The structure of nominal paradigms in Indo-European languages
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The inflection of the oldest Indo-European languages shows different kinds of underspecification in the nominal paradigm. With regard to the a- and ā-stems in Old Indian, the most frequent stems in this language, the case system displays the most instances of underspecification. Confer for the masculine and feminine:

(1)(a) masculine
plural nominative/vocative devāḥ, dative/ablative devēbhyaḥ
dual nominative/vocative/accusative devāu,
instrumental/dative/ablative devēbhyaṁ, genitive/locative devāyuḥ

(1)(b) feminine
singular ablative/genitive sēnāyāḥ
plural nominative/vocative/accusative sēnāḥ
dual nominative/vocative/accusative sēnē,
instrumental/dative/ablative sēnābhyaṁ, genitive/locative sēnayoh

Number is not underspecified with one exception:
(2) feminine vocative singular sēne and the dual nominative/vocative/accusative sēne.
And gender, except that of the genitive plural,

(3) genitive plural masculine devānām, feminine sēnānām

does not display underspecification. Following Corbett’s definition of gender (1991: 44): it’s first defining property is agreement. Secondly, gender is the most idiosyncratic of the functional categories of the noun, since it is ‘either specified by virtue of inherent ... properties (natural kinds, of ‘sorts’), or it is arbitrarily specified and hence must be learnt for the noun in question.’ Gender is more important than number, since gender ‘is inherently fixed for a noun, whereas [number] is usually instantiated and gives rise to different word forms in the paradigm of a noun.’

Concerning nouns the gender seems to be the most important grammatical category. Therefore, we will deal with phenomena that are connected to gender differentiation in the following. Firstly, we will treat transformations that bring about gender differences in the nominal paradigm. Then, we will turn to the relation of inflection and word formation of the feminine gender. In the process we will also talk about the semantic domain that is

---

1 Here, an important characteristic of the morphophonemics of the nominal paradigms of Old Indian becomes clear: In establishing paradigms, the Old Indian grammarians used the following procedure: identical case forms are never separated from each other. Compare the co-occurrence of the homophonic genitive and ablative singular of the ā-stems or the co-occurrence of the homophonic dative and ablative plural. This very old tradition has the same motivation as the Minimalist Morphology analysis. The purposes of the learner of the paradigms are respected (Wunderlich & Fabri 1995).
fundamental for expressing the *sexus femininum*. Finally, we will discuss the conception of word class that is linked to the above.

1. Transformations according to the pronoun

Sticking to the paradigm of the Old Indian a- and ā-stems for the moment one can find endings that usually occur on pronouns. One assumes that pronominally inflected adjectives like viśva- ‘all’ are responsible for this. However, mostly demonstrative pronouns are the driving force for the definition of the reference act\(^2\). Moreover, languages show gender very explicitly in this form category, especially natural gender\(^3\). Therefore, one can assume that the inflection of the Old Indian a- and ā-stems in certain cells of the paradigm followed those of the pronoun. Probably in those cases where a coincidence of masculine and feminine would have occurred\(^4\); for example:

(4) instr.sg. sēnaya\(^5\) instead of sēnā = older masc. devā; cf. táyā from the pronoun tá- ‘this’
dat.sg. sēnayai instead of *sēnai = older masc. dévai; cf. táyai
loc.sg. sēnāyām instead of *sēne = masc. devē; cf. táyām\(^6\)

However, the gender allocation concerning the Old Indian a- and ā-stems is partly motivated partly arbitrary. As is well known, one can find terms for animae as well as inanimate entities amongst the Old Indian a- and ā-stems:


In this case the gender differentiation does not have anything to do with the natural gender but is due to the nominal classification\(^7\). Hence, we are faced by the question where this differentiation comes from and ultimately by the question about the origin of the Genus femininum in the Indo-European languages.

