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0. The morphological elements of Old Indo-Aryan (language of āryas) [OIA] nouns, pronouns, and verbs are to a large extent inherited from Proto-Indo-European [PIE] through Proto-Indo-Iranian (Proto-Aryan) [PII], and agree with those of Old Iranian (Avestan [Av.] and Old Persian [OPers.]) very well. The oldest forms are represented in the language of the Ṛgveda [RV] (ca. 1200 B.C.), then the Atharvaveda [AV] and other Vedic mantras (ca. 1000 B.C.–), mostly in verse. The prose occurs in the “brāhmaṇa”s of the Yajurveda-Sanhitās (ca. 800 B.C.–), in the Brāhmaṇas (7th c. B.C.–), and the oldest Upaniṣads (6th–5th c. B.C.). The language of these Vedic texts is called “Vedic”, and is handed down for the most part in accented form. The succeeding development of OIA, to which the grammar of Pāṇini (ca. 380 B.C.) was applicable as the standard, is “Classical Sanskrit”. “Epic Sanskrit”, a somewhat more popular form, is used in the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana. Vedic, especially the language of the RV, is the major focus for reconstructing PII and for comparative and historical IE linguistics in general.


0.1. We begin by introducing some terminology regarding the ablaut scheme in a paradigm. The term “dynamic” refers to a pattern in which the syllable having an accented *-e*-vocalism appears (in ; other elements show an unaccented zero grade or *-o*-grade). The dynamic scheme starts from the standard that a

word consists of three syllabic elements A-B-C, which correspond in most cases to root-suffix-ending. A formation without suffix (root-ending), as in the root nouns, inj. of the athemat. root pres. or aor., is regarded as B-C, observed from the end. The “strong form” in a paradigm (e.g., nom. sg. in nouns) has *-é- in A or B; the “weak form” (e.g., an oblique case) in A, B, or C; the place of *-é- in a weak form does not go back beyond that of the strong form:

acrodynamic: in strong forms A-B-C, in weak forms A-B-C
proterodynamic: A-B-C, A-B-C
amphidynamic: A-B-C, A-B-C
hysterodynamic: A-B-C, A-B-C

The reconstructed endings, however, do not have a complete variety of ablaut grades, but some endings can only be reconstructed with a full-grade (e.g., dat. sg. *-e, nom. pl. *-es), or zero-grade form (e.g., acc. pl. *-ns, *-ns).

1. nouns

Like PIE and other old languages, OIA distinguishes three genders: masculine [m.], feminine [f.], and neuter [n.]. Nouns consist of substantives [subst.] and adjectives [adj.]. The adj.s are declinable in three genders. Words designating male and female beings are m. and f. respectively. There are some motion suffixes inherited from PIE, e.g., -ā- < *-é-h₂-, -yā-/ī- < *-jéh₂-/īh₂-, cf. also -h₂- in -u-h₂- (1.4.1.). Inanimate objects and concepts are m., f., or n., largely depending on their word-formation, i.e. the suffix. Words for trees are m. (: vṛksā- m. ‘tree’), herbs are f. (: óṣadhi- f.), and fruits n. (: phāla- n.). Animals are represented either by a m. (śvān- ‘dog’ < *kṣēn- :: śuvā- ‘she-dog’, hainaśā- ‘goose, gander’) or a f. (gāv- ‘cow’ and ‘cattle’ < *gʷh₂- (< *gʷh₁-), there are many terms for each kind of cattle according to gender, age, and use). OIA has three numbers: singular [sg.], dual [du.], and plural [pl.]. The du. is used to refer to two persons or objects in general, not restricted to forming a pair. Eight cases are used: nominative [nom.] for the subject, vocative [voc.] for addressing a person (or thing), accusative [acc.] for the direct object, dative [dat.] for the indirect object or aim, genitive [gen.] to indicate possession or part, instrumental [instr.] for means or association, ablative [abl.] to indicate separation, and locative [loc.] to indicate location.

1.1. The basis of the nominal inflexion (declension) is the nominal stem, which carries the lexical meaning, and is in most cases with substantive nouns bound to one of the genders, at least originally. Every inflected form terminates

---

2) Concerning the accent place, one can speak of acro-static, protero-kinetic, etc.

with an ending ("case ending"), which indicates number, case, and in part, gender. Nominal paradigms belong to one of two inflectional types: thematic and athematic, depending on whether or not a vowel -a- (PIE *-e/o-) precedes the endings. The former type secondarily spreads to some forms, especially in "vowel stems". Neuter nouns are inflected like masculines except that they have different endings in the nom. = acc. for all three numbers.

1.1.1. The endings (or terminations, Ausgänge, i.e. the ending fused together with the final part of the stem) of the thematic -a- stems are:

In the singular,

nom., m. *as < PII *-as < PIE *-o-s,

voc. *a < *-a < *-e (i.e. *-e + O)

acc. *am < *-am < *-o-m,

nom. acc. n. *am < *-am < *-o-m,

instr. *ā < *-ā < *-e-h₁₁, but usually replaced by pronominal *ena⁴a) < *-aṁnā (cf. 2.2.2. [4]: p.71), ⁴b) dat. *āya < *āya (remodelled in PII after gen. *-asja, cf. WACKERNAGEL Kl.Schr. 274f.; OAv. -āi,ā, -āiiā beside OAv. YAv. *āi < PII *-āi < PIE *-o-ej),

abl. *āt⁵ < *-āt, *-aat⁶ < *-o-at/d⁷, *-o-h₂et/d, or *-o-et/d(?),

gen. *asya < *-asja < *-o-sjō (beside *-o-so, not continued in Indo-Iran.),

loc. *e < *-ai⁸ < *-o-ī;

---

⁴a) Also -ena, cf. LANMAN 332, MACDONELL 256f., AiG III 92.

