we expect word order to act as a reliable syntactic signal, poetry where we
expect these signals to be distorted by rhetorical and aesthetic pressures. We
should perhaps be wary of our expectations in these matters.
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Gathic Avestan cikōtārās

Jay H. Jasanoff
(Cornell University)

One of the most puzzling verbal forms in the Gathas is the hapax 3 pl.
cikōtārās, found at Y 32.11. The passage is given by Kellens and Pirart as
follows:¹

taecīt mā mōraṇḍon jiśītām, yōi draguvaŋtō mabhīs cikōtārās
aŋ'hīscā aŋhauuascā, apaiieitī rēxanaphō vaēdam
yōi vihăsītā ašaōnō, maddī rēsīgīt maŋnhō

'Illean corrompent ma substance, les (mauvaiss) maitres et maitresses qui se
signalent comme des partisans de la Tromperie par de grands (torts) ..., s'éloignant ainsi, ô Mazda, de la très divine Pensée et de l'Harmonie.'

Similar interpretations – at least as far as the nuclear relative clause yōi
cikōtārās is concerned – are offered by Insler ('who appear as')² and Humbach
('die ... glänzen').³ All these scholars take cikōtārās to be the 3 pl. perfect of
the root cit- (= Ved. cit- ‘understand, appear’). Independent evidence for a
perfect of this root in Indo-Iranian comes from Vedic (cf. cikēta, cikitūr, cikitē,
cikit(r)ē, etc.), Younger Avestan (ptcp. cikiētē), and Gathic itself (ptcp. cikiētā Y 43.2). The meaning 'appear' (≠ 'se signaler', 'glänzen'), though not
otherwise found in Avestan, recurs in the perfect middle forms in Vedic (cf. prā
nū yād esān mahānā cikitē ‘now that they have appeared in their grandeur' RV
I 186.9, sākām nāro dānaśaṅgā a cikitīnīre 'all at once the men have appeared
in (all) their wondrousness' I 166.13).⁴

Yet cikōtārās (i.e., /cikātēs/),⁵ if it is indeed a 3 pl. perfect, is a very
peculiar one. The other 3 pl. perfects in Avestan are GYA. āḍarā (/: ah-),
GYA. ādārā (/: ad-), GAV. cāmnārā (/: kan-), YAV. *cāmnārā (/: kan-), YAV.
dāhārā (/: dāh-), YAV. bāhārā (/: bar-), YAV. bābbuārā (/: bū-), vacnārā (/: van-),
YAV. viḍārā (/: vid-), YAV. irītīrā (/: riθ-), YAV. *sasārā (/: stā-). All these
forms, unlike cikōtārās, show the zero-grade that is regular in the perfect plural
in Indo-Iranian and the other early IE languages (cf. Ved. cikitūr, dad(h)ūr,
vidūr, tadvāh, etc.; Gk. oǐō : iō, Gk. wait : witun, etc.). The ending -ārē
< *-rē is also exceptional. The normal ending of the 3 pl. perfect in Avestan is
not -ārē but GAV. -ārē, YAV. -āro, continuing IR. *-r < */-r, with the same

¹Cf. Kellens - Pirart (1988: 121). I am grateful to James Benson, Stanley Insler and
Stephanie Jamison for their help during the planning and writing of this paper. I owe
a special debt to Professor Beekes, whose comments on an oral version delivered in Leiden
in April, 1996 did much to clarify my presentation here.
⁴Translations after Insler (1975: 206).
⁵As correctly interpreted by Beekes (1988: 24).
phonological treatment of word-final *-r as in yākara 'liver' (= Gk. ἱππαρ) and Ved. āhar 'day'. I Ir. *-rš, which gave the regular 3 pl. perfect in -ur in Vedic (cf. gen. sg. pitur < *-tr-s), is otherwise found in Avestan only in the 3 pl. optative (cf. YAv. dahiārās beside dahiāṇā (da-), jamiārās beside jamiāṇā (jam-)), bhaiārās beside bhaiān (b-), *sačiārās (hac-)). This "optative" use of *-rš, which is also regular in Vedic (cf. ganyūr, bhūyūr, etc.), was clearly an Indo-Iranian feature. What is unclear is how *-rš and *-r were distributed in the perfect itself, where the Vedic evidence points to *-rš, but where Avestan has both *-rš and *-r — the former in the apophonically deviant cikōita-rās, the latter in every other perfect in the language.

