

ÖSTERREICHISCHE AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN
PHILOSOPHISCH-HISTORISCHE KLASSE
SITZUNGSBERICHTE, 849. BAND

VERÖFFENTLICHUNGEN ZUR IRANISTIK
HERAUSGEGEBEN VON BERT G. FRAGNER UND VELIZAR SADOVSKI

NR. 60

TOSHIFUMI GOTŌ

OLD INDO-ARYAN MORPHOLOGY
AND ITS INDO-IRANIAN BACKGROUND

in co-operation with

Jared S. Klein and Velizar Sadovski

Verlag der
Österreichischen Akademie
der Wissenschaften



Wien 2013

OAW

Vorgelegt von w. M. BERT G. FRAGNER
in der Sitzung am 1. Oktober 2010

Diese Publikation wurde einem anonymen, internationalen
peer-review Verfahren unterzogen.

This publication had been anonymously reviewed by international peers.

Die verwendete Papiersorte ist aus chlorfrei gebleichtem Zellstoff hergestellt,
frei von säurebildenden Bestandteilen und alterungsbeständig.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

ISBN 978-3-7001-6948-2

Copyright © 2013 by
Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Wien

Druck und Bindung:
Prime Rate kft., Budapest

Printed and bound in the EU

<http://hw.oeaw.ac.at/6948-2>
<http://verlag.oeaw.ac.at>

Old Indo-Aryan morphology and its Indo-Iranian background

Toshifumi Gotō

Dem Andenken

KARL HOFFMANNS 26.2.1915 – 21.5.1996 und

MANFRED MAYRHOFERS 26.9.1926 – 31.10.2011

Recently I had occasion to write a short contribution on the morphology of Old Indo-Aryan for a handbook of historical linguistics. I soon recognized, however, that we lack an up-to-date summary on the subject, so I expanded my manuscript. My colleague Velizar Sadoovski examined my rough draft on my visit to Vienna in September 2009 and suggested to me that I should write a booklet including more thorough-going references to the preceding Indo-Iranian stage. The present monograph is the result. It is admittedly only a sketch, which is to be revised and enlarged with corrections and completions, especially with regard to recent researches in this field. I hope it serves nevertheless as a basis for future studies.

I have put in this work many items of material and method I have learned from my teacher Karl Hoffmann, to whom I express my deepest respect, in Erlangen between 1977 and 1985, in those good days. This book is thus an “Erlangen program” of the eighties summarised from my perspective. Writing these lines, I remember Hoffmann’s words that one should have the courage to fail in order to bring advances to our discipline. My teacher seems to have had for himself too little courage, but I venture it. I owe my scholarly training in Erlangen also to Gert Klingenschmitt and other colleagues. I express my sincere thanks to them.

We have today a fundamental grammar of Avestan, which describes, so to speak, (Proto-)Indo-Iranian from the Avestan side: *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre* by Karl HOFFMANN and Bernhard FORSSMAN, Innsbruck 1996, ²2004. So, I may begin with Old Indo-Aryan.

Indo-European comparative grammar is important not only for philology and linguistics, but it is of fundamental importance for understanding human history as a whole and our position today in the “global” world. I try to trace word forms back to Proto-Indo-Iranian

and to Proto-Indo-European. Many books have accompanied my work: among others, Manfred MAYRHOFER, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, I–III, Heidelberg 1992–2001, and Helmut RIX, *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*, Darmstadt 1976. I feel proud in going forward together with them.

May this booklet be of benefit for Vedic and Sanskrit philologists, Iranists, scholars of Indo-European studies, and those who are interested in language. I am indebted to Velizar Sadovski for his valuable advice and friendship. I should like to record my sincere thanks to Professor Dr. Manfred Mayrhofer, who also helped me with my first publication in the Austrian Academy of Sciences. Taking this occasion I extend my thanks to the following Professors and Doctors for their help and encouragement: above all, to my teacher Johanna Narten and Erlangen seniors Heiner Eichner, Bernhard Forssman, Rosemarie Lühr, Norbert Oettinger, Eva Tichy, and Michael Witzel, as well as to my colleagues and friends, Rahul Peter Das, George Dunkel, Harry Falk, José Luis García Ramón, Jost Gippert, Olav Hackstein, Jón Axel Hardarson, Heinrich Hettrich, Jean Kellens, Jared S. Klein, Thomas Krisch, Leonid Kulikov, Martin Joachim Kümmel, Beda Künzle, Reiner Lipp, Alexander M. Lubotsky, Michael Meier-Brügger, Gerhard Meiser, Thomas Oberlies, Georges-Jean Pinault, Eric Pirart, Salvatore Scarlata, Christiane Schaefer, Rüdiger Schmitt, Günter Schweiger, Xavier Tremblay, Chlodwig H. Werba, Albrecht Wezler, Sabine Ziegler, the late Jochem Schindler and Ronald E. Emmerick, as well as my best colleague, Junko Sakamoto-Gotō, and many other persons whom I may have only accidentally forgotten to name. I am much obliged also to our younger colleagues and students.

Dr. Naoko Nishimura (Sendai) read my manuscript through and compiled indices with the assistance of Mr. Tomoki Yamada (M.A., Sendai). Mr. Jonathan Morris (M.A., Sendai) and Prof. Dr. James Tink (Tōhoku University, Sendai) kindly read and corrected my English. Prof. Dr. Toshiya Tanaka (Kyūshū University, Fukuoka) gave me important suggestions for improvement of the English. Mr. Takaaki Araiwa (Leipzig) helped me with information about Slavic languages. I am much obliged to them for their assistance.

Sendai, June 2010

My respected colleagues Jared Stephen Klein (University of Georgia at Athens), Velizar Sadovski (Austrian Academy of Sciences), Rüdiger Schmitt (Laboe), and Jost Gippert (Frankfurt a. M.) read my book manuscript through and corrected not only my poor English but also many shortcomings in the scholarly contents. For their kindly efforts, which saved my honour in many points, I express my sincere thanks. Drs. Sunao Kasamatsu and Junichi Ozono (Sendai) were kind enough to help me with the last revision of the indices.

Morioka/Vienna, December 2012

Table of contents

0.	general remarks	
0.1.	“dynamic” scheme of the inflexional paradigms	7
1.	nouns	
1.1.	nominal inflexion	8
1.1.1.	the endings (or terminations) of the thematic <i>-a-</i> stems	9
1.1.2.	the endings of athematic inflexions	11
1.1.3.	notes on the locative singular	14
1.2.	stem formations and ablaut	15
1.2.1.	root nouns, elemental vocabulary items, and some other monosyllabic stems	16
1.2.1.1.	root nouns ending in ° <i>ā-</i>	19
1.2.2.	<i>-ā-</i> suffix stems	20
1.2.3.	<i>-ī-</i> stem inflexions	21
1.2.4.	<i>-ū-</i> stem inflexions	23
1.2.5.	<i>-i-</i> and <i>-u-</i> stem inflexions	
1.2.5.1.	<i>-i-</i> stem inflexions	24
1.2.5.2.	<i>-u-</i> stem inflexions	26
1.2.5.3.	<i>rayí-</i> , <i>ví-</i> , <i>ávi-</i> , <i>arí-</i> , <i>páti-</i> , <i>sákhāy-</i> , Av. <i>kauuaiti-</i>	28
1.2.5.4.	<i>dāru-</i> , <i>jānu-</i> , <i>sānu-</i> , Av. <i>āiiu-</i> , <i>krātu-</i>	30
1.2.6.	stems in <i>-tar-/tr-/tṛ-</i> , <i>-ar-/r-/ṛ-</i> ; <i>nápāt-</i> , <i>nár-</i> , <i>stár-</i>	30
1.2.7.	neuter heteroclitics in <i>-ar-/r-/ṛ-</i> and <i>-an-/n-</i>	32
1.2.7.1.	<i>páruṣ-</i> , <i>párvaṇ-</i> , <i>dhānuṣ-</i> , <i>dhānvan-</i> , <i>uṣár-</i>	33
1.2.8.	suppletive inflexions for nouns of body-parts with <i>-i-</i> and <i>-an-/n-</i> ; <i>śíras-</i> , <i>yúṣ-</i> , <i>ās-</i> , <i>hárd-/hṛd-</i>	34
1.2.9.	<i>-as-</i> stems; <i>mās-</i> , <i>púmāms-</i> , <i>māmsá-</i>	35
1.2.9.1.	accent distribution, <i>ápas-</i> :: <i>apás-</i> , <i>bráhman-</i> :: <i>brahmán-</i>	37
1.2.9.2.	<i>-iṣ-</i> stems	37
1.2.9.3.	<i>-uṣ-</i> stems	37
1.2.10.	<i>-n-</i> stems: [1] hysterodynamic <i>*-én-</i> type, [2] amphidynamic (and proterodynamic) <i>*-on-</i> type, [3] <i>yíivan-</i> , <i>kanyā-</i>	38
1.2.11.	<i>-ín-</i> stems	43
1.2.12.	<i>pánthā-/path-/pathí-</i>	43
1.2.13.	stems in <i>-āñc-/ác-/-(ī)c-</i>	44

