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The Vedic type syáti revisited

Abstract: This paper deals with the verbs belonging to the Vedic type syáti. It is argued that the class VI analysis (-sy-ti, -dy-ti, etc.) conforms much better to the synchronic features (semantics, syntax, paradigmatic properties, etc.) of this group than the class IV analysis (-s-yti, -d-yti, etc.). The origin of this formation is unclear; in some verbs of this class -y may originate in the suffix *(e)i- (perhaps related to the class IV present suffix -ya-), which has been secondarily reinterpreted as part of the root.

1. The type syáti: two approaches

The Vedic present s(i)yaṭi RV + 'bind' and four more presents of the same phonological structure (ch(i)yaṭi AV1x + 'cut [the skin]', -dyā-ṭi YS + 'distribute, divide', -d(i)yaṭi RV1x + 'bind', syāṭi RV1x + 'sharpen'; hereafter referred to as Cyāti presents) derived from the Cā roots (sā, chā, etc.) are one of the most obscure morphological formations in the Vedic system of present types.

This type is, no doubt, inherited from Proto-Indo-Iranian, which can be proved by the Avestan cognates of s(i)yaṭi 'bind', 2 and, possibly, -dyaṭi 'distribute, divide', 3 and -d(i)yaṭi 'bind'. 4 Parallels with this type can also be found outside Indo-Iranian, in Anatolian, cf. Hitt. ishijanzi (cf. WITTMANN 1973: 41; OETTINGER 1979: 461; RASMUSSEN 1989: 36).

In the recent studies, these presents are generally regarded as belonging to class IV (i.e. s-yāṭi etc.). This analysis was adopted by Indian grammarians (cf. Pāṇini 7.3.71) and

---

1 I am most grateful to A. Lubotsky for his detailed comments on the earlier drafts of this paper. I also would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to the audience of the Arbeitstagung "Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik" in Erlangen (October 1997) and, particularly, to B. Forssman, G. Meiser, N. Oettinger, G.-J. Pinault, J. Rasmussen, D. Baum, for their comments and criticism.

2 hā/hī 'bind' - hiia-: subj. hiiqni Y 8.55, grouped by KELLENS (1984: 100) together with thematic zero grade root presents (= Indian class VI).

3 GaV. 2dā 'distribute' - diia-: diāā Y 29.8 (or an -aiia-present 'daiāā?'); for a discussion, cf. KELLENS 1984: 121, note (3). Otherwise HUMBACH (1991: I, 122; II, 41 (7)): hiiaq ... diāā 'so that I may enjoy': 1 sg.subj. of pres. diia- or diāā from the root daiāā = Ved. dhi 'look at, perceive'.

4 3vādā 'bind' - ñiia-: 3 sg.impv.med. ñi ñiiaqam (at Y 48.7: ñi aēsmōi ñi diiaqam paiti ramam paiti sii6(z)dum). The morphological analysis of this Gāthic form is unclear. KELLENS (1984: 120) takes -diiaqam as 3 sg.impv.med. of diia- 'bind', which would be the exact cognate of Vedic -dyāti 'binds'; correspondingly, KELLENS & PIRART (1988: 170) translate: 'Que la Rage s’empêtre!' This interpretation is followed by HOFFMANN/FRORSSMAN 1996: 57 (§ 24ba), 197 (§ 149a) ('soll niedergebunden werden'). HUMBACH considers this form a passive to ni-dā 'lay down', mentioning the former interpretation as less plausible ('less likely is <...> mid. of ni-dā 'let (wrath) be tied up', HUMBACH 1991: II, 201 (2)), and translates: 'Let wrath be laid down!' (ibid., I, 177).

