

S o n d e r d r u c k

überreicht

mit freundlicher Empfehlung

von Autor/Autorin, Herausgeber und Verleger

avec les compliments distingués

de l'auteur/autrice et de l'éditeur

saludos cordiales

del autor/a, del editor y de la editorial

con i migliori saluti

dall'autore/autrice, dal curatore e dall editore

with compliments

of the author, editor and publisher

/// SCHWEIGER VWT-VERLAG ///

Verlag für Wissenschaft und Technik

Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Günter Schweiger, M.A.

Bahnweg 9

D-93104 Taimering (Riekofen)

BR DEUTSCHLAND RF ALLEMAGNE FR GERMANY

E-Post :

guenter.schweiger@extern.uni-regensburg.de

INDOGERMANICA
Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt

INDISCHE, IRANISCHE UND INDOGERMANISCHE
STUDIEN
DEM VEREHRTEN JUBILAR DARGEBRACHT ZU
SEINEM FÜNFUNDSECHZIGSTEN GEBURTSTAG

Herausgegeben von
GÜNTER SCHWEIGER

TAIMERING 2005
SCHWEIGER VWT-VERLAG

Gedruckt mit großzügigen Zuschüssen des Ehepaares Gotō (Prof. Dr. Toshifumi Gotō und Frau Dr. Junko Gotō, Tohoku Universität in Sendai), Herrn Prof. Dr. Chlodwig Werba (Universität Wien), des CII (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, London), des AIIT (Ancient India and Iran Trust, London), der Kulturabteilung der Botschaft der Islāmischen Republik Irān, des Kulturreferates der Stadt Regensburg und den Zuwendungen im Vorwort namentlich genannter finanzieller Förderer.

INDOGERMANICA – Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt :

Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien
dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag /
hrsg. von Günter Schweiger — Taimering (Riekofen) : Schweiger VWT, 2005

(Studien zur Iranistik und Indogermanistik ; Bd. 3)

ISBN 3-934548-01-6

NE: Schweiger, Günter [Hrsg.]; Klingenschmitt, Gert; GT

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem und alterungsbeständigem Werkdruckpapier

ISBN 3-934548-01-6

© 2005 • Schweiger VWT-Verlag

Verlag für Wissenschaft und Technik Taimering (bei Regensburg)

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Printed and bound in Germany and the ČR

I N H A L T

VORWORT	ix
TABULA GRATULATORIA	xii
A U F S Ä T Z E	
IGNACIO-JAVIER ADIEGO LAJARA, Barcelona Licio <i>ñ</i> y <i>ñ̃</i>	1
AGUSTÍ ALEMANY VILAMAJÓ, Barcelona Some notes on language contacts between Old Ossetic (Alanic) and Old Turkic	15
PETER ANREITER & MARIALUISE HASLINGER, Innsbruck Zu den vorrömischen Komponenten des (ost-)alpinen Wortschatzes . .	23
JOHNNY CHEUNG, London Sanskrit <i>meh</i> , <i>mīh-</i> , <i>meghā-</i> and <i>niméghamāna-</i> with an excursion on Persian <i>mih</i>	45
GEORGE DUNKEL, Zürich <i>μετά</i> und <i>πεδά</i>	57
HEINER EICHNER, Wien Etymologische Notiz zu gotisch <i>iddja</i> und altenglisch <i>eode</i> ‘ging’ aus sprachgeschichtlicher Sicht	71
JOSEF ELFENBEIN, Cambridge Taboo	73
WOLFRAM EULER, München Ostbaltisch, Westgermanisch und Britannisch (Grundsätzliche Überlegungen zur Existenz von Zwischenstufen zwischen Protosprachen und Einzelsprachen)	85
BERNHARD FORSSMANN, Erlangen Zwischen Erde und (zwischen) Himmel	105
SONJA FRITZ, Frankfurt Der sprachliche Ausdruck von Sozialstrukturen in Südasien	113

JOSÉ LUIS GARCÍA RAMÓN, Köln	
Der thessalische Name <i>Σπύραγος, σπυρός</i> ‘Weizen(korn)’: att. <i>πυρός</i> und <i>πυροῦς ἄγειν</i> ‘Weizen(korn) zu Wasser transportieren’	127
BADROLZAMAN GHARĪB, Tehrān	
The shift of optative mood (formation) to durative preterite in some Iranian languages	145
JOST GIPPERT, Frankfurt	
Armeno – Albanica	155
JUNKO GOTŌ, Sendai	
Pāli <i>thīna-middha-</i> , amg. <i>thīṇagiddhi-/thīṇaddhi-</i> und ved. <i>mardh/mṛdh</i>	167
TOSHIFUMI GOTŌ, Sendai	
Ai. <i>ādbhuta-</i> , <i>ādabdha-</i> , jav. <i>abda-</i> , <i>dapta-</i> und ai. <i>addhā</i> , aav. ap. <i>azdā</i>	193
ROBERTO GUSMANI, Udine	
‘Ihrzen’ im deutschsprachigen Hochmittelalter	213
IVO HAJNAL, Innsbruck	
Die Flexion der <i>ah</i> ₂ -Stämme im Tocharischen: ererbt oder geneuert?	221
ALMUT HINTZE, London	
Indo-Iranian <i>*gar</i> ‘to raise aloft’	247
MICHAEL JANDA, Münster	
Wanken und Fall der Feinde Mithras: jungavestisch <i>vīθiš-</i> als Element indoiranischer Dichtersprache	261
SOON HWAN JEON, Seoul	
Ein typologischer Überblick. Zum Ablaut im Koreanischen: – mit Rücksicht auf deverbale Ableitungen –	273
JEAN KELLENS, Paris	
L’amphipolarité sémantique et la démonisation des daivas	283
AGNES KORN, Frankfurt	
Das Nominalsystem des Balochi, mitteliranisch betrachtet	289
THOMAS KRISCH, Salzburg	
Preliminaries to the study of adjectival syntax in Proto-Indo-European	303
MARTIN JOACHIM KÜMMEL, Freiburg	
Ved. <i>tand-</i> und ein neues indoiranisches Lautgesetz	321
CHARLES DE LAMBERTERIE, Paris	
Le verbe arménien <i>unim / kalay</i>	333
JENNY HELENA LARSSON, Kopenhagen	
The Orthographic Variants ⟨oa⟩ and ⟨ea⟩ – Traces of Accent in the Elbing Vocabulary	359

