of functional and semantic parallels like *mīdahuuača 'possessing false speech' (Gāthic: Y. 31.12, 49.9), whose combining and neut. sandhi forms are *mīdahuuaças. The functional coincidence of the two forms, the phonological ambiguity in some sandhi positions, and the salient lengthening found in the nom. sg. m. *-as- stem (almost) exclusively in possessive value triggered the remodelling of the possessive *-vant-stem. The *-vant-stems of appurtenance and the ordinary *-ant-present participle escape the remodelling because they are functionally distinct.

Thus, the Avestan nom. sg. m. *-vas to *-vant-stems can be explained independently of the *-vāms of its Vedic counterpart, and a mysteriously generated suppletion need not be assumed for the Proto-Indo-Iranian paradigm.

Jay H. JasanoFF

The Ablaut of the Root Aorist Optative in Proto-Indo-European

The mark of the PIE optative was an ablauting suffix *-jēh₁-, *-ih₁-, which was added to present stems to make the present optative and to aorist stems to make the aorist optative¹. The rules for the formation of the present optative can be stated with some precision:

a) "hysterokinetic" athematic presents (e.g., nasal presents and root presents of the type *h₁ēs-ti 'is': *h₁s-enti 'are') added *-jēh₁- to the zero-grade of the present stem in the active singular, and *-ih₁- elsewhere, with displacement of the accent to the endings (cf. OLat. 3 sg. siet, pl. sīmus, sīent; Gk. eĩ, eĩer, eĩeν; PIE *h₁s-jēh₁- / *h₁s-ih₁-)²;

b) other athematic presents (e.g., reduplicated presents and presents with "Narten" ablaut) added invariant *-ih₁- to the weak stem, with retention of the accent on the stem (cf. Lat. uelit-, -mus, -int, Go. wili, -eima, -eina, OCS velitā, -imā, -ētā; PIE *yel(h₁)-ih₁-, indic. *yel(h₁)- 'wish, choose')³;

c) thematic presents added invariant *-ih₁- directly to the o-timbre of the thematic vowel, again with retention of the accent on the stem (cf. Ved.

---

¹ I would like to thank Stanley InSLER for his valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper. Any remaining errors are, of course, my own.

² The perfect optative, which will not be discussed here, seems to have been formed according to the same rule (cf. Ved. vēda 'knows', opt. vidyāt; Go. wait 'id.', opt. wīt).

³ In my view, Lat. uolo and OLith. pa-velmi 'I wish, allow' go back to a present of this kind, rather than to a root aorist secondarily used as a present, as claimed by HOFFMANN (1968: 5 ff.). To be sure, the root *yel(h₁)- also made a root aorist, which appears in Ved. 3 sg. in vṛtā, opt. vṛttā; but Ved. vṛtē 'chooses' is a replacement of PIE 3 sg. act. *yel(h₁)-ti or 3 sg. mid. *yel(h₁)-tor. Another originally aoristic root which formed a Narten present was *h₁d- 'eat' < *bītē (cf. Lat. 3 sg. bītē, opt. editē, etc.), the earlier sense of which is still detectable in *h₁d-ont- 'tooth' (cf. Gk. ὄδούς, etc.; personal communication of J. SCHINDLER).
The rules for the aorist optative, however, are less clear. Only in the case of the thematic aorist (type Vedic *āvadāt 'found', Gk. εἶπεν 'saw') do the optative forms attested in Indo-Iranian and Greek conform to the pattern of the corresponding present optatives (Vedic *vidēt, Gk. ἠκύρω, etc., like bhāret). The behavior of the sigmatic aorist, with its inherited *e: *e ablaut and fixed root accent (cf. Vedic 3 sg. āvāt 'conveyed', subj. vāksat < ēmēh-s) might have been expected to form a "Narten" optative with invariant *s-ih₁-, is in fact conspicuously irregular. No active s-aorist optatives are found at all in Indo-Iranian — a significant morphological anomaly which will figure prominently in the discussion that follows. In Greek, where there are two distinct and competing s-aorist optative formations, one (the type *dēl-e, -eien: (: δείκνυμι 'I show')) is patently late and analogical, while the other (the misnamed "AEolic" type *dēl-e, -eien) remains unexplained.

The optative of the root aorist presents difficulties as well. In Vedic Sanskrit the normal root aorist optative shows the predictable zero grade of the root followed by -yā/-e-; cf. 3 sg. ṛdhyaḥ, 1 pl. ṛdhīyāma, mid. ṛdhūmāhi (: ṛdh- 'thrive'); further 3 sg. ṛṣṭiyāḥ (: ṛṣu- 'hear'), bhiyāḥ (: bhā- 'be'), vṛjyāḥ (: vṛj- 'twist'), gāmyāḥ (: gām- 'go')⁴. Significantly, however, this pattern does not extend to roots in -ā-, which make irregular optatives in -eyā- in the Rigveda (cf. 1 sg. dēyām (: dā- 'give'); dheyām, 3 pl. dheyrur (: dha- 'put'); 2 sg. jīteyāḥ (: jīta- 'know'), 3 sg. pēyāḥ (: pā- 'drink'), 1 pl. sīteyāma (: stāh- 'stand')). The occasional trisyllabic scanse of these forms (dḥhyāyām, etc.) shows that they continue sequences of the type *dhā- + -i-/i- or dhehi₁- + -i₁-/i₁-, with full grade of the root syllable. In principle, this vocalism could be secondary, just as the full grade of Gathic Avestan 3 sg. opt. dātāt is secondary beside the zero grade of older dātī, 1 sg. dītām (see below). But no attempt to explain the sequence -eyā- can ignore the wider evidence for

4 As will be seen below, YAv. opt. 3 sg. zahī (: za- 'win') is a late replacement of the root aorist optative *za-(:, cf. GAv. 1 pl. zāmā).

5 Like all 3 sg. root aorist optatives in the Rigveda, these forms show the substitution of -yāḥ with "precative" -s, for expected -yār.

6 The metrical evidence thus argues against INSLER (1975), who identifies the -e- of dheyām, etc. with the -e- (< *e-ih₁-) of the thematic aorist optative *vidēt.


