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32. Derivational morphology

Rau 2009, 78–109 surveys instances in Av. and Ved. of “Property concept” adjectives showing Caland system alternations. He argues that, in PIE and the early IE languages, the Caland system is the main derivational mechanism for nominalizing property concept states, in particular those encoded by morphologically simple root-based formations. Dell’Oro 2015 studies the Caland system as a theoretical problem in the history of Indo-European linguistics. Oettinger 2012, 213f. surveys Av. examples for internal derivation by substantivisation and retraction of the accent.

33. Inflectional accent and ablaut

Kümmel 2014 investigates the relationship between accent and suffixal ablaut in Indo-Iranian. With regard to Ved. and Av. inflectional paradigms of stem-classes which show evidence for protokinetic inflection, he argues that vowel alternation in the suffix is not necessarily indicative of a shifting accent. Rather he suggests that in PIIr. and possibly also PIE the distribution of zero and full grade suffixes was not, or was no longer, directly governed by the accent, but by the structure of the root syllable. De Vaan 2004 examines the validity of the Av. evidence for so-called ‘Narten roots’, where inflected forms are constructed by means of an alternation of the root vowel between lengthened R(ê) and full grade R(é), while in other roots the vowel alternates between full and zero grades. According to him, all of the Av. forms which support the alternation characteristic of ‘Narten roots’ can be explained as resulting from developments within Avestan. Reviewing the debate and defending the existence of Narten roots, Keydana 2016 argues that in Indo-Iranian a small group of lexically accented verbal roots formed an active athematic inflectional paradigm with lengthened grade in the singular and full grade in the plural while the accent was static on the root. He identifies the inherent lexical accent on the root as the crucial feature which sets Narten roots apart from other verbal roots and concludes that the pattern survives in Av. and Ved. only in remnants in the form of thematic presents with long root vowel and in some lengthened grade forms outside the present tense.

34. Number

Tremblay 1997 argues that Av. preserves the category of numerative in the language of the Vidēvēdā. The grammatical system of the latter would accordingly comprise not three but four numbers: singular, dual, plural and numerative. According to him, pairs such as Vd 9.33 istros xšafna ‘three nights’ (numerative) vs. Yt 8.13 dása xšapanō ‘ten nights’ (nom.pl.) indicate that a noun may take the ending of the numerative when it is immediately preceded by a numeral (p. 161f.). The stem may be strong or weak, with the clearest examples coming from athematic animate nouns (m. or f.), whose numerative forms look like thematic neuter plurals in -a. Tremblay
suggests that forms, which he describes as numerative, are vestiges of the IE comprehensive, identified by Eichner 1985, and that they constitute an archaic feature in the language of the Vidévdād (p. 168). The origin of the category would thus be different from that of the numerative in Sogdian and Paštô, which Sims-Williams 1979, 339–342 derives from the Old Iranian dual.

Cantera 2001–2 argues that the IE comprehensive or collective, which serves as the neuter plur. in a range of IE languages, is historically a derivative rather than an inflectional category. He supports this view with reference to secondary derivatives that are based on comprehensives formed from both nominal and pronominal stems, such as OP artāvan-, Av. *artāvan-, Ved. rtāvan- < *hṛtēh-yan- ‘righteous’, identified by Tichy 1986, and Av. tāvant-, Ved. tāvant- < *teh-yent- ‘so great’, identified by Klingenschmitt 1972, 101, 108 notes 6 and 7.

35. Case endings

Gotō 2013, 8–15 surveys the Ved. case endings in comparison with Avestan. Nikolaev 2000 argues that PIE *osjo is a composite ending of the gen.sg. *es/-os extended by a particle *jo. It functions as the marker of the genitive case in PIE ergative preterite constructions and contrasts with the gen. in *es/-os, which was used in present tense constructions with accusative alignment. Kümmel 2013 discusses the Indo-Iranian evidence for the metrical value of the ending of the gen.pl. and its reconstruction in PIE. Considering that the ending of the gen.pl. is metrical disyllabic -ām in all Gāthic attestations and in about one third of its attestations in the Rigveda, he argues that in all stem classes of PIE and PIR. the ending of the genitive plural involved an intervocalic laryngeal (PIE *-oHom or *-eHom) which is responsible for the disyllabic scansion in Avestan and, partly, in Vedic. A laryngeal had likewise been reconstructed for the ending of the gen. dual by Hoffmann 1976, 561 fn.2 and 599 fn.14, according to whom the laryngeal *h may have spread analogically from the nom.dual to the gen., where it is metrical traceable in OAv. and, in the gen./loc., in Vedic. Kortlandt 1991, 5–6 (= 2010, 155f.) suggests that OAv. attests neuter dual forms with unexpected -i (< PIE *-i) instead of -i (< PIE *-ih), although he admits that the evidence is not conclusive. While the Ved. gen./loc. ending -oh may result from a contamination of the gen. and loc. dual endings, the endings are still distinguished in Avestan. Mahlzbach 1999 [2000], 219 and fn. 30 and 31 derives the Av. ending of the gen. dual atheme. -ā, them. -aidd (with -a from the pronominal inflection) from Indo-Iranian *-Hās and points out that in the Av. metrical texts, forms of the loc. dual provide no evidence for a laryngeal in the OAv. ending atheme. -ā < *-ay, them. -aidd. Skjærvø 2007, 322–327 discusses the treatment of the clusters that arise in the forms of consonantal stems, where the stem-final consonant meets with the
initial *-b- of the case suffixes instr.pl. *-biš, dat./abl.pl. *-bjaḥ, dat./abl./instr. dual *-bjaḏ.

36. a-stems

Tucker 2013 examines the restructuring of vowel quantities of IE *a*-grade thematic verbal nouns in Indo-Iranian. She argues that quantities of root vowels were levelled in PDr. not merely as a result of formal analogies, but because the contrast between short and long root vowels came to be used to distinguish the inherited functions of action and agent nouns.

With regard to the lists of names in Yet 1 and Yet 15, Panaino 2002, 93–98 suggests that the nom.sg. forms with the endings -a, -e and -o (instead of -o) of a-stems, and with -o (instead of -i) of i-stems reflect a linguistic reality rather than poor transmission in the manuscripts. According to him, these forms indicate the early stages of break-down of the inflectional system at the time when the Av. canon was fixed and the lists of names, which belong to the widespread genre of nāmastotras, came to be incorporated in the Yašts. They testify to a language which Panaino terms “Deutero-Later Av.” (p. 98). De Vaan 2004b, 367f. comments that he has independently come to a similar conclusion and discusses some differences between his and Panaino’s explanations of the various aberrant forms. De Vaan 2003, 446–450 argues that the occasional form of the nom.sg. in -o of a-/ah/-an-stems in Yet 1.12–15 and 15.43–48 betrays “a more recent layer of YAv. language”. He suggests that the Av. ending -o in particular would provide independent evidence for the vocalic reflex of *-ah in early Middle Iranian times (p. 450), while he attributes the spelling -a instead of expected -o in the nom.sg. of a-stems to a confusion with the nom.sg. of stems with suffix -tar (p. 446). Kūmmel 2007, 276 suggests that rather than being a Western Middle Iranian vestige in the language of the Avesta, the ending -o might be due to the influence of Eastern Middle Iranian languages such as Bactrian or Sogdian, where the reduction of *-ah > -i might have happened via *-a(h). According to Skjærvø 2005, 203–205, the expression ahuəre mazda in Y 60.11 (= 71.29) represents the otherwise unattested YAv. loc.sg. *ahuəre mazde*, from Proto-Av. *ahuəre mazda*, of the divine name ahuera-mazdaa.

Pirart 2000, 378ff. discusses the use of the ending -ā for the neuter pl. of thematic stems. Hock 2014 interprets the numerous instances as indicating that loss of gender distinction had already started in YAv. The fact that the neuter plural could be formed like the fem. plur. of a long ā-stem would point to the existence of a new congruence class of fem./neuter forms in the plural.

Kellens 1996, 53 considers the forms ašma/ašmi in Y 7.2 and haomi, which most manuscripts transmit in Y 7.3, to be corrupted forms of the expected acc.pl. ašma and haomā respectively. Kellens 1997, 131 revises his earlier proposal and
suggests that aęsmi and haomi rather point towards the acc.pl. forms aęsmō and haomō because the vowels i, u, ū, e frequently interchange with one another, but rarely alternate with those of the group a, o and q. According to him, the forms aęsmi and haomi preserve vestiges of the older acc.pl. form in -ā, which had escaped normalisation as -q. The latter ending -q of the acc.pl. instead of expected -ā (< PrIr. *-ānī) has been explained by Hoffmann 1970, 189 (= 1975, 276) as a preferred representation of the nasalised form -ā of the vowel -ā, occurring after a nasal consonant.

Albino 2001 studies the two final datives in -xiīāi, which are attested in the forms aawaxiīāi and rafōno.xiīāi in Y 58.7 and Yt 10.78. He notes their syntactic function as final datives, but rejects Bartholomae’s 1904, 179 and 1510 analysis as dat.sg. of a neuter stem *-ah-ja- and Hoffmann & Narten’s 1989, 53f. and 81 fn.13 explanation as dat. sg. of a fem. stem *-ah-ja-. According to Albino, the Av. forms in *-jāī were remodelled from Indo-Iranian final datives formed with a suffix *-jā, which is preserved in its original form in Ved. final datives in -yā but whose origin is obscure.

37. i- and u- stems

With reference chiefly to the inflection of Indo-Iranian u-stems, in particular Av. parstå- ‘rib’ (attested in form parståi in FIO 3g = Klingenschmitt 1968 no. 184), ratu- ‘time (-unit); model’, parståu- ‘ford’ and pitu- ‘food’, Tremblay 1998 reconstructs an amphikinetic (or, in his terminology “acrokinitique ou rhizokinétique”) inflectional type according to which the accent shifts between the root syllable in the nom. and acc., and the case endings in the gen., dat. and instr., while the unaccented stem-forming suffix -u- remains unchanged in the zero grade throughout the paradigm. Widmer 2004, 56–61 and 71, however, considers the positing of a separate inflectional type as uneconomical, and questions the validity of Tremblay’s examples because the features on which Tremblay’s argument is based are also found in proterokinetic and acrostatic inflectional paradigms. Kümml 2014, 165, 167 draws attention to the zero grade suffix in the weak cases of parståu- and ratu-.

Tremblay 1996, 214; 1999a, 165f. §117 and §175 analyses YAv. xraui.druuō, hāzuuō, and raśnuuō as forms of the instr.sg. in *-au-H from u-stems, built like genitives in -ōś with full grade suffix and zero grade ending. Rather than interpreting these forms as loc.sg. functioning as instr.sg., as Bartholomae 1895–1901, 229, §407 thought, Tremblay suggests that they represent genuine instr.sg. forms and entail the development -uuō < *-au < *-auH. Kümml 2014, 168 attempts a phonetic explanation of the processes involved in the genesis of these instr. forms in -uuō by suggesting that the word-final laryngeal only seemingly failed to undergo vocalisation in so far as -i after -u- was labialised and merged with the preceding labial consonant, entailing the development *-au-H > *-au-i > *-au > *-au. Skjærø 2005 surveys the formation of the loc.sg. of u-stems and observes that the ending -ā is confined to the
It should be noted, however, that in Y 31.8, which Cantera, 2007, 10 adduces as a second attestation, the form *hišqm is not found in the manuscripts but only as the result of a conjecture by Kellens & Pirart 1988–1991 I 51, 114, III 66. Most manuscripts in fact transmit the form haišm.
ing such an ablaut pattern in the paradigm of the noun vaiiia- ‘air, wind’, Remmer establishes the conditions for the YAv. shortening of prevocalic *-āj- > -aj- in the pretonic position (on which see Hintze 2014, 22), thus providing an explanation for the short root vowel in the Av. noun vaiiia- in contrast to its Ved. counterpart vēyūa-.

Hintze 1989, 38f.; 1991, XVIII and 1994, 60 comments on the spelling of the endings of the acc.sg. and pl. in -ām, -ās, -ām, -ās in the Yašt manuscript F1, where in word-final syllables, the i and u usually appear as short vowels, although there may be differences between different Yašts. With regard to the liturgical and exegetical manuscripts of the Yasna, Visperad and Vidēvdād, Cantera 2016 concludes that in both Iranian and Indian mss. the ending of the acc.sg. of u- and ū-stems is usually spelt -ām and that in Iranian mss. the spelling -ām contrasts with -um in the acc.sg. of ya-stems. By contrast, the distinction would be lost in the Indian mss., where the acc.sg. of ya-stems is likewise spelt -ām. Cantera suggests that the observable spelling alternations between -ām and -um in the mss. reflect the pronunciation of the syllables at different times and places in the oral tradition of the Avesta.

Tremblay 1997, 165 fn.14 regards the unique form frauwaśsiš in Y 37.3 from the i-stem frauwaśsi-, as the genuine form of the acc.pl. Hintze 2007, 181 surveys the scholarly debate about this form, providing contextual and syntactic support for the interpretation of frauwaśsiš as the regular acc.pl. of the -i-stem. De Vaan 2006 examines eight YAv. forms in -āš and -uš have been taken as evidence for lenition of -b- in the ending *-uš of the instr.pl. On the basis of the relevant text passages, he argues that the interpretation as instr.pl. of the forms in question is untenable with the exception of N 57 ‘pitaiš and vēzaiš and Y 12.4 auanhašiš and yārasiš, which would present the only reliable evidence for the contraction of *-ušiš to -āš.

38. i-stems

Attestation of the vṛkē-declension in Old Iranian is scarce but certain, and is discussed by Mayrhofer 1980. Sims-Williams 1979, 345 retrieves residual evidence in the Sogd. plur. suffix -išt, which is attached to certain masculine light-stem nouns denoting animals or persons. Deriving -išt from OIr. *-išt-tā-, he analyses the ending as a suffix conglomerate in which the fem. abstract suffix *-išt-, with collective sense, is attached to the form of the nom.sg. He thus identifies the equivalent of the Ved. nom.sg. vṛkē in the Sogd. dir.pl. form wṛpqššt ‘wolves’ < *vṛkē-tā. In YAv., by contrast, this particular noun has the stem vēhrkā- (Lat. lupa) and inflects after the ā-declension. De Vaan 2003, 272–273 and 581 surveys the Av. evidence for vṛkē-declension and proposes to interpret narośiš and rajiš in Y 53.9 as nom.sg. forms of i-stems. According to Remmer 2010 [2011], 159, the gen.sg. forms in fošīrīś, attested in the eschatological female personal names srūtāfōšīrī-, vanīhu.fošīrī-, orvadatfošīrī- in
Yt 13.141–142, regularly exhibit vrki-declension.2 By contrast, devi-declension is expected when female personal names are derived with vrddhi and the suffix -i- from thematic stems. Remmer 2010 [2011] discusses Ved. and Av. fem. names formed with no vrddhi, but showing devi-declension instead of the expected vrki-declension or ā-suffix. She argues that the Av. fem. names frānī, srīnī and huuarānī represent shortened forms based on masc. Av. frānah-, Indo-Iranian *tritayan(a)- and *suHar- dāta- respectively, and that they preserve the original possessive function of the suffix *-ih2 denoting belonging (pp. 159, 164f.).

Widmer 2005, 192–193 explains the IE origin of the vrki-formations by way of hypothasis from predicative instr.sg. forms with associative function (*-i-h1 ‘being together with X’). He posits the derivational chain *yklw-eho- m. ‘wolf’ : *yklw-ih1 ‘(the state of) being together with a wolf’; *yklw-ih2- 'the one who is together with a wolf, she-wolf’. Stüber 2007, 5–6, admits that this explanation is semantically plausible and provides an elegant solution to the absence of suffixal ablaut of the vrki-declension. She objects to it, however, on the grounds that the assumption of an intermediary abstract noun in -i-, which is normally derived from an adjective, as the derivational basis of the vrki-declension, conflicts with the direct link between vrki-stems and thematic substantives. Arguing for functional and formal identity of the suffix of both vrki- and devi-stems, she identifies the laryngeal of both inflectional types as the collective suffix *-h2 and postulates a composite suffix *-i-h2. The latter would have originated in the loc.sg. of athetic nouns and denoted a ‘multitude of what is at X’. By way of hypothasis, the nom.sg. would then have been formed with the “individualizing” nom.sg. ending -s to denote ‘an individual that is at X’ (pp. 9–11). This explanation is supported by the old function of vrki-stems to denote ‘belonging’, and by their indifference to gender, as emerges from instances where the suffix is attached to a noun denoting an object rather than a person, such as *roth2-ā- ‘chariot’ (Ved. rātha-, Av. rāṣṭa- m.). The derivative could therefore also refer to a male individual, e.g. *roth2-ih2-s ‘the one who is at a chariot, charioteer’ (Ved. rathē-, Av. raiśīf- m.).3

---

2 In Yt 13.141–142, the expected gen.sg. forms in ṣpōriiō are attested for all three compounds in the tradition of the Iranian Khorde Avesta, in particular in the ms. Mf3. The variant reading ṣpōriiā in the Indian tradition for the second and third name is probably due to the influence of the surrounding forms in -ā.

3 Stüber 2007, 11. The Av. equivalent of the Ved. acc.sg. rathyām from the stem rath- was identified by Humbach 1952 [1956], 26 in the form Y 50.6 raiśīm. Bartholomae’s 1904, 1508 interpretation of raiśīm as the acc.sg. of the adj. rātiīa- ignores the form’s trisyllabic value.
39. n-stems

The Av. evidence for n-stems is taken into account in Stüber’s 1997 discussion of the ablaut of neuter n-stems in IE and in Schneider’s 2010 survey of man-stems in Ved. (esp. pp. 77–79). García-Ramón 2009, 82 argues that Av. neuters in -man formed from verbal roots are nomina rei actae rather than nomina actionis and that they have nominal rather than verbal rection. Stüber 1998, 45 finds a parallel to the OAv. gen.sg. ending -mənɡ < Indo-Iranian *-man-s with full grade suffix and zero grade case ending in the form of the Proto-Celtic gen.sg. ending *-mes < *-men-s. The abl.sg. with the ending *-d, which is formed in YAv. parallel to the gen.sg. in *-man-s (Hoffmann & Forssman 2004, 143), is present in the formula frastoratát paiat barasmon ‘at the sacrificial strew spread out’ (Y 57.2, A 4.5, A 4.7, Yt 10.91, Yt 10.137, Yt 15.2, Vd 9.45), where the accompanying attribute frastoratát unequivocally identifies barasmon as the abl.sg. De Vaan 2001 provides a second example by analyzing the YAv. form vaēsmanada in Yt 10.86 as the abl.sg. extended by the post-position -a of the neuter man-stem vaēsma- (= Ved. véśman-) ‘house, abode’. Hintze 2007, 177–181 surveys the debate on the OAv. forms nāmam (Y 38.3) and nāmɔni (Y 37.3) and endorses the view that they represent variant forms of the nom./acc.pl. of n-stems, the former built with lengthened grade suffix, the latter with both lengthened grade suffix and ending -i < *-h. Hardarson 2005 discusses the formation in IE of the nom.sg. of m./f. n-stems and of the nom./acc.pl. of neuter n-stems. According to Tremblay 2003, 240 fn.32, the instr.sg. of proterokinetic -man- and heteroclitic -uuar/ uuan-stems ends in -māi(m)ī and -uua(i)mī respectively, while the loc.sg. has a lengthened grade suffix.

Av. plural forms in -iš formed from n-stems continue to be the subject of debate (for older literature see Tichy 1985, 150 with fn.2). Pointing out that neither n-stems nor heteroclitics in fact attest the expected instr.pl. form in *-abiš (< IE *-bʰiš), Tichy 1985, 160–161 argues that the form sūnīš in Vd 14.1, Vd 13.50 and 51 is the instr.pl. form that came to be used as nom./acc.pl. to refer to both male and female dogs. Along similar lines Narten 1985, 177–178 (= 1995, 302–303) makes the case that the OAv. plural form nāməniš (Y 51.22) is a genuine instr.pl. employed in YAv. as nom./acc.pl., while Skjervø 2007, 322–324 regards the form nāməniš in Y 51.22 as the regular YAv. instr.pl., suggesting that the entire last verse line of the Gāthic hymn is in YAv. In his view, the instr.pl. of man- and uuan-stems has the ending -iš, which would replace the original ending *-giš < *-biš between vowels. Tremblay 2008, 20 surveys phonetic explanations that have been proposed, in addition to those discussed by Kuiper 1978, 84f., for the interpretation of the form nāməniš as an instr.pl. While De Vaan 2003, 271 rejects any derivation of the ending -iš < *-biš on the grounds that *b should have left a trace in the form of either -b- or -aur-, Tremblay 1997, 165 fn.14 regards all alleged OAv. and YAv. instr.pl. forms in -iš from n-stems (sūnīš,
nāmānīś, aśaonis Vṛ 21.3, P35) as genuine acc.pl. forms. But his proposal that -iś results from the collective ending *-h₂ > -i recharacterised by means of the acc.pl. ending -ns, i.e. *-i-ns > -iś, fails to convince. For the form frauwaśīś, see p. 7, no. 37 above: i- and u-stems (at the end).

40. r-stems

Tichy’s 1995 study of the Ved. agent nouns formed with the suffix -tar- takes much of the Av. evidence into account, particularly with regard to morphological and syntactic features (pp. 31–84). Hintze 2007, 247–249 surveys the debate on the phonetic processes that led to the acc.pl. ending OAv. -ərəq (e.g. Y 38.5 mātərəq2, nərəq), YAv. -ərəq (e.g. nərəq) < *-i-ns. The latter is an Indo-Iranian innovation analogous to the acc.pl. of i- and u-stems, IE *-i-ns and *-u-ns (OAv. ašī, OAv., YAv. gairīś, OAv. xratīś, Gothic gastins, Grk dial. πόλινς), as compared to IE *-(t)frış continued, for instance, in the Greek acc.pl. πατέρας, μητέρας ‘fathers, mothers’.

41. s-stems

In a study of the primary s-stems in Indo-European, Stüber 2002 distinguishes the three morphological categories of neuters, second term of compounds and (rare) masc. or fem. collectives. Surveying the Indo-Iranian evidence (pp. 40–45), she notes that s-stems are less productive in Avestan than in Vedic. Most of them are action nouns, some of which are attested within the Caland system (e.g. stauwah- ‘thickness’, barzəh- ‘height’, məzəh- ‘size’). In addition, there are pairs of uncompound s-stems functioning both as neuter nouns and as adjectives, such as baoəh- ‘perception’ and baoəh- ‘perceptive’, rədəh- ‘liberality’ and rədəh- ‘liberal’.

Stüber 2000a, 155, 160 interprets the amphikinetic s-stems as collective derivatives from neuter proterokinetic s-stems. For the nom./acc.pl. of neuter -ah-stems an IE collective form *-əs > Indo-Iranian *-əs is posited to account for the Av. ending -ə. In addition, an equivalent of the Ved. nom./acc.pl. vārcənśi has been seen in the OAv. acc.pl. varəcə hi-cə/varəcə hicə (Y 32.14), which was thought to represent the only instance of an Av. nom./acc.pl. of an ah-stem in *-əh-i instead of expected -ə.5 However, in agreement with Kellens 1974, 88–89, Gippert 2002, 184–187 suggests that in Y 32.14 varəcə is the regular acc.pl. of varəcəh- ‘splendour’ while hicə is the instr.sg. of the root noun hic- ‘pouring’.

42. ɨs-stems

Stems in -iś, such as OAv. təuəś- ‘force’ from the IE root *təeh₂ ‘to become strong’, YAv. stəriś- ‘strew’ from *sterh₁ ‘to spread out’, are explained by Schindler

1975 as originating from formations in which the zero grade variety of the suffix *-ex-/-os- is attached to roots ending in a laryngeal. By contrast, Stüber 2002, 21, explains stems in *-iś- as resulting from a contamination of *i- and s-stems.

43. t-stems
Vičuanas 2009, 108–138 surveys nominal formations in Indo-Iranian derived with suffix -t- or -Vt- directly from verbal roots. Suggesting that in PIE the suffix *-t- formed verbal abstracts (p. 134), he distinguishes two groups, derivative t-stems and enlarged root nouns. Derivative t-stems, such as *nōk*-t- and *lēyk-ot-, are formed with the derivational suffix *-t/-Vt-, while in enlarged root nouns, such as Indo-Iranian *stūt- t- and *daēja-stūt-i-, the *-t- enlarges the root. Regarding the derivative t-stems as primary to the enlarged root nouns, Vičuanas constructs a scenario for the processes by which in Indo-Iranian the derivational suffix *-t- came to be re-interpreted as a root-enlargement, and became characteristic of roots ending in the short vowels *-i, *-u, and *-f (pp. 131–133).

44. Demonstrative pronouns
Hintze 2007, 119–123 surveys deixis and forms of the nom.sg.m. of the pronoun OAv. hūō (IE *sa-y), YAv. hāu (IE *sā-y). The latter is morphologically the form of the nom.sg.f., but functions in YAv. as nom.sg. of both m. and f. The Sogdian article xw (< *hay) reflects this indifference to the distinction of gender, in that it came occasionally to be used with fem. as well as masc. nouns. Yakubovitch 2012, 496 endorses Wendtland’s conclusion that the occasional use of the Sogdian definite article masc. xw for the fem. is a vestige of the Prfr. lack of distinction between masc. and fem. in the nom.sg. of the far-deictic pronoun. Hoffmann & Forssman 2004, 86, §50d suggest that the development of *(−)jāhā > *(−)juhe instead of *(−)اهе in the gen.m./ntr. and loc.sg.fem. of the interrogative, relative and demonstrative pronouns could be dialectal, while de Vaan 2003, 401–404, 614 argues for a linguistic explanation.

Pirart 1997a finds no evidence in the Younger Avesta for the function of the pronoun hīm (Ved. sīm) as a particle and concludes that hīm is probably not used as a particle in the Older Avesta either. Kellens & Pirart 1997, 44–45 consider the use of the form of the nom.sg. of enclitic pronouns to be an archaic trait of the OAv. language, and possibly of Av. in general. They review various translations of Y 30.3, which is widely regarded as the “dualist key passage” (Gershevitch 1995, 16), and describe the function of the pronoun hī in the stanza’s second verse line manahicā vacahicā šīaōthānōī hī vahīi akomčā, as posing the stanza’s “problème capital” (1997, 46). In their analysis hī is the nom. dual ntr. of the enclitic pronoun hī- and derives its gender from šīaōthānōī, which must necessarily be the first word of a new independent clause. They translate the relevant words of Y 30.3 line 2 as “au moment
de l’acte, il y a deux (actes), le meilleur et le mauvais’ (1997, 48–50). Their parsing of \( h\) is in agreement with Hoffmann & Forssman 2004, 162, who, however, regard the form as tonic. Ahmadi 2013 critically reviews the interpretation of Y 30.3 by Kellens & Pirart and other scholars. Pointing out that \( h\) can refer only to a dual feminine or neuter antecedent (p. 239), Ahmadi 2013, 245f. suggests that the “rule” of the obligatory second positioning of the enclitic in the sentence interacts with poetic and formulaic factors. According to him, the syntagm in Y 30.3bb’ \( h\) vahii\( o\) ak\( m\)c\( c\) is an elliptical construction and applies to each of the triad members man\( ah\)-, vac\( ah\)-, \( \#\)i\( o\)\( an\)\( a\)-, from which the form \( h\) derives its neuter gender. Accordingly, Y 30.3b is short for *manah\( h\) vahii\( o\) ak\( m\)c\( c\) vac\( ah\) h\( i\) vahii\( o\) ak\( m\)c\( c\) s\( i\)\( a\)\( o\)\( h\)\( a\)n\( o\)i h\( i\) vahii\( o\) ak\( m\)c\( c\) ‘in area of thought, two (kinds), one good and one bad; in area of speech, two (kinds), one good and one bad; in area of action, two (kinds), one good and one bad’; see also below no.79: Studies of individual words s.v. -c\( \dot{a}\).

De Vaan 2004a discusses pronominal gen.pl. forms such as k\( m\)c\( j\) and an\( i\)\( q\)\( m\) in the Vid\( e\)vd\( d\)\( d\) with an unexpected ending -qm instead of -a\( \\dot{e}\)\( s\)\( q\)\( m\). Regarding such forms as innovations, he argues that they were created analogically on the model the gen.pl. of the dem. stem a\( -i\)\( t\), a\( \\dot{e}\)\( s\)\( q\)\( m\), which was re-interpreted as belonging to the dem. stem a\( \dot{e}\)\( s\)\( a\). He is able to support this explanation with the fact that the gen.pl. a\( \dot{e}\)\( s\)\( q\)\( m\) and the nom.sg.fem. a\( \dot{e}\)\( s\)\( a\) occur in textual proximity in Vd 3.14 and in the expression ku\( u\)\( u\) a\( \dot{e}\)\( s\)\( q\)\( m\), a\( \dot{e}\)\( s\)\( a\) dru\( x\)\( s\), which is repeated 57 times in Vd 8.41–69.

45. Personal pronouns

Gotö 1999,139–141 analyses the dat.sg. forms maibi\( o\) und taibi\( o\) as resulting from the combination of maibi\( \dot{u}\), taibi\( \dot{u}\) with the enclitic particle \( u\). Kümmel 2013, 196 suggests that the gen.pl. forms of the pers. pronoun, Indo-Iranian *asm\( \acute{a}\)\( k\)am, *u\( s\)\( m\)\( \acute{a}\)\( k\)am, historically represent petrified forms of the sing. of old adjectives *asm\( \acute{a}\)\( k\)a, u\( s\)\( m\)\( \acute{a}\)\( k\)a- denoting belonging.

