## 'Narten' Roots from the Avestan Point of View

## Michiel de Vaan Leiden University

1. At the 1993 Copenhagen meeting of the Indo-European society, Jochem Schindler presented a new theory about the origin of the so-called (acro)static root present. In his own words (Schindler 1994: 398): "Verbalen Nartenformationen entsprechen systematisch Nominalbildungen mit analogen Ablautverhältnissen. Das läßt auf zwei ursprüngliche Wurzeltypen schließen, Standard- und Nartenwurzeln." His theory implies the existence in PIE of a separate category of roots which inherently show 'upgraded' ablaut with respect to other roots: lengthened grade where other roots have full grade, and full grade where others have zero grade.

Schindler illustrates his theory by means of twelve very short notes. The first three of them intend to show that the 'upgraded' ablaut occurs with all three tenses, viz. present, perfect and aorist. Subsequently, Schindler offers reconstructed forms from nine different PIE roots which seem to show 'upgraded' ablaut. He distinguishes between verbal (A) and nominal (B) forms. He illustrates most of the reconstructions with one or two attested forms. In numbers, these are divided as follows: Vedic Sanskrit 12 forms (to 7 roots), Avestan 13 (5), Greek 9 (5), Latin 3, Old Irish 2, Old Church Slavonic 1, Lithuanian 1, Old High German 1, English 1. Whereas it is not unusual to find a numerical preponderance of Indo-Iranian and Greek in a list of examples, the fact that Avestan outnumbers Sanskrit is striking.

Schindler himself admits: "Für das Material bestehen natürlich z.T. Alternativerklärungen". The key word here is 'partly': how much of the evidence can be explained *only* by means of PIE 'upgraded' ablaut? If an alternative solution is proposed for a limited number of the adduced forms, this does not affect the general picture: the usefulness of the concept of PIE 'Narten' roots remains intact. Yet if credible alternative solutions exist for many of the forms which Schindler adduces, his theory will lose much of its attraction. It is the aim of this paper to test the validity of the Avestan evidence adduced by Schindler.

2.

• PIE \*ueĝh-: Av. pass. vaziia-, ptc.pf.med. vauuazāna-, adj. vāzišta-, ptc.pf.pass. vašta-.

Vaziia- appears in the OAv. pres.ptc.med. vaziiamna- 'getting married' (of girls). The meaning matches the Rigvedic use of vah- 'to carry; to marry (of a man)', the passive of which is attested in paryuhyámānā 'who is being carried around' = 'who gets married'. This suggests that IIr. \*ujh-iá- 'to be conveyed' had already acquired the meaning 'to get married'.

Usually, the Avestan passive in \*- $i\acute{a}$ - < PIE \*- $i\acute{e}$ / $\acute{o}$ - takes the zero grade of the root. Exceptions occur in Avestan when the root vocalism shows no synchronic alternation, viz. in the case of  $\bar{a}fiia$ - 'to be reached' (Skt.  $\bar{a}py\acute{a}$ -), and of YAv.  $\delta aiia$ - 'to be put, to be given' < \* $d\bar{a}$ -ia-, with YAv. analogical shortening of \* $\bar{a}$  (cf. de Vaan 2003: 147). Another root which does not display zero-grade formations in Avestan is yaz- 'to worship', and accordingly we find the pres.pass. yeziia- < \* $ia\acute{p}$ -ia- 'to be worshipped'.

The two remaining passives with full grade of the root are vaziia- 'to marry' (Skt. uhyáte) and bairiia- 'to be carried' (Skt. bhriyáte). Schindler regards vaziia- and bairiia- as archaisms with PIE 'upgraded' root vocalism in front of the suffix \*- $i\acute{e}/\acute{o}$ -; they would have escaped the introduction of a zero grade. However, it is perfectly possible that vaziia- and bairiia- are due to an innovation on the Avestan side, introducing the full grade in order to make the passive more similar to other verbal formations (Kellens 1984: 128).

