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THE VEDIC TYPE PATAYATI REVISITED: SEMANTIC OPPOSITIONS, PARADIGMATIC RELATIONSHIPS AND HISTORICAL CONNECTIONS

LEONID KULIKOV

—You know, Khaim, I have bought a bike for my little Moshe, and now he rides like lightning!
—What, that fast?
—No, I mean, in zigzags.

A Jewish joke

1. The Vedic -aya-presents: preliminary remarks

1.1 Two types of -aya-presents: causatives vs. non-causatives

The Vedic system of present stems includes two formations with the suffix -aya-. The formal difference between these two morphological types consists in the alternation grade of the root syllable. The first type shows long or full grade: long grade mostly appears in the roots of the structure CaC, while full grade (guna) is selected by the roots of other structure, cf. *pat 'fly': pātāyatī, cīt 'appear': cetāyatī. By contrast, the second type has full (in CaC roots) or zero (in roots of other structures) grade, cf. *pat: patāyatī, cīt: citāyatī. This formal opposition can be reformulated in terms of length of the root syllable:¹ the first type must have a long root syllable (that is, long grade for CaC, CaC-aya-, and full grade for other structures: CaRC-aya-, CeC-aya- < *CaC-āja-, CoC-aya- < *CaC-āja-), the second type must have a short root syllable (CaC-aya-, CRC-aya-, where R stands for the vocalic variant of a sonant).²

Historically, the former type can be uniformly explained as based on the Proto-Indo-European *o-grade of the root, which yields ā in open syllables

¹ Let it be recalled that a syllable is long if it contains a long vowel (ā, e, o, i, u) and/or is closed.
² The formal opposition between these two morphological types can be neutralized in the case of (i) non-alternating (non-ablauting) verbal roots – for instance, those which have zero grade (typically, i or ii) in all formations (cf. vid 'be firm': við-aya 'makes firm') and (ii) some CaC roots (mostly those terminating in a nasal sonant, m or n) which fail to lengthen the root syllable (cf. ja- 'be born, beget': ja-āyatī).
in accordance with Brugmann’s law (see e.g. Volkart 1994 and Lubotsky 1997), i.e. pātāya- < PIE *poi̯-éye-; cetāya- < PIE *kʰoi̯-éye- (see LIV: 382).

The semantic distinction between the full/long grade -āya-formations (= long root syllable -āya-formations, hereafter called ‘type pātāyatī’ for short) as opposed to the zero/full grade -āya-formations (= short root syllable -āya-formations, hereafter called ‘type patāyatī’) is well-known and noticed in all standard Indo-European and Vedic grammars (see, e.g., Beekes 1995: 229; for the most comprehensive treatment of the issue, see Jamison 1983 and Lubotsky 1989): the type pātāyatī mostly includes causatives (e.g. pātāyatī ‘makes fall, makes fly’, cetāyatī ‘makes appear, makes perceive’), while the class of the short root syllable -āya-formations (type patāyatī) mainly consists of non-causative and, most often, intransitive presents.3

The Vedic present suffix -āya- of both formations, together with its equally well-attested Iranian parallel (Avestan -aiia-, Old Persian -āya-), is undoubtedly inherited from Proto-Indo-European. The reflexes of the PIE *-éье/о-presei are found in a number of Indo-European branches (cf. Slavic -i-present, Gothic -j-causative, Greek verbs in -éye, etc.); like the Indo-Iranian -āya-causatives, many of them preserve a causative meaning.

1.2 The non-causative -āya-presei and their semantics

While the semantic opposition between the long vs. short root syllable -āya-presei (type pātāyatī vs. type patāyatī) poses no serious problems, the meaning of the type patāyatī as opposed to other intransitive present formations made from the same root (as, e.g., in the pair patāyatī ~ pātāyi ‘fly’ or citāyatī, -te ~ cètati ‘appear, perceive’) puzzled many Indo-Europeanists. Generally, we find two claims in the literature: (i) (some) Proto-Indo-European *-éье/о-presei could be itératives (intensives), denoting repeated processes/activities;4 and (ii) this iterative meaning, which

---

3 Exceptions to this regularity are not impossible. Thus, of the 21 occurrences of the short root syllable -āya-present citāyatī, 13 occur in intransitive constructions, meaning ‘appear’. and 4 are causatives, meaning ‘make appear’ or ‘make perceive’ (thus being synonymous with the long root syllable -āya-present cetāyatī); see Jamison 1983: 57.

4 This statement essentially goes back to Brugmann’s and Delbrück’s studies, in particular to a short but important article by Delbrück (1894); for the history of the problem, see fn. 10 below. The two competing functions of *-éье/о-presei, i.e. causative and iterative, are now said to be lexically distributed in the proto-language, so that *-éье/о-presei were causatives if derived from the roots of one class and iteratives if derived from the roots of another class; see LIV: 22f. and section 5 below for some suggestions.
could be proper to the sources of the presents of the type patāyati in the proto-language, is only weakly attested or entirely lacking in Vedic (and perhaps already in Proto-Indo-Iranian).

