

ОРСАТ Л. ЛИГОРИО*

Универзитет у Београду

Филозофски факултет

Одељење за класичне науке

Београд

PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN 'EAT' AND 'MOUTH'

PIE $*h_1o\varrho-s-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-s-$) 'mouth' is derived from PIE $*h_1ed-$ 'to eat', as an s -stem o -grade postverbal, assuming that $*dC$ yields $*\varrho C$ (= $*h_1C$), which is a well-known phenomenon of the Glottalic Theory.

Keywords: Proto-Indo-European, Etymology, Glottalic Theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

Ever since it has been established that, within the Glottalic Theory, PIE $*dC$ under specific conditions yields PIE $*\varrho C$ (= $*h_1C$), it has been possible to recover cognates which otherwise wouldn't be deemed comparable with their respective Proto-Indo-European etyma; cf. e.g. PIE $*du-$ 'two', $*dekm$ 'ten' and PIE $*\varrho u-i+\varrho km-t-i-$ (= $*du-i+dkm-t-i-$) 'twenty' (> Av. *vīsaiti* id., G ep. ἐξείκοσι /ἐ(φ)ίκοσι/ id., etc.) (KORTLANDT 1983: 97) (= 2010: 100).

In this paper, I propose to consider whether, by the same token, PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-$ 'mouth' is to be compared with PIE $*h_1ed-$ 'eat' on the premise that PIE 'mouth' is in fact to be reconstructed as $*h_1oh_1-s-$.

2. PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN 'EAT' AND 'MOUTH'

Typically, PIE 'mouth' is reconstructed as $*h_3oh_1-s-$ (NIL 387); cf. Hitt. *aiš* 'mouth' (gen sg *iššaš*), CLuw. *āaš* 'mouth', Skt. *āś-* 'mouth', Av. *āh-* 'mouth', L *ōs* 'mouth', and OIr. *á* 'mouth'.

PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-$ is an ablauting s -stem; it ablauts in both the root and the stem.

* orsat.ligorio@gmail.com

In the root, 1. the full *o*-grade, PIE $*h_3oh_1-$, is reconstructed by NIL 1a. on the basis of *a-* in Hitt. *aiš* and \bar{a} - (hyper-plene) in CLuw. $\bar{a}aš$, where the root is followed by the full grade *s*-stem, PIE $*h_3oh_1Vs-$, eventually resulting in a hiatus (which is due to PIE $*Vh_1V$ yielding PANat. $*V\bar{V}$, q.v. KLOEKHORST 2008: 71), 1b. on the basis of \bar{a} - in Skt. $\bar{a}s-$ and Av. $\bar{a}h-$, where the root is followed by the zero-grade *s*-stem, PIE $*h_3oh_1s-$, eventually resulting in an acute length, and 1c. on the basis of \bar{o} - in L $\bar{o}s$ and \acute{a} in OIr. \acute{a} , where the root is followed either by the zero-grade *s*-stem, PIE $*h_3oh_1s-$, eventually resulting in an acute length, or by the full grade *s*-stem, PIE $*h_3oh_1Vs-$, eventually resulting in a contracted length; 2. and, the zero-grade, PIE $*h_3h_1-$, is reconstructed on the basis of Hitt. gen sg *iššaš*, where, according to RIEKEN 1999: 185ff., the root is followed by the full *e*-grade *s*-stem, PIE $*h_3h_1es-$.

In the stem, 1. the full *o*-grade, PIE $*h_3oh_1os-$, can be reconstructed on the basis of $\bar{a}š$ in CLuw. $\bar{a}aš$; 2. the full *e*-grade, PIE $*h_3oh_1es-$ or $*h_3h_1es-$, on the basis of $\bar{i}š$ in Hitt. *aiš* and $\bar{i}š$ - in Hitt. *iššaš*; 3. and, the \emptyset -grade, PIE $*h_3oh_1s-$, on the basis of \bar{s} - in Skt. $\bar{a}s-$ and Av. $\bar{a}h-$. (L $\bar{o}s$ and OIr. \acute{a} may reflect either the full *o*-grade *s*-stem, PIE $*h_3oh_1os-$, or the \emptyset -grade *s*-stem, PIE $*h_3oh_1s-$; the exact grade cannot be determined because, based on the data, it is unclear whether the length in L $\bar{o}s$ and OIr. \acute{a} is a contracted length, as though from PIE $*h_3oh_1os-$, or an acute length, as though from PIE $*h_3oh_1s-$. (Incidentally, the length in Skt. $\bar{a}s-$ and Av. $\bar{a}h-$ must be an acute length, and not the contracted one, because one would expect Skt. $\bar{a}s-$ and Av. $\bar{a}h-$ to scan disyllabically if it truly were a contracted length — and they do not. In the Rigveda and the Avesta they in fact scan monosyllabically; cf. e.g. Skt. abl sg $\bar{a}sás$ (= 2 syllables) in RV VII 99, 7 or OAv. gen sg $\bar{a}ñhō$ (= 2 syllables) in Y 31, 3. See GRASSMANN 1873: 190 and KELLENS-PIRART 1988: 113. Therefore, Skt. $\bar{a}s-$ and Av. $\bar{a}h-$ point to PIIr. $*Hās-$, not $*Haas-$.)

