Indoarisch, Iranisch
und die Indogermanistik

Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft
vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen

Herausgegeben von
Bernhard Forssman und Robert Plath

Leonid Kulikov

The Vedic type *syáti* revisited[*]

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

1. The type *syáti*: two approaches

The Vedic present -*s*[(i)]*yá-*[ti] RV + 'bind' and four more presents of the same phonological structure (*ch*[(i)]*yá-*[ti] AV[1x] + 'cut [the skin]',[1] -*dyá-*[ti/te] YS + 'distribute, divide', -*d*[(i)]*yá-*[ti] RV[1x] + 'bind', *śyá-*[ti] RV[1x] + 'sharpen'; hereafter referred to as *Cyáti* presents) derived from the *Cā* roots (*sā, chā*, etc.) are one of the most obscure morphological formations in the Vedic system of present types.

This type is, no doubt, inherited from Proto-Indo-Iranian, which can be proved by the Avestan cognates of -*s*[(i)]*yá-*[ti] 'bind',[2] and, possibly, -*dyá-*[ti/te] 'distribute, divide'[3] and -*d*[(i)]*yá-*[ti] 'bind'.[4] Parallels with this type can also be found outside Indo-Iranian, in Anatolian, cf. Hitt. *išḫijanzi* (cf. WITTMANN 1973: 41; OETTINGER 1979: 461; RASMUSSEN 1989: 36). In the recent studies, these presents are generally regarded as belonging to class IV (i.e. *s-yá-*[ti] etc.). This analysis was adopted by Indian grammarians (cf. Pāṇini 7.3.71) and

---

[1] For the meaning of this present, cf. HOFFMANN 1966: 70f. [= Aufs. II, 463f.].

[2] *hā/hi* 'bind' - *hiia*-: subj. *hiiąn* Yt 8.55, grouped by KELLENS (1984: 100) together with thematic zero grade root presents (= Indian class VI).

[3] GAv. [2]*dā* 'distribute' - *diia*-: *diiāi* Y 29.8 (or an -*aiia*-present *ᵈdaiiāi*?); for a discussion, cf. KELLENS 1984: 121, note (3). Otherwise HUMBACH (1991: I, 122; II, 41 (7)): *hiiaṯ ... diiāi* 'so that I may enjoy': 1 sg.subj. of pres. *diia*- or *diiā* from the root *dai/dī* = Ved. *dhī* 'look at, perceive'.

[4] [3o]*dā* 'bind' - [o]*diia*-: 3 sg.impv.med. *nī-diiātąm* (at Y 48.7: *nī aēšəmōi nī diiātąm paitī rəməm paitī siiō(z)dūm*). The morphological analysis of this Gāthic form is unclear. KELLENS (1984: 120) takes -*diiātąm* as 3 sg.impv.med. of *diia*- 'bind', which would be the exact cognate of Vedic -*dyáti* 'binds'; correspondingly, KELLENS & PIRART (1988: 170) translate: 'Que la Rage s'empêtre!' This interpretation is followed by HOFFMANN/FORSSMAN 1996: 57 (§ 24ba), 197 (§ 149a) ('soll niedergebunden werden').
HUMBACH considers this form a passive to *ni-dā* 'lay down', mentioning the former interpretation as less plausible ("less likely is < ... > mid. of *ni-dā* 'let (wrath) be tied up'", HUMBACH 1991: II, 201 (2)), and translates: 'Let wrath be laid down!' (ibid., I, 177).
Adjacent to -*diiātąm*, we find the form *siiō(z)dūm*, which is generally taken as cognate of yet another *Cyáti* present, *ch*[(i)]*yá-*[ti] 'cut', but this interpretation leads to forced translations (KELLENS & PIRART 1988: 170: 'Tranchez l'Entrave!'; HUMBACH, ibid.: 'Chop the fury...'). More attractive is LUBOTSKY's suggestion (pers. comm.) to connect this form with the root *siiazd*- 'banish', thus translating it as 'banish the fury!'

appears already in the earliest European descriptions of Sanskrit (BÖHTLINGK 1845: 280f.;
BENFEY 1846: 758; BENFEY 1852: 355, § 796, III; BENFEY 1865: 1378 [= Kl.S. II, 149];
AVERY 1873: 234ff. (*syati* etc.), 248 (*śyat*); DELBRÜCK 1874: 164ff.; WEBER 1895: 829;
NEGELEIN 1898: 34ff.), as well as in comparative Indo-European studies (cf. OSTHOFF
1878;[5] MEILLET 1896: 375 (*ch-yati*); BRUGMANN 1902: 524; KURYŁOWICZ 1935: 64f.[6]);
it has also prevailed for the last few decades, especially since the 60's, cf. GONDA 1948:
50; MAYRHOFER 1965: 248; NARTEN 1968: 130 [= Kl.S. I, 92], fn. 104; LINDEMAN
1968: 112ff.; BEEKES 1969: 174f.; BURROW 1973: 331; INSLER 1971: 580ff.; EICHNER
1974: 57f.; JOACHIM 1978: 159f. (*ś(i)-ya-*), 166 (*s(i)-yá-*); KLINGENSCHMITT 1982: 9f.,
132; GOTŌ 1987: 44; GOTŌ 1990: 988 (*-dyá-*: "IVd"); GARCÍA-RAMÓN 1994-95: 340 (*syá-*
< *sh_2-i̯ó/é-*).[7] However, by the turn of the century this approach was replaced by the
class VI analysis. The turning point was, no doubt, WHITNEY's "Roots" (1885), where the
type *syáti* has been reanalysed as *sy-á-^ti*, *dy-á-^ti*, etc. (with a question mark, though).
WHITNEY's influential grammar (1896: 273f.) and verbal dictionary (1885) determined the
new view-point of this formation for nearly 100 years, throughout the emergence of most
of the standard grammars of (Vedic) Sanskrit (cf. HENRY 1902: 103, 259; MACDONELL
1910: 328; SCHARPÉ 1945: 112; RENOU 1952: 271; THUMB/HAUSCHILD 1959: 243f.); the
class VI analysis has also been adopted by some Indo-Europeanists (SCHULZE 1885: 423
[= Kl.S., 51];[8] BECHTEL 1892: 268f.; REICHELT 1906: 9f.; HIRT 1921: 60, 168, 211[9]).
Most interestingly, however, after the 50's scholars almost unanimously returned to the
earlier class IV analysis, without any explicit discussion,[10] and now the class VI analysis
occurs only rarely (cf. LIEBERT 1957: 5ff., 12; VEKERDI 1961: 269f.; MORGENROTH 1977:
365; ELIZARENKOVA 1987: 108; RASMUSSEN 1989: 37ff., esp. fn. 22). Such an intriguing
transformation of views may be the subject of a separate study on the history of the Indo-
European linguistics, but this topic goes beyond the scope of the present paper.

