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Abstract

The PIIran. verbal composition *mans dʰā is attested in Av. mān/men/mas/maz(...)/dā and underlies many derivatives in Av. and Ved., e.g. Av. mazā- = Ved. medā-. In this paper the morphology and etymology of *mans, which has not ever been examined thoroughly, is investigated from a viewpoint of historical linguistics. It is made clear that *mans can represent the gen. sg. of a root noun *man- ‘thought’ or one of the acc./gen./loc. sg. of the old nominal -s-stem *man-s- ‘thought,’ while forms with a different ablaut *mas- is the stem form of the same s-stem. *mas- as a prevarb or *mans- as the first member of a nominal composition are the results of secondary introduction of *mas- of nominal compositions and the case form *mans respectively. This conclusion will be the basis of the syntactic study of *mans dʰā.

1. Introduction

The PIIran. verbal composition *mans dʰā (< dʰaH < PIE *dʰeh₁ ‘put, place, set’) is evidenced by YAv. mcts ... dā (lx) and OAv. mān/men- (4x). The identification of the OAv. and YAv. forms is above all based on the fact that OAv. mān/men- is not only repeated as mās within the Av. text itself (→ 3.1), but it also shows common syntactic and semantic features with the YAv. counterpart. Thus they all, if finite verbs, conjugate in the middle voice and take Zoroaster or a believer of his religion as its subject and the doctrines of the religion of Mazdā, etc., (in a noun or noun clause) as its direct object. They have been translated as ‘dem Gedächtnis einprägen’ etc. (Bartholomae), ‘achten auf ..., sich einprägen’ (Humbach), ‘tenir/prendre compte de ...; être attentif à ...’ (Kellens-Pirart), ‘note in (one’s) mind’ (Humbach et al.), ‘den Sinn auf etwas richten, Gedanken anstellen’ (Scarlata) etc., e.g. Y° 44,8 or sl mōi vaocā ahūra ‘māzdā (masdi) yā tōi mazdā

1 The following abbreviations are used in this article: PIE = Proto-Indo-European, PIIran. = Proto-Indo-Iranian, PAv. = Proto-Avestan, OAv. = Old Avestan, YAv. = Young Avestan, Ved. = Vedic, Gr. = Greek, Lat. Latin, OCS = Old Church Slavic; Y = Yasna (the superscript Y and ° before Y denote YAv. and OAv. respectively), RV = Rig-Veda-Sanhitā, AV = Atharva-Veda-Sanhitā, VS = Vājasaneyi-Sanhitā, KS = Kathaka-Sanhitā, TS = Taittirīya Sanhitā, Baudhāyana-Sūtra, Taittirīya-Sūtra, Dharmasūtra = Āpastamba-Sūtra (* denotes that the example belongs to the prosaic portion). Popular abbreviations such as acc. gen., inf. mid. are not included here.

2 Not dā ‘give’, see the YAv. example Y° 9,31 mās ... datānahe (perf. ptcple).

Tell me (= Zoroaster) straightforward, o Master, in order that I (can) pay attention to / note in my mind / etc. (inf.), what is your instructions, o Mazda!’ One could add OAv. mëng (1x) accompanied by no verb, which itself phonologically corresponds to YAv. mags, but must remain uncertain unless approved by syntax. YAv. mazdā- ‘wise’ and OAv. hu-mazdā- ‘very learned’ are evidently derived from *mans dā. On the other hand, a different ablaut of *mans is to be seen in *mas (< *mags) of OAv. verb maz-dā (1x/2x) and some derivatives such as Av. mazdā- ‘wisdom; wise; god’s name’ = Ved. medhā- ‘wisdom,’ Ved. médhira- ‘wise’ (~ Av. [-]mazdra-), Ved. mandhātār- ‘wise, sage; nom. prop.’ and some more. In view of the variations Av. māṇ/māṇa/mag(…)/māz-dā as well as Av. (-)mazdra- ~ Ved. médhira-, there can be no doubt that *mans and *mas are of the same origin. As observed in the meanings given to the related words above, a concept of the semantical domain ‘thought, mind, memory, attention’ etc. has been assumed for PIIran. *mans/mas. However, the morphology of *mans/mas and the syntax of *mans/mas dā have hardly been investigated sufficiently, although a better understanding of many important vocabularies like mazdā- could contribute directly to the elucidation of aspects of Zoroastrianism. In this paper I will examine all the possible etymologies of *mans/mas based on the Indo-Iranian evidence of this and other related words. Only such a morphological study will enable us to clarify the syntactic and semantic relationship between *mans/mas and *dā and also the original meanings of such words as mazdā-, mazdra-, all of which I will discuss in another article.

2 Etymology of PIIran. *mans

Relating māṇ/māṇa/mag(…)/māz(…)/māzdā with a PIE root *mendh, if any such, repeatedly alleged by Bartholomae (e.g. Wb 1136, 1181), has long been given up. To recognize the difficulty of his idea, it would be sufficient to point out that he was forced to derive maz-dā from “*man(δ)-dha” (i.e. *mandɛdā, and maz-dā from *ma(d)ɛdā) and assume that *mend itself, influenced by maz-dā or zraz-dā, not only conjugated like a verb with dā, but even split into māṇ/māṇa and dā,5 which is too hypothetical and cannot but complicate the situation. We should start from a s-including PIIran. *mans, as generally accepted. There are two possible etymologies to be examined below.

2.1 *mans as the gen./abl. sg. of the root noun *man-

Humbach et al., (1991) II 197 explains YO 48,2 mëng phonologically the proper OAv. form correspondent to PIIr. *mans, as a “petrified gen.sg. of a root noun *man- ‘mind’” (functioning as an adverb ‘in mind’), which they identify with māṇ/māṇa. Morphologically this analysis is well justified. Schindler (1972) proposed two types of ablaut, each with two subgroups7, for the root noun in PIE: the one with the ablaut {strong = ὅ-full grade :: weak = ὐ-full grade (with gen.-s)/e-full

---

1 It is to be investigated how far this no doubt very archaic expression *mans dā goes back in the PIE and how broadly this was spread in other IE languages, using the possible IE materials suggested frequently such as Gr. μνήμα, OCS mdr₃ (~ Av. mazdra-), cf. Frisk, Hjalmar Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. 1973 Heidelberg. II 171, Mayrhofer EWAia 378 with literature. But since we know no sure evidence of the syntax corresponding to PIIr. *mans dā and therefore this should be examined within inside Indo-Iranian first of all, I do not go into the other IE languages in this article.