Based on Hittite (nom sg *aiš*, gen sg *iššaš*), RIEKEN 1999: 185ff reconstructs a proterokinetic paradigm; following Rieken, NIL posits the proterokinetic paradigm for Proto-Indo-European as well (nom sg $*h_3oh_1s-\emptyset$, gen sg $*h_3h_1és-os$).

PIE nom sg $*h_3oh_1s-\emptyset$ is reflected in L nom sg $\bar{o}s$ and OIr. nom sg \acute{a} provided these stand for PIE $*h_3oh_1s-\emptyset$; alternatively, if they stand for $*h_3oh_1os-\emptyset$ or $*h_3oh_1es-\emptyset$, L $\bar{o}s$ and OIr. \acute{a} coincide with CLuw. $\bar{a}aš$ and Hitt. *aiš* (qq.v.).

PIE gen sg $*h_3h_1és-os$ is reflected in Hitt. gen sg *iššaš* provided NIL is right to reconstruct *iššaš* as $*h_3h_1és-os$.

(PIE $*h_3h_1és-os$ would regularly yield Hitt. *ešaš* /*ésas*/. Rieken assumes that *ešaš* /*ésas*/ developed into *iššaš* /*isás*/ under the influence of the /*gráits*, /*grítás*/-type nouns; in this scenario, the accent in /*ésas*/ is shifted forward leaving *e* unstressed in the protonic position, where it regularly yields *i*; see KLOEKHORST 2008: 97. However, this explanation accounts only for the *i-* of Hitt. *iššaš*, not for the $\bar{s}š$ -.)

PIE nom sg $*h_3óh_1-s-ø$ is reflected in Anatolian and Indo-Iranian as well, though not exactly.

In Anatolian, it is reflected as $*h_3oh_1-os-ø$ and $*h_3oh_1-es-ø$ in CLuw. nom sg $\bar{a}aš$ and Hitt. nom sg $aiš$, respectively.

(In Cuneiform Luwian, the full *o*-grade was presumably introduced into the strong proterokinetic stem following other kinetic *s*-stems, such as the hysterokinetic or amphikinetic ones, which have the full grade instead of the zero-grade in the strong stem; on the other hand, in Hittite, the full *e*-grade must have been introduced into the strong proterokinetic stem from the weak proterokinetic stem, PIE $*h_1h_1-és-$. See KLOEKHORST 2008: 167. Therefore, the full grade in both $*h_3oh_1-os-ø$ and $*h_3oh_1-es-ø$ is secondary; if so, CLuw. nom sg $\bar{a}aš$ and Hitt. nom sg $aiš$ point to PIE nom sg $*h_3oh_1-s-ø$.)

In Indo-Iranian, PIE nom sg $*h_3óh_1-s-ø$ is reflected as PIIr. $*Hās-$; cf. Skt. $\bar{a}s-$ and Av. $\bar{a}h-$.

(In both Sanskrit and Avestan, the Proto-Indo-European nominative singular was remade into a presumably non-ablauting stem, PIIr. $*Hās-$, which is recorded in the weak stem cases only, viz. genitive / ablative singular (Skt. abl $\bar{a}sás$, OAv. gen $\bar{a}ñhō$) and instrumental singular (Skt. $\bar{a}sā$, OAv. $\bar{a}ñhā$ (*Lentoform*), YAv. $\bar{a}ñha$).

The strong proterokinetic stem, PIE $*h_3óh_1-s-$, is also reconstructed by NIL in a number of derivatives; cf. e.g. PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-en-$ (Skt. $\bar{a}sán$ ‘in the mouth’), PIE $*pro(H)+h_3oh_1-s-n-o-$ (L *pronus* ‘leaning forward, bending down, inclined’), PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-eh_2-$ (L *ōra* ‘coast’), PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-i-o-$ (Skt. $\bar{a}syā$ ‘mouth; throat’), PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-t-o-$ (Lith. *uostas* ‘river mouth; haven’, Latv. *uosts* ‘river mouth; haven’), PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-t-eh_2-$ (Lith. *uostà* ‘river mouth; haven’, Latv. *uōsta* ‘river mouth; haven’), PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-t-i-o-$ (L *ōstium* ‘entrance’), PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-t-i-eh_2-$ (L *ōstia* ‘river mouth’), etc.

However, PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-$ can *ceteris paribus* be reconstructed as $*h_1eh_3-s-$ or $*h_1oh_1-s-$ as well; thus e.g. ZUCHA 1988: 135 and MATASOVIĆ 2000: 39, 2009: 44, respectively.

(PIE $*h_1eh_3-s-$ is also reconstructed by e.g. KLOEKHORST 2008: 166 or KROONEN 2013: 394, who in fact reconstructs it as $*h_{1/3}eh_{1/3}-s-$.)

