

ROBERT S. P. BEEKES

Avestan $-\bar{o}$, $-uu\bar{o}$

Wordfinal PII $*-au$ is represented in Avestan as $-\bar{o}$ or $-uu\bar{o}$. HOFFMANN'S interpretation is as follows: $*-au > *-au\bar{u} > *-\bar{o}\bar{u}$ (i.e. with $au > \bar{o}$) $>$ with metathesis $-\bar{u}\bar{o} > -uu\bar{o}$ (Aufs. 2.599 n. 14; AvLFL 69, § 37 jc; thus Joh. NARTEN 1986, 145ff). The variant $-\bar{o}$ would be dialectal. I doubt this explanation. — The form is found in locatives and vocatives singular of the u -stems, and in the locative dual ending. For the forms see note 4.

It is argued that a parallel for the development is found in $-\bar{e} > *-\bar{i}\bar{e}$ (AvLFL § 36 ic). This last form is posited to explain the epenthetic $-i-$ before $-C\bar{e}$ and the palatalization of the nasal in $\bar{r}h\bar{e}$. However, it is clear that this supposed development is not parallel to the form $-uu\bar{o}$, for in that case we would expect forms in, e.g., $-tii\bar{e}$ beside those in $-tuu\bar{o}$ ($g\bar{a}tuu\bar{o}$, $zantuu\bar{o}$ etc.). This means that the \bar{e} did not develop into $*\bar{i}\bar{e}$ in which both sounds are phonemes; in the case of $-uu\bar{o}$ we have no reason to doubt that we have a sequence of two phonemes. And we do not need to assume a development to $-\bar{i}\bar{e}$ either, for it is well known that e , \bar{e} can palatalize (cf. Skt. $ca < *k^w e$). Whether there was a phonetic, subphonemic $\bar{i}\bar{e}$ we cannot know, and is not relevant.

The weakest point in the supposed development is the metathesis $-\bar{o}\bar{u} > -\bar{u}\bar{o}$.¹ I have never seen such a metathesis and I doubt that it is possible. Metathesis normally concerns two consonants. As to metathesis of vowels, I found Tarent. *suticare* from Vulg. Lat. **secutare* (cf. Sicil. *sicutari*), where “Les deux premières voyelles aussi ont été métathésées; c’est qu’après le t l’ i est plus normal que l’ u , qui demande un retour en arrière;” (GRAMMONT 1939,

¹ The development $*-au > *-au\bar{u} > *-\bar{o}\bar{u}$ seems to me a paper reconstruction, but this is not essential here. That $-au$ was $-au\bar{u}$ is based on Old Persian $-auv$, but this may well be just a graphical matter. — Note that HOFFMANN earlier assumed $*-au > *-\bar{o}\bar{u} > -\bar{u}\bar{o}$. That one part of a diphthong is or becomes longer may not be a problem. Lastly, it is perhaps not certain that \bar{o} indicated a long \bar{o} .

351f). Another instance is OIr. *cluine-thar*, with *kluni-* from **klinu-*; here it is clear that the metathesis was caused by pressure of the root *klu-*. Of the same kind is Gr. *στορε-* for **στερο-*, probably after the present *στόρνυμι*; otherwise the metathesis would be completely understandable. Thus there are special circumstances which cause this kind of metathesis. — Metathesis between a vowel and a consonant is usually limited to vowel and *r*.² For *rV*, cf. the type OE *þrydde* > Eng. *third*; HOCK 1986, 110f).³ (And here it may be that sometimes we do not have metathesis, but a development *CrVC* > *CrC* > *CVrC*; cf. VAN LOON 1986 on Dutch forms like *bert*, *bart*, *bort* beside OHG *bret* (1986, 134ff). It is strange that the reverse development is also found, e.g. MDu. *ors* > Dutch *ros* 'horse'. When Slavic got its open syllables, *Vr,l* was metathesized, but *VN* resulted in nasal vowels, and diphthongs were monophthongized. This type of metathesis is almost exclusively found with *r*, and less often with *l*, so that it must depend from the character of these specific sounds. — What comes closest to the metathesis here in discussion, is the stress shift of diphthongs as in Oic. *séa* > *siá*. This is usually not called metathesis, and it may well be a quite different process. In our case we should have had *óu* (ignoring the length for the moment) > *ou*, but I doubt that this could result in *uó*. Apparently we have *ei* > *ie* in Lithuanian (under the stress), but here there was an intermediate stage with a long vowel, *ē* (and this is what I am going to propose here). Thus, a metathesis of this kind is most improbable.

