Vedic *nakhá-* and devoicing by laryngeal.

Timothy G. Barnes

§1. *nakhá-* and the words for 'nail; claw, talon, hoof'. - §2. Aspiration by laryngeal and Kümmel's devoicing by laryngeal rule in Iranian. - §3. Two old "Greco-Aryan" cruxes: *makhá-*, *math^i-*, §4. ?*granth^i-*, ?*kha-*. - §5. Phonetic interpretation.

1. *nakhá-* and the words for 'nail; claw, talon, hoof'.

1.1. The well-known inherited word for '(finger-, toe-)nail; claw, talon, hoof' et sim., with cognates in every branch but Albanian (with lexical replacement >> *thua/thue* < AK ?*$h_2\hat{k}\acute{o}n$).

For the range of meanings, cf., e.g., Akkadian *ṣupru* 'nail; claw, talon, hoof', Sum. u m b i n 'nail; claw, talon, hoof' (probably a semantic universal).

Advances in our understanding of PIE phonology and morphology have reduced the chaotic situation presented in older handbooks considerably, but several oddities remain, including the voiceless aspirate of the Vedic form.

1.2. Survey.

1.2.a. A **root noun** *h_3nog^{wh}- / *h_3neg^{wh}- can be set up on the basis of Greek, Tocharian, and Luwian, and probably also Armenian.

1.2.a.α. Greek (Myc., Hom. +) ?*o-nu*(*-ke, -ka*), ὄνυξ '1. talon, claw; 2. nail (of a person)'.

> - 'talon of a bird' the only meaning in Homer and Hesiod: e.g. *Il.* 8.247-8 αὐτίκα δ' αἰετὸν ἧκε τελειότατον πετεηνῶν, / νεβρὸν ἔχοντ' ὀνύχεσσι τέκος ἐλάφοιο ταχείης (further 12.202, 220, *Od.* 2.153, 15.161, Hes. *Op.* 204, 205). Meaning 'hoof' implied by archaic cpd. μώνυχες (-ας) ἵπποι (-ους). Later hex. and Attic prose (+) 'nail' (of a person).

> - The inclusion of the Myc. *o-nu*(*-ke, -ka*) here is quite uncertain: see *DMic.* II 28f. for details.

For the raising of *$o > u$ see of course Cowgill 1960, Vine 1999. Lack of "Saussure effect" explained by paradigmatic levelling, i.e. restoration of the initial on the basis of the weak stem *$h_3n(e)g^{wh}$-.

1.2.a.β. Tocharian A *meku*, B *mekwa* pl. tant. 'finger-nails (of a person)'.

TA: A 321 a2 /// *yetusāṃ kapśañi • tsres maku āṅkaräsyo* 'the body adorned [with 80 secondary characteristics], sharp nails (and) incisors' (trans. adapted from Adrian Musitz apud CEToM).

> Buddha-nails are usually described as prominent (*tuṅga-*), copper-coloured (*tāmra-*), and glossy (*snigdha-*), cf. Mahāvāstu 2. 43 *buddhānāṃ bhagavatām aśīty anuvyaṃjanāni āsi // buddhānāṃ bhagavatāṃ* **tuṅganakhā tāmranakhā snigdhanakhā**, and esp. 2.306 **tuṃganakhā tāmranakhāḥ** *kailāsaśikharopamāḥ / lakṣaṇair utsadais caiṣāṃ kāyam atīva śobhitaṃ,* Lalitavistara p.76 *katamāni ca mahārāja tānyaśītyanuvyañjanāni? tadyathā -* **tuṅganakhaśca** *mahārāja sarvārthasiddhaḥ kumāraḥ /* **tāmranakhaśca snigdhanakhaśca** etc.

TB: B 74 a6 /// *ts· ˌ praroñ māka ˌ lalaṃṣkane ˌ lyelyūkwa ṣañ ˌ mekwasa* (= verse 18c) 'his fingers, very soft, illuminated by his own nails'.

> For the luminosity of finger- or toe-nails, a stock theme in kāvya, cf., e.g., Aśvaghoṣa *Buddhacaritam* 4.47 (*nakhaprabhayā*), Saund. 4.17, Kālidāsa *Kumārasaṃbhava* 1.33 (*abhyunnatāṅguṣṭhanakhaprabhābhir nikṣepaṇād rāgam ivodgirantau / ājahratus taccaraṇau pṛthivyāṃ sthalāravindaśriyam avyavasthām*), *Raghuvaṃśa* 2.31 (*nakhaprabhābhūṣitakaṅkapattre*), etc., etc.