2. Origin of the genus femininum

2.1. Hittite

2.1.1. Determinative

To date research into this subject matter can be found in Irslinger (2010), Melchert (2011; 2012) and Meier-Brügger (2010). A conference in memory of Johannes Schmidt ‘Collective

---

3 Even languages that do not have a gender differentiation, may have such a differentiation concerning pronouns, cf. engl. he, she, it.
6 Doch auch das Maskulinum hat Umbildungen nach dem Pronomen erfahren, z.B. dat/abl.pl. devêbhyaḥ anstelle von *devâbhah; vgl. tébhyaḥ.
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and Feminine: Inflection or Word Formation?’ took place in Jena this summer. A *communis opinio* to this topic is yet pending. However, I want to propose a new starting scenario. My consideration is concerned with the question: Where do languages that do not have a Genus femininum mark the Sexus femininum the most likely? One does not have to look long for such a language in Indo-European. It is Hittite. Hittite does not have any formal marking of the feminine gender. Still, one can find markings of the Sexus femininum, namely the determinative *MUNUS* for people’s names:

\[(6) (a) \text{MUNUS} Puduḫepas\]

for relational terms:

\[(6) (b) \text{MUNUS} šiunzanna- ‘mother of god(s)’ (priestess)\]

\[(6) (c) \text{MUNUS} alḫuesra-alḫuïtra- ‘priestess’\]

for other terms relating to people:

\[(6) (b) \text{MUNUS} annawanna- ‘stepmother’\]

\[(6) (b) \text{MUNUS} udatt- ‘female member of a certain social group, widow?, foster-mother?’\]

---

8 Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 64, 66. According to Hoffner & Melchert it remains a matter of debate whether this reflects a prehistoric merger of inherited masculine and feminine into a common (or animative) gender (Hardarson 1994: 32ff.) or an archaic system in which there was no feminine distinct from the masculine (Neu 1969: 237ff.). Likewise controversial is the suggestion that adjectives of the type *dankui*- ‘dark’, *parkui*- ‘pure’ are formal relics of the PIE feminine that have lost their original connotation as feminines (Oettinger 1987; Starke 1990: 85ff.; Melchert 1994). Complicating the picture of the *i*-stem noun is the phenomenon of so-called *i*-motion (or *i*-mutation). Most (but not all) Luwian nominal stems insert an obligatory *-i*- between the stem and the case endings of the nominative and accusative of the common gender, singular and plural (Starke 1990: 56ff.). In the case of *a*-stems, the *-a*- of the stem is deleted before the *-i*. Derivatives show that the *-i*- is not part of the stem. The result, however, is in effect a paradigm with *-i*- in some forms and *-a*- in others. When the Hittites began to borrow Luwian nouns and suffixes, they not only imitated the Luwian usage in loanwords but also carried it over in some cases to native Hittite words. In paradigms of such nouns, the *i*-forms tend to be found in the common gender nominative and accusative, and the *-a*- forms elsewhere (Rieken 1994: 43–47). This entailed not only creating new *-i*-forms to old *a*-stems (pl. nom. c. *MUNUS, MUNUS, katriēs to *MUNUS, katra*- ‘female musician’, *attiēs to atta*- ‘father’, pl. acc. c. *annius to anna*- ‘mother’, *gimniš to gimnu*- ‘field’, sg. acc. com. *gini*nāt to nata*- ‘reed’), but also by ‘reverse *i*-mutation’ new *-a*- forms to old *i*-stems (sg. gen. *gibš* *hulugannas*, abl. *gibš* *hulugannaz to *gibš* *huluganni*-), which in OH is a simple *i*-stem without mutation (vgl. auch Ledo-Lemos 2002: 37ff.; Matasovič 2004: 36ff).

9 In respect to the lack of a masculine-feminine contrast, the Hittite declension of pronouns and substantives resembles that of nouns such as Latin *fēlis* ‘cat’ and *canis* ‘dog’, which can be masculine or feminine according to the biological gender of the animal referent (Sihler 1995: 244).

10 Tischler 2001: 245.

11 Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 64. Bei Namen verwendet man das Zeichen *f* für *MUNUS* (früher oder Silbenwert *sal*).