THOMAS LINDNER, Salzburg Nominalkomposition im Vulgärlatein und Frühromanischen sowie ein Plädoyer für die Imperativthese	377
MELANIE MALZAHN, Wien Westtocharische Substantive auf <i>-au</i> und einige Fortsetzer von indo- germanischen <i>men</i> -Stämmen im Tocharischen	389
JAVIER MARTÍNEZ GARCÍA, Oviedo Laryngeal ending cases and the <i>-n</i> -element in Old Indian declension	409
JOACHIM MATZINGER & MONICA GENESIN, Jena & Lecce Nominalkomposition im Missale des Gjon Buzuku	413
MICHAEL MEIER-BRÜGGER, Berlin Griechische Präsentien mit Suffixkonglomerat <i>-nǰé-</i> : <i>κλίνω, πλύνω; κρίνω, πίνω; φαίνω</i>	435
BIRGIT ANETTE OLSEN, Kopenhagen The development of IE <i>*mp</i> and <i>*mb^h</i> in Armenian – Dumézil reconsidered	443
ANTONIO PANAINO, Bologna Yt. 8, 8: <i>stārō kərēmā?</i> ‘Stelle infuocate’ o ‘Stelle–verme’?	455
GEORGES-JEAN PINAULT, Paris Analyse étymologique d’un nom de parenté indo-européen	465
ROBERT PLATH, Erlangen <i>apratí-</i> und vergleichbare Bildungen: Zur Genese einer Adjektiv- klasse im Rigveda	487
HEINZ DIETER POHL, Klagenfurt Überlegungen zum Namen slaw. <i>němьskō</i> ‘Deutsch’	505
JENS ELMEGÅRD RASMUSSEN, Kopenhagen Zur Herkunft des lateinischen Suffixes <i>-tīvus</i>	513
JOHANNES REINHART, Wien Altrussisch <i>l̥z̥z̥</i> ‘Tuch, Band’	517
VELIZAR SADOVSKI, Wien Dichtersprachliche Stilmittel im Altiranischen und Altindischen	521
STEPHAN SCHAFFNER, Regensburg Urgerm. <i>*yrōχ/gi-</i> f. ‘Rüge, Tadel; Anklage’ und <i>*nēχ^wa-</i> ‘nahe’	541
KLAUS T. SCHMIDT, Saarbrücken Ex oriente lux III. Zur Vorgeschichte der tocharischen <i>-tk</i> -Präsentien	557
STEFAN SCHUMACHER, Wien Zur Form des gegischen Infinitivs	561
GÜNTER SCHWEIGER, Regensburg Fragment einer bisher unbekanntem ap. Inschrift aus Susa	579

NICHOLAS SIMS-WILLIAMS, London & ELIZABETH TUCKER, Oxford Avestan <i>huvōišta</i> and its cognates	587
MARKO SNOJ, Ljubljana Zur Bewahrung und weiteren Entwicklung von einigen Fällen der urindogermanischen Akzentmobilität im Urslawischen	605
WOJCIECH SOWA, Krakau Anmerkungen zum Balkanindogermanischen	611
DAVID STIFTER, Wien Tocharisch A <i>wäśśi</i> und <i>wäśśitsune</i>	629
XAVIER TREMBLAY, Tournai Zum Narten-Aorist; Apophonica IV	637
MICHIEL DE VAAN, Leiden The reflex of intervocalic <i>*b</i> in Avestan	665
CALVERT WATKINS, Harvard Two tokens of Indo-Iranian hieratic language	681
ANTJE WENDTLAND, Göttingen Ist der Satan weiblich? Zur Interpretation von soghdisch <i>xH</i>	689
CHLODWIG WERBA, Wien Sanskrit <i>duhitár-</i> und ihre (indo-)iranischen Verwandten	699
MICHAEL WITZEL, Harvard Notes on Vedic Dialects, 2.	733
INDIZES	
WORTINDEX	745
SACHINDEX	763
PERSONENINDEX	773
STELLENINDEX	775
SCHRIFTENVERZEICHNIS	779

V O R W O R T

S^{AGT} mir, wie habt Ihr gedacht,
wie habt Ihr gesprochen,
habt Ihr so wie wir gelacht,
woher seid Ihr aufgebrochen?

G. Sch.

53 Autoren aus drei Kontinenten haben zu diesem Band „Indogermanica“ aktuelle Ergebnisse aus ihren jeweiligen Forschungsgebieten beigetragen. Ihrem Engagement, ihrer Mühe und ihrem Vertrauen hoffe ich mit diesem Buch zu entsprechen und danke ihnen herzlich für ihre Beiträge, die aufzeigen, wie reich das Arbeitsgebiet der Indogermanistik ist. Ihre Untersuchungen sind durchdacht und komplex, sie geben Anstöße, erschließen Zusammenhänge, sie verlangen eine intensive Lektüre, die mit der Erkenntnis der Tragweite der Ergebnisse belohnt wird. Denn da wir Menschen über die Sprache miteinander kommunizieren, ermöglicht ihre Analyse Erkenntnisse über unsere Herkunft, Entwicklung und Geschichte, die ihrerseits wiederum vielleicht dazu beitragen können, uns einander besser zu verstehen, die Kommunikation der Völker auf der Basis eines umfangreicheren Wissens voneinander zu intensivieren und zu optimieren. So mag der Blick auf die Vergangenheit eine friedliche Zukunft der universalen Menschheit ermöglichen.

Die mit mathematisch strenger Argumentation im Studiolo gewonnenen Ergebnisse der Indogermanistik sind jedoch weniger attraktiv und haptisch greifbar wie die prominent präsentierten Realien ihrer Nachbarwissenschaft, der Archäologie, die spätestens seit Erkundung der Pharaonengräber eine romantisch-mystische Schatzgräberaura umweht. Deshalb wird die Indogermanistik öffentlich nicht ihrer Bedeutung entsprechend rezipiert. In Zeiten kurzlebigen, plakativen und daher bevorzugt knapp gehaltenen „Infotainments“ ist dieses intensive Studium nach PR- und Marketingkriterien schwer zu vermitteln, erscheint es doch schon den Wissenschaftsministerien als suspektes Orchideenfach, da es nicht nach Rentabilitäts Gesichtspunkten zu evaluieren ist. Rechtfertigungszwänge sind jedoch nach dem Wissenschaftverständnis im Humboldtischen Sinne nicht vorgesehen. Ohne in die Defensive oder gar in Resignation zu verfallen, ist zu beklagen, daß der renommierte Lehrstuhl für Indogermanistik an der Universität Regensburg mit dem Weggang von Prof. Dr. Gert Klingenschmitt mit dem Wintersemester 2005/2006 seinen Lehrbetrieb einstellen mußte.

