

Schrijver 1999  
(NB p. 153)

PETER SCHRIJVER

**Vedic *gr̥bhñāti*, *gr̥bhāyāti* and the semantic of \*ye-derivatives of nasal presents**

**Abstract**

A study of the semantics of *gr̥bhñāti* (< \*g<sup>h</sup>r̥b<sup>h</sup>-n-eH-) and *gr̥bhāyāti* (< \*g<sup>h</sup>r̥b<sup>h</sup>-ñ-H-ye-) in the Rigveda reveals that the former means '(passively) receives, gets, catches', where the object is thought of as moving in the direction of the subject, while the latter means '(actively) grasps, takes' and it is the subject that moves in the direction of the object (sections 1-3). I argue that this reversal of subject and object roles vis-à-vis the verbal action is a constant feature of \*ye-derivatives of nasal presents in Indo-Iranian (4-5), Greek (6), and Italic and Celtic (7-8): if the nasal present means, say, 'S leaves O', its \*ye-derivative can be glossed approximately as 'S makes O leave S', whence Lat. *linquit* 'leaves' and OIr. *léicid* 'lets go', respectively. The striking semantic similarity to the Vedic type *ricyate* 'remains, stays behind' is addressed in section 10.

The highly specific semantic features of adding \*ye to nasal presents combined with the wide distribution of these derivatives across the IE family point to the PIE date of the type. In section 11, an attempt is made to ascribe a similar function to the \*ye of the PIE causative-iterative suffix \*-e-ye-, and to account for the unusual semantics of \*ye by tentatively reformulating these in terms of an original difference in actant coding of athematic forms, such as nasal presents, and thematic forms, such as \*ye-presents.

1. *gr̥bh̥nāti*, *gr̥bh̥hāyāti*: semantics<sup>1</sup>

The well-attested Vedic nasal present *gr̥bh̥nāti* is usually translated as 'takes, gets hold of'. Beside this nasal present there is a similarly well-attested present *gr̥bh̥hāyāti*, which is believed to have the same meaning (so recently JAMISON 1983: 100, EWAla I 505). As a careful scrutiny of the meaning of the Rigvedic attestations of these verbs bears out, however, there are clear semantic differences.

In the Rigveda, there are 27 instances of *gr̥bh̥nāti*. Its meaning is primarily 'receive, get' rather than 'take, grab hold of', in other words, the subject of the verb has a relatively low degree of control over the action:

(1) RV 1.55.2ab *só ar̥iavó ná nád̥yāhi samud̥t̥yāhi práti gr̥bh̥nāti víst̥iā vārm̥abh̥hi* 'he (Indra) receives (the streams of Soma), as the flood of the sea, with its wide expanses, (receives) the separate rivers'

The comparison with rivers flowing into the sea points to the conclusion that *gr̥bh̥nāti* here means 'receives, absorbs' rather than 'grabs, takes'. This conclusion presents itself even clearer in the following example:

(2) RV 7.101.3c *pit̥h̥ p̥yāhi práti gr̥bh̥nāti māā́* 'the mother receives the milk (= semen) of the father (thereby the father prospers, the son prospers)'

A translation 'grabs, takes' would clearly be absurd. Similarly, in the next instances 'receives, gets' would seem to be a more appropriate translation than 'takes, grabs hold of':

(3) RV 3.9.6a *tān tvā mar̥tā agr̥bh̥nāta* 'the mortals received (for themselves) you (= Agni 'Fire', who transports the sacrificial offering to the gods)'

(4) RV 6.8.4a *ap̥ān up̥ās̥the mah̥s̥iā agr̥bh̥nāta* 'in the bosom of the waters the bulls (i.e. the gods, perhaps the priests?) received (Agni 'Fire')'

Since Agni is a gift to the mortals, again 'receive' seems the appropriate translation. The following examples describe similar situations:

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to Robert Beekes, Rick Derksen, Leonid Kulikov and Alexander Lubotsky for a number of valuable comments on an earlier draft of this article. Needless to say, the responsibility for the views expressed in this article is mine.

(5) RV 8.45.39ab *ā h̥arī gr̥bh̥ne sum̥d̥arathā́* 'I (i.e. the priest) receive (your, i.e. Indra's) two fallow horses with the good chariot (in order that you may donate to the priests)'

(6) RV 9.70.3d *ād̥ tā r̥jānam man̥dā agr̥bh̥nāta* (when the radiance of Soma had penetrated gods and men) 'only then did the mindful receive the King (i.e. Soma)'

(7) RV 9.86.30c *tvām us̥f̥iāh̥ prathamā́ agr̥bh̥nāta* 'first the Desirous (i.e. priests) received You (i.e. Soma)'

(8) RV 9.113.3c *tām gandharvāh̥ práty agr̥bh̥nān* 'the Gandharvas (i.e. the heavenly musicians, that are inspired by Soma) receive him (i.e. Soma)'

In (5) – (7), the mortal priests are granted possession of divine horses or the god Soma; 'receive' is therefore more likely than 'grab, take'. (8) differs in the sense that the possessors are divine, but the semantic context is highly similar to that of the previous instances.

In other instances, the nasal present can be most appropriately translated as 'catch, hold'. As in the case of 'receive', the subject is relatively passive, either because the object consents (9) or, more specifically, because the object unwittingly runs into the subject, like a rushing animal (10–13):

(9) RV 1.163.2c *gandharvó asya ras̥anām agr̥bh̥nāi* 'Gandharva held (received) his reins' (i.e. of the primeval horse that was first mounted by Indra; the line belongs to a hymn on the divine horse)

(10) RV 9.83.4c *gr̥bh̥nāti rip̥ūn nidh̥yā nidh̥āpatih̥* 'the snare master catches the fraud with a snare' (snaring being a passive way of catching)

(11) RV 9.86.43d *hiranyapatvāh̥ pasūm āsu gr̥bh̥nate* 'those who purify the gold (i.e. Soma) catch the animal (i.e. Soma) in these (liquids)' (the priests 'snare' Soma, who in the previous line is compared with a rushing bull)

(12) RV 9.14.7c *pr̥sthā gr̥bh̥nāta vāh̥nāh̥* '(the fingers) receive/catch the back(s) of the nimble horse (i.e. Soma)'

(13) RV 9.1.7ab *tām im̥ ān̥vīh̥ samaryá́ ā gr̥bh̥nānti yósano dáśa* 'the ten delicate women (i.e. the fingers) receive/grab him (i.e. Soma) in competition / at the feast'

In (12) and (13) the reference is clearly to the fingers, which are used to press soma; as (12) shows, however, especially against the backdrop of (10) and

(11), 'catch' rather than 'press, knead' is intended here.

In other instances, the nasal present can similarly be translated as 'receive, (passively) catch, hold', but the context does not allow us the subtlety to exclude '(actively) take, grab', which imply a relatively high degree of control by the subject of the verb. Examples of this ambiguity are as follows:

(14) RV 1.162.15d *tám devásah prāti gr̥bhñanty áśvam* 'the gods receive/take that horse'

(15) RV 3.30.5d *yát samgr̥bhñá maghavan kāsír ít te* 'when you, mighty one (i.e. Indra), hold/take together (these two hemispheres), (they are) just a handful for you'

(16) RV 8.72.3c *gr̥bhñānti jihvāyā sasám* 'they (i.e. the gods?) receive/take the food with/by the tongue (i.e. Agni 'Fire?')'

(17) RV 9.46.4ab *suhastyah śukrá gr̥bhñīta manthínā* 'Ye with capable hands, receive/take the shining and mixed (Soma)'

(18) RV 9.78.1c *gr̥bhñāti riprám ávir asya tánvā* 'the stretched-out sheep (i.e. sieve made of wool) receives/takes his impurity (i.e. of the unstrained Soma)'

(19) RV 10.62.1d (=2d,3d,4d) *prāti gr̥bhñīta mānavám sumedhasah* 'Wise Ones (i.e. Angiras, deities communicating between gods and men), receive/take man'

In view of their figurative meaning, two instances are difficult to assess for present purposes:

(20) RV 5.31.7c *śuśṇasya cit pári māyā agr̥bhñāh* 'you (i.e. Indra) have checked/controlled even the ruses of Śuśṇa (demon of drought) (with pári 'around'; this example may probably be compared to 10–13 above)

(21) RV 10.145.4a *nahy ásyā nāma gr̥bhñāmi* 'I do not mention her name (i.e. the name of her rival)', i.e. 'I cannot get her name across my lips'.

Only in three examples does '(actively) grab, take' seem to be more likely, but not unambiguously so:

(22) RV 7.103.4a (Frog Hymn:) *anyó anyám ánu gr̥bhñāti enoh*, which seems to mean 'one of the two (brahmanas) greets the other' on the human level of

this hymn, but 'one of the two clasps the other from behind (in copulation)' (with *ánu* 'after, behind'; see JAMISON 1993: 139–40, following BENDER 1917); if the latter translation is correct (which has often been disputed, see JAMISON 1993: 139), we may perhaps compare this instance with examples of the meaning 'passively catch' (10–13 above), but biological data rather suggest 'actively grab', in which case this instance semantically overlaps with *gr̥bhāyāti* (see below).

(23) RV 9.106.3b *grābhám gr̥bhñīta sānasím* 'may he (Indra) grab (or: acquire?) the profitable grasp (or: acquisition?)'

(24) RV 10.85.36a *gr̥bhñāmi te saubhagatvāya hástam* 'I (the groom) take your hand for prosperity'; the scene describes the wedding ceremony; a translation 'I receive your hand (in matrimony) is conceivable, but in view of the Indo-European custom whereby the groom 'leads' (PIE \*wed<sup>h</sup>-) the bride into his house, 'take' would seem to be more probable. Note, however, that this example occurs in the relatively late tenth book, which may show a beginning confusion of *gr̥bhñāti* and *gr̥bhāyāti*.

Whereas *gr̥bhñāti* primarily means 'receives, gets, (passively) catches', the first and foremost meaning of *gr̥bhāyāti* is '(actively) grabs, takes':

(25) RV 1.81.7cd *sám gr̥bhāya purú śatóbhayāhastyá vásu* 'grab together (Indra) many hundreds of treasures, both hands full (... bring treasures)'

A translation 'receive, get' is most unlikely: Indra is urged upon, not to receive treasures, but to collect them in order to bestow them upon the sacrificers. The next examples are even clearer:

(26) RV 7.104.18b *gr̥bhāyāta raksásah sám pinastana* '(Maruts,) grab hold of, crush the Rakṣasas (i.e. demons)'

(27) RV 1.140.7a *sá samstīro viṣṭīrah sám gr̥bhāyati* 'He (Agni 'Fire') grabs hold of those that are packed closely together and those that are packed loosely together (i.e. firewood)'

The next five instances can be translated similarly:

(28) RV 5.83.10a *ávarṣīr varṣám úd u śú gr̥bhāya-* '(Parjanya) you have made

- it rain, now stop it ('hold it up') nicely' (with *úd* 'up': take up > stop)
- (29) RV 8.69.10c *apasphúram ṛbhāyata* 'grab (2pl.) hold of the escapee' (i.e. Soma, so that Indra can drink it)
- (30) RV 8.70.12acd *tvām na indrāsām ... dhānānām ná sām ṛbhāyāsmayúr dvīh sām ṛbhāyāsmayúh* 'of these (cows), Indra, take thou for our sakes, as if they were grains, take thou doubly for our sakes' (in order to bestow on us)
- (31) RV 8.81.1b *citrām grābhām sām ṛbhāya* '(Indra) grab (acquire?) a wonderful grasp' (contrast 23 above)
- (32) RV 10.44.4c *ójah kṛṣva sām ṛbhāya tve ápi-* 'take on strength, grab it together in yourself'

As in the case of *ṛbhñāti*, there are numerous occurrences of *ṛbhāyāti* where the context does not allow us to distinguish the subtle difference between '(actively) grab, take' and '(passively) receive, get':

- (33) RV 1.91.4d *rājan soma prāti havyá ṛbhāya* 'take/receive the sacrifice, King Soma'
- (34) RV 1.148.3c *prá sú nayanta ṛbhāyanta iṣṭāv* 'they led him (i.e. Agni) nicely, grabbing him on their search' (see section 5 on shortening of \**āyant* to *ayant*)
- (35) RV 2.28.6b *samrāḷ ṛtāvó 'nu mā ṛbhāya-* 'take/receive me, true king of all'
- (36) RV 3.36.2c *prayamyámānān prāti sú ṛbhāya-* '(Indra,) take/receive the offerings (of Soma) nicely'
- (37) RV 4.4.15b *prāti stómaṃ śasyámānaṃ ṛbhāya* '(Agni) take/receive the recited praise'
- (38) RV 6.47.28d *déva ratha prāti havyá ṛbhāya* 'Divine Chariot, take/receive the sacrifices'
- (39) RV 8.17.5c *ṛbhāyá jihváyā mādhu* '(Indra) take/receive the honey with the tongue' (contrast 16)
- (40) RV 10.116.7b *prāti samrāḷ áhrñāno ṛbhāya* 'take/receive (this sacrifice) not unwillingly, King of All (i.e. Indra)'

As mentioned earlier, the semantic difference between 'receive, get, catch passively' and 'grab, take actively' can be described as a difference in the degree of control over the verbal action exerted by the subject. In 'receive'

the subject has relatively little control, while it has relatively high control in 'grab'. There is further confirmation of the presence of this semantic difference: 14 out of 16 occurrences of *ṛbhāyāti* are in the imperative mood, a category that implies a relatively high degree of control by the subject. Among the 27 instances of *ṛbhñāti* there are only two imperatives (9.46.4b, 10.62.1d=2d=3d=4d).<sup>2</sup> The choice of preverbs may well point into a similar direction: *prāti* 'against, face to face' is used together with semantically clearly marked *ṛbhñāti* 'receive' (1, 2, 8, 14, 19) but only with semantically unclearly marked *ṛbhāyāti* (33, 36, 37, 38, 40). Since *prāti* implies a small distance between subject and object, it is more appropriately connected with 'receive' than with 'grab': compare German *entgegennehmen* 'receive', with relatively low control of the subject. The preverb *sám* 'together', on the other hand, implies direct contact between subject and object and shows a preference for semantically clearly marked *ṛbhāyāti* 'grab' (25, 27, 30, 31, 32), whereas it occurs only once in connection with *ṛbhñāti*, in an instance which is not clearly marked as 'receive' (15): cf. German *zusammennehmen* 'collect', with relatively high control of the subject.<sup>3</sup>

Now the question arises whether this semantic distinction of *ṛbhñāti* and *ṛbhāyāti* is a Vedic innovation or rather an ancient inheritance. Avestan has exact formal counterparts of both Vedic verbs. The rare Late Avestan present *gərəβnāiti* matches Vedic *ṛbhñāti*:

Y 57.25 *haēnābyō yā us xrūrəm drafsəm gərəβnan* 'enemy hosts that will hold up the bloody banner'

Yt 10.13 *yō paoriiiō zaraniio.pīsō / srīrā barəšnauua gərəβnāiti* '(Miθra,) who as the first reaches (holds, controls?) the beautiful heights, adorned with gold (thence the very mighty one beholds the entire Aryan territory)'

Yt 10.68.1 = 10.143.3 *yejhe vāšəm hangrəβnāiti* 'whose chariot she holds (under control)?' Cf. the instances (9)–(13) of *ṛbhñāti*?