12 VBoT 58 iv 3 (OH/NS) *ūgg=a* *MUNUS* annanāš ēmi ‘und ich bin eine annanna-Frau’.
MUNUS
ammama- ‘female cult official’
MUNUS
‘annati- ‘female cult servant’
MUNUS
‘ankuwaru- ‘female cult official’
MUNUS
‘azinna- ‘female official of the cult of the goddess Ištar’
MUNUS
‘entanni- ‘female official of a ritual’
MUNUS
eši- ‘female official, courtesan?’ (Luwian in Hittite context)
MUNUS
‘haḫḫallalla- ‘female official’ (Luwian in Hittite context)
MUNUS
‘hašawa- ‘old woman, female magician’ (kind of priestess) (MUNUS\SU.GI)
MUNUS
‘hulpa- ‘female official’
MUNUS
‘huřigala- ‘female official’
MUNUS
‘išli- ‘female official of a cult’
MUNUS
‘ištahṭatalla ‘female official of a cult, female food taster?’
MUNUS
‘iwant- ‘female cult official’
MUNUS
‘kankatitalla- ‘woman, who serves kankati-soup’
MUNUS
‘katra- (katri-) ‘female musician’
MUNUS
‘manahuerata- ‘female cult official’
MUNUS
‘ṣatuhī- ‘female cult official’
MUNUS
‘šišalluhī- ‘female official in a Hurrian-Hittite ritual’
MUNUS
‘daniti- ‘high priestess?’
MUNUS
‘taptara- ‘woman of a death ritual, wailer’
MUNUS
‘tarpašgana- ‘female official’
MUNUS
‘tešant- ‘female official’
MUNUS
‘wašummaniyauši- ‘female official of a ritual’ (Luwian in Hittite context) female musician’
MUNUS
‘zintuši- (zintušiya-) ‘female official, female singer’

Terms for people that have a determiner for ‘man’ as well as for ‘woman’ are of special interest:

(7) LÚ/MUNUS
allawant[u]- ‘(female) official’
LÚ/MUNUS
arkamiyala- ‘player of the arkammi-instrument’
LÚ/MUNUS
‘arzanala- ‘(female) cult official’
LÚ/MUNUS
barwant- ‘(female) guard’ (LÚ/MUNUS\UMMEDA?)
LÚ/MUNUS
huwaššanallia- ‘worshipper of Huwaššana’
LÚ/MUNUS
‘ispunalla- ‘(female) cult official’
LÚ/MUNUS
dammaša- ‘low female cult servant’, rarely, low cult servant ’ (Luwian in Hittite context)
LÚ/MUNUS
‘tapritašši- ‘officials, who are concerned with the GÍš tapri-’
LÚ/MUNUS
‘urayanni- (uriyanni-) ‘high (female) official’
LÚ\wawi- ‘official’, MUNUS\uwauwa- ‘female official’

All of these nouns are Communia. But which semantic type of person term applies for (7)?
If we first have a look at people terms with determinative LÚ, i.e. words like LÚ\wawi- ‘official’, then we can find a so-called GENERICUM. In German words like commandant (Kommandant) belong to this group. Eisenberg (2000: 93) uses following classification with M for masculine and F for feminine.
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The **GENERICUM** unites two characteristics in (8): masculine and feminine. The classification can be compared to the main word classes according to the features \[+/-8\] (= substantivity) and \[+/-V\] (= verbalism), where one word class, the adjective, also possesses two features:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>NEUT</th>
<th>FEM</th>
<th>REMAINING MASC</th>
<th>GENERICUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+^13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nouns that come within the **GENERICUM** have two usages: On the one hand they specifically characterise men:

(10)(a) Still male doctors earn more than their female counterparts. (Noch immer verdienen Ärzte mehr als Ärztinnen.)

On the other hand they are applied to women and men in a generalising way, especially in plural.

(10)(b) Some politicians are of the opinion that doctors earn too much. (Einige Politiker meinen, Ärzte verdienen zu viel.)

