



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

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

Kulikov, L.I.; Krisch Th., Lindner Th.

Citation

Kulikov, L. I. (2008). The Vedic root variants of the type CaC // C(C)ā:
Morphophonological features and syntactic patterns. *Indogermanistik Und
Linguistik Im Dialog. Akten Der Xiii. Fachtagung Der Indogermanischen
Gesellschaft Vom 21. Bis 27. September 2008 In Salzburg*, 310-320.
Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16625>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16625>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

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

WIESBADEN 2011
REICHERT VERLAG

ISBN: 978-3-89500-681-4

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

KRISCH, Thomas / LINDNER, Thomas: Vorwort	IX
VINE, Brent: On Dissimilatory r-Loss in Greek	1
ACKERMANN, Katsiaryna: Kontinuität und Innovation in der Genese des slavischen Verbuns: Das System des urslavischen Aorists.....	18
BABIČ, Matjaž: Enklitika in Korpussprachen	29
BAUER, Anna: Verberststellung im Hethitischen.....	39
VAN BEEK, Lucien: Vowel Assimilation in Greek: the Evidence Recon- sidered	49
BENEDETTI, Marina: Linguistik und alte Sprachen: „Experimente“ zu alt- gr. ἔχεν.....	59
BICHLMEIER, Harald: Josef Karst und sein Mittelarmenisches Wörter- buch.....	69
BLAŽEK, Václav: Indo-European * <i>suHnu</i> - ‘son’ and his relatives.....	79
BOCK, Bettina: Kollokationen mit ‚geben‘ in altindogermanischen Spra- chen und im Urindogermanischen	90
BRUNO, Carla: When stylistics is a matter of syntax: cognate accusatives in Ancient Greek.....	100
CERETI, Carlo G.: Copulative Compounds in Iranian Onomastics	110
COTTICELLI KURRAS, Paola / RIZZA, Alfredo: Die hethitische Partikel - <i>z(a)</i> im Licht neuer theoretischer Ansätze	120
CROMBACH, Michael: Historische Sprachwissenschaft und Evolution.....	131
DRACHMAN, Gaberell / MALIKOUTI-DRACHMAN, Angeliki: Polysemy and semantic change in Greek preverbal morphology.....	141
EYTHÓRSSON, Thórhallur / BARÐDAL, Jóhanna: Die Konstruktions- grammatik und die komparative Methode	148
FRUYT, Michèle: Word-formation in Latin: a linguistic approach	157
GAMKRELIDZE, Thomas V.: Language Typology & Linguistic Reconstruc- tion: A New Paradigm in Historical Comparative Linguistics.....	168
GARCÍA TRABAZO, José Virgilio: Über die Herkunft des indoiranischen <i>ya</i> -Passivums.....	172
GRIFFITH, Aaron: The genesis of the animacy hierarchy in the Old Irish <i>notae augentes</i>	182
HACKSTEIN, Olav: Proklise und Subordination im Indogermanischen.....	192

