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1. General remarks

1.1. There are six roots in -iv- in Vedic Sanskrit: sīv- ‘to sew’, jīv- ‘to be alive’, dīv- ‘to play dice’, sīhīv- ‘to spit’, mīv- ‘to push away’, sīrv- ‘tomiscarry’. In Vedic, these roots almost always appear in the zero-grade with automatic alternation *Civ- (i.e., Cihu-) before a vowel or y, but Cyū- (i.e., CjuH-) before a consonant, and this is also true for their cognates in other languages. For instance, the Pr. present stem *siHUa- (Skt. śīvatī), and the similarly vocalized Goth. siujan ‘to sew’ are opposed to Pr. *siuHUa- ‘sewn’ (Skt. syūta-, Oss. x'yad'xd), Lith. sūtė, Scr. šūtī ‘to sew’ (AIGr. I:91f.). This distribution is most probably due to the rule *CihuTCz > *CiuHCz (Cz # j); in other words, the laryngeal always stands after the vocalic element (cf. for the vocalization dīvV, dīvV, dīuC), as was already surmised by Kretschmer in 1892.

The peculiar root structure of this type, the lack of ablaution and, at the same time, its archaic character have fascinated many scholars, but the origin and the internal analysis of the -iv-roots remain puzzling.

1.2. As already mentioned, the -iv-roots predominantly appear in the zero-grade in Vedic, other ablaut grades being avoided. The rare full-grades mostly show -ev-; see the following list, which is intended to be exhaustive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sēvanī- f.</td>
<td>'seam, suture' (Br.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēvana- n.</td>
<td>'(place for) playing dice' (RV 10.43.5), adhīdevana- n. ‘id.’ (AV+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>didēva 3sg. pf.</td>
<td>*dīv- ‘to play dice’ (AV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhi-tīṣṭha 3sg. pf.</td>
<td>*tīṣṭhī- ‘to spit, spit out’ (ŚB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>srevāyant- (RV 7.18.8), srevaśīymi (PS 19.10.12; ŚŚ 6.73.2 in a parallel passage reads śrīvaśīymi), caus. of *sīrv- ‘to miscarry’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-sremān- adj.</td>
<td>‘being not a miscarriage’ (RV 3.29.13, 10.8.2; &lt; *srevmān-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>srēvaka- adj.</td>
<td>‘miscarrying’ (MS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. further Lubotsky 2000:320 and nn14 and 16 for more examples of this rule in Vedic.

Nevertheless, there are also four cases of full-grades with -av- and lengthened-grades with -Av-:

davasoti 1sg. aor. subj. 'dāv- 'help' (RV 10.34.5)
d-avatya- adj. 'unflinching' (RV 10.94.11)
assyvati 3sg. aor. 'śrīvā- 'to play dice' (JB 2.2)
asthauvatam 1sg. aor. 'śrīvā- 'to go' (GopP 1.2.7)

Our handbooks (e.g., Narten 1964:142; Mayrhofer EWAiu s.vv. 'dīv-, mū-, śrīv-; cf. also Rassmusen 1989:117) explain the dāv-forms as secondary full-grades to *dāv-, mū- < *dīj-, mīj-, etc., where *i would have disappeared as in sīthra-. The line, cord' (AV+1) to sīv-/*sīvā- 'to sew'. However, the *i-less forms *dā-, śīh-, śrī-, are unattested in Vedic, and, furthermore, the distribution is remarkable: the forms with -Av- are only found before i in the next syllable, while full-grades with -av- never occur in this position. Although the evidence is limited, it seems likely that we have to do with dissimilation, i.e., *dāiyīs- > dāvās-.

This type of dissimilation is reminiscent of the rule *CaizytC > *CaizytC in Vedic, mentioned by Debrunner in his Nachträge to AifGr. I (p.158). The regular and expected 2sg. pf. of the root i- 'to go', iyātha (< *Hī-Haun-tha), is only attested at the beginning of a line in RV 4.9.1c, whereas after a short or long ā we find iyātha: kāvā + iyāthā (RV 8.17a) "where did you go?" - > kavāiyāthā > kāvyāthā, nā + iyāthā (SS 8.11.10b) "you did not go" = /nāiyāthāl > nāiyāthā > nēyāthā, etc. For more examples of i-dissimilation in Sanskrit see Lubotsky forthcoming.

1.3. In this article I shall advance the hypothesis that all -āv-roots share the same derivational history, viz., a root in -H → i-present → noun in -āv- → denominal verb. In order to demonstrate this derivational chain, I would like first to take the root 'to yawn' as an example, especially since the discussion of this root at the weekly seminars of the Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary project was the starting point for the present investigation.4

3 The i-presents have an enigmatic predilection for u-derivatives. As is well known, Vedic secondary verbal stems in -i- productively form nomina agents in -i-yā (AifGr. I:2/834fl.), type vīrāyate 'to behave as a hero': vīrāyās-, and this type clearly goes back to Proto-Indo-Iranian; cf. Yav. haunātāi- 'containing haoma'. Further, there are a few old formations, both nomina agents and nomina actions, like Skt. manyā- m. 'passion, rage' (RV+), OAv. maunātāi- m. 'mind, spirit' (PIE *mn-), Skt. pāyān-, OAv. pāvā- m. 'guard, protector, shepherd', Gr. zōn n. 'herd' (PIE *poh-), etc.

4 I would like to use the opportunity to express my gratitude to the participants in these seminars: Lucien van Beck, Alwin Kloekhorst, Guus Kroonen, Michael Peyrot, Tjijme Pronk, and Michiel de Veen. I am also grateful to Frederik Kortlandt and Leonid Kulikov, as well as to

2. Example: PIE *g'h2-ī-ū- 'to yawn'

2.1. Root in -H

We start with the PIE root *g'h2- 'to be wide open, gape'. This root is only attested with enclitics (which are likely to have been verbal suffixes originally):

*gh2-ī-ū-: Gr. χας n. 'chaos'; χαυ 'to devour'; χανος 'slack, porous, loose, bloated';

*gh2-ī-ū-: Gr. χασκο 'to gape, yawn, open the mouth wide', aor. χαυειν, perf. χανειν; Pgmnc. *gama- (ON gaman n. 'yawning', gamu 'to be opened [of eyes, mouth], stare');

*gh2-ī-ū- m. 'goose' (Gr. χυ, OHG gans, Lith. žas, etc.) is most probably derived from this root, too (a 'gaper'; for the suffix we may compare the word for 'moon', PIE *meh1-ns-).

2.2. i-present

The root *g'h2- 'has a well-established i-present, which can be reconstructed as *g'h2-i-ē/*g'h2-i-ī on the basis of Lat. hiā, hiāre 'to be wide open, gape', OCS zjājī, 1sg. zējō 'to open (one's mouth), gape, be wide open', Lith. žūtį 'to open (one's mouth)', TochB kāy- 'to open (one's mouth)' (ptc. pret. kākavya < *g'h2-ī-ē). Especially important are the Slavic forms. Mainly because of OCS 1sg. zējō, Rassmusen (1989:52), followed by LIV reconstructed the root as *g'h2-ī-, but this reconstruction cannot be correct, as it leaves Gr. χασκο and χασο unaccounted for. Furthermore, the circumflex accentuation of Scr. zjev 'muzzle' (< PSlav. *zēv, for which see below) is incompatible with the reconstruction *g'h2-ī-. The strong form yielded *zē-, which has acquired an automatic j- during later thematicization (i.e., *zē-mb >...
Nevertheless, there are also four cases of full-grades with -av- and lengthened-grades with -āv-:

\[ dāvānī 1sg. aor. subj. -ādīv- (RV 10.34.5) \]
\[ ṛā-māvānī- adj. ‘unflinching’ (RV 10.94.11) \]
\[ asvāvānī 3sg. aor. āvāv- (JB 2.2) \]
\[ asthavānī 1sg. aor. āvāhī- (Gopī B 1.2.7) \]

Our handbooks (e.g., Narten 1964:142; Mayrhofer EWAiu s.vv. dīv-, mīv-, sṛv-; cf. also Rasmussen 1989:117) explain the āv-forms as secondary full-grades to *dīv-, mīv- < *dívā-, mīvā-, etc., where *j would have disappeared as in sūdra- n. ‘line, cord’ (AV+I) to sūv- *sāv-āhī- ‘to sew’. However, the *i-less forms *dā-, sṛhū-, sṛā- are unattested in Vedic, and, furthermore, the distribution is remarkable: the forms with -āv- are only found before ī in the next syllable, while full-grades with -av- never occur in this position. Although the evidence is limited, it seems likely that we have to do with dissimilation, i.e., *dāvā- > dāv-.

This type of dissimilation is reminiscent of the rule *CaivyāC > *CaivyāC in Vedic, mentioned by Debrunner in his Nachträg Lie Gr. I (p.158). The regular and expected 2sg. pf. of the root -i- ‘to go’, iyētha (< *Hi-Hai-tha), is only attested at the beginning of a line in RV 4.9.1c, whereas after a short or long ā we find iyātha kvā- + *iyāthī (RV 8.17.7a) “where did you go?” = /kuivyāthā/ > /kāvāyāthā > kāvyāthā, nā- + *iyāthā (ŚŚ 8.1.10b) “you did not go” = /nāiyāthā! > *nāiyāthā > nēyāthā, etc. For more examples of i-dissimilation in Sanskrit see Lubotsky forthcoming.

1.3. In this article I shall advance the hypothesis that all -āv-roots share the same derivational history, viz., a root in -H → i-present → noun in -av- → denominal verb. In order to demonstrate this derivational chain, I would like first to take the root ‘to yawn’ as an example, especially since the discussion of this root at the weekly seminars of the Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary project was the starting point for the present investigation.4

3 The i-presents have an enigmatic predilection for u-derivatives. As is well known, Vedic secondary verbal stems in -j- productively form nomina agents in -j-ur (IGr. 11/2:834f). For instance, *viraṃya ‘to behave as a hero’; *viraṃya-, and this type clearly goes back to Proto-Indo-Iranian; cf. Ya. *hama ‘containing haoma’. Further, there are a few old formations, both nomina agents and nomina actionis, like Skt. *mæ̯j-ur ‘passion, rage’ (RV+), OAv. *mæ̯na- m. ‘mind, spirit’ (PIE *mæ̯-i-ur, Skt. *mæ̯ur-, OAv. *pæ̯ur- m. ‘guard, protector, shepherd’, Gr. *kou-n n. ‘herd’ (PIE *poj-u-i-ur), etc.

I would like to use the opportunity to express my gratitude to the participants in these seminars: Lucien van Beek, Alwin Kloekhorst, Guus Kroonen, Michael Peyrot, Tijmen Pronk, and Michiel de Vaan. I am also grateful to Frederik Kortlandt and Leonid Kulikov, as well as to

2. Example: PIE *g'h2-ī-u- ‘to yawn’

2.1. Root in -H

We start with the PIE root *g’h2- ‘to be wide open, gape’. This root is only attested with enclitics (which are likely to have been verbal suffixes originally):

*gh2-ī-u- Gr. yapos n. ‘chaos’; yapo ‘to devour’; ᵜαγός ‘slack, porous, loose, bloated’;
*gh2-ī-Gr. *χαίε ‘to gape, yawn, open the mouth wide’, aor. *χάειν, perf. *χάεται; PGMc. *gana ‘(ON gana n. ‘yawning’, gana ‘to be opened [of eyes, mouth], stare’);
*gh2-ena-s m. ‘goose’ (Gr. *χέε, OHG gans, Lith. žėsis, etc.) is most probably derived from this root, too (a ‘gaper’; for the suffix we may compare the word for ‘moon’, PIE *mēh₁-ns-).

2.2. i-Present

The root *g’h2- has a well-established i-present, which can be reconstructed as *g’h2-ī-i-m *g’h2-ī-5 on the basis of Lat. hiā, hiāre ‘to be wide open, gape’, OCS zižati, 1sg. žė zo ‘to open (one’s mouth), gape, be wide open’, Lith. žūtis ‘to open (one’s mouth)’, TochB *kāy ‘to open (one’s mouth)’ (p.c. pret. *kādyau) < *g’h2- (ei)-. Especially important are the Slavic forms. Mainly because of OCS 1sg. žējo, Rasmussen (1989:52), followed by LIV reconstructed the root as *g’h2- (ei), but this reconstruction cannot be correct, as it leaves Gr. yapos and ᵜαγός unaccounted for.5 Furthermore, the circumflex accentuation of Scr. žīvn ‘muzzle’ (< PSlav. *žēvn, for which see below) is incompatible with the reconstruction *g’h2-ī-m. The only way to account for the Slavic facts is to assume an athematic paradigm *g’h2-ī-ī-er *g’h2-ī or *g’h2-ī-er *g’h2-ī. The strong form yielded *zh2-, which has acquired an automatic *j- during later thematicization (i.e., *zē-mb > *zh2-īm).