46. Pronominal adjectives

De Vaan 2005a argues that pronominal possessive adjective *hya- is continued in inflected forms of OAv. x\( a\)- ‘one’s own’ and in YAv. as first term of compounds and in the adv. x\( a\)t\( o\) (< *hya-tah) ‘by oneself’. In addition, in YAv. only the inflected possessive adj. takes the form hau\( a\)a- ‘own’, while the variant hau\( a\)a- belongs to inferior mss. He suggests that YAv. *hya- replaces *hya- and represents an innovation analogical on personal and demonstrative pronouns with initial *ha- (see also no.79 below s.v. hau\( a\)a-). Sims-Williams 1997 argues that in pronominal adjectives in -wu\( a\)nt- such as Av. au\( a\)nt- ‘so much’, au\( a\) au\( a\)nt- ‘that much’, a\( e\) au\( a\) au\( a\)nt- ‘such’ (Ved. et\( a\)v\( a\)nt-), au\( a\) au\( a\)nt- ‘as much as’ (Ved. y\( a\)v\( a\)nt-), the suffix -wu\( a\)nt- is attached to the inflected form of the nom./acc.pl. ntr. in *-\( a\)H of the respective pronouns.
47. Comparative

Av., like Ved. and Greek, has two sets of suffixes for the comparative and the superlative, one more archaic (comparative *-jes/-jós-, superlative *-is-te/o-) and the other more recent and productive (*-tero-, superlative *-tynto-). Rau 2014 investigates the morphological history of the primary comparative formed with suffix -jes/-jós- and its ties to the Caland system. Widmer 2004, 149–152 suggests that the sequence -xii- in the OAv. (Y 31.2) comparative nom.sg.m. važiá (< *gahijåh), as compared to -hi- in the nom./acc.sg.ntr. važiá (< *gahijåh, Ved. vásayh), indicates a shifting accent. According to him, in the inflectional paradigm of m./f. comparative forms, the accent shifted from the root to the suffix in the acc.sg. according to the *kʰetyôres-rule and from there spread analogically to the nom.sg. The neuter, by contrast, inflected according to the acrostotic paradigm, with the accent fixed on the root.

48. Superlatives

Tucker 1998 and 2009 distinguishes two types of Old Iranian superlatives in -ištá-. Those of the first group, such as OAv. aọiʃša- ‘strongest’ alongside the positive ugra- ‘strong’ and sraʃša- ‘finest’ alongside srîra- ‘fine’, have “Caland” adjectives as the positive term and often no verb at all. Their meaning is intrinsically adjectival. Those of the second type, represented by haiʃša- ‘best at bringing, carrying’, are deverbal and formed on the basis of a verb stem. While the first group constitutes an inherited but moribund category, the second becomes to some extent productive within Iranian and displays morphological developments. In particular, the root vocalism of the superlative corresponds to that of the verbal stem, e.g. (paiti.jdãrîʃta- Yt 11.2 ‘best at resisting’ besides causative present dãraiia- ‘to hold’, while the superlatives jayniʃta-, viʃaymiʃta-, dãhîʃta-, paʃiʃta- and nasiʃta- are parallel new formations linked to thematic aorist stems. While Tucker argues that the process of deriving superlatives from verb stems became productive only in Younger Av., Hintze 2007, 133–144 projects the process back to OAv. by suggesting that Y 36.3 vâziʃta- is deverbal and derives its lengthened grade from the transitive-causative stem *vâzaiia-, Ved. vâjâya- ‘to cause someone to be vigorous, to enliven, invigorate, arouse’. The meaning of the adj. is accordingly ‘most invigorating, most enlivening’. Surveying the debate surrounding vâziʃta- and the various contexts in which it occurs, she suggests that in Y 36.3 it expresses the idea that when inhabited by Ahura Mazda’s life-giving force, spãnta- mainiu-, the ritual fire is seen as ‘providing life-force’ and energy (vâziʃta-; cf. no. 79 below s.vv. spãnta-, vâziʃta-). García-Ramón 2010 examines Av. [*]haiʃša- its Homeric cognate φέρωρος and Hitt. nakkû ‘heavy, important’ and reconstructs a suppletive system of nominal forms derived from the verbal roots *bher- ‘to carry’ and *hînek ‘to receive, take’ respectively. He suggests that the latter developed the meaning ‘to carry’ under the influence of *bher-. 
Dieu 2011, 163–167 argues that Av. bairiša- and Grk φέρσις describe the gods as divine dispensers of gifts (“les plus apporteurs”) and rejects (p. 172 fn. 185) Bader’s 1999, 350–351 interpretation as an original epithet of warriors (in the sense of carrying booty), while Goldman 2015, 128–134 discusses the attestation of bairiša- alongside the superlatives vaēšīša-, viōcōšīša-, 'parakauistəma, nijaynīša- and nasištə- in Yt 12.7–8.

49. Numerals

Gotō 2013, 60–65 provides a comprehensive survey of numerals in Ved. and Av., and Emmerick 1992a, adopting an IE perspective, discusses in detail cardinals, ordinals, multiplicative adverbs and adjectives, fractions, distributives, collectives and the order of composite numerals in Old, Middle and New Iranian languages. Schmitt 1994 examines the cardinal numbers ‘ten’ to ‘nineteen’ from the oldest to modern Iranian languages, while Blažek 1999e discusses numeral systems in non-Indo-European (pp. 1–140) and, especially, Indo-European languages (pp. 141–324). Bringing together a large amount of material, the work covers the numerals ‘one’ to ‘ten’, ‘hundred’ and ‘thousand’, and includes reprints of studies of individual numerals in IE languages, in particular of ‘one’ (1999), ‘three’ (1999a), ‘six’ (2000), ‘eight’ (1998), ‘nine’ (1999b), ‘hundred’ (1999c) and ‘thousand’ (1999d). De Vaan 1997a [2000] reviews Blažek’s attempts at identifying the ways in which IE numerals have been formed. Carruba 1999 studies the numerals “1” in IE, while Miyakawa 2002 [2006] examines the causes for the long -ā- in the numeral for ‘five’ in pāncāsata- and when followed by an enclitic, as in YAv. pāncāa-, and suggests that the long vowel is a reflex of an old collective. Viređaz 1997, 131–135 considers the initial velar of Av. xšīuāš ‘six’ to be an innovation that occurred in the common Proto-Iranian period. Rau 2009, 11–63 discusses the derivational history of the decade numerals ‘20’ to ‘90’ from an Indo-European perspective.

In a study of mixed fractions in Iranian, Panaino 1997, 98–103 queries Hoffmann’s 1965: 251f. (= 1975: 187f.) proposal to analyse a stem such as ṭēśwai- ‘a third’ as an adjectival derivative with suffix -ya- from the multiplicative adverb ṭēśa- ‘three times’. He considers Hoffmann’s assumption of a semantic development from ‘three times’ to ‘a third’ to be implausible. Like Hoffmann, however, Panaino elaborates on the old idea that the loc.pl. played a role in the way fractions are denoted in Iranian languages. Suggesting that the derivational process started in fractions where the numerator was one and the denominator many: ‘one in three (seven, eight)’, he argues that the adjectives ṭēśwai- ‘a third’, haptāŋhua- ‘a seventh’ and aŋtāŋhua-
'an eighth'\textsuperscript{3} arose by hypostasis from the form of the loc.pl. of the cardinals \textit{hrī-}, \textit{hapta-} and \textit{ašta-} respectively.

50. Verbal Morphology

Kellens 1984 remains the most comprehensive treatment of the Av. verb and is supplemented by his list of verbal roots and forms (Kellens 1995) and the addenda and corrigenda by Tremblay 2008, 21–33. Gotō 2004 discusses a range of verb forms in Y 9.

51. Personal endings

Tremblay 2002 [2006] examines the history and prehistory of the Indo-Iranian \textit{r}-endings. Noting that in both Ved. and Av. the ending \textit{*-r(ə)} is found in the active voice, while \textit{*-rai, -ram} is confined to the middle voice, he examines the active ending \textit{-āra} in the Middle Iranian languages Khotanese and Choresmian and in Modern Iranian Yaghnobi. With regard to the 3pl.pres.opt.act. of thematic verbs, Skjærvø 1998, 191 and 2007a, 321–328 draws attention to forms in the Iranian Vidēvdād Sāde and Pahlavi Vidēvdād with the ending \textit{-aišən}. Since they not only represent the expected outcome of \textit{*-aja-š-ant} but are also found in the better manuscript tradition, he suggests that they are to be preferred to the variant forms ending in \textit{-aiṣən}, which have for no good reason found their way into the Av. grammar books in spite of the fact that they belong to the inferior tradition of the Indian Vulgate.

52. Thematic and reduplicated presents

Hill 2007 studies Indo-Iranian stems with accented thematic vowel and zero grade root of the type Ved. \textit{sṛj-}, Av. \textit{hāreza-} (Indo-Iranian \textit{*sṛj} ‘to release’) and, with nasal infix, Ved. \textit{kṛnt-}, YAv. \textit{kṛnta-} (Indo-Iranian \textit{*kṛt} ‘to cut’). The morphological type is traditionally referred to as “aorist-presents” (“Aorist-Präsenten”) because the stems without nasal infix are found in the aorist as well as in the present tense system. The work examines all attestations of this class in the oldest Ved., Av. and Old Persian texts with a view to establishing their morphology, semantics and syntactic functions. Hill argues that historically some of the thematic stems derive from older zero grade root present and aorist forms (summary on pp. 290–292), while thematic nasal-infix presents go back to athematic nasal presents, such as Ved. \textit{vindr-} from \textit{vinād-} (Av. \textit{vinad-, vind-} ‘to find’).

Heenen 2006 provides a detailed account of the Indo-Iranian desiderative. Focusing on the semantic roles of the constituent components of the category, he argues that the desiderative had originally a more prospective rather than desiderative function.

\footnote{The latter two are attested only in FiO 1 (= Klingenschmitt 1968 nos. 20 and 21).}
While the work has a clear focus on Ved., the relatively few Av. forms are occasionally, rather than systematically discussed. Heenen’s suggestion that the reduplication was the original marker of the desiderative meaning and that the suffix -sa- was added later on the analogy of the aorist subjunctive, remains, as Kümmel 2010, 182 comments, rather uncertain. According to Kortlandt 2008, the perfective -s- was the oldest component and the thematic -a- was added to the reduplicated sigmatic formation.

53. nu- and nasal infix presents

Steer 2013–4 discusses the relationship between nasal infix and nu-presents in an IE perspective. Rather than deriving the latter from the former, as suggested previously, he argues that the nasal-infix *-ne-/*n- arose in early PIE by way of a morphological reanalysis of the suffix *-ney-/*nu- of older nu-presents, from where it spread analogically. In his reconstruction of the prehistoric linguistic developments, nu-presents existed as zero grade formations alongside u-adjectives. For example, the root root *d³e³h³ ‘to diminish’ formed the nu-present *d³e³h³-néy- (Av. dobo-na-o-itii ‘cheats, deceives’) alongside the adjective *d³e³h³-u- (Hittite tepu ‘little, few’). Subsequently, Steer argues, a secondary derivational connection between the two formations led to the re-analysis of the present stem as *d³e³h³-né-u-, as if it was derived from the u-adj. d³e³h³-u-. This provided a new derivational pattern by which new present stems were formed by inserting *ne- before the suffixal -u of u-adjectives. The derivational pattern then spread to verbal roots ending in -u, such as *kléy ‘to hear’, pres. *klé-u-ti, Ved. śr-ṇá-ti, Av. sormaoiti, and from there to any root, e.g. *jeu-g ‘to yoke’, pres. *jeu-né-g-ti, Ved. yunäkti.

54. Intensives

Schaefer 1994, 50–51 surveys the Av. evidence for intensives, of which eight athematic stems have an equivalent in Vedic. Kellens 1984, 194, 195 note 4, interprets the Av. stem ja-ñ-a- as representing an intensive present stem which was dissimilated from *jan-ñ-a- (Ved. jāṅghan-), thus separating Av. ja-ñ-a- etymologically from Grk πε-γν-ε/o-. This interpretation is accepted by Schaefer 1994, 51, but criticised by Strunk 1994, 427 (summarised by Hintze 1999, 108). Hintze 1999, 107–109 argues that the pairs Av. zîzana- (pres.), Ved. fîjana- (aor.), and Av. ja-ñ-a- (pres.), Grk πε-γν-ε/o- (aor.) represent inherited reduplicated stems originally denoting the mode of action (Aktionsart) of verbal plurality (e.g. iterative, distributive, intensive, frequentative). Av. ja-ñ-a- still shows it in the context of its three attestations, where numerals reinforce the action of repeated hitting. Considering Av. ja-ñ-a- and Grk πε-γν-ε/o- as etymologically identical, she suggests that in the wake of the development of aspects in Late IE, the former came to be allocated to the imperfective aspect (present), the latter to the perfective aspect (aorist).
55. Denominatives

In both Ved. and Av. most denominative verbs are derived with suffix *-ja- from s-stems, such as Av. nomahiia-, Ved. namasya- ‘to pay homage, reverence’ from Indo-Iranian *namahi- ntr. ‘homage, reverence’. In addition, the two branches provide evidence for denominatives from a-stems, such as Av. arzaiia- ‘to do battle, fight’ from arza- ‘battle’ and Ved. devaia- ‘to worship the gods’ from deva- ‘god’. While Ved. also has denominatives derived from nouns formed with suffixes such as -ma-, -tra-, which make the nominal character of the base obvious (e.g. Ved. vasnaia- ‘to bargain’ from vasnai- ‘price’), Tucker 2004 notes that Av. provides no evidence for this type. Conversely, she identifies as an Av. peculiarity a small group of YAv. denominative verbs based on thematic stems where the thematic vowel is elided, such as haomanaiaja- ‘to be of good spirit’ (< *haymanah-ja-) from the neuter substantive haomanaia- ‘good-spiritedness, happiness’. A further group consists of verb stems which show ambiguity as to whether they are denominal or deverbal. Such is the case with lengthened-grade -ja-present stems such as pairi.karaia- ‘to scatter’. The formation could be explained either as derived from a thematic nominal stem, or as an -aia- present derived from a verbal root with an IE *o-grade, which in an open syllable is regularly continued as -a- in Indo-Iranian after Brugmann’s Law. However, since the conditions for the application of Brugmann’s Law are not met in pairi.karaia-, as it is based on the root *karH ‘to scatter’ with a closed syllable, Tucker suggests that pairi.karaia- was created within Av. on the basis of the thematic nominal stem pairi.kara- ‘scattering’, with which it forms a figura etymologica in Vd 17.6, by lengthening the root vowel and adding the suffix -ja-. Avestan thus created denominative verbs that were identical in form to inherited *-ajia- presents. Further examples which Tucker adduces include vohaiia- ‘to chop’ from vohai- ‘wedge, axe, a tool for chopping wood’ (Ved. vadh- m. ‘weapon’), and pairi.daizaiia- ‘to wall around’ from pairi.daizai- ‘surrounding wall’ (p. 553f.). She concludes that in Av. inherited *-aiia- presents came to be interpreted as denominatives and supplied a model for new denominative verbs with suffix -ja- derived from thematic stems (p. 558).

56. Moods

In addition to his 1984 summary, Kellens’s survey in Kellens & Pirart 1988–1991, vol. II 65–69 is the most detailed study of the use of tenses and moods in OAv. Panaino 2015, 54–59 discusses the functions of the subjunctive mood and the primary and secondary endings in the juxtaposed forms in Y 31.5c yā nōi tva aŋha t aŋhāit va ‘(the things) which either do not exist or (which) do exist’. Av. opt. forms in -ima, -i from full grade roots play a major role in Pinault’s 2015 reconstruction of the origins in PIE of the optative suffix, which he suggests arises from a serial verb con-
struction of an i-passive aorist of impersonal meaning and the inflected injunctive form of a verbal root *hiih- ‘to go’. According to his proposal, the OAı form sr̥vaunmā goes back to Indo-Iranian *čṛāyi-Hima < PIE *kloy-i + HiHmē, literally meaning ‘one hears; we can go (for it)’ = ‘we may listen’, with shortening of *-āyi- > *-aui- in the fourth syllable from the end of the word after the merging of the two forms into one verb (pp. 171–173). It is, however, doubtful that the form sr̥vaunmā can carry the weight of the argument because the alleged shortening in the form sr̥vaunmā is poorly supported. Moreover, at its single Gāthic attestation (Y 28.7), sr̥vaunmā is metrically trisyllabic, while one would expect four syllables in Pinault’s reconstruction, and, furthermore, both Av. sr̥auu and Ved. -sr̥vī have a passive rather than the active meaning posited for the first term of Pinault’s periphrastic construction.

57. Present Participles

Hintze 1994, 136 and 280–281, 1999, 105 and fn.24 (references) notes the confusion between thematic and athematic forms in the weak cases of fem. forms of present participles active, such as the acc.pl.fem. xruaśiiteiśi ‘blood-thirsty’ from the thematic pres. stem xruaśiite-. Such confusion extends to nominal stems formed with the primary athematic suffix -ant/-at-. For instance, the adj. bharz-ant- ‘lofty’ attests both the thematic gen.pl. bharz-a-nt-qm in Yt 19.15 and the expected athematic bharz-at-qm in Yt 13.82 and Y 26.3. Swennen 1995 discusses fem. forms of the pres.part.act. with a view to establishing the system for the treatment of the suffix *-nt- preceding the fem. suffix. -i. Examining participles derived from both thematic and athematic present stems, he provides an inventory of the forms attested in Avestan. Martinez 2000 discusses the inflection of the participle fiianhant- (< *fiiahy-ant-/at- ) ‘hailing’ and identifies the athematic gen.sg.fem. fiianhuuaitiśa, transmitted by the manuscripts F1 and E1 in Yt 16.10, as lectio difficilest (p. 343f.). See no. 79 below s.v. x‘airiianant-. Hintze 2017, 169–170 and fn. 12–14 discusses the participles vōrāmno, *upa.vāṭiś and uzgrimbio attested in HN 2.7, 2.25 and, partly, in Vyt 8.3 (55).

58. Aorist

Hardarson 1993 studies accent, ablaut, inflection and morphological innovations of the root aorist in Indo-Iranian and in Greek. While the co-existence of athematic and thematic root formations from the same root is common, the Av. and Ved. verb ar, in which several etymologically distinct roots have fallen together, displays a change of voice in showing middle root aorists alongside active thematic aorists. Disentangling forms of *ar < IE *hser ‘to set oneself in motion’ and *ar < IE *hser ‘to reach’, Kümmel 2000a argues that *ar forms a middle root aorist and reduplicated
present and ār a thematic active aorist of the type Ved. ārā-t and an inchoative present of the type Ved. rcchā-iti. Hintze 1977, 172–174 adds the form frârânti (HN 2.9, Vyt 8.4) as a second attestation of the active thematic aorist of ār ‘to reach, arrive’, in addition to OAv. āraṃ (Y 43.10), see no. 79 below s.v. ar.

Bendahan’s 1993 dissertation on reduplicated aorists in IE languages surveys the evidence of verbal roots in Indo-Iranian that form a- (< *e) reduplicated, zero-grade thematic stems (pp. 194–205). Interpreting the Av. stem vaōca-, Ved. voca- (< *ya-uc-a-, from *yauc- ‘to speak’), as a reduplicated aorist rather than as a thematic perfect stem, as suggested by some scholars, she endorses its equation with Grk εἰταύειν and assumes that this category, which originally had athematic inflection, developed in late PIE (pp. 40–41, 201–203), while Willi 2007, 39–41 projects the formation even further back into PIE.

59. Static and i-passive

Kümmler 1996 examines the function and form of the two archaic verbal categories static and i-passive in Vedic and Avestan. The static, for which there is evidence also outside Indo-Iranian, consists of middle presents, with 3.sg. in Indo-Iranian *-ai, and with 3.pl. in *-raj, for example Ved. sāy-e ‘he/she/it lies’, plur. sē-re ‘they lie’. The i-passives, by contrast, are confined to Indo-Iranian They are represented by forms with 3.sg. in *-i and 3.pl. in *-rami/ with special ablaut and a partly patitive function, for example OAv. srāvī ‘is famous’. Providing an inventory and discussion of the relevant forms and their contexts, Kümmler categorises the different meanings of the statics and passive aorists. He argues that, within the synchronic systems of the two languages, Ved. 3rd plural forms in -rami/ and Av. 3rd sg. imperatives in -am form paradigms with i-passive aorists. In contrast to Kümmler 1996, 145f., who assumes that a static form such as OAv. iśe (Ved. īṣe) is substituted in YAv. by the middle īṣte, Pooth 2000, 2001 argues that in Indo-Iranian static forms may also have an agentive, reflexive or factitive function, which would allow them to be associated with the middle. Assuming that later attestations do not necessarily represent later linguistic forms, he pairs the OAv. static īṣe (Y 50.1) ‘is able’ with the 3sg.mid. YAv. īste (Purs 11), the Ved. static sāye with the 3sg. mid. Ved. sēte, YAv. saēte, and the static Ved. stāve with the 3sg. mid. YAv. staōta, and he considers the middle forms as well as the statics to be inherited from Late IE rather than Indo-Iranian innovations. According to him, Late IE had pairs such as the static *stēy-o(-i) alongside the middle *stēy-to(-i) (Pooth 2000, 95).

Jasanoff 2016, 140 argues that Indo-Iranian passive aorists are linked via an IE derivational process to middle root presents of the ‘static-intransitive’ type in 3sg. *-di. The i-passive form mraoī in Y 32.14 is discussed by Gippert 1998, who argues that mraoī is 3sg. i-passive of the root present stem of mru ‘to speak’ rather than of
the homonymous *mrū ‘to maltreat’, as proposed by Humbach, and represents the earliest Av. attestation of an i-passive based on the present rather than the aorist stem. Hintze 2001, 271, who accepts this analysis, explains the form *mrāoī instead of the expected OAv. *mrāuuī (< Indo-Iranian *mrāyH-i) as analogous with other forms of *mrū ‘to speak’, such as 1sg. mrāomi. By contrast, de Vaan 2003, 372 postulates an (irregular) *mrūyī which remained unaffected by the change *-yī- > *-yī-. After the change *-yī- > *-yī- was completed, he suggests, *mrūyī was shortened to *mrāuuī on the model of the pres. subj. stem mrāuu-.

60. Perfect

The most substantial contribution to the study of the Av. perfect during the review period is Kümmel’s 2000 monograph on the perfect in Indo-Iranian. The work aims at providing complete coverage of the perfect stems and forms in Ved. and Av. and investigates their historical development from PIE. Owing to the much smaller size of the corpus in comparison to Ved., the Av. material occupies only a little more than 10% of the book’s space. Each perfect form of the 66 roots which show perfect formations in Av. is examined in the context of its attestation, which is usually quoted and accompanied by the author’s own translation.6

The augment being only rarely attested in Av., there is no evidence for augmented perfect stems with secondary endings (perfect preterites or pluperfect), whereas the category is well documented in Vedic. However, its relationship to the imperfect and reduplicated aorist has been subject to a debate which is surveyed by Bandhahan 1993, 126–137 and Kümmel 2000, 82–86; Willi 2007 sees the origin of the augment in the reduplication syllable of verbs with initial laryngeal (*hve-hi...). There is Av. evidence for unaugmented forms (perf.inj.), the best example of which is the Gāthic form mrēraost (Y 51.12; Kümmel 2000, 87f., 667). In addition, there are thematic forms with secondary endings built from the unaugmented e-reduplicated zero-grade stem. These forms are particularly ambiguous in that from a formal point of view, they might be interpreted as thematic perfect injunctives, perfect subjunctives or reduplicated thematic aorists. Thus, the forms tataśat and jaymat are interpreted as (very rare) perf. subjunctives by Kellens 1984, 400, 411 n.1, 420; Pirart 1992, 25f., and Kümmel 2000, 89, 630, 639, but, following Bartholomae 1904, 645, as thematic perfect injunctives by Hintze 1994, 122 and Tremblay, 1996, 114f.; 2008, 31.

Jasanoff 1997 explains the form cikōtaraś, a hapax legomenon in Y 32.11, as the 3pl. inj.perf. or pluperfect (rather than 3pl. ind.perf. as previously assumed) of the verb cit ‘to perceive’ (< Indo-Iranian *ći-kāj-t-ṛ). He thus finds in cikōtaraś the Av. counterpart of Ved. 3pl.inj.perf.act. forms built from the full grade root, such as Ved.

vivesūr (RV 4.23.9) from viś ‘to enter’ and, with augment (perfect preterite or pluperfect) adīdhayu ‘(they) appeared’ (RV 5.40.5). Jasanoff argues that, in both the pluperfect and the optative, the inherited 3pl. perfect ending *-rṣ is paradigmatically associated with the active secondary endings 1sg. in *-m, 2sg. in *-s, and 3sg. in *-t. While cīkūtāraṇ is the only evidence of the 3pl. pluperfect in Av., the ending *-rṣ is well attested in the 3pl.opt. (e.g. YAv. jamiīrāṣa of gam ‘to come’). The 3pl. pluperfect contrasts in ablaut and ending with the 3pl. ind.perf., which is characterised by the ending *-r in combination with the zero grade root (e.g. OAv. cāxnarā from kan ‘to be pleased with’). Assuming that the PIE perfect system was originally characterised by *o : *e ablaut, Jasanoff concludes that the type represented by Av. cīkūtāraṇ (IE *kʷekʰ rút) is an archaism that preserves “the inherited weak stem more faithfully than any of the attested forms of the perfect proper” (p. 129). Jasanoff’s interpretation is endorsed by Tremblay 2002 [2006], 265f. fn.24, while Kūmmel 2000, 635–636 points out that all other finite forms of the verb *kajt ‘to perceive’ show -ṣ- in Av. He discusses the alternative proposal by Kellens & Pirat 1988–1991 III 89, according to which the form cīkūtāraṇ is the gen.sg. of an agent noun cīkūtār-, derived from the present stem YAv. cikāi- (Ved. cikēti). Although this analysis is supported by other agent nouns based on the the present stem, in particular the OAv. fem. stem man-avārī-, Ved. manōtār-manōtār-, built on the present stem Indo-Iranian *manāy- ‘to remember’, Kūmmel points out that the meaning and function of the postulated agent noun in the context of Y 32.11 remain unclear.

As far as modes derived from the perfect stem are concerned, Kūmmel 2000, 88–90 concludes that Av. modal forms consistenly show resultative meaning. By contrast, Ved. attests only a few modal forms with perfect function while other forms appear to function rather as variants of modal forms of present or aorist stems.

Skjaervo 1997a, 145–147; 1997b, 612, and 1998, 191 restores an Av. perfect participle stem vauxuxah- of the verb vac ‘to speak’ by his analysis of the compound ‘mītho.vauxuxah ‘having spoken falsely’ in Yt 19.95, where the mss. transmit a variety of readings, including mīθro. aoxuxah (F1) and mīθro.vauxuxah (E1). He distinguishes the attestation in Yt 19.95 from Yt 10.104 mīθro.əojənəh ‘having the strength of Mithra’, in contrast to Hintze 1994, 392, who, following Kellens 1974, 170–171, reads mīθo.əojənəh ‘speaking falsely’ in both passages.

The vowel of the reduplicative syllable of the perfect stem of the root gar ‘to wake up’ varies in the manuscripts between -i- and -a-, and the spellings of the root vowel between -a- and -ā-, while zero grade forms of the stem are absent. Kellens 1984, 402f. n. 15 considers the stem form based on jayār- to represent the better reading. Tremblay 1997a discusses the irregular ablaut grade of the YAv. perf. participle

---

7 The attestations of 3pl. opt. forms in -iūrāṣ are conveniently listed by de Vaan 2003, 531.
Forms of infinitives and supines in IE languages are conveniently listed in Gordon 2012, 503–504.
syntax of infinitives and verbal abstractions in Indo-Iranian *-(C)ani, including OP formations in <s-τa-na-i-yā>, which he interprets as */tani/, and Ved. *ppuπatāni. Stüber 2000a, 164 traces the development of -sāni from the loc. case form of an amphikinetically verbal abstract (*s-ēn plus -i) to an infinitive, and views this development in parallel to that of -āse, which, however, has never lost its connection with the nominal stem. She notes that the OAv. infinitives in -aṅhē (< *a-bhāj, Ved. -āsē, -āse, originally dat.sg. of an s-abstract), are built from present (frādāṅhē, vaēnāṅhē, rākṣāṅhē, srāuṣuṅhē) and aorist (vaocaṅhē) stems rather than from roots (p. 141f.). This phenomenon, which is also found in Ved. (e.g. RV pusaṣā ‘in order to thrive’, vyāṣā ‘in order to twist’, Stüber 2000a, 145f.), indicates that -aṅhē has become productive as a suffix marking an infinitive form within the verbal system. Elaborating on this observation, Fortson 2012a, 103 and 107 suggests that OAv. -aṅhē may have been on the way to becoming the default active infinitive ending, in contrast to -díaī, which was confined chiefly to the medio-passive. According to him, the functional difference may have been an oppositional one between active and medio-passive, as, for example, in the pair OAv. srāuṣuṅhē (Y 29.8) ‘to recite’ vs. YAv. srāuṣuṅiéhi (Yvt 7.2 = 46),’ the only surviving pair of this type of infinitive derived from the same stem; also in OAv. active dānuoi ‘to place, give’ (Y 44.14) vs. middle mandāyidi ‘to put in mind’ (Y 44.8).

Goto 2013, 132–138 records thirteen types of infinitive formation in Ved., eight of which have corresponding forms in Av., while Hoffmann & Forssman 2004, 240–243 identify ten types in Avestan. Noting that the category is relatively rare in YAv., Kellens 1994 provides an inventory of its attestations in OAv. He concludes that they have final dative function and distinguish voice and, possibly, tense. García-Ramón 1994 and 2009 argues that the types OAv. viduānōi, Grk σιδένω and Ved. dāvānē, Cyprian to-we-na-i /dowenai/, go back to PIE *vid-ye)n-ej and *dhv-ye)n-ej respectively, that is, to the dative forms of a full proterokinetic inflectional paradigm in PIE of heteroclitic verbal nouns in *-ye)n-/n-. By contrast, infinitives of the type Ved. dāmanē and vidmānē, are reflexes of two different PIE ablaut types of non-heteroclitic *-men-stems (2009, 85; 2009a, 246). While Ved. forms of the type -mānē still function as the datives of action nouns and those of the type -māne as quasi-infinitives, García-Ramón suggests that OAv. xšqmānē (Y 29.9), the only Av. form in */mānaj/, is a full infinitive which has reached the same stage of development as Greek infinitives in -μενα (2009; 2009a, 248); see also no.79 below s.v. xšqmānē.