Hitt. $aiš$ and CLuw. $\bar{a}aš$ point to PAnat. $*\lambda o^2-s-$, Skt. $\bar{a}s-$ and Av. $\bar{a}h-$ to PIIr. $*Hās-$, and L $\bar{o}s$ and OIr. \acute{a} to PICelt. $*\bar{o}s-$.

PIIr. $*Hās-$ and PICelt. $*\bar{o}s-$ point to non-Anat. IE $*Hōs-$.

Due to laryngeal colouring, PIE $*h_1eh_3-s-$ develops into $*h_1oh_3-s-$; thus, the choice between PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-$, PIE $*h_1eh_3-s-$, and PIE $*h_1oh_1-s-$ effectively becomes the choice between PIE $*h_3oh_1-s-$, PIE $*h_1oh_3-s-$, and PIE $*h_1oh_1-s-$.

In Proto-Anatolian, PIE $*h_3oh_1s-$, PIE $*h_3oh_3s-$, and PIE $*h_1oh_1s-$ all merge into $*\rho o\lambda s-$ since both PIE $*h_1o-$ and PIE $*h_3o-$ develop into PANat. $*\rho o-$ and PIE $*-h_1s-$ and PIE $*-h_3s-$ develop into PANat. $*\lambda s-$; see KLOECKHORST 2008: 75, 78.

In non-Anatolian Indo-European, PIE $*h_3oh_1s-$, PIE $*h_1oh_3s-$, and PIE $*h_1oh_1s-$ all merge into $*H\bar{o}s-$ since both PIE $*h_1o-$ and PIE $*h_3o-$ develop into non-Anat. IE $*Ho-$ and PIE $*-oh_1s-$ and PIE $*-oh_3s-$ develop into non-Anat. IE $*-\bar{o}s-$.

Therefore, PANat. $*\rho o\lambda s-$ and non-Anat. IE $*H\bar{o}s-$ can point to PIE $*h_3oh_1s-$, PIE $*h_1eh_3s-$ ($*h_1oh_3s-$), or PIE $*h_1oh_1s-$.

(Some authors reconstruct PIE $*h_3eh_1s-$ as well, e.g. SCHRIJVER 1991: 55, RIEKEN 1999: 185, DE VAAN 2008: 489, and KROONEN 2013: 394 (who in fact reconstructs $*h_{1/3}eh_{1/3}s-$). This, however, is an incorrect reconstruction because PIE $*h_3e-$ develops into PANat. $*Ho-$ (> Hitt. $ha-$, CLuw. $ha-$) (v. MELCHERT 1987, KLOECKHORST 2006: 85–96, 2008: 75); cf. e.g. PIE $*h_3eu-i-$ ‘sheep’ > Hitt. $h\bar{a}ui-$ id., CLuw. $h\bar{a}ui-$ id.)

Based on the data, it is impossible to determine which reconstruction is the correct one: PIE $*h_3oh_1s-$, PIE $*h_1eh_3s-$ ($*h_1oh_3s-$), or PIE $*h_1oh_1s-$.

However, if we interpret $*h_1oh_1s-$ as $*h_1o\lambda s-$ and assume that $*h_1o\lambda s-$ is the correct reconstruction for PIE ‘mouth’, it becomes possible to derive PIE $*h_1o\lambda s-$ from PIE $*h_1od-s-$, where, attractively, $*h_1od-$ seems to be the *o*-grade of the PIE root $*h_1ed-$ ‘to eat’ (> Ved. $\acute{a}tti$ id., G $\xi\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$ id., L $ed\bar{o}$ id., Go. $itan$ id., Lith. $\acute{e}sti$ ‘feed’, OCS $jasti$ id., etc.) (LIV² 230).

Compare PIE $*h_2eu-$ ‘to see; to hear’ (Hitt. $au-i$, L *audio*, etc.) and PIE $*h_2ou-s-$ ‘ear’ (G $o\ddot{u}\zeta$, L *auris*, OCS *uxo*, etc.) (SZEMERÉNYI 1960: 242) or PIE $*h_3ek^u-$ ‘to look’ (Skt. $\acute{i}k\acute{s}ate$, G $\acute{o}\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha$, etc.) and PIE $*h_3ok^u-s-$ ‘eye’ (Skt. $ak\acute{s}$ -) (LIV² 297, NIL 370).

PIE $*h_1od-s-$ yields PIE $*h_1o\lambda s-$ by $*dC$ developing into $*\lambda C$ (= $*h_1C$).

