



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The reflex of intervocalic *b in Avestan

Vaan, M.A.C. de; Schweiger G.

Citation

Vaan, M. A. C. de. (2005). The reflex of intervocalic *b in Avestan. *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt*, 665-679. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14128>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14128>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

S o n d e r d r u c k

überreicht

mit freundlicher Empfehlung

von Autor/Autorin, Herausgeber und Verleger

avec les compliments distingués

de l'auteur/autrice et de l'éditeur

saludos cordiales

del autor/a, del editor y de la editorial

con i migliori auguri

da parte dell'autore, del curatore e dell'editore

with compliments

of the author, editor and publisher

/// SCHWEIGER VWT-VERLAG ///

Verlag für Wissenschaft und Technik

Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Günter Schweiger, M.A.

Bahnweg 9

D-93104 Taimering (Riekofen)

BR DEUTSCHLAND RF ALLEMAGNE FR GERMANY

E-Post :

guenter.schweiger@extern.uni-regensburg.de

INDOGERMANICA

Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt

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

Herausgegeben von
GÜNTER SCHWEIGER

TAIMERING 2005
SCHWEIGER VWT-VERLAG

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

INDOGERMANICA – Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt :

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

(Studien zur Iranistik und Indogermanistik ; Bd. 3)

ISBN 3-934548-01-6

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

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem und alterungsbeständigem Werkdruckpapier

ISBN 3-934548-01-6

© 2005 • Schweiger VWT-Verlag

Verlag für Wissenschaft und Technik Taimering (bei Regensburg)

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des

Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages
unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für
Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die
Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Printed and bound in Germany and the ČR

I N H A L T

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

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

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

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

V O R W O R T

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

G. Sch.

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

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

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

THE REFLEX OF INTERVOCALIC **b* IN AVESTAN

1. Proto-Iranian **b* has been preserved as *b* in YAv. in word-initial position, after a nasal consonant, and after *z*; compare *band-* ‘to bind’, *brātar-* ‘brother’, *kambišta-* ‘least’, *zəmbaiia-* ‘to crush’, *uz-bara-* ‘to carry out’, *zbaia-* ‘to call’.

Word-internally, PIr. **b* yields a bilabial fricative β ¹ after all other consonants than nasals and *z*, and before all consonants except **i*. Among the examples with β following a consonant are *garəβa-* ‘womb’ (Skt. *gárbha-*) and *gaṇdarəβa-*² ‘Gandarva’ (to Skt. *Gandharvá-*³). YAv. β preceding a consonant is illustrated by *aβra-* ‘cloud’ (Skt. *abhrá-*), *xšuuβra-* ‘quick’ (Skt. *kṣiprá-*; **b* as in YAv. *xšuuβi-*), *baβrarə* (3p.pf.ind. to *bar-*), *baβri-* ‘beaver’ (cf. Skt. *babhrú-*), *vaβžaka-* ‘wasp’ (PIr. **vabza-*, cf. Oss. *æβzæn*), *diβžat* (desid. to *dab-*), and the present stem *gərəβnā-* (to the root *grab*); The development of **b* > β can be compared with the YAv. lenition of **d* > δ and of **g* > γ .

When PIr. **b* is in intervocalic position or in front of **i*, the YAv. reflexes are β and *uu*. Most scholars seem to agree on a phonetic development from **b* to $(*)\beta$ and subsequently, in part of the forms, to *uu*. Much of the evidence for the synchronic co-occurrence of β and *uu* has been collected by HOFFMANN-NARTEN 1989: 81-83. According to them, the vacillation between β and *uu* is caused by dialectal variation among the transmitters of the texts. They regard β as the regular reflex of intervocalic **b*, which further changed to *uu* in one of the (post-)Avestan dialects.

The hypothesis of different dialects is problematic, because it would predict a vacillation between the two variants β and *uu*, regardless of phonetic or morphological context. This, however, does not seem to be the case: β and *uu* occur in complementary distribution in at least part of the forms. The clearest example is

¹ The main reason for this interpretation of β is that its form is derived from the letter *p*, which in Middle-Persian had developed to a voiced bilabial fricative word-internally between vowels; cf. HOFFMANN-NARTEN 1989: 26.

² It is difficult to decide on the basis of the mss. whether *gaṇdarəβa-* or *gaṇdərəβa-* is the original reading. However, the fact that β has not been further lenited to **u* suggests that it stood after consonantal *r* rather than after vocalic *ərə*: judging by *gəuruuāia-* < **grbaia-* ‘to grab’, **gandṛba-* would yield **gaṇdəuruua-*.

³ The name vacillated between *°rva-* and *°rba-* in Indo-Iranian, cf. EWAia I: 462, HINTZE 1994: 220. This may be due to the phonological incorporation into IIr. of a foreign loanword, cf. LUBOTSKY 2001: 311.

the preverb **abi*, which appears as *auui* in isolation, but as *aiβi*^o when it is the first member of a compound.

This distribution rather points to a language-internal cause of the vacillation between *β* and *uu*. The development of **b* intervocalically and in front of **i* must therefore be discussed once more. I will subdivide the evidence in the following way: isolated lexemes are discussed in § 2, dative, instrumental and ablative plural endings in IIr. **b^h* in § 3, and the preverb **abi* (Skt. *abhí*) in § 4.

2. Among the category of isolated YAv. lexemes, intervocalic *β* is rare. Of the six items with a more or less reliable etymology, three belong to the same root⁴.

- *xšuaēβa-* (Yt 8.6,37 *xšuaēβō*, V 18.65 *xšuaēβāṇhō*) ‘sparkling’ and *āsu.xšuaēβa-* (Yt 8.37 *-əm*) ‘with rapid pulsation’ reflect PIr. **(k)šuaiba-*. Since *xšuaēβa-* must probably be connected with Skt. *kṣip-* ‘to fling’, the voiced labial is surprising (cf. MAYRHOFER 1986-96 I: 437), but it is confirmed by other Iranian languages.
- *xšuaēβaiiat. aštra-* (Yt 5.130) ‘making the whip vibrate’.
- *xšuiβi.išu-* (Yt 8.6,37, 10.102, 17.12) ‘who has vibrant arrows’, *xšuiβi.išuatama-* (8.6,37) ‘who has the most vibrant arrows’, *xšuiβi.vāza-* (Yt 8.37) ‘who has a vibrant flight’. The form *xšuiβi-* is the compound form of *xšuiβra-* ‘fast’. Short *i* is unexpected in YAv. open syllable after *uu* (cf. DE VAAN 2003: 230); it may be due to the influence of final short *-i*.
- *uzgərəβiiat* (Yt 13.46), abl.sg. of a noun or adjective meaning ‘raising’ or ‘raised’. This meaning matches the more frequent form *uzgərəpta-* ‘raised’ < **uz-grb-ta-* to the root *grab-* ‘to grab’. It occurs in the following context:

