

Alexander LUBOTSKY

**AVESTAN *x^varənah-*:
THE ETYMOLOGY AND CONCEPT**

(*Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen. Innsbruck. 1998*)

0. The etymology and concept of Avestan *x^varənah-* and its Iranian cognates have always been subject of debate¹. The problems have been reviewed several times² and are well-known.

1. Let us start with a short outline of the major constructions involving Av. *x^varənah-*. The meaning of *x^varənah-* we will discuss later, but for the moment, I shall gloss *x^varənah-* by ‘fortune’, without pretending that this is the best rendering.

1.1. The most frequent formula with *x^varənah-* is the octosyllabic line *ahe* (*mana* / *āṅhəm*) *raiiā x^varənaṅhaca* ‘on account of his (my/their) wealth and fortune’, which occurs hundreds of times in the Yashts. A typical example is Yt 3.18 (*et passim*)

ahe raiiā x^varənaṅhaca təm yazāi surunuūata yasna

‘On account of his wealth and fortune,

I will worship him with audible veneration’.

‘Wealth and fortune’ are attributes of a god, who can bestow them on a devotee. In Yt 10.108, for instance, Mithra asks (translation Gershevitch 1959: 127):

*kahmāi raēšca x^varənasca kahmāi tanuuō druuatātəm azəm baxšāni xšai-
iamnō*

‘On whom may I bestow riches and fortune, on whom health of the body?’

‘Wealth and fortune’ appear together in other formulae, too, cf. *raēšca x^varənasca* (Y 68.11, 21, Yt 10.108), *raiiqmca x^varənaṅhamca* (Y 60.4), *raēuuant- x^varənaṅhant-* (*passim*).

1.2. Another juxtaposition is formed by *x^varənah-* and *sauuah-* ‘power’, cf. *sauuasca x^varənasca* (Y 60.2); *x^varənaṅhō sauuaṅhō mazdaδātahe* (Y 1.14, 3.16, 4.19; Yt 17.0, 62); *x^varənō mazdaδātəm... sauuō mazdaδātəm...* (Y2.14, 17.14), etc.

1.3. Our knowledge about *x^varənah-* primarily comes from the Yashts. In Yt 19, two types of *x^varənah-* are distinguished: *kauuaēm x^varənah-* ‘the fortune of the Kavi-dynasty’ and *ax^varətəm- x^varənah-*³. The *kauuaēm x^varənah-* belongs to the gods. By its power they may create and preserve the world. It further accompanied the ancient kings and heroes and gave them extraordinary powers. The *ax^varətəm x^varənah-*, on the other hand, is described as an object of desire for divinities and heroes, who permanently struggle for it. Ahura Mazdā even prescribes to every mortal to fight for the *ax^varətəm x^varənah-*.

In Yt 18, the Aryan *x^varənah-* (*airianəm x^varənah-*) is honoured. It was created by Ahura Mazdā, is full of milk and pastures, and overcomes the Daēvas and the non-Aryan countries.

2. The major problem we encounter when dealing with the etymology of this word, is its anlaut. Whereas Avestan *x^varənah-*, Pahl. *xwarrah*, and MoPers. *xorre* point to initial **x^v-*, the other languages show initial **f-*, cf. OP *°farnah-* in PN (*Viⁿdafarnah-*), MP (Man., Parthian) *prh*, *frh* /*farrah*, *farroh*/ ‘fortune, glory’, Sogd. (Buddh.) *prn*, (Man.) *frn*, (Chr.) *fn* /*farn*/ ‘glory, high rank’, Bactrian φαρ(ρ)ο on Kushān coins, Khot. *phārra-* ‘splendour, rank (of Buddha)’, MoPers. *farr(e)*, Oss. *farn/farnæ*. ‘happiness, wealth, well-being’.

For a long time it was held that the initial *f-* is due to a specific Median sound-law Plr. **x^v-* > Med. *f-*. The theory assumed that *farnah-* was borrowed by Old Persian from Median, and then disseminated all over the Iranian territory in the period of the Achaemenid empire. In 1983, however, P.O. Skjærvø convincingly showed that the “Median” theory is untenable. His conclusions can be summarized as follows:

1) It is impossible to prove that *farnah-* is an originally Median word and that there was an exclusively Median development **x^v-* > *f-*.