PIE $*dC$ develops into PIE $*\lambda C$: 1. where $*C$ is PIE $*k$, cf. Skt. $d\acute{a}\acute{s}v\acute{a}ms-$ ‘devout, pious’ < PIE pt pf act $*de-d\acute{k}-uos-$ (KLINGENSCHMITT 1982: 129), G $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\alpha$ (Ion. $\tau\rho\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\nu\alpha$) ‘thirty’ < PIE num card $*tri-h_2+d\acute{k}om-t-h_2$, G $\pi\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\nu\alpha$ ‘fifty’ < PIE num card $*penk^ue+d\acute{k}om-t-h_2$, G $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{o}\nu$ ‘hundred’ < PIE num card $*d\acute{k}m-t-om$ (KORTLANDT 1983: 97) (= 2010: 105); 2. where $*C$ is PIE $*u$ (i.e. $*y$) and the following syllable starts with a dental, cf. G $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\sigma\iota$ ‘twenty’ (ep. $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\iota\kappa\omicron\sigma\iota$ / $\acute{\epsilon}(\acute{\Gamma})\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\sigma\iota$, Dor. Boeot. $\acute{\Gamma}\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\tau\iota$) < PIE num card $*du-i+d\acute{k}m-t-i-$ (KORTLANDT 1983: 97) (= 2010: 100), Skt. $\acute{a}vidhat$ (scanned long, $\acute{á}vidhat$) < PIE 3sg ind aor act $*h_1e-dui+d^h h_1e-t-\emptyset$ (LUBOTSKY 1994), OCS $v\acute{i}tor\acute{u}$ ‘second(ary)’ < PIE nom msg $*dui-tor-o-s$ (DERKSEN 2008: 532), Skt. adv $v\acute{i}tar\acute{a}m$ ‘further’, Av. adv $v\acute{i}tar\acute{a}m$ ‘further’ < PIE acc nsg $*dui-ter-o-m$, OPhr. $v\acute{i}taran$ ‘second’ (?) < PIE acc fsg $*dui-ter-eh_2-m$; 3. where $*C$ is PIE $*r$, cf. CLuw. $ya-a-ar$ ‘water’, Skt. $v\acute{a}r-$ id. < PIE $*uod-r-$ (LUBOTSKY 2013).

Also, PIE **dC* develops into PIE **ʔC* where **C* is an obstruent (most likely PIE **t*) in a number of verbal roots which appear to show the **...d- ~ *...h₁-* variation, cf. PIE **h₂ed-* (Hitt. *hāt-ⁱ / hāt-* ‘dry up, become parched’, G ἄζω ‘dry up’) (LIV² 255) ~ PIE **h₂eh₁-* (Pal. *hāri, hānta* ‘be hot’, Av. *āt(ə)r-* ‘fire’) (LIV² 257); PIE **med-* (OIr. *midithir* ‘to measure; judge’, YAv. *vī-mad-* ‘healer; physician’, G μέδω ‘rule’, Go. *mitan, miton* ‘measure; consider’, etc.) (LIV² 423) ~ PIE **meh₁-* (Skt. *mā-* ‘measure; measure out, assign’, L *mētior* ‘measure’, etc.) (LIV² 424); PIE **(s)pend-* (L *pendō* ‘weigh; pay’, Lith. *spęsti* ‘set a trap’) (LIV² 578) ~ PIE **(s)penh₁-* (G πένομαι ‘exert oneself, toil’, Lith. *pinti* ‘twist’, OCS *pęti* ‘stretch’, Arm. *henum* ‘weave’, Go. *spinnan* ‘spin’, etc.) (LIV² 578); PIE **tend-* (L *tondeō* ‘cut hair, shear’, G τένδω ‘gnaw at’) (LIV² 628) ~ PIE **temh₁-* (G ep. *τάμνω* ‘cut’, MĪr. *tamnaid* ‘cut’, L *temnō* ‘scorn, despise’) (LIV² 625). See LUBOTSKY 2013: 162f (and, now, also GARNIER 2014).

If the present proposition is true, it would suggest that PIE **dC* develops into **ʔC* before PIE **s* as well.

3. CONCLUSION¹

PIE **h₁oh₁-s-* (= **h₁oʔs-*) ‘mouth’ can regularly be derived from PIE **h₁ed-* ‘to eat’.

PIE **h₁ed-* [1] ablauts into either the zero grade, PIE **h₁d-* [2], or the full *o*-grade, PIE **h₁od-* [6], and thence forms an *s*-stem, PIE **h₁d-s-* [3] / **h₁od-s-* [7], where, before the zero-grade stem, PIE **h₁d-s-* / **h₁od-s-* allomorphs into PIE **h₁ʔs-* (= **h₁h₁-s-*) [4] / **h₁oʔs-* (= **h₁oh₁-s-*) [8], which is reflected regularly as PANat. **ʔʔs-* [5] / **ʔoʔs-* [9–11], PIIr. — / *Hās-* [12–14], and PICelt. — / **ōs-* [15–17]; the full *o*-grade allomorph, PIE **h₁oʔs-* (= **h₁oh₁-s-*), is also reflected in its various derivatives in Indic [18–21, 28–30], Latin [22, 23, 26, 27, 31, 36–40], Proto-Germanic [24, 25], and Baltic [31–35].

Based on the data, it seems unnecessary to reconstruct a full grade *s*-stem in Proto-Indo-European.