As I have argued elsewhere, the 3 pl. perfect ending had three formal variants in the parent language.4 The allomorph *-rš appears in cikōita-rās, the Vedic 3 pl. perfect in -ur, and the Indo-Iranian optative forms just discussed. The byform *-r, which gave Av. -ār, appears outside Indo-Iranian in the Old Irish 3 pl. preterite ending -(a)tar < *-ontar, which shows the addition of *-r (>*-ar), the ending of the 3 pl. perfect, to the *-ont of the thematic aorist (cf. 3 pl. lotar 'went' < * tudontar < *h₁udhont (= Gk. ἑκδον)) + *r). The third variant was *-r, which appears in Lat. -ēre (i.e., *-rē his et nunc *i) and probably also underlies the Hittite 3 pl. preterite in -ēr (ti-ē-r 'they put'), u-ē-r ('they came'), etc. The patterning of these forms suggests that the original shape of the 3 pl. perfect ending was *-(e)rs, structurally parallel to the active ending *-(e)nt. The zero-grade variant *-rs was retained into the dialectal period, giving *-rs in Indo-Iranian. Full-grade *-ērs, on the other hand, was converted to *-ēr by an inner-IE sound change — the phonological rule, familiar from the nominative singular of *-, and n-stem nouns (cf. *ph₂-tēr 'father' < *ph₂-tērs, *uks₂-'ox' < *uks₂-ērs, etc.), that took sequences of the form *-Vrs to *-Vr in word-final position.4 The -ē less-zero-grade variant *-r probably arose as an early compromise between *-rs and *-ērs (>*-e). At some time after the creation of *-r, but still within the common period, the 3 pl. middle endings *-ro (cf. Ved. śēre 'they lie', impf. āśe(s)/a) and *-ēro (cf. YAv. āphārē (they) sit (= Skt. āsate)) were created or reformed on the basis of the *-t and *-ēr of the perfect.5

5The rule is best known from its statement by Szemerényi (1970: 155). The parallel change of word-final *-Vfr to *-Vr is discussed by Nussbaum (1986: 128f).
6The term "perfect endings" is technically a misnomer, albeit a convenient one. *-hr, *-hrē, *-hr(e), *-hr(e)-rs, etc. were originally the endings of a pre-PIE category which, for want of a better term, I have called the "protomiddle" (cf. Jasanoff 1994: 162f). Protomiddle paradigms which became "true" middles in late Proto-Indo-European underwent a series of inner-IE formal renewals, including a) the elimination of paradigmatic ablaut, b) the introduction of the middle h insecurity particle *r, and c) the generalization of *-imare in the third person endings (e.g., 3 sg. -o(e), later also -o-to(e)). Protomiddle paradigms which were not renewed as middles, on the other hand, retained their "perfect" endings and ablaut, yielding a) perfects proper, characterized by reduplication, *o : zero ablaut, and resultant static meaning; and b) actives of the "h₃-conjugation," built to a variety of stem types and functionally indistinguishable from "mi-conjugation" actives in *-mi(*-i), *-at(i), *-at(i)-adj(i), etc. Strictly speaking, the 3 pl. middle endings *-ro and *-ēro were probably influenced not by the perfect endings as such, but by the h₃-conjugation active endings *-r and *-ēr, just as the 3 pl. middle ending *-ento was influenced by the mi-conjugation active ending *-e(n)to. Cf. note 16.
7Compare, e.g., the spread of *-w- in the plural and dual of the strong preterite in German (Go. 1 duo wihtas < *-we, 2 duo wihtas, pl. wihtum, *w-, un), where the only phonologically regular form was the 3 pl. in *-un < *-unt. On the Avestan forms, and the 3 sg. *dihašiti in particular, see Insler (1971: 583f.), followed by Kellem (1984: 183). The process by which presents back-formed to perfects is described at greater length by Thieme (1929: 35ff.), elaborating on Wackernagel (1905: 302f.).
3 pl. pluperfect corresponding to 3 sg. plpf. abībhēt (X 138.5), 3 sg. perf. bibhāya, and 3 pl. perf. bibhyur (bhi-='fear').