<i>tē ābiiō frērētā frērēnuuainti</i>	‘They allot allotments to them,
<i>ašaonəm vaṇhībiiō sūrābiiō</i>	to the good, strong, holy
<i>spəntābiiō frauuāšibiiō</i>	Fravašis of the righteous ones,
<i>θaxtaiiāt parō aṇhuiiāt</i>	...
<i>uzgərəβiiāt parō bāzuβe</i>	... ’

The syntactic construction of the last part is not completely clear. Whereas *θaxtaiiāt aṇhuiiāt* ‘the drawn sword’ is an abl.sg. depending on *parō* ‘before’, *uzgərəβiiāt bāzuβe* shows the combination of an abl.sg. plus a dat/ins/abl.du. Therefore, *uzgərəβiiāt* may be a noun. BARTHOLOMAE (1904: 411) assumes that it is the abl.sg. of a f. *uz-gərəβā-* ‘lifting, raising’. He compares the OAv. acc.sg. *gərəβqm* (Y 34.10), which is assumed to reflect a f. noun *gərəβā-* ‘understanding’ (MONNA 1978: 147, BEEKES 1988: 128). KELLENS (1975: 28) apparently regards Bartholomae’s interpretation as uncertain, since he leaves *uzgərəβiiāt* untranslated. In fact, the expected ending of an *a*-stem would be *-aiiāt*, and in

⁴ The forms *gərəβieiti* and *gərəβiaite* (Vyt 30) and *haṇgərəβiiāt* in N 67 are not trustworthy. KELLENS 1984: 178 regards them as errors for **gərəβnāiti* (Vyt 30) and **haṇgərəβnāt*, which seems to be the best solution.

front of *a*, **b* usually yields **u*, compare the verb *gəuruuāia-* < **gr̥baia-*. Hence, we must posit either a f. noun *uz-gərəβi-*, or an *īia*-stem *uz-gərəβiia-* ‘the raising’. Morphologically, the latter possibility is more attractive, and we may connect the Skt. ‘absolutive’ *gṛbhya*. Since this requires an adjectival meaning, we must render the text as follows:

<i>ṽaxtaiiāt parō aṇhuiiāt</i>	‘before the sword is drawn,
<i>uzgərəβiīāt parō bāzuβe</i>	before it is raised with both arms.’

Since the suffix *-īia-* of the gerundive is mostly disyllabic in OAv. and in Skt. (cf. BEEKES 1988: 195), it is possible that *uzgərəβiīāt* goes back to **us-gr̥biHāt*, in which case *β* would be the reflex in front of *i* rather than **j*. The price which we must pay for this solution is a nine-syllable line *uzgərəβiīāt parō bāzuβe*, where we would prefer an eight-syllable line. In view of our imperfect knowledge of YAv. verse techniques, this is not a decisive counterargument.

- *jaiβi.vafra-* (V 7.27) ‘with deep snow’. The element *jaiβi* is the compound form of *jafra-* ‘deep’ < **jab^hra-*.
- *biβiuuah-* (Yt 11.5, 13.41) ‘afraid of’, **bṛ̥βiuuāyha* (Yt 19.48,50) ‘terrifying’, perfect part.act. **bi-bi-^uuah-* to *bi-* ‘to be afraid’, cf. Skt. *bibhāvāms-*.

There are five other forms in *β*, the etymology of which is less certain or unknown:

- *daiβiš* (V 2.29f., 19.43), nom.sg., name of a demon. It might be derived from the root *dab-* ‘to deceive’; the preform would then be IIr. **d^hab^h-i-*.
- *driβikāca* (V 1.8) ‘?’. It may be a derivative of the word *driβi-* ‘stain’, see the next entry. PIRART (1998: 539) suggests that the Skt. demon *dṛbhika-* (RV 2.14) might also be a derivative of an IIr. stem **d^hrb^h-i-*.
- *driβiš* (V 2.29f., 19.43) ‘spot, stain’. The gen.sg. *driβiīā*, discussed below, points to a stem *driβi-*. In that case, we would expect to find **driβiš*. Since the form is surrounded by forms in short *-iš* in the context (*harəidiš*, *daiβiš*), it is possible that the original ending was influenced by those forms.
- *akaranəm.driβiīā* (V 7.2, 9.26), gen.sg. of *akaranəm.driβi-* ‘having stains all over’. The first member contains *a-karana-* ‘endless’. Whereas Bartholomae edits this form as a compound, Geldner has two separate words *akaranəm driβiīā*. They occur in a series of gen.sg.f. forms, all of which are unexpected in the context: *aeša druṣṣ yā nasuṣ upa.duuqsaiti apāxədraēibiiō naēmaēibiiō, maxši(.)kəhrpa əṛəγaitiīā frašnaoṣ apazaḍaṇhō akaranəm.driβiīā* ‘This Druj, the Nasu, comes flying in from the north, in the shape of a horrible, bow-legged, salient-rumped fly, which has stains all over’. The four gen.sg. forms following *maxši(.)kəhrpa* are probably epithets of *maxši* ‘fly’; the combination of *maxši-* and *əṛəγant-* also appears in V 14.6 *baēuuarə maxšingm əṛəγaitingm* ‘10 000 horrible flies’, which shows the feminine gender of *maxši-*. The uninflected status of *maxši* is problematic, since *kəhrpa-* usually takes a gen. in front of it, as e.g. in Yt 5.64 *upa.tacaṭ arəduuī sūra anāhita kainīnō kəhrpa srīraiīā* ‘Arəduuī, the strong Anāhita, approached in the shape of a beautiful young woman.’ BARTHOLOMAE (1904: 46)

is probably right with his remark that “es wird fortgefahren, als ob es vorher *maxšiiā kəhrpa* hiesse”.

- *duduβi.buzda* (F 690) is translated by KLINGENSCHMITT 1968: 210 as ‘observed by a deafened person’ or ‘perceived as something deafening.’ For *duδuβi* ‘deafened’ or ‘deafening’, he posits a reduplicated adjective **d^hu-d^hub^h-i-* of the Skt. type *súšvi-* ‘pressing’, *yúyudhi-* ‘warlike’.