1.2.14.	[1] active participles with <i>-ánt-</i> / <i>-nt-</i> / <i>-at-</i> , [2] in thematic inflexions, [3] in acrodynamic and reduplicated inflexions; — <i>bṛhánt-</i> , <i>mahánt-</i> , <i>dánt-</i> , <i>járant-</i>	45
1.2.15.	<i>-vant-</i> / <i>-vat-</i> and <i>-mant-</i> / <i>-mat-</i> stems	47
1.2.16.	<i>-vāns-</i> / <i>-ús-</i> stems	47
1.3.	comparatives and superlatives	
1.3.1.	<i>-tara-</i> , <i>-tama-</i> ; <i>-ra-</i> , <i>-ma-</i>	48
1.3.2.	<i>-(ī)yāns-</i> / <i>-(ī)yas-</i> , <i>-iṣṭha-</i>	49
1.4.1.	motion suffixes: [1] <i>-ā-</i> , [2] <i>-ī-</i> ; <i>-nī-</i>	51
1.4.2.	<i>-ā-</i> :: <i>-ú-</i> , <i>-yā-</i> :: <i>-yú-</i> ; <i>-ká-</i> , <i>-ikā-</i>	53
1.4.3.	old vṛddhi-formations	53
1.4.4.	CALAND forms	54
1.4.5.	formant <i>-t-</i>	54
1.5.	nominal composition: [1] copulative, [2] endocentric, [2a] appositional compounds, [2b] determinative compounds, [3] exocentric, [4] other groups	55
2.1.	numerals	
2.1.1.	cardinals	60
2.1.2.	ordinals	62
2.1.3.	fractions	63
2.1.4.	other numeral adjectives and adverbs	64
2.2.	pronouns	
2.2.1.	personal pronouns	66
2.2.2.	demonstrative pronouns	67
2.2.3.	interrogative and indefinite pronouns	73
2.2.4.	relative pronouns	74
2.2.5.	possessive pronouns or adjectives	75
2.2.6.	reflexive expressions	75
2.2.7.	adjectives with pronominal forms	76
3.	verbs	
3.1.	general remarks	
3.1.1.	diathesis (active and middle)	79
3.1.2.	Aktionsart, Verhaltensart, and Rektionsart	81
3.1.3.	aspects, suppletion	81

3.1.4.	aspect stems; present stem formations	83
3.2.	endings	
3.2.1.	active endings	85
3.2.2.	middle endings	86
3.2.3.	PII endings	87
3.2.4.	PIE endings	88
3.3.	moods	
3.3.1.	indicative of present and aorist; imperfect; injunctive	89
3.3.2.	subjunctive	91
3.3.3.	optative, precative	92
3.3.4.	imperative	96
3.4.	present system	
3.4.1.	thematic present stems: [Th. 1]–[Th.7]	99
3.4.2.	athematic stems	
3.4.2.1.	athematic root stems [Ath. 1]	101
3.4.2.2.	“stative” forms [Ath. 1.1.]	101
3.4.2.3.	acrodynamic root-present [Ath. 2]	102
3.4.2.4.	reduplicated stems [Ath. 3]	103
3.4.2.5.	nasal presents [Ath. 4.1]–[Ath. 4.3]	104
3.5.	aorist system	
3.5.1.	athematic root-aorists	107
3.5.2.	thematic root-aorists	110
3.5.3.	reduplicated aorists	111
3.5.4.	sigmatic aorists: [1] -s-, [2] -iṣ-, [3] -siṣ-, [4] -sa- aor.	113
3.5.5.	medio-passive aorist forms	118
3.6.	perfect system	
3.6.1.	stem and ending	119
3.6.2.	moods (subjunctive, optative, imperative) of the perfect	121
3.6.3.	preterite of the perfect, injunctive perfect	122
3.6.4.	participles	122
3.6.5.	periphrastic perfects	123
3.7.	secondary present systems	
3.7.1.	future	123
3.7.1.1.	future II	124
3.7.2.	desiderative	125
3.7.3.	intensive	126
3.7.4.	causative	128

3.7.5.	passive	129
3.7.6.	denominative	130
3.8.	nominal and other formations from the verb	
3.8.1.	infinitives: [1] <i>-dhyai</i> , [2] <i>-e</i> , <i>-ai</i> , [3] <i>-tave</i> , <i>-tavai</i> , [4] <i>-táye</i> , [4.1] <i>-tyái</i> , [5] <i>-aye</i> , [6] <i>-ase</i> , <i>-se</i> , [7] <i>-mane</i> , [8] <i>-vane</i> ; [9] <i>-as</i> , [10] <i>-tos</i> ; [11] <i>-am</i> , [12] <i>-tum</i> ; [13] <i>-sáni</i>	132
3.8.2.	participles in <i>-ánt-</i> / <i>-nt-</i> / <i>-at-</i> ; <i>-māna-</i> , <i>-āná-</i> / <i>-āna-</i>	138
3.8.3.	verbal adjectives in <i>-tá-</i> , <i>-ná-</i> ; <i>-tá-vant-</i>	138
3.8.4.	gerundives: [1] <i>-ya-</i> , [2] <i>-āyīya-</i> , [3] <i>-enīya-</i> , <i>-enya-</i> , [4] <i>-tva-</i> , [5] <i>-tavyā-</i> (<i>-tavīya-</i>), [6] <i>-añīya-</i>	140
3.8.5.	gerunds (absolutives): [1] <i>-tvā</i> , [2] <i>-tvāya</i> , [3] <i>-tvī</i> , [4] <i>-yā</i> , [5] <i>-am</i>	141
3.9.	preverbs	144
4.	adverbs and indeclinables	
4.1.	adnominal prepositions	145
4.2.	adverbial suffixes: [1]–[12]	145
4.3.	adverbial case forms	147
4.4.	particles	149
4.5.	adverbial constructions	151
4.6.	interjections	152
	bibliography	153
	abbreviations	170
	symbols	171
	on sandhi and <i>ruki</i>	171
	on laryngeals; <i>seṭ</i>, <i>aniṭ</i>	172
	indices:	
	subjects and grammatical elements	173
	words and forms	181
	passages	220

0. The morphological elements of Old Indo-Aryan (language of *āryas*) [OIA] nouns, pronouns, and verbs are to a large extent inherited from Proto-Indo-European [PIE] through Proto-Indo-Iranian (Proto-Aryan) [PII], and agree with those of Old Iranian (Avestan [Av.] and Old Persian [OPers.]) very well. The oldest forms are represented in the language of the *R̥gveda* [RV] (ca. 1200 B.C.), then the *Atharvaveda* [AV] and other Vedic *mantras* (ca. 1000 B.C.–), mostly in verse. The prose occurs in the “*brāhmaṇa*”s of the *Yajurveda-Samhitās* (ca. 800 B.C.–), in the *Brāhmaṇas* (7th c. B.C.–), and the oldest *Upaniṣads* (6th–5th c. B.C.). The language of these Vedic texts is called “Vedic”, and is handed down for the most part in accented form. The succeeding development of OIA, to which the grammar of Pāṇini (ca. 380 B.C.) was applicable as the standard, is “Classical Sanskrit”. “Epic Sanskrit”, a somewhat more popular form, is used in the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*. Vedic, especially the language of the RV, is the major focus for reconstructing PII and for comparative and historical IE linguistics in general.

General references: MACDONELL Vedic Grammar (1910); WACKERNAGEL–DEBRUNER Altindische Grammatik [AiG] I–III (1896–1954); WHITNEY A Sanskrit Grammar (²1889); RENOU Grammaire sanscrite (1930, ²1961). — HOFFMANN–FORSSMAN Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre (1996); RIX Historische Grammatik des Griechischen (1976). — HOFFMANN Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik I–III (1975, 1976, 1992); NARTEN Kleine Schriften I (1995). — BÖHTLINGK–ROTH Sanskrit-Wörterbuch [PW] (1855–1875); VISHVA BANDHU ŚĀSTRĪ A Vedic Word-Concordance [VWC] (1942–1976); GRASSMANN Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda (1872–1885); MAYRHOFFER Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoirischen [EWAia] I–III ([1986/]1992–2001).

0.1. We begin by introducing some terminology regarding the ablaut scheme in a paradigm.¹⁾ The term “dynamic” refers to a pattern in which the syllable having an accented **-e*-vocalism appears (in $\square$; other elements show an unaccented zero grade or **-o*- grade). The dynamic scheme starts from the standard that a

¹⁾ Cf. PEDERSEN La cinquième déclinaison latine (København 1926); KURYLOWICZ Études indoeuropéennes (Kraków 1935) 131ff.; KUIPER Notes on Vedic Noun-Inflexion (Amsterdam 1942); EICHNER MSS 31 (1973) 91, Sprache 20 (1974) 26ff. (bibliography in 27 n. 1); SCHINDLER Sprache 13 (1967) 191ff., 15 (1969) 144ff., 19 (1973) 148–157, KZ 81 (1967) 290ff., BSL 67 (1972) 31–38, 70 (1975) 1–10, Flexion und Wortbildung (1975) 259ff.; NARTEN Fs. Kuiper (1968) 9–19 = Kl. Schr. 97–107; BEEKES KZ 86 (1972) 30–63, KZ 87 (1973) 86–98; HOFFMANN Aufs. II (1976) 597ff., KLINGENSCHMITT KZ 92 (1978) 1–13 = Aufs. 159–169 (“prototon”), Altarm. Verbum (1982) 289 (“rhizoton”); RIX MSS 18 (1965) 79–92, Hist. Gramm. 123; STRUNK Grammatische Kategorien (VII. Fachtagung), 1985, 490–514; SZEMERÉNYI Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft³ (Darmstadt 1989) 170f.

word consists of three syllabic elements A-B-C, which correspond in most cases to root-suffix-ending. A formation without suffix (root-ending), as in the root nouns, inj. of the athemat. root pres. or aor., is regarded as B-C, observed from the end. The “strong form” in a paradigm (e.g., nom. sg. in nouns) has *-é- in A or B; the “weak form” (e.g., an oblique case) in A, B, or C; the place of *-é- in a weak form does not go back beyond that of the strong form:²⁾

acrodynamic: in strong forms	$\boxed{A}$ -B-C,	in weak forms	$\boxed{A}$ -B-C
proterodynamic:	$\boxed{A}$ -B-C,		A- $\boxed{B}$ -C
amphidynamic:	$\boxed{A}$ -B-C,		A-B- $\boxed{C}$,
hysterodynamic:	A- $\boxed{B}$ -C,		A-B- $\boxed{C}$.

The reconstructed endings, however, do not have a complete variety of ablaut grades, but some endings can only be reconstructed with a full-grade (e.g., dat. sg. *-eġ, nom. pl. *-es), or zero-grade form (e.g., acc. pl. *-ṛns, *-ns).