HÄUSLER, Sabine: Zur Semantik und grammatischen Kategorisierung der Wurzel uridg. * <i>Hejk-</i> . Auf den Spuren eines <i>haben</i> -Verbs im Urindogermanischen.....	203
HANSEN, Bjarne Simmelkjær Sandgaard: Long roots long back in time: the prehistory of the Indo-European ERU/RÜ-roots	213
HETRICH, Heinrich: Konkurrierender Gebrauch obliquier Kasus im Rgveda.....	223
JOHNSEN, Sverre Stausland: The phonetics and phonologization of Verner's law	232
JUNGHÄNEL, Anja: Coding Motion Events in Indo-European	242
KARVOUNIS, Christos: Was ist ein Prädikativ? Eine Auseinandersetzung zwischen moderner Linguistik und traditioneller Sprachwissenschaft	252
KLOEKHORST, Alwin: Weise's Law: Depalatalization of Palatovelars before * <i>r</i> in Sanskrit	261
KOCHAROV, Petr: On <i>ana</i> -presents of Armenian	271
KÖLLIGAN, Daniel: Griechisch <i>χρίμπτομαι</i>	279
KRASUCHIN, Konstantin G.: Universaltendenzen in der Entwicklung des Aspekt-Tempus-Systems (Aspekt und Zeitdauer).....	289
KRISCH, Thomas: Some Remarks on the Position of Adverbials in Greek and Vedic Sentences.....	300
KULIKOV, Leonid: The Vedic root variants of the type <i>CaC // C(C)ā</i> : Morphophonological features and syntactic patterns.....	310
LÜHR, Rosemarie: Zur Validität linguistischer Theorien in der Indogermanistik.....	321
LURAGHI, Silvia: Two theoretical approaches to cases in comparison.....	331
MAGNI, Elisabetta: Between typology and etymology: The <i>-nd-</i> forms in Latin.....	342
MAJER, Marek: PIE * <i>so</i> , * <i>seh₂</i> , * <i>tod</i> / PSl. * <i>tb</i> , * <i>ta</i> , * <i>to</i> and the development of PIE word-final * <i>-os</i> in Proto-Slavic.....	352
MALZAHN, Melanie: Die tocharischen Präsens- und Konjunktivstämme auf suffixales <i>-sk-</i> und eine innertocharische Vokalschwächungsregel.....	361
MANOLESSOU, Io / PANTELIDIS, Nikolaos: Die relative Chronologie des Frühgriechischen: silbische Liquiden/Nasale und Schwund des intervokalischen /s/.....	367
MARCHESINI, Simona: Suffixkomposition und die „Word Formation Rules“ (WFR) am Beispiel einer vorrömischen agglutinierenden Sprache (Etruskisch)	377
MELAZZO, Lucio: A Few Remarks on the Left Periphery in Indo-European.....	386

MELCHERT, H. Craig: The PIE Collective Plural and the “τὰ ζῶα τρέχει rule”	395
MERCADO, Angelo O.: Italic and Celtic: Problems in the Comparison of Metrical Systems	401
MUMM, Peter-Arnold: Optativ und verbale Indefinitheit	411
NIEDERREITER, Stefan: Zum Wortfeld der verba dicendi im R̥gveda	421
ORLANDINI, Anna / POCETTI, Paolo: Structures corrélatives entre coordination et subordination. Une hypothèse déictique pour lat. <i>ast</i> , <i>at</i> , <i>atque</i>	431
PACIARONI, Tania: Regelmäßigkeit und Variation im stilistischen Aufbau des vedischen Versrhythmus	442
PINAULT, Georges-Jean: Some Tocharian abstract suffixes	453
POLJAKOV, Oleg: Litauische Morphonologie und vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft	463
POOTH, Roland A.: Die 2. und 3. Person Dual Aktiv und das Medium	473
POURTSKHAVANIDZE, Zakharia: A New Perspective on the Notion of Subject in Georgian	484
RASMUSSEN, Jens Elmegård: Über Status und Entwicklung des sog. <i>u</i> -Präsens im Indogermanischen	491
RIEKEN, Elisabeth: Verberststellung in hethitischen Übersetzungstexten	498
SCHUHMAN, Roland: Zum analogischen Ausgleich bei den got. <i>ja</i> -Stämmen	508
SCHWEITZER, Jürgen: Sprachliche Rekonstruktion in den Mayasprachen: ein methodologischer Vergleich mit der Indogermanistik	517
SERŽANT, Ilja A.: Die Entstehung der Kategorie Inagentiv im Tocharischen	527
SIMON, Zsolt: Die Fortsetzung der Laryngale im Karischen	538
STEINBAUER, Dieter H.: Etruskisch (historisch-)genealogisch und (areal-)typologisch	548
STIFTER, David: Lack of Syncope and other <i>nichtlautgesetzlich</i> Vowel Developments in OIr. Consonant-Stem Nouns. Animacy Rearing its Head in Morphology?	556
STÜBER, Karin: Grammatikalisierung von Infinitiven am Beispiel des Altirischen	566
TREMBLAY, Xavier: Zur Erschließung der Bedeutung der drei Wurzelnomina-Ablaute (<i>e/ø</i> , <i>o/e</i> , <i>ē/e</i>) (Zusammenfassung) Apophonica VI bis	575
TRONCI, Liana: Taxonomie der Mediumkonstruktionen und Verbalmorphologie im Altgriechischen	585