I thus assume that vaziia and bairiia- continue regular IIr. passive presents  $*uj^h$ - $i\acute{a}$ - and  $*b^h r$ - $i\acute{a}$ -, which analogically introduced the root forms vaz- and bar-on the model of the full grade in the present stems vaza- 'to convey' and bara- 'to carry'. In the case of bairiia-, this assumption can be supported by the following observation. Wherever we find a zero-grade passive present of roots in \*-ar(H), the corresponding active present also has the zero grade, or at least it never has the full grade: kiriia- 'to be made' < \*kria- (pres. karanu-), piriia- 'to be confiscated' < \*pria- (pres. paranu- and para-), miriia- 'to die' < \*mria- (no active present attested), " $uu\bar{o}iriia$ - 'to be covered' < \*Huria- (pres. varan-), striia- 'to be thrown down' < \*stria- (pres. staranu-)<sup>2</sup>. Only the passives bairiia- and variiia- 'to be consumed' (pres. varan-) occur beside a full-grade thematic present.

The only exception is °γairiia- 'to be greeted' (pres. °garan-), which belongs to the root PIr. \*garH-. The form is a hapax in Yt 13.50 kahe nō iδa nama āγairiiāṭ 'By whom now will our name be greeted?'

Apart from *vaziiamna*- there is one other, alleged occurrence of *vaziia*- which is reported to have the passive meaning 'to be conveyed'. We find it in Yašt 14.43-44 together with the (alleged) form *vašta*- 'conveyed', which would also show a full grade as opposed to Skt. *ūḍhá*-. The passage tells that when two armies clash, the army which is the first to invoke Vərəθraγna will prevail. I give the text according to Geldner's edition, with my own translation of the less controversial parts:

14.43 āaṭ mraoṭ ahurō mazdā yaṭ spā6a hanjasāṇte spitama zarav uštra <sup>×</sup>rāštəm rasma katarasciṭ vaštāŋhō³ ahmiia nōiṭ yaziiāṇte⁴ jatāŋhō ahmiia nōiṭ janiiāṇte

14.44 cataŋrō pərənå viðāraiiōiš
auui paðam katarasciṭ
yatārō †paouruuō frāiiazāite

(...)
atārō vərəðra \*hacāite.

Thus spoke Ahura Mazdā: When the armies come together, oh Spitāma Zarathustra, each of them an orderly battle-rank;

You must spread out four feathers towards each of the roads<sup>5</sup>; the one of them both which is the first to worship [Vərəθraγna], (...) that one will acquire the victory.

The problem lies in the last two lines of 14.43. Firstly, their meaning in the context is unclear. The loc.sg. ahmiia 'in it' can only refer to rasma 'battle-rank'; the subjunctive forms vaziiante and janiiante may or may not depend on yat, like hanjasante. A literal translation runs: '(when) the v. in it will not be v., (when) the slain ones in it will not be slain.' Bartholomae assumes that this refers to an undecided outcome of the battle, which is possible; but it might also be a description of rastom rasma, i.e. refer to the situation before the battle. Secondly, and this is most relevant to the present problem, the reading of the penultimate line is disputed. In his edition, Geldner (1886-96) gives this line as vastanto ahmiia nõit vaziiante, under the assumption (expressed in Geldner 1882: 80) that the double use of the verb jan- in the second line presupposes the double use

It has been tentatively assumed that OAv. vaziiamna- represents a denominative to YAv. vaziia- 'burden, load' (Humbach 1956: 74f. 'auf der Hochzeitsfahrt befindlich', Kellens 1984: 20 'se trouver sur le chariot de noce'); apart from the fact that this would require haplology to have taken place (from \*vaziaia-), it would disturb the idiomatic agreement between Sanskrit and OAv.

V.II. F1 vaštåŋhō, M12 vištåŋhō · J10 varštåŋho · E1 varštåŋhō, K16 varštåŋhō, s.m. vaståŋhō · Pt1.P13.O3 varaståŋhō, L18 varaštåŋhō · L11 varštåŋhō, M4 vaštåŋhō · Jm4 varaštåŋhō · K38.36 vištåŋhō.

V.II. F1.E1 vaniiāṇte · J10.M4 vaniiāṇti · Pt1+, L11.O3 vaziiāṇti · Jm4 janiiāṇte · K38 vaniiāṇte, K36.Ml2 vanaiiāṇti.