Kellens, 1994, 46 suggests that the words borzah iβa srāuṣuṅiéhi išīōš xšaθrom ahu-rahe daβwšō in Yvt 7.2 (= 46) may be the reflex of a, possibly incomplete, OAv. phrase, and that the inf. srāuṣuṅiéhi may not be authentically YAv.
Rau 1998, 146–149 notes that OAv. disyllabic *viduiē (< *yid-yaj) ‘to know’ and *dāuōi (< *daH-yaj) ‘to give’ are the only Av. infinitives in *-yaj, a formant which has no correspondents elsewhere in Indo-Iranian or in other IE languages. Assuming that this formation represents the frozen case form of a verbal substantive that has come to be integrated into the verbal system, he suggests that both Av. forms are to be taken as the dat.sg. of Pre- or Proto-Av. u-stem root-accented verbal substantives *yid-u- ‘act of knowing; knowledge’ and *dāH-u- ‘act of giving’. Rau interprets the zero-grade ablaut of the suffix in the oblique case of Av. viduiē < *yid-u-aj, as indicating that in PIE the verbal substantive was inflected as an acrostatic u-stem *yogdu-/*yeddu- ‘act of knowing; knowledge’. From this u-stem, a protorokinetic possessive adj. *yedu-/*yedu- ‘having knowledge, knowing’, the pre-form of OAv. vīdu-, Ved. vīdu- ‘knowing, knower’, was internally derived (Rau 1998, 156).

While García-Ramón 1993 derives the PIIR. infinitive ending *-dʰjāj from a PIE dative *-dʰjo-ej, and the Sabellic passive infinitive ending -f-jej (Ümbrian -f(e)i, Oscan -f(e)r) from the instr.sg. PIE *-dʰjo-hi, Fortson 2012, 51 points out that no other infinitives in IE languages derive from instrumental. He nevertheless tries to “bridge the gap” between the Indo-Iranian and the Sabellic forms by suggesting that the *-dʰj form morpheme underlies both Indo-Iranian *-dʰjāj and Sabellic [-f-ej], although he leaves the ultimate origin of the latter open. Considering it to be difficult to conceive that an earlier thematic stage of the suffix in Common Indo-Iranian times was completely effaced in Ved., where synchronically -dhyai was really -a-dhyai (2012a, 95), he suggests that the suffix was originally deprepositional, rather than deradical and athematic, and added specifically to thematic stems (2012, 52). The original locus of the suffix Indo-Iranian *-dʰjāj would have been in thematic presents, from where in both Av. and Ved. it spread to athematic presents and thence to roots, with further spread in Av. to aorists (2012a, 104–105). In Av. this led to a mixture of athematic deprepositional, thematic deprepositional, and athematic deradical forms. Thus, according to him, the various athematic and deradical Av. forms in -diāāi are innovations rather than relocations.

By contrast, Lühr 1994 separates the Indo-Iranian suffix from the Sabellic passive infinitives and argues for a verbal origin of *-dʰjāj within Indo-Iranian Noting that infinitives in *-dʰjāj are usually formed from the present stem (e.g. Av. varṇīditāi ‘to decide’, varṣeṣeidīāi ‘to work’, vāzaidīāi ‘to travel’) and may be used like finite verbal forms denoting a will or an intention, especially of the 1sg person sg. (p. 79, 85f.), she suggests that from a historical point of view, the *-āj in *-dʰjāj represents the ending of the 1sg. subj.middle rather than the case ending of the thematic dat. sg. According to her, the suffix *-dʰjāj arose in PIIR. by way of resegmentation in pairs of phonologically and semantically close verbs such as *ṛṛh ‘to succeed, reach a goal’ and *ṛ ‘to reach, arrive’ (IE *hṛ). In her reconstruction of the historical processes, a
lsg. pres.mid. such as *rdh-į-jāj ‘I want to succeed, reach a goal’ was re-interpreted as *r-dį-įj ‘in order to arrive’ (p. 92f.). While allowing for the possibility that the process may also have happened in other verbs, she notes that the roots *rdh ‘to succeed, reach a goal’ and *r ‘to reach, arrive’ constitute the only attested pair of this kind. Lühr corroborates her argument with reference to the form uz缲rijdidiā in Y 43.12 and 14, which she analyses as the lsg. subj.pres.mid. of the verb ard ‘to succeed, reach’, rather than as an inf. in -diāi of one of the homonymous roots ar, as earlier studies had done. She considers the function of the form uz缲rijdidiā as the lsg. to be particularly clear in Y 43.14, where the form is followed by the lsg. personal pronoun azōm.

62. Composition

Sadovski 2004 studies the internal syntax of compounds involving adjectives or pronouns as first term, and nouns as second term. Focusing on compounds where the relationship between the first to the second term is either attributive or partitive, he discusses the formation and semantics of these compounds and of their external syntax in Vedic and Avestan. With regard to viςpō.taniā- (Y 9.17) ‘extending over the whole body’ he confirms Bartholomae’s interpretation that viςpā- denotes the domain, and finds a syntagmatic equivalent in expressions such as Yt 16.7, 14.29 tanūād viςpāiād druuaatātom ‘health of the whole body’. On the basis of Vedic parallels, he sees Indo-Iranian poetic diction in the use of Indo-Iranian *yīcya- denoting the totality to which a feature extends and suggests that the relationship between the first and second term of compounds with Indo-Iranian *yīcya- is a predicative, or adverbial attribution. A further use is that Indo-Iranian *yīcya- is an attribute of another adjective, denoting the latter in its totality. In this function it has the potential of being a periphrastic analytical expression that is functionally equivalent to the superlative (Sadovski 2004, 322–323).

In a study of the mechanisms by which possessive compounds formed without a compositional suffix of the type entheos ‘having the god within’, came to be reinterpreted as prepositional governing compounds (e.g. the Ved. entheos compound ama-vrata- ‘whose vrata- is appropriate’ → ‘who is, acts according to the vrata-’), Sadovski 2001, 109–111 discusses Av. compounds with *danhu-/*dāxiu- as second term and preverbs or adverbs as first term. He suggests that the two possible translations of some of these forms as either entheos compound or as prepositional governing compound, turn out to be pragmatically identical, for example, upairi.dāxiu- ‘having the land above’ or ‘being above the land’. An exception is any compound form with Av. uz/us, which like Ved. īd is never used as a preposition in compounds, but only as a preverbof or an adverb. Av. compounds with uz/us therefore cannot be prepositional governing compounds. Accordingly, uz.danhu-/*dāxiu- is an entheos compound and describes a person ‘who has his country away’, ‘a for-
eigné’. Sadovsky suggests that *daxiitnu- was formed as an antonym to uz.daiju/-
daxiitu- and that the pair provided the compositional model for the other six com-
ounds with *daxiitu-, all of which are hapax legomena in Yt 10.144.

Pinault 2016, 102 adds Av. parañi- as ‘carrying the flourishing across’ (see no.
79 below s.v.) to the Av. examples of verbal governing compounds with a root noun
as first member. Hintze 2003, 147 fn.11 surveys interpretations of *niuñâ, *niuñqun,
which form the second term of the compounds rãmanuñâ, bãmanuñâ, aﬁmanuñâ,
aﬁsmanuñâqun. A new analysis is put forward by de Vaan 2012, who argues that Av.
*niuñâ, *niuñqun represent a root noun *ni-ganH ‘spreading out’. He explains the
forms ending in -niuñâ as the nom.sg. formed with the ending Indo-Iranian *
-gâš, which according to him was analogically introduced into the root noun on the model
of -yant- and -mant stems, where it serves as a suppletive nom.sg. (p. 41). Interpreting
‘spreading out’ as ‘dispensing’, he renders rãmanuñâ as ‘dispensing peace’, bãmanuñâ
as ‘dispensing radiance’, aﬁsmanuñâqun as ‘dispensing verse-lines’ (in the sense of
delivering all verse-lines of the Gãthãs in the right order, and offering the libations
with all verse-lines in the right order). Rather than positing a separate root, as pro-
posed by Ziegler 2004 (IE *yenhi) and Cheung 2007, 205–206 (Iır. *HyæH), de
Vaan 2012, 38–39 considers the meaning ‘to spread out’, which van has especially in
combination with the preverb ni, to be a semantic development through metaphorical
extension of van- ‘to win, conquer’. The latter root had developed a variant *
ganH-
in ııır. under the influence of the semantically close ııır. root *sanH- ‘to gain’ (p. 40–
41). According to him, Av. has two homonymous roots, van ‘to win, conquer’ and
van ‘to love’ (the latter is only attested in nominal derivatives, see no.79 below s.v.
vãunu-).

De Vaan 2003, 170–173 surveys compounds that provide evidence for the length-
ening of the first term’s stem final vowel in front an initial laryngeal of the second
term. Lubotsky 1999 examines the lack of *s > 9 after r, u, k, i, on the one hand, and
secondary spread of 9, on the other, at the beginning of both the second term of com-
ounds and of the second syllable of reduplicated formations. He suggests that in Av.
compounds, the retention of st (< IE *st) and of sp (< IE *sp) at the beginning of the
second term after r, u, k, i, is due to the abundance of the sequences ist (< *itt) and of
sp (< PIE *ǵy), respectively. In contrast, sm- and sn- are always affected by preceding
r, u, k, i at the beginning of the second term of a compound. Vijûnas 2009, 109, 115–
119 surveys Indo-Iranian compounds whose second term is a primary t-stem. The
latter is built with the formant -t- attached to roots that are usually in the zero grade
and end in the short vowels -i, -u, -ç, and -a (< *p, q).

Remmer 2006, 44–47, 52–59 and 2012 discusses the form and function of for-
mations consisting of the interrogative stem Indo-Iranian *kà-, ki- and kú- prefixed to
nouns, adjectives and adverbs to form compounds meaning ‘what an X!’ ‘where is
X?’ or similar. In contrast to Old Persian, Av. preserves no personal names of this type, but Remmer identifies two toponyms which do attest it. One is the name of the lake kaššāoiita-, which she analyses as *ka⁻śay(id)ata- ‘how swelling!’, the other is that of the mountain kakahiitii- in Yt 19.4 (< *ka⁻-kas-itit- ‘how split!’), see no.79 below s.vv. She suggests that the prefixing of interrogative particles belongs to the more colloquial speech and increases the emotive meaning of the formation in a variety of ways, including pejorative and diminutive senses (2006, 58–59).

Panaino 2012 discusses compounds with mainitu- and Ahmadi 2013a those with paoiritia- as second term. The latter scholar suggests that aša.paoiritia-, maṇaš.paoiritia-, ārmaiti.paoiritia- are not different rank-orderings of the three Amaša Špontas, as previously suggested, but possessive adjectives expressing a restrictive qualification marking a subset of ‘creations’ (dāman-) or persons who strive for, or value aša-, maṇaš-, ārmaiti- foremost (p. 869, 876). According to him the three compounds mean ‘for whom aša- is foremost’, ‘for whom maṇaš- is foremost’, ‘for whom ārmaiti- is foremost’. Lubotsky 1998 points out that ta-past participles as first term in possessive (Bahuvr̥hi) compounds refer to an action in the past or to the result of this action. Swennen 2002, 2003 studies Av., Old Persian and Ved. compounds whose first term is a colour word and whose second term is the word for ‘horse’. Noting that some of them serve as epithets of deities and may be used instead of the deity’s name, he argues that they transitioned into onomastics and came to be used as personal names of human beings. He reconstructs a PrIr. personal name *zarjaspa-, indirectly transmitted in za-ri-aš-ba of the Persepolis Tablets, the counterpart of Ved. hāryaśva- ‘whose horses are dun-coloured’. Swennen 1998 and 2001, 2001 postulates a compound consisting of three terms auruṣaspō.stoaiiehiš ‘as strong as the one who has white horses’ (“aussi vigoureuses que celui qui a des chevaux blancs”) in Yt 5.7, where the manuscript F1 and others transmit auruṣ. aspō. stoaiiehiš. He suggests that auruṣaspō stands for Mithra, who has the attribute auruṣāspōm in Yt 10.102, and that Araduull’s epithet auruṣaspō.stoaiiehiš in Yt 5.7 is equivalent to a hypothetical *miθro.stoaiiehiš ‘aussi vigoureuses que Miθra’.

63. Derivation

With special reference to Av., Tremblay 2003 argues that in internal derivation the accent can denote logical categories. Elaborating on the observation of Kellens 1996, 65f. fn.24, that the acc.sg. forms sāuvaŋhaēm and frādat.śaom point towards hystero-kinetic inflection, Tremblay suggests that the hystero-kinetic adjectives contrast with the proterokinetic substantives sāuvaŋhi- and frādat.śu- respectively in so far as they denote different logical categories: the hystero-kinetic type denotes a relational category and the proterokinetic type a generic category (253f.). According to Tremblay, sāuvaŋhi- and sāuvaŋhaē- were both derived with suffix -i- from sauvaḥ-, probably
within the history of Avestan. He interprets their different inflectional behaviour as indicating that at the time of their formation, Ablaut was still productive in internal derivation, and constitutes an archaic feature especially in the language of Y 1–7 (250f.).

64. Suffixes

-anā- Deriving the complex suffix -anā- from *e-neh-*, Vijūnas 2009, 122–123 notes that this suffix is directly added to the root.

-ant- Sims-Williams 1997 examines Indo-Iranian quantitative adjectives which are formed with suffix -ant- attached to collective forms in *-h₂ of demonstrative, relative and interrogative pronouns. He argues that the survival of the suffix -ant- in correlative pronounal derivatives is an archaism in Indo-Iranian, as the suffix was in the process of being replaced by *-yent- in the historical IE languages.

Indo-Iranian *-anč*- The suffixoid (Scarleta 1999, 17) -anč/-ač- takes a middle position between composition and derivation (Wackernagel & Debrunner 1896–1954, vol. II.2, p. 152). What comes to be used as a suffix in Indo-Iranian is historically, according to Steer 2015, 224, either the root *h₁okʷ~*h₂okʷ- ‘to see’ or the derived root-noun *h₁okʷ~*h₂okʷ- ‘eye, face’. Scarleta 1999, 17 suggests that the nasal in the suffix form *-anč- is an infix that spread analogically in Indo-Iranian from the root *h₁enk- ‘to bend’, while Gotō 2013, 44f. posits a suppletive paradigm in which the strong cases are formed with *-anč- (from the IE root noun *h₁enk- ‘bend’) and the weak cases with *-ič-/*(ţ)ič- (from the IE root noun *h₁ekʷ~*h₂ekʷ- ‘look, glance’). Steer 2015, 226, however, doubts that *-anč- reflects the PIE root *h₁enk- ‘to bend’ and endorses the explanation of Schmitt 1968, 140 according to which the nasal originated in PIr. by analogy to the n̥-participles in order to distinguish strong and weak cases. Steer 2015, 224 surveys various formations in Indo-Iranian languages and Schmitt 1968, 137f. identifies ten Av. stems in *-anč-.

Indo-Iranian *-dēč- De Vaan 2000 discusses the four Iranian nouns formed with the Indo-Iranian suffix *-āča-, which in Indo-Aryan is only found in Ved. lopāsā- ‘a kind of jackal’. The Iranian equivalent is present in the Elamite spelling ra-ua-ba-sa, rendering OP *raupāka- or *raupaška-, and in MP rwp’h ‘fox’, Khot. rrūvāsa- ‘jackal’, etc. The noun is derived from *raupi- ‘fox’ attested in Av. raopi- (Vd 13.16), whose Indo-Aryan equivalent *lōpi- survives in Dardic dialects (p. 280). The other three nouns formed with this suffix are Av. kahrkāsa- ‘vulture’, from *karka- ‘fowl’, *karpāsa-ka- ‘lizard’ in various Mfr. languages, including Buddhist Sogdian kṛps’k, etc., from *karpa- ‘frog (?)’, and, finally, Khot. mūrāsa- ‘peacock’ from *mṛgu-. Khot. mura- ‘bird’. De Vaan concludes that the suffix *-dēč- denotes an animal which is larger or fiercer than the animal to which the derivational basis refers. In view of
the lack of alternative plausible explanations, he suggests that the suffix was borrowed in PIIr. times from a non-IE Central Asian language (290f.).

-āna- Rau 2007, 60 surveys Av. stems in -āna-, a suffix which is well attested in the formation of patronyms and pro-patronyms.

-ānī- Attached to thematic stems and showing devī-inflection, feminines in -ānī- mean either ‘wife of x’ or ‘the divine woman, female genius of x’. While the suffix remains productive in Ved., in Iranian it only occurs in Av. ahurānī-, whose use is discussed by Hintze 2007, 230–235, and in *našīānī-, which is only indirectly attested in Pahl. mšyyng. In a study of the origins and derivational history of -ānī-, Rau 2007 aligns feminines in -ānī- with Ved. and Av. derivatives in -āna-, fem. -ānā-. He concludes that the ‘lateral’ meaning ‘woman/wife of x’ became characteristic of stems in -ānī-, while the genitival and patronymic meaning ‘daughter of x’ came to be associated with the stems in -ānā-.

-ka- Jamison 2009 argues that, rather than having merely a diminutive or deprecatory function, the Indo-Iranian suffix *-ka- is not only a morphologically convenient suffix to protect the end of a word from phonological erosion but also a sociolinguistic marker of colloquial or informal speech partly associated with the speech of and about women. Noting that apart from pasuka- and daitika- in Y 39.1–2. -ka-forms are absent from the high poetic language of the Old Avesta, she concludes that the suffix “can cluster in striking density” in YAv. passages such as Yt 5.95, which describes unwelcome libations; also in animal names, daēvic vocabulary, and in words for (evil or polluted) women, where -kā-suffixed forms chiefly designate females in their collective existence. On the basis of the rich evidence for ka-formations in the personal names of the Persepolis Tablets, Jamison suggests that this suffix was widespread in OIr. times, but is sparsely represented in the extant texts (pp. 319–322). Without reference to Jamison, Ciancaglini 2012, 2012a likewise notes that the suffix -ka- is rare in OAv., and that it occurs in YAv. chiefly in “daēvic” derivatives indicating sins, desease, and evil beings. She concludes that no socio-linguistic connotation is present in the oldest ascertainable function of the suffix, which is the derivation of adjectives from personal pronouns. She interprets the diffusion of the suffix in YAv., OP and Ved. as an isogloss shared by these languages and inherited from PIIr. In a forthcoming monograph, Ciancaglini provides an exhaustive examination of the suffix -ka- in the Old and Middle Iranian languages.


IE *-nes- Lipp 2009 II 428–431 and Nikolaev 2012–2013, 220–223 analyse the IE suffix *-nes- as a conglomerate of *-no- and *-s-; cf. no.79 below s.v. x’arənah-.


\textbf{IIR. *-\textit{yj}a-} Buyaner 2014, 701–703 discusses Av. formations with suffix *-\textit{yj}a- and argues that they have the semantic component of ‘substitute’ in the vocabulary denoting members of a family.

\textbf{65. Onomastics}

The dictionaries of personal names in Bactrian by Sims-Williams 2010 and in Sogdian by Lurje 2010 take a wide range of Av. onomastic material into account. Sadovski 2006 studies the compositional structure of the 422 Av. personal names, which he defines according to the principles governing the \textit{Iranisches Personennamenbuch}, and Sadovski 2007 investigates personal names and epithets in their relationship to poetical phraseology in Indo-Iranian and PIE. In a study of morphology and semantics of Indo-Iranian personal names and epithets, Sadovski 2009a, 2013 surveys the compositional system of Indo-Iranian personal names and provides an in-depth study of the numerous names and epithets entailing words for ‘horse’ and ‘chariot’. He argues that their prominence in the Indo-Iranian onomastic system reflects the collective memory of the migrations of the Indo-Iranian peoples.

Schmitt 2003 discusses the types of names in the catalogue of the Fravardin Yašt (Yt 13.95–142). With 249 (or 250) male and 27 (24 according to Remmer 2006, see below and fn. 10) female personal names, this text provides more than two thirds of the personal names found in the entire Avesta. Schmitt shows that naming conventions in the Avesta show flexibility in so far as individuals may be identified by a single name (idionym), by the combination of the idionym with the genitive of the father’s name and, occasionally, further ancestors, by a patronymic adjective, or by the gen.pl. of the name of the clan or the land of origin. Six female names are accompanied by the name of their husband. Remmer 2006 provides the first systematic study of the ca. 60 Rigvedic and Av. names of women, including mythological and semi-divine beings, but excluding female deities and daēvic witches (whose names are listed on p. 106 fn.80). Of the 27 female personal names and 4 epithets and patronyms attested in the Avesta, 24 occur in the Fravardin Yašt (Yt 13.139–142).\footnote{In her review of Remmer 2006, Kazzazi 2008, 88 fn.2 points out that Remmer refers to 23 attestations in Yt 13 on p.12, but to 24 on p. 106. Other reviews of the book include Jamison 2008.} Although the number of female personal names is dwarfed by almost 400 male counterparts, it appears high in comparison to the number of ca. 35 (partly uncertain) female names and gamonyms (i.e. derivatives of the husband’s name) of the considerably larger corpus of the Rigveda, which, however, lacks a catalogue of names comparable to that of Yt 13. Noting that a substantial number of female personal names are derived from male names, Remmer provides a range of insightful analyses, such as that of the pair \textit{armanauācī} and \textit{saippauācī} as ‘pronouncing the guilt’ (‘die Schuld aus-
sprechend”) and ‘pronouncing the teaching’ (“die Verkündigung aussprechend”) respectively (pp. 214–225).

Schmitt 2012 examines Ofr. personal names with the aīriia- (ariya-ṛṣan-, ariya-farnah-) in the light of the Av. phrases aṛṣa aīriianqam daśiiunqam and xʿarōnō aīriianqam daśiiunqam, and suggests that the names imply an anthroponomastic allusion to Haorsrauah. Schmitt 2006 studies names formed with Western Ofr. farnah-. He argues that there are instances where farnah- is functionally equivalent to Ved. śravas- and suggests that Prfr. *crajah- ‘fame’ was substituted with Ir. farnah-ḥyarnah- in a process of onomastic modernisation. He sees the model for the substitution in the name *aṛžītī-farnah- ‘of imperishable glory’, the modernised form of *aṛžītī-crajah- ‘of imperishable fame’. In a study of copulative compounds in Iranian onomastics, Cereti 2011 surveys the debate on the Av. names māzdrāuanhu- and sṛrāuanhu- (Yt 13.118), and aṣāhura- (Yt 13.113) and sides with the view that these names are best explained as possessive or determinative compounds. While there are some examples in Western Old Iranian, he argues that such names become frequent only in Middle Iranian times, although they remain rare in the Pahlavi literature.

66. Syntax
Syntax has notoriously received less scholarly attention than phonology and morphology in the study of Old Iranian grammar. Reichelt 1909, 218–387 is still the most complete presentation although he failed to distinguish systematically between Old and Young Av. and, for Av. case syntax, relied on an even older work, Hübischmann’s Casuslehre of 1875, 147–288. Hewson & Bubenik 2006: 131–159 survey case syntax from Old to Modern Iranian languages, and Skjærvø’s 2009 description of Old Iranian includes a substantial section on Av. syntax. Beekes’s 1988 work on OAv. phonology and morphology is complemented by Kellens & Pirart’s 1988–1991 II 3–193 study of OAv. syntax. West’s 2011 work on Old Av. Syntax and Stylistic is characterised by Schmitt 2012a, 166 as a syntactic commentary on his own translation of these texts of 2010. Studies on individual aspects of Av. syntax are surveyed below.

67. Number
Kellens 1991a examines the OAv. texts for the agreement in the category number between nouns, on the one hand, and attributes (genitives or pronouns) and finite verbal forms, on the other. He discusses the triad ‘thought, word, deed’ in greater detail and notes an opposition between the singular forms of the complete triad and the plural when only one or two of its members are used. He concludes that the plurals of ʾavāḥ-, which he considers to be homonymous with ʾavāḥ- ‘word’, and of ʾɛiioaḥaṇa- ‘action’ are elliptic for the complete triad (p. 107). The topic of number in OAv. is resumed by Ahmadi 2014a, who studies unexpected plurals, in particular the
forms *ašā* (Y 34.9), *xšaθrāš* (Y 46.11), *xratānuḥ* (Y 45.2, 46.3), *xratūš* (Y 31.11, 32.14), *sauvāŋham* (Y 28.9) and *frauvāšiš* (Y 37.3). Pointing out that in all such occurrences the noun is associated with a plurality of persons, he suggests that the phenomenon belongs to the order of discourse rather than grammar (p. 70). According to him, the plural has a distributive function and indicates the individuated attribution to a plurality of persons. For example, the instr.pl. *xšaθrāš* in Y 46.11 would mean ‘(the Karapans and the Kavis) each through their power (yoke man, etc.)’ (p. 65). In Y 28.9, the plural form *sauvāŋham* would denote the “individuation of the desired action in relation to the members of the group” (p. 66), and the acc. plural *ašā* in Y 34.9 the aspiration of each and every one of the ‘men of bad action’ for a blissful afterlife (p. 71). The plural emphatically ties the noun to each and every member of the group with which it is associated. Cantera 2001–2 examines the question why the collective/comprehensive (e.g. *saxvārāš* in Y 29.4) that constitutes the nom.pl.ntr. takes the verb in the singular while the collective/comprehensive that constitutes the nom.pl.m. (e.g. *mašišā*) takes the verb in the plural.

68. Cases

The most detailed study of *Av.* case syntax is Bichlmeier’s 2011 systematic treatment of the use of the ablative, locative and instrumental cases in *YAv.*11 In contrast to his predecessors in the study of *Av.* syntax, Bichlmeier uses a theoretical framework which goes well beyond the traditional approach, and which includes the theory that in ancient IE languages each case has an autonomous prototypical function that constitutes its semantic centre. While the investigation is generally synchronic, as far as the diachronic perspective is concerned, Bichlmeier generally confirms what might previously have been assumed on rather impressionistic grounds, namely that *YAv.* case syntax takes a middle position between the archaic OAv. and Ved. stages, where the individual cases still have a large degree of autonomy and local particles nuance the sentence rather than modifying the case form, and the more advanced stage of development represented by Old Persian and characterised by a rigid valency frame for the verbs and the marking of cases by means of adpositions (pp. 396–398). The work provides a comprehensive inventory of the *YAv.* attestations of the three cases, classified according to their functions. Kellens 1997a surveys the various functions of the genitive in OAv. and concludes that the genitive is the only legitimate abnodinal case. Pirart 2000 discusses ungrammatical uses of case forms with special reference to the neuter plural, and Hintze 1994, 317–318 surveys instances of the use of the dat. in the syntactic function of the gen.

---

11 Reviews include Hintze 2012 and Dieu 2013.
Cantera 2005 argues that in Indo-Iranian adjectives in adverbial-predicative function are used freely and are preferred to the adverb. While in some modern European languages the adjective in adverbial-predicative function is rare (**Er kam intelligent an** does not exist), Indo-Iranian has a class of adjectives that can be used in this way. Lowe 2014 examines adjectives and nouns in OAv. that optionally or obligatorily display verbal government of objects in the accusative case, which cannot be explained as an adjunct expressing extent or goal. Noting that cross-linguistically such transitive nominals are rare, and their existence even explicitly excluded in some theoretical models of linguistic categorization, he aims at establishing a set of rules and constraints on nominal transitivity in OAv. He identifies desiderative adjectives, such as eixšnušō ‘desirous of gratifying’, superlatives in -išta- such as maïrišta- ‘best at remembering’, both of which are based on potentially transitive verbal roots (xšnu ‘to gratify’, mar ‘to remember’), and the OAv. reduplicated stems casxi- and ma- náošrī-, as the clearest categories attested for nominal transitives in OAv., and argues that transitive nominals are restricted to nouns that show clear morphological patterning with the verbal system. Lowe establishes a correlation between transitivity of nominals and their nominative (subject) predication and suggests that there is even positive evidence that nonpredicated forms of potentially transitive nominal categories may have been unable to display transitivity (p. 573f.).

YAv. provides evidence for the non-canonical marking of the subject argument by the accusative and, occasionally, by the genitive or dative, and of the object by the nominative. While Spiegel 1882, 410–412 interpreted this phenomenon as indicating the beginning of the break-down of the inflectional system in YAv., Reichelt 1909, 225–226 attributed it to the poor transmission of the Avesta. Danesi 2014, in turn, provides a linguistic explanation. Observing that accusative subjects chiefly occur in intransitive patterns and occasionally with verbs that possess inherent low transitivity, she interprets the accusative subjects as indicating the possible existence, in YAv., of a general oblique subject construction, where the subject is not in the nominative case (pp. 245f., 250), and adduces parallels from other IE languages. According to her, the feature could be an archaism that survived in less formal language especially of the Vidēvdād, but not in the highly poetic diction of the Older Avesta. Her conclusions accord with the argument of Barddal & Eythórdsson 2009, that subject-like obliques have their origin in the PIE stative–active language, where oblique subjects formed a natural part of the alignment system.

69. Ergativity

In addition to normal nominative-accusative alignment in most clauses, some Old Iranian transitive clauses in the perfective aspect or in the past tense show evidence for a nominal construction whose head is the verbal adj. in -ta-, which in Middle
Iranian develops into the past stem. The logical subject is in the gen./dat. case and the logical object is in the nominative. While there are several studies about the shift from accusative alignment to split-ergativity in Iranian, among the more recent ones being Bynon 2005 and Haig 2008, for OIr. they focus on Old Persian and its manā kṛtām construction.

The Av. evidence has been studied in greater detail by Bichlmeier 2011, 319–339, who discusses the marking of the agent in YAv. and observes that the instrumental is the most common case to denote the agent in passive constructions. In combination with the verbal adj. in -ta- the agent is usually marked by the dative, as is the case also in other IE languages, and occasionally by the genitive, ablative and locative cases. The most complete study of the Av. evidence is by Jügel 2010 and, especially, 2015. The latter two-volume work, reviews of which include Schmitt 2016, provides an inventory and translation of all Av. attestations as well as those in OP, MP, Parthian and Bactrian, and traces the development of the ergative construction in Old and Middle Iranian. With reference to Lazard’s 2005, 81 fn.1 observation, that the ergative construction comprises both passive and possessive components because the verbal adj. in *-ta- has passive meaning while the agent in the oblique case is a possessive complement, Jügel 2015, 25 maintains that the passive and possessive morphological markers of the OP construction are unsuitable to explain the ergative construction of Middle Iranian. He argues that the construction started from a clause in which a verbal adjective in -ta- is in the nominative case, functions as a predicative noun, and implies, or is constructed with, the copula. The dative of benefit, or dativus commodi, which may be combined with it, already came to be re-interpreted as the agent in OIr., and this process led to the development of the ergative construction. The fact that the adj. in -ta- has resultative meaning eventually leads to the integration of the construction into the verbal system. With reference to Brugmann, Jügel 2010, 112 and 2015, 471–474 argues that the ergative construction fills a gap in the PIE verbal system, where the synthetic resultative perfect refers to the agent, while the verbal adjective in -ta- provides the possibility of denoting the result with reference to its primary participant. The latter is generally the object if the verb is transitive and the subject if it is intransitive.