Pace Adams (DTB² s.v. *mekwa*), TB *kw* cannot be a direct reflex of the labiovelar; instead *h_3nog^{wh}-s > *moks* [n.b. with apparently irregular *m-*] > *mek* (exactly as TB *ek* : TA *ak* < *oks* < *h_3ok^ws*), with secondary transfer to plural class I.2 B *-wa*, A *-u*). N.b., this is not necessarily evidence for a u-stem!

For the apparent sporadic development $*n…K^w > *m…K^w$ cf. some by-forms of 'naked': YAv. *maγna-* 'naked', as if $< *mog^wnó-$, dissimilated further in Khot. *būnaa-* $< *baγnaka-$, and the even stranger Greek γυμνός, for which a parallel $*mog^wnó-$ seems to be necessary (cf. Cowgill 1960:156f.) and hence either $*mog^wnó- >> *g^womnó- > gumnó-$ (by Cowgill's Law) or first $*mog^wnó- > *mugnó-$ (by Cowgill) $>> gumnó-$. Cf. further Cl.Arm. *merk* 'naked' $< *meg^w-ro-$ uel sim.

1.2.a.γ. CLuw. *tammūga* 'nail-(clippings)' (per Hart 2004): $*sh_3eng^{wh}- > *Temg^w-$ [with *-m-* by "assimilation" (?) and preservation of g^w after nasal] $> *Témug-$ (metathesis / epenthetic [o?] vowel?) > (Čop) *tammūg-*.

The meaning is reasonably certain at KUB 32.8+ iii 16ff. (per Starke's interpretation):

> iš-ša-ra<-aš-ša>-an-za=ti-i=t-ta | pa-a-ta-aš-ša-an-za ta-am-mu-u-ga la-a-at-ta | za-an-da du-ú-pa-im-mi-in iš-ša-ri-in | za-an-da du-ú-pa-im-mi-in EME-in

> '(s)he has taken away the nails of his/her hands and feet; the afflicted (*zanta dupa(i)-*) hand, the afflicted tongue'

Suggest that *tammūga* represents a collective plural to the root noun set up on the basis of Greek and Tocharian. The Schwebeablaut $*sh_3eng^{wh}-$ can be motivated in two ways:

- phonological: the addition of the "s-mobile" triggers a resyllabification: $*sh_3neg^{wh}- > *sh_3eng^{wh}-$. This would be the "mirror-image" of the development seen in (e.g.) $*h_2eug- \rightarrow *h_2\mathring{u}og-s-$ (: OHG *wahsan*) / $*h_2\mathring{u}eg-s-$ (: Gk ἀέξω).
- morphological: the coll. pl. was made in **two** derivational steps: (i) to weak stem ($*sh_3neg^{wh}- >>$) $*sh_3\mathring{n}g^{wh}- \rightarrow$ vṛddhi $*sh_3éng^{wh}-o- \rightarrow$ coll.pl. $*sh_3éng^{wh}eh_2$. Cf. Nussbaum 2014 and 2018.

The *-m-* of the CLuw. is in need of further clarification. Could it have arisen via the development seen in Tocharian? A bolder hypothesis would start with a $*h_3meg^{wh}- / *(s-)h_3emg^{wh}-$. (For the root shape cf. $*temk-$ and $*h_2em\hat{g}^h-$.) Toch. would then reflect the *-m-* directly (as would Arm. *magil* 'claw'). The *-n* of the nuclear branches could have spread from the variant with regular assimilation in the Schwebeablauting context ($*h_3emg^{wh}- > * h_3eng^{wh}-$). But this is probably too far-fetched.

?**1**.2.a.δ. Armenian *ełungn* 'nail' (plus (somehow) *magil* 'claw'). *ełungn* inflects as an n-stem on the model of other anatomical terms, cf. *akn* 'eye' and *otn* 'foot'. Would probably have expected **anungn*. Various attempts to explain the initial by dissimilation (cf. Gk λυμνός· γυμνός $< *numno- < *nog^wno-$, Saussure 1922:109 n.1) and tinkering with the prothetic vowel.

The prehistory of *magil* 'claw' is quite obscure, but it is notable for the initial *m-*, either by dissimilation $*n…K^w > *m…K^w$, or (less likely) as a relic of the original Anlaut $*h_3m-°$. Cf. Olsen 1995:453.

?**1**.2.a.ε Lat. (glossarial) *unx*? Probably a ghost-word.

1.2.b. An **i-stem** can be set up on the basis of Latin and Hittite, and possibly reflected in Celtic as well.

1.2.b.α. Latin *unguis* (Pl., Cato +) '(finger-, toe-)nail; claw, talon'. Non-human anatomical reading renewed by *ungula* 'claw, talon, hoof' (Pl., Enn.+).