Bartholomae 1904: 894 translates "vier Federn sollst du verteilen auf den Weg nach beiden Seiten hin". This implies two anomalies, viz. the use of the gen.pl. padam for the acc.sg. (originally pantam, later pantanam), and the use of the nom.sg. katarascit as an accusative of goal. My translation implies only one anomaly, viz. the nom.sg. katarascit being governed by the preposition auui, which normally governs the acc.

of a single verb in the first line too. However, neither vašta- nor vaziia- are secured philologically. The reading vašta- appears in F1, but most other mss. have var(a)šta-; since there is no word in the context from which -r- could have been adopted, it seems that F1 vašta- has lost -r- (maybe due to \*raštam, spelled raštam in all mss. including F1). The mss. K36 and K38 spell vištåŋhō, but since we expect \*višt- to yield višt- in the archetype (cf. de Vaan 2003: 223ff.), it is likely that they too go back to varštanho. The verb form is given as vaniia- in most mss., and vaziia- can be due to a simple scribal mistake of z for n, both letters being very similar in the Avestan alphabet (if one assumes that vaniiante originally contained the letter  $\vec{n}$ , the similarity is even greater). Thus, the original version seems to have been varštånhō ahmiia nōiţ vaniiånte. A passive vaniia- 'to be conquered' would admittedly be a hapax, but it would nicely match the meaning of janiia- 'to be slain'. The juxtaposition of van- and jan- in connection with warfare returns in this same hymn: Yt 14.58 yada azəm aom spādəm vanāni ... yada azəm aom spādəm nijanāni 'so that I may conquer that army, ... so that I may strike down that army'. The meaning of varšta- is less clear. We may compare the past ptc. ounaršta- 'made, done', but this does not yield a cogent meaning. Kellens' judgement of the passage is clear (1984: 127): "Le Yt 14,43, vraisemblablement très corrompu, n'offre aucune garantie." The safest assumption to be made about it is that the alleged stems vašta- and vaziia- are probably ghost words.

The form vauuazāna- is also a hapax: Yt 10.124 frauuazaite miðrā ... vāṣṣm srīrəm vauuazānam. Kellens (1984: 409) argues that the original form may have been nom.sg. \*vauuazānā, referring to miðrā. The translation would then be: 'Mithra drives forth his beautiful chariot, which he has driven' (or 'been driving'). Of course, a form \*vaozāna- < \*va-uz-āna- would have been perfectly possible, cf. 3s.pf.ind. vaoze 'he has conveyed' and 3p. vaozīrām. But instead of regarding a participle of the perfect middle as a very archaic form with 'Narten' ablaut, it seems more likely that vauuazāna- has adopted the full grade from other verb forms of vaz; note the occurrence of fra-uuazaite in the same line.

The superlative  $v\bar{a}zi\bar{s}ta$ - probably does not belong to the root vaz- 'to convey'. Insler 1996 has argued that its meaning can hardly be 'most conveying' as was proposed by Bartholomae 1904: 1417 and many scholars afterwards, but must rather be 'most respected'. This means that  $v\bar{a}zi\bar{s}ta$ - must first of all be compared with Av. uzema- (Yasna 44.7) 'respectful', maybe for  $*\bar{u}zma$ -, and with YAv.  $a\bar{s}a.v\bar{a}zah$ -, which can mean 'having respect for the truth'. Iranian  $v\bar{a}z$ -/ $*\bar{u}z$ -can be connected with Skt.  $v\bar{a}has$ - 'respect' (RV  $zt\bar{a}sya$   $v\bar{a}has$  matching Av.  $a\bar{s}a.v\bar{a}zah$ -) and the superlative  $v\bar{a}histha$ -, which Insler separates from  $v\bar{a}histha$ -and translates as 'most respectful'. According to Insler, the Skt. verbal forms  $uh\hat{e}$ ,  $uh\hat{e}$ ,  $uh\hat{e}$ ,  $uh\hat{e}$  'I respect' and  $uhy\hat{e}$ the 'you two respect' may belong to the same root, although he leaves their relationship to uh-other etc. undiscussed. In any case,

the connection of Av. vāzah- and vāzišta- with Skt. forms in vāh-/ūh- implies an IIr. reconstruction as \*uaHjh-, which must be separated from PIE \*ueĝh-.

• PIE \*bher-: pass. bairiia-, agent noun bāṣar-.