      From a morphophonological point of view, both of the approaches have disadvantages.
The main argument against the class IV analysis is that the stem *Cyá-* is often disyllabic

---

[5] Letter to Karl Brugmann, dated 26.05.1878, published in OSTHOFF 1992: 56f. BENFEY (1846: 759) and
OSTHOFF, ibid. account for the root *sā*, pres. *s-yá-^ti* 'bind' as the zero grade variant (with the root exten-
sion *-ā-*) of *as*, pres. *ás-ya-^ti* 'throw' - which is of course semantically impossible.

[6] J. SCHMIDT (1881: 67) and KURYŁOWICZ (ibid., 254) hesitantly add one more form to the aforementioned
Cyati presents, viz. aor. *ákhyat*, on different grounds though. SCHMIDT explains it as derived with the suf-
fix *-ya-* from the alleged root *kha-* and thus parallel to *d(a)yáti, s(a)yáti* [thus in SCHMIDT's notation] etc.,
while KURYŁOWICZ relates it to pres. *cáyati* (i.e. *khya- < *kə(i)i̯é-*). Both assumptions are untenable.

[7] The same treatment of the corresponding Avestan cognates (*-iia-*presents) is adopted in Avestan grammars;
cf., for instance, HOFFMANN/FORSSMAN 1996: 185 (§ 138.6).

[8] Though only for *sy-á-^ti*; in another article by the same author (SCHULZE 1888: 258 [= Kl.S., 363]) *d-yáti*
is considered a *-ya-*present; see footnote 36 below.

[9] But cf. *d-yati* 'binds' in an earlier HIRT's monograph (1900: 29); cf. also footnote 41 below for more details
on HIRT's analysis.

[10] Cf. e.g. LINDEMAN's (1968: 113f.) Excursus, where *Cyáti* presents are treated as built with the suffix *-ya-*
without even mentioning the alternative class VI analysis.

($C^{(i)}$*yá-*), whereas the present suffix *-ya-* appears as *-ⁱya-* very rarely, even after a heavy syllable.[11] Furthermore, it is unclear whether $C^{(i)}$*ya-* is actually a regular reflex of the sequence **CH-ya-*. We do not find sufficient evidence outside this type; *-yá-*passives derived from *Cā* roots generally have *ī* in the root (cf. *dīyáte, dhīyáte* to *dā, dhā*, etc.), whereas *Cā* roots which build *´-ya-*presents do not show ablaut (*kṣáya-*[ti] 'burn', *tráya-*[te] 'rescue', *mláya-*[ti] 'relax', etc.; cf. GOTŌ 1987: 44)[12], so that one might even expect ***sáyati* etc.

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

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

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

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

2.1 Semantic and syntactic features
2.1.1 Class IV (active)
As is well-known, most *´-ya-*presents are intransitive; many of them refer to inner states that belong either to the sphere of emotions (*krúdhya-*[ti] 'be angry', *tṛ́pya-*[ti] 'be satisfied'), or to the domain of physiological processes (*kṛ́śya-*[ti] 'be lean', *kṣúdhya-*[ti] 'be hungry', etc.),[14] as well as to their starting points ('become angry', 'become old', etc.). Besides, there is also a small subgroup of *´-ya-*presents denoting intransitive activities (*dívya-*[ti/(te)] 'play', *nṛ́tya-*[ti] 'dance', etc.), and a small subgroup of transitives (*ásya-*[ti/(te)] 'throw', *náh-ya-*[ti/(te)] 'tie', etc.). These subclasses, albeit old and inherited from Proto-Indo-Iranian, are unproductive and do not recruit new members after the RV, unlike intransitive statives.

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

---

[11] Cf. SEEBOLD 1972: 287ff.

[12] If we accept the class IV but not the class I analysis for these formations. The latter is most plausible, particularly, for *gáya-*[ti/te] 'sing' (i.e. *gáy-a-*[ti/te]) and, presumably, for some other presents; cf. WACKERNAGEL 1896 [AiG I]: 87; THUMB/HAUSCHILD 1959: 244.

[13] There are a number of crucial differences between class IV presents attested in the middle only (*pádyate, mányate*, etc.) and those which are mostly employed with the active inflexion (see KULIKOV, in preparation). Since *Cyáti* formations mostly occur with active endings, it makes sense to focus on the latter subclass of class IV, i.e. on the active *´-ya-*presents.

[14] Cf. WHITNEY 1896: 273.

in time rather than concentrated within a short ("punctual") period, cf. e.g. DELBRÜCK 1897: 26ff.[15]

2.1.2 Class VI[16]

By contrast, most of the class VI presents are transitives referring to "energetic" activities which imply some crucial involvement of the patient in the process, but, usually, do not lead to its death or destruction[17] (cf. *kṣipá-*[ti] 'throw', *khidá-*[ti] 'tear', *tudá-*[ti] 'push', etc.).