⁴b) Only the forms in -ā < *-ā occur in OIran. On relics in -ā in OIA (espec. in the n.; only uncertain examples are found in the prose; forms in -ā appear in older layers in Pāli beside -ena), cf. LANMAN 331ff. (espec. 334f.), MACDONELL 257. Cf. AiG III 90–92.

⁵) Disyllabic -aṭ (-aat) probably in parākāṭ RV I 30,21, VIII 5,31, X 22,6, antārikṣāṭ X 158,1, sadāṣṭhāṭ VIII 11,7; according to LANMAN 337f., however, "extremely doubtful".


in the **dual**,  
nom. voc. acc. m. *ā*\(^9\) < PII *-ā < PIE *-o-h\(_1\), *au < *-ā + *yu (only in OIA),  
nom. acc. n. *e < *-a\(^10\) < *-o-ih\(_1\),  
instr. dat. abl. *ābhyaṃ instead of *"ebhy" < PII *-aibbʰ já\(^11\) + *-m/-am,\(^12\)  
gen. loc. *ayos: a blend of PII gen. *-aiiəs\(^13\) < *-o-ḥ₁ōs and loc. *-aiça\(^14\) <  
* -o-ḥ₁o\(y\)\(^15\);  

in the **plural**,  
nom. voc. m. *ās < *-o-es\(^16\),  
acc. *ān\(^?\) (with long ā introduced from the nom. *ās; PII *-ans\(^18\) < PIE  
* -o-ns < Pre-PIE **-o-ns-m-s),  
nom. acc. n. *ā, *ān\(^19\) < PIE *-ā < *-e-h\(_2\) (collective),

\(^9\) Also -a in the voc., especially in nouns referring to Mitra and Varuṇa, cf. AiG III 53.  
[cf. KUIPER Shortening (1955).]  
\(^10\) OAv. *ōi, YAv. *e. The form *-aiH is postulated in the OIA “pragṛhya”-sandhi of -e  
(FORSSMAN MSS 25, 1969, 49 n.11), cf. also n.27.  
\(^11\) OAv. *ōibiiā, YAv. *aeibiiā, OPers. *aibiyā preserve the old formation *-oibʰj₁.\(^\ast\). In  
OIA, -ā in the nom. voc. acc. is assumed to be introduced in place of -ai-, thus also YAv.  
forms in *ābiiā (HOFMANN Aufs. 55 n.7).  
\(^12\) One assumes generally *ābhyaṃ in the case of a few trisyllabic forms (cf. LAMMAN  
343f.), but *ābhyaṃ (i.e. *abhyaaṃ) is equally possible. It seems that no trisyllabic form is  
found in athematic inflexions. A PIE form can be reconstructed without complete  
certainty: *-oibʰi-m or *-oibʰj₁-eh₁ (?), cf. RIX Hist.Gramm. 141.  
\(^13\) OAv. aṣaiiāš ‘of both parties’, YAv. víraiiāš ‘of both men’, and numeral duwaiiāš ‘of  
two’, uuaiiāš ‘of both’ (HOFMANN–FORSSMAN 120).  
\(^14\) OAv. zastaiiō ‘in both hands’, ubōîiō, YAv. *uuaiiō ‘in both’ (loc. cit.).  
\(^15\) About gen. and loc. du. in PIE cf. HOFMANN Aufs. 561 n.2, 599 n.14, LINDEMAN  
\(^16\) Collective *ā < *-e-h\(_2\) was generalised in the thematic inflexion in Iranian as in Pāli.  
Ved., OAv., YAv., and Pāli have also hyper-marked forms in *āṣas (< *ās-ās) beside *ās or  
*ā. Such forms occur also in the -ā- stems (p.21), and in pānthāsas ‘ways’ (p.44)[; also  
anīyāḥa bagāḥa ‘the other gods’ in OPers., cf. KENT §10, §172, SCHMITT F.s. Eilers 265ff.]  
\(^17\) And *āns in the sandhi-form *āns ca. Cf. n.31.  
HOFMANN–FORSSMAN 66: §35hc, 88: §54d). OPers. *ā seems to go back to *āns as in  
OIA, judging from the fact that the final -a caused by the loss of a consonant (t, n, h)  
preserves its quantity (HOFMANN Aufs. 634).  
\(^19\) Later (Vedic prose +) only *āni which is formed probably after -n- stems, e.g. nāmā́  
nāmā́ni ‘names’ (cf. p.41). No form with short -a is reported. In Iranian only -ā (in YAv.  
regularly to -a, in OPers. only āyadanā).
1.1.1. thematic terminations;  1.1.2. athematic endings

instr. *ais < *-āiš < *-ōiš

dat. abl. *ebhyas < *-āi-ōyas

gen. *ānām (also *ānām/*ānaam/) < *-ānām/-ānaam < *-o-om,

loc. *esu < *-a-īsu

Many nouns have this thematic inflexion, e.g., devá- ‘heavenly; god’: devás, deva, devám, devéna (also devénā, devā), devát, deváya, devásya, devé; devá or deváu, devábhyaṃ, devávos; devás (also devásas), devās (also devāsas), devān, devais (also devēbhis), devēbhyaś, devānāṃ, devēsu.