<sup>2</sup> It may well be that the choice of *ṛbhñāti* in (23) and of *ṛbhāyāti* in (31) in an identical context was dictated by the fact that (31) has the verb in the imperative, with high control, whereas (23) has not.

<sup>3</sup> I am indebted to Heinrich Hettrich for drawing my attention to these preverbs in a letter dated 7-1-1999.

It is difficult to distil the semantics of *gərəβnāiti* from these instances, in two of which the meaning is modified by a preverb. Neither 'receive, get', nor 'take, grab' do full justice to any of the three.<sup>4</sup> We may observe that BARTHOLOMAE's translation of the only form without preverb, Yt 10.13, as 'gewinnen, (als Ziel) erreichen', comes closer to 'get' than to 'grab, take'. Needless to say, no firm conclusions can be based on these forms.

The frequent Avestan present *gəuruuaiti*, on the other hand, is generally translated as 'nehmen, raffen, ergreifen' (e.g. EWAia I 505-7, HOFFMANN-FORSSMAN 1996: 186), which corresponds directly with the meaning of its Vedic counterpart *grbhāyāti*. A case in point is Yt 19.51 *ā.dim haθra hangəuruuaiti apəm napā auruuat.aspō* 'then immediately Apəm Napāt, who has swift horses, grabbed him'.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, OPers. <agrbyam> 'I captured, seized, took prisoner' is in striking semantic agreement with its Avestan and Vedic counterparts.

We may conclude that the Iranian cognates of Ved. *grbhāyāti* show the same semantic restriction to 'grab, take' as does the Vedic form. The scanty Iranian evidence for the cognate of Ved. *grbhnāti* does not necessarily agree or disagree with the meaning of the Vedic verb, but we can at least say that it is semantically different from *grbhāyāti*. Thus the claim is justified that the semantic distinction between both verbs must be relatively old. The question is: how old? In order to answer this, we must consider the historical morphology of both verbs.

The reconstruction of *grbhnāti* is straightforward: it is a nasal present *\*g<sup>h</sup>rb<sup>h</sup>-n-eH-* of the set root *\*g<sup>h</sup>reb<sup>h</sup>H-* (EWAia I 506, with reff.). As for *grbhāyāti*, two reconstructions have been proposed. It has been explained as a denominative verb, derived from a noun *\*grbhā-* 'grip'.<sup>6</sup> Since this noun is not reliably attested in Vedic<sup>7</sup> or Avestan and the root is a primary verbal root, this account is unsatisfactory. According to the alternative reconstruction, *grbhāyāti* is a deverbal derivative in *\*-ye-* of the stem of the nasal present,

<sup>4</sup> See BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 527-8; the reading of *hangərəβnāi* (N. 65) is uncertain (BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 529 n. 16).

<sup>5</sup> HINTZE (1994: 269) translates 'ergriff'.

<sup>6</sup> KUIPER 1937: 232 (with reff.); hesitatingly HOFFMANN-FORSSMAN 1996: 186.

<sup>7</sup> It is by no means certain that RV 7.21.2 *grbhā-* means 'ergreifend' (EWAia I 505).

hence *\*g<sup>h</sup>rb<sup>h</sup>-n-H-ye-* > Indo-Iranian *\*g<sup>h</sup>rb<sup>h</sup>āya-*.<sup>8</sup> There are other verbs in Vedic which show a *nā-*present of the ninth class beside an allegedly synonymous *āya-*present (HOFFMANN 1966: 68-9; JAMISON 1983: 178-9). It seems to me that the latter reconstruction is superior to the former, as it can be supported by the semantics involved in creating *ye-*derivatives of nasal presents in general, both in Indo-Iranian and in other Indo-European languages. This is the subject that will be explored in the remainder of this article.

## 2. Semantics reformulated: 'reversed' derivative

Ved. *grbhnāti* '(passively) receives, gets, catches' and *grbhāyāti* '(actively) grasps, takes' differ from one another not only by the degree of control exerted by the subject. The semantic difference can also be analyzed according to another parameter, which I shall call the *internal direction of the verbal action*. In the clause 'the King of Persia receives the prisoners', it is implied that the object ('prisoners') moves, or is moved by someone, in the direction of the subject. Accordingly, the object of clauses (1) - (8) above, where *grbhnāti* can be translated as 'receive', is thought of as moving towards the subject. Strikingly, in the hunting terminology of clauses (10) - (13), *grbhnāti* means 'catch an animal' by lying in wait or setting a snare, whereby the animal blunders into the hunter or his snare.

In the clause 'the King of Persia takes prisoners', however, the direction is reversed: the subject moves in the direction of the object. This is the situation in the examples (25) - (32) of *grbhāyāti*.

I shall argue that this reversal of subject and object roles with regard to the verbal action, which can still be glimpsed in Vedic *grbhnāti* / *grbhāyāti*, is a constant feature of *\*ye-*derivatives of nasal presents, and that it is in fact the old function of *\*ye-*. For the sake of convenience these *\*ye-*derivatives will be

<sup>8</sup> SAUSSURE (1878: 251f.), INSLER (1971: 574 n. 4), Werba, Schindler and Eichner apud PETERS (1980: 323), HOLLIFIELD (1981: 168), JAMISON (1983: 179), PETERS (1986: 372 n. 26), MAYRHOFER (EWAia I, 506), RASMUSSEN (1989: 278 on SCHINDLER's Avestan pair *mitaiiatu* Y.10.1 'soll wohnen' vs. *miθnāiti* Y.10.39; RASMUSSEN accounts for the type in *āyá* on the basis of an optative), HACKSTEIN (1995: 29-30 on the Tocharian B pair *mintanam* (nasal present), *māntaññem* (nasal present + *\*ye-*), to which Michiel Driessen drew my attention).

labelled 'reversed' derivatives. The internal direction of the verbal action will be symbolized by  $\rightarrow$  and  $\leftarrow$  (note that the reversal of the arrow in derivation rather than its direction in each single instance is of importance). I shall use S and O as abbreviations for subject and object:

nasal present:	'I receive (prisoners)'	S $\leftarrow$ (O)
nasal present + *ye:	'I take (prisoners)'	S $\rightarrow$ (O)

According to this description, the difference in control exerted by the subject in 'receives' vs. 'takes' is a consequence of the reversal of the internal direction of the verbal action. In order to confirm that this description is historically more accurate than a semantic description in terms of degree of control by the subject, we shall need pairs of plain nasal present and nasal present + \*ye with 'reversed' meaning, where the semantic difference between nasal present and \*ye-derivative cannot be simply described in terms of control by the subject. Such pairs do indeed exist, as I shall argue later on (e.g. 'reach' vs. 'get', and 'drive' vs. 'drive oneself to, visit'). For the moment it suffices to state as a working hypothesis that the addition of \*ye to the nasal present \*g<sup>h</sup>ṛb<sup>h</sup>-n-H- 'he receives' originally turned 'he receives' (> gr̥bhñāti) into its 'reversed' counterpart 'he makes receive' (vel sim.), whence the attested 'he takes, grabs' (> gr̥bhāyāti) has developed. This hypothesis will now be put to the test.

### 3. The importance of morphological minimal pairs for establishing meaning

If one seeks to establish the meaning of a morpheme, the most direct way of obtaining a reliable result is by collecting pairs of words which distinguish themselves only by the presence or absence of this morpheme. Subsequently the semantic features which distinguish the word with the morpheme from the same word without the morpheme can be ascribed to the morpheme. This is the method that I have adopted above and that I shall continue to apply throughout this article: the meaning of \*ye will be established by comparing the semantics of concrete nasal presents with the semantics of the same nasal presents + \*ye. In order not to restrict the amount of material unduly, nasal presents and their \*ye-derivatives that differ from one another in mood, voice, time

(present/imperfect) and accompanying preverbs will be included.

This method has the advantage that it reduces a complicated problem, the meaning of \*ye, to its bare bones. Thus the meaning of gr̥bhāyāti < \*g<sup>h</sup>ṛb<sup>h</sup>-n-H-ye- is contrasted with that of its derivational base, gr̥bhñāti < \*g<sup>h</sup>ṛb<sup>h</sup>-n-eH-, and not with the meaning of, say, German graben, Lithuanian gróbtī or Slavic grabiti, which have a completely different morphological structure. The semantic difference between gr̥bhāyāti and, say, grabiti can be attributed to any number of the morphological differences between both forms, which disqualifies the value of this comparison for establishing the meaning of \*ye-derivatives. Working with minimal pairs such as gr̥bhāyāti < \*g<sup>h</sup>ṛb<sup>h</sup>-n-H-ye- and gr̥bhñāti < \*g<sup>h</sup>ṛb<sup>h</sup>-n-eH- will yield reliable results whilst steering clear of the obvious pitfalls involved in treating more general questions such as 'what do the nasal presents mean?'<sup>9</sup> and 'what do the ye-presents mean?' Rather, understanding the meaning of \*ye on the basis of minimal pairs will contribute to a general theory concerning the meaning of \*ye-presents, and not vice versa.

### 4. More evidence I: Vedic ṛñj-, irajyá-

The nasal present stem ṛñj- has the meaning 'direct oneself towards, press ahead towards, strive after'.<sup>10</sup> It belongs to the root \*h<sub>3</sub>reg-, which is also found in Gr. ὀπέγω 'stretch out, reach for', Lat. regō 'direct' (EWAia II 425). Hence ṛñj- reflects a zero grade nasal present stem \*h<sub>3</sub>r-n-g-. Middle forms of the nasal present occur frequently in the Rigveda, but the middle endings are not responsible for the gloss 'oneself' in 'direct oneself towards', as the following examples of the active voice show:

RV 1.171.2b ṛñjati sáruḥ 'a projectile that presses ahead' (thrown by the Maruts)

RV 3.31.1c pitá ... duhitúḥ sékam ṛñján 'the father directing himself towards (striving after) the outpouring (i.e. fertilization?) of the daughter'

<sup>9</sup> On which see now MEISER 1993.

<sup>10</sup> A meaning 'direct someone/something' is not securely established: see JOACHIM 1978: 60-62.

RV 3.43.6c *prá yé dvitá divá rñjánty áitāh* ‘who press ahead again and again towards (i.e. push open? [GELDNER]) the closed doors of heaven’

RV 4.38.8b *durvartuḥ smā bhavati bhīmá rñján* (when thousands fight with him) ‘he is difficult to avert, pressing ahead, the terrible one’

A synchronically opaque derivative in \**ye* of this nasal present stem is found in the archaic *irajyáti* (Schindler apud JASANOFF 1983: 72; PETERS 1986: 372; EWAia II 425).<sup>11</sup> Here *ir* reflects a syllabic *r* in antevocalic position (cf. Skt. \**rHV* > *irV*); this \**r* was doubtlessly introduced from the simple nasal present \**h<sub>3</sub>r-n-eǵ-*.<sup>12</sup> *irajyáti* does not mean ‘direct oneself towards’, however, but ‘lead, rule, hold sway over, control’, usually with a genetical complement, as is common with verbs belonging to this semantic sphere:

RV 1.55.3b *mahó nṛmñásya dhármanām irajyasi* ‘you (Indra) control the powers of great manliness’

RV 1.151.6d *yuvám víprasya mánmanām irajyathah* (Mitra and Varuṇa) ‘you control the thoughts of the wise’

RV 8.41.9e *sá saptānām irajyati* ‘he rules the seven (streams)’<sup>13</sup>

So while a 1sg. active present of *rñj-* means ‘I direct myself towards something/–one’, its counterpart of the derivative *irajyá-* presupposes a ‘reversed’ meaning ‘I direct someone / something’, perhaps ‘towards myself’, hence ‘I rule’. The element ‘towards myself’ is probably still discernible in the following example:

RV 10.75.2d *yád eṣām ágraṃ jágatām irajyási* ‘(in your course you [i.e. the

<sup>11</sup> Other reconstructions and various considerations can be found in KUIPER 1937: 59, BEEKES 1979: 15–17, OLSEN 1993: 364.

<sup>12</sup> JASANOFF 1983: 72 n. 32, PETERS 1986: 372 n. 26. The analogical influence exerted by \**h<sub>3</sub>r-n-eǵ-* > \**rñj-* also accounts for the zero grade *rñj-* instead of expected \**raj-* < \**h<sub>3</sub>r-n-ǵ-* (cf. *raghú-* ‘quick’ < \**h<sub>1</sub>ṛg<sup>wh</sup>-u-*, Gr. *ἐλαχύς* ‘small’, *ἐλαφρός* ‘quick’). Thus *rñj-* has analogical *rñ* instead of expected *ra* and *irajyáti* has analogical *ir* < \**r* instead of expected *r*.

<sup>13</sup> Other instances in RV are 1.7.9b; 6.60.1c; 7.23.2b; 8.39.10c; 8.40.5b; 8.46.16a; 10.93.3a; 10.140.4a.

river Sindhu] pass over the back of the earth) when you direct the tip of these that move (i.e. the tributary rivers) towards yourself’.