According to HOFFMANN, the Gathic Avestan 1 pl. aorist optatives varzāmācād (: varz- 'perform'), srauāmā (srau- 'hear') and zaēm-cā (: zā- 'win') (< *leave behind', Ved. hā- 'leave') directly continue PIE preforms uergh₁-me, klēu₁h₁-me and gheh₁h₁-me, with the same radical full grade as in the aorist indicative/injunctives Ved. 1 pl. āgāna, ākarma (: ākr- 'do'), dhāma, and Gk. εἰμι (: βε- 'go'), ἔστημι (: στά- 'stand'), ἔγνωμι (: γνω- 'know'). The evidence of these forms, and of zaēm in particular, suggests that the dheyā-type may have had its starting point in weak forms of the type 1 pl. *dhēh₁₁-me, *dēh₁₁h₁₁-me and *stēh₁₁h₁₁-me. A pre-Sanskrit *dhālma, supported by *dhāta in the 2 pl., could easily have triggered the creation of an analogical singular *dhaiyām, *ayāh, *aṭāty; the sequence *-aṭāty (> *-ayāt) would then have replaced *-āt in the plural, just as -yā- replaced -i- in the optative of the present (cf. 1, 2 pl. syāma, syāta for earlier *stāmā, *stā (Lat. stāmus, stātis)). Such an explanation finds support, in HOFFMANN'S view, in the corresponding Greek optatives θείν : θείναι, δοίν : δοίμαι and σταίν : σταίμαι. Neither the stem-form θείν nor θεί can be referred to a canonical PIE preform; the traditionally reconstructed strong stem *dhāh₁₁(i)-jēh₁₁ would have given *θη- or *θέν in Greek, while the weak stem *dhāh₁₁-th₁₁ would have given *-ē-. The assumption of a PIE *dhēh₁₁₁-me, *dēh₁₁₁h₁₁₁-te, with full grade, would permit a direct phonological derivation of θείναι, θείρε, from which θείν, like dheyām in Sanskrit, could be explained by analogy.⁷

The proposed equation of IIR. *dhālma with Gk. θείναι is instantly appealing, but it raises as many questions as it answers. Was the stem *dhēh₁₁₁-th₁₁₁ confined to the plural, or was it also used in the singular? If *dhēh₁₁1-th₁₁₁ was common to both singular and plural, what interpretation should be placed on the obviously archaic GAv. diām and dīāt? Were all root aorist optatives made in the same way, or do forms like GAv. 1 pl. būtāmā (: YAv. 3 sg. būtāt) and jamīāmā (: 3 sg. jamīāt) point to the existence of a second optative type with the ablaut pattern of present optatives like *h₁₁₁s-jēh₁₁₁₁*-h₁₁₁s-th₁₁₁₁? HOFFMANN does not confront these issues in his 1968 paper, but he touches on

7 An obvious model for the creation of θείν from θείναι would have been the present optative type θέν, θέμεν, where the stem of the singular added -η- to the stem of the plural.

8 His silence is deliberate: "außer Betracht soll hier die Frage bleiben, wie die anderen Personalformen des Aorist-Optativas im einzelnen strukturiert wären" (p. 7).
them in a later study (1976: 606). Here he states that the 1 pl. form zaemâ < 
*ĝhēh₁-ih₁-me implies a Proto-Iranian 3 sg. *za-t-t < *ĝhēh₁-ih₁-t; such a
form, he claims, is actually preserved in YAv. opt. 3 sg. vainiŋ < *uên-ih₁-t
(: van- 'win, obtain'). HOFFMANN's view is taken up and elaborated on by
KELLENS (1984: 362 f.), who identifies three layers of root aorist optatives in
Avestan: 1) the inherited type, with invariant full grade of the root and zero
grade of the mood sign (varazmā, sruuutmā, zaemā, *daemā (= pre-Skt.
*dhaoma), vainin); 2) the main innovated type, modeled on the optative of
the present, with zero grade of the root and full grade of the mood sign (diiāt,
buiiāt, jaialmā, etc.)³; and 3) the still later type seen in GA. daitāt, YAv.
2 sg. diātā, with -iiā- as in 2), but with full grade substituted for zero grade in
the root syllable.

KELLENS' system is not very satisfactory. The bulk of the evidence for full
grade in the root aorist optative comes from the plural: the only certain example
of a full-grade form in the active singular is vainiŋ¹⁰. It is difficult to believe
that an inherited pre-Avestan 3 sg. *daet or *da-t-t would have been remade
into diiāt in Gathic, where the zero grade d(i)- is already in full retreat before the
dominant root allomorph da-. Nor is it clear why Sanskrit, if it had inherited
a 3 sg. opt. *dhet < *dheh₁-ih₁-t besides 1 pl. *dheṇa < dheh₁-ih₁-me, would
have remade *dhet to *dheyā; *dheyāt (whence the quasi-attested *dheyāḥ)
is much easier to explain as a replacement of *dhēyāt (= diāt) under the
influence of *dheṇa. Even in Greek, the type 3 sg. θείν is more naturally
taken from *θέ(η)ν, with secondary -ēt for -ē under the influence of
θείευν, than from *θεί (< dheh₁-ih₁-t), with -η borrowed from the optative of
the present¹¹. For "long-vowel" roots, at least, the comparative evidence points to
a 3 sg. *dheh₁-(i)jēh₁-t with 1 pl. dheh₁-ih₁-me, rather than to KELLENS' dheh₁-
ih₁-t : dheh₁-ih₁-me, as the PIE paradigm.