Dabei ist die Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft der Indogermanistik, der Altaistik, der Semitistik, der Turkologie, Hethitologie, Etruskologie usw. ihrer Aufgabenvielfalt gewahr. Es gilt, um nur die vorrangigsten Bereiche zu nennen, frühe

INDO-IRANIAN *gar* ‘TO RAISE ALOFT’

The¹ existence of an Indo-Iranian set-root *gar* ‘to raise (one’s hand or weapon preparatory to striking)’, an etymological equivalent of Greek $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ ‘to throw, hurl, hit’, is disputed in both Avestan and Vedic Studies. Thus, while some scholars, for instance MAYRHOFER, *EWAia* I 470, assume that there is sufficient evidence for a Vedic root *gar*ⁱ³ ‘ausholen (zum Schlag), aufheben (Waffe)’, a cognate of Avestan *gar* attested in the form *ni-γrāire*, others, e. g. Kümmel in *LIV*² 208 n. 1, reject the assumption of IIr. cognates of Greek $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$. In what follows I propose to examine the Avestan and Vedic evidence for such an IIr. verb.

1. Avestan *gar* ‘to raise aloft’

The only Avestan evidence for a root *gar* ‘to raise (a weapon)’ is the isolated form *ni-γrāire*, which occurs only in Yt 10.40 (twice) but, according to Geldner’s edition (*Avesta* II 134), without variant manuscript readings. Bartholomae, *AirWb.* 512 posits a verb *ni-gar* ‘to strike down’, of which *ni-γrāire* would be a 3pl. middle form from a present stem *grā-*. The latter would be formed like the Greek aorist $\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\beta\lambda\eta\text{-}\tau\omicron$. KELLENS, *Verbe av.* 164 rightly objects that Avestan does not have either present or aorist forms of this type. It is more likely, therefore, that BAILEY’s analysis (1956, 97) is correct. He segments the word as *ni-γr-āire* (with 3pl. middle ending *-āre*).² Since the ending *-āre/-re* is primary, *ni-γrāire* can only be the form of a root present.³ With the preverb *ni-*, Bailey argues, the verb *ni-gar* would thus mean ‘to bring (a weapon) down upon’:

Yt 10.40
karətaciṭ aēšqm hufrāiiuxta
yōi ni-γrāire sarahu mašiiākanqm

¹ I am grateful to Elizabeth Tucker (Oxford) for valuable comments on an earlier draft of this article.

² While Bailey’s alternative segmentation *ni-γrā-ire* is only possible if the underlying root ends in a laryngeal, as in the case of Grk. $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, it is excluded in his own analysis because he connects *ni-γrāire* with the anit-root Ved. *har* ‘to take’. KÜMMEL, *Stativ und Passivaorist* 147 n. 19 rightly comments that one would expect ***γar* if the underlying root was set.

³ Although KELLENS, *Verbe av.* 164 classifies the form as belonging to a present in *-ā* (“à suffixe rare” with reference to Parth. *gr’y-* ‘to incline, slide, fall down’, NP *girāyistan*), he considers a root present to be more likely in spite of the fact that no other evidence for such a present exists.

ašəmnō.janō bauuaiti
yaθa grantō upa.tbištō
apaiti.zaṅtō miθnāiti
miθrō yō vouru.gaoiiaoiš
vazraciṭ aēšqm huniuuixta
yōi niγrāire sarahu mašiiākanqm
ašəmnō.janō bauuaiti
yaθa grantō upa.tbištō
apaiti.zaṅtō miθnāiti
miθrō yō vouru.gaoiiaoiš

Their very swords, well wielded,
 which are brought down on the heads of men,
 do not slay with the blade⁴
 because Mithra of wide cattle-pastures,
 who has not been acknowledged, remains⁵ enraged, provoked.
 Their very cudgels, well directed,
 which are brought down on the heads of men,
 do not slay with the blade
 because Mithra of wide cattle-pastures,
 who has not been acknowledged,
 remains enraged, provoked.

The Avestan form *niγrāire* would thus attest a root present of *gar* ‘to raise (one’s hand or weapon preparatory to striking)’ which, according to Bailey, forms a reduplicated present *jīgharti* in Vedic. More importantly, he equates the Av. phrase *vazra*^o . . . *niγrāire* (Yt 10.40) with the Ved. expression *vájram á jīgharti* (RV 5.48.3) which he translates as ‘he brings the club down upon’. While GRASSMANN 421 regards *jīgharti* in RV 5.48.3 and 4.17.14 as a present of the root *ghar* ‘to drip, sprinkle’, which here would have the meaning ‘to throw’, BAILEY 1956, 98 f. points out the semantic difficulty presented by such divergent meanings and, taking up Geldner’s earlier suggestion, posits a separate Vedic root *ghar*, which would be a variant of *har* ‘to take’.⁶

⁴ If it is accepted that in the course of transmission of the text metathesis of *-nm-* to *-mn-* occurred, possibly under the influence of the middle participles’ suffix, then the first member of the compounds *ašəmnō.jan-* ‘not slaying with the blade’ and *ašəmnō.vid-* ‘not piercing with the blade’ is *šanman-* ‘blade’. Av. *šanman-* has been equated by both Humbach and Henning with Ved. *kṣádman-* ‘blade’, see KELLENS, *Noms-racines* 71 f., MAYRHOFER, *EWAia* I 422 with references.

⁵ The form *miθnāiti* belongs to the verb *mit* ‘to remain, rest’, see KELLENS, *Verbe av.* 177 with n. 11.

⁶ GELDNER, *Rig-Veda* III 128 ad 10.6.4 d; II 54 ad 5.48.3 b. BAILEY 1956, 98 also notes that Geldner does not refer to Iranian. That Av. *gar* ‘prendre’ corresponds to Ved. *har* is also suggested by BENVENISTE, *Journal Asiatique* 225, 1934, 178-180, but the Av. compounds with *aibi*, adduced by him, belong to *gar* ‘to welcome’, see KELLENS, *Noms-racines* 21-27,

Bailey's equation of Ved. *ghar* 'to take' with Av. *gar* in *niγrāire* requires the assumption that the supposed Vedic variant *har* 'to take' begins with either a pure or labio-velar and that Av. *niγrāire* is to be separated from both Vedic *apa-gar²* 'to raise (one's hand or weapon preparatory to striking)' and Greek βάλλω 'to throw, hurl, hit'. A morphological problem, not addressed by Bailey, is posed by there being both a reduplicated (Ved. *jighar-*) and a root present (Av. *niγrāire*) for the same root Ir. **ghar*. This is on the basis of one example apiece, for the other instance adduced by BAILEY 1956, 96 for Av. *gar* 'to take' belongs to homonymous *gar* 'to welcome'.⁷ Furthermore, in the context of RV 5.48.3 a special use of *jigharti* 'to drip, sprinkle' would be plausible, because the verb forms part of a metaphor in which the *vájra-* is a figure for the Soma extracted with the pressing stones:

RV 5.48.3

á grávabhir ahanyèbhir aktúbhir váriṣṭhaṃ vájram á jigharti māyīni /

In the daylight he (the god-fearing man) squirts⁸ the choicest mace (i. e. Soma) down upon the magic one with the pressing stones.

