Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog

Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft
vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg

Herausgegeben von
Thomas Krisch und Thomas Lindner
unter redaktioneller Mitarbeit von Michael Crombach
und Stefan Niederreiter

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

VIII

The Vedic root variants of the type *CaC* // *C(C)ā*: Morphophonological features and syntactic patterns[*]

Leonid Kulikov

Abstract: The present paper offers a systematic analysis of the Vedic root pairs of the type *i* (*ay*) 'go' // *yā* 'drive' or *tṛ* (*tar*) 'pass' // *trā* 'protect, rescue' (labelled *C*- and *ā*-verbs), concentrating on their syntactic features. It will be argued that *ā*-verbs generally attest lesser syntactic flexibility, being employed either only/mostly in intransitive usages, or only/mostly in transitive usages (non-diffuse type). The corresponding *C*-verbs typically are more diffuse (= more flexible in transitivity), cf. *yā* (intransitive) vs. *i* (*ay*) (intransitive and transitive); *trā* (transitive) vs. *tṛ* (intr. and transitive).

1. The *C*//*ā*-alternation: a preliminary survey

The Vedic verbal lexicon contains some twenty root pairs of the type *i* (*ay*) 'go' // *yā* 'drive', *gam* 'go' // *gā* 'tread', *tṛ* (*tar*) 'pass' // *trā* 'protect, rescue', *dham* // *dhmā* 'blow', *pṛ* (*par*) // *prā* 'fill', *bhas* 'devour' // *psā* 'chew', *man* 'think' // *mnā* 'mention', etc. In all such pairs, the second member ends in *ā* and can be derived, in formal terms, by adding *ā* to a certain modification (most often, the zero grade) of the first member (*i-ā, psā* [= *bhs-ā*], *mn-ā*, etc.). Schematically, the formal relationship between the members of such pairs can be represented as *CaC* // *C(C)ā*, where the final consonant is, most often, a sonant (*i* = *ay*, *tṛ* = *tar*, etc.), thus: *CR* (/*CaR*) // *CRā*. Accordingly, I will hereafter refer to the second members of such pairs as *ā*-roots (*ā*-verbs), while the first members, the 'base roots', will be called, for the lack of better term, *C*-roots (*C*-verbs). The alternation of this type will be referred to as '*C*//*ā*-alternation'.

The origins of such pairs are quite variegated. Some of them can be treated in terms of the pattern *CaC* // *CCā*, which suggests that the second member of the pair is derived by means of the **root extension**, cf. *i* – *yā*, *man* – *mnā*. Some others follow the pattern *CR* (*CaR*) // *CRā* (where *R* stands for a sonant), and thus, at the level of Indo-European reconstruction, instantiate **Schwebeablaut**, i.e. alternation of the type *CeCC* // *CCeC*. The members of the schwebeablauting pairs, *CaR* and *CRā*, are often called, according to the Indo-Europeanist tradition, 'full grade I' (Vollstufe I) and 'full grade II' (Vollstufe II), respectively (see, for instance, Gotō 1987: 45f.). Finally, a few pairs exemplify the type *CaC* (*CaR*) // *Cā*, as in the case of *gam* 'go' // *gā* 'tread' and *dru* (*drav*) // *drā* 'run'. Some of these pairs may be formed by etymologically unrelated roots as a result of their semantic and phonological convergence.[1]

---

[1] For our purposes we need to identify any relevant formation as belonging to the system of the *C*- or *ā*-root. Generally, this task poses no problem, cf. infinitives *étave* and *tar(i)tum* (built on the *C*-roots *ay* and *tar*), as opposed to *yátave* and *trātum* (*ā*-roots *yā* and *trā*). However, the zero grade forms of the schwebeablauting roots, such as *pṛ* (*par*) // *prā* (cf. verbal adj. *pūrṇá-*), might belong to either of the two variants, i.e. either to

There is no uniformity in the treatment of such pairs in Sanskrit scholarship. Some of them are taken as root variants distributed between the formations of one single paradigm, as in the case of *dhami̯* // *dhmā* 'blow'. The emergence of two different full grades is mostly explained in terms of secondary developments and paradigmatic reanalyses.[2] In some other cases, the tradition is rather inclined to treat the members of such pairs as different lexical units (roots), which, nevertheless, are considered 'related' (see below on *pṝ* (*par̯*) // *prā* 'fill'). However, no Vedic grammar deals with the pairs of the type *tṝ* // *trā* in the chapter on verbal derivation,[3] treating the second members (*trā* etc.) as separate (lexical) units.

The *C//ā*-alternation is intimately related to two well-known and, unfortunately, quite ill-famed phenomena of the proto-language. One is Schwebeablaut, the alternation of the type *CeRC- // CReC-*; for the most comprehensive study of this phenomenon see Anttila 1969. Here must belong, in particular, such pairs as *tṝ*/*tar̯* (cf. class I pres. *tárati* < *terH-e-ti) // *trā* (cf. class IV pres. *trá-ya-te*) < **treH-*. Another problem directly related to our *C//ā*-pairs is the highly controversial issue of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeal root extension and/or suffix *-*ē*-. Thus, pairs of the type *i* // *yā* or *dah* // *kṣā* can only be taken as related if the second members are treated as comprising the morphological element (morpheme?) -*ā*- (< PIE *-*ē*- or *-*eH*-). The suffix *-*eh₁*-, presumably with an intransitivizing function and/or stative meaning, is posited in many Indo-European handbooks,[4] but the Vedic roots such as *yā* or *kṣā* are (usually) treated separately from the -*ē*-verbs in Indo-European scholarship of the last century.[5] Accordingly, we are forced to posit the laryngeal extension (*-*(e)H*-) at the end of these roots. This analysis is adopted, in