2) Forms with *f-* are attested on the whole Iranian territory, whereas *x^v-* is confined to Avestan. Pahl. *xwarrah* and MoP *xorre* can be considered loanwords from Avestan.

3) There is no evidence that *farnah-* was so important in the Achaemenid empire that this term was borrowed into all Iranian dialects of that time and replaced the local variants.

The “Median” theory being discarded, what then is the reason for the difference in anlaut? Skjærvø sees two possible answers:

A. Since *farnah-* is the most frequent form, it may also be the original one. In other words, Av. *x^varənah-* may be an adaptation of **farnah-* < **p^harnas-* (?) to the Avestan phonological system, which had no initial *f-* before a vowel⁴.

B. The development PIr. **huarnah-* > *farnah-* is due to dissimilation *hu* - *h* > *f-h* (or *h-h* > *f-h*, followed by *fua-* > *fa-*). Avestan has escaped this dissimilation because the initial **hu-* had become *x^v-* early enough.

Skjærvø considers the second option more probable⁵, but the whole scenario seems very unlikely to me (cf. also the criticism by Lecoq 1987). A dissimilation of the type **huarnah-* > *farnah-* can be a sporadic development at best, especially if we take into account that the newly arisen *fa-* is a unique sequence in most of the Iranian dialects. Therefore, we can safely rule out the possibility that this dissimilation could have occurred independently in Median, Persian, Sogdian, Khotanese, etc. The only other possibility would then be to assume that this development took place in Common Iranian when the speakers of Avestan had already left, but this is not very probable either: there is not a shred of evidence that Avestan separated from Common Iranian before other dialects.

2.1. Let us now take a closer look at Skjærvø's solution A, which, in my view, is essentially correct. First of all, the original form **farnah-* accounts better for the distribution: forms with *f-* are attested on the whole Iranian territory, whereas *x^v-* is confined to Avestan. As indicated by Skjærvø, the initial *x^v-* of Av. *x^varənah-* can be explained by substitution of *fa-* by *x^va-*. This kind of substitution is not uncommon in loan words. For instance, in South Russian dialects, *f(-)* in loan words is regularly reflected as *x^w*, cf. *x^wábr'ika* 'factory' (Standard Russ. *fábrica*), *x^wanář* 'lantern' (Standard Russ. *fonar'*, a borrowing from Gr. *φανάριον*), etc. (cf. KUZNECOV 1960: 79; AVANESOV 1949: 124)⁶.

2.2. Secondly, there is an important linguistic argument against a Proto-Iranian reconstruction **huarnah-*, which, as far as I know, has never been mentioned in the literature. Avestan compounds with second members in °*x^v-* normally appear with *-š(.)x^v-* after *i*, *u*, *r*, which is the result of the RUKI-rule⁷, cf. *hušx^vafa* (Y 57.17) 3sg. pf. *√x^vap-* 'to sleep'; *paitiš.x^vana-* (N 26) 'disturbing noise'; *pairiš. x^vaxta-* (Y 11.7) 'surrounded on all sides'; *paitiš(.)x^varəna-* (V 3.14, 8.43,44, 9.16,40) 'jaws'; *aiianhō.paitišx^varəna-* (Yt 10.70) 'with iron jaws'; *aiβiš.x^varəθa-* (V 6.32,38,41) 'suitable for consumption'; *anaβiš. x^varəθa-* (V 6.31,34-5,37) 'unsuitable for consumption'; *mainiuš.x^varəθa-* (Y 55.22; Yt 10.125) 'reared on supernatural food' (GERSHEVITCH 1959: 135); *pasuš.x^varəθa-* n. (V 19.41 Gl.) 'food for the cattle'.

Apart from three compounded verbs⁸, unchanged *x^v-* is only found in compounds with °*x^varənah-*: *ātərə-x^varənah-* (Yt 13.102) PN; *aiβi-x^varənah-* (Yt 13.117) PN; *aiβi. x^varənah-* (Yt 15.48) 'full of *x^varənah-*'; *pouru. x^varənah-* (Yt 18.1; V 19.3; Ny 3.11, 5.6; S 1.9, 2.9; Vyt 7, 24 *paouru.x^varənah-*) 'with much *x^varənah-*'; *viñdi-x^varənah-* (Yt 15.45) 'with the found *x^varənah-*'.⁹

Also in the position after \tilde{a} , the initial x^v of ${}^o x^v arənah-$ remains unchanged (*ušta.x^varənah-*, *vīspō.x^varənah-*, *barō.x^varənah-*, *haomō.x^varənah-*), whereas, for instance, the initial x^v of ${}^o x^v arəna-$ ‘eating’ often appears as $-ŋ^v h-$ (*āṅ^vharəna-* ‘dish, bowl’, *haṅ^vharəna-* ‘cheek’).