There are two points to be noted about these β -forms. Firstly, β is always securely attested, and there is hardly any alternation with *uu* in the manuscripts. Also, β does not alternate with *b* in the same forms elsewhere in Avestan (e.g. beside *xšuuāēβa-* there is no **xšuuāēuuā-* or **xšuuāēba-*). As we will see below, this sets them apart from the lexemes with *uu*, which do alternate with *b* (e.g. *ašauuauuiō* beside *ašauuabiō*). Secondly, in all stems except *xšuuāēβa-*, β is followed by *i* or *ī*.

We now turn to the isolated forms with the reflex *uu*, most of which have been discussed by HOFFMANN-NARTEN 1989: 81ff.

- *auuānta-* (Yt 5.65, V 22.5) ‘healthy, not ill’ (cf. *baṇta-* ‘ill’). In N 56, we find unlenited *b* in *abaṇta-*.
- *auuarōit* (Yt 10.73) ‘raised’ < **a-barait*, an augmented optative; for this interpretation, see the discussion of the passage in HOFFMANN 1976: 613.
- *adaoiāmna-* (Yt 10 passim) ‘undeceivable’ < **a-dab-iamna-*.
- *adaoia-* ‘undeceivable’ (Yt 10.82, 12.1) < **a-dab-iHa-*.
- *+apauuarāni* (V 22.6) ‘I will take away’ from *apa-bar-*. The same word occurs with unlenited *b* in Yt 9.10 and 10.111 *apa.barāni* (BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 936).
- *uua* m., *uiie* f.n., nom.du. of *uua-* ‘both’ < **ubā*, **ubai* (Skt. *ubhā*, *ubhé*).
- *uuaiia-* ‘mutual, of both kinds’ (Skt. *ubhāya-*).
- **jaγauruua* (H 2.8, 26), **ājaγauruua* (N 54), 1s. and 3s.pf.ind. **ja-garb-* to *grab* ‘to grab’. The reflex /*u*/ is unexpected in a sequence **-arb-*, and so is the vocalization (we expect **ja-grab-*). KÜMMEL (2000: 634) explains the vocalism as a remake on the basis of the zero grade **jagərb-* or the present *gərəβnā-*. A zero grade **jagərb-* would phonetically yield **jaγəuruu-*, which would then also explain the *-uu-*.
- *gaḍauuara-* (Y 9.10, Yt 13.61, 136) ‘carrying a mace’, a compound of *gaḍā-* ‘mace’ and *bara-* ‘to carry’.
- *gəuruuaiia-* ‘to grab’ < **grbaia-* (Skt. *grbhāyā-*).
- *grauua-* ‘stick’ (Y 9.26, V 9.14) to the root *grab-* ‘to grab’.
- *dauuaiθiiā*, gen.sg.f. of **dabant-* ‘deceiving’ (Y 9.18).
- *dauuaiieinti* (Y 10.15), nom.sg.f. of **dābāiant-*, pres.part.act. to *dābāia-* ‘to deceive’.
- *buuāuua* (Yt 13.2, V 5.25), 3s.pf.ind. **bubāya* of *bū-*. The 3p.pf.ind. *bābuuarə* does not show lenition; it has probably restored *b*, maybe on the basis of the YAv. aorist forms *buua*, *buuat*, etc.

- *frabauuara* (Yt 10.79) ‘has bestowed’, **bauuara* (Yt 10.81) ‘has given’ < **babara*. Since the IIr. 3s.pf.ind.act. of **b^har-* must be reconstructed as **b^hab^hāra*, the Avestan form presupposes the analogical introduction of the root vowel *a* in the 3s.pf.; cf. KÜMMEL 2000: 27.
- *frauūāiti* ‘it shines’ (Yt 14.13), *viiāuuant-* ‘shining forth towards’ (Yt 8.2, 17.6), *vīuuant-* ‘shining forth’ (Yt 5.62), *vohuuāuuant-* ‘shining good things’ (Yt 7.5). Yt 8.40 *vīuuāiti* ‘shines forth’ belongs here too, in the analysis of FORSSMAN 2000: 108. All of these probably contain a preverb plus the root **bā-* ‘to shine’ (Skt. *bhā-*).
- *niuuaxtar-* (Vyt 38) ‘bestower’ < **ni-baxtar-*, in nom.sg. *baxtaca niuuaxtaca* ‘bestower and (down-) bestower.’
- *māuuōīia* ‘to me’ (OAv. *maibīiā*), *māuuaiia*^o, *xšmāuuōīia* and *hūuāuuōīia*, dat. of the 1s., 2p. and 3s. personal pronouns: **mabīa*, **šmabīa*, **hyabīa*.
- *sruuara-* (Y 9.11, Yt 19.40) ‘horned’ probably represents a compound of *srū-* ‘horn’ or ‘horny skin’ (cf. HINTZE 1994: 214) and **bara-* ‘carrying’.

I omit Yt 10.120 *auuauuat*, which is analyzed by HOFFMANN-NARTEN 1989: 82 as **aβayāt* ‘was’ to the stem *bauua-*. In my opinion, *auuauuat* represents the neuter of the pronominal adj. *auuauuant-* ‘so much, so many’. I also exclude the personal names nom.sg. *aδauuīš* (Yt 1.14, 10.143) and *vīδauuīš* (Yt 1.14). They are usually regarded as *i*-stems **a-dab-i-* and **vi-dab-i-* to the root **dab-* ‘to deceive’ (but the mss. evidence points to *ī*-stems *aδauuī-* and *vīδauuī-*, cf. DE VAAN 2003: 273f.). The absence of the development of **ayī* to *-əuui-*, which characterizes words with IIr. **u*, also favours the reconstruction of **b* in *aδauuīš* and *vīδauuīš*. Since these are names, however, we cannot be sure that the etymology is correct.

The evidence of the isolated lexemes discussed in § 2 shows a complementary distribution. PIr. **b* yields *β* when followed by *i*⁵, but *uu* in front of *ā* or *ī*. The reflex *b*, where it occurs, is the result of analogical restoration. For instance, in *apauuarāni* we find the regular result of lenition, but in *apa.barāni*, root-initial *b* has been restored. This restoration is restricted to clear morpheme boundaries: *fra-bara-*, *a-bauuat*, *frazā-baoδah-*, etc.