1.1.2. Other inflexions are characterised by the same set of endings:

In the singular,

nom., m. f. -s < PII, PIE *-s, or -Ø (in the case of long-grade stems),

voc. -Ø,

acc. m. f. -m, -am < *-m, *-m,

nom. acc. n. -Ø,

instr.24) -ā, or lengthening of preceding vowel < *-ā, *-H < *-eh1, *-h1,

20) In the RV and other mantra text portions also *ebhis (cf., e.g. -ā-bhis in f. -ā- stem) as in the pronom. inflexion, e.g. tēbhis (RV and other mantras) beside tāis (AV+, however, cf. OAv. tāś, Grk. tōiɔ < *tōiš). Cf. also Pāli ʻehi.

21) Probably PIE *-o-mo-s crossed with instr. *-o-bhi(-s).

22) OPers. *ānām, but OAv. YAv. *aṇā with short a before *nām (also in the -ā- inflexion; for the explanation cf. HOFFMANN–FORSSMAN 60: §26bd. There are two exceptions YAv. maśṭiṇām ‘of men, people’ and y’ṇaṇām (y’nā-/g’nā- ‘woman’); the former could be interpreted as avoiding three short syllables (SAUSSURE–WACKERNAGEL’s law, cf. AİG I, Nachtr. 177 on 313,42) from *mārtyyanaām (the final ‘ām is scanned almost consistently disyllabically, thus < *-aṇām), but there are also contra-examples. The termination in PIE is *-ōm < *-o-om (cf. n. 36). In Indo-Iranian, the formant -nām is introduced in the “vowel stems” as *Vānām: YAv. gaśrīṇām = Ved. giriṇām ‘of mountains’, OAv. vohunām = Ved. vāsinām ‘of good…’, YAv. tanunām = Ved. tanunām ‘of bodies’, -i-nām, yātū-ju-nām ‘of the ones urged by sorcery’ beside jōgūvām ‘of the ones who are jubilating’, etc. The disyllabic -naam is known a few times in -ā- stems, and more than ten times in -i-stems (MACDONELL 267, 287). The precise process of this development is unknown, cf. n. 36. The alleged Vedic forms with *ām (such as devām; candidates in ib. 262) are all uncertain.


24) Indo-Iranian has generalised the ending *-eh1 (originally in the amphi- or hysteroodynamic type). The ending *-h1, which must have been generated as an ablaut variant in theacro- and proterodynamic types, is preserved in Vedic -i- stems (ūṭi, cīti, ēcīti, etc., and with -i, originally from a pre-vocalic position with loss of h1, e.g. avyktā ‘through good praising’, cf. LANMAN 380f., MACDONELL 281), and Avestan -i- and -u- stems (cf. n.75, n.79): OAv.
1. nouns

In the dual,

nom. voc. acc. m. f. 27) -ā, -au (-ā + ū), or lengthening of preceding vowel < *-ā, *-H < (*-eh₁), *-h₁,

nom. acc. n. -ī < *-ī 28) < *-ih₁,

instr. dat. abl. -bhyām < *-bīā + *-m/-am (cf. n. 12),

gen. loc. -ōs: a blend of PII gen. *-ās < *-h₁ōs and loc. *-aū < *-h₁oū 29;
of existence’. YAv. uruuaraiā∴ (uruuarā- ‘plant’) is attested both in the loc. and gen. Cf. n.13–15.


31) -ns in the sandhi-form, e.g. -niś ca. Cf. n. 17, n. 76, n.91.

32) Hitt. -ns suggests that -*ns had not been assimilated to *-ns.


34) Av. -bīš, OPers. -bīš.


36) The distribution -ām, -aam after consonants, and -nām, -naam after sonants (“vowel
1. nouns

loc.  -su < *-stu\(^{37}\) < *-stu.

1.1.3. notes on the locative singular

There is a variety of forms in the locative singular in Indo-Iranian athematic inflexions. In the case of stems without ablaut, -i is simply added in general (in Iranian, the form is not seldom unified with postposition ā), e.g., the -t-stem, OAv. amēr\(^{3}tā\-tī ‘in immortality’, Ved. uparātāti ‘in superiority’, with -a YAv. uṣṭaṭāti ‘in desire’; the *-as-stem, YAv. manaḥi = Ved. mānasī ‘in thinking’ OAv. yāhī, YAv. yāhi ‘in request’, OAv. srauwaḥī = Ved. śrāvasi ‘in fame’, with -ō OPers. drayaḥayā ‘in a lake’; the *-iś-stem, YAv. viḥīṣi ‘in trial’, Ved. barhiṣi ‘on ritual grass’; the radical -r-stem, uśtāt YAv. sārī, YAv. sārī ‘in union’, Ved. dhūr ‘on a yoke-saddle’, purī ‘in a palisade’; the radical *-ē-stem, YAv. viśi = Ved. viśi, with -ō YAv. viśīa, OPers. viṭhyā ‘in a settlement’. Otherwise, see the ablaut-scheme in the following overview:


2. Long grade in the stem: the radical *m-stem, OAv. dām, +‑i dāmi ‘in a house’; the radical *ā-stem +‑i OAv. ā-dāi (with disyllabic āi) ‘at the endowment (?)’ Y 33,11 < *āH-i (also possible: < *aH-a; or *aH-i with analogic ā, so HOFFMANN–FORSSMAN 124).


stems”) has originated in PII, cf. also n.22. The question as to whether the disyllabic ending in PIE should be interpreted as a replacement by the thematic termination, or there was a special disyllabic ending, is still open.


\(^{38}\) The loc. sg. forms attested in the manuscripts of some Av. -u- stems are collected in SKJÆRVO Gs. MacKenzie (2005) 197ff.


(5) From the stem in various grades: full grade ē+ -i YAv. zōmī ~ Ved. kṣāmi ‘on the earth’; zero grade + PIE ∗-aḥ (cf. Grk. χῶμαι) YAv. zīmē, unifined with -ā YAv. jmav-ā; probably + ∗-en (cf. p. 34), to the ∗-o- full-grade stem kṣām-an, kṣām-an-i, to the zero-grade jm-ān; + -er/-r YAv. ∗zamař; cf. p. 18f.

1.2. stem formations39) and ablaut

The -a- stems from PIE ∗-e/o- stems show no ablaut other than the “abtönung” of the PIE thematic vowel itself. On their inlexion, cf. 1.1.1.: p. 9f. Also the -ā-stems (substantives and feminine forms of the thematic adjectives) have no ablaut, showing always a full grade in the suffix, thus already the PIE ∗-eh₂-stems (or “mesodynamic”, if one wants to speak of the ablaut-scheme); but there are case forms not directly inherited (→ 1.2.2.: p. 20f.).

Ablaut is observed in stems in -án-t/-at-, -vánt/-vat-, -mánt/-mat-, -váns/-váš/-úš-, -án/-n/-a-, -ván/-va/-un-, -mán/-mn/-ma-, -ānč/-ac-(/-tč-), -tār/-tr/-tr, -ār/-r/-r-, root nouns, some nouns originating in elemental vocabulary (‘dog’, ‘cow’, ‘mouse’, etc.), and partially nouns in -av/-i-, -av/-u-, -yā/-r-, etc. The nom. voc. and acc. in the singular and dual, the nom. and voc. in the plural, and the loc. sg. are strong cases (cases having a strong form according to the scheme cited in 0.1.) in PIE, on which the nominal inflexions in Indo-Iranian and OIA are based. In Indo-Iranian, neuter nouns predominantly show weak stem-('dog', 'cow', 'mouse', etc.), and partially nouns in -san scheme cited in and the loc. sg. are strong cases (cases having a strong form according to the alternation of the vowel quantity is abandoned (BRUGMANN’s law may have obstacles’ maintains its ablaut (partially with analogic -san), cf. Av. sánı, The root nouns with -sanı stem (root) and ending, thus nom. és, — -hán- ‘slaying (someone, something)’ largely maintains its ablaut (partially analogous -ha-): nom. vrtra-há ‘slaying Vṛtra, obstacles’ (OAv. vṛṛθṛṃja, YAv. vṛṛθṛja), acc. vrtra-hāṃ (YAv. vṛṛθṛjanā), instr. vrtra-gn-ā (YAv. vṛṛθṛjana), dat. -gn-é (YAv. vṛṛθṛjaye), gen. -gnás (YAv. vṛṛθṛraynō), pl. nom. sattru-hāṇas ‘slaying enemies’ (YAv. vṛṛθṛjanō), instr. vrtra-hā-bhis: < *gwḥén-s, *gwḥén-m, *gwḥn-éh₁, *gwḥn-ēs, *gwḥēn-es, *gwḥn-bh₁s. — These developments seem rather to be isolated cases, and not dependent on some phonological circumstance.

The root nouns with -sāni/-sā- ‘conquering’ (*senh₂/*sṇh₂) in the last member of compounds show mixed paradigms from -sāni-, -san-, -sā-, -s-, -sa-. SCARLATA Wurzelkomposita 577–586 investigates all the forms and summarizes 585f. as follows: sg. nom. -sās and -sāni-s, acc. -sám, -s, -sāni-m, gen. -s-ās, -san-as, dat. -s-e, pl. nom. -sās, -sānas, instr. -sās. The form -sāni- is introduced from acc. sg. -sāni-m < *-senh₂-m (instead of *-m); gen. sg. -san-as stands for *-sṇh₂-ēs; -sā- might go back to an unattested pl.-form such as *-sābhīs < *-sṇh₂-ḥ₁is, or the nom. sg. *-sēnh₂-s could have become -sās with the nasal’s loss as SCARLATA proposes among other possibilities. This phenomenon is al-