Even though PANat. **ʔoʔs-* is reflected as **ʔoʔes-* in Hitt. *aiš* and as **ʔoʔos-* in CLuw. *āaš*, these forms, **ʔoʔes-* and **ʔoʔos-*, are secondary to PANat. **ʔoʔs-*; see sec. 2. Therefore, they do not warrant the reconstruction of a full grade *s*-stem in Proto-Indo-European; cf. e.g. Hitt. *nēpiš-* and CLuw. *tappaš-* next to PIE **neb^h-s-* ‘heaven’. Likewise, the reconstruction of a full grade cannot be justified by PICelt. **ōs-* either, because it is simpler to derive it from the zero-grade, PIE **h₁oʔs-* (= **h₁oh₁-s-*); cf. PIIr. **Hās-*.

¹ Numbers in square brackets refer to lines in the Appendix (see below).

Moreover, the zero-grade *s*-stem must be reconstructed on the basis of *šš* in Hitt. gen sg *iššaš* as well because the geminate can only be explained as arising from the cluster **-h₁s-*; cf. Hitt. *āššu-* from PIE **h₁o-h₁s-u-* (KLOECKHORST 2008: 223). (The *i-* in Hitt. *išš-* is a prothesis.)

The exact paradigm, static or kinetic, is difficult to reconstruct because the data seems to be conflicted: the supposed strong stem, PIE **h₁od-s-*, is suggestive of a static noun and the supposed weak stem, PIE **h₁d-s-*, of a kinetic noun (hysterokinetic or amphikinetic).

The structure of the strong stem, PIE **CoC-s-*, is conspicuous, though; it reappears in other *s*-stem neuters which designate body parts, such as PIE **h₂ou-s-* ‘ear’ or PIE **h₃ok^u-s-* ‘eye’.

4. MISC

In the *o*-grade, PIE **h₁ed-* ‘eat’ apparently formed an *us*-derivative as well, PIE **h₁od-us-* [41] ‘mouth’, perhaps originally a participle (as e.g. PIE **h₃d-ont-* ‘biter’ > ‘tooth’, from PIE **h₃ed-* ‘to bite’), which was apparently subjected to allomorphy as well,² producing PIE **h₁oʔ-us-* (= **h₁oh₁-us-*) [42], whence a derivative was formed, PIE **h₁oʔ-us-t(H)-* (= **h₁oh₁-us-t(H)-*) [43], which, still further derived, is attested as PIE *h₁oʔ-us-t(H)-o-* (= **h₁oh₁-us-t(H)-o-*) [44] in Indo-Iranian [45–47] and Slavic [48], as PIE **h₁oʔ-us-t(H)-i-o-* (= **h₁oh₁-us-t(H)-i-o-*) [49–50] in Slavic [51], as PIE **h₁oʔ-us-t(H)-r-o-* (= **h₁oh₁-us-t(H)-r-o-*) [52–53] in Avestan [54], and as PIE **h₁oʔ-us-t(H)-eh₂-* (= **h₁oh₁-us-t(H)-eh₂-*) [55] in Old Prussian [56].

² The allomorphy must have originated in the strong stem, PIE **h₁d-uos-*, and was then spread by analogy to the weak stem, PIE **h₁od-us-*, since **h₁od-us-* would supposedly have remained unaffected by **dC* developing into **ʔC*.

APPENDIX

- PIE root **h₁d-* ‘eat’³ [1]
- ∴ *∅*-grade **h₁d-* id. [2]
- ⇒ *∅*-grade *s*-stem **h₁d-s-* ‘mouth’ (< ‘eat’) [3]
- ∴ allomorph **h₁ǵ-s-* (= **h₁h₁-s-*) id. [4]
- > Hitt. *iš-* id. (e.g. in gen sg *iššāš /iš-ša-a-aš/*)⁴ [5]
- ∴ *o*-grade **h₁od-* id. [6]
- ⇒ *∅*-grade *s*-stem **h₁od-s-* ‘mouth’ (< ‘eat’) [7]
- ∴ allomorph **h₁oǵ-s-* (= **h₁oh₁-s-*) id. [8]
- > PAnat. **ǵoǵ-s-* id. [9]
- >> Hitt. nom sg *aiš /a-i-iš/* n. (c.) id.⁴ [10]
- >> CLuw. nom sg *āaš /a-a-aš-ša/* n. id.⁴ [11]
- > PIIr. **Hās-* id. [12]
- > Skt. *āś-* n. id., ‘face’, abl sg *āsás*⁵ [13]
- > Av. *āh-* n. id., gen sg *āṅhō*⁶ [14]
- > PICelt. **ōs-* id.⁷ [15]
- > PIt. **ōs-* id. (L *ōs* n. id., gen sg *ōris*)⁸ [16]
- > PCelt. *ās-* (OIr. poet. *á* id., gen sg *á* (in *fer há* ‘man of the mouth’ (= ‘tooth’))⁹ [17]
- ⇒ *n*-stem derivative **h₁oǵ-s-n-* (= **h₁oh₁-s-n-*) id. [18]
- ⇒ *e*-grade *n*-stem noun **h₁oǵ-s-en-* (= **h₁oh₁-s-en-*) [19]
- loc sg **h₁oǵ-s-en-∅* (= **h₁oh₁-s-en-∅*) ‘in mouth’ [20]
- > Skt. *āsán* id. (in adj *āsānn-iṣu-* ‘having arrows in the mouth’)⁵ [21]
- ⇒ *o*-stem derivative **pro(H)+h₁oǵ-s-n-o-* (= **pro(H)+h₁oh₁-s-n-o-*) ‘facing forward’ (< ‘with mouth, face forward’) [22]
- > L adj *pronus* ‘leaning forward, bending down, inclined’¹⁰ [23]
- ⇒ *o*-stem noun **h₁oǵ-s-o-* (= **h₁oh₁-s-o-*) ‘river mouth, estuary’ (< ‘mouth’) [24]
- > PGM. **ōsa-* id. (ON *óss* m. id., Far. *ósi* m. id., Nw. *os* m. / n. id., ‘hole in the ice’, OE *ōr* n. ‘edge’, *ōra* m. id.)¹¹ [25]
- ⇒ *eh₂*-stem noun **h₁oǵ-s-eh₂-* (= **h₁oh₁-s-eh₂-*) ‘edge’ (< ‘mouth’) [26]
- > L *ōra* f. id., ‘coast’ [27]
- ⇒ *i*-derivative **h₁oǵ-s-i-* (= **h₁oh₁-s-i-*) id. [28]
- ⇒ *o*-stem noun **h₁oǵ-s-i-o-* (= **h₁oh₁-s-i-o-*) [29]
- > Skt. *āsya*^o id., ‘throat’ (in adj *āsya-daghná-* ‘reaching up to the mouth’)⁵ [30]