Adjacent to -diiaqam, we find the form sii6(z)dām, which is generally taken as cognate of yet another Cyāti present, ch(i)yaṭi 'cut', but this interpretation leads to forced translations (KELLENS & PIRART 1988: 170: 'Tranchez l’Entrave!'; HUMBACH, ibid.: 'Chop the fury...'). More attractive is LUBOTSKY’S suggestion (pers. comm.) to connect this form with the root siiazd- ‘banish’, thus translating it as ‘banish the fury!’
appears already in the earliest European descriptions of Sanskrit (BÖHTLINGK 1845: 280f.; BENFEY 1846: 758; BENFEY 1852: 355, § 796, III; BENFEY 1865: 1378 [= Kl.S. II, 149]; AVERY 1873: 234ff. (śyati etc.), 248 (śyati); DELBRÜCK 1874: 164ff.; WEBER 1895: 829; NEGELEIN 1898: 34ff.), as well as in comparative Indo-European studies (cf. OSTHOFF 1878; MEILLET 1886: 375 (ch-yati); BRÜGMANN 1902: 524; KURYLOWICZ 1935: 64ff.; it has also prevailed for the last few decades, especially since the 60’s, cf. GONDA 1948: 50; MAYRHOFER 1965: 248; NARTEN 1968: 130 [= Kl.S. I, 92], fn. 104; LINDEMAN 1971: 58ff. (§yat); DELBROCK 1874: 164ff.; WEBER 1895: 829; NEGELEIN 1898: 34ff.; as well as in comparative Indo-European studies (cf. OSTHOFF 1878; MEILLET 1886: 375 (ch-yati); BRÜGMANN 1902: 524; KURYLOWICZ 1935: 64ff.; it has also prevailed for the last few decades, especially since the 60’s, cf. GONDA 1948: 50; MAYRHOFER 1965: 248; NARTEN 1968: 130 [= Kl.S. I, 92], fn. 104; LINDEMAN 1968: 112ff.; BEEKES 1969: 174ff.; BURROW 1973: 331; INSLER 1971: 580ff.; EICHNER 1974: 57ff.; JOACHIM 1978: 159f. (ś(i)-ya-), 166 (ś(i)-yā-); KLINGENSCHMITT 1982: 9f., 132; GOTÓ 1987: 44; GOTÓ 1990: 988 (-dyā-: "IVd"); GARCÍA-RAMÓN 1994-95: 340 (syā- < *sh₂-ióé-). However, by the turn of the century this approach was replaced by the class VI analysis. The turning point was, no doubt, WHITNEY’S "Roots" (1885), where the type syāti has been reanalysed as syaṭi, dyāṭi, etc. (with a question mark, though). WHITNEY’S influential grammar (1896: 273ff.) and verbal dictionary (1885) determined the new view-point of this formation for nearly 100 years, throughout the emergence of most of the standard grammars of (Vedic) Sanskrit (cf. HENRY 1902: 103, 259; MACDONELL 1910: 328; SCHARPÉ 1945: 112; RENOU 1952: 271; THUMB/HAUSCHILD 1959: 243ff.); the class VI analysis has also been adopted by some Indo-Europeanists (SCHULZE 1885: 423 [= Kl.S., 51]; BECHTEL 1892: 268f.; REICHELT 1906: 9f.; HIRT 1921: 60, 168, 211). Most interestingly, however, after the 50’s scholars almost unanimously returned to the earlier class IV analysis, without any explicit discussion, and now the class VI analysis occurs only rarely (cf. LIEBERT 1957: 5ff., 12; VEKERDI 1961: 269f.; MORGENROTH 1977: 365; ELIZARENKOVA 1987: 108; RASMUSSEN 1989: 37ff., esp. fn. 22). Such an intriguing transformation of views may be the subject of a separate study on the history of the Indo-European linguistics, but this topic goes beyond the scope of the present paper.

From a morphophonological point of view, both of the approaches have disadvantages. The main argument against the class IV analysis is that the stem Cyā- is often disyllabic
(C<sup>0</sup>yá-), whereas the present suffix -ya- appears as -'ya- very rarely, even after a heavy syllable. Furthermore, it is unclear whether C<sup>0</sup>ya- is actually a regular reflex of the sequence *CH-ya-. We do not find sufficient evidence outside this type; -yá-passives derived from Cā roots generally have i in the root (cf. diyāte, dhiyāte to dā, dhā, etc.), whereas Cā roots which build -'ya-passives do not show ablaut (kṣāya-<sup>t</sup> ‘burn’, trāya-<sup>e</sup> ‘rescue’, mlāya-<sup>t</sup> ‘relax’, etc.; cf. GOTO 1987: 44)<sup>12</sup>, so that one might even expect "sāyati etc.

On the other hand, the class VI analysis is not free from shortcomings either, being unable to account for -y- before the thematic vowel, at least in some of these presents.

Both analyses being controversial from the morphophonological point of view, it is advisable to carefully examine other features of the formations under investigation, i.e. semantics, syntax and paradigmatic properties. In other words, it might be helpful to compare system-related features of the class IV and class VI formations with those of the type Cyāti in order to determine how closely each of the two classes is related to the type Cyāti within the synchronic system of present formations.

An exhaustive study of these two well-attested morphological types within this paper is impossible, and I will limit myself to a short survey of class VI and active<sup>13</sup> class IV presents.

2. A comparative sketch of class IV and class VI presents

2.1 Semantic and syntactic features

2.1.1 Class IV (active)

As is well-known, most -'ya-presents are intransitive; many of them refer to inner states that belong either to the sphere of emotions (krūdhyā-<sup>t</sup> ‘be angry’, tīpya-<sup>i</sup> ‘be satisfied’), or to the domain of physiological processes (kṛṣya-<sup>t</sup> ‘be lean’, kṛṣūdhyā-<sup>t</sup> ‘be hungry’, etc.),<sup>14</sup> as well as to their starting points ('become angry', ‘become old’, etc.). Besides, there is also a small subgroup of -'ya-presents denoting intransitive activities (dīrṇya-<sup>AiG</sup> ‘play’, nṛtya-<sup>t</sup> ‘dance’, etc.), and a small subgroup of transitives (āsyā-<sup>AiG</sup> ‘throw’, nāh-ya-<sup>AiG</sup> ‘tie’, etc.). These subclasses, albeit old and inherited from Proto-Indo-Iranian, are unproductive and do not recruit new members after the RV, unlike intransitive statives.

Another feature shared by the class IV presents belongs to the domain of aspectual meanings: a good many of these presents are durative, referring to the processes extended

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. SEEHOLD 1972: 287ff.

