

Indo-Iranian *mans d^hā

— A morphological study —

Eijirō Dōyama

edoyama@let.osaka-u.ac.jp

Keywords: Indo-European, Indo-Iranian, Avestan, Vedic, Av. *məṇ/məṇ/mas/maz(...)*dā, ablaut, flexion type, root noun, -s-stem

Abstract

The PIIran. verbal composition *mans d^hā is attested in Av. *məṇ/məṇ/mas/maz(...)*dā and underlies many derivatives in Av. and Ved., e.g. Av. *mazdā* = Ved. *medhā*-. 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 preverb 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 d^hā.

1. Introduction¹

The PIIran. verbal composition *mans d^hā (< *d^haH < PIE *d^heh₁ ‘put, place, set’)² is evidenced by YAv. *mas ... dā* (1x) and OAv. *məṇ/məṇ(...)*dā (4x). The identification of the OAv. and YAv. forms is above all based on the fact that OAv. *məṇ/məṇ-* is not only repeated as *mas* 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.,³ e.g. Y^o 44,8 *ər^əš mōi vaocā ahurā ‘ +məṇdā’diiāi ‘ 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 Slavonic; Y = Yasna (the superscript ^Y and ^o before Y denote YAv. and OAv. respectively), RV = Rig-Veda-Saṁhitā, AV = Atharva-Veda-Saṁhitā, VS Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā, KS = Kāthaka-Saṁhitā, TS = Taittirīya-Saṁhitā, BaudhŚrSū = Baudhāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra, ĀpŚrSū = Āpastamba-Śrauta-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^Y 9,31 *mas ... daθānahe* (perf. pteple).

³ Bartholomae *Wb* 1136, 1181 etc., Humbach I (1959) 77 (‘achten auf ...’), 89 etc. (‘sich einprägen’), Kellens-Pirart (1988) I 114, 150 etc., II (1990) 256 (‘être attentif à ...’), Humbach et al. (1991) 118, 127 etc., Scarlata (1999) 257, cf. also Hoffmann-Forsman (2004) 314f. (index) ‘sich einprägen’ (*mazdā-*), ‘Kenntnis nehmen’ (*məṇdā-*) ‘zur Kenntnis nehmen’ (*mazdā-*).

ādištiš ‘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. *māng* (1x) accompanied by no verb, which itself phonologically corresponds to YAv. *maš*, but must remain uncertain unless approved by syntax. YAv. *maqdra-* ‘wise’ and OAv. *hu-maqdra-* ‘very learned’ are evidently derived from **mans d^hā*. On the other hand, a different ablaut of **mans* is to be seen in **mas* (< ***mns*) 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. [-]*maqdra-*), Ved. *mandhātár-* ‘wise, sage; nom. prop.’ and some more. In view of the variations Av. *mān/mən/maš(...)**dā* ~ *maz-dā* as well as Av. (-)*maqdra-* ~ 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 d^hā* 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.⁴ Only such a morphological study will enable us to clarify the syntactic and semantic relationship between **mans/mas* and **d^hā* and also the original meanings of such words as *mazdā-*, *maqdra-*, all of which I will discuss in another article.

2 Etymology of PIIran. **mans*

Relating *mān/mən/maš/maz(...)**dā* 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 *maq-dā* from “**man(δ)-dhā*” (i.e. **mand^hd^hā*, and *maz-dā* from **mad^hd^hā*) and assume that **mand* itself, influenced by *maq-dā* or *zraz-dā*, not only conjugated like a verb with *dā*, but even split into *mān/mən* and *dā*,⁵ which is too hypothetical and cannot but complicate the situation. We should start from a *s*-including PIIr. **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 Y⁰ 48,2 *māng* 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 *mān/mən*. Morphologically this analysis is well justified.⁶ Schindler (1972) proposed two types of ablaut, each with two subgroups⁷, for the root noun in PIE: the one with the ablaut {strong = *ó*-full grade :: weak = *é*-full grade (with gen. -*s*)/*e*-full

⁴ It is to be investigated how far this no doubt very archaic expression **mans d^hā* 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. *μανθάνω*, OCS *mōdrъ* (~ Av. *maqdra-*), cf. Frisk, Hjalmar *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 1973 Heidelberg. II 171, Mayrhofer *EWAla* 378 with literature. But since we know no sure evidence of the syntagma corresponding to PIIr. **mans d^hā* 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.

⁵ Cf. Humbach (1957) 82 n. 4., (1959) I 69, Kellens (1984) 350.

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

⁷ His argument is reviewed and developed by Scarlata (2000) 755ff.

grade/zero grade (with gen. *-ós[-és]*) represents “substantifs féminins à valeur résultative ou passive” or “noms d’agent (substantifs et adjectifs), souvent avec une nuance itérative”; the other type shows the ablaut {strong = *é*-full grade :: weak = zero grade (with gen. *-ós[-és]*)} 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*-⁸ belonging to the first type just like PIE **dóm-* (strong) ‘house’ ~ gen. sg. **dém-s* > PIIr. **dams*: OAv. *dəṅg* in *dəṅg patōiš* ≈ Ved. *pátir dán*⁹ (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. PIIr. **kyp-* ‘body’ ~ Lat. *corpus* ‘do.’ (Schindler 1979: 58f.).