Here, as in dibh-, there is a nascent present stem: the participle bibhāyat- occurs already in the Rigveda, and finite forms of the present bibhētēi begin to appear in the Atharvaveda. In the case of acikayur, properly the 3 pl. corresponding to 3 sg. plpf. aciket (X 51.3; cf. 3 sg. perf. cikāya, 3 pl. perf. cikyur), a secondary reduplicated present appears in the participle cikyat- (RV) and in the 2 sg. cikēśi (AV). From the synchronic perspective of late Vedic, the pluperfects abībhāyur and acikayur are imperfects - a mechanical consequence of the fact that the corresponding perfects were renewed as reduplicated presents. It was such "neo-imperfects" as these that gave rise to the synchronic rule - rarely noticed or commented on by Indo-Europeanists - that the reduplicated presents built to roots ending in *-t, *-h, and *-k take guna before the -ur of the 3 pl. imperfect. Forms of this type (abībhāhar, ajuhāvar, asusava, etc.) are canonical in Classical Sanskrit (cf. Whitney 1889: 246-7).

The list of 3 pl. pluperfects attested in the Rigveda is not confined to abīdhāyur. Other forms of interest include the following:

a) avivyacur (vya-='encompas'; X 56.4), historically the 3 pl. pluperfect (3 sg. avivyakvīkata, corresponding to the perfect vivyācā (2 sg. vivyāκtā)); cf. also augmentless vivyacur (IX 80.1). A secondary present appears in 3 du. viviktā (2x).

b) ánamadur (mád-='rejoice, delight'; VII 18.21), properly the 3 pl. pluperfect corresponding to 3 sg. perf. mamāda; a secondary present appears in the 2 sg. form mamāsi (IV 21.9). Note the contrasting 3 pl. perfect mandūr < -*me-md- (VII 33.1, VIII 12.13), traditionally assigned to the collateral root mand-.

c) anonavur (nu-='roar, praise'; I 80.9, VIII 59.4), the 3 pl. pluperfect/imperfect corresponding to the "intensive" perfect nāvāya (I 79.2), 3 pl. nonuvur (VI 47.25). The 3 sg. counterpart of anonavur is (á)nu- (V 45.7, VI 3.7), occupying the place of expected *ánonot (cf. nāvīnot VI 3.7).

The relationship of the intensive perfect nāvāa, nonuvur to the ordinary intensive present nāvātī is formally the same as that of bibhāya, cikāya, etc. to bibhētī, cikēti.

d) àśiśrayur (śri-='direct, lay'; VII 2.5, etc.), ácucyavur (cyu-='move, stir'; V 53.6, etc.), and àśiśrayur (śru-='heark'; X 94.12), pluperfects in form but not in meaning. àśiśrayur, the 3 pl. counterpart of 3 sg. àśiśray (III 38.8, VII 38.1), has the same preterital value as the perfect àśiśraya (X 42.6).

11The long reduplication of abībhāyur is secondary and not confined to the pluperfect; a perfect bibhāya is found in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.
12Here too belongs the 3 du. form aviśiktā (X 12.4), probably not an old pluperfect, but a productively formed preteritalization of viviktā.
13See Narten (1981: 4) and the references there cited.
14Note also abhi àśiśrayur (śṛt-='mix'; IX 11.2, 86.17), probably also a pluperfect, but without a securely attested perfect active.

Both the hapax asurāyur (perf. suśrāva) and ácucyavur (9x; cf. also 3 sg. acucyaśīt, 2 pl. acucyaśītāna), the commonest pluperfect form in the Rigveda, pattern synchronically as reduplicated aorists.

e) viveśur (vīś-='enter'; IV 23.9), probably the augmentless pluperfect (cf. 2 sg. plpf. avīvēṣīth III 32.10) corresponding to 3 sg. perf. vīvesā. The true 3 pl. perfect is vīvesā (3x), with zero grade.

Although several of these forms allow more than one interpretation, the evidence as a whole - and in particular the pairs dīdiyur: abīdhāyur, bibhīyur: abībhāyur, cikyur: acikayur, mandūr: ánamadur, and nonuvur: anonavur - makes it abundantly clear that in Vedic Sanskrit the 3 pl. pluperfect was made from the strong form of the perfect stem. There are no exceptions to this rule in the Rigveda.