70. Verb syntax

Elaborating on Kellens’s 1984, 247–249 suggestion that in YAv. augmented imperfect forms either belong to the language of the Daēuas (as an old-fashioned way of speaking) or denote anteriority, Oettinger 2013 argues that they have in addition come to denote the remote past while their original function as the narrative tense is taken over by the injunctive. He also establishes a typological parallel with the French passé simple, whose function has developed from a narrative tense to denoting the
remote past. Hale 1993 discusses the fronting of preverbs in tmesi in Vedic and Avestan. He notes that in the RV a preverb in tmesi may be fronted to sentence-initial position to the left of an interrogative or relative pronoun or other complement, and suggests that Av. is innovative by not allowing any word to appear to the left of a question word or a relative pronoun. Ciancaglini 2011 examines morpho-syntactic features in Iranian and Indo-Aryan languages of verbal locutions formed by a nominal stem and a verb with a weak semantic value, such as ‘to do’, ‘to have’, ‘to give’, ‘to be’, etc., and argues that periphrastic verbal expressions have a long history in Iranian languages and are to be considered as an Indo-Iranian feature.

71. Participles
Noting that in the RV, the overwhelming majority of negated participles are based on the verbal present stem, with only a few derived from the aorist or perfect stem, Lowe 2011 argues that negated present participles differ from non-negated ones and finite verbal forms both syntactically and semantically. On the basis of comparative evidence, he postulates a rule for PIE to the effect that a participle compounded with the negative prefix produced a non-participial adjective, which differed from non-negated participles in that negated participles are regularly intransitive and occur in the function of adjectives rather than participles. He explains rare instances of transitive negated participles in Av. and Ved. as an innovation that took place independently in the two branches of Indo-Iranian (p. 31 fn.19). Sommer 2013–4 examines the syntax and function in YAv. of participles in grammatical subordination and as an alternative to finite clauses with a subordinating conjunction. Taking the perspective of cross-linguistic research on non-finite verb forms, or converses, that serve to express adverbial subordination, he identifies the “adverbial” function of participles to be the dominant one and argues that the position of adverbial participles within main clauses is in principle free, but that postponing of purpose clauses is preferred.

72. Hypotaxis
Studies of complex sentences include Panaino 1993a on irreal conditional constructions, Hintze 1997 on paratactic and hypotactic constructions and Pirart 1997c on “unrecognised” subordination. Widmer 2012 provides the first ever investigation of the formal and functional properties of cleft sentences in Av., and in Old and Middle Persian, a construction whose existence has hitherto not been recognised in these languages. Widmer argues that Av. cleft sentences mainly function as a focussing device and show greater formal and functional variation as compared to Old Persian, where their principal function consists in the structuring of information on a text level.
73. Stylistics and poetics

The oral nature of ancient Iranian, and Indo-European, poetry is emphasised by Watkins 1995, 70. He describes the Indo-European poet as “the highest-paid professional in his society”, who was in a business relationship with a patron (for further studies on the oral composition of the Avesta, see Skjærvø 2005–6 and Hintze 2014, 9). Jackson 2016 engages Indo-Iranian and Grk comparative evidence to examine the patron-client relationship in the socio-economic context of ritual performance. In particular, he argues that the itinerant poet-priest paved the way for a happy afterlife of his client, the patron, by means of ritual action and ritual poetry. Regarding poetry as a window on the ritual economy, Jackson 2002–3 and 2014 argues that Y 44.20, the last stanza of this OAv. hymn, reveals a similar, but inverted scenario with a polemical bite of Ved. versions of the so-called Vala-myth, within the framework of a dānastuti. Watkins’s 1995 monograph on Comparative Indo-European poetics has a special focus on the motif of the hero killing a serpent or dragon, and includes substantial sections on the role of the spoken word in IE society. In particular, he identifies the liturgical style of the YH as belonging to a poetic genre intermediate between prose and the quantitative IE metrical verse. He argues that what he calls the “strophic style” of the YH has parallels in other IE traditions, such as Cato’s Early Latin suonitaurilia, and the Umbrian Tables of Iguvium (1995, 231). Endorsing Watkins’s conclusions that both the metrical, stichic and the non-metrical, rhythmic style are parallel inheritances from the PIE poetic language and of equal antiquity, Hintze 2007, 2–21 discusses the poetic form and composition of the YH and concludes that in spite of the small volume of surviving early Zoroastrian texts, both styles are represented in the OAv. text corpus: the metrical, stichic one by the Gāthās, the non-metrical, rhythmic by the YH.

In a series of articles, Skjærvø 2001, 2002, 2002a, 2003, 2003a, 2005a adduces Rigvedic and other IE parallels for OAv. poetic techniques and the role of the poet-sacrificer in society. Jamison 2007 is an enquiry into Gāthic poetry and the Gāthic poetic voice in comparison with that of the Rigveda with a view to establishing similarities and differences between the two corpora. While emphasizing their common heritage, Jamison 2005 and 2007, 30–49 observes major stylistic distinctions between the Gāthās, on the one hand, and the Ved. hymns, on the other. She argues that the composer of the Gāthās employs the poetic elements of their shared tradition in significantly different ways from any Rigvedic poet. The stylistic divergences identified by Jamison include the dominant use of the 1st person sg., which makes the Gāthās more interactive in so far as the relationship between man and god is depicted in a more direct and mutual way. Another major difference is that in the Rigveda, the speech is almost always one-sided, as the god does not answer back. In the Gāthās, by contrast, Ahura Mazdā and other divine beings participate in the dialogue (Jamison
Vice versa, Jamison 2005 [2009], while remaining agnostic about the identity of the Gāthic poet, argues that supposed aberrancies in verbal usages that Kellens and other scholars take as evidence against a Zarathustra-poet (references in Jamison 2007, 21f. and fn.4) can be paralleled by the habits of undoubted Ved. poets.

West 2011, 131–142 surveys stylistic figures in OAv. They include the ‘augmented triad’, which was discovered and described by West 2004 and 2007, 117–119 with examples from Ved., Greek, Germanic, Celtic as well as Av. literatures. The figure is an end-weighted structure according to the principle of Behaghel’s Law, of three parallel words or phrases of which the third is the bulkiest. Watkins 2005 identifies a basic “creation catalogue” in OIr. and Ved., which is repeated with unbound variation in the context of traditional oral literature. He observes that three lists in OIr. (Y 44,3–5, 37.1 and in the OP text DN 1ff.) share a number of grammatical and stylistic features, including anaphora, dyads and repetition of the main verb. Hintze 1995a discusses the poetic technique of the Yaštśs with regard to structuring devices (ritornello and ring-composition, parallelism with anaphora and epiphora, chiastic construction, polyptoton with growing members) and also features of humour and irony. Hintze 1997 detects a paratactic style in the Yaštśs as compared with the more intricate style of the Gāthās, which abound in syntactic subordination, albeit largely made by the single conjunction hīiāq. In the Younger Avesta, by contrast, a greater variety of segmental subordinators is found, although a feature of the poetic style of the Yaštś is that paratactic coordination is preferred to hypotactic subordination. Sadovski 2005, 2008 and 2009 studies poetic figures of speech in Old Iranian and Old Indo-Aryan. Sadovski 2012 provides an analysis of the structure and contents of lists and catalogues in Indo-Iranian, and Sadovski 2012a a study of ritual spells. Jügel 2015a and 2015b studies repetitive sequences in the Pahlavi Yasna manuscript J2 with a view to establishing the function of repetitions in the compositional structure of the Yasna.

Following the research of H.-P. Schmidt and other scholars on the composition of Gāthic hymns, especially of Y 49, 47 and 33, Schwartz 1998 and 2003, with particular reference to Y 32 and 29 respectively, elaborates on parallelism and ring-composition as structuring devices of Gāthic hymns. According to him, the stanzas of a hymn are concatenated concentrically. The central stanza is hereby thematically particularly significant and concatenates with the preceding and following stanzas and with the first and last stanzas of the hymn. Formal relatedness being the primary basis of Gāthic poetry, the argument goes, concatenation with concentricism is achieved through words which are related by either form or meaning, or both. Schwartz suggests that a Gāthic hymn was generated from a proto-poem through the systematic concatenation of concentrically related stanzas to the first and last stanzas and through expansion of verses in between the cardinal points of the hymn. Moreover, according to him one poem was composed on the phraseological basis of another by employing
the principle of symmetrical ring-composition, Y 29 being the first and Y 53 the last poem to be composed (Schwartz 2002 [2006], 54; 2010, 219). He also argues that Y 32 and 48 contain imimical recasting of lexico-phraseological material from an OAv. proto-form of the YAv. hymn to Haōma (Y 9–11, Schwartz 2006a, 2006b). Schwartz has elaborated on his ideas about the poetic structure and production of the OAv. hymns in a series of articles, and he gives a general overview of his thinking in an analytical bibliography (Schwartz 2006, 497f.) and in Schwartz 2014.

Hintze 2002 argues that the extant arrangement of the OAv. texts is not only indicated by cross-references between different Gāthic hymns but also explicitly referred to in the Younger Avesta. She argues that the way in which the OAv. texts are arranged within the Yasna is deliberate and intended by the priest-poet(s). Analysing Y28 and 43 as examples of ring-composition, she detects an internal structure both in the composition of each individual hymn and in the way the hymns follow one another, and interprets the position of the Yasna Haptaŋhāiti after the first Gāthā as indicating that it represents the liturgical centre of the entire ceremony. According to Kellens 2007, who likewise focuses on Y 28, the individual hāiti constitute complete poems but are not independent from one another because they display a conceptual progression from hymn to hymn. Kellens 2013 elaborates on his understanding of the Gāthā as the basic unit of the OAv. corpus. Observing a concentration of ritual vocabulary at the end of the first three Gāthās, each of which consists of several hāiti, he suggests that the first, Ahunauwaiti Gāthā represents the recitation text of a self-contained morning (ušahina-) ritual whose name might have been dasoma-, a word which occurs in Y 28.9 (p. 58 fn.6). West 2007a attempts to bring out the coherence of the composition of Y 29.

Forsman 2009 discusses the stylistic figure of different tense forms of one and the same verbal root occurring in syntactic vicinity, such as of the type vanainiti vā vəŋghon və vaonara və ‘they win or will win or have won’. He surveys the six occurrences of the figure in the Gāthās, and for the first time presents an inventory of the YAv. attestations, arranged according to the verbal root. For this type of paronymy he coins the term polychronon, analogous to the term polyptoton. Forsman 2005 discusses the repetition of prepositions which are coordinated by -ca, in particular of antara in expressions such as antara caṃ antara ca asmanam ‘between earth and sky’ in the context of IE phraseology. He argues that a number of IE languages developed the tendency, probably independently from each other, to repeat the prepositions. According to Jamison 2002 the words vīspā tā at the beginning of Y 51.5 are an anagram for the name of Zarathustra’s patron Vištāspa. She suggests that in Y 51 the poet twice asks (Y 51.4 and 11) and answers the question where Zarathustra will find support, and that the first answer is immediate but phonetically scrambled (Y 51.5), while the second is postponed to Y 51.16, but straightforward.
Slade 2008 [2010] and 2009 adduces evidence from Iranian, Ved. and other IE texts for the poetic motif of ‘splitting’ as well as ‘killing’ the dragon, while Gippert 1998 examines Av. passages dealing with the killing of a cow. Andrés-Toledo 2009, 2010 reconstructs three Indo-Iranian syntagmas involving forms of *bandʰ ‘to bind’, *sarj ‘to release’, *griHyaH- ‘neck’ and *najH ‘to lead’ and depicting death as a hunter who hurls a noose around the mortal’s neck, binds him and leads him away like a prey. Watkins 1997 studies the Indo-Iranian stylistic figure ‘Throng-lord of throns’ and Miyakawa 2002a [2006] discusses the Av. figures of reinforcement daēuanaqtdaēu, daēuanaqtdaēuodotma- in the light of Ved. devō devānām ‘god of gods’, devānām devātama- ‘the highest god of the gods’ and explores the Indo-Iranian roots of the figures. Janda 2014, 338–339 compares the Av. expression nasāustara-bar with Grk νεών προφύλαξιν ‘to carry a dead body before (the relatives)’ and considers it to be an inherited IE phrase. He also retrieves the PIIr. phrase ‘the name of the cow’ by comparing Yt 8.2 gāṣaqa nama and Ved. gōr … nāma (2008, 496). With reference to the phrase māṇhoma māṇhomanma miiuđomca frā yazamaide in Yt 8.1, Janda 2008 argues for the PIIr. origin of the concept of lunar mansions. J. Katz 2000 investigates Indo-Iranian and Grk poetic expressions for the personification of the night as wearing a star-spangled cloak, and Jackson 2001 and 2002 studies a Graeco-Av. parallel regarding the adornment of the sky with stars. He interprets the Av. phrase ‘the star-adorned cloak, created by the spirit’ (vaṇhaṇom sthrpaṣayhom mainiu.tāstom Yt 13.3) as one of several Indo-Iranian formulae for the notion of a sky-dwelling deity who is robed with the vault of heaven.

74. Lexicon

Kellens 2005 discusses Av. lexicography and Doctor 2004 provides direct and reverse indices based on Geldner’s 1889–1896 edition of the Avesta, supplemented by computer-generated lexicostatistical data, including the frequencies of individual characters and their combinations. According to Kellens 2003, 109–111 terms with positive and negative meanings in Av. and Ved. are remnants of lexical and semantic oppositions in PIIr. which are progressively being lost in the two language branches. Schlerath 1991 [1992] suggests that the language of the Gathas reflects inherited opposites and points to a direction that was suppressed in the RV.

Cereti 2005 studies the spelling of 248 Av. (loan)words, about half of which are personal names, in the Pahlavi script and suggests that variations in the Pahlavi spelling of the same Av. word might indicate loans at different points in time, and the existence of different strata of the tradition. Macuch 2005 draws attention to Av. expressions still in use in late Sasanian jurisprudence, including yō.hē pascaēta ‘who (succeeds) him afterwards’ from a lost Av. context. She argues that the term denotes the legal successor regardless of his or her gender and the form of succession in-
volved, and that the term belongs to a period predating the development of the complex rules of succession of Sasanian times. Macuch 2005, 381 with fn.19 also points out that Av. tā'iu- ‘thief’ and hāzan'han- ‘robber’ already reflect the legal distinction between MP daezd and appar, namely theft as an act of stealing secretly and openly respectively. Panaino 1998a attempts a linguistic analysis of the obscure words which the Turanian Frarpasian utters after his three unsuccessful efforts to catch the x’arwnah- in the Lake Vouru.kaša. According to him, the words have an obscene meaning.

### 75. Semantics

Hintze 2000 studies semantically similar words for ‘reward, remuneration’ in Av. and Ved. with a view to establishing their semantic relationships and contrasts. The Av. lexemes mīžda-, ašī-, āāpta- and zmānā- and Ved. mīḍhā-, vāja-, dākṣīnā- are identified as words for ‘reward, remuneration’ by using a prototypical situational frame, and their etymologies and semantics are examined. It is concluded that these words contrast with one another semantically in that each of them highlights a different aspect of the situational frame.12 Hintze 2003, 151–153 discusses different words for the recitation of the sacred texts. Piras 1998 studies Gāthic expressions for the activity of ‘seeing’, both physically and mentally, with a view to establishing the Av. “optical code” from psychological and semasiological points of view, while Panaino 1998 investigates Av. words for good and bad smell. In a study of expressions in Indo-Iranian for ‘to recognise’, Lühr 1998 identifies Av. vi-et ‘to distinguish’ as the only prefixed verb with that meaning. She argues that the verb ci ‘to pile up’, which denotes a physical action, was turned into a verb denoting recognition (‘to distinguish’) by means of the addition of the prefix vi ‘apart’, ‘asunder’. Observing that in Av. and also in Ved. the reflexes of the IE root *smeuk- ‘to strip off, wipe’ conventionally collocate with words for feet or feet-coverings, Joseph & Karnits 2005 argue that *smeuk- developed a foot-related specialised meaning in Indo-Iranian when compounded with preverbs. According to them, the semantic specialisation of Av. framuxti- ‘taking off footwear’ (hapax in Vd 6.27, Ved. prāmukti-) and pai-ti.šmuxtta- ‘wearing shoes’ (Yt 5.64, 78 and Yt 10.125, cf. Ved. pratimukta-) is inherited from the Indo-Iranian specialised usage. Panaino 2009 examines the etymology of, and the semantic relationship between, the adjectives ciḍrauaaaiti-, daxstaauaiti- and vohunaauaiti-, which occur in the Vidēvdād as a fixed sequence describing a woman in her menses (see also no. 79 below s.vv. ciḍra- and daxsta-).

---

12 Reviews include Kazzazi 2003 and Oberlies 2004 [2006].
The eschatological function of the term daēnā- is emphasised by Kellens 1994a and 1995a, and by Piras 2003, with reference to her role as a psychopomp, while Ahmadi 2014, 90ff. emphasises the connection between daēnā- and the (sacrificial) cow. Hintze 2007, 59ff. quotes Y 48.4 to illustrate the view that the daēnā- is moulded by a person’s choices. Piras 1996, 14 points out the parallelism in imagery and function between daēnā- and xratu-, in connection with saoxiianh- on the one hand, and with the dawn and the ‘cow’ (or ‘bull’) on the other. He derives āsna-, which is collocated with xratu-, from the root san ‘to ascend’ and suggests that the expression refers to the upward traversing of space towards heaven (see also no. 79 below s.vv. āsna- and xratu-).

76. Substrate words in Indo-Iranian
A range of Indo-Iranian, chiefly cultural words such as *uštr ‘camel’, *khar ‘donkey’, *išt ‘brick’, which lack an IE etymology, have been explained as loanwords from the unknown language of the substrate culture of the Bactria-Margiana Cultural Complex (BMAC), which flourished in the areas bordering Northern Iran and Northern Afghanistan in the late third and first part of the second millennium BCE. The argument goes that the words were borrowed by intrusive Indo-Iranian speakers and assimilated during a period of acculturation. Witzel 1999, 2003 discusses the archaeological and historical background and the linguistic evidence, and in 2003, 28ff. engages with Lubotsky’s 2001 discussion of the topic. The latter presents a list of isolates in Indo-Iranian, which lack an IE etymology.

77. Indo-Iranian loanwords in Finno-Ugrian languages

78. Iranian loanwords in Greek, Caucasian and Semitic languages
Brust 2005 (second edition 2008) provides a philological and linguistic analysis of more than 200 Iranian and Indo-Aryan words and loanwords in ancient Greek. In a detailed review of the work’s first edition of 2005, Schmitt 2007, 86 comments that in spite of several shortcomings, Brust’s monograph is an important contribution to
scholarship as it constitutes the first systematic treatment of the Indo-Iranian lexical material in Greek. In a discussion of the question of Herodotus’ knowledge of Iranian languages, Schmitt 2011 emphasises the political and linguistic contacts between Greeks and Persians during the Achaemenid period and Herodotus’ interest in languages. With special reference to Athenaios’ work ‘Deipnosophistai’, Huyse 1990 discusses Iranian loanwords in Greek authors and lexicographers, including παρασάργης, ἀκανθῆς, ἀστάνης, ἀγγαρος, σχοῖνος, βατάκη, σαλάκιον, σύννακρον, σύννακρον, λάβοζος, σάρπης, καλάστις, ἀκτής, γανόκης, κανικής. Schaffner 1993 [1994], 234 adduces Hesych’s gloss βρίτος - ἔρος as evidence for Iranian brī ‘to cut, shear’. Schwartz 2015 studies the term grastapatis, which occurs in a 4th century BCE Greek inscription from Mylasa in southwest Anatolia, and analyses it in the light of OAv. grōhma - (see no. 79 below s.v.).


79. Studies of individual words
The list of word studies provided here continues Kellens 1991, 26–31, and supplements the one by Tremblay 2008, 33–39.

Order of the alphabet: a, ā, ā, q, ă, b, β, c, d, ð, e, ĕ, ë, f, g, ɟ, h, i, ĩ, j, k, m, n, ñ, n, ą, ḍ, o, ō, p, r, s, ʂ, ʃ, š, ș, t, t, ť, u, ĭu, v, x, ʃ, ʃ, y, y, z, ʒ, aōdādāttii - Macuch 2012, 2012a, 524–536 discusses the Av. term, whose literal meaning is ‘placing on the road’, and the legal contexts of its MP cognate adwadādādāc-

aēsmā- Catt 2014 examines the discrepancies in root vocalism and root-final consonants -s in Av. and -dh in Ved. of the otherwise apparently semantically and morphologically identical pair YAv. aēsmā- ‘firewood’, Ved. idhmā- ‘id.’. He suggests that both nouns derive with suffix -ma- from an underlying s-stem, whereby aēsmā- would go back to *Hajdē-s-ma-, with full-grade root and zero grade suffix, idhmā- would derive from *Hūdē-s-ma-, with both zero grade root and suffix.

aētā-, aētā- Fischer & Ritter 1991 argue that the YAv. stems ‘aētā- ‘share’ (‘das gebührende Teil’), and aētā- ‘liability to punishment’ (‘Strafbarkheit’) posited by Bartholomae 1904, 11–12, 19, are ghost words. Instead, all attestations belong to the demonstrative stem aētā- ‘this’.

aftsman, aftsman- ‘syllable’. Reconstructing Indo-Iranian *Hapsman- as the prehistoric form of OAv. aftsman-, YAv. aftsman- ‘part, section’, de Vaan 2012, 35–36 envisages different etymological scenarios. He suggests connecting this noun with Av. ‘apah- ‘work’ (PIE *h₁epes-), or, alternatively, with the PIE root *h₂sep- ‘to fit, join’ and, possibly, āpsas- ‘breast, forehead, front’. According to Hintze 2007,
2–3, the OAv. expression *Y 46.17 ašmānī ... nōīṁ anaśmāṃ ‘in verses ... not in non-verses’ specifically characterises the presentation of what in Ved. is termed the dānastuti- ‘praise of the gift’.

*ayūria*- Cantera 1999, 46–48 connects the hapax legomenon *ayūre* in Vd 20.9 (= 21.18 and 22.21) with the adj. *agrū- ‘unmarried, not pregnant’ (Ved. *agrū-*) and interprets *ayūria*- as the name of parasites or diseases that prevent pregnancies.

*agoniia*- Balles 1997 argues that Av. *agoniia-*, Ved. ághnya-, ághnya- (< *ŋ-gʷn-iyo-*) ‘prize cow’ are cognates of Grk ἀγὴν(ε)ν ‘wealth’ (< *ŋ-gʷn-es/os*). Maintaining that the Indo-Iranians would never have expressed the killing of a sacrificial animal by means of the verb *foun- (< PIE *gʷh₂en*), which was used for the legitimate killing of foes or the illegitimate murder of allies, Jackson 2014, 104 suggests that Indo-Iranian *a-gʷn-iǐa- specifically means ‘not to be killed’ in a situation outside the ritual context, rather than being an epithet of milch cows that were considered to be too valuable to be killed under any circumstances.

*ahāxšita*- ‘uncountable, innumerable’ is connected with Khot. *akamkišta- ‘innumerable’ by Emmerick 1992, 177.

*ahu*- Eichner 2002, 136–140 connects Av. *ahu-*, Ved. *āsu-* with Hittite *hassu- ‘king’, rather than with the verb *ah- ‘to be’ as in Mayrhofer 1992–2001 I 147, and argues that Indo-Iranian *asu-* specifically means ‘engendered life’ (“das gezogene Leben und die durch die Zeugung übermittelte Zeugungsfähigkeit”, p. 138). Swennen 2016a examines the role of the formula *uba-ahu- ‘both existences’ in the liturgy of the YH. He suggests that the expression designates the ultimate goal of the ritual, which consists in the unification of the mental and physical lives in eternal life.

*ahura*- Hintze 1998, 147ff. and 2015, 32 discusses the attestation of the divine name, in a neo-Assyrian text, *qas-sa-ra ḫma-za-āš*, whose first part has been taken as an attestation of Indo-Iranian *asura-* with an unchanged intervocalic -s- in Iranian. Narten 1996, 73–77 surveys the use of *ahura-* in OAv. and YAv. and notes that the noun refers to a range of both human and divine beings. She rejects the theory that *ahura-* denoted a specific group of gods in Plr. According to Kellens 2013, 63f. there is a stanza in each Gāthā that distinguishes between an anonymous *ahura- * and *mazdā-.*

*ahuraštāta-* Considering the adjectives *ahuraštāta- and mazdāštāta- to be synonymous, Panaino 1992 argues that their distribution is governed by metrical considerations (cf. below s.v. *mazdāštāta-*).

*aifīiāxśaiia*- Werba 1999 suggests that the YAv. pres. stem *aifīiāxśaiia-* is denominate from an Or. stem *aβi-axśa-. The latter would be an *entheos* compound ‘having the eyes around’ and a cognate of Ved. *ādhy-aksā- ‘supervisor’.

*aifīthiō- Differently from Bartholomae 1904, 91, who accepts an earlier explanation by Geldner in interpreting the hapax legomenon *aifīthiō* in Vd. 18.17 (= 18.25) as
the nom.pl. of *aīšī-sī- from the root sī ‘to lie’ with “Persian” ə instead of s, Can- tera 2012–4 suggests that -ōiiō represents the nom.pl. of the root-noun *ōī-, Ved. dhī- ‘vision, perception, thought’ (< Indo-Iranian *d(h)iH-), with sporadic devoicing of ə instead of ə.

aīšīīūra- Janda 2005a, 267 provides support for Hoffmann’s equation of Av. aīšīīūra- as ‘unshakable’ with Ved. ā-vithura- in the form of the verbal root Av. *viiaə (Ved. vyath ‘to falter, waver’), which he identifies in Yt 10.80 viiseti (q.v.).

aīšīsrūdrīma- abigaiia- Translating the name of the evening watch as ‘the time of chanting characterised by attentive listening’, Hintze 2003 argues that the name lexicalises two aspects of the same process, one being the ‘singing’ (aībi-gā) of the sacred texts, the Avesta, and the other the ‘attentive listening’ (aīšī-šru) to such a recitation. On the basis of N 60, she suggests that the evening watch was the time when members of a household audibly recite Avestan texts at or near their homes while carrying on with their ‘works of pasture’.

aiiehiīā- Schwartz 2008 [2012] analyses this hapax legomenon in Vd 21.17, left unexplained by Bartholomae 1904, 161, as the OAv. form of a derivative with suffix *-ja- from aiaih- ‘metal’. He suggests that aiiehīīā-, the name of a demoness who afflicts childbirth, embodies the hard and belliscose connotations of bronze (pp. 96–97).

aniiō.kaēja-, aniiō.varēna- Panaino 1993 argues that these compounds denote people of religions other than that of the Daēuva-worshippers.


airīta- Kellens 2003, 102f., 107 suggests that Av. airīta-, MP ēr correspond to Ved. ārya- rather than to aryā-, and that the term has been re-interpreted in the narrative of the mythological origins of the Iranian peoples. He concludes that airīta- is an ethnic term which is specific to the Iranians and should be translated as ‘Iranian’ rather than ‘Aryan’ (p. 108). Gnoli 1993 examines the ethnic and religious connotations and notes that the Grk term Arianē coincides with the lands located east of the Iranian plateau and described in Yt 10.13f. and Vd 1. He argues that the concept of ērānšahr has political, religious and ethnic connotations, is a product of the first half of the 3rd century CE and forms of a systematic programme of Sasanian political propaganda. The notion of Iran as an ethnic and a religious idea, however, has a history that goes back well into the first millennium BCE.

airīman- According to Haudry 1993, 185–186 Indo-Iranian *arıman- represents an IE compound *er̥-y̥me/on- with the zero grade form of nāman- as second term. It would denote the name of a clan in contrast to names of individual families. Without entirely excluding Haudry’s reconstruction, and while noting that -man- is
usually a primary suffix, Schneider 2010, 102–106 posits a secondary abstract noun derived with suffix -man- from the adj. *arjā- and concludes that Av. airīa- man- could point towards an Indo-Iranian neuter *ārjaman- that existed alongside the masc. *ārjāman-, which is continued in Ved. arṣāman-.

airīana- Gnoli 1993, 15–17 emphasises that in the Avesta the expression airīana vaējah- denotes the homeland of Zarathustra rather than that of all the Iranian peoples.

airiō.xšuḫta- Rejecting Panaino’s 1990, 127 preference for the reading airiō.sīhāj, Kellens 2003, 106 interprets this name (or attribute) of a mountain in Yt 8.6 and 37 as ‘where the Iranians sneeze’ (“où les ariias éternuent”). He suggests that the second term of the compound is based on the root xšu-, otherwise unattested in Av., which corresponds to Ved. kṣu- ‘to sneeze’.

anādruxti- Durkin-Meisterernst 2017 discusses the passage para anādruxtīi in Yt 19.33 and suggests that the phrase could result from the contamination of two clauses.

anāhītā- Various interpretations are surveyed by de Vaan 2003, 66f. and Kellens 2002–3. Elaborating on an etymology proposed by Gotō 2000, 160–161 (and earlier by Hertel 1927, 20 and n.1, 22), according to which anāhītā- is formed from the root ħā ‘to bind’ (Pfr. *an-ā-sH-tā-), Oettinger 2001 argues that the name of the goddess derives from her characteristic quality, that she represents a rushing, ‘unbound’, ‘unrestrained’ torrential river, streaming down from the mountains into an enormous lake. Although the geographical location of this river remains uncertain, he suggests that the name might imply the Oxus river originating in the Pamir mountains and flowing into the Aral Lake. According to Kellens 2002–3, 324, by contrast, the name ‘unbound’ denotes the idea that Anāhītā is free from being subject to any cycle (ratu-) of nature, in contrast to Mithra, whose role is tied to the alternation of day and night. Assuming that the three adjectives arvādūt-, sūrā- and anāhītā- are epithets of the goddess, Pirart 1997a, 156–159 suggests that her personal name is hī-, on the basis of the formula Yt 5.1 etc. yazaēsha mē hīn spitama zaraḥuṣtra yam avarvām sūrām anāhītām and Yt 5.120 mīštī zī mē hīn spitama zaraḥuṣtra vārantaeca etc. Kellens 2002–3, 325 endorses this interpretation, which would entail a figura etymologica hī- anāhītā- ‘unbound bond’, while Pirart 2003, 200 fn. 3 retracts his own earlier proposal. According to Skjærvø 2013, 113, 119 n.3, the three adjectives arvādūt-, sūrā- and anāhītā- qualify an omitted, or gapped, noun ‘water’ (ap-). He contends that, contrary to Pirart’s 1997a claim, consecutive enclitic pronouns are in fact found in Avestan and that it is therefore legitimate to interpret hīn in Yt 5.1 etc. as the acc.sg. of the 3rd person pronoun. Skjærvø discusses the phenomenon that both Av. anāhītā- and its rendering in Pahlavi, which may be read as both ‘wstn’ and ‘nwst’, allow for the interpretations
'unsullied’ (Pahl. awinast) and ‘unattached’ (Pahl. aniwast, < OIr. *a-ni-basta-). Malandrea 2013 discusses the question of how Pahl. anâhôgêñid ‘undefiled’ came to gloss anâhîtâ- ‘unbound’. Vegas Sansalvador 2016 studies three features shared by Anâhîti and the Greek goddess Artemis, namely their function as helpers in childbirth, their connection with rivers and marshy grounds, and their being ‘unbound’, i.e. virgins.