<hr/>

the *C*-root *CṜ* / *CaR̯* (< *CṚH- /* *CeRH*-), or to the *ā*-root *CṜ* / *CRā* (< *CṚH- /* *CReH*-), that is, in our case, either to *pṝ*/*par̯*, or to *prā*. (This problem does not actually arise in the case of pairs such as *tṝ*'pass' // *trā* 'protect, rescue', where the *C*- and *ā*-roots clearly differ in meaning, cf. *tīrṇá*- 'passed, crossed' (≠ 'protected, rescued')). However, there are some reasons to believe that all zero grade forms should be grouped with the *C*-roots. Specifically, many *ā*-roots such as *trā* and *prā* tend to generalize full grade (i.e. *ā*). Thus, we find *ā*-grade in -*ta*/-*na* adjectives, cf. *trāta*-, *dhmātá*-, *prātá*-, as opposed to such adjectives as *sthitá*- and *dhitá*-, made from the 'independent' (= non-schwebeablauting) roots *sthā* 'stand' and *dhā* 'suck'. In other words, the *ā*-roots such as *trā*, *dhmā* and *prā* belong to the 'non-alternating' morphophonological type in terms of Zaliznjak (1975: 68ff.); cf. also Renou (1930: 75): "La tendance de ce groupe sonante + *ā* est de s'immobiliser et de se dissocier de la racine de base, en manière d'élargissement autonome". Sanskrit grammars and dictionaries usually do not connect formations such as *pūrṇá*-, *tīrṇá*-, pres. *pṛṇáti, tiráti* etc. with *ā*-roots. I will basically follow this tradition, grouping zero grade formations with the corresponding *C*-roots, unless there are clear semantic indications for the opposite analysis (as in the case of *yā* 'drive' – pres. *íyate*).

2 Thus, the full grade *dhami̯*, as in the class I present *dháma-ti̯*, can be explained as resulting from the reinterpretation of the athematic root present (= class II pres.: 3pl. *dhámanti* for *dhamánti < *dʰmH-énti) or thematic class VI present: 3sg. *dhámati* for *dhamáti < *dʰmH-é-ti); see Gotō 1987: 46, fn. 11.

3 Thus, Whitney's (1889: 103) comprehensive grammar treats such roots as "variations or differentiated forms of one another". Specifically, Whitney mentions "roots in ā and in a nasal, as khā and khan, gā and gam, jā and jan; roots made by an added ā, as trā from tṛ, mnā from man, psā from bhas, yā from i".

4 See, e.g., Benfey 1873: 403 [= *Kl. Schr.* I/2, 171f.] ("Wie dieses *â* zu deuten, ist noch sehr fraglich"); Wagner 1950; Kuryłowicz 1964: 76-84; Watkins 1971; Szemerényi 1990: 298ff.; Beekes 1995: 230 ("this suffix served to express a situation"); Jasanoff 2002-2003. Note, however, that in the *ā*-members of the majority of *C//ā*-pairs *ā* is probably going back to Proto-Indo-European *eh₂, not to *eh₁ (see Section 5 for details).

5 The analysis of such roots as containing the suffix -*ā*- was advocated, in particular, by Brugmann (1878). Since then, it was largely abandoned; for a survey of the literature, see Anttila 1969: 3ff. The old idea of the Indo-Iranian suffix -*ā*- posited in such roots as *yā* and *kṣā* was recently retrieved by Yakubovitch (1999), but the presentation and analysis of the material in this paper is far from convincing and barely clarifies the matters.

particular, by Anttila (1969: 59-63) and Mayrhofer (EWAia, *sub voce*) for *kṣā* (EWAia I, 430), *psā* (EWAia II, 198) and *yā* (EWAia II, 407).

In what follows, I will make no attempt to reconstruct the Proto-Indo-European origins of the *C//ā*-alternation. Rather, I will concentrate on the systematic treatment of the features of the members of the Vedic *C//ā*-pairs, foremost in a synchronic perspective.

2. Syntactic features of the *C//ā*-roots: a hypothesis

To begin with, let us have a closer look at the features of two *C//ā*-pairs.

(i) *pṝ* (*parⁱ*) // *prā* 'fill'

The roots *pṝ* and *prā* 'fill' are synonymous and occur in similar constructions, cf.:

(1)   (RV 8.64.4) *óbhé pṛṇāsi ródasī*   'You fill both worlds.'

(2)   (RV 9.97.38) *óbhé aprā ródasī*   'You have filled both worlds.'

There is, however, a remarkable difference between their properties that seems to have escaped scholarly attention. The verbal system of *pṝ* contains both intransitive (cf. (3-4)) and transitive (cf. (1)) formations; both usages are well-attested from early Vedic (= the language of the Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda) onwards, cf.:

(3)   (RV 1.51.10) *á tvā ... á pūryamāṇaṃ avahan abhí śrávaḥ* '[The wind-horses] conveyed you (sc. Indra), who were growing full [with soma and strength], to glory.'

(4)   (RV 3.50.1) *á ... pṛṇatām ebhír ánnaiḥ* 'Let him fill himself with this food.'

By contrast, *prā* is mostly employed in transitive constructions, as in (2).

The intransitive class IV present *pūryate* must belong to the *C*-root *pṝ*, and there is no present passive **prāyáte.[6] The only attestation of an intransitive (passive?) form built on this root, the medio-passive *i*-aorist *-aprāyi* (with the preverb *á*), appears at the end of the early Vedic period, in stanza (5); see Kümmel 1996: 72f.; Griffiths 2009: 213f.:

(5)   (RVKh. 4.2.1 = AVŚ 19.47.1 = AVP 6.20.1 = VS 34.32) *á rátri párthivaṃ rájaḥ* ' *pitúr aprāyi dhámabhiḥ* 'O night, the earthly space has been filled / has become full[7] with the establishments of the father.'

(ii) *i* (*ay*) 'go; send, set in motion' // *yā* 'drive, speed'

As in the case of *pṝ* // *prā*, the *ā*-root *yā* differs from its *C*-counterpart *i* (*ay*) in syntactic features. For the root *i*, both intransitive and transitive formations are well-attested from the early Vedic period onwards. Intransitive derivatives, meaning 'go', are represented, in particular, by the class II present (= athematic root present) *éti*, as in (6). The transitive-causative counterpart of *éti* is the class V present *inóti* and its thematicization

---

[6]   Note also the remarkable observation by Kümmel (1996: 73) on the fundamentally transitive character of the verb *prā*: "Auch wenn die Wurzel *pleh₁ ursprünglich fientive [≈ non-passive intransitive, or anticausative. – LK] Bedeutung gehabt haben sollte, ist die v e d i s c h e Wurzel *prā* primär agentiv-transitiv".

[7]   Translated as passive ('[a]ngefüllt (worden) ist') by Kümmel (1996: 72) and as non-passive intransitive ('has become full') by Griffiths (2009: 213f.).