How is this peculiarity to be explained? In principle, the full-grade root of the 3 pl. pluperfect could either have been an Indic innovation or an inheritance from Proto-Indo-Iranian. The first possibility is unlikely, since there was no verbal category in early Indic that could have provided a model for the replacement of 3 pl. forms of the type *ādihiyur, *abībhīyur, etc. by the attested ādihiyur, abībhīyur. The vocalism of ādihiyur, abībhīyur, etc. is therefore probably an archaism. The evidence from Iranian is consistent with this conclusion. We know from GAv. 3 sg. urūrañct (Y 51.12) 'rejected!' < *(†)rua(m)jct < *(†)ruaurاست, a form related to YAv. 1 sg. perf. *urūrañct (Y 1.21), that the pluperfect was an Indo-Iranian category. There are no independently assured instances of the plural of the pluperfect in Iranian; we therefore cannot tell by simple inspection whether the 3 pl. equivalent of urūrañct would have had full or zero grade of the root, or whether it would have ended in -ařa, -a baño, *-a (< *-pa) or -on (- *-ent). But the indeterminacy of the Iranian material makes it tempting to assume that the rule for the formation of the 3 pl. pluperfect in Avestan was the same as in Vedic Sanskrit, with the ending - "ag added to the "strong" perfect stem. If the Indic and Iranian pluperfects were in fact identically formed, the 3 pl. counterpart of urūrañct would have been *urūrañct (i.e., /uruau[ŋ]/). Precisely such a 3 pl. form, I suggest, is attested in cikōitārōs, which is best taken as not a perfect but as a pluperfect.

From a semantic point of view there can be no objection to the interpretation of cikōitārōs as a pluperfect or perfect injunctive. The gloss 'appeared/ se signalait/ glänzte' gives as good a reading of Y 32.11 as 'appear/ se signalaient/ glänzen' - at least if we follow Inser (cf. above) in taking mōraṇdan, the verb of the main clause, as a pretterite (= augmentless imperfect) rather than as a present injunctive. If, on the other hand, we take mōraṇdan as an injunctive with the force of a general present ('ils corrompent', 'they destroy', etc.), then cikōitārōs can just as easily be read as a perfect injunctive - i.e., as a stative present of general or indefinite temporal reference ('appear from time to time', 'se signalent de temps en temps', etc.). It is significant that in the structurally parallel preceding verse (Y 32.10), where the main clause verb is 3 sg. mōraṇdat (matching mōraṇdan in Y 32.11), the position of cikōitārōs
occupied by the imperfect/ present injunctive *srauui.15
If cikoiwras is in fact a pluperfect or perfect injunctive, then the Indo-Iranian system can be envisaged as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 sg.</th>
<th>3 pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perfect indicative</td>
<td>*cikait-t&lt; *cikait-ţ (&gt;*ciki&lt;)</td>
<td>*cikait-t&lt; *cikait-ţ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form *cikait-ţ is from every point of view an anomaly. Yet peculiar as the above array may seem, it has a logic of its own. *-ţ, as opposed to *-t, patterns specifically as a secondary ending in Indo-Iranian – not only in the pair *cicit-ţ: *cikait-ţ, but also in the optative, where the s-less ending *-t does not occur. In both the pluperfect and the optative, moreover, the role of *-ţ is that of an ordinary active ending, paradigmatically associated with a 1 sg. in *-m, a 2 sg. in *-s, and a 3 sg. in *-t. The rationale for the use of *-ţ in the active optative has been discussed elsewhere (cf. Jasanoff 1991: 111ff.). As I have there argued, the PIE optatives corresponding to the active presents and aorists of the "h₂-conjugation" – the formal types represented, e.g., by *melmh₂/ *melh₂/ (pres.) 'grind' and *yén₂/ *yén₂ (aor.) 'strive for' – were probably originally characterized by the h₂-conjugation (i.e., perfect) endings. 16 This situation is not directly continued in the daughter languages; at some point prior to the breakup of Proto-Indo-European, and probably within the parent language itself, forms of the type 1 sg. *melmh₂-ih₂-ę, *yén₂-ih₂-ę, 2 sg. *melmh₂-ih₂-th₂-ę, *yén₂-ih₂-th₂-ę, and 3 sg. *melmh₂-ih₂-ę, *yén₂-ih₂-ę, which were functionally active, were regularized to 1 sg. *melmh₂-ih₂-m, *yén₂-ih₂-m, 2 sg. *melmh₂-ih₂-s, *yén₂-ih₂-s, and 3 sg. *melmh₂-ih₂-t, *yén₂-ih₂-t (= YAv. vainit), with the ordinary active endings. 17 Only in the 3 pl., for reasons that are still unclear, did the inherited perfect ending survive. Eventually, 3 pl. forms of the type *melmh₂-ih₂-t, *yén₂-ih₂-t became the point of departure for the (originally optional) extension of 1 pl. *-t to all athematic optatives. 18