1.2.b.β. Hittite *šankuu̯ai-* (OH+) nom sg. *ša-an-ku-wa-a-iš*, sum. UMBIN '1. fingernail, toenail; 2. unit of measurement' $< AK *sh_3\mathring{n}g^{wh}ói-$ (Weitenberg 1979 and CHD s.v.).

To be seen in conjunction with other i-stem anatomical designations: see esp. Hitt. *ḫaštai-* 'bone' besides the root noun continued by CLuw. *ḫāš-*, Lat. *os(s)*.

1.2.b.γ. Celtic: Old Irish *ingen* (f. *ā*) '1. fingernail, toenail; 2. hoof, claw, talon', Brittonic forms reflecting $*ang^wīnā$: OW *eguin*, M/ModW *ewin* 'fingernail, toenail; 2. hoof, claw, talon', etc.

Suggest i-stem derivational basis PIE $*h_3\mathring{n}g^{wh}i- > PC *ang^wi-$ 'nail' $\rightarrow *ang^wīno-$ 'made of nail', substantivised f. $*ang^wīnā-$ 'nail (etc.)', with Dybo shortening of the vowel in OIr. However, Italic at least

suggests *-īno- had taken on a life of its own as a suffix to a number of different stem types. Hence i-stem basis is not assured.

The replacement of the basic noun with its own substantivised genitival derivative is a constant phenomenon in Indo-European anatomical terminology. To be thought of as a *cycle* (in the sense of the "Jespersen cycle" in negations), whereby anatomical terminology is constantly renewed; this e.g. *ḱerd-/ḱr̥d- → *ḱr̥d-iịo- → καρδίᾱ ; *h₂ost- → *h₂ost-eịo- > ὀστέον, and so on. (For the derivational morphology involved in genitivals global ref. is made to Nussbaum 2009.)

1.2.c. A **thematic** stem is attested in Balto-Slavic: *h₃nogʷʰó- > Lith. nãgas (4), Latv. nags '(finger-, toe-)nail, claw, hoof'; specialised in the meaning 'stone' in the determinative cpd. Lith. tìtnagas 'flint' (see Petit 2007); *h₃nogʷʰéh₂ > Lith. nagà 'id.' (4), PSl. nogà 'foot'.

Latvian has what looks like a "genus alternans" in m.sg. nags 'nail, claw, hoof', f.pl. nagas '(both) hands; hands and feet' (besides regular pl. nagi 'nails, claws, etc.'). This suggests starting with a collective pl. *h₃nogʷʰéh₂, whose (backformed) singulative n.sg. *h₃nogʷʰóm was remade as a masc. within Baltic, and otherwise gave the feminine stem common to both Baltic and Slavic. (Semantics of this bifurcation need further discussion, but cannot engage in this now).

OPr. nagutis 'nail', OCS (+) nogъtь 'id.' not necessarily evidence for a u-stem, the suffix *-uti- mildly productive: cf. ALEW s.v. nãgas:

Das Suffix dieser Bildung und ihrer slav. Entsprechungen um aksl. nogъtь sm. 'Nagel' findet man speziell bei Bezeichnungen für Körperteile auch in aksl. lakъtь g.sg. -kъte, russ. lókot' g.sg. -ktja sm. 'Ellbogen', dessen Derivationsbasis in lett. ę̃lks, ę̃lka sm. 'Ellbogen' vorliegt. Dazu allgemein Vaillant 2,1.224, 4.699f.

1.2.d. A genitival derivative stem in *-lo- is reflected in the Germanic designations for 'nail', and also indirectly in Indo-Iranian.

1.2.d.α. For Germanic, *naglaz is suggested by OE nǣg(e)l, OHG, OS nagal (etc.). ON nagl, pl. negl by contrast inflects as a consonant stem. Most likely secondary transfer to athematic inflection on the model of 'foot'. Thus set up originally genitival *h₃nogʷʰ- → *h₃nogʷʰ-lo- 'made of nail' (with o-grade of the strong stem copied), hence substantivised according to the derivational cycle discussed above. For genitival *-lo- see esp. the pronominal genitive type Hitt. kēl < *ke-lo- etc. (per Rieken 2008). For loss of the labial element before the following consonant cf. Lass 1994:20-1.

1.2.d.β. A parallel formation probably underlies Ved. (VS +) áṅghri- 'foot; root (of a tree)'. Here start from *h₃n̥gʷʰ-ló- 'made of nail' > 'nail, claw, etc.' → vr̥ddhi *h₃éngʷʰ-li-, with the cycle repeated again.