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

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

2.2 The ratio of the present, imperfect and injunctive forms

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

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

---

[15] DELBRÜCK labels this meaning 'kursiv'.

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

[17] Cf. KORTLANDT 1984: 315ff.

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

2.3 Paradigmatic properties: competing present types

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

2.3.1 Class IV

One of the remarkable features of the active ´-ya-presents is the lack of other present types within the IVS (except for productive *-áya-*causatives). Only few of them co-occur synchronically with other presents: *ísya-^{ti/(te)}* 'send' RV + // *isnắti* RV + 'id.';[19] *júrya-^{ti}* RV, *jī́rya-^{ti}* AV + 'become old' // *jára-^{ti/(te)}* RV 'make old'; *ránya-^{ti}* 'rejoice' // *rána-^{ti}* 'id.' (both are attested mostly or only in the RV, cf. GOTŌ 1987: 258f.); *dṛ́hya-^{ti/(te)}* RV 'be firm' // *dṛṃhá-^{ti}* RV[1x] + 'make firm'. *tṛ́pya-^{ti}* Kh., AV + 'be satisfied' appears as a recent replacement of *tṛpnó-^{ti}*, *tṛmpá-^{ti}* (RV +); *sídhya-^{ti}* 'succeed' is attested only once in early Vedic (in maṇḍala I of the RV), while the parallel *sādha-^{ti/te}* nearly disappears after the RV (GOTŌ 1987: 326); similarly, *-hṛṣya-^{ti}* 'be excited' occurs only once in early Vedic, in the late tenth maṇḍala of the RV, while *hárṣa-^{ti}* is exceptional after the RV (GOTŌ 1987: 347).[20]

Note that, with the exception of three pairs (which makes up less than 5% of the total number of active ´-ya-presents), viz. *ísya-^{ti/(te)}* // *isnắti*, *ránya-^{ti}* // *rána-^{ti}* and *tṛ́pya-^{ti}* // *tṛpnó-^{ti}*, *tṛmpá-^{ti}*, ´-ya-presents are not quite parallel to competing formations, i.e. they either do not co-occur synchronically, or are employed in different usages (cf. e.g. intr. *dṛ́hya-^{ti/(te)}* // tr.-caus. *dṛṃhá-^{ti}*).

2.3.2 Class VI

Unlike class IV presents, many of class VI presents co-exist within the IVS with other (synonymous or nearly synonymous) present formations: with class I presents (cf. *kṛṣá-^{ti}* RV + 'plough'// *kárṣa-^{ti/te}* RV + 'drag',[21] *jurá-^{ti}* RV[22] // *jára-^{ti/(te)}* RV 'make old'), with nasal presents (*tujá-^{ti}* 'move, put in panic' // *tuñjánti* etc. RV 'id.'; *dhū̆vá-^{ti}* AV +[23] 'fan' // *dhūnó-^{ti}* RV + 'shake'), with root presents (cf. *yuvá-^{ti}* RV 'join' // *yaúti* AV + 'id.'),

---

[19] The nasal present may be a recent formation though, cf. JOACHIM 1978: 43.

[20] I do not mention here rare ´-ya-presents, such as hapax *-pruṣya-^{ti}* 'spirt' ŚB[1x] (// *pruṣṇuvanti* etc. RV) or quasi-hapax *śúcya-^{ti}* ŚB[1x], JB[1x] (?) 'suffer, feel pain' (// *śóca-^{ti}* RV +) (cf. GOTŌ 1987: 307).

[21] For the difference in meaning and use, cf. GOTŌ 1987: 112f.

[22] The only finite form attested to this stem is *jurátam* (RV 1.182.3) 'make weak, infirm'. It is interpreted by WHITNEY (1885: 55), NARTEN (1964: 121), JOACHIM (1978: 83), LAZZERONI (1978: 142f.) as class VI present, by GOTŌ (1987: 152) as thematic aorist; cf. also Section 4.2.2.2, Excursus.

[23] Mostly with *ní*.

with reduplicated presents (cf. *-tirá-*[ti] 'make pass' // *títrat-* RV[1x] 'id.',[24] *diśánt-* etc. RV+ 'indicate' // *didéṣṭu* etc. RV 'id.', *yuvanta* RV[1x] +[25] 'keep aside' // *yuyó-*[ti] RV + 'id.').

Note, in particular, that some of class VI presents are in competition with reduplicated presents, while *´-ya*-presents <u>never</u> co-exist with this formation.[26]

2.4 Passivizability

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

2.4.1 Class IV

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

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

2.4.2 Class VI

-yá-passives to class VI presents are relatively few and mostly of late age too (some of them have no *-ya*-passives in Vedic at all, cf. *kṣipá-*[ti] 'throw'), in spite of transitivity of the base verbs, but less exceptional and older than the passive counterparts of the transitive active *´-ya*-presents. We find three *-yá*-passives in the oldest parts of the RV (*tujyáte* 2x 'is put to panic flight', *sṛjyá-*[te] 'be emitted', *stūyá-*[te] 'be praised') and one more in maṇḍala X (*sūyá-*[te] 'be consecrated');[28] others appear in the young Saṃhitās of the Yajur-Veda and

---

[24] *títrat-* RV 2.31.2, albeit a hapax in the RV, seems to go back to Proto-Indo-Iranian, as its Av. cognate *titaraṭ* proves (Gotō 1987: 165, fn. 266).

[25] For RV 8.71.4 *yuvanta*, cf. Joachim 1978: 140.

[26] I do not count *tūrya* RV[1x] (// *títrat-*), which is a nonce formation. *yásya-*[ti] AV 'boil' does not co-occur synchronically with the reduplicated present (RVic hapax *yayastu*), which is replaced by the former after the RV.

[27] The parallel passage of the AVŚ (11.3.14) has the *-ta*-participle *préṣita-*.