anhuia- see below s.v. ašaiā-.
aojis Panaino 2002, 79 suggests that the form aojis in Yt 15.46, which Bartholomae 1904, 41 regards as very doubtful (‘sehr zweifelhaft’), is a corrupt form of aojishtô ‘strongest’.
aoxtô.nâman- Panaino 1994, 172–173 interprets the phrase aoxtô.nâmana yasna yaz- as the technical term of the ritual worship of a deity with an Avestan hymn.
apaianti- The verb â-pâ ‘to observe’, which Sims-Williams 1989, 257 recognised in the form apaïantæhæ in Y 9.31 (rather than ap ‘to reach, obtain’, as suggested by Bartholomae 1904, 71), is also attested in Sogd. ëy ‘to perceive, recognise, understand’ (< *â-pâ/aya-., Sims-Williams & Durkin-Meisterernst 2012, 15), and in the Bactr. adj. ãï.setDate ‘cultivated’ < *â-pâta-, in the phrase ãï.setDate ãï.Date ‘to cultivate’, NP âbâd kardan (Sims-Williams 2007, 181). The form apaïantæhæ shows the YAv. shortening of prevocalic *(j-)aï-, *(j-)aï- in the pretonic position, on which see Hintze 2014, 22. The clause Y 9.31 aïj חד daênaïâ mãs vaca dañâhæ nöït šíiaoañnâïs apaïantæhæ means accordingly, ‘who focuses his mind on this religion with his word, while not observing (i.e. the religion) with his actions’.
apaunaita- Schmitt 1999 analyses Av. apaunaita- (Vd 2.29 and 37) as a compound of apa ‘away’ and *âunaita-, the Iranian counterpart of Ved. ãavâ- ‘mating instinct, sexual appetite’. The meaning of the Av. compound would be as a Bahuvrīhi ‘whose sexual appetite is gone’.
ap De Vaan 2008 argues that ape in Y 19.8, for which Bartholomae 1904, 82 posited a separate entry, is a spelling error for aipi. The latter form postulated by de Vaan is in fact attested in some of the manuscripts that have recently become available online in the Avestan Digital Archive, including the Iranian Yasna Sāde mss. 0015_MZK4, 0060_ML15285 (where the first i is crossed out) and 0082_MZK3.
ar Various homonymous roots ar in Indo-Iranian and their IE antecedents are surveyed by Hintze 2000, 73f. and Kümmel 2000a, 253–255, who also examines the aorist formations of the roots ar in Indo-Iranian, and by Tremblay 2006, 306f. Distinguishing between ‘ar ‘to set oneself in motion’ (IE *h₄er) and ‘ar ‘to reach, arrive’ (IE *h₄er), Hintze 2017 analyses the form frēraŋti (HN 2.9, Vvt 8.4) as the nom.sg.fem. of the participle of the active thematic aorist fra-ar-a- of ‘ar ‘to reach, arrive’; see also no. 58 above: Aorist.
ard Lühr 1994, 87–91 interprets the form uzərdiiddīāī in Y 43.12 and 14 as the 1sg. subj. mid. of the present stem ardidiia- (Ved. ṛdhya-) of the root ard ‘to succeed’, rather than as an infinitive in -diiddī of one of the homonymous roots ar, see also above, p. 24f.


arrmauaddī- Remmer 2006, 214–225 analyses this female personal name as ‘pronouncing the guilt’ ("die Schuld aussprechend"), see no. 65 above: Onomastics.

arrushman- Tucker 1998, 109f. and 2009, 523 suggests that, in the expression arrushman bairišta (Yt 12.7), the hapax legomenon arrushman is the direct object of the superlative bairišta-. Positing the literal meaning of arrushman as ‘what is equipped with an object or purpose’ (Av. arrhiša- ntr. ‘cause, lawsuit’), she translates the expression as ‘who best supports the cause’. Accepting Tucker’s analysis, Goldman 2015, 131–134 renders the attribute of Rašnu as ‘best supporter of the judiciary’, and relates it to the god’s intercession in the varah- ‘ordeal’ and his character as the genius of justice.

arshan- Pronk 2009 argues that Av. arshan-, Ved. (v)rśabhā-, vṛṣan- and Grk ἀρσον, ἀρσόν are etymologically related and are based on an IE noun *yrs-ṇ- ‘male animal’ and an IE root *yrs ‘to desire, be ready for’, with loss of the initial *y- in some forms in Indo-Iranian and in Grk

asar- ‘place’. Jamison 1991, 82 fn.9 discusses the connection between Av. asar- and Ved. āśā- ‘space, area’.

ascium Lubotsky 2002 argues that the form ascium (Vd. 8.63–65 and 9.23) is the acc.sg. of a thematic stem ascuum- rather than of a u-stem ascu- as posited by Bartholomae 1904, 211. According to Lubotsky, ascuum- goes back to PrAv. *asci̯a- and, together with Ved. ashi-[na]- ‘kneecap’, derives from an Indo-Iranian compound *Hastci[Hyu]-, which would mean ‘shin, shank’ rather than ‘knee-joint’.

asrauvalidate gāthā- Panaino 2013 examines the attestations of this YAv. compound and suggests that it entails the existence of priests who refused to recite the Gāthās and were opposed to the cult promoted by the Avesta.
asta- ntr. ‘home’. Garcia-Ramón 2012, 160f. and fn. 49 surveys the various meanings that have been proposed for the IE root *nes ‘to get in contact (with the desired goal)’, which in Av. only occurs in nominal forms.

‘asti-’ m. ‘guest’. Pinault 1998, 468–470 derives Av. asti-, Ved. ātithi- from Indo-Iranian *ātHiti- < PIE *h₂o-th₂-ti- ‘the one who stays close’ (“qui se tient auprès”). Ramharter 2012, 242–247, who doubts Pinault’s reconstruction involving the existence in Indo-Iranian of the preverb *h₂o and of a variant without *s- of the root *steh₂ ‘to take position’, like Pinault posits a personified ti-abstract, but reconstructs the prehistoric form of Av. asti-, Ved. ātihit- as *ṇ-th₂-ti- ‘non-stealing’, personified as ‘non-thief’. The formation would be of the type Ved. ā-dtiti- (*ṇ-dhi-ti-) personified as ‘non-binding’. The noun *ṇ-th₂-ti- would denote the dear, welcome guest and contrast semantically with PIE *gʷós-ti- (Lat. hostis etc.) as the ‘seized’ stranger, guest (p. 254).

‘āṣti-’ f. a unit of measure. Abandoning Henning’s connection with PIE *h₂ok- ‘pointed’, de Vaan 1997a [2000], 241 derives ‘āṣti- as a ti-abstract *h₂agk-ti- from the root *h₂nek ‘to reach’ and interprets the noun as denoting the ‘stretching’ (Ved. āṣṭi- ‘reaching’) of (twice) the four fingers of a hand, without the thumb, when counting (zacāṣṭi-) and measuring (aṣṭi māsah- ‘of the size of a stretching (of four fingers)’).

astō vīdatu- Andrés-Toledo 2010, 105–122 discusses the Av. and MP attestations of this demon.

āṣa- ntr. ‘order, truth’. Cantera 2003 argues that As. āṣa- derives from a PIr. zero-grade form *p̂ṭa- and agrees in its ablaut grade with the rest of the Old and Middle Iranian languages. The OAv. form would have been *ŝhdrta-, which further developed to *ŝhṛtə- and, by way of a special development in word initial position, resulted in YAv. *ŝhrta-. In the course of the Avesta recitation the voiceless -r- would have come to be pronounced as a lateral fricative by the time the Avestan alphabet was invented and denoted by the special letter š, as outlined by Hoffmann 1986, 173, 179 (= 1992, 847, 853), and the word came to be written as āṣa-. Hintze 2007, 53–58, who surveys this and other interpretations of the morphology and semantics of this word, draws attention to the full grade forms arta- attested in various compounds, concluding that they support a derivation of āṣa- from the full grade root, and she assumes that the substantivization of Indo-Iranian *Hṛtā- → *ϑṛta- is an innovation setting Avestan apart from the other Old and Middle Iranian languages. Ahmad 2015a studies the semantics of āṣa- in an Indo-Iranian perspective and proposes the translation ‘cosmos’ in the sense of the ordered, perfect world “as an object of eschatological longing” (p. 313). According to Ahmad 2012, 530–533 and 2013a, 866 fn.18, in the Gāthās the adnominal āṣāt hācā literally means “being oriented to (the domain of) āṣa-” and implies the meaning
“soteriological”. Skjærvø 2003a examines the Olr., Mlr. and Ved. sources for three types of conflict (cosmological, social and eschatological) that result from the opposition between cosmic Order (aša-), which is real and true (haithia-), and the Lie (druj-), which merely seems to be real. Nichols 2016 discusses how the Iranian concept of aša- is presented in Greek sources.

ašaiiā- Rejecting Hoffmann’s proposal, apud Kellens 1996, 57, that ašaiiā- means ‘striving for truth’, Tucker 2004, 557 fn. 20 suggests that ašaiiā- represents a secondary noun created on the basis of the adverb ašaiia ‘in the right way’, which like Ved. ṛtayā is employed to indicate ritual correctness. She translates the expression ašaiia vanhuīia (Vd 18.34 etc., for attestations see Bartholomae 1904, 244 s.v. ašaiia) as ‘by good performance of truth’, and suggests that the secondary noun gave rise to the verbal stem ašaiia-, which in turn provided the model for the nonce formation aṇhuiia- (A 4.4).

ažmaoya- Deriving ažmaoya- from *ṛta-maug’a-, Skjærvø 2003a, 401f. discusses the attestation in Y 9.31 and posits the meaning of this YAv. compound as ‘who obfuscates Order, shams/pretends Orderly behavior’.

ažauruna- ‘priestly service’, ažauruana- ‘priest’. Hintze 2009, 175–179 discusses the form and function of these terms.

auuruna- Swennen 2003 analyses the Av. attestations (in addition to those of the Ved. cognate arunā-) and argues that in the Avesta the adj. no longer has its etymological meaning of ‘ruddy’, but means ‘wild’ from the Gāthās onwards. According to him, the RV, where the fem. arunī- describes the cow and the dawn (uśās-), reflects an earlier, more archaic stage. He suggests that the celebration and the cult of the goddess uśās- arunī- has disappeared in the Avesta and been replaced by the cult of Mazdā.

auurū, aspū. staaiehī For this compound in Yt 5.7, see above, p. 27.

auurūa₁hā₂hū₁- Piras 2003 studies this attribute of the Good Daēnā in H 2.9 in the context of IE poetic language.

auu ‘to help’. García-Ramón 2012 traces the semantic shifts of the verb *haleyh₁- from its meaning ‘to run (to/for)’ attested in Anatolian, to ‘to assist, help’ in some IE languages, and to ‘to seek, desire’ in others. Cf. below s.v. auyauha-.

auuah- Hintze 2009a argues that the noun auuah- ‘water’, posited by Bartholomae 1904, 178, is a ghost word.

auyauha- ntr. ‘provision’. García-Ramón 2012, 163f. and fn. 62 (references) suggests that the word family of YAv. auyauha- (Ved. avasā- ntr. ‘food’) may have developed the meaning ‘to be greedy, eat (greedily)’ by semantic specialization from ‘desire (food)’. It then belongs to IE *haleyh₁- ‘run (to/for)’ (Av. auu ‘to help, see above s.v.). García-Ramón’s explanation dispenses with a homonymous root Ved. *au ‘to eat’ (IE *haleyh, Rix et al. 2001, 274; Hintze 2009a, 119).
ax̂arāta- Hintze 1994, 237–240 interprets this epithet of x̂arəmah- as a formation with shortened preverb ā meaning ‘gleaning’ (lit.: ‘having gleamed’), while Panaino 2002a, 93 and fn. 2 prefers the interpretation with privative a- meaning ‘not burnt up’. With reference to the rendering of ax̂arāta- in Pahlavi as agrātī and the Bactrian form ʃawrō [xward] ‘taken’ (< OIr. *hyarta-., Sims-Williams 1997a, 24), Humbach & Ichaporia 1998, 15–16 endorse Bartholomaeus’s ‘unseized, un-taken’. By contrast, Nikolaev 2012–2013, who argues for the etymological connection of x̂arəmah- (q.v.) with the word for ‘sun’, interprets the “oxymoron” ax̂arəntom x̂arənō as ‘sunless sun’ (p. 217 fn. 130).

ažī- Oettinger 2010, 279, 283 reconstructs the ancestor form of Av. ažī-, Ved. āhi- as PIE *ŋgʷhī-, rather than as *h₁gʷhī- or, as posited by Slade 2008 [2010], as h₃gʰhī-.

āfant- Accepting the derivation of āfant- ‘rich in water’ from *āpyant-, Hintze 1994, 97 fn. 18 surveys different analyses that have been provided. Referring to Gershevitch’s 1959, 172–174 linking of Av. āfant- with Ossetic words for ‘time’, in particular Iron afon and Digoron afonae, Kellens 2000, 127–128 suggests that the expressions frāštartom paiti āfantom (Yt 8.35, 13.54, Vd 21.5) and frāštartom paiti zurūnām (Yt 13.56) contain elliptic forms of frāštartom paiti zurūnām āfantom and denote the rainy season, cf. s.v. frāštar-ta- below.

ārmaiti- Skjærvø 2002a discusses ārmaiti- in the wider IE, especially Indo-Iranian, context. De Vaan 2003, 97–98 explains the long initial vowel of ārmaiti-, which replaced Indo-Iranian *aramati- (Ved. arāmati- ‘right-mindedness’) at an early stage in the tradition of the Avesta, as deriving from the combination of the noun with its standing epithet spānta- ‘life-giving’, which contracted to *spantāramaiti- in most Iranian dialects. Schwartz’s 2000, 15 suggestion that the form ārmaiti- shows remodelling by analogy with the first syllable of a Sogd. word which he transcribes as ārōbār, and as meaning ‘plot of land’, is weakened by the fact that it is based on a Sogd. word that shows spelling variations with one and two initial alephs, rōr, rōr, see Benveniste 1940, 245. Razmjou 2001 identifies the Iranian goddess Spontā Ārmaiti in the deity named Ispandakurtiš in Achaemenid Elamite. He argues that the name could be a spelling for Iranian Ispandarmattiš, since the ideogram KUR, which is used in the name, can also be read mad/ti in Akkadian.

In a personal communication (e-mail of 9 August 2017), Schwartz revises his remarks of 2000, 15 as follows: “We must proceed from Indo-Iranian *aramati-proper/regular/ harmonious thought’. In the Rig-Veda, the term is both a common noun ‘devotion’, but also the name of a goddess. Skjærvø was right in seeing RV 10.92.5, ‘the rivers ... have run across Great Aramati’ as showing that already in Ved. times Aramati was an earth goddess (which I would explain as a hypostasis of divine Devotedness). The antiquity of this notion in Iran is shown by the data
from of the Young Avesta, Persepolis (Razmjou 2001), Khotanese, and Armenian. As to why in OAv., as indicated in Schwartz 2000, 13–15, 𐓂𐓂𐓂 𐓂 is not an earth-goddess, but a broad divine hypostasis of cosmic Proper Thought which brings things into regular realization (to which I now add 𐓂 30.7), and particularly the realm of nature (which also explains the connection with pastures as at 𐓂 48.11), is due to Zarathushtra’s proclivity for abstract divine entities as part of his Godhead, whereby some minor pre-Zarathushtrian gods could be reformulated and recycled into his theology (cf. Schwartz 2006, 485). At the same time, Zarathushtra retained *aramati- as a common noun ‘devotion’; the most interesting attestation, which intentionally straddles the categories of *aramati- as human piety and as part of the Godhead, is 𐓂 32.2c ‘We choose/accept your good holy devotion, may it be Ours’, which seems to be an echo of an ancient formula, cf. RV 7.34.21 ‘May Aramati, seeking goods, be ours’. It may be added that */aramati/- as ‘proper thought’ = ‘devotion’ (Y 45.10a, object of worshipful bestowal) is elaborated in a complex poetic play on *aram ‘properly’ plus the verb root man ‘to think’ at Y 45.11a-b. Note in this connection that it can be shown by charting the systematic stanza-by-stanza lexemic correlations between 𐓂 46 proceeding forwards and 𐓂 51 proceeding backwards, 𐓂 46 */aramati-/ correlates with 𐓂 51.14 */aram/; cf. the collocation, as a figura etymologica of */aramati/- and */aram/ at 𐓂 43.10b, indicating that Zarathushtra was very consciously aware of the etymology of */aramati-/*.

äšna- Piras 1996 derives this attribute of xruatu- from the root 𐓂 ‘to rise, ascend’, rather than 𐓂 ‘to give birth, beget’ as suggested by Bartholomae 1904, 341 s.v. ‘äšna- ‘inmate’. He also finds the adjective äšna- ‘rising’ in the first term of the compound äšmō.uruan-, which he translates as ‘whose soul has risen’ (p. 12).

äšito.gātto- Considering the initial ä- of this compound as unetymological, Lubotsky 1998 interprets *asita.gātto- as ‘of unlain-on couch’, i.e. ‘who never sees his bed’. De Vaan 2003, 66f., however, objects that this compound lacks the conditions for lengthening of privative *a-, which he identifies as being when *a- is followed by any syllables containing short a or ā. Instead, following Humbach & Ichaporia 1998, 116, he sees the adj. äšito- ‘set up, planted’ (Y 10.14) in the first term of the compound, and translates äšito.gātto- as ‘whose place is set up’.

ätar- Lipp 2009 II 349f. and fn.91 provides a full discussion with ample references concerning the etymological and phonological issues of this noun and its inflection.

äžiinti- According to Pirart 2000, 396–400 the word äžiinti- derives with suffix -tī from the root IE *ǵēmH (e.g. in Av. zâmātar- ‘son-in-law’), and means ‘transposition’ of a text word by word from one dialect or language to another. By contrast, Benkato 2017, 117f. derives Av. äžiinti- from the verb 𐓂 ‘to know’, with ä-
prefix and ti-suffix, and posits the meaning ‘explanation, interpretation (of a sacred text)’. He argues that the inherited meaning is still present in a Manichaean Sogdian text, while elsewhere in Manichaean literature āzand is the technical term for the literary category of the ‘parable’. It is a two-part text with a narrative in the first part and the explanation and interpretation of that narrative in the second part.

Cantera 2004, 1–4 discusses the attestations and meaning of Av. āzainti-.

āzūti- Jamison 2011, 23 and 25 endorses Narten’s 1986, 203–205 conclusion that in OAv. āzūti-, generally rendered as ‘butter’ or ‘fat’, still has the meaning of the abstract noun ‘libation’; cf. also below s.v. xšuēd-.


qsašutā̄ Segments this metrically trisyllabic hapax legomenon in Y 48.1 as *ansušutā, Schwartz 2006a, 221 suggests a word play *ansušutā ‘pressing of the haōma-stalks’ and *ansušutā ‘action(s) of malice’. Ahmadi 2015, 163, 193 notes 53 and 54 discusses earlier interpretations and analyses the word as *qs, the root from which the OAv. angra- ‘evil’ is derived, combined with either the loc.sg. of the ti-abstr or the nom.pl.ntr. of the ta-perfect passive participle of the root š(i)īstu- ‘to set in motion’.

bag- Deriving the stem of the Grk verb σφαζειν ‘to slaughter’ (esp. victims for sacrifice) from *x-bag-je-ō-, Janda 2014, 304–317 connects the Grk verb with Indo-Iranian *b̥hag ‘to share’ and argues for a ritual connection between ‘slaughter’ and ‘eat’.

baya- Panaino 2013a examines the MP attestations for the meaning ‘giver’ of Pahl. bay, with a view to establishing the meaning of Ofir. baga-. Arguing that in Pahl. the stars are described as bay, not because they were considered to be divine beings, but because they were perceived as ‘givers’, he traces the tradition of bay ‘giver’ back to the Avesta. He argues that YAv. beya- does not simply mean ‘god’ but still has the connotation of ‘sharer’, particularly in the compound bāyā-baxta-.

barmāitiarna- Janda 2006a, 108 analyses this attribute of a bull (gōuš aršnō) in Yt 17.55 as ‘making the womb pregnant, impregnating’.

baršman- Rezania 2014, 216–218 suggests that the meanings of Av. baršman- include that of a spread of grass on which the sacrificial gifts were placed.

barōx̣arənān- Panaino 1992 [1994], 156 argues that this hapax legomenon in Vd 19.37 is based on the expression in Yt 14.2 baru.x̣arənō mazdaōātām.

bā De Vaan 2009 studies the syntax and etymology of the YAv. particles bā and bōγ and settles on the derivation of bā from the PIE particle *b̥o/e. Sims-Williams 1996, 186 connects Chor. f̣ and Sogd. -β(y) with Av. bā and notes that like Av.
bā, but unlike Sogd. -β(y), Chor. TexParameter takes the second position after the first accented word in a clause and has precedence over enclitic pronouns, while Bactr. -βa takes the third position in a clause after the sentence-initial enclitic particle -ό, -ό(-< *uit; Sims-Williams & Cribb 1995–6, 86f.). Sims-Williams 1996, 184–186 argues that enclitic -ba is probably also found in the MMP particles b' and hyh, and in Pahl. bê.

bāda De Vaan 2015 explains bāda etymologically as an inner-Avestan derivative of the particle bā. On the basis of a review of the attestations he interprets bāda as a modality adverb meaning ‘clearly, obviously’, and its superlative bāaśītōm as ‘most clearly’. Skjervø [forthcoming 2018] n.19 objects that de Vaan’s proposal strains the meaning of the passages in question, and that it is contradicted by the meaning ‘ever and again, often’, of bāaśītān in a Parthian Turfan text. The Sogd. cognate occurs in a reduplicated phrase ββββ ‘again and again’ in Ancient Letter 3.5.

bāxōri- Tremblay 2004, 136–138 discusses in detail the various forms of the name ‘Bactria’ and suggests that Av. bāxōri- represents an older Bactrian form, before the change of odable to l, while Ved. bāxīka- (and some Tibetan and Chinese forms) may derive from a slightly later Bactrian form. From a chronological point of view, he separates the phonological development of this group of forms from that of the Western Iranian ones, which arrive at a similar outcome but by a different route (*xdr > xr > lx, e.g. MP b‘hl, NP Bālx). De Blois 2013, 270 argues that the YAv. form represents the middle step, which cannot be later than the early Achaemenid period, of the specifically Bactrian shift of post-consonantal ńr > őr > l. Hintze 2015, 34 surveys the debate on Av. bāxōri- (instead of *bāxōri- which would be expected according to Av. sound laws) in relation to Bactr. βαγξο, and concludes that it might be a Bactrian dialect form which entered the recitation of the Avesta in the East Iranian oral tradition. Sims-Williams 2016a surveys the various forms of the name in Old and Middle Iranian languages and provides philological support to Étienne de la Vaissière’s hypothesis, that Bactria/Balkh is referred to both by Chinese forms such as Fudiyе and by the Sogd. and Bactr. adjectives βτξκ or βτξκ and βαγξογγο.

bānduwa- Noting that Y 49.1a is employed in Vd 11.4 as a verse line to be recited for purifying the house and as the first in a sequence of mantras, each of which mentions the object to be purified, Tucker 2013a, 218 suggests that OAv. bānduwa-, whatever its literal meaning or function, may represent OIr. *bānda-, a cognate of Ved. bhānda- ‘property, household goods’, and, possibly, of Latin fundus and, by metathesis, of Av. bana-, Ved. budhna-.

bīxōra- Milizia 2012 analyses bīxōra-, a hapax legomenon in Vd 19.21, as ‘instrument of purification’, from PIE *bʰi-ko-tro- of a root *bʰejk- ‘to purify’, and equates
it with the Greek adjective ἄφικτρος ‘impure’ (Hesychius). By contrast, Skjærvø 1997c, 121–126, who adopts the reading baxhräm of the Vidēvādā Śāde manuscripts, postulates a noun baxhrāra- ‘spade’, derived from IE *bhreg, and a cognate of Ved. bhājī ‘to break (up)’. The noun would then be a homonym of Av. baxhrāra- ‘share, portion’ (IE *bhreg). Skjærvø’s analysis is accepted by Tremblay 2004, 136, who translates baxhrāra- in Vd 19.21 as ‘épée’.

brī- ‘to cut, shear’ in Iranian is studied by Schaffner 1993 [1994].

būṭī Accepting Darmesteter’s (1892–1893 III xli–xlviii, II 259 note 4) linking of būṭī daēwō (Vd 19.1, 2 and 43) with the Sanskrit name Buddha, Klingenschmitt 2000, 194 suggests that the form būṭī represents an early Middle Iranian form with the nom.sg. ending -i < *-ah < *-ah. De Vaan 2003, 450 fn. 561, however, finds a later date of the form būṭī difficult to reconcile with the collocation of būṭī daēwō with demons of Indo-Iranian pedigree, in particular indra-, saura- and nāgahaiśīya- in Vd 19.43.

-cā Kellens & Pirart 1988–1991 I 9 allow only four possibilities in Indo-Iranian for the position of the coordinating enclitic particle -cā in the concatenation of three terms, but Ahmadi 2013, 244f. comments that, as far as the Rigveda is concerned, Klein’s 1985, 162–208 repertoire in fact provides evidence for more than four figures, one of which is the pattern XYcaZ, which Kellens’ and Pirart’s “rule” disallows for the Avesta. In particular, Ahmadi argues that Y 30.3b attests the configuration XYcā/Z, which shows an XYca construction in one pāda and an additional term in the subsequent pāda; see also no.44 above: Demonstrative pronouns, p 12.

cāt- f. ‘well’. Vījūnas 2009, 108 and fn. 228–230 surveys various explanations for the morphology and inflection of this noun.

ciṅgθan- ‘perceptive’. Rau 1998, 144f. and fn. 37 analyses the hapax legomenon ciṅgθā (Y 43.2) as the nom.sg. of a *-yan- stem that forms part of a small series of stems in *-ur-, *-qi-, and *-yan- added to the perfect stem and alternating with ‘normal’ perfect participles.

ciṅgθōraś Jasanoff 1997 argues that the form is 3pl.inj.perf. (or: pluperfect), see no.60 above: Perfect.

ciṅvaat pṛṣṭu- Connecting the pres. part. ciṅvaat- with the root ci ‘to collect, gather’, Kellens 1988 and 1995a, 48 interprets the expression ciṅvaat pṛṣṭu- as ‘Bridge of the Piler’ (‘Pont de l’entasseur’), the ‘piler’ implying Yima. Cantera 2004a, 100–103, following Kellens, interprets the expression as ‘Piler’s Pass’. Hintze 2007, 198 fn.5 endorses the derivation of ciṅvaat- as being from the root ci ‘to collect, gather’, but relates the ‘collecting’ to the good and bad deeds being collected at the Bridge. Similarly Skjærvø 2012, 73 interprets the term as the ‘ford/bridge of the accountant’, denoting the place where, according to the Pahlavi texts, one’s good and bad thoughts, words, and deeds, were totalled and weighed
on the scales of Rašnu. Schwartz 2010a, 102–103 sees a connection between cinuuatu and the compound vi-ci ‘to discriminate’ and interprets the Bridge as that of the ‘Selector’, or ‘Examiner’.

ciθra- Tremblay 2008, 36 surveys earlier interpretations. Hintze 2005 [2009], 57–58 discusses the meaning of ciθra- and endorses the view that similarly to Latin species, the semantic range of the single lemma ciθra- could encompass both ‘appearance, manifestation’ and ‘seed, origin, descent’. Panaino 2009, 207–215 discusses the passages where ciθra- occurs in collocation with daxšta- ‘sign, menses’ and argues that in connection with menstruation ciθra- denotes the manifestation of female sexual maturity and fertility, the ‘germen’ or ‘manifest (seed)’ of a woman. He suggests that the noun refers to the female reproductive capacity that is ‘visible’ in menstruation and that the semantic value of ‘race, kin, descent’ might have developed from such a use. Ahmadi 2017 suggests that ciθram in Y 32.3 functions as an adverb, meaning something like ‘characteristically’ or ‘recognizably’. According to him, Av. ciθra- means only (characteristic) ‘appearance’, ‘apparition’, but not ‘seed’, ‘origin’.

daenā- The derivation of daenā- from *deyāHjanā- and Pirart’s 2012, 129ff. proposal of reviving the old connection of Av. daenā- with Ved. dhēnā- are critically reviewed by Cantera 2013, 97 fn.27. The latter returns to Schindler’s 1972, 27 analysis as *deyāHjanā-. For the meaning of daenā-, see above, p 40f. no.75.

daenua- Various aspects of Iranian demonology are explored in the volume edited by Swemmen 2015a.

dailbit(a)nā Ahmadi 2014b, 49, 63–75 argues that the Gāthic adverb means ‘in twos, together’.

danaro Adducing cognates in Greek (θετν) and Germanic languages, Janda 1998, 1–14 argues that danaro (Vd 16.7) is the petrified acc.sg. of a heteroclitic neuter r/n-stem IE *θenr denoting a unit of volume for solid and liquid substances of a quantity that fills the hand, a ‘handful’. Janda recognises the n-variant of the stem in the second term of compounds, e.g. taro.dman-, which denotes a measure of length.

dar Reading viodærmnō in HN 2.7, 2.25, Vyt 8.3 (= 55) with the mss. of the Vyt, Hintze 2017, 169f. fn.12 interprets the form as the pres. part. middle of the present stem dāra- of dar ‘to hold’.

daxšta- While Cheung 2007, 70 follows Inslur in deriving daxšta- ‘sign, menses’ from dis ‘to show’, Panaino 2009, 197–205, following an earlier proposal by Burrow, connects daxšta- with daxša- ‘fire’ and derives both from a secondary root daxš of the verb daj ‘to burn’.

daxiun, dajhu- Hintze 1994, 284 assumes that in the expression daxiunam zātanam azātanamca in Yt 19.56–64, daxiunam refers metonymically to the inhabitants of
lands. By contrast, Schmitt 2012, 361–364 and fn. 6 translates ‘lands’ and contends (1999a, 443) that the meaning ‘inhabitants of a land’ would require the pos-
ing of two lemmata ‘dájhu- fem. ‘land’ and ‘dájhu- m. ‘inhabitant of a land’, the latter being the etymological equivalent of Ved. dásyu- m. ‘enemy’. Sadovsky 2001, 109–111 discusses Av. compounds with *dájhu-/*dátiu-,
see no. 62 above: Composition, p 25f.

dā ‘to give; to set’. Hintze 2007, 162–167 discusses the question of the meaning ‘to
create’ of this root.

dbōišta- Sins-Williams & Tucker 2005, 594–596 consider the possibility that YAv.
dbótišta- belongs with OP duvaišta- ‘farthest’ (an option that was rejected by Bar-
tholomea 1904 on the grounds that t�� instead of db- would be expected for the
Av. form), and they suggest that it shows a State II *dyaH- from *dā- in Av. dūra-
far’, Ved. dūrā- ‘id.’.

dāush.srauaaH- see below s.v. haosrauaah-.

draoša- Buyaner 2015 studies the semantics and etymology of the Av. word and its
Pahl. cognate drōš, and of the phonologically and semantically similar Pahl. noun
drōz. Proposing the meaning ‘mutilation’ for draoša- and for drōš, he argues that
drōš and drōz are reflexes of different extensions of the IE root *dʊrəy/*dʊru- ‘to
diminish, injure, harm’.

drīgu- Thompson 2002 provides further support for the view, succinctly presented by
Narten 1986, 238f. fn. 158, that Av. drīgu- is primary to Ved. ādhrīgu-, which
would have been subject to re-analysis within Ved. as adhrī-gu-.

druca pauruuṣanca Reading the formulaic expression, which is attested in Yt 13.99 =
Yt 19.85 as druca pauruuṣanaca, Hintze 1994, 356f. interprets the pair as two instru-
mental sg. forms ‘with wood and shaft’ used metonymically in this instance for
‘with bow and arrow’. This interpretation is criticised by Tremblay 1996, 129f.
who, following Schindler apud Watkins 1995, 162f., reads the expression as two
suffixless locatives ‘draucca pauruuṣanca ‘in tree and in rock’. Janda 1997, 33–36,
140–158, however, considers the reading druca to be a better transmission, and
interprets druca pauruuṣanca as nom./acc.pl., which in turn would be based on col-
lectives *dru< *druh- and *pergón, the latter with replacement of the ending -āro
of the heteroclitic noun with -qn. He adduces Vyt 4.6 (= 29) as a third Av. attes-
tation, and finds cognates of the collocation in other IE languages, especially in the
Greek formula δρής καὶ πέτρα ‘wood and rock’. He reconstructs an IE phrase
like-
ewise interpret pauruuṣanca as acc.pl., but consider it to be used instead of the
instr.pl. and coordinated with the instr.sg. druca. According to Pirart, the acc.pl.
pauruuṣanca was introduced into the text by a recensor to replace the original form
of the instr.pl., which he sees attested in Vyt 4.6 (= 29) "paūruwaainišca. See also below s.v. "pauruwiapii".

dugadar- Lipp 2009 II 351ff. studies the Indo-Iranian reflexes of PIE *dʰughitá- and Werba 2005 the problem of the vocalisation of the laryngeal in this and other Indo-Iranian words; cf. Hintze 2014, 28f. on the Iranian outcome of laryngeals between consonants.