In the second case the nouns specialise in gender-neutral people terms. The **GENERICUM**, a masculine, stands for the so-called perceived natural gender here. That means: ‘If the person is perceived as referent and at the same time is not distinguished regarding the natural gender the masculine gender assignment ensues.’^14 The generic use in present-day German has often been criticised for making it seem as if women were not meant as well. Pair formulae are the consequence:

(11)(a) Studenten und Studentinnen

or:

---

^13 Manfred Bierwisch (1998:93) established the following feature specification for gender systems with three genera:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASC</th>
<th>NEUT</th>
<th>FEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The masculine is considered as an unmarked category and is understood with the aid of the features \[+/-N\] (= neutrality) and \[+/-F\] (feminity). One has to agree with Eisenberg (2000:93) that the relation between neuter and feminine remains unclear. Why is neuter more marked than feminine?

(11)(b) StudentInnen\textsuperscript{15}

Therefore, the GENERICUM differs from the REMAINING MASCULINE. This genus consists of masculines from which the GENERICUM is separated, German Tisch, Stuhl. But as Studentin (female student) shows, the typical GENERICUM may entail feminine motion. Exactly this kind of feminine is indicated by the nouns with the determinative \textsuperscript{MUNUS} in Hittite, e.g. MUNUS tapritašši- 'female official, who is concerned with the grid tapri-' besides LÜ tapritašši-.

To sum this up: Hittite shows that the GENERICUM, as a gender underspecified people term, is an instance of the language system where the need for a special gender marker of the Sexus femininum can arise. If a language has three genera like German the GENERICUM is a masculine, if it has two genera like Commune and neuter in Hittite the GENERICUM is Commune.

2.1.2. Suffix

Hittite makes a second matter apparent. Like in other Old Indo-European languages the Sexus femininum can also be indicated by a suffix. In this way the suffix -(š)sara-\textsuperscript{16} serves as an derivation for terms for female human or divine entities. It makes a distinction between haššuš ‘king’ and haššušaraš ‘queen’, iššaš ‘lord’ and iššašaraš ‘lady’, šuppiš ‘holy/consecrated man’ and šuppeššaraš ‘virgin’ possible and is the basis of the Sumerian word GÊME ‘female slave’ (compared to ŠR ‘male slave’). Cf.:

(12)(a) KUB 31.4 + KBo 3.41 6 restored from KBo 13.78 obv. 5.
[(IR-na)]n=ašta GÊME-šan natta kuelka dahḫun
‘I took no one’s [male slave] (or) female slave’

(12)(b) cf. also Luwian nan-i-š ‘brother’ and nan-ašr-i-š ‘sister’ (-ašr-) (to Luwian *ašr(i)- cf. the derivatives ašraḥtí- ‘femininity’, ašral(i )- ‘female, feminine’)\textsuperscript{17} or the Luwian derivational suffix -wiya-, -wašha- in onomastics\textsuperscript{18}

3. Collective

Research into the development of the Genus femininum usually focuses on the role of the collective. Hittite also has this phenomenon directly next to terms of the Sexus femininum According to Oettinger (1995: 214) these are:

(13)(a) collective D(INGIR) kuwanšaya (< *kuyansāi) and nominative plural commune D(INGIR) kuwanšes ‘female deities’ (to Hitt. kuem- ‘woman’)

(13)(b) collective nom./acc. MUNUS.MES ha-az-ka-rara-ri ‘girls orchestra, group of female drum musicians\textsuperscript{19} and commune MUNUS hazgara- ‘girl in temple service’

\textsuperscript{15} Gallmann 2006: 156.
\textsuperscript{16} This suffix is connected with IE *t(r)i-sor-es f., three’, *suḫšur ‘sister’.
\textsuperscript{17} The Hittite word for ‘woman’, however, reflects the PIE root *gʷen-, as does Luwian wanat- (see Starke 1980).
\textsuperscript{18} Zehnder 2009: 63, 70 (to -wiya- as hypocoristic shortening of wanati- ‘woman’), 90.
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A Commune like 
\text{MUNIS} hazgara- is exactly that type of term for female entities belonging to a GENERICUM. The collective, however, is semantically animate, referring only to persons, but as a collective is grammatically neuter\textsuperscript{20}.

2.1.4. Pronominal reference

A pronominal reference that shows agreement with the Sexus femininum, as one would most likely expect it from the demonstrative pronouns \textit{ka-} ‘this’ and \textit{apa-} ‘that’, does not exist in Hittite.