5 The only other reason mentioned, viz., Gr. ᵜαγός ‘mussel’ (Philyll., Arist., Hell. paps.), is a late word of doubtful etymology, which is, moreover, ambiguous as far as its vocalism is concerned.

The editors of this volume Stephanie Jamison and Craig Melchert, for valuable comments on an earlier version of this article.

The editors of this volume Stephanie Jamison and Craig Melchert, for valuable comments on an earlier version of this article.


7 The only other reason mentioned, viz., Gr. ᵜαγός ‘mussel’ (Philyll., Arist., Hell. paps.), is a late word of doubtful etymology, which is, moreover, ambiguous as far as its vocalism is concerned.

8 LIV therefore postulates a root *g’h2- for Gr. yapos and its congeners.
*zê-q > zê(y). The weak form was metathesized in the position before a consonant, and the resulting *gê̊h₂er is not only the basis of OCS žijati and Lith. žioti, but also of Lat. hiōs (with addition of the suffix *-eh₂-).\(^9\)

Presumably *gê̊h₂ei̊- was considered a root already in PIE, since a nasal causative-factitive was formed by adding -n- to it, i.e., *gê̊h₂i̊n-: Hitt. kium.\(^2\) ‘to open (up), break open’;\(^10\) PSl. *zëvōti (OCS žîvūti, Scr. žîvūti, Sl. žîvīti) ‘to open (one’s mouth)’, ON gîna ‘to gape, yawn’.

2.3. u-Noun

A u-noun *gê̊h₂oi̊u- ‘mouth’ was formed not from the root, to the original present stem: PT *kua>y - TochB koyn n., pl. koynuva ‘mouth’, TochA kow- ‘id.’ (loc. sg. kowam ‘in the mouth’).\(^11\) PSlav. *zêvno ‘muzzle’ (CSlav. zêvno, Scr. zîyev). Note that the fixed expression TochB koyn kakâya is a figura etymologica, as already indicated by Adams 1999 s.v. koyn.

2.4. Denominal verb

The last part of this chain seems to be the verbal root *gê̊h₂eu - or *gê̊h₂oi̊u - ‘to yawn’, which must be a denominal formation. The meaning ‘to yawn’ occasionally occurs in the forms mentioned above, but it is only with -u- in the root that the meaning is invariably ‘to yawn’ (except for some minor developments). This is true for PSl. *zēvati (Ru. zvēt, Scr. zîvētā, Sl. zēvati with circumflex accentuation in the root), Lith. žiōvati, Latv. zâvā, TochA śew-, and also for PGmc. *giwōn- (OHiG giōn, gewōn, MHG given, gewen, Du. geeven; only OE gi(o)wan has a secondary meaning ‘to long, ask for’).

Although all these formations share a formant -u- and the same meaning, their vocalism does not generally match. This is no doubt due to the influence of the i-present. We see it most clearly in Lith. žiōvati, which has evidently adopted the vocalism of žiōti ‘to open (one’s mouth)’. The same is most probably true of Latv. zâvā, although the Latvian cognate of žiōti is not preserved. Also in the case of TochA śew- ‘to yawn’ (only present 12 śew-u-), we have to assume some influence of the original verb: PIE *gê̊h₂oi̊u- would have given TochA **śew-, so that the palatalization was secondary there. Since *gê̊h₂ēu- ‘to live’

\(^9\) A similar analysis accounts for OCS ljuati, 1sg. lêjy ‘to pour’ < *lêk̑y-ei̊- (for the root see Craig Melchert’s article elsewhere in this volume).

\(^10\) Klokkhorst (2010, 215-6) has convincingly argued that the Hittite spellings of this verb point to *gê̊h₂i̊-n-.

\(^11\) For the vocalism cf. both TochA and TochB or ‘wood’ < *dorv.
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(\footnote{12} It is unclear whether Cluw. 3pl. ñi̊s-ê-hi̊-ja-an-ti can be used as an indication that reduplication was old in this present.\footnote{13} Deriving Skt. sēv- and YAv. haê̊t- directly from the stem *sāh- after laryngeal metathesis, better accounts for the initial accentuation of sēv- (cf. Lubotsky 1988:47).\footnote{10} Alexander Lubotsky

3. PIE *sḥi̊-u- ‘to sew’

We can now try to analyze the Vedic verbs in -i̊v- from the viewpoint of the derivational chain mentioned above, i.e., \(\text{v-} \rightarrow \text{i̊-present} \rightarrow \text{-u-noun} \rightarrow \text{denominal verb}\). We start with śēv- ‘to sew’.

3.1. Root in -H

The IE root *seḥ-i̊ is represented in PIfrr. *saiH > Skt. sā- ‘to fasten, fetter’: root aor. sāt 3sg. inj. act. (RV+), ava-sat 3sg. subj. (PS 4.15.6), vi ... sitam 2nd. impv. (RV), sām satām 3pl. impv. med. (PS 4.14.5); sūt- ‘bound’ (RV+), vi-sūt- ‘untied’ (RV+); ava-sūt- m. ‘liberator’ (RV) ~ Av. viśūt- ‘untied’, viśūspae-PN (‘with loosened horses’) < *u-sîtaH-; MP wiśād ‘to let free’, etc. Although the connection between this root for ‘to fasten, fetter’ and Skt. śēv- is obvious, it has never, to my knowledge, been proposed before.

3.2. i̊-Present

As is well known, the IE root *seḥ-i̊ forms an i̊-present *sḥi̊-oi̊u/*sḥi̊-i̊ (for the reconstruction see Oettinger 2002:xxviii, 2004:400; Klokkhorst 2006, 2008:391); Hitt. 3sg. i̊-ša-a-i, 3pl. i̊-ša-an-zi ‘to bind, wrap: to obligate with, impose upon’, Cluw. 3pl. bi̊-i̊-ša-an-ti ‘to bind’.\(^12\) In Skt. we find pres. *sāyāt (RV+), only with prev. avā ‘to unharness’ and vi ‘to release (a knot), open (the lips)’ and the perfect ā sūtā, which exactly corresponds to OAv. ā-hūśāti ‘holds fettered’. Since perfects are normally derived from the root, PiIfrr. *siś-Hāi-a was synchronically analyzed as a perfect to the root *sāH-, which led to the creation of derivatives like Skt. sēt- m. ‘bind, bridge’, YAv. haēt- m. ‘dam’, etc.\(^13\) The circumflex of Lith. sētās, sētās m. ‘tie’ also points to the reconstruction *sḥ-oi̊u-
*zē-o > zējo). The weak form was metathesized in the position before a consonant, and the resulting *g1h2ei- is not only the basis of OCS žijati and Lith. žioti, but also of Lat. hiō (with addition of the suffix *-eh-).9

Presumably *g1h2ei- was considered a root already in PIE, since a nasal causative-factitive was formed by adding -n- to it, i.e., *g1h2i-n-/*g1h2n-: Hitt. kīnu (‘to open (up), break open’);10 PSl. *ziōnti (OS ziōnti, Scr. zōniti, Sl. zōniti) ‘to open (one’s mouth)’, On gīna ‘to gape, yawn’.

2.3. u-Noun

A u-noun *g1h2oi-u- ‘mouth’ was formed not from the root, to the original present stem: PT *koyan > TochA koyn, pl. koynuva ‘mouth’, TochA koy- ‘id.’ (loc. sg. koym ‘in the mouth’).11 PSlav. *zēvni ‘muzzle’ (CSlav. zěvni, Scr. zíjev).

Note that the fixed expression TochB koyn kakāyau is a figura etymologica, as already indicated by Adams 1999 s.v. koyn.

2.4. Denominal verb

The last part of this chain seems to be the verbal root *g1h2oiu- or *g1h2oiu- ‘to yawn’, which must be a denominal formation. The meaning ‘to yawn’ occasionally occurs in the forms mentioned above, but it is only with -u- in the root that the meaning is invariably ‘to yawn’ (except for some minor secondary developments). This is true for PSl. *zēvati (Ru. zevat’, Scr. zëvati, Sl. zevati with circumflex accentuation in the root), Lith. žiotauti, Latv. žiāt, TochA șew-, and also for PGmc. *gīwōn- (OHG gīwen, gewōn, MHG gewen, gewen, Du. geewen; only OE ge(o)wen has a secondary meaning ‘to long, ask for’).

Although all these formations share a formant -u- and the same meaning, their vocalism does not generally match. This is no doubt due to the influence of the i-present. We see it most clearly in Lith. žiotauti, which has evidently adopted the vocalism of žioti ‘to open (one’s mouth)’. The same is most probably true of Latv. žiāt, although the Latvian cognate of žioti is not preserved. Also in the case of TochA șew- ‘to yawn’ (only present 12 șew-iihi-), we have to assume some influence of the original verb: PIE *g1h2oiu- would have given TochA **kew-, so that the palatalization was secondary there. Since *g1h2iiu- ‘to live’

9 A similar analysis accounts for OCS ljati, 1sg. lējy ‘to pour’ < *l1h2ei- (for the root see Craig Melchert’s article elsewhere in this volume).

10 Kloekhorst (2010:215–6) has convincingly argued that the Hittite spellings of this verb point to *g1h2e-ne-.

11 For the vocalism cf. both TochA and TochB or ‘wood’ < *dorāv.

(foro which see below) was first metathesized to *g1h2ei- and then developed to *g1h2ebi- > TochB șebi- and finally to *g1h2ebi- > TochA șebi-, and we can surmise that a similar development took place in the zero-grade of the i-present *g1h2ei-/*g1h2i-C > *g1h2i-C > *g1h2i-C > PT *sāi-. From there the palatalized onset was adopted in TochA șew- Finally, the zero-grade vocalism of PGmc. *gīwōn- is likely to have been copied from the vocalism of PGmc. *g1-éjan- (OHG gīen ‘to yawn’).

3. PIE *sh1-i-’u- ‘to sew’

We can now try to analyze the Vedic verbs in -īv- from the viewpoint of the derivational chain mentioned above, i.e., -īH- > i-present > -u-noun > denominal verb. We start with sīv- ‘to sew’.

3.1. Root in -īH

The IE root *seH2- is represented in PIf. *sāH2- > Skt. sā- ‘to fasten, fetter’: root aor. sāt 3sg. inj. act. (RV+), ava-sāt 3sg. subj. (PS 4.15.6), vi ... sitam 2dn. impv. (RV), saum satām 3pl. impv. med. (PS 4.14.5); sātv- ‘bound’ (RV+), vi-sātv- ‘untied’ (RV+); ava-sātv- m. ‘liberator’ (RV) ~ Av. viiši ‘untied’; viiśāpa PN ‘(with loosened horses)’ < *a-sāH2-ta-; MP viśiṣādan ‘to let free’, etc. Although the connection between this root for ‘to fasten, fetter’ and Skt. sīv-/syā- seems obvious, it has never, to my knowledge, been proposed before.

3.2. i-Present

As is well known, the IE root *seH2- forms an i-present *sh1-i/*sh1-i- (for the reconstruction see Oettinger 2002:xxviii, 2004:400; Kloekhorst 2006, 2008:391): Hitt. 3sg. ši-ša-i-3, 3pl. ši-ši-an-zi ‘to bind, wrap; to obligate with, impose upon’, Cluw. 3pl. ši-ši-ža-an-ti ‘to bind’.12 In Skt. we find pres. *sāyati (RV+), only with prev. āva ‘to unharness’ and vi ‘to release (a knot), open (the lips)’ and the perfect ā ṭīṣāya, which exactly corresponds to OAv. ā-hiṣāla ‘holds fettered’. Since perfects are normally derived from the root, PIf. *si-sH2- was synchronically analyzed as a perfect to the root *sH2-; which led to the creation of derivatives like Skt. sētu- m. ‘bond, bridge’, YAv. haētu- m. ‘dam’, etc.13 The circumflex of Lith. sūtės, sūtās m. ‘tie’ also points to the reconstruction *sh1-i-.
which suggests a PIE date for this development (thus already Kloeckhorst 2008: 391).

In zero-grade, at least before a consonant, laryngeal metathesis took place:  

\[ *s\text{h}1\text{-}\text{i}-\text{C}- > *s\text{h}2\text{-i}-\text{C}-. \]

The root-final position of the laryngeal was then generalized in the full-grade, too:  

\[ *\text{sei}h2-\text{i} > *\text{sih}2-\text{i}. \]

It is possible that the causative-factitive Skt. *sinātī ‘to make fettered’ has been formed to the metathesized root *sīh2-. If the laryngeal *sīh2- ‘is depressed’ belongs here, this formation is likely to be of IE age.