The root *ghar* 'to drip' could also underly the form *jigharti* in RV 4.17.14, where the object *vájra-* is probably implied, although there is no reference to any liquid:

RV 4.17.14

ayám cakráṃ iṣaṇat sūryasya ny étaśaṃ rīramat sasṃmāṇám /

á kṛṣṇá īṃ juhurāṇó jigharti tvacó budhné rájaso asyá yónau //

This one here spun the wheel of the sun, he stopped Etaśa who had sprung forth.⁹ Being angry,¹⁰ he "sprinkles" it (i. e. the *vájra-*) upon the black (horse), on the bottom of the skin, in the lap of his aerial world.¹¹

NARTEN, *YH* 88-90. Support for Bailey's analysis could derive from the use of the Vedic compound *pra-har*, which according to E. TICHY (in SCHAEFER, *Intensivum* 120 n. 332) is the technical term for threatening with a weapon. However, the two passages referred to contain rather forms of the verb *pra-bhar* (*prá bharā* RV 1.61.12, *vṛtráya prá vadháṃ jabhāra* RV 2.30.3 quoted below p. 254).

⁷ See preceding footnote.

⁸ ATKINS 1950, 36 translates 'sprinkles, squirts'; OLDENBERG, *Noten* I 345 'spritzt er den trefflichsten Vajra (den Soma)'; RENO 1954, 382: '(Indra) throws the *vájra* on the demon by sprinkling it (against him)'.
⁹ The form *sasṃmāṇám*, which is a perfect participle formed with the thematic suffix *-māna-*, occurs here instead of the expected athematic *sasrāṇá-*, see NARTEN 1969, 81 f. (= *Kl. Schr.* 128), KÜMMEL, *Perfekt* 552, 602 (with two different translations of the perfect participle).

¹⁰ As argued convincingly by INSLER 1968, *juhurāṇó* is a perfect participle from *har²* 'to be angry' and not, as previously assumed by other scholars, from *hvar* 'to go astray, deviate'; see also KÜMMEL, *Perfekt* 602.

¹¹ Translation of padas b-d after INSLER 1968, 222, who renders *jigharti* as 'strikes'.

BURROW 1957a, 136f. objects to Bailey's supposition of a variant *ghar* on the grounds that *har* 'to take' forms a perfect *jahāra*.¹² Instead, he posits another new root *ghar* 'to whirl, brandish, swing (a weapon)' with a past participle *ghūrṇa-* 'whirled, brandished, swung'¹³ for those passages discussed by Bailey where the meaning of *ghar*, *jīgharti* appears difficult to reconcile with *ghar* 'to sprinkle'. Burrow further objects that Bailey does not account for Ved. *garⁱ* 'to raise (one's hand or weapon preparatory to striking)' which would go very well with Greek βάλλω and also yield a reasonable equivalent of Av. *gar* in *niγrāire*. Consequently he retains the old equation of Av. *gar* in *niγrāire* with the Vedic verb *garⁱ* (*gur*), whose meaning he posits as 'to propel'.

The only alleged Avestan cognate of this root, Yt 10.40 *niγrāire*, is eliminated by INSLER 1967. Elaborating on an earlier suggestion by Windischmann,¹⁴ he emends *niγrāire* to ^{*}*niγnāire*, thus retrieving a 3pl. stative of the common root *jan* 'to slay', of which a 3sg. stative *niγne* is attested in Yt 10.104 (= Y 57.29).¹⁵ Insler argues that the transmitted form *niγrāire* involved a scribal error "due to the very close orthographic similarity between the signs for *r* and *n* in the Avestan script system" (p. 262). He does not, however, adduce examples of the alleged confusion of the signs. Instead, he supports his emendation with a syntactic argument. In Vedic, the verb *ni-han* may participate in three different syntactic figures. In the most common, the weapon utilized is in the accusative as the object of the verb while the person or bodily part struck with the weapon is in the locative. Since this syntactic construction is also found in Yt 10.40 and 101, Insler reconstructs an Indo-Iranian expression ^{*}*ni tāsmi vāzram jhanti* 'he strikes the cudgel down on him' (p. 264).

The proposal yields a text which is immaculate, syntactically plausible and with a verbal form fitting well into the paradigm of the root *jan* 'to slay'. But perhaps the strongest argument in favour of the emendation is, as pointed out by INSLER, *ibid.* 260f., the fact that the distribution of the old stative ending *-āre/-re* is very limited in Avestan. Apart from the disputed form, there are only ^o*mrūuāire* from *mrū* 'to speak', *sōire* (= Ved. *śéire*) from *si* 'to lie' and ^a*āghāire* from *āh* 'to sit'.¹⁶ While statives of these three roots and of *jan* 'to slay' are well documented, such a formation would be difficult to justify for an isolated root *gar* 'to raise (one's hand or weapon preparatory to striking)' otherwise unattested in

¹² Along similar lines, MAYRHOFER, *EWAia* II 804 comments that *har* probably does not have forms with ^{*}*ghar*.

¹³ More details on this are given by MAYRHOFER, *EWAia* I 515.

¹⁴ WINDISCHMANN, *Mithra* 35.

¹⁵ A full list of references to Insler's predecessors adopting this interpretation is given by KELLENS, *Noms-racines* 152 n.3. The emendation is favourably considered by him, *Verbe av.* 164, and accepted, for instance, by KÜMMEL, *Stativ und Passivaorist* 147 and in *LIV* 186 n.1.

¹⁶ HOFFMANN/FORSSMAN p. 203.

Avestan. Insler's syntactic argument, however, although superficially attractive, is not quite so compelling because the construction involving the weapon in the accusative and the object hit in the locative is also found in the case of other roots from this semantic field. For instance, it holds equally well for Bailey's Vedic cognate *jigharti*. More seriously, there is the palaeographic observation, not addressed by Insler, that the signs *n* and *r* are not usually confused.¹⁷ The spelling of *w*, *n*, ' and *r* by the same vertical stroke in the Pahlavi script was disambiguated by the inventor of the Avesta script. While the vertical stroke is used for *n* only, *r* is graphically represented by the letter *l* of the Pahlavi script.¹⁸ As a result, in the extant manuscripts *n* and *r* differ distinctively in so far as *n* is either a straight or a wavy short vertical stroke while the upper part of *r* slants upwards to the left and rises well above the main body of the text.

