



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The Indo-European suffix *-ens- and its Indo-Uralic origin

Lubotsky, A.; Kloekhorst A., Pronk T.

Citation

Lubotsky, A. (2019). The Indo-European suffix *-ens- and its Indo-Uralic origin. In P. T. Kloekhorst A. (Ed.), *Leiden Studies in Indo-European* (pp. 151-162). Leiden / Boston: Brill.
doi:10.1163/9789004409354

Version: Submitted Manuscript (under Review)
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/79598>

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

The Indo-European suffix **-ens-* and its Indo-Uralic origin

Alexander Lubotsky (Leiden University)

1. A nominal suffix **-ens-* does not belong to the standard equipment of the Indo-Europeanist. This suffix is not listed in the major handbooks and is but rarely reconstructed. The only exceptions I am aware of are the word for ‘moon’ **meh₁-ns-* and the word for ‘goose’, which Kortlandt (1978, 1985, 2013) has reconstructed as **ǵ^hh₂-ens-*. I believe, however, that this suffix is found in quite a few Indo-European nominal and verbal formations.¹

2. Nouns.

2.1. PIE **ǵ^hh₂-ens-*

- Gr. *χῆν* m. ‘goose’ (nom.pl. *χῆνες*, Dor., Boeot. *χῆν*);
- Skt. *haṃśá-* m. ‘goose’ (RV+);
- Lat. *ānser* m. ‘goose’ (< **hānser* < **ǵ^hh₂ens-(e)ro-*);
- OIr. *géis* f. ‘swan’;
- PGerm. **gans-* f. ‘goose’: OHG *gans*, ON *gás*, OE *gōs*, etc.;
- Lith. *žqsis* f. ‘goose’ (gen.pl. *žqsū*), Latv. *zūoss* ‘id.’, Opr. *sansy* ‘id.’;
- PSlav. **gops* f. ‘goose’: Ru. *gus*; OCz. *hus*; Slk. *hus*; Pl. *gęś*; Sln. *gōs*.

The word for ‘goose’ is likely to be a derivative of the PIE root **ǵ^heh₂-* ‘to gape’ (Gr. *χάος* n. ‘chaos’ < **ǵ^hh₂-(e)u-*, Gr. *χάσχω* ‘to gape, yawn, open the mouth wide’ < **ǵ^hh₂-n-*, etc.; for the reconstruction of the root I refer to Lubotsky 2011: 107f.). This etymology is very attractive both from the formal and semantic point of view, as the geese are ‘gaping’ birds.

The evidence points to an athematic stem, and we would certainly expect an ablauting paradigm (Kortlandt 1985 and 2013 reconstructed nom.sg. **ǵ^heh₂ns*, [[152]] acc. **ǵ^hh₂ensm*, gen. **ǵ^hh₂nsos*), but the evidence for it is unfortunately rather slim², based only on the necessity to account for the alternation of the initial consonants in Balto-Slavic. Slavic *g-* may be due to depalatalization in the position before a laryngeal³, but then it is not clear why Baltic does not attest this development. This riddle would be solved by reconstructing an alternating paradigm **ǵ^hh₂-ens-* > BSL. **g-* vs. **ǵ^heh₂-ns-* > BSL. **ǵ-*.

¹ I am grateful to Lucien van Beek, Frederik Kortlandt, Michaël Peyrot, Tijmen Pronk, Michiel de Vaan, and Mixail Živlov for comments on an earlier version of this paper.

² Lucien van Beek suggests to me (p.c.) that the reason for the ubiquitous stem **ǵ^hh₂ens-* may be due to the fact that the word for ‘goose’ was very often used in the plural.

³ Depalatalization in the position before a vocalic nasal did not occur in Balto-Slavic (Kortlandt 2013). Depalatalization in Slavic in the position before a laryngeal may be attested in the word for ‘grey’, cf. Cz. *šerý*, Pol. *szary* < PSlav. **šérz* < **xérz* < **kHoiro-* (Derkens 2008: 447), if this is not a loanword from Germanic, as suggested by Kroonen (2013: 201).

An alternative solution would to assume that the Slavic word is a loanword from Germanic, which is a controversial issue. Borrowing has been suggested, albeit hesitatingly, in some recent publications (Gašiorowski 2012: 125, fn. 14, Matasović 2014: 23). On the other hand, Tijmen Pronk has argued (apud Kortlandt 2013: 14) that the Slavic word is unlikely to have been borrowed because it has the same stem formation as in Baltic and because of the parallel between PSlav. **gǫserǝ* m. ‘gander’ (Cz. *houser*; Pol. *gąsior*; Sln. *gosér*; Bulg. *gáser*) and Lat. *ānser* m. ‘goose’.⁴

2.2. PIE **g^{wh}r-ens(o)-* ‘heat’

- Skt. *ghraṃsá-* m. ‘blaze of the sun, summer heat’ (RV, AV, KauśS);
- MW *gwres* m. ‘heat (of the sun, fire), passion, lust’ (< **g^{wh}renso-*); OIr. *grís* ‘heat, fire, embers, hot ashes’ (< **g^{wh}rēnsō-*).

