

## The accentuation of the genitive of '3' in Sanskrit and Indo-Iranian

While in one late RV hymn (10.185.1), the genitive plural of the numeral *trī-* is attested as a completely regular *i*-stem form *trīṇām*, all later Old Indo-Aryan texts (starting from the Yajurveda) exhibit a different, synchronically suppletive form *trayāṇām* (also acknowledged by Pāṇini 7.1.53). Burrow (1959: 258) explained this as a replacement of an older *\*trayām* = Avestan *θraiiqm* and indeed, the irregular form of later Indo-Aryan would be difficult to explain if Rigvedic *trīṇām* were the original form (instead, this form is considered an innovation by Eichner 1982: 186f. n. 88). Therefore, it is probable that the Proto-Indo-Iranian (PIIr) and Proto-Indo-Aryan (PIA) form was *\*traya(H)am*.

Until now I have avoided to mark accentuation, the reason being that there are contradictory statements. Burrow writes *tráyāṇām* and reconstructs a barytone form *\*tráyām*, and the same is done by Hoffmann (1976: 561 n. 2), Eichner (1982: 152, 185 n. 83), and Emmerick (1992: 166) who, following Wackernagel & Debrunner (1930: 346f.), also explicitly dismiss *trayāṇām* as secondary. This latter form, however, is given nearly everywhere else since Bopp (1863: 157f.), and seems to be implied by Pāṇini 6.1.179.

What is the reason for this apparent confusion? An explicit argumentation is found in Wackernagel & Debrunner (followed by Eichner): They cite the earliest attestation of the form in Taittirīya Saṃhitā 3.4.3.8 as *tráyāṇām* and use this as an argument against the assumption that this form belongs to *trayá-* 'threefold'. Indeed, *tráyāṇām* is the form given by Weber in his edition of TS (p. 292), without any variants. However, this is not only contradicted by Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa 3.9.3.3 *trayāṇām-trayāṇām* (within the very same Vedic school) and by *trayāṇām* ŚBK 4.1.4.13, but also by all other editions of the TS itself where we only<sup>1</sup> find *trayāṇām* which is accordingly the only form given by the VWC (I,3 1507a; II,1 699a). In addition, only the oxytone form is grammatically expected, since all other oblique case forms of the word are oxytone (*tribhís, tribhyás, triśú*). The only evidence for *tráyāṇām* is the text of Weber's edition, and as long as we do not have information about actual manuscript readings, the available data can only lead to the conclusion that *tráyāṇām* is an error of that edition, and this ghost form should be deleted from the records of Sanskrit, Indo-Iranian and Indo-European linguistics. The Vedic form was *trayāṇām* which then is probably refashioned from PIA *\*trayám* = Av. *θraiiqm* < PIIr *\*tray-áHam*.

As PIIr *\*trayáHam* must be an archaism, this means that Indo-Iranian points to PIE *\*trej-óHom* with oxytone accent; there is no concrete evidence for barytone *\*tréj-oHom*.

## References

### Sanskrit texts

Pāṇini

Ed. Böhtlingk: *Pāṇini's Grammatik*. Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen von Otto Böhtlingk. Leipzig 1877.

TS

Ed. Albrecht Weber: *Die Taittirīya-Saṃhitā*. Vol. 1. (Indische Studien, 11-12). Leipzig 1871-72.

Ed. A. Mahadeva Sastri, K. Rangacharya: *The Taittirīya Saṃhitā of the Black Yajurveda with the Commentary of Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra*. Vol. 5 Kāṇḍaḥ 3, praśnāḥ 1 - 5. Government Oriental Library Series, Mysore 1894-1898. (Reprint Delhi 1986.)

<sup>1</sup> I could not check the edition of Kashinath Sastri Agashe, though. The unknown edition given in the internet under <http://www.vedamu.org/PageViewer/Image.aspx?DivId=1002>, p. 1658 has त्रयाणामे° which must be a mistake for त्रयाणामे; it cannot be explained from त्रयाणामे.

- Ed. Kashinath Sastri Agashe: *The Taittirīya-Saṃhitā with the commentary of Sāyaṇa*. 8 vols. (Ānandāśrama-Saṃskṛta-Granthāvaliḥ, 42). Poona 1900-1908.
- Ed. Śrīpādaśarma Dāmodara Sātavalekar: *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurvedīya Taittirīya-saṃhitā*. Bahālagāḍha: Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, 2036 = 1979.
- Ed. Trivikrama Nārāyaṇa Dharmādhikārī: *Kṛṣṇayajurvedīyā Taittirīya-Saṃhitā*. Vol. 2,2 ṛtīyaṃ kāṇḍam. Pune: Tilaka-Mahārāṣṭra-Vidyāpīṭha-Śākhābhūta-Vaidika-Saṃśodhana-Maṇḍala 1985.
- TB
- Ed. A. Mahadeva Sastri: *The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa with the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Miśra*. 4 vols. Government Oriental Library Series, Mysore 1911-1913. (Reprint Delhi 1985.)
- BK
- Ed. W. CALAND: *The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in the Kāṇvīya Recension*. 2 vols. (Panjab Sanskrit Series, 10). Lahore 1926, 1939. (2. ed. revised by Dr. Raghu Vira, Delhi 1983.)

### Scholarly literature

- Bopp, Franz. 1863. *Kritische Grammatik der Sanskrita-Sprache in kürzerer Fassung*. 3. Aufl. Berlin: Nicolai.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1959. *The Sanskrit Language*. London: Faber & Faber.
- . 1973. *The Sanskrit Language*. New and revised edition. London: Faber & Faber.
- Eichner, Heiner. 1982. *Studien zu den indogermanischen Numeralia*. Rekonstruktion des urindogermanischen Formensystems und Dokumentation seiner einzelsprachlichen Vertretung bei den niederen Kardinalia 'zwei' bis 'fünf'. Habilitationsschrift Regensburg.
- Emmerick, Ronald E. 1992. Old Indian. In: Jadranka Gvozdanović (ed.), *Indo-European Numerals*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 163-198.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1976. RV. X 32,3 *adhīyati*. In: *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. Hrsg. von Johanna Narten, Vol. 2, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 561-562.
- VWC: Viśva Bandhu Śāstrī, *Vaidika-Padānukramakoṣa or A Vedic Word Concordance*. Shantaki Vedic Series. I Saṃhitās. 6 vols. Hoshiarpur<sup>2</sup> 1976, Hoshiarpur<sup>1</sup> 1955-1963. II. The Brāhmaṇas and the Āraṇyakas. 2 vols. Hoshiarpur<sup>2</sup> 1973. III. The Upaniṣads. 2 vols. Hoshiarpur<sup>2</sup> 1977.
- Wackernagel, Jacob & Debrunner, Albert. 1930. *Altindische Grammatik*. Band III: Nominalflexion – Zahlwort – Pronomen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1879. *A Sanskrit Grammar*. Cambridge (Mass.) 1889.