Contrary to common belief\textsuperscript{21} the pronouns do not have to have been the driving force behind the development of the Genus femininum by all means. This has to be taken into consideration when we now turn to the Genus femininum in Graeco-Aryan.

3. Old Indic

Therefore, let us look for GENERICA and corresponding feminines. From synchronic perspective primarily the productive inflection types and word formation patterns come into question in Old Indic. However, the substantival \textit{a-} and \textit{ā-} stems in the RV are no candidates for this\textsuperscript{22}. At best one can find animal terms that could point to a GENERICUM:

(14)(a) \textit{ajā-} ‘he-goat’ \hspace{1cm} \textit{aj-ā-} ‘goat’
\textit{āśva-} ‘horse’ \hspace{1cm} \textit{āśv-ā-} ‘mare’

The plural form of ‘he-goat’ is especially used for the he-goats as the team of the Pūṣan\textsuperscript{23}. Female animals could be included:

(15) RV 6,55,6
\textit{ājāṣah pūṣānaṁ rāthe niśāmbhṛ̥s āśe janaśriyam / devām vahantu bibhratah}
‘Die stolzierenden (?) Böcke sollen herfahren, zu Wagen den Gott Pūṣan bringend, durch welchen die Leute zu Ehren kommen.’ (Geldner) (‘The parading bucks are supposed to drive up, bringing the god Pūṣan by cart, by which people attain honours’.)

In one instance in the RV the feminine \textit{ajā-} clearly indicates the Sexus feminum:

(16) RV 8,70,15
\textit{karpaghr̥yā maghāvā sauradevyō vatsām nas tribhṛ̥yā ānayat / ajām sūrīr nā dhātave}
‘Der freigebige Sohn des Šuradeva führte uns dreien ein Kalb zu, an den Ohren es packend, wie eine Geiß (den drei Zicklein), um daran zu saugen, der noble Herr.’ (Geldner) (‘The generous

\begin{tabular}{ll}
19 & Cf. Rieken 2004: 535, 540. \\
20 & Hoffner 1998: 37ff. \\
21 & E.g. Tichy 1993: 11ff. \\
22 & Concerning the function of *-\textit{ah}, in Hittite and PIE as an ‘individualizing’ Suffix cf. Melchert 2011; 2012. \\
23 & Hence, it is an unambiguous reference. For semantic definites cf. Loebner 1985. \\
\end{tabular}
son of Śūradeva gave us three a calf, grabbing it at its ears like a she-goat (the three kids), to suck on it, the noble lord.’

It seems that the masculine plural of āśva- ‘horse’ in (17) is also used generically:

(17) RV 1,114,8
mā nas tokē tānaye mā na āvaū mā no gōsu mā no āśveṣu rīrisah
‘Nicht sollst du uns an dem leiblichen Samen, nicht an unserm (eigenen) Leben, nicht an unseren Kühen und Pferden schädigen.’ (Geldner) (‘You shall not harm our fleshly seeds, not our (own) lives, not our cows and horses.’)

This includes the Sexus femininum indicating āśvā- ‘mare’, e.g. regarding Uṣas:

(18) RV 1,30,21
vayām hi te āmanmahy āntād ā parākāt / āśve nā citre arusi
‘Denn wir haben nah und fern deiner gedacht, du wie eine Stute Prangende, Rötliche.’ (Geldner) (‘Because we commemorated you near and far, you like a mare parading, reddish.’)

Probably there are so few a- and ā-stems in the RV as terms of natural gender masculine and feminine because the formantia –a- and -ā- were not used as means of word formation anymore in Old Indic but as indicators of inflection and agreement markers for pronouns and adjectives. How this could have taken place has been dealt with manifold. Concerning the assumption of substantival ā-stems as a starting point of the development of the Genus feminum the reference to Modern High German Stute ‘female horse’, which dates back to the collective Old High German stuat ‘herd of horses’, is often compared24. Indeed, there may be a connection between the terms for female entities, that belong to a GENERICUM, as the mentioned Hittite collective MUNUSMESha-az-ka-rā-ri ‘girls orchestra, group of female drum musicians’ and the Commune MUNUShazagara- ‘girls on temple service’ show. If this comparison is valid, the development of agreement in Graeco-Aryan for pronominal reference of an individual may have taken place like Tichy (1993) and Zeilsfelder (2001:213) illustrated for the demonstrative pronoun *sā-h. However that be25, as soon as there were feminine motion present in the language all words, that were formed in the same way, could be defined as feminines regardless which semantic category they belonged to, thus, object terms as well26, e.g.:

---

24 For the Graeco-Aryan ah2-stems that term female animals, Litscher (2009: 282f.) describes it in the following way: ‘... in der Haustierhaltung [spielen] die männlichen und die weiblichen Tiere sehr unterschiedliche Rollen ... Die Männchen werden z.B. ... bei Pferden meist einzeln gehalten, die Weibchen hingegen in Gruppen. Daher überrascht es nicht, wenn eine Bezeichnung für eine Gruppe von Tieren zur Bezeichnung eines einzelnen Tieres verwendet wird, damit ... ein einzelnes weibliches Tier gemeint ist.’ (‘...the male and female animals play very different roles when kept as pets ... The male animals are for example ... in the case of horses kept individually, the female animals, however, in groups. Therefore, it does not surprise when a term for a group of animals is used as the term for an individual animal, ... to indicate that it is an individual female animal.’)


With the adoption of agreement functions for first pronouns, then for adjectives the formantia -ā- and -ā- do not seem suitable for terming the Sexus femininum in Vedic. Therefore, more obvious word formation elements had to assume this role.

These are the vṛkṛḥ- and devī-formations. The pattern of the vṛkṛḥ-type stands for the female sexuality in nouns that pertain to animate entities, human, divine women as well as animals. The basis is formed by the a-stems. One can actually find GENERICA here corresponding to terms for the Sexus femininum. There are people terms like:

(20)(a) árāvī̄ ‘female monster’ vs. árāvā- ‘monster’

(20)(b) RV 8.61.11
nā pāpāso manāmahe nārāyāso nā jáhavaḥ
‘Nicht halten wir uns für schlechte Leute noch für karge …, (Geldner) (‘We neither think of ourselves as bad people nor bleak …,)

(20)(c) RV 10.155.2
árāvā̄̄m brahmaṇas pate īkṣṇaśaṣṭigodṛśāṁ ihi
‘Geh du, spitzgehörnter Brahmanaspati, die Unholdin aufzuspießen!’ (‘You go, spiky-horned Brahmanaspati, to spear the female monster!’)

Animal terms like:

(21)(a) mešā ‘(female) sheep’ vs. meśā- ‘ram’

(21)(b) RV 10.91.14
yāśminn āśāśa ṛṣabhāsa uksāno vaśā meśā avasṛṣṭāsa āhutāh
‘In welchem Rosse, Stiere, Ochsen, Kühe, Widder (zum Opfer) freigelassen geopfert werden’ (adapted from Geldner) (‘In which steeds, bulls, oxes, cows, rams freed to be sacrificed (as sacrifice)’)

(21)(c) RV 1.43.6
śām nāh karaty ārvate sugām meśāya meśyē / nīḥhyo nāribhyo gāve
‘Er schaffe Heil unserem Ross, guten Fortgang dem Schafbock und der Schafmutter, den Männern und Frauen, dem Rinde.’ (Geldner) (‘May he bring well-being to our steed, good progress to the ram and the mother sheep, to the men and women, the cow.’)

27 The Suffix *-eh₁ forms exocentric concrete and abstract nouns in Lycian (Melchert 1992; Hajnal 1994) and in limited numbers in Hittite (see Melchert 1994 and Har á rson 1994). There is no basis for assumption of singulatives backformed from inanimate collectives, either directly (Lat. naua ‘sailor’ < ‘crew’, as per Balles 2004: 46 following Klingenschmitt) or by addition of *-s (as per Leukart 1994: 149ff. for Myc. /Krētas/ ‘inhabitant of Crete’ < Kpriā́ ‘Cretan’ etc.), cf. Melchert 2012.