1. nouns

Like PIE and other old languages, OIA distinguishes three genders: masculine [m.], feminine [f.], and neuter [n.]. Nouns consist of substantives [subst.] and adjectives [adj.]. The adj.s are declinable in three genders. Words designating male and female beings are m. and f. respectively. There are some motion suffixes inherited from PIE, e.g., -ā- < *-é-h₂-, -yā-/ī- < *-jéh₂-/-ih₂-, cf. also -h₂- in -u-h₂- (1.4.1.). Inanimate objects and concepts are m., f., or n., largely depending on their word-formation, i.e. the suffix. Words for trees are m. (: vrkṣá- m. ‘tree’), herbs are f. (: óṣadhi- f.), and fruits n. (: phála- n.). Animals are represented either by a m. (śván- ‘dog’ < *k_uén- :: śunī- ‘she-dog’, haṁsá- ‘goose, gander’) or a f. (gáv- ‘cow’ and ‘cattle’ < *g^wóu-, there are many terms for each kind of cattle according to gender, age, and use). OIA has three numbers: singular [sg.], dual [du.], and plural [pl.]. The du. is used to refer to two persons or objects in general, not restricted to forming a pair. Eight cases are used: nominative [nom.] for the subject, vocative [voc.] for addressing a person (or thing), accusative [acc.] for the direct object, dative [dat.] for the indirect object or aim, genitive [gen.] to indicate possession or part, instrumental [instr.] for means or association, ablative [abl.] to indicate separation, and locative [loc.] to indicate location.

1.1. The basis of the nominal inflexion (declension)³⁾ is the nominal stem, which carries the lexical meaning, and is in most cases with substantive nouns bound to one of the genders, at least originally. Every inflected form terminates

²⁾ Concerning the accent place, one can speak of acro-static, protero-kinetic, etc.

³⁾ Cf. LANMAN JAOS 10 (1872–1880) 325–601, AiG III (1930).

with an ending (“case ending”), which indicates number, case, and in part, gender. Nominal paradigms belong to one of two inflectional types: thematic and athematic, depending on whether or not a vowel *-a-* (PIE **-e/o-*) precedes the endings. The former type secondarily spreads to some forms, especially in “vowel stems”. Neuter nouns are inflected like masculines except that they have different endings in the nom. = acc. for all three numbers.

1.1.1. The **endings** (or terminations, *Ausgänge*, i.e. the ending fused together with the final part of the stem) **of the thematic *-a-* stems** are:⁴⁾

In the **singular**,

nom., m. °*as* < PII **-as* < PIE **-o-s*,

voc. °*a* < **-a* < **-e* (i.e. **-e* + Ø)

acc. °*am* < **-am* < **-o-m*,

nom. acc. n. °*am* < **-am* < **-o-m*,

instr. °*ā* < **-ā* < **-e-h₁*, but usually replaced by pronominal °*ena*^{4a)} < **-a₁nā* (cf. 2.2.2. [4]: p. 71),^{4b)}

dat. °*āya* < **ā₁ia* (remodelled in PII after gen. **-as₁ia*, cf. WACKERNAGEL Kl. Schr. 274f.; OAv. *-āi.ā*, *-āiīā* beside OAv. YAv. °*āi* < PII **-āi* < PIE **-o-e₁*),

abl. °*āt*⁵⁾ < **-āt*, **-aat*⁶⁾ < **-o-at/d⁷⁾*, **-o-h₂et/d*, or **-o-et/d(?)*,

gen. °*asya* < **-as₁ia* < **-o-s₁io* (beside **-o-so*, not continued in Indo-Iran.),

loc. °*e* < **-a₁i*⁸⁾ < **-o-₁i*;

⁴⁾ Some elements in the thematic inflexion are common to those in the pronominal inflexion.

^{4a)} Also *-enā*, cf. LANMAN 332, MACDONELL 256f., AiG III 92.

^{4b)} Only the forms in *-ā* < **-ā* occur in OIran. On relics in *-ā* in OIA (espec. in the n.; only uncertain examples are found in the prose; forms in *-ā* appear in older layers in Pāli beside *-ena*), cf. LANMAN 331ff. (espec. 334f.), MACDONELL 257. Cf. AiG III 90–92.

⁵⁾ Disyllabic *-aāt* (*-aat*) probably in *parākaāt* RV I 30,21, VIII 5,31, X 22,6, *antārikṣaāt* X 158,1, *sadāsthāāt* VIII 11,7; according to LANMAN 337f., however, “extremely doubtful”.

⁶⁾ Av. °*ā₁*, OPers. °*ā* (< **-ā₁*), unified with postposition *-ā* in YAv. *xšaθrāda* beside *xšaθ-rā₁* ‘from the dominion’; with *-cā*: *āat-cā* < **aāt-ca* in OAv. *ašāat-cā*, YAv. *yasnāat-cā* ‘from the worship’, furthermore, OAv. *ašāat-hacā* ‘on the basis of law’, and with shortening in the third-last syllable YAv. *nmāna₁t-hacā* ‘from house’, cf. HOFFMANN–FORSSMAN 119.

⁷⁾ Cf. STANG Vergleichende Grammatik der Baltischen Sprachen (1966) 128, DUNKEL Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie, Akten Leiden (1992) 175 with n. 91.

⁸⁾ OAv. °*ōi*, °*e*, °*aē-cā*, YAv. °*e*, °*aē-ca*, OPers. °*aiy*; unified with postposition *-ā*: OAv. *xšaθrōi.ā*, *akōiīā* ‘in bad...’, YAv. *Vo^hrukašaiīa*, *zastaiīa*, OPers. *dastayā* (cf. Ved. *hāsta ā* ‘on the hand’), cf. HOFFMANN–FORSSMAN 119.

in the **dual**,

nom. voc. acc. m. $^{\circ}\bar{a}^{9)}$ < PII $^{*}\bar{a}$ < PIE $^{*}o-h_1$, $^{\circ}au$ < $^{*}\bar{a} + ^{*}u$ (only in OIA),

nom. acc. n. $^{\circ}e$ < $^{*}a_i^{10)}$ < $^{*}o-ih_1$,

instr. dat. abl. $^{\circ}\bar{a}bhy\bar{a}m$ instead of $^{*}ebhy^{\circ}$ < PII $^{*}a_i b^h i \bar{a}^{11)}$, + $^{*}m/-am$,¹²⁾

gen. loc. $^{\circ}ayos$: a blend of PII gen. $^{*}a_{i\bar{i}}\bar{a}s^{13)}$ < $^{*}o_i-h_1\bar{o}s$ and loc. $^{*}a_{i\bar{i}}au^{14)}$ < $^{*}o_i-h_1ou^{15)}$;

in the **plural**,

nom. voc. m. $^{\circ}\bar{a}s$ < $^{*}o-es^{16)}$,

acc. $^{\circ}\bar{a}n^{17)}$ (with long $\bar{a}$ introduced from the nom. $^{\circ}\bar{a}s$; PII $^{*}ans^{18)}$ < PIE $^{*}o-ns$ < Pre-PIE $^{**}o-m-s$),

nom. acc. n. $^{\circ}\bar{a}$, $^{\circ}\bar{a}ni^{19)}$ < PIE $^{*}\bar{a}$ < $^{*}e-h_2$ (collective),

⁹⁾ Also $-a$ in the voc., especially in nouns referring to Mitra and Varuṇa, cf. AiG III 53. [Cf. KUIPER Shortening (1955).]

¹⁰⁾ OAv. $^{\circ}oi$, YAv. $^{\circ}e$. The form $^{*}a_i$ is postulated in the OIA “pragṛhya”-sandhi of $-e$ (FORSSMAN MSS 25, 1969, 49 n. 11), cf. also n. 27.

¹¹⁾ OAv. $^{\circ}oibii\bar{a}$, YAv. $^{\circ}aēbiia$, OPers. $^{\circ}aibi\bar{y}\bar{a}$ preserve the old formation $^{*}o_i-b^h i^{\circ}$. In OIA, $-\bar{a}$ in the nom. voc. acc. is assumed to be introduced in place of $-a_i$, thus also YAv. forms in $^{\circ}\bar{a}biia$ (HOFFMANN Aufs. 55 n. 7).

¹²⁾ One assumes generally $^{\circ}\bar{a}bhy\bar{a}m$ in the case of a few trisyllabic forms (cf. LANMAN 343f.), but $^{\circ}\bar{a}bhy\bar{a}m$ (i.e. $^{\circ}\bar{a}bhyaam$) is equally possible. It seems that no trisyllabic form is found in athematic inflexions. A PIE form can be reconstructed without complete certainty: $^{*}o_i-b^h i-m$ or $^{*}o_i-b^h i-eh_1$ (?), cf. RIX Hist. Gramm. 141.

¹³⁾ OAv. $qsauii\bar{a}$ ‘of both parties’, YAv. $vīrauii\bar{a}$ ‘of both men’, and numeral $duuuii\bar{a}$ ‘of two’, $uuuii\bar{a}$ ‘of both’ (HOFFMANN–FORSSMAN 120).

¹⁴⁾ OAv. $zastaii\bar{o}$ ‘in both hands’, $ubōi\bar{o}$, YAv. $^{+}uuaii\bar{o}$ ‘in both’ (loc. cit.).

¹⁵⁾ About gen. and loc. du. in PIE cf. HOFFMANN Aufs. 561 n. 2, 599 n. 14, LINDEMAN NTS 26 (1972) 231, Triple representation (1982) 31 n. 23, LÜHR MSS 35 (1977) 84 n. 3.

¹⁶⁾ Collective $^{\circ}\bar{a}$ < $^{*}e-h_2$ was generalised in the thematic inflexion in Iranian as in Pāli. Ved., OAv., YAv., and Pāli have also hyper-marked forms in $^{\circ}\bar{a}sas$ (< $^{*}\bar{a}s-as$) beside $^{\circ}\bar{a}s$ or $^{\circ}\bar{a}$. Such forms occur also in the $-\bar{a}$ -stems (p. 21), and in $pānthāsas$ ‘ways’ (p. 44)[; also $aniyāha bagāha$ ‘the other gods’ in OPers., cf. KENT §10, §172, SCHMITT Fs. Eilers 265ff.]