As in section 2, the semantic difference between the nasal present (*rñj-*) and its derivative in \**ye* (*irajyá-*) can be described in terms of a reversal of the internal direction of the verbal action:

* <i>h<sub>3</sub>r-n-ǵ-</i>	‘I direct myself’	S ←
* <i>h<sub>3</sub>r-n-ǵ-</i> + * <i>ye</i>	‘I direct someone/something (towards myself?)’ → ‘I rule’	S →

Clearly the semantic aspects of deriving *irajyá-* from *rñj-* cannot simply be described as an increase in the degree of control by the subject, as was possible in the case of *gr̥bhñáti*, *gr̥bhāyáti*. Nor, it may be added, can the semantics of \**ye* be described as plainly causative, although *rñj-* : *irajyá-* comes quite close, as this does not account for the difference between *gr̥bhñáti* ‘receive’ and *gr̥bhāyáti* ‘take’.

## 5. More evidence II: Vedic *iṣṇáti*, *iṣayati* and its Greek cognates

In the Rigveda, the relatively rare verb *iṣṇáti* means ‘impart movement to, give an impulse, impel, send’, combined with an accusative which expresses either the direction (send to + acc.), or the person or thing that is being sent. It is a nasal present, reflecting \**His-n-eh<sub>2</sub>-*, of the PIE root \**Hish<sub>2</sub>-* (EWAia I 271–2).

RV 1.63.2d (*vájram yena amitrān*) *púra iṣṇási puruhūta pūrvīḥ* ‘the club with which you, much invoked one, drive off the enemies to many fortresses’

RV 1.61.13c *yudhé ... iṣṇáná áyudhāni* ‘driving himself to (his) weapons, for fighting’

RV 1.181.6b *pūrvír iṣás ... mádhva iṣṇán* (of the ox pulling the chariot of one of the Ásvins:) ‘sending out many libations of honey’

RV 2.20.5b *índro gātúm iṣṇán* ‘Indra, setting (the *bráhma* of the Angirasas) on course’

RV 4.17.3a *bhinád girtm śavasā vájram iṣṇánn* ‘he (Indra) split the mountain, impelling his club with force’

RV 9.17.5c *iṣṇán sūryam ná codayaḥ* 'you (Soma) spur (your horses) as one who impels the sun'

RV 10.61.5a *práthiṣṭa yásya vīrákarmam iṣṇád* 'made himself wide, urging on his penis? / desiring a man's work? (see GELDNER 1951 ad loc.)

Beside the nasal present there is a present stem *iṣaya-*, with short *-a-*, which in 14 out of 18 occurrences is represented by participial and 3pl. forms, all of which show the sequence *-áyant-*. As LUBOTSKY (1989: 101–105) has argued, the active present participle and 3pl. forms in *-nt-* provide the original locus for metrical shortening of *\*-ā-*, so that a present stem *\*iṣāya-* may well be hiding behind attested *iṣáyant-* (thus JAMISON 1983: 179, with references).

While there is a consensus that all forms are derivatives of the same PIE root, the question whether *iṣaya-* represents more than one derivative of this root, with correspondingly different meanings, is a vexed one. According to JAMISON (1983: 49, 100), who discusses previous scholarship, there are two verbs. The first is *iṣaya-* 'prosper, is strong'. This is a combination of GRASSMANN's *iṣay-* 'frisch, kräftig sein' (1996: 226) and most instances of his 'causative' *iṣāya-* 'zustreben, fördern, (Gaben) mittheilen' etc. (1996: 222–3; see JAMISON 1983: 49 n. 3 for a convincing disposal of the formal reasons for a separation).<sup>14</sup> Again according to JAMISON (1983: 100), three instances of GRASSMANN's causative *iṣāya-* remain, as 'send, impel' vel sim. would be a more appropriate rendering than 'prosper'. The three instances in question are the following:

RV 1.77.4d (*ye maghāvānas sáviṣṭhāḥ ...*) *iṣáyanta mánma* 'the most powerful patrons, who for their own sakes send (?) a hymn (to the gods)'

RV 7.87.3d (*kaváyah*) *yá iṣáyanta mánma* 'the wise ones, who for their own sakes send (?) a hymn (to the gods)'

RV 8.26.3c *pūrvīr iṣā iṣáyantav áti kṣapáh* (Aśvins and Vāyus,) 'sending (?) many libations throughout the nights'

JAMISON's case rests on two observations (1983: 100 n. 55). In the first two instances, the subjects of *iṣáyanta* are patrons/kavis, and the object is *mánma*,

<sup>14</sup> Yet JAMISON seems not to have convinced LUBOTSKY (1997: 316, 320), who maintains GRASSMANN's subdivision.

a hymn, and the expected action performed with a song by patrons/kavis is that of 'sending' the song to the gods. However, as GOTŌ pointed out (GOTŌ 1988: 310), the patrons/kavis also 'prosper by' the song, as the gods will reward them for the sacrifice, and there is therefore no semantic reason to prefer 'send' to 'prosper by'. In RV 8.26.3c, the Aśvins and Vāyus may just as well be 'enjoying libations' sent by the sacrificers.

What remains is JAMISON's formal reason: the three instances allegedly meaning 'send' have a direct object while the other instances, meaning 'prosper', are intransitive. This situation in itself is not a compelling reason to distinguish two verbs: English 'walk' is normally intransitive, but the fact that it occasionally has an object, as in 'walk the streets, walk the dog', does not justify setting up two different verbs. More specifically, there is one instance where *iṣaya-* has an accusative complement and a meaning 'send' is impossible:

RV 6.16.27b *iṣáyanto viśvam áyuh* (these are your protégés, Agni,) who enjoy their whole life'.<sup>15</sup>

Therefore, since there is a transitive *iṣaya-* that does not mean 'send' but rather 'enjoy, prosper', there is no longer any formal reason to deny the other instances of transitive *iṣaya-* the same translation.

As a result, neither formal nor semantic reasons for distinguishing more than one verb *iṣaya-* remain. The four instances with direct object discussed above and the following instances, which lack an object, are all in agreement with an approximate translation 'prosper, enjoy, be strong':

RV 1.185.9d *-iṣā mādanta iṣayema devāḥ* 'enjoying ourselves by libation, let us prosper, o gods'

RV 2.2.11b *yásmin sujātā iṣáyanta sūrāyah* (Agni,) 'by whom the noble lords (of the sacrifice, i.e. the patrons) prosper'

RV 6.1.2b *ilás padá iṣáyann* (Agni) 'prospering in the place of libation' (similar construction in 10.91.1b)

<sup>15</sup> GELDNER 1951: II, 111 translates: 'Diese sind deine Schützlinge, Agni, die des vollen Lebens sich erfreuen sollen, die der Kargheit des Geldprotzen entgehen, die die Missgunst des Geldprotzen überwinden'. GRASSMANN (1996: 222–3) assigns the meaning 'fördern, erlaben, erquicken' to the verb in this verse.

- RV 6.1.8c *prētīṣaṇim iṣáyantam pāvakám ... agnīm* ‘striving, prospering, pure Agni’  
 RV 6.16.25b *iṣayaté mártýāya* ‘(seeing you, Agni, is good) for a strong/prospering mortal’  
 RV 6.18.5 *valám ... hánn ... -iṣáyantam* ‘you (Indra) slew Vala, who enjoyed (the cows)’  
 RV 6.64.4d *rayīm ... iṣayádhyai* ‘riches to enjoy’ (same infinitive in 1.183.3c, 6.49.5c)  
 RV 9.84.3b *devánām sumná iṣáyann* ‘prospering by the favour of the gods’

In four instances, the context would seem to favour a translation ‘cause to prosper’:

- RV 3.33.12c *prá pinvadhvam iṣáyantīh surádhāh-* (to the rivers that have just provided passage to an army:) ‘Swell ye, who provide prosperity, generous ones’  
 RV 4.56.4 *rodasī ... nah ... iṣáyantī ... pātam* ‘worlds, protect us, providing prosperity’  
 RV 5.49.4b *sindhava iṣáyanto* ‘rivers, bringing prosperity’  
 RV 8.5.5ab *mámhiṣṭhā vājasátamā-iṣáyantā śubhás páti* ‘the most generous, most rewarding lords of beauty, bringing prosperity’ (the Aśvins)

Remarkably, none of these four instances of ‘cause to prosper’ has an object, so this meaning cannot be strictly proved. Put differently, when *iṣaya-* has an object, it never has causative meaning. Under these circumstances it seems more likely that ‘prosper’ is the core meaning and that ‘cause to prosper’, if it is real, is a peripheral development than vice versa.

Since *iṣaya-* probably reflects an older *\*iṣāya-* (see above), the question arises what the origin of this form is. According to LUBOTSKY (1989: 104), *\*iṣāya-* is a denominative derived from the root noun *iṣ-*. Since nouns with a stem ending in a consonant form verbs by adding *ya* directly to the final consonant (*apas-yá-* ‘be active’; MACDONELL 1910: 401), one would in that case expect to find *iṣyá-* rather than *\*iṣāya-*. LUBOTSKY acknowledges this, but claims that root nouns behaved differently on the evidence of *ūrjáyant-* ‘strengthening’, which is derived from the root noun *ūrj-*. This parallel is not entirely convincing, however, as there is residual evidence for an *a-*stem in

*ūrja-sani-* ‘bestowing strength’ (RV 6.4.4), from which *ūrjayant-* < *\*ūrjāyant-* may alternatively have been derived.<sup>16</sup>

JAMISON (1983: 49, 100, 178) considered *iṣayati* ‘prosper’ to be an *aya-*derivative of the verbal root *iṣ-*, while she reconstructed *iṣayati* ‘send’ as *\*iṣāyāti* and connected this with *iṣñāti*, in accordance with the type *gr̥bhñāti* – *gr̥bhāyāti*. Since we saw earlier that there is no good reason to distinguish two verbs with different histories, a choice must be made among these alternatives. In view of LUBOTSKY’s demonstration that hiding behind *aya-*formations (almost) exclusively attested as participial forms are *āya-*formations rather than causatives, *iṣaya-* is probably not a causative. As a denominative origin meets with a formal problem (one would expect *\*\*iṣ-yá-*, see above), we are left with the option that *iṣaya-* belongs to the type *gr̥bhāyāti*.

In fact, interpreting *iṣayati* < *\*iṣāyāti* as a *ye-*derivative, *\*His-n-h<sub>2</sub>-ye-*, of the nasal present reflected in *iṣñāti* has a distinct advantage: the meaning of nasal present + *\*ye* reconstructed in sections 2 and 4 is capable of bridging the considerable semantic gap between ‘impel, send’ and ‘prosper, enjoy’:

<i>*His-n-h<sub>2</sub>-</i>	‘impel someone / something’	S →
<i>*His-n-h<sub>2</sub>- + *ye</i>	‘impel oneself by something, enjoy something’	S ←

This pair is also an instance where the addition of *\*ye* does not increase the degree of control by the subject: the effect is rather the reverse.

GA. *iṣaiṣas* ‘prospering’ (Y.50.9) is the exact formal and semantic equivalent of RV *iṣaya-*, from which we may conclude that the *ye-*derivative is at least as old as Proto-Indo-Iranian. Both the nasal present and its derivative may be traced even further back in time.

<sup>16</sup> Alternatively, JAMISON (1983: 180 n. 4) claims that transitive *ūrjáyati* was reinterpreted from originally intransitive *ūrjáyati* ‘becomes strong’.

## 6. Greek evidence

The Indo-Iranian nasal presents of the root *\*Hish<sub>2</sub>-* are particularly interesting because they probably have an exact counterpart in Greek.

The simple nasal present is represented by the rare verb *ινάω*, *ινέω* 'to empty, clear, carry off by evacuations' (thus LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES-MCKENZIE s.v.). This is a thematicization<sup>17</sup> of *\*ināmi* < *\*isnāmi* < *\*His-n-h<sub>2</sub>-mi* (GARCÍA-RAMÓN 1986: 503 ff.). Its semantics are somewhat removed from that of RV *iṣṇāti*, but an unproblematic semantic chain can be constructed to fill the gap: 'impel, drive' > 'drive off' (cf. RV 1.63.2d above) > 'empty' > 'clear, cleanse'.

Much more frequently attested is its cognate *ιαίνομαι* 'become warm, freshen oneself up, enjoy', *ιαίνω* 'warm, freshen someone up', which has an s-aorist stem *ιην-* and an intransitive aorist *ιάνθη*. Cf. the following examples of the present-imperfect tense:

- κ 359 *ιαίνετο δ' ὕδωρ* 'the water heated up'  
 τ 537 *σφιν ιαίνομαι εισσορώσα* 'watching I enjoy them'  
 ο 379 *οἷά τε θυμὸν ἀεὶ δμῶεσσιν ιαίνει* 'such as time and again refresh the heart of slaves'

GARCÍA-RAMÓN (1986: 503ff.)<sup>18</sup> regards *ιαίνω* as a denominative verb, derived from the *r/n*-stem *\*Hish<sub>2</sub>-r/n-*, which is indirectly attested in LAV. *iṣarā* 'quickly' and the Vedic denominative *iṣanyāti* 'sends'. However, since other explanations have been suggested for *iṣanyāti* (cf. JASANOFF 1983: 72ff., who argues for a deverbative origin), the existence of the *n*-stem remains to be proved. The interpretation of RV 2.2.9 *iṣāni* is obscure (so recently EWAia I 272, LUBOTSKY 1997 s.v.). This renders the denominative origin speculative, though in itself quite possible. In comparison, a deverbative origin seems more likely: the basic nasal present is in fact attested in both Greek and Vedic.

Semantically, the Greek middle comes very close to the Vedic active forms of *iṣaya-* 'prosper'. The Vedic state of affairs is probably older: it is

<sup>17</sup> A particularly early example is 3sg. them. present *δαμνᾶι* (λ 221; RISCH 1974: 320).