- ⇒ *t*-derivative $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-s-t-$) ‘mouth; river mouth’
(< ‘mouth’) [31]
- ⇒ *o*-stem noun $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-o-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-s-t-o-$) id. [32]
> Lith. *úostas* m. id., ‘haven’, Latv. *uosts* m. id., ‘haven’¹² [33]
- ⇒ *eh*₂-stem noun $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-eh_2-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-s-t-eh_2-$) id. [34]
> Lith. *uostà* id., ‘haven’, Latv. *uōsta* f. id., ‘haven’¹² [35]
- ⇒ *i*-derivative $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-i-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-s-t-i-$) id. [36]
⇒ *o*-stem noun $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-i-o-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-s-t-i-o-$) id. [37]
> L *ōstium* n. id., ‘entrance’ (< ‘mouth’) [38]
⇒ *eh*₂-stem noun $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-i-eh_2-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-s-t-i-eh_2-$) id. [39]
> L *ōstia* f. id.⁷ [40]
- ⇒ *us*-stem $*h_1od-us-$ ‘mouth’ (< ‘eat’) [41]
.. allomorph $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-us-$) id. [42]
- ⇒ *t(H)*-derivative $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-$) ‘mouth;
lip’ (< ‘mouth’) [43]
⇒ *o*-stem noun $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-o-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-o-$) id. [44]
> PIIr. $*Haušt^ha-$ ‘upper lip’ (< ‘mouth; lip’) [45]
> Skr. *óṣṭha-* m. id.¹³ [46]
> YAv. *aošta-* m. id.¹⁴ [47]
> PSl. **usta* ‘mouth’ (OCS pl *usta* n. id., Ru. pl *ustá* n. id.,
‘lips’, Cz. pl *ústa* n. id., Slk. pl *ústa* n. id., Pl. pl *usta* id.,
SCr. pl *ústa* n. id., Sln. pl *ústa* n. id., Bulg. *ustá* f. id.)¹⁵ [48]
- ⇒ *i*-derivative $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-i-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-i-$) ‘mouth;
estuary’ (< ‘mouth’) [49]
⇒ *o*-stem noun $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-i-o-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-i-o-$) id. [50]
>> PSl. *ustīje* id. (Ru. *ust’e* n. id., ‘mouth; orifice’,
Cz. *ústí* n. id., Slk. *ústie* n. id., Pl. *ujście* n. id.,
Sln. *ústje* n. id., SCr. *ušće* n. id., Bulg. *ústie* n. id.,
‘opening’)¹⁶ [51]
- ⇒ *r*-derivative $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-r-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-r-$) ‘mouth; lip’
(< ‘mouth’) [52]
⇒ *o*-stem noun $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-r-o-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-r-o-$) ‘lip’
(< ‘mouth; lip’) [53]
> Av. *aoštra-* m. ‘lower lip’ (< ‘lip’)¹⁴ [54]
- ⇒ *eh*₂-stem noun $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-eh_2-$ (= $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-eh_2-$)
‘mouth’ [55]
> OPr. *austo* id.¹² [56]

³ IEW 287, LIV² 230, NIL 208, 387.

⁴ KLOEKHORST 2008: 166.

⁵ MAYRHOFER 1992: 181.

⁶ BARTHOLOMAE 1903: 345.

⁷ PICelt. **ōs-* can reflect PIE **h₁oh₁-os-* as well; cf. CLuw. *āaš* above.