6 But on another morphological possibility of Y 48,2 mëng see 3.3.

7 His argument is reviewed and developed by Scarlata (2000) 755ff.
grade/zero grade (with gen. -öś[-ėś])) represents “substantifs féminins à valeur résultative ou passive” or “noms d’agent (substantifs et adjetsifs), souvent avec une nuance itérative”; the other type shows the ablaut {strong = é-full grade :: weak = zero grade (with gen. -öś[-ėś])} and can be “noms d’action” or “noms d’agent tirés de verbes d’état.” According to this definition *mans- can be the regular genitive of the root noun *man- belonging to the first type just like PIE *dóm-(strong) ‘house’ ~ gen. sg. *dém-s > PIlr. *dams: OAv. dōng in dōng patōis = Ved. pāṭir dān9 (Schindler op. cit. 32). *man- would then mean ‘what is thought, thought (?)’ although it still remains to be examined to what extent the semantic value posited by Schindler can be supported.10

An indirect support for the root noun *man- would be that a root noun besides a -s-stem (manah-) can be seen otherwise too in IE languages, e.g. PIlr. *kṛṣ- ‘body’ ~ Lat. corpus ‘do.’ (Schindler 1979: 58f.).

To be compared is a similar verbal composition OAv. yaoś ... dā and YAv. yaoz-dā. Schindler (1975) 266 thinks yaoś/yaoz to be an old acc. sg. of a -s-stem PIE *yēu-s-. Nevertheless, it is most likely the gen. sg. (< PIE. *hjēù-s) of Av. āīīu- ‘life, vital force’ (= Ved. āyu-‘life’ < PIE. *hjēu-), as is first suggested by Kuiper (1942) 31f., who connected it with other case forms of the same stem: acc. sg. OAv. āīīu ~ dat. sg. yavōī, yavē, YAv. yauue. This is reviewed later philologically by Szemerényi (1979) 165ff.11, who defined the meaning of yaoz-dā as ‘place within the sphere of vital force’ (genitive of sphere), so ‘endow with vital power.’ We could then see a similar construction in *mans as gen. sg. and dā, as is already pointed out by Stüber (2002) 28f.

The problem of this idea is that the root noun of the verb man- ‘think’ is otherwise hardly attested in Indo-Iranian (as well as in Greek), cf. 3.3.12 Probably the only possible example is Ved. man-īśā- ‘thinking, mental activity.’ As far as this meaning is originating in ‘the shaft of thought’ as is paraphrased by Yāska (see Thieme 1967: 99),13 the first member of the compound can be nothing but a root noun.14 If it comes from *mánas- or *mans-, we would have to assume an ‘irgendwie unregelmäßig gebildete[s] Komposition aus manas „Denken“ + īśā „Deichsel“’ (loc. cit.) or at least an unusual drop of the final -s- of *mans- before a vowel.

2.2 *mans as related to *mánas-
2.2.1 Stem form or case form?

The most prevailing view is to regard *mans as identical with the well-attested word Av. manah-

---

8 Jean Haudry (1977) L’emploi des cas en vedique. Lyon. L’hermès: 459 also points out the possibility of ‘le nom racine de *men- as well as ‘son élargissement en *-s- (cf. mene/os-) sous la forme du thème nu’, but without any further morphological discussion.
9 The weak form of the gen. ending -s is also otherwise preserved in Indo-Iranian, e.g. OAv. caśmēng ‘of the eye, of the sight’ (caśman-), xēng ‘of the sun’ (< PIr. hūgan) ~ Ved. svār (< PIlr. *sīgar-s), YAv. zoostař (zaotar-) ‘of the Zaotar-priest (the pourer)’ = hōtur (hautr-s).
10 Schindler (1975: 266) himself takes *mans as the acc. sg. of an old -s-stem (see below).
11 For other literature see Mayrhofer EWAia s.v. yōs.
12 Cf. Schindler, (1972) Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen. Würzburg (Diss.). The Av. root noun -man- included in YAv. framan.nara- and framan.narō.vīra- belong to another root man ‘wait, remain,’ as Klingenschmitt (1967) made clear: ‘(the dawn aśah-) by which the men (and the champions) remain at the front.’
13 Gotō (1997) 1021 n. 112, supporting this traditional view, suggests ‘Orientierung, Richtungsbestimmung des Denkens, Nachdenken, Planung.’
14 Another option *mani- ‘Gedanke’ suggested by Thieme op. cit. 103 is very improbable.
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‘thinking; thinking power/organ; thought’ = Ved. mánas- ‘do.’ = Gr. μενός ‘do.’ < PIE *ménos/ménes- with the zero grade of the suffix *-as-. But it is often unexpressed whether *mans represents a stem form or some case form. First it should be confirmed that *mans can only be an oblique case form, i.e. an independent word. The existence of a naked noun stem used as a preverb (or an adverb) is very unlikely in the PIE15, still more so as the five Av. examples of *mans even show free use (tmesis), though this could also be a later development. A stem form as preverb can scarcely be found otherwise in Old Indo-Iranian. One would think of the well-known verbal composition YAv. zras ... dā ‘put one’s faith (in ...), trust, believe’ (~ OAv. zrazdā- ‘putting one’s faith, trusting’) ~ Ved. śrad(-)dha ‘do.’ (~ śradhā- ‘faith, trust’). It is true that Av. zras/zrad- ~ Ved. šrād go back to PIE *krēd- (> Ved. śrad-) or *g̥rēd- (> Av. zrad-), which was, unlike *mans, firmly established as a preverb to *dēh, already in the PIE period, cf. Lat. crēdō ‘I believe’ (Goto 2007: 566f.). However, this cannot be positive support for a noun stem as preverb, since PIE *krēd-/*g̥rēd- is understood without problem as an independent form, namely the nom./acc. sg. of a neuter noun of the same stem16. — The pres. stem OAv. išūdīia- ‘give strength’ = Ved. iṣudhya- ‘strive for, aim at’ might be a pres. stem (ja-present?) of the verbal composition with a stem form as the first element *iśū-dā based on the syntagma *iśūm dā ‘fit an arrow,’ as this assumption fits the meaning of Ved. iṣudhya- very well. But this is no doubt a denominative,17 as clearly shown by its derivatives O/YAv. iṣud- ‘strength(ning)’ and RV iṣdhudyū- ‘striving’ (adj.), iṣudhyā- ‘striving’ (subst.).

