F. B. J. KUIPER

OLD EAST IRANIAN *NĀMANI 'NAMES', ETC.

In a paper which has appeared in vol. 18, p. 241ff. of this journal1 three plural forms of neuter stems in -an- were quoted, viz. GAy. afšmānī, sāxvšnī ‘instructions’ and YH. nāmšnī ‘names’. As for afšmānī, the traditional interpretation as ‘merits’ is preferable to ‘verses’, cf. Lommel 1935: 109, Kent 1928: 106f., Altheim 1949: 267 n. 93 (with a reference to Thieme) and Bailey 1969: 141 n. 1. As instances from LAv. should have been mentioned V. 13.64 bāēuani ‘ten thousands’ and Y. 12.3 cinmānī ‘desires’, with a long ā that is also found in the dat. sing. cinmāne and perhaps in cinmānahe (cinamānahe MSS.). See Benveniste 1935: 51.

In a letter dated 20 June 1976 Professor Georg Morgenstierne kindly drew my attention to Pashto carmān, f. ‘skin’ and lamān, f. ‘border, hem’, which can be explained as old neuter plural forms in -ani (rather than -anī > -ani, Morgenstierne 1927: 18, 37), later reinterpreted as feminine stems in -anī. If this is correct, it confirms the common assumption that there were, indeed, neuter plural forms in -i in Avestan and that sāxvšnī is one of them. Insler’s recent attempt (1976: 17, 110, 274) to get rid of them is, apart from the questionable presupposition that all plural forms of neuter stems in -an must end in -qn, not acceptable because reading *sāxvšnī ‘these words’ instead of it, and interpreting these words as standing for *sāxvšqnī (or even *sāxvšqnī) would only be possible if the demonstrative ā ‘these’ could be used attributively and could stand after the noun. However, parallels for this construction are, as far as I can see, lacking. Nor can afšmānī beside anafšmānum (Y. 46.17) easily be interpreted as a locative, which would have been *afšmānī (or, theoretically, *afšmānī). For the use of dialectal variants in one and the same passage cf. V. 13.64 bāēuani ‘ten thousands’ beside 13.59 bāēuqn. For the correctness of the interpretation of afšmānī as a neuter plural cf. LAv. cinmānī ‘desires’ (Bartholomae 1895: 225, 1904: 895).

It is neither possible nor necessary to dwell here upon the many problems posed by nāmšnī (nāmšnī) and nāmšnīš, which have puzzled scholars for more than a century (see the ample discussion by Johannes Schmidt 1889: 259ff.). A few remarks must suffice to outline the basic difficulties.

First, a construction of Vedic yaj- with a double accusative, although often taken for granted (Grassmann 1873: 1070f., Gaedicke 1880: 159, 269, Joh. Schmidt

1889: 267, Humbach 1959: 1,26f.) is unknown. The normal construction, in Vedic as well as in Avestan, is with (an acc. and) an instr. (Wenzel 1879: 72f.). Cf. RS. VI.3.2 yē jajêbhīh sašāmē sāṁtiḥīh, III.17.2 evā nēna havishā yakṣī devān, VI.47.27 īndrasya vājraṁ havishā rāthāṁ yaja, V.3.8 tvāṁ . . . ayajanta havyaṁ.2 In Avestan cf. YH. 38.4 yā vā . . . ahūro mazdā nāmān ḍadi. . . . tāsi vā yazamaide, 39.4 aōā ḍāa ṛī ṭiṣ yazamaide; with the instr. yasna cf. Yt. 17.61 anā ḍāa ṛiṣ yasna yazāne, 5.9 tām yazāi surinuata yasna, 8.11 yeōi zīt mā māṣīṭka aoxtō namana yasna yazalānta, 8.25 tisṭhīṁ . . . aoxtō namana yasna yaze; with the instr. vaca cf. Y. 65.9 kava zaota xsāta vaca āpō . . . yazāte. On the basis of this evidence we may reconstruct as fixed phrases of the Proto-Indo-Iranian poetry *tam yaṁī yazāi and *tam ēhaṭrubhīs yazāi, cf. Yt. 5.8 kō mān stavuṭa, kō yazāte . . . aoṭrābūṭ, RS. VII.60.9 āva vēdīṁ hōṭrābhīr yajeta.

As for nāmānīś, the only form that is attested in the Gathas proper in Y. 51.22 (= 15.2) tā yazāi xṭaś nāmānīś, various attempts have been made to explain it as an acc. plur. (Joh. Schmidt, Humbach). Since, however, the last two words cannot be separated any more than xṭaś śiūaṭānīś (Y. 46.4, 51.13 and 14) or śiūaṭānīś xṭaś (Y. 31.20), the form nāmānīś must stand for the instr. plur. (as Westergaard was the first to suggest). Cf., e.g., Seiler 1960: 149. The corresponding form of dāman- is dāmābīs (Yt. 19.19, Vr. 19.2), which contrasts characteristically with the dat.-abl. plur. dāmābīo (Yt. 19.2, Vr. 20.1). Since dāmābīs is probably a graphic rendering of [dāmāhβīs], it must be a new formation due to the analogy of the ah-stems (e.g. raocbīs), which has taken the place of *dāmābī. For य़ = ah see Hoffmann 1958: 8 (1975: 65). In just the same way Vedic āḥobhīh (RS. I¹ X¹ AS. KS. TS.) has arisen by the side of āhahbīh (RS. 9). It has long been recognized that as a result of the PIE. and PInIr. shortening of a long /s/, the loc. plur. of the PIE. es-stems, e.g., *H₂ēṅḥes-su had become *H₂ēṅḥesu, PInIr. *H₂ēṅhusu, cf. AS. āṁhasu, Av. āzahu. This case form thus coincided with the corresponding form of the an-stems, e.g. nāma-su. Hence the intrusion of -ah-forms into the an-declension; cf. also Vedic āḥhasu (TS. 7) for āhasu.

In view of dāmābīs, therefore, an instr. plur. *nāmābīs would have been quite regular in the Gothic dialect. However, neither this form, nor *nāmābīo is attested in Avestan. The only difference between dāman- and nāman- that could account for this absence is the circumstance that in the latter word two nasals would have preceded the labial b of the endings [-bīś] and [-byah]. A possible explanation, therefore, is that this led to an assimilation *nāmānīś and further to a dissimilation nāmānīś at an early stage of oral transmission of the Gathas. A conceivable alternative explanation would be *nāmabīs > *nāmānīś > *nāmānīś > nāmānīś, -ṁ- being merely graphic for -an- (Bartholomae 1895: 154). Every explanation of this kind, however, is based on the implicit presupposition that, presumably at an early date, the syntactical function of the form nāmānīś was no longer understood by the