<sup>18</sup> For SANDOZ's reconstruction of a basic *\*is-n-ei-ti*, *\*is-n-i-mes* (SANDOZ 1974), see the objections raised by GARCÍA-RAMÓN (op. cit. 504).

easy to see how an active verb meaning 'prosper, become warm' adopted middle inflection in Greek because of its meaning, and a new active verb, *ιαίνω* 'to make prosperous, warm someone up', with appropriate active semantics, was created by analogy. By comparison, it would be much more difficult to explain the Vedic active inflection as secondary.

Now the semantic relation of Gr. *ινάω* to *ιαίνομαι* can be described in the same way as the semantic relation of other nasal presents to nasal presents + *\*ye*, in particular, of *iṣṇāti* to *iṣayati*. This leads to the reconstruction of *ιαίνομαι* as *\*isan-y-* < *\*His-ṇ-h<sub>2</sub>-y-* and the following semantic analysis:

<i>*His-n-h<sub>2</sub>-</i>	'impel' > Gr. 'empty, clean'	S →
<i>*His-n-h<sub>2</sub>- + *ye</i>	'impel oneself' > 'prosper' > 'get warm'	S ←

Thus we find the reversed meaning expected of a *\*ye*-derivative of a nasal present.

Incidentally, this account of the Greek verb would offer precious evidence for the development of *\*CRHy* in Greek: the reconstruction, if correct, indicates that the sequence *\*CRHy* develops as *\*CRHV* would, and not as *\*CRHC*. As far as I know, there is no reliable evidence to either prove or disprove this assumption for Greek. On general phonetic grounds, the inherently high sonority of *y* makes it the most vowel-like of all consonants and therefore the consonant most likely to behave like a vowel.

Greek has another pair just like this, with a similar derived meaning in the form with *\*ye*. The basic nasal present is found in *μάρναμαι* 'fight, do battle', which is intransitive and in Homer has no forms outside the present/imperfect middle. A typical example is:

- Γ 307 *μαρνάμενον φίλον υἱὸν ἀρηϊφίλω Μενελάω* 'that my son fights with Menelaos, Ares' favourite'

It is generally acknowledged that *μάρναμαι* reflects a nasal present *\*mr-n-h<sub>2</sub>-* of the PIE root *\*merh<sub>2</sub>-* 'grab' (EWAia II 320), which is also attested in RV 10.138.4 *amṛṇat* 'robbed' (of Indra plundering treasure houses), RV 6.44.17 *prá mṛṇā* 'grab!' (of Indra vanquishing the enemy). The meaning of the Greek

verb can be derived from basic 'grab, take (away)' through an approximate 'come to grips, grab one another'.

Its *ye*-derivative appears in *μαραίνομαι*, which occurs only twice in Homer, where it refers to a fire going out:

I 212 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ πῦρ ἐκάη καὶ φλόξ ἐμαράνθη 'when the fire had burnt through and through and the flame had died down'

Ψ 228 τῆμος πυρκαϊῆ ἐμαραίνετο, παύσατο δὲ φλόξ 'then the burning pyre went out, and the flame stopped'

After Homer, *μαραίνομαι* also means 'waste away', for example as a result of an illness. Only then does the active counterpart appear: *μαραίνω* 'waste, wither, quench someone or something'. In view of its later appearance, this may well be a secondary formation based on the older middle form.

The semantic relation between *μάρναμαι* and *μαραίνομαι* or, in other words, between the nasal present and its derivative in *\*ye* agrees with what was found in the verbs that were discussed previously:

<i>*mr̥-n-h₂-</i>	'grab, take away' > (middle) 'come to grips, grab (mutually), fight'	S →
<i>*mr-ŋ-h₂- + *ye</i> <sup>19</sup>	'take oneself away' > (middle) 'die down, waste away'	S ←

## 7. Italic and Celtic

The best evidence for *ye*-derivatives of nasal presents and their 'reversed' semantics is to be found in Italic and Celtic, which preserve a relatively large number of nasal presents with their derivatives.

<sup>19</sup> *\*mr-ŋ-h₂-y-* would regularly have developed into *\*\*βραίνω*; syllabic *\*r̥* > *αρ* was doubtlessly introduced from the basic nasal present, *μάρναμαι* (cf. fn. 12 on the *\*r̥* > *ir* of Vedic *irajyāti*).

## 7.1. Latin *linquere*, Old Irish *léicid*

Lat. *linquere* 'to leave' reflects the simple nasal present *\*li-n-kʷ-*, which is also attested in Skt. *rinákti* 'leaves'. The object of *linquere* represents that which is left by the subject:

Verg. A 3.124 *linquimus Ortygiae portus* 'we leave the harbour of Ortygia'

OIr. *léicid* is the well-known Celtic representative of this nasal present. Before we can turn to the semantics of this form, a number of formal aspects must be discussed.

The vocalism of the first syllable can easily be explained on the basis of PIE *\*linkʷ-* (> Prim.Ir. *\*līgʷ-* > *léc-*).<sup>20</sup> *léicid* belongs to THURNEISEN'S class AII presents, which normally represent old causatives in *\*-eye-*, denominatives in *\*(i)ye-* (Prim.Ir. *\*-ie-*) and, perhaps, *\*-eye-*, and, finally, statives in *\*-ē-ye-*. OIr. *léicid* belongs to none of these types. It is not a stative in view of the meaning and the presence of the nasal infix. Nor is it a denominative verb: the root is a primary verbal root, and the nasal infix gives its verbal origin away. Nor can *léicid* be a causative, as causatives drop the suffix *\*-eye-* outside the present: cf. *ad·suidi* 'fix, cause to settle' < *\*sod-eye-*, 2sg. *a*-subjunctive *ad·sodae* < *\*sod-āse-*. This conclusion is further supported by the absence of *o*-grade in the root and the presence of the nasal infix in *léicid*. As if it were a denominative, *léicid* retains the suffix, as its 2sg. *a*-subjunctive *léice* < *\*linkʷ-i-āse-* shows (cf. denominative *ad·rtmi* 'counts', derived from *rtm* 'number', 2sg. *a*-subjunctive *·rtme* < *\*-rīm-i-āse*, not *\*\*·rtmae* < *\*-rīm-āse-*). From a formal point of view, the suffix in *léicid* can be reconstructed as *\*-eye-*, *\*-iye-* or *\*-ye-*. Since there is no deverbial *\*-iye-* in IE, nor deverbial *\*-eye-* outside the causatives, the only remaining possibility is *\*-ye-*, which is of course a well-known deverbial suffix in all IE languages.

It is normally assumed that IE *\*ye*-presents ended up in the OIr. BII class, which has a suffix *\*-ye-* throughout the present tense but loses this in the other tenses and moods. This consensus is surprising for two connected

<sup>20</sup> SCHRIJVER 1993: 42-6; MCCONE 1996: 64; but MCCONE 1998 explains the vocalism by analogy.

reasons. The 3sg. present conjunct of a typical BII verb like (absolute) *gaibid*, (conjunct) *gaib* 'takes' cannot be explained on the basis of a suffix *\*ye*: *\*gab-ye-t(i)* should have yielded *\*gabiet* > OIr. *\*\*gaibi* rather than *gaib*. Furthermore, since PIE *\*y* /C\_V regularly became *\*i* in Prim.Ir. (cf. PCl. *\*alyos* (> Welsh *eil*) > Prim.Ir. *\*alios* > OIr. *aile* 'second'), the expected reflex of *\*-ye-ti* in OIr. is *\*-yet* (early *i*-apocope) > *\*-ieh* > *-i*, in other words, the attested ending of the 3sg. present conjunct of the AII verbs (*léicid*, *léici*).

Although this issue merits a detailed analysis, which will be provided in SCHRIJVER (forthcoming), a brief outline of what I believe to be the origin of the OIr. AII and BII classes is in order:

- AII – beside causatives in *\*-eye-*, statives in *\*-ēye-* and denominatives in *\*(t)ye-*, which are well-known,  
 – deverbatives in *\*-ye-* which have generalized this suffix throughout the inflection (cf. Germanic non-denominative non-causative verbs in *-jan*, e.g. Goth. *taujan* 'do', *siujan* 'sew'; Latin type *audire*, *audīvī* 'hear'); here belongs *léicid* and two verbs to be discussed later on, *tréicid* 'leaves' and *con-téici* 'freezes'.
- BII – *\*ye*-presents which lack *\*ye* in non-present forms. To this group belongs *maidid*, conjunct *maid* 'breaks', which in view of MWelsh *maeddu* 'to knead' < *\*majδ-* < *\*mayy-* < *\*mad-ye-* must have had *\*-ye-* rather than *\*-i-* (SCHRIJVER 1995: 317).  
 – athematic *i*-presents which lack *i* in non-present forms. The type is preserved in Italic: *faciō*, *facīs* < *\*d<sup>h</sup>ak-i-si* etc., Oscan *factud*, *fakiiad* < *\*d<sup>h</sup>ak-i-tōd*, *\*d<sup>h</sup>ak-i-āt*; it is required in order to explain the OIr. 3sg. present conjunct: *\*g<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>h</sup>-i-ti* > *\*gabit* (early *i*-apocope) > OIr. *gaib* 'takes' (cf. Umbrian *hahtu* 'let him grab', *habiest* 'he will grab' < *\*g<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>h</sup>-i-*).<sup>21</sup>

Accordingly, the reconstruction of OIr. *léicid* as *\*link<sup>w</sup>-ye-ti*, plausible enough

<sup>21</sup> I withdraw my earlier opinion, expressed in SCHRIJVER 1995: 110, that *\*-ye-* > *\*-e-* is capable of generating *gaib* from *\*g<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>h</sup>-ye-ti*: BII forms like OIr. *guid* 'prays' < *\*g<sup>w</sup>idih* < *\*g<sup>w</sup>ed<sup>h</sup>-i-* require a Prim.Ir. *\*i* rather than *\*e* in the second syllable.

in itself, can be embedded into the larger structure of OIr. verbal derivation. Returning now to the issue at hand, we may observe that the meaning of *léicid* is not 'leaves', as in Latin *linquit*, but 'lets go'.<sup>22</sup>

*in leicfide in cimbid* (Ir. Texts i 11.7) 'would the prisoner be set free?'  
*bean ... leicter ar bein* (Laws V 292.22) 'a woman ... that was left for another woman'  
*co ro leic guth* (SR 1300) 'and he let go a call'

The distinctive meaning is even clearer in the compound *do-léici*, which not only means 'lets go, gives up' but also 'casts':

*nīs-teilcset a ndrúid ass sein* (TBC2 20) 'their druids did not let them go thence'  
*do-lleici cloich asa thailm* (TBC2 815) 'he casts a stone from his sling'

Only rarely do the meanings of *linquere* and *léicid* overlap, as in the following examples:

*act nand léicci concupiscentia carnalis* (Wb. 3d13) gl. 'apart from the fact that c.c. does not allow it'  
*lupos apud ovis linquere* (Pl.Ps. 141) 'to allow wolves with the sheep'

The meaning 'allow' can easily be derived from either 'leave' or 'let go' and consequently tells us little about the central meanings of *linquere* and *léicid*, which, as we have seen, are quite different. This semantic difference can again be described in terms of a reversal of the internal direction of the verbal action:

<i>*li-n-k<sup>w</sup>-</i>	'leaves'	S ←
<i>*li-n-k<sup>w</sup>-ye-</i>	'lets go, casts'	S →

<sup>22</sup> The bare nasal present, Ved. *rinákti*, means 'lets go, releases' and agrees better with *léicid* than with *linquere*. This proves little, however. Since in Indo-Iranian, unlike in Italo-Celtic, there was no opposition between *\*linek<sup>w</sup>-ti* and *\*link<sup>w</sup>-ye-*, the latter being unattested, there was nothing to prevent the semantics of *\*linek<sup>w</sup>-ti* to change from 'leaves' to 'releases, lets go'.

At this point it may be useful to extend the semantic analysis in order to show how the semantic shift involved in adding *\*ye* to a nasal present differs from passive forms, where the subject has no control over the action, and from causative forms, where a new actor is introduced:

verb active	S (+control) ← (O)	<i>linquit</i> 'he leaves (her)'
verb- <i>*ye</i> active	S (+control) → (O)	<i>léicid</i> 'he lets (her) go'
verb passive	S (-control) →	<i>linquitur</i> 'he is left'
verb- <i>*ye</i> passive	S (-control) ←	<i>léicthir</i> 'he is let go'
causative verb	S (+control) O ⇔ (O)	'he makes (her) leave (the house)', or 'he makes (her) let go (of the bird)'

Clearly, whereas the *ye*-derivative has semantic features in common with the passive (subject is affected by the leaving) and the causative (subject makes someone or something leave), it cannot be described fully by either term.

### 7.2. Old Irish *tréicid*

Like *léicid*, OIr. *tréicid* 'leaves' is an AII present:

*ni·irnaidiub Coin Culaind ar ro-m·thréic* (LU 4015) 'I shall not wait for Cú Chulainn, for he has left me'

*mo chorp trúag nach·tréic tenid* (Arch iii 216.27) 'my poor body, which could not leave the fire'

*tréicid* may be reconstructed as *\*tr̥nk-ye-*. The *-n-* is probably the nasal infix. The possibility that the root was *\*tr̥nk-* cannot be excluded, however, as its cognates all contain *-n-*: Goth. *preihan* 'press, crush' < PGM. *\*prinx-*, OE *pringan*, OHG *dringan* 'press, drive' < PGM. *\*pring-* < *\*trenk-*, probably also Lith. *treñkti* 'push roughly'.

Although the reconstruction of a nasal present is not certain, the semantic relation between the basic verb attested in Germanic and Baltic on the one hand, and the *ye*-derivative on the other is the same as that between nasal

present and nasal present + *\*ye*: while the subject of *preihan* performs the 'pushing', the subject of *tréicid* undergoes the 'pushing', while remaining in control of the action:

<i>*tr-ṅ-k-</i>	'he pushes (someone)'	S →
<i>*tr-ṅ-k-ye-</i>	'he pushes himself away' > 'leaves'	S ←

The semantic connection of 'push' and 'leave' is in itself unproblematic: cf. such parallels as Engl. *push off*, German *sich drücken*, Dutch *zich drukken* 'abscond, shun'.