1.2.e. Indo-Iranian reflexes.

1.2.e.α. Iir. consistently display what appears to be a voiceless aspirate: Ved. nakhá-, Middle Indic nakha-, (further forms Turner 6915, 6916); Ir. MP, NP nāxun, Bal. nākun, Khot. nāhune (pl. tant.), Sogd. n'xn, n'γn; Oss. nix, nyx; but voiced stop in Talysh nangыr, Wāxī diẏ́ər/digə́r.

Kümmel (2018, 2021, and elsewhere) has convincingly explained the Iranian forms as devoicing by *h₂ (the cases of *h₁ are less certain), see such cases as:

- 'big': *meǵoh₂, weak stem *m(e)ǵh₂- > *majaH ~ *majH- > YAv. mazā- ~ mas-, OP *madā- ~ maϑ- (cf. further comp. masiiah-, Sogd., Khw. and MParth. ms 'further, furthermore', superl. masišta- etc.)

- 'navel': PIE *h₃nobʰ-(i)- (Ved. nā́bhi- f.): YAv. nāfa- 'navel, origin, family': found in both West Iranian (MP nāfag, NP nāfa; Parth. nāf 'family', MP nāf) and in East (better perhaps "peripheral") Ir., thus Ossetic naf(f)æ, Sogdian nāf 'people, tribe, nation', Khotanese *nāha- 'navel' (reconstructed on the basis of late Khot. locative forms nehä = nābhau, lte-ba, etc.), and similar in modern Pamir languages. "Expected" -b- shows us in the cpd. YAv. nabānazdišta- 'closely

related' ("navel-nearest"), exactly as Vedic *nā́bhānédiṣṭha*, a personal name obviously built to the same compound (RV 10.61.18).

Suggests (e.g.) *nabʰ-aH-* (: *nabānazdišta*) beside vṛddhi-derivative *nābʰ-H-a-* (i.e., phon. [naːbʰχa-]) > *nāpʰHa-* > *nāfa-*.

- 'cold, ice': YAv. *isu-*, Pashto *asə́y* 'hoar frost' (< *isukī* or the like) besides Wāxī *yaz* 'glacier (Sarikoli *yoz* 'id.') < Proto-Ir. *yajaH*, coll.pl. to the archaic PIE *i̯eĝo-* > Hitt. *eka-* 'ice', *i̯eĝi-* > OIr. *aig*, gen. *ego*, MW *ia*, Gmc *ieka(n)-* > ON *jaki* 'icicle', etc. (Add here Lith. *ižà* 'ice-floe', *ižas* 'id.' (usually connected with *áiža* 'fissure' (et al.), but (i) an ice floe is not the same thing as a crack in the ice, and (ii) the short *i* of the words for 'ice floe' is unexplained on the usual view).) Thus derive YAv. *isu-* < *ii̯H-u-* (for secondary u-stem, cf. Hitt. *miliddu-* 'sweet, honeyed', derived from *milit(t)-* 'honey', cf. Gk μέλι, etc.).

1.2.e.β. For the main group of Iranian forms, start with vṛddhi *h₃nōgʷʰ-h₂-o-* → nominalising u-stem *h₃nōgʷʰ-h₂-u-* 'naily thing' = 'nail' > *(γ)na:gʰχu-* > *nākʰHu-* with Kümmel devoicing > *nāxHu-* 'nail' → *nāxHu-na-* (: Ved. *śmáśru-* 'beard' : *śmaśruṇá-* 'bärtig', *dắru-* wood : *dāruṇá-* 'hard' (sc. hard as wood)) 'made of nail' > 'nail' (with repetition of the by-now-familiar cycle) > MP, NP *nāxun*, Bal. *nākun*, Khot. *nāhune* (pl. tant., in typical lists of body parts), Sogd. *n'xn, n'γn*.

N.b. the long-vowel of these forms cannot be *o > ā via Brugmann, since the laryngeal closes the syllable.

For the u-stem (without vṛddhi) and associated adj., compare perhaps Dameli (a Dardic lang. of Chitral, N. Pakistan) *nawur* < *nakhura-* (← *nakhu-*).

Ossetic *nix, nyx* stands apart, and probably continues a thematic stem *naxa-* < *naxHa-* (as Vedic, see below).

Talysh *nangыr*, Wāxī *diɣə́r/digə́r* appear (uniquely within Iranian) to continue the "expected" voiced asp., e.g. PIIr. *nagʰu-ra-*.

1.2.e.γ. For Vedic *nakhá-* then set up *h₃nogʷʰ-h₂-ó-*. This will be a genetival derivative to the collective encountered above in Luwian and Balto-Slavic and, indirectly, in Iranian.