VIII

VITI, Carlotta: The use of the dual number in Homeric Greek	595
WILLI, Andreas: Morphosyntaktische Überlegungen zum Ursprung des griechischen Futurs.....	605
WOLFE, Brendan: Gothic Dependence on Greek: Evidence from Nomin- al Compounds	616
ZEHNDER, Thomas: Zur Funktion der Infinitive im Veda.....	622
ZEILFELDER, Susanne: Der Christengott und die altarmenische Deter- minansphrase	632
Indices.....	639

The Vedic root variants of the type $CaC // C(C)\bar{a}$: 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’ // $y\bar{a}$ ‘drive’ or $t\bar{r}$ (tar^i) ‘pass’ // $tr\bar{a}$ ‘protect, rescue’ (labelled C - and \bar{a} -verbs), concentrating on their syntactic features. It will be argued that \bar{a} -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. $y\bar{a}$ (intransitive) vs. $i(ay)$ (intransitive and transitive); $tr\bar{a}$ (transitive) vs. $t\bar{r}$ (intr. and transitive).

1. The $C//\bar{a}$ -alternation: a preliminary survey

The Vedic verbal lexicon contains some twenty root pairs of the type $i(ay)$ ‘go’ // $y\bar{a}$ ‘drive’, gam ‘go’ // $g\bar{a}$ ‘tread’, $t\bar{r}$ (tar^i) ‘pass’ // $tr\bar{a}$ ‘protect, rescue’, $dham^i$ // $dhm\bar{a}$ ‘blow’, $p\bar{r}$ (par^i) // $pr\bar{a}$ ‘fill’, $bhas$ ‘devour’ // $ps\bar{a}$ ‘chew’, man ‘think’ // $mn\bar{a}$ ‘mention’, etc. In all such pairs, the second member ends in \bar{a} and can be derived, in formal terms, by adding \bar{a} to a certain modification (most often, the zero grade) of the first member ($i-\bar{a}$, $ps\bar{a}$ [= $bhs-\bar{a}$], $mn-\bar{a}$, etc.). Schematically, the formal relationship between the members of such pairs can be represented as $CaC // C(C)\bar{a}$, where the final consonant is, most often, a sonant ($i = ay$, $t\bar{r} = tar^i$, etc.), thus: $CR^i (/CaR) // CR\bar{a}$. Accordingly, I will hereafter refer to the second members of such pairs as \bar{a} -roots (\bar{a} -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 ‘ $C//\bar{a}$ -alternation’.

The origins of such pairs are quite variegated. Some of them can be treated in terms of the pattern $CaC // CC\bar{a}$, which suggests that the second member of the pair is derived by means of the root extension, cf. $i - y\bar{a}$, $man - mn\bar{a}$. Some others follow the pattern $CR^i (CaR^i) // CR\bar{a}$ (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^i and $CR\bar{a}$, 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 $CaC (CaR) // C\bar{a}$, as in the case of gam ‘go’ // $g\bar{a}$ ‘tread’ and dru ($drav$) // $dr\bar{a}$ ‘run’. Some of these pairs may be formed by etymologically unrelated roots as a result of their semantic and phonological convergence.¹

* This is a revised and extended version of my earlier paper (Kulikov 1991). I would like to thank R. Anttila, T.Ja. Elizarenkova, W. Knobl, A. Lubotsky, and S. Starostin for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper. I also would like to express my thanks to the audience of the XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft for remarks and criticism – in particular, to J.L. García-Ramón, F. Kortlandt, T. Krisch and A. Lubotsky. – The abbreviations (text sigla) used in the paper are the following: AV(Ś) – Atharvaveda (Śaunakiya recension), AVP – AV, Paippalāda recension, Br. – Brāhmaṇas, RV – Ṛgveda, RVKh. – Ṛgveda-Khilāni, ŚB(M) – Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (Mādhyandina), VS – Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā, YV – Yajurveda.