¹⁷⁾ And $^{*}\bar{a}ns$ in the sandhi-form $^{\circ}\bar{a}niś$ ca. Cf. n. 31.

¹⁸⁾ In OAv. $^{\circ}\bar{a}ng$, $^{\circ}q\bar{s}-c\bar{a}$, YAv. $^{\circ}q\bar{s}$, $^{\circ}q\bar{s}-ca$ (and variant forms $^{\circ}\bar{a}$, $^{\circ}\bar{a}s-ca$) < $^{*}ans$ (cf. HOFFMANN–FORSSMAN 66: §35hc, 88: §54d). OPers. $^{\circ}\bar{a}$ seems to go back to $^{*}\bar{a}ns$ as in OIA, judging from the fact that the final $-a$ caused by the loss of a consonant (t , n , h) preserves its quantity (HOFFMANN Aufs. 634).

¹⁹⁾ Later (Vedic prose +) only $^{\circ}\bar{a}ni$ which is formed probably after $-n$ -stems, e.g. $nāmā :: nāmāni$ ‘names’ (cf. p. 41). No form with short $-a$ is reported. In Iranian only $-\bar{a}$ (in YAv. regularly to $-a$, in OPers. only $\bar{a}yadan\bar{a}$).

instr. $^{\circ}ais < *-\bar{a}i\check{s} < *-\bar{o}i\check{s}$ ²⁰,
dat. abl. $^{\circ}ebhyas < *-\bar{a}i-b^hi\check{s}$ ²¹,
gen. $^{\circ}\bar{a}n\bar{a}m$ (also $^{\circ}\bar{a}n_oam / ^{\circ}\bar{a}naam$) $< *-\bar{a}n\bar{a}m / -\bar{a}naam$ ²² $< *-\bar{o}-om$,
loc. $^{\circ}e\check{s}u < *-\bar{a}i\check{s}u$ ²³ $< *-\bar{o}i\check{s}u$.

Many nouns have this thematic inflexion, e.g., *devá-* ‘heavenly; god’: *devás*, *deva*, *devám*, *devéna* (also *devénā*, *devā*), *devât*, *devāya*, *devásya*, *devé*; *devā* or *deváu*, *devābhyām*, *deváyos*; *devás* (also *devásas*), *devās* (also *devāsas*), *devân*, *deváis* (also *devébhis*), *devébhyas*, *devânām*, *devēsu*.

1.1.2. Other inflexions are characterised by the same set of endings:

In the **singular**,

nom., m. f. $-s < \text{PII, PIE } *-s, \text{ or } -\emptyset$ (in the case of long-grade stems),
voc. $-\emptyset$,
acc. m. f. $-m, -am < *-m, *-m$,
nom. acc. n. $-\emptyset$,
instr.²⁴ $-\bar{a}$, or lengthening of preceding vowel $< *-\bar{a}, *-H < *-eh_1, *-h_1$,

²⁰ In the RV and other mantra text portions also $^{\circ}ebhis$ (cf., e.g. $-\bar{a}-bhis$ in f. $-\bar{a}$ - stem) as in the pronom. inflexion, e.g. $^{\circ}tébhis$ (RV and other mantras) beside $^{\circ}táis$ (AV+, however, cf. OAv. $tāiš$, Grk. $toĩ\check{s} < *tōi\check{s}$). Cf. also Pāli $^{\circ}ehi$.

²¹ Probably PIE $*-o-mo-s$ crossed with instr. $*-o-b^hi(-s)$.

²² OPers. $^{\circ}\bar{a}n\bar{a}m$, but OAv. YAv. $^{\circ}anqm$ with short a before $^{\circ}n\bar{a}m$ (also in the $-\bar{a}$ - inflexion; for the explanation cf. HOFFMANN–FORSSMAN 60: §26bd. There are two exceptions YAv. $ma\check{s}ii\bar{a}nqm$ ‘of men, people’ and $^{\circ}n\bar{a}nqm$ ($^{\circ}n\bar{a}-/g^{\circ}n\bar{a}-$ ‘woman’); the former could be interpreted as avoiding three short syllables (SAUSSURE–WACKERNAGEL’s law, cf. AiG I, Nachtr. 177 on 313,42) from $*m\bar{a}rtiyana\check{a}m$ (the final $^{\circ}qm$ is scanned almost consistently disyllabically, thus $< *-\bar{a}na\check{a}m$), but there are also contra-examples. The termination in PIE is $*-\bar{o}m < *-\bar{o}-om$ (cf. n. 36). In Indo-Iranian, the formant $-\bar{n}\bar{a}m$ is introduced in the ‘vowel stems’ as $^{\circ}Vn\bar{a}m$: YAv. $ga'r\bar{i}n\bar{a}m$ = Ved. $gir\bar{i}n\bar{a}m$ ‘of mountains’, OAv. $vo\check{h}unqm$ = Ved. $v\bar{a}s\bar{u}n\bar{a}m$ ‘of good...’, YAv. $tanunqm$ = Ved. $tan\bar{u}n\bar{a}m$ ‘of bodies’, $-\bar{i}-n\bar{a}m$, $y\bar{a}tu-j\bar{u}n\bar{a}m$ ‘of the ones urged by sorcery’ beside $j\bar{o}guv-\bar{a}m$ ‘of the ones who are jubilating’, etc. The disyllabic $-naam$ is known a few times in $-\bar{a}$ - stems, and more than ten times in $-i$ - stems (MACDONELL 267, 287). The precise process of this development is unknown, cf. n. 36. The alleged Vedic forms with $^{\circ}\bar{a}m$ (such as $dev\bar{a}m$; candidates in ib. 262) are all uncertain.

²³ OAv. $-a\check{e}š\bar{u}$, YAv. $-a\check{e}š\bar{u}$, and unified with postposition $-\bar{a}$: YAv. $rao\check{d}a\check{e}š\bar{u}ua$, OPers. $M\bar{a}daišuv\bar{a}$.

²⁴ Indo-Iranian has generalised the ending $*-eh_1$ (originally in the amphi- or hysterodynamic type). The ending $*-h_1$, which must have been generated as an ablaut variant in the acro- and proterodynamic types, is preserved in Vedic $-i$ - stems ($\bar{u}t\bar{i}$, $c\bar{i}t\bar{i}$, $\acute{a}c\bar{i}t\bar{i}$, etc., and with $-i$, originally from a pre-vocalic position with loss of h_1 , e.g. $su\check{v}r\check{k}t\bar{i}$ ‘through good praising’, cf. LANMAN 380f., MACDONELL 281), and Avestan $-i$ - and $-u$ - stems (cf. n. 75, n. 79): OAv.

in the plural,

nom. voc. m. f. *-as* < **-as*³⁰ < **-es*,

acc. m. f. *-as/-n(s)*³¹ < **-as*/**-ns* < **-ns*³²/**-ns* (< ***-ms*),

nom. acc. n. *-i, -Ø* (with or without lengthening of preceding vowel) < **-h₂* (collective),³³

instr. *-bhis* < **-b^{hi}iš*³⁴ < **-b^{hi}i(-s)*,

dat. abl. *-bhyas* < **-b^{hi}ias*³⁵ < **-b^{hi}ios*/**-b^{hi}os*/**-mos* (see n. 21),

gen. *-ām, -_aam, -nām, -n_aam* < **-ām, -aam, -nām, -naam*³⁶ < **-om, *-oom*,

of existence'. YAv. *uruuaraiiā-* (*uruuarā-* 'plant') is attested both in the loc. and gen. Cf. n. 13–15.

³⁰) > Av. *-ō*, OPers. *-a*.

³¹) *-ns* in the sandhi-form, e.g. *-mīs ca*. Cf. n. 17, n. 76, n. 91.

³²) Hitt. *-us* suggests that **-ns* had not been assimilated to **-ns*.

³³) In Iranian: 1) with lengthening of the suffix-vowel: *-ū* (OAv. *po^urū, vohū* = Ved. *purū* 'many', *vásū* 'good' HO[FFMANN–]FO[RSSMAN] 131, Ved. knows also the type *mádhū* and secondary *mádhūni* 'honey, mead', later also 'sweet'), *-ī* (YAv. *zaraθuštri* 'Zoroastrian', cf. Ved. *śúcī*, HOFO 135, Ved. also type *bhūrī* and *bhūrīni* 'much'); — 2) with long suffix-syllable going back to the PIE long-grade in the collective formation: **-mān* (OAv. *an-ašmān* 'benefits', *dāmān, dāmān* 'territories, creatures', *nāmān* 'names', *var³dāmān* 'aids', *hax³mān* 'followers', YAv. *dumāmān* 'clouds', HOFO 144), **-uānt* (OAv. *mīždauuān* 'having reward', HOFO 150), *-ār* (OAv. *aiiār³* 'days', *sax³ār³* 'achievements', HOFO 153), **-ān* (YAv. *aiiān* 'days', *ruθβān, ruθβān-ca* 'entrails', HOFO 153), **-ās* (OAv. YAv. *manā* 'thinking, minds', YAv. *manās-ca*, OAv. YAv. *raocā, OAv. raocās-cā* 'lights', YAv. *vañhās-ca* 'better ones', HOFO 155); — 3) with no markers **-uant* (OAv. *rōiθβān?* 'joining in', HOFO 150), *-iš* (YAv. *x³ā.bar³ziš* 'being one's own cushion', *x³ā.sta³riš* 'being one's own lair, bed', HOFO 157), cf. Ved. *dirghaśrūt* 'to be heard at a long distance' (VII 61,2, VIII 25,17, cf. SCARLATA 555); — 4) with *-i*, added to forms of type 2): Av. *ašmānī* 'shortcomings', YAv. *cinmāni* 'desires' (HOFO 144); OAv. *var³cā.hī-cā* 'abilities' (HOFO 155); added to forms with the full-grade suffix: YAv. *baēuani* 'tens of thousands', OAv. *sāx³ēnī* 'instructions' (HOFO 153), as well as YAv. *ast-i* (HOFO 140). No form is attested in OPers., on *taumanī* 'powers' cf. HOFO 144: dual.