28 sūrya- m. ‘sun god’ and sūryā- f. ‘sun goddess’ remain out of consideration because it is a case of individuation. The same applies to derivations of male proper names like indrāṇiิ- ‘wife of Indra’ (to indra- name of the god Indra) (Matzinger 2008: 221ff).
The suffix *也非常 of the vṛkṣ-type used to characterise female entities by the underlying noun\(^9\). The meaning feature ‘affiliation’ plays a role here as well as the masculine

(22) Old Indic rathirī ‘charioteer’ as ‘the one belonging to the chariot’\(^30\)
shows. *-ih\(_2\) was probably, following the example of the masculine ending *-os, provided with *-s in nominative as an indicator for an animate agent\(^31\). That means that the GENERICUM on *-os and the corresponding motion-feminine on *-ih\(_2\)-s became equivalent to each other within the animacy hierarchy.

In comparison, the devī-type derived from non-a-stems suggests an original abstract word like

(23) Old Indic śācī ‘strength’, vēpī ‘poetry’, Greek φῦα ‘escape’, Lat. aciēs ‘sharpness, edge’, maciēs ‘leaness’\(^32\)
illustrate. Brugmann (1997: 25f.) already acknowledged this\(^33\). However, it is likely that the relationship between masculine *dejūdr- and the Indo-European feminine *dejyih\(_2\), *djyāh\(_2\)-s

(24) RV devīm uṣāsam; hom. Ḥōc...ōta

served as a model for further devī-formations as motion-formations of a-stem masculine vṛddhi-derivations\(^4\). Although the exact instance of the reinterpretation of the abstract word to a Sexus femininum term cannot be identified anymore there is the possibility that the path from abstract word to a concrete feminine people term lead to a Nomen agentis\(^5\); cf. German Bedienung (waitress)\(^6\). Old Indic devī-formations that are adjunct to a GENERICUM are:

(25) Vedic (AV) bharitrī- ‘female preserver, mother’ vs. Vedic bharṭār- ‘preserver’\(^137\)
śun-tī- ‘she-dog’ vs. śvān- ‘dog’

The devī-type is also used for terming the Genus femininum for adjectival simplicia and compounds:

---

30 Wackernagl & Debrunner 1954: 408.
32 In Baltic the suffix *-ī (Lithuanian martī ‘bride’) and the abstract suffix *-ibō (Old Church Slavonic ĭ-ba) coalesced into a new abstract suffix: *-ibō was remodeled to *-ibō; cf. Lithuanian dialectal gadryba ‘wisdom’ – adjective feminine gudri ‘wise’ (Vaillant 1974: 381). Here, the middle vowel in *-ibō is identical with that of the inflectional ending of the nominative; cf. Lithuanian adjective barzdōtas ‘bearded’ - barzdā ‘beard’ (Lühr 1999: 306f.; but cf. Keydana 2002: 48).
34 Mayerhofer 1992: 744.
35 Eisenberg & Sayatze 2002: 40.
36 At least there is a feminine hereditary word for the motion-feminines to the Nomina agentis on –tar- or –tār-: Old Indic jāmīrī- ‘natural mother’, Greek γενέτερα, Lat. generīrix (Tichy 1995: 62).
37 Tichy 1995: 133.
(26) āruṣī- ‘reddish; red mare, dawn’ vs. arusā- ‘reddish’
su-paṃṛī- ‘beautifully winged’ vs. su-parṇā- ‘beautifully winged’

This means the devī-formation also stands for terming the agreement with a feminine noun.

One can only find isolated instances of the vyāh-stems in classical Sanscrit; e.g. lakṣmīḥ ‘goddess of fortune’. The asigmatic nominative prevailed in this language stage\(^{38}\). The ā-stems constitute the model here; they became productive in later times for the formation of motion-feminines from a-stems; e.g.

(27) ep. ātmajā- ‘daughter’ to ātmaja- ‘son’\(^{39}\)

Occasionally other i-suffixes were also applied for indicating the Sexus femininum, e.g. an original diminutive suffix like in:

(28) māks- ‘fly’ vs. māksikā- ‘fly, bee’

Compared to the i-containing suffixes\(^{40}\) the ā-suffixes play a marginal role in connection with the GENERICUM and corresponding feminine, e.g.