The PIE **elemental vocabulary item** pād/-pad- m. ‘foot’ is particularly archaic: sg. nom. pāt, acc. pād-am (from this a new stem pāda-; YAv. pādom), gen. pād-ás, loc. pād-i, du. nom. acc. pād-ā (YAv. pāda), pl. acc. pād-ás (YAv. pādō): < *pōd-s, *pōd-ṇ, *ped-ēs (<*pād-ēs?; Lat. pedis). — āp/-ap- f. ‘water’, imagined as living being(s) and used mostly in the pl., shows ablaut between āp and ap, just like pād/-pad-, or Av. vāc/-vac:41 sg. instr. ap-ā, gen. abl. ap-ás, pl. nom. āp-as, acc. ap-ās, instr. ad-bhīs, dat. ad-bhyās, loc. ap-sú. The zero-grade form *-h₂p- is found in anūp-ā- ‘river basin’, dvīp-ā- ‘island’, etc. In Av.: sg. nom. YAv. āpās, acc. āpom, apom-ca, instr. apa, apā-ca, dat. ape, apaē-cīq, abl. apa, gen. āpō; du. nom. acc. āpā; pl. nom. āpō, acc. OAv. YAv. āpō, apas-cā, (YAv. also āpō), dat. YAv. ābīōō, gen. apqm. — Hysterodynamic inflexion underlies these paradigms (or amphidynamic, if one should assume the absence of a suffix).

The **monosyllabic noun** dyāv- m. (f.) ‘heaven’ preserves its original hysterodynamic scheme: sg. nom. dyāu-s, voc. (after nom.) dyau, dyāus, dyāus, acc. dyām, dyām (secondary div-am), loc. dyāv-ā, div-ē, abl. gen. div-ās, (secondary dyō-s), loc. dyāv-i, div-i; du. nom. acc. dyāv-ā41a); pl. nom. dyāv-as, acc. dyān, div-as. In Iran., only YAv. gen. sg. diuāos is attested (Yt 3,13, according to HUMBACH KZ 81, 282f. ‘der [Brut der] Hölle’, cf. also KELLENS Noms-racines 402); the form is identical with Ved. dyō-s (6× in the RV :: div-ās more than 400×), but is to be judged as analogic after gós (PII *gay-ś), cf. AiG III 224. The PIE paradigm is: sg. nom. *diēu-s (Grk. Zēs), *diēu-s42, acc. *diēm (Grk. Zēv, Zēv-α) < *diēu- m. (after STANG’s law), *diēm42, dat. *diuē- (Grk. Corinthian Διε, Cyprian Δι-ει-φιλος, Mycenaean di-we /diwei/), abl. gen. *diuē-és/ōs (Grk. Διός), loc. *diēu + -i (Lat. ioue), *diēg42 (Lat. iū), (Grk. Δί, probably < *diu- i.e., secondary after the forms with *diu- just like Ved. div-i); pl. nom. *diēu-es (with ē after sg.?), acc. *diu-ns or *diu-ns.

41) The alternation between pūr and pur in the stem pūr- f. ‘palisade, fortification’ is phonological in nature. The stem *pōlh- had no ablaut, or abandoned it (cf. Grk. πολῶς < *pōlh-i-s?, with dat. [loc.] Hom. πολῖν < *pōlh-i-ē + -i, KLINGENSCHMITT in lectures). It appears regularly as pūr before vowels and pur before consonants (i.e., PII *phH or *phH > *phH* or *phH*, and according to the constellation, *phHCV > pur* or pūr, respectively, preserving its syllabic quantity): sg. nom. pūr, acc. pūr-am, instr. pur-ā, pl. loc. pūr-sū, probably < *phH-s, *phH-m, *phH-ēh, *phH-sū. Cf. n. 147.


42) Disyllabic LINDEMAN variant.
nouns

preservation of old formations (in the loc.):
through phonological change, simplification of the consonant group, analogy, or
gāv- f. ‘cow’ maintains its acrodynemic pattern: gāv-us (< *gʷʰōu-s, OAv. YAv. gāuš), gām (< *gʷʰōm < *gʷʰōu-m, after STANG; OAv. YAv. gām, YAv. secondary also gaom), gen. gōs (< *gʷʰōu-s, OAv. YAv. gōuš, YAv. gaoš), loc. gāvi, pl. nom. gāv-as (< *gʷʰōu-es; YAv. gauuā)\(^{43}\), acc. gās (OAv. YAv. gā ̃, after gām, gām).\(^{44}\)

náv- f. ‘ship, boat’\(^{45}\) goes back to *náh₂-u- (and perhaps also *náh₂-u-) which does not alter this shape: nom. nāu- (< *náh₂-u-s, Hom. νης; probably disyllabic nā-as US V 59,2 < *náh₂-u-s < *néh₂-u-s), acc. nāvam (*náh₂-u-n, Hom. νῖα, Lat. nāvem), gen. nāv-ás (*nah₂-u-és, cf. νης), pl. nom. nāv-as (*náh₂-u-és, νης), náubhis (ναῦβης).

dvār-/dur- f. ‘door’ follows a hysteronomic (or amphidyn.) inflexion just like pād-/pad-, āp-/ap-: sg. nom. dvār (AV+); du. dvār-ā, dvār-ā, dvār-au; pl. nom. dvār-as (5×), acc. durās I 193,7, dūras (many times, also in I 188,5), dvār-as I 130,3, voc. dvār-as. In YAv., acc. sg. duvarom and perhaps loc. sg. duvar (Vid 3,29) are attested; OPer. has a thematised loc. sg. duvarayā < *dʰuvara- + a. They go back to PIE *dʰywó, *dʰyérm, *dʰur-és, *dʰywér, *dʰyór-es, *dʰur-ńís. OIA d instead of *dʰ is interpreted through association with dvāv ‘two’.