⁸ SCHRIJVER 1991: 55, DE VAAN 2008: 436.

⁹ MATASOVIĆ 2009: 44

¹⁰ DE VAAN 2008: 489.

¹¹ KROONEN 2013: 394.

¹² DERKSEN 2015: 481. (Derksen takes Lith. *úostas* ‘river mouth; haven’ and Latv. *uosts* ‘river mouth; haven’ together with OP *austo* ‘mouth’ [56] and derives both from PIE **Hous-t-* (> Skt. *óṣṭha-* ‘upper lip’) ascribing the aberrant vocalism of the East Baltic forms to the influence of PIE ‘mouth’, **h₁oh₁-s-* (or, as he reconstructs it, **h₃oh₁-s-*), whereas, in this paper, PIE **Hous-t-* is taken to be a derivative of **h₁ed-* (∴ **h₁eʔ-*) ‘eat’ and reconstructed as **h₁oʔ-us-t(H)-* (= **h₁oh₁-us-t(H)-*) [43], whence OP *austo* would later arise, and Lith. *úostas* and Latv. *uosts* are taken to be descendents of a different derivative of **h₁ed-* (∴ **h₁eʔ-*) ‘eat’, PIE **h₁oʔ-s-t-* (= **h₁oh₁-s-t-*) [31], seen also e.g. in L *ōstium* ‘entrance’ [38].)

¹³ MAYRHOFER 1992: 282.

¹⁴ BARTHOLOMAE 1903: 44.

¹⁵ DERKSEN 2008: 509.

¹⁶ DERKSEN 2008: 510.

ABBREVIATIONS

*	— reconstructed form	→	— forms
:	— <i>is in ablaut with</i>	←	— <i>is formed from</i>
::	— <i>is in ablaut gradation with</i>	>	— <i>regularly yields</i>
..	— <i>is an allomorph of</i>	<	— <i>regularly derives from</i>
⇒	— <i>derives into</i>	>>	— <i>irregularly yields</i>
⇐	— <i>is derived from</i>	<<	— <i>irregularly derives from</i>
1, 2, 3	— tres verbi personae	ind	— indicativus
acc	— accusativus	loc	— locativus
act	— activum	m	— masculinum
adj	— adjectivum	n	— neutrum
adv	— adverbium	nom	— nominativus
aor	— aoristum	num	— numerale
c	— commune	pf	— perfectum
card	— cardinale	pl	— pluralis
f	— femininum	pt	— participium
fut	— futurum	sg	— singularis
gen	— genitivus		
Anat.	— Anatolian	OE	— Old English
Arm.	— Armenian	OIr.	— Old Irish
Av.	— Avestan	ON	— Old Norse
Boeot.	— Boeotian	OPhr.	— Old Phrygian
Bulg.	— Bulgarian	OPr.	— Old Prussian
CLuw.	— Cuneiform Luwian	Pal.	— Palaic
Cz.	— Czech	PAnat.	— Proto-Anatolian
Dor.	— Doric	PGm.	— Proto-Germanic
ep.	— epic	PICelt.	— Proto-Italo-Celtic
Far.	— Faroese	PIE	— Proto-Indo-European
G	— Greek	PIIr.	— Proto-Indo-Iranian
Go.	— Gothic	PIt.	— Proto-Italic
Hitt.	— Hittite	Pl.	— Polish
IE	— Indo-European	PSl.	— Proto-Slavic
L	— Latin	Ru.	— Russian
Latv.	— Latvian	SCr.	— Serbo-Croatian
Lith.	— Lithuanian	Skt.	— Sanskrit
MIr.	— Middle Irish	Slk.	— Slovak
Nw.	— Norwegian	Sln.	— Slovenian
OCs	— Old Church Slavonic	YAv.	— Young Avestan

REFERENCES

- BARTHOLOMAE, Christian. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1904.
- DERKSEN, Rick. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2008.
- DERKSEN, Rick. *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2015.
- DE VAAN, Michiel. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2008.
- GARNIER, Romain. »Nouvelles considérations sur l’effet Kortlandt«. *Glotta* 90: pp. 139–159.
- GRASSMANN, Hermann. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1873.
- IEW = POKORNY, Julius. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bd. 1. Bern — München: Francke, 1959.
- KELLENS, Jean, Eric Pirart. *Les textes vieil-avestiques*. Vol. I. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1988.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, Gert. *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1982.
- KLOEKHORST, Alwin. Initial Laryngeals in Anatolian. *Historische Sprachforschung* 119, 2006: pp. 77–108.
- KLOEKHORST, Alwin. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2008.
- KORTLANDT, Frederik. Greek Numerals and PIE Glottalic Consonants. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 42, 1983: pp. 97–104.
- KORTLANDT, Frederik. *Studies in Germanic, Indo-European, and Indo-Uralic*. Amsterdam — New York: Rodopi, 2010.
- KROONEN, Guus. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2013.
- LIV² = RIX, Helmut (ed.) & al. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben : die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert, 2001² (Bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer.)
- LUBOTSKY, Alexander. RV. *ávidhat. Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch : Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich*. (Eds. George E. DUNKEL, G. MEYER, Salvatore SCARLATA, Christian SEIDEL. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.) 1994: 201–206.
- LUBOTSKY, Alexander. The Vedic Paradigm for ‘Water’. *Multi Nominis Grammaticus : Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, (Eds. Adam I. COOPER, Jeremy RAU, Michael WEISS. Ann Arbor — New York: Beech Stave Press.) 2013: 159–164.
- MATASOVIĆ, Ranko. *Kultura i književnost Hetita*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2000.
- MATASOVIĆ, Ranko. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2009.
- MAYRHOFER, Manfred. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Bd. I. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1992.
- MELCHERT, H. Craig. Reflexes of *h₃ in Anatolian. *Die Sprache* 33, 1987: pp. 19–28.