The possibility of an inflectional pattern dhēh₁-(i)jēh₁-t : dheh₁-ih₁-me is not
seriously considered by HOFFMANN or his followers. The reasons are obvious:
the evidence for dhēh₁-(i)jēh₁-t is compromised by the full grade root of vainiŋ
< *uên-ih₁-t, while the putative strengthening of *dheh₁- to *dheh₁- in the weak
stem *dheh₁-ih₁- has no parallel in any other IE morphological category.¹²
Neither of these objections, however, is decisive. diiāt and vainiŋ do not
necessarily belong to the same formation: diiāt is the optative corresponding to
the root aorist indicative/injunctive dāt, Ved. (a)di(h)āt, while vainiŋ is
synchronically the optative of the s-aorist vāns- (cf. GA. vāps, subj. vānak,
Ved. vāmsi, vāmśat, etc.). As noted repeatedly by HOFFMANN (1967: 32 f.;
1968: 4⁴; 1976: ibid.), the pairing of an s-aorist indicative/injunctive with a root
aorist optative is a recurrent pattern in Indo-Iranian; other examples include Ved.
vaus-, opt. yāya- (: yu- 'restrain'), saks-, opt. sāhīya- (: sakh- 'conquer'), and avis-, opt. avāya- (: av- 'favor'). As long as the origin of this idiosyncratic suppletion is disputed, there can be no certainty that the
ablaut pattern of "true" root aorist optatives like that of *dheh₁- was the
same as that of "substitutive" root aorist optatives like that of *yen-. For this
reason it will be useful to distinguish in principle between root aorist optatives
of type I and type II, corresponding to the Indo-Iranian and Indo-European
precursors of dāt and vainiŋ, respectively. A similar distinction is recognized by
NARTEN (1984), who sets up an originally hysterokinetic paradigm (*dheh₁-
(i)jēh₁-t : *dheh₁-ih₁-me) for type I and an acrostatic paradigm (*uên-ih₁-t : *uên-
ih₁-me) for type II. Reflexes of type I, in her view, include the forms in
KELLENS' second class (dīatā, buiāt, jaialmā, etc.); reflexes of type II, other than
vainiŋ itself, include varazmā and zaemā, both of which correspond to sigmatic
aorists outside the optative (cf. GA. subj. 3 pl. varasat; YAv. opt. 3 sg.
zahq, rebuilt under the influence of the indicative stem *zah- = Ved. hās-).
The only forms not accounted for in this framework are sruuutmā, for which
we should have expected type I *sruuutmā or *sruuutmā, with zero-grade of
the root (cf. Ved. indic. śravam, śrāt, etc.); and HOFFMANN's I Ir. *dhaoma (=
*daemā, dhe(yā)ma, théiēu), for which we should have expected type I
*dhāma (Av. *dāmā or *diāmā, Ved. *dāh(yā)ma). NARTEN (pp. 103-4)
attributes the full grade of sruuutmā to the influence of the semantically related

In particular, it is difficult to see how a pre-Greek *θéi(η)ν could have given anything but
θείν; *θεί, on the other hand, could plausibly have been remade to *θεί (cf. θέλειν),
or even escaped remodeling altogether.

¹ In the middle, types 1) and 2) were alike; both, in KELLENS' scheme, had zero grade
of the root and zero grade of the mood sign.

¹⁰ From a purely phonological point of view, the root syllable of vainiŋ could also
represent an old zero grade, although the zero grade of the following optative suffix makes
this distinctly unlikely. Formally similar, though morphologically unclear, is
YAv. brāuṣṇā, but this could equally well be the optative of an acrostatic present brāaus-
(cf. HOFFMANN (1976: 607)). The 2 sg. middle form bṛāuṣniṣā is discussed below.

¹² Indeed, "proterokinetic" paradigms in the parent language (type *pēh₂-yī, gen. *ph₂-
<yē>-s 'fire'; cf. SCHINDLER (1975: 9 f.)) displayed precisely the opposite distribution of strong
and weak stems.
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Verb xšヌaui- 'enjoy, heed', which inherited a sigmatic aorist and a type II optative xšヌaui- (GAv. 2 sg. mid.(f) xšヌauišša). She does not discuss the status of dheydma and théµen at all.

My own view of the aorist optatives of type I differs from NARIEN's in one crucial respect. Like her, I believe that the type I paradigm was originally hysterokinetic, with fixed zero grade of the root syllable and an ablauting mood sign. The following were some typical early PIE forms:

SG 1 *klu-jehm, *dhjr(i)jehjm; cf. pres. opt. *hjes-m
2 *klu-jehs, *dhjr(i)jehs
3 *klu-jeht, *dhjr(i)jeht

PL 1 *kluy-ihm, *dhjr(i)jerm; *hjesm
2 *kluy-ihs, *dhjr(i)jerhs
3 *kluy-iht, *dhjr(i)jerht

The zero-grade of the optative (*kluy-ihm, *dhjr(i)jerm, *dh(i)yam). The asymmetry was repaired by a simple proportion:

1-3 pl. indic. *hjes-m, -te, -ent : opt. *hjes-ihm, -ihs, -iht
1,2 pl. *kluy-eme, -te, *dhjr-eme, -te : X,
where X was solved as 1 pl. *kluy-ihm, *dhjr-ihm, 2 pl. *kluy-ihs, *dhjr-ihs.

In this way, the type I root aorist optative came to be associated with a "mixed" inflection in late PIE — an inflection fundamentally hysterokinetic, but with superficially acrostatic forms in the 1 pl. and 2 pl.13 The Indo-Iranian and Greek reflexes of the optative of *dhjr- are worth noting explicitly:

Late PIE Indo-Iranian Pre-Greek
*dhjr(i)jerm *dh(i)yam *θiµen
*dhjr(i)jerhs *dh(i)yas *θiµς
dhjr(i)jerht *dh(i)yat *θiŋ

*dhjr-ihm, *dhjr-ihs, *dhjr-ihht

In hysterokinetic presents like *hjes- the forms of the optative plural appeared to be derived from the corresponding forms of the indicative plural by inserting the mood sign *ih- between the root and the personal endings. In the root aorist this pattern held in the 3 pl. (*klu-eme, *dhjr-eme; *hjes-m) but not in the 1 pl. or 2 pl., where the full-grade root of the indicative (*klu-eme, -te, *dhjr-eme, -te; cf. HOFFMANN (1968: 249 f.)) contrasted with

In the absence of any actually attested forms it is impossible to discuss the dual, which presumably patterned with the 1 pl. and 2 pl.

13 That *daêma and *daêta would have been in a good position to resist analogical replacement is suggested by the survival of zaêma, although the latter, as a type II form, was not necessarily subject to the same inner-paradigmatic pressures as *daêma. It is also possible, of course, that the actual Gothic forms were *diãma, -tã or *daiãma, -tã, with the same remodeling as in jamídæma and buiãam.
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The only other branch of the IE family which retains significant traces of the root optative is Italic. Osc. *fueld [fieed] 'fuerit' rests on the strong stem *bhulh-ih-, similarly, Lat. det presupposes an optative *dhelih-, Special interest attaches to the modal stem *doct- seen in OLAt. pres. subj. -dum, -ts, etc., Falisc. pres. subj. 3 sg. *perduoaid and Umbr. impv. 3 sg. *pertuiutu, pertuviutu (10X), fut. 2 sg. *pertuvies (IX). It is tempting to regard these forms as developments of the inherited optative 1, 2 pl. *doimo, doit (< *dheu-ih-, me, *te), with contraction inhibited by the morpheme boundary and a hiatus-breaking *-u- inserted between the root and the mood sign.