In the case of ksām-/ksā/-/km-/jm- f. ‘earth’, various forms are developed through phonological change, simplification of the consonant group, analogy, or preservation of old formations (in the loc.): sg. nom. ksās (YAv. zā), acc. ksā-m, ksā-ām (OAv. YAv. zām), instr. ksām-ā, jm-ā (YAv. z₃mā, jm-ās)\(^{46}\) (YAv. z₃maṭ, z₃māṭ, z₃māṭ-ca, z₃māda), gen. jm-ás (YAv. z₃mō, z₃mas-ca)\(^{46a}\), loc. ksām-i (YAv. zāmi), ksām-ā, jm-ā (YAv. z₃mē, < PIE *-aι, cf. Grk. γαφι), ksām-an, ksām-an-i, jm-an; du. ksām-ā; pl. nom. ksām-as (YAv. voc. xömō), acc. ksās, ksās IV 28,5 (YAv. zōmas-ca), (gen. YAv. zōməm-ca), loc. ksā-su.\(^{47}\) — These start from a PIE *-em- stem: sg. nom. *dʰegʰóm (Hitt. tégan (te-e-kān)) → *g³h³óm\(^{47a}\) (χθόνος); acc.*dʰegʰóm (from *dʰegʰom-m after STANG’s law; Hitt. just as in the nom.) → *g³h³óm (ksā-m; and from *-m: ksā-ām, χθόνα).

---

\(^{43}\) With YAv. / East-Iranian phonological change *-āmu- > *-aμa-, cf. n. 45, n. 58.

\(^{44}\) Throughout with the PIE *-ó-vocalism because of its onomatopoetic origin.

\(^{45}\) In YAv. in nauu-uča- ‘sailor, navigator’ = Ved. nāv-ājā- (cf. n. 43) < *nāh₂-u-hdgo-, cf. Lat. nāūigāre.

\(^{46}\) Dissimilated in dvās ca gmās ca in the abl. and gen.

\(^{46a}\) Also LINDEMANN variant OAv. zimō, YAv. zimō is attested.

\(^{47}\) ksé in IV 3,6 nāsatūya kaš (according to GRASSMANN a dat. sg. of ksā-) is to be emended to nāsatūya yakṣé, cf. HOFFMANN apud SCHINDLER Diss. (1972) 15, GÖTÖ Linguistics, Archaeology and Human Past (2009) 208.

\(^{47a}\) *g³h³ is used here as a symbol for the combination of *g³ + ʰ (allomorph of ʰ).
and *gʰómₕₘₜₜ (zãm); abl. gen. *dʰgʰm⁻ši/os (cf. Hitt. tagnas 〈ták-na-(a-)aš〉 > *gʰdm⁻ši/os (kšmás, cf. žlovoš), and *gʰm⁻ši (jmás, zšmā); instr. *dʰgʰm⁻ēh₁ > *gʰm⁻ēh₁ (kšamā), and *gʰm⁻ēh₁ (jmā, zšmā); — loc. *dʰgʰēm(-i) (cf. Hitt. dągān from *-ōmₜₜ (49)) > *gʰōm(-i)(kšami), and *gʰēm(-i)(zami); PIE *-a- case (cf. p. 149: 4.3.) in: *gʰōm-a/i */gʰm-a/i > χαυαί (from the LINDEMAN variant *gʰmᵐⁿm⁻a/i), zšmē, with + ā > kšmavā, jmav-ā, *gʰōm-ā (reformed after *gʰōm) > Lat. humē, homē, with *-en: *gʰōm-en > kšam-an, kšam-an-i, *gʰm⁻ēn > jm⁻ān; with *-e(r): YAv. +zamar² ‘in the earth’ (Yt 1,29, after BARTHOLOMAE) < *gʰem-er or *-r; — Indo-Iran. pl. forms come from *gʰōm-és, *gʰm⁻nīs (50). The nom. sg. Ved. kšā-s, YAv. zā, Vedd. loc. pl. kšā-su have been formed analogically after the -ā-stems through the link of acc. sg. kšā-m, zām, acc. pl. kšās. The frequently attested n. nom. sg. kšáma or kšámā owes its -man- stem form to an imitation based on the loc. kšamān, kšamāni. This vocabulary item was, as is the case in many IE languages, no longer in use, and an epithet prthivī- ‘(the) wide one’ was (euphemistically) used as a common word for ‘earth’ beside bhūmī-(OAv. būmē-, YAv. būmē-, OPers. būmē-) from bhav⁻/bhū ‘come into being, become’, etc. The word prthivī- is originally the f. of the adj. prthū- ‘wide’ (cf. kšám ... prthvām RV X 31,9 ~ YAv. zām porʰbūm, porʰbē ... zōmō-; urvī prthvī ... dyāvaprthivī VI 70, 1,4) but has been fixed in this form and meaning, whereas the f. adj. ‘wide’ shows the form prthvī- without vocalization of *h₂. The starting point was: *plth₂-u⁻-ih > prthvī ‘wide’, gen. *plth₂-u⁻-ēh₂-s > *prt⁻iyās > prthivyās/prthivyās (used in the value ‘of the earth’); oblique cases of the f. adj. seem not to be attested) (51).