In British, the cognates of *tréicid* became intransitive 'perish, die': MWelsh *trengli* 'perish', deverbal noun *tranc* 'death' (cf. Engl. *pass away*).

### 7.3. Old Irish *·ic*, Latin *nanciō*, *nancior*

In all probability, OIr. *·ic* 'reaches' ultimately reflects a nasal present *\*h<sub>2</sub>n-n-k-* of the root *\*h<sub>2</sub>nek-* 'reach', cf. Skt. *asñóti* 'reach, obtain': for the details I refer to SCHRIJVER 1993: 39–41 (in short: *\*h<sub>2</sub>ṅnk-* > PCI. *\*annk-* > Prim.Ir. *\*ennk-* > *\*ink-* > *·ic*, cf. MW *di-anc* 'leave').<sup>23</sup>

The same nasal present, but this time with a suffix *\*ye*, is reflected in the rare OLat. verb *\*nanciō*, *\*nancior*, more frequently *nanciō* 'to obtain'. The explanation of *-a-* in *\*nanciō* has always been problematic. I have argued for a rule *\*(C)CCCC > \*(C)CaCCC*, according to which *\*h<sub>2</sub>n-n-k-yoH* became

<sup>23</sup> MCCONE (1996: 64, 108) maintains his earlier view that *·ic* reflects PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>ēnk-*, which can be done only at the cost of losing the highly attractive etymology of OIr. *set*, W *hyn* 'path' < *\*sēntu-* < PIE *\*seh<sub>2</sub>ntu-*, cf. Toch. A *ṣont* 'road'. He objects to my account of *·icc*: 'if *ennk* was simplified to *enk* early enough, it would surely have shared in the development to *ēg*'. Indeed, my point is that *ennk* was *not* simplified to *enk* early enough. Incidentally, MCCONE's rule *\*-μVnk-* > OIr. /μəŋg/ if the *-V-* was unstressed, which would account for *con·ic* vs. *·cumaing* 'can', is probably incorrect in view of *tairnge* 'nail', Gallo-Lat. *tarinca* 'id' (lit. 'what passes through'), which shows the same unexpected development of *\*nk* to *ng* but lacks the preceding *\*μ*. I would claim that it is more than accidental that remarkable *\*nk > ng* is limited to two forms that both belong to the same etymon as *·icc* and therefore propose that *\*-Vnk* became Ir. *-Vng* if *V* was unstressed. Obviously this entails the assumption that in *tairnge* and the verbal noun *cumang* the present tense stem was introduced.

\*(h<sub>2</sub>)nankyō (SCHRIJVER 1991: 491, 494–7).

*si nanciam populi desiderium* (Gracch.orat. 28) ‘if I should reach (fulfil) the wish of the people’

*nancitor in XII nactus erit, praenderit, item in foedere Latino: ‘pecuniam quis nancitor, habeto’* (Fest.p. 166M) ‘n. in the Laws of the Twelve Tables (means) ‘will have obtained, will have got’, thus in the Latin Treaty: ‘who will have obtained money, let him keep it’

*renancitur significat reprehenderit, unde adhuc nos dicimus nanciscitur et nactus, id est adeptus* (Paul.Fest.p. 276M) ‘r. means ‘will have got’; accordingly we still say n. and n., that is, obtained’

The semantic distinction between *·ic* and *\*nanciō* corresponds to that between other nasal presents and their *ye*-derivatives. The internal direction of the action is reversed: while the subject of *·ic* does the reaching, the subject of *\*nanciō* undergoes the reaching; in both verbs, the subject is in control:

*h <sub>2</sub> n-n-k-	‘reaches (sth.)’	S → (O)
*h <sub>2</sub> n-n-k-ye-	‘obtains (sth.)’	S ← (O)

Another verbal root containing a nasal and possessing a nasal present is found in Skt. *tanākti* ‘makes congeal, contracts’ < *\*ṭn-n-ek-ti*. MCCONE (1997) has argued that this nasal present also underlies the OIr. cognate, *con-téici* ‘becomes solid, freezes’ (AII):

*ro·choteg ind lind* (Trip<sup>2</sup> 545) ‘the liquid had congealed’

MCCONE reconstructs *·téici* as *\*ṭn-n-k-* (cf. the root *\*tenk-* in e.g. OIr. *técht* ‘solid’ < *\*ṭnk-to-*, Welsh *tanc* ‘peace’ < *\*ṭnk-*, Goth. *peihan* < *\*pinxan* < *\*tenk-* ‘to thrive’). For reasons of historical phonology this reconstruction excludes the reconstruction of OIr. *·ic* as *\*h<sub>2</sub>n-n-k-*. Since there is no satisfactory alternative explanation for *·ic* (see above), while there is for *con-téici*, viz. as a *\*ye*-present derived from the root *\*ṭnk-*, I cannot accept MCCONE’s reconstruction. Nevertheless the semantic relation of *tanākti* to *con-téici* is more or less in accordance with what would be expected on the basis of other pairs of nasal present and nasal present + *\*ye*:

*tn-n-k-	‘contracts, makes congeal’	S →
??*tn-n-k-ye-	‘contracts itself’ > ‘congeals’	S ←

There are other *\*ye*-derivatives of nasal presents in Latin, viz. *vincīre* ‘tie up, bind’ and *sancīre* ‘hallow’, but since the basic nasal presents of neither verb are attested in any IE language, it is impossible to determine whether the semantics of these verbs match that of other *ye*-derivatives of nasal presents.

### 8. Italic and Celtic nasal presents of roots ending in a laryngeal and their *ye*-derivatives

In Latin, nasal presents of roots ending in a laryngeal usually ended up in the third conjugation, e.g. *sternēre*, cf. Ved. *stṛṇāti*, while in Old Irish most of these presents ended up in a separate present class, the athematic *\*nā*-verbs, e.g. OIr. *sernaid* < *\*sternāti-* (BIV in THURNEYSSEN’s classification).<sup>24</sup> Ever since WATKINS (1965: 184), *\*nā* is explained as the generalized zero grade *\*-n-H-* (> Italo-Celtic *\*nā*; cf. SCHRIJVER 1991: 406ff.).

Yet there are a number of nasal presents that entered the Latin first conjugation and the Old Irish AI class, both of which otherwise contain verbs in *\*-ā-(ye/o-)*. Remarkably, such presents often pair up with *\*nā*-presents, as in the case of *appellāre*, *consternāre* beside *pellere*, *sternere*. It has therefore been suggested that the type *appellāre* represents the generalized full grade *\*p(e)l-n-eh<sub>2</sub>-* > *\*pellā-* (STEINBAUER 1989: 99, 134).<sup>25</sup> I have argued against this idea that it does not account for, say, *āspernārī* instead of expected *\*āspernērī* < *\*-sp(e)r-n-eh<sub>1</sub>-* nor, more conclusively, for the remarkable fact that in both Italic and Celtic the forms in *\*-nā-* occur only where the verb is compounded with a preverb (SCHRIJVER 1991: 408–10). I suggested that the compound forms in *\*-nā-* reflected *\*-nā-* < *\*-nH-* followed by a derivative present suffix *\*-ye-*, arguing that ‘a compound is a derived form, and the common derivative verbal suffix is *\*-je/o-*’ (1991: 411). I am no longer

<sup>24</sup> Nasal presents of roots ending in *\*-h<sub>1</sub>*, probably resulted in *\*nī*-presents, as has been argued by MCCONE (e.g. MCCONE 1991: 12–13).

<sup>25</sup> STEINBAUER argues convincingly against assigning the type *appellāre* to the denominative type *occupāre*.

convinced of the correctness of this motivation, for which I was rightly criticized by RASMUSSEN (1993: 198), but I do believe that the idea that *\*-nā-* reflects *\*-nā-ye-* is correct. Since, as I have argued, there is evidence that the addition of *\*ye* to a nasal present brings about a remarkable change in the meaning of the nasal present, it is possible to check whether this change in meaning can also be found in the verbs in *-nā-*.

(1) Lat. *pellere* means 'set in motion, drive, push, strike'. This meaning is also manifest in compounds such as *appellere* 'drive in a certain direction', *compellere* 'force, drive together', *expellere* 'drive out', *impellere* 'thrust against, cause to move', *dēpellere* 'push to the side, ward off'. Its Umbrian cognate is found in *ampentu* 'let him thrust (?)'.<sup>26</sup> As is generally acknowledged, *pellere* reflects a nasal present *\*p(e)l-n-h<sub>2</sub>-*, which in view of Gr. *πίλναμαι* 'approach, come near' (i.e. middle 'drive oneself') and OIr. *ad·ella* 'visits' (MCCONE 1991: 32–33; see below) is probably of PIE date.

There are two compounds in *-pellāre*, viz. *appellāre* and *compellāre*, which semantically distinguish themselves clearly from *pellere*. *appellāre* means 'turn to, address, call' and is more or less synonymous with *compellāre*:

*nec audet appellāre virum virgō* (Ov. Met. 4.682) 'and a girl does not dare address a man' *mater, te appello, tu ... surge et sepeli natum* (Pac. trag. 197) 'mother, I appeal to you, stand up and bury your child'

*scurrae filium appellat* (Cic. Phil. 13.23) 'he calls him son of a scoundrel'

*blande hominem compellābō* (Pl. Poen. 685) 'I shall address the man sweetly'

'To address, call' can easily be explained as a specialisation of 'to turn to, drive oneself to', 'to' being expressed by the preverb *\*ad-*. This more general meaning can be found in the exact counterpart of *appellāre* in OIr., *ad·ella* (AI) 'visits, approaches' < *\*ad-p(e)l-n-h<sub>2</sub>-*:

*ata·ella-som* (RC 3, 177.5) 'he approaches her'

*airis cuit adaill ad-n·ellat sidi in fini* (Ml. 102a15) 'for it is a (short) visit with which they visit the vine'.

<sup>26</sup> See MEISER 1986: 164–65, also on *ar·peltu*.

Other compounds of *·ella* show a similar basic meaning, modified by preverbs:<sup>27</sup>

*do·aidlea* (< *\*tu-* 'to' + *\*ad* 'at, to') 'visits, approaches, attacks':

*ar do·ecmalla in mertrech cuicce pecthu ind lina do-da·aidlea* (Wb. 9d5) 'for the whore collects onto herself the sins of the number (of people) that visits her'

*do·ella* (< *\*tu-* 'to') 'turns on, assails':

*do·ella-som forsin macraid sethnon in taige* (LU 4896) 'he turns on the boys throughout the house'

*do·ella* (< *\*dī-* 'away from') 'goes aside, turns aside, deviates, goes astray' (*do·diella* has the same meaning):

*do·r·ellsat* gl. *deviarunt* (Ml. 36c22)

*do·r·éll for écnuch na Trínoiti* (Trip.<sup>2</sup> 478) 'he turned to reviling the Trinity'

*sechmi·ella*, *sechmo·ella* (*sechmi/o-* 'past') 'passes by, neglects':

*cid ecen áisndts do neuch as doruid coleir, ni·sechmalfaider cuimre and dano* (Ml. 14d3) 'although it is necessary to explain everything that is difficult, briefness will not be neglected, though'

The nasal present corresponding to Lat. *pellere* is not attested in Celtic, but its former presence and meaning 'drive, set in motion' can be safely assumed on the basis of OIr. *eblaid* 'will drive' < *\*pi-plā-se/o-*, which functions as the future of *agid* 'drives'. The semantic agreement of Italic and Celtic is striking: while the nasal present *\*pel-n-a-* means 'to drive, set in motion', the compounded stem *\*pel-n-ā-* has the approximate meaning 'to drive oneself, go, move'. I propose that the semantic difference is a result of the fact that *\*pel-n-ā-* reflects a *ye*-derivative, *\*pel-nā-ye-*: as with other *ye*-derivatives studied so far, the semantic role of the object of *\*pel-nā-* corresponds to the semantic role of the subject of *\*pel-nā-ye-*, in other words, the internal

<sup>27</sup> Whether *do·ecmalla* 'gathers, brings together' < *\*tu-in-kom-Vlla* belongs here is questionable: its semantics differ considerably from those of other compounds of *·ella*, and early OIr. non-palatal *-ml-* in Wb. 7a7 (prima manus) *túercómlássát* 'they have collected' presupposes a syncopated back vowel (*\*tu-in-ro-kom-alla*). In view of these considerations, a connection with *ad·comla* 'unites, connects, adds' (not *\*coimlea* < *\*kom-ella-*), *do·inola* 'collects' and, eventually, *ro·lá* 'puts' (on which see MCCONE 1991: 33) seems more likely. Note that PEDERSEN (1913: 509–11) fails to distinguish the two etyma.

direction of the verbal action is reversed:

<i>*p(e)l-n-h<sub>2</sub>-</i>	'sets in motion, drives'	S →
<i>*p(e)l-n-h<sub>2</sub> + *-ye-</i>	'sets oneself in motion'	S ←

(2) OIr. *·cella* appears only after preverbs:

*im·cella* (*\*ambi-*; very rare) 'encloses, surrounds':

*.i. sechis ol imme·chella .i. a sliab* (Ml. 67d12) 'that is to say, he surrounds (the city), viz. the mountain'

*do·imchella* (*\*tu-ambi-*) 'goes round, makes a circuit, surrounds':

*timchellad a tech imme cúairt ón dorús dialailiu* (TBFr. ed. Meid 1970, l. 59) 'they made a circuit around the house from one door to another'

*Mons Sión .i. du·imchella son in cathraig andes 7 aniar 7 antuaid* (Ml. 67d8) 'Mount Sion, i.e. it surrounds the city from the south, the west and the north'

*imm·timchella* (with double *\*ambi*) 'surrounds':

*im·timchella gl. cingit* (Ml. 40c14)

*do·airchella* (*\*tu-ari-*) 'closes in'

*cúachi dí or ... hi taircellad a folt* (LU 10234-5) 'gold buckles in which her hair was enclosed'

*do·rairchel ilar tiri ... fo choemrige* (SR 6797) 'he enclosed many countries under his reign'

There is also *do·airmchella* (*\*tu-ari-ambi-*) 'surround' and a very rare *im·timairchella* 'surround' (see DIL s.vv.).