<sup>12</sup> If we accept the class IV but not the class I analysis for these formations. The latter is most plausible, particularly, for gāya-<sup>AiG</sup> ‘sing’ (i.e. gōy-<sup>AiG</sup>a-) and, presumably, for some other presents; cf. WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 87; THUMB/HAUSCHILD 1959: 244.

<sup>13</sup> There are a number of crucial differences between class IV presents attested in the middle only (pādyate, mānyate, etc.) and those which are mostly employed with the active inflexion (see KULIKOV, in preparation). Since Cyāti formations mostly occur with active endings, it makes sense to focus on the latter subclass of class IV, i.e. on the active -'ya-presents.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. WHITNEY 1896: 273.
in time rather than concentrated within a short ("punctual") period, cf. e.g. DELBRÜCK 1897: 26ff.\(^\text{15}\)

2.1.2 Class VI\(^\text{16}\)

By contrast, most of the class VI presents are transitives referring to "energetic" activities which imply some crucial involvement of the patient in the process, but, usually, do not lead to its death or destruction\(^\text{17}\) (cf. \textit{ksipá}-\(^{\text{ii}}\) ‘throw’, \textit{khidá}-\(^{\text{ii}}\) ‘tear’, \textit{tudá}-\(^{\text{ii}}\) ‘push’, etc.).

The majority of class VI presents denote punctual, or terminative, activities (cf. DELBRÜCK 1897: 90ff.; RENOU 1925; KORTLANDT, ibid.; cf. also LAZZERONI 1978 for discussion\(^\text{18}\)).

Incidentally, transitivity and punctuality correspond well together, being not quite independent of each other. As has been demonstrated by HOPPER and THOMPSON (1980), transitivity can be treated as a complex set of features all of which are concerned with the effectiveness of an action taking place. Within this framework, we are able to explain some correlations between syntactic patterns (transitive/intransitive) and aspectual properties of the verbal forms. In particular, the punctual meaning can be shown to correlate with the higher transitivity degree, whereas the durative semantics is generally associated with intransitivity.

2.2 The ratio of the present, imperfect and injunctive forms

As has been repeatedly suggested (cf. e.g. SAUSSURE 1879: 9; LEUMANN 1895: 42), the majority of the class VI presents may go back to the thematic aorists. The common origin of these two formations may account for the fact that forms with secondary endings (imperfects and injunctives) are a little more current than forms with primary endings (presents proper), especially in early Vedic (in the RV); cf. e.g. LEUMANN, ibid., KURYLOWICZ 1964: 116: most likely, the latter part of the paradigm of this morphological type was not yet well-established by that time. In the case of poorly attested formations, it is often impossible to decide whether the form under consideration belongs with thematic aorists or class VI presents; cf., for instance, \textit{jurátam} ‘make weak’ (discussed in Section 4.2.2.2 below).

Unlike class VI presents, active ‘-ya-presents have a well-established paradigm in the present and, moreover, forms with primary endings predominate (cf. the lists in MACDONELL 1910: 331ff.).

\(^{15}\) DELBRÜCK labels this meaning ‘kursiv’.

\(^{16}\) There is no monographic treatment of this present class, but several important features have been captured by RENOU (1925); cf. also LAZZERONI 1978; KORTLANDT 1984: 315ff.

\(^{17}\) Cf. KORTLANDT 1984: 315ff.

\(^{18}\) LAZZERONI believes that the punctual meaning is not inherently associated with this morphological type: "I verbi della VI classe non hanno uno specifico valore di aspetto: la funzione delle singole forme dipende unicamente dalla loro collocazione nel sistema." (op.cit., p.143).
2.3 Paradigmatic properties: competing present types

As is well known, some morphological formations regularly co-occur within the same individual verbal system (IVS) (e.g. intransitive middle -'ya-presents and transitive presents with nasal affixes, cf. rīyate ‘flows’ - rīnāti ‘makes flow’, mūcyeṭe ‘becomes free’ - muḥcāṭi ‘releases’, etc.), whereas some others co-exist only rarely, exceptionally or never. Thus, any information about presents which are in competition with those under consideration may be helpful for determining their actual position within the system of present types.

2.3.1 Class IV

One of the remarkable features of the active -'ya-presents is the lack of other present types within the IVS (except for productive -āya-causatives). Only few of them co-occur synchronically with other presents: ṭīṣya.rfis (te) ‘send’ RV + // iṣṇāti RV + ‘id.’;19 jūrya.rfis RV, jīrya.rfis AV + ‘become old’ // jāra.rfis RV ‘make old’; janya.rfis ‘rejoice’ // rāna.rfis ‘id.’ (both are attested mostly or only in the RV, cf. GOTO 1987: 258f.); dfhya.rfis RV ‘be firm’ // drmhas.rfis RV1x + ‘make firm’. tṛpya.rfis Kh., AV + ‘be satisfied’ appears as a recent replacement of trpnō.rfis, trmpā.rfis (RV +); sādhyā.rfis ‘succeed’ is attested only once in early Vedic (in mandala I of the RV), while the parallel sādha-rfis nearly disappears after the RV (GOTO 1987: 326); similarly, -hṛṣya-rfis ‘be excited’ occurs only once in early Vedic, in the late tenth mandala of the RV, while hārṣa-rfis is exceptional after the RV (GOTO 1987: 347).20

Note that, with the exception of three pairs (which makes up less than 5% of the total number of active -'ya-presents), viz. ṭīṣya.rfis // iṣṇāti, janya-rfis // rāna-rfis and tṛpya-rfis // trpnō-rfis, trmpā-rfis, -'ya-presents are not quite parallel to competing formations, i.e. they either do not co-occur synchronically, or are employed in different usages (cf. e.g. intr. dfhya-rfis // tr.-caus. drmhas-rfis).