For the passive present bairia- (Skt. bhriyáte), see above. YAv. bāṣ̄ar- 'rider' represents an IIr. agent noun with the suffix \*-tar-, a formation type which usually contains the full grade of the root. Since the expected reflex of \*bār-tar-would be \*baṣ̄ar-, Schindler reconstructs IIr. \*ā in \*bʰār-tar-. However, bāṣ̄ar- can be counted among a small number of words with an unexpected sequence -āṣ̄-< \*-árt-, cf. Hoffmann 1986: 847. In all cases, the consonant preceding -ā- is a labial: xʰāṣ̄a- 'food' < \*su̞arta-, xʰāṣ̄ar- 'drinker' < \*su̞ar-tar- and vāṣ̄a- 'vehicle' < \*u̞art-a-. We may posit phonetic lengthening of IIr. \*a in stressed initial syllable in front of ṣ̄ < \*rt, conditioned by a preceding labial (cf. de Vaan 2003: 54-56).

• PIE \*h<sub>3</sub>reĝ-: nom.acc.n. rāzarə : ins.sg. rašn-.

Schindler refers to a footnote in Strunk 1987: 390, who writes: "Schindler (by oral communication) compares OAv. rāzara (n.) 'statute, order', instr. sg. rašnā with alternation of lengthened and full grade in an acrostatic heteroclitic noun of the same root." However, it seems doubtful whether rašnā is compelling evidence for IIr. ablaut. Firstly, we find also the gen.sg. rāzāng and the gen.pl. rāšnam attested in OAv., with the same long vowel as in rāzarā. Secondly, there is a number of Avestan forms in which \*ā was shortened to a in front of ā in the next syllable, such as paiti. zanāt (Yt 13.50) 'knows' as against paiti. zānanti to zāna-, pres.subj.act. fraðat and med. fraðataēca to fraða- 'to flourish', or acc.sg. asnataram to a-snatar- 'washer'. In OAv., such a shortening may explain the acc.pl. sax vārā to the noun \*sāh-uar- 'command', cf. ins.sg. sāx vānī. It is possible that the same shortening is responsible for our form rašna < rašna. In that case, all forms of the noun \* $r\bar{a}z$ -ar/n- originally possessed the long vowel which we also find in the causative rāzaiia- and in the verbal adj. rāšta-, but not in other derivatives (rasman-). This \*a may ultimately stem from the root noun \* $h_3 r \bar{e} g^2$ -s and/or from the root present (Skt.  $r \bar{a} s t^2$ ), although the Skt. present stands isolated within Indo-European.

• PIE \*uerĝ-: varəzimācā, root noun °uuarəz-, past ptc. °uuaršta-.

The 1p. aor.opt. varəzimā-cā (Y 35.3) of varz- 'to work' goes back to IIr. \*uarf-iH-ma. The combination of full grade of the root plus zero grade of the suffix is unusual for a 1p. optative form; however, a few other OAv. root aorist opt. forms also display a full grade of the root, viz. mainimadi-cā, srəuuīmā and zaēmā. Schindler apparently concludes that the roots in question have 'upgraded' their ablaut in the aorist optative. Yet the ablaut grade of these root aorist optative forms does not necessarily go back to PIE. Hoffmann (1967: 32f.) points out that in the oldest layers of Sanskrit, the s-aorist lacks active op-

tative forms: they are supplied by the root aorist, e.g. Skt. 23s.opt. sahyās to s-aorist sākṣ- (sah- 'to conquer'). Narten (1984: 99) observes that the same situation seems to apply to Av. varz-: most of the active aorist forms are s-aorists, but there is no s-aorist optative. Therefore Avestan, like Sanskrit, may have supplied the aor.opt.act. by means of the root aorist (cf. also Harðarson 1993: 125). In that case, it cannot be excluded that the ablaut grade of the s-aorist \*varš- has influenced that of the root aorist varzīmā° which was used as its optative.