As shown above *mans- cannot be a stem form in its origin. Then, *mans- as a stem would only be possible if it were a form extracted from nominal compounds such as Av. (-)mazdra-, Ved. mandhātār-, where a nominal stem is usually used. But this again cannot be true, because another stem form in nominal compounds *mas- < *mn-s- (Av. mazda- = Ved. medhā-, medhira-) is much better attested and probably represents the original and legitimate ablaut (– 4.1). All these observations enable us to postulate some lost oblique case of *ménos/ménes- as the starting point of our discussion in this chapter.

2.2.2 *mans as a case form of *manas-

Since *mans cannot be explained within the paradigm of PIE *mén-os-∅ (strong: nom./acc.) ~ mén-es- (weak) with fixed accent and without ablaut, as reconstructed from the Indo-Iranian and Greek evidence, one must search for the still earlier stage where the word may have shown ablaut. Schindler (1975) 264ff. suggested that the original ablaut of the neuter s-stem in PIE was proterodynamic and had the ablaut {strong = é-full grade R[oot] + S[uffix] -s (nom./acc.) :: weak = zero grade R. + S. -ēs} before the stage of {strong = é-full grade R. + S. -os :: weak = é-full grade R.}

15 Cf. Schindler (1975) 266: “Da es im Indogermanischen Verbalkomposita mit Nominalstamm im Vorderglied nicht gegeben hat, muß in *mans, was auch die Tmesis erweist, eine selbständige Wortform vorliegen”. Av. zras (for *zrad) ... dā ‘to trust.’
16 Schindler in the review of Kellens, Les noms-racines de l’Avesta (Sprache 25,1, 1979: 58f.) assumes an original -s-stem *krēd-s-, just as he does so for *man-s-, see below.
17 Probably from PIIr. *iśū-dī- = Ved. iṣū-dhi- meaning *fitting an arrow, aiming at,’ see Graumann (1873) 227. Most interpretations try to connect the verb to OAv. iš- ‘power,’ Ved. iṣ- ‘refreshment, nourishment’ and explain -ud- in some way or other, most notably suggesting *iśū-ud- with such meaning as ‘bring strength to ...’ by PIIr. *vad- ‘take/bring (a woman for marriage towards one’s house),’ see Mayrhofer EWAlia s.v. with literature.
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+ S. -es} as we actually have. Stüber (2002) 19ff., 199ff., supports Schindler’s theory by comprehensively examining IE s-stems. With this scheme we get *mén-s ~ mn-és- or men-és (by the leveling in favor of the strong root) in an early stage of PIE. According to Schindler op. cit. 266 this old nom./acc. *mén-s is found in our PIIr. *mans. He further assumes that the same is true of PIIr. *jauś dā (OAv. yaoś ... dā, YAv. yaoś-dā: Mayrhofer EWAia s.v. yōś ‘mit Lebenskraft versehen’, Schindler loc. cit. ‘Heil setzen, heilwirkend machen’). *jauś, however, is understood also as the gen. sg. of Av. āitiis- ‘Leben, Lebenskraft’ not only morphologically but also syntactically, as most scholars after him think (→ 2.1).

In restoring the proterodynamic type as the original flexion of the s-neuter, one has to rely only on a few examples apparently with the expected ablaut taken from various Indo-European languages. Among the materials Stüber (op. cit. 199f.) used, for example, only Hitt. word coming from PIE *h₂eh₁-os (strong) ‘mouth’ ~ *h₁h₁-és-os shows this ablaut within one and the same paradigm, all the others being defectively attested only in its weak form. This means that the assumption of the proterodynamic type is more or less hypothetical, and, therefore, it would not be useless to consider other morphological possibilities of *mans within the frame of different flexion types.

We can also mention the acc. or the gen./abl. sg. of the acrodynamic type with the ablaut {strong = ő-full-grade R. + zero-grade S. :: weak = é-full-grade R. + zero-grade S.}, according to which acc. *món-s and gen./abl. *mén-s-s > *mén-s would be gained, both resulting in PIIr. *máns, cf. PIE *nokʷ-t- ‘night’ (strong) ~ gen. sg. *nokʷ-t-s > Hitt. nekuz. Schindler (1975) 264, in his argument against the acrodynamic type, only refers to the abnormality of the full-grade of suffix. But notice that, as he (op. cit. 267) pointed out, another type of the acrodynamic flexion with ę-long grade of root in the strong stem (Ved. váhás- ‘cloth’, váhás- ‘bringing [an offering]’, Gr. γηρᾶς ‘old age’ [~ γέρας ‘gift of honor’], ἱθος ‘custom’ [~ θος ‘do.’]) may have existed in PIE (cf. Stüber op. cit. 22, 204ff.). Finally the loc.sg. without ending of the same acrodynamic type would also be possible as well, cf. loc. sig. OAv. dám of dam- ‘house’ (→ YAv. daṇī). Only it should be remarked that the IE loc. sg. often takes a special ablaut distinct from that of the other strong cases: e-full grade or ę-long grade either in root or suffix18. It may, therefore, be more accurate to mention simply *mén as a possible loc. sg. of *mén-s- rather than to strictly connect it to a particular flexion type. The loc. may seem even more possible because it can be naturally connected with dā ‘put ... in thought/mind’ etc. just as a loc. sg. is proposed for PIE *kréd in *kréd-dēh₁ (Ved. śrād-dāḥa ∼ Av. zras/zrad[...]dā) ‘mettre dans le coeur’ (Sandoz in Kellens 1974: 208). But Indo-Iranian knows only the loc. sg. with the case ending -i for -s-stems, see Goto (2007) 567. Thus, morphologically speaking, we cannot regard the loc. to be as probable as the acc. and the gen.

3 OAv. mān/mān-

While YAv. mās retains the original shape of PIIr. *mans, clear instances of the corresponding OAv. word all indicate mān or mān-. As a whole long ő is thought to be the original reading in accordance with OAv. -ōng < PIIr. *ans. The short ő appears in no manuscript in Y 53,5 mānçā

and only in one unimportant manuscript L20 in Y 31.5 mānca. Also in Y 28.4 (mān gaire) 5 is secured in almost all principal manuscripts (though with a somewhat corrupted shape): K5 mān, J2 māq, Mf1. K4 māq, cf. Mf2 māqan, cf. a short ə in J7, K11. L13. O1 etc., and e in J3 meq. On the other hand, short ə appears to have been original in Y 44.8 māndāidiāi, as is transmitted by principal manuscripts such as Mf1. J2. S1. J3. Mf2. Jpl mānd (cf. K5 mānd), while mān- is found for example in K4 mānd (cf. mndP4).19 It is difficult to determine whether or not this should be attributed to its preverbal character.