A comparable replacement of the perfect endings by the active endings seems to have taken place in the pluperfect. Although the relevant forms are often overlooked, a pluperfect of the Indo-Iranian type is attested in a number of other IE languages. In Greek, for example, the plural and dual of the Homeric pluperfect are formed by adding the normal active secondary endings to the perfect stem (cf. 1 pl. (i)*παθανα 'we believed', 3 du. *δεξήσαντες 'they (two) resembled', exactly, as in Vedic and Avestan. 19 The still unexplained Greek pluperfect singular in -ενα, -ενε, -ενέ-α (1 sg. (i)*παθανα 'I believed', etc.) is probably a late replacement of the inherited singular in -γα, -σα, -τα – endings which would have led to inconveniently shortened surface forms in the 2 sg. and 3 sg. (e.g., 2 sg. *γας, *σας < -γας, -σας, 3 sg. *τας < -τας; 2 sg. *ήλαλως < *κ+θας, 3 sg. *ελλαλως < *κ+θας, etc.). 20 In Hittite, an old pluperfect was probably served by the irregular Middle Hittite form we-wakta (< *γεγκατ-), which patterns synchronically as the 3 sg. preterite of the perfecto-present 3 sg. wewakki 'demands' (< PIE 3 sg. perf. *γεγκατ- 'wishes'; cf. Ved. ptcn. vávašana- 'desiring'). 21 Further afield, German preserves a pluperfect in the isolated and irregular Gothic prohibitive ni oga (pus) 'fear not!' The 2 sg. form oga, a derivative of the preterito-present (< perfect) oga 'fear' (< *agh-), is usually referred to a "short-vowel" perfect subjunctive in *-es. 22 But no other trace of the PIE subjunctive remains in German, and prohibitions in the parent language were expressed not with the subjunctive but with the unaugmented secondary tenses of the indicative, i.e., the present, aorist, and perfect injunctive. The simplest interpretation of oga, therefore, is as a pluperfect/ perfect injunctive *agh-s; compare Ved. má bibheh (AV), also meaning 'fear not!'

Proto-Indo-European would thus seem to have had a pluperfect in *-m, *s, *t (*kwekki-s, *bhebbor-s, *γεγκατ-), which contrasted with the

15The line is bound na na nara pada yend in YAv. varnai yend / gsm melbii huaona, rendered 'Il corrompt mes hynnes, l'homme qui en prononce un tres mauvais pour voir de ses yeux la Vache et le soleil' (Kellens-Pirat). 'Each man has (also) ruined Thy teachings: the one who has professed the worst in order to ward off the sun and with the sun his eyes' (Insler). 'Der einzige Mann verdirbt die Augen der Völker' (Humbach).

16 Cf. note 8. h₂-conjugation aorists of the type *yén₂/ *yén₂, which employed a suppletive sigmatic stem (*yén-e, etc.) in the 3 sg. indicative, eventually gave rise to s-aorists of the classical type in Indo-Iranian, Greek and other branches of the family. Significantly, however, the optative paradigm corresponding to the aorist indicative was never naturalized in Indo-Iranian (cf. Hoffmann 1967: 31ff.), where the root aorist optatives that replace s-aorist optatives (e.g., Ved. 3 sg. vanyah (indic. vásqa, subj. vásqa), YAv. vainit (GAv. subj. vásqa)) can be shown to have had an acrostic paradigm different from that of the "normal" root aorists (Jasanoff, loc. cit.).

17 Here I depart from the chronology of my 1991 article, where I interpreted the replacement of forms of the type 3 sg. *yén₂-ih₂-ę by *yén₂-ih₂-t as a purely Indo-Iranian development and saw the Greek s-aorist optative in -οια, -οιας (cf. Cretan baxoxen, xoámos) as an inner-Greek naturalization of older 1 sg. *ia (< *-ih₂-ę, ā) 3 sg. *ie (< *-ihe₂-ę), etc. (16ff.). Partly owing to the parallelism between the h₂-conjugation optative and the pluperfect, I now think it likelier that the "alphathematic" inflection of the Greek s-aorist optative was entirely a Greek innovation, replacing late PIE *-ihe₂-m, *-ihe₂-s, *-ihe₂-t.

18Pre-Br. *-i-ț, of course, would regularly have given *-i(y)ur in Vedic; the attested scansion yur shows the influence of the -yā- of the other active forms. The *-yā- of YAv. yāsra is likewise analagous.

19 So too in the 3 pl., where -au (e.g., (r)fawu (they knew) is synchronically simply an active secondary ending. The perfect middle (e.g., 3 sg. (i)*kamorno 'understood', diakto 'was fated', etc.) is formed in the same way as the plural and dual of the active.