3. The second group of YAv. forms with a vacillation between *β* and *uu* consists of those with a plural ending in IIr. **b^h*-. Of the total number of approximately 750 attestations of the endings **-bīā* and **-bīah* in Yasna, Yašts and Vīdēvdād, 31 (about 4%) show a lenited consonant *β* or (**uu*). The percentage is higher in the Yašts (27 out of 208) than in the Yasna (2 out of 307) and the Vīdēvdād (2 out of 229). Since intervocalic **b* is otherwise always changed to *β* or *uu* in YAv., the

⁵ This condition was already observed by BOPP 1833: 43f., on the basis of less evidence: “Nach anderen Consonanten als *ϑ* und *δ* scheint *β* nicht vorzukommen, sondern nur *uu* zulässig; dagegen hat *β* zwischen zwei *i*-Lauten oder *i* und *ii* eine beliebte Stellung, in welcher *uu* unerlaubt scheint.” [I have modernized Bopp’s transliteration.]

96% forms containing *b* must be due to analogical restoration. We sometimes find the same case form of the same stem both with lenition (e.g. *nərəuuiō ašauuauuiō*, *gaēθāuuiō*) and without it (e.g. *nərəbiiō ašauuabiiō*, *gaēθābiiō*). The model for the restoration was probably provided by stems in an obstruent, such as *vīžbiiō* (*vis-*) or *druuatbiiō* (*druuant-*), in which *b* had been retained all along.

3.1 The forms which display β are the following:

- *aiβiiō*, dat.pl. **ap-biah* of *āp-* ‘water’ (Y, V and Vr passim). Not a single form **a(i)biiō* is attested. It always occurs in the formula *aiβiiō vaŋ^hibiiō*.
- *aiβiasca* (Yt 10.82), abl.pl.f. **ābīasca* of the pronoun *a-/i-*. It occurs twice in the expression *ābiiō dōiθrābiiō aiβiasca yaoxštibiiō* ‘thanks to these eyes and these perceptions’. There are two remarkable features about *aiβiasca*, viz. the shortening of initial **a-*, and the presence of *i*-epenthesis; except for the *a*-stem ending *-aēibiiō*, *i*-epenthesis never occurs in the *b*-endings when *b* is retained, cf. DE VAAN 2003: 552f. The shortening of initial **ā-* may point to dynamic stress on the syllable preceding *-ca*: **ābīasca*. It is possible that the same stress is responsible for the reflex β of **b*, see § 4.
- *xštəuuiβiiō* (Yt 13.37), dat.pl. of the name *xštəuui-*.
- *gaošaēβe* (Yt 16.7) and *gaošaiβe* (Yt 10.107), dat.du. **gaušaibīā* of *gaoša-* ‘ear’. The spelling *gaošaiβe* is a corruption of earlier **gaošaēβe*.
- *bāzuβe* (Yt 10.105, 13.46, 16.7, V 8.75⁶), ins.du. and dat.du. of *bāzu-* ‘arm’. We find the unlenited form *bāzubīia* in Yt 13.107 *hauuaēibīia bāzubīia* ‘with both his arms’.
- *hinūiβiiō* (Yt 13.100) ‘fettters’, abl.pl. of *hinu-*. As in *aiβiiō* and *aiβiasca*, we find *i*-epenthesis in front of β . PIRART (2000: 405) restores **haēineβiiō*, but the mss. situation hardly allows us to rely on the variants of J10 and K14 only. The stem *hinu-* is not attested elsewhere in Avestan, nor do there seem to be cognates in Iranian or in Indo-Aryan which reflect an IIr. stem **sinu-*. Nevertheless, Avestan *hinu-* is usually compared with Old English *sinu*, OHG *senawa*, OIc. *sin* < Proto-Germanic **sinu-*. As for their meaning, both forms may derive from the PIE root **sh₂ei-* ‘to tie’ (cf. LIV², p. 544). Reconstructing PIE **sh₂i-nu-* for Gm. **sinu-*, the short vowel in the first syllable is problematic; compare OIc. *sími*, OE *sīma*, OS *sīmo* ‘rope, tie’ < **sh₂i-mōn*. KÜMMEL (2000: 550) suggests that the laryngeal metathesis to ***sih₂-nu-* was analogically avoided; but one may also argue that the original PGm. outcome was **sīnu-*, which was then shortened by Dybo’s shortening of long vowels in front of resonants in pretonic syllables (cf. SCHRIJVER 1991: 357). Note that animate *nu*-stems are usually oxytone in

⁶ The text is edited as *bānuβe* by Geldner, the reading of all mss., except Mf2 *bāzuβe*. However, the meaning of *bānu-* ‘ray’ does not fit the context. Hence, I follow GELDNER (1881: 577, 584) and KELLENS (1974: 175), who read *bāzuβe* ‘with both arms’, in spite of BARTHOLOMAE’s objections (1904: 954).

Vedic. The IIr. outcome of ***sih₂-nu-* would have been **sīnu-*, and there is no regular phonetic shortening of **ī* in this position in Avestan. One might suggest an analogical shortening, e.g. on the example of the nasal present which surfaces as *sināti* in Vedic (no nasal present of this root is attested in Avestan), or the participle *hita-* in Avestan. For the time being, then, the connection with Gm. **sinu-* may be retained.

3.2 The forms which display *uu* or *o* are:

- *ašauuaoiio* (Yt 8.11, 10.55, 74) and *ašāuuaoiio* (Yt 3.4, 13.86), dat.abl.pl. of *ašauuan-*. For long *ā* in *ašāuuaoiio*, cf. DE VAAN 2003: 125 f. Contrary to what we find in the Yašts, all attestations in the Yasna and the Vīdēvdād show *ašauuabiiō* (Y 71.6, V 27x).
- *gaēθāuuiio* (Y 9.8), dat.pl. of *gaēθā-* ‘living being’. The unlenited form *gaēθābiiō* occurs more frequently, viz. in Y 65.9, Yt 11.1, 19.93, V 13 passim, N 2, P 12.
- *pāδauue*, abl.du. (Y 9.28) and dat.du. (Yt 16.7) of *pād-* ‘foot’. The suffix vowel *a* is strange for two reasons. Firstly, the ins.du. of *pād-* is attested as *pādaēibiia* in V 5.11 and 6.46, with the suffix **ai* of thematic nouns. Secondly, both *pāδauue* and *pādaēibiia* are unexpected since *pad-* is originally athematic, compare the plural form Vr 14.1 *paṭ biiasca*, *paḍəbiiasca*. Hence, BARTHOLOMAE (1894-95: 128) assumes that the abl.ins.du. was reformed on the basis of the nom.acc.du. *pāda*; this seems quite plausible. He interprets this as an original form in a short vowel (Greek πόδε), but in view of Skt. *pādā*, original **pādābīa* might be more likely. This is in fact the reconstruction of HOFFMANN-FORSSMAN 1996: 85, who assume subsequent shortening of **pādāβε* to *pāδauue*. Shortening of **ā* is not regular in this position, however (cf. DE VAAN 2003: 123 ff.); hence, one may consider the formation of the new **pāda+*bīa* to have taken place after the YAv. shortening of long final vowels in polysyllables. The latter development can be dated relatively early in the history of YAv. (cf. DE VAAN 2003: 616).