To be compared is a similar verbal composition OAv. *yaoš ... dā* and YAv. *yaož-dā*. Schindler (1975) 266 thinks *yaoš/yaož* to be an old acc. sg. of a *-s*-stem PIE **yéu-s-*. Nevertheless, it is most likely the gen. sg. (< PIE. **h₂iéu-s*) of Av. *āiū-* ‘life, vital force’ (= Ved. *āyu-* ‘life’ < PIE **h₂óiu-*), as is first suggested by Kuiper (1942) 31f., who connected it with other case forms of the same stem: acc. sg. OAv. *āiū* ~ dat. sg. *yavōi, yavē*, YAv. *yauue*. This is reviewed later philologically by Szemerényi (1979) 165ff.¹¹, who defined the meaning of *yaož-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 *d^hā*, 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-īṣā-* ‘thinking, mental activity.’ As far as this meaning is originated 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] Kompositum aus *manas*, „Denken“ + *īṣā* „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 védique*. Lyon. L’hermès: 459 also points out the possibility of ‘le nom racine de **men-*’ as well as ‘son élargissement en **-s-* (cf. *méne/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. *cašmāṅg* ‘of the eye, of the sight’ (*cašman-*), *x^həṅg* ‘of the sun’ (< PIIr. *húyānh*) ~ Ved. *svàr* (< PIIr. **súyār-š*), YAv. *zaotarš* (*zaotar-*) ‘of the Zaotar-priest (the pourer)’ = *hóur* (*háut-š*).

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. *yōš*.

¹² Cf. Schindler, (1972) *Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen*. Würzburg (Diss.). The Av. root noun *-man-* included in YAv. *framən.nara-* and *framən.narō.vīra-* belong to another root *man* ‘wait, remain,’ as Klingenschmitt (1967) made clear: ‘(the dawn *ušah-*) 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.

‘thinking; thinking power/organ; thought’ = Ved. *mānas-* ‘do.’ = Gr. *μένοϛ* ‘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. *śrád(-)dhā* ‘do.’ (~ *śráddhā-* ‘faith, trust’). It is true that Av. *zras/zrad-* ~ Ved. *śrád* go back to PIE **kréd-* (> Ved. *śrád-*) or **ǵʰréd-* (> Av. *zrad-*), which was, unlike **mans*, firmly established as a preverb to **dʰeh₁*, already in the PIE period, cf. Lat. *crēdō* ‘I believe’ (Gotō 2007: 566f.). However, this cannot be positive support for a noun stem as preverb, since PIE **kréd-/ǵʰréd-* 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. *išū’diia-* ‘give strength’ = Ved. *iṣudhya-* ‘strive for, aim at’ might be a pres. stem (*īa*-present?) of the verbal composition with a stem form as the first element **iṣu-dʰā* based on the syntagma **iṣum dʰā* ‘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. *išud-* ‘strength(ning)’ and RV *iṣdhudyú-* ‘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. *mandhātár-*, where a nominal stem is usually used. But this again cannot be true, because another stem form in nominal compounds **mas-* < **m̥s-* (Av. *mazdā-* = Ved. *medhā-*, *médhira-*) 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. -és} 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 **kréd-s-*, just as he does so for **man-s-*, see below.

¹⁷ Probably from PIIr. **iṣu-dʰi-* = Ved. *iṣu-dhí-* meaning ‘fitting an arrow, aiming at,’ see Graßmann (1873) 227. Most interpretations try to connect the verb to OAv. *iš-* ‘power,’ Ved. *íṣ-* ‘refreshment, nourishment’ and explain -*ud-* in some way or other, most notably suggesting **iṣ-udʰ-* with such meaning as ‘bring strength to ...’ by PIIr. **vadʰ* ‘take/bring (a woman for marriage towards one’s house),’ see Mayrhofer *EWAia* s.v. with literature.

+ 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 PIIran. **iauš d̄hā* (OAv. *yaoš ... dā*, YAv. *yaož-dā*: Mayrhofer *EWAia* s.v. *yós* 'mit Lebenskraft versehen', Schindler loc. cit. 'Heil setzen, heilwirkend machen'). **iauš*, however, is understood also as the gen. sg. of Av. *āiiu-* '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 **h₃éh₁-os* (strong) 'mouth' ~ **h₃h₁-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 = *ó*-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 **nok^w-t-* 'night' (strong) ~ gen. sg. **nok^w-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 *ē*-long grade of root in the strong stem (Ved. *vásas-* 'cloth', *váhas-* 'bringing [an offering]', Gr. *γῆρας* 'old age' [~ *γέρας* 'gift of honor'], *ἥθος* 'custom' [~ *έθος* '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. *dam* of *dam-* 'house' (~ YAv. *dami*). 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 *ē*-long grade either in root or suffix¹⁸. It may, therefore, be more accurate to mention simply **méns* as a possible loc. sg. of **méns-* 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-d^heh₁* (Ved. *śrād-dhā* ~ 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 Gotō (2007) 567. Thus, morphologically speaking, we cannot regard the loc. to be as probable as the acc. and the gen.