ínvati,[8] meaning 'send, impel, set in motion', as in (7):

(6)   (RV 1.191.8) *út purástāt súrya eti* 'The sun rises (lit. goes up) in the East.'

(7)   (RV 4.53.5) *tisró dívaḥ pr̥thivís tisrá invati* 'He sets in motion three heavens (and) three earths.'

By contrast, the *ā*-root *yā* is basically intransitive (cf. pres. *yā́ti, íyate*[9] 'drives, speeds', etc.). The *-aya*-causative *yāpayati* first appears in the Brāhmaṇas.[10]

There is a remarkable syntactic feature shared by the pairs *pr̥ // prā* and *i // yā*. While the *C*-verbs are well-attested in both intransitive and transitive-causative usages, their *ā*-counterparts show lesser 'syntactic flexibility', restricting their usages either to intransitive or to transitive only. The former, more flexible, type of syntactic behaviour, exemplified by such *C*-verbs as *pr̥* and *i*, will hereafter be called '**diffuse**'. The most typical representatives of the diffuse type are verbs some forms of which can be employed both intransitively and transitively, thus showing the **labile** syntax.[11] Apparently, both *ā*-verbs under discussion, *yā* and *prā*, belong to the **non-diffuse** syntactic type: their forms can only be employed intransitively or transitively, while the opposite type of usage (transitive or intransitive, respectively) is either unattested or exceptional and/or only appears in late texts.

Thus, the clue to the functional value of the *C//ā*-alternation is likely to be found in the domain of syntactic features and transitivity of the verbs in question.

3. The Vedic *C//ā*-verbs and their syntax

There are almost twenty root pairs exemplifying the *C//ā*-alternation. For the reasons of space, I am unable to offer a detailed discussion of all these pairs. A comprehensive analysis of these verbs is given elsewhere (Kulikov, forthc.). Here I will only give a list of the members of this verbal class, accompanied with short morphological and syntactic notes.

kan[12] *// kā* 'yearn, enjoy' (med. pf. *cake*, RVic hapax pres.part. *kā́yamāna-*: transitive)[13]
kāś 'become visible, appear (?); see'[14] *// kśā (khyā)*[15] 'see, consider, reckon'

---

[8]   *i* and *i(nv)* are taken as (synchronically) distinct roots in some grammars and dictionaries (cf., for instance, Joachim 1978: 41), but, in fact, there is no need to treat them separately (see, in particular, Whitney 1885: 8; LIV 232). The relationship between *éti* 'goes' and *inóti, ínvati* 'sets in motion, sends' (= 'makes go') belongs to the regular causative type. For these causatives, see, in particular, Kulikov 2000a: 197f.

[9]   On this formation, see Kulikov 2001: 261f., with bibl. For evidence against the assumption that the nasal presents *inóti, ínvati* 'sets in motion, sends' belong together with *íyate*, as its transitive-causative counterparts (thus Insler 1972: 96ff.; LIV 233, note 12), see Joachim 1978: 138f.; Kulikov 2001: 261f.

[10]   In particular, in the compound *yathākāma-prayāpya-* (Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa 7.29.3) 'to be moved according to wish'. AVP 16.75.7 *yāpayanti* (~ AVŚ 9.8.17 *mohayanti*), attested in the Kashmir ms., must be an erroneous reading for *yopayanti* (thus in Orissa mss.) 'they erase, destroy' (A. Griffiths, p.c.).

[11]   See below on act. pf. *pīpāya*. For a discussion of the labile syntactic type in Vedic, see Kulikov 2003.

[12]   Perfect *cākana*, inj. *cākán*, etc; constructed with accusatives or, more often, with locatives or genitives.

[13]   These two roots are usually considered as genetically unrelated (see Mayrhofer, EWAia I, 296f., 334 and LIV 343, 352 on the roots *kan* 'Gefallen an etwas finden, sich freuen' and *kā* 'begehren, gern haben'). However, in view of their semantic affinity, possible (secondary) connections between them should not be ruled out.

[14]   The vowel length is likely to be secondary (see Gotō 1987: 115; Mayrhofer, EWAia I, 344f.; LIV 383ff.). As Jamison (1983: 125) suggests, *kāś* may belong to the same syntactic type as *dr̥ś*, cf. med. *dadr̥śé* 'appears' ~ act. *darśáyati* 'reveals'. Correspondingly, intransitive usages can be reconstructed for early Vedic (see also

gam 'go' // *gā* 'go, tread'[16]

jan[i] 'be born; beget, generate' // *jñā* 'know'[17]

tan[18] // *tā*[19] 'stretch, extend'

tr̥̄ (*tar*) 'pass' (a typical example of diffuse verb, well-attested both in intransitive[20] and transitive-causative[21] constructions) // *trā* 'protect, rescue' (transitive)

dah[22] // *kṣā* [< **dʰgᵘʰ-ehₗ-*; see Mayrhofer, EWAia I, 430; LIV 133f.] (intr.)[23] 'burn'

dru (*drav*) // *drā* 'run'[24]

Gotō 1987: 115; Roesler 1997: 204); differently Schaefer 1994: 103. For the syntax of *(sám-)kṣā* (*khyā̆*), see Kulikov 2008.

[15] The root variant *khyā̆* results from the secondary development of *kṣā̆* (preserved in the Maitrāyaṇī and Kāṭhaka traditions); see, in particular, Lubotsky 1983: 176.

[16] *gam* and *gā* are often connected in early scholarship (cf., e.g., Benfey 1837: Sp. 927 [= *Kl. Schr.* I/2, 29]; Reichelt 1904: 40; Persson 1912: 572ff.), and this view is adopted by Mayrhofer (EWAia I, 466: "Mit *GAM* vermutlich wurzelverwandt ... ist *GĀ*¹"; see also EWAia I, 482). **gᵘe-* could not be a possible root structure in Proto-Indo-European, and thus PIE **gᵘem-* (> Ved. *gam*) and **gᵘeh₂-* (> Ved. *gā*) cannot be directly related in terms of root extensions. Nevertheless, the semantic affinity between the members of this pair could be supported by the model of the semantically similar pair *dram* // *drā* 'run' (see below), which may be associated with *gam* // *gā* as 'rime-words' ('Reimbildungen'; see, for instance, Güntert 1914). The syntactic features of these two roots are very similar to the features of most other *C//ā*-pairs. The *C*-verb *gam* is fundamentally intransitive, but its causatives (pres. *gámáyati* and aor. *ajīgamat*; see Jamison 1983: 172) are attested from early Vedic onwards. By contrast, causative of the intransitive *gā* (*gāpáyati) is lacking.