It is important that the perfect, in contradistinction to the present, expresses a non-volitional action, over which the grammatical subject exercises no control; cf. RV 10.28.10a supārṇā itihā lakṣhāṇāṁ ā sīṣāyā ‘In this way, an eagle has (got)...

14 The root of PSlav. *sītō ‘snare, net’ (OCS sītô, Cz. sít, Pl. sítě, etc.) is likely to be circumflex, too. As pointed out to me by Prof. Körtlandt (p.c.), Sltv. siet’ clearly indicates that the original paradigm of this Slavic word was (b) (rather than (a), reconstructed by Derksen 2008:448). Together with Lith. sētās ‘cord’ and OHG sellā ‘cord’, these forms go back to *sī(ē)lōsām. If Gr. ἱός ‘song, hymn’ is derived from this root (cf. Beekes 2010:1057 with references), it would likewise point to *sīh2-ēlōsām.

15 The Indo-European laryngeal metathesis still awaits a monographic treatment. Important for its chronology are forms like Sltv. grēsūm- m. ‘summer, hot season’ (RV+)<*grēh2-sm(8)-h-<*grēh2-isi-sm(8)-h-o, lit. ‘heavy summer’, with the *sūryōc- treatment of the second member; Sltv. agra-i, f. ‘virgin, unmarried woman’ (RV+)<*ngg1-ra-h-<*ngg1-rh-uh-; and Gr. ἱπποκός ‘heavy, oppressive’, ἵππος ‘to be laden with, be full of’<*grēh2-ih(d(5)-h). (cf. Rasmussen 1989:95), which show that metathesis was at least anterior to vocalization of the resonants in separate languages.

The situation in Anatolian is not quite clear. The only strong evidence in favor of laryngeal metathesis in this branch is the pair Hitt. sūbēh₂-2sūbēh₂- and  Birdāq2-2Birdāq2-, both ‘to throw, scatter’ (see the discussion in Kloeckhorst 2008:773 and Melchert elsewhere in this volume, who further adds Hittite sūbas-<*fah₂- vs. C.Luw. lu-awaw-<*Väh₂-, both ‘to pour’, as yet another example of this metathesis, although the Luwian form seems to allow for other explanations). If the laryngeal metathesis is of pre-Anatolian age, we have to assume that formations like Hitt. išēgma-‘string, line’ are due to analogical restoration of the consonant order in ištāti ‘to bind’.

It is usually assumed that the metathesis only took place before a consonant, but it seems probable to me that it was operative in a prevocalic position, too. At least, I do not know of any evidence precluding this.

16 This generalization has not taken place everywhere: in Balto-Slavic, metathesis was analogically ‘undone’ whenever there was a model for it. Full-grade *sīth₂-ōr is found in Lith. sētīt, Latv. siet ‘to tie’ with the expected circumflex intonation, whereas zero-grade *sīh2-i-C- is reflected in PSlav. *sidō (b) ‘noose, snare’ (OCS sīlō, Ru. sīlō, Pl. sīlō) <*sīh2-ī-ślō; PSlav. *sīnō (b) (OCS sīt ‘twining’, Slm. sīt ‘rush’) <*sīh2-ī-śm (Derksen 2008:450–1). The fact that Hitt’s Law did not operate in these forms proves that the laryngeal preceded r at that stage.

His claw fettered,’’ 8.67.8a mā naḥ sētuh sīsed aivām ‘May this fetter not hold us fettered’; OAv. Y 29.1 amat usēmā hatasacā romū [aḥisūi]i dordā[cā] tuviścā ‘(For) the cruelty of fury and violence, of bondage and might, holds me in captivity’ (Insler 1975:29). In Indo-Iranian there are a number of formations that belong to the category of i-perfects and behave in a similar way. Those are briefly described in §9, the appendix below.

In Vedic, the nasal present sinātī (RV+; later sinōti JB+) functions as a causative to the perfect and means ‘to make fettered’.

3.3.  

The evidence for an old u-noun is rather weak here. We only have Skt. syū-, attested in two Yajurvedic mantras viṣṇoh syār asī (VS 5.21 + parallel passages) and indrasya syār asī (VS 5.30 + parallels), and traditionally glossed as ‘seam’ or ‘cord’ (cf. Schindler 1972:49f).

3.4. Denominative verb

The most important forms are Skt. śīv-śiyā, ‘to sew’: class IV present śīvatūt impv. (RV+), 2a-ptcl. syās- (RV+)<Khot. hīya ‘sewn stuff’, Oss. x’éyjnyx’śun ‘to sew’ ~ Goth. siyjan ‘to sew’; Lith. sītīti ‘to sew, tailor’; Latv. šīt, SČr. šīti ‘to sew’, etc. The meaning ‘to sew’ is universal and shows very little variation.

4. PIE *g’h2-i-n- ‘to live’

In my view, the verb for ‘to live’ can be analysed in exactly the same fashion, although it shows some peculiar features.

4.1. Root in -H

I would like to propose to start with the IE root *g’h2-ēh₂-, to be found in Gr. βόσκω ‘to feed, tend’, med. ‘to feed oneself’ (H.), ἵππος ‘fodder’, ἄρης ‘id.’, and in Lith. gitot ‘herd’ (*g’h2-ēh₂-ta-). The IE word for ‘cow’ (*g’h2ēh₂r<*g’h2-et-e) is also most probably a derivative of this root (Lubotsky 1990:133f).

4.2. i-Perfect

The only vestige of an original verbal i-formation in Indo-Iranian is YAv. jiyaśa <*jiyāiśe <*jiyaśe <*jiyāśa ‘to live’, dfv- ‘to play dice’ (Y 62.10 in a figura etymologica gaiya jiyaśa), which seems to point to the stem *gri-g’h2-ōr-. An i-present is further reflected in Arm. keam ‘to live’, Gr. βίομαι fut. med. ‘to stay alive’, Lith. gyti ‘to
which suggests a PIE date for this development (thus already Kloekhorst 2008:391).14

In zero-grade, at least before a consonant, laryngeal metathesis took place:

\[ \text{**st}_- \text{oi-l}_h^2-\text{i-C-} \]

The root-final position of the laryngeal was then generalized in the full-grade, too:

\[ \text{**seih}_2-\text{sih}_2-\text{-} \]

16 It is possible that the causative-factive Skt. *sināṭi ‘to make fettered’ has been formed to the metathesized root *sih-2. If *tochA sināṣṭār ‘is depressed’ belongs here, this formation is likely to be of IE age.

It is important that the perfect, in contradistinction to the present, expresses a non-volitional action, over which the grammatical subject exercises no control; cf. RV 10.28.10a *suparnā itthā nakham ā sīṣāya “In this way, an eagle has (got)

14 The root of PSlav. *śētn ‘snare, net’ (OCS šētn, Cz. šít, Pl. šiec, etc.) is likely to be circumflex, too. As pointed out to me by Prof. Korflund (p.c.), Sh. siet clearly indicates that the original paradigm of this Slavic word was (b) (rather than (a), reconstructed by Derksen 2008:448). Together with Lith. sētaus ‘cord’ and OHG seid 2n ‘cord’, these forms go back to *ṣv(ḥ)lōدن. If Gr. ἀφαν ‘song, hymn’ is derived from this root (cf. Beekes 2010:1057 with references), it would likewise point to *śh-2-l2.".

15 The Indo-European laryngeal metathesis still awaits a monographic treatment. Important for its chronology are forms like Skt. grā sadda-m. ‘summer, hot season’ (RV+) < *śṛḥ-ṣm(ḥ)-a- < *ṛh-h-ṣm(ḥ)-a-, lit. ‘heavy summer’, with the śvṛvyoć function of the second member; Skt. āgrā- f. ‘virgin, unmarried woman’ (RV+) < *ngṛṛ-ṛ-h- < *ngṛṛ-ṛ-ḥhkh-; and Gr. πηθος ‘heavy, oppressive’, ἰπήθο ‘to be laden with, be full of’ < *ṛh-ṛ-dh(ḥ)k-. (cf. Rasmussen 1989:95), which show that metathesis was at least anterior to vocalization of the resonants in separate languages.

The situation in Anatolian is not quite clear. The only strong evidence in favor of laryngeal metathesis in this branch is the pair Hitt. šubhasi̱-šubh- and ʾiḫqai-ʾiḫḫw, both ‘to throw, scatter’ (see the discussion in Kloekhorst 2008:773 and Melchert elsewhere in this volume, who further adds Hittite šūba- < *foh₂-p₂- vs. CLev. šu-aw-a < šaḥ₂-r₂- both ‘to pour’, as yet another example of this metathesis, although the Luvian form seems to allow for other explanations). If the laryngeal metathesis is of pre-Anatolian age, we have to assume that formations like Hitt. ʾiḫḫman- ‘string, line’ are due to analogical restoration of the consonant order in šubh₂ ‘to bind’.

It is usually assumed that the metathesis only took place before a consonant, but it seems probable to me that it was operative in a prevocalic position, too. At least, I do not know of any evidence precluding this.

16 This generalization has not taken place everywhere: in Balto-Slavic, metathesis was analogically “undone” whenever there was a model for it. Full-grade *šh₂-2-2- is found in Lith. šītē, Latv. siet ‘to tie’ with the expected circumflex intonation, whereas zero-grade *śh₂-2-C- is reflected in PSlav. *śilō (b) ‘noose, snare’ (OCS šilō, Ru. sīlo, Pl. sílo) < *śh₂-2-p₂lām; PSlav. *śilō (b) (OCS. sīt ‘twinning’, Sm. sīt ‘rush’) < *śh₂-2-tām (Derksen 2008:450-1). The fact that Hitt.’s Law did not operate in these forms proves that the laryngeal preceded r at that stage.

his claw fettered,” 8.67.8a mà naḥ sētuḥ sīset ayām “May this fetter not hold us fettered”; OAh. Y 29.1 āmā ačkimā hataucā roṃō [aḥišiṣāi dora(z)ã] bauiaucā “(For) the cruelty of fury and violence, of bondage and might, holds me in captivity” (Insler 1975:29). In Indo-Iranian there are a number of formations that belong to the category of i-perfects and behave in a similar way. Those are briefly described in §9, the appendix below.

In Vedic, the nasal present *sināṭi (RV+; later sinosti JB+) functions as a causative to the perfect and means ‘to make fettered’.

3.3. u-Noun

The evidence for an old u-noun is rather weak here. We only have Skt. syū-, attested in two Yajurvedic mantras viṣṇuḥ syār asi (VS 5.21 + parallel passages) and indrasya syār asi (VS 5.30 + parallels), and traditionally glossed as ‘seam’ or ‘cord’ (cf. Schindler 1972:49f).

3.4. Denominal verb

The most important forms are Skt. sīv-syū- ‘to sew’: class IV present sīvyatu impv. (RV+), ta-pnc. sīvā (RV+) ~ Khot. hyya ‘sewn stuff’, Oss. xyyynh/syajun ‘to sew’ ~ Goth. sīyjan ‘to sew’; Lith. sītū ‘to sew, tailor’; Latv. sīt, SCr. šīt ‘to sew’, etc. The meaning ‘to sew’ is universal and shows very little variation.

4. PIE *g'h₂-i-u- ‘to live’

In my view, the verb for ‘to live’ can be analysed in exactly the same fashion, although it shows some peculiar features.

4.1. Root in -H

I would like to propose to start with the IE root *g‘eh₂-, to be found in Gr. βόσκω ‘to feed, tend’, med. ‘to feed oneself’ (H1), βόσκς ‘fodder’, βοτάν ‘id.’, and in Lith. giotas ‘herd’ (*g‘eh₂-ta-). The IE word for ‘cow’ (*g‘eh₂-st-/*g‘eh₂-eur-) is also most probably a derivative of this root (cf. Lubotsky 1990:133f).