[28] The class VI present *vṛścá-*[ti] 'cut; bring low [to a deity]' (~ pass. *vṛścya-*[te] RV_X[1x] +) goes back to a fossilized *-cha*-present.

in the Brāhmaṇas.

3. A survey of the type *Cyáti*

3.1 Semantic and syntactic features

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

3.2 The ratio of the present, imperfect and injunctive forms

Two of the *Cyáti* formations occur in the RV with secondary endings only (*adyaḥ* 'bound' RV 2.13.9, *syat* RV 1.130.4[bis]), so that we cannot be sure whether the paradigm of the present was well-established by that time or not; only *-s[(i)]yá-[ti]* is well-attested with primary endings.

3.3 Paradigmatic properties

Three of the five *Cyáti* presents co-exist with other present formations within the IVS: *-s(i)yá-[ti]* 'bind' // *siná-[ti]* RV +; *syá-[ti]* 'sharpen' // *śíśāti, śíśīte* etc. RV +; *-dyá-[ti]* YS + 'cut, divide, distribute' // *dáya-[te]* 'distribute' RV +.[29]

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

3.4 Passivization

Passives, attested for two of the five *Cyáti* presents, are relatively rare and appear from the YS onwards. The following forms are met: *dīyate* 'is divided' KS[p] 9.14:117.2, TS[p] 6.3.10.3 ~ AB 2.10[ter] ~ ŚBK 4.8.3.9; *samdīyámāna-* 'bound' TS[m] 7.1.19.1 ~ KS-Aśvamedha[m] 5.1.10:154.2. *-dyá-[ti]* 'bind' has also passive aorist *samdáyi* (RV 1.139.1).

3.5 Compounds with preverbs

One of the most remarkable features of the type *Cyáti* is that forms with preverbs are much more common than simplex ones. Four of the five presents under discussion, *-s(i)yá-[ti]*, *-dyá-[ti]* 'cut, divide, distribute' and *-dyá-[ti]* 'bind', do not occur as simplex at all; *syá-[ti]* appears as simplex only in the ŚB (2x); *chyá-[ti]* is attested   exclusively with *ánu* and *ā́*.[30]

---

[29] For the different usages of the present *dáya-[te]*, see KUIPER 1974. KUIPER seems to be too categorical when considering *-dyá-[ti]* and *dáya-[te]* unrelated; cf. GOTŌ 1987: 172ff.

[30] *chyati* TS[m] 5.2.12.1a = KS-Aśvamedha[m] 5.10.6:185.16 probably has to be read [+]*ā́-chyati*, cf. HOFFMANN 1966: 70f. [= Aufs. II, 463f.].

By contrast, other presents of the same IVS (if any) either occur as simplex (*dáya-^{te}*; *sinā-^{ti}* in the AV) only or are attested both as simplex and in compounds (*sinā-^{ti}* in the RV;[31] *śiśāti* etc.).

3.6 A synopsis

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

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

In addition, one has to note that some of class VI presents which are in competition with other present formations (listed in section 2.3.2) are mostly employed with preverbs (*–tirá–^{ti}*, *dhūvá–^{ti}*), while other presents of the same root are well-attested as simplex.

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

4. On the origin of the type *Cyáti*

4.1 Preliminary remarks

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

---

[31] 1x as simplex, 1x with *ví*.

(morphophonology, syntax, semantics, paradigmatic properties, etc.). None of the features on their own can be sufficient evidence for or against certain analysis of a morphological formation, but a <u>set of independent features</u> shared by two formations seems to point to their synchronic affinity. I tried to show that the cluster of properties of the type *Cyáti* is basically the same as that of class VI and, hence, treating *Cyáti* presents as class VI formations is more appropriate than a class IV analysis within a <u>synchronic</u> description of the Vedic verb.

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

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

4.2 Where the type *Cyáti* comes from?
4.2.1 Class IV origin: *CH-i̯a-*
As has been mentioned in Section 1, the class IV analysis leaves unexplained some features of the type *Cyáti*, particularly: why *CH-i̯a-* does not yield ***Cī́ya-*, nor (possibly) ***Cā́ya-*? Nevertheless, it cannot be ruled out that some of *Cyáti* presents go back to -*ya*-formations which have later rebuilt their original shape (***Cī́ya-*? ***Cā́ya-*?) in analogy with some other *Cyáti* presents of different origin. Of course, this assumption leaves open the general problem of the origin of the type *Cyáti*.

4.2.2 Class VI origin
4.2.2.1. *CH-i̯a-*: i̯ belongs to the root
The class VI analysis has one disadvantage. Given the assumption that *Cyáti* is derived from the root *Cā* (*sā*, *śā*, etc.), how are we to account for the element -*y*- before the thematic vowel?[32] It should be recalled, however, that at least for some of the five verbs of this group root variants with the final -*i̯*- can be posited. Then the type *Cyáti* may be accounted for as class VI presents based on *i* roots: *si*, *śi* etc. This analysis was adopted, for instance, by HIRT (1921: 60, 168, 210f.), who regarded *syáti* etc. as 'aoristic presents'

---

[32] I refrain from a discussion of the controversial hypothesis proposed by DIVER (1959), who suggests that -*y*- in *Cyáti* (as well as in some other Vedic stems in -*ya*-) goes back to the palatal laryngeal **H̯* (*H₁); see also CHRISTOL 1990 and cf. LINDEMAN (1992: 60) for criticism. One should also mention the analysis suggested by BADER (1990: 10f.), who rejects both **sh₂i-e-* and **sh₂-°yo-* (thus in her notation) and traces the type *syáti* immediately to *sh₂-e-ti and, likewise, *dyáti* 'binds' to *dh₁-e-ti - without any convincing argumentation, however.

("Aoristpräsens"). Here I will only briefly mention the most important evidence for *CHi̯*
variants; a detailed discussion of this *Cā//Ci* alternation can be found in RASMUSSEN 1989:
50ff.; cf. also MAYRHOFER, EWAia, s.vv.