1.2.1.1. The root nouns, or the nouns to be regarded as such, ending in ˚ā- are inflected as follows: sg. nom. m. sthā-s ‘standing’ (used also as n.), rathe-sthā-s (YAv. rabaē-stā); f. 52) gnā-s ‘god’s wife’, (YAv. xā ‘spring’); acc. sthā-m, rathe-

48) All Av. forms come from simplified *gʰ (*gʰ would have become *z in Av.).
50) *gʰm⁻nīs has become *gʰmᵐⁿm⁻nīs (YAv. zōmas-ca) as a LINDEMAN variant, or simplified *gʰm⁻nīs (kšās, kšās).
52) Forms without -s in the nom. sg. f. are to be identified as pertaining to the -ā- stem inflexion. A transition happens easily through the link of PII formations such as instr. sg. -ā beside -āyā in the -ā- stems, oblique cases in the pl. -ā-bhis, -ā-bhyas, -ā-su, cf. 1.2.2.: p. 20f. Forms with -ā- stem inflexion increase after the RV in the abstract substantives and f. adjectives. Cf. the discussion by SCARLATA cited in the next footnote, and ibidem, p. 378,
1. nouns

\ṣṭhā-m (YAv. raṭaē-ṣṭam), gnā-m, khā-m ‘spring’; instr. (only f., and not always certain) apa-dhā ‘by removal’ II 12,3 < *-dʰḥ₁-ēḥ₁; 53) prati-dhā VIII 77,4 ‘in (one) draught(?)’, abhī-khyā ‘by glance, looking-at’, etc., (OAv. ā-dā ‘through endowment’, Y 33,12); dat. (1) m. d-ē ‘for giving’ < *dhā-ē, ści-p-ē ‘for the drinker of the clear (Soma)’, (YAv. raṭaē-ṣte54), (2) as inf. pra-khyāi ‘to see’, upa-yāi ‘to travel near’, etc. < *-ēh₂-ē(?) (YAv. raṭaē-ṣtāi55); gen. m. krṣṭi-prās ‘filling boundaries’, (YAv. raṭaē-ṣtā instead of -ō); in OAv. loc. ā-dāi (cf. p. 14: (2)); du. m. krṣṭi-prā, go-pā, go-pāu ‘herdsman’; pl. nom. m. raṭe-ṣṭhās, (YAv. armaē-ṣtā ‘standing still’), f. gnās, (YAv. xā); acc. m. (no certain examples in Ved.; YAv. raṭaē-ṣṭā, raṭaē-ṣṭā-s-ca), f. gnās, jās ‘children’, (YAv. xā); instr. m. agre-p-ā-bhis ‘drinking at first’, (YAv. akō-dābiś ‘producing bad things’), f. gn-ā-bhis, ratna-dh-ā-bhis ‘treasure-giving’; abl. m. bhūri-d-ā-bhyas ‘than many giving ones’; loc. f. gn-ā-su, j-ā-su, (OAv. adāhū ‘at the oblations’ < *ā-dʰā-); and in YAv. gen. xam, (no root-form is attested in the gen. pl. in Ved.).

1.2.2. The -ā- suffix stems are the descendants of PIE *-ah₂- < *-eh₂- stems with the endings presented in 1.1.2. (p.11ff.). But there are some PII or OIA innovations, especially the forms which have been clarified by employing formations from the devit- inflexion (proterodynamic type) of the *-ēh₂-/-ih₂- stems or the like:

In the sg. instr. (1) -āyā: jihvāyā ‘with a tongue’, etc., (OAv. daēnaiā, YAv. daēnaiā56) ‘by religious vision’; OPers. framānāyā ‘command’ is a mixed formation) < PII *-āyā, analogically after [*daiyā-i :: *daiy-i-jā = dʰər-ā :: x, x = dʰər-a-jā], or after instr. sg. tāyā of the prounoun tā- < *tēh₂- (cf. OChSlav. toj < *tajā-m, n. 170); (2) -ā: jihvā etc. (Vedic, frequently in -yā- and -tā- stems; OAv.

on pra-mā-, prati-mā X 130,3 and pramē IX 70,4. OAv. vay’iī ādā Y 49,1 (‘good endowment’?) is the nom. sg. of the derivative -ā stem (*-dʰh₁-ēh₂-), on the original root noun ā-dā- cf. above p. 14: (2); cf. NARTEN Yasna Haptaḥāiti 268.

53) sva-dhā ‘by one’s own decision’ possibly in VIII 32,6; but the frequently attested sva-dhāyā suggests an -ā- stem (*-dʰh₁-ēh₂-), or, at least, a transition to it, cf. SCARLATA 264f. A similar remark applies also to several other -ā- formations. On śrad-dhē I 102, 2 and śrad-dhā it VII 32,14 from śrad-dh-ā- (*kred-dʰh₁-ēh₂-), as opposed to the OAv. root noun rzar-dā- ‘believing, trusting’ (nom. pl. rzar-dā, dā < *aH-as, Y 31,1; YAv. a-rzar-dā- is a thematic stem), cf. ib. 263.