Most scholars unanimously agree on (i), but disagree in their opinions as far as (ii) (the preservation of the alleged iterative semantics) is concerned. The iterative meaning is said to be actually attested (Macdonell), (very) poorly attested (Renou), or not attested at all (Jamison, Roessler):

"Those [-āya]-verbs in which the root, though capable of being strengthened, remains unchanged, have not a causative, but an iterative sense." (Macdonell 1910: 393)

"Une autre catégorie moins cohérente, moins nette, est celle de présents (vaguement itératifs) en -āyati, type patāyati («voler ») de PAT-..." (Renou 1952: 273)

"Well-attested patāyati [...], primarily active, is in competition with synonymous act. them. pātati, also common in the RV." (Jamison 1983: 61)

Gotō (1987: 60) joins the first group of opinions in the introductory part of his monograph on class I presents:

"Zur Gruppe citāya-" , glänzen, leuchten’ RV Kh. [...] gehören: ví...dyutayanta,blitzen’RV; rucayanta RV,rucayant-JS,leuchten’;sucayant-,glühend’ RV; subháyant-, subhaye, -anta ,sich schmücken’ RV [...]. Diese Bildungen sind als Iterative zu beurteilen."

On the same page Gotō qualifies patāyati as an iterative:

"Bei patāya-ii, (patāyanta), fliegen’ RV+ (neben pāṭii-a-ii) und dravayanta, laufen’ RV dient das kurze -a- in der Wz.-Silbe zur Abgrenzung des Iterativs vom Kaus. (pāṭaya-, drāva-)."

However, later, in the lemma pāta-ii, he seems to have changed his mind, noticing that patāya-ii lacks an iterative semantics:

"[D]as -aya-Präss. patāya-ii [...] dürfte eigentlich eine iterative Bildung gewesen sein, obwohl zwischen pāta-ii und patāya-ii im Ved. kaum mehr ein Bedeutungsunterschied bemerkbar ist." (Gotō 1987: 205)

Likewise, Roesler, whose study (1997) on the verbs of light and shining deals, inter alia, with a number of short root syllable -āya-presents, finds no conclusive evidence for the iterative semantics of the type patāyati:
To begin with, it will be necessary to formulate a definition of telicity. An action or process can be qualified as telic if it is directed to a certain goal, suggested by the very nature of this action/process (cf. also the term 'Grenzbezogenheit' introduced by Andersson (1972)). After the achievement of this goal the activity can be considered as realized and thus, normally, stops. By contrast, an atelic action or process does not suggest any inner terminal point built into the situation.

The statement on the lack of any specific semantics of the short root syllable -āya- presents expressed by Jamison and some other scholars appears to be confirmed by the fact that no substantial evidence for the iterative analysis of the type pātāyatī has been provided thus far. By now, this idea seems to have become the communis opinio.

Surprisingly, in the Indo-European scholarship, we can find a perfectly clear description of the semantics of the type pātāyatī. More than 100 years ago, in his seminal Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen, Delbrück (1897: 109ff.) qualified its semantics as "iterativ-ziellose Bedeutung" (emphasis is mine – LK). The second part of this definition adequately captures the functional opposition between this type and competing intransitive presents belonging to the same individual verbal system (IVS). I will return to Delbrück’s analysis at the end of section 2.

Below I will try to substantiate the following claims. At least for some verbs (in particular, for pātī ‘fall, fly’), there is a semantic opposition between formations of the type pātāyatī and other intransitive presents (such as pātāti). However, the meaning of the type pātāyatī cannot be determined as primarily iterative (although in some contexts the iterative meaning may indeed appear). Rather, the opposition between the members of some pairs of the type pātāti ~ pātāyatī can be captured in terms of the telic/atelic distinction; or, at least, this distinction appears to identify the actual semantic content of the pātāti ~ pātāyatī opposition more adequately than other aspeccual meanings (Aktionsarten, or actionalities), such as iterative or intensive.

1.3 The telic/atelic distinction

To begin with, it will be necessary to formulate a definition of telicity. An action or process can be qualified as telic if it is directed to a certain goal, suggested by the very nature of this action/process (cf. also the term 'Grenzbezogenheit' introduced by Andersson (1972)). After the achievement of this goal the activity can be considered as realized and thus, normally, stops. By contrast, an atelic action or process does not suggest any inner terminal point built into the situation.
The telic/atelic opposition (also referred to as ‘bound/unbound’ and as ‘predel’nyj/nepredel’nyj’ in the Russian aspectological tradition) is well-studied in the literature dealing with aspectual distinctions and Aktionsarten (actionalities), particularly in Slavicist aspectological studies (see, for instance, Xolodovič 1963; Maslov 1978 = 2004: 314ff.; Maslov 1984: 11ff. = 2004: 29ff.; Comrie 1976: 44-48; Declerck 1979; Dahl 1981). This semantic distinction is well-attested in Slavic languages, where many verbal roots form telic/atelic pairs. Quite naturally, the telicity opposition can be best observed in the cases where the goal of a process/action amounts to a spatial goal, that is, with verbs of motion.