In Ved., in addition to *mádhū/mádhū/mádhūni* etc., *bhūrī/bhūrī/bhūrīni* etc., and *dirghaśrūt: sánti* (participle of *as* 'be'), *mahánti* 'great', *ghṛtāvānti* 'equipped with butter-oil', *paśu-mānti* 'having cattle'; *akṣāni* 'eyes', *áhāni* 'days', etc. beside *áhā, śīrṣā* 'heads', *kármāni/ kármā/kárma* 'deeds' etc., *dhánvāni/dhánva* 'steppes', *párvāni/párva* 'joints' (*párvā* AV), *bṛhánti* 'high' (AV), etc.; with a secondary nasal *arcīmṣi* 'flames', *āyūmṣi* 'lives', *vácāmṣi* 'words' etc., and *návyāmṣi* 'newer'. Cf. p. 41f. [Cf. KUIPER Shortening (1955).]

³⁴) Av. *-biš*, OPers. *-biš*.

³⁵) Av. *-biiō*. Cf. n. 21.

³⁶) The distribution *-ām, -aam* after consonants, and *-nām, -naam* after sonants ('vowel

loc. $-su < *{-su}^{37}) < *{-su}$.

1.1.3. notes on the locative singular

There is a variety of forms in the locative singular in Indo-Iranian athematic inflexions. In the case of stems without ablaut, $-i$ is simply added in general (in Iranian, the form is not seldom unified with postposition $\bar{a}$), e.g., the $-t$ - stem, OAv. *amər^atāⁱtī* ‘in immortality’, Ved. *uparātātī* ‘in superiority’, <with $-\bar{a}$ > YAv. *uštātāⁱtiia* ‘in desire’; the $*-as$ - stem, YAv. *manahi* = Ved. *mānasi* ‘in thinking’ OAv. *yāhī*, YAv. *yāhi* ‘in request’, OAv. *srauuahī* = Ved. *śrávasi* ‘in fame’, <with $-\bar{a}$ > OPers. *drayahayā* ‘in a lake’; the $*-iś$ - stem, YAv. *vīθišī* ‘in trial’, Ved. *barhīši* ‘on ritual grass’; the radical $-r$ - stem, <+ $-i$ > OAv. *sa^rrī*, YAv. *sa^rri* ‘in union’, Ved. *dhurī* ‘on a yoke-saddle’, *purī* ‘in a palisade’; the radical $*-é$ - stem, YAv. *vīsi* = Ved. *viśī*, <with $-\bar{a}$ > YAv. *vīsiia*, OPers. *viθiyā* ‘in a settlement’. Otherwise, see the ablaut-scheme in the following overview:

(1) Suffix in the long grade: the $-u$ - stem³⁸⁾, PII $*-āu$, OAv. YAv. *vañhāu* = Ved. *vásau*, OAv. $^{+}xratāu$ ($^{+}x-ā$), $^{+}pər^{a}tāu$ ($^{+}p-ā$) ‘at a ford’, Ved. *krátau* ‘in mental power’, *sánitau* ‘in acquisition’, *sānau* ‘on a summit, back’, (radical) *mitá-drau* ‘in running solidly(?)’; — the $-i$ - stem, PII $*-ā < \text{PIE } *-ē(i)$, OAv. *gər^azďā* ‘in a step’, YAv. *gara*, Ved. *giráu* ($-\ddot{a} + u$ of secondary origin) ‘in a mountain’, *śúcā*, *śúcau* ‘in purely bright ...’.

(2) Long grade in the stem: the radical om - stem, OAv. *dqm*, <+ $-i$ > *dqmi* ‘in a house’; the radical oā - stem <+ $-i$ > OAv. *ā-dāi* (with disyllabic *āi*) ‘at the endowment(?)’ Y 33,11 < $*^oāH-i$ (also possible: < $*^oaH-ai$, or $*^oaH-i$ with analogic $\bar{a}$, so HOFFMANN–FORSSMAN 124).

(3) Suffix in the full grade (mostly PIE $*-e$): the $-u$ - stem³⁸⁾, OAv. *pər^atō* ‘at a ford’, YAv. *añhuuō* ‘in existence’, *dañhō*, *dañhuuō* (< $*dahīau$) ‘in a land’, *vaštō* ‘in desire’, *šātō* ‘in peace’, *haētō* ‘on a bridge’, *həntō* ‘in gain’, OPers. *Margauv*, <with $-\bar{a}$ > YAv. *añhauua* (< $*añhau-ā$), *dañhauua*, OPers. *dahayauvā*, <+ $-i$ > Ved. *dásyavi* ‘in the Dasyu, enemy’, *sānavi* ‘on a summit, back’; — the $-an$ -,

stems”) has originated in PII, cf. also n. 22. The question as to whether the disyllabic ending in PIE should be interpreted as a replacement by the thematic termination, or there was a special disyllabic ending, is still open.

³⁷⁾ OAv. $-hū$, YAv. $-hu$, and its *ruki*-variant $-šū$, $-šu$. Unified with postposition $-\bar{a}$ in YAv. *gaēθāhuua* ‘among living beings’, *bar^aθrišuua* ‘among mothers’, *pasuš.huua* (< $*pasu-šu-ā$) ‘among cattle’, $^{+}var^{a}šuua$ ‘in citadels’, *dāmahuua* ‘among creatures’, $^{+}ruθβō.huua$ ‘in entrails’, *raocōhuua* ‘in lights’, *ušahuua* ‘at dawns’, and OPers. *maškāuvā* ‘in skins’, *aniyāuvā* ‘among the others’, *dahayūšuvā* ‘in lands, provinces’.

³⁸⁾ The loc. sg. forms attested in the manuscripts of some Av. $-u$ - stems are collected in SKJERVØ Gs. MacKenzie (2005) 197ff.

-man-, *-uan-* stem, $\langle \pm -i \rangle$ Ved. *rājan(i)*, (to the zero-grade stem: *rājñi* etc. ŚB+) ‘in, at a king’; OAv. *ānmānī* ‘on breath’, *cašma’nī* ‘in sight’, Ved. *(ā)tmān(i)*, ‘in one’s self’, *ásman(i)* ‘on a rock’, (zero grade: *lómni* ‘in hair’ etc. AV+); *ádhan(i)* ‘in a way’, $\langle$ with *-ā* $\rangle$ YAv. *+ašauuaniia* ‘righteous’ ($\sim$ Ved. *ṛtāvani*); the *-ant-*, *-uant-* stem, $\langle + -i \rangle$ YAv. *astuua’nti* ‘having bone’, $\langle$ with *-ā* $\rangle$ YAv. *bər²za’ntiia*, (in Ved., to the zero-grade stem *brhati* ‘high’, also in *-mant-* stems, e.g. *gó-mati* ‘having cattle’); — the *-ar-* stem $\langle + -i \rangle$ YAv. *na’ri* = Ved. *nári* ‘in a man’ (zero grade: f. *usrí*, also *usrāām* ‘at dawn’; *nánānd^ari* ‘in a husband’s sister’); — the *-tar-* stem $\langle + -i \rangle$ Ved. *pitári* ‘at a father’, *netári* ‘in a leader’, *kartári* *sácā* ‘with a maker’, *hótari* ‘in a Hotar-priest’; — the *-r/-n-* stem, $\langle \pm -i \rangle$ Ved. *áhan(i)* ‘on a day’, *s_uvār* ‘in sun’s light’, (zero grade: YAv. *asni* ‘on a day’); — the *-yas-* (*-yāms-*) stem $\langle + -i \rangle$ Ved. *sáhīyasi* ‘stronger’; the *-aṃ-*, *-aṇ-* stem, $\langle + -i \rangle$ Ved. *gávi* ‘in a cow’, *dýávi* (zero grade: *diví*, very frequent) ‘in heaven’; — the “radical” *-p-* stem $\langle + -i \rangle$ OPers. *api*, $\langle$ with *-ā* $\rangle$ OPers. *apiyā* ‘in water’ (zero-grade formation in YAv. *kəhrpiia* ‘on a body’); furthermore Ved. *pad-í* ‘on a foot’).

(4) Suffix in zero grade (cf. also under (3)): the *-ū-* stem, Ved. *tanú* ‘on a body’, *camú* ‘in a vessel’, $\langle + -i \rangle$ YAv. *tanuui* = Ved. *tan_uvī*, *tan_uvī*, in Ved. secondarily with *-ām*: *ś_uvaś_uvām* ‘in a mother-in-law’, *tan_uvām* (AV); — Ved. $\langle + -i \rangle$, the *-añc-* stem, *práci* (m.) ‘eastward’; the *-ant-* stem, *á-sati* (*sati* AV+) ‘not being’; the *-vant-* stem, *ár_vati* ‘in a race-horse’; the *-ma(m)s-* stem, *pur_usí* ‘in a man’; — the *-ī-* stem, not attested in Iran., (*vṛkī-* type) Ved. *gaurí* ‘in a she-Gaura-buffalo’ RV IX 12,3, *sarasí* ‘in a pond, lake’, *nadí* ‘in a river’, (in the *deví-* type + *-ām*: *rātryām* ‘in the night’, *ásikn_uvām* ‘in the dark’, *araṇyānyām* ‘in, at Aranyāni, genius of the wilderness’, *dev_uvām* ‘in, at a goddess’); — zero-grade form $\langle + -i \rangle$ in the radical *-h-* stem *anaḍúhi* (AV) ‘in a draught-ox’.

(5) From the stem in various grades: full grade $\langle + -i \rangle$ YAv. *zəmi* $\sim$ Ved. *kṣámi* ‘on the earth’; zero grade + PIE **-aṇ-* (cf. Grk. *χαμαι*) YAv. *zəmə*, $\langle$ unified with *-ā* $\rangle$ Ved. *jmāy-ā*; probably + **-en* (cf. p. 34), to the **-o-* full-grade stem *kṣām-an*, *kṣām-an-i*, to the zero-grade *jm-án*; + *-er/-r* YAv. *+zamarə*; cf. p. 18f.