A graphic confusion of *r* and *n* being unlikely, the emendation could be made plausible with the phonetic argument that ^x*niγnāire* was assimilated to *niγrāire* during the course of oral tradition, possibly under the influence of Mithra's epithet *grantō*, which occurs repeatedly in the context of the verbal form.¹⁹ The postulated assimilation of ^x*niγnāire* to *niγrāire* should have resulted from a Vulgate pronunciation which at some point entered the manuscript tradition of F1's ancestors. Such corruption would have happened fairly early in the transmission of the text because of the consistent spelling with *-r-* in the manuscripts belonging to the F1-line. Although GELDNER, *Avesta* II 134 does not record any variant readings, a manuscript which he did not have at his disposal when editing the Avesta does yield decisive support to Insler's emendation: a spelling with *-n-* is attested in ms. J 18 of J. M. JamaspAsa's collection, where the reading is *niγnāiri* the first time (fol. 138v l. 4) and *niγrāira* the second (fol. 138v l. 9). Although J 18, dating from 1827 A. D., is a recent and often incorrect manuscript, the reading with *-n-* is likely to be *lectio difficilior* because the unique position taken by J 18 is confirmed by numerous other instances of variant readings which suggest that this manuscript was either influenced by, or even belonged to, a tradition independent of F1.²⁰ Since all mss. of the F1-line transmit the reading with *-r-*,

¹⁷ Cf. also the cautioning comment by KELLENS, *Noms-racines* 152 n. 3. There is, however, rare evidence for confusion of *r* and *n* in Yt 15.53, where K40 has *vīmərəkəre* whereas F1 and other mss. have *vīmanəkarə*. Confusion of the two signs is assumed by HUMBACH 1973, 188 in Vd 18.4, where he emends *aštrəm* ^x*ainīm* for *aštrəm mairīm* edited without variants by GELDNER, *Avesta* III 112.

¹⁸ HOFFMANN 1971, 72 (= *Aufs.* I 324).

¹⁹ I owe some clarification of this point to a discussion with P. O. SKJÆRVØ.

²⁰ The manuscript is described by HINTZE, *Zamyād-Yašt* 56 and 1989, 45-48. Another Khorde Avesta and Yašt codex, J19, of J. M. JamaspAsa's collection was equally not at Geldner's disposition, but, like J18, was kindly made available to me by Dastur Dr. K. M. JAMASPASA. Yt 10.40 is on fol. 198r l. 3-7, but unfortunately, the first section from *karətaciṭ* to *vouru.gaōiiaoitīš* has been omitted by the scribe. In the second half of the stanza, beginning with *vazraciṭ*, the reading of the verbal form is corrupt: *ne garāre*

that with *-n-* must belong to a tradition independent from the F1-line. In view of this new manuscript evidence, on the one hand, and of the morphological problems involved in positing a rare (stative) formation for an otherwise unattested Avestan root *gar*, on the other, it seems preferable on balance to accept Insler's suggestion. His assertive concluding comment that the emendation of *niγrāire* to **niγnāire* "should be adopted by all those working with Avestan material" (p. 264), is therefore justified.

Although the emended 3pl. form **niγnāire* fits well into the paradigm alongside a 3sg. stative *niγne*, the question remains as to why a root with punctual-terminative meaning like *jan* 'to hit, slay' takes stative endings. This problem is to be seen in connection with the root present formed by Av. *jan*, Ved. *han*. From a theoretical point of view, the root present is equally unexpected because Indo-Iranian action verbs which form athematic root presents usually have stative, durative or iterative verbal character. GARCÍA-RAMÓN 1998, 141, 146 f. consequently postulates that IE **g^{wh}en*, like other action verbs, originally had durative-iterative verbal character 'to hit repeatedly'. Under certain circumstances, the meaning 'to hit repeatedly' could become 'to slay, to kill'. Such an assumption of the root's durative-iterative verbal character would account for the forms of an athematic root present in both Vedic and Avestan, on the one hand, and for those with stative endings, attested in Avestan only, on the other. In Yt 10.40 the syntactic context of the stative **niγnāire* suggests the meaning '(the swords/maces) are struck repeatedly (on the heads of the mortals)'.

2. Vedic *gar^ḥ* 'to raise aloft'

In Vedic, forms which some scholars connect with an IIr. root *gar^ḥ* 'to raise (one's hand or weapon preparatory to striking)',²¹ are considered by others to belong to the homonymous root *gar^ḥ* (*gur*) 'to welcome, honour, praise'.²² Members of the latter group argue that when compounded with the preverb *ápa* the root *gar^ḥ* (*gur*) acquires the opposite meaning 'to blame, revile, abuse', just like the verb *ápa-vad* in Vedic Prose. The compound *apa-gur* would therefore denote the utterance of verbal abuse immediately prior to the physical attack.

Yet already the Dhātupāṭha records a separate root *gar^ḥ* (*gur*) 'to raise (a weapon)', glossed as *udyamane* 'raise aloft', in addition to *gar^ḥ* (*gur*) 'to welcome, honour, praise' and *gar^ḥ* (*gir*) 'to swallow'. Moreover, Sāyaṇa comments on RV 5.32.6 *apaḡūryā: ūrdhvaṃ vajram udyamya 'apaḡūryā* (means) having raised the cudgel'. SCHAEFER, *Intensivum* 117 n. 318, 118 suggests that Sāyaṇa may

(fol. 198r l. 4). The readings of J19 often agree with J10 rather than F1.

²¹ For instance GELDNER, *Rig-Veda* II 31, WACKERNAGEL/DEBRUNNER 1942, 159 and MAYRHOFER, *EWAia* I 470.

²² For instance by BÖHTLINGK/ROTH, *PW* II 766 f., GRASSMANN 402 f., DELBRÜCK, *Ai Syntax* 447, and more recently by SCHAEFER, *Intensivum* 116-122 whose conclusions are accepted, for instance, by KÜMMEL, *Stativ und Passivaorist* 147 n. 19; *LIV*² 208 n. 1.

have based his interpretation on the Dhātupāṭha gloss and, moreover, may also have misunderstood it in so far as the true sense of the gloss *udyamane* is ‘to raise one’s voice’. That is the meaning of the verb *ud-yam* in two Rigvedic passages where it occurs with the object *vācas-* ‘word, speech’. Against this view, however, is the context of RV 5.32.6-7, where not only does *apa-gur* occur but so also does *ud-yam* with the clear meaning ‘to raise a weapon’ (*vádhar-*):

RV 5.32.6

tám cin mandānó vṛṣabháh sutásyocair índro apagúryā jaghāna //

Indra, the bull, intoxicated by the pressed (Soma), having raised (his arm) aloft,²³ slew precisely this one.

RV 5.32.7

úd yád índro mahaté dānaváya vádhar yámiṣṭa sáho ápratitam /

yád im vājrasya prábhṛtau dadábha vísvasya jantór adhamám cakāra //

When Indra raised his murderous-weapon, his unopposed force, against the mighty Dānu-son, when he outwitted him in brandishing the cudgel, he made him the lowest of all creatures.