¹ For our purposes we need to identify any relevant formation as belonging to the system of the C - or \bar{a} -root. Generally, this task poses no problem, cf. infinitives $étave$ and $tar(i)tum$ (built on the C -roots ay and tar^i), as opposed to $yātave$ and $trātum$ (\bar{a} -roots $y\bar{a}$ and $tr\bar{a}$). However, the zero grade forms of the schwebeablauting roots, such as $p\bar{r}$ (par^i) // $pr\bar{a}$ (cf. verbal adj. $pūrṇā-$), 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 *dhamí // 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 (parí) // 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 Schwebelaut, 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 / tarí* (cf. class I pres. *táratí* < **terH-e-tí*) // *trā* (cf. class IV pres. *trā-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

the *C*-root *CṚ / CaRí* (< **CRH-* / **CeRH-*), or to the *ā*-root *CṚ / CRā* (< **CRH-* / **CREH-*), that is, in our case, either to *pṝ / parí*, 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-*, *dhmāta-*, *prāta-*, as opposed to such adjectives as *sthita-* and *dhīta-*, made from the ‘independent’ (= non-schwebelauting) 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. *pṛṇāti*, *tírāti* 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 *dhamí*, as in the class I present *dháma-í*, can be explained as resulting from the reinterpretation of the athematic root present (= class II pres.: 3pl. *dhámanti* for **dhamánti* < **d^hṛH-énti*) or thematic class VI present: 3sg. *dhámati* for **dhamáti* < **d^hṛH-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 *ṛ*, *mnā* from *man*, *psā* from *bhas*, *yā* from *i*”.

⁴ See, e.g., Benfey 1873: 403 [= *Kl. Schr.* I/2, 171f.] (“Wie dieses *ā* 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*(*par̄*) // *prā* ‘fill’

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

- (1) (RV 8.64.4) *óbhé pṝnāsi ródasi* ‘You fill both worlds.’
 (2) (RV 9.97.38) *óbhé aprā ródasi* ‘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 púryamāṇaṃ 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 ... pṝṇatām 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 *púryate* 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 rātri pāṛthivaṃ rájaḥ pitúr aprāyi dhāmabhiḥ* ‘O night, the earthly space has been filled / has become full⁷ 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 thematization

⁶ Note also the remarkable observation by Kümmel (1996: 73) on the fundamentally transitive character of the verb *prā*: “Auch wenn die Wurzel **pleh*, 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.).

invati,⁸ meaning ‘send, impel, set in motion’, as in (7):

- (6) (RV 1.191.8) *út purástāt sūrya eti* ‘The sun rises (lit. goes up) in the East.’
 (7) (RV 4.53.5) *tisrō dīvaḥ pṛthivís tisrá invati* ‘He sets in motion three heavens (and) three earths.’

By contrast, the *ā*-root *yā* is basically intransitive (cf. pres. *yāti, ŷyate*⁹ ‘drives, speeds’, etc.). The *-aya*-causative *yāpayati* first appears in the Brāhmaṇas.¹⁰

There is a remarkable syntactic feature shared by the pairs *pṝ // pṛā* 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 *pṝ* 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 *pṛā*, 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.

*kanī*¹² // *kā* ‘yearn, enjoy’ (med. pf. *cake*, RVic hapax pres.part. *kāyamāna-*: transitive)¹³
kās ‘become visible, appear (?)’; see¹⁴ // *ksā* (*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, invati* ‘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, invati* ‘sets in motion, sends’ belong together with *ŷyate*, 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. *cākān*, 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 *kanī* ‘Gefallen ein 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, *kās* may belong to the same syntactic type as *dṛś*, cf. med. *dadrśé* ‘appears’ ~ act. *darśayati* ‘reveals’. Correspondingly, intransitive usages can be reconstructed for early Vedic (see also

gam ‘go’ // *gā* ‘go, tread’¹⁶
janí ‘be born; beget, generate’ // *jñā* ‘know’¹⁷
*tan*¹⁸ // *tā*¹⁹ ‘stretch, extend’
tṛ (*tarí*) ‘pass’ (a typical example of diffuse verb, well-attested both in intransitive²⁰ and transitive-causative²¹ constructions) // *trā* ‘protect, rescue’ (transitive)
*dah*²² // *kṣā* [< **d^hg^{uh}-eh₁-*; 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-*)/*ksā* (*kyā*), see Kulikov 2008.

¹⁵ The root variant *kyā* results from the secondary development of *ksā* (preserved in the Maitrāyaṇī and Kāthaka 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*!”; see also EWAia I, 482). **g^ue-* could not be a possible root structure in Proto-Indo-European, and thus PIE **g^uem-* (> Ved. *gam*) and **g^ueh₂-* (> 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. *gāmāyati* and aor. *ajīgamat*; see Jamison 1983: 172) are attested from early Vedic onwards. By contrast, causative of the intransitive *gā* (**gāpāyati*) is lacking.