In an Atharvavedic formula, attested at AVŚ 7.18.2 = AVP 20.4.7⁵, *ná ghráṃs tatāpa ná himó jaghāna* ‘not heat burned, not cold smote’ (Whitney), we encounter the root noun *ghráṃs-*, which is explained by Debrunner and Wackernagel as due to a kind of haplology from *ghraṃsás* (AiGr. III: 8of.), but this is improbable: the root noun is likely to be old. OIr. *grís* also indirectly points to an athematic **g^{wh}rēns* with monosyllabic lengthening.

Although it is universally accepted that **g^{wh}renso-* is a derivative of the root **g^{wh}er-* ‘to be hot’ (cf. Gr. θερμαί ‘to become warm’, OCS *grějati* ‘to warm’, OCS *gorěti* ‘to burn’, Mlr. *guirid* ‘to warm’, etc.), its formation is considered unclear. For instance, Mayrhofer writes in EWAia: 519: “Die Bildungsweise ist nicht klar”, with reference to Schindler 1972: 17. [[153]]

2.3. PIE **dh₁-ens-* ‘dense’

- Hitt. *daššu-* ‘strong, powerful; heavy; well-fed; difficult; important’ < **dens-u-* (Kloekhorst 2008: 854);
- Lat. *dēnsus* [o/ā] ‘dense, thick, closely packed’ < **dens-o-* / **d̥ns-o-*;
- Gr. δασύς ‘hairy, thick with leaves; aspirated’, Gr. δαυλός ‘thick, shaggy’ < **d̥nsu-(lo-)*.

The Greek forms have recently been discussed by Lucien van Beek (2013: 25of.), who comes to the conclusion that Gr. δασύς must have got its -s- from the forms with full grade in the root (**densu-*).⁶ This presupposes an alternating paradigm **dens-u-*, *d̥ns-eu-* within Greek. As to the semantics, van Beek assumes that all meanings of Hittite, Latin and Greek adjectives can be explained from the original meaning ‘dense’.

As demonstrated by Kloekhorst 2010, the cuneiform sign DA is used in Old Hittite texts for spelling clusters of a dental stop plus a laryngeal. Kloekhorst did not treat Hitt. *daššu-* in his article because this word does not occur in Old Hittite, but since the Middle Hittite texts show the same

⁴ On the word for ‘gander’ see Gašiorowski 2012: 125, however. It cannot be excluded that the Slavic word was also borrowed from Germanic (cf. MHG *ganzer*).

⁵ For the AVP text, see Kubisch 2012: 39.

⁶ A similar solution is given by Nikolaev (2010: 241).

distribution and since Hitt. *daššu-* is consistently spelled with DA-, with very few exceptions⁷, we are bound to reconstruct the root as **dHens-*. It seems then attractive to derive this adjective from the root **deh-* ‘to bind’ (Gr. δέω, Skt. *-dyati*) and to assume that its original meaning was ‘bound, bundled’ and from there ‘firm, dense, strong’.

We may now consider the relationship of our adjective with the IE verb **dens-*, which is glossed in LIV² as ‘kundig werden, kunstfertig werden’. In the active, this verbal root means ‘to instruct, teach, make capable’, cf. Vedic *daṁsáyās* 2sg.inj.act. (RV), *daṁsayantu* 3pl.impv.act. (AVP), OAv. *didqs* 3sg.inj.act., Gr. διδάσκω, aor. δέδαε, whereas in the middle it means ‘to learn, be instructed’, cf. OAv. *dīdaijhe* 1sg.pres.med., Gr. διδάσχομαι, aor. δαῖναι. These meanings may have easily developed from ‘to make or to become able, strong’, so that the verb is likely to be denominal in origin, derived from the adjective **dh,ens-* ‘firm, dense, strong’.⁸ [[154]]

The nominal character of the root **d(h,)ens-* further follows from the fact that the root is part of the Caland system, forming adjectives in **-mo-* (Skt. *dasmá-* ‘wondrous, masterly’, OAv. *dahma-* ‘wondrous, miraculous’) and **-ro-* (Skt. *dasrá-* ‘accomplishing wonderful deeds’, Av. *dayra-* ‘wise, capable’); the superlative in **-is-tHo-* (Skt. *dám̐siṣṭha-*, YAv. *dahišta-*), an abstract in **-es-* (Skt. *dám̐sas-* n. ‘miraculous ability’, YAv. (*hizuuō*) *dayhah-* n. ‘miraculous power, dexterity (of the tongue)’, Gr. δῆνεα n.pl. ‘counsels, plans’), a compound form in **-i-* (Gr. δαῖφρων ‘artful, experienced’).