3 OAv. *mān̄/mən̄-*

While YAv. *mas* retains the original shape of PIIr. **mans*, clear instances of the corresponding OAv. word all indicate *mān̄* or *mən̄-*. As a whole long *ā* is thought to be the original reading in accordance with OAv. *-ān̄g* < PIIran. **-ans*. The short *ə* appears in no manuscript in Y 53,5 *māncā*

¹⁸ Cf. e.g. nom. sg. **d^hégh^hōm* 'earth' (Hitt. *te-e-kán*; ~ acc. Ved. *kṣām*) ~ gen. sg. **(d^h)gh^hm-és* (Ved. *jmás*) ~ loc. sg. **d^hégh^hém* (Ved. *kṣám-i*); nom. sg. **d̄jēu-s* 'heaven' (Ved. *dyáu-s*) ~ gen. sg. **d̄jēu-és* (Ved. *div-ás*) ~ loc. sg. **d̄jēu-i* (Ved. *dyáv-i*)

and only in one unimportant manuscript L20 in Y 31,5 *māncā*. Also in Y 28,4 (*mān gairē*) *ā* is secured in almost all principal manuscripts (though with a somewhat corrupted shape): K5 *mān*, J2 *māq*, Mf1. K4 *mā.qn* (cf. Mf2 *mēqn*), cf. a short *ə* in J7. K11. L13. O1 etc., and *e* in J3 *meñ*, S1 *meq*. On the other hand, short *ə* appears to have been original in Y 44,8 *māñdāidiūāi*, as is transmitted by principal manuscripts such as Mf1. J2. S1. J3. Mf2. Jp1 *māñd°* (cf. K5 *māñd°*), while *māñ-* is found for example in K4 *māñd°* (cf. *mñd°* Pt4).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 *māñ/māñ-*

To deal with the final sound of OAv. *māñ/māñ-*, 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. *maštā*: *man* ‘think’ *s*-aor. inj. 3sg. mid.), before enclitics (OAv. *kas-tē* ‘who your ...?’; OAv. *yas-cā* ‘and who ...’ :: OAv. *kā ~* YAv. *kō*; OAv. *yāñg ~* YAv. *ya*), and in the first member of a compound (OAv. *əṛš-uxda-* ‘rightly spoken’ for *əṛš*).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 *māñ/māñ-*, one (Y^o 28,4) appears independently (as a pausal form) and the other ones before an enclitic *-cā* (Y^o 31,5, Y^o 53,5) or prefixed to the infinitive *dādiūāi*²² (Y^o 44,8). Thus, notable peculiarities are: Y^o 28,4 does not have the expected OAv. *-āñg*, but *-āñ*; Y^o 31,5 and 53,5 do not show the regular phonological change to *-as-cā* like OAv. *maθraqs-cā*, *mašiiqs-cā*, *yaq-cā*; Y^o 44,8 has *māñ-* instead of the expected **maq-d°* as seen in the compound (-)*maqdra-*. It should also be mentioned that Y^o 53,5 *māñ-cā ... [maq]dazdūm* 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, *māñ* was still intelligible to those later authors and it was *maq/māq* in their dialect, which was most likely that of the YAv.

¹⁹ All of the variant readings are: *māñdāidiūāi* S1. J3. J6. Mf2. H1. Jm1. L13. L1, *māñdāidiūāi* C1. K11. O2. Bb1 *māñdāidiūāi* J4. S2, *māñdāidiūāi* J7, *māñdāidiūāi* L3, *mañdāidiūāi* Dh1, *mañdāidiūāi* M1, *māñdāidiūāi* J2. Mf1. Jp1. *māñdāidiūāi* K4, *māñdāidiūāi* Pt4, *māñdāidiūāi* K5.

²⁰ That means, *əṛš* constitutes the first member of a compound. *əṛš.vacah-* ‘who has the right speech’ is transmitted as two separate words as is indicated by the punctuation. But cf. YAv. *arš-uxda* without punctuation.

²¹ Cf. Humbach (1959) 17f., Humbach et al. (1991) loc. cit.

²² There are two variant readings in the principal manuscripts as to the first vowel of *-dāidiūāi*: J2. Mf1. Jp1. K5. K4. Pt4 *-dāidiūāi* :: S1. J3. Mf2 *-dāidiūāi*. In Av. the infinitive in **-dāiāi* 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 **-adāiāi*, which is productive in Ved., and therefore is thought to be a Ved. innovation (Sgall 1958: 154f. with literature), *-dāidiūāi* (< **dāH-adāiāi*), is more likely than *-dāidiūāi* (< **dH-adāiāi*). However, *dādiūāi* in Y 31,5 *māñcā dādiūāi* shows no variant reading of the first vowel, which encourages us to withhold a conclusion as to the quantity of the vowel.

²³ See Humbach (1959) I 15ff., Kellens-Pirart (1988) I 45f., Hoffmann-Narten (1989) 89 n. 11, Humbach et al., (1991) I 59f., Hoffmann-Forsman (2004) 34f., 176f.

(Kellens-Pirart 1988: I 46) as is seen in Y^Y 9,31 *maq*²⁴.

Kellens-Pirart (1988) I 47f. assume an old phonological change (“sandhi”) *PIIran. *mans > PAv.²⁵ *man not only before the independent *ga'rē* (Y^O 28,4, see below) but also before *-cā* and the inf. *da'diāi*.²⁶ They further see “une isoglosse phonétique étonnante” between this and Ved. *mandhātār-*. This idea is seemingly tempting, because indeed all the examples but one (*-maqdra-*) in OAv. as well as Ved. do not show *-s-*. It, however, still remains unexplained why such an old phonological change was retained in *mān/mān-*,²⁷ while otherwise pausal *-āng* and non-pausal *-as-* are almost consistently introduced,²⁸ and a *s*-including OAv. *-maqdra-* is a very thorny problem.²⁹ Also it may have been difficult for later (YAv.) authors to identify *mān* in Y^O 53,5 with *maq*/*maq* of their language. Ved. *mandhātār-* 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 *mān/mān-* from OAv. *māng* or *maq*-.