The form *pāδauue* has undergone the changes **-bīa > *-uīa > -ue*. This seems to be in conflict with the evidence of *hāuuōiia < IIr. *saṽ(H)īa-* ‘left’ and personal pronouns such as *māuuōiia* ‘to me’ *< *mabīa*, which do not show the reflex *-e*. However, the different reflex in the latter forms may be due to their original disyllabicity: they must have acquired an anaptyctic vowel between *u* and *i* before final *-e* could arise.

- *nəruuiio* and its variants (*nərauiio*, *nuruuiio*), for earlier **nəruuiio* (Yt 3.4, 8.11, 10.55, 74), dat.pl. of *nar-* ‘man’. All of these attestations are in combination with *ašauuaoiio*. Apart from them, we find unlenited *nərauiio* in Yt 8.1 and 13.10, and in all Vīdēvdād attestations. In V 2.41, there is a du. form *nərauiia*.
- *yūšmaoiio* (Yt 13.38), abl.pl. of *yūžəm* ‘you’.
- *vōiγnāuiio* (Y 68.13)⁷, abl.pl. of *vōiγnā-* ‘wave, raid’.

⁷ Some of the less important mss. (J7.K11.P6.L3) spell *-biiō*, in imitation of the surrounding

- *rasmaoiō* (Yt 5.68, 10.8, 47, 48, 15.49), dat.pl. of *rasman-* ‘battle rank’.
- **stiuuiō* (Yt 13.86), dat.abl.pl. (in the function of a genitive) of *sti-* ‘creature’. As I have argued in DE VAAN 2003: 126, it is possible that *staoiō ašāuuaoiō* in Yt 13.86 is a corruption of **stiuuiō ašāuuaoiō*.
- *šanmaoiō* (Yt 10.24), dat.pl. of *šanman-* ‘blade, sharp point’.

3.3 The ins.pl. ending **-biš* is never found with a lenited consonant, except in two *u*-stems in Y 12.4. The expected ins.pl. of an *u*-stem would be *-ubīš*, which is once attested in OAv. *hizubīš* ‘with tongues’. Via lenition of **b* to **u*, **-uyiš* has yielded Yav. *-ūš* in the archetype of the Avesta, cf. HOFFMANN 1976: 614. The endings **-βīš* or **-uyīš* do not exist. The only reliable evidence for an ins.pl. in *-ūš* or *-uš* is found in Y 12.4 *auuap̄hūš* ‘bad’ and *yātuš* ‘sorcerer’, and two more probable but not completely certain occurrences are N 57 **pituš* ‘food’ and *vīzušiča* ‘kind of animal’. All other alleged instances must be explained differently; for a detailed discussion of all the relevant forms concerning an ins.pl. in *-ūš* or *-uš*, I refer the reader to DE VAAN fthc.

3.4 Evaluating the *b*-cases, we have seen that the unrestored reflex *-uu-* and the forms in *-β-* are mainly found in the Yašts. It is unclear, however, which conclusions may be drawn from this observation, since they are not entirely confined to the Yašts: *uu* also occurs in Y 9, Y 12 (ins.pl), Y 68 and probably N 57; *bāzuβe* appears in one V passage, and *aiβiiō* occurs everywhere throughout YAv. Also, there is still a majority of forms with *b* in the Yašts themselves. I am unable to find a solution for this problem in the external history of the texts.

Neither do language-internal developments yield a satisfactory explanation of all the facts. The different reflexes of **-bīa*, in *pādaue*, on the one hand, but *bāzuβe* and *(*)gaošaēβe*, on the other, can be explained in two ways. Either we must posit a development **-uue > -βe* after *u* and *aē*; this is a very specific rule, however, with questionable phonetic probability. Or there is an analogical cause, for instance, that **-bīa* was restored in **bāzubia* and **gaušaibia*; but in that case, it is unclear why these forms did not yield *-biia*, as the restored ending did elsewhere. The consistent appearance of *β* in *aiβiiō* ‘to the waters’ also defies an explanation. It may still have been **apbiō* at the time of the lenition of **b*, or **b* was restored as in so many other dat.abl.pl. forms; but the change to *aiβiiō* is unexpected on any account. The form *aiβiiasca* may be explained by the earlier stress placement; see section 4 below. Finally, there are the hapaxes *xštəuuiβiiō* and *hinūiβiiō*.

4. The preverb IIr. **ab^{hi}* ‘towards’ (Skt. *abhi*, OAv. *aibi*) shows the reflexes *aiβi* and *auui* in YAv. As was seen by HOFFMANN-NARTEN 1989: 81 f., these variants depend on the use of **abi* as an independent word or in a compound. When used independently, **abi* yields *auui* when it is not followed by a clitic, but

forms in the text of Y 68.13.

aiβi when *-ca* or *-cit* follow: *auui*, but *aiβica*⁸, *aiβicit*⁹. The spelling of *auui* differs according to the preferences of the different mss.; we often find *aoi*, which Geldner has adopted in his edition especially in the Yasna and in Yašt 5 (see DE VAAN 2003: 425 for details). When **abi* is the first member of a nominal or verbal compound, we find both *aiβi* and *auui*. The overwhelming majority of forms take *aiβi*, but a closer look at the attestations shows that *auui* occurs in a specific phonetic environment.

4.1 The form *aiβi* is found in front of vowels, dental and velar obstruents, *v* and *r*. It is of no importance whether the compound is written as one word or with a separation point between the first and the second member, except for the pair *aiβiiāma-* versus *auui.ama-*, which will be discussed below. Furthermore, *aiβi*^o is found in the form *aiβitō* ‘around’ (Skt. *abhītas*).