[17] These two roots are historically unrelated (see Anttila 1969: 130); note, in particular, the different laryngeals: *jan[i]* < PIE **ǵenhₗ-* vs. *jñā* < PIE **ǵneh₃-*; for details, see Mayrhofer, EWAia I, 567f., 599ff. Yet, this pair is worthy of mention in our discussion, foremost because of the fact that the syntactic behaviour of its members perfectly fits the pattern of the type *pr̥̄* // *prā*. The verb *jan[i]*, well-attested both in intransitive (pres. *jáya-[ic]*, pf. *jajñé*, medio-pass. aorist *ájani*, sigmatic aorist *ájaniṣṭa*) and transitive-causative (pres. *jána-[li]*, *janáya-[li]*, pf. *jajána*, etc.) usages instantiates the diffuse syntactic type. By contrast, *jñā* is fundamentally transitive; passive usages are only attested for the present passive *jñāyá-[ic]* 'be known' (RV 4.51.6 +; see Kulikov 2001: 74ff.).

[18] The present system forms most often occur in transitive-causative usages, while perfect forms are more common in intransitive constructions; for details, see Kulikov 1999: 26ff.

[19] The root variant *tā*, created on the model *pā* 'drink' – *pape*, is never treated as a separate root. With the exception of one isolated perfect form, 3sg.pf.med. *tate* (RV 1.83.5) 'has extended' (transitive), it only appears in two intransitive (passive) formations: pres. pass. *tāyáte* (RV+) 'is stretched, extended' and, in late Vedic, pass. -*i*-aorist *prātāyi* (hapax in the Aitareya-Āraṇyaka).

[20] Cf. class I pres. *tára-[li]* 'passes'. Note that the accusative noun in such constructions refers to the goal of motion, not to a patient (= "affiziertes Objekt", in Gotō's (1987) terms); see Haudry 1977: 318ff.

[21] Cf. class VI pres. *tiráti* 'makes pass', with the preverb *prá* typically meaning 'make someone's life(time) safely pass over [obstacles and dangers] and reach its natural end'. See Gotō 1987: 161ff. On the causative opposition between class I and class VI presents, see Gotō 1987: 57f.; Kulikov 2000b: 277f.

[22] *dah* is fundamentally transitive. However, the intransitive present *dahya-[ic]*, attested both with root (non-passive) and suffix (passive) accentuation (*dáhya-[ic]* in the RVKh.; *dahyá-[ic]* in the YV and ŚB (Kāṇva)), becomes quite common at the end of the early Vedic period, from the Atharvaveda onwards. Thus, by the end of the early Vedic period, *dah* behaves as a diffuse, rather than as a predominantly transitive, verb.

[23] Attested, for instance, in the class IV present *kṣáya-[li]* (AVP+; see Kulikov 2001: 397f.). Causative formations of *kṣā* appear from the late Ṛgveda onwards (injunctive of the causative aorist *cikṣipas* RV 10.16.1; pres.caus. *kṣāpáya-[li]* AV+; see Jamison 1983: 140).

[24] The syntactic pattern essentially reproduce the pattern of *gam* // *gā*. *dru* is fundamentally intransitive; on the early Vedic causative *drāváyati*, see Jamison 1983: 114. The causative of *drā*, *drāpayati*, is middle Vedic (ŚB

dhaṁⁱ ((predominantly) trans.)[25] // *dhmā* 'blow, inflate' (trans.)

dhī (dhayⁱ)[26] // *dhyā*[27] 'consider, think, reflect'

pǐ (pay⁽ⁱ⁾) (diffuse)[28] // *pyā* 'swell' (only intrans. in RV)[29]

bhan 'speak'[30] // *bhā* (intrans. root pres. *bháti*) 'shine'[31]

bhas 'devour' // *psā* 'chew' (both transitive; passives are unattested)

man 'think, believe; respect'[32] // *mnā* 'mention' (tr.)[33]

mṝ (marⁱ) 'crush'[34] // *mlā* 'wither, wilt'[35]

śṝ[36] // *śrā*[37] 'become ready; cook'

hū (havⁱ)[38] // *hvā*[39] 'call'

9.1.1.24). Evidence for the syntactic type of another *C*-root, *dram* (intransitive? cf. intensive part. *dandramyamāṇa-* (Up.) 'running (around)'; see Schaefer 1994: 47; LIV 128; Kulikov 2001: 229), is meager.

[25] For pres. pass. *dhamyate* RV^{lx}, see Kulikov 2001: 99f.

[26] Mostly in the perfect *dīdhaya* (also pluperfect *ádīdhet* and reduplicated present created on the basis of the perfect subjunctive), well-attested in early Vedic and employed transitively; see Kümmel 2000: 257-261.

[27] Constructed with the accusative. This root first appears in the AVP, but becomes common only in middle Vedic (YV^p+); for its attestations and genesis, see Kulikov 2001: 422-425.

[28] Pres. *pínva-^{ti}* (tr.-caus.), *pínva-^{te}* (intr.); active perf. *pīpáya* 'has swollen; has made swell' is labile (albeit predominantly intransitive); see Kümmel 2000: 298ff. Evidence for the morphophonological type of the root, i.e. aniṭ (*pi*) or seṭ (*pī*), is controversial; see Mayrhofer, EWAia II, 83ff. and Kümmel 2000: 298, fn. 487.

[29] On formations derived from *pyā* (pres. *-pyāya-^{te}* RV+ etc.), see Kümmel 2000: 316f.; LIV 465; Kulikov 2001: 249f. The *-áya*-causative *pyāyáyati* first appears in the AV (see Jamison 1983: 149).

[30] Four occurrences of the class I present *bhána-^{ti/te}* in the Ṛgveda exhibit a remarkable variety of syntactic patterns. These include two active forms (3sg.act. *bhánati* at RV 6.11.13 and 3pl.act. *bhananti* at RV 4.18.6, both employed transitively) and two attestations of the middle form *bhananta* (reflexive at RV 7.18.7 and reciprocal at RV 4.18.7); see Gotō 1987: 222f., with fn. 472-473.