A clue to solving our problem is to be sought in Y^O 28,4 γᵱ “*ruuānəm mān ga'rē ... dadē* ‘[I], who, for [singing] a welcome song, put *mān* (pres. ind. 1sg. mid.) the/my soul,’ where *ga'rē* is the dat. sg. of *gar-* ‘(welcome) song’ (Ved. *gír-*).³¹ That means, *mān* represents an independent word and we should start from the regular pausal form *māng*. The simplest solution to the peculiar *n* is to see a transcriptional negligence for original **māng* due to the following *g*, as assumed probably by Humbach et al., (1991) 21: “restoration”: *mān*<*g*> *gairē*, and explicitly suggested by de Vaan (2003) 491, according to whom “the velar stops of **māng gairē* had merged into a form **māngairē*, after which a wrong split has yielded *mān gairē*.” But such transcriptional reinterpretation, if any, must have occurred in a very late stage of the manuscripts, as we have *māngairē* and the like only in the recent and bad manuscripts.³² Moreover, it is difficult to find a reason why the metanalyzed **māngairē* was subject to metanalysis again as *mān*. *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 *mān* reflects the original phonological value, for Av. *-āng* has an especially distinctive status in terms of the historical phonology of Av.

²⁴ So *-as* instead of the expected YAv. *-ā* or *-a*. According to Humbach (1955) 43 n. 9 *maq* of Y^Y 9,31 *maq vaca* is a “Pseudopausaform” for *maq* before the voiced *v*.

²⁵ This seems to be equivalent to their “langue originale”.

²⁶ Thus they adopt the reading *mān ga'rē* in Y 28,4 probably based on variant readings showing *-qn* or *-q*, and see *n* before enclitic *-cā* and *-d* as a preconsonantal variant of *n*.

²⁷ The only other potential example they quote, Y^O 51,22 *ta yazāi* ‘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 “á cause du *-r-* qui suit **-d(h)-*”

³⁰ Cf. OAv. *dāng patāiš* ‘master of the house’ :: Ved. *dām-pati-* (~ *pátir dán*), cf. Debrunner *AiG* III 244.

³¹ See literature in Kellens 1984: 344. Insler (1975) assumes a “redivision” of original **māng airē* into *mān gairē*. But *gairē* (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 *māng a°* to peculiar *mān ga°* than to see the simplification of geminate *g*, see below.

³² Variants are: *mān* K5, *mān* J7, K11, L13, O1 *māq* J2, *māqn* Pt4, C1, *mā.qn* Mf1, K4, K37, Pd, *miq* J6, *māqn* H1, L17, *māqn* Mf2, *meñ* J3, P11, K6, *meq* S1, P6, *maq* B3, *mā.qgiri* L20, *māngaire* J5, *māngairē* Bb1, B2, L1, L2, *māngairi* O2, P1, *miqairi* L3.

3.2 OAv. *-ŋg* and the origin of *māṇ/māṇ-*

It is a well known fact that the Av. letter *ṇ* 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 *ṇ* 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. *-ŋg* indicates its original pronunciation *-ŋg^h* or *-ŋg < -ŋh < *-ns*. Op. cit. 71f. also points out that the characteristic letter *ḡ* as the variant for *g* in the manuscripts is especially frequent in *-əṇg*, and that this may have been a different sound from the usual *g* as well as an implosive [ḡ] which was denoted by *-gəṭ* (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 *-əṇg* sounded probably like a weakened velar fricative *ɣ*, which could be pronounced almost in a way the tongue is slightly tapped against the uvula³³, resulting in a sound like *ŋɣ* or *ŋʷ*, similar to an explosive [ŋ] as seen in Eng. *singer* [sɪŋə], but not of *longer* [lɔŋgə].³⁴

Founded on this hypothesis we could envisage how OAv. *māṇ* in Y 28,4 came into existence as follows: PAv. **manh*, when standing independently, regularly became OAv. *māṇγ* or *māṇʷ*, which turned into *māṇ* before the following *g*³⁵. *māṇ* remained as such with a final *ṇ* which was distinctive enough to indicate that it came from *māṇγ* < PIIran. **mans*,³⁶ until finally this peculiar final sound was replaced by [N] (*ṇ*) in southwest Iran. The situation is quite different in Y^o 31,5 and 53,5 before the enclitic *-cā* and in Y^o 44,8 before *dā’diūāi*. The regular and thus the oldest shape must have been PAv. **mans-cā* and **manz-d^o*, respectively. But as OAv. developed its own phonological rule **-ans > -əṇγ*, **mans-/manz-* with a quite different shape was replaced by *māṇγ* to secure its clear morphology.³⁷ That *māṇγ/k-* dropped its final stop resulting in *māṇ-*, but not (yet) *māṇ-* or [māṇ-], is suggested by YAv. *paṇtaṇhum* ‘fifth’ < **paṇtahum* < PIIran. **paṇkt^o* and Ved. *pañtī-* ‘group of five,’ *yundhī* ‘Yoke!’ (pres. iptv. 2sg. act.) appearing often in Ved. manuscripts for *pañktī-*, *yundhī*.³⁸ The later (YAv.) authors, who were responsible for the preverb repetition of Y^o 53,5 *māṇ-cā* ... [maq]dazdūm, must have understood *māṇ-* as synonymous with their *maq/maz*, which again makes it probable that the phonological value of *māṇ-* was still *māṇ-* in their time. *māṇ-cā/d^o* was no doubt more liable than its independent counterpart to the replacement by [māṇ-] 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: [ŋa], [ŋo], etc.