4.2. i-Perfect

The only vestige of an original verbal i-formation in Indo-Iranian is YAv. jiyādāsa < *jiyaiaiže< 2sg, pf. opt. med. ‘to live’ (Y 62.10 in a figura etymologica gauia jiyādās), which seems to point to the stem *g‘i*-g‘h₂-ur-. An i-present is further reflected in Arm. kaem ‘to live’, Gr. βεομι fut. med. ‘to stay alive’, Lith. gyži ‘to
become healthy, heal, live’, OCS *žiti ‘to heal, live’. The e-vocalism in Gr. βοσκει and Arm. keam can easily be restored, whereas the reconstruction *gʰh₁rei- may account for the lack of palatalization in Armenian (cf. Kortlandt 1975a; the non-palatalized β in Greek may be an Aeolism). The laryngeal metathesis in the zero-grade, here again, yielded an awkward paradigm: *gʰh₁rei-/ *gʰh₁reι-C > *gʰh₂rei-/ *gʰrh₂-C,18 but, unlike the cases we have discussed above, the problem was partly resolved in a different fashion. In Balto-Slavic the laryngeal metathesis was simply undone at some point—the usual procedure in this language branch (cf. n16)—and *gʰh₂/C was restored, which explains the stressed forms such as Ru. žila f. ‘lived’ and mobility in Lith. gyvas (3) ‘alive’ (Kortlandt 1975b:3). In Greek, and in some other languages too, the order of the elements in the zero-grade *gʰh₁rei- was introduced into the full-grade *gʰh₂rei-, which led to a new full-grade *gʰrieh₁r. This full-grade *gʰrieh₁r must be responsible for the Greek adjective ζωος ‘alive’, for the present ζύω ‘to live’, and for OAv. jūttę- m. ‘life’.19

The original meaning of the i-present was probably ‘to subsist’ or ‘to feed’, as follows from many nominal derivatives meaning ‘food’; cf. OCS žito ‘corn, fruits’, OPr. gepyte (EV), geits (Ench.) ‘bread’; W bneyd ‘food, meat’, etc. Cf. further Skt. gāya- m. ‘house, household, property’, Av. gādēk- f. ‘household, world’, OP gāthā f. ‘livestock, cattle’, ORU. goi m. ‘peace, friendship’, OCS. hof ‘abundance’, Slн. gõj m. ‘care, cultivation’, SCr. gojiti ‘to fatten, foster, raise’, Slн. goji ‘to foster, feed’; Bulg. gojá ‘to fatten’, and also Gr. βρός m. ‘mode of life, livelihood, subsistence’, βροτός m. ‘way of life, sustenance’. These derivatives strongly indicate a connection with the root of Gr. βροσκο.

Sanskrit further attests a nasal causative-factitive jināyi 2sg. (RV 5.84.1), later thematicized to jīvanī (RV +) ‘to impel, feed, strengthen’. The pair pf. YAv. jīyaēśa : Skt. jināsī is reminiscent of the pair sīsāya : sīnātī/sinoti, which we have discussed in §3.2.

17 As with Skt. sīsāya and OAv. dīhātāsā, the meaning ‘to stay alive, to heal’ presupposes a role of experimenter for the subject: ‘there is subsistence, life to him’.

18 The metathesized root *gʰrieh₁r is, inter alia, responsible for Greek formations like βρός < *gʰrieh₁r-βροτός < *gʰre₂h₁-βροτό ‘life’ and probably for the aor. ἐβίων < *gʰre₂h₁-εβίον (cf. Klein 1988:268).

19 Skt. jīvāt ‘life’ eventually goes back to PIlr. *fiūbih-, too, but has been reshaped after the adjective jīvāk. The mobile accentuation in Balto-Slavic (PSL. *žína, Lith. gyvas (3), Latv. dzīvs; see Derksen 2008:564) shows that, in this branch, the laryngeal preceded i at the time of Hirt’s Law (cf. already Kortlandt 1975b:3). On the other hand, Lith. sūt tin ‘to sew, tailor’, Latv. šūt, SCr. šūt, etc. ‘to sew’ have fixed stress, which means that the metathesis *sh₂ju-C > *suhi-C did take place in Balto-Slavic. We may conclude that the SBl word for ‘alive’ has taken over the root shape of the i-present Lith. gyti/OCS žiti (see the previous section).21 The reason why metathesis was not analogically undone in the verb for ‘to sew’ is that its connection with *sh₂ju-i-/*sh₂-j-i was lost because of the divergent meaning.

Greek too has generalized the vocalism of the present, which accounts for the form ζοος ‘alive’. 4.4. Denominal verb

The verb for ‘to live’ is very well attested in the IE languages. It is everywhere thematic and shows little variation in meaning: Skt. śvafety (RV +), OAv. juvāmāhī 1pl., OP śvā 2sg. impv., Lat. vīvō, OCS žīva, OP. gūvasi 2sg., etc. Denominal verbs that are simple thematic, without a specific denominal suffix, are admittedly rare, but not unknown: for instance, Skt. dyūtate ‘to shine’ is clearly derived from the noun dyūt- f. ‘shine’ (RV +), vi-dyūt- f. ‘lightning’ (RV +).

5. PIE *dh₂j-i-u- ‘to gamble’

Before embarking upon a search for an etymology of Skt. dīv- ‘to play dice, gamble’, which has no cognates outside of Sanskrit, let me briefly explain the rules of Vedic dicing (for a detailed account I refer the reader to Falk 1986). Without counting, every player grabs with two hands a large amount of small

18 The short vowel in Gothic is due to Dybo’s pretonic shortening (cf. Kortlandt 1981:207-35).

21 As shown by forms like Lith. mini < *-il vs. OCS muni(th) < *-ei, ablaut alternation in the suffix was preserved in Balto-Slavic i-presents for a long time.
become healthy, heal, live', OCS žiti 'to heal, live'. The e-vocalism in Gr. βόσκων and Arm. keam can easily be restored, whereas the reconstruction *gʰr'yei- may account for the lack of palatalization in Armenian (cf. Kortlandt 1975a; the non-palatalized β in Greek may be an Aeolism). The laryngeal metathesis in the zero-grade, here again, yielded an awkward paradigm: *gʰr'yei-/*gʰr'yei-C > *gʰr'yei-/*gʰr'yei-C.18 but, unlike the cases we have discussed above, the problem was partly resolved in a different fashion. In Balto-Slavic the laryngeal metathesis was simply undone at some point—the usual procedure in this language branch (cf. n16)—and *gʰr'yei- was restored, which explains the stressed forms such as Ru. žilā f. 'lived' and mobility in Lith. gyvas (3) ‘alive’ (Kortlandt 1975b:3). In Greek, and in some other languages too, the order of the elements in the zero-grade *gʰr'yei- was introduced into the full-grade *gʰr'yei-, which led to a new full-grade *gʰr'yei-. This full-grade *gʰr'yei- must be responsible for the Greek adjective ζωός ‘alive’, for the present ζωό ‘to live’, and for OAv. jīūt-ta-etc. ‘life’.19

The original meaning of the i-present was probably 'to subsist' or 'to feed', as follows from many nominal derivatives meaning 'food': cf. OCS žito ‘corn, fruits’, OPr. geitye (EV), geits (Ench.) ‘bread’; W bnyd ‘food, meat’, etc. Cf. further Skt. gāyā m. ‘house, household, property’, Av. gaētha- etc. ‘household, world’, OPr. gadihā f. ‘livestock, cattle’, OPr. goi m. ‘peace, friendship’, OCz. hof ‘abundance’, Sln. goj m. ‘care, cultivation’, SCr. gōjī ‘to fatten, foster, raise’, Sln. goji ‘to foster, feed’; Bulg. gojā ‘to fatten’, and also Gr. βλός m. ‘mode of life, livelihood, subsistence’, βλόρος m. ‘way of life, sustenance’. These derivatives strongly indicate a connection with the root of Gr. βλέπο.

Sanskrit further attests a nasal causative-factitive jināyi 2sg. (RV 5.84.1), later thematicized to jināvali (RV+) ‘to impel, feed, strengthen’. The pair pf. YAv. jīyača: Skt. jīnāpi is reminiscent of the pair sīsāya: sīnātis/nosoti, which we have discussed in §3.2.

17 As with Skt. sīsāya and OAv. dā-hítāsā, the meaning ‘to stay alive, to heal’ presupposes a role of experiences for the subject: ‘there is subsistence, life to him’.

18 The metathesized root *gʰr'yei- is, inter alia, responsible for Greek formations like βλός < *gʰr'yei-o-; βλόρος < *gʰr'yei-o-tos- ‘life’ and probably for the aor. ĺliwos < *gʰr'yei-čh-r- (cf. Klein 1988:268).

19 Skt. jīvyā ‘life’ eventually goes back to PPr. *jīvaHtā-, too, but has been reshaped after the adjective jīvā.

4.3. u-Noun

The “u-noun” in this particular case is a thematic adjective with the meaning ‘alive’, active” (Skt. ḍvā- (RV+) ~ Av. jūa-, OP ḍvā- ~ Lat. vivus, Goth. qius). OCS žvns, Lith. gyvas, etc. (< *gʰjat-u-o-). It can hardly be a coincidence that this is the only adjective in this category of u-nouns and, at the same time, the only thematic derivative. The thematicization must have been very early (type *udr- ‘water’; *udr-o- ‘water-animal [lit. watery]).

The mobile accentuation in Balto-Slavic (PSL *žvns (c), Lith. gyvas (3), Latv. dzīvs; see Derksen 2008:564) shows that, in this branch, the laryngeal preceded i at the time of Hirt’s Law (cf. already Kortlandt 1975b:3). On the other hand, Lith. šūti ‘to sew, tailor’, Latv. šūt, SCr. šūt, etc. ‘to sew’ have fixed stress, which means that the metathesis *sh₂jui-C > *šjui-C did take place in Balto-Slavic. We may conclude that the BSI word for ‘alive’ has taken over the root shape of the i-present Lith. gyti/OCS žiti (see the previous section).21 The reason why metathesis was not analogically undone in the verb for ‘to sew’ is that its connection with *sh₂jui-/*sh₂j is lost because of the divergent meaning.

Greek too has generalized the vocalism of the present, which accounts for the form ζωός ‘alive’.

4.4. Denominal verb

The verb for ‘to live’ is very well attested in the IE languages. It is everywhere thematic and shows little variation in meaning: Skt. ḍvati (RV+); OAv. jūmādāti 1pl.; OP ḍvā 2sg. impv., Lat. vivō, OCS žvpi, OPr. gūvasi 2sg., etc.

Denominal verbs that are simple thematic, without a specific denominal suffix, are admittedly rare, but not unknown: for instance, Skt. dyātate ‘to shine’ is clearly derived from the noun dyāt- f. ‘shine’ (RV+), vi-dyāt- f. ‘lightning’ (RV+).

5. PIE *dh₂j-u- ‘to gamble’

Before embarking upon a search for an etymology of Skt. ḍiv- ‘to play dice, gamble’, which has no cognates outside of Sanskrit, let me briefly explain the rules of Vedic dicing (for a detailed account I refer the reader to Falk 1986). Without counting, every player grabs with two hands a large amount of small...
vibhādaka nuts out of a huge pile (containing at least 150 nuts). Then he returns to his place and arranges his portion in rows of four. If, at the end, no nuts are left (that is, if the number of nuts is divisible by four), he is the winner. If only a single nut is left over \((4n + 1)\), he is the loser, the “dog.”

5.1. Root in -H

Since Vedic dicing basically involves dividing the nuts into rows, it becomes attractive to start with the IE root \(\ast\text{deh}_2\)-, attested in Skt. dā- ‘to divide, distribute, cut’ (root aor. avādār [MS+], dīṣya 2sg. impv. med. [VS+]; ta-ptic. (nir-)jāva-īta-[KS+]) and in Gr. ὀδόξομαι ‘to distribute’.

5.2. i-Present

The IE root \(\ast\text{deh}_2\)- has a well-established i-present \(\ast\text{dh}_2\text{-eic-}\)*, found in Skt. dāvate med. (RV+) (< PIE \(\ast\text{dh}_2\text{-eic-}\)) ‘to divide, distribute, cut’ and aya-dyāti (YY+) ‘id.’, as well as in Gr. ὀδόξει to ‘divide’.

5.3. u-Noun

A u-noun \(\ast\text{dh}_2\text{-i-}\) can be identified with Skt. dīv-īdyā- f. ‘gambling, play’ (RV dat. dīvē, loc. dīvī, ÍŚ ak. dyīvam, dat. dyūve), which may also be the basis of pratidvīna- m. ‘adversary at play’ (dat. -dīvē RV, AV).

5.4. Denominal verb

Finally we arrive at our denominal verb Skt. dīv- ‘to play dice, gamble’ (RV+); class IV present dīvyah 2sg. inj. (RV+), i-s-aor. dāvīsāni 1sg. subj. (RV), pf. didēvā (AV), ta-ptic. dyūdā-, also n. ‘game’ (AV+). This verb has no cognates outside Sanskrit.

6. PIE \(\ast\text{spēh}_1\text{-u-} ‘to spit’

In the case of the verb for ‘to spit’, an explanation along similar lines seems more speculative but still quite feasible.