20 The endings -ena, -ene, -ene-α will be discussed in a forthcoming study by Joshua Katz. The unique pluperfect singular of the verb 'to know', which rests on a stem *(i)*weid- (cf. especially 2 sg. *(i)*weid- (r)hs, *(i)*weid- (h)ds, *weid- (s)ds), is best explained, in my view, as a back-formation from the optative *(i)*weid- – itself an inner-Greek replacement of the inherited perfect optative *(i)*weid- (= Ved. vīdām).

21 The forms are discussed by Oettinger (1979: 432ff.), where two occurrences of wewakta are quoted; only the citation at KUB XLI 23 23 Rs 12, however, is valid, as Gillian Hart points out to me. Oettinger's attempt (p. 433) to refer wewakki and wewakta to a PIE present *γεγκατ- is prima facie improbable, since such a present ought to have yielded a mi-verb in Hittite. The accent of the Vedic 2 sg. present vayakṣi shows it to be a neologism like mamansati (cf. above), back-formed from a pluperfect *γεγκατ-.

22 So, e.g., Bammesberger (1986: 89), Krause (1968: 227).
familiar perfect in *-tpe, *-thpe, *-e (*knekti-tbpe, *khebhoidh-tppe, *veyek-hpe). The endings *-m, *-s, *-t, etc. served, in effect, as the "secondary" perfect endings; their introduction into the perfect system was presumably motivated by a need to distinguish between the use of the perfect as a stative present and its ancillary pre-PIE use as a stative preterite.23 As Ir. *cikait-ś shows us, however, the use of the active secondary endings for this purpose was not quite universal. The 3 pl. of the nascent imperfectus seems never to have passed through a stage *knekti-taṁ or *knekti-ti, with the active ending *-(e)nt. Rather, as the Vedic and Avestan evidence suggests, the 3 pl. imperfectus retained its original r-ending, which here, in the h-pe-conjugation optative, took the form *-tš.

The r-ending of *cikait-ś, which contrasts with the other perfectus endings, is thus probably an archaism. But what of the other notable peculiarity of *cikait-ś – its ablaut grade? Our decision in the preceding discussion to treat the full grade of Ved. ādīdhayur, ādīhīhayur, etc. as an Indo-Iranian, rather than as a purely Indic, feature was made necessary by the impossibility of motivating a replacement of the type *ādīdhīhayur → ādīdhīhayur within Vedic. Yet the prospects for explaining a replacement of the type * (ā) cikait-ś → * (ā) cikait-ś, at the Indo-Iranian level are not much better. We must therefore consider the third logical possibility, namely, that the full grade of Ir. *cikait-ś, like its ending, was inherited from Proto-Indo-European itself. Seen from the vantage point of the parent language, the vocalism of *cikait-ś is not altogether surprising. The canonical *o : zero ablaut of the perfect, though often discussed as if it were a typical IE alternation pattern, was actually quite exceptional within the PIE system. Alternations of *e with zero, *e with *e, and *e with *e are all well attested in IE paradigms, both nominal and verbal.24 On the other hand, apparent cases of *o : zero ablaut are usually replacements of an older *o : *e pattern, as, e.g., in root nouns (type *yēk-s 'clan', gen. *yēk-es (cf. Ved. viśk)), replacing older gen. *yēk-s,25 suffixed nouns (*dēr-u 'wood', gen. *dēr-u-s (cf. Ved. dṛōh), replacing older gen. *dēr-u-s), and root presents (*kōk-e 'hangs', *kōk-e 'hangs', etc.) served, in effect, as the "secondary" perfect.

Similarly, in the 2 sg.:

In the 3 pl., there is good reason to believe that the late PIE representative of the perfect proper was *y'id-ēr (< *-ērs) 'they know', with zero grade of the root and the accented full-grade variant of the underlying ending *(e)rs. In the pluperfect, on the other hand, the Indo-Iranian evidence points to a preform of the type *yōid-ērs or *yōid-ērs, with an indeterminate full grade. Leaving the unknown elements unspecified, we obtain the schema

* y-id- 'they know/knew'  
* yōid-ērs 'they know/knew'  
* yōid-t 'they knew'  

- where the simplest "solution" is plainly

23According to Meillet (1919: 139), the PIE e-grade *kink- would have given *kink- in Hittite. Starting from roots of the structure TERT-, where -r gave -rak- by regular sound change, the vowel -e- (never -a-) enjoyed a considerable secondary productivity in Hittite. The Hittite "morphological" zero-grade in -s-8 will be discussed at greater length in Jasanoff (to appear).