54) Thus presumably Vīd 14,9 (2×) instead of raṭhōṣṭi (according to BARTHOLOMAE the loc. sg.). — YAv. shows also forms from the -tar- stem.

55) Always preceding vāśtriīāi ‘for the farmer’, Yt 19,8; 13,88, Vīd 5,57,58.

56) In addition, there occurs a form with *iū: xāṭhrō-kāmii Y 9,24 (‘kāmiiāi’).
1.2.2. -ā- suffix stems; 1.2.3. -ī- stem inflexions

daēnā, YAv. daēna) < PII *-ā <-*-ah₂-eh₁; — dat. -āvai:⁵⁷) manāvai ‘for devotion’ etc. < PII *-āja, possibly *-ā- + *-iāj of the devī- inflexion, (YAv.)⁵⁸) daēnaiā (⁵⁹) ; — abl.⁶⁰) gen. -āyā: sēnāyās ‘army etc. < PII *-ājas, probably *-ā- + *-iāj of the devī- inflexion, (OAv. YAv. daēnaiā [YAv. form, cf. n.58], YAv. haēnaiā, YAv. haēnaiās-ca, OPers. haināyā ‘army’); — loc. -āyām: grīvāyām ‘on the neck’ etc. < *-ā- + *-iām of the devī- inflexion; PII *-ā: YAv. grīnuīia (cf. n. 58), OPers. Abhrēyā; — voc. (1) -e: jāye ‘wife’ etc. < PII *-aṭ of unknown origin, (OAv. bōr’xōē ‘estimated’, YAv. daēne); (2) PII *-ā in OAv. Pourucištā, YAv. sūra ‘strong’; the co-existence of two voc. forms has produced the YAv. nom. sg. pēr’ne ‘full’.

Other forms are regularly built: nom. -ā, -ās; acc. -ām, -ām; — du. nom. acc. voc. -e (cf. n. 27); abl. -ā-bhyām; gen. loc. -āyos, -ayos < PII loc. -*aH-Haū × gen. *aH-Hās, PII gen. *aṭās in YAv. uruuaraiā ‘of the two plants’ (cf. n. 58); — pl. nom. voc. -ās, -ās and the double formation -ās, -āsas (cf. n. 16); acc. -ās, -ās; instr. -ā-bhīs, -ā-bhīs; dat. abl. -ā-bhyas, -ā-bhyas; gen. -ānām, -ānām, also with ‘nām (cf. n. 22); loc. -ā-su, -ā-su.⁶¹)

1.2.3. The -ī- stem inflexion has two main types. [1] The vṛkṣī- (‘she-wolf’) type, comprising root nouns, e.g. dhī- ‘thought, reflexion’, and derivative feminines from m. -ā- stems⁶²), as well as some m., e.g. rathī- ‘charioteer’, has no ablaut in the stem.⁶³) sg. nom. dhī-s, acc. dhīy-am, rathī-ām, instr. dhīy-ā, rathy-ā, dat. dhīy-ē, rathy-ā, gen. dhīy-ās, ahīy-ā, ‘mother-cow’, loc. gaurī, sarasī, nādi (cf. 1.1.3. (4); p. 15), voc. nadi ‘river’, yami ‘Yamī’; — du. nom. acc. abhi-sṛiī-ā, -aū

---

⁵⁷) On ści for gen., abl. in the language of the theologists cf. n. 25.
⁵⁸) With YAv. / East-Iranian change *-aṭa- > -aṭa-, cf. n. 43.
⁵⁹) Also *iīī in gāēhiā ‘for the living being’ Y 9,3 (‘gāēhiā?’, cf. GOTO Akten Kraków 161 n.3.
⁶¹) kānā ‘girl’ (f.) shows in the nom. sg. -ā, but the stem goes back to a formation with HOFFMANN’s possessive suffix -aH- (<*-aH-)>-aH-, cf. 1.2.10. [3]; p. 42f.
⁶²) Cf. p. 51: [2]. Also, e.g. naptī- ‘granddaughter’ (beside AV+ naptī-, naptī-) to nāpāt- ‘grandson’.
⁶³) Thus also in Av. (in OPers., the -ī- stem inflexion has been partially transferred to the -ī- inflexion): e.g., sg. nom. OAv. sṛ̣iẓ-jī-s ‘living honestly’, YAv. zaṛa´nēnī ‘golden’, acc. OAv. ratḥim ‘charioteer’ (with disyllabic -im, i.e. a YAv. form < *ratḥiarm, YAv. yauwājim ‘living eternally’ (< *jījim), dat. OAv. sṛiẓ-jīịi ( < *jīja), gen. Śrūtāt.f’driiiō (girl’s name, ‘having a famous father’); du. nom. YAv. rātu-brii ‘pleasing the Supervisor(s)’; pl. nom. YAv. rātu-briiō, acc. OAv. yauwāj-jīiō, YAv. tīṣtriāniō, ‘aēnias-ca ‘Sirius-stars’, dat. YAv. yauwāj-jībiō. The endings, e.g. in the gen. sg. -ās, may point to a hysterodyn. origin.