2.3.2 Class VI

Unlike class IV presents, many of class VI presents co-exist within the IVS with other (synonymous or nearly synonymous) present formations: with class I presents (cf. kṛṣa-rfis RV + ‘plough’// kārṣa-rf is RV + ‘drag’;21 jurā-rfis RV22 // jāra-rfis RV ‘make old’), with nasal presents (tuja-rfis ‘move, put in panic’ // tuṇjanti etc. RV ‘id.’; dhūvā-rfis AV +23 ‘fan’ // dhūnas-rfis RV + ‘shake’), with root presents (cf. yuvā-rfis RV ‘join’ // yauti AV + ‘id.’),

19 The nasal present may be a recent formation though, cf. JOACHIM 1978: 43.
20 I do not mention here rare -'ya-presents, such as hapax -pruṣya-rfis ‘spirit’ SB1x (// pruṣnuvanti etc. RV) or quasi-hapax śucya-rfis SB1x, JB1x (?) ‘suffer, feel pain’ (// sōca-rfis RV +) (cf. GOTO 1987: 307).
21 For the difference in meaning and use, cf. GOTO 1987: 112f.
22 The only finite form attested to this stem is jurātam (RV 1.182.3) ‘make weak, infirm’. It is interpreted by WHITNEY (1885: 55), NATEN (1964: 121), JOACHIM (1978: 83), LAZZERONI (1978: 142f.) as class VI present, by GOTO (1987: 152) as thematic aorist; cf. also Section 4.2.2.2, Excursus.
23 Mostly with nī.
with reduplicated presents (cf. -tirá- ‘make pass’ // títrat- RV\textsuperscript{1x} ‘id.’\textsuperscript{24}, disánt- etc. RV + ‘indicate’ // distéśt\textsuperscript{u} etc. RV ‘id.’, yuv\textsuperscript{u}a\textsuperscript{a} RV\textsuperscript{1x} +\textsuperscript{25} ‘keep aside’ // yuyó-\textsuperscript{a} RV + ‘id.’). 

Note, in particular, that some of class VI presents are in competition with reduplicated presents, while ‘-ya-presents never co-exist with this formation.\textsuperscript{26}

2.4 Passivizability
An important property of transitive verbs is their ability to build passives. Theoretically, all transitives might be expected to passivize; but this is not the case in early Vedic, where -yá-passives are not yet well-established as a fully productive morphological formation, so that the existence/lack of -yá-passives is an important feature for classifying transitives.

2.4.1 Class IV
Quite naturally, the majority of active ‘-ya-presents, being intransitive, cannot be passivized; but even transitive -ya-formations lack -yá-passives. The eight roots which build transitive active ‘-ya-presents (as ‘throw’, is ‘send’, dhyá ‘think’, nah ‘tie’, paś ‘see’, pí ‘blame’, vyadh ‘pierce’, siv ‘sew’) occur as few as four times in -yá-passives throughout all Vedic texts: asyamāna- (AA 2.3.5) ‘thrown’, presyate (AVP 16.54.8) ‘is sent forth’, apinahyāmāna- (AV 12.5.25) ‘being fastened up’ and vi-vidhyamāna- (JB 2.426:4) ‘being shot down’; in addition, we find nṛtyate (JB 2.69:3, 10) ‘[the dance] is danced’, which is passive to a content accusative construction. Among these, only two occurrences are met in early Vedic (in the AV), whereby apinahyāmāna- appears in hymn 12.5, which abounds in nonce passives, and thus may be a nonce form; presyate in the AVP cannot be sufficient evidence either.\textsuperscript{27}

This peculiarity may be due to the tendency to avoid two different -ya-formations (i.e. active ‘-ya-presents and -yá-passives) within the same IVS. This constraint seems to have been valid until the very end of the Vedic period.

2.4.2 Class VI
-yá-passives to class VI presents are relatively few and mostly of late age too (some of them have no -ya-passives in Vedic at all, cf. kṣipá- ‘throw’), in spite of transitivity of the base verbs, but less exceptional and older than the passive counterparts of the transitive active ‘-ya-presents. We find three -yá-passives in the oldest parts of the RV (tujyate 2x ‘is put to panic flight’, srjyá-te ‘be emitted’, stūyá-te ‘be praised’) and one more in mandala X (sūyá-te ‘be consecrated’);\textsuperscript{28} others appear in the young Saṁhitās of the Yajur-Veda and

\textsuperscript{24} títrat- RV 2.31.2, albeit a hapax in the RV, seems to go back to Proto-Indo-Iranian, as its Av. cognate títara\textsuperscript{a} proves (Gott\textsuperscript{t} 1987: 165, fn. 266).