1.2. stem formations³⁹⁾ and ablaut

The *-a-* stems from PIE **-e/o-* stems show no ablaut other than the “*abtönung*” of the PIE thematic vowel itself. On their inflexion, cf. 1.1.1.: p. 9ff. Also the *-ā-* stems (substantives and feminine forms of the thematic adjectives) have no ablaut, showing always a full grade in the suffix, thus already the PIE **-eh₂-* stems (or “mesodynamic”, if one wants to speak of the ablaut-scheme); but there are case forms not directly inherited ($\rightarrow$ 1.2.2.: p. 20f.).

³⁹⁾ Cf. LINDNER Altindische Nominalbildung (1878), AiG II-2 (1954).

Ablaut is observed in stems in *-ánt-/at-*, *-vánt-/vat-*, *-mánt-/mat-*, *-vāns-/vás-/ús-*, *-án-/n-/a-*, *-ván-/va-/un-*, *-mán-/mn-/ma-*, *-añc-/ac- (/īc-)*, *-tár-/tr-/tr̥-*, *-ár-/r-/r̥-*, root nouns, some nouns originating in elemental vocabulary ('dog', 'cow', 'mouse', etc.), and partially nouns in *-ay-/i-*, *-av-/u-*, *-yā-/ī-*, etc. The nom. voc. and acc. in the singular and dual, the nom. and voc. in the plural, and the loc. sg. are strong cases (cases having a strong form according to the scheme cited in 0.1.) in PIE, on which the nominal inflexions in Indo-Iranian and OIA are based. In Indo-Iranian, neuter nouns predominantly show weak stem-forms in the nom.-acc. in the sg. and du., but strong forms in the nom.-acc. pl., partly with a long grade which probably came from the collective formation. On the ablaut in the loc. sg. cf. 1.1.3. Many stems and forms have lost totally or partially the ablaut which is postulated for them in particular positions on theoretical or comparative grounds.

1.2.1. The **root noun**⁴⁰⁾ *dīś-* f. 'direction' has columnar accentuation without ablaut. The accent position moves in the case of *vāc-* f. 'speech, voice' between stem (root) and ending, thus nom. *vā́k*, gen. *vāc-ás* (cf. Lat. *uōx*, *uōcis*), but the alternation of the vowel quantity is abandoned (BRUGMANN's law may have influenced this partially), cf. Av. *vāc-/vac-* (no **uc-*): OAv. YAv. *vāxs̥*, gen. YAv. *vacō*, pl. nom. *vācō*, acc. *vacō*. — *-hán-* 'slaying (someone, something)' largely maintains its ablaut (partially with analogic *-ha-*): nom. *vṛtra-há* 'slaying Vṛtra, obstacles' (OAv. *vər̥θrəm.jā*, YAv. *vər̥θraja*), acc. *vṛtra-hānam* (YAv. *vər̥θrā-janəm*), instr. *vṛtra-ghn-ā* (YAv. *vər̥θrājana*), dat. *-ghn-é* (YAv. *vər̥θrayne*), gen. *-ghnás* (YAv. *vər̥θraynō*), pl. nom. *śatru-hānas* 'slaying enemies' (YAv. *vər̥θrā-janō*), instr. *vṛtra-há-bhis*: < **-g^{wh}én-s*, **-g^{wh}én-m̥*, **-g^{wh}n-éh₁*, **-g^{wh}n-éh̊*, **-g^{wh}n-és*, **-g^{wh}én-es*, **-g^{wh}n̥-b^his*. — These developments seem rather to be isolated cases, and not dependent on some phonological circumstance.

The root nouns with *-sani-/sā-* 'conquering' (**senh₂/*sñh₂*) in the last member of compounds show mixed paradigms from *-sáni-*, *-san-*, *-sā-*, *-s-*, *-sa-*. SCARLATA *Wurzelkomposita* 577–586 investigates all the forms and summarizes 585f. as follows: sg. nom. *-sās* and *-sáni-s*, acc. *-sām*, *-saām*, *-sáni-m*, gen. *-s-ás*, *-san-as*, dat. *-s-é*, pl. nom. *-sās*, *-sāsas*, instr. *-sáis*. The form *-sáni-* is introduced from acc. sg. *-sáni-m* < **-senh₂-m* (instead of **-m̥*); gen. sg. *-san-as* stands for **-sñh₂-és*; *-sā-* might go back to an unattested pl.-form such as **-sābhis* < **-sñh₂-b^his*, or the nom. sg. **-sénh₂-s* could have become *-sās* with the nasal's loss as SCARLATA proposes among other possibilities. This phenomenon is al-

⁴⁰⁾ Cf. Jochem SCHINDLER *Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen*, Diss. Würzburg 1972, Salvatore SCARLATA *Die Wurzelkomposita im R̥g-Veda*, Wiesbaden 1999, cf. also KELLENS *Les noms-racines de l'Avesta*, Wiesbaden 1974.

ready seen in Indo-Iranian, as shown in dat. sg. *pašu-š-é*, gen. sg. *pašu-š-ás*, YAv. gen. sg. *ḡṣū-š-ə, ḡṣū-š-ō* ‘cattle-gainer’, cf. also KELLENS Noms-racines 106–111.

The PIE **elemental vocabulary item** *pād-/pad-* m. ‘foot’ is particularly archaic: sg. nom. *pāt*, acc. *pād-am* (from this a new stem *pāda-*; YAv. *pāḍəm*), gen. *pad-ás*, loc. *pad-i*, du. nom. acc. *pād-ā* (YAv. *pāḍa*), pl. acc. *pad-ás* (YAv. *padō*): < **pōd-s*, **pód-m*, **ped-és* (< **pe*-*és*?; Lat. *pedis*). — *āp-/ap-* f. ‘water’, imagined as living being(s) and used mostly in the pl., shows ablaut between *āp* and *ap*, just like *pād-/pad-*, or Av. *vāc-/vac-*:⁴¹⁾ sg. instr. *ap-ā*, gen. abl. *ap-ás*, pl. nom. *āp-as*, acc. *ap-ás*, instr. *ad-bhīs*, dat. *ad-bhyás*, loc. *ap-sú*. The zero-grade form **-h₂p-* is found in *anūp-ā-* ‘river basin’, *dvīp-ā-* ‘island’, etc. In Av.: sg. nom. YAv. *āḡš*, acc. *āpəm*, *apəm-ca*, instr. *apa*, *apā-ca*, dat. *ape*, *apaē-ciṭ*, abl. *apaṭ*, gen. *āpō*; du. nom. acc. *āpa*; pl. nom. *āpō*, acc. OAv. YAv. *apō*, *apas-cā*, (YAv. also *āpō*), dat. YAv. *aḡḡiō*, gen. *apam*. — Hysterodynamic inflexion underlies these paradigms (or amphidynamic, if one should assume the absence of a suffix).

The **monosyllabic noun** *dyáv-* m. (f.) ‘heaven’ preserves its original hysterodynamic scheme: sg. nom. *dyáu-s*, voc. (after nom.) *dyaus*, *dyáus*, *dyáus*, acc. *dyām*, *dyām* (secondary *dív-am*), instr. *div-ā*, dat. *div-é*, abl. gen. *div-ás*, (secondary *dyó-s*), loc. *dyáv-i*, *dív-i*; du. nom. acc. *dyáv-ā*^{41a)}; pl. nom. *dyáv-as*, acc. *dyūn*, *dív-as*. In Iran., only YAv. gen. sg. *dīiaoš* is attested (Yt 3,13, according to HUMBACH KZ 81, 282f. ‘der [Brut der] Hölle’, cf. also KELLENS Noms-racines 402); the form is identical with Ved. *dyó-s* (6× in the RV :: *div-ás* more than 400×), but is to be judged as analogic after *gós* (PII **gau-š*), cf. AiG III 224. The PIE paradigm is: sg. nom. **dīēu-s* (Grk. *Ζεύς*), **dīēu-s*⁴²⁾, acc. **dīēm* (Grk. *Ζῆν*, *Ζῆν-α*) < **dīēu-m* (after STANG’s law), **dīēm*⁴²⁾, dat. **dīu-éi* (Grk. Corinthian *Δτεί*, Cyprian *Δτεί-φίλος*, Mycenaean *di-we /diwei/*), abl. gen. **dīu-és/ós* (Grk. *Διός*), loc. **dīēu* + *-i* (Lat. *Ioue*), **dīēu*⁴²⁾ (Lat. *diū*), (Grk. *Δί*, probably < **dīu-i*, i. e., secondary after the forms with **dīu-* just like Ved. *div-i*); pl. nom. **dīēu-es* (with *é* after sg.?), acc. **dīu-ns* or **dīu-m̥s*.

⁴¹⁾ The alternation between *pūr* and *pur* in the stem *pūr-* f. ‘palisade, fortification’ is phonological in nature. The stem **p̥l̥h₁-* had no ablaut, or abandoned it (cf. Grk. *πόλις* < **pólihi-s*?, with dat. [loc.] Hom. *πόλη* < **polhi-ēḡ* + *-i*, KLINGENSCHMITT in lectures). It appears regularly as *pūr* before vowels and *pur* before consonants (i. e., PII **p̥rH°* or **p̥l̥H°* > **p̥arH°* or **p̥alH°*, and according to the constellation, **p̥arHV°* or **p̥arH(CV°)* > *pur°* or *pūr°*, respectively, preserving its syllabic quantity): sg. nom. *pūr*, acc. *pūr-am*, instr. *pur-ā*, pl. loc. *pūr-sú*, probably < **p̥l̥h₁-s*, **p̥l̥h₁-m̥*, **p̥l̥h₁-éh₁*, **p̥l̥h₁-sú*. Cf. n. 147.

^{41a)} On the du. *dyávī* RV IV 56,5, cf. GOTÖ 14th World Skt. Conf. 2009, forthcoming.