6.1. Root in -H

We start with the root \(\ast\text{speh}_1\)-. This root is often glossed in the literature as ‘to succeed, prosper’, but in view of Hittite ispā, ispājanz ‘be satiated’, its original meaning was rather ‘to be full to the rim’. Here are some of its derivatives: Hitt. ispān ‘satiation’; Skt. sphātī- f. ‘abundance’ (RV+), gaya-sphāna- adj. ‘producing domestic abundance’ (RV); Oss. afsadyniefsadanus ‘to nourish’, Sariq. spon-

‘to fill, replenish’, Yzgh. s\(\ast\text{spān-} ‘to saturate’ (cf. Cheung 2007:350); OE spēwan ‘to prosper, succeed’; OCS spēti ‘to succeed’, Ru. speti ‘to ripen; to manage’; Lith. spėti ‘to be in time; to guess’, etc. It is conceivable that YAv. spāma- ‘spit, saliva’ (V 6.7, 29) is also derived from this root, especially in view of the analysis proposed below.

6.2. i-Present

The i-present to the root \(\ast\text{speh}_1\)- has been reconstructed by Kloekhorst (2006:115, 2008 s.v.) on the basis of Hittite ispā, ispājanz ‘to be satiated’ as \(\ast\text{spēh}_1\text{-oi-} / \ast\text{spēh}_1\text{-i-}\). This reconstruction immediately accounts for the Sanskrit class IV present sphāyā (sphāyatai 3sg. subj. med. PS 8.11.11+); it explains both the aspiration of \(-ph\)- otherwise unexplained—and the long vowel, which must then be due to Brugmann’s Law. The present formant has early become incorporated into the root, which led to forms like Skt. sphāyate 3sg. med. (Śāmacidh 3.3.1) and sphā-ta-spēha- ‘complete, not lacking anything’ (MS+).

As suggested to me by Michiel de Vaan, the Indo-European word for ‘foam, froth’ is likely to be a derivative of this “new” root with an \(i\)-enlargement, if we assume that its original meaning was ‘overflow, something that overflows’. There is some vacillation in the position of the laryngeal, which is typical for i-presents and their derivatives; cf. the following forms:

Skt. pēchā- m. ‘foam, froth’ (RV+), NP ṛṇ ‘snot’, ṛnāk ‘sea foam’, Oss. ṛṇkiknāke ‘foam’ point to PIr. *pHāna-;

OPr. spōeyno ‘foam (of fermenting beer)’, Lith. spānė ‘foam (on waves)’, OCS pēna, Ru. pēna, SCr. plēna, spēna (Dalm.) ‘foam’ point to BSl. *sypēna? (Derksen 2008:397; *(s)pyēnā? seems also possible);

OEE sân, OGH Gēin m. ‘foam’ < PGmc. *gūma- and Lat. spāna f. ‘foam’ are ambiguous as far as the position of the laryngeal is concerned.

Because of *m- in Germanic and Latin, it is attractive to assume that we are dealing with an original masculine derivative with the suffix *-men- (cf., for a parallel, Skt. budhnu- m. ‘bottom, ground, depth’, OFr. bodem ‘bottom’, Gr. νοῦξ- m. ‘ground, basis’ < PIE *bʰudm>-men- ) and to reconstruct *(s)phēm-men-. This variation *(s)phēm-\(i\)-*(s)phēm- could have arisen through paradigmatic levelling (after laryngeal metathesis in the zero-grade *(s)phēm-\(m\)- > *(s)phēm-\(i\)-\(m\)) or be due to the influence of the verb.

---

22 Cf. also Khot. spair- (spvē-, spar-) ‘to satisfy; be satisfied’. 
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vibǎɗaka nuts out of a huge pile (containing at least 150 nuts). Then he returns to his place and arranges his portion in rows of four. If, at the end, no nuts are left (that is, if the number of nuts is divisible by four), he is the winner. If only a single nut is left over \((4n + 1)\), he is the loser, the "dog."

5.1. Root in -H

Since Vedic dicing basically involves dividing the nuts into rows, it becomes attractive to start with the IE root \(*deh₂-\), attested in Skt. dā- 'to divide, distribute, cut' (root aor. avādā[MS+], divṣa 2sg. impv. med. [VS+]; ta-ptic. (nir-)yāva-ita-[KS+]) and in Gr. διάτεκα to 'distrubute'.

5.2. i-Present

The IE root \(*deh₂-\) has a well-established i-present \(*dh₁-i-u-\), found in Skt. dāyate med. (RV+) (< PIE \(*dh₂-ei-\) 'to divide, distribute, cut' and av-a-ḥāti (YV+) 'id.', as well as in Gr. διάτεκα to 'divide'.

5.3. u-Noun

A u-noun \(*dh₁-i-u-\) can be identified with Skt. dīv-ḏi-ya- f. 'gambling, play' (RV dat. dīvē, loc. dīvē, SS acc. dīvāṃ, dat. dyuve), which may also be the basis of pratidivam- m. 'adversary at play' (dat. -dvīne RV, AV).

5.4. Denominal verb

Finally we arrive at our denominal verb Skt. dīv- 'to play dice, gamble' (RV+): class IV present dīvyah 2sg. inj. (RV+), iš-aor. davāsāni 1sg. subj. (RV), pf. didīva (AV), ta-ptic. dyāu-, also n. 'game' (AV+). This verb has no cognates outside Sanskrit.

6. PIE \(*spḥ₁-i-u-\) ‘to spit’

In the case of the verb for ‘to spit’, an explanation along similar lines seems more speculative but still quite feasible.

6.1. Root in -H

We start with the root \(*spēh₁-\). This root is often glossed in the literature as ‘to succeed, prosper’, but in view of Hittite išpāi, īspājani ‘to be satiated’, its original meaning was rather ‘to be full to the rim’. Here are some of its derivatives: Hitt. išpān ‘satiation’; Skt. śphātī- f. ‘abundance’ (RV+), gavya-śphāna- adj. ‘producing domestic abundance’ (RV); Oss. afsadyn/fasadan ‘to nourish’, Sariq. spon-
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‘to fill, replenish’, Yzgh. s(s)pān- ‘to saturate’, \(cf\). Cheung 2007:350; OE spōwan ‘to prosper, succeed’; OCS spēti ‘to succeed’, Ru. speť ‘to ripen; to manage’; Lith. spėti ‘to be in time; to guess’, etc. It is conceivable that YAv. spūma- ‘spit, saliva’ (V 6.7, 29) is also derived from this root, especially in view of the analysis proposed below.

6.2. i-Present

The i-present to the root \(*spēh₁-\) has been reconstructed by Kloekhorst (2006:115, 2008 s.v.) on the basis of Hittite išpāi, īspājani ‘to be satiated’ as \(*spēh₁-oī-\) \(*spēh₁-i-\). This reconstruction immediately accounts for the Sanskrit class IV present spāy(ha) (spāyātai 3sg. subj. med. PS 8.11.11+);\(^{22}\) it explains both the aspiration of -spḥ that otherwise unexplained—and the long vowel, which must then be due to Brugmann’s Law. The present formant has early become incorporated into the root, which led to forms like Skt. spāyate 3sg. med. (Sāmavīdabha 3.3.1) and sām-sphāta- ‘complete, not lacking anything’ (MS+).

As suggested to me by Michiel de Vaan, the Indo-European word for ‘foam, froth’ is likely to be a derivative of this ‘new’ root with an i-enlargement, if we assume that its original meaning was ‘overflow, something that overflows’. There is some vacillation in the position of the laryngeal, which is typical for i-presents and their derivatives; cf. the following forms:

Skt. pṛēṇa- m. ‘foam, froth’ (RV+), Np. fīn ‘snout’, finak ‘sea foam’, Oss. ynk ūnke ‘foam’ point to PIr. *pHainā-;

Opr. sponugno ‘foam (of fermenting beer)’, Lith. spūina ‘foam (on waves)’, OCS pūna, Ru. pěna, ScR. pěna, spjēna (Dalm.) ‘foam’ point to BSl. *spjēna? (Derksen 2008:397, *spjēna? seems also possible);

OE fīn n., OHG jīn m. ‘foam’ < PGmc. *faima- and Lat. spuma f. ‘foam’ are ambiguous as far as the position of the laryngeal is concerned.

Because of -m- in Germanic and Latin, it is attractive to assume that we are dealing with an original masculine derivative with the suffix *-men- (cf., for a parallel, Skt. budhumā m. ‘bottom, ground, depth’, Ořf. bōdun ‘bottom’, Gr. ἄλης m. ‘ground, basis’ < PIE *bhadm-en- and to reconstruct *spōh₁-men-. This vacillation *spōh₁-en/*spōh₁-en- could have arisen through paradigmatic levelling (after laryngeal metathesis in the zero-grade *spōh₁-m> *spūh₁-m) or be due to the influence of the verb.

\(^{22}\) Cf. also Khot. spair- (spair-, spair-) ‘to satisfy; be satisfied’. 
6.3. *-Noun

In parallel to -*ī*-roots, discussed above, we must look for a *u*-stem *(s)phī-ur-. This noun may be reflected in Armenian *t'uk* ‘spit, saliva’ (cf. Martirosyan 2010:298), if its irregular onset is due to labial dissimilation *phiu- > *thiu-.

6.4. Denominal verb

There are a few minor problems with reconstructing the IE verb for ‘to spit’, but the available evidence is perfectly compatible with the reconstruction *spīeuH-. Outside of Sanskrit, all the other branches point to *(s)phuHu-/*(s)piHuH-, which can eventually go back to *(s)phiu-: Gr. *πυεο-, Lat. *spuātum, Goth. *spuian, Lith. *spiauti, Latv. *spiauti, OCS pjuvati, lsg. pjuvo, etc. The deviating onset of the Sanskrit root *ṣṭh-/*ṣṭh- (pratvāṣṭhitvan 3pl. impf. AV, *ṣṭhyāta- SB+I) presents three problems: (1) why retroflex, (2) why aspirated, and (3) why dental? A good illustration of the treatment of these problems is LIV:584, where Kümmel reconstructs the PIE root as *spīeuH- and writes: “Alt nur mit i endenden Präverbien, daher immer *ṣṭh für *ṣṭh. Ist wegen ved. *ṭh grundsprachliches *spθ anzusetzen (wogegen das Gr. spricht) oder mit erst sekundärer onomato-poietischer Aspiration (Spuckgeräusch) zu rechnen?”

Ad (1): Indeed, as is repeatedly pointed out (cf. AiGr. 1:236), the initial retroflex *ṣḍh- of the Skt. root is likely to be due to the combination with the preverbs abhi, práti, and especially nīṣ, which last is particularly fitting semantically (‘to spit out’).

Ad (2): It does not seem attractive to invoke onomato-poietic distortions in Sanskrit in order to account for aspiration, because the correspondences elsewhere are quite regular. There are two ways—not mutually exclusive—to explain *ṭh. First, we can assume that the aspiration comes from the verb *spīhu*- (through the mediation of the unattested r-stem). For the second, see immediately below.

There is yet another possible *u*-noun to this root, i.e., Skt. *pīva-, f. *pīvaīr- ‘fat’, Gr. *πυεο, f. *πηρι ‘fat, fertile, rich’, *ṣṭρ n. ‘fat, tallow’, Skt. *piθu-, YAv. *pyānt-, n. ‘fat, tallow’. From the point of view of meaning, the words for ‘fat’ belong here rather than with the verbal root for ‘to yield milk’, which is discussed below in §9.1. Laryngeal metathesis (*phθq- > *phθq-pr) is likely to be of Proto-Indo-European age (see n15), so that the absence of aspiration in Sanskrit is not surprising. Since the word for ‘fat’ had no initial r-, its connection with the verb ‘to overflow, be abundant’ was not felt any longer, and the aspirated stop of the verb was not restored. However, in view of its meaning, the word for ‘fat’ cannot be the source of the verbal root *(s)phiu- ‘to spit’. Presumably, when the connection of *(s)phiu- ‘fat’ with the verb was lost, a new *r*-derivative was formed, this time with the meaning ‘overflow, spit, saliva’ (= ‘mouth foam’, parallel to *(s)phvaj-o-men- ‘Foam’).

Ad (3): LIV solves the problem of the Skt. dental by reconstructing the IE root as *(s)piH-, but it is hard to get rid of this *t in all the other languages. Usually scholars explain Skt. *t by dissimilation of *(s)p to *(s)t (cf. Mayrhofer KEWA III:409), but this explanation too is not without problems. Our handbooks report that Skt. *(s)p is often dissimilated in the neighborhood of other labials, and the product of this dissimilation is either k or r (cf. Hoffmann 1963:13f. with references). Nevertheless, the best examples show k: *klomān- m. ‘lung’ < *pleu-mon- (Gr. πανάκομον m. ‘id.’), kṣu-mānts- ‘rich in cattle’ < *plu-ment- (YAv. *fōmnanta- ‘id.’), takman- m. ‘fever’ < *tep-mon- (cf. YAv. *taphnān- n. ‘fever’). We find a dental only at the end of the stem in kakādmanta- ‘having a hump’ (RV; beside kakān-mant- VS) for *kakābd(h)mant-, where the two velars in the stem may have prevented dissimilation to a velar, and in adbhīthi instr. pl., adbhīthāh dat. pl. of āp- ‘water’, where the -d- is likely to be analogical (cf. AiGr. 1:180 + Nachträge). It is clear that a dental reflex is late and analogical in Sanskrit.