As evidence for 'Narten' vocalism, Schindler also adduces the root noun "unarəz- 'working' which is used as the second member of a compound, e.g. in ayāunarəz- 'who does evil' and haiðiiāunarəz- 'who makes real'. Kellens (1974: 66) ascribes the full grade of "unarəz- to analogical influence of the nom.sg. "unarəz \* \*-urə-s, which has regular -ar- < PIr. \*-r- in front of ɔ. This is one possible explanation. Alternatively, one may ascribe "unarəz- to the analogical introduction of (what looked like) the full grade from other derivatives of varz-, such as the ptc. "unarəza- 'done' and the adj. varəzuna- 'what must be done'. This scenario seems especially likely because the frequent thematization of the root noun in YAv. is always accompanied by the full grade of the root: nom.sg. sraosāunarəzō, gen.pl. vāstriiāunarəzanamaca, etc.

Schindler adduces the past participle "unaršta- 'done, made' in Old Avestan hunaršta-, dužunaršta- and haiðiiāunaršta- as evidence for a PIE \*-tó- formation with full grade in Avestan. In OAv., the vowel -a- is unexpected: Proto-Avestan \*-rš- regularly yields -ərəš- in Old Avestan, as opposed to -arš- in YAv. However, we find a number of OAv. forms which do contain -arš- < \*-rš-, such as aršnaunant- 'with a stallion', daršti- 'sight' and paršta- 'question'. These are probably due to YAv. influence on the OAv. texts: the OAv. sequence \*-rš- was replaced by YAv. -arš- in the speech of the YAv. text transmittors (thus Beekes 1988: 94 and Hoffmann-Forssman 1996: 91). We may regard "unaršta- as another instance of this YAv. influence on OAv.

• PIE \*ĝenh<sub>1</sub>-: noun ni-zonta-, fra-zainti-.

596

 PIE \*ĝenh<sub>1</sub>-. On the contrary, I would argue that nizənta- represents a more recent derivation of the root Av. zan-.

The word frazainti- < \*pra-janHti- is regarded as a possible old formation by Hoffmann 1986: 846, who connects it with Gr. yéveois and Latin gēns. For these forms, Beekes 1969: 228 has suggested the possibility of a PIE ablauting paradigm nom.sg. \*génh,tis, gen.sg. \*gnh,téis. The zero grade in the root and suffixal accent might then be continued in Skt. prájāti-, although this does not occur in the oldest Skt. texts, and has a slightly different meaning 'generating or generative power, generation, production, bringing forth, delivery' (Br.); ŚrS.; BhP. It is therefore possible that prájāti- is an inner-Sanskrit formation on the basis of Skt. prajá- (RV+) 'offspring' and prájāta- (RV+) 'born, produced'. This would leave Av. frazainti- as the only IIr. descendant of \*genh<sub>1</sub>-ti-, which renders the explanation from an ablauting paradigm unnecessary (though not impossible). Instead, frazainti- may be due to the introduction of the full grade of the root zan- 'to give birth to'.

- 3. So far the Avestan evidence which was used by Schindler. There is another form which has often been regarded as evidence for 'Narten' ablaut in Avestan:
- OAv. stāumī (Y 43.8), 1s. pres.ind.act. of stu-'praise'.

This form was discussed by Narten 1968: 17, who concluded that it might represent the Avestan counterpart of the lengthened grade in Skt. stáumi. However, instead of stāumī we must in all probability read Y 43.8 staomī, with the same full grade as in YAv. staomī. This is borne out by the variant readings: all mss. have staomī except for the Iranian Vīdēvdād sāde mss. Jp1, Mf2 and K4, which have stāumī. Although it is true that these mss. sometimes preserve an older reading than the other ms. classes, the sequences -āum- and -aom- tend to be mixed up by Jp1, Mf2 and K4, cf. De Vaan 2000; in particular, they tend to replace -aom- by -āum-. Thus, we must read Y 43.8 staomī.