Ever since PEDERSEN (1913: 485) *·cella* is reconstructed as *\*k<sup>w</sup>elnā-* and connected with Gr. περιτέλλομαι 'pass, turn (of time)', τέλλω 'accomplish, finish', which according to MCCONE (1991: 31) reflect a secondarily thematicized nasal present < *\*k<sup>w</sup>el-n-H-* rather than *\*k<sup>w</sup>elH-ye-*. The root is PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>elH-* (in e.g. Skt. *cáratī* 'moves', Gr. πέλομαι 'move about', Lat. *colere* 'till, inhabit'). In view of the Greek forms, the basic meaning of the simple nasal present was approximately 'turn (sth.) around', whence 'turn around full circle, accomplish'. Middle περιτέλλομαι has the expected meaning 'turn oneself around, pass'.

Reconstructing *·cella* as *\*k<sup>w</sup>ellā-* < *\*k<sup>w</sup>(e)l-n-ǎ-* + *\*-ye-*, we are once

again confronted with an instance where *\*ye* brings about a particular change in meaning that I have labelled 'reversed': the basic nasal present means 'turns sth. round', whence Gr. 'accomplish', while the derived present means 'turns oneself around sth.', whence OIr. 'encompasses'. The semantic function of the object of the basic present is that of the subject of the derived present:

<i>*k<sup>w</sup>(e)l-n-h<sub>2</sub>-</i>	'turns sth. around'	S →
<i>*k<sup>w</sup>(e)l-n-h<sub>2</sub>-</i>	'turn oneself around sth.' > 'enclose'	S ←

It seems likely that the basic nasal present survives in MW *pallu* 'to perish, die, fail, run out' (MCCONE 1991: 11) < *\*k<sup>w</sup>alnā-* < *\*k<sup>w</sup>l-n-H-*. The semantic chain could be something like: 'turn (one's life) full circle' → 'pass away' → 'perish, die'.

At this point it may be well to stress that I do not claim that a change in meaning like the one observed in *·cella* may not produce itself spontaneously in the course of time. Compare for example, MW *a* < *\*aget(i)* 'goes', which is the exact formal counterpart of the IE thematic present 'drive, set in motion' in e.g. OIr. *agid*, Lat. *agere* etc., where the semantic change of 'drive' to 'go' is not connected with a morphological difference. The crucial point with regard to the nasal presents is that the semantic difference between, say, 'turns sth.' and 'makes oneself be turned' corresponds systematically with the formal difference between basic nasal present and nasal present + *\*-ye-*. It is this systematic nature that forces me to ascribe the change in meaning to *\*-ye-*.

The following four Latin verbs in *\*-nā-* cannot provide independent evidence for the semantics of *\*-ye-* after nasal presents, as it is difficult, for various reasons, to trace the original difference in meaning between the basic nasal present and its presumed derivative in *\*-ye-*.

(3) The general meaning of Lat. *sternere* is 'to spread, lay out, scatter (e.g. sand, clothes), make a bed, prostrate, cover':

*matronae ... his foliis cubitus sibi sternunt* (Plin.Nat. 24.59)  
'women cover the beds with these leaves'

*fessi sternunt corpora* (Liv. 27,47,9) 'tired, they stretch their bodies'

*vidi te, Ulixes, saxo sternentem Hectora* (Inc.trag. 61) 'I have seen that you, U., have flattened H. with a stone'<sup>28</sup>

*in fundo dolii ... sale sternito* (Cato.Agr. 162.1) 'scatter with salt on the bottom of the vat'

The semantics of the simplex are approximately reflected in its various compounds, such as *cōnsternere* 'to cover (by spreading out), stretch out, fell', *īnsternere* 'to cover, lay on', *praesternere* 'to strew in front of, cover', *prōsternere* 'to fell, stretch out; to lie (i.e. 'cover the floor')'. The inherited meaning of the nasal present is clearly 'spread out, strew': cf. Gr. στρόννυμι, Ved. *strñāti* 'spread out, strew', OIr. *fo·sern* 'spread out, arrange', all of which reflect PIE *\*st(e)r-n-h<sub>3</sub>-*.

The compound *cōn-sternāre* has a highly specific meaning 'to throw into confusion, confound, shock', as in *tumultū ... etiam sanōs cōnsternante animōs* (Liv. 8.27.9) 'with a noise that threw even sound minds into confusion'. If we were to ascribe a 'reversed' meaning to *\*ster-nā-ye-* > *-sternāre*, it could be glossed as '(a noise) scatters oneself with respect to someone', whence '(a noise) throws someone into confusion'. While this seems quite possible, the scēnario is far from compelling: 'to scatter' → 'to scatter someone' → 'to throw into confusion' is certainly a shorter semantic chain, which requires no 'reversed' semantics.

(4) Lat. *spernere* means 'to kick away, despise, spurn':

*nunc spes, opes auxiliaque a me segregant spernuntque se* (Pl.Capt. 517) 'now hope, resources and succour separate and remove themselves from me'  
*ius atque aequom se a malis spernit procul* (Enn.scen. 189) 'law and justice keep themselves far away from evil'

*ut quae te cupit, eam ne spernas* (Pl.Mil. 1050) 'that you do not spurn the woman that desires you'

The original meaning was doubtlessly 'kick away', cf. the nasal present reflected in OIc. *sperna* 'kick (with the feet)', Engl. *spurn*, and further Lith. *spirti* 'kick with the feet, force', Skt. *sphurāti* 'push away, trample', OIr.

<sup>28</sup> *sternere* with this meaning is now usually relegated to the root *\*ster-* in Skt. *strñōti* 'fell, lay down, subdue' (NARTEN 1967, EWAia II 755).

*seir* 'heel'. The root is PIE *\*sperh<sub>1</sub>-*, with *\*h<sub>1</sub>* in view of *sprēvī*, *sprētum*. Lat. *spernere* reflects *\*spernā-* < *\*sp(e)r-n-h<sub>1</sub>-*.

Beside *spernere* there is a compound, *ā-spernārī*, which has approximately the same meaning as *spernere*: 'to repel, scorn, reject'. On occasion, however, a slight semantic difference can be observed:

*nemo ... est ... qui vos non oculis fugiat, auribus respuat, animo aspernetur* (Cic.Pis. 45) 'there is nobody that does not flee from you with his eyes, turn away with his ears, shy away with his thoughts'

*fugiat* und *respuat* provide indications that *aspernetur* does not mean 'kick something away' but rather 'shy away, kick oneself away'. The latter would be in accordance with the expected meaning of the *ye-*derivative *\*-spernā-ye-* > *-spernā-*. The meaning 'to refuse to endure something', listed by the Oxford Latin Dictionary seems to fit in better with 'shy away from something' than with 'kick something away':

*Parthi longinquam militiam spernabantur* (Tac.Ann. 11.10) 'the Parthians refused to go on a long expedition'

In most cases such a subtle semantic difference, if it exists at all, cannot be traced. Thus, *aspernabantur hanc liberalitatem meam* (Cic.Agr. 2.12), for instance, means 'they refused my generosity', which can be explained on the basis of 'they kicked away, refused', but also on the basis of 'they kicked themselves away from, they shied, refused'.

However, even if the meaning 'kick oneself away, shy' was well-established, it need not be explained on the basis of the specific meaning of *\*ye-*: one might just as well argue that the same effect could be produced by the medio-passive endings.

(5) The following *nā-*verb is a *hapax*: *perfinēs* gl. *perfringas* (Fest.p. 205M). This subjunctive presupposes a present *\*per-fināre* 'break' < *\*b<sup>h</sup>inā-* < *\*b<sup>h</sup>inā-ye-* < PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>i-n-H-* + *\*-ye-*. The basic nasal present is attested in OIr. *benaid* (BIV) 'strikes' < *\*binati-* < *\*b<sup>h</sup>i-n-H-*. The *\*ye-*derivative would have meant something like 'break oneself', but this is not attested: Lat. *frangere* is always transitive 'break (sth.)'. Since the Latin verb is a *hapax* without context and we possess no more than Festus' opinion as to its meaning, it seems unwise to use it to prove or disprove anything.

(6) Finally, *dēstināre* 'to fix', *obstināre* 'to set one's mind on sth.'

*praestināre* 'to fix a price on sth.' seem to reflect a nasal present *\*-stenā-*, which, if it is that old, may reflect *\*st-(e)n-h<sub>2</sub>-* + *\*-ye-*. Since the basic nasal present *\*st-(e)n-h<sub>2</sub>-* is not attested in any IE language,<sup>29</sup> it is impossible to determine whether the semantics of *-stināre* match those of other *ye*-derivatives of nasal presents.

We may conclude that the analysis of *\*-nā-* as earlier *\*-nā-ye-* is supported by (1) *-pellāre* / *·ella* and (2) *·cella*, which show the expected 'reversed' meaning. Such a meaning could (but by no means must) be reconstructed for (3) *-sternāre* and (4) *-spernārī*, while neither (5) *perfinēs* nor (6) *-stināre* can be used as evidence for the semantics at all. Accordingly, the balance clearly swings in favour of *\*-nā-* < *\*-nā-ye-*.<sup>30</sup>

What remains to be accounted for is the fact that the verbs discussed in this section occur only in compounds. A tentative explanation can be suggested, along the following lines. As we have seen, the valency of the verb changes if *\*ye* is added: *\*h<sub>2</sub>n-n-k-* 'reaches' vs. *\*h<sub>2</sub>n-n-k-ye-* 'obtains', in other words, the role of the subject of 'reaches' is performed by the object of 'obtains' and the role of the object of 'reaches' is performed by the subject of 'obtains'. In most Indo-European languages, preverbs can have similar effects: intransitive verbs can become transitive, cf. German *stehen*, *verstehen*; *sitzen*, *besitzen*; Lat. *vādere* 'go', *invādere* 'attack'. More to the point, transitive verbs can change the internal direction of the verbal action, as in German *er sieht ihn* vs. *er sieht gut aus*. In the latter *sieht* can be glossed by '(lets himself) be seen', which comes very close to *\*h<sub>2</sub>n-n-k-ye-* 'lets himself be reached', hence 'obtains'. It seems quite possible that verbs in *\*-nā-ye-* survived only in preverbal compounds because a preverb and *\*ye* produced a similar semantic change, the preverb being by far the commoner agent of the two. Note, too, that unlike in the case of the verbs discussed in the preceding sections, such as Lat. *nanciō* and OIr. *léicid*, the basic *nā*-present and the *nā-ye*-derivative often survive side by side in one and the same

<sup>29</sup> Gr. ἰστώνω 'position (oneself)', OCS *stanō* 'place oneself, become', OPruss. *postānimai* 'we get' are probably all relatively recent formations.

<sup>30</sup> It is not clear whether *\*-nā-ye-* directly reflects PIE *\*-nHye-*, with syllabification of *\*-H-*, or whether *\*-ye-* was added at a later stage to the zero grade nasal present stem in *\*-nā-*, much as *stāre* < *\*stā-* + *\*-ē-* (COWGILL 1973).

language:

<i>*-nā-</i>	<i>*-nā-ye-</i>
Lat. <i>pellāre</i>	<i>-pellāre</i>
OIr. <i>·ella</i>	(indirectly: fut. <i>eblaid</i> )
OIr. <i>·cella</i>	(W <i>pallu?</i> )
Lat. <i>sternēre</i>	<i>-sternāre</i>
Lat. <i>spernēre</i>	<i>-spernārī</i>

Since *\*-ye-* was obviously no longer a productive morpheme in the separate histories of Insular Celtic and Latin, having become absorbed by regular sound change (*\*-nā-ye-* > *\*-nāe-* > *\*-nā-*), its semantic function was taken over by the preverb, which was a common carrier of this type of meaning and as such would be the most likely candidate to support the semantic difference between basic *nā*-present and *nā-ye*-derivative.

### 9. Return to Vedic: loss of the semantic distinction between nasal presents and their *\*ye*-derivatives

Exploring the highly specific semantic characteristics of *\*ye* added to nasal presents, we have started with Vedic, then turned to Greek and Italo-Celtic, accumulating the evidence in order to lay the foundations for the claim that the 'reversed' meaning of *\*ye* must be reconstructed for PIE (see further section 11). We may now return to Vedic in order to see how this old semantic function of *\*ye*-derivatives was changed and could on occasion be obliterated.

In the case of *gr̥bhñāti* vs. *gr̥bhāyāti* the semantic opposition became one of low vs. high control by the subject: 'receive, take' vs. 'grab'. This led to a preponderance of forms of *gr̥bhāyāti* in the imperative. Already in Vedic the formal and semantic difference between *ṛñj-* 'speed ahead towards' and *irajyāti* 'direct, lead' was such that they were completely dissociated. The case is similar for *iṣṇāti* 'send' and pseudo-causative *iṣaya-* 'enjoy, thrive'.

In other cases, the nasal present and its *\*ye*-derivative survive in the Rigveda without observable difference in meaning (cf. HOFFMANN 1966:

68-69).<sup>31</sup>

*muṣṇāti, muṣāyāti* 'steal something (acc.) from someone (acc.)' < \**mus-n-H-(ye-)*  
*mathnāti, mathāyāti* 'tear, pluck someone/-thing away' < \**mṇt-n-h<sub>2</sub>-(ye-)*<sup>32</sup>  
*śrathnāti, śrathāyāti* 'free someone (acc.) from something (acc.)' < \**kr̥et-n-H-(ye-)*

Just how neutralization of the semantic opposition may have come about is illustrated by a comparison of synonymous *skabhnāti* and *stabhnāti* with their *ye*-derivatives, *skabhāyāti* and *stabhāyāti*. All of these have the approximate meaning 'support'.

The basic nasal present means 'prop up, support something (acc.)' in the sense of 'provide a support for something (acc.)':

RV 10.6.3cd *havīṃsy agnau / áriṣṭharathaḥ skabhnāti* '(the sacrificer) with undamaged chariot props up the sacrifices (acc.) on Agni (the sacrificial fire, loc.)'

RV 3.31.12c *viṣkabhnānta skāmbhanenā jānitri* 'they (the Angiras) prop up both genitors (heaven and earth, acc.) with a support (instr.)'