What we expect from word final **-au*, parallel to **-ai* > *-ē*, is of course **-ō*. And this enables us at the same time to explain the variant *-ō* (see below). We can then explain *-uuō* simply from diphthongization of *-ō*. This process is of course well known (OHG, Lith.). I can think of several reasons why this simple solution was not chosen. One is that *-ē* did not become *-iiē* (see above). The solution will be given in the next point. Another consideration may have been that Av. *-ō* from **-ah* was not diphthongised. This can be

² In recent years COWGILL suggested that Greek 3 sg. them. *-ετι* resulted from *-eti* > *-eit*. This idea has now been generally given up, I think.

³ I have not found a discussion of the many different types of metathesis; I think that it is necessary to distinguish between them, their origin and their behaviour. — I disagree fundamentally with HOCK 1986, 110ff, who holds that metathesis is normally irregular. His treatment does not make the necessary distinctions between the types of metathesis, e.g. between contact and distance metathesis. In my view metathesis is normally regular, and only in very special instances irregular.

explained by assuming that the two \bar{o} 's had not merged. That this is what happened may be shown by the fact that the latter $-\bar{o}$ has a variant $-\bar{\delta}$ (in Gathic), whereas $-\bar{\delta}$ is never found to represent $*-au$. Of course, it is well known that a new long \bar{e} or \bar{o} does not necessarily merge with an existing one (e.g. in Greek $\epsilon\iota$ vs. η). However, the fact that this $-\bar{\delta}$ became $-\bar{o}$ will exactly have been the reason that the other $-\bar{o}$ (from $*-au$) was diphthongised. This also explains why \bar{e} was not diphthongised: there arose no second \bar{e} .

A third reason may be that $-uu\bar{o}$ is mostly considered to represent earlier $-\underline{u}\bar{o}$. Thus Joh. NARTEN (1986, 145 n. 40, referring to HOFFMANN, Aufs. 1, 323, where, however, this particular problem is not discussed). The interpretation may be partly an inheritance from earlier scholarship, when it was assumed that $-\nu\bar{o}$ (which was the normal transcription) contained a \underline{u} from the u -inflection which would have been introduced analogically (BARTHOLOMAE Grdr. 229). Or the transcription $-\nu\bar{o}$ with $-\nu-$ itself may have influenced scholars. Of course, we know that the notation makes an original $-\underline{u}\bar{o}$ just as possible as $-\underline{u}\bar{o}$. HUMBACH (1959 I, 21ff) argued that the forms in $-tuu\bar{o}$, not $-\delta\beta\bar{o}$, proved that the form (at one time at least) had an initial vowel. It could also be, however, that $-\underline{u}\bar{o}$ was so late that the law of spirantization did not work any longer. Another argument may have been that GAV. $huu\bar{o}$ is monosyllabic. However, we know that this form mostly stands for $h\bar{o} < *hah$ (NARTEN l.c.). It is supposed that $huu\bar{o}$ also replaced an original GAV. $*hau$, but it is not very easy to imagine how this happened; see the argumentation in HUMBACH (l.c.) and NARTEN (l.c. 147). The situation can now be explained more easily, if we assume that $*hau$ first became $(*)h\bar{o}$ by regular sound law, and later $huu\bar{o}$. Both these forms were of course monosyllabic, but that does not prove that $huu\bar{o}$ was monosyllabic too. Thus it cannot be shown that $-uu\bar{o}$ was originally monosyllabic.

The suggestion that the $-\bar{o}$, the 'variant' beside $-u\bar{o}$, is a dialectal form is not supported by evidence, and is therefore no more than a guess. Note that this interpretation presupposes that in a closely related dialect $*-au$ had become $-\bar{o}$. To explain the two variants I have considered the possibility that the diphthongised form was the stressed form. However, comparison with the cognate Indic forms does not confirm that.⁴ Another way to explain the two