3.1 The treatment of word finals in OAv. and mān/mān-

To deal with the final sound of OAv. mān/mān-, one should keep the general treatment of final sounds in OAv. in mind. While in the Gāthā text individual words are transmitted in principle in their independent or pausal forms, some words show euphonic (Sandhi) variations, which, according to Humbach (1959) I 16ff., represent the original shape of the text before the pausal forms were introduced. They are found almost regularly in inlaut (O/YAv. māstā: mān ‘think’ s-aor. inj. 3sg. mid.), before enclitics (OAv. kas-tē ‘who your ...?'; OAv. yas-cā ‘and who ...’ :: OAv. kā ~ YAv. kō; OAv. yāng ~ YAv. ya), and in the first member of a compound (OAv. ardāuxā `rightly spoken’ for ar3s).20 But such a non-pausal form is very rare elsewhere, and is in most cases very uncertain.21 This means that methodologically we should start from the assumption that the OAv. text highly standardized the treatment of final sounds as described above, and that we can discuss the Avestan phonology and morphology only on this basis.

Of our examples of mān/mān-, one (Y° 28.4) appears independently (as a pausal form) and the other ones before an enclitic -Ca (Y° 31.5, Y° 53.5) or prefixed to the infinitive dádiāi22 (Y° 44.8). Thus, notable peculiarities are: Y° 28.4 does not have the expected OAv. -āng, but -ān; Y° 31.5 and 53.5 do not show the regular phonological change to -ās-cā like OAv. māqras-cā, māssias-cā, yas-cā; Y° 44.8 has mān- instead of the expected *māq-dā as seen in the compound (-)māqdzā. It should also be mentioned that Y° 53.5 mān-cā ... [māq]dāzūm belongs to cases where a preverb in tmesis was repeated just before a verb by a later hand (so not to be read metrically).23 As Humbach et al., (1991) 60 indicate, this later insertion goes back to the time when “the Old Avestan sandhi rules were still known to the authors of the insertion.” That means, mān was still intelligible to those later authors and it was māq/māz in their dialect, which was most likely that of the YAv.

20 That means, ar3s constitutes the first member of a compound. arās vacah ‘who has the right speech’ is transmitted as two separate words as is indicated by the punctuation. But cf. YAv. arās-uxā without punctuation.
22 There are two variant readings in the principal manuscripts as to the first vowel of -dādiāi: J2. Mf1. Jp1. K5. K4. P4 -dādiāi :: S1. J3. Mf2 -dādiāi. In Av. the infinitive in *-dājān either appears on a pres. stem or directly on a root or possibly a root-aor. stem. Since there is in Av. no example of thematic formation *-adājān, which is productive in Ved., and therefore is thought to be a Ved. innovation (Sgall 1958: 154f. with literature), -dādiāi (< *dāH-dājān), is more likely than -dādiāi (< *dH-adājān). However, dādiāi in Y 31.5 mānca dādiāi shows no variant reading of the first vowel, which encourages us to withhold a conclusion as to the quantity of the vowel.
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(Kellens-Pirart 1988: I 46) as is seen in Y° 9,31 mqs24.

Kellens-Pirart (1988) I 47f. assume an old phonological change ("sandhi") *PIr. *mans > PAv.25 *man not only before the independent ga`re (Y° 28,4, see below) but also before -cã and the inf. dediïäi.26 They further see "une isoglosse phonétique étonnante" between this and Ved. mandhâdar-. This idea is seemingly tempting, because indeed all the examples but one (=-mazdra-) in OAv. as well as Ved. do not show -s-. It, however, still remains unexplained why such an old phonological change was retained in mãṉ/maṉ-,27 while otherwise pausal -ṣṅg and non-pausal -qs- are almost consistently introduced,28 and a s-including OAv. -mazdra- is a very thorny problem.29 Also it may have been difficult for later (YAv.) authors to identify mãṉ in Y° 53,5 with mṣ/mqṣ of their language. Ved. mandhâdar- can be explained by the general tendency in Ved. to lose the middle of three-consonant clusters (Wackernagel AIG I 268f.).30 If we start from a high consistency of the treatment of final sounds in OAv. as mentioned above, it would be more plausible to explain mãṉ/maṉ- from OAv. mãṅ or mṣ-.

A clue to solving our problem is to be sought in Y° 28,4 yā "ruutānən mãṉ gārē ... dade [I], who, for [singing] a welcome song, put mãṉ (pres. ind. 1sg. mid.) the/my soul,' where gārē is the dat. sg. of gär- ‘(welcome) song’ (Ved. gîr-).31 That means, mãṉ represents an independent word and we should start from the regular pausal form mãṅ. The simplest solution to the peculiar n is to see a transcriptional negligence for original *mãṅ due to the following g, as assumed probably by Humbach et al., (1991) 21: “restoration”: mãṅ<g> gaire, and explicitly suggested by de Vaan (2003) 491, according to whom "the velar stops of *mãṅ gaire had merged into a form *mãṅgairē, after which a wrong split has yielded mãṅ gairē." But such transcriptional reinterpretation, if any, must have occurred in a very late stage of the manuscripts, as we have mãṅgairē and the like only in the recent and bad manuscripts.32 Moreover, it is difficult to find a reason why the metanalyzed *mãṅgairē was subject to metanalysis again as mãṅ. g*, as appears in important manuscripts, such as K5 and J3, in spite of the unusual final -n. It would be recommended to suspect that the pausal form mãṅ reflects the original phonological value, for Av. -ṣṅg has an especially distinctive status in terms of the historical phonology of Av.