[31] *bhan* and *bhā* are usually taken as etymologically related, in spite of a considerable semantic distance between their meanings; cf. also *bhāṣ* 'speak' and *bhās* 'shine' as well as Gr. φημί 'declare' and φαίνομαι 'appear'; see Mayrhofer, EWAia II, 244, 260; LIV 68-70, lemmata "1. *bʰeh₂-* 'glänzen, leuchten, scheinen' " and "2. *bʰeh₂-* 'sprechen, sagen' " ("morphologisch homonym ... wohl urspr. identisch").

[32] Attested both in transitive (e.g. class IV pres. *mánya-^{te}*, sigm. aor. *ámaṁsta* etc. – with direct speech or with two accusatives: 'X [nom.] considers/believes Y [acc.] to be Z [acc.]'; pres. *manuté* with acc./gen.: 'respect, remember with respect') and intransitive (reflexive) usages (*mánya-^{te}* 'X [nom.] considers/believes him-/herself to be Z [nom.]'). For a discussion of attested patterns, see Oertel 1941: 88ff. [= *Kl. Schr.* II, 1457ff.]; Joachim 1978: 121; Gotō 1997: 1016ff.; Kümmel 2000: 360ff.; Kulikov 2001: 253ff.; Hettrich 2004.

[33] Traditionally regarded as an extension of *man* (see, e.g., Mayrhofer, EWAia II, 385; LIV 447); for its attestations (Br.+), see Gotō 1987: 239; 1997: 1025. This verb is fundamentally transitive; its passive first appears in the (post-Vedic) Bhāradvāja-Śrautasūtra (3pl. *ā-mnāyante*).

[34] Fundamentally transitive; the rare passive present *-mūryá-^{te}* only occurs in ŚB 1.7.3.21 ≈ 1.7.4.12.

[35] Fundamentally intransitive (attested, in particular, in class IV pres. *mlāya-^{ti}* AVP, ŚB; see Kulikov 2001: 448). Caus. *mlāpáya-^{ti}* first appears in the Atharvaveda (see Jamison 1983: 143).

[36] Evidence for the syntactic type of the *C*-root *śṝ/śar* (aniṭ) is scant. It is only attested in the verbal adj. *śṛtá-* 'cooked; ready' (RV+), which might be based either on a trans. ('cook') or on an intr. ('become ready') usage.

[37] The only early Vedic occurrence of the *ā*-root *śrā*, pres.part. *śráyant-* RV 8.99.3, can be tentatively interpreted as intransitive: 'gar werden' (K. Hoffmann apud Joachim 1978: 162 and Narten 1987: 272f. [= *Kl. Schr.* 1, 342f.], fn. 3). Causatives of *śrā* appear after the RV (pres. *śrapáyati* 'cooks, prepares' AV+, see Jamison 1983: 145; aor. *áśiśrapāma* 'we have cooked' ŚBM 3.8.2.28 = ŚB-Kāṇva 4.8.2.21).

[38] The verb *hū (havⁱ)* is fundamentally transitive (presents *hávate* and *hváyati* 'calls', pf. *juháva* 'has called', etc.; see Gotō 1987: 347ff.; Lubotsky 1989; Kümmel 2000: 606ff.), but its passive (pres. *hūyá-^{te}* RV+; pass. aorist participle *huvāná-* RV) is well-attested from early Vedic onwards (see Kulikov 2001: 232-235; 2006: 55f.).

4. Syntactic features of the *ā*-verbs: a recapitulation

The results of the present study are summarized in Table 1. The members of the above-discussed verbal pairs are distributed between five syntactic classes in accordance with their syntactic features. Two non-diffuse classes include (1) intransitive verbs causatives of which are unattested or exceptional in early Vedic texts (i.e. in the RV and AV); and (5) transitive verbs passives of which are unattested or exceptional in early Vedic. Three diffuse classes consist of (2) fundamentally intransitive verbs causatives of which are attested from early Vedic onwards (weak-diffuse intransitives); (3) verbs which are well-attested in both intransitive and transitive (causative) usages; and (4) fundamentally transitive verbs intransitive (passive) derivatives of which are well-attested from early Vedic onwards (weak-diffuse transitives).

(1) Non-diffuse (intransitive) only intransitive usages; causatives are unattested/rare or late	(2) (weak-diffuse) basically intransitive verbs; causatives are attested	(3) Diffuse both intransitive and transitive (causative) usages are attested	(4) (weak-diffuse) basically trans. verbs; intr. (pass.) usages are attested	(5) Non-diffuse (transitive) basically tr. verbs; passives are unat-tested/rare or late
		pattern *CaC* // *C(C)ā*		
yā 'drive, speed'		*i* (*ay*) 'go' *kan̄* 'be pleased' *kāś* 'appear (?)'; see	*kśā* (*khyā*) 'look at'	*kā* 'yearn'
gā 'tread'	*gam* 'go'	*tan* 'stretch'	(*tā*)	
	kṣā 'burn'		← *dah* 'burn'	
drā (// *dram* ?) 'run'	*dru* 'run'			
bhā 'shine'	*pyā* 'swell'	*pi* (*pī*?) 'swell'	*bhan* 'speak'	
				bhas 'devour' // *psā* 'chew'
		man 'think, respect'		*mnā* 'mention'
	śrā 'become ready'	(*śṛ* (?))		
		pattern *CR̥* (*CaR̀*) // *CRā*		
		[*jan̄* 'be born, beget'	*jn̄ā* 'know']	*trā* 'protect' (*dhmā*)
		tr̄ (*tar̀*) 'pass'	*dham̄* 'blow'	*dhī* (*dhaỳ*) // *dhyā* 'think, reflect'
				prā 'fill'
		pr̄ (*par̀*) 'fill'		*mr̄* (*mar̀*) 'crush'
	mlā 'wither'		*hū* (*hav̀*) 'call'	(*hvā* 'call')

Table 1. Syntactic types of verbs belonging to *C*//*ā*-pairs

---

[39] The root variant *hvā* (= full grade II) could have arisen on the model of some *ā*-roots which form *-áya*-presents, such as *dhā* – *dháyati* 'sucks' and *dā* – *-dáyate* 'distributes' (i.e. *dhā* : *dháyati* = X : *hváyati*). All formations built on *hvā* (late Vedic: *hvātar*- Jaim.-Br., fut. *-hvāsya-*[iⁱᵗᶜ], caus. *-hvāpayati* Śr.-Sū.) are transitive.