The root *sā* provides more evidence for *-i-* as part of the root than any other root of
the group under consideration: *sétu-* 'fetter, band', perf. *sisā́ya* (cf. LUBOTSKY 1995: 214),
nom.ag. *setár-* (cf. RASMUSSEN 1989: 59), caus. *sāyáyati* (cf. INSLER 1987: 65) point to
saHi̯- < PIE *seh₂i̯-* (cf. already HIRT 1900: 37; also RASMUSSEN, ibid.; MAYRHOFER,
EWAia II, 720f.; GARCÍA-RAMÓN 1994-95: 339ff.; cf. also BURROW 1949: 46; MAYR-
HOFER 1965: 248, fn.23). Evidence for two other roots, *śā* and *chā*, is more scarce but not
neglectable, cf. Av. *saēni-* and Ved. caus. *chāyáyati*, which may point to *ḱeh₃(i̯)-* (cf.
INSLER 1987: 65; RASMUSSEN 1989: 53; MAYRHOFER, EWAia II, 627) and *sḱeh₂i̯-* (RAS-
MUSSEN 1989: 61), respectively. For *śā*, cf. also the late Vedic root aorist participle -
ś(y)āna- 'sharpening' (AB 7.16.2 *nihśāna-*[33] ~ ŚŚS 15.21.11 *niśyāna-*), which could only
have been based on the root *śy- (śi-)* (with the secondary loss of *-y-* in the variant attested
in the AB).[34] For *-dyáti*, cf. RASMUSSEN 1989: 51, esp. No.2. Evidence for *-i-* as part
of the root is furnished by Anatolian, too, notably, by nominal derivatives in *-i-* like Hitt.
išḫi-man- 'strap' (~ *išḫāi* 'he binds'),[35] which are derived from the roots in *-i-* (N.
OETTINGER, letter of 15.10.97).

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

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

Furthermore, we have to explain the irregular reflex of the vocalized laryngeal be-
fore *-i-*: we might expect **Cīyá-* (rather than *C(i)yá-*), as in *-yá-*-passives of *Cā* roots

---

[33] The variant attested in the AB is generally taken as corrupt (KEITH 1920: 303, fn. 3); BÖHTLINGK's
Chrestomathie (1909: 32, line 14; 394, line 23) conjectures ⁺*niśyāna-* in accordance with the reading of the
ŚŚS; cf. also DEBRUNNER 1954 [AiG II, 2]: 274, § 162.b.β); DEBRUNNER 1957 [AiG, Nachtr. zu I]: 149.

[34] Note that middle participles of the structure *Cāna-* are unattested for roots in *-ā*, so that *-śāna-* is unlikely
to belong to the root variant *śā*.

[35] Cf. WITTMANN 1973: 41.

[36] Quite symptomatically, SCHULZE (1885: 423) accepts a class VI analysis for *sy-áti*, but takes *d-yáti* as a
*-ya-*present in another article (SCHULZE 1888: 258). Likewise, the Avestan cognate of *-syáti*, i.e. *hiia-*, is
treated by KELLENS (1984: 100) as a thematic zero grade root present (Indian class VI), unlike other
(possible) cognates of the type *Cyáti*, which are grouped with *-iia-*presents (see fn. 2-4).

(*dīyáte, dhīyáte*, etc.), with the secondary lengthening of *i* before *y*. All this seems to indicate that -*i̥*-, although <u>synchronically</u> belonging to the root, must be of secondary origin.

4.2.2.2 The pattern *dáya-ᵗᵉ* // -*dyá-ᵗⁱ*

Yet another source of -*y*- in *Cyáti* may have existed, at least for one of the members of this class. -*dyá-ᵗⁱ* 'cut, make sacrificial cuttings, distribute, divide' is in competition with the present *dáya-ᵗᵉ* 'distribute', whose morphological analysis is unclear. Generally, it is considered an -*áya*-present (cf. e.g. LUBOTSKY 1989: 95; MAYRHOFER, EWAia I, 700), although not always consistently.[37] Whatever the status of -*y*- in *dáya-ᵗᵉ* (part of the root or part of the suffix), *dáya-ᵗᵉ* and -*dyá-ᵗⁱ* may belong together as class I present and class VI present, respectively. Here it might be advisable to make a short digression on this paradigmatic pattern.

<div align="center">

Excursus

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

</div>

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

In my opinion, the functional value of this pattern within the Vedic verbal system, albeit semantically less transparent than, for instance, that of the pattern "-*ya*-presents // nasal presents", should not be underestimated. Here belong the following verbs:

1. *tára-ᵗⁱ/ᵗᵉ* RV + 'pass, cross over' // -*tirá-ᵗⁱ/ᵗᵉ* RV + 'carry through, save' (only with preverbs);
2. *várṣa-ᵗⁱ* RV + 'rain' // -*vṛṣa-ᵗᵉ* RV, Sū. 'cause to rain, make fall down as rain' (only with *á*).

In both of these pairs class VI present is opposed to class I present as transitive-causative ("factitive") to intransitive (cf. GOTŌ, ibid.).

3. *kárṣa-ᵗⁱ/ᵗᵉ* RV + 'draw, drag' // *kṛṣá-ᵗⁱ* RV + 'plough, drag [a plough]';
4. *dhā́va-ᵗⁱ* RV + 'rub, wash' // *dhū̆vá-ᵗⁱ* AV−YSᵖ 'fan'.

In these two pairs the semantic opposition is less transparent. GOTŌ (ibid., 58, fn. 27) hesitantly takes the meaning of the second members as causative,[38] but his interpretation seems forced. Rather one might say that the second members refer to more concrete and specific kinds of activities. Besides, -*vṛṣa-ᵗᵉ* and *dhū̆vá-ᵗⁱ* can be qualified as referring to more "energetic" activities, as compared to those denoted by the corresponding class I presents (cf. GOTŌ, ibid., 187f. on *dhū̆vá-ᵗⁱ*).