The question immediately arises: could the Vedic voiceless aspirate be explained in Iranian style, as the lautgesetzlich continuation of the cluster *-gʷʰh₂-* (phonetically [-gʷʰχ-] ~ [-gʷʰħ-])?

2. Aspiration and devoicing by laryngeal in Indo-Iranian.

2.1. *T + h₂* > PIIr. *Tʰ*. The well known rule first formulated by Saussure for *th* ('Contribution à l'histoire des aspirées sourdes', *BSL* 7 (1892) 118) and extended to *kh* and *ph* by Pedersen and Kuryłowicz:

Paradebeispiel 'path': AK *péntoh₂-s*, gen. *pṇth₂és* > PIIr. nom. *pántaHs* ~ gen. *pṇtʰHás* > Avestan *paṇtā̊*, *paθō*, Ved. *pánthāḥ*, *patháḥ* (n.b. with levelling of *tʰ ~ t >> th*). [*h₂* ex hypothesi, n.b.]

2.2.a. *D + h₂* > IA *Dʰ*. The parallel rule first formulated by Cuny ('Indo-européen et sémitique ', Revue de phonétique 2 (1912) 101sqq.):

Paradebeispiel 'big': *meĝh₂-* > PIIr. *majʰH-* > Ved. *máhi* (for *h₂* cf. Gk μέγα; Hitt. *mekki* with geminate; etc.).

2.2.b. Kümmel's Iranian devoicing rule (discussed above) - differential treatment of *h₂* in Iranian:

Paradebeispiel 'big': *meĝoh₂*, weak stem *m(e)ĝh₂-* > *majaH ~ *majH-* > YAv. *mazā- ~ mas-*, etc.

2.3. *Dʰ + h₂* > PIA *Tʰ*?

A few preliminary points:

2.3.a. Since the laryngeal effects surveyed above have generally been conceived of as "aspiration by laryngeal", obvious assumption is that nothing would happen in the case of $*D^h + h_2$ since there is *already* aspiration. Hence, no one seems to have considered the question of **what actually happened** in such cases.

2.3.b. Note that there are only **2** roots in $*-D^h h_2$ in LIV² ($*b^h ed^h h_2$-: Hitt. *padda-*, Lat. *fodio*, etc. (where the $*h_2$ is set up to explain the Hittite geminate), with no IIr. cognates, and $*d^h eg^{wh} h_2$-, where the Vedic reflexes are aniṭ (further discussion below)), beside **16** in $*Th_2$ (and **4** in $*-Dh_2$-). I am **not** hereby suggesting that a change of $*D^h h_2 > *T^{(h)} h_2$- was already PIE; rather, the asymmetry may be a result of the fact that roots reconstructed in final $*-Th_2$ are in some cases done so on the basis of precisely Indo-Aryan, and it may be that **some** of these reflect instead $*D^h h_2 > *T^h h_2$.

2.3.c. A particular advantage of the latter scenario would be to provide a rationale for certain cases of Ved. *Th* : Gk T^h. No laryngeal aspiration will be necessary in the case of Greek if these can be seen to continue $*D^h h_2$ sequences, sinch D^h obviously yields Greek T^h directly (regardless of the following laryngeal).

3. Two old "Greco-Aryan" cruxes.

§3.1. Ved. *makhá-* and derivatives: Gk μάχομαι et al. 'race, vie, contend, fight' - §3.2. Ved. *math^i-* 'steal': Gk *Promḗtheus*, *Promātheus*.

Hence begin our survey of potential parallels with **two** such cases:

3.1. Ved. *makhá-* and derivatives: Gk μάχομαι et al.

3.1.a. The Vedic adj. *makhá-* appears to mean both 'generous, freigebig' and 'warrior, Kämpfer'. For the former an inner-Vedic connection with *maghá-* n. 'Gabe, Geschenk, Lohn, Reichtum' seems desirable (cf. AiGr I² Nachträge 69), whereas the latter obviously points to Gk μάχομαι (and has since the 19th c.: e.g. Grassmann Wb s.v. *makhá-* "von einer Wurzel *makh (gr. μάχομαι), welche mit mah, maṃh nichts gemein hat"). Our tentative sound law facilitates the inner-Vedic connection whilst also allowing the possibility of reconciling **both** etymological connections (to be further explored below). In nuce, suggest a conflation of:

- To PIIr. $*mag^h$- 'give (uel sim.)' (PIE form not entirely clear, cf. Hitt. *maškan-* 'Gabe, Bestechung, Sühnegabe' if < virtual $*mag$-sk-°): n. $*mag^h ám$ Gabe, coll.pl. $mag^h áH$ → $*mag^h H$-á- 'freigebig' > $*mak^h Há$- > $*makhá$-;
- To PIE $*meg^h h_2$- 'run, vie with, fight' (Gk μάχομαι, Toch. B *mäk^ā-*) simply suggest $*mog^h h_2 ó$- 'runner, fighter' > $*mag^h H$-á- > $*mak^h Há$- > $*makhá$-.