\textsuperscript{25} For RV 8.71.4 yuv\textsuperscript{a}a, cf. Jöhch\textsuperscript{i}m 1978: 140.

\textsuperscript{26} I do not count târya RV\textsuperscript{1x} (// títrat-), which is a nonce formation. yásya- AV ‘boil’ does not co-occur synchronically with the reduplicated present (RVic hapax yavy\textsuperscript{u}a\textsuperscript{a}), which is replaced by the former after the RV.

\textsuperscript{27} The parallel passage of the AVŚ (11.3.14) has the -ta-participle prēśita-.

\textsuperscript{28} The class VI present vrścā- ‘cut; bring low [to a deity]’ (\textsuperscript{~ pass. vrścéyā-} RV\textsuperscript{x1x} +) goes back to a fossilized -cha-present.
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3. A survey of the type Cyáti

3.1 Semantic and syntactic features

From the semantic and syntactic point of view, all the five presents of the type Cyáti are remarkably uniform. All of them are transitive, mostly with a punctual meaning, and belong to the same semantic area as most of the class VI presents (energetic activities).

3.2 The ratio of the present, imperfect and injunctive forms

Two of the Cyáti formations occur in the RV with secondary endings only (adyah ‘bound’ RV 2.13.9, syá RV 1.130.4bis), so that we cannot be sure whether the paradigm of the present was well-established by that time or not; only -sóyá-d is well-attested with primary endings.

3.3 Paradigmatic properties

Three of the five Cyáti presents co-exist with other present formations within the IVS: -s(l)yá-d ‘bind’ // siná-d RV +; syá-d ‘sharpen’ // sísáti, sísíte etc. RV +; -dyá-d YS + ‘cut, divide, distribute’ // dáya- ‘distribute’ RV +.29

Note especially that the pair ſyá-d ‘sharpen’ // sísáti etc. would be unique and isolated under the class IV analysis: we do not find reduplicated presents in competition with ‘-ya-presents (cf. JOACHIM 1978: 159f.). By contrast, the class VI analysis is more attractive, since parallel class VI and class III presents are attested for a number of roots (cf. Section 2.3.2).

3.4 Passivization

Passives, attested for two of the five Cyáti presents, are relatively rare and appear from the YS onwards. The following forms are met: diyate ‘is divided’ KS9 9.14:117.2, TS6 3.10.3  AB 2.10er  ŠBK 4.8.3.9; samdiyámána- ‘bound’ TS6 7.1.19.1  KS-Aśvamedha6 5.1.10:154.2. -dyá-d ‘bind’ has also passive aorist samdáyi (RV 1.139.1).

3.5 Compounds with preverbs

One of the most remarkable features of the type Cyáti is that forms with preverbs are much more common than simplex ones. Four of the five presents under discussion, -s(l)yá-d, -dyá-d ‘cut, divide, distribute’ and -dyá-d ‘bind’, do not occur as simplex at all; syá-d appears as simplex only in the ŠB (2x); chyá-d is attested exclusively with ánu and á.

29 For the different usages of the present dáya-d, see KUIPER 1974. KUIPER seems to be too categorical when considering -dyá-d and dáya-d unrelated; cf. GOTO 1987: 172ff.

30 chyáti TS6 5.2.12.1a = KS-Aśvamedha6 5.10.6:185.16 probably has to be read +á-chyati, cf. HOFFMANN 1966: 70f. [= Aufs. II, 463f.].

in the Bråhmanas.
By contrast, other presents of the same IVS (if any) either occur as simplex (dāya-"; sinā-" in the AV) only or are attested both as simplex and in compounds (sinā-" in the RV;31 śīśāti etc.).

3.6 A synopsis
For the sake of clarity, I summarize the above-mentioned features of the three present types in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>features</th>
<th>class IV (active)</th>
<th>type Cyāti</th>
<th>class VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1a) semantic and syntactic properties</td>
<td>mostly intransitive statives; a small subgroup of transitives</td>
<td>transitives denoting &quot;energetic&quot; activities</td>
<td>mostly transitives denoting &quot;energetic&quot; activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1b) aspectual meaning</td>
<td>mostly durative</td>
<td>mostly punctual</td>
<td>mostly punctual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) the ratio of the present, imperfect and injunctive forms</td>
<td>forms with primary endings are prevalent</td>
<td>for two of the three Cyāti formations attested in the RV only forms with secondary endings are met</td>
<td>the paradigm of the present is not yet well-established in early Vedic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) paradigmatic features: are there parallel presents?</td>
<td>rarely (for \approx 5% of 'ya-presents)</td>
<td>parallel presents exist for three of the five Cyāti presents</td>
<td>often (for \approx 1/3 of presents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) passivization</td>
<td>exceptionally</td>
<td>passives are attested for two of the five Cyāti verbs (YS +)</td>
<td>passives are attested for \approx 1/3 of the verbs (mostly after the RV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, one has to note that some of class VI presents which are in competition with other present formations (listed in section 2.3.2) are mostly employed with preverbs (-tīrā-", dhūvā-"), while other presents of the same root are well-attested as simplex.