Thus, in Russian, telic/atelic pairs are attested for a number of verbs of motion, such as bežat’ ‘run’ (telic) - begat’ ‘run’ (typically, in different directions, without any particular or specified goal, chaotically – atelic), idti ‘walk’ (telic) - xodit’ ‘walk’ (atelic) [a suppletive pair], letet’ ‘fly’ (telic) - letat’ ‘fly’ (atelic), plyt’ ‘swim’ (telic) - plavat’ ‘swim’ (atelic), nesti ‘bear, carry’ (telic) - nosit’ ‘bear, carry’ (atelic), vesti ‘lead’ (telic) - vodit’ ‘lead’ (atelic), vezti ‘carry, drive’ (telic) - vozit’ ‘carry, drive’ (atelic), etc.

There are several diagnostic contexts which allow for either only telic or only atelic verbs and thus help to distinguish between these two meanings, cf. (1-5) (see also Declerck 1979: 763ff.).

(1) Dlja togo čtoby podderživat’ formu, Ivan ežednevno begal [xodil, plavat, …] / *bežal [*šišel, *plyl, …] 2 časa.
‘In order to stay fit, John was running [walking, swimming, …] for two hours every day’. (atelic)

In fact, it is quite difficult to find pure diagnostic contexts, i.e. those which only allow for one member of the telic/atelic pair and entirely rule out the other, so that asterisks in (1-5) should probably be bracketed: Ivan ežednevno begal [xodil, plavat, …] / **bežal [*šišel, *plyl, …] 2 časa, etc. In all cases where either telic or atelic reading is clearly preferred, as in (1-5), we can figure out a rather rare but theoretically possible situation which may legalize the opposite reading. Thus, adding domoj ‘home’ to (1) (i.e., Ivan ežednevno [verb of motion] domoj 2 časa ‘John was running, swimming, walking, …] home two hours every day’), we can use telic verbs on condition that we understand the situation as follows: on his way home (oriented, telic motion!), John started to run [walk, etc.] and was running [walking, …] for two hours.

In all such cases, contextual clarifications may help to make one of the two readings very improbable, but we are practically unable to get rid of it entirely. This situation is typical of aspectual contrasts (and well-known to aspectologists). Thus, there are many contexts which favour the perfective (imperfective) aspect but there are very few which entirely rule out the opposite member.
(2) Ne znaja, čem sebja zanjat', Ivan begal [xodil] po komnate [plaval v basejne, ...] / *bežal [*šël] po komnate [*plaval v basejne, ...].
‘Not knowing how to keep himself occupied, John was running [swimming] in the room [swimming in the pool, ...].’ (atelic)

(3) Segodnja Ivan bežal [šël, plavl, ...] / *begal [*xodil, *plavl, ...] domoj odin.
‘Today John was running [walking, swimming, ...] home alone’. (telic)

(4) Na puti domoj Ivan bežal [šël, ...] / *begal [*xodil, ...] čerez les.
‘On his way home John was running [walking, ...] through the forest’. (telic)

(5) Ivan bežal [šël, plavl, ...] / *begal [*xodil, *plavl, ...] (celyx) 2 km.
‘John was running [walking, swimming, ...] (as much as) 2 km’. (telic, said of a motion directed to some goal)

Note that the telic/atelic distinction cannot be identified with and is essentially independent from the aspectual opposition ‘perfective/imperfective’ [‘soveršennýj/nesoveršennýj vid’] – although there are some correlations between telicity and perfectivity. Thus, imperfective verbs can be atelic (bogat’, letat’, etc.) or telic (bežat’, letet’, etc.).

Likewise, atelicity cannot be identified with iterativity/frequentativity, although the atelic, non-oriented character of an activity (motion) obviously favours the development of an iterative semantics, in accordance with scenarios such as the following: ‘move without a certain goal’ → ‘move in different directions’ → ‘move repeatedly, several times’.