3.1.b. This hypothesis needs to be tested against the Vedic material. A full survey is impossible here, but see esp. several passages in which **both** senses seem to be operative:

α) 1.119.3 sáṃ yán mitháḥ paspṛdhānā́so ágmata , śubhé makhā́ ámitā jāyávo ráṇe / yuvór áha pravaṇé cekite rátho , yád aśvinā váhathaḥ sūrím ā́ váram

Geldner: Als im gegenseitigen Wettstreit **die reichen Herren** um zu prunken in unermeßlicher Zahl zusammengekommen waren, die im Kampfe siegreichen, da tat sich euer Wagen in rascher Fahrt hervor, da ihr Aśvin die Herrin nach Wunsch fahret.

Jamison-Brereton: When, contending with each other, they have clashed with one another for beauty - (those) innumerable **combatants**, victorious in battle - then your chariot appears ever brighter in its steep descent, when you convey the patron according to his fill, Aśvins.

Likewise Elizarenkova has бесчисленные соперники 'innumerable combatants, rivals' for *makhā́ ámitā*.

Renou EVP 16 (1967), 20: ici *makhá-* est clairement «combattant»; tout au plus supposera-t-on un double sens (+ «genereux»), comme dans *ráṇa-* qui suit («combat» + «manifestation de joie»).

The śleṣa only works if there are two distinct senses: here primary 'fighter, combattant', secondary 'generous, genereux'.

Likewise verbal stem *makhasy-* :

β) 9.61.27 ná tvā śatáṁ caná hrúto , rā́dho dítsantam ā́ minan , yát punānó makhasyáse

Renou : 'Même cent fourberies ne sauraient te perdre, (quand) tu cherches à donner un bienfait, / vu qu'en te clarifiant, tu te-montres-généreux' ; but EVP 8, 91 (comm. ad loc.): "le contexte inviterait plutôt au sens de «combattre», mais cf. [9.]50, 2 ([9.]20, 7) ci-dessus ; peut-être *superposition sémantique* [my italics]".

J-B follow this up: A hundred crooks [/wool tufts] will never confound you when you are eager to give largesse, / when you, becoming purified, do battle [/act bounteously].

γ) 9.101.5 índur índrāya pavate , íti devā́so abruvan / vācás pátir makhasyate , víśvasyéśāna ójasā

Renou: Le suc-de-soma se clarifie pour Indra, ainsi ont dit les dieux./ Maître de la parole, il se sent-valeureux, lui qui commande tout par sa force-formidable.

J-B: "The drop purifies himself for Indra", so the gods said. / The lord of speech does battle [/ seeks bounties], holding sway over all with his strength.

Geldner as usual operates with only the 'bounteous' meaning ('Der Meister der Rede zeigt sich als Freigebiger').

δ) 10.11.6 *svapasyáte makhás* : généreux, il s'active à l'œuvre (Renou): der Freigebige(?) verrichtet gutes Werk (Geldner), прекрасно действует щедрый (Elizarenkova); EVP 14, 71 (comm. ad loc.): "*makhá-* «généreux» …Agni est *svápas* en tant qu'il fait des largesses, 9,66,21"; J-B "the bounteous one [= Agni?] is performing his work well".

I would suggest that we have a śleṣa here too: 'bounteous' (of Agni) / 'combatant' (of Soma, cf. 9.61.27 above).

Cf. Jamison comm. ad 10.11.6: "As noted in the publ. intro., this last vs. of the Jagatī hymn is esp. crammed with matter and subject to simultaneous and overlapping readings. As Re points out, the vs. contains 7 finite verbs, of which 6 are pres. indic. (only the first is exceptional, the impv. īraya). For none of them is the subject identified (save for epithets or descriptors). Suggestions for the identities of the subjects vary widely; I will not list them all, but give what I consider the primary referents in each case – but as indicated in the publ. intro., the studied vagueness as to identity is **surely meant to invite the audience to interpr. each statement as applicable to both Agni and Soma (or vice versa)**."

ε) In many passages only the 'generous' meaning is applicable, e.g. *adurmakha-* (8.75.14) evidently 'not without gifts': non exempt de générosité (Renou EVP 13 80, comm. 157), nichtkarg (Geldner), не-скупец (Elizarenkova), no stingy patron (J-B).