Obviously, the class VI analysis conforms much better to the features of the type Cyāti than the most commonly acknowledged class IV analysis.

4. On the origin of the type Cyāti

4.1 Preliminary remarks
So far I was concerned with determining the position of the class Cyāti within the synchronic system of the Vedic present types. Any present type can be said to associate with a cluster of features belonging to different layers of the language structure

---

31 1x as simplex, 1x with vf.
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None of the features on their own can be sufficient evidence for or against certain analysis of a morphological formation, but a set of independent features shared by two formations seems to point to their synchronic affinity. I tried to show that the cluster of properties of the type *Cyāti* is basically the same as that of class VI and, hence, treating *Cyāti* presents as class VI formations is more appropriate than a class IV analysis within a synchronic description of the Vedic verb.

This is not to say, however, that all or most of the *Cyāti* presents are of the same origin as typical class VI presents. The synchronic status of a formation and its origin are to be treated separately, as two different (albeit often related) matters. In particular, I am not claiming that all or most of the *Cyāti* presents, albeit belonging, synchronically, to class VI, actually go back to the zero grade thematic presents, rather than to -ya-presents or any other present type(s). We cannot rule out that the predecessors of some of these formations have been secondarily rebuilt and reinterpreted as class VI presents, due to several analogical developments.

Thus, the main problem which remains open is: how are we to reconcile a class VI analysis, based on purely synchronic (semantic, syntactic and paradigmatic) features, with the morphological structure and origin of the *Cyāti* presents?

4.2 Where the type *Cyāti* comes from?

4.2.1 Class IV origin: *CH-ia-

As has been mentioned in Section 1, the class IV analysis leaves unexplained some features of the type *Cyāti*, particularly: why *CH-ia-* does not yield "Ciya-", nor (possibly) "Cāya-?

Nevertheless, it cannot be ruled out that some of *Cyāti* presents go back to -ya-formations which have later rebuilt their original shape ("Ciya-? "Cāya-?) in analogy with some other *Cyāti* presents of different origin. Of course, this assumption leaves open the general problem of the origin of the type *Cyāti*.

4.2.2 Class VI origin

4.2.2.1. *CH-ia-*: i belongs to the root

The class VI analysis has one disadvantage. Given the assumption that *Cyāti* is derived from the root Cā (sā, sā, etc.), how are we to account for the element -y- before the thematic vowel? It should be recalled, however, that at least for some of the five verbs of this group root variants with the final -i- can be posited. Then the type *Cyāti* may be accounted for as class VI presents based on i roots: sī, sī etc. This analysis was adopted, for instance, by HIRT (1921: 60, 168, 210f.), who regarded *syāti* etc. as 'aoristic presents'  

---

32 I refrain from a discussion of the controversial hypothesis proposed by DIVER (1959), who suggests that -y- in *Cyāti* (as well as in some other Vedic stems in -ya-) goes back to the palatal laryngeal "IP ("H); see also CHRISTOL 1990 and cf. LINDEMAN (1992: 60) for criticism. One should also mention the analysis suggested by BADER (1990: 10f.), who rejects both "sh2-e-ti- and "sh2-yo- (thus in her notation) and traces the type *syāti* immediately to "sh2-e-ti and, likewise, dyāti ‘binds’ to "dh2-e-ti - without any convincing argumentation, however.
("Aoristpräsen"). Here I will only briefly mention the most important evidence for CHi variants; a detailed discussion of this Cā//Ci alternation can be found in Rasmusson 1989: 50ff.; cf. also Mayrhofer, EWAia, s.vv.

The root sā provides more evidence for -i- as part of the root than any other root of the group under consideration: sētu- ‘fetter, band’, perf. sīsāya (cf. Lubotsky 1995: 214), nom.ag. setār- (cf. Rasmusson 1989: 59), caus. sāyāyat (cf. Inslser 1987: 65) point to *saHi- < PIE *seh₂- (cf. already Hirt 1900: 37; also Rasmusson, ibid.; Mayrhofer, EWAia II, 720f.; García-Ramón 1994-95: 339ff.; cf. also Burrow 1949: 46; Mayrhofer 1965: 248, fn.23). Evidence for two other roots, sā and chā, is more scarce but not neglectable, cf. Av. saēni- and Ved. caus. chāyāyat, which may point to *keh₂(ji)- (cf. Inslser 1987: 65; Rasmusson 1989: 53; Mayrhofer, EWAia II, 627) and *skeh₂- (Rasmusson 1989: 61), respectively. For sā, cf. also the late Vedic root aorist participle -s(y)iina- ‘sharpening’ (AB 7.16.2 nisah₂na-; 15.21.11 nisyāna-), which could only have been based on the root sy- (śi-) (with the secondary loss of -y- in the variant attested in the AB).34 For -dyāti, cf. Rasmusson 1989: 51, esp. No.2. Evidence for -i- as part of the root is furnished by Anatolian, too, notably, by nominal derivatives in -i- like Hitt. isbi-mnn- ‘strap’ (~ i§bai ‘he binds’),35 which are derived from the roots in (N. Oettinger, letter of 15.10.97).