⁴²⁾ Disyllabic LINDEMAN variant.

gáv- f. ‘cow’ maintains its acrodynamic pattern: *gáu-s* (< **g^wōu-s*, OAv. YAv. *gāuš*), *gām* (< **g^wōm* < **g^wōu-m*, after STANG; OAv. YAv. *gqm*, YAv. secondary also *gaom*), gen. *gós* (< **g^wōu-s*, OAv. YAv. *gəuš*, YAv. *gaos*), loc. *gáv-i*, pl. nom. *gáv-as* (< **g^wōu-es*; YAv. *gauuō*⁴³⁾), acc. *gās* (OAv. YAv. *gā*, after *gām*, *gqm*).⁴⁴⁾

náv- f. ‘ship, boat’⁴⁵⁾ goes back to **náh₂-u-* (and perhaps also **náh₂-u-*) which does not alter this shape: nom. *náu-s* (< **nāu-s* < **náh₂-u-s*, Hom. *νηῦς*; probably disyllabic *ná-us* RV V 59,2 < **náh₂-u-s* < **néh₂-u-s*), acc. *návam* (**náh₂-u-m*, Hom. *νηα*, Lat. *nāuem*), gen. *nāv-ás* (**náh₂-u-és*, cf. *νηός*), pl. nom. *náv-as* (**náh₂-u-es*, *νηες*), acc. *náv-as* (**náh₂-u-ms*, *νηας*), *náubhis* (*ναῦφι*).

dvār-/dur- f. ‘door’ follows a hysterodynamic (or amphidyn.) inflexion just like *pād-/pad-*, *āp-/ap-*: sg. nom. *dvār* (AV+); du. *dvār-ā*, *d₁nvár-ā*, *dvār-au*; pl. nom. *dvār-as* (5×), acc. *dúras* I 193,7, *dúras* (many times, also in I 188,5), *dvār-as* I 130,3, voc. *dvār-as*. In YAv., acc. sg. *duuarəm* and perhaps loc. sg. *duuarə*² (Vīd 3,29) are attested; OPers. has a thematised loc. sg. *duvarayā* < **d^(h)uvara-ī* + *ā*. They go back to PIE **d^huór*, **d^huér-m*, **d^hur-és*, **d^huér*, **d^huór-es*, **d^hur-nis*. OIA *d* instead of **d^h* is interpreted through association with *dváu* ‘two’.

In the case of *kšám-/kšā-/kšm-/jm-* f. ‘earth’, various forms are developed through phonological change, simplification of the consonant group, analogy, or preservation of old formations (in the loc.): **sg.** nom. *kšā-s* (YAv. *zā*), acc. *kšā-m*, *kšāām* (OAv. YAv. *zqm*), instr. *kšam-ā*, *jm-ā* (YAv. *z²mā*), abl. *kšm-ás*, *jm-ás*⁴⁶⁾ (YAv. *z²mat*, *z²māt*, *z²māat-ca*, *z²māda*), gen. *jm-ás* (YAv. *z²mō*, *z²mas-ca*)^{46a)}, loc. *kšám-i* (YAv. *zəmi*), *kšm-ay-ā*, *jm-ay-ā* (YAv. *z²mē*, < PIE *-*aī*, cf. Grk. *χαμοί*), *kšám-an*, *kšám-an-i*, *jm-án*; **du.** *kšām-ā*; **pl.** nom. *kšám-as* (YAv. voc. *zə-mō*), acc. *kšās*, *kšāās* IV 28,5 (YAv. *zəmas-ca*), (gen. YAv. *zəmaq-ca*), loc. *kšā-su*.⁴⁷⁾ — These start from a PIE *-*em-* stem: sg. nom. **d^hég^hōm* (Hitt. *tégan* < *te-e-kán*) → **ǵǵ^hōm*^{47a)} (*χθών*); acc. **d^hég^hōm* (from **d^hég^hōm-m* after STANG’s law; Hitt. just as in the nom.) → **ǵǵ^hōm* (*kšā-m*; and from *-*ni*: *kšāām*, *χθόνα*),

⁴³⁾ With YAv. / East-Iranian phonological change *-*āua-* > *-*aua-*, cf. n. 45, n. 58.

⁴⁴⁾ Throughout with the PIE *-*ó*-vocalism because of its onomatopoetic origin.

⁴⁵⁾ In YAv. in *nauu-āza-* ‘sailor, navigator’ = Ved. *nāv-ājá-* (cf. n. 43) < **náh₂-u-h₂ōgo-*, cf. Lat. *nāuigāre*.

⁴⁶⁾ Dissimilated in *divás ca gmás ca* in the abl. and gen.

^{46a)} Also LINDEMAN variant OAv. *zimō*, YAv. *zəmə* is attested.

⁴⁷⁾ *kšé* in IV 3,6 *násatyāya kšé* (according to GRASSMANN a dat. sg. of *kšā-*) is to be emended to **násatyāya yakšé*⁺, cf. HOFFMANN apud SCHINDLER Diss. (1972) 15, GOTO Linguistics, Archaeology and Human Past (2009) 208.

^{47a)} **ǵǵ^h* is used here as a symbol for the combination of **ǵ^h* + **ǵ^h* (allomorph of *p*).

and * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m$ ⁴⁸⁾ (*zqm*); abl. gen. * $d^h\acute{g}^hm\text{-}\acute{e}s/\acute{o}s$ (cf. Hitt. *tagnas* <*ták-na-(a-)aš*>) > * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m\text{-}\acute{e}s/\acute{o}s$ (*kšmās*, cf. *χθονός*), and * $\acute{g}^hm\text{-}\acute{e}s$ (*jmās*, *z²mō*); instr. * $d^h\acute{g}^hm\text{-}\acute{e}h_1$ > * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m\text{-}\acute{e}h_1$ (→ *kšamā*), and * $\acute{g}^hm\text{-}\acute{e}h_1$ (*jmā*, *z²mā*); — loc. * $d^h\acute{g}^hm\text{-}i$ (cf. Hitt. *dagān* from * $\acute{o}m$ ⁴⁹⁾) > * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m\text{-}i$ (*kšāmi*), and * $\acute{g}^hm\text{-}i$ (*zāmi*); PIE *-a- case (cf. p. 149: 4.3.) in: * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m\text{-}ai$ /* $\acute{g}^hm\text{-}ai$ > *χουαί* (from the LINDEMAN variant * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m\text{-}ai$), *z²mē*, with + *ā* > *kšmayā*, *jm-ay-ā*, * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m\text{-}ai$ (reformed after * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m$) > Lat. *humī*, *homī*; with *-en: * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m\text{-}en$ > *kšām-an*, *kšām-an-i*, * $\acute{g}^hm\text{-}en$ > *jm-án*; with *-(e)r: YAv. ⁺*zamar^o* ‘in the earth’ (Yt 1,29, after BARTHOLOMAE) < * $\acute{g}^hm\text{-}er$ or * $\acute{g}^hm\text{-}r$; — Indo-Iran. pl. forms come from * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m\text{-}\acute{e}s$, * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m\text{-}\acute{n}is$ ⁵⁰⁾. The nom. sg. Ved. *kšā-s*, YAv. *zā*, Ved. loc. pl. *kšā-su* have been formed analogically after the -ā- stems through the link of acc. sg. *kšā-m*, *zqm*, acc. pl. *kšās*. The frequently attested n. nom. sg. *kšāma* or *kšāmā* owes its -man- stem form to an imitation based on the loc. *kšāman*, *kšāmani*. This vocabulary item was, as is the case in many IE languages, no longer in use, and an epithet *pr̥thivī-* ‘(the) wide one’ was (euphemistically) used as a common word for ‘earth’ beside *bhūmi-* (OAv. *būmī-*, YAv. *būmī-*, OPers. *būmī-*) from *bhav*!/ *bhū* ‘come into being, become’, etc. The word *pr̥thivī-* is originally the f. of the adj. *pr̥thú-* ‘wide’ (cf. *kšām ... pr̥thvīm* RV X 31,9 ~ YAv. *zqm pər^oθβīm*, *pər^oθβe ... zāmō-*; *urvī pr̥thvī ... dyāvāpr̥thivī* VI 70, 1.4) but has been fixed in this form and meaning, whereas the f. adj. ‘wide’ shows the form *pr̥thvī-* without vocalization of * h_2 . The starting point was: * $p\acute{r}th_2\text{-}u\text{-}ih_2$ > *pr̥thvī* ‘wide’, gen. * $p\acute{r}th_2\text{-}u\text{-}i\acute{e}h_2\text{-}s$ > * $p\acute{r}t^{(h)}iv_2yās$ > *pr̥thivyās*/*pr̥thiviyās* (used in the value ‘of the earth’; oblique cases of the f. adj. seem not to be attested).⁵¹⁾

On *nár-* m. ‘man’ and *stár-* ‘star’, cf. p. 32; on *hárd-* ‘heart’, *ās-* n. ‘mouth’, *dós-* ‘forearm’, *ákš-i* ‘eye’, and *yūs-* n. ‘broth’, cf. p. 34f.; on *śván-* ‘dog’, cf. p. 39.

1.2.1.1. The root nouns, or the nouns to be regarded as such, ending in °ā- are inflected as follows: **sg.** nom. m. *sthā-s* ‘standing’ (used also as n.), *rathe-ṣthā-s* (YAv. *raθaē-štā*); f.⁵²⁾ *gnā-s* ‘god’s wife’, (YAv. *xā* ‘spring’); acc. *sthā-m*, *rathe-*

⁴⁸⁾ All Av. forms come from simplified * $\acute{g}^h$ (* $\acute{g}^h$ would have become * $\acute{z}$ in Av.).

⁴⁹⁾ Cf. MELCHERT *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (1994) 135.

⁵⁰⁾ * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m\text{-}\acute{n}is$ has become * $\acute{g}^hm\text{-}\acute{n}is$ (YAv. *zamas-ca*) as a LINDEMAN variant, or simplified * $\acute{g}^h\acute{o}m\text{-}\acute{n}is$ (*kšās*, *kšāās*).

⁵¹⁾ Cf. also DUNKEL *Sprache* 34 (1988–1990) 12.