However variegated the syntax of the *C*- and *ā*-verbs might appear, there is at least one remarkable feature (tentatively formulated in Section 2) which is shared by nearly all *ā*-verbs and makes this distribution non-random. The *ā*-verbs (shown in the boldface in the table) are typically employed either mostly/only in intransitive usages, or mostly/only in transitive usages, and thus belong to the **non-diffuse syntactic type**. The corresponding *C*-verbs are **more diffuse**. Cf. *yā* (intr.) // *i* (intr. and tr.), *trā* (tr.) // *tī̆* (intr. and tr.), *drā* (intr.) // *dru* (intr. and tr.-caus.). There are also a few pairs where both members belong to the same syntactic class, cf. *dhyā* // *dhī* and *psā* // *bhas* (all – transitive). The only pair where the *ā*-verb can be considered more diffuse than the corresponding *C*-verb is *mlā* // *mī̆*. *mlā* is fundamentally intransitive, whilst *mī̆* is transitive, but caus. *mlāpáya-^{ti}* (AV+), is a bit older than the passive of *mī̆*, *-mūryá-^{tc}* (ŚB). In fact, this seems to be an exception that proves the rule: due to the difference in final sonants (*l/r*) (a dialectal feature?), the historical relations between *mlā* and *mī̆* (*mar^i*) are more blurred than those between the members of any other root pair, and synchronically they clearly do not belong together.

As to more specific correlations between the syntactic features of the verbs and the type of formal relationship between *C*- and *ā*-roots, the following regularities can be observed.

(i) Within the pairs which follow the schwebeablauting pattern *CaR^i (CR̥)* // *CRā* (i.e., in diachronic terms, **CaRH-* // **CRaH-*), the *ā*-member is often **transitive**, as opposed to the (more) diffuse *C*-verb; cf. especially *tī̆* (*tar^i*) 'pass' // *trā* 'protect, rescue' and *pī̆* (*par^i*) // *prā* 'fill'. Note that present passives with the suffix *-ya-* and passive aorists (*i*-aorists) are rare or unattested in Vedic for most of these *ā*-roots. Thus, *aprāyi* is a hapax (RVKh.–AV^{1×}); *dhmāyate* first appears in late Vedic; pass. *trāyate* 'is (being) protected' does not occur before Classical Sanskrit; for other *ā*-roots *-ya*-passives and *i*-aorists are unattested.

(ii) By contrast, many *ā*-verbs which follow the pattern *CaC // C(C)ā*, i.e., in diachronic terms, contain the root enlargement (suffix) *-ā-* (< PIE **-eH-*), are (predominantly) **intransitive**, as opposed to the (more) diffuse *C*-verbs. Note, in particular, that present causatives with the suffix *-(p)áya-* (well-attested in early Vedic for some roots in *-ā* such as *sthā* 'stand' and *dhā* 'suck') are (relatively) late or entirely lacking for the *ā*-roots of the *CaC // C(C)ā*-pairs. Thus, causatives of *yā* and *drā* first appear in the Brāhmaṇas; causative of *gā* is unattested. The intransitivizing effect of *-ā-* is also fairly obvious in the pair *dah* // *kṣā* 'burn': *dah* is basically transitive, later drifting into the diffuse type, whilst *kṣā* is a predominantly intransitive verb, which forms an *-áya*-causative.

5. Possible historical sources of the *C//ā*-alternation

Evidence from Indo-European languages outside Indo-Iranian furnishes few parallels to the syntactic patterns described in Section 4. Moreover, many of the *ā*-verbs have no reliable cognates outside Indo-Iranian, and, thus, we have to look for the origins of this syntactic patterning on the Indo-Iranian (or even Indo-Aryan) ground.

Possible sources of the correlations between the attested formal patterns and syntactic features can be summarized as follows.

(i) In the case of the *CaC//CCā*-type, the (predominantly) intransitive character of some *ā*-verbs may be a vestige of the intransitive/stative function of the hypothetical Proto-Indo-European suffix **-ē-* (**-eH-*). In fact, as mentioned above, a comparison with this suffix poses some problems: while in the 'stative' suffix **-ē-* we have to reconstruct h_1 (**-eh_1-*; see Beekes 1995: 230), in most of the above-discussed *ā*-roots we are probably dealing with the reflex of another laryngeal, h_2. The full evidence can be summarized as follows (the reconstruction mostly follows Mayrhofer's EWAia and LIV):

h_1 : $ks\bar{a} < *d^hg^{uh}\text{-}eh_1\text{-}$ 'burn' (intransitive with -*áya*-causatives)

               $pr\bar{a} < *pleh_1\text{-}$ 'fill' (transitive)

               $ml\bar{a} < *mleh_1\text{-}$ (?) 'wither, wilt' (intransitive with -*áya*-causatives)

               $\acute{s}r\bar{a} < *\acute{k}l\text{-}eh_1\text{-}$ [? see LIV 323] 'become ready' (intr. (?) with -*áya*-caus.)

h_2 : $k\bar{a} < *keh_2\text{-}$ (?) 'yearn, enjoy' (transitive)

               $g\bar{a} < *g^ueh_2\text{-}$ 'go, tread' (intransitive)

               $tr\bar{a} < *treh_2\text{-}$ 'protect, rescue' (transitive)

               $dr\bar{a} < *dreh_2\text{-}$ 'run' (intransitive)

               $bh\bar{a} < *b^heh_2\text{-}$ 'shine' (intransitive)

               $mn\bar{a} < *mn\text{-}eh_2\text{-}$ 'mention' (transitive)

               $y\bar{a} < *(H)ieh_2\text{-}$ 'drive' (intransitive)

h_3 : no reliable examples

H (unknown) : $k\acute{s}\bar{a} < *k^u\acute{k}\text{-}eH\text{-}$ 'see, consider, reckon' (transitive with passives)

               $dhm\bar{a} < *d^hmeH\text{-}$ 'blow, inflate' (transitive)

               $dhy\bar{a} < *d^hieH\text{-}$ 'consider, reflect' (transitive)

               $py\bar{a} < *pieH\text{-}$ 'swell' (intransitive)

               $ps\bar{a} < *b^hs\text{-}eH\text{-}$ 'chew' (transitive)

               $hv\bar{a} < *\acute{g}^hueH\text{-}$ [h_2 or h_3? see Mayrhofer, EWAia II, 811] 'call' (tr.)