The aforementioned forms cannot of course serve as unambiguous evidence for the hypothesis that -i- belonged to the root from the very beginning. Nevertheless, even given the assumption that -i- eventually originates in a suffix (PIE *(e)i- (?)), these forms show that at certain moment it has been reconsidered as part of the root, giving rise to forms like setār-, chāyāyat, etc. Note that some roots have succeeded more than some others in adopting -i- into the root; in particular, to put it in non-formal terms, sā//si goes one step further than other roots.36

Thus, it cannot be ruled out that C(i)yā- represents a class VI present derived from the root *CHi, with optional syllabification of the laryngeal before -i-. However, this assumption does not solve the whole problem: we still have to account for the root variants without -i-, even in the case of sā//si; note, for instance, that alongside setār- (RV 7.84.2) we find ava-sātār- (RV 10.27.9).

Furthermore, we have to explain the irregular reflex of the vocalized laryngeal before -i-: we might expect **C(y)a- (rather than C(i)yā-), as in -yā-passives of Cā roots

33 The variant attested in the AB is generally taken as corrupt (Keith 1920: 303, fn. 3); Bohtlingk’s Chrêstomathie (1909: 32, line 14; 394, line 23) conjectures *nisya- in accordance with the reading of the ŠSS; cf. also Debrunner 1954 [AIG II, 2]: 274, § 162.b.ß); Debrunner 1957 [AIG, Nachtr. zu I]: 149.
34 Note that middle participles of the structure Cāna- are unattested for roots in -ā, so that -sāna- is unlikely to belong to the root variant sā.
36 Quite symptomatically, Schulze (1885: 423) accepts a class VI analysis for sy-āti, but takes d-ya- as a -ya-present in another article (Schulze 1888: 258). Likewise, the Avestan cognate of -sāti, i.e. hita-, is treated by Kelless (1984: 100) as a thematic zero grade root present (Indian class VI), unlike other (possible) cognates of the type Cyāti, which are grouped with -ita-presents (see fn. 2.4).
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(dīyāte, dhīyāte, etc.), with the secondary lengthening of i before y. All this seems to indicate that -i-, although synchronically belonging to the root, must be of secondary origin.

4.2.2.2 The pattern dāya-
Yet another source of -y- in Cyāti may have existed, at least for one of the members of this class. -dya-
‘cut, make sacrificial cuttings, distribute, divide’ is in competition with the present dāya-
‘distribute’, whose morphological analysis is uncertain. Generally, it is considered an -āya-present (cf. e.g. Lubotsky 1989: 95; Mayrhofer, EWAIa I, 700), although not always consistently. Whatever the status of -y- in dāya- (part of the root or part of the suffix), dāya- and -dya- may belong together as class I present and class VI present, respectively. Here it might be advisable to make a short digression on this paradigmatic pattern.

Excursus
Paradigmatic pattern "class I present // zero grade thematic formation"

To my knowledge, the paradigmatic opposition of class I presents and zero grade thematic formations within the IVS (hereafter labelled, for brevity, "I/VI pattern") has never been treated systematically in Vedic studies, unlike some other well-established patterns, such as "intransitive -ya-presents // transitive nasal presents"; Gotō (1987: 57f.) mentions only four reliable instances of this type.

In my opinion, the functional value of this pattern within the Vedic verbal system, albeit semantically less transparent than, for instance, that of the pattern "-ya-presents // nasal presents", should not be underestimated. Here belong the following verbs:
1. tāra-tīte RV ‘pass, cross over’ // -tīrā- RV ‘carry through, save’ (only with preverbs);
2. vārṣa-RV ‘rain’ // -vṛṣa- RV, Śū. ‘cause to rain, make fall down as rain’ (only with ā).
In both of these pairs class VI present is opposed to class I present as transitive-causative ("factitive") to intransitive (cf. Gotō, ibid.).
3. kāṛṣa- RV ‘draw, drag’ // kṛṣa- RV ‘plough, drag [a plough];
In these two pairs the semantic opposition is less transparent. Gotō (ibid., 58, fn. 27) hesitantly takes the meaning of the second members as causative, but his interpretation seems forced. Rather one might say that the second members refer to more concrete and specific kinds of activities. Besides, -vṛṣa- and dhūvā- can be qualified as referring to more “energetic” activities, as compared to those denoted by the corresponding class I presents (cf. Gotō, ibid., 187f. on dhūvā).
5. rāva-YS ‘roar’ // ruvā- RV + ‘id.;
6. nāva-RV, TB’s ‘roar’ // nuvāntam (participle) RV, ‘id.’
The hapax nuvāntam has been created in analogy with the pair rāva- // ruvā- and refers to more energetic (loud) roaring (cf. Joachim 1978: 103; Gotō 1987: 198).