2. Vedic oppositions of the type patáyati ~ pátati

2.1 Evidence from the Rgveda and Atharvaveda

The two most ancient Vedic texts, the Rgveda (RV) and Atharvaveda (AV), attest fifteen pairs consisting of an intransitive short root syllable -áya-present of the type patáyati and another intransitive present formation belonging to the same individual verbal system (IVS). The full list of such pairs (given by Jamison (1983: 56ff.)) includes: krpáyati ~ krpate ‘mourn (for), long (for)’, citáyati, -te ~ cetati ‘appear, perceive’, tujáyati ~ tujáti ‘press forward’, taráyati (RV), tvaráyati (AV₁X) ~ tvaránt ‘hasten’, dasayáte (RV₁X) ~ dáysati ‘become exhausted’, vi duýtayáte (RV₁X) ~ duótate ‘shine’, draváyánta (RV₁X) ~ drávati ‘run’, nádáyati, -te ~ nádati (AV+) ‘resound’, patáyati ~ pátati ‘fly’, riśayádhyai (RV₁X) ~ riśyati ‘harm, to be harmed’, rucayáte (RV₁X) ~ rócati ‘shine’, šucáyati ~ šócati ‘gleam’, šubháyati, -te ~
fluttering of any. Accordingly, in what follows, I will limit my search to the evidence available from the RV.

Some of the above-listed -āya-intransitives are hapaxes and/or nonce formations created analogically. Therefore, it makes sense to start with pairs consisting of a formation of the type patāyati and its counterpart, another intransitive present, both of which are well-attested in Vedic and, presumably, inherited from Proto-Indo-European. A textbook example of such pair is patāyati ~ pātati. Let us have a closer look at the usages, contexts, syntactic patterns and semantic features typical of these two formations.

2.2 Types of subjects

First, in order to determine the character of motion expressed by pātati and patāyati, it will be in order to catalog the most typical subjects with which these two presents are attested.

pātati usually appears with the subjects referring to deities, creatures or things moving (flying) purposefully, usually towards a certain goal. This present is particularly common with the subject of Aśvins making their divine journey (RV 1.183.1, 5.78.1-3, 8.10.6, 8.35.7, 8.35.8, 8.35.9) or of their chariot (1.46.3); it also occurs with the subject of Yama (10.14.16), as well as of horses driving Śūrya (5.29.5) or Maruts (8.7.35). Very frequent is pātati with the subject of arrow(s) (dīdū-, didyū-, bānā-) or of other weapons shot at some target, cf. RV 4.16.17 (tīṃnā yād ... aśāniḥ pātāti ‘when the sharp thunderbolt will fly ...’), 6.75.11, 6.75.16, 6.75.17, 7.25.1, 7.85.2, 10.27.22 (where arrows are compared with birds), 10.38.1, 10.134.5, 10.158.2. Other

---

6 Thus, a number of verbs of light and shining have built short root syllable -āya-presents analogically (see Gotō 1987: 60; Roesler 1997: 161, fn. 290); they may be of denominative origin (Lubotsky 1989).

7 Although Aśvins can be compared with birds (as in RV 1.183.1 vir nā ‘like a bird’; 5.78.1-3, 8.35.8 hamsāro iva ‘like two geese’; 8.35.9 śyenāro iva ‘like two hawks’), it is evident that their motion is crucially different from the predominantly non-oriented fluttering of birds.
subjects attested with *páṭati* include, in particular, prayer (3.39.3), falling flows of rain (1.79.2) and race horses (6.4.5).

By contrast, *patáyati* occurs with the subject of fluttering bird(s), cf. RV 1.24.6, 1.155.5, 1.163.6, 5.45.9, 7.104.18 – that is, beings whose motion is regarded as prevailingly non-oriented and chaotic. Also, it appears with the subject of:

- mountains fluttering like birds (RV 4.54.5);
- evil creatures of various kinds (6.71.5 *ābhvam* ‘monster(s)’, 7.104.20 *śvāyātavah* ‘dog-like sorcerers’);
- *Indra* compared to an angry bull dashing around (RV 10.43.8 *vīṣā nā kruddhāh patayad rājussv ā*);
- the semen chaotically moving within the vagina before conceptions takes place (10.162.3);
- senses and wishes going in different directions, cf. RV 6.9.6 *vī me kāṇā patayato vī cākṣuḥ* ‘my hearing [lit. ears] flies in all directions, my seeing’; 3.55.3 *vī me purutrā patayanti kāmāḥ* ‘my wishes fly in many directions’, 10.64.2 *vēnāḥ patāyanyā ā disaḥ* ‘mental powers fly in all directions’;
- stream(s) of liquid in a whirlpool (RV 4.58.7, 9.86.43);
- lightnings (RV 5.83.4).

In all these usages, *patáyati* is likely to refer to essentially non-oriented or chaotic flying, dashing around, meandering and similar types of motion.

This is not to say of course that these types of subjects are impossible or exceptional with the class I present *páṭati*. Thus, *páṭati* does occur with the subject of birds; however, in such cases it normally denotes an oriented non-chaotic motion, crucially different from that expressed by *patáyati*, cf. RV 1.25.7 (*vīnām padām antārikṣena páṭatām* ‘path of birds flying through the atmosphere’), 1.164.47, 10.27.22, 10.165.5.\(^8\)

---

\(^8\) Cf. Rus. *glaza razbegajutsja* (lit.) ‘eyes are running in all directions’ (said of someone who tries to visualize, cover with seeing, too many different objects), with the verbal prefix *raz*-; which is the semantic equivalent of Ved. *vī-*.