4.2 When *auui* occurs in compounds, it is always followed by *m-* or *b-*, in front of which *aiβi* is not attested; once, we find *auui* followed by a vowel.

The only compounds with *auui.m-* occur in Yašt 10, viz. *auui.miθri-* (Yt 10.20 2x) ‘the Antimithra’ and *auui.miθrana-* (Yt 10.101) ‘anti-Mithrian’. The spelling *auui* is securely attested, but the meaning which *auui* expresses here is surprising.

Most of the compounds with *auui* in front of *b-* concern the verb *bar-*. The best attestation of *auui.bar-* in Geldner’s edition is Vr 11.2 *auui.bərəta* ‘having been brought towards’ (2x),

ima asmana hāuuana auui.bərəta haoma zāire

ima aiiaphaēna hāuuana auui.bərəta haoma zāire

‘This stone haoma-crusher, which has been brought, o golden Haoma,
this iron haoma-crusher, which has been brought, o golden Haoma.’

Some of the mss. spell *auua* instead of *auui*, but in view of the surrounding forms in ^oa, *auui* is lectio difficilior, and therefore probably the original spelling. The compound *auui.bərəta-* may be compared with occurrences of *auui ... bar-* in tmesis: V 18.19, Yt 10.37, Yt 10.101.

The two remaining attestations of *auui.bar-* are much less certain. They occur in Yašt 8.24 and 25, where Geldner edits the text as follows (translations by PANAINO 1990):

8.24 *auui mqm auui.baβriiqm ... aojō*

‘I would have procured for myself ... the strength’

8.25 *auui dim auui.barāmi ... aojō*

‘I procure for him ... the strength’

In his edition of Yašt 8, PANAINO 1990: 50f. leaves this form of the text intact, but BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 937 changes it to ⁺*auua ... auui.bar-* in both passages,

⁸ Viz. in Yt 8.8, Yt 10.118,120, V 2.30,38, V 15.48, A 4.6.

⁹ Only once in Yt 19.12.

because *auua* is found in the ms. F1, on which all other mss. except J10 are based in Yašt 8 (Geldner gives no v.l. for J10). However, like its Skt. counterpart *áva*, Av. *auua* is seldom if ever used as a preposition which may rule a case form; it is usually prefixed to a verb form, and sometimes it serves as an independent preverb ‘down, towards’. The expression ‘to bring something to someone, to procure something for someone’, which we find in Yt 8.24-25, and which Bartholomae edits as ⁺*auua auui.bar-*, is expressed with the opposite order of preverbs, viz. *auui (...) auua.bar-*, in other Avestan passages: Yt 10.23, V 3.25, V 8.81 (cf. BARTHOLOMAE loc. cit.). This seems to be the more original version; not only because it occurs in a larger number of passages, but also because the combination *auua.bar-* ‘to bring down, to bring towards’ is quite frequent in YAv., for example:

Y 65.2 *yā vīspanqm hāirišingm dāitīm raθβīm paēma auua.baraiti*

‘Who procures for all females the lawful, ritually correct milk.’

V 6.42 *kaṭ tā haoma yaoždiṇ ašāum ahura mazda yā nasāum auua.bərəta*

‘Must these Haomas be purified, o righteous Ahura Mazda, which have been brought towards a corpse?’

Similarly, in RV the combination *abhī-bhar-* is very rare and has the specific meaning ‘to lay the blame on someone’ (RV 5.3.7), whereas *áva-bhar-* is much more frequent and usually has the more literal meaning ‘to hurl down; to sever’. Thus, both internal and comparative arguments suggest that Yt 8.24-25 *auui ... auui.bar-* is probably the result of a text corruption of earlier **auui ... auua.bar-*. The corruption must predate the ms. F1.

In Yt 10.134, we find three times the phrase *auui bāda fratərəsaiti* and once *auui bāda fratərəsənti*, translated by GERSHEVITCH (1959: 141) as ‘now it recoils in fear’ and ‘now they recoil in fear’. In view of the strange use of *auui* ‘towards’ in a construction meaning ‘to recoil’, we might prefer the alternative analysis proposed by HOFFMANN-NARTEN (1989: 82), viz. of the first two words as one compound ⁺*auui.bāda*, ins.sg. of *auui.bād(a)-* ‘hindrance, obstacle’, which they compare with Skt. *abhī bādḥ-* ‘to check, curb’.

There is only one compound which shows both reflexes of **abi*, viz. **abi-ama-* ‘exceedingly strong’: it has the form *auui.ama-* in Yt 8.13 and 13.35, but *aiβiiāma-* in Y 26.3, 59.20, Yt 13.82 and Yt 19.15, and its superlative *aiβiiāmatəma-* in Y 13.3 and Vr 3.5. The second form has undergone lengthening of the initial **a-* of **ama-* due to the change of **aβi-* to **aβi-* (cf. DE VAAN 2003: 33). The only important difference between the two variants is their frequency of attestation: *auui.ama-* occurs only twice in the Yašts, one of which (Yt 8) has a very shallow ms. tradition; *aiβiiāma-*, in its turn, is attested six times in three different Avesta books (Yasna, Yašt, Vispered). This suggests that the origin of the different reflexes may lie in the post-YAv. period of text transmission, rather than in the language as it once was spoken.

The context in which *aiβiiāma-* and *aiβiiāmatəma-* occur is the same in all four resp. two passages, so that we can make the following comparison of contexts:

Yt 8.13

tištriio . . . vazəmnō narš kəhrpa paṇca.dasaghō xšaētahe spiti.dōiθrahe bərəzatō auui.amahe amauuatō hunairiiaṇcō

‘Tištrya . . . flying in the shape of a fifteen-year-old man, radiant, with clear eyes, high, exceedingly strong, vigorous, able.’

Yt 13.35

frauuašaiio yazamaide frasnūtā vanat.pəšanā auui.amā spārō.dāštā amuiiamnā
‘We worship the Fravašis, the renowned ones, who win battles, exceedingly strong, who grant prosperity, unshakeable.’

Y 13.3 ≈ Vr 3.5

ratuš āstāiia aməšqscā spəntq saošiiāntascā dāhištq aršuuacastəm q aiβiiāmatəm q ašxṛāx’anutəm q; mazištq am q āmruiiē daēnaiiā māzdaiiasnōiš

‘I install as Ratus the holy immortals and the Saošyants who are the most learned, who are the best in speaking rightly, the most offensive ones, the most . . .¹⁰; I call on the greatest powers of the Mazdayasnean religion.’