4. It has become clear that the Avestan evidence does not support Schindler's theory; but there is more. A cornerstone of his system is formed by lengthened grades in acrostatic presents such as Skt. táṣṭi and ráṣṭi, but an alternative explanation for these lengthened grades has been found in the simplification of original reduplication in roots of the type \*TeK-. This idea has been developed by Kortlandt 1999, who builds on a suggestion by Lubotsky (p.c.): "When lengthened grade superseded reduplication in the active singular of the static present, first in TeK-roots such as táṣṭi 'fashions', dáṣṭi 'makes offering', then analogically in máṛṣṭi 'wipes', stáuti 'praises', the long vowel became characteristic of this type of derived present" (Kortlandt 1999: 6). This explanation combines a simple observation on the phonological structure of roots

showing 'Narten' presents with the fact that the lengthened grade has spread especially in Indo-Iranian (and within IIr., especially in Indo-Aryan). Since it does not introduce an otherwise unknown phonological parameter for PIE, and since it is tailored to the languages which contain most or all of the disputed lengthened grade presents, Kortlandt's explanation carries more conviction than the theory of PIE 'upgrading' roots. The proposed origin of lengthened grade presents in reduplication also removes the apparent anomaly that some PIE roots would have formed both a root present and a root aorist (cf. Kümmel 1998). Finally, it has been argued by Harðarson 1993: 89 and by Kümmel 1998: 204 that lengthened grade root presents are characterized by an intensive or iterative (Kümmel also speaks of durative) meaning. Since one of the main functions of reduplication in PIE is to express repetition, this observation neatly fits Kortlandt's explanation.

5. We have seen in section 2 that none of the adduced Avestan forms remains as trustworthy evidence for PIE 'upgraded' ablaut; all of them can be explained as the result of phonetic development within Avestan or from morphological rearrangement. The conclusion seems to be justified that the Avestan pillar under the theory of 'Narten' roots has collapsed. Added to the attractive alternative explanation which exists for the acrostatic root presents in Skt., the concept of 'Narten' roots can be abandoned altogether.

## Bibliography

Bartholomae, C., 1904: Altiranisches Wörterbuch. Straßburg.

Beekes, R., 1969: The development of the PIE laryngeals in Greek. The Hague / Paris.

Beekes, R., 1988: A grammar of Gatha-Avestan. Leiden.

Geldner, K., 1882: Studien zum Avesta. Straßburg / London.

Geldner, K. (ed.), 1886-96: Avesta. The sacred books of the Parsis. Stuttgart (reprint New Delhi 1991).

Harðarson, J.A., 1993: Studien zum urindogermanischen Wurzelaorist. Innsbruck.

Hoffmann, K., 1967: "Der vedische Prekativtyp jesam, jesma". – Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 20: 25-37.

Hoffmann, K., 1986: "Avestisch f". – R. Schmitt & P.O. Skjærvø (eds.): Studia grammatica iranica: Festschrift für Helmut Humbach. München: 163-183.

Hoffmann, K. & B. Forssman, 1996: Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre. Innsbruck.

Humbach, H., 1956: "Rituelle Termini technici in den awestischen Gathas (daēna-, urvan-, yāh, yāna-)". – Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 8: 74-83.

Insler, S., 1996: "Avestan vāz and Vedic vāh". – Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik 20 [= Festschrift Paul Thieme]: 169-186.

Kellens, J., 1974: Les noms-racines de l'Avesta. Wiesbaden.

Kellens, J., 1984: Le verbe avestique. Wiesbaden.

Kortlandt, F., 1999: Accent and ablaut in the Vedic verb, http://www.kortlandt.nl/editions/art188a.pdf.

- Kümmel, M., 1998: "Wurzelpräsens neben Wurzelaorist im Indogermanischen". Historische Sprachforschung 111: 191-208.
- Narten, J., 1968: "Zum "proterodynamischen" Wurzelpräsens". Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European studies presented to F.B.J. Kuiper on his sixtieth birthday. The Hague/Paris: 9-19.
- Narten, J., 1984: "Optativ und Tempusstamm im Altavestischen". Die Sprache 30: 96-108.
- Schindler, J., 1994: "Alte und neue Fragen zum indogermanischen Nomen (Erweitertes Handout)". Ed. J.E. Rasmussen unter Mitwirkung von Benedicte Nielsen: In honorem Holger Pedersen, Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen. Wiesbaden: 397-400.
- Strunk, K., 1987: "Further evidence for diachronic selection: Ved. ráṣṭi, Lat. regit etc.". Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald. Tübingen: 385-392.
- de Vaan, M., 2000: "Die Lautfolge *āum* im Vīdēvdād". B. Forssman & R. Plath (eds.): Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik. Wiesbaden: 523-533.
- de Vaan, M., 2003: The Avestan vowels. Amsterdam / New York.