⁴ The forms are, with $-uu\bar{o}$: $anjhuu\bar{o}$ (Skt. $\acute{a}su-$), $daijhuu\bar{o}$ (Skt. $d\acute{a}syu-$) but see below on this form, $hinduu\bar{o}$ (sínđu-), $huxratuu\bar{o}$ (sukrátu-), but $b\bar{a}zuiu\bar{o}$ ($b\bar{a}h\acute{u}-$), $\text{ərəzuu}\bar{o}$ ($rj\acute{u}-$),

variants is to assume that $-\bar{o}$ is simply the older form, $-uu\bar{o}$ a more recent development.⁵ We have seen that we expect $-au$ to become $-\bar{o}$, so it is easiest to assume that the form $-\bar{o}$ we find is this expected form. We have also seen that this assumption gives an easier explanation for GAv. *huuō*. To state this in full, we assume:

* <i>hah</i>	>	GAv. $-\bar{h}\bar{a}$	LA. <i>hō</i> ₂
* <i>hau</i>	>	GAv. $-\bar{h}\bar{o}$ ₁	LA. <i>huuō</i>

(Note that the two \bar{o} 's were not identical, which I indicate by a number.) There will have been an intermediate stage with *hō*₂ and *hō*₁. We can hardly be surprised that in the course of the tradition/transmission of the text both forms came to be replaced by *huuō*.

Thus I suppose that Gathic still had **hō* from **hau*. This may be confirmed by the fact that Gathic has $-\bar{o}$ in the one relevant form, *p̄r̄ət̄ō*; the other locatives are *p̄r̄ət̄ā* (Y 51.13b; the form in $-\bar{o}$ stands in the preceding strophe!), *xr̄ət̄ā*, with $-\bar{a}$ probably denoting $-\bar{a}u$, and *var̄jhāu*. So this is not a very reliable argument.

Although it is hardly possible, then, to demonstrate that $-\bar{o}$ is the old form (but see note 5), it fits so well in the proposed development that we need not doubt it.

gātūuō (*gātú-*), *zantūuō* (*jantú-*); without Skt. equivalent: *barəšnuuō*, *rašnuuō*, *ratuuō*, *xruui.druuō*; with $-\bar{o}$: *daiñhō* (*dásyu-*) but the variant *daxiiu-* points to stress on the second syllable (cf. AvLFL 107d), *haētō* (*sétu-*), but *haomaiiō* (cf. *ūr̄ṇayú-*), *mainiiō* (*manyú-*), *vaiiō* (*vāyú-*); without Skt. equivalent: *p̄r̄ət̄ō*, *viḍātō*. AvLFL 130 mentions *həntō* 'im Gewinn', Skt. *sánitau*, a form found in Y 68,11 = 71,29. — AvLFL 130 also gives *šātō*; this word is elsewhere an *i*-stem. — The locative dual forms are irrelevant here. They are: GAv. *zastaiiō*, GAv. *ubōiiō*/LA. *uuaiiō*, GAv. *añhuuō* (note that her $-uu-$ is the stem (cf. *ahuuā*; Skt. $-\bar{voh}$), so that the ending could be $-\bar{o}$ as well as $-uu\bar{o}$.) The only other loc. du. form I have found is LA. *uruuaraiiā*, which probably has the gen. du. ending for the locative (AvLFL 115).

⁵ It is striking that after *y* (*ii*) we always find $-\bar{o}$: loc. *haomaiiō*, voc. *mainiiō*, *vaiiō*; loc. du. *zastaiiō*, *ubōiiō*/*uuaiiō*. We find *daiñhuuō* (< **daiñhuō*), but this is the only word that has also the other ending, *daiñhō* (Vr 12.5 in exactly the same context). Was $-uu\bar{o}$ taken over from preceding *zantūuō*? It seems, then, that a preceding *y* inhibited the development of the *u*. To my mind this proves that $-uu\bar{o}$ is the younger development of $-\bar{o}$. (For the other forms see note 4.)

Bibliography

- AvLFL 1996: HOFFMANN, K. – FORSSMAN, B. Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre. Innsbruck.
- GRAMMONT, M. 1939. *Traité de phonétique*. 2me éd. Paris.
- HOCK, H.H. 1986. *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam, Mouton de Gruyter.
- HOFFMANN, K. 1975–1992. *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. Wiesbaden.
- HUMBACH, H. 1959. *Die Gathas des Zarathustra*, 1. Heidelberg.
- LOON, J. van 1986. *Historische fonologie van het Nederlands*. Amersfoort.
- NARTEN, Joh. 1986. *Der Yasna Haptanhāiti*. Wiesbaden.