Y 26.3ff.

frauuašaiio yazamaide yā aməšanqm spəntanqm xšaētanqm vərəzi.dōiθranqm bərəzatqm aiβiiāmanqm taxmanqm āhūiriianqm

‘We worship the Fravašis, those of radiant, actively viewing, high, exceedingly strong, valiant, ahuric holy immortals.’

In Yt 8.13, *auui.amahe* is immediately followed by *amauuatō*; it is possible that this caused an earlier form **aβiamahe* to be split into **aβi.amahe*. In Yt 13.35, *auui.amā* is surrounded by two compounds which are also split in two (viz. *vanat.pəšanā* and *spārō.dāštā*), which may similarly have prompted a split of **aβiamā* into **aβi.amā*. If this hypothesis is correct, it follows that *auui.ama-* is the direct reflex of **aβi.ama-*. It can be compared with *auui.bərəta-* < **abi.bərəta-*. The reflex *aiβiiāma-*, on the other hand, is more widely spread in the corpus, and cannot be due to a very recent merger of two members of a compound, due to its *ā* which must have developed from **a* exactly because **abi-ama-* was pronounced as one word.

Four other compounds display *auui* in front of a non-bilabial consonant, but in all cases we have reason to doubt their testimony:

- *auui.spašta-* ‘threatened’ (Yt 13.69), from the root *spas-* ‘to watch’. Geldner gives no v.ll. for *auui*, but there are arguments for supposing that the text may originally have had **auua.spašta-*. In the Rigveda, we find both *áva-spaś-* and *abhí-spaś-* in the meaning ‘to regard’, but *áva-spaś-* of course also means ‘to look down’. The meaning ‘to look down’ better fits Yt 13.69 *auui.spašta-* ‘threatened’ (‘looked down upon’), so that we may restore **auua.spašta-*. In fact,

¹⁰ Meaning and etymology of *aš.xṛāx’anutəma-*, probably a compound in *aš-* ‘big’, are unknown.

Yašt 11.5 shows a twofold attestation of *auua* + *spas*:- *nōit̃ ... auua.spašticina auua.spašnaot̃* ‘he shall not perceive by means of perception.’

- *auui.gərəftəm* (N67). The spelling of the Nērangestān is on the whole less reliable. It is probable that the original preverb was *auua*, cf. BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 528.

- *auui.ciciṽušīm* (V 18.67,69). It is likely that *auui* did not originally form part of the text, but was introduced by part of the mss. in anticipation of the following words *xšudrā auui fraγharəzaiti*. In support of this, Geldner notes that the Pahlavī translation of the text ignores *auui* in front of *ciciṽušīm*. Another possible solution was proposed by HOFFMANN-NARTEN 1989: 81, footnote 12, who posit original **a-uuī-ciciṽušī-* ‘not heeding, not thinking about’ < **a* + *vi-ciciṽuš-*, cf. Skt. *vī cit-* ‘to observe, understand.’

- *auui.ṽrāγhaiiete* in Yt 10.41 *miṽrō auui.ṽrāγhaiiete, rašnuš paiti.ṽrāγhaiiete* ‘Mithra drives the frightened regiments hither, Rašnu drives them thither’ (GERSHEVITCH 1959: 95). This is the only serious exception to the rule that **abi* yields *aiβi^o* in compounds in front of non-labials. As a solution, one might propose that the text tradition regarded *auui* and *ṽrāγhaiiete* as two separate words; or we might reconstruct **auua*, and ascribe *oi* to the influence of *paiti*.

4.3 Reviewing the evidence, we have found the following compounds with *auui*: *auui.bərəta*, *auui.bād(a)-*, *auui.ama-*, *auui.miṽri-*, *auui.miṽranīia-*. Since no compounds are attested with *aiβi* in front of a second member in *m-* or *b-* or *am-*, we may state that compounds always take *auui* if the first consonant to follow is a bilabial. This condition does not apply if **aiβi* is attached to the second member of the compound without a separation point: hence *aiβiiāma(təma)-*, and also *aiβiiāuuah-* ‘assistance’, with a following, bilabial *-uu*-¹¹.

Phonetically, *auui* is probably due to dissimilation: in front of a following bilabial consonant, the earlier fricative *β* was reduced to an approximant *uu*. The fact that initial *v-* of the second member does not cause the change to *auui* suggests that *v* was not a bilabial.

4.4 We are now in a better position to explain the occurrence of *auui* versus *aiβica*, *aiβicit̃* and *aiβitō*. Since *auui^o* in compounds is due to a dissimilation of bilabials, the original distribution was as follows: **aui* as a separate word, **aβi* in all cases where one or more syllables follow. All compounds with *aiβi* in front of a separation point must be more recent than this split into **aui* and **aβi*; put differently, this split must pre-date the Redactional Compound Split. Compounds with *aiβi^o* in front of a vowel without a separation point must reflect the original state: *aiβiiāma-*, *aiβiiāmatəma-*, *aiβiiāsta-*, *aiβiiāuuah-*, *aiβiiāxštar-*, *aiβiiāxšaiia-*, *aiβiiāiti* and *aiβiiāγhana-*.

¹¹ I do not follow HOFFMANN-NARTEN 1989: 81, who assume a compound **auui.auuaxīia-* in Yt 10.78. It seems to me that *auui* represents a secondary intrusion into the original text; cf. DE VAAN 2003: 569.

Since there is no obvious way to explain one of the two different reflexes of **abi* from analogical restoration, the origin of the distribution must be a regular phonetic development. We find **aβi* in compounds and in front of enclitics, but **aui* in isolation. In combination with what is known of the phonetics of Avestan in the more recent periods of the transmission, this points to the place of the stress as a possible cause for the split.

In DE VAAN 2003: 606 f., I have posited three subsequent stages in the place of the stress in Avestan and of the post-Avestan transmission period: 1. Proto-Indo-Iranian place of stress, 2. penultimate stress, 3. initial stress. I think that the difference between *auii* and *aiβica* is best understood in the light of the second stage, in which the penultimate syllable would have been stressed: **[áβi]* but **[aβíca]*. Apparently, then, compounds counted as single words for the sake of stress placement at this time, so that a compound such as **aβi-srūθrima-* would have been stressed only on the penultimate of the second member (or only on the final of the first member). This yields the following rule: intervocalic **b* was lenited to **β*, which did not further lenite to *u* in front of *i*, unless the vowel preceding **u* was stressed.