Apparently, there are as few as one or two root pairs where the intransitivity of the *ā*-verb can be explained as a direct reflex of the intransitive function of the PIE suffix *-*eh*$_1$-. Note, however, that the development of the syntactic features ('non-diffuseness') of the *ā*-verbs should probably be dated to Proto-Indo-Iranian, where the three PIE laryngeals have fallen together. Accordingly, it cannot be ruled out that a few (derived) roots with the reflex of the PIE 'stative-intransitive' suffix *-*eh*$_1$- > PIIr. *-*aH*- (*d^hg^{uh}-*eh*$_1$-?, *$\acute{k}l$-*eh*$_1$-?) could trigger and/or support the development of similar syntactic properties of the verbal forms derived from all *CC-*aH*-roots, irrespectively of the quality of the PIE laryngeal.

(ii) In some cases, the syntactic features of the formations built on different grades of one verb/root (cf. trans. aor. *aprāt* ~ intr. pres. *púryate* and tr.-caus. pres. *pr̥ṇáti*) could be associated with the corresponding (*C*- vs. *ā*-) root variants. Subsequently, one paradigm could split in two sub-paradigms, and, accordingly, one lexical unit (verb) gave rise to two different (albeit etymologically and derivationally related) verbs. Thus, the transitive syntax of the root aorist *áprās* could be generalized for all formations built on the full grade (II) of the root *pr̥* / *prā* 'fill', as opposed to formations derived from the zero grade (pres. *púrya-^{tc}*, *pūryá-^{tc}*, *pr̥ṇáti*, *pr̥ṇá-^{tc}*), which, eventually, has led to the split of one single lexical unit in two, *pr̥* (*pūr*) 'become full; fill' and *prā* 'fill' (see Albino 1999; Kümmel 2000: 325ff.), differing in syntactic features: diffuse vs. (predominantly) transitive. This difference in syntax could be expanded to another root pair following the same pattern (*CaR^i // CRā*), *tr̥* 'pass' // *trā* 'protect'. In some cases this syntactic difference could be supplemented with idiomatic shifts (cf. *tr̥* (*tar^i*) 'pass' // *trā* 'protect'; *man* 'think; respect' // *mnā* 'mention').

(iii) Finally, it cannot be ruled out that the difference in syntactic properties between some historically (and semantically) unrelated but formally similar roots has contributed to the development of the functional (syntactic) value of the *C*//*ā*-alternation. Particularly instructive is the case of *jan^i* 'be born; generate' // *jñā* 'know'. In spite of the lack of semantic and historical connections between these two roots, their formal similarity and remarkable difference in syntax (*jan^i* is diffuse; *jñā* is fundamentally transitive) could have supported the syntactic model of the etymological *CaR^i // CRā* pairs such as *pr̥* // *prā*.

Bibliography

Albino 1999: Marcos Albino, Vedisch *pūr* 'füllen', *WZKS* 43: 5–19.

Anttila 1969: Raimo Anttila, *Proto-Indo-European Schwebeablaut*, Berkeley, Los Angeles.

Beekes 1995: Robert S.P. Beekes, *Comparative Indo-European linguistics*, Amsterdam.

Benfey 1837: Theodor Benfey, Review of: A.F. Pott. *Etymologische Forschungen...*, *Ergänzungsbl. zur Allgem. Literatur-Zeitung (Halle)* 114–117: 905–933. [= *Kl. Schr.* I/2, 3–35].

Benfey 1873: Th. Benfey, Die Suffixe anti, âti und ianti, iâti, *NGG* 15: 391–404 [= *Kl.Schr.* I/2,163–172].

Brugmann 1878: Karl Brugmann, Das verbale suffix *â* im indogermanischen und die sogen. aeolische flexion der verba contracta, in: *Morphologische Untersuchungen* 1, Leipzig: 1–91.

Gotō 1987, [2]1996: Toshifumi Gotō, *Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen: Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia*, Wien.

Gotō 1997: Toshifumi Gotō, Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 16. *chad* ..., *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka)* 22/4: 1001–1059.

Griffiths 2009: Arlo Griffiths, *The Paippalādasaṃhitā of the Atharvaveda, Kāṇḍas 6 and 7. A new edition with translation and commentary*, Groningen.

Güntert 1914: Herman Güntert, *Über Reimwortbildungen im Arischen und Griechischen*, Heidelberg.

Haudry 1977: Jean Haudry, *L'emploi des cas en védique. Introduction à l'étude des cas en indo-européen*, Lyon.

Hettrich 2004: Heinrich Hettrich, Zu Konstruktion und Bedeutung der Wurzel [1]*man* im Ṛgveda, in: *Analecta homini universali dicata: Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik, Linguistik, Philologie, Politik ...: Fs. für O. Panagl zum 65. Geburtstag*, Th. Krisch et al. (eds), Stuttgart: 75–83.

Insler 1972: Stanley Insler, Vedic *mamatsi*, *ámamdur* and *íyate*, *KZ* 86: 93–103.

Jamison 1983: Stephanie W. Jamison, *Function and form in the -áya-formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda*, Göttingen.

Jasanoff 2002-2003: Jay Jasanoff, 'Stative' *-ē-* revisited, *Die Sprache* 43: 127–170.

Joachim 1978: Ulrike Joachim, *Mehrfachpräsentien im Ṛgveda*, Frankfurt/Main etc.

Kulikov 1991: Leonid Kulikov, Drevneindijskie glagol'nye korni na *-ā* (k probleme opredelitelej kornja i perestanovočnogo ablauta) [Old Indian verbal roots in *-ā*], in: *Slavistika. Indoevropeistika. Nostratika. K 60-letiju so dnja roždenija V.A. Dybo*. Tez. dokl., Moscow: 82–87.

Kulikov 1999: L. Kulikov, Split causativity: remarks on correlations between transitivity, aspect, and tense, in: *Tense-aspect, transitivity and causativity. Essays in honour of Vladimir Nedjalkov*, W. Abraham & L. Kulikov (eds), Amsterdam: 21–42.

Kulikov 2000a: L. Kulikov, Vedic causative nasal presents and their thematicization: a functional approach, in: *Historical linguistics* 1995. Vol. 1: *General issues and non-Germanic Languages*, J.Ch. Smith & D. Bentley (eds), Amsterdam: 191–209.