This state of affairs shows that the initial x^v- of Avestan $x^v arənah-$ can hardly reflect Proto-Iranian $*h_u-$ < PIE $*s_u-$.

2.3. Skjærvø has probably rejected $*farnah-$ as a proto-form because the Plr. reconstruction $*p^h arnah-$ does not lead any further, but, as a matter of fact, there is no need to reconstruct this Proto-Iranian form. As already assumed by Bartholomae and many others, $*farnah-$ is likely to be a dialectal word. The whole problem must accordingly be seen in a different light: if $*farnah-$ is a form of an Iranian dialect, which Proto-Iranian word can it reflect? In the following I shall argue that $*farnah-$ goes back to Plr. $*parnah-$. The proof is Skt. *pārīṇas-*, which is not only the same morphological formation, but, as we shall presently see, has the same range of meanings.

3. Skt. *pārīṇas-* n. is traditionally glossed ‘fullness, abundance’ and derived from the PIE root $*pelH_1-$ ‘to fill’ (cf. Mayrhofer, EWAia s.v.). For Skt. *pārīṇas-* we can reconstruct PIE $*pelH_1-nos-$, the expected Iranian reflex of which is $*parnah-$ with loss of the laryngeal in inlaut. We shall return to the problem of the Iranian initial $f-$ a little later. Let us first look at the actual occurrences of Ved. *pārīṇas-*. This word is attested only in the RV (the other occurrences being RV-ic repetitions or variants). It occurs eleven times as a simplex and twice in the compound *gōparīṇas-*. Finally, there is one attestation of the adjective or neuter *parīṇasá-*.

3.1. Among the eleven occurrences of *pārīṇas-*, we find four times an asyndetic formula *rāyā pārīṇasā*¹⁰ at the end of the line, three times referring to Indra and once to Agni. A typical example is 8.97.6a-d (other passages are 1.129.9a; 4.31.12b; 5.10.1c):

*sá naḥ sómeṣu somapāḥ sutēṣu śavasas pate /
mādāyasva rādhasā sūnṛtāvātā- -īndra rāyā pārīṇasā //*

‘Get intoxicated with our pressed out Soma-juices, o Indra, Soma-drinker, Lord of power, with (your) bountiful gifts, with (your) wealth (and) *pārīṇas-*.’

Presumably *pārīṇas-* was already moribund in the RV because the poet of 3.24 mistakenly made *pārīṇas-* masculine when he transposed the formula into the accusative, cf. 3.24.5ab

agne dā dāsūṣe rayīm vīrāvāntam pārīṇasam /

‘O Agni, give to the devoted one wealth, consisting of valiant heroes, and *pārīṇas-*!’

It seems reasonable to identify the formula *rayā páriṇasā* with the Avestan formula (*ahe/mana/āṅhqm*) *raia x^varənahaca* and its variants. This is without a doubt an example of a Proto-Indo-Iranian formula.

3.2. At the end of a hymn to the Maruts, 1.166.14, we read:

*yéna dīrghám marutaḥ śúśávāma yuṣmākena páriṇasā turāsaḥ /
ā yát tatánan vṛjáne jánāsa ebhír yajñébhīś tād abhīṣṭim aśyām //*

‘Your *páriṇas-*, o Maruts, through which we shall stay powerful for a long time, o strong ones, and which (other) people will try to draw into their surrounding, is what I seek to acquire with these sacrifices as a gift’.

First of all, the passage shows that there is a direct connection between the *páriṇas-* and the power (root *sū-*), which is reminiscent of the Avestan pair *sauuasca x^varənasca*, cf. § 1.2.¹¹ Furthermore, we may conclude from the passage that *páriṇas-* is not simply ‘abundance’, but also some kind of military superiority, sovereignty. The imagery is essentially the same as that of Avestan *airiianəm x^varənō*¹².