Given the common origin of the thematic aorist and class VI present (the distinction between these two formations is not clear-cut in some cases), one may append some pairs "class I present // thematic aorist" to

---

37 Mayrhofer, ibid., takes dāyate as an -āya-present and, at the same time, treats y as part of the root (DAY). I do not understand how these two claims can be reconciled.
38 ‘er zieht, schlepp’t ~ ‘er pfliigt’ = ‘er läßt einen Pflug eine Furche ziehen’; ‘er reibt, spült ab’ ~ ‘er befählet’ = ‘er bewegt einen Fächer hin und her’ und gleichzeitig ‘der Fächer übt durch Hin- und Herbewegung eine Wirkung auf den Gegenstand aus’.
the above list:

7. ājāra- (III-I) RV ‘make old’ // jurātām (impv.) ‘make weak, infirm’ RV 1.182.3.
Both ājāra- and jurātām are employed transitively, but the imperative jurātām refers to a more energetic activity (‘hinfällig werden lassen’, as opposed to ājāra- ‘allmählich hohes Alter erreichen lassen’, cf. NARTEN 1964: 121; JOACHIM 1978: 83; GOTO 1987: 152); these two formations seem to differ in their aspectual meaning, too: jurātām is perfective (GOTO, ibid.). Obviously, the semantic difference between ājāra- (III-I) and jurātām is basically the same as that between the members of the most of the aforementioned pairs (1-6).
Thus, whatever the morphological analysis of jurātām, i.e. class VI present (WHITNEY 1885: 55; NARTEN 1964: 121; JOACHIM 1978: 83; LAZZERONI 1978: 142f.) or thematic aorist (GOTO, ibid.), I do not see good reasons for treating this pair separately from the ‘I/VI pattern’ class.

8. hāva- (III) RV + (mantras) ‘call, invoke’ // ahuva (ahuva) etc. RV ‘id.’
The zero grade thematic formations do not occur with primary endings, except for the unclear (but well-attested) form huvē (1 sg.med.), so that there is no sufficient evidence for positing a class VI present (GOTO 1987: 349f.).

The list of the ‘I/VI’ pairs may be probably expanded, but those given above suffice to make some preliminary conclusions about the functional value of this morphological opposition. The above-listed formations are not a random group but correspond to a cluster of features:

(i) First, the ‘I/VI pattern’ is correlated with a number of semantic and syntactic distinctions (‘intransitive’ ~ ‘transitive (causative), ‘less concrete’ ~ ‘more concrete’, ‘less energetic’ ~ ‘more energetic’, ‘imperfective’ ~ ‘perfective’), which can all be grouped together under the heading ‘lower degree of the effectiveness of an action taking place’ = ‘lower degree of transitivity’ ~ ‘higher degree of the effectiveness of an action taking place’ = ‘higher degree of transitivity’, in terms of HOPPER and THOMPSON’S (1980) approach to transitivity.

(ii) Members of most of the above pairs differ in diathesis properties: some of class I presents are media tantum (or quasi-tantum) (cf. rāva-, nāva-), while some of thematic zero grade formations are activa tantum (krṣā-, dhūvā-, nūvā-, nuvāntam, jurātām).
(iii) Second members of some pairs, namely -tīrā- and -vrṣa-, occur in compounds with preverbs only; dhūvā- is almost exceptional as simplex.

The above sketch suffices to demonstrate that the pair dāya- // -dyā- perfectly conforms to these three features: dāya- ‘distribute’ is medium tantum, -dyā- ‘cut, divide, distribute’ occurs with preverbs only and is a ritual term, referring to a more concrete punctual event (cutting off a sacrificial portion), thus, as it seems, being more transitive in HOPPER and THOMPSON’S terms. Whatever the origin of these two formations, this is strong evidence for treating them synchronically as class I and class VI presents, respectively, even under the assumption that -y- in dāya- originates in the suffix -āya-. It is unclear which exact diachronic scenario might lead to the rise of this and similar pairs. One may assume that the zero grade of the root results from the reduction of the full grade thematic stem with the concomitant accent shift, which was operative in compounds with preverbs (i.e. *-C-e- > *-CC-e-), but the exact nature of this process is unclear to me.

39 An intransitive interpretation of the only middle occurrence, jaranta RV 10.31.7, is less probable; cf. GOTO 1987: 152.
40 dāya- and -dyā- are actually treated as class I and class VI presents of the same root already in WHITNEY 1885: 70, 72.
41 To my knowledge, this hypothesis was first formulated by BECHTEL (1892: 153f., 268f.), who has extended to the verbal compounds the rule proposed by J. SCHMIDT (1881: 53ff.) for the nominal compounds: a in the
5. Conclusions

To sum up, I have tried to argue that the class VI analysis conforms much better to the features of the type Cyáti than the class IV analysis, thus being more attractive from the synchronic point of view. This is not to say, however, that all Cyáti presents are of the same origin as class VI presents of the type tudáti. In some verbs of this class, -y- may originate in the suffix -(e)i- (perhaps related to the class IV present suffix -ya-). Thematicizing the original stems ('dH-(e)i-, 'sH-(e)i-, etc.) could have yielded both "class VI" (-dy-á-ti, -sy-á-ti, etc.) and "class I" (dáy-á-te) formations. Then Cyáti presents have been secondarily assimilated to each other, building a special subclass of present class VI.
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