5. *ráva-ᵗᵉ* YSᵖ + 'roar' // *ruvá-ᵗⁱ* RV + 'id.';
6. *náva-ᵗᵉ/(ᵗⁱ)* RV, TBᵐˡˣ 'roar' // *nuvántam* (participle) RV₁¹ˣ 'id.'

The hapax *nuvántam* has been created in analogy with the pair *ráva-ᵗᵉ* // *ruvá-ᵗⁱ* and refers to more energetic (loud) roaring (cf. JOACHIM 1978: 103; GOTŌ 1987: 198).

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

---

[37] MAYRHOFER, ibid., takes *dáyate* as an -*áya*-present and, at the same time, treats *y* as part of the root (*DAY²*). I do not understand how these two claims can be reconciled.

[38] 'er zieht, schleppt' ~ 'er pflügt' = 'er läßt einen Pflug eine Furche ziehen'; 'er reibt, spült ab' ~ 'er befächelt' = 'er bewegt einen Fächer hin und her' und gleichzeitig 'der Fächer übt durch Hin- und Herbewegung eine Wirkung auf den Gegenstand aus'.

the above list:

    7. *jára-*[ti/(te)] RV 'make old' // *jurátam* (impv.) 'make weak, infirm' RV 1.182.3.

Both *jára-*[ti/(te)] and *jurátam* are employed transitively,[39] but the imperative *jurátam* refers to a more energetic activity ('hinfällig werden lassen', as opposed to *jára-*[ti] 'allmählich hohes Alter erreichen lassen', cf. NARTEN 1964: 121; JOACHIM 1978: 83; GOTŌ 1987: 152); these two formations seem to differ in their aspectual meaning, too: *jurátam* is perfective (GOTŌ, ibid.). Obviously, the semantic difference between *jára-*[ti/(te)] and *jurátam* is basically the same as that between the members of the most of the aforementioned pairs (1-6). Thus, whatever the morphological analysis of *jurátam*, i.e. class VI present (WHITNEY 1885: 55; NARTEN 1964: 121; JOACHIM 1978: 83; LAZZERONI 1978: 142f.) or thematic aorist (GOTŌ, ibid.), I do not see good reasons for treating this pair separately from the 'I//VI pattern' class.

    8. *háva-*[te] RV + (mantras) 'call, invoke' // *áhuvat* (*ah*[(u)]*vat*) etc. RV 'id.'

The zero grade thematic formations do not occur with primary endings, except for the unclear (but well-attested) form *huvé* (1 sg.med.), so that there is no sufficient evidence for positing a class VI present (GOTŌ 1987: 349f.).

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

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

    (ii) Members of most of the above pairs differ in diathesis properties: some of class I presents are media tantum (or quasi-tantum) (cf. *ráva-*[te], *náva-*[te/(ti)]), while some of thematic zero grade formations are activa tantum (*kr̥ṣá-*[ti], *dhŭvá-*[ti], *ruvá-*[ti], *nuvántam*, *jurátam*).

    (iii) Second members of some pairs, namely *-tirá-*[ti/te] and *-vr̥ṣa-*[te], occur in compounds with preverbs only; *dhŭvá-*[ti] is almost exceptional as simplex.

The above sketch suffices to demonstrate that the pair *dáya-*[te] // *-dyá-*[ti/te] perfectly conforms to these three features: *dáya-*[te] 'distribute' is medium tantum, *-dyá-*[ti/te] 'cut, divide, distribute' occurs with preverbs only and is a ritual term, referring to a more concrete punctual event (cutting off a sacrificial portion), thus, as it seems, being more transitive in HOPPER and THOMPSON's terms. Whatever the origin of these two formations, this is strong evidence for treating them <u>synchronically</u> as class I and class VI presents, respectively, even under the assumption that *-y-* in *dáya-*[te] originates in the suffix *-áya-*.[40] It is unclear which exact diachronic scenario might lead to the rise of this and similar pairs. One may assume that the zero grade of the root results from the reduction of the full grade thematic stem with the concomitant accent shift, which was operative in compounds with preverbs (i.e. *-CéC-e- > *-CC-é-),[41] but the exact nature of this process is unclear to me.

---

[39] An intransitive interpretation of the only middle occurrence, *jaranta* RV 10.31.7, is less probable; cf. GOTŌ 1987: 152.

[40] *dáya-*[te] and *-dyá-*[ti/te] are actually treated as class I and class VI presents of the same root already in WHITNEY 1885: 70, 72.

[41] To my knowledge, this hypothesis was first formulated by BECHTEL (1892: 153f., 268f.), who has extended to the verbal compounds the rule proposed by J. SCHMIDT (1881: 53ff.) for the nominal compounds: *a* in the

5. Conclusions

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

Abbreviations

AĀ = Aitareya-Āraṇyaka, AB = Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, AV = Atharva-Veda, AVP = Atharva-Veda, Paippalāda recension, AVŚ = Atharva-Veda, Śaunaka recension, IVS = individual verbal system, JB = Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa, Kh. - Ṛg-Veda-Khilāni, KpS = Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā, KS = Kāṭhaka, MS = Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, RV = Ṛg-Veda, ŚB = Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, ŚBK = Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Kāṇva recension, ŚSS = Śāṅkhāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra, Sū. = Sūtras, TB = Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa, TS = Taittirīya-Saṃhitā, Y = Yasna, YS = Saṃhitās of the Yajur-Veda, Yt = Yašt.

References

AVERY, John. 1873. Contributions to the history of verb-inflection in Sanskrit. *JAOS* 10, 219-324.

BADER, Françoise. 1990. Le liage, la peausserie et les poètes-chanteurs Homère et Hésiode: la racine **seh₂-* "lier". *BSL* 85 (1), 1-59.