---

24 So -qs instead of the expected YAv. -ृ or -q. According to Humbach (1955) 43 n. 9 mṣ of Y° 9,31 mṣ vaca is a "Pseudopausaform" for mṣc before the voiced v.
25 This seems to be equivalent to their "lingue originaire".
26 Thus they adopt the reading mãṉ gārē in Y° 28,4 probably based on variant readings showing -qu or -q, and see n before enclitic -cã and -d" as a preconsonantal variant of n.
27 The only other potential example they quote, Y° 51,22 tā yāzāi 'I will praise those,' should rather be an influence of YAv. q < PIr. *-ans, cf. de Vaan (2003) 490.
28 Cf. also the critique of Kellens-Pirart by de Vaan (2003) 490f.
29 "à cause du -r- qui suit *-(d)h-"
30 Cf. OAv. dāṅg pātãs 'master of the house' :: Ved. dāṁ-pat- (= pâtr dāṁ), cf. Debrunner AIG III 244.
31 See literature in Kellens 1984: 344. Insler (1975) assumes a "redivision" of original *mãṅg airē into mãṅ gairē. But airē (loc. cit. "inf. to the root ar 'rise, raise'"") brings us nothing but other morphological and semantical problems (cf. Kellens op. cit.) and therefore no better understanding of the stanza. Needless to say, Insler’s idea makes it more difficult to find a reason for redividing unnecessarily mãṅg a’ to peculiar mãṅ g’ than to see the simplification of geminate g g, see below.
3.2 OAv. -ng and the origin of män/map-

It is a well known fact that the Av. letter ŋ stands for all kinds of nasals corresponding to
the following stops and therefore contradicts the phonetic character of the Av. script. Hoffmann-Narten
(1989) 67f. suggest that this letter ŋ actually reflects the (later) pronunciation of the Avesta in
southwest Iran, where it was probably the “merkmallose, postuvulare ... Nasal [N].” In the recitation
of the Gāthā in east Iran, on the other hand, nasals before stops used to be pronounced at the same
position as the following stops. Thus OAv. -ng indicates its original pronunciation -ng< or -ŋg < -ŋh
< *-ns. Op. cit. 71f. also points out that the characteristic letter g as the variant for g in the
manuscripts is especially frequent in -āng, and that this may have been a different sound from the
usual g as well as an implosive [g̴] which was denoted by -gš (op. cit. 71). Considering that PAv. *h
in the original *-anh (maybe a phoneme covering a glottal/pharyngeal/uvular fricative) must have
been vocalized by the preceding nasal, but also assimilated to it in articulatory position, then g in
-āng sounded probably like a weakened velar fricative γ, which could be pronounced almost in a
way the tongue is slightly tapped against the uvula, resulting in a sound like γγ or γ', similar to an
explosive [n] as seen in Eng. singer [sɪŋə], but not of longer [lɪŋɡə].

Founded on this hypothesis we could envisage how OAv. män in Y 28,4 came into existence as
follows: PAv. *manh, when standing independently, regularly became OAv. māγγ or māγ', which
turned into māγ before the following g<. māγ remained as such with a final γ which was distinctive
enough to indicate that it came from māγγ < PIIran. *mans, until finally this peculiar final sound
was replaced by [n] (ŋ) in southwest Iran. The situation is quite different in YO 31,5 and 53,5 before
the enclitic -cā and in YO 44,8 before dādīāī. The regular and thus the oldest shape must have been
PAv. *mans-cā and *manz-d', respectively. But as OAv. developed its own phonological rule *-ans
> -āγγ, *mans/-manz- with a quite different shape was replaced by māγγ to secure its clear
morphology. That māγγ/k- dropped its final stop resulting in māγ-, but not (yet) mān- or [māN-],
is suggested by YAv. panytaγhun ‘fifth’ < *panytaγhun < PIIran. *pāγkt- and Ved. panyṯ- ‘group of
five,’ yundhē ‘Yoke!’ (pres. iptv. 2sg. act.) appearing often in Ved. manuscripts for pankṯ-, yunγdhi. The later (YAv.) authors, who were responsible for the preverb repetition of YO 53,5
mān-cā ... [māγ]dazdium, must have understood mān- as synonymous with their māγ/māγ, which
again makes it probable that the phonological value of māγ- was still māγ- in their time. māγ-cāld'
was no doubt more liable than its independent counterpart to the replacement by [māN-] in
southwest Iran because this is almost the only nasal allowed before consonants, as is seen in YAv.

33 This is a necessary process when one makes air flow from the nasal cavity to the oral cavity.
34 Some dialects of Modern Japanese as well as the standard pronunciation of Japan Broadcasting
Corporation (NHK) still retain [ŋ] before vowels: [iŋa], [oŋa], etc.
35 It is however not quite clear why the same process did not occur otherwise, e.g. Y 32,8 ahmāγγ gauś (without
any variant). Does it depend on accentuation?
36 For a similar case where an allophonic nasal standing independently reveals the original phonological environment,
compare Ved. dāṇ̱, pāṇ̱ < *-əp̱kš.
37 A resembling replacement of *-ans- with *-āγγ can be found incompletely also in yēγγ-gs-ū for *yγγs-ū, cf.
38 Bartholomae (1888) 500ff. thinks that such “reduction” of [nasal + stop + obstruent > nasal + obstruent] was a
common Indo-Iranian phonological change, which further developed in each language group, cf. also Wackernagel
AIG I 269 (further examples and literature in Nachtr. zu I: 149), Hoffmann (1965) 252, Hoffmann-Forssman (2004)
88.
marayante `he destroy oneself' (3sg. pres. mid.) for *ma, yte < Pllran. *mrnktai39 (as opposed to panta ihum) and probably in YAv. apaš 'turned away' < *apāyš (< *apāyškš = Ved. āpān). In consequence, [māN-] both from the original māy- and māy was transcribed as mān in the “Sasanian archetype.”

De Vaan (2003) 491 similarly assumes the replacement of the original *mans- by *manh- (i.e. māng-) for mān-cā, but explains Y° 44,8 mānd-dādiidāi from two separate words *māng daidiidāi and refers to “the later pronunciation” (probably of mān-cā?) as responsible for the change from *māng d’ to “[mānd-]” and the latter to “[mānd].” Rather the fact that *mans shows the same treatment both before -cā and dādiidāi illustrates the same close phonetical connection of *mans to the verb as before an enclitic -cā.

3.3 OAv. māng, mām?

Y° 48,2 māng is generally identified with mān/mam-, which however allows various interpretations, since it appears in a verbless and so contextually unclear sentence: Y° 48,2 vaoca māi yā tāum viduud ahurā `parā hiiat mā yā māng parēdā jīmadāi ‘Tell me (Zoroaster) [the things] which You (already) know. O Master, before the compensations40 that are māng41 / that [I put] māng / that [you put] māng will go towards me!’ Moreover, reading māng in combination with the preceding word as yā māng (= gen. sg. of *yāman- = Ved. yāman- ‘going, march, course’) has also been proposed, see Insler (1975) 286, cf. Humbach (1991) II 242.42 Each of these morphological possibilities will be examined in my next syntactic study. For the present it is sufficient to say that māng represents the only regular OAv. form expected for Pllran. *mans, and thus can be further evidence of the legitimacy of PAv. *mans, cf. 3.1.