³⁵ It is however not quite clear why the same process did not occur otherwise, e.g. Y 32,8 *ahmākəṇg gāuš* (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. *ápāñ, páráñ* < **-aṇkš*.

³⁷ A resembling replacement of **-ans-* with **-əṇγ* can be found incompletely also in *yəṇgs-tū* for **yās-tū*, cf. Humbach (1959) I 17, de Vaan (2003) 491.

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 *AtG* I 269 (further examples and literature in Nachtr. zu I: 149), Hoffmann (1965) 252, Hoffmann-Forsman (2004) 88.

mər²γ²nte ‘he destroy oneself’ (3sg. pres. mid.) for **mər²γte* < PIIran. **mṛṅktaṭ*³⁹ (as opposed to *paṅtaṅhum*) and probably in YAv. *apaš* ‘turned away’ < **apāṅš* (< **apāṅkš* = Ved. *ápāni*). In consequence, [m̄N-] both from the original *māṅ-* and *māṅ* was transcribed as *māṅ* in the “Sasanian archetype.”

De Vaan (2003) 491 similarly assumes the replacement of the original **mans-* by **manh-* (i.e. *māṅg-*) for *māṅ-cā*, but explains Y^o 44,8 *māṅ-dā’diāi* from two separate words **māṅg daidiāi* and refers to “the later pronunciation” (probably of *māṅ-cā*?) as responsible for the change from **māṅg d̄* to “[*māṅd-*]” and the latter to “[*māṅd*].” Rather the fact that **mans* shows the same treatment both before *-cā* and *dā’diāi* illustrates the same close phonetical connection of **mans* to the verb as before an enclitic *-cā*.

3.3 OAv. *māṅg*, *mām*?

Y^o 48,2 *māṅg* is generally identified with *māṅ/māṅ-*, which however allows various interpretations, since it appears in a verbless and so contextually unclear sentence: Y^o 48,2 *vaocā mōi yā tuuēm vīduuā ahurā parā hiiṭ mā yā māṅg pər²θā jima’tī* ‘Tell me (Zoroaster) [the things] which You (already) know, O Master, before the compensations⁴⁰ that are *māṅg*⁴¹ / that [I put] *māṅg* / that [you put] *māṅg* will go towards me!’ Moreover, reading *māṅg* in combination with the preceding word as *yā.māṅg* (= 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 *māṅg* represents the only regular OAv. form expected for PIIran. **mans*, and thus can be further evidence of the legitimacy of PAv. **mans*, cf. 3.1.

The condition is much worse in Y^o 53,4 *mām*⁴³ (or *mām.bēāduš*), which is sometimes claimed to be identical with *māṅ* as well (most recently de Vaan 2003: 490 without any syntactic consideration). This idea entails serious morphological difficulties. The expected independent form is *māṅg*, for which we would have to assume a double Sandhi (**māṅg* → **māṅ* → *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, as 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 *bēāduš* is almost hopelessly obscure in the context of the stanza⁴⁵, we have no choice but to exclude *mām* from our

³⁹ -*γ²n-* was incorrectly reconstructed later for *-ṅg-* = *-ḡ-*, see Hoffmann-Forssman loc. cit.

⁴⁰ Provided that *pər²θa-* (< *par* ‘fill [up]’ = Ved. *par* ‘do.’) has such sense.

⁴¹ Provisionally *māṅg*, *māṅ*, 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. *māṅg* = gen. sg. of *māh-* ‘moon’ (op. cit. 1990: II 286).

⁴³ Variant readings are: *mām* J2. J6. J7, Pt4. S2. L2. K4. K11. K10. H1. Lb2. P6. Jm1. L13. L1. L2. B2. Dh1. M11, *mām* L20. Jm3. Bb1, *māḡṅ* Jp1, *mā* K5. J3. L3).

⁴⁴ Cf. Humbach (1959) 17f.: “Von mangelndem Verständnis zeugt z.B. das *ā* in dem nach der Sandhiform *mām* stehenden *bēāduš*.”

⁴⁵ So the translation is often given up, but cf. Humbach et al. (1991) I 193, who translate Y 53,4 *manayhō vaḡhēuš’ x’ēnuuāt haḡhuš mām.bēāduš’ mazdā dadāt ahurō’ daēniāi vaḡhuiāi’ yauuōi vīspāi.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’ (: *bēāduš* for **bēāndu-* = Ved. *bāndhu-* op. cit. II 242), where the meaning of *haḡhuš-* (‘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 *bēāduš*: J3. H1. P6. K10. L2, *bēāduš* Jp1, *bēāduš* L13, *bēduš* B2. L1, *bēiduš* J6. Jm1. S2, *bēāduš* Mf1. 2.

list of potential forms of PIIran. **mans*.⁴⁶

4 **mans-* and **mas-* in composition

PIIr. **mas*, an ablaut variant of **mans*, is found in OAv. verb *maz-dā* and its derivatives in Indo-Iranian: Av. *mazdā-* = Ved. *medhā-* and Ved. *médhira-*. Since clear evidence of the verb form is only found in Y 45,1 *mazdāñhō.dūm*⁴⁷ 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 **déms-poti-* ‘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 **mṛs-*, unless one thinks of some more or less absurd process, such as a haplology from gen./abl. sg.(or collective?) **masas-* (< **mṛs-és*) 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, PIIr. **mas-* in Av. *mazdā-* = Ved. *medhā-* and Ved. *médhira-* cannot be a case form of **manas-*, but can only be a stem form of **manas-/mans-*: **mṛs-* (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 **mṛs-* 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 **dʰā-*: Av. *mīžda-* ‘reward’ = Ved. *mīdhā-* ‘do.’ = Gr. *μισθός* ‘do.’ etc. < PIE **mis-dʰh₁-ó-*, of which the first member appears with double full grade in its independent stem: Av. *maīiah-* ‘pleasure’ = Ved. *máyas-* ‘refreshment’ < PIIr. **máī-as-*, as suggested by Mayrhofer *EWAia* s.v. *mīdhā-*. The etymological connection between these two words,

bāz̄t.uš K5. Pt4, *bāz̄tuš* Lb2, *bāz̄t.uš* J2, *bīr̄duš* K4, *buδuš* L20, *bār̄duš* J7. Dh1. O2. Bb1. L3. Jm3, *bār̄duš* K11, none of which shows a nasal.