ārṣī- m. ‘seer, poet’. Panaino 2015 provides a detailed analysis of the Gāthic stanza Y 31.5, where ārṣī- (Ved. āṣī-) occurs as a hapax legomenon, and discusses it in connection with its adjectival derivative ārṣīti- ‘inspired’ in Y 40.4. He interprets Y 31.5 in the light of the Indo-Iranian concepts of the ‘mental vision’ (man-) and the ‘inspired seer’ (ārṣī-). By contrast, Skjærvø 1997, 109, 111 derives ārṣī- from the verb ar- ‘to obtain’ and translates the noun as ‘desire to obtain’. Forāxām Kellens 1994, 47 interprets the form Forāxām in Y 43.9 as the sole witness of an absolute in -am in Av. and adduces RV 7.86.3 viṣṭham ‘in order to inquire’ (translation by Jamison & Brereton 2014 III 901) as a parallel.

forarāt- adj. ‘moving forth’. Vījūnas 2009, 5 discusses different explanations for the formation of this noun and accepts Nussbaum’s analysis as a secondary derivative with suffix *-ot- from the thematic stem.

fradāṭī ‘for the benefit of’. Sims-Williams 2009 argues that the Av. dative is continued in the Bactr. preposition ṣāro, ṣāro-, ṣap- ‘to, for’, see below s.v. frādā.

fraurāt In agreement with Insler 1975, 167, Plath 2006 derives the adv. fraurāt from *pra-vṛt, and connects the form with vart ‘to turn’, rather than with var ‘to choose’ as proposed by Bartholomae 1904, 976. Plath points out that the type of adverbial compound with a local particle as the first term and a verbal root in the zero grade as second term is inherited from Indo-Iranian, as demonstrated by a form such as RV an-apāvṛt, and also exists outside Indo-Iranian, cf. Grk ἀπόδοπα < *upo-dṛk.

frašā On the basis of Bartholomae’s 1904, 1005–06 explanation of this adverb as an old instr.sg. of the adj. frānc- (< Indo-Iranian *pra-anč-), but separating frašā etymologically from the adj. fraša- ‘excellent’, Hintze 1994, 250, 383 fn. 81 assumes that the fem. gender of the form (< *pra-ac-ī, from a stem *pra-ac-ī) derives from an elliptic fem. noun such as *dis- ‘direction’. Cantera 2005, 110ff., who objects that the noun *dis is not attested in Av. and that the instr. is not used adnominally, prefers to take the form fraša as the instr.sg. of an adj *praču-, an analysis which Bartholomae had proposed for the adj. fraša- ‘excellent’. By contrast, Ahmad 2014, 912 segments fraša as *fra-arta- ‘advancing’, from ar ‘to set (oneself) in motion’ (PIE *h₂ser).

fravrūta- Forsman 2016 argues that fravrūta- means ‘widely known, famous’ when it relates to a person, but ‘clearly proclaimed’ when the object is a text, such as the
Ahuna Vairya-prayer. The two different meanings reflect different meanings of the causative present stem frasrâuuaiai-. 

frauaši- Haudry 1995 rejects the analysis of Av. frauaši- as a ti-abstract from the root var and instead revives the derivation from the root vart ‘to turn’ with suffix -i-. Comparing the Av. word with Germanic *wurdi-, he posits its meaning as ‘destiny’.

frād Sims-Williams 2009 connects Av. frādaḏāi etymologically with the Bactrian preposition ɐap [far] ‘to, for, etc.’, which marks indirect objects and beneficiaries, and with Parth. frh [fraha] ‘for’. He notes that, like Av. frādaḏāi, Parth. frh [fraha] displays shortening of -ā- in the root syllable, while the Bactr. form may go back to a form with either a long or a short root vowel.

frārnti (HN 2.9, Vyt 8.4) see s.v. ar above.

fsrati- ‘enjoyment, joy, exhilaration’. Hintze 2007, 192–195 argues that this metrically disyllabic fem. verbal abstract noun represents *fsrati- instead of *fšrati-. It is formed either with suffix -tii- (Grk -tû- ) or with suffix -tu- transitioned to fem. -tii- in the process of the noun’s personification as a female being. The suffix is attached to the thematic pres. stem fsra- of the OIr. root *fšar- continued in Khotan. ṣṣar- ‘to exhilarate’.

gaoćiдра- Panaino 2005a argues that the basic meaning of gaocidra- is ‘having the shape of a bull’ (‘avente la forma di un toro’. p. 814). As an epithet of the moon (māh- ) it denotes the curved shape of the crescent moon. According to Hintze 2005 [2009], however, the meaning of cîdra- (q.v.) in gaociдра- is ‘origin, seed’ rather than ‘appearance’. She suggests that the compound points to the existence in Avestan of the creation myth, found in the Pahlavi sources, according to which the numerous animal species arose from a single reproductive prototype, whose seed or essence was purified in the moon.

garō dōmān- Jackson 2016, 178 prefers to translate this phrase as ‘house of praise’ rather than ‘house of welcome’, while emphasising that ‘praise, song’ and ‘welcome’ condition each other.

gātu- De Blois 1995 studies the semantic development OP gāṭu- in comparison with its Av. cognate gātu- and suggests that the original meaning is ‘walk-way’ or ‘(raised) standing-place’. According to him, the meaning ‘throne’ might be due to Elamite substratum influence and entered Av. from OP.

gūš Tremblay 2002 [2006], 269 fn. 31 interprets the OAv. form (Y 32.8) as the 3sg. of the sigmatic aorist and connects it with a wide range of forms in Middle Iranian languages (e.g. Sogd. γaw- ‘to be necessary, desirable, to lack’, Bactr. γo- ‘to lack’, Chor. ɣaw- ‘to be necessary’) and with Grk ḡuos. Hintze 1994, 187–188 discusses the phonological and linguistic problems of Y 32.8.
gorozdi- Mehendale 1992 argues that the Av. forms belong with Ved. grdh ‘to long for, to desire for, to strive after’. Gershevitc 1996, 70–73 endorses Bartholomae’s 1904, 514f., 524, etymology of this word as a ti-abstract of the Av. verb gared, a cognate of Lat. gradī ‘to step’. He posits the meaning of gorozdi- as ‘step, grade, rank’.

gōnas tašan- Kellens 1995b suggests that the expression gōnas tašan- denotes the divination of the ritual function of restoring the body of the sacrificial animal during the ritual.

graua- Yoshida 1996 [1998], 169 points out that the connection of Av. graua- ‘stick’ with Sogd. yrw ‘bamboo’ rules out the derivation of the Av. word from *grabha- and the root grab ‘to grab’, which Bartholomae 1904, 529 n.1 regards as a possible explanation.


hacā Most scholars regard Av. hacā ‘from’ as the etymological cognate of Ved. sācā ‘together with’ and as a petrified case form of either the root noun *sāc- ‘fellowship’ or the thematic stem *sāca- ‘id.’ of the root *sek- ‘to follow’ (Mayrhofer 1992–2001 II 688). Dunkel 2014, 726f. fn. 58 and 58a, who endorses this etymology, suggests that the meaning ‘from’ of Av. hacā is due to its combination with the separative ablative, and contrast with Ved. sācā ‘together with’, which takes the locative case. Schneider 2011 [2012], 140 notes that Av. and OP hacā have directional meaning (A away from B towards C), which is also partly found in Ved. sācā. Dunkel 2014, 726f. fn. 58 and Scarlata 1999, 31 record the etymological evidence proposed by Forssman 1986, 26 fn.18, according to which Ved. sācā, Av. hacā are analogically remodelled from an Indo-Iranian instr.sg. *sācā (< *sṁhəkʷ-ō-hi) and are cognates of Ved. sākəm ‘together’ (< *sṁhəkʷ-ō-m) ‘seen together with’. According to Hale 1993, 33, OAv. hacā means ‘from’ when it is a preposition (e.g. Y 44.17.. hacā xəmaṯ ‘from you’), but ‘in accordance with’ when it is a postposition (e.g. aśaṭ hacā ‘in accordance with truth’).
haēca,spa- Tremblay 2002 [2006], 283 suggests that the zero grade ablaut of the suffix of the first term of the compound points to an IE athematic acrostic intransitive root present 3sg. *sējkʷ*-ti, 3pl. *sējkʷ*-tī. Nikolaev 2012, by contrast, reconstructs the accent on the suffix in agreement with the accentuation of the compound type Ved. bharād-vāja-, while he associates the ablaut grade haēca- of the first member of the compound synchronically with the middle stem, which, although otherwise absent from Av., is attested in Ved. sēca-te. Translating the name as ‘having that besprinkle/bathe themselves’, he examines the Indo-Iranian mythological background of this name on the basis of a new interpretation of RV 4.43, and reconstructs an Indo-Iranian phrase *sajē *ācyān(s).

haiṭiuā- Lowe 2011, 36 fn.27 argues that the meaning ‘true’ is at least of Indo-Iranian date. According to Skjærvø 2003a, 396, Av. haiṭiuā-, Ved. satyā- refer to ‘true reality’ in the sense of ‘real’, as opposed to mere appearance in the sense of ‘false, false, not the right one’. Ahmadi 2016 surveys the debate on the semantics of this adjective, and views its meaning in an eschatological perspective.

haiṭiiō.aiiāna- Positing the stem of this compound, which is absent from Duchesne-Guillemin’s Composées (1936), as a masculine haiṭiiō.aiiāna-, Bartholomae 1904, 1762 leaves it without further analysis or exploration of the meaning in the, according to him, “worthless” (“wertlos”) passage Yt 4.5, the compound’s sole attestation. Swennen 2006, 229, by contrast, posits the stem as haiṭiiō.aiiāna-, and analyses it as an adjective with haiṭiuia- as first term and, as second term, aiīna- ‘path’ (Ved. āyana-), which is also found in Yt 10.112 fraiīana-. Since in the context of Yt 4.5, the compound refers to the Lie, Swennen suggests that its meaning is ‘qui prétend connaître le chemin conduisant aux dieux’, rather than ‘dont le chemin est divin’.

hamaspaōmaēdaia- Hintze 2009b, 105–111 surveys the debate on this noun and analyses the expression hamaspaōmaēdaia- rātus- as ‘the time belonging to the middle of the path of summer’. It refers to the time of the vernal equinox, when the sun has reached the middle point of its path from the winter to the summer solstice.

hanara ‘without’. Zehnder 2012, 474, 481f. analyses this OAv. adverb (preposition) as loc.sg. *ṣpa-er-, formed with suffix *-er from the IE adverb *spu ‘apart’.

haōma- Taillieu 1994 [1995] concludes that the available textual evidence is inadequate to confirm the botanical identity of Indo-Iranian *saya-, and Taillieu 2003 surveys the research on this question in the light of its description in the Avesta and Vedas. Clark 2017 revisits the issue and suggest that Indo-Iranian *saya- refers not to the main ingredient of the drink but to the end-product of ‘pressing’, which is the meaning of the root Av. hu, Ved. su ‘to press’ from which the noun is derived. In his view, haōma- and its Ved. counterpart sóma- refer not to a single
plant, but to the concoction of a combination of different plants, including harmel (mountain/wild rue), Peganum harmala, argued for by Flattery and Schwartz 1989, and is typologically similar to the brew called ayahuasca used in ceremonies among the indigenous peoples of the Amazon basin.

**haosrauvaḥ-** Rau 2007a argues that the name of the hero and its antonym ḍuṣṛauvaḥ- came about by retraction of the accent to the first syllable and concomitant full grade of this syllable and substantivization. According to him, this derivational strategy was analogically extended to athematic stems and generated an abstract noun *(H)hāya-rauvaḥ- ‘good fame’, *dāyās-rauvaḥ- ‘bad fame’ from adjectives *(H)hu-rāvaḥ- ‘having good fame’, *dūṣ-rauvaḥ- ‘having bad fame’.

**hapta.srūḥ-** Panaino 1995–6, 199–201 posits a to date unrecognised compound hapta.sṛūḥ- on the basis of a new interpretation of the expression hapta.srauvaḥ in Vd 19.42. Translating it as ‘Seven Horns’, he interprets the compound as the Av. name of the Little Bear, or Ursa minor, while hapta.irdīnga- is the name of the Great Bear, or Ursa major.

**haranḥhaiti-** Schmitt 2001 surveys and discusses the attestations of the name Arachosia in Iranian and non-Iranian sources and explains the different meanings of the name as resulting from the semantic development of the name of a river to that of a land to that of a place. Stüber 2000 defines the meaning of the IE s-stem that is preserved in Av. *harah-, Ved. sāraḥ- and Grk ἦσος as ‘place where water comes to a standstill’, and of the underlying IE root *sel as ‘to come to a standstill, to remain, dwell’.

**hauva-** De Vaan 2005a argues that the possessive adjective x'ā- (< Plr. *hya-, Ved. svā-) existed only in OAv., and that the YAv. stem haupha- results from a replacement of *hya- by *hāya- by analogy with other personal and demonstrative pronouns with initial *ha-, in particular the personal pronoun *hai (p. 705). According to him, a stem huva- did not exist in YAv. and the YAv. form haua̞uūaisha (< *hya-ja, with haua instead of x’ā-) in Y 59.30 escaped replacement by hauua because it was part of the paradigm of personal pronouns (YAv. māuūaisha < *mahja, xāmuuūaisha < *tamāhja, p. 706).

**hazəŋh‐** Deriving hazəŋh‐ from *səŋh-es-haŋ-, Stüber 2000a, 136f. reconstructs a stem formed with the possessive suffix identified by K. Hoffmann. Goldman 2015, 136–137 discusses the spellings in the mss. of this word with -apha- and -apuha-. On the semantic distinction between Av. tāīu- ‘thief’ and hazəŋh‐ ‘robber’, see Macuch 2005, 381 and fn.19.

**hazəŋro.ziṃa-** Panaino 2004 studies an Av. fragment preserved at the end of Vd 2.19 in the mss. of the Vidēvdād Sāde, and, as a quotation embedded in the Pahlavi commentary, of the Pahlavi Vidēvdād. He argues that the adj. hazəŋro.ziṃa-, which occurs in the fragment, attests the existence in Av. of a tradition according
to which the time of Yima lasted for a thousand, rather than 900, years, and that this tradition is also attested in Yt 9.10. There is thus Av. evidence for the millenarian concept.

hārīṣṭ- Emmerick 1992a, 293 and 337–338 n.19 discusses this word in connection with a postulated IE noun *sor- ‘woman’.

hāṇḍu- On the basis of Paul Thieme’s etymology and semantic definition of the basic meaning of Ved. śiṇḍu-, Av. hāṇḍu- as ‘(natural) frontier’ in the sense of a barrier or obstacle such as a large river, Panaino 2016a examines a range of problems connected with the linguistic data in the light of Indo-Iranian and Av. mythology.

hitāspa- see s.v. viśāspa-.

hiḍu- Tremblay 1998, 202 argues that the form hiḍyam (Y 34.10) derives by Stang’s Law from *hiḍyum, and is the acc.sg. of the stem hiḍu-, of which the nom.sg. is attested in Y 48.7 hiḍuṣa, cf. also above no.37 i- and u-stems, p 6 and fn. 1.

huuāpah- Lubotsky 1990, 131 argues for the non-etymological nature of the long -ā- in huuāpah- ‘of good works’ and that linguistically, huunāpah- is expected for all attestations of this compound. This view is endorsed by Stüber 2002, 110 and de Vaan 2005, 62.

hū Tucker in Sims-Williams & Tucker 2005, 600–601 surveys present stems of the Indo-Iranian verb *suH- ‘to impel’ and argues that in OIr. the full grade State II root *hyā had developed a secondary root meaning ‘to have authority, to be authoritative’, for which the nasal present stem hunā- may have provided present forms with transitive value ‘to authorise, to make authoritative’.

huuōista- According to Sims-Williams & Tucker 2005 [2006], 594–596, huuōista- ‘most important, oldest’ (cf. Khotanese hvāста- ‘best, chief’, ‘teacher’, Sogdian xwyṣik ‘teacher’, xwyṣtr ‘superior’, Bactrian χωοχο, χωοδόρο ‘elder, greater’), probably shows an inherited Indo-Iranian State II *hyauH- from the root hū ‘to impel’ (< Indo-Iranian *suH), just as OP duvāśta- ‘farthest’ (and YAv dūōśta-, if it has the same meaning) shows a State II *duauH- from *dū- preserved in Av. dārā-, Ved. dārā- ‘far’.

išārə Oettinger 2012, 209–210 connects the Av. adverb išārə ‘at once’ etymologically with Grk ἵκτρα ‘nearby’.

jahikā-, jahi- De Jong 1995, 29 notes that a version of Vd 18.62 is quoted in Herb. 12.4, but with jahi of Vd 18.62 substituted by nārīka. He argues that jahikā- and jahi- refer to real life, often married but sexually suspect women, who endanger the legitimacy of their husbands’ offspring by their promiscuous behaviour. Doubting Bartholomae’s 1904, 606 connection with Ved. has ‘to laugh’, but leaving the etymology open, Kellens 2013a argues on the basis of its contexts that jahikā- denotes a woman who fails to conform to the religious norms prescribed by the Avesta, rather than a prostitute, as postulated by Bartholomae.

Pirart 1993 suggests that in Y 10.15 the form janiiəś edited by Geldner 1889–1896 I 53 with the ms. K4 janiiəś, is to be preferred to janiiəś, which Bartholomae 1904, 604 reads with Pt4 and many others mss. Pirart further proposes to emended janiiəś to janiiuś. The latter form would represent a gen. sg. form that corresponds to the Ved. gen.sg. jányuh.

De Vaan 2000, 284 connects this name of a daēvianimal in Vd 14.5 with Chor. krə̆bən ‘lizard’ and analyses it as *kār-, for which he suggests the meaning ‘frog’, and the Indo-Iranian suffix *-una- used in animal names in both Ved. and Iranian.

Remmer 2006, 58 and 2012 analyses the name of the mountain in Yt 19.4 as a compound consisting of the interrogative stem Indo-Iranian *kā- prefixed to *kahiui- (< *ka-kas-ju- ‘how split!’), the Av. root kah being a cognate of Ved. kas ‘to split’.

Regarding the unique form korə̆nusī, which appears in Y 10.13 instead of the expected *korə̆nuəśi, Hoffmann & Forssman 2004, 215 propose to emend korə̆nuśe (2sg.ind.pres.mid.), while de Vaan 2003, 306 accepts a proposal by Lubotsky, according to which the form korə̆nusī is a corrupt form for *korə̆nuši (2sg.ipt.pres.act.).

After critically examining various etymologies, Jamison 2009 [2013] connects the Av. priestly title with two isolated Ved. forms, RV 10.99.9 kr̥pāne and 10.22.10 kārpaṇē with no underlying root attested.

Redard 2012, 195–196 surveys etymologies proposed for the name of this bird. Accepting Gershievitch’s explanation as ‘black-winged’, she adduces further Mythological evidence suggesting that the name designates the raven.

Jamison 2007a, 162 surveys the hysterokinetic inflectional pattern of this stem, while Jamison 2007, 120–123, 137 discusses the scholarly debate on the semantic discrepancies between Av. kauui- and its Ved. counterpart kavi-, and endorses the traditional association of YAv. kauui- with royal power. Pointing out the divided
usage in the Gāthās, where four of the attestations are in very negative contexts, while in two others kauui- appears in the name of Zarathustra’s patron Kauui Vištāspa, she notes that the word xṣādra- ‘rule’ occurs in half of the Gāthic attestations of kauui-, a fact which she interprets as indicating an association of kauui- with royal power and its exercise. She concludes that in Indo-Iranian the *kayi- was the ‘word-master’ close to the ruler, and that in Iranian his designation came to be interpreted as a royal title.

kāsaiia- Tucker 2004, 554 suggests that the present stem with lengthened root vocalism was created on the basis of the noun with full-grade root vocalism kaśa- ‘arm-pit’ (Ved. kākṣa-), denoting a place of concealment. The verb would mean ‘to conceal, keep hidden’ in its two Av. attestations in Vd 18.4.

kašaiia- Remmer 2006, 57–58 and 2012 analyses the name of the Lake kašaiia- as *kam-sai(i)ja- ‘how swelling!’, a compound consisting of the interrogative particle kam and saioii- from the root sū ‘to swell’; cf. also below s.vv. saošiian- and sponia-.

karama- Panaino 2005 argues that the expression stāro karamā, which in the Entire Av. corpus occurs only once in Yt 8.8, represents a possessive compound stāro karama- ‘belonging to worm-stars’. The second term karama- would be formed with suffix -a- possessivum replacing the -i- of the simplex *karami- ‘worm’ (Ved. kṛmi-).

mad Hintze 2000a finds evidence for the root mad ‘to measure’ not only in the expression vimāhascit vimāhataia- in Vd 7.38 and 40, but also in the OAv. form māsatā (Y 54.1) and in vohu-maide (Y 12.1, Vd 19.11).

maga- According to Gershevitch 1996, 60–68, maga- denotes the ‘Vow’ of acceptance of Ahura Mazda’s revelation to Zarathustra. Schmidt 1991 surveys the Gāthic attestations and reaffirms the etymological connection of Av. maga-, which he renders as ‘bounty, gift’, with Ved. maghā-. Assuming a semantic development by way of metonymy (pars pro toto) of ‘gift’ → ‘situation in which gifts are exchanged’, Hintze 2000, 45–50, 264f. fn. 66 and 2004a, 30–35, 43 argues that Av. maga- is a technical term for the ritually enacted exchange of gifts which circulate between three agents: the patron, the priest and the god(s). By contrast, Skjærvø 2008, 498–503, while likewise positing the meaning of maga- as ‘gift-exchange’, postulates a bipolar structure, in which the poet-sacrificer and the god(s) exchange gifts and counter-gifts. Janda 2014, 228–238 argues for the etymological connection between Indo-Iranian *mogh- and Grk μύγη, the original meaning of which he posits as ‘contest’ (a collective < *mogh-eh2), and derives these words from IE *mogh- ‘prize at stake’. Dieu 2015, 211–212 critically evaluates this proposal. Jamison 2007, 135f. notes the linkage of maga- and kauui- in the Gāthās and sug-
gests that it points to the figure of Indra, who is called both kávi- and maghávan-
in the RV.

mayauka- Panaino 2016 examines the expression mayauka frauaxšōit in the context
of Vd 4.47. He concludes that the words are either the fragment of a longer sen-
tence or an interpolation, whilst representing one of the cruces desperationis of
Avestan philology.

magauzan- According to Meissner 1993, Ved. maghávan- and its Av. cognate
magauzan- (only OAv.) are remodelled from an Indo-Iranian agent noun *mag’a-
yāna- ‘winning/giving the gift’, although Scarlata 1999, 466–467 cautions that the
earlier analysis of an adjective formed with suffix Indo-Iranian *-yan- and mean-
ing ‘provided with gifts, generous’ still remains a possibility.

mainiitauasah- Forssman 1995 reads mainiitauasah- and identifies an otherwise unat-
tested s-stem *asah- ‘swiftness’ in the second term of this compound, which he
translates literally as ‘having the swiftness of thinking’ (“Schnelligkeit des Geistes
(Denkens) habend”). Kellens & Pirart 1997, 65f. fn. 63 point out that differently
from the Av. compound, the first term is manah- in the Ved. cognates mano-jav-
no-java- and mano-java- ‘as swift as thought’, which Forssman (p. 29) adduc-
es as parallels. Panaino 2012, 177f. translates the Av. compound as ‘swift like the
(willing) thought’.

mainii- Kellens & Pirart 1997, 65 fn. 63 see the semantic difference between
mainii- and manah- in that the former denotes the ‘thinking thought’ (“pensée pensante”)
and the latter the ‘content of thought’ (“contenue de la pensée”), while
Panaino 2012, 171–173, 178 fn. 55, building on Malamoud’s definition of the
Ved. cognate manya- as a permanent, essential mental faculty, proposes that
mainii- refers to a ‘willing (or deliberate) thought’, manah- to the product of a
mental vision or representation.

mainii.tāsta- Panaino 2012 argues that as the first term of compounds, mainiiu-
denotes the instrument, rather than the agent in mainiiu.tāsta- ‘made/carved (etc.)
[together (hām)] by means of a mental act (or will)’, rather than ‘by a spirit/Spirit’,
and of mainiiu.stāta- (Yt 13.2) ‘mentally established’ or ‘established by (means
of) active thought’.

man Steer 2015, 221f. surveys the various IE roots *men, *menH, *mneH. Following
a suggestion by Zehnder in Rix, H. et al. 2001, 447 n.1, he argues on the basis of
Anatolian evidence that the primary meaning of *men ‘to think’ and *mneH ‘to
think of’ was ‘to see’.

mazdā- The fem ā-stem mazdā- ‘wisdom’, which occurs as a hapax legomenon in Y
40.1, corresponds to Ved. medhā- and represents a suffixed ā-stem (PIE *mgs-
dʰh₁-éh₂-) according to Kellens & Pirart 1988–1991 II 285; Scarlata 1999, 257;

mazdādēta- Panaino 1992 argues that the distribution of mazdādēta- and ahurādēta- in the Avesta is governed by metrical rather than ideological principles. Panaino 1992, 199f. and 1992 [1994] examines the only attestation at which mazdādēta- is thought to characterise vrasərayna- (thus e.g. Bartholomae 1904, 1159). Interpreting the passage in question (nizbāiemi vrasəraynəm ahurādətəm barō.x'aronō mazdādətəm Vd 19.37) in the light of Yt 14.2, he argues that the adj. in fact describes x'aronah-, cf. above, s.v. barō.x'aronah-.


mōrzū- After reviewing previous interpretations of mōrzū-, Panaino 1995–6 suggests that the noun denotes the ‘peg, vertebra’ located between Ursa minor and Ursa maior (cf. above, s.v. hapta.srū-).

mūšī Pirart 1997a: 157 and fn. 73 translates this form, which is attested in Yt 5.120 and 7.4 (= Ny 3.6) as ‘sans cesse’. Nikolaev 2012, 567f. and fn. 9–10 surveys various interpretations.

mūšī- Janda 1998, 14–16 examines this noun, which is attested as the first term of the compound mūšī.masah- ‘having the size of a fist’, in its IE context and analyses it as a ti-abstract of the root IE *mus ‘to close’.

mūθra- While the meaning of the Ved. cognate mūtra- is ‘urine’, Tichy 1997, 95–97 argues that Av. mūθra- denotes ‘faeces’ in a liquid form.

naotara- Oettinger 2012, 213f. derives the Av. name of the clan naotara- as an internal derivative of PIr. *nutāra- < *nu-tēro- ‘quick’ and connects it with Luwian namantuarija- ‘present, swift’.

napāt- Vijñānas 2009, 6f. considers Av. napāt- ‘grandson’ to be the reflex of an IE primary derivative r-stem with an amphikinetic inflectional paradigm with nom.sg.

