Extended Abstract

## The complements of the root dā in Avestan and old Persian languages

**Sahar Vahdati Hosseinian[1]**
PhD Student, Department of Ancient Iranian Culture and Languages, Islamic Azad University Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran.
vsahar18@gmail.com

**Ehsan Changizi[2]\***
Associate Professor, Department of Linguistics, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran
ehsan.changizi@atu.ac.ir

**Jaleh Amouzgar Yeghaneh[3]**
Professor, Department of Ancient Iranian Culture and Languages, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran
jalehamouzegar@yahoo.com

**Ameneh Zaheri Abdvand[4]**
Assistant Professor, Department of Iranian Ancient Culture and Languages, Islamic Azad University Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran
amnhzahrybdwnd@gmail.com

## Introduction

In ancient Iranian languages, verbs were accompanied by different types of complements in various inflected forms. Depending on the case and the verb used in the sentence, these complements determine the implied semantic role. However, there has been little attention paid to the representation of these complements and their functions with different verbs, except for some brief references. Therefore, this article aims to explore the complements associated with the root "dā" which is one of the most widely used and frequent roots in the Avestan language. The research thoroughly investigates the complements and dependents of this root, the cases in which they appear, and the semantic roles they imply, to shed light on one of the important debates in the study of Avestan and Old Persian languages.

## Materials & Methods

Various Avesta texts, including Yasens, Hafts, Yashts, Vandidads, and Old Persian inscriptions, have been used to collect sentences containing the root "dā" (non-preverbal). However, there is currently no comprehensive research on verb valency and the semantic roles of cases in Old Persian and Avestan. Nevertheless, some significant studies have been conducted on the functions of each of the eight cases. Reichelt (1909), Skjærvø (2009), West (2011), and Jügel (2017) have researched Avestan, while Kent (1953), Skjærvø (2009), and Jügel (2017) have researched Old Persian. None of these researchers have classified the functions of cases based on the valency of the verb. For instance, Reichelt divided the function of the genitive case into three main categories: with a verb, with a noun, and indicating time and place. Genitives with nouns have other subgroups, such as a partitive genitive, which can replace the nominative and accusative cases and even the accusative cases of referring to the destination. However, all of these subgroups

---

\* Corresponding Author

are placed under the dependents of the verb in the division based on the valency verb. By classifying cases according to the valency verb, it is possible to identify that the genitive cases can also be among the dependents of the verb. The primary issue in this research is to determine what complements the root "dā" carries and in what cases these complements appear, as well as what semantic roles each one implies.

## Results & Discussion

Verbs derived from the root dā may take one or two complements depending on their meaning and context, especially when used metaphorically or figuratively. In Avesta, the root dā has several meanings, but the most widely used one is "to give". As aforementioned, verbs derived from this root may have one or two complements depending on the context. The first complement can be in the accusative case, referring to the semantic role of the theme or patient. The second complement can be in the accusative, dative, or genitive case, indicating the semantic role of the recipient or beneficiary. The existence of multiple cases to indicate the same semantic role suggests that there are different interpretations of a single event. However, the exact semantic difference between these sentences is unknown. It is worth noting that sometimes sentences or infinitives are used instead of some complements.

In Old Persian, the root dā means to give or bestow, and is accompanied by the accusative and the dative case to denote the theme or patient and the recipient or beneficiary.

The root "dā-" is commonly used in Avesta with the meaning "to create". Verbs that are derived from this root, in both Avesta and old Persian, require a complement that serves as the theme or patient of the sentence. Sometimes, the complement of the verb is expressed by an enclitic pronoun in the genitive-dative case that represents the semantic role of the theme or patient.

In Avestan, the root "dā-" is used to indicate the act of putting something in. Generally, these complements take the form of an accusative case, which shows the semantic role of the patient or theme. In some cases, there can be double accusative cases that indicate both the patient/ theme and the object complement. Additionally, the accusative and locative cases can be used to indicate the patient/ theme and location. Lastly, the accusative and dative cases are employed to express the patient/ theme and location. It's important to note that the semantic role of location can refer to temporal and spatial positions, abstract situations, or the state of an object. There is only one sentence with a double accusative and a dative case referring to the patient/ theme, object complement, and recipient/beneficiary semantic roles. The dative case is an optional complement.

## Conclusion

Verbs derived from the root "dā" in Old Persian have two common meanings: "to create" and "to give". When used to denote "to give", it is a bivalent verb that takes both the accusative and dative cases for the theme/ patient and the recipient/beneficiary, respectively. On the other hand, when used to represent "to create", it is a monovalent verb that only takes the accusative case for the theme/ patient.

However, in Avestan, the root "dā" has three meanings – "to give", "to create", and "to put". These meanings have complements that come in different cases and imply multiple semantic roles. Sometimes, the infinitive or the sentence can also replace the complements.

In the Avestan language, the root "dā" means "to give". This root has two complements. The first complement indicates the role of the theme or patient, which is shown by the accusative and sometimes genitive cases. The second complement indicates the role of the recipient or beneficiary, which appears in the accusative, dative, and genitive cases.