15 The only other branch of the IE family which retains significant traces of the root optative is Italic. Osc. *fueld [fieed] 'fuerit' rests on the strong stem *bhulh-ih-, similarly, Lat. det presupposes an optative *dhelih-, Special interest attaches to the modal stem *doct- seen in OLAt. pres. subj. -dum, -ts, etc., Falisc. pres. subj. 3 sg. *perduoaid and Umbr. impv. 3 sg. *pertuiutu, pertuviutu (10X), fut. 2 sg. *pertuvies (IX). It is tempting to regard these forms as developments of the inherited optative 1, 2 pl. *doimo, doit (< *dheu-ih-, me, *te), with contraction inhibited by the morpheme boundary and a hiatus-breaking *-u- inserted between the root and the mood sign.

16 The historical explanation for the association of s-aorist indicatives with root aorist optatives seems hardly ever to have been discussed. NARFEN (1984: 99) thinks that it may be secondary, arising "etwa durch gleichzeitiges Nebeneinander von Wurzelaktiv und s-matischem Aorist."
for o-grade in the s-less forms\footnote{Such o-grades survive in two archaic categories: 1) the non-sigmatic middle preterite type exemplified by A 3 sg. nakāti 'perished' (< *nok-to), replacing older *nok-e; and 2) the athematic o-grade subjunctive Type B 1 sg. nēku 'I will/may destroy', representing a development of the aorist indicative *nok-h-e.}, suggest that the sigmatic aorist originated in a pre-PIE root aorist of the "h₂-e- conjugation"\footnote{See JASANOFF (1979), where it is suggested that PIE *melh₂- 'grind' and a small number of other roots originally formed present stems with *e: *e ablaut and endings identical with those of the perfect (cf. Lat. molō, Go. malan, Lith. malu, OCS meljo, OIr. melid, Hitt. mall(a). (hi-conj.). Such forms, whatever their diathesis in pre-PIE, were synchronically active by the time of the breakup of the parent language. Other present classes which took the perfect endings included the type in *-i- (cf. Hitt. dāi 'puts', 3 pl. tāyanzi, as if < *dēhe₁-i-/*dērh₁-i-)) and the reduplicated type in *-s- (cf. Hitt. iššai 'does repeatedly', 3 pl. iššānti < *i₁-i₁-s- or *i₁-i₂-h₁-s-).}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sg.</th>
<th><em>prōk-h-e (</em>\text{-h}_2\text{u}?)\footnote{In JASANOFF (1988: 65 f.) I posit the variant *-h₂u to account for Toch. *wa (&lt; *-uh₂, with laryngeal metathesis), Ved. -au (cf. 1 sg. perf. tāsthāu (&lt; *-o(h₂)-h₂u) 'I stand') and Hitt. -hun (i.e., *-h₂u + -n; see, however, EICHNER (1988: 136\textsuperscript{44}). A third variant *-h₂u is attested in the 1 sg. active of the thematic conjugation (cf. *bhēro₁-h₂ 'I carry'). The allomorphs *-h₂-e, *-h₂, and *-h₂u recall the three variants of the ending of the nominative-accusative dual (cf. Gk. νοῦς (&lt; *-h₂e) 'two feet', λέον (&lt; *-o-h₂) two wolves', Ved. ṣkgā, *au (&lt; *-o-h₂, *-o-h₂u) 'id.'.)}</th>
<th>*prōk-me\footnote{Or perhaps *prēk-me, *prēk-te, as in JASANOFF (1988); but it is probably simpler to assume that the 1 pl. and 2 pl. of the h₂-e- conjugation aorist were strong, as in other root aorists.}</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*prōk-th-e</td>
<td>*prōk-(t)e</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*prōk-e</td>
<td>*prēk-ς\footnote{For the 3 pl. in *-ς and its relationship to the full-grade variant *-ër cf. JASANOFF, op. cit., 71\textsuperscript{3}).}</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The crucial step in the evolution of the classical s-aorist, I believe, was the inner-PIE replacement of the 3 sg. in *-e (*prōk-e) and the subjunctive in *-e/o-* (prēk-e/o) by new forms borrowed from a wholly different category — the athematic s-presents with "NARTEN" ablaut (type Hitt. ganešzi 'recognizes', spatulasi 'recognizes', vaimulasi, varazimti *prok-me by new forms borrowed from a wholly different category — the athematic o-grade subjunctive Type B 1 sg. nēku 'I will/may destroy', representing a development of the aorist indicative *nok-h-e.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{17} Such o-grades survive in two archaic categories: 1) the non-sigmatic middle preterite type exemplified by A 3 sg. nakāti 'perished' (< *nok-to), replacing older *nok-e; and 2) the athematic o-grade subjunctive Type B 1 sg. nēku 'I will/may destroy', representing a development of the aorist indicative *nok-h-e.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{18} See JASANOFF (1979), where it is suggested that PIE *melh₂- 'grind' and a small number of other roots originally formed present stems with *e: *e ablaut and endings identical with those of the perfect (cf. Lat. molō, Go. malan, Lith. malu, OCS meljo, OIr. melid, Hitt. mall(a). (hi-conj.). Such forms, whatever their diathesis in pre-PIE, were synchronically active by the time of the breakup of the parent language. Other present classes which took the perfect endings included the type in *-i- (cf. Hitt. dāi 'puts', 3 pl. tāyanzi, as if < *dēhe₁-i-/*dērh₁-i-)) and the reduplicated type in *-s- (cf. Hitt. iššai 'does repeatedly', 3 pl. iššānti < *i₁-i₁-s- or *i₁-i₂-h₁-s-).}

The full-grade root and zero-grade suffix of vainīq, xšauwīšā, varūdnā and zaēnā can thus, under this view, be taken as a direct inheritance from PIE. NARTEN’s hypothesis of an acrostic type I is in my opinion entirely correct; moreover, there is a significant body of evidence, hitherto overlooked or misinterpreted, which strongly suggests that forms of the same kind once existed in Sanskrit and Greek.

Let us pursue the above reasoning a step further. If the sigmatic aorist is in fact descended from a root aorist with perfect-like endings, it is plausible to suppose that the corresponding optative was once inflected in the same way. This suggests the following for the late PIE aorist indicative and optative of the root *-yen-:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sg.</th>
<th><em>prōk-h-e (</em>\text{-h}_2\textμ)</th>
<th>*prōk-me</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*prōk-th-e</td>
<td>*prōk-(t)e</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[*prēk-s-t]</td>
<td>*prēk-ς</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spread of the sigmatic subjunctive in *-s- is must have been favored by the fact that roots which formed both h₂-e-conjugation aorists and thematic presents, such as *pelek- 'cook, ripen' and dhēgʰh₁- 'burn', would otherwise have had identical aorist subjunctives and present indicatives.