⁴⁶ Bartholomae *Wb* 956 “Rettungslos verderbt.”, cf. also Szemerényi (1979) 169.

⁴⁷ The uncertain example Y 30,1 *mazdāθā* 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. *mīdhá* as ‘*Satzung/Schaffung der Labung, Restaurierungsleistung?’ (Gotō 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. *mīazda-* ‘sacrificial meal, meal for ritual’ = Ved. *mīyédha-* ‘do.’ < PIr. **mij-és-d^h-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 **májas-* in the composition with **d^hā*, 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 **májas-* to **d^hā* is most likely that of acc. object.

4.2 *mas- in verbal compositions

Now we come to the verb form Y 45,1 *mazdāñhō.dūm* (*s*-aor. subj. 2pl. mid.) and possibly Y 30,1 *mazdāθā*. 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 a 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 happened 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 *mazdāñhō.dūm*. The same holds true in Y 30,1 *mazdāθā*, which, however, can also be interpreted as a derivative with PIr. **-r^ha-*: Y^o 30,1 *at tā vaxšiiā išəntō* ‘*yā mazdāθā hīiətcī vīdušē* ‘Then, I shall proclaim these [words], which you should put *maz* (root-aor. subj. 2pl. act.?) for the one who (already) knows / which are *mazdāθā* 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. *gāθā-* ‘hymn, song’ = Ved. *gāthā-* ‘do.’ (besides AV+ *ud-gīthā-* ‘singing [a Sāman]; service of the Udgātar-priest’) for a root in *-ā*. It should still be investigated how the peculiar active voice supposed in *mazdāθā* 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 *cazdōñhuuant-* ‘désireux’ [P.], Y 31,3; 44,5) and Y 49,10 *vazdah-* (~ RV *vedhás-*: epithet of gods) ‘charmeur’ (P.), deriving them from PIIran. **čas-d^hH-as-* and **uas-d^hH-as-* respectively. Thus according to him, **čas-* (< **čns-*) is the weak stem of **čanas-* (= RV+ *cānas-* ‘favor, satisfaction’) and **uas-* (< **uṅs-*) belongs to **vanas-* (= RV *vānas-*) ‘desire, preference’ (‘charme’ P.), which he derives from *van* ‘win, conquer’, not from *vanⁱ* ‘like, desire’ as is generally assumed (Mayrhofer EWAia s.v.). Most interestingly, he (1987: 209ff.) further sees the underlying syntagma of *vazdah-*, viz. **uanas/*uans d^hā*, in Y 51,20 *vā.nē ... daⁱdiūi* (**vanah dā* ‘mettre sous le charme’?) and RV *vandādhyai* (inf.), thus assuming remarkable parallelism with PIIran. *masd^h°* ~ **mans/mas(...)*d^hā ~

Ved. *mánas dhā*. A morphological difficulty of his suggestion of *čas- consists in its etymology with PIIran. root *kanⁱ ~ canⁱ* ‘take pleasure, enjoy,’ which must have yielded PIIran. *kas-⁴⁹ and, because of its *seṭ*-character, would have had PIIran. *čās-, although one could call on analogical substitution of *k by *č- of the ablaut variant of *canⁱ* and also leveling replacement of *čās- by *cas- as appears in the usual weak -s-stem (*mās- ~ *mánas-) at least in PIIran. As for *vazdah-*, Av. *vā.nē* represents indeed the legitimate OAv. form expected for PIIran. **uanas-* rather than **vanah-*. But unfortunately the alleged syntagma Av. *vā.nē ... dādiīai* and RV *vandādhyai* does not seem so convincing that we cannot disprove the generally accepted etymology to derive RV (-) *vánas-* from *vanⁱ* and *vandādhyai* from *vand* ‘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 + *d^hā*} 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 *čas-*d^hH-as-* will be RV *cánas dhā* ‘take pleasure’ (with various cases, Pirart 1984: 49 n.3), *cāno-dhā-* ‘gracious, well-disposed’ (VS), *cāno-hita-* ‘made gracious’ (RV etc.), which are to be compared with RV *mánas dhā* and thus can be suggestive for the syntactic observation of PIIran. **mans d^hā*.

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 *manz-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 *manz-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 PIIr. 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 *mandhātár-* ‘wise man; poet; nom. prop.’ besides *medhá-* ‘wisdom.’