The difference between the accusative and genitive cases in the semantic role of the theme/ patient is based on the quantity of the subject. The genitive case refers to a part of the subject, while the accusative case refers to the whole part.

The difference between the accusative and dative cases in the semantic role of the recipient/beneficiary can also be based on their degree of influence. The dative case has a lower degree of effectiveness than the accusative. However, the use of other cases in the same role, such as the genitive in the recipient/beneficiary role, is not very clear.

The Avestan root "dā" means "to create" and is a monovalent verb similar to Old Persian. Its complement indicates the semantic role of the patient or theme. However, unlike in Old Persian, the complement appears in both the accusative and genitive cases.

In Avestan, "dā" is used exclusively to mean "to put". Depending on the context of the sentence, it can have one complement in the accusative case, indicating the semantic role of the patient or theme. Alternatively, it may have two complements, with the second complement appearing in the accusative case and representing the object complement, or in the locative or dative case to refer to a real or abstract situation or place. However, the difference between these two cases is not fully understood.

**Keywords:** Inflection, Case, Complement, Semantic role, Root dā

### References

Ágel, V. & Fischer, K. (2015). Dependency grammar and valency theory. In.: Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog (eds), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis*. 2nd ed. (pp. 224-258). Oxford-NewYork: Oxford University Press.

Allerton, D. J.  (1982). *Valency and the English verb*. London/New York: Academic Press.

Anderson, J. M. (1971). *The grammar of case: Towards a localistic grammar*. London/ New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bartholomae, Ch. (1961). *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin: Walterde Gruyter & CO.

Benvenuto, M. C. & Pompeo, F. (2019*)*. Some remarks on the accusative in old Persian. *Vicino Oriente Journal XXIII*, pp. 81-93.

Blake, B. J. (2004). *Case*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bussmann, H. (2006). *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*. translated and edited by Gregory Trauth and Kerstin Kazzazi. London/ New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Dik,S. (1978). *Functinal grammar*. Amesterdam: North Holland.

Fillmore, Ch. (1968). The case for case. In: Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms (eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory*. (pp. 1–88). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Götz-Votteler, K. (2007). Describing semantic valency. In: Thomas Herbst & Katrin Götz-Votteler, Valency: *Theoretical, descriptive and cognitive issues*, (pp. 37.49). Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haspelmath, M. (2008). Terminology of Case. In. Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer, *The Oxford Handbook of Case*. (pp. 505-517). Oxford-NewYork: Oxford University Press.

Helbig, G. (1992). *Probleme der Valenz- und Kasustheorie*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Helbig, G. and W. Schenkel (1973). *Wörterbuch zur Valenz und Distribution deutscher Verben*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.

Herbst, Th. (2007). Valency complements or valency patterns?. In: Thomas Herbs & Katrin Götz-Votteler (eds), *Valency: Theoretical, descriptive and cognitive issues*. (pp. 15-35). Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jügel, Th. (2017). Iranian 35. The syntax of Iranian. In: Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, Matthias Fritz, In cooperation with Mark Wenthe (eds). *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics*, Vol. I. (pp.549-566). Berlin/ Boston: de Gruyter GmbH.

Kent, R. G. (1953). *Old Persian grammar, texts, lexicon*. 2nd ed. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Kittilä, S. (2005). Recipient prominence vs. beneficiary prominence. *journal Linguistic Typology.* http://hdl.handle.net/10138/251209. Accessed January 24, 2024.

Klein, J., Brian J., Matthias F., & Wenthe, M. (2017). *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics*. I−III. Berlin/ Boston: de Gruyter GmbH.

Luraghi, S. & Narrog, H. (2014). Perspectives on semantic roles: An introduction. In: Silvia Luraghi & Heiko Narrog (eds). *Perspectives on Semantic Roles*. (pp.1-21). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Luraghi, S. (2003). *On the meaning of prepositions and cases (The expression of semantic roles in ancient Greek).* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Narrog, H. (2010). A diachronic dimension in maps of case functions. *Linguistic Discovery Journal 28*. pp. 233-254. doi: 10.1349/PS1.1537-0852.A.352.

Reichelt, H. (1909). *Awestisches elementabuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätbuchhandlung.

Schmitt, R. (2009). *Die altpersischen Inschriften der Achaimeniden: Editio minor mit deutscher Übersetzung.*Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Skjærvø, P. O. (2009). Old Iranian languages and middle west Iranian. In: Gernot Windfuhr (ed.), *The Iranian languages*. (pp.43−195, 196−278). London: Routledge.

Starosta, S. (1988). *The case for lexicae*. London: Pinter.

Tabibzadeh, Omid (2014). Persian Grammer: a Theory of Autonomous Phrases Based on Dependency Grammar. 2nd ed. Tehran: Nashr-e-Markax Publishing Co. [In Persian].

Tesniere, L. (1953). Esquisse d'une syntax structural. Paris: C. Klincksieck.

Tesniere, L. (1959). Elements de syntax structural. Paris: C. Klincksieck.

West, M. L. (2011). *Old Avestan syntax and stylistics with an edition of the texts*. Berlin: De Gruyter. Westergaard, Niels Ludvig.