\footnote{The reasons for the intrusion of sigmatic forms into the h₂-e-conjugation root aorist are discussed in JASANOFF, op. cit., 63 ff. The suppletive 3 sg. in *-ς is probably introduced into the paradigm to serve as the transitive counterpart to *-e, which had been relegated to intransitive functions in late PIE. The spread of the sigmatic subjunctive in *-s- must have been favored by the fact that roots which formed both h₂-e-conjugation aorists and thematic presents, such as *pelek- 'cook, ripen' and dhēgʰh₁- 'burn', would otherwise have had identical aorist subjunctives and present indicatives.}
In Indo-Iranian, most of these forms were lost or transformed before the separation of the two branches. The h₂e-conjugation endings were largely eliminated — in the indicative through the spread of the "mi-conjugation" stem užn-s, and in the optative through the direct substitution of *-m, *-s, *-t (cf. Vainik, probably under the influence of the indicative, for the obsolescent *-h₂e, *-th₂e, *-e. But the 3 pl. optative was treated differently. Here the sequence *ih₁-rs (> IIR. *-(i)irš) not only survived, but actually extended its sphere of usage at the expense of the type I ending *(i)ian < *-ih₁-ent. In Sanskrit the replacement of *-yan (< *(i)ian) by -yur (< *(i)irš) was complete: -yur was generalized to every active 3 pl. optative in the language (cf. sahyur (type II), dheyur (type I), syur (root present), bharerat (thematic present), etc.). Avestan was more conservative, keeping -iian (< *(i)ian) as the only ending in thematic stems (cf. YaV. bařariian = Gk. φιδωρ). And, retaining -iian (< *(i)ian), with analogically generalized *i- alongside newer -iianš (< *-(i)iršš, likewise with analogical *i-<i-) in athematic stems (cf. YaV. jatian/jatianš (type I), zinš (root present), daïiian/daïiianš (reduplicated present), etc.). The spread of *-iršš may have been facilitated by the survival in early Indo-Iranian of a group of h₂e conjugation presents, notably including the type *moθh₂i/*melh₂-<grid (cf. note 17), with optatives similar to the type II forms posited above.

23 The scansion -yur (rather than *(i)ur) reflects the influence of the full-grade suffix-form -ya.
24 The replacement of *-oih₂-i by *-oih₂-ent in the 3 pl. optative of thematic presents and aorists seems to have been an innovation of the PIE period.
25 No 3 pl. forms are attested from root aorist optatives of type II; the expected ending would have been *-trš.
26 The regular form would have been *hīsrš; the absence of *-s is either a mistake or due to analogy with the 3 pl. perfect in -ara.

This explanation of the r-endings of the 3 pl. optative is preferable to the standard view, as set forth, e.g., by Leumann (1952: 37 f.). Leumann attributes the -ur of the Sanskrit optative to the influence of 3 pl. aorist indicatives of the type dad(h)ur, astur, etc., which were themselves modeled on imperfects of the type dadad(h)ur and, ultimately, on perfects of the type dad(h)ur. But it is hard to see how this can be correct, since the 3 pl. in *(i)irš was clearly already part of the optative paradigm in Common Indo-Iranian, while the *-ur of Skt. dad(h)ur and dadad(h)ur is a purely Indic innovation (cf. Av. 3 pl. aor. dan, impf. dadaḥ < *(i)ur). An alternative possibility would be to take the *-ur of the optative as a back-formation from the corresponding 3 pl. middles in -ra[m], -ra[t] (cf. RV dadiran, bhārerata, etc.); the perfect indicative, where the 3 pl. active ended in -ur and the 3 pl. middle ended in -re, could have provided a model, albeit inexact, for such a development. An explanation of this kind, however, would not account for the failure of *(i)irš to penetrate to thematic stems in Avestan — a distributional peculiarity which follows naturally from the h₂e-conjugation theory. Nor is the origin of *(i)irš likely to have been the perfect optative itself, even though an r-ending would here have been etymologically justified27. It is simply not credible that a category as marginal as the perfect optative could have imposed its 3 pl. ending on the optatives of the other tense systems.

In addition to serving as the point of departure for the spread of *(i)irš, the type II optatives were apparently the locus of another important post-IE innovation — the replacement of the 3 sg. root aorist optative in *(i)āih by -yāh (i.e., -yās) in Vedic Sanskrit. Forms of the type bhiyāt, gamyāt etc., though attested in the later Samhitas and, mutatis mutandis, in Iranian, are not found in the Rigveda. Their place is taken by the "precatives" bhiyāt, gamyāḥ, etc., which spawned a complete paradigm in -yās- in the later Vedic language (cf. 1 sg. bhiyāsām RV X. 166. 5, later 1 sg. bhāyāsma, 3 pl. bhāyāsaṃ, etc.). As pointed out by Leumann (op. cit., 41) and other scholars, the origin of the 3 sg. optative in -yāḥ is no doubt to be sought in the s-aorist indicative, where the pre-Vedic reduction of final consonant clusters frequently led to the apparent substitution of *s for *t in the 3 sg. (cf. 2, 3 sg. dyaḥ < *d-yā-s-s, *s-t (< yā-<ride, drive>) vs. impf. 2 sg. dyaḥ, 3 sg. dyaḥ). This pattern was generalized to

27 In fact, the evidence of Indo-Iranian and Greek (cf. Ved. viḍyāt, eidoṣ, etc.) suggests that the perfect optative took the normal active endings in PIE (*-m, *-s, *-t, etc.), rather than the theoretically expected *-h₂e, *-th₂e, *-e.
the optative: the distinction between the 2 sg. opt. -yāh and 3 sg. opt. -yār was maintained in the present system, but lost in the optative of the aorist, where *-yār was replaced by -yāh < *-yās. That the influence of the s-aorist indicative should have been strong enough to eliminate *-yār from the whole of the aorist system may seem surprising, given the survival of -yāt in the present and the ubiquitousness of -t as a 3 sg. person marker. The substitution of *-s(t) for *-t finds its explanation, however, in the fact that the pre-Indic optative corresponding to the s-aorist was a distinct formal category, characterized by the endings *-tm, *-dš, *-t (type II, for earlier *-iḥ-ḥe, etc.) rather than the usual *-yām, *-yās, *-yāt (type I). The fundamental step in the creation of the 3 sg. precative was the universal replacement of the aorist optative in *-t by *-s(t) under the influence of the corresponding s-aorist indicative in *-s(t).