Consequently, dissimilation of p in Pihr. *spīHu-/*spīuH- must rather have yielded *skiH-/*skiiH-. If this happened sufficiently early, the k was affected by palatalization, and the new group *-sC- may have phonetically given *ṣC. As I have argued elsewhere (Lubotsky 2001), Pihr. *ṣC first became *sc and eventually yielded Skt. ch [ś]. In a cluster of s + ch [ś], the second sibilant can easily become dissimilated, which would give *ṣ in all the other languages.

7. PIE *(s)miH-i-u- ‘to move’?

In the case of Skt. *viH- and its cognates, the schema *-H + i-present + -u-noun + denominal verb is not readily available. The root *(s)miH-/*muH- (-*muH- itself is quite rare in Indo-Iranian. As is often the case with verbs of movement,
6.3. u-Noun

In parallel to -v-roots, discussed above, we must look for a u-stem *sphii-ui-. This noun may be reflected in Armenian t’uk ‘spit, saliva’ (cf. Martirosyan 2010:298), if its irregular onset is due to labial dissimilation *phiu- > *ttiu-.

6.4. Denominal verb

There are a few minor problems with reconstructing the IE verb for ‘to spit’, but the available evidence is perfectly compatible with the reconstruction *sphii-ui-. Outside of Sanskrit, all the other branches point to *(s)phliu-/*(s)pliuH-, which can eventually go back to *(s)phiu-. Gr. πύθω, Lat. spuīō/spūtum, Goth. spreīan, Lith. spūtai, Latv. spūtai, OCS pļūvai, lsg. pļūjo, etc. The deviating onset of the Sanskrit root sfih/-sfhyi- (pratyskhyiavan 3pl. impf. AV+, -sfhyiata- SB+) presents three problems: (1) why reflexes, (2) why aspirated, and (3) why dental? A good illustration of the treatment of these problems is LIV:854, where Kümmel reconstructs the PIE root as *spiyegH- and writes: “Allt nur mit i endenden Präverben, daher immer sfi für sth. Ist wegen ved. th grundsprachliches *spth anzusetzen (wogegen das Gr. spricht) oder mit erst sekundärer onomato-

etischer Aspiration (Spuckgeräusch) zu rechnen?”

Ad (1): Indeed, as is repeatedly pointed out (cf. AIGr. 1:236), the initial reflex sfiH- of the Skt. root is likely to be due to the combination with the preverbs adhi, prāti, and especially nīs, which last is particularly fitting semantically (‘to spit out’).

Ad (2): It does not seem attractive to invoke onomatopoetic distortions in Sanskrit in order to account for aspiration, because the correspondences elsewhere are quite regular. There are two ways—not mutually exclusive—to explain th. First, we can assume that the aspiration comes from the verb sphāya- (through the mediation of the unattested r-stem). For the second, see immediately below.

There is yet another possible u-noun to this root, i.e., Skt. pīvan-, p. pīvar- ‘fat’, Gr. πυθω, f. pīwōn ‘fat, fertile, rich’, tāpt n. ‘fat, tallow’, Skt. pīnas- n., YAv. pīnava- n. ‘fat, tallow’. From the point of view of semantics, the words for ‘fat’ belong here rather than with the verbal root for ‘to yield milk’, which is discussed below in §9.1. Laryngeal metathesis (*phhi-g > *phgh-gr) is likely to be of Proto-Indo-European age (see n15), so that the absence of aspiration in Sanskrit is not surprising. Since the word for ‘fat’ had no initial r, its connection with the verb ‘to overflow, be abundant’ was not felt any longer, and the aspirated stop of the verb was not restored. However, in view of its meaning, the word for ‘fat’ cannot be the source of the verbal root *sphii-ui- ‘to spit’. Presumably, when the connection of *phghi- ‘fat’ with the verb was lost, a new r-derivative was formed, this time with the meaning ‘overflow, spittle, saliva’ (= ‘mouth foam’, parallel to *(b)jih-oh-men- ‘foam’).

Ad (3): LIV solves the problem of the Skt. dental by reconstructing the IE root as *spiyegH-, but it is hard to get rid of this t in all the other languages. Usually scholars explain Skt. t by dissimilation of *p to *t (cf. Mayrhofer KEWA III:409), but this explanation too is not without problems. Our handbooks report that Skt. *p is often dissimilated in the neighborhood of other labials, and the product of this dissimilation is either k or t (cf. Hoffmann 1963:35f. with references). Nevertheless, the best examples show k: klomān- m. ‘lung’ < *pleu-mon- (Gr. πλωμον μ. ‘id.’), kṣa-manta- ‘rich in cattle’ (< *plu-ment- (YAv. fśmánt- ‘id.’), takman- m. ‘fever’ < *tep-mon- (cf. YAv. tāfnah- n. ‘fever’). We find a dental only at the end of the stem in kakādman- ‘having a hump’ (RV; beside kakān-mant- VS) for *kakah(h)mant-<, where the two velars in the stem may have prevented dissimilation to a velar, and in advhih instr. pl., adhvihāh dat. pl. of ṣp- ‘water’, where the -d- is likely to be analogical (cf. AIGr. 1:180 + Nachträge). It is clear that a dental reflex is late and analogical in Sanskrit.24

In Iranian also, dissimilation of labials seems to result in a velar, if we accept Hoffmann’s attractive explanation (Hoffmann 1965:238 = 1975:338) of Plr. *daxma- ‘grave’ (YAv. daxma- m., Sogd. (Buddh.) dyvyn, MParth. dhm γαμαμ γαμμα ‘tomb’, Bactr. gagency(α) ‘grave’, kagyγy ‘place of burial’) as assimilated from *dauyna- and thus related to Gr. ἡπάτα ‘to bury’ and Arm. damban ‘tomb’. Skjervøy’s etymology (2005) of Av. vañna- ‘hymn’ as assimilated from *vafa- ‘weaving’ points in the same direction.

Consequently, dissimilation of p in Plr. *spiliH-/*spiH- must rather have yielded *shliH-/*skiH-. If this happened sufficiently early, the k was affected by palatalization, and the new group *sc- may have phonetically given sfi. As I have argued elsewhere (Lubotsky 2001), Plr. *sc first became *sc and eventually yielded Skt. ch (ś). In a cluster of s + ch (śś), the second sibilant can easily become dissimilated, which would give sfi as a result.

7. PIE *mH-i-u- ‘to move’?

In the case of Skt. mīv- and its cognates, the scheme V1-H → i-present → -u-noun → denominal verb is not readily available. The root *mH-i-μH- (< *μjuH-) itself is quite rare in Indo-Iranian. As is often the case with verbs of movement,
the preverbs are semantically dominant, so that it is not easy to establish the basic meaning of the verb.26 For instance, the only occurrence of the verb mīv- in the AV is the passage SS 5.7.7 (= PS 7.9.7) vēda vāhām nimāvantam nimudantim arātī “I know you, o Arātī, [to be] the one who forces down, who thrusts down” (tr. Griffiths 2009:341). Here it is used in parallel with ni tud- ‘to push, thrust down’, and this is all we can gather from the context. The oldest attestation in Vedic is RV 10.10.11, where Yami, trying to seduce her brother Yama, calls her self kāmanatā “shaken/moved/prompted by love”, where again we cannot grasp the exact shade of meaning.

In Iranian too, this verb is not abundantly attested (cf. Cheung 2007:273). In YAv. we only find a negated pass. participle a-muiaamna- ‘unshakable’ and 1pl. pres. in the passage V 18.55 – 18.59 pascaēta vaēm yēi daēuua haēat vaēm auua.miuiamahí hizuaascas pīuaasca “and then we, the daēua’s, remove (?) at the same time [his] tongue and [his] fat.” Parthian attests an inchoative (with a prefix *para- or *pari-) pr-mwes- ‘to be terrified’ and a causative prm-‘/parmaw-/ ‘to terrify’. Khwar. 1-mwē ‘to loosen’ (with the preverb *fra-) and Oss. m̥i̥/m̥i̥we ‘thing, matter; work, affair’ do not contribute much to the original meaning.

Among usually presented IE cognates (cf. LIV s.v. *mjeq̣ḥ-),28 we find verbs which point to an unstable, shaking movement: TochA mēw-, B mīw- ‘to tremble’, PSlav. *mječi ‘to wash’ (OCS muyt, Ru. myt, SCr. mii, etc.)29 a general verb of movement: Lat. movère ‘to move’ (both tr. and intr.), although it often means ‘to move to and fro, shake, agitation too; and verbs which describe a short, abrupt action: Hitt. 1sg. mu-ul-ḫi, 3sg. ma-a-štī ‘to fall’, Lith. mačti ‘to put on, tear, pull, stab, strike, dash’, Latv. maait ‘to pull off, bridle’. However, it is by no means certain that all these verbs belong together. Only Indo-Iranian and Tocharian show (traces of) *i- in the root, whereas the other branches point to PIE
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*meuH- with a reasonably regular ablaut. Since the development *mi- > *m-probably took place already in PIE, all these roots can theoretically go back to a single protoform, but it seems very difficult to me to connect the roots for ‘to tremble’ and ‘to fall’ semantically.

To be on the safe side, we can examine whether we can decide on an original meaning for the Indo-Iranian and Tocharian verbs. As already mentioned, the meaning of the Indo-Iranian verb is hard to pin down, but ‘trembling, shaking’—the basic meaning of the Tocharian verb—is definitely present in various Indo-Iranian formations, too, most clearly in Parthian pr-mwes- ‘to be terrified’, YAv. a-muiaamna- ‘unshakable’, and further in Skt. ā-muiaamna- ‘unflinching, unwavering’, a Rigvedic hapax that occurs in a description of the pressing stones: 10.94.11 tydīlā ṣāḍīlā ṣādroyo śramanā āśāritām āmyāyavaḥ | anāturā ajāra śāhmuiaamnaa supivaśa āśītā āṣītāyavaḥ “Zersprengend, selbst nicht zersprungen sind die Steine, unermüdlich, nie gelockert, nie sterbend, nie krank, nie alternd seid ihr, unentwegt, feist, nicht durstig, nie verdurstend” (Geldner 1951 III: 297).

We can then assume that the root *miHw-/ *muH- originally meant something like ‘to shake, tremble’ and is related to PIE *m(H)eH- ‘to change (places), exchange’ (Skt. vi mayanta ‘they alternate’, OCS mimi ‘to pass’, Cz. miet ‘id.’, Latv. mī ‘to exchange’, TochB /mask- ‘to exchange’, Lat. medere ‘to proceed, traverse’, etc.), but at the present stage this connection must unfortunately remain hypothetical.

8. PIE *sl-i-u- ‘to abort’?

The last verb in the series of Sanskrit ñ-verbs is sṛiva- ‘to be aborted, miscarried (of embryos)’. The verb is very rare, with a handful of occurrences in the whole of the Vedic corpus. The oldest form is the causative srevaunyant- ‘making [Aiti] miscarry’ (RV 7.18.8), srevaunyam30 ‘I make [your intention] fail’ (PS 19.10.12 ~ SS 6.73.2 sṛivaunyam). Also in the RV we encounter a-sreman- adj. ‘being not a miscarriage’ (RV 3.29.13, 10.8.2), which presumably stands for *sreman- (Debrunner, Nachtrüge zu AIGRN 1.91.37). The Brāhmaṇas attest two occurrences of class IV present sṛivaunyati (sṛiveyur MS 4.6.9:92.1231) and sṛivaunyant- AitB 4.22.4) and a hapax sṛvéduka- adj. ‘miscarrying’, which occurs in the same line of

27 E.g., in the passage Yi 13.35 amuiaamnaa rezātanana “(Frawās) unflinching from the straightest (paths),” “die von den geradeiten (Pfaden) nicht abzubringende” (Bartholomae 1904 s.v.).
28 It seems to be a communis opinio nowadays that the laryngeal must necessarily be *h₂, but the evidence adduced does not seem probative to me. Lat. movère must be a secondary full-grade formation to *muH- and the suffix *-eH- could be restored any time. In Tocharian the verb shows regular ablaut, where mīv- functions as a zero-grade /mai/w- to māi-
29 Here must also belong Lith. māudaity ‘to bathe’; Latv. māit ‘to submerge, swim’; māudāt ‘to bathe’.
30 The āś vacillation is fairly common in the Aitavaveda and later texts.
31 For a peculiar change of the intransitive construction into a transitive one in the late Sūtra repetitions, see Kulikov 2001:485f.
the preverbs are semantically dominant, so that it is not easy to establish the basic meaning of the verb.\(^\text{26}\) For instance, the only occurrence of the verb mīv- in the AV is the passage SS 5.7.7 (= PS 7.9.7) vēda vāhānā nimāvantīm nimūdantīm arātī “I know you, o Arātī, [to be] the one who forces down, who thrusts down” (tr. Griffiths 2009:341). Here it is used in parallel with ni tud- ‘to push, thrust down’, and this is all we can gather from the context. The oldest attestation in Vedic is RV 10.10.11, where Yami, trying to seduce her brother Yama, calls her self kāmanātī ‘shaken/moved/prompted by love’, where again we cannot grasp the exact shade of meaning.