[N.b. For the moment I leave open the possibility that the Gk family of words may also in some instances continue the etymon of Ved. *maghá-*, as suggested (with different details, of course) by M. Janda, *Purpurnes Meer: Sprache und Kultur der homerischen Welt*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft. Neue Folge, Band 7), Innsbruck 2014 - ch. 15]

3.2. Ved. *math^i-* 'steal': Gk *Promēt^heus*, *Promāt^heus*.

Famous connection made by A. Kuhn, *KZ* 4 (1855), 124, and again *Die Herabkunft des Feuers und des Göttertranks* (2nd ed. Gütersloh 1886), 18f.

For the details regarding the stem *math^i-* (to be separated from *manth^i-* 'churn') see Narten 1960 [= 1995:11-25]. Last footnote of the article (1960:135[=1995:25] n40) Narten accepts with some reserve Kuhn's connection.

Hence set up the root as **mad^h h_2-* (> **mad^hH-* > **mat^hH-* > *math^i-*) and operate with a lengthened grade in **-mād^h h_2-* > Gk *-māt^h-* ~ *mēt^h-*.

4. Other possible parallels: ?*granth^i-*, ?*kha-*

4.1. Ved. *granthⁱ-* : i-stem in *granthí-* 'knot', them. stem in Khot. *grantha-* 'id.', MParth. *gryẖ* 'id.', MP *gryh* 'id' (cf. also MParth. *gryhcg* 'small joint, chain, joint of a chain', MP *grcg* 'joint'): Gk γρόνθος (attested late: 1ˢᵗ CE +) 'fist'.

Chantraine:

> poing » subsiste en grec moderne.
> *Et.:* Les données philologiques font croire qu'il s'agit d'un terme récent qui a concurrencé πύξ et l'a évincé. Si l'on pense qu'il ne s'agit pas d'une création récente, mais d'un vieux mot populaire qui n'est attesté que par l'effet du hasard, après l'ère chrétienne, il est licite d'en chercher une étymologie par la grammaire comparée. On a supposé un suffixe –θος (cf. βρόχθος, etc.) et rapproché le vieux norrois *krumma* f. « main », v.h.a. *krimma* « serrer » et plus loin lat. *gremium*. Tout cela reste en l'air

Suggest nominal formations *$grond^hh_2i$- *$grond^hh_2o$-. Allows an exact equation with Lithuanian *grandìs* 'ring, armband, joint of a chain', OPr. ⁺*grandis* 'Rincke' 'Grindelring am Pflug' and similar.

[The Germanic words sometimes adduced in this context (e.g. NHG Kranz) appear to continue *-*d*-, which might suggest a different root; I omit further discussion.]

4.2. Ved. *kha-* n. 'hole, canal' : root *g^heh_2- 'open, gape, yawn' (vs. usual connection with *khanⁱ-* 'dig'). BSl. demand a palatal velar here, but perhaps this is not insurmountable.

RN *g^heh_2- → *g^hh_2-ó- (cf. *g^hh_2-u̯o- → *g^hh_2-u̯o-s- (transp.) n. in Gk χάος) > *g^hHa- > *k^hHa- > *kha*-.

Summing up the discussion of sections 3.1-2, 4.1-2, four further hitherto intractable forms can be explained in this way. Are five examples sufficient to establish a sound law?

4.3. Counter-examples

are surprisingly few. Ones that do exist can be explained **either** as analogical / late creations e.g. *bha-* n. 'star, planet' (sū. +) either restored from expected *b^hH-a- > *ph-a- or simply created after the operation of the rule,

or the root has been reconstructed wrongly: see the case of *$d^heg^{wh}h_2$-, which at least from the point of view of Vedic is aniṭ: aor. *mā́ dhak*, pres. *daghnóti*. Further, Toch. AB *kätk*⁽ā⁾- 'cross, pass, overstep' probably has a different etymology. Evidence for a laryngeal is thus confined to Greek. It may be that Gk ἔφθη, φθάνω etc. continues a Wurzelerweiterung *d^hg^{wh}-eh_2- [Much more to say here, but omitted for time's sake.]

5. Phonetic interpretation.

Would tentatively suggest that the sequence of breathy voiced stop + voiceless pharyngeal (or uvular) fricative *-$d^ħ$- gave a "true voiced aspirate" [d̪t̪ʰ] uel [d̪ʰ] which merged with *-*tħ*- > [tʰ].

For a "true voiced aspirate" beginning voiced and ending in voiceless aspiration cf. the famous case of Kelabit (Blust 1974:50, Kümmel 2012:294).