RV 6.47.5d *ayām mahān mahatā skāmbhanena-/-ūd dyām astabhnād vṛṣabhō marútvān* 'this big one propped up heaven (acc.) with a big support (inst.), the bull accompanied by the Maruts'

RV 10.18.13a *út te stabhnāmi pṛthivīm tvát pári-* 'I prop up the earth (acc.) over you' (of a subterranean grave, propped up by poles)

(All other examples are of *stabhnāti*: RV 2.12.2d, 2.13.10c, 2.17.5d, 3.30.9c, 3.53.9b, 6.8.3a, 7.99.2c, 7.99.3c, 8.42.1a, 8.89.5d, 10.55.1c, 10.113.4d, 10.153.3c)

<sup>31</sup> There is also no observable semantic difference between *damāyāti* and the basic nasal present surviving in gr. δάμνημι 'tame'.

<sup>32</sup> On the separation of PIE \**math<sub>2</sub>-* 'tear, steal' (in *mathnāti*) and \**menth<sub>2</sub>-* 'stir, rub', see EWAia II 298, 311, HACKSTEIN 1995: 29-30, but since this is formally far from compelling I retain \**menth<sub>2</sub>-* for both.

In the *ye*-derivatives *skabhāyāti* and *stabhāyāti*, the inherited 'reversed' meaning 'make oneself into a support/prop (for something, acc.)' can still be glimpsed:

RV 2.15.2a *avamśé dyām astabhāyad brhántam* 'in a pillar-less (place) he propped up the high heaven (acc.)' (the idea clearly being that 'he' made himself into a support)

RV 4.5.1d *-úpa stabhāyad upamín ná ródhaḥ* 'he props up (heaven) as a pier (props up) a dam'

RV 6.17.7b *úpa dyām ṛṣvó brhád indra stabhāyaḥ* 'you, Indra, standing erect, have propped up heaven high'

RV 6.44.22b *indreṇa yujā pañim astabhāyat* 'with Indra as his ally he has stemmed Pañi (acc.)'

In almost all other instances the *ye*-derivatives do not allow us to make a confident distinction between 'provide a support for sth.' and 'make oneself into a support for sth.', e.g.:

RV 1.154.1c *yó áskabhāyad úttaram sadhástham* '(Viṣṇu) who supported the uppermost abode'

(The other semantically ambiguous instances are: RV 1.164.25a, 4.6.2d, 5.29.4a, 6.44.24a, 10.3.2c, 10.44.8c, 10.76.4b)

Indeed, the semantic distinction is so subtle that it is hardly surprising that the verbs occasionally merged semantically. A case in point is

RV 4.21.5a *úpa yó námo námasi stabhāyán* 'piling up praise (acc.) onto praise (loc.)',

where the *ye*-derivative has an accusative and a locative complement, its meaning being indistinguishable from that of *skabhnāti* + accusative and locative in RV 10.6.3cd quoted above.

10. The Vedic type *ricyate*

Although this article only treats *ye*-derivatives of nasal presents, one cannot fail to be struck by the semantic similarity of this type to Vedic intransitives with suffix *-ya-* of the type *ricyate*, *ricyáte* 'remains, stays behind'. Compared with *rinákti* 'leaves, lets go', Ved. *ricyate* 'remains, stays behind' shows the same reversal of actant roles that was observed in Lat. *linquere* 'leave' vs. *léicid* 'lets go': it is the subject of both *ricyate* and *léicid*, but the object of *rinákti* and *linquere*, which undergo the action of leaving. Another similar pair is *pácati* 'cooks' vs. *pacyáte*, *pácyate* 'becomes ripe, is cooked'.

Yet there is a clear distinction between *ye*-derivatives of nasal presents and the Vedic intransitives in *ya*: while the subject of the former has a high degree of control over the action, the subject of the latter has not: while the meaning of *léicid* can be glossed as 'he causes (something) to leave him', the meaning of *ricyate* is more appropriately rendered by 'he is the object of leaving'. This difference may perhaps be ascribed to the medio-passive endings of the type *ricyate*, although this might be a simplification: we cannot at this point ignore that *léicid* and *ricyate* do not constitute a minimal pair.<sup>33</sup>

## 11. Conclusions and consequences

I have argued for the existence of *\*ye*-derivatives of nasal presents in Indo-Iranian, Greek and Italo-Celtic. The examples that have been discussed all show highly specific and non-trivial semantics: the basic nasal presents, all of which, incidentally, are transitive, have a meaning of the type 'S leaves O', where S performs the 'leaving' and is in control, while their *\*ye*-derivatives, all of which are at least optionally transitive,<sup>34</sup> reflect a meaning 'S lets O go', where O performs the leaving but S remains in control.

<sup>33</sup> The type *ricyate* is the subject of an extensive dissertation by Leonid Kulikov (Leiden), which is nearing its completion. Meanwhile, see KULIKOV 1998.

<sup>34</sup> RV *iṣayati*, which is usually found without direct object, may appear with one (section 5). The intransitivity of the Greek forms in section 6 is doubtlessly a consequence of their medio-passive endings (their active counterparts are transitive). OIr. *con-téici* 'becomes solid' is not necessarily derived from a nasal present (end of section 7.3).

A semantic gloss of the *\*ye*-derivative that contains the verb that is also used to gloss the meaning of the basic nasal present, in this case 'leave', would be 'S makes S be left by O' or 'S makes O leave S', which is equivalent to 'S lets O go'. Such glosses can be provided for all plausible *\*ye*-derivatives that have been discussed:

- \*gr̥bh<sup>h</sup>-n-H-* 'S receives O' > 'S receives, catches O' receive ~ grab
- \*gr̥bh<sup>h</sup>-n-H-ye-* 'S makes O to be received by S' > 'S grasps O by moving towards O' ~~receive~~ grab
- \*h<sub>3</sub>r̥-n-ġ-* 'S directs itself towards O' ~~rule~~ rush, press
- \*h<sub>3</sub>r̥-n-ġ-ye-* 'S makes O direct itself (towards S?)' > 'S rules' rule
- \*His-n-h<sub>2</sub>-* 'S impels O' impel
- \*His-n-h<sub>2</sub>-ye-* 'S makes S be impelled (by O)' > 'S prospers, S enjoys O' prosper
- \*mṛ-n-h<sub>2</sub>-* 'S takes O (away)'
- \*mṛ-n-h<sub>2</sub>-ye-* 'S makes S be taken away (by O)' > 'S dies down'
- \*li-n-k<sup>w</sup>-* 'S leaves O'
- \*li-n-k<sup>w</sup>-ye-* 'S makes S be left by O, S makes O leave S' > 'S lets O go'
- \*tr-ṇ-k-* 'S pushes O'
- \*tr-ṇ-k-ye-* 'S makes S be pushed away with regard to O' > 'S leaves O'
- \*h<sub>2</sub>n-n-k̄-* 'S reaches O'
- \*h<sub>2</sub>n-n-k̄-ye-* 'S makes S be reached by O, S makes O reach S' > 'S obtains O'
- \*p(e)l-n-h<sub>2</sub>-* 'S drives O'
- \*p(e)l-n-h<sub>2</sub>-ye-* 'S makes S be driven (+ *\*h<sub>2</sub>ed* 'in the direction of O') > 'S visits O'
- \*k<sup>w</sup>(e)l-n-h<sub>2</sub>-* 'S turns O around'
- \*k<sup>w</sup>(e)l-n-h<sub>2</sub>-ye-* 'S makes S be turned around (+ *\*h<sub>2</sub>emb<sup>h</sup>i* 'around O') > 'S surrounds O'

This highly specific function of *\*ye* and the fact that it is attested in the westernmost and the southeasternmost IE languages render a PIE origin of *\*ye*-derivatives of nasal presents unavoidable. A major consequence is that in PIE presents could apparently be derived from other presents (with a difference in meaning of course). It is in principle unlikely that *\*ye*-derivatives could be made only from nasal presents and not from, say, root presents and reduplicated presents. We should as a consequence be prepared, at least in principle, to reconstruct both basic and derived PIE presents for a single verbal root and not automatically assume that presents derived from presents are qualitate qua of post-PIE date. This conclusion could shed a new light on the possible antiquity of formations such as Gr. τιταίνω (PIE *\*ye*-derivative of a reduplicated present?), Gr. τιτρώσκω (PIE *\*sk*-derivative of a reduplicated present?), Gr. ὑφαίνω, Skt. *iṣanyati* (PIE nasal presents derived from *\*ye*-presents?), etc.<sup>35</sup> Much further research will be necessary, of course, but for the time being we can at least feel confident that such research will be rewarding.

It is understandable that the notion that presents could be derived from presents in PIE has so far not been seriously entertained: most *\*ye*-presents, such as Skt. *dṛh-yati* 'makes firm', *pás-yati* 'sees', have stems that do not brand them as derivatives of presents, as they could equally well have been derived directly from the root or from the aorist stem. Only the rare *\*ye*-presents based upon unambiguously marked present stems, i.e. nasal presents and reduplicated presents with *\*-i-* in the reduplicative syllable, are tell-tale signs able to give the principle of 'present-from-present' derivation away.

In section 10 I have argued that *\*ye* after nasal presents may ultimately be compared with *\*ye* in the type Ved. *ricyate* in view of their close semantic similarity. One may well ask<sup>36</sup> whether this *\*ye* can be connected with *\*ye* in the causative suffix *\*-eye-*. Such a connection presupposes that causative *\*-eye-* is to be split up as *\*-e-* + *\*-ye-*. This is indeed eminently plausible.

<sup>35</sup> *iṣanyati* 'send' < *\*Hish<sub>2</sub>-n-ye-* may well have been derived from *iṣyati* 'send' < *\*Hish<sub>2</sub>-ye-*, with the nasal infix placed before the penultimate consonant, in this case *\*y*, of the derivational base. For other such forms, see JASANOFF 1983: 72-75.

<sup>36</sup> As Dr. Peter-Arnold MUMM did when I gave a paper on the subject in München in July 1998.

The alternative analysis as *\*-ey-e-* is no longer supported by the supposed link of Indo-Iranian *-āya*-formations with participles in *-i-tá-*, which is clearly secondary (JAMISON 1983: 214-16).<sup>37</sup> Rather, the analysis *\*-e-ye-* can be supported by Italic and Celtic evidence, which points to a non-present stem of causatives ending in *\*-e-*: cf. Umbrian *taśeto-* 'silenced', *uīřeto-* 'visible', *uofeto-* 'dedicated' (RIX 1992: 224 n. 6). The Celtic evidence for a causative stem *\*CoC-e-* outside the present has been known for a long time: the Middle Welsh 3sg. preterite in *-es* and impersonal preterite in *-et* with roots containing *-o-* (*-es* < 3sg. *s*-aorist *\*-e-s-t*; *-et* < participle *\*-e-tos*) and the OIr. *s*-preterite type 3sg. *·corastar*, 3pl. *·coirsetar* 'put' < *\*kor-e-s-t*.<sup>38</sup> Applying this analysis to a PIE causative such as *\*h<sub>1</sub>gor-e-ye-*, we cannot fail to be struck by the resemblance of what precedes *\*-ye-* to a 3sg. of an unreduplicated perfect stem. Now there is indeed an archaic layer of Vedic *-āya*-formations that serve as causatives to perfects, and *\*h<sub>1</sub>gor-e-ye-* > *jāráyati* 'makes awake' beside *jāgāra* 'is awake' is a case in point (see further JAMISON 1983: 160ff.). In general, the oldest Vedic *-āya*-formations show a factitive rather than a causative meaning (LUBOTSKY 1989: 109-110): *vedāyati* 'dedicates, makes known' (not 'makes know, makes see'), *śrāvāyati* 'makes heard, famed' (not 'makes hear'), *spāśāyate* probably 'makes seen, spied out' (not 'makes see'). The semantic glosses of these *-āya*-formations and the connection with (intransitive) perfects bring to light the nature of the relation between base verb and causative derivative:

(*\*h<sub>1</sub>ge-*)*h<sub>1</sub>gor-e* 'he is awake' → *\*h<sub>1</sub>gor-e-ye-* 'he makes someone awake'

The person that wakes up is the subject of the base verb but the object of the causative. This is highly reminiscent of the effect produced by *\*ye* after nasal presents, where the roles of subject and object with regard to the verbal action are reversed in a similar way: the subject of the base verb *\*li-n-ek<sup>w</sup>-ti* 'leaves' and the object of the derivative *\*li-n-k<sup>w</sup>-ye-* 'let go' do the

<sup>37</sup> If the causative is ultimately derived from the passive aorist in *-i*, as was suggested by KORTLANDT (1981: 127; LUBOTSKY 1989: 110-11), *\*-ey-e* would certainly be the historically correct division. As it stands, however, the details remain to be worked out. On the passive aorist, see KÜMMEL 1996.

<sup>38</sup> POKORNY 1919, 1933; WATKINS 1962: 178-79.

'leaving'. Thus it would seem to be a reasonable assumption to ultimately identify *\*ye* after nasal presents with *\*-ye-* in causatives.

At the end of this study we have arrived at the conclusion that PIE had a suffix *\*ye* that conveyed a 'reversed' meaning and which was used to derive presents from nasal presents and may well have been present in the type *ricyate* and in the PIE causatives. Yet an awkward problem remains: a suffix with this exact meaning is typologically remarkable. Does this mean that what has been argued in this article is all wrong? It seems to me that the following two considerations are relevant.

I would like to stress that the 'reversed' meaning of *\*ye* after nasal presents is a reconstruction and not a description of the attested forms: in no IE language has this derivation remained productive. Thus, OIr. *léicid* does not mean 'lets himself be left, makes someone leave himself' but simply 'lets go'; similarly, Ved. *grbhāyāti* does not mean 'lets oneself be received' but 'grabs'. The 'reversed' meaning is reconstructed on the basis of a comparison of cognate formations in cognate languages. Hence I do not posit a 'reversing' derivative in *\*ye* on the synchronic level of any IE language. This of course shifts the problem back to PIE.