In Iranian too, this verb is not abundantly attested (cf. Cheung 2007:273). In YAv. we only find a negated pass. participle a-muīiamna- ‘unshakable’\(^\text{27}\) and 1pl. pres. in the passage V 18.55 – 18.59 pascaēta vaēm yōi daēnwā haka vaēm auna.miūväahā hizuwacsc pīuwacsc “and then we, the daēwā’s, remove (?) at the same time [his] tongue and [his] fat.” Parthian attests an inchoative (with a prefix *para- or *pari-) pr-mwes- /parmē-/ ‘to be terrified’ and a causative prm-’w-/parmē-/ ‘to terrify’. Khwar. š-mwē- ‘to loosen’ (with the preverb *fra-) and Oss. mi/miwe ‘thing, matter; work, affair’ do not contribute much to the original meaning.

Among usually presented IE cognates (cf. LIV s.v. *mjēgnd-),\(^\text{28}\) we find verbs which point to an unstable, shaking movement: TochA nēw-, B mīv- ‘to tremble’, PSlav. *mityi ‘to wash’ (OCS myti, Ru. myt’, SCR. mili, etc.);\(^\text{29}\) a general verb of movement: Lat. movēre ‘to move’ (both tr. and intr.), although it often means ‘to move to and fro, shake, agitate’ too; and verbs which describe a short, abrupt action: Hitt. 1sg. mu-ul-hi, 3sg. ma-u-ži ‘to fall’, Lith. mūtį ‘to put on, tear, pull, stab, strike, dash’, Latv. mait ‘to pull off, bridle’. However, it is by no means certain that all these verbs belong together. Only Indo-Iranian and Tocharian show (traces of) -i- in the root, whereas the other branches point to PIE *meuH- with a reasonably regular aublaut. Since the development *mj>- *m- probably took place already in PIE, all these roots can theoretically go back to a single protoform, but it seems very difficult to me to connect the roots for ‘to tremble’ and ‘to fall’ semantically.

To be on the safe side, we can examine whether we can decide on an original meaning for the Indo-Iranian and Tocharian verbs. As already mentioned, the meaning of the Indo-Iranian verb is hard to pin down, but ‘trembling, shaking’ — the basic meaning of the Tocharian verb—is definitely present in various Indo-Iranian formations, too, most clearly in Parthian pr-mwes- ‘to be terrified’, YAv. a-muīiamna- ‘unshakable’, and further in Skt. ā-muīijana- ‘unflinching, unwavering’, a Rigvedic hapax that occurs in a description of the pressing stones: 10.94.11 tīḍālā ātīḍilās ōdrāyō śramānā āśṛhtā āmytavah | anāturā ājāra śāṃmuśivavah suśivāsā āśṛtāt ātṛṣtyāvaḥ “Zēsprengend, selbst nicht zersprüngen sind die Steine, unermüdlich, nie gelockert, nie sterbend, nie krank, nie alt, der dem sich, unentwegt, feist, nicht durstig, nie verdurstend” (Geldner 1951 III: 297).

We can then assume that the root *miHwH-/*muH- originally meant something like ‘to shake, tremble’ and is related to PPI *m(H)eH- ‘to change (places), exchange’ (Skt. vi mayante ‘they alternate’, OCS mīgu ‘to pass’, Cz. mějte ‘id.’, Latv. mē ‘to exchange’, TochB /mask- ‘to exchange’, Lat. medere ‘to proceed, traverse’, etc.), but at the present stage this connection must unfortunately remain hypothetical.

8. PIE *sl-i-ua- ‘to abort’?

The last verb in the series of Sanskrit ā-verbs is sṛiv- ‘to be aborted, miscarried (of embryos)’. The verb is very rare, with a handful of occurrences in the whole of the Vedic corpus. The oldest form is the causative srevaṃya- ‘making [Aditi] miscarry’ (RV 7.18.8), srevaṃyām\(^\text{30}\) ‘I make [your intention] fail’ (PS 19.10.12 – SS 6.73.2 srevaṃyām). Also in the RV we encounter a-sremhn- adj. ‘being not a miscarriage’ (RV 3.29.13, 10.8.2), which presumably stands for *srevaṃn- (Debrunner, Nachträge zu AiGr. I: 91.37). The Brāhmaṇas attest two occurrences of class IV present sṛivyaati (sṛivyeyur MS 4.6.9:92.12\(^\text{31}\) and sṛivyanty AiB 4.22.4) and a hapax sṛevikā- adj. ‘miscarrying’, which occurs in the same line of
the MS. Finally, aor. asrāvīt is found once in the JB (2.2). Zero-grades with -ā- are not found in the texts, but Pāñini (6.4.20) prescribes a ta-ptic sūṛata-.

As far as the etymology of sūṛa- is concerned, Mayrhofer (EWIA 11:787) reports no generally acknowledged cognates and considers the etymology "unklar." In my view, sūṛa- cannot be separated from the Sanskrit verb sūrdh- "to fail, err," which further corresponds to OE slidan, MHG slīten 'to slide', Lith. slidās, Latv. slīds 'slippery', and goes back to PIE *sleidh-. As follows from nouns like ON slím 'slime', Lat. limus 'mud, slime' < *sleidh-, OCS slazhd- 'slippery' < *sli-go-, etc., the -dḥ- in *sleidh- is likely to have been an old suffix. The remaining *sleid/*sli- can be an original i-formation of the root *sel- 'to jump, spring forth' (Gr. ἀλίλουμ, Lat. saltūō). As we have seen above (§3.2, cf. also §9, the appendix below), i-formations can express a non-volitional, non-controlled action, which would be very fitting in this case, since an involuntary jump usually leads to slipping, falling, and failure.

It therefore seems reasonable to explain Skt. sūṛa- as a denominal verb based on an (unattested) u-derivative of *sleid/*sli- with an original meaning 'failure', along the lines established for the other roots in -īv-. There is one formal problem, though: forms like Skt. sūrdh- and Lith. slidās clearly show that there was no laryngeal in the root, which means that vowel length in sūṛa- and sūṛa-cannot be old. On the other hand, Skt. sūṛa-deviates from the other -īv-roots in that its oldest attested forms contain a full-grade srev-, while the ablaut form found in the RV. The two hapaxes with the present sūṛayati can easily be influenced in their vocalism by sūryāti, dṛvyāti, and the same influence probably accounts for Pāñini's rule prescribing a ta-ptic sūṛita-. Evidently, there was no regular way to vocalize the zero-grade *sṛuC- in Sanskrit.

9. Appendix: i-perfects

This is not the place to discuss the whole issue of PIE i-perfects, but I would like to adduce here a few further examples of these perfects in Indo-Iranian (the list can be extended), next to Skt. ā sitāya ā OAv. ā-hišāti and possibly YAv. jiyaēsā mentioned above. All of these i-perfects have in common that they lost the connection with the original root at an early stage and that they describe the result of a non-volitional, non-controlled action. It seems probable to me that the original construction had a dative subject, as argued by Kortlandt (1983, 2010: 373f.). These constructions are found in most Indo-European languages, but have been totally abolished in Indo-Iranian, as in 'melttheke' → 'I think'.

9.1. Skt. pīpāya ā Av. (a)piṇiūśi- ā Lith. papiusi

The Skt. rootpay-, usually glossed 'to swell, overflow, be full, flow lavishly', essentially attests only two formations: the perfect pīpāya and the causative-factitive pres. (V=7) pinvati. The same is true of Avestan: YAv. pf. (a)piṇiūśi- tpt. 'to (not) suckling' (V 15.8) and the causative-factitive fra-pinavāti 'make thrive' (V 3.31).

The perfect pīpāya is abundantly attested in the RV and typically refers to a female (or a female breast, or an udder) overflowing with milk. The same meaning underlies YAv. (a)piṇiūši- tpt. act. f. 'to suckling' (V 15.8) and Lith. papiusi kārve 'milch cow' and must be reconstructed for PIE. This meaning is further confirmed by the derivatives Skt. pāyas- n. 'milk', YAv. pāidha- n. 'id.', pāeman- n. 'mother's milk', and by Lith. pienas 'milk' and pūti 'to give milk'. Since the root actually means 'to yield milk', it can hardly be separated from *peh-r- 'to drink'. We know that i-formations often led to secondary roots, so that the Skt. root pay- and its congers can all be dependent on an i-perfect *pi-phyo-te (parallel to sitāya < *si-sho-i-e). As far as the semantics is concerned, the i-perfect describes the result of a non-volitional action, which we have already seen with sitāya. For instance, Skt. pīpāya dhenur (RV 1.153.3a)

32 Only found in the RV: e.g. pres. sredhati, u-aor. sredhat 3sg. inj., ā-sreedhāna- tpt. med.
33 The acute intonation in Lith. sūsti, pret. slīdo 'to slip, glide' is no doubt due to the sī-present. The appurtenance of Gr. ἀλάθενα 'to slide, slip' remains uncertain.
34 A similar pattern is found with the PIE root *h3er- 'to rise, come up': i-present *h3er- 'to bubble up, whirl' (Skt. ṛiṣate, ṛīdā 'to bubble up, tremble'; Hitt. arati/ari- 'to rise') → *h3er-yū 'to waver' (Lith. riedūti 'to roll', OE ridan 'to ride, fall', Ofr. imm-réd 'to ride, drive around').
35 If a-sreman- goes back to *sreman-, the irregular vocalization of *sreman- must of course have been dependent on srevasati.
36 The vowel of the first syllable is metrically short (cf. Kåmmen 2000:298 for the references).
37 "Typischerweise geht es um Milchfülle des Kuhers" (Kåmmen 2000:299). Even in the metaphorical usage, the connection with breasts remains obvious: cf. RV 1.64.5 bhimāṁ pinvant pāyasā pāriyāyā "The omnipresent ones (Maruts) fill the Earth with milk." The secondary root Skt. pykā 'to swell, fill' (RV+), mostly attested in the present a-pyhdāmāna- tpt. med. (RV+), a-pyhyāvā 2sg. impv. med. (RV+), has the same connotations. Note that the full-grade *pihār- is reminiscent of *gīrh- discussed above.
38 Cf. also Lith. pūti 'to give milk' vs. OCS pūti 'to drink', which must obviously represent the same formation.
39 Because of the alternation *pi-phyo-te: *pi-phyr-, the influence of *h1 on p, if any, could be easily undone.
the MS. Finally, aor. *asrāvīt is found once in the JB (2.2). Zero-grades with ā- are not found in the texts, but Pāṇini (6.4.20) prescribes a ta-ptc. srūta-.

As far as the etymology of srūv- is concerned, Mayrhofer (EW 11:787) reports no generally acknowledged cognates and considers the etymology “unklar.” In my view, srūv- cannot be separated from the Sanskrit verb srīdha- “to fail, err,” which further corresponds to OE slidan, MHG sliten ‘to slide’, Lith. slidias, Latv. slids ‘slippery’, and goes back to PIE *sleidh-. As follows from notions like OE slīm ‘slime’, Lat. limus ‘mud, slime’ < *sleimo-, OCS složvko ‘slippery’ < *sle-jo-, etc., the -d- in *sleidh- is likely to have been an old suffix. The remaining *sleih-*sli- can be an original i-formation of the root *sol- ‘to jump, spring forth’ (Gr. ἀλλομοι, Lat. saltāō). As we have seen above (§3.2, cf. also §9, the appendix below), i-formations can express a non-volitional, non-controlled action, which would be very fitting in this case, since an involuntary jump usually leads to slippage, falling, and failure.34

It therefore seems reasonable to explain Skt. srūv- as a denominal verb based on an (unattested) u-derivative of *sleih-*sli- with an original meaning ‘failure’, along the lines established for the other roots in -āv-. There is one formal problem, though: forms like Skt. srīdha- and Lith. slidias clearly show that there was no laryngeal in the root, which means that vowel length in srīv- and sru- cannot be old. On the other hand, Skt. srīv- deviates from the other -āv-roots in that its oldest attested forms contain a full-grade srev-, the only ablaut form found in Sanskrit.