The condition is much worse in Y° 53,4 mām43 (or mām.bādūs), which is sometimes claimed to be identical with mān as well (most recently de Vaan 2003: 490 without any syntactic consideration). This idea entails serious morphological difficulties. The expected independent form is māng, for which we would have to assume a double Sandhi (*māng → *mān → mām). It would be better to assume a Sandhi form of the root noun *man- (Humbach et al. 1991: II 242), cf. 2.1 above. However, we do not have other sure instances of such Sandhis,44 and above all as the meaning of either independent mām or a compound of “thought” and another unclear word bādūs is almost hopelessly obscure in the context of the stanza45, we have no choice but to exclude mām from our

39 -ṣ- was incorrectly reconstructed later for -ṣ- = -ṣ-, see Hoffmann-Forssman loc. cit.
40 Provided that porēdā- (< par `fill [up]’ = Ved. par ‘do.’) has such sense.
41 Provisionally māng, mān, etc., is left untranslated and the verb dā is rendered mechanically with ‘put,’ if necessary.
42 There is a quite different interpretation in Kellens-Pirart (1991) III 221: ‘plénitude de la lune,’ i.e. māng = gen. sg. of māh- ‘moon’ (op. cit. 1990: II 286).
44 Cf. Humbach (1959) 17f.: “Von mangelndem Verständnis zeugt z.B. das 5a in dem nach der Sandhiform mām stehenden bādūs.”
45 So the translation is often given up, but cf. Humbach et al. (1991) I 193, who translate Y 53,4 manayhā vapsed‘ x’rũraat hay Śāh mān.baddūs’ mazād ādāt ahuru ‘dādāτi vahāuiiūi’ yauudī vśpāt.ā as ‘(It is) the sunny harvest of good thought (which), valuing the bonds of kinship, the Wise Ahura grants to (women of) good religion for all time’ (: bādūs for *bādūs = Ved. bāndhru- op. cit. II 242), where the meaning of hay Śāh- (~ Ved. saṣa- ‘fruit’ ~ Ved. sasā- ‘crops, grain?’) is also not certain. Note that there are, as against the almost invariable reading of mām, different variant readings of bādūs: J3. H1. P6. K10. L2, bādūs Jp1, bādūs L13, bādūs B2. L1, bādūs J6. Jm1. S2, bādūs Mf1. 2.
list of potential forms of PIr. *mans.⁴⁶

4. *mans- and *mas- in composition

PIr. *mas-, an ablaut variant of *mans, is found in OAv. verb maz-dā and its derivatives in Indo-Iranian: Av. mazdā- = Ved. mediā- and Ved. mēdhira-. Since clear evidence of the verb form is only found in Y 45,1 mazdāghā.thām⁴⁷ and the peculiar ablaut of *mas- as opposed to other five examples with *mans seems to be motivated by no rational reason, we start our discussion from the well attested noun forms, which can be much better explained.

4.1 *mas- in nominal compositions

In Indo-European, two kinds of nominal composition are known, namely a univerbation with a case form as the first member as seen in the very archaic word *dēms-potī- ‘master of the house’ and a stem-compound with a bare stem as the first member (Dunkel 1999: 47f., Scarlata 1999: 761f. with literature), although the latter is often thought to be older.⁴⁸ As concerns *mas-, a stem compound is nearly the only option, because we have just confirmed that *mans can only be interpreted as a case form and the existence of another case form in the same connection with dā, if any, would entail two different syntactic constructions, which is very improbable. What is more, there is morphologically no potential case form for *mās-, unless one thinks of some more or less absurd process, such as a haplology from gen./abl. sg.(or collective?) *masas- (< *mā-s-ēs) of the amphidynamic or hysterodynamic types, or a secondary ablaut to *mans only after the latter was fixed as a preverb/adverb regardless of its etymology. Therefore, PIr. *mas- in Av. mazdā- = Ved. mediā- and Ved. mēdhira- cannot be a case form of *manas-, but can only be a stem form of *manās-/mans-: *mās- (Schindler 1975: 266). This consequence agrees perfectly with the understanding that a nominal stem as the first member of a stem-compound, neutralized in its number and gender, shows “maximale Schwundstufe des Stammes” (Schindler 1997: 537, see also Wackernagel AiG II,1 52f.). A stem as the first member can represent various syntactic functions corresponding to more than one case, of which the acc. object. is assumed in an overwhelming majority of cases (Wackernagel op. cit. 197ff.) as suggested by a great number of nominal compositions with an acc. case form as the first member (op. cit. 201ff.).

Now attention should be paid to the very archaic ablaut of *mās- with zero grade both in root and suffix, which must go back to the PIE where the system of ablaut accompanied by accentuation was still alive (Scarlata op. cit. 257). To be compared is another important word which likewise shows double zero grade in a composition with *dēā: Av. mīḍā- ‘reward’ = Ved. mūḍhā- ‘do.’ = Gr. μοθός ‘do.’ etc. < PIE *mīs-dēh,-ō-, of which the first member appears with double full grade in its independent stem: Av. maiiah- ‘pleasure’ = Ved. māyas- ‘refreshment’ < PIr. *māj-as-, as suggested by Mayrhofer EWAia s.v. mūḍhā-. The etymological connection between these two words,

---

⁴⁶ Bartholomae Wb 956 “Rettungslos verderbt .”, cf. also Szemerényi (1979) 169.
⁴⁷ The uncertain example Y 30,1 mazāṭthā will be discussed below 4.1.
⁴⁸ Dunkel attempts to prove, contrary to the traditional view, the origin of stem-compound from univerbation.
though appearing not widely acknowledged (cf. Stüber 2002: 29, 127 with n. 70), is more probable when assuming the original meaning of Ved. mūḍhā as ‘‘Satzung/Schaffung der Labung, Restaurierungsleistung?’ (Goto 2000: 147 n. 3), because the refreshment by food and drink must have been one of important rewards for an act such as a battle or ritual. If this is correct, we can also add the long discussed Av. miiazaḍa- ‘sacrificial meal, meal for ritual’ = Ved. miyēḍha- ‘do.’ < PIlr. *mij-ēs-dʰ-a- (see Mayrhofer KEWA s.v., cf. EWAia s.v.) < ‘‘giving refreshment (to the gods as a payment for wishes).’ Then, we have two kinds of ablaut of *mājās- in the composition with *dʰa, the one with double zero grade, the other with zero grade in root and with full grade in suffix. From the semantical considerations above, the syntactic relationship of *mājās- to *dʰa is most likely that of acc. object.