Just as Av. *x^varənah-*, Vedic *páriṇas-* is a quality possessed by the gods (especially Indra and his gang, the Maruts), which can be bestowed on the devotees. This also follows from 8.21.7-8ab:

*nūtñā íd indra te vayám ūṣṭī abhūma nahí nú te adrivaḥ /
vidmā purā páriṇasaḥ //*

‘We, of the new generation, are dependent on your help, Indra. We have known your *páriṇas-*, not (only) now, but also before, o master of the pressing stones’.¹³

3.3. From 8.77.9 we learn that *páriṇas-* is something through which Indra performs his heroic deeds:

etā cyautnāni te kṛtā vārṣiṣṭhāni páriṇasā / hṛdā vīdv ādhārayaḥ //

‘These highest deeds of yours, performed with *páriṇas-*, you kept firmly on your heart’.

This point is reminiscent of Yt 19.10, where it is said that *x^varənah-* belongs to Ahura Mazdā (*asti ahurahe mazdā*), so that he creates the world.

3.4. A more profane aspect of *páriṇas-* follows from 1.133.7a:

vanóti hí sunván kṣáyam páriṇasaḥ

‘The presser (of Soma) wins indeed a house of *páriṇas-*.’

The idea that *x^varənah-* is present in the house of a devoted man follows, for instance, from Y 60.7 *mā yauue imaṭ nmānəm x^vāḍrauuat x^varənō frazahīt*

‘May the comfort-bringing *x^varənah-* never leave this house’.¹⁴ A similar meaning has been preserved to this very day in Ossetic *farn* ‘happiness, peace, prosperity’.

3.5. The remaining two RV-ic passages containing *páriṇas-* and the one containing *pariṇasá-* are less diagnostic¹⁵, so that I shall skip them now.

3.6. Finally, let me shortly mention the compound *góparīnas-*, which at least in 8.45.24¹⁶ means something like ‘abundance of milk’:

ihá tvā góparīnasā mahé mandantu rādhase / sáro gauró yáthā piba //

‘May (the juices) with the abundance of milk intoxicate you here for a great gift! Drink a lake as a bull!’

Compare this compound with Avestan Yt 18.1:

mraoϕ ahurō mazdā^ǎ spitamāi zarađuštrāi:

azəm dadqəm airiianəm x^varənō gaomauuaitīm pouru.vqðβəm

‘Says Ahura Mazda to Spitama Zarađuštra: I have created the Aryan x^varənah, full of milk, full of pastures’.

4. What can be said about the original meaning of *pārīnas-*? As is well known, the Indo-European words with the suffix **-nos-* often have the meaning of some property (Wackernagel – Debrunner 1954: 737f.), cf. Skt. *ápnas-*, Av. *afnah-* ‘property’; Skt. *dráviņas-*, Av. *draonah-* ‘share, divided property’ (Hoffmann 1957: 70f. = 1976: 420f.); Skt. *rékñas-* ‘wealth’, Av. *raēxənah-* ‘heritage’. Therefore, *pārīnas-* may have originally meant ‘full property, omnipossession, sovereignty’, then also ‘abundance’. ‘Sovereignty, dominion, control over a territory’ seems to be an essential element of Av. *x^varənah-*¹⁷ and its Iranian cognates¹⁸. It should be borne in mind that control of a vast territory is absolutely vital for a nomadic society: it has been calculated that in order to raise 6-7 cows or horses one needs 1 square km of pasture in the Eurasian steppes (Kuz’mina 1994: 205).

5. And now the last intriguing question: how to account for the initial *f-* of Iranian *farnah-* instead of the expected **p-*? Since *farnah-* is most probably a dialectal Iranian form, we must look for an Iranian language, where **p* regularly yields *f*. I know of only one such language: Ossetic. The date of the Ossetic sound change **p > f* has been disputed. The Sarmatian names on Greek inscriptions in Southern Russia (1st c. B.C. – 3rd c. A.D.) show both π and ϕ :

Πουρδαίος (Olbia) / Φουρτας (Tanais) (< **puδra-*, Oss. *fyrt/furt*);

Πιδος (Berezan’) / Φιδας (Tanais, Panticapaeum) (< **pitā*, Oss. *fyd / fidæ*).

Abaev (1949: 212f., 1979: 332) interpreted the π/ϕ alternation diachronically, but, as indicated by Bielmeier (1989: 240), the different reflexes may belong to different dialects: forms with π are attested in the West (Olbia)¹⁹, whereas forms with ϕ are found in the East. Therefore we may assume that the sound change **p > f* took place in some of the Scythian dialects early enough to be found in various Iranian names.