24 Another category with secondary *o : zero ablaut is the Indo-Iranian sorit "passive" (type Ved. abhodhi 'awoke', pl. abudhara; cf. Jasanoff 1992: 134ff, Jasanoff 1992: 134ff). The spread of zero grade at the expense of the PIE "weak" position is not, of course, confined to categories with *o : *e ablaut, but is also found in paradigms of the type Ved. stātu (< *stētu-), pl. stāvānti (for *stāvati < *stēpy-; cf. Narten op. cit., 15ff.).

25 This example, atypical in its lack of reduplication, is chosen purely for convenience.
I suggest, therefore, that e-grade, and not zero grade, was the original "weak" vocalism of the perfect. By late PIE times, of course, the system had changed: zero grade had clearly been introduced into the forms of the plural, as shown by Ved. *vidur, Gk. ἰσόν, Go. wūtun, etc. But in the 3 pl., at least, the replacement of e-grade by zero grade seems to have been an innovation confined to the perfect proper. In the 3 pl., and perhaps originally throughout the whole plural and dual of the pluperfect, the pluperfect was distinguished from the perfect by its retained accented e-grade, the relic of an older acrostatic paradigm with *o: *e ablaut.30

If this explanation of the 3 pl. pluperfect is correct, we can refine our account of the distribution of *-ēr, *-r, and *-rs in late Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Indo-Iranian (cf. above). Apophonically "normal" 3 pl. perfects like *yid-ēr, *kēckēl-ēr, etc. were oxytone at the time of the breakup of the parent language and took the accentuated full-grade form of the ending *-ērs. But alongside the normal perfect, the parent language also had a number of marginal perfect types, including an acrostatic "Narten" class with *o: *ē ablaut (cf. Gk. ἵλή 'is accustomed', γύναικα 'shouts') and a second acrostatic type with *a: *a ablaut (cf. Gk. (α)κάτη 'is unnoticed (by you)'), Ofr. ro-líamair 'dared', Lat. scábē 'scratched', etc.).31 In perfects like these, the root was always accented, and both the perfect and pluperfect would regularly have ended in *-rs in the 3 pl. In tabular form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>perfect proper</th>
<th>pluperfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;normal&quot; perfect stems</td>
<td>*-ēr</td>
<td>*-rs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;long-vowel&quot; perfect stems</td>
<td>*-r</td>
<td>*-rs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can now see why *-ēr and *-rs were eventually joined by the analogical s-less variant *-r. *-rs was the ending of the 3 pl. pluperfect in all stem types; *-rs also occurred in the perfect proper, but only in the small minority of perfect stems that belonged to one of the two "long-vowel" types. It would have been very natural, therefore, for speakers to reanalyze the final *-s of *-rs as a morphological mark of the pluperfect, and to replace *-rs by *-r in the

30 Although it would be reasonable to suppose that e-grade was once the general weak vocalism of the pluperfect, it is impossible to confirm this from the meager Ved. evidence (cf. note 12). In Greek, the zero grade of forms like τ♢μον, λυστρα, etc. is easily explainable as a transfer from the perfect; the same is true a fortiori of the heavily remade 3 pl. perfect (f)ίλου. As will be argued elsewhere, the paradigm of the verb 'to know' in Celtic (OIr. ro-bhith 'knows', know) (≠ "wēd-īr"); MW 3 sg. gwyr know) (≠ "wēd-īr"); pl. gw(y)r dúgu (≠ "wēd-īr") rests on an amalgam of the perfect *wēid-/ *wēd- and the pluperfect *wēid-/ *wēid- (3 pl. *wēid-īrg).

31 The weak stem corresponding to λαδόει appears in forms like 3 sg. mid. λαδοει, ptcp. λαδοειν, etc. The existence of a weak stem in *-s in the type λαδοει (≠ "sēsūdēs") is purely conjectural.

The extension of *-r to the oxytone 3 pl. of "normal" perfects - the process that culminated in the generalization of *-r (≠ GAv. -ar, YAv. -ar) at the expense of *-ēr in Indo-Iranian and elsewhere - must have been a development of the dialectal period.32