YAv. napāt < *nēp-ōt-s and gen.sg. YAv. naptō < *nēp-t-ōs.

nas Kellens 1984, 368f. n.14 and 1995, 40–41 posits two homonymous roots, nas ‘to perish’ and nas ‘to reach’. By contrast, García-Ramón 1999, 60–62, like Hoffmann & Forssman 2004, 311, posits three roots nas, which are homonymous in Av., but have different etymological origins. In addition to nas ‘to perish’ (IE *nek), he distinguishes IE *hnek ‘to reach’, continued in the Av. pres. ašnāu-, and *hnek ‘to take’ in the s-aor. nāš-, which forms a suppletive aorist alongside present forms from the root bar ‘to carry’.

nasišta- Tucker 2009, 522 suggests that this superlative means ‘best at reaching, best at attacking’, and is based on the root aorist subjunctive stem *nasa- (Ved. nasa-) of the OIr. root nas (< *Hnek) ‘to reach’, which in Ved. is frequently employed
for reaching in a hostile sense, rather than the homonymous *nas- (< *nek) ‘to perish’. Goldman 2015, 136 endorses this explanation.

*nāuīta-  Panaino 1990, 115f. (with references) and 2004a endorses Gniloi’s suggestion that *nāuīta- refers to ‘channelled waters’ in Vd 14.16 and 18.74, where the Pahlavi translation āb ī nāvdāg is glossed as kahas ī ābdān pad dān. He supports this argument with reference to the terms for ‘pipe’ and ‘tube’ in Germanic languages. Widmer 2007 objects to Bartholomae’s 1904, 1064f. meaning ‘navigable’ (‘schiffbar’), which is widely accepted, on the grounds that neither Ved. nor Av. attestations refer to a river’s navigability. Rather than being a secondary derivative from the nominal stem *nāy- ‘ship, boat’, Widmer suggests that Indo-Iranian *nāyja- is a primary derivative from the verbal root Indo-Iranian *nāy ‘to flow’ and means ‘streaming, raging’. Along similar lines, but without reference to Widmer, Skjærvø 2011, 326 and fn.3 suggests the meaning ‘in spate’ and adduces Sogd. n’ywʌ ‘deep’. The meaning of Pahl. nāvdāg, an epithet of rivers (rōd) and water (āb), is accordingly ‘raging’ rather than ‘navigable’, as usually assumed (MacKenzie 1971, 58 s.v. *nāydāg). Filippone 2017 summarises the various interpretations of Av. nāuīta- and/or Pahl. <n’ywrk> as follows: (1) ‘navigable’, (2) ‘channelled, flowing in channel’, (3) ‘deep’, (4) ‘tumultuous’, (5) ‘unfordable’, (6) ‘in spate, flooding’, and (7) ‘streaming, raging’ (p. 100 with references). Examining the textual and lexical documentation of Plr. *nāy-, she concludes that similar to the English word: trough, the semantic range of the Iranian outcomes of Plr. *nāy- could have been equally as wide.

*nāmiša-  Hintze 2007, 138 fn. 78 attributes the long root vowel of the superlative of nam ‘to attribute’ to the influence of forms of the homonymous root nam ‘to bend’, where, in addition to the adj. namra- ‘bending’, long root vocalism is attested in the Caland i-stem constituting the first term of the compound nāmīi-asus- ‘with pliant stem’.

*nīid-  Tremblay 1999 argues that the 3sg. form nāist is the inj. of the root present (Indo-Iranian *nāid-) of the verb nīd ‘to blame, revile’, see Hintze 2014, 33.

*nīuīät-  De Vaan 2012, 39–40 argues that in both of its attestations in Y 10.16 and N 66 (= 84), the noun means ‘separation’, a specialised semantic development of nīuān- ‘to spread out’ from the root van ‘to win, conquer’; cf. below s.v. van.

*nīuāēdāia-  Swennen 2015 examines the liturgical function of Indo-Iranian *nīuāēdāja-.

*pairikā-  is analysed by Janda 2006 [2008], 213–219 as ‘surrounder’ < PIE *perih₂kʷe-h₂ and interpreted as referring to the magic bonds by which the sorceress controls her victim. Schwartz 2008 [2012], 98–100, who also discusses alternative explanations, accepts this etymology and explores in Iranian mythological thought
the ways in which the ‘surrounding’ horrid female became the one who ruins fertility.

parəndi- Pinault 2016 reviews the scholarly debate about this Indo-Iranian noun (Ved. pīramīdi-). He analyses it as a compound with a governing verbal root noun in the zero grade as first term: *pə-Handi- ‘carrying the flourishing across’, ‘promoter of flourishing, or thriving’, and deified ‘Thriving’.

paurvuanīia- Janda 1997, 36–39 interprets the hapax legomenon Yt 9.26 paurvuanīm, an epithet of the ‘girdle’ (aiśṭāṇhāna-), as ‘stony’ and derives it with suffix -ja- from the IE heteroclitic stem *paryār-/paryān- ‘stone’, which he also finds in YAv. paurvuanca, see above s.v. draça paurvuanca. However, he also allows for the possibility of a derivation of paurvuania- from the homonymous, and possibly etymologically identical *paryār-/paryān- ‘knot’, as proposed by Geldner 1877, 140.

pāiriwāza- Janda 2006a, 105 connects the second term of this epithet of the wild boar (Yt 14.15, 10.127) with IE *h3yeg ‘to be vigorous, awake’ and interprets the compound as a Bahuvṛtī ‘having superior power’ (‘überlegene Kraft habend’), with lengthening of the first syllable (*pātrī).

parat- f. ‘battle’. Vijūnas 2009, 121–123 discusses the etymology and morphological history this noun. He suggests that it is a derivative with suffix *-t- from the root *per ‘to beat’ and represents an original action noun ‘beating, thrashing’.

parbud- Discussing the inflection of parbud- ‘passage’, which is derived with suffix -tu- from the root *per ‘to cross’, Tremblay 1998, 201–203 argues that the noun followed a holokinetik inflectional pattern with nom. *pēr-tu-s, gen. *per-tu-ės.

piśīa- de Vaan 2000a connects the Av. forms of this verbal stem with Ved. pec ‘to press’ and argues that the Av. verb denotes rejected ritual practices.

pauru.azoθra- Rejecting the assumption of an exception to the rule for u-mutation of *a, de Vaan 1997 [2000] discusses Yt 10.113 and emends the transmitted gouru.azoθranam to pouru.azoθranam ‘with many libations’.


raśnu- In connection with a discussion of Av. raśnu-, Schwartz 2010a, 102 proposes a rule according to which Indo-Iranian *-zh- became Av. -zn- ordinarily, but -sn- when r preceded. Goldman 2015, 24–26 argues that in the Avesta raśnu- only occurs as a masculine substantive in the singular and denotes the divinity ‘Justice’.

raṭtu- According to Kellens 1996, 103–104 and 2006, 9–10, Av. raṭtu-, which corresponds etymologically to Ved. rti-, has four different applications. In the first two, which are inherited, Av. raṭtu- denotes a recurring period of time or biological
function (e.g. in Y 1.3–9), and a divine pronunciation defining a rule in agreement with āša- (e.g. in Y 1.10–18). From these two meanings developed the third and fourth applications in which the word denotes, respectively, the prototype of the living species, and a divine title of Ahura Mazda and yazata-s such as Mithra, whose function is connected with recurring periods of time. The different meanings and usages proposed for Av. rātu- are also discussed by Raffaelli 2014, 8 and fn.27–28, p. 182, and by Tremblay 1998, 192–196, who identifies ‘point in time’ (“moment”) and ‘rule, model’ (“règle, modèle”) as the most ancient meanings (pp. 195, 196). According to Skjærvø 2006 [2007], 72; 2012, 65; 2013, 105, rātu-denotes the ‘models’, ‘blueprint’ or ‘prototypes’ in the spiritual world of Ahura Mazda’s world of living beings, which they also protect. Ahmadi 2012, 535–537, who favours the derivation of rātu- from the root ar ‘to fit, join’ (IE *h₂er), discusses the use of rātu- in the Gāthās and suggests the translation ‘measure’. Excluding the possibility of an analogical or phonetic replacement of *ar- by *ra-, Tremblay derives rātu- from *h₂retu-, and postulates a derivative in *et-u- from the root *h₂er ‘to fit’. The same root would also have produced a noun formed with suffix *-tu-, continued, for example, in Grk ἀρχή ‘σύνταξις (Hsch.), Lat. artus (p. 201). Rejecting Tremblay’s proposal, Widmer 2004, 58 and fn.68 suggests that Av. rātu- incorporates forms and meanings of three etymologically distinct nouns. One is *artu-/ṛtu- (Ved. ṛtṝ-) ‘time, moment’ < *h₂er-tu-/h₂ṛ-tu- (from IE *h₂er ‘to fit’); another is rātu- < *rehi-tu- from the root rā ‘to grant’. Here the laryngeal would have been lost in the stem allomorph *rehi-tu- (Av. raḥt-) according to the “Wetter”-rule. Widmer adduces Ved. ṛāna- ‘gift’ < *rehiṇē/o- as a parallel for such a loss of the laryngeal. The third noun would be IE *le(H)i-o- ‘warm season, day, summer’, which is preserved in Slavic and Celtic languages and, as a loan-word, in Finno-Ugrian.

rāna- According to Skjærvø 2005b, 76–77; 2013a, 125 rāṇa- means ‘thigh’ and refers to the strong legs which a charioteer needs in order not be thrown off the chariot during the race. Humbach 2017 argues in favour of the translation of this noun as ‘balance’.

san Tremblay 1996a discusses the morphological identity of the YAv. form sanat of the root san ‘to rise’ in relation to its nu-present asanaōiti. He concludes that historically sana- represents the stem of the root aor.subj., but synchronically it functions as a thematic present, which forms the basis of several forms in Middle and New Iranian languages.

sahauuāti- Remmer 2006, 214–225 analyses this female personal name as ‘pronouncing the teaching’ (“die Verkündigung aussprechend”), see no. 65 above: Onomastics, p 30.
sayhant- Sims-Williams 2016 connects Av. sayhant-, a cognate of Ved. śāsvant-
 forming a continuous series, numerous, frequent, all together, each', with Sogd.
 s’t ‘all, whole, entire’, an adj. so far without etymology. Deriving the former from
 Plr. *sah-yant- and the latter from *sah-ant-, he identifies a precise parallel to the
 relationship between pairs such as *jaH-yant- and *jaH-ant- or *čiH-yant- and
 *čiH-ant-.
saošiiaNt- Skjørvø 2011a, 61 fn. 25; 2008, 496 fn. 13, who translates the term as
 ‘Revitalizer’, maintains that the future participle has the transitive meaning ‘he
 who will make (the world) swell’ and is an epithet of the successful sacrificer. Re-
 ferring to the noun’s etymological connection with sauaa-, Schwartz 2014, 28 in-
 terprets saošiian- as ‘bringer of evil-expelling weal’ and translates ‘weal-bringer’.
 In a discussion of the semantic development of the term saošiian- in the Gāthās
 and in YAv., Hintze 1995, 78 emphasises the intransitive meaning of the root sá
 ‘to swell’ established by Kellens 1974a, and interprets the term as ‘he who will be
 strong’ in the sense that he will be stronger than Evil. Hintze 1999a argues that the
 YAv. myth of the ‘victorious’ saošiian- incorporates elements of the dragon-
 killer topos of the heroic epic tradition, while Kellens 2007a, 120–121 and 2013,
 77–78 further refines and corroborates his argument that saošiian- is a title of the
 officiating priests. Cf. also above s.v. kṣāośiian- and below s.v. sponta-
sauaa- Schwartz 2014, 28 describes the meaning of this noun as referring to the de-
feat of Wrong by Right and translates it as ‘beneficial weal’.
 sīyūria- Endorsing Bartholomae’s 1904, 1580 connection of Av. sīyūria- in the
 compound sīyīre.cīdra- with the Ved. name of a tribe and of a plant sīgrua-,
 Cantera 1999, 45 argues that the YAv. loss of -y- before -u- is chronologically lat-
er than the YAv. development of -ru̯i- > -uru-. Lubotsky 2012, 103 suggests that
 Ved. sīgrua- ‘Moringa pterygo-sperma’ might be an Iranian (Scythian) loan word.
 siiiazd Lubotsky 2004 examines Av. attestations of the root siiiazd ‘to withdraw,
 flinch’ and argues in favour of the etymological connection with Ved. sēdh and
 Latin cēdere ‘to flinch’.
 spaiaθra- Schwartz 2014, 23 translates the hapax legomenon in Y 30.10 spaiaθra-
as ‘attachment of the chariot’s shaft (pole) to the yoke’. He supports his translation
 with reference to the cognate root stem -spā-t- in YAv. upairi.spāt- ‘chariot pole’
 and, with preverbs *s-, *vi-, and *ava-, in Sanglechi, Yidgχa, and Wakhi words
 for the functionally equivalent ‘plow-shaft’.
 spāda- Deriving this noun from *spod/o- of an IE root *sped ‘to be forceful’, Weiss
 1991–1993 connects it with OCS spodū, which denotes a company of people sit-
ting together at a meal, and with the Oscan name Σπάδᾱς.
 spānauvant- Following Humbach 1959 II 93 and interpreting the -a- after -n- as ana-
ptctic, Andrés-Toledo 2013, 14–15 analyses the form spānauwaiti, an attribute of
daēna- in Vd 19.30, as the nom.sg.fem. of spōnuant- ‘prospering’, rather than as ‘having two dogs’ (Bartholomae 1904, 1617).

spōnta- Skjærve 2002, 32 fn.11 and 2011a, 61 fn.25 points out that the root spā and its variants sīr-, sau (Indo-Iranian *cyaH, *cůH, *cůuH), from which spōnta-, sīra-, sauah- and other words are derived, literally means ‘to swell’, and in religious context refers to nature swelling with (the juices of) life. He proposes the translation ‘(re)vitalizing, life-giving’ for words containing this root. Accepting this definition of the meaning of the root spā and its variants, Hintze 2014a, 243–244 suggests that the expression amaśa- spōnta- collectively refers to the spiritual creation, and that the attribute spōnta- ‘life-giving’, specifically denotes the idea that the spiritual creation is perceived as giving rise to the material world.

spōntā.tāma-, spōnīṣṭa- Panaino 2007 examines the use of the two superlatives in the Avesta with special attention to the relationship between Ahura Mazdā and Spōnta Mainiu.

spītāma- Schmitt 2003, 367 and fn. 24 suggests that the form spītamahe- in Yt 13.98 is the “singulative” of the plural name of the clan.

sraoṣa- Tremblay apud Swennen 2016, 61 suggests that the Av. stem sraoṣa- is based on the sacrificial call *sraoṣat ‘let him hear!’”, the postulated Iranian counterpart of the Ved. sacrificial expression srauṣat.

staota- yesnīa- Studying the canonization of the Avestan ligurgical texts, Rezania 2010a argues that the expression staota- yesnīa- denotes a liturgical genre rather than a specific liturgy. According to him, the general structure of the liturgical genre is outlined in Vr 1.3–9 (repeated with minor variations in Vr 2.5–11), while Y 27–59 are one particular version which became part of the canon.

stīja- Lubotsky 2008 argues that the form and meaning of the Ir root are *(s)tiṣ ‘to penetrate’ (Rix et al. 2001, 592f.), rather than *stīg ‘to step’ (Rix et al. 2001, 593) and that the root stīg is a variant with an s-mobile of Ved. tiṣ ‘to sharpen’, whose Iranian cognates are only found in nominal derivatives (tīra- ‘pointed’ etc.). His proposal to translate stīja in Yt 10.71 as ‘with the point / tip (of the tusks)’ agrees with that of J. Schindler, Die Sprache 25, 1979, 58, not quoted by Lubotsky, who posits a noun stīj- ‘Hauer’ or ‘Stich, Durchbohrung’ from the root *steig ‘spitzen, stechen’. Lubotsky emends Yt 10.71 stīja to *stīji following Kellens 1974, 85.

strī- Dunkel 2016 discusses the etymology of PIIr. *strī- ‘woman’, which he derives by haplology from Early PIIr. *sriH-triH-. He analyses the latter as a derivative of PIE *sīr- ‘female, woman’ via an intermediate *sri-iH- by means of hypercharacterization followed by haplology.

stuiē Jasanoff 2016, 140 interprets the YAv. 1sg. ‘stuiē ‘I hereby (for)swear’, as an archaic form which retains the performative function of the Indo-Iranian 1sg.
*stuy-aj. The latter represents an Indo-Iranian zero-grade middle root present whose paradigm in the singular was 1sg. *stuyāi, 2sg. *stusāi, 3sg. *stuyāi. Jasanoff suggests that in Ved. *stuyāi was replaced by the enigmatic 1sg. stusē ‘I shall praise’.

stūrīn Buyaner 2014 interprets this hapax legomenon, which is absent from Bartholomae’s 1904 dictionary, as the acc.sg. of an Indo-Iranian stem *stryja-. The latter would be derived with suffix *-yja- from a nominal stem *star-.

sub Sims-Williams 2001 argues that the Ir. root sub ‘to bore, pierce’ (Ved. subh), which Bailey 1943, 221 had identified in Av. sufrā-, sufrā- from *sub-rā- ‘goat’, is also present in the verb aifīi-suwa- (< *suřa- < *suba-) in Vd 2.10, where it was corrupted to aifīi-iuwa- under the influence of fraca.śuwa- a few words further on.

tanū- Pinault 2001, 181 derives Av. tanū-, Ved. tanū- from a heterocinetic IE noun *tanyh-ū-hz-, as opposed to the proterocinetic adj. *tēnhyu-/*tanyh-ēy- ‘stretched’ in Ved. tanū-, from the root tan ‘to stretch’.

tanu.mādra- Grenet 2006 [2010], 96 and apud de La Vaissiere & Riboud 2003, 134–135 recognises an illustration of the compound tanu.mādra- ‘whose body is the sacred formula’ in a Sogdian painting from Penjikent, see also Hintze 2014, 6. Skjærvø, by contrast, interprets the first part of the compound as belonging to the root tan ‘to stretch’ and translates tanu.mādra- as ‘spinning the poetic thought’ (e.g. in Yt 5.91, Skjærvø 2011b, 62).

tanu.puruθa- Skalmowski 1991 studies this compound.

tara̱dē- Hintze 1994, 101–102 and Vijñānas 2009, 109–115 and 129 discuss the formation and semantics of the adj. tara̱dē- ‘overcoming’, a t-stem compound, whose athematic inflection is secured by the gen. tara̱dētō (Y 22.24 etc.). Vijñānas reconstructs the compound’s second term as a derivative athematic i-stem with full grade root *dē̱ehi-t- formed with the suffix *-ot/-t-.

ṯāiuj- See above s.v. hazaphan-.


ðbhrs Hill 2007, 272–277 surveys the attestations of ðbhrs ‘to cut’ and defines the functions of its different present and aorist stems.

ðbhrāsta- According to Lubotsky 1998a, 74–78 ðbhrāsta- zruwan- means ‘allotted life-time’. Differently, Kellens 2000, 128–131 reads the attestations in Yt 8.11, Yt 10.55 and 74, as upa aðbhrāstahæ jaymiqm in agreement with the ms. F1. Translating the expression as ‘je serais venu ... pour (toute la durée du temps) non façonné’, he establishes an opposition in Av. between limited and unlimited time, or, in his words, “temps fabriqué (ðbhrāsta-) du monde des hommes, qui est celui du mélangé” and “temps non fabriqué (aðbhrāsta-) du séjour des dieux, qui peut être défini comme akarana- ‘sans bords’”. Panaino 2003, 196–198 endorses the opposi-
tion between 𐭄𐭩𐭰𐭵𐭟- and a𐭄𐭩𐭰𐭵- noted by Kellens in these passages. By contrast, de Vaan 2005a, 700 and fn.1 considers the reading a𐭄𐭩𐭰𐭵xehe in F1 in the above passages to be corrupt, and prefers the reading 𐭄𐭩𐭰xehe.

𐭄𐭨𐭳𐭦- Assuming with Beekes 1988, 94 that 𐭤 stands for 𐭥, Lubotsky 1994 argues that 𐭄𐭨𐭳𐭦- represents *𐭄𐭨𐭳𐭦- and, together with its Ved. cognate tvāṣṭar-, goes back to an Indo-Iranian zero grade formation *tyrē-tar-. According to him, the Indo-Iranian root *tyrē is attested only in zero grade formations. While de Vaan 2003, 508 accepts this analysis, Tichy 1995, 34 and fn.17 reconstructs a full grade form *tyārē-tar-.

𐭄𐭦𐭯𐭰𐭥- Jackson & Oettinger 2002, 222 argue that the form without a diphthong in the second syllable is the one which is better transmitted and represents Prdr. *𐭄𐭦𐭯𐭰𐭥--, which corresponds to Ved. trātana-. On the basis of the story of the sailor Pāurūa related in Yt 5.61f. and of Ved. passages, esp. RV 1.158.5, they reconstruct the Indo-Iranian story of a pious man who is rescued by a hero named *Trātana/*Trātana.

𐭄𐭦𐭯𐭰- Cantera 1994–5 interprets the form 𐭄𐭦𐭯𐭰 in Y 34.3, 46.7 and Vr 12.4 as the nom.sg. of an agent noun 𐭄𐭦𐭯𐭰- ‘nourisher’ (‘Gedeiher’) of the root 𐭄𐭦.

𐭣𐭤𐭥- Mehendale 2010 suggests connecting this compound, which is attested in Yt 13.31, with the root car ‘to move around’, rather than kar ‘to do’ as proposed by Bartholomae 1904, 395. According to Mehendale, the meaning of the compound is ‘one whose movement is above, who moves in the air’.

𐭥𐭤𐭦𐭳­- In H 2.7 and 25, Tremblay 1997a, 123 and fn.2 emends 𐭥𐭤𐭦­="vānu ‘having blown’ (‘ayant soufflé’). Interpreting the form as the nom.sg. of the perf.part.act. of the root vā ‘to blow’, he reconstructs it as PIE *uypo-hye-huhi-yōs. By contrast, Hintze 2017, 170 fn. 13 accepts the emendation ‘uṇa vāi’s proposed by Kellens 1984, 137, 337f. (followed by Pias 2000, 88), but points out that, while the correction of -au- to -ii- is unexceptionable, vā ‘to blow’ normally forms a root present. She therefore assumes the crossing of vā ‘to blow’ with the present stem of the homonymous root vā ‘to go out, extinguish’. The latter forms a pres. stem vāya- in Ved., but also shows crossing with the pres. stem of vā ‘to blow’ (e.g. Ved. pres. part. udvāntī- ‘extinguishing’).

urupi- Deriving urupi- by metathesis from *(H)ulpī-, de Vaan 2000, 280–284, 289f. endorses Hoffmann’s connection of urupi- with Lat. volpēs, but with the difference that de Vaan posits a normal i-stem inflection, with nom.sg. urupiś, and gen.sg. *urupoiś. According to him, urupi- denotes a small animal such as ‘marten’, ‘mink’ or ‘ermine’ and is to be distinguished from the i-stem ruopi- (Vd 13.16) ‘fox’, which, together with Indo-Aryan *topi-, attested in Dardic dialects, goes back to Indo-Iranian *Hraupi- ‘fox’.
uruaŋi Tremblay apud Swennen 2016, 69, suggests that two Gāthic attestations (Y 32.12 and 44.8) make direct reference to the ‘cri rituel’ by which the soul of the sacrificial animal is dispatched to the gods. Translating the form uruaŋi, which he parses as the 3sg. inj. sigmatic aorist of the root uruaŋ ‘to proceed’, as ‘qu’il avance’, he suggests that it refers to the action of ‘taking to the road’ or ‘starting the journey’.

uruaŋi While rejecting Insler’s interpretation of this hapax legomenon in Y 31.2 as the dat. sg. of uruwan- ‘soul’, Kellens & Pirart II 60, 312 leave the form in the dark. In agreement with Bartholomae 1904, 1544, Lubotsky 1997a, 146–147 connects it as an infinitive with the verb var ‘to choose’. Reconstructing the pre-forms as *rûyánaj < *urHyánaj, he sees a related formation in Ved. urvári- ‘lady of choice, wife’. Cantera 2001, 10 adduces a Ved. phraseological parallel in support of the connection of uruaŋi with var ‘to choose’. By contrast, García-Ramón 2009a, 244 accepts the explanation, first published by Humbach in MSS 11, 1957, 77, according to which the form represents an infinitive *uruuaŋi < *mr-γanaj, from the root ar, whose meaning Humbach posits as ‘to move’. Humbach 1991 II 59 specifies the meaning of the root as ‘to move towards, to reach, attain to’, thus indicating that the verb he has in mind is IE *hier ‘to reach, arrive’ rather than *hier ‘to set (oneself) in motion’ as proposed by Hoffmann & Forssman 1996, 241. Humbach & Faisst 2010, 172 suggest that the unexpected –ā in uruaŋi may be influenced by uruaŋā in Y 31.1.


usân- For references on the relationship between the stems usân- and usâdan-, which continues to be subject to debate, see Jamison 2007, 125 fn.8. Jamison 2007a discusses the morphology of Av. kauâi- usân-, usâdan- and its cognate Ved. uśânā kāvyā.

uṣace Steer 2015, 224 fn.94 interprets Av. usca, Ved. uccā ‘above, from above, upwards’ as representing the adverbial instr.sg. of the thematic stem *ud(s)-uś-<ā-. He reviews two possible explanations for Av. us-. According to the first, which is implied by Schmitt 1968, 140, us represents the generalised sandhi form that originated when the local preverb *ud ‘up(wards)’ was followed immediately by a dental (e.g. Av. ustāna- ‘stretched up’ < *ud-tāna-). According to the second explanation, adopted by Hoffmann & Forssman 2004, 98, us goes back to an extended local adverb *ud-s, instead of simple *ud.

uṣahina- Hintze 2007b argues that the internal structure of the five Gāhs indicates that they were composed with uṣahina- intended as Gāh 1.
uzāmōhi Hintze 2007, 134f. fn.67 discusses earlier proposals and suggests to emend uzāmōhi (Y 46.9) to ‘uzāmōhā, the loc.pl. of a stem in *-man- denoting the circumstances of an event or action, like, for example, the loc.sg. yāhī ‘in the appeal (ceremony)’ in Y 46.14 and 49.9.

vaēbōm Following a proposal by Schindler apud Watkins 1987, 275, Watkins 1995, 319 explains the transmitted form vaēbōm in Yt 19.92 as being due to anticipation of the following vaējō, and emends vaēbōm to vaēbōm, the acc.sg. of the Av. stem vaēbh- corresponding to Ved. vaēdha- ‘weapon’.

vaḍra.yaona- Surveying earlier interpretations of this compound in Yt 5.87, Oettinger 2016 suggests emending ‘vaḍrī.yaonā ‘with barren womb’ and connects the first term of the compound with Ved. vaḍhri- ‘castrated, barren’.

vaēdvhōišt Humbach 2014, 6–7 retrieves an OIr. deity *vaēdvhōišt- (< *vaēi-.duhōišt-) ‘wind (blowing) most far-off’ on the basis of the transcription of the name in Av. characters in the Dēnkard.

vaēkārata- The name of the seventh land created by Ahura Mazda (Vd 1.9), whose identification with Gāndhāra has been taken as ‘proved’ by Henning 1947, 52 (= 1977, 286), is explained by Humbach 2014, 5–6 as a compound vaē-kārata- < *vaēi-kārata- ‘built/founded by Vaiiu’, its first member being Av. vaiiu- ‘wind’ personified as a deity.

vaēpiia- König 2010, 206–214 provides an extensive discussion of this hapax legomenon in Y 51.12.

vaēsmondā de Vaan 2001 interprets this hapax legomenon in Yt 10.86 as an abl.sg. in *-an-t, to which the postposition -a is attached. The form would thus provide a second example for an n-stem abl.sg. in -ant in addition to baisman (< *bairman), cf. no.39 above: n-stems, p 9.

vaēfās Like Bartholomae 1904, 1346f., Schwartz 2003, 210 derives this OAv. noun, which is attested in Y 29.6 and 48.9, from the verb vaē ‘to weave’ (PIE *yehb’). Positing the etymological meaning as denoting a woven object, ‘a web’, Schwartz translates vaēfās as ‘(cosmic) design, pattern’, and discusses the phonology and morphology of the stem. Skjaervø 2005a, 274 interprets the noun as ‘hymn’ in the sense of ‘poetic web’.

vaḥ Strunk 1999 identifies ‘to stay’ (“(ver)weilen, bleibten”) as the original meaning of the root vah (IE. *h2yes), and argues that the meaning ‘to pass the night’ (’übernachten’) developed by semantic specialisation in the syntactic collocation ‘to stay for the night’, as in YAv. xşapanam ... vaghaiti ‘it (i.e. the soul) stays for the night’ (H 2.1, Vyt 8.2 = 54).

vaḥma- Kellens 1994b, 106f. fn. 7 and Skjaervø 2005a, 274f. and fn. 16 survey various etymologies that have been proposed. Assuming dissimilation of the labials *vafma- > vahma-, both scholars favour the etymology that connects the noun
with the root *yebh ‘to weave’. By contrast, Hintze [forthcoming] argues that vahmu- belongs to the word family of the Av. adjective vohus- ‘good’ and the Iran- nian verb *pati-yah- ‘to supplicate’ and forms part of the Caland system of the property concept state-oriented root PIE *h₁yes ‘to be, become good’.

vaiitü- m. ‘wind’. Remmer 2011 provides an explanation for the short root vowel in the Av. noun in contrast to its Ved. counterpart vāyū-, see above, p 6f., no. 37 i- and u-stems. Panaino 2017, 77 fn.18 discusses Pirart’s (e.g. 2003b, further references in Panaino, ibid.) proposal to derive the noun from the root vā ‘to be void, disappear’ rather than from vā ‘to blow’.