Stanza 7 clarifies stanza 6 in so far as *úd . . . vádhar yámiṣṭa* explains *apagúryā*, i. e. in the way that Sāyaṇa understood it. Moreover, the passage mentions a trick used by Indra against his enemy (*yád im vājrasya prábhṛtau dadábha* ‘when he outwitted him in brandishing the cudgel’). Narten convincingly interprets this verse as alluding to a special technique employed by Indra when fighting against Vṛtra.²⁴ His ploy is referred to as *māyā-* in other, less explicit passages, such as RV 1.80.7 and RV 1.32.4:

RV 1.32.4

yád indráhan prathamajám áhīnām án māyínām ámināḥ próta māyāḥ /

When you, O Indra, slew the first-born of the dragons, then you outwitted even the deceptions of the deceitful ones.

The same device further used by Indra against his enemy is also referred to in the context of the second attestation of *apa-gur* in RV 5.29.4:

RV 5.29.4

ád ródasī vitarám ví ṣkabhāyat saṃviviyānás cid bhīyáse mṛgám kaḥ /

jígartim índro apajárgurāṇaḥ práti śvasántam áva dānavám han //

Then he stemmed heaven and earth apart. Having cloaked himself he frightened the wild animal. Indra, raising (his arm), slew the voracious, hissing Dānu-son.

²³ SCHAEFER, *Intensivum* 116 interprets *uccaiḥ* as ‘loud’ which would characterize a *verbum dicendi*. However, in the Saṃhitās (here and in the Atharva Veda) the form has the local meaning ‘high’, the metaphorical use ‘loud’ being attested only from Vedic Prose onwards.

²⁴ NARTEN 1988-90, 148 n.14 (= *Kl.Schr.* 386). On the practice of deception or trickery as applied in combat, see INSLER 1969, 23-24, where the relevant expression in RV 5.32.7 is translated as ‘when he tricked him into the impact of the cudgel’. On *pra-bhar* as a technical term for threatening with a weapon, see above p. 3 n. 6.

The perfect participle *saṃvivyānāḥ* ‘having cloaked himself’ describes the trick which Indra used to frighten *Vṛtra*. More details are found in RV 2.30.3:

RV 2.30.3

*ūrdhvō hy ásthād ádhy antárikṣé ’dhā vṛtráya prá vadháṃ jabhāra /
míhaṃ vásāna úpa hím ádudrot tigmāyudho ajayac chátṛum índraḥ //*

For he stood upright in the sky and thrust his murderous-weapon at *Vṛtra*. Enveloping himself in a cloud he had run up to him. Having a sharp weapon, Indra defeated the enemy.

GELDNER, *Rig-Veda* I 313 interprets *míhaṃ vásānaḥ* ‘enveloping himself in a cloud’ as referring to a ploy by *Vṛtra*. However, apart from the awkward change of subject that this involves, RV 5.29.4 *saṃvivyānāḥ* confirms that it was Indra who was cloaked in a cloud while approaching the serpent in order to slay it. It is in this situation that the verb *apa-gur* occurs, immediately preceding Indra’s action of ‘slaying’ (*han*) the serpent.

In any case, the passages quoted suggest that Indra employed a physical trick rather than a verbal one – as would be implied if *apa-gur* meant ‘to revile, abuse’ – in the situation immediately preceding the act of slaying. Moreover, none of the innumerable allusions in the RV to his great feat mentions that the god made an insulting speech before slaying the serpent. In its two Rigvedic attestations (RV 5.29.4 and 5.32.6), *apa-gur* occurs as an absolutive and a participle respectively, without object but qualifying the verb *han* in both instances. The syntactic context suggests that the action denoted by *apa-gur* immediately precedes, and forms part of, that expressed by the verb *han*.

Not only in the Rigveda but also in Vedic Prose forms of *apa-gur* occur in the textual vicinity of the verb *han* ‘to slay’. From the Taittirīya Saṃhitā onwards, forms of *gur* with prefixes *apa*, *ava* and *ud* appear particularly in legal contexts where *apa-gur* denotes an action immediately preceding a physical attack. It describes the first of three stages by which one person inflicts bodily injury on another with a weapon. The verbs characterizing the different stages are *ápa-gur* for the one before the attack, *ní-han* ‘to strike down’ for the second stage referring to the blow with a weapon, and finally *lohitaṃ kṛ* ‘to shed blood’, describing the effects of the blow.²⁵

A comparable distinction is also found in Zoroastrian law where special terms for various offences, defined in Vd 4.17-43, N 42 and FiO 25b (= KLINGENSCHMITT, FiO § 699-704), form part of its legal terminology. While there are some differences between the lists of the Videvdad and that of the Farhang-ī oīm, the latter enumerates six offences in order of increasing gravity. The Middle Persian terms are *āgrift*, *ōirišt*, *arduš*, *xwar*, *bāzā-zanišnīh* and *yād*. All concern physical attack and any possible injury resulting therefrom. The mildest one, *āgrift* (‘*glpt*,

²⁵ The relevant passages are quoted by OERTEL, 1931, 287 f.; BURROW 1957b, 9-11; SCHAEFER, *Intensivum* 117 f.

Av. *āgərəpta-* from *ā-grab* ‘to seize’), is committed by rising up to grasp a weapon (*snavθem usəhištaiti* Vd 4.17) with the intention of hitting an innocent person (KLINGENSCHMITT § 699, Vd 4.18-21). The second, *ōirišt* (+*’wwylšt*, Av. *auuaoirišta-* from *auua-uruuaēs* ‘to turn (a weapon) towards, against someone’, *AirWb.* 168 f.) denotes the offence of wielding a weapon against such a one (FiO § 700, Vd 4.21-25). The Videvdad explains that one attacks (*yaṭ frašusaiti* Vd 4.17) with a weapon turned against another person (*auua-uruuaēs*). The third, Av. *arəduš-*, MP *arduš* (*’lduš*), applies when one actually hits another person with a weapon with the intention of inflicting an injury (*aēnō.manayha paiti. ašnaoiti* Vd 4.17) but without causing a visible wound (FiO § 701, *arədusa snavθa jaiṇti* Vd 4.26, 29). As suggested by BARTHOLOMAE, *AirWb.* 194, the noun *arəduš-* belongs with the Vedic verb *ard*, the meaning of which was established by GOTŌ as ‘to stagger, lurch, flounder’.²⁶ Both the Vedic cognate and the position taken by the Av. term *arəduš-* in the hierarchy of physical attacks suggest that *arəduš-snavθa-* denotes a stroke which causes the victim to shake and lose balance but without being visibly wounded (*x’ara-*).