Just as Av. (-) *mazdra-*, Ved. *médhira-* is probably of later formation, but in a different manner from that of Av. Ved. -(i) *ra-* is in principle a primary suffix attached to a root (+ preverb), see Debrunner *AiG* II,2 361f, 849ff.⁵¹ As the -(i) *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” **mazd^h* or **med^h* reinterpreted from **mas-dhā*

⁴⁹ He assumes the PIE root **k^wenH* for PIIran. *kanⁱ ~ canⁱ* (so PIE **k^wṛHs-d^hh₁-es-* for *čas-*d^hH-as-*), but a non-palatal *k, if this is a PIE root, is assured for PIIran. on Indo-Iranian evidence, see Mayrhofer *EWAia* s.v. *kanⁱ*. Another (similar) root included in Ved. *kāma-* ‘wish, desire,’ which Pirart (1984: 48) attributes also to **k^wenH*, should be **keh₂* again with a non-palatal, see op. cit. s.v. *Kā* and *kāma-*.

⁵⁰ Especially *cazdah-*, *vazdah-* = Ved. *vedhás-* could implicate an old formation of “animate” -s-stem as suggested by Scarlata (1999) 258 n. 355: “Es sind dann belebte s-Sämme des Typus *apás-*, also **mṛsd^hh₁-és-* und **ṛṣsd^hh₁-és-* ‘Lust bereitend’ oder ‘Gewinn bereitend’, zu erwägen.”

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 *túmra* ‘strong, big’, *vīpra-* ‘excited’, *śávīra-* ‘powerful’, *sthāvīra-* ‘thick.’

⁵² *médhira-* is one of the very few Ved. examples cited by loc. cit., but cf. accent shift in other examples: *ámhu-* → *aínhurá-*, *rátha-* → *rathirá-*.

(Scarlata 1999: 257). This means that Ved. *médhira-* as well as Av. (-) *maqzdra-* were each formed individually by a different reinterpretation. — Ved. *mandhātár-*, together with the simplex form *dhātár-* ‘who places/puts’ or *dhātár-* (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)-*, *su-*, *du-* from RV on, see Tichy (1995) 79ff.⁵³ This implies that the formation of *mandhātár-* 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.⁵⁴

We may also include Ved. *māndhuká-* ‘made from the Mandhuka-tree’ here. This is attested in TS^p III 4,8,3, ĀpŚrSū XVII 14,8 (~ KS^p XXI 10: 50,4 *bāndhuka-* instead), BaudhŚrSū XIV 18: 9–12 (2x) and is used always as an adjective derived by Vṛddhi from **mandhukā-* designating a tree, from which firewood (*māndhuká-* *idhmá-*) for a particular ritual should be made. **mandhukā-* 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.), **mandhuka-* is thought to be a later formation from the already metanalyzed root **mandh* modeled after forms in *-ánC-uka-* such as *udbándh-uka-* ‘binding = hanging oneself’ (TS^p), *dámśu-ka-* ‘biting’ (KS^p, TS^p etc.), cf. *upasthāy-uka-* ‘standing near, approaching’ (KS^p) for the root in *-ā-*.

Finally, also Gr. Μανδάνη for a Median feminine name (the daughter of Αστύαγης and the mother of Κύρος II) may reflect Med. **mandānā-*,⁵⁵ which can be taken as the middle participle (f.) of the root-aorist: PIIr. **mans-d^hH-ānā-*, 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. *mas ... dā*, OAv. *mān/mān/maz(...)**dā*, Av. *mazdā-*, Av. (-) *maqzdra-* and Ved. *medhā-*, *médhira-*, *mandhātár-*, *māndhuká-* assures PIIr. verbal composition **mans d^hā*. **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. *mānas-*. 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 regular formation in nominal compositions, while **mas-* appearing as a preverb in the verbal composition

⁵³ See also Wackernagel II,1 189.

⁵⁴ See Schindler (1975) 266: “... ai. *mandhātár-* ‘Andächtiger’, das wegen des in Komposita unzulässigen Suffixes nicht als **mans-dhātár-*, sondern als **mandhā-tár-* zu analysieren ist.”

⁵⁵ Cf. Hinz, Walther (1975) *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*. Wiesbaden: 158, who supposes “ein *-āna*-Patronymikon bzw. -Matronymikon zur aw. Wurzel *mand-* ‘im Gedächtnis behalten.’” This is evidently based on the old interpretation seen in Bartholomae (see 2), but is sufficiently suggestive in spite of the criticism from Rüdiger Schmitt (2011) *Iranisches Personennamen in der griechischen Literatur vor Alexander d. Gr.* Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

OAv. *mazdā* is secondarily introduced from the nominal composition Av. *mazdā-* = Ved. *médhā-*. On the other hand, **manz-* in nominal composition (Av. [-]*mazdra-*, Ved. *mandhātár-*, *māndhuká-*) seems to result from an opposite process where **mans* 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 dhā* makes no sense at all. We will not only examine the Av. examples of the syntagma *mān/mən/mas/maz(...)**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. *śrad(...)**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^o 48,2 *māng* (→ 3.3) and Y 30,1 *mazdāthā* (→ 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.