Bibl.:

Blust, R. 1974. 'A double counter-universal in Kelabit.' *Papers in Linguistics* 7(3/4), 309–324.

Cowgill, W. 1960. 'Evidence [for laryngeals] in Greek'. In W. Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeals*, 93-162. Austin, Texas: Dept. of Germanic Languages, University of Texas.

Elizarenkova, T. 1999. *Rigveda* : *Ṛgvēdasaṃhitā*. Moscow: Nauk.

Geldner, K.F. 1951-1957. *Der Rig-Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen.* 4 vols. [HOS vols. 33-36]. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP [repr. 2003 [HOS vol. 63]].

Hart, G. R. 2004. 'Some Problems in Anatolian Phonology and Etymology'. In J.H.W. Penney (ed), *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, 341-354. Oxford: OUP.

Jamison, S. and Brereton, J. 2013. *The Rig-Veda. The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*. 3 vols. Oxford: OUP.

Kuhn, A. 1855. 'Die Sprachvergleichung und die Urgeschichte der indogermanischen Völker.' *KZ* 4.2, 81–124.

id. 1886. *Die Herabkunft des Feuers und des Göttertranks* 2nd ed. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann.

Kümmel, M. 2012. 'Typology and reconstruction. The consonants and vowels of Proto-Indo-European', in Whitehead, B.N., Olander, Th., Olsen, B.A, and Rasmussen J.E. (eds), *The Sound of Indo-European: Phonetics, Phonemics, and Morphophonemics*, 291-330. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum.

id. 2018. 'The survival of laryngeals in Iranian', in L. van Beek, A. Kloekhorst, G. Kroonen, M. Peyrot, T. Pronk (eds.). *Farnah. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European studies in honor of Sasha Lubotsky*, 162–172. Ann Arbor - New York: Beech Stave.

id. 2021. 'Zum Verhältnis von avestisch nāf° und nabā- 'Nabel''. In M. Tarsi (ed), *Studies in General and Historical Linguistics offered to Jón Axel Harðarson on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, 191-202. Innsbruck.

id. 2022. 'On new reconstructions of PIE "laryngeals", especially as uvular stops.' *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 18.1, 199–215.

Lass, R. 1994. *Old English: A Historical Linguistic Companion*. Cambridge: CUP.

Narten, J. 1960. 'Das vedische Verbum *math*-', *IIJ* 4, 121-135 [=J.N., *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. v. M. Albino and M. Fritz (Wiesbaden 1995) 11-25]

Nussbaum, A. 2009. 'Genitivalia.' Paper delivered at the 28th East Coast Indo-European Conference, University of Iceland, Rejkjavík.

Nussbaum, A. 2014. 'Feminine, Abstract, Collective, Neuter Plural: Some remarks on each (Expanded Handout)'. In In *Studies on the Collective and Feminine in Indo-European from a Diachronic and Typological Perspective*, ed. S. Neri & R. Schuhmann, 273–306. Leiden-Boston: Brill.

id. 2018. 'A Dedicatory Thigh: Greek μηρός and μῆρα Once Again', in L. van Beek, A. Kloekhorst, G. Kroonen, M. Peyrot, T. Pronk (eds.). *Farnah. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European studies in honor of Sasha Lubotsky*, 232-248. Ann Arbor - New York: Beech Stave.

Oldenberg, H. 1909. *Ṛgveda : Textkritische und exegetische Noten*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Olsen, B. 1995. *The Noun in Biblical Armenian. Origin and Word-Formation*. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Petit, D. 2007. 'Zur baltischen Bezeichnung des Feuersteins.' *IF* 112, 277-302.

Renou, L. 1955-1979. *Études védiques et paninéennes.* 17 vols. Paris: E. de Broccard.

Rieken, E. 2008. 'The Origin of the *l*-Genitive and the History of the Stems in *-īl-* and *-ūl-* in Hittite.' In K. Jones-Bley et al. (eds), *Proceedings of the 19th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

de Saussure, F. 1922. *Recueil de publications scientifiques de Ferdinand de Saussure*. Lausanne etc.: Payot.

Starke, F. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. [StBoT 31] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Vine, B. 1999. "On 'Cowgill's Law' in Greek", in *Compositiones Indogermanicae in Memoriam Jochem Schindler*, ed. C. Luschützky and H. Eichner, 555-600. Prague/Vienna: enigma.

Weitenberg, J.J.S. 1979. 'Einige Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Diphthong-Stämmen'. In E. Neu and W. Meid (eds), *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, 289-303. Innsbruck: Institut fur Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.