The fourth offence entails a visible injury, *x’ara-* (FiO 702), of which the Videvdad distinguishes three types. One does not bleed (*yō narəm vīxrūmənṭəm x’arəm jaiṇti* ‘the one who strikes a man a wound that does not bleed’ Vd 4.30, 33), the second does (*tacaṭ.vohunīm x’arəm jaiṇti* ‘he strikes a wound characterized by running blood’ Vd 4.34, 36) and the third one results in a broken bone (*astō.biḍəm x’arəm jaiṇti* ‘he strikes a wound characterized by a broken bone’ Vd 4.37, 39). Of the latter, the FiO distinguishes two types. As convincingly argued by Gert Klingenschmitt, the specific case of hitting and injuring someone’s arm is called *bāzujata-* in Av. and rendered into Pahlavi as *b’c’y znšnyh* (*bāzā-zanišnāh*, also written *b’c’y MḤYTWN-šnyh*, KLINGENSCHMITT § 703 with n. 2, N 42), while the other one, Av. *yāta-*, Pahl. *y’t lwbšn /yād rawišn/*, entails doing the same to someone’s leg (§ 704, N 42). The fifth and final offence is a fatal stroke (*frazābaodaghəm snavθem jaiṇti* ‘he strikes a fatal stroke’ Vd 4.40, 43).²⁷

²⁶ GOTŌ, *I. Präsensklasse* 102-104 and 1993, 119 f., cf. also *LIV*² 223 f. The Vedic causative *ardāya-* ‘make shake violently, set in violent motion, shake to pieces’ appears both with *vṛtrām* and the demons destroyed by Indra as direct objects, see JAMISON, *āya-Formations* 107 with n. 2, GOTŌ, *I. Präsensklasse* 104. Accordingly, *arəduš-* is a derivative with suffix *-uš-* from the root *ard* ‘to shake’. The suffix *-uš-* attached directly to the root has the same function as *-as-* and denotes the carrying out of the action expressed by the verbal root (*AiGr.* II 2 pp. 229, 489). In the expression *arəduš-snavθa-* the syntactic relationship between the two nouns is that of an apposition if *arəduš-* is a substantive. Alternatively, *arəduš-* could also function as an adjective, cf. on adjectives in *-uš-* *AiGr.* II 2 p. 490 f.

²⁷ According to BARTHOLOMAE 1899, 6 n. 1 and *AirWb.* 1005 n. 3, *fra-zā-* in *frazā-baodah-* stands for *fra-zyā-* and comes from *zyā* ‘to harm’, thus also DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN, *Composés* 72. It is more likely, however, that the compound contains the root *zā* ‘to leave behind’. The Ved. equivalent *hā* forms a compound *fra-hā* ‘to leave, desert, abandon, quit’ and a feminine root noun *prahā-* which occurs as a technical gambling term denoting an ‘advantage’, but whose precise meaning is difficult to determine, see SCARLATA,

Although different vocabularies are used in Iranian and Vedic, the first two stages of the Zoroastrian system, preceding the actual attack and denoted by Av. *āgərəpta-* (Pahl. *āgrift*) and *auuaoirišta-* (Pahl. *ōirišt*) respectively, resemble *apa-gur* in Vedic law. Av. *arəduš-* (Pahl. *arduš*) and the blow to produce a non-bleeding wound, Av. *vīxrūmañt- x^vara-*, correspond to the Vedic second stage denoted by *ni-han* ‘to strike down’, while the varieties of Av. *x^vara-* (Pahl. *xwar*) involving blood as well as the ‘fatal blow’, Av. *frazābaodah- snaθa-*, agree with Vedic *lohitaṃ kṛ* ‘to shed blood’. The Vedic and Avestan correspondences are summarized in the following table:

Types of physical injury in Vedic and Avestan

Stage	Offence	Vedic	Avestan
One: Preparing for an assault	Seizing a weapon with the intention of physical attack	<i>apa-gur</i> ‘to raise (one’s hand or weapon preparatory to striking)’	<i>āgərəpta-</i> seize a weapon <i>auuaoirišta-</i> turn a weapon against a person
Two: Carrying out an assault without shedding blood	Hitting a person with a weapon but without shedding any blood	<i>ni-han</i> ‘to strike down’	<i>arəduš- snaθa-</i> a stroke which causes the person hit to shake and lose balance <i>x^vara- vīxrūmañt-</i> a non-bleeding injury
Three: Carrying out an assault with shedding blood	Hitting a person with a weapon so as to shed blood	<i>lohitaṃ kṛ</i> ‘to shed blood’	<i>x^vara- tacaṭ.vohunīm</i> a bleeding injury <i>x^vara- astō.bid-</i> injury resulting in fracture: 1. <i>bāzujata-</i> of the arm 2. <i>yāta-</i> of the leg <i>frazābaodah- snaθa-</i> a fatal stroke

As in the Rig-Vedic passages, in Vedic Prose the action denoted by *apa-gur* immediately precedes that expressed by the verb *han*. That such action consists in raising one’s arm in preparation for a stroke is suggested by the position taken by Ved. *apa-gur* in the classification of physical injuries. Like Av. *āgərəpta-* and

Wurzelkomposita 698-700. As an exocentric compound and an epithet of a blow or strike (*snaθa-*), the literal meaning of *frazābaodah-* is ‘characterized by leaving perception’. That perception (*baodah-*) leaves the body at the moment of death, is stated in Vd 7.2 *išarə pasca para.īristīm ... us haca baodō aiiāt* ‘immediately after death ... perception will go away from (the body).’

auuaoirišta-, it denotes the handling of a weapon in preparation for a physical attack.

3. Conclusion

This investigation shows that while the alleged Avestan evidence for *gar* ‘to raise (one’s hand or weapon preparatory to striking)’ has to be abandoned, forms of this root *are* attested in Vedic. There remains, however, the semantic problem of how to reconcile the meaning of Vedic *gar* with that of Greek $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$. The latter refers to ‘hitting by throwing’ using a weapon such as a spear, stone or arrow²⁸ while, as rightly pointed out by KELLENS, *Noms-racines* 151 n. 3, the cudgel is a weapon which is not thrown but held in the hand when striking an enemy. Yet in spite of their different use, Vedic *gar* and Greek $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ are semantically close since both describe aspects of an action aimed at hitting an enemy with a weapon either held in or released from the hand. If the two verbs are etymologically related, the older Greek application would be that of hitting by throwing a weapon such as a spear or a stone, while the shooting of an arrow would be a later use. In order to achieve the maximum impact of the weapon thrown – at least as far as spear and stone are concerned – the aggressor has to raise his arm forcefully and aim precisely. This part of the action, which is essential and decisive for its success, is denoted in Vedic by *gar*, reinforced by the preverb *apa* ‘away’. The path of the weapon from the aggressor’s hand to the enemy remains outside his control regardless of whether the weapon is hurled through the air or forcefully struck down on the victim while being held in the hand. In both forms of aggression, the success of the blow entirely depends on the preparatory stage of raising the arm and aiming precisely. Such stage is highlighted by the Vedic verb *apa-gur*, while the meaning of Greek $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ focuses on the success of the action when the victim is hit.