¹⁷ These two roots are historically unrelated (see Anttila 1969: 130); note, in particular, the different laryngeals: *janí* < PIE **ǵen_h-* 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 *pṛ* // *prā*. The verb *janí*, well-attested both in intransitive (pres. *jāya^{-lc}*, pf. *jajñé*, medio-pass. aorist *ājani*, sigmatic aorist *ājaniṣṭa*) and transitive-causative (pres. *jána⁻ⁱⁱ*, *janāya⁻ⁱⁱ*, pf. *jajāna*, etc.) usages instantiates the diffuse syntactic type. By contrast, *jñā* is fundamentally transitive; passive usages are only attested for the present passive *jñāyá^{-lc}* ‘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. *tāyāte* (RV+) ‘is stretched, extended’ and, in late Vedic, pass. *-i*-aorist *prātāyi* (hapax in the Aitareya-Āranyaka).

²⁰ Cf. class I pres. *tāra⁻ⁱⁱ* ‘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. *tīrāti* ‘makes pass’, with the preverb *prā* 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^{-lc}*, attested both with root (non-passive) and suffix (passive) accentuation (*dāhya^{-lc}* in the RVKh.; *dahyá^{-lc}* 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 *kṣāya⁻ⁱⁱ* (AVP+; see Kulikov 2001: 397f.). Causative formations of *kṣā* appear from the late Ṛgveda onwards (injunctive of the causative aorist *ciṣṣipas* RV 10.16.1; pres.caus. *kṣāpāya⁻ⁱⁱ* 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 *drāvāyati*, see Jamison 1983: 114. The causative of *drā*, *drāpāyati*, is middle Vedic (ŚB