\(^9\) One of the few exceptions is RV 10.80.5 *vāyo antārikṣe páttantaḥ* ‘birds flying in the atmosphere/sky’, where one might expect the *āyā*-present (*patáyantah*). *Páṭati* is likely to refer here to a non-specified type of motion; see Section 2.4 below.
2.3. Other syntactic arguments and typical usages/contexts

The relevance of the telic/atelic distinction for the interpretation of the opposition between \textit{pātati} and \textit{patāyatī} is further corroborated by other syntactic features of constructions attested with these presents, such as secondary arguments with which they occur. In this section I will discuss a few such features, illustrating some configurations of flying typically expressed by these verbs.

Most importantly, \textit{pātati} may appear with an accusative, dative or adpositional (postpositional) phrase (PP) referring to the spatial goal of motion or general (abstract) goal to be achieved, as shown in the following figure:

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\draw[->] (0,0) -- (2,0) node[right] {goal};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

Cf.:
\begin{itemize}
\item +Acc: RV 1.33.2 \textit{jūṣṭāṁ ná śyenó vasatim patāmi} ‘I am flying like a falcon to his beloved nest’; 1.164.47 (\textit{dīvam} ‘to the sky’);
\item +Dat: RV 1.25.4 (\textit{vāsyāiṣtaye} ‘in search of the better, of welfare’), 8.35.9 (\textit{havyādātaye} ‘for presenting oblations’);
\item +PP: RV 8.35.7 (\textit{vānēd úpa} ‘to the wooden vessel’).
\end{itemize}

Furthermore, \textit{pātati} occurs constructed with the instrumental denoting the place through which the subject is moving, particularly often with \textit{antārikṣeṇa} ‘through the atmosphere, sky, intermediary space between earth and heaven’ (1.25.7, 8.7.35, 10.136.4), also with \textit{pathībhūḥ} ‘(following) the paths’ (10.87.6). We also find accusatives in this usage, cf. RV 1.168.6 (\textit{vī ... patāthā tveṣāṁ arṇavāṁ} ‘you fly through a mighty stream’), 10.14.16 (\textit{... pātati sāḥ urvih} ‘[Yama] flies through six wide [spaces]’). Such a feature can hardly characterize a non-oriented flying (cf. (4) above). The spatial configuration characterizing this type of motion can be schematically represented as follows:

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\draw (0,0) rectangle (2,2);
\draw[->] (1,1) -- (1.5,1);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}
Furthermore, *pātati* appears with the accusative of covered distance, which, again, suggests the motion directed to a certain goal (cf. (5)), as in RV 2.16.3 *yād ... pātasi yójanaḥ purū ‘when you fly many yojanas’:* 

![Distance Diagram](attachment:image.png)

Finally, unlike *pātāyati*, *pātati* is not infrequent with preverbs which specify the direction of flying or falling: *prā ‘away, forth’* (10.27.22, 10.95.14, 10.97.13, 10.165.5), *nīr ‘away’* (10.24.5), *uṇ ‘up(wards)’* (1.164.47, 2.43.3) and *āva ‘down’* (10.97.17). Cf. also RV 1.29.6, where *pātāti ‘[the wind] will fly’* is constructed with the adverb *dūrām ‘far away’*.

By contrast, *pātāyati* typically refers to a chaotic motion (flying, fluttering, etc.) and accordingly may occur constructed with the locative of the space within which this motion is performed, as in RV 10.43.8 *vīṣā nā kruddhāḥ patayad rājasvo ā ‘like an angry bull, [Indra] is dashing in clouds of dust (aerial spaces?)’*:

![Diagram](attachment:image.png)

We also find usages where *pātāyati* is constructed with adverbials such as *purutrā, (RV 3.55.3: ‘my wishes fly in many directions’) or ā diśāh (RV 10.64.2: ‘[the watching mental powers] fly in all directions’), explicitly referring to the motion (flying) of a plural subject in many (all) directions:
Finally, *patāyati* does not occur with preverbs which denote the direction of motion, such as *prá* or *áva* (common with *páti*), but is well-attested with the preverb expressing the chaotic (multidirectional) motion, *vi* (RV 3.55.3, 6.9.6).