⁵²⁾ Forms without -s in the nom. sg. f. are to be identified as pertaining to the -ā- stem inflexion. A transition happens easily through the link of PII formations such as instr. sg. -ā beside -āyā in the -ā- stems, oblique cases in the pl. -ā-bhis, -ā-bhyas, -ā-su, cf. 1.2.2.: p. 20f. Forms with -ā- stem inflexion increase after the RV in the abstract substantives and f. adjectives. Cf. the discussion by SCARLATA cited in the next footnote, and *ibidem*, p. 378,

sthā-m (YAv. *raθaē-štqm*), *gnā-m*, *khā-m* ‘spring’; instr. (only f., and not always certain) *apa-dhā* ‘by removal’ II 12,3 < **-d^hh₁-éh₁*,⁵³) *prati-dhā* VIII 77,4 ‘in (one) draught(?)’, *abhi-khyā* ‘by glance, looking-at’, etc., (OAv. *ā-dāā* ‘through endowment’, Y 33,12); dat. (1) m. *d-é* ‘for giving’ < **dh₃-éj*, *śuci-p-é* ‘for the drinker of the clear (Soma)’, (YAv. *raθaē-šte*⁵⁴), (2) as inf. *pra-khyái* ‘to see’, *upa-yái* ‘to travel near’, etc. < **-jeh₂-éj*(?), (YAv. *raθaē-štāi*⁵⁵); gen. m. *kṛṣti-prās* ‘filling boundaries’, (YAv. *raθaē-štā* instead of *-ō*); in OAv. loc. *ā-dāi* (cf. p. 14: (2)); **du.** m. *kṛṣti-prā*, *go-pā*, *go-páu* ‘herdsmen’; **pl.** nom. m. *rathe-ṣthās*, (YAv. *armaē-štā* ‘standing still’), f. *gnās*, (YAv. *xā*); acc. m. (no certain examples in Ved.; YAv. *raθaē-štā*, *raθaē-štās-ca*), f. *gnās*, *jās* ‘children’, (YAv. *xā*); instr. m. *agre-p-ā-bhis* ‘drinking at first’, (YAv. *akō.dābiš* ‘producing bad things’), f. *gn-ā-bhis*, *ratna-dh-ā-bhis* ‘treasure-giving’; abl. m. *bhūri-d-ā-bhyas* ‘than many giving ones’; loc. f. *gn-ā-su*, *j-ā-su*, (OAv. *adāhū* ‘at the oblations’ < **ā-d^hā-*); and in YAv. gen. *xqm*, (no root-form is attested in the gen. pl. in Ved.).

1.2.2. The *-ā-* suffix stems are the descendants of PIE **-ah₂-* < **-eh₂-* stems with the endings presented in 1.1.2. (p. 11ff.). But there are some PII or OIA innovations, especially the forms which have been clarified by employing formations from the *devī-* inflexion (proterodynamic type) of the **-jeh₂-*/*-ih₂-* stems or the like:

In the **sg.** instr. (1) *-āyā*: *jihvāyā* ‘with a tongue’, etc., (OAv. *daēnaiiā*, YAv. *daēnaiia*⁵⁶) ‘by religious vision’; OPers. *framānāyā* ‘command’ is a mixed formation) < PII **-ājā*, analogically after [**dajū-i-ā* :: **dajū-i-ā* = *d^hār-ā* :: *x*, *x* = *d^hār-a-īā*], or after instr. sg. *tāyā* of the pronoun *tā-* < **téh₂-* (cf. OChSlav. *tojō* < **tajā-m*, n. 170); (2) *-ā*: *jihvā* etc. (Vedic, frequently in *-yā-* and *-tā-* stems; OAv.

on *pra-mā-*, *prati-mā* X 130,3 and *pramē* IX 70,4. OAv. *var^hī ādā* Y 49,1 (‘good endowment’?) is the nom. sg. of the derivative *-ā-* stem (**-d^hh₁-éh₂-*), on the original root noun *ā-dā-* cf. above p. 14: (2), cf. NARTEN Yasna Haptanḥāiti 268.

⁵³) *sva-dhā* ‘by one’s own decision’ possibly in VIII 32,6; but the frequently attested *sva-dhāyā* suggests an *-ā-* stem (**-d^hh₁-éh₂-*), or, at least, a transition to it, cf. SCARLATA 264f. A similar remark applies also to several other °*ā-* formations. On *śrad-dhē* I 102, 2 and *śrad-dhā* it VII 32,14 from *śrad-dh-ā-* (**kred-d^hh₁-éh₂-*), as opposed to the OAv. root noun *zraz-dā-* ‘believing, trusting’ (nom. pl. *zraz-dā* < **āH-as*, Y 31,1; YAv. *a-zraz-da-* is a thematic stem), cf. ib. 263.

⁵⁴) Thus presumably Vīd 14,9 (2×) instead of *raθōišti* (according to BARTHOLOMAE the loc. sg.). — YAv. shows also forms from the *-tar-* stem.

⁵⁵) Always preceding *vāstriiāi* ‘for the farmer’, Yt 19,8; 13,88, Vīd 5,57,58.

⁵⁶) In addition, there occurs a form with °*iū*: *xšaθrō.kāmaia* Y 9,24 (°*kāmaia*?).

daēnā, YAv. *daēna*) < PII *-ā < *-ah₂-eh₁; — dat. -āy_{ai}:⁵⁷⁾ *manāy_{ai}* ‘for devotion’ etc. < PII *-āiāi, probably *-ā- + *-iāi of the *devī-* inflexion, (YAv.⁵⁸⁾ *daēnaiiāi*⁵⁹⁾; — abl.⁶⁰⁾ gen. -āyās: *sēnāyās* ‘army’ etc. < PII *-āiās, probably *-ā- + *-iās of the *devī-* inflexion, (OAv. YAv. *daēnaiiā* [YAv. form, cf. n. 58], YAv. *haēnaiiā*, YAv. *haēnaiiās-ca*, OPers. *haināyā* ‘army’); — loc. -āyām: *grīvāyām* ‘on the neck’ etc. < *-ā- + *-iām of the *devī-* inflexion; PIE *-ā: YAv. *grīuuaiia* (cf. n. 58), OPers. *θurāyā*; — voc. (1) -e: *jāye* ‘wife’ etc. < PII *-ai of unknown origin, (OAv. *bər³xōē* ‘estimated’, YAv. *daēne*); (2) PII *-ā in OAv. *Pourucištā*, YAv. *sūra* ‘strong’; the co-existence of two voc. forms has produced the YAv. nom. sg. *pər³ne* ‘full’.

Other forms are regularly built: nom. -ā, -ā; acc. -ām, -ām; — **du.** nom. acc. voc. -e (cf. n. 27); abl. -ā-bhyām; gen. loc. -āyos, -āyos < PII loc. *-aH-Hay × gen. *-aH-Hās, PII gen. *-aiās in YAv. *uruuaraiiā* ‘of the two plants’ (cf. n. 58); — **pl.** nom. voc. -ās, -ās, and the double formation -āsas, -āsas (cf. n. 16); acc. -ās, -ās; instr. -ā-bhis, -ā-bhis; dat. abl. -ā-bhyas, -ā-bhyas; gen. -ānām, -ānām, also with **nām* (cf. n. 22); loc. -ā-su, -ā-su.⁶¹⁾

1.2.3. The **-ī- stem** inflexion has two main types. [1] The *vrkī-* (‘she-wolf’) type, comprising root nouns, e.g. *dhī-* ‘thought, reflexion’, and derivative feminines from m. -a- stems⁶²⁾, as well as some m., e.g. *rathī-* ‘charioteer’, has no ablaut in the stem.⁶³⁾ **sg.** nom. *dhī-s*, acc. *dhīy-am*, *rathīy-ām*, instr. *dhīy-ā*, *rathīy-ā*, dat. *dhīy-é*, *rathīy-ā*, gen. *dhīy-ās*, *ahīy-ās* ‘mother-cow’, loc. *gaurī*, *sarasī*, *nadī* (cf. **1.1.3.** (4): p. 15), voc. *nadi* ‘river’, *yami* ‘Yamī’; — **du.** nom. acc. *abhi-śrīy-ā*, *au*

⁵⁷⁾ On °*ai* for gen., abl. in the language of the theologists cf. n. 25.

⁵⁸⁾ With YAv. / East-Iranian change *-āja- > -aja-, cf. n. 43.

⁵⁹⁾ Also °*iāi* in *gaēθiāi* ‘for the living being’ Y 9,3 (**gaēθaiāi*?), cf. GOTÖ Akten Kraków 161 n. 3.

⁶⁰⁾ About YAv. abl. -*aiiāi*, cf. n. 26.

⁶¹⁾ *kanyā* ‘girl’ (f.) shows in the nom. sg. -ā, but the stem goes back to a formation with HOFFMANN’s possessive suffix -*h₃ón-* (< *-*h₃én-*)/-*h₃n-*, cf. **1.2.10.** [3]: p. 42f.

⁶²⁾ Cf. p. 51: [2]. Also, e.g. *naptī-* ‘granddaughter’ (beside AV+ *naptṛī-*, *naptī-*) to *nāpāt-* ‘grandson’.

⁶³⁾ Thus also in Av. (in OPers., the *-ī-* stem inflexion has been partially transferred to the *-i-* inflexion): e.g., sg. nom. OAv. *ər³ž³-jī-s* ‘living honestly’, YAv. *zar³naēnīs* ‘golden’, acc. OAv. *ra³θīm* ‘charioteer’ (with disyllabic -*īm*, i.e. a YAv. form < *-*raθijām*), YAv. *yauuaē-jim* ‘living eternally’ (< *-*jijām*), dat. OAv. *ər³ž³-jiiōi* (< *-*jiiāi*), gen. *Srūtaf³driiō* (girl’s name, ‘having a famous father’); du. nom. YAv. *ratu-friia* ‘pleasing the Supervisor(s)’, pl. nom. YAv. *ratu-friiō*, acc. OAv. *yauuaē-jiiō*, YAv. *tištriiaēniō*, °*aēnias-ca* ‘Sirius-stars’, dat. YAv. *yauuaē-jibiō*. The endings, e.g. in the gen. sg. -ās, may point to a hysterodyn. origin.