Main References

- Bartholomae, Christian (1888) Die arische flexion der adjektive und partizipia auf nt-. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 29: 487–588.
- Bartholomae, Christian (1979) *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin/New York. Reprint of the first edition (1904 Strassburg): Walter de Gruyter. = *Wb*.
- Dunkel, George E. (1999) On the origins of nominal composition in Indo-European. In: *Compositiones indogermanicae*. Hrgb. von H. Eichner und H. Ch. Luschützky, 47–68. Praha: enigma corporation (Gs. Schindler)
- Gotō, Toshifumi (1997) Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 16–29. In: *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology* 16-3, 1001–1059: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Gotō, Toshifumi (2000) Vasiṣṭha und Varuṇa in RV VII 88. In: *Indoarisch, Iraisch, und die Indogermanistik*. Hrsg. von B. Forssman und R. Plath, 147–161. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Gotō, Toshifumi (2007) *śraddhā-*, *crēdō* no gogi to gokei ni tsuite (Japanese). *Indogaku Shūkyō Gakkai, Ronshū* 34: 578–561. Sendai: Indogaku Shūkyō Gakkai.
- Geldner, Karl F. (1886) *Avesta. The Sacred Book of the Parsis*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Graßmann, Hermann (1873) *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhohaas.
- Hoffmann, Karl (1965) Zu den altiranischen Bruchzahlen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 79, 247–254. (= *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik* 1975: 183–190)
- Hoffmann, Karl/Forssman, Bernhard (2004) *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*. 2., durchgesehene

- und erweiterte Auflage. Innsbruck. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Hoffmann, Karl/Narten, Johanna (1989) *Der Sasanidische Archetypus*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Humbach, Helmut (1955) Die Genitivformen von idg. *dem- (ar. *dam-) "Haus." Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 6: 41–49.
- Humbach, Helmut (1957) Ahura Mazdā und die Daēvas. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 1: 81–94
- Humbach, Helmut (1959) *Die Gathas des Zarathustra*. 2. Bände. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Humbach, Helmut/Elfenbein, Josef/Skjærvø, Prods O. (1991) *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra*. 2 Parts. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Insler, Stanley (1975) *The Gāthās of Zarathustra*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Kellens Jean (1974) *Les noms-racines de l'Avesta*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Kellens Jean (1984) *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Kellens, Jean/Pirart, Eric (1988, 1990, 1991) *Les textes vieil-avestiques*. I–III. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert (1967) Avestan Possessive Compounds with a Root Noun in the First Member. In: *Sir J. J. Zarhoshti Madressa Centenary Volume*, 120–122. Bombay. (= *Aufsätze zur Indogermanistik*. 2005: 17f.).
- Kuiper, F. B. J. (1942) Notes on Vedic Noun-Inflexion. In: *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde*, 5/4: 161–256. Amsterdam. (= *Selected Writings on Indian Linguistics and Philology*. 1997: 439–530)
- Lubotsky, Alexander M. (1988) *The System of Nominal Accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European*. Leiden et al.: E. J. Brill
- Mayrhofer, Manfred (1956–1980) *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. 4 Bände. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag. = KEWA
- Mayrhofer, Manfred (1992, 1996, 2001) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. 3 Bände. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag. = EWAia
- Pirart, Eric (1984) Gāthique *cazdōnghuuantəm*. (Brief Communications). *Indo-Iranian Journal* 27: 48–49.
- Pirart, Eric (1985) Gāthique *vazdahā auuēmīrā*. (Brief Communications). *Indo-Iranian Journal* 28: 204–206.
- Pirart, Eric (1987) Deux notes indo-iraniennes. *Instituto Universitario Orientale, Annali* 47,2. Napoli: 209–213.
- Scarlata, Salvatore (1999) *Die Wurzelkomposita im Ṛg-Veda*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Schindler, Jochem (1972) L'apophonie des noms-racines indo-européens. In: *Bulletin de la société de linguistique* 67, 31–38.
- Schindler, Jochem (1975) Zum Ablaut der neutralen s-Stämme des Indogermanischen. In: *Flexion und Wortbildung*. Hrsg. von H. Rix. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

- Schindler, Jochem (1997) Zur internen Syntax der indogermanischen Nominalkomposita (Handout of a speech). In: *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy*. Editades por E. C. y J. L. García Ramón. Madrid/Wiesbaden: Ediciones de la UAM/ Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Sgall, Petr (1958) Die Infinitiv im Rg-Veda. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philologica* No. 2: 135–268. Praha.
- Stüber, Karin (2002) *Die primären s-Stämme des Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Szemerényi, Oswald (1979) Vedic *šam, šam yoḥ, and šam(ča) yošca*. *Incontri Linguistici* 4: 159–184 (= *Scripta Minora* IV 1991: 1725–1750)
- Thieme, Paul (1967) Vedisch *manīšā*. In: *Beiträge zur Indogermanistik und Keltologie Julius Pokorny zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Hrsg. von W. Meid, 99–106. Innsbruck. (= *Kleine Schriften*. 1971: 239–246).
- Tichy, Eva (1995) *Die Nomina agentis auf -tar- im Vedischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- de Vaan, Michiel (2003) *The Avestan Vowel*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.
- Wackernagel, Jacob/Debrunner, Albert (1896–1930) *Altindische Grammatik*: Einleitung (1896), Introduction générale (L. Renou, 1957), I (1896), Nachträge zu I (1957), II,1 (1905), Nachträge zu II,1 (1957), II,2 (1954), III (1930), Register (R. Hauschild, 1964). Göttingen.: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. = *AiG*

古インド・イラン語 *mans d^hā

—形態論的研究—

堂山 英次郎

edoyama@let.osaka-u.ac.jp

キーワード: インド・ヨーロッパ語, 古インド・イラン語, アヴェスタ語, ヴェーダ語, *mān/mən/maṣ/maz(...)*dā, アップラウト, 活用タイプ, 語根名詞, -s-語幹

要旨

古インド・イラン語の複合動詞 *mans d^hā は Av. *mān/mən/maṣ/maz(...)*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 *mans 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, *mans 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- は後者の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 *mans- の形は, それぞれ複合名詞の *mas- 及び格形である *mans- が二次的に持ち込まれた形と思われる。この結果に基づき, 今後 mans d^hā 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)