As far as the etymology of srīv- is concerned, Mayrhofer cannot be old. On the other hand, Skt. srīv- deviates from the other -āv-roots in that its oldest attested forms contain a full-grade srev-, the only ablaut form found in Sanskrit.35 The two hapaxes with the present srīvatai can easily be influenced in their vocalism by sīvatai, śīvatai, and the same influence probably accounts for Pāṇini’s rule prescribing a ta-ptc. srūta-. Evidently, there was no regular way to vocalize the zero-grade *srīvC- in Sanskrit.

9. Appendix: i-perfects

This is not the place to discuss the whole issue of PIE i-perfects, but I would like to adduce here a few further examples of these perfects in Indo-Iranian (the list can be extended), next to Skt. ā siṣṭya- ~ OAv. ā-hiṣṭāīt and possibly YAv. jīvaśā mentioned above. All of these i-perfects have in common that they lost the connection with the original root at an early stage and that they describe the result of a non-volitional, non-controlled action. It seems probable to me that the original construction had a dative subject, as argued by Kortlandt (1983, 2010: 371f.). These constructions are found in most Indo-European languages, but have been totally abolished in Indo-Iranian, as in ‘meltthes’ – ‘I think’.

9.1. Skt. pipāya- ~ Av. (a)piṣṭī- ~ Lith. papījusi

The Skt. root pay-, usually glossed ‘to swell, overflow, be full, flow lavishly’, essentially attests only two formations: the perfect pipāya and the causative-factive pres. (V>3) pīvati. The same is true of Avestan: YAv. pf. (a)pīpīṣi- ptc. ‘(not) sucking’ (V 15.8) and the causative-factive fra-pīnaoiti ‘make thrive’ (V 3.31).

The perfect pipāya is abundantly attested in the RV and typically refers to a female (or a female breast, or an udder) overflowing with milk. The same meaning underlies YAv. (a)pīpīṣi- ptc. pf. act. f. ‘(not) sucking’ (V 15.8) and Lith. papijusi kārē ‘milk cow’ and must be reconstructed for PIE. This meaning is further confirmed by the derivatives Skt. pāyas- n. ‘milk’, YAv. pāyadh- n. ‘id’, paema- n. ‘mother’s milk’, and by Lith. pienas ‘milk’ and pūtį ‘to give milk’.

Since the root actually means ‘to yield milk’, it can hardly be separated from *peh- ‘to drink’. We know that i-formations often led to secondary roots, so that the Skt. root pay- and its congeners can all be dependent on an i-perfect *pi-ph-oi-e (parallel to siṣṭya- < *si-šh-oi-e). As far as the semantics is concerned, the i-perfect describes the result of a non-volitional action, which we have already seen with siṣṭya. For instance, Skt. pipāya dhenur (RV 1.153.3a)

32 Only found in the RV: class I present srevhati, 2-aor. srevhat 3sg. inj., ā-srevhdhānā- ptc. med.
33 The acute intonation in Lith. sīūstį, pret. sīūsto ‘to slip, glide’ is no doubt due to the st-present. The appurrtenance of Gr. ἀλκλίνειν ‘to slide, slip’ remains uncertain.
34 A similar pattern is found with the PIE root *hder- ‘to rise, come up’: i-present *hdeiri- ‘to bubble up, whirl’ (Skt. ṛiyate, lēbya ‘to bubble up, tremble’; Hitt. aratiari- ‘to rise’) → *hdeirei ‘to wave’ (Lith. riediti ‘to roll’, OE ridan ‘to ride, fullter’, Ofr. imm-reid ‘to ride, drive around’).
35 If *asrēmān- goes back to *sremsān-, the irregular vocalization of *sremsān- most of course have been dependent on srevasati.
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37 “Typischerweise geht es um Milchfülle des Kuhutters” (Kümmel 2000:298 for the references).
38 As far as the semantics is concerned, the i-perfect describes the result of a non-volitional action, which we have already seen with siṣṭya. For instance, Skt. pipāya dhenur (RV 1.153.3a)
“the cow (Aditi) yields milk” can be rendered “the cow (Aditi) has given to drink” = “yields milk.”

The difference in meaning between pf. *pījāya ‘to yield milk’ and Gr. aor. ἔτον ‘to drink’ exactly matches that of Skt. *sīśāya and *syāti discussed above in §3.2.

9.2. Skt. ḍidhaya ~ YAv. ā-diśāia

It is clear that the perfect is primary in this Indo-Iranian root for ‘to consider, perceive’, which may not have any certain Indo-European etymology.40 In Sanskrit we find both act. ḍidhaya (1sg.) and middle didhvyey (RV+),41 but Avestan only attests the active perfect YAv. ā-diśāia 3sg., vi-dūndu3 ptc. (Yt 14.13) and a few forms of the reduplicated present OAv. dāiddiāt (< *diddiāt) 3pl. inj. (Y 44,10), YAv. tāiiti.dāiśīāt 3sg. subj. (them.), tāiiddiātqm gen. pl. ptc., evidently based on the perfect (see Kūmmel 2000:640ff. for discussion).

This is a very important root for Indo-Iranian culture, and its derivatives, Skt. dhī- f. ‘vision, poetry, praise’ (RV+) and Av. daēnā- (< *daiH-anā-) f. ‘view, religion’ (Mod. Pers. din), are key notions in Indo-Iranian religion and poetry. For a root of that standing, it would be very attractive to have a decent IE etymology, although this is by no means a compelling argument.

In my view, Skt. ḍidhaya ~ YAv. ā-diśāia can be considered an i-perfect to the PIE root *dʰeh₂- (< *dēh₁), a formation akin to Old Hitt. dāi, tāinz < *dʰē₁-t₁-ē₁-t₁-ē₁-en₁ (Kloekhorst 2006, 2008 s.v.), the zero-grade of which was metathesized. Also from the point of view of semantics, this analysis is unproblematic. The central element of the meaning of the PIIr. root seems to be ‘inspiration, revelation’, something that occurs to you, literally “put” into you (often by the gods).

9.3. Skt. didāya

This primary perfect is usually considered as a verb of shining and glossed ‘to shine, be bright, radiant’, ‘strahlen, leuchten, glänzen’ (for a discussion of the forms see Narten 1987 = 1995:367–79). However, it is almost exclusively said of fire (Agni) and describes the state of fire after kindling. For the intimate connection of didāya with the root idh- ‘to kindle’, cf., for instance, RV 7.12.1b yó ḍidēya sāmaddhah śvē dūronē “who, after being kindled, d. in his abode” or 2.35.4d

40 The only cognate mentioned in the recent literature is Alb. di ‘to know, be aware; be able’, which may or may not be related.

41 The present dhīyey 3sg. opt. act. (PS 9.21.1), dhīyayast 3sg. act. (YVP+) is clearly secondary. Note again the full-grade *dʰa₁t₁-, however.
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*dīḍēyānīdham ghytānīrṇāg upsā “he, who is invested in ghee, d. without fuel in the waters.” It seems therefore likely that dīḍāya—at least, originally—referred to burning rather than to shining and that this form is an i-perfect to the PIE root *dēh₂- (< *dēh₁) ‘to burn’,42 reflected in Gr. ὀἴκο ‘to kindle’, ὀἴνη 1sg. pf. act. ‘to burn’, Skt. dūnā ‘to kindle, burn’ (AV+), etc.

Traditionally it is assumed that Skt. dīḍāya is related to Gr. ὀἴκο 3sg. impf. ‘seemed’, ὀίνος ‘clear’ (< *dēh₁-o-s). The IE root is then reconstructed as *dēh₂- and considered to be an enlargement of *dei- ‘to be bright’ (found in Skt. dātaus, madhyāmādina-, etc.). In my view the connection with Gr. ὀἴκο can be upheld. As we have seen above on several occasions, the laryngeal metathesis *dʰ₂- > *dḥ₂- could lead to the rise of a new root *dēh₂-. Semantically, too, this etymology is unproblematic. The further relation with the root for ‘to be bright’ must, however, be abandoned under our analysis, but it was not very probable from the beginning: the root *dei- is clearly nominal in origin.

9.4. Skt. mimāya

Since Skt. pf. mimāya ‘bellows’ (p pf. āmīnet and subj. mimā yat show long reduplication) is synchronically formed to the root mā- (present III mimāti, inf. māvavati), it would have been the clearest example of an i-perfect in Vedic, but, unfortunately, this root has no certain cognates. Nevertheless, we may tentatively reconstruct *mā-mhl-i-e in parallel to the other formations and hope that IE cognates will pop up sometime in the future.

42 I owe this observation to Martin Kūmmel (p.c.). Of course, the notions of burning and shining are often difficult to tell apart; cf. also Greek derivatives of the root *dēh₂- (< *dēh₁) ‘torch’.
“the cow (Aditi) yields milk” can be rendered “the cow (Aditi) has given to drink” or “yields milk.”

The difference in meaning between pf. paisya ‘to yield milk’ and Gr. aor. ényn ‘to drink’ exactly matches that of Skt. sīśāya and *syāti discussed above in §3.2.

9.2. Skt. didhaya ~ YAv. ā-dīdāia

It is clear that the perfect is primary in this Indo-Iranian root for ‘to consider, perceive’, which does not have any certain Indo-European etymology. In Sanskrit we find both act. didhaya (1sg.) and middle didhaye (RV+), but Avestan only attests the active perfect YAv. ā-dīdāia 3sg., vi-dīdāid ptc. (Yt 14.13) and a few forms of the reduplicated present OAv. daidiiait (< *didiiait) 3pl. inj. (Y 44,10). YAv. ṭpaii. dāiśịśịt 3sg. subj. (them.), ṭdāiśịśịtām gen. pl. ptc., evidently based on the perfect (see Kümmel 2000:640ff. for discussion).

This is a very important root for Indo-Iranian culture, and its derivatives, Skt. dhī- f. ‘vision, poetry, praise’ (RV+) and Av. daēnā- (< *daiH-anā--) f. ‘view, religion’ (Mod. Pers. dīn), are key notions in Indo-Iranian religion and poetry. For a root of that standing, it would be very attractive to have a decent IE etymology, although this is by no means a compelling argument.

In my view, Skt. didhaya ~ YAv. ā-dīdāia can be considered an i-perfect to the PIE root *dʰeh₂- (< *dʰeiH), a formation akin to Old Hitt. dāi, tian₃₃ < *dʰeiH-oi-ei*-dʰeiH-iti-centric (Kloeckhorst 2006, 2008 s.v.), the zero-grade of which was metathesized. Also from the point of view of semantics, this analysis is unproblematic. The central element of the meaning of the PIlr. root seems to be ‘inspiration, revelation’, something that occurs to you, literally “put” into you (often by the gods).

9.3. Skt. didāya

This primary perfect is usually perceived as a verb of shining and glossed ‘to shine, be bright, radiate’, ‘strahlen, leuchten, glänzen’ (for a discussion of the forms see Narten 1987 = 1995:367–79). However, it is almost exclusively said of fire (Agni) and describes the state of fire after kindling. For the intimate connection of didāya with the root idh- ‘to kindle’, cf., for instance, RV 7.12.1b yó didāya sāmīddhah svē dūrenē “who, after being kindled, d. in his abode” or 2.35.4d didāyānīdhmō ghyātānīryg apṣā “he, who is invested in ghee, d. without fuel in the waters.” It seems therefore likely that didāya—at least, originally—referred to burning rather than to shining and that this form is an i-perfect to the PIE root *dʰeh₂- (< *dʰeiH) ‘to burn’, reflected in Gr. ὀψō ‘to kindle’, ὀψη 1sg. pf. act. ‘to burn’, Skt. durāti ‘to kindle, burn’ (AV+), etc. Unfortunately, this root has no certain cognates. Nevertheless, we may tentatively reconstruct *mē-mel-oi-e in parallel to the other formations and hope that IE cognates will pop up sometime in the future.

9.4. Skt. mimāya

Since Skt. pf. mimāya ‘bellows’ (ppf. āmīnem and subj. mimāyat show long reduplication) is synchronically formed to the root mī- (present III mimāti, inf. mājāvati), it would have been the clearest example of an i-perfect in Vedic, but, unfortunately, this root has no certain cognates. Nevertheless, we may tentatively reconstruct *mē-mel-oi-e in parallel to the other formations and hope that IE cognates will pop up sometime in the future.
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Notes:
40 The only cognate mentioned in the recent literature is Alb. di ‘to know, be aware; be able’, which may or may not be related.
41 The present dhyāyāt 3sg. opt. act. (PS 9.21.1), dhyāyāt 3sg. act. (YV(+)) is clearly secondary. Note again the full-grade *dʰaiH, however.
References


The Origin of Sanskrit Roots of the Type stv- ‘to sew’, div- ‘to play dice’
References