4.2 *mas- in verbal compositions

Now we come to the verb form Y 45,1 mazdāphō.ū.dūm (s-aor. subj. 2p. mid.) and possibly Y 30,1 mazdābā. If maz- of archaic ablaut originally functioned as a preverb, then we would have to suppose that the noun stem *mas- was abstracted as a preverb already in the PIE stage, which itself is improbable (see the similar discussion for *mans 2.2.1). It is also impossible to see two preverbs PIE *mes- *mens- of different ablaut at the same time. The Av. evidence shows that the verb forms both with *maz- and manz- conjugate in the middle and have no difference of meaning from each other. We are thus justified in assuming a secondary introduction of *mas- by the influence of the nominal compound mazdā- (Schindler 1975: 266). Presumably such an analogy happen only when *mas- prefixed to a verb, as no independent *mas is attested, and only when it resulted in the phonological shape mazdā- as in Y 45,1 mazdāphō.ū.dūm. The same holds true in Y 30,1 mazdābā, which, however, can also be interpreted as a derivative with PIlr. *-təa-: YO 30,1 aṭ tā vaxšītā iṣeṇṭō ‘yā mazdābā hiṅtē ṣūduśē ‘Then, I shall proclaim these [words], which you should put maz (root-aor. subj. 2p. act.?) for the one who (already) knows / which are mazdābā even for the one who (already) knows, ...’ Although this suffix forms mostly neuter (and also feminine) substantives from a root with zero grade (Debrunner AiG II,2 717f.), we still have one important example YAv. gāṭhā- ‘hymn, song’ = Ved. gāṭhā- ‘do.’ (besides AV+ ud-gāṭhā- ‘singing [a Sāman]; service of the Udgātar-priest’) for a root in -ā. It should still be investigated how the pecuiliar active voice supposed in mazdābā can be explained from a syntactic point of view in our next research.

Pirart (1984, 1985) suggested new etymologies of two difficult OAv. words, cazdah- (of cazdōhhuuant- ‘désireux’ [P.], Y 31,3; 44,5) and Y 49,10 vazdah- (~ RV vedhās-: epithet of gods) ‘charmeur’ (P.), deriving them from PIlr. *cās-dʰ-h-as- and *yas-dʰ-h-as- respectively. Thus according to him, *cās- (< *cēs-) is the weak stem of *cānas- (= RV cānas- ‘favor, satisfaction’) and *yas- (< *yēs-) belongs to *vanas- (= RV vānas- ‘desire, preference’ (‘charme’ P.), which he derives from van ‘win, conquer’, not from van ‘like, desire’ as is generally assumed (Mayrhofer EWAia s.v.). Most interestingly, he (1987: 209ff.) further sees the underlying syntagma of vazdah-, viz. *vanas/yans dʰā, in Y 51,20 vānā ... daelītāi (“vanah dā ‘mettre sous le charme’?) and RV vandādhayai (inf.), thus assuming remarkable parallelism with PIlr. masdʰₕ- ~ *mans/mas(...).dʰā ~
Ved. *mánaś dhā. A morphological difficulty of his suggestion of *čas- consists in its etymology with PIIran. root *kari ~ *cari ‘take pleasure, enjoy,’ which must have yielded PIIran. *kás-, although, because of its set-character, would have had PIIran. *čas-, and its analogical substitution of *k by *č-only of the ablaut variant of *cari and also leveling replacement of *čas- by *cás-as appears in the usual weak -s-stem (*máś- ~ *mánaś-) at least in PIIran. As for *vazdah-, Av. vásnā represents indeed the legitimate OAv. form expected for PIIran. *yanas- rather than *vanah-. But unfortunately the alleged syntagma Av. vásnā .... dādātī and RV vandādhyai does not seem so convincing that we cannot disprove the generally accepted etymology to derive RV (-)vánas- from var- and vandādhyai from van- ‘praise.’ Nevertheless, if his hypothesis is true irrespective of the meaning assumed of each word, they provide us with very interesting examples which would prove the productivity of the composition type {-s-stem + dhd} in PIIran. or PIE.50 The potential syntagma in Av. and Ved. still have to be examined carefully in our syntactic study. Also of special treatment for *cas-d̐hH-as- will be RV cānās dhā ‘take pleasure’ (with various cases, Pirart 1984: 49 n.3), cano-dhā- ‘gracious, well-disposed’ (VS), cāno-hita- ‘made gracious’ (RV etc.), which are to be compared with RV mánaś dhā and thus can be suggestive for the syntactic observation of PIIran. *mans d̐ā.

4.3  *mans- in nominal compositions

As the result from introducing *maz- as a preverb besides *manz-, there must have been a phase where both *mans-dā and *maz-dā could be used as free variations for a verb form as well as a nominal derivation, while an independent *mans is only possible in a verbal construction. This must have meant that both *mans-dā and *maz-dā could serve as a “root” for nominal derivation. Thus we also have O/YAv. (-)mazdra- (< *mans-), besides mazdā- (< *mas-). It should be emphasized, however, that such a phase had already appeared in the PIIran. period, as suggested by the same -ra-derivation formed with different ablauts, Av. (-)mazdra- ‘wise’ and Ved. médhira- ‘do.,’ as well as by free use of the variations within Ved., as seen in mandhātār- ‘wise man; poet; nom. prop.’ besides médhā- ‘wisdom.’

Just as Av. (-)mazdra-, Ved. médhira- is probably of later formation, but in a different manner from that of Av. Ved. -i(ā)ra- is in principle a primary suffix attached to a root (+ preverb), see Debrunner AiG II,2 361f, 849ff.51 As the -i(ā)ra-derivative clearly from a nominal root is attested in comparatively later literature (op. cit. 36252, 856ff.), and there is no evidence of a preverb *mas-, médhira- is most likely the derivation of a “root” *mazdh or *medh reinterpreted from *mas-dhā

49 He assumes the PIE root *k′enH for PIIran. *kari ~ *cari (so PIE *k′e(n)Hs-d′h₁-es- for *čas-d′H-as-), but a non-palatal *k, if this is a PIE root, is assured for PIIran. on Indo-Iranian evidence, see Mayrhofer EWAla s.v. kari. Another (similar) root included in Ved. kāma- ‘wish, desire,’ which Pirart (1984: 48) attributes also to *k′enH, should be *keH₂ again with a non-palatal, see op. cit. s.v. KĀ and kāma.