We have come a considerable distance from cikōitaras, and it may be useful to review our main findings. The "strong" vocalism of the 3 pl. pluperfect in Vedic (ādīdhayur, abībhuyayurt, etc.) invites the assumption that cikōitaras was likewise a form of this type. But if this surmise is correct, then Proto-Indo-Iranian must have had 3 pl. pluperfects of the type *(ā)kīsaiťpēs, *(ā)yaidťpēs, etc., which contrasted in both ablaut and ending with the corresponding perfect types *(čiśtē, *yidč, etc.). The formal difference between the 3 pl. perfect and pluperfect can only be explained in the light of the pre-IE history of the pluperfect. While there is no way that the vocalism of *(ā)kīsaiťpēs could have been generated in the pluperfect within Indo-Iranian, an inner-IE replacement of e-grade by zero grade in the plural of the perfect would have been in complete agreement with the general tendency of morphological change in late Proto-Indo-European. We are thus led to a conclusion of unexpected generality - that the PIE perfect system was originally characterized by *o: *e ablaut, and that pluperfects of the type 3 pl. *kēckēlētpēs/*(ā)kēsaiētpēs/cikōitaras preserve the inherited weak stem more faithfully than any of the attested forms of the perfect proper.
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32 The same generalization of the zero-grade ending took place in Celtic (OIr. -(a)tar ≠ *-ont-r) and probably Germanic, where *-r was subsequently replaced by *-gs (> Go. -un).
L’ accusatif pluriel des thèmes en -a- en avestique

Jean Kellens
(Collège de France)

Les chapitres parallèles du début du Yasna présentent l’étrange divergence Y 3.2 aësmä aïseque yefti baoiçi xânûmaine ... = Y 4.1 aësmâsca baoiôîma ... paîrica daôômahî aca vaéôaiamahî = Y 7.2 aêsiaa daôômî aësa baoiçi xânûmaine ... L’indépendance relative de Y 4.1 n’est pas surprenante: sa liste litâ­
nique est différente de celle des autres chapitres et, la coordination en fait foi,
autrement structurée. Par contre, la disparité entre les chapitres 3 et 7, iden­
tiques à l’exception du groupe verbal, paraît anormale. Johanna Narten (ASA
134 n. 2), comme l’avait fait Bartholomae (AIW 27 et 918), diagnostique pour­
tant deux constructions distinctes: aësmä ... baoïçi allérait accusatif pluriel
et instrumental comitatif, tandis que aësa baoïçi serait un dvandva accusatif.
Je reste persuadé qu’une variation syntaxique entre ces passages est une anoma­
lité, d’autant que l’instrumental comitatif est toujours une solution de facilité
et que le comitatif de l’objet n’est pas sûrement usité (Kellens, Second European
Conference of Iranian Studies, Roma 1995, 354 n. 17, notant la pauvreté du
matériel relevé par Kellens-Pirart, TVA II 6-7).

Il est préférable de reconnaître en aësmä ... baoïçi un véritable dvandva com­
bining deux particularités plausibles: insertion de mots entre les deux termes1,
dans comme RS 7.42.5 à nêkta bahôî sadatâm usêkô (AIG II 1, 151 sq.),
et désinence plurielle du terme impliquant une réelle pluralité, comme dans
le vocatif indômaratabô de RS 2.29.3 (ibid. 156). Mais pourquoi la désinence
plurielle ne figure-t-elle pas dans Y 7.2?

aësa n’est pas une leçon incontestable. La situation est la suivante selon
Geldner: aësa P44 Mf4 J3.6.7 H1 L13 K11, aësmî J2 Mf1.2 B2, aësê J3 L2,
aësa K5 P6, aësmahe L3. Certaines de ces leçons sont sans autorité réelle.
aësa de P44 et Mf4 ne s’impose pas, puisque Mf1, copie plus ancienne du
même modèle, lit aësmî. De même aësmô de K5, car J2, qui descend plus
directement du modèle commun, lit lui aussi aësimî. aësmê de J3 est isolé au
sein des trois traditions pehlevies. En fait, le choix se situe entre aësma de
la Vulgate (Vidévôdô et Yasna sôde indien) et aësimî, qui est absurde, mais qui
est la leçon originale commune aux traditions pehlevies indiennes et iraniennes
et à la sâde iranienne.

Or, dans la phrase suivante, la même leçon absurde haômô, au lieu de haôma
attendu et figurant effectivement dans Y 3.3, est si massivement représentée
que Geldner se sent obligé de s’y tenir: haômô J2.3.6.7 K5.4.11 P4 Mf1.2.4
H1 L13.2 O1.2 C1 B1, haôma K6, haôma J5 L20.5, haômahe L3. haômô
n’est pas attesté et haômae est négligeable, puisque K6 est une copie de J3,

1Dans Y 3, le groupe verbal aïseque yefti suit toujours la liste des objets. Paradoxalement,
on insertion entre ces deux-ci établît-elle entre eux une relation différente de la simple
asyndiste?