Only later, when the distinction between types I and II was eliminated and -yāt was substituted for *-t everywhere in the active (cf. syāmā for *stāmā, stīyāmā for *stāvīma, etc.), was the paradigm *vānūm, *vāntīs *vāntīs(t) remodeled to *vānymā, *vanyās, *vanyāś(t), thus allowing the type II 3 sg. in *-yāst to compete with, and eventually to supplant, the type I 3 sg. in *-yās.

Our hypothesis of a type II aorist optative 3 sg. in *-s(t), later replaced by *-yās(t), is directly confirmed by the peculiar precative forms 1 sg. khyēṣam (khya- 'catch sight of'; VS, TS, etc.); 1 sg. gesam, pl. -ṣma (: gā- 'go'; AV, VS, TS, etc.); 1 sg. jesam, (: ji- 'conquer'; VS, TS), pl. jēṣma, (RV, VS, TS, MS, etc.); 1 sg. jēṣam, pl. -ṣma (: jiḥ-; AV, etc.); 1 pl. deṣma (: dā-; VS);

28 It is of course immaterial whether we think of the analogy as operating at a time when the indicative endings were still 2 sg. *-s(-s) and 3 sg. *-s, or whether we date the introduction of *-s into the optative to a period when the 2 sg. and 3 sg. indicative had already merged as *-s. In the former case, the result of the analogy would have been the establishment of an optative 3 sg. in *-s-t, from which the creation of a full-blown precative in 1 sg. -ṣam, 1 pl. -ṣma, etc. would have been particularly simple.

29 The original type II 3 sg. in *-s(t) also engendered a 3 sg. middle in -ṣma < *-ṣma and a 2 sg. middle in -ṭhāth. The new precative endings spread at the expense of type 1 -ṭa and -ṭhāth; the Rigveda has arta and urta beside the root aorists 3 sg. ātra 'went' and 3 sg. āvṛtta 'chose', but also muṣṭita and padṣita beside the root aorists 2 pl. amudghām 'put on (clothes)' and 3 pl. apadān 'fell'. In the s-, is- and sis-aorists, which formed the original locus of the middle precative, the elimination of -ṭa and -ṭhāth was practically universal (cf. 2 sg. mamṣṭhāth, 3 sg. mamṣṭa, janisṭa, vanisṭa etc.; the unique 3 sg. bhakṣita (: bhaj- 'divide'; SV) is correctly explained as secondary by NARTE (1964: 180)). The sigmatic stem of mamṣṭa, etc. (for expected type II *manṣṭa) is an obvious innovation.
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1 sg. yēṣam (: yā-; RV); 1 sg. sesam (: *sa- 'gain'; VS, MS, etc.); 1 sg. sthesam, 3 pl. -ṣur (: sthā-; AV, VS, MS). These forms are discussed by HOFFMANN (1967), who regards khyēṣam as the oldest member of the class. In HOFFMANN's view (p. 31), khyēṣam is simply a "precativization" of khyēyam, the optative associated with the well-attested thematic aorist khyā-. The 3 pl. corresponding to *khyēṣam was *khyēṣur, precativized (i.e., sigmatized) from khyēyur; according to HOFFMANN, the coexistence of *khyēṣur and khyēyur led to the creation of precativized *jñēṣur, *dēṣur, *sthēṣur, etc. beside the regular optatives *jñēyur, *dēyur, *sthēyur. From here the sequence *-ēṣ was extended to the first person, giving -ēṣam and -ēṣma; in similar fashion, jēṣam and jēsa were built to *jēṣur, the precativized form of a 3 pl. opt. *jēyur < *jay-iy-ur, with radical full grade as in jēṣamur < *dha-iy-ur (p. 34). This theory is rightly criticized by COWGILL (1969: 28 ff.), who points out the unacceptability, on several grounds, of assuming an early precativization of *khyē- to *khyē-s-. COWGILL himself proposes to derive the 3 pl. in *-ēṣur from a direct precativization of the 3 pl. optative in *-ṣur; it is not clear, however, why this process would not rather have yielded forms of the type *jñēyāṣur, *dēyāṣur and *sthēyāṣur (cf. 3 sg. *jñeyāḥ,*dēyāḥ, *sthēyāḥ). In more general terms, both HOFFMANN's and COWGILL's theories suffer from the disadvantage of having to explain the relatively well-established forms in -ēṣam and -ēṣma on the basis of the barely attested 3 pl. in -ēṣur, which occurs only once in the Atharvaveda (sthēṣur XVI. 4. 7).

In fact, the precatives in -ēṣ- can be easily explained in the context of the framework proposed above. The only two forms of this type that occur in the Rigveda are yesam and jēṣama, built to the roots yā- and ji-, respectively. It is surely no accident that of the eight roots that make -es-precatives (khya-, gā-, ji-, jiḥ-, dā-, yā-, "sā", sthā-), yā- and ji- are precisely the two that also form well-attested s-aorists (cf. 3 sg. āyāh, ājaḥ)30. The regular Indo-Iranian optatives of yā- and ji- would thus have been *yāḥ- and *jiḥ- (type II; cf. Gāv. zaēmā- < *zhā-), continuing PIE *jih₂-ih₁- and *gēj₂-ih₁. In Indic the expected 3 sg. forms *yāḥ- and *jiḥ- underwent precativization to *yāḥ- and *jiḥ- (whence Vedic *yēh and *jēh). No 3 sg. aorist optatives are in fact attested from these roots in the Rigveda; it is not unlikely that the predicted *yēh and *jēh would eventually have been remade to *yeyāḥ and *jeyāḥ on the
model of the dominant type dheyam, peyâh, etc. Before their disappearance, however, these short forms — or perhaps rather their predecessors *yâêt and *jâêt — triggered the creation of the first person precatives yešam, *yěisma (*yěšam *-šma) and jēsām, jēśma (*jâjśam, *-šma). The other precatives in -eś were built by analogy in historical times: just as yâ- made a 1 sg. yešam and a pl. *yēsam, the roots jēhâ, dâ-, stâ-, etc. were equipped with new forms in -esam and -esma. The 3 pl. shesur is best regarded as a nonce formation on the basis of shesam, *-šma.