Since the 'reversed' meaning is a reconstructed meaning, its unnaturalness may well be caused by the fact that it is no more than the reconstructible shadow of something much more natural that lies behind it. We can indeed make sense of it if we assume that on the synchronic PIE level it was not the internal direction of the verbal action that changed when *\*ye* was added, but the way in which the subject was encoded in the verbal form. As much has been argued by KORTLANDT (1983: 320–22), who proposed that the subject of a thematic present was originally in the dative if it was animate and in the instrumental if it was inanimate (cf. German *mir träumt*), while the subject of athematic presents probably was in the ergative (with transitive verbs) or the absolutive (with intransitive verbs). Accordingly, the subject of athematic *\*linek<sup>w</sup>mi* was encoded in a different way than the subject of thematic *\*link<sup>w</sup>yoH*, which is expressed by different verbal endings and, presumably, different case endings on the subject. Semantically, the thematic inflection had a modal (subjunctive) and a 'non-volitional', 'inexpressive and aspectually indeterminate indicative' function (thematic present; KORTLANDT 1983: 318–19, with extensive references to Renou's studies of the Rigvedic

material). KORTLANDT compared this to Slavic constructions of the type 'it sleeps itself to me', yielding both modal 'I am sleepy, I want to sleep' (Bulgarian *spi mi se*) and non-modal non-volitional low-control 'I sleep' (Polish *spao mi się bardzo smacznie* 'I slept very soundly'). Applying these ideas to our nasal presents, thematic *\*link<sup>w</sup>yoH* can be glossed as 'there is leaving concerning me (of someone/something in the accusative)', which is not far removed from 'I let (someone or something) go' (= OIr. *léicid*), while athematic *\*linek<sup>w</sup>mi* can be glossed as 'there is leaving by me (of someone/something in the accusative)', whence 'I leave (someone/something)' (= Lat. *linquere*). This comes pretty close to being an explanatory scenario. The question remains by what case-forms the subject 'concerning me' in the thematic form and 'by me' in the athematic form would have been expressed. It seems to me more than accidental that the 1sg. personal pronoun has two reconstructible forms, *\*h<sub>1</sub>eǵHom* and *\*h<sub>1</sub>eǵ(H)oH*, which mirror the athematic and thematic 1sg. verbal endings. One might suggest that in PIE the former corresponds to 'by me' and the latter to 'concerning me', and that after PIE the semantic difference between the two disappeared along with the original semantic difference between thematic and athematic presents, so that each IE language could generalize one of the two pronouns arbitrarily. For the other persons, no unambiguous pronominal or, in the third person, nominal correlates of the thematic vs. athematic endings can be indicated, but not for want of available forms: one may for instance very tentatively suggest that 2sg. *\*tu-h<sub>1</sub>* 'you' corresponds to thematic *\*-e-h<sub>1</sub>i*, and that 3sg. nominal and pronominal Nsg. *\*-s* corresponds to athematic *\*-t(i)*, while nominal and pronominal Nsg. *-ø* [*\*ph<sub>2</sub>tēr*, *\*peh<sub>3</sub>imōn*, *\*so*] corresponds to thematic 3sg. *\*-e-ø*.

Along these lines the reversed meaning reconstructed for *\*ye* after nasal presents, which is typologically extraordinary, can be seen as a reflection of a typologically ordinary system whereby the subject of a transitive verb can be expressed as having relatively high (athematic flexion) or relatively low control (thematic flexion). The semantic shift produced by *\*ye* is essentially the product of a shift from athematic to thematic inflection. The structural details of the system remain to be worked out, especially the way in which the nouns or pronouns coreferring to the athematic and thematic endings were encoded. As 1sg. athematic *-m(i)* = *\*h<sub>1</sub>eǵHom* and 1sg. thematic *\*-oH* = *\*h<sub>1</sub>eǵ(H)oH* would seem to indicate, the PIE case of the subject of an athematic present and

the PIE case of the subject of a thematic present eventually probably collapsed into what in the early Indo-European languages is the nominative.<sup>39</sup>

If PIE had a semantic contrast between athematic and thematic forms, which seems clear enough, there is no inherent reason why thematic and athematic endings could not be meaningfully combined in one and the same form, in PIE or at some later stage. If the thematic inflection can be compared with German *mir träumt* and the athematic inflection with *ich mache*, a combined athematic + thematic inflection could be compared with *ich ziehe mir die Jacke aus, ich mache mir einen Kaffee*. There are two indications that such combined forms did indeed exist:

(1) Throughout this article we have come across a number of \*ye-derivatives of nasal presents where the subject plays a double role. Thus, OIr. *léicid* is not fully glossed by 'there is leaving concerning him (of someone/something)', as the subject is in control: a complete gloss would be 'there is leaving concerning him by him (of someone/something)', whence the reversed 'he makes someone or something leave him', whence 'he lets go, he throws'. If we fill in the forms in accordance with this fuller gloss, we arrive at:

\*link<sup>w</sup>- 'there is leaving' + \*ye 'concerning him' + \*-t(i) 'by him (now)'  
→ 'he makes (sth.) leave him' → 'he lets go'

Similarly:

\*g<sup>h</sup>ṛb<sup>h</sup>nH- 'there is receiving' + \*ye 'concerning him' + \*-t(i) 'by him (now)' → 'he makes himself be received by ' → 'he grabs' (Ved. *grbhāyāti*)

\*p(e)lnh<sub>2</sub>- 'there is driving' + \*ye 'concerning him' + \*-t(i) 'by him (now)' → 'he makes himself be driven' → (+ \*ad 'to') 'he visits' (OIr. *ad·ella*)

\*h<sub>2</sub>nnk̄- 'there is reaching' + \*ye 'concerning him' + \*-t(i) 'by him (now)' → 'he makes something reach him' → 'he receives' (Lat. *\*nancit*)

<sup>39</sup> All this is relevant for the discussion about the 'ergative' or 'active' character of PIE, which concerns itself with many other issues not treated in this article, such as the different behaviour of animate vs. inanimate (neuter) nouns.

etc.

(2) In Indo-Iranian, the PIE thematic 1sg. \*-oH > Iir. -ā survived unchanged only in the subjunctive (with or without the particle -ni), while those thematic presents that were incorporated into the Indo-Iranian non-modal present tense system generally have -ā-mi < \*-oH-mi.<sup>40</sup> Since the subjunctive has a lower degree of control by the subject ('I may ...') than does the present and since athematic -mi correlates with a relatively high degree of control by the subject, we can finally understand why in Indo-Iranian -mi is so predominant in the present and absent in the subjunctive. This presupposes, of course, that Indo-Iranian at an early stage had both \*-ā and \*-ā-mi, with distinguishable semantics.<sup>41</sup>

If such combined forms ever existed, their semantic potential was evidently not exploited extensively in the early IE languages. Their disappearance as a living category was doubtlessly connected with the upheaval of the old semantic distinction between athematic and thematic presents and the concomitant loss of the distinction between the two subject cases (types \*h<sub>1</sub>eǵHom and \*h<sub>1</sub>eǵ(H)oH).

<sup>40</sup> Avestan, of course, does have 1sg. presents in -ā beside those in -āmi (cf. HOFFMANN-FORSSMAN 1986: 190).

<sup>41</sup> This system may be present in Gaulish as well: *neddamon delgu linda* (Banassac) 'may I hold the drinks of the next ones', *regu-c cambion* (Chamalières) '(?) may I straighten what is crooked' vs. *uediiumi* (Chamalières) 'I pray', *pissiumi* (Chamalières) 'I see' or future 'I shall see'. The alternative explanation is that -mi is enclitic 'me' < PIE \*(h<sub>1</sub>)me.

## References

- BARTHOLOMAE, C., 1904: Altiranisches Wörterbuch, Berlin.
- BEEKES, R.S.P., 1979: 'GAv. *uzirāidyāi* and *arāraša*', Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 38, 9–20.
- BENDER, H., 1917: 'On the naturalistic background of the 'Frog-Hymn', RV VII. 103', Journal of the American Oriental Society 37, 186–91.
- COWGILL, W., 1973: 'The source of Latin *stāre*, with notes on comparable forms elsewhere in Indo-European', Journal of Indo-European Studies 1, 271–303.
- DIL: E.G. Quin, Dictionary of the Irish Language (Compact Edition), Dublin 1983.
- EWAla: M. Mayrhofer, Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoirischen, Heidelberg 1986ff.
- GARCÍA-RAMÓN, J., 1986: 'Griego *ιάομαι*', in A. Etter (ed.), O-o-pe-ro-si (Festschrift für Ernst Risch), Berlin/New York, pp. 497–514.
- GELDNER, K., 1951, Der Rig-Veda I–III, Cambridge/London/Wiesbaden.
- GOTÖ, T., 1988: Review of JAMISON 1983, Indo-Iranian Journal 31, 303–21.
- GRASSMANN, H., 1996: Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda (6th edition by Maria Kozińska), Wiesbaden.
- HACKSTEIN, O., 1995: Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsensstambildungen des Tocharischen, Göttingen.
- HINTZE, A., 1994: Der Zamyād-Yašt, Wiesbaden.
- HOFFMANN, K., 1966: 'Vedisch *vichāyāti* und *govyachā-*' Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 19, 61–72.
- HOFFMANN, K., B. FORSSMAN, 1996: Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre, Innsbruck.
- HOLLIFIELD, H., 1981: 'Homeric *κείω* and the Greek desideratives of the type *δρασεῖν*', Indogermanische Forschungen 86, 161–89.
- INSLER, S., 1971: 'Some problems of Indo-European \**a* in Avestan', Language 47, 573–85.
- JAMISON, S., 1983: Function and Form in the *-āya*-Formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda, Göttingen.
- JAMISON, S., 1993: 'Natural history notes on the Rigvedic 'Frog' Hymn', Annals B.O.R. Institute 72–73 (1991, 1992), 137–44.
- JASANOFF, J., 1983: 'The IE. "*ā*-preterite" and related forms', Indogermanische Forschungen 88, 54–83.
- JOACHIM, U., 1978: Mehrfachpräsentien im Rgveda, Frankfurt/Bern/Las Vegas.
- KORTLANDT, F., 1981: '1st sg. middle \**-H<sub>2</sub>*', Indogermanische Forschungen 86, 123–36.
- KORTLANDT, F., 1983: 'Proto-Indo-European verbal syntax', Journal of Indo-European Studies 11, 307–24.
- KUIPER, F.B.J., 1937: Die indogermanischen Nasalpräsentia. Ein Versuch zu einer morphologischen Analyse. Amsterdam.
- KULIKOV, L., 1998: 'Passive, anticausative and classification of verbs: the case of Vedic', in L. Kulikov, H. Vater (eds), Typology of Verbal Categories (Fs. Nedjalkov), Tübingen, pp. 139–53.
- KÜMMEL, M., 1996: Stativ und Passivaorist im Indoiranischen, Göttingen.
- LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES-MCKENZIE: Greek-English Lexicon, Oxford 1968.
- LUBOTSKY, A., 1989: 'The Vedic *-āya*-formations', Indo-Iranian Journal 32, 89–113.
- LUBOTSKY, A., 1997: A Rgvedic Word Concordance I–II, New Haven.
- MACDONELL, A., 1910: A Vedic Grammar, Delhi.
- MCCONE, K., 1991: The Indo-European Origins of the Old Irish Nasal Presents, Subjunctives and Futures, Innsbruck.
- MCCONE, K., 1996: Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change, Maynooth.
- MCCONE, K., 1998: "Double nasal" presents in Celtic, and Old Irish *léicid* "leaves", in J. Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, L. Oliver, Mír Curad (Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins), Innsbruck, pp. 465–476.
- MEISER, G., 1986: Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache, Innsbruck.
- MEISER, G., 1993: 'Zur Funktion des Nasalpräsens im Urindogermanischen', in G. MEISER (ed.), Indogermanica et Italica (Festschrift für Helmut RIX zum 65. Geburtstag), Innsbruck, pp. 280–313.
- NARTEN, J., 1967: 'Ai. *st̥-* 'niederstrecken' und *st̥r-* 'ausbreiten': ein methodisches Problem', Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 22, 57–66.
- OLSEN, B.A., 1993: 'Vedic and laryngeals, *irajyāti* and *iradhanta* — *badhnāti* and *ubhnāti*', in G. MEISER (ed.), Indogermanica et Italica (Festschrift für Helmut RIX zum 65. Geburtstag), Innsbruck, pp. 362–71.
- PEDERSEN, H., 1913: Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen II, Göttingen.
- PETERS, M., 1980: Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen, Wien.
- PETERS, M., 1986: 'Probleme mit anlautenden Laryngalen', Die Sprache 32, 365–83.
- POKORNY, J., 1919: 'Zur Stambildung der irischen Kausativa', Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung (KZ) 49, 74–83.
- POKORNY, J., 1933: 'Zum indogermanischen Kausativum', Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung (KZ) 60, 253.
- RASMUSSEN, J., 1989: Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache, Innsbruck.
- RASMUSSEN, J., 1993: Review of SCHRIJVER 1991, Acta Linguistica Hafniensia 26, 175–205.
- RISCH, E., 1974: Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache, Berlin / New York.
- RIX, H., 1992: 'Zur Entstehung des lateinischen Perfektparadigmas', in O. Panagl, T. Krisch (eds), Latein und Indogermanisch, Innsbruck, pp. 221–40.
- SANDOZ, C., 1974: 'Une classe résiduelle du verbe indo-européen', Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris 69/1, 55–61.
- SAUSSURE, F. de, 1878: Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes, Leipzig.
- SCHRIJVER, P., 1991: The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin, Amsterdam / Atlanta.

- SCHRIJVER, P., 1993: 'On the development of vowels before tautosyllabic nasals in Primitive Irish', *Ériu* 44, 33-52.
- SCHRIJVER, P., 1995: *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam/Atlanta.
- SCHRIJVER, P., forthcoming: 'The athematic *i*-presents: the Italic and Celtic evidence'.
- STEINBAUER, D., 1989: *Etymologische Untersuchungen zu den bei Plautus belegten Verben der lateinischen ersten Konjugation. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Denominative*, Regensburg.
- WATKINS, C., 1962: *Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb I. The Sigmatic Aorist*, Dublin.
- WATKINS, C., 1965: 'Evidence from Latin', in W. Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeals*, The Hague, pp. 182-89.