dhamī ((predominantly) trans.)²⁵ // *dhmā* ‘blow, inflate’ (trans.)
dhī (*dhay*)²⁶ // *dhyā*²⁷ ‘consider, think, reflect’
pī (*pay*)²⁸ (diffuse) // *pyā* ‘swell’ (only intrans. in RV)²⁹
bhan ‘speak’³⁰ // *bhā* (intrans. root pres. *bhāti*) ‘shine’³¹
bhas ‘devour’ // *psā* ‘chew’ (both transitive; passives are unattested)
man ‘think, believe; respect’³² // *mnā* ‘mention’ (tr.)³³
mī (*mar*)³⁴ ‘crush’ // *mlā* ‘wither, wilt’³⁵
*śī*³⁶ // *śrā*³⁷ ‘become ready; cook’
hū (*hav*)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^{1x}, 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 (YV⁰+); for its attestations and genesis, see Kulikov 2001: 422-425.
- 28 Pres. *pīnva*-^{ti} (tr.-caus.), *pīnva*-^{lc} (intr.); active perf. *pīpāya* ‘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 (*pī*) or set (*pī*), is controversial; see Mayrhofer, EWAia II, 83ff. and Kümmel 2000: 298, fn. 487.
- 29 On formations derived from *pyā* (pres. *-pyāya*-^{lc} RV+ etc.), see Kümmel 2000: 316f.; LIV 465; Kulikov 2001: 249f. The *-āya*-causative *pyāyati* first appears in the AV (see Jamison 1983: 149).
- 30 Four occurrences of the class I present *bhāna*-^{l/c} in the R̥gveda exhibit a remarkable variety of syntactic patterns. These include two active forms (3sg.act. *bhānati* 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 *bhās* ‘speak’ and *bhās* ‘shine’ as well as Gr. φημί ‘declare’ and φαίνομαι ‘appear’; see Mayrhofer, EWAia II, 244, 260; LIV 68-70, lemmata “1. **b^heh₂-* ‘glänzen, leuchten, scheinen’” and “2. **b^heh₂-* ‘sprechen, sagen’” (“morphologisch homonym ... wohl urspr. identisch”).
- 32 Attested both in transitive (e.g. class IV pres. *mānya*-^{lc}, sigm. aor. *āmamsta* 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 (*mānya*-^{lc} ‘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 *-mūryā*-^{lc} 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. *mlāpāya*-^{ti} first appears in the Atharvaveda (see Jamison 1983: 143).
- 36 Evidence for the syntactic type of the *C*-root *śī/śar* (aniṭ) is scant. It is only attested in the verbal adj. *śrtā*- ‘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. *śrāyant-* RV 8.99.3, can be tentatively interpreted as intransitive: ‘gar werden’ (K. Hoffmann apud Joachim 1978: 162 and Narten 1987: 272f. [= *Kl. Schr.* I, 342f.], fn. 3). Causatives of *śrā* appear after the RV (pres. *śrapāyati* ‘cooks, prepares’ AV+, see Jamison 1983: 145; aor. *āsīśrapāma* ‘we have cooked’ ŚBM 3.8.2.28 = ŚB-Kāṇva 4.8.2.21).
- 38 The verb *hū* (*hav*) is fundamentally transitive (presents *hāvate* and *hvāyati* ‘calls’, pf. *juhāva* ‘has called’, etc.; see Gotō 1987: 347ff.; Lubotsky 1989; Kümmel 2000: 606ff.), but its passive (pres. *hūyā*-^{lc} RV+; pass. aorist participle *huvānā*- 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) <u>Non-diffuse</u> (intransitive)	(2) (weak-diffuse)	(3) <u>Diffuse</u>	(4) (weak-diffuse)	(5) <u>Non-diffuse</u> (transitive)
only intransitive usages; causatives are unattested/rare or late	basically intransitive verbs; causatives are attested	both intransitive and transitive (causative) usages are attested	basically trans. verbs; intr. (pass.) usages are attested	basically tr. verbs; passives are unattested/rare or late
pattern <i>CaC // C(C)ā</i>				
<i>yā</i> 'drive, speed'		<i>i</i> (<i>ay</i>) 'go' <i>kan</i> 'be pleased' <i>kās</i> 'appear (?); see'	<i>ksā</i> (<i>khyā</i>) 'look at'	<i>kā</i> 'yearn'
<i>gā</i> 'tread'	<i>gam</i> 'go'	<i>tan</i> 'stretch'	(<i>tā</i>) ← <i>dah</i> 'burn'	
<i>drā</i> (// <i>dram</i> ?) 'run'	<i>kṣā</i> 'burn' <i>dru</i> 'run' <i>pyā</i> 'swell'	<i>pi</i> (<i>pī</i> ?) 'swell'		
<i>bhā</i> 'shine'		<i>man</i> 'think, respect'	<i>bhan</i> 'speak'	<i>bhas</i> 'devour' // <i>psā</i> 'chew' <i>mnā</i> 'mention'
	<i>śrā</i> 'become ready'	(<i>śr</i> ?)		
pattern <i>CR̄ (CaR̄) // CRā</i>				
		[<i>jan</i> 'be born, beget' <i>tṛ</i> (<i>tar</i> ?) 'pass'	<i>jñā</i> 'know' <i>dham</i> 'blow'	<i>trā</i> 'protect' (<i>dhmā</i>) <i>dhī</i> (<i>dhay</i> ?) // <i>dhyā</i> 'think, reflect'
	<i>mā</i> 'wither'	<i>pṛ</i> (<i>par</i> ?) 'fill'	<i>hū</i> (<i>hav</i> ?) 'call'	<i>prā</i> 'fill' <i>mṛ</i> (<i>mar</i> ?) 'crush' (<i>hvā</i> '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 *-āya*-presents, such as *dhā* – *dhāyati* 'sucks' and *dā* – *-dāyate* 'distributes' (i.e. *dhā* : *dhāyati* = X : *hvāyati*). All formations built on *hvā* (late Vedic: *hvātar*-Jaim.-Br., fut. *-hvāsyā*^{-*ū*te}, 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.) // *tṛ* (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* // *mṛ*. *mlā* is fundamentally intransitive, whilst *mṛ* is transitive, but caus. *mlāpāya*⁻ⁱⁱ (AV+), is a bit older than the passive of *mṛ*, *-mūryā*^{-ic} (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 *mṛ* (*mar*) 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 *CaRⁱ (CṚ) // CRā* (i.e., in diachronic terms, **CaRH- // *CRaH-*), the *ā-*member is often **transitive**, as opposed to the (more) diffuse *C-*verb; cf. especially *tṛ* (*tar*) ‘pass’ // *trā* ‘protect, rescue’ and *pṛ* (*par*) // *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, *apṛāyi* is a hapax (RVKh.–AV^{1x}); *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)āya-* (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 *-āya-*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 *h₁* (**-eh₁-*; see Beekes 1995: 230), in most of the above-discussed *ā-*roots we are probably dealing with the reflex of another laryngeal, *h₂*. The full evidence can be summarized as follows (the reconstruction mostly follows Mayrhofer’s EWAia and LIV):