Interestingly, the type II root aorist optative has also left a distinctive trace in Greek. This is by no means self-evident, since the optative of the s-aorist in Greek, while problematic in many respects, is fully sigmatic. We find, as noted earlier, two main formal types:

a) the normal type in -σει (δείκαμ, -οίς, -α, -αμεν, -ατε, -αν; mid. δείκαμην, etc.), obviously built to the "alphathematic" indicative stem δείκα- in imitation of the pattern indic. δείκ.: opt. δείκαμ, -οίς; and

b) the defective "Aeolic" type in -σει with alphathematic inflection, represented by 2 sg. δείκεσαι, 3 sg. δείκει and 3 pl. δείκεσαι. The late grammarian Choerobosclls claims to record a 1 sg. in -σει, 1 pl. in -αμεν and 2 pl. in -ατε, on which see FORBES (1958: 165 ff.).

The origin of the Aeolic type, which is clearly the more archaic of the two formations, is obscure; summaries of earlier proposals, none of them compelling, are given by SCHWYZER (1938: 796 f.) and RIX (1976: 233). Important light on the problem is shed by the Cretan 3 pl. opt. ἐρέσατε (Gortyn), and especially by the remarkable 3 sg. opt. forms κοσμησεί and δικασσεί (Derrus), the final short vowel of which is assured. The presence of -σει rather than -σαι is, of course, meant to imply that these forms are of identical origin. The -ει of δείκαμ is the result of inner-paradigmatic leveling; that of δείκαμ reflects the influence of δείκα (δείκαμ 'I throw'); that of ἐρέσατε (cf. pluperfect ἐρέσατα, ἐρέσατο 'I knew') is linked, at least synchronically, to the -ει (< *-ih₂-th₂s) of the optative type φαευετ (cf. s-aorist passive. ἐφόσαμ [appeared']). The essential point is simply that the -ει of -σει need not be original, and is indeed not likely to be.

The paradigms that follow are merely schematic; no attempt has been made to take account of the chronology of such important, but here irrelevant, changes as the establishment of -σαι in the 1 pl., the elimination of lengthened grade in the indicative, or the replacement of the 3 sg. indicative in *-ς (< *-st) by -σαι.

31 Compare HOFFMANN (1967: 474) and COWGILL (1969: 286). Rigvedic 2 sg. jeh (VI. 4. 4) is less likely to be a true optative *jâêt < gâj₂-th₂s than an injunctive or an apocopated imperative in -si (cf. NARTEN (1964: 119 f.).

32 The 1 pl. probably played a pivotal role in the extension process. Both type I and type II inherited 1 pl. optatives in -ema; when *yēma (type II) acquired the precativized byform *yěisma, it was only natural for *dēma, *sthēma, etc. to undergo precativization to desma, *sthēma.

33 A doubtful addition is the Gortynian form διλωνας (GDI 5004, 9), which, if a verb
The optative at this period still retained the inherited peculiarity of being built directly to the root rather than to the sigmatic stem of the indicative and subjunctive. This feature was preserved in Indo-Iranian, but in the less "root-centered" verbal system of Greek its elimination was inevitable. The change, when it took place, was very simple: *deikt- in the optative was mechanically replaced by *dei-, with no alteration in the form of the endings and mood sign. *deikα thus became *deiκα, and the third person forms in *-με and *-τε became remade to *-σμε and *-στε, the immediate antecedents of Cretan -σμε and -στε.

To explain the dialectal replacement of *deiκε, etc. by deiktε, one further change must be posited for the Common Greek period. We have seen in our discussion of type I (p. 107) that verbs like θη- 'put' originally formed root aorist optatives with full grade of the root in the 1 pl. and 2 pl. (pre-Gk. *θείμεν *θείτε < *θθεί-ιθη-, and zero grade elsewhere (sg. *θείη, *θείς, *θείη (< *θθεί-ο-ιθη-), 3 pl. *θείον (< *θθεί-ο-ιθη-). It would seem simplest to assume — and I would like to suggest here — that the plural paradigm *θείμεν, *θείτε, *θείον triggered an analogical change by which *-ει- was substituted for *-ι- in the optative plural of the s-aorist. The proportion was straightforward:

*θείμεν : *θείειμεν, *θείειτε :: *θείεμεν : X,

where X was solved as *θείεμεν, *θείειτε. The result was the paradigm reconstructible for Late Common Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sg.</th>
<th>*θείμεν</th>
<th>1 *θείμεν</th>
<th>2 *θείέμεν</th>
<th>3 *θείειτε</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>*θείειμεν</td>
<td>*θείειμεν</td>
<td>*θείειετε</td>
<td>*θείειν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From here the development of the attested forms was very simple. Those dialects which, like Attic-Ionic, created a "classical" Aeolic optative generalized the *-ει- of the 1 pl. and 2 pl. to the other persons and numbers, thus generating a 1 sg. *θείμεν, 2 sg. *θείειμεν, 3 sg. *θείειετε and 3 pl. *θείειν (cf. the change of *θυην, etc. to *θείην, etc.). The 3 pl. was subsequently remade to the attested *θείειν under the influence of the 3 pl. indicative *θεικαν. The latter change was probably assisted, if not actually induced, by the partial overlap of the original 3 pl. *θείειν with the 3 sg. *θείει, which had the form *θεικαν when suffixed by movable -ν.  

The Aeolic optative was ultimately supplanted by the more transparent optative in -α-, another creation of the Common Greek period. We have no direct evidence for the locus of this formation, but the most obvious place to look is the paradigm of the middle. Here the inherited forms, after sigmaticization, would have been *θείκαμαι, *θείκα, etc., and there would have been no inherited *θείκαμαι, *θείκα, etc. to trigger the replacement of *-ι- by *-ει-, as happened in the 1 pl. and 2 pl. active. The elimination of *-ι- was therefore accomplished differently — namely, by forming an optative *θείκαμαι from the indicative *θείκαμαι on the model of the optative of the thematic aorist (cf. *θιοίκαι : indic. *θιοικαί). Later, in the dialectal period, the middle optative in -α- induced the creation of a back-formed active, the "normal" s-aorist optative *θείκαμαι, *θείκας, etc. In the dialects known to us, the forms in -α- completely supplanted their Aeolic counterparts in the 1 sg., 1 pl. and 2 pl., where the change to the new type simply entailed the substitution of one diphthong for another (*θείκαμαι → *θείκαιαι (-α-ιμαι), *θείκαμεν → *θείκαμεν, *θείκετε → *θείκετε). The 2 sg., 3 sg. and 3 pl., with their distinctive alphathematic endings -σαις, -σει and -σεαν, proved more resistant to replacement, but eventually gave way to the type in -α- within the historical period.  