The first attestation of the element *farnah-* in Median onomastics can be dated around 714 B.C. (the reign of Sargon II, 721-705 B.C., Lecoq 1987: 678). We know that at that time Media was invaded by Scythian tribes, and it is only

natural to assume that the Median princes and high military officials were of Scythian descent. On the Persepolis reliefs, Median chieftains are dressed like Scythians and wear the same weapons as Scythians (Sakā Tigraxaudā) (Vogel-sang 1992: esp. 173ff.).

6. Let us sum up: Iranian *farnah-* is of Scythian origin, cognate with Vedic *pārīṇas-*, as shown by Avestan and Vedic formulae. The original meaning of Indo-Iranian **parHnas-* was ‘sovereignty, control’, then ‘abundance’. Avestan *x^varənah-* is a borrowing from Scythian with substitution of the initial *fa-* by *x^va-*.

The genuine Avestan word related to Scythian *farnah-* and Skt. *pārīṇas-* is Av. **parənah-*, preserved in the adjective *parənaṅhuxtəm* (Yt 5.130), meaning something like ‘abundant’²⁰.

NOTES

¹ Due to circumstances, I was unable to prepare a full-fledged article for this volume. Here I present the unaltered text of my Innsbruck paper, to which I have only added some footnotes and the bibliography.

² A good recent review of the *x^varənah-* problem can be found in Hintze 1994: 15ff. Cf. further Gnoli 1990, 1996, Jacobs 1987, Lecoq 1987, Skjærvø 1983.

³ The meaning of *ax^varətəm* is disputed. In my opinion, the adjective *ax^varəta-* means ‘ungiven, undistributed’ and is a loan from “Scythian” **afarta-* < Proto-Iranian **a-parta-* (probably reflected in Ossetic *æværd/ævard* ‘put apart, saved, preserved’, *æværyn/æværun* ‘to place apart, to save’) with substitution of *-f-* by *-x^v-* (for the mechanism see § 2.1 and § 5). This is of no consequence for the present discussion, however.

⁴ The only example in Bartholomae’s dictionary is the hapax Yt 19.3 *fānkauuō* ‘top of the mountain’, but this word must probably be corrected to *^xfānkauuō*, cf. Hintze 1994: 79.

⁵ Also accepted by Gnoli 1990 and 1996.

⁶ There are many other parallels for substitution of *f* by *x^v/hv* in loan words. After the presentation of my paper, Stefan Schumacher mentioned to me Middle Welsh *Chwefror* ‘February’, a borrowing of Latin *Februārius* (cf. also Schrijver 1995: 160). In Finnish we find *sohva* ‘sofa’, *kirahvi* ‘giraffe’, etc. In Lithuanian, which had no phoneme /h/, *f* was substituted by *kv*, e.g. *kvalbōnas* ‘flounce’, borrowed from Polish *falbana*, cf. also German *Falbel* (Mayrhofer, per litt.).

⁷ For more details on *-šx-* in Avestan compounds I refer the reader to Lubotsky, forthcoming.

⁸ V IX.16,24 *ni-x^vabdaiieiti* 3sg. ‘to put to sleep’, Y 57.10 *paiti x^vaṅhaiieiti* 3sg. ‘to thrash’. ViD 10 *aīfi x^varənti* 3pl. ‘to eat’.

⁹ Also in Middle Iranian there are, to my knowledge, no certain traces of *-š(x^v)-* in compounds with **x^varənah-*. Klingenschmitt (1975: 149, fn. 1) assumed that Toch. A compounds *puttišparām* ‘Buddhawürde’, *ārāntišparām* ‘Arhatwürde’, etc. are borrowed from an Iranian language where these compounds sounded like **putišuarnah-* being analogically formed to the old determinative compound **kaui-šuarah-* ‘Kavi-Würde’. This hypothetical scenario has several weaknesses. First, all East Iranian languages show the reflexes of **farnah-* and not **x^varənah-*, and the Tocharian simplex A *parām*, B *perne* reflects **farnah-* rather than **x^varənah-*. Klingenschmitt sees the difficulty and assumes that Toch. *p-* may also reflect Iran. *hu-*, but his only parallel is Toch. B *waipecce* from Iran. *hūaipadīa-*, for which he has to resort to the peculiar Tocharian variation *p : w*. Secondly, compounds of this type are not attested in Middle Iranian. In Sogdian, for instance, the normal expression for Buddha’s rank’ is *pwty’kh prn / putyāk farn/*, where *pwty’kh* is a denominal abstract (cf. Sims-Williams 1981: 12f.). It is therefore easier to assume that the unexplained element *-iš-* of the Tocharian compounds goes back to a denominal suffix of the Iranian donor language (**-ičʔ*).