It may therefore be suggested that in IE the root $*g^welh_1$ denoted the action of raising an arm with a weapon in one’s hand in order to hit an enemy. The weapon could either be used to strike the victim while being retained in the aggressor’s hand or released and thrown through the air. In Greek, a semantic specialization took place in which the meaning was narrowed down to hitting an enemy with a weapon thrown at them. In Vedic the verb has become obsolete, presumably because of pressure from the homonymous roots *gar* ‘to welcome’ and *gar* ‘to swallow’. The verb in its original meaning survives only in two Rigvedic attestations and later as a legal technical term denoting, like its antecedent in the Rigveda, the forceful raising of one’s arm preparatory to striking with a weapon.

²⁸ TICHY 1979, 201 f.; SCHAEFER, *Intensivum* 119 with references.

R e f e r e n c e s

- ATKINS 1950: S. D. Atkins, "The Meaning of Vedic *aktú*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 70, 24-40.
- AiGr.* see: WACKERNAGEL(/DEBRUNNER).
- BAILEY 1956: H. W. Bailey, "Armeno-Indo-iranica." *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 88-126.
- BARTHOLOMAE *AirWb.*: Chr. Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Straßburg: Trübner, 1904, repr. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1979.
- BARTHOLOMAE 1899: Chr. Bartholomae, "Arica IX." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 10, 1-20.
- BÖHTLINGK/ROTH *PW*: O. Böhtlingk/R. Roth, *Sanskrit Wörterbuch*. Herausgegeben von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. St Petersburg 1855-1875, reprint 1966.
- BURROW 1957 a: Th. Burrow, "Sanskrit *gṛ/gur* 'to welcome'." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 20 (= *Fs Sir Ralph TURNER*), 133-144.
- BURROW 1957 b: Th. Burrow, "Nirvacanāni." *Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras* 13, Sect. 5, 4-13.
- DELBRÜCK *AiSyntax*: B. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*. Halle 1888 (Syntaktische Forschungen 5), reprint Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchgesellschaft, 1976.
- DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN *Composés*: J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *Les composés de l'Avesta*. Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, 1936 (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 74).
- EWAia* see: MAYRHOFER, *EWAia*.
- GARCÍA-RAMÓN 1998: J. L. García-Ramón, "Indogermanisch **g^{uh}en-* '(wiederholt) schlagen', 'töten'." In: J. JASANOFF, H. Craig MELCHERT and Lisi OLIVER (eds.), *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert WATKINS*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 139-154.
- GELDNER, *Avesta*: K. F. Geldner, *Avesta*. The sacred books of the Parsis. 3 vols., Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1896. 1889. 1896.
- GELDNER, *Rig-Veda*: K. F. Geldner, *Der Rig-Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt*. 3 Bde., Cambridge, Mass., 1951 (= Harvard Oriental Series 33-35).
- GERSHEVITCH, *Mithra*: I. Gershevitch, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra*. With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary. Cambridge: CUP, 1959, repr. 1967.
- GOTŌ, *I. Präsensklasse*: T. Gotō, *Die I. Präsensklasse im Vedischen*. Untersuchungen der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia. Wien: Österr. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1987 (*SbÖAW* 489).
- GOTŌ 1993: T. Gotō, "Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen, Nr. 8-15." *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology* 18, no. 1, 119-141.
- GRASSMANN: H. Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig 1893, reprint Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1964, 6th revised edition 1996.
- HINTZE, *Zamyād-Yašt* A. Hintze, *Der Zamyād-Yašt. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Wiesbaden: Reichert 1994 (Beitäge zur Iranistik 15).

- HINTZE 1989: A. Hintze, "F1, E1 und drei neue Yašt-Handschriften". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 50, 31-50.
- HOFFMANN, *Aufs.*: K. Hoffmann, *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. 3 vols., Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1975. 1976. 1992.
- HOFFMANN 1971: K. Hoffmann, "Zum Zeicheninventar der Avesta-Schrift." In: W. EILERS (ed.), *Festgabe Deutscher Iranisten zur 2500 Jahrfeier Irans*. Stuttgart: Hochwacht (= *Aufs.* I 316-326).
- HOFFMANN/FORSSMAN: K. Hoffmann/B. Forssman, *Avestische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 1996 (IBS 84).
- HUMBACH 1973: H. Humbach, "Beobachtungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Avesta." *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31, 109-122.
- INSLER 1967: St. Insler, "Avestan *niγrāire*." *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 81, 259-264.
- INSLER 1968: St. Insler, "Vedic *juhuras*, *juhūrthās*, *juhuranta* and *juhurāṇá*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88, 1968, 219-223.
- INSLER 1969: St. Insler, "Vedic *dambhátyati*." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 74, 13-31.
- JAMISON, *-áya-Formations*: St. W. Jamison, *Function and Form in the -áya-Formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983 (Ergänzungsheft zur Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung 31).
- KELLENS, *Noms-racines*: J. Kellens, *Les noms-racines de l'Avesta*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1974.
- KELLENS, *Verbe av.*: J. Kellens, *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1984.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, *FiO*: G. Klingenschmitt, *Farhang-i oīm*. Edition und Kommentar. (Unpublished PhD dissertation). Erlangen 1968.
- KÜMMEL, *Perfekt*: M. J. Kümmel, *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen*. Eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2000.
- KÜMMEL, *Stativ und Passivaorist*: M. J. Kümmel, *Stativ und Passivaorist im Indoiranischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996 (Historische Sprachforschung, Ergänzungsheft 39).
- LIV*²: H. RIX et alii, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1998, 2., erw. und verb. Aufl. 2001.
- MAYRHOFFER, *EWAia*: M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg: Winter, vol. I 1992, vol. II 1996, vol. III 1997 ff.
- NARTEN, *Kl. Schr.*: J. Narten, *Kleine Schriften*. Ed. by M. ALBINO and M. FRITZ. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1995.
- NARTEN, *YH*: J. Narten, *Der Yasna Haptaḡhāiti*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1986.
- NARTEN 1969: J. Narten, "Ai. *sr* in synchronischer und diachronischer Sicht." *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 26, 77-103 (= *Kl. Schr.* 125-143).
- NARTEN 1988-90: J. "Die vedischen Verbalwurzeln *dambh* und *dabh*." *Die Sprache* 34, 142-157 (= *Kl. Schr.* 380-395).