### 2.4 Semantic and syntactic features of *páti* and *patāyati*: a recapitulation

The most important of the above-discussed features are summarized in the table below. For each of them, I indicate the number of occurrences of *páti* and *patāyati*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th><strong>páti</strong></th>
<th><strong>patāyati</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>birds</td>
<td>4× (1.25.7, 1.164.47, 10.27.22, 10.165.5 – all said of oriented flying); 1× (10.80.5 – non-specified?)</td>
<td>6× (1.24.6, 1.155.5, 1.163.6, 5.45.9, 6.46.11, 7.104.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senses, wishes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3× (3.55.3, 6.9.6, 10.64.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evil creatures</td>
<td>1× (10.87.6 – with Ins. of path)</td>
<td>2× (6.71.5, 7.104.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aśvins</td>
<td>6× (1.183.1, 5.78.1-3, 8.10.6, 8.35.7, 8.35.8, 8.35.9)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chariot or horses of some god(s)</td>
<td>3× (1.46.3, 5.29.5, 8.7.35)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrows and other weapons</td>
<td>10× (4.16.17, 6.75.11, 6.75.17, 7.25.1, 7.85.2, 10.27.22, 10.38.1, 10.134.5, 10.158.2)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other syntactic arguments and typical usages/contexts**

+ **Acc./Dat./PP of goal**: 5× (1.33.2, 1.164.47; 1.25.4, 8.35.9; 8.35.7)
+ **Ins. or Acc. of intermediary space**: 6× (1.25.7, 1.168.6, 8.7.35, 10.14.16, 10.87.6, 10.136.4)
‘in all directions’ \(2\times (10.38.1, 10.134.5)\)  \(3\times (3.55.3, 6.9.6, 10.64.2)\)  

| Compounds with preverbs         | \(4\times (10.27.22, 10.95.14, 10.97.13, 10.165.5)\) | \(-\)  
|-------------------------------|----------------|-----|
| \(prá\) ‘away’                 | 2\times (1.164.47, 2.43.3) | \(-\)  
| \(úd\) ‘up(wards)’             | \(-\) | \(2\times (3.55.3, 6.9.6)\)  

The above table clearly shows that the content of the semantic opposition \(páta \sim pätayati\) can most adequately be captured in terms of the telic/atelic distinction.

The difference between these two present formations does not, of course, amount to this single semantic contrast. First of all, in some cases, certain parameters may favour a telic reading, while others support another one, or vice versa. Thus, in RV 10.38.1 \(vīśvak pánti didyāvah\) ‘arrows fly in all directions’ and 10.134.5 \(vīśvak pāntitu didyāvah\) ‘let arrows fly in all directions’, \(pátatí\) occurs with the adverb \(vīśvak\) ‘in all directions’, typical of an atelic motion. In spite of that, the author may have chosen the class I present because of the subject of arrows (\(didyāvah\)), which strongly imposes a telic (goal-oriented) interpretation. By contrast, in RV 6.46.11 \(yād antārikṣe pātayanti parṇino didyāvah\) ‘when feathered arrows fly in the sky ...’, the author may have used the atelic present \(pātayanti\) with the subject of arrows, comparing numerous arrows flying in all directions with chaotically fluttering birds (\(parṇīnīḥ\)).

Furthermore, as mentioned in section 1.3, in some contexts atelic verbal forms could easily develop an iterative semantics, according to the scenario ‘move chaotically’ \(→\) ‘move in different directions’ \(→\) ‘move repeatedly’. Yet the atelic meaning seems to be more basic and underlie the iterative one, rather than vice versa.

Finally, in some usages \(páta\), as the unmarked member of the morphological opposition, could denote types of motion non-specified with regard to the telic/atelic distinction, cf. RV 10.80.5 \(vāyo antārikṣe pātantaḥ\) ‘birds flying in the atmosphere/sky’, discussed above.

No doubt, Delbrück (1897: 109ff.) had this predominantly atelic semantics of \(pātayati\) in mind when characterizing its meaning as “iterativ-ziellose Bedeutung”. He also rightly noticed the unmarked character and non-specific usages of one member of the opposition, \(páta\), as opposed to the marked \(pātayati\):
"Dass bei patāyati der Ausgangs- oder Zielpunkt bezeichnet wäre, habe ich nicht gefunden [...]. Pātati kann so gebraucht werden, dass man eine Verschiedenheit von patāyati nicht bemerkt [...]. In anderen Stellen erscheint deutlich der begrenzte (eineaktige) Gebrauch, z.B. [...] fliege der Pfeil [...]" (Delbrück 1897: 110)

Unfortunately, Delbrück’s observation was disregarded in the later scholarship.¹⁰ Like in many other cases, he considerably anticipated the contemporary Indo-European linguistics – a feature which he has in common with the addressee of this Festschrift.

3. Other pairs of the type patāyati ~ pātati

In this section I will discuss a few other examples of the type patāyati ~ pātati, i.e. of the opposition built by a short root syllable -āya-formation and another intransitive present of the same IVS.

3.1 dravayanta ~ drāvati ‘run’

Noteworthy is the only occurrence of the short root syllable -āya-formation dravayanta:

(6) (RV 10.148.5)
    ūṁr nā nimmāḥ dravayanta vākvaḥ

    ‘The [praises] are running sinuously, like a stream through a valley’.