- h_1 : *ksā* < **dʰgʰh-eh₁*- ‘burn’ (intransitive with *-áya*-causatives)
prā < **pleh₁*- ‘fill’ (transitive)
mlā < **mleh₁*- (?) ‘wither, wilt’ (intransitive with *-áya*-causatives)
śrā < **kl-eh₁*- [? see LIV 323] ‘become ready’ (intr. (?) with *-áya*-caus.)
- h_2 : *kā* < **keh₂*- (?) ‘yearn, enjoy’ (transitive)
gā < **gʰeh₂*- ‘go, tread’ (intransitive)
trā < **treh₂*- ‘protect, rescue’ (transitive)
drā < **dreh₂*- ‘run’ (intransitive)
bhā < **bʰeh₂*- ‘shine’ (intransitive)
mnā < **mn-eh₂*- ‘mention’ (transitive)
yā < *(*H*)*ieh₂*- ‘drive’ (intransitive)
- h_3 : no reliable examples
- H*(unknown) : *ksā* < **kʰk-eH*- ‘see, consider, reckon’ (transitive with passives)
dhmā < **dʰmeH*- ‘blow, inflate’ (transitive)
dhyā < **dʰjeH*- ‘consider, reflect’ (transitive)
pyā < **pjeH*- ‘swell’ (intransitive)
psā < **bʰs-eH*- ‘chew’ (transitive)
hvā < **gʰueH*- [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 *-*eh₁*-. 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 *-*eh₁*- > PIIr. *-*aH*- (**dʰgʰh-eh₁*-, **kl-eh₁*-?) 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. *pūryate* and tr.-caus. pres. *pṛṇāti*) 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 *āprās* could be generalized for all formations built on the full grade (II) of the root *pṝ*/*prā* ‘fill’, as opposed to formations derived from the zero grade (pres. *pūrya^{-tc}*, *pūryá^{-tc}*, *pṝṇāti*, *pṝṇá^{-tc}*), which, eventually, has led to the split of one single lexical unit in two, *pṝ*(*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 (*CaRⁱ* // *CRā*), *tṝ* ‘pass’ // *trā* ‘protect’. In some cases this syntactic difference could be supplemented with idiomatic shifts (cf. *tṝ*(*tar*) ‘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 *janⁱ* ‘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 (*janⁱ* is diffuse; *jñā* is fundamentally transitive) could have supported the syntactic model of the etymological *CaRⁱ* // *CRā* pairs such as *pṝ* // *prā*.

Bibliography

- Albino 1999: Marcos Albino, Vedisch *pūr* 'füllen', *WZKS* 43: 5–19.
- Anttila 1969: Raimo Anttila, *Proto-Indo-European Schwabeablaut*, 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, ²1996: 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 Paippalādasamhitā 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 Rgveda, 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*, *āmamdur* and *īyate*, *KZ* 86: 93–103.
- Jamison 1983: Stephanie W. Jamison, *Function and form in the -āya-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 Rgveda*, Frankfurt/Main etc.
- Kulikov 1991: Leonid Kulikov, Drevneindijskie glagol'nye korni na *-ā* (k probleme opredelitelej kornja i perestanočnogo ablauta) [Old Indian verbal roots in *-ā*], in: *Slavistika. Indo-evropeistika. 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 *syāti* 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., *III*25: 167–179.
- Lubotsky 1989: Alexander Lubotsky, The Vedic *-áya*-formations, *III*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 Altindischen*. Bd. I–II, Heidelberg, 1986–96.
- Narten 1987: Johanna Narten, Ved. *śrīṇáti*, gr. *ῥεῖων, ῥεῶν*, *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 Rgveda. 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 Indogermanischen 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 Indogermanischen 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 Indogermanische 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 Indogermanischen 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 Indogermanischen 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 Indogermanischen 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 Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Marburg, 24. bis 26. September 2007
Hg. von Elisabeth Rieken
und Paul Widmer
2009. 8°. 352 S., kart.
(978-3-89500-677-7)