51 Although adjectives/substantives of the -ra-derivation show in principle zero grade in root with oxytone accent (Lubotsky 1988: 91f.), the ablaut and the accentuation is not a decisive factor. For there are also exceptions such as śūnra ‘strong, big’, vipra- ‘excited’, śāvra- ‘powerful’, sthāvra- ‘thick.’

52 médhira- is one of the very few Ved. examples cited by loc. cit., but cf. accent shift in other examples: ānhu- → anhurā-, rāhā- → rathirā-.
This means that Ved. médhira- as well as Av. (-)mazdra- were each formed individually by a different reinterpretation. — Ved. mandhältár-, together with the simplex form dháitar- ‘who places/puts’ or dháitar- (nom prop. of a god), represents a regular primary formation of the agent noun with -tar-. “Rektionskompositum” consisting of a nominal stem and -tar- is only seen after AV and that quite sporadically, whereas this suffix was frequently composed with an adverb, preposition, preverb, or the prefixes a(n)-, -s-, -us- from RV on, see Tichy (1995) 79ff. This implies that the formation of mandhältár- should be placed somewhere during the Indo-Iranian time when *mans- was no longer recognized as a case form and at the same time it still functioned as a preverb.

We may also include Ved. mändhuká- ‘made from the Mandhuka-tree’ here. This is attested in TS³ III 4.8.3, ĀpŚrŚu XVII 14.8 (~ KS² XXI 10: 50.4 bändhuka- instead), BaudhŚrŚu XIV 18: 9–12 (2x) and is used always as an adjective derived by Vṛddhi from *mändhuká- designating a tree, from which firewood (mändhuká- idhmá-) for a particular ritual should be made. *mändhuká- is most naturally analyzed as a primary derivation with the suffix -uka- of verbal character meaning ‘doing ...’ But since this derivation is only found in Ved., not Av., and is usually accompanied by the full or long grade of root (Debrunner op. cit. 481ff.), *mändhuká- is thought to be a later formation from the already metanalyzed root *mándh modeled after forms in -ánC-uka- such as udbändh-uka- ‘binding = hanging oneself’ (TS), dáníska-ka- ‘biting’ (KS², TS² etc.), cf. upasštáy-uka- ‘standing near, approaching’ (KS²) for the root in -ā.

Finally, also Gr. Mavάvrifor a Median feminine name (the daughter of Αοτναγίς and the mother of Κόρος II) may reflect Med. *mandāná-, which can be taken as the middle participle (f.) of the root-aorist: PIlr. *mans-d'H-ānār-, if Median (or at least Greek?) allows the disappearance of the middle -s-.

5 Conclusion

From our morphological study we can draw the following conclusions. The clear evidence of YAv. mās ... dā, OAv. mān/mās/maz(...dā, Av. mazdā-, Av. (-)mazdra- and Ved. medhā-, médhira-, mandhältár-, mándhuká- assures PIlran. verbal composition *mans dā. *mans can be the gen./abl. sg. of the root noun *man- ‘thought’ or a case form of the old -s-stem *man-s-, in contrast to the attested forms of Av. manah- and Ved. bánas-. Candidates for this case form are the acc. sg. of the proterodynamic flexion type, the acc. sg. and the gen./abl. sg. of the acrodynamic type, and the loc. sg. irrespective of the flexion type. Its ablaut variant *mas-, which is also found in the Av. verb/noun mazdā- and Ved. nouns medhā-, médhira-, represents a bare stem and thus the relugar formation in nominal compositions, while *mas- appearing as a preverb in the verbal composition

53 See also Wackernagel II, 1 189.
OAv. *mazdā* is secondarily introduced from the nominal composition Av. *mazdā- = Ved. *mēdhā-*. On the other hand, *manz-* in nominal composition (Av. [*-]*mañzdra-, Ved. *mandhāṭar-, māndhukā-*) seems to result from an opposite process where *manz* was introduced in a nominal compound. Av. and Ved. evidence indicate a PIIRan. stage in which *mans* ~ *mas* could be used as free variations for both verbal and nominal compositions.

Founded on these results, our next step is to ascertain the meaning of our verbal compositions from a syntactic point of view, for which two main elements, namely the case syntax of each assumed case form and the context of each example, have to be taken into account. As a preliminary remark here we could safely rule out the abl. sg. from the possible cases mentioned above without any further syntactic consideration, because such meaning ‘put ... out of/from thought/mind’ etc., as expected for *mans* dā makes no sense at all. We will not only examine the Av. examples of the syntagma mān/mān/mās/māz(...dā, but also RV. mānas dhā and related expressions, while they are also compared with the similar verbal compositions such as YAv. yaoš ... dā, YAv. zras ... dā, Ved. śrād(...dhā, cānas dhā etc., which were also of importance in our morphological study. Only after this we will be able to re-examine syntactically Y 48,2 māṅg (→ 3.3) and Y 30,1 mazdāθā (→ 4.2) on the one hand, and return to the essential problem of what original meanings in fact can be assumed for such important religious words as mazdā-, medhā- etc., on the other hand.
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要旨
古インド・イラン語の複合動詞 *man*dāはAv. māṇ/māṇ/māṇs/māṇs(…)*dāによって例証されており, またその派生語がアヴェスタ語及びヴェーダの中から回収される。これらはしばしば注目されてきた語であるが, これまで*man*sの語源・形態が十分に検討されてきたとは言いがたい。本論では, 歴史言語学の立場からこれを試みるものである。考察の結果, *man*sは語根名詞*man*-「思考」の単数属格・奪格か, 古い-s-語幹名詞*man*-s-「思考」の対格・属格・処格単数のいずれかであり, 一方で複合名詞に現れる異なるアップラウト形*mas*-は後の者語幹の形であることが分かった。動詞に前置される*mas*-や複合名詞の前半に現れる*man*sの形は, それぞれ複合名詞の*mas*-及び格形である*man*s-が二的に持ち込まれた形と思われる。この結果に基づき, 今後*man*dāの統語論的研究を予定している。

（どうやま・えいじろう　大阪大学）