2.4. PIE **trh₂-ns*

- PIIr. **trHas*: Skt. *tirás* prep. ‘through, across, beyond, apart from’ (RV+), YAv. *tarō* prep. ‘through, across, except’, OAv. *tarā-maiti-* f. ‘overconfidence, pride’, OP *t[r]* /*tara/* prep. ‘through’ (DZc 12);
- PIt. **trāns*: Lat. *trāns* prep. ‘across, through’, Umb. *trahaf* prep. ‘on the other side of’;
- OIr. *trá* adv., conj. ‘then, therefore; but’, MW *tra* prep. ‘beyond, over, across’.

Although it is universally recognized that these Indo-Iranian and Italo-Celtic prepositions are derived from the root **terh₂-* ‘to go through, cross through’, they are usually interpreted in a different fashion: IIr. **trHas* is assumed to reflect **trh₂-os* (EWAia: 646), in parallel to PIE **prH-os* (Skt. *purás* ‘in front, before’, YAv. *parō* ‘before’, Gr. πᾶρος ‘before, formerly’) whereas PIt. **trāns*, together with OIr. *trá* and MW *tra* (for which see Zair 2012: 179), is usually interpreted as a nom.sg. m. of the PIE participle **trh₂-nt-s* ‘crossing’ (cf. de Vaan 2008: 627 for a discussion and references).

It would, of course, be preferable to find a unified explanation for these prepositions, the more so as the proposed etymological analysis of the Italo-Celtic forms seems rather strained to me. The development from a nom.sg. m. of a participle to a preposition would be fairly unusual, and, secondly, the formation (with its double zero grade) and the meaning (for which see below) is not what we would expect from an aorist (?) participle.

⁷ Only the names of diseases *taššijatar* n. (nom.-acc.sg. *ta-aš-ši-ja-tar*), *taššijayar* n. (nom.-acc.sg. *ta-aš-ši-ja-u-ya-ar*) and *taššijama-* c. (acc.sg. *ta-aš-ši-ja-ma-an*), which have often been etymologically connected with *daššu-* (see Kloekhorst 2008: s.v. *daššu-*), are spelled with TA-, but this etymology is most probably wrong.

⁸ Van Beek (2013: 250f.) considers the semantic development from ‘dense’ to ‘experienced’ and gives as a parallel Gr. πυκνός, πυκινός ‘hairy, dense’ and πυκιμήδης ‘shrewd’, lit. “with dense plans”, πυκινόφρων ‘id.’, lit. “with dense mind”. To this it can be added that in Indo-Iranian, the notion of ‘experienced, dexterous’ has further developed into ‘supernaturally dexterous’.

On the other hand, the reconstruction **trh₂ns* accounts for all the forms. The difference in vocalization is the same as in the word for ‘wind’, PIE **h₂ueh₁nto-*, where PIIr. has vocalised the *n* before the loss of the laryngeal (PIIr. **HuaHata-* > Skt. *vā́ta-*, OAv. *vāta-* /*vaʔata-*/), whereas the order of developments was the opposite in other languages (Lat. *uentus* m. ‘wind’; Goth. *winds* ‘wind’; Toch. A *want* ‘wind’; Toch. B *yente* ‘wind’). The same vocalization pattern is found with the word for ‘moon’, for which see below.

The double zero grade of **trh₂ns* is probably due to its use as a preposition. It is conceivable that OIr. *tar* prep. ‘over, across’ has preserved the form with the [[155]] expected full grade of the suffix, **trh₂-ens*, although functionally, OIr. *tar* rather matches MW *tra*.

The unextended IE verb **terh₂-* is only preserved in Indo-Iranian (for the apparent Hittite forms see Kloekhorst 2008: 835ff.), and it is basically transitive there, meaning ‘to cross smth.’. Also the IE *-u*-present **terh₂-u-* ‘to prevail, overcome’ is transitive. Since the Indo-Iranian and Italo-Celtic prepositions refer to the completed crossing, ‘beyond, across’, we can assume that the original meaning of **trh₂ns* was ‘crossed over, gone through’.