1 ‘van ‘to win, conquer’. Kellens’s 1974, 76–80 conclusion that the four roots van pos- ited by Bartholomae 1904, 1350–1353 in fact represent only one root van ‘to win, conquer’ is endorsed by de Vaan 2012, 38f., and Ziegler 2004, 4 fn.8 surveys the syntactic constructions of this verb. Kellens 1974, 79 fn.1 considers the OP form avantiya to be the only attestation in OIr. of a root van whose meaning is different from van ‘to win, conquer’. The relationship between van ‘to win, conquer’ and van ‘to hold dear, desire, love’ (see below s.v. vāmu-) remains subject to debate. Gotô 1987, 285, who posits two etymologically distinct roots, notes that the Av. pres. vana- formally agrees with that of Ved. vāna-, but that the former belongs with van ‘to win, conquer’, and the latter with van ‘to hold dear’. Hetrich 2007 argues that apart from vānča- all Ved. verbal forms, including the perf. vāvāna, traditionally connected with van ‘to hold dear’, in fact belong to van ‘to win’. Meissner 1993, 47 argues that a sej-variant *yanH of the verb *yan ‘to win’ might have developed by analogy with the root *sanH ‘to win’ rather than by analogy with *yanH ‘to hold dear, desire’.

Ziegler 2004 and Cheung 2007, 205–206 posit an IE root *yeh₁ to throw out, spread’ (cf. Rix et al. 2001, 683, and online Addenda und Corrigenda zu LIV s.v. *yeh₁₁ → *yeh₁- ‘hinschütten, ausstreuen’). Assuming a semantic development from ‘spread out’ to ‘cover, hide’, Ziegler 2004, 3–4 considers the root van ‘to throw out, spread’ to be attested in Yt 14.41 and Yt 10.75. De Vaan 2012, 39 accepts this meaning for the former passage but is doubtful about the latter. He dispenses with positing a separate root van ‘to spread out’ by assuming that the meaning ‘to throw out, spread’ developed from ‘to win’, and finds Av. evidence for the meaning ‘spread out’ in four compounds ending in *niuud and *niuq, see no. 62 above: Composition, p 26.

vara- Oettinger 2013 discusses different interpretations that have been proposed for vara-. Comparing the vara- story of Vd 2 with myths of the Flood in other traditions, he suggests that the Avestan tale is an adaptation of a Flood-myth to the geography of Iran.
varah- ntr. ‘ordeal’. Goldman 2015, 50–86 provides a detailed discussion of varah- and argues that the noun denotes an ordeal ritual.


varc ‘to pull’. Hill 2007, 277–278 discusses the attestations of the present stem varca-.

vasna- While there is general agreement that vasnā, the only form of this stem attested in Av., is the istr. sg. of a stem vasna-, scholars disagree about the root from which the noun is derived. Regarding the form as a cognate of OP vaśnā, Hintze 1994, 115 with fn. 130 retains Bartholomae’s 1904, 1393 connection of the stem with the root vas ‘to wish’ (< IE *yek-no-) and assumes analogical -sn- instead of expected -sn-, as in yasna- instead of *yaśna- (Hoffmann & Forssman 2004, 102). Sims-Williams 2001, 61–64 discusses the meaning of the OP form, which only occurs in the fixed expression vaśnā Aūramazdāha, and its Middle Iranian cognates, all of which he connects with the root vas ‘to wish’. By contrast, Schwartz 2013, 80 proposes to derive Av. vasna- from the root vaz ‘to be vigorous’, while Skjærvø 1999, 38–39 and 2011, 326, who considers the evidence for the interpretation ‘by the will of’ as slender, translates OP vaśnā ‘by the greatness of’ after Szemerényi, but Klein 1988, 393ff. fn.12 objects that ‘by the greatness’ is semantically not better than ‘by the will’. As far as Av. vasnā is concerned, Skjærvø 2002, 44ff. fn.50; 2005b, 56 and 2008, 509, 513 interprets it as in exchange value, accepting the suggestion of Humbach 1991 II 115 and Humbach & Ichaporia 1998, 88, to dissociate Av. vasnā from OP vaśnā and to connect it instead with Ved. vasnā- ‘price, value’ and the root IE *yes ‘to sell’. Likewise dissociating Av. vasnā from OP vaśnā, Kellens 2013, 82 interprets vasnā as ‘by means of the morning light’ (‘par ... la lumière aurorale’) and derives it from verb vah ‘to illuminate, shine’.

vaśa- Tucker 2004, 550f. modifies Kellens’s proposal that the present stem vaśa- represents a denominative of the fem. root noun vac-/vāc- ‘speech’ by suggesting that the present stem is based on the inherited compound frauāka- ntr. ‘speaking forth’ (cf. Ved. sōma-pravāka-). She argues that by substituting -yā- for the thematic vowel -a-, a denominative *frau-yāk-ā- might have developed to Indo-Iranian *frayācija- and then further in Iranian to OAv. *frauāša-. In forms such as 3sg.ipf.mid. *frauāšata, shortening of the long root vowel in the antepenultimate syllable might have produced the form frauāšata (Y1 14.54, 17.18, 21), from which the simple present verb stem vaśa-, attested in the Vidēvdād, may have been back-formed.

vazdah- Pinault 2012 examines the etymology and semantics of the OAv. noun vazdah- (Y 49.10) and the YAv. second term of personal names in *u-zdah- (Mayrhofer 1979, 24, 59, 100), in connection with a detailed study of scholarship
and attestations of its Ved. congeners vedhás- and védi-. The etymological equation of Ved. vedhás- and Av. vazdah- is supported by their syntactic combination with Indo-Iranian *Hṛtá- ‘order, truth’, in particular Ved. vedhá ṛtáya and the common personal name YAV. aśauazdah-, OP *ṛta-vazdah-, indirectly attested by Grk Ἀρτάβανός, Lat. Artavasdes, Arm. Artavazd. Pinault suggests that Av. vazdah- and Ved. vedhás- derive from Indo-Iranian ya-zdh-ah-. He interprets the latter as a de-genital derivative IE *ye-zd-hz-ēs- from the compound *yē-zd-hz- ‘ritual seat’, which he posits as the ancestor of Ved. védi-. The second part of IE *ye-zd-hz-ēs would incorporate an “allomorph” *zd-hz-ēs- of the noun *sēd-hz-es- ‘seat’ (Ved. sādhis-). According to him, Indo-Iranian ya-zdh-ah- originally referred to the priest who was responsible for the foundation of the altar and the space around it, which provided a seat for the gods attending the ritual as guests. Lundquist 2014, 741 critically reviews Pinault’s reconstruction and points out that the laryngeal *h₂-, which Pinault posits, lacks justification.

vaziiama- Fritz 2000, 115–116 analyses the OAv. hapax legomenon in Y 53.5 as the middle participle of the future Pfr. *yad-ziā- from the root vad ‘to lead’ (Indo-Iranian *yadâ*).

vā ‘to blow’ see above s.v. upā.vāuuō.

vānu- Kümmele 2000, 662f., followed by de Vaan 2003, 85, 376, analyses the hapax legomenon vānu-u (Y 28.8) ‘desirous’, as the nom.sg.m. of a reduplicated u-stem adj. vā-un-u- of the type ma-mn-u- of the root van ‘to hold dear, desire, love’ (IE *yenH, Rix et al. 2001, 682f.); cf. also above s.v. van.

vāzišta- In order to account for the long root vowel, Insler 1996, 174, 184 posits a root with long root vocalism Av. vāz/ūz, Ved. vāh/ūh, for which de Vaan 2004, 594 reconstructs a pre-form Indo-Iranian *yaho*. By contrast, Hintze 2007, 133–137 analyses vāzišta- as a deverbal formation from the causative present stem Av. *vāziit-, Ved. vājāya- ‘to invigorate’, and posits the meaning as ‘most invigorating’, see also no. 48 above: Superlatives, p. 13.

vārṣrayana- mazdaāta- Panaino 1992 [1994] examines the expression vārṣrayana-mazdaāta- in Vd 19.37, see above s.v. mazdaāta-.

vifra- Rejecting Thieme’s proposal that Av. vifrō, a hapax legomenon in Yt 5.61, is borrowed and adapted from Sanskrit, Jackson & Oettinger 2002, 227f. argue that it is based on the Indo-Iranian epithet *vifra- ‘inspired; poet’ (‘beguistert; Dichter’). The latter described a character in a specific rescue story which forms part of Indo-Iranian heroic poetry (see above s.v. ṛāčaonā-). Following Bartholomae 1904, 357, Schwartz 2008 [2012], 98 takes ṣifra- in Yt 13.104 as a variant of vifra- and translates it as ‘trembling’. He suggests that in the tale of the shipwrecked boatman Pāruuā (pāruuō yō vifrō nauuāzō Yt 5.61), vifra- would merely refer to his being tossed about by the sea (p. 100). König 2010, 196–199,
by contrast, concludes that the Av. adj. denotes the ‘inspired singer’, like its Ved. cognate viprā-. According to him, in Av. the adj. fell out of use because of its association with kauūi-, which came to be used as the title of rejected priests; cf. also above s.v. kauūi- and below s.v. vip-.

viśāxana- Elaborating on a suggestion by Oettinger and explaining the long -ā- of viśāxana- ‘eloquent; bragging’ as resulting from the Av. lengthening of short a in the position after ā (Ciṣa > Čiśā, as proposed by de Vaan 2003, 32), and the vowel preceding -n- as anaptyctic, Lubotsky 2012 argues on formal and semantic grounds that Av. viśāxana- has a counterpart in the OP month name Viyav(-a)nā-. He suggests that the latter denotes the month of verbal contests at the New Year festival. Rejecting Kuiper’s connection with the Ved. verb yāc- ‘to implore’, which is better explained as an extension with a velar of the root yā ‘to ask for’, he proposes to connect viśāxana- and related nouns with the verb vac ‘to speak’ and Ved. vākman- ‘utterance, speech’ by deriving *yi-jaxna-*, *yi-jaxman- via dissimilation from *yi-ṣaxna-*, *yi-ṣaxman-. Since one would expect passive meaning for a formation with suffix -na-, he further suggests that *yi-jaxna- shows the loss of -m- and goes back to *yi-ṣaxmn- ‘pertaining to the verbal contest’, a thematic derivative from *yi-jaxman- (p. 98f.).

vināṣaia- Hintze 1994, 124 and fn.169; 2009, 186–189 accepts Kellens’s 1976, 66f. suggestion that -a instead of the expected -e- in the present stem vināṣaia- is a Persism, and Cantera 2012–4, 91 and 2017, 43–45 notes that, in the course of the transmission of the Avesta, the Persism must have entered the stem before the Persian sound change of ŋ > h took place (cf. Pahl. vināh ‘sin, offence’). According to him, the influence of the Persian pronunciation on this Av. word is due to its technical usage and the key importance of the concept it denotes also in the West Iranian tradition.

vip- König 2010, 180–281 discusses the Av. attestations and their Pahlavi versions, of vip- ‘to vibrate’ and its derivatives. He suggests that the possibility cannot be excluded that *vip- denoted sexual-ecstatic actions in addition to ecstatic speech in PIr. König 2007 argues that in the Vidēvdād vaēpaiō and vipāō show no reference to ecstatic speech and that the two forms denote the active and passive sodomite respectively.

vis Hintze 2013 discusses the syntactic combination of a middle form of the verb vis ‘to enter, make oneself available’ with a predicative nominative as an example of the adaptation of a Gāthic phrase to a YAv. context. Macuch 2017, 262–264 examines the meaning and the legal context of the Av. phrase yā ahmāi vīsaṭ ‘(she,) who makes herself available to him’, quoted in Pursišn 73 of the ninth-century Pahlavi Rivāyat i Ādurfarbay.
viš- Sommer 2014a rejects the traditional interpretation of the form viš in Y 9.11 (= Yt 19.40) as the nom.sg. of a root noun meaning ‘poison’ on the grounds that elsewhere in Avestan and in other IE languages the noun only occurs as a thematic stem. Moreover, he argues that the meaning ‘poison’ is implausible in the context of the stanza. Instead, he postulates a root noun viš- ‘horn’. While isolated in Iranian, such a noun would have cognates in other IE languages, including Ved. višānā- f., višāna- ntr. ‘horn’, Germanic words for the ‘bison’ and Old Prussian wissambs.

viš.huška- Assuming confusion between huška- and hišku- ‘dry, dried up’, Lubotsky 1999, 318f. suggests that viš.huškō in Vd 5.36 is a corrupt form for a form of the stem hišku-.

viđaēuva- Cantera 2006 argues that the Av. expression dāta- viđaēuva-, from which the name of the text Viđevdād derives, means ‘Law that keeps the demons away’. It is concerned with purification rules and contrasts with dāta- zarāθuṣṭri- ‘law of Zarathustra’, which deals with legal matters.

viđuš Tremblay 1997a, 124 fn. 6 and Rau 1998 argue for the interpretation of the OAv. form viđuš as the nom.sg.m. of a u-stem adjective viđu- (= Ved. viđu-) built on the perfect stem. Rau 1998, 149, 156 argues that the PIIr. verbal adj. *viđī- ‘knowing, knower’ and the verbal subst. *viđu- ‘act of knowing; knowledge’ (in the OAv. inf. viđuiē) are inherited formations, see no. 61 above: Infinitives, p 24.

viṅṛumant- Lubotsky 1999, 319f. suggests that viṅṛumant- x’ara- describes an injury with bruises.

vipta-, vaēpātia- see s.v. vipa.

viśaptaθa- Bielmeier 1992, 57–58, following Geiger 1882, 319, suggests that viśaptaθa-denotes the additional days that were inserted between the seven-day quarters of a month. Hintze 2009b, 103f. and fn. 12 surveys the debate and endorses Bielmeier’s interpretation.

vištāspa- García-Ramón 2005 detects shared inherited onomastic motives in the personal names Av. and OP vištāspa- ‘whose horses have been let loose’ in comparison with the Grk names ἰππόλιτος, Λόστιτος, and also in Av. yuxtāspa-, hitāspa- ‘whose horses have been yoked, bound’ in comparison with Grk ζεῦξιππος. Kellens 2002–3, 323 surveys the phonological processes which are entailed by the connection of vištāspa- and hitāspa- with the ta-particples *sH-ta and *sH-ta respectively, of the verb root hā ‘to bind’.

viṣiṣi Janda 2005a, 266–269 analyses the hapax legomenon viṣiṣi in Yt 10.80 as the loc.sg. of a stem viṣi-, which he equates with Ved. vyāthiṣ-. He argues that the former shows zero grade, while the latter has the expected full grade of the root. The verb is not attested in Av., but the root is also found in the adj. aiṣṭhidāra- ‘un-
shakable’ (Ved. á-vithura-). By contrast, Pirart 2006, 133 and fn.163 reads vidushī ‘celle qui sait’.

vīnuāti in Y 8.40 is explained by Forssman 2000 as *yi-bāti ‘shines forth’, from the root hā ‘to shine’.

xaftza- König 2010, 230 fn. 434 discusses explanations that have been put forward for this hapax legomenon in Vd 8.31 and 32. With reference to Parth. kāz (and MMP kāz ‘jug’), he suggests that xafza- goes back to *kaftza- and might be a loan word from Semitic *kaftza-. König argues that the initial x- of xafza- is by analogy with xumba- ‘pot’, with which it is coordinated in both passages. He also adduces Av. xan- ‘well’ from kan- ‘to dig’ as a further example for x- instead of k-.

xrāstra- Hoffmann & Forssman 2004, 258 (on §71b) suggest that the basic meaning of xrāstra- is ‘predatory’ (‘räuberisch’), and consider an etymological connection with Grk λέοντας.

xratu- Piras 1996 argues that the expression āsna- xratu- refers to the ‘rising’ xratu- in an eschatological sense. Ahmadi 2014 suggests that xratu- is a technical term already existing in Proto-Iranian and denoting “the mental power to attain the divine sphere” in the cult of the Indo-Iranian gods, the *daiif-. According to him, xratu- refers to the resourcefulness in achieving the goal of reaching the divine sphere, and has a specifically eschatological function not only in the Gāthās but also in the Younger Avesta and the Pahlavi texts.

xrūui.dru- Hintze’s 1994, 245–246 proposal that this epithet of aēšma- ‘violence, rage’ means ‘attacking cruelly’, rather than ‘of bloody club’ (Bartholomae 1904, 540), is further supported by Buyaner 2015, 57–60, who in his fn.133 draws attention to xrūui.yni- (Vd 11.9) ‘hitting cruelly’.

xšanmōnī García-Ramón 2009 discusses this hapax legomenon in Y 29.9 in the light of Ved., Indo-Iranian and IE verbal nouns, see no. 61 above: Infinitives, p 23. Schwartz 2003, 213f.; 2013, 69 argues that the connection with the Ved. root kšam is invalidated by Pašto z~amol ‘to endure’, whose z~- would require the Av. cognate to have *yā-. Translating xšanmōnī as ‘instead’, he analyses it as *xšan-man-aj, the dat. sg. of a stem *xšanman- ‘exchange’, from an Iranian root *xšan, which he connects with the root xšnu (q.v.).

xšnu Schwartz 2003, 213f. connects the Iranian root xšn(a)nu, whose basic meaning he describes as *to satisfy merits or expectations, give hospitality or its cultic equivalent’, with the Grk noun *ξῖνρος (> ξῖνος, ξῖνος) ‘host, guest, guest-friend’ (literally: *one engaging in institutional gift-exchange’).

xšuud- Noting that the word džuutí-, the Av. cognate of Ved. āhutí- ‘oblation’, co-occurs with xšuud- in all but one of the five Av. passages containing xšuud-, Jamison 2011 argues that xšuud- is connected with Av. xīd, PIE *sjuid ‘to sweat’, a suggestion which de Vaan 2003, 228 fn. 200 has made independently, but with-

Jamison surveys the meaning and usage of xšuīd- in OĀv. and YAv. On the basis of the Ved. Bahuvr̥ihī svēdu-havya- ‘whose oblation is sweat’ and of the OĀv. expression āzūtoś xšuīd- ‘the sweat of the oblation’, she postulates that the two elements ‘oblation’ and ‘sweat’ formed a compound that would have been part of the Indo-Iranian liturgical language. A putative pre-Avestan *āzūtī-šuīd- would have been broken up into its constituent parts and the “rukified” š- in initial “unprotected” position would have been reinforced as xš- (p. 26), while outside the liturgical language xšd- ‘to sweat’ became part of the daēvīc vocabulary, or at least occurs in daēvīc contexts (p. 20f.). She concludes that the originally unitary inherited root PIE *ṣyid thus split in Av. into two entities that were dissociated from each other both semantically and phonologically.

x’adātā- In connection with a discussion of the expression mārēzi paurīwā.x’adātā in Vd 19.42, Panaino 1995–6, 198f. endorses Zaehner’s translation of this compound as ‘having, following its own law’, i.e. the law which Panaino identifies with the law of Ahura Mazdā.

x’afnā- In a study of the “twins stanza” Y 30.3, Ahmadi 2013, 240–243 interprets x’afnā as instr.sg. and explores the concept of sleep and dreams as a “gateway to the beyond or to the beginnings”; for his and other scholars interpretation of this stanza, see above, p 11f., no. 44: Demonstrative pronouns. Panaino 2015a examines oneiric vocabulary in Av. and Pahl. texts with special reference to Y 30.3. Skjaervø 1997, 111 suggests that the passage in Y 30.3 means ‘who have become known as the twin sleeps,’ rather than ‘twin dreams’ In his view, x’afnā could refer to two sleeping foetuses in the sense of the later Zurvanite myth.

x’ainī- Positing an Iranian root *hyan ‘to be fresh, pleasant’, with which he also connects the adj. x’andra- ‘pleasant’ (see below s.v.), Cantera 2000, 46 interprets Av. x’ainī- as the full grade version of the zero grade Caland form *huni, which he sees attested in the MĪr. adjectives MMP and Parth. hwnsnd ‘happy, content’, Bactr. uovouννο, uovouννο ‘content, satisfied’ (< *huni-sand). By contrast, Sims-Williams 2007, 273 analyses the MIR. forms as going back to *hu-ni-sand-.

x’airīiunt- Tremblay 1996, 117f. recognises in Y 9.4 x’airīiqn the nom.sg.ntr. of the pres. part pass. x’airīiunt-. The phrase Y 9.4 x’airīiqn x’arāḏəm ‘afīiāmēm means accordingly ‘the food, while being eaten, (was) undiminsishing’. After surveying previous proposals, Kellens 1999 restores the nom. dual ntr. of this participle and the 3dual ipf. of the verb ah ‘to be’ in the phrase Yt 19.32 ‘x’airīieinti āstəm uie x’arāḏe afijiamne ‘both foods, while being consumed, were undiminishing’. The passages are also discussed in detail by Skjaervø 1999 [2002], 186–187.
\(x\text{\'anda}\)- Cantera's 2000, 43–45 derives \(x\text{\'anda}\)- from a formation with the full grade root \(*x\text{\'an-ra}\)- with “epenthetic” \(-d\)- and argues that it forms a Caland system with that \(x\text{\'aini}\)- (see above s.v.), while Kümmel 2005, 327–329 reconstructs a zero grade form \(*x\text{\'an-r\textendash o}\)- \(\rightarrow\) Plfr. \(*x\text{\'an-r\textendash a}\)- \(\rightarrow\) \(*x\text{\'andra}\)-. He considers \(x\text{\'anda}\)- to be a likely candidate for the sound development \(*\eta\), \(*\eta > an(d), am(d)\) in the position before \(r\), for which he also finds evidence in Vedic.

\(x\text{\'ar\textendash anah}\)- Hintze 1994, 15–33 discusses the meaning and etymology of this noun, and, following an oral communication by K. Hoffmann (p. 31), argues for a primary derivative with suffix \(-nah\)- from the root Plfr. \(*x\text{\'yar}\) (IE \(*x\text{\'yel}\)) ‘to burn without a flame, smoulder’ on phonological (the disyllabic value of the noun) and morphological \(-nah\)- being a primary suffix) grounds. In accepting this etymology, Gnoli 1996, 176–178 and 2002, 106–107 abandons his earlier derivation of \(x\text{\'ar\textendash anah}\)- from the IE word for ‘sun’, while emphasizing the semantic affinity between the two words. While Elfenbein 2001, 490, 492 regards \(x\text{\'ar\textendash anah}\)- to be secondary to \(far\text{\'anah}\)-, Lubotsky 1998b and 2002a, 191–195 connects \(x\text{\'ar\textendash anah}\)- as a Skythian loan word with the Av. adj. \(par\text{\'an\textendash hant}\)- ‘abundant’ and equates it with Ved. \(par\text{\'in\textendash as}\)- ‘abundance’. Although the equation is supported by phraseological parallels, Tremblay 2000, 194, Panaino 2002a, 95, and Hintze 2007a, 179–180 object to it on the grounds of the ad-hoc character of the postulated substitution of \(*par\text{\'nah}\) with Skythian \(*far\text{\'nah}\)- in all Iranian dialects, and the further substitution of \(x\text{\'a}\)- for \(*fa\)- in Avestan. Schmitt 2006, 1560 also has reservations and notes that, in contrast to the numerous Iranian compounds with \(-far\text{\'anah}\)- and \(-x\text{\'ar\textendash anah}\)-, Ved. attests only one compound with \(-par\text{\'in\textendash as}\)-. Tremblay 2008a, 569ff. connects Av. \(x\text{\'ar\textendash anah}\)- as ‘splendour’ with Ved. \(s\text{\'hul\textendash i\textendash ni\textendash i}\)- ‘one of the seven tongues of the fire’ and \(vi\text{\'s\textendash l\textendash i\textendash ng\textendash a\textendash k\textendash a\textendash k\textendash a\textendash k\textendash a\)- ‘spark’. A completely different analysis is that of Janda 2005, 278–286, who posits an Indo-Iranian compound \(*x\text{\'orn\textendash mas}\)- ‘escaping to the sun’ (‘(sich rettend) zur Sonne kommen’, p. 282) as the basis of Av. \(x\text{\'ar\textendash anah\textendash}\), with the monosyllabic allomorph PIE \(*s(h)\text{\'yt\textendash ol}\)- of the word for ‘sun’ as the first term and the root noun of the verb \(*nes\) ‘to escape, to return home’ as the second term. Lipp 2009 II 428–431 and Nikolaev 2012–2013, 220–223 likewise connect the first syllable of \(x\text{\'ar\textendash anah\textendash}\) with the word for ‘sun’, but interpret \(-nah\)- as a suffix. Independently from one another (Lipp 2009 II 429 fn.167), they analyse the IE suffix \(*-ne\text{\'os}\)- as a conglomerate of \(*-no\)- and \(*-s\)-. According to Lipp, \(x\text{\'ar\textendash anah\textendash}\) goes back to an IE abstract noun \(*x\text{\'yt\textendash sos}\)/\(*x\text{\'yt\textendash n\textendash os\textendash}\)- ‘sunshine’, which he considers to be a secondary denominial \(s\)-stem derived from \(*x\text{\'yt\textendash el\textendash no\textendash}\)- ‘sunray’ (attested in Ved. \(sv\text{\'ar\textendash na\textendash ra\textendash}\), an epithet of Agni). The latter in turn would be the substantivised version of \(*x\text{\'yt\textendash no\textendash}\)- ‘consisting of sunlight, shining’, an adjectival derivative from the heteroclitic neuter

xid ‘to sweat’, see above s.v. xšuaid.

yaka De Vaan 2003, 68–69 casts doubts on the long vowel of yākara ‘liver’ (Grk ἠφαρ) and argues that the form with a short vowel in the first syllable has a better transmission. The vowel grade of Avestan yaka thus agrees with cognates in Mgr. languages and in Ved., all of which preserve Indo-Iranian *ṭakar-.

yasna- Hintze 2004, 311–315 suggests that when yasna- denotes a text, it refers to the Yasná Haptanhaítí.

yaṣṭi-/yeṣṭi-; yaṣṭa- Panaino 1993–4 and 1994 argues that the name Yašt derives from Av. yaṣṭa- rather than yaṣṭi-/yeṣṭi-. He reconstructs the Av. expression yaṣṭom kar on the basis of Yt 15.56. While Kellens 1996, 41 endorses Panaino’s analysis (although with a caveat, ibid. fn.5), Pirart 1997b evaluates it critically. Questioning the derivation of yaṣṭa- from the root yaz ‘to sacrifice, worship’, Pirart proposes to connect yaṣṭa- with Av. *yaṣas ‘donner un statut particulier’ (p. 376f.), which is preserved in Av. yasah-, Ved. yaṣas- ‘fame’.

yaunaeji- Weiss 1994 argues that the Av. compound yaunaeji- ‘living forever’, together with Lat. īsīs ‘overflowing’, Grk ἄγηζ ‘healthy’ and Gothic ajuklīþs ‘eternity’, goes back to a PIE collocation of *h₂soj- ‘life’ and *gʷejhs/*gʷihš ‘to live’.

yaṣṭi- Tremblay 2009, 331 discusses the etymology of this noun, which has been equated with Ved. yaṣṭi- ‘stick’ (Mayrhofer 1992–2001 II 406).

yaz Hintze 2007, 181–186 discusses the syntax and semantics of the verb yaz and, especially, the question of its construction with a double accusative, and Hintze 2004, 313–315 suggests that the figura etymologica yasnam yaz- denotes specifically the performance of the Yasná Haptanhaítí. Oettinger 2010, 279f. endorses the reconstruction of the root’s prehistoric form with root-vowel *-a- as PIE *h₂jag ‘to revere, worship’.

yazata- Kellens 2002–3, 319 and fn.5 points out that no feminine form is attested for the stem yazata-.

yāh- In contrast to Narten 1986, 149–155, who derives the noun yāh- from yā ‘to ask for, request’, Schwartz 2003a, 377–378 and 2014, 22–23 connects it with the homonymous root yā ‘to race, to course’, and argues for the meaning ‘(chariot-) race’ and, by semantic shift, ‘agon’. The question of the root’s identity is reviewed by Hintze 2007, 128–131, who translates the noun as ‘appeal, entreaty’.

yātu- Sommer 2014 discusses the etymology of Indo-Iranian *jātu- and argues that the noun is derived with suffix *-tu- from the PIE root *Həh₁ ‘to throw’.

yima- Schwartz 2002 [2006], 55–56 discusses the recasting of the name yima- in the Gāthás, while Scharfe 2014 examines Yama’s Path in the Rgveda and the Avesta.
The volume edited by Azamouche & Redard 2012 explores various aspects of the Indo-Iranian myth of *jama-. Oettinger 2016a, 238f. suggests that the ancestor figure of Yima formed part of an PIE creation myth, in which *h₂jémp₃H₂-ó- was split and came to form one of a pair of twins in Indo-Iranian Oettinger 2013a, 176f. reconstructs the form as PIE *h₂jémp₃-₃-ó- ‘belonging to a duplicate, belonging to imitation’, and interprets the latter as a derivative from *h₂jémp₃-₃h₂- ‘duplicate’, on which Lat. imágō ‘image’ is based.

yuua- Skjærvø 1997c argues that the Av. word for ‘yoke’ was yuua- (< *yuua-, Ved. yugō-) and that it forms part of the compound yauuō,fraēdō ‘having the width of a yoke’ in Vd 19.19.

yuxtāspa- see vīxtāspa-

zamanā- Hintze 2000, 76f. and 218f. discusses the etymology and semantics. On Sogd. zmnh ‘income’ (?) in Ancient Letter II, see Sims-Williams 2001a, 278.

zruwan- Lubotsky 1997a, 147; 1998a discusses the semantics, inflection and etymology of this noun. He endorses the traditional derivation of zruwan- ‘life-time, time-span’ from the PIE root *ǵerh₂ ‘to become old’ but redefines the phonetic processes that have led to this stem. He argues that the Av. masc. stem originally formed one paradigm with zaṟuwan- ‘old age, senility’ and was remodelled from an I Ir. heteroclitic -r/-n- neuter with nom.sg. *ǵṛH-wr. gen. *ǵṛH-yāns. Accepting Lubotsky’s reconstruction, Panaino 2017a continues his studies (listed ibid. p. 153) of the linguistic, religious, liturgical and theological significance of the notion of time in Iran. Rezania 2010 examines the Zoroastrian concept of time in Avestan, Middle Persian and non-Iranian sources.
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