(29) nṛtā- ‘female dancer’ vs. nṛtā- ‘dancer’\(^{41}\)

3. Greek

Greek developed the formation of terms of the Sexus femininum to GENERICA further compared with Old Indic\(^{42}\): Thus, there are productive or active word formation elements:

(30)(a) -τερα to Nomina agentis on -τηρ and -τωρ (productive in epic language)
(30)(b) -τρα to Nomina agentis on -τρ- (productive in Attic and Koine)
(30)(c) -τρα (active)
(30)(d) -ανα (active in literary Greek, productive in comedy, in Koine)
(30)(f) -έα/ειά (active)
(30)(g) -ίδ- (productive)
(30)(h) -ιδ- (productive)
(30)(i) -αι (active)
(30)(j) -ισσα (since Koine productive and also borrowed in Latin)

In Greek the suffix -α/η also belongs to the productive suffixes that form feminines of the Sexus femininum to GENERICA. Possibly this is due to the adjectives being two-ended a lot of the time\(^{43}\). Therefore, the suffix -α/η was not as much committed to agreement as in Old Indic.

---

38 Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 368f.
39 Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 239.
40 Cf. also yoxut- ‘young girl’, rohit- ‘reddish mare’, harit- ‘yellowish mare’.
41 Matzinger 2008: 226.
42 Balles 2008: 229ff.
43 Kastner 1967.
4. Word class conception

Finally, we need to compare the word class conception of Old Indic and Greek on the one hand and Hittite on the other hand.

4.1. Old Indic, Greek

(31) LEXICON

| I---GENERICUM---I RESTMASC---I NEUTR---I FEMIN---I | adjective/pronoun: |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| MASCULINUM | śātr-, āgni- | mādhu-, dheni- | agreement: |
| -tār- | -ēu-, -rī, | λόγος, δήμος | haviś-, -anā, -āni-, masc/(fem)/neutr |
| -τοὺς | | | -nī-, -i-, -ā, |
| Sexus femininum | | | δίώρον, | -iā(ti)- |
| -iḥ, -i (-ā) | | | -μα, -τρόν | -της, -iā, |
| -τεμα, -τεμα, -τρίδ., -ανα, | | | -εια/εια, | -ικη, -ςις |
| -εια/εια, -ιδ-, -τιδ-, -αδ- | | | | |
| -ισσα, -α/η | | | | |

4.2. Hittite

(32) LEXICON

| I---GENERICUM---I RESTCOMMUNE---I NEUTR---I | adjective/pronoun: |
|-------|---|---|
| COMMUNE | aruna-, lāl-, | wātar-, |
| -ala- | -tara-, | -war, -eššar, |
| -at(ī)alla- | ḫspar- | commune/neutr |
| Sexus femininum | -mar, -es, -an, |
| MUNUS, -(<)šara- | -ulli, -āli |

For both language groups the GENERICUM is the pole of the anthropocentric continuum, where the typical GENERICUM can develop a motion-feminine. The other pole is taken by the feminine or neuter. These genera show a variety of abstract formations\(^{44}\). Sexus femininum and abstractness face each other. Grammar comes into play on a second level when agreement relations are established. These can have a paradigmatic effect like the a- and ā-stems in Old Indic that were covered at the beginning. However, the derivation of the Sexus femininum from terms that belong to the GENERICUM has got the advantage that – in contrast to individual words like ‘dawn’\(^{45}\) or ‘widow’\(^{46}\) as a starting point – the motivation for the names can be grasped at once. Like with the Hittite female cult officials these kind of feminines are created when cultural or societal reasons demand it, as for example the German Bundeskanzlerin (female chancellor)\(^{47}\).

\(^{44}\) For the question why abstract nouns are often feminine cf. Vogel 1996. She distinguishes between masculines like German Hieb which are countable, feminines like German Schönheit which get countable concrete nouns when pluralized and neuters like German Lachen. The feminine is the typical abstract noun here (Brugmann 1897).

\(^{45}\) Fritz 1998.

\(^{46}\) Tichy 1993.
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