Jamison (1983: 60) qualifies it as a nonce formation created alongside the ordinary class I present drāvati, but leaves unanswered the question which

¹⁰ It is important to note that Brugmann (1892: 1147f.), as well as Delbrück in an earlier paper of his (1894), offers as many as three terms for identifying the semantic distinction between pātati and patāyati (‘eine Funktion, die man als intensive, Iterative oder frequency bezeichnen mag’). In this list we do not find yet any mention of the atelic (‘ziellose’) meaning. It appears a few years later in Delbrück’s Vergleichende Syntax, replacing the term ‘intensive’. In the 2nd edition of his Grundriss (1916: 247), Brugmann accurately mentioned this important correction by Delbrück: “Die Verba dieser Klasse [= with the suffix *-ējel- – LK] fungieren seit uridg. Zeit als Kausativa [...] oder als Iterativa (genauer ist die Bedeutung als iterativ-ziellos zu bezeichnen), bzw. Intensiva”. Unfortunately, most scholars seem to have merely disregarded this important addendum, only referring to Brugmann’s and Delbrück’s earlier formulations, instead of Delbrück’s more correct definition (1897). The terms ‘iterative’ and ‘intensive’ (“meist iterativ-intensive Bedeutung”) appear, in particular, in Thumb and Hauschild’s authoritative handbook (1959: 338ff.). From Brugmann’s and Thumb and Hauschild’s handbooks, they have found their way into some other studies on the Indo-European and Vedic verb, still further obscuring matters.
specific meaning the author of the hymn may have had in mind when using this particular form. According to Gotō (1987: 178), “dravayanta ist wohl als Iterativ-Stamm zu beurteilen”; however, the context barely supports the iterative interpretation of this passage (‘praises are running repeatedly’?). It seems that the poet rather refers to a typical trajectory of a water stream on a flat surface, a river whimsically meandering through a valley, as shown in the below figure; the same idea is expressed by the adjective vākva- ‘sinuous, crooked’, derived from the root vāṇc ‘move, go crookedly, waveringly’:

3.2 vi ... dyutayanta ~ dyōtānā: ‘shine, flash’

Oppositions of the type patāyati ~ pātati are also attested for a few verbs of light and shining: vi dyutayate ~ dyōtate ‘shine’, rucayate ~ rōcate ‘shine’, sucāyati ~ sōcati ‘gleam’, subhāyati, -te ~ sōbhate, sūmbhate, sūbhāte ‘be beautiful, splendid’. Most often, we do not discover any subsumable semantic distinction between the members of such pairs; as rightly noticed by Roesler (1997: 161, fn. 290), a few such verbs built zero grade -āya-formations analogically. Furthermore, the telic/atelic distinction seems to be much less important for verbs of this semantic domain than for verbs of motion.

Yet, there is at least one pair for which the telic/atelic distinction appears to be as relevant as in the case of patāyati ~ pātati. The RVic hapax -āya-present -dyutayate ‘shine, flash’ (cf. (7)) is opposed to the class I present dyōta-ṣe id., attested from the late RV onwards (one occurrence in book 10, quoted under (8)):

(7) (RV 2.34.2)

vy ābhriyā nā dyutayanta vrṣṭāyah

‘[The lightnings] flash like rainy thunderclouds.’

(8) (RV 10.177.2)

tāṁ dyōtānāṁ svaryāṁ maniśāṁ

‘This sun-like (?) knowledge, which lights up …’
An important difference between these two usages consists, in particular, in the type of subjects of dyut. While vy ... dyutayanta refers to flashings produced by lightnings (note the figura etymologica vidyût- ‘lightning’ / vy ... dyutayanta), dyôtamânā- is likely to characterize the light similar to that produced by the sun. The creation of the nonce form vy ... dyutayanta was certainly supported by the noun vidyût-. In addition, the -āya-present may emphasize both the repeated (iterative) flashing and the non-straightforward, zigzag trajectory of a chained or forked lightning (cf. the joke quoted in the epigraph). Note also that the subject of lightning occurs with yet another short root syllable -āya-present, patáyati (RV 5.83.4), where it is likely to refer to a zigzag motion, too. The constant illuminating light produced by the sun (dyôtamânā) is of a clearly different nature.

4. Other (present) formations with atelic semantics

The relevance of the telic/atelic distinction is not limited to the -āya-presents of the type patáyati. There is another formation which may exhibit the atelic meaning, the reduplicated present (class III in the traditional notation).

A particularly instructive example is provided by the verb bhṛ ‘carry, bring’. The class I present derived from the verb bhṛ exhibits a telic or non-specified meaning (bhārati ‘brings’; cf. Germ. bringen, Rus.нести), being clearly opposed to the reduplicated present bibharti ‘carries’ (cf. Germ. tragen, Rus. nosit’), employed with an atelic (or iterative) meaning. Again, as in the case of the type patáyati, the atelic semantics of some reduplicated presents has been noticed as early as Delbrück’s Vergleichende Syntax (1897:18): "bibharti….. wird von der nicht auf ein Ziel gerichteten Thätigkeit des Tragens gebraucht". 11 Cf. an especially clear instance of the telic/atelic opposition in (9):

---

(9)  (RV 10.30.13)
yāḍ āpa ādṛṣram ... ghṛtām pāyāṃsi bibhratīr mādhūṇi ... īndrāya sōmaṇ sūṣutam bhārantīḥ

‘When the waters, which carry [bibhratīr] ghee, milk, and honey, which bring [bhārantīḥ] the well-pressed soma-sap to Indra, became visible...’