BECHTEL, Fritz. 1892. *Die Hauptprobleme der indogermanischen Lautlehre seit Schleicher.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

BEEKES, Robert S.P. 1969. *The development of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Greek.* The Hague etc.: Mouton.

BENFEY, Theodor. 1846. Review of Böhtlingk 1845 [Sanskrit-Chrestomathie ...]. [2. Teil].

---

root of the second member weakens to zero after the preceding accented syllable of the first member, cf. PIE **dóru-* 'tree' - Ved. *hari-dru-* 'a kind of tree', PIE **sónu-* 'back' - Ved. *ghṛtá-snu-* 'one whose back is brilliant with ghee'. BECHTEL goes still further (probably, too far), reconstructing presents **sáyati* and **śáyati* (indirect traces of which he sees in forms like Ved. *sénā-* and Av. *saēni-*, respectively) on the model *dáyate // -dyáti*. A few years after BECHTEL, LEUMANN (1895: 41ff.) hypothesized the development exemplified by such pairs as *prá-khādàti → prá-khidàti* (in LEUMANN's notation), surmising two possible sources of the class VI presents: class I presents with preverbs and thematic aorists (without mentioning the pair *dáyate // -dyáti* though). The treatment of *-dyáti* as the zero grade variant of *dáyate* is adopted by REICHELT (1906: 9) and HIRT in his *Indogermanische Grammatik* (1921: 168; cf. also p. 210f.). The distribution *dáyate* (simplex) // *-dyáti* (in compounds) has also been noticed by HOFFMANN (apud EICHNER 1974: 57f.) and KLINGENSCHMITT (1982: 132, 146, fn. 5); cf. also OETTINGER 1979: 350.

GGA 1846, St. 76, 725-760.

---. 1852. *Handbuch der Sanskritsprache*. 1. Abtheilung: *Grammatik*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

---. 1865. Review of: SCHMIDT, Johannes. *Die Wurzel AK im Indogermanischen*. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1865. *GGA* 1865, St. 35, 1376-1391. [= *Kl.S.* II, 148-159].

BÖHTLINGK, Otto. 1845. *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie, zunächst zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungen*. St. Petersburg: Akademie der Wissenschaften.

---. 1909. *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie*. 3. verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Hrsg. von Richard Garbe. Leipzig: H. Haessel.

BRUGMANN, Karl. 1902. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg: Trübner.

BURROW, Thomas. 1949 [1950]. 'Shwa' in Sanskrit. *TPS* 1949, 22-61.

---. 1973³. *The Sanskrit language*. London: Faber and Faber.

CHRISTOL, Alain. 1990. Les laryngales entre phonétique et phonologie. In: *La reconstruction des laryngales*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 101-127. (*Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège*; 253).

DELBRÜCK, Berthold. 1874. *Das altindische Verbum*. Halle: Vlg. der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

---. 1897. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. 2. Theil. Strassburg: Trübner. (K. Brugmann und B. Delbrück. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Band IV).

DIVER, William. 1959. Palatal quality and vocalic length in Indo-European. *Word* 15, 110-122.

EICHNER, Heiner. 1974. *Untersuchungen zur hethitischen Deklination*. Inaugural-Diss. (Teildruck). Kronach.

ELIZARENKOVA, Tat'jana Ja. 1987. *Vedijskij jazyk*. Moskva: Nauka.

GARCÍA-RAMÓN, José Luis. 1994-95. The word family of Mycenaean *a-ja-me-no* /aiăi(s)meno-/ 'inlaid, overlaid' and IE *sehₐi- 'bind, attach'. *Minos* 29-30, 335-346.

GONDA, Jan. 1948³. *Kurze Elementar-Grammatik der Sanskrit-Sprache*. Leiden: Brill.

GOTŌ, Toshifumi. 1987. *Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen: Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (*Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philos.-Hist. Klasse. Sitzungsberichte*; 489).

---. 1990. Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 1. *amⁱ*, 2.*ay/i*, 3. *as/s*. *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology* (Osaka) 15 (4), 987-1012.

HENRY, Victor. 1902. *Eléments de sanscrit classique*. Paris: E. Leroux.

HIRT, Herman. 1900. *Der indogermanische Ablaut, vornehmlich in seinem Verhältnis zur Betonung*. Strassburg: Trübner.

---. 1921. *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Teil II. *Der indogermanische Vocalismus*. Heidelberg: Winter.

HOFFMANN, Karl. 1966. Vedisch *vicháyáti* und *govyachá-*. *MSS* 19, 61-72. [= *Aufs.* II, 455-564].

HOFFMANN, Karl / Bernhard FORSSMAN. 1996. *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (*Innsbrucker*

Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft; 84).

HOPPER, Paul J. and Sandra A. THOMPSON. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56 (2), 251-299.

HUMBACH, Helmut. 1991. *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra and the other Old Avestan texts*. Pt. I: *Introduction - Text and translation*; Pt. II: *Commentary*. Heidelberg: Winter.

INSLER, Stanley. 1971. Some problems of Indo-European *ə* in Avestan. *Language* 47 (3), 573-585.

---. 1987. The Vedic causative type *jāpáyati*. In: C. Watkins (Ed.), *Studies in memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985)*. Berlin etc.: de Gruyter, 54-65.

JAMISON, Stephanie W. 1983. *Function and form in the -áya-formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (*Ergänzungshefte zur KZ*; 31).

JOACHIM, Ulrike. 1978. *Mehrfachpräsentien im Ṛgveda*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang.

KEITH, Arthur B. 1920. *Rigveda Brāhmaṇas: The Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rigveda translated from the original Sanskrit*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. (*Harvard Oriental Series*; 25).

KELLENS, Jean. 1984. *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

KELLENS, Jean and Eric PIRART. 1988. *Les textes vieil-avestiques*. Vol. I. *Introduction, texte et traduction*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

KLINGENSCHMITT, Gert. 1982. *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

KORTLANDT, Frederik. 1984. Proto-Indo-European verbal syntax. *JIES* 12, 307-324.