¹⁰ The asyndetic character of *rayā páriṇasā* was recognized for the first time by Wackernagel – Debrunner 1954: 738.

¹¹ Compare also the same combination in 8.97.6. cited above, where Indra is, on the one hand, *śavusas pate*, and *rāyā páriṇasā*, on the other.

¹² From Yt 10.27 it follows that *x^varənah-* can also be possessed by the ‘bad guys’: *yō daijñāuš raxšiiqiđiā para razištā baraiti, paiti x^varənā vāraiiēiti, apa vərəδrayṇəm baraiti* ‘(Miḍra), who carries off the straightest (paths) of the defiant country, diverts its chances, removes its victoriousness’ (Gershevitch). It is clear that one has to fight for the *x^varənah-* with the enemy. Cf. also Hintze 1994: 27.

¹³ This rendering seems more adequate than Geldner’s ‘Wir sind aufs neue deiner Hilfe gewartig, Indra, denn noch haben wir früher deine volle Größe nicht kennen gelernt, o Herr des Preßsteins’. Cf. especially 8.75.16 *vidmā hí te purā vayám ágne pitúr yáthávasah ādhā te sunnám imahe* ‘For we have known your help before, o Agni, as that of a father. Therefore we ask you for your good-will’.

¹⁴ The same image is probably alluded to in a difficult passage Yt 14.41, for which see Kellens 1974: 78ff.: *vərəδrayṇō auui imaṭ nmānəm gaosurābiiō x^varənō pairi.vərənauuaiti...* ‘Vərəδrayṇa entoure cette maison de x^varənah en même temps que de richesse en vaches...’

¹⁵ The passages are:

1.56.2a-b; *tám gūrtāyo nemannīśah páriṇasah samudrām ná saṃcāraṇe sanišyāvah*

‘The praises of (his) *páriṇas-*, seeking for the guidance, (fill) him, like (rivers filling) the ocean, competing in the joint movement.’

8.84.7a-c: *kásya nūnám páriṇaso dhíyo jinvasi dampate / gósātā yásya te girah//*

‘Whose poetic thoughts concerning *páriṇas-* do you incite now, O master of the house (Agni), so that his praises of you will be cattle-winning?’

9.97.9c-d: *pariṇasám kṛṇute tigmásṛṅgo divā hárir dáđṛše náktam rjrah //*

‘He with pointed horns (Soma) becomes *pariasá-*. In the day-time he looks bay, at night he looks white.’

¹⁶ The passage 10.62. 10a-c is less clear:

utá dāsá parivīṣe smāddiṣṭī gōparīṇasā yādus turvās ca māmahe

‘And two slaves for serving, equally trained, together with abundance of milk (?), gave (me) Yadu and Turva(śa).’

¹⁷ Hintze 1994: 26ff. argues that *x^varənah-* is considered by the authors of the Yashts as something visible. Even if this view be correct - the relevant passages allow of more than one interpretation -, the image of the visible *x^varənah-* can be ascribed to the influence of the Middle-Eastern idea of visible sovereignty.

¹⁸ This rendering is very close to the meaning which was posited for Av. *x^varənah-* by Bailey 1943 on the basis of a careful analysis of the Avestan texts. He gives the following rendering of *x^varənah-*: “‘a thing obtained or desired’, thence ‘a good thing, a desirable thing, possessions, good things’” (1943: 2). It is on the basis of this meaning that Bailey tried to etymologize the word, first as **h_uar-nah-* from the root *h_uar-* ‘to grasp’, later as **hu-arnah-*. His etymologies are not very appealing, but his semantic analysis is excellent.

¹⁹ Justi 1895: 94 mentions the name Παρνος found in Olbia, who was the father of Κασαις, a strategos in Olbia!