Kulikov 2000b: L. Kulikov, The Vedic type *syáti* revisited, in: *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik*, B. Forssman & R. Plath (eds), Wiesbaden: 267–283.

Kulikov 2001: L. Kulikov, *The Vedic -ya-presents*. PhD diss., Leiden University.

Kulikov 2003: L. Kulikov, The labile syntactic type in a diachronic perspective: The case of Vedic, *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 16: 93–112.

Kulikov 2006: L. Kulikov, The Vedic medio-passive aorists, statives and their participles: Reconsidering the paradigm, in: *Themes and Tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics*, B. Tikkanen and H. Hettrich (eds), Delhi: 45–63.

Kulikov 2008: L. Kulikov, The Vedic causative *saṃkhyāpáyati/saṃkṣāpáyati* reconsidered, in: *Indologica. T. Ya. Elizarenkova Memorial Vol.*, L. Kulikov & M. Rusanov (eds), Moscow: 245–261.

Kulikov forthc.: L. Kulikov, The Vedic root variants of the type *CaC // C(C)ā*: Formal patterns and syntactic features, in a Festschrift.

Kümmel 1996: Martin Kümmel, *Stativ und Passivaorist im Indoiranischen*, Göttingen.

Kümmel 2000: Martin Kümmel, *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen*, Wiesbaden.

Kuryłowicz 1964: Jerzy Kuryłowicz, *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*, Heidelberg.

LIV. ²2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen.* Unter der Leitung von Helmut Rix … 2., erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage, Wiesbaden.

Lubotsky 1983: Alexander Lubotsky, On the external sandhis of the Maitr. Saṃh., *IIJ* 25: 167–179.

Lubotsky 1989: Alexander Lubotsky, The Vedic *-áya*-formations, *IIJ* 32: 89–113.

Mayrhofer, KEWA: Manfred Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen.* Bd. I–IV, Heidelberg, 1956–80.

Mayrhofer, EWAia: Manfred Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen.* Bd. I–II, Heidelberg, 1986–96.

Narten 1987: Johanna Narten, Ved. *śrīṇáti*, gr. κρείων, κρέων, *KZ* 100: 270–296 [=*Kl.Schr.*: 340–366].

Oertel 1941: Hanns Oertel, *Die Dativi finales abstrakter Nomina und andere Beispiele nominaler Satzfügung in der vedischen Prosa*, München. [= *Kl. Schr.* II, 1371–1500].

Persson 1912: Per Persson, *Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung.* 2 Teile, Uppsala, Leipzig.

Reichelt 1904: Hans Reichelt, Der sekundäre ablaut, *KZ* 39: 1–80.

Renou 1930/²1960: Louis Renou, *Grammaire sanscrite*, Paris.

Roesler 1997: Ulrike Roesler, *Licht und Leuchten im Ṛgveda. Untersuchungen zum Wortfeld des Leuchtens und zur Bedeutung des Lichts*, Swisttal-Odendorf.

Schaefer 1994: Christiane Schaefer, *Das Intensivum im Vedischen*, Göttingen.

Szemerényi ⁴1990: Oswald Szemerényi, *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*, Darmstadt.

Wagner 1950: Heinrich Wagner, *Zur Herkunft der e-Verba in den indogerm. Sprachen*, Zürich.

Watkins 1971 [1973]: Calvert Watkins, Hittite and Indo-European studies: the denominative in *-ē-*, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1971: 51–93.

Whitney 1885: William Dwight Whitney, *The roots, verb-forms, and primary derivatives of the Sanskrit language*, Leipzig.

Whitney 1889: William Dwight Whitney, *Sanskrit grammar.* 2nd ed, Cambridge, Mass.

Yakubovich 1999: Ilya Yakubovich, "Stative" suffix /-āi-a/ in the verbal system of Old Indic, *Proc. of the 10th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, Washington: 65–75.

Zaliznjak 1975: Andrej A. Zaliznjak, Morfonologičeskaja klassifikacija drevneindijskix glagol'nyx kornej [A morphophonological classification of the Old Indian verbal roots], *Očerki po fonologii vostočnyx jazykov*, T.Ja. Elizarenkova (ed.), Moskva: 59–85.

Leonid Kulikov
PO Box 9515
Leiden University, Institute of Linguistics
2300 RA Leiden
l.kulikov@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Sprachwissenschaft

Protolanguage and Prehistory
Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indo-
germanischen Gesellschaft, Krakau,
11. bis 15. Oktober 2004
Ed. by Rosemarie Lühr
and Sabine Ziegler
2009. 8°. 534 pp., pb. (978-3-89500-598-5)

Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel
Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indo-
germanischen Gesellschaft, Halle an der
Saale, 17. bis 23. September 2000
Hg. von Gerhard Meiser
und Olav Hackstein
2005. 8°. 764 S., kart. (978-3-89500-475-9)

**Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis
indoeuropea hoy**
Actas del Coloquio de la Indo-
germanische Gesellschaft Madrid,
21–24 de septiembre de 1994
Ed. by Emilio Crespo
and José Luis García Ramón
1998. 8°. 672 pp., pb. (978-3-89500-043-0)

Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch
Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indo-
germanischen Gesellschaft, Zürich,
5. bis 9. Oktober 1992
Hg. von E. Dunkel, Gisela Meyer,
Salvatore Scarlata und Christian Seidl
8°. 476 S., kart. (978-3-88226-735-8)

Oskisch – Umbrisch
Texte und Grammatik. Arbeitstagung
der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft
und der Società Italiana di Glottologia,
Freiburg, 25. bis 28. September 1991
Hg. von Helmut Rix
8°. 348 S., kart. (978-3-88226-550-7)

**Grammatische Kategorie – Funktion
und Geschichte**
Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indo-
germanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin,
20. bis 25. Februar 1983
Hg. von Bernfried Schlerath
8°. 588 S., kart. (978-3-88226-255-1)

Flexion und Wortbildung
Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indo-
germanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg,
9. bis 14. September 1973
Hg. von Helmut Rix
8°. 392 S., kart. (978-3-920153-40-7)

**Pragmatische Kategorien. Form,
Funktion und Diachronie**
Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indo-
germanischen Gesellschaft, Marburg,
24. bis 26. September 2007
Hg. von Elisabeth Rieken
und Paul Widmer
2009. 8°. 352 S., kart.
(978-3-89500-677-7)