KUIPER, Franciscus B.J. 1939. Indoiranica. 20. Aw. *sā* 'wehren'. *Acta Orientalia* 17, 63-64. [= *Sel. wr.*, 219-220].

---. 1974 [1975]. *ví dayate* and *vidátha-*. *Indologica Taurinensia* 2, 121-132. [= *Sel. wr.*, 406-417].

KULIKOV, Leonid (in preparation). *Vedic -ya-presents*.

KURYŁOWICZ, Jerzy. 1935. *Études indoeuropéennes*. I. Krakow. (*Polska Akademja Umiejętności. Prace komisji językowej*; 21).

---. 1964. *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Winter.

LAZZERONI, Romano. 1978. Fra glottogonia e storia: i verbi sanscriti della VI classe. *Studi e saggi linguistici* 18, 129-148.

LEUMANN, Ernst. 1895. Die Herkunft der sechsten Praesens-Klasse im Indischen. *Actes du Xme Congrès International des Orientalistes*. 2^{me} partie. Section *bis*: *Linguistique et langues aryennes*. Leide: Brill, 41-44.

LIEBERT, Gösta. 1957. *Die indoeuropäischen Personalpronomina und die Laryngaltheorie. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Pronominalbildung*. Lund: Gleerup. (*Lunds universitets årsskrift*. N.F., Avd. 1, Bd. 52, Nr. 7).

LINDEMAN, Fredrik O. 1968. Bemerkungen zu den indogermanischen Langdiphthongen. *Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap* 22, 99-114.

--- 1992. Review of: *La reconstruction des laryngales*. Paris, 1990. *Kratylos* 37, 58-62.

LUBOTSKY, Alexander. 1989. The Vedic -áya-formations. *IIJ* 32 (2), 89-113.

---. 1995. Reflexes of intervocalic laryngeals in Sanskrit. In: W. Smoczyński (ed.)

Analecta Indoeuropea Cracoviensia, vol. II. *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume*. Part One. Cracow: Universitas, 213-233.

MACDONELL, Arthur A. 1910. *Vedic grammar*. Strassburg: Trübner.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred. 1965. Hethitisches und arisches Lexikon. *IF* 70 (3), 245-257.

---. 1986-1996. [*EWAia*] *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Bd. I-II. Heidelberg: Winter.

MEILLET, Antoine. 1896. Indo-iranica. *MSL* 9, 365-380.

MORGENROTH, Wolfgang. 1977. *Lehrbuch des Sanskrit*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.

NARTEN, Johanna. 1964. *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

---. 1968. Das altindische Verb in der Sprachwissenschaft. *Sprache* 14, 113-134. [= *Kl.S.* I, 75-96].

NEGELEIN, Julius von. 1898. *Zur Sprachgeschichte des Veda. Das Verbalsystem des Atharva-Veda sprachwissenschaftlich geordnet und dargestellt*. Berlin: Mayer & Müller.

OETTINGER, Norbert. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.

OSTHOFF, Herrmann. 1992. *Lieber freund ... Die Briefe Hermann Osthoffs an Karl Brugmann, 1875-1904*. Hrsg. von Eveline Einhauser. Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.

RASMUSSEN, Jens E. 1989. *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (*Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft*; 55).

REICHELT, Hans. 1906. Der sekundäre ablaut. *KZ* 39, 1-80.

RENOU, Louis. 1925. Le type védique *tudáti*. In: *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. J. Vendryes par ses amis et ses élèves*. Paris: Champion, 309-316. (*Collection linguistique publiée par la Société linguistique de Paris*; 17).

---. 1952. *Grammaire de la langue védique*. Lyon: IAC.

SAUSSURE, Ferdinand de. 1879. *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes*. Leipsick: Teubner.

SCHARPÉ, Adriaan 1945. *Précis de grammaire du sanscrit classique*. I. *Phonétique - Declinaison - Conjugaison (Système du présent)*. Louvain: S.A. de Vlaamsche Drukkerij.

SCHMIDT, Johannes. 1881. Zwei arische *a*-laute und die palatalen. *KZ* 25, 1-179.

SCHULZE, Wilhelm. 1885. Indogermanische *āi*-wurzeln. *KZ* 27, 420-429. [= *Kl.S.*, 49-56].

---. 1888. Miscellen. *KZ* 29, 255-271.

SEEBOLD, Elmar. 1972. *Das System der indogermanischen Halbvokale: Untersuchungen zum sogenannten 'Sieversschen Gesetz' und zu den halbvokalhaltigen Suffixen in den indogermanischen Sprachen, besonders im Vedischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

THUMB, Albert / Richard HAUSCHILD. 1959. *Handbuch des Sanskrit*. II. Teil: *Formenlehre*. Heidelberg: Winter.

VEKERDI, J. 1961. On polymorphic presents in the Ṛgveda. *Acta Orientalia Hungaricae* 12, 250-287.

WACKERNAGEL, Jacob / Albert DEBRUNNER (1896, 1954, 1957) [*AiG*] *Altindische Grammatik*. Bd. I. *Lautlehre* (1896); Bd. II, 2. *Die Nominalsuffixe* (1954); *Nachträge zu* Bd. I (1957). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

WEBER, Albrecht. 1895. Vedische Beiträge. 4. Das achtzehnte Buch der Atharvasaṃhitâ. *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Jg. 1895 (2), 815-866.

WHITNEY, William D. 1885. *The roots, verb-forms, and primary derivatives of the Sanskrit language*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.

---. 1896. *A Sanskrit grammar*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.

WITTMANN, Henri. 1973. Some Hittite etymologies II. *Sprache* 19, 39-43.

Department of Comparative Linguistics
Leiden University
PB 9515
NL-2300 RA Leiden
eMail: Kulikov@rullet.LeidenUniv.nl