²⁰ The difficult passage reads *upa stərəmāēšu vārəma daiḍe parənanḥuṇtəm +vīspqm.hujiiāūtīm iriḍəntəm xšaδrəm zazāiti*. Bartholomae-Wolff leave the last three words untranslated and render the rest as ‘In (seinen) Lagerräumen bringt er nach Belieben in reicher Fülle alles unter, was zum Wohlleben dient’. Oettinger (1983: 126) translates: ‘In den Lagerräumen bringe ich mir nach Wunsch Fülle bietenden und alles Wohlleben mit sich führenden (Reichtum) unter. Erst den Sterbenden verläßt das Besitztum’.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABAEV, V.I. 1949. Osetinskij jazyk i fol’klor. Moskva – Leningrad.

ABAEV, V.I. 1979. Skifo-sarmatskie narečija. Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija – drevneiranskije jazyki. Moskva, 272-364.

BARTHOLOMAE – Wolff: Avesta, die heiligen Bücher der Parsen, übersetzt auf der Grundlage von Chr. Bartholomae’s altiranischem Wörterbuch von Fritz Wolff. Strassburg 1910.

AVANESOV, R.I. 1949. Očerki ruskogo dialektologii I. Moskva.

BAILEY, H.W. 1943. Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books. Ratanbai Katrak Lectures. Oxford 1943, repr. with Introduction 1971.

BIELMEIER, R. 1989. Sarmatisch, Alanisch, Jassisch und Altossetisch. Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum, herausg. von R. Schmitt. Wiesbaden.

- GELDNER, K.F. Der Rig-veda, aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt..., 4 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1951-1957.
- GERSHEVITCH, I. 1959. The Avestan hymn to Mithra. Cambridge.
- GNOLI, G. 1990. On Old Persian *farnah-*. Iranica Varia: Papers in honor of Professor Ehsan Yarshater (Acta Iranica 30. Troisième série. Textes et mémoires, vol. XVI), Leiden, 83-92.
- GNOLI, G. 1996. Über das iranische **hyarnah-*: lautliche, morphologische und etymologische Probleme. Zum Stand der Forschung. Altorientalische Forschungen 23, 171-180.
- HINTZE, A. 1994. Der Zamyād-Yašt: Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Wiesbaden.
- HOFFMANN, K. 1957. Zwei vedische Wortsippen: 1. *kava-*, 2. *drū*. MSS 10, 59-71.
- HOFFMANN, K. 1976. Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik II. Wiesbaden.
- JACOBS, B. 1987. Das Chvarnah - Zum Stand der Forschung. MDOG 119, 215-248.
- JUSTI, F. 1895. Iranisches Namenbuch. Marburg. (Reprint: 1963, Hildesheim.)
- KELLENS, J. 1974. Les noms-racines de l'Avesta. Wiesbaden.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, G. 1975. Tocharisch und Urindogermanisch. Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.-14. September 1973, ed. H. Rix. Wiesbaden, 148-163.
- KUZ'MINA, E.E. 1994. Otkuda prišli indoarii? – Material'naja kul'tura plemen andronovskoj obščnosti i proisxoždenie indoirancev. Moskva.
- KUZNECOV, P.S. 1960. Russkaja dialektologija. Moskva³.
- LECOQ, P. 1987. Le mot *farnah-* et les Scythes. Comptes-Rendus d'Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres 1987, 671-682.
- LUBOTSKY, A. forthcoming. Avestan compounds and the *ruki*-rule. Compositiones indogermanicae in memoriae Jochem Schindler, edd. H. Eichner, H.C. Luschützky.
- MAYRHOFER, M. EWAia. Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen. Heidelberg, 1986-1996.
- OETTINGER, N. 1983. Untersuchungen zur avestischen Sprache am Beispiel des Ardvīsur-Yašt. Habilschrift.
- SCHRIJVER, P. 1995. Studies in British Celtic historical phonology. Amsterdam – Atlanta.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, N. 1981. Some Sogdian denominal abstract suffixes. AO 42, 11-19.
- SKJÆRVØ, P.O. 1983. *Farnah-*: mot mède en vieux-perse? Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris 78, 241-259.
- VOGELSANG, W.J. 1992. The Rise & Organisation of the Achaemenid Empire: The Eastern Iranian Evidence. Leiden - New York - Köln.
- WACKERNAGEL, J. – A. DEBRUNNER, 1954. Altindische Grammatik, Band II,2: Die Nominalsuffixe. Göttingen.