36 It is to be noted that prior to the replacement of *-σειν by *-σίν, the optative of the s-aorist was the only category in Common Greek where the 3 sg. and 3 pl. differed simply in the presence vs. absence of -ν.  

37 Contamination of the two types can be seen in the Arcadian dialect form δικαλωσει, with retention of -ει- but loss of alphathematic inflection, and in the Elean form αεικαλωσει, with retention of alphathematic inflection but substitution of -α- for *ει-.
Thus Greek, no less than Indo-Iranian, preserves clear remnants of the inhered distinction between types I and II. It may be useful to compare and contrast the developments posited for the two branches.

Type I, properly associated with active root aorists of the classically reconstituted type, originally added the ablauting mood sign *je²h₁-/*i²h₁- to the zero-grade form of the root. Later, but still within the parent language, the root vocalism of the 1 pl. and 2 pl. was analogically strengthened from zero grade to full grade, following the pattern of the indicative (cf. 1 pl. *dhe²h₁-i²h₁-me, *Eli²h₁-i²h₁-me, (= GAe. srawatna), etc.). In roots of the "long-vowel" type, both Vedic Sanskrit and Greek generalized the full grade of the 1 pl. and 2 pl. to the rest of the paradigm, whence Ved. dheyám, dheyáh, dheyyáh, dheyyúr and Gk. θείσν, θείς, θείον, θείων, etc. That this last step was a post-IE innovation is shown by GAe. diaág, diiát, with preserved zero grade.

Type II, properly associated with acrostatic h₂e-conjugation aorists which were later sigmatized, added the invariant mood sign *-i²h₁- and the endings *h₂e-, *-th²e-, etc. to the e-grade of the root. In Indo-Iranian the endings of the h₂e-series, apart from the 3 pl. in *-(i)i²rs (> Ved. -ya²r, Av. -ita²rd), were replaced by those of the mi-series — a state of affairs directly attested in YAv. 3 sg. vainti (as if < *uén-i²h₁-t). Vedic Sanskrit went a step further, replacing the 3 sg. opt. in *-nt by *-ot(i) under the influence of the corresponding indicative in *-s(i). In a handful of forms, *-ot(i) eventually gave rise to the preactive type in -es (yesam, jésm, etc.); elsewhere, with the general replacement of *-t- by -ya² throughout the active, it yielded the aorist optative 3 sg. in -ya²h and the normal preactive in -ya². In Greek the treatment of type II was very different. Here, except for the change of 3 pl. *-(i)i²rs to *-(i)i²nt (> -(i)ev), the h₂e-conjugation endings were mostly retained. The fundamental innovation of Greek was the introduction of -a into the optative from the indicative and subjunctive (*deitē > *dei²te; cf. kouμη, etc.), followed by the analogical replacement of -σ(τ)- by -σ(τ)- in the 1 pl. and 2 pl. The spread of -σ(τ)- from the new forms in -σ(τ)men and -σ(τ)te to the rest of the active, like the spread of the diphthong -αυ- to the active from its probable locus in the middle, was a development proper to the history of the individual Greek dialects. The divergent treatments of type II can be summarized in tabular form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>IIr.</th>
<th>Av.</th>
<th>pre-Ved.</th>
<th>Ved.</th>
<th>Gk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.sg indic.</td>
<td>Root-st</td>
<td>-i-t</td>
<td>-s-t</td>
<td>-s(-t)</td>
<td>-(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.sg opt.</td>
<td>Root-i²h₁-e</td>
<td>-i-t</td>
<td>-i²t</td>
<td>-i²(-t)</td>
<td>-ya²h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "optative of the s-aorist" had three notable peculiarities in PIE: it lacked the *-s- of the s-aorist subjunctive and 3 sg. indicative; it showed persistent zero grade of the optative suffix, even in the active singular; and it took the h₂e-conjugation endings rather than the normal endings of the mi-series. The oldest Indo-Iranian, represented by Avestan, retained the first two features but not the third; the oldest Greek, represented by Cretan κοιμης and ηρημας, retained the second and third but not the first. The more innovative dialects of each branch simplified further. Vedic Sanskrit introduced the *-s- of the s-aorist indicative into the 3 sg. optative and replaced *-n- by -ya², Attic-Ionic Greek, after a period of experiment with the alphathematic "Aeolic" optative in -σ(ε)-, finally abandoned it for the regularly inflected type in -αω-. As so often proves to be the case in historical morphology, the best attested languages and dialects of each group were by no means the most conservative.

Bibliography
Das neutrale ved. Substantiv abhva- "Unding, Unwesen, unheimliches Wesen, Spuk, Blendwerk"\(^1\) ist seit dem RV belegt, vgl. u.a. I 63,1 mit \(\text{vřśvā ... abhvā} \) "alles Gewaltige (selbst die festen Berge)"\(^2\), I 24,6 mit \(\text{vātasya ... abhvam} \) (es handelt sich um die Gewalt des Windes) oder I 140,5 mit \(\text{kṛṣṇām abhvan} \) (es handelt sich um den schwarzen Feuerrauch von Agni). Es stellt ein Kompositum dar mit negierendem \(*η-\) im Vorderglied und Wurzel \(*b\text{h}uH2-/*b\text{h}uH3- \) "werden" im Hinterglied. Bedeutung: "keinen Wuchs besitzend" bzw. "einen Unwuchs habend"\(^3\). Die im Ved. allein belegte Zweissilbigkeit weist auf eine vorzugsweise Grundform \(*η-b\text{h}y-\text{O-} \) mit bereits uridg. Schwund des Laryngals wie in \(\nu\text{eγνφς} \) (seit den hom. Hymnen) "neugeboren" mit Hinterglied \(-\text{gno-} \) \(*-\text{g} \text{nH1-} \text{O-} \)\(^4\).

Das feminine griech. Substantiv \(\dot{α}φόν \), meist pluralisch \(\dot{α}φόνοι, \) oft in kollektivem Sinn "small-fry, like our Whitebait, including the young of various fishes"\(^5\) ist seit Epicharm (vgl. die Frgm. 60, 89, 124 KAI(EL) und Aristophanes (vgl. u.a. Ach. 640 mit \(\dot{α}φόνοι \text{ τιμήν} \) bezeugt. Zu \(\dot{α}φόπιε \) weitergebildet ist

---

\(^1\) So W. NEISER, Zum Wörterbuch des Rgveda I (1924) 74f. und danach M. MAYRHOFER, EWAia I/2 (1987) 94.

\(^2\) So K. HOFFMANN, Injunktiv (1967) 181.