- NIL = WODTKO, Dagmar, Britta IRSLINGER, Carolin SCHNEIDER. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2008.
- RIEKEN, Elisabeth. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999.
- SCHRIJVER, Peter. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam — Atlanta, GA, 1991.
- SZEMERÉNYI, Oswald. *Etyma Latina I*. (1–6). *Glotta* 38, 3–4, 1960: pp. 216–251.
- ZUCHA, Ivo. *The Nominal Stem Types in Hittite*. Oxford: University of Oxford, 1988. (PhD Dissertation)

Орсат Л. Лигорио
 Универзитет у Београду
 Филозофски факултет
 Одељење за класичне науке

ПРАИНДОЕВРОПСКИ ‘ЈЕСТИ’ И ‘УСТА’

С а ж е т а к

Пие. $*h_1oh_1-s-$ ($= *h_1o\varrho-s-$) ‘уста’ (> хет. *aiš id.*, клин. лув. *āaš id.*, стинд. *ās- id.*, ав. *āh- id.*, лат. *ōs id.*, итд.) изводи се од пие. коријена $*h_1ed-$ ‘јести’ (> стинд. *atti id.*, грч. ἔδμεναι *id.*, лат. *edō id.*, гот. *itan id.*, стсл. *jasti id.*, итд.), као поствербал s -основâ степена $*h_1od-$, под претпоставком да, у оквиру глоталне теорије, пие. $*dC$ ($= *^2dC$) даје пие. $*\varrho C$ ($= *h_1C$), што бива и у којекаким другим случајевима, као нпр. у пие. $*\varrho u-i+\varrho km-t-i-$ ($= *h_1u-i+h_1km-t-i-$) ‘двадесет’ (> ав. *vīsaiti id.*, грч. ἐπίκοσι /ἐ(ρ)ίκοσι/ *id.*, итд.), од пие. $*du-i+dkm-t-i-$ (тј. од пие. $*du-$ ‘два’ и $*dek̑m$ ‘десет’), или у пие. $*\varrho o\varrho-r-$ ($= *uoh_1-r-$) ‘вода’ (> клин. лув. *ua-a-ar id.*, скр. *vār- id.*, итд.), од ие. $*uod-r-$ ‘вода’ (> хет. *wa-a-tar*, итд.).

Кључне ријечи: праиндоевропски, етимологија, глотална теорија.

Орсат Л. Лигорио
 Филозофски факултет Белградског универзитета
 Одделение класических наук

ПРАИНДОЕВРПЕЈСКИЕ ‘ЕСТЬ’ И ‘РОТ’

Резюме

Праие. $*h_1oh_1-s-$ ($= *h_1o\varrho-s-$) ‘рот’ (> хетт. *aiš id.*, клинопис лув. *āaš id.*, др.-инд. *ās- id.*, авест. *āh- id.*, лат. *ōs id.*, и т.д.) изводи се од ие. корња $*h_1ed-$ ‘есть’ (> др.-инд. *atti id.*, грч. ἔδμεναι *id.*, лат. *edō id.*, гот. *itan id.*, ст.-слав. *jasti id.*, и т.д.) в качестве поствербала s -основ степени $*h_1od-$, с предположением, что, в рамках глотальной теории, праие. $*dC$ ($= *^2dC$) дает праие. $*\varrho C$ ($= *h_1C$), а такое бывает и в разных иных случаях, как напр. в ие. $*\varrho u-i+\varrho km-t-i-$ ($= *h_1u-i+h_1km-t-i-$)

‘двадцать’ (> авест. *vīsaiti id.*, греч. эп. ἑξήκοντι / ἑξ(ρ)ήκοντι *id.*, и т.д.) от праие. **du-i+dḱm-t-i-* (т.е. праие. **du-* ‘два’ и **deḱm* ‘десять’), или в ие. **uod-r-* (= **uoh-r-*) ‘вода’ (> клинопись лув. *ua-a-ar id.*, санскр. *vār- id.*, и т.д.), от ие. **uod-r-* ‘вода’ (> хетт. *wa-a-tar*, и т.д.).

Ключевые слова: праиндоевропейский, этимология, глоттальная теория.