A similar semantic opposition between non-reduplicated and reduplicated presents is instantiated by the verb pād ‘fall, move’. The -ya-present pādyate ‘falls, moves’ (unspecified motion) is opposed to the reduplicated present pībda- ‘trudge, plod’ (atelic; in Strunk/Gotō’s description, ‘stapfen, auf der Stelle treten’), attested in the middle participle pībdamāṇa- (see Strunk 1977: 977-980; Gotō 1987: 280, fn. 650).

Note that, as in the case of the type patāyatī, in some usages the atelic (non-oriented) verbal forms can easily develop the iterative semantics, so that reduplicated presents can also express repeated, iterated activities.

It is interesting to note that, in fact, there is a double functional parallelism between -āya-presents and reduplicated formations. On the one hand, both short root syllable -āya-presents (type patāyatī) and reduplicated presents (class III) can render the atelic (‘ziellose’) meaning. On the other hand, the causative function is shared by the long root syllable -āya-presents (type pāpatatī) and yet another reduplicated formation, the causative aorist of the type āpīpatat. As M. Leumann has demonstrated (1962), the causative reduplicated aorist is likely to originate in the imperfect of the reduplicated present. Note also that a few reduplicated (class III) presents function in Vedic as causatives within the corresponding IVs, cf. ṛcchāti ‘attains, reaches’, ṛcchati ‘moves, sets in motion’ ~ ṛyartī ‘sets in motion’,¹² ṭucchati ‘keeps away’ ~ ṭuyotī ‘makes keep away’ (see e.g. Joachim 1978: 53ff.; 139ff.).

This functional similarity is shown in the scheme below:

---

¹² For the relationships between several presents derived from r (ar) that probably reflect more than one originally different roots (PIE *h₁-er-, *h₂-er- and *h₃-er- (?)), see, in particular, Kümmel 2000; LIV: 238, 269ff., 299ff.
5. Concluding remarks: cognates and sources of the type *patāyati

To conclude the discussion of the semantics of the type *patāyati, it will be in order to briefly touch upon its possible cognates and parallels outside Indo-Iranian. There is probably no need to argue that evidence for the atelic meaning of some *-ējel/o*-presents can be found in other branches of Indo-European. In fact, some reflexes of this Proto-Indo-European type which are traditionally called ‘iteratives’ can be more adequately characterized as atelic formations. This holds, in particular, for a few Greek -ēο verbs, such as ποτέομαι ‘flutter around’, 13 and, especially, some Slavic i-verbs. Note that, as in the case of the Vedic -āya*-presents, this morphological type is ‘shared’ by causatives and iterative/aticelic verbs; cf. Old Church Slavonic causatives -moriti ‘make die’, -ložiti ‘make lie, place’, topiti ‘make sink’, kvasiti ‘make sour’, etc. vs. atelic verbs nositi ‘bear, carry’, voditi ‘lead’, voziti ‘carry, drive’, etc. 14 On the basis of the Slavic evidence, it would be tempting to assume that the distribution of these two *-ējel/o*-types was dependent on the transitivity of the base verb: the same suffix functioned as a transitivizer (causative morpheme) when applying to intransitives and rendered the atelic meaning with transitives. The Vedic evidence partly supports this scheme: in early Vedic, -āya-causatives can only be derived from intransitives; however, in contrast to the situation in Slavic, *patāyati* iteratives mostly derive from intransitives, too. Since we find no reliable evidence for the Proto-Indo-European *-ējel/o*-presents with the *e- or zero grade in the root (which might yield the Vedic type *patāyati/duytāyati*), this morphological subtype may represent an Indo-Aryan innovation. Perhaps Vedic has interpreted the original opposition between causative and atelic *-ējel/o*-presents derived from intransitives and transitives, respectively,

---

13 See Tucker’s (1990: 144ff. et passim) objections against the iterative interpretation of this type in Greek.
14 See e.g. Vaillant 1966: 410ff. and, particularly, the delicate analysis of the Balto-Slavic reflexes of the *-ējel/o*- causatives and iteratives and their interplay with another verbal type, *-ēie*-denominatives, offered by Kortlandt (1989).
as the opposition between causatives and (prevailing intransitive) non-causatives, entirely blocking the -áya-derivation from transitives. Later, the secondary distinction between short and long root syllable -áya-presents could be introduced, in order to distinguish atelic verbs from causatives.
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