The retention of the bilabial fricative **β* in front of (stressed) *i* may be phonetically understood in the following way: the change from a fricative to an approximant did not take place because the spreading of the lips for *i* obstructs the outgoing airstream more than with any other vowel. A phonetic parallel which shows that *i* can indeed have such an effect on labials is found in Modern Irish, where the phonological opposition /w/ vs. /w'/ (that is, non-palatal *w* versus palatal *w'*) is realised phonetically as [w] vs. [v'] (cf. Ó SIADHAIL 1989: 78, 82). Compare also the voiced labial-palatal approximant [ɥ] which has arisen in French from bilabial **u* in front of /i/, but not in front of other vowels: *huit* [ɥi(t)] 'eight', *huître* [ɥitr] 'oyster'. The same explanation as for *aiβi* may also be valid for the words in section 2 with *β* in front of *i*, except for *daiβiš* and *driβiš*, in which the first syllable would have been stressed.

5. The investigation has shown that most of the evidence can be explained with a small number of phonetic rules. Intervocalic **b* was first lenited to *β*. This stage was retained in two categories: in the preverb **abi*, when it occurred as the first member of a compound (eventually yielding *aiβi*), and in isolated lexemes, when it stood in front of *i* and **i̇*. The preservation of the fricative can be understood from the phonetic influence of the vowel *i*. With two exceptions, this vowel was probably stressed at some stage of the Avesta transmission, which may have been an additional condition for the preservation of *β*.

In front of other vowels and in front of **i̇*, *β* further lenited to *uu*. The stop *b* has been restored at morpheme boundaries in various lexemes, and in most instances of the dual and plural case endings in **b*; the Yašts show a number of forms retaining lenited *uu*. They also display a small number of forms in *-βiio̯*

and $-\beta e$ which are very difficult to explain. Their β might be the result of a more recent lenition of (restored) b than the original lenition $*b > *u$.

Two forms are particularly problematic. The first one is the dat.pl. $ai\beta i i \bar{o}$ 'waters', which occurs rather frequently in YAv. It is understandable that b was not restored in $ai\beta i i \bar{o}$, because no nominal stem $\bar{a}p/ap$ - could be recognized in it anymore; but it is less clear why $ai\beta i i \bar{o}$ did not develop into $*au i i i \bar{o}$, since it has nearly the same syllable structure as $au i$. The second one is $xš u u a \bar{e} \beta a$ - instead of $*xš u u a \bar{e} u u a$ -. One might argue that there was a reluctance to create the same bilabial approximant which already is at the beginning of the syllable, but this does not seem to be an impediment in $aš a u u a o i i \bar{o}$. Possibly, $xš u u a \bar{e} \beta a$ - was analogically influenced by $xš u u i \beta i$ - (and $xš u u i \beta r a$ -) at the time of the lenition.

R e f e r e n c e s

- BARTHOLOMAE 1904: Ch. Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg.
- BEEKES 1988: R. Beekes, *A grammar of Gatha-Avestan*, Leiden.
- BOPP 1833: F. Bopp, *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litthauischen, Gothischen und Deutschen*, Berlin.
- FORSSMAN 2000: B. Forssman, Jungavestisch $vīuuāiti$ Yt 8,40. In: *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik*, edd. B. Forssman and R. Plath, Wiesbaden, 103-109.
- GELDNER 1881: K. Geldner, Uebersetzungen aus dem Avesta. IV. Jasht 8.10.13 Vendidad 8.16, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 25, 465-590.
- HINTZE 1994: A. Hintze, *Der Zamyād-Yašt*, Wiesbaden.
- HOFFMANN 1975: K. Hoffmann, *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, ed. J. Narten, Band 1, Wiesbaden.
- HOFFMANN 1976: *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, ed. J. Narten, Band 2, Wiesbaden.
- HOFFMANN & FORSSMAN 1996: K. Hoffmann and B. Forssman, *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*, Innsbruck.
- HOFFMANN & NARTEN 1989: K. Hoffmann and J. Narten, *Der sasanidische Archetypus: Untersuchungen zur Schreibung und Lautgestalt des Avestischen*, Wiesbaden.
- KELLENS 1974: J. Kellens, *Les noms-racines de l'Avesta*, Wiesbaden.
- KELLENS 1975: J. Kellens, *Fravardīn Yašt (1-70). Introduction, édition et glossaire*, Wiesbaden.
- KELLENS 1984: J. Kellens, *Le verbe avestique*, Wiesbaden.
- KLINGENSCHMITT 1968: G. Klingenschmitt, *Farhang-i ōm. Edition und Kommentar*, Inaugural-Dissertation Erlangen-Nürnberg (unpublished).
- KÜMMEL 2000: M. Kümmel, *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen*, Wiesbaden.
- LUBOTSKY 2001: A. Lubotsky, The Indo-Iranian substratum. In: *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-ougrienne 242.) Chr. Carpelan, A. Parpola, P. Koskikallio (edd.), Helsinki, 301-317.

- MAYRHOFFER 1986-1996: M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen (EWAia)*, Heidelberg.
- MONNA 1978: M. Monna, *The Gathas of Zarathustra*, Amsterdam.
- Ó SIADHAIL 1989: M. Siadhail, *Modern Irish: Grammatical structure and dialectal variation*, Cambridge.
- PANAINO 1990: A. Panaino, *Tištrya. Part I: The Avestan hymn to Sirius*, Rome.
- PIRART 1998: E. Pirart, Historicité des forces du mal dans la Ṛgvedasamhitā, *Journal Asiatique* 286, 521-569.
- PIRART 2000: E. Pirart, Anomalies grammaticales avestiques, *Journal Asiatique* 288, 369-409.
- SCHRIJVER 1991: P. Schrijver, *The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Latin*, Amsterdam - Atlanta.
- SKJÆRVØ 1994: P.O. Skjærvø, Hymnic composition in the Avesta, *Die Sprache* 26, 199-241.
- DE VAAN 2003: M. de Vaan, *The Avestan Vowels*, Amsterdam - New York.
- DE VAAN fthc: M. de Vaan, The instrumental plural of *u*-stems in Young Avestan, *Proceedings of the 5th Congress of the Societas Iranologica Europaea*, Ravenna, October 2003.