elamite

by SALMAN ALIYARI BABOLGHANI

In analogia con l'interpretazione ampiamente accettata della forma elamita del congiuntivo II (k-conj.) come indicante tempo passato, anche la forma AE del congiuntivo IIm è considerata una forma del passato. Mentre la funzione precisa e il significato di questa forma rimangono dibattuti, questa breve nota si concentra sull'uso del congiuntivo IIm nelle iscrizioni reali acheemenidi, sottolineando che il congiuntivo IIm (o almeno la sua 3a persona sg., che è l'unica forma attestata in queste iscrizioni) differisce dal congiuntivo II nel rappresentare un tempo presente e probabilmente una voce attiva.

Vengono esaminate diverse interpretazioni di passi AE contenenti la forma in questione, anche sulla base di alcuni frammenti iscrizionali inediti.

In analogy to the widely accepted interpretation of the Elamite conj. II (k-conj.) form as a past tense, the AE form of the conj. IIm is also assumed a past form. While the precise function and meaning of this form remain debated, this short note focuses on the usage of the conj. IIm in Achaemenid royal inscriptions emphasizing that AE conj. IIm (or at least its 3<sup>rd</sup> sg., which is the only form attested in these inscriptions) differs from conj. II in representing a present tense and probably an active voice.

Several interpretations of AE passages containing the questioned form are reviewed, also on the basis of some unpublished inscriptional fragments.

It is widely accepted that conj. II (k-conj.) in Elamite functions as a past tense,<sup>1</sup> and accordingly, the conj. IIm in Achaemenid Elamite (AE) is also assumed a past form. Despite many investigations, none of the suggested interpretations of the *m*-conj.<sup>2</sup> is fully satisfactory, and the precise function and meaning of these forms remain unclear. I do not intend to dwell upon this issue in this short note. Instead, I will focus on the usage of the conj. IIm in Achaemenid royal inscriptions (ARI) and would only like to emphasize that AE conj. IIm (or at least its 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. which is attested in ARI) differs from conj. II in representing a present tense and probably an active voice.

As can be observed in the following instances,<sup>3</sup> (1) AE conj. IIm forms occur in correspondence with Old Persian (OP) verbs in the present tense (cf. AE and OP words in **bold**); (2) they can occur in parallel clauses (linked by coordinating conjunctions) to AE conj. III verbs that represent present (or non-past) tenses (cf. underlined words).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. e.g. Stolper 2004: 80 and references.

<sup>2</sup> Some of them are listed in Stolper 2004: 80.

<sup>3</sup> The ARI quoted or referred to here are based on the following sources: DARIOSH-Louvre Project (in progress) for Susa/OP, AE, AB; Aliyari Babolghani 1394/2015 for DB/AE; Schmitt 2009 for the other ARI/OP; Vallat 1977 and Quintana 2014 (online) for the other ARI/AE.