2.5. PIE **meh₁-ns* ‘moon, month’

- Gr. (Att.) μήν m., gen.sg. μηνός ‘month, moon’, (Ion.) μείς, (Lesb.) gen.sg. μῆννος;
- Lat. *mēnsis* m. ‘month’;
- OIr. *mí* m.f. ‘month’, MW *mis* m. ‘id.’ < PCelt. **mī(n)s-*;
- PIIr. **maHas-*: Skt. *mās-* m. ‘moon, month’ (RV+), *māsa-* m. ‘month’ (RV+), *°mās_(i)ya-* ‘...months old, ...monthly’ (AV+) || PIr. **maHah-*: OAv. nom.sg. *mā* /*maHah*/, YAv. gen.sg. *mājho* m. ‘moon’, *mājha-* m. ‘moon, month’; *°māhiia-* ‘...monthly’, OP *māh-* ‘month’; Sogd. *m’γ* ‘moon, month’; Oss. *mæj/mæjæ* ‘moon, month’ (< **māhiā*);
- PAlb. **mēn-*: Alb. *muaj* / *mu(e)j* m. ‘month’;
- Arm. *amis*, gen.sg. *ams-o-y* ‘month’ (the initial *a-* is due to the influence of *am* ‘year’);
- OCS *měsęcъ* m. ‘moon, month’;
- Toch. A *mañ* ‘moon, month’; Toch. B *meñe* ‘moon, month’;
- Lith. *mėnuo* (acc.sg. *mėnesį*) ‘moon, month’; Latv. *mēness* ‘moon’, *mēnesis* ‘month’; OPr. *menig* (EV) ‘moon’;
- PGerm. **mēnan-*: Goth. *mena* m. ‘moon’, ON *máni* m. ‘id.’, OE *mōna* m. ‘id.’, etc.;
- PGerm. **mēnōp-*: Go. *menops* m. ‘month’, ON *mánaðr* m. ‘id.’, OE *mōnað* m. ‘id.’, etc.

In the recent literature, the connection of **meh₁-ns* with the root **meh₁-* ‘to measure’ – under the assumption that its original meaning was ‘measure (of time)’ – is not questioned, but the original inflection is debated. PIE **meh₁-ns* is different from the other formations in *-ns-* in that the root has full grade and the suffix zero grade and that the full grade of the suffix in some languages seems to appear as *-nes-*, rather than **-ens-*.

Most languages point to **meh₁-ns* without any ablaut alternations. This is clearly the case for Greek, Latin, Celtic, Indo-Iranian (with early vocalization of *n*, cf. on **trh₂ns* above), Albanian and Armenian. Slavic can also go back to [[156]] this stem where *-n-* was dissimilatorily lost because of an

n in the suffix. Tocharian may have lost the final **-s* in the nom. **meh₁ns* >⁹ PToch. **men*, which then joined the *n*-stems.

In order to account for the Germanic and Baltic forms, we can reconstruct a PIE suppletive paradigm nom.sg. **meh₁nōt*, acc.sg. **meh₁nes-m*, gen.sg. **meh₁ns-es* (cf. Beekes 1982)¹⁰, but even this highly irregular paradigm would require a lot of restructuring before we get the Germanic and Balto-Slavic facts right. Therefore, it seems worthwhile to investigate whether a single stem **meh₁ns-* can account for the Germanic and Balto-Slavic forms, too.

Traditionally (cf. already Brugmann 1911: 126, fn. 1, 128), the Germanic forms are explained out of a single *t*-stem paradigm -- nom.sg. **mēnō*, gen.sg. **mēnōdiz* -- with subsequent split into two paradigms and concomitant semantic specialization: on the basis of the nominative, an *n*-stem with the meaning ‘moon’ was created¹¹, whereas the oblique cases in *-ōd-* got a new nominative and the meaning ‘month’. Brugmann (op.cit.: 128) further draws attention to OE *mónapfyllen* ‘time of full moon’ in order to show that the original *t*-stem had both meanings.

This is an elegant and economical explanation, but there are still two questions to be answered: (1) what happened with the final *-s* of **meh₁ns-*, and (2) what is the origin of the Germanic suffix **-ōd-*. We can envisage the following scenario. At an early stage of Germanic, before the operation of Osthoff’s Law, nom.sg. **meh₁ns* could have been reanalyzed as the stem **meh₁n-* + the ending *-s*. The new stem **meh₁n-* was enlarged with the suffix **-ot-*, which is also found in PGerm. **leuh-ad-a* n. ‘light’ (cf. Hitt. *lukkatt-* c. ‘dawn, next morning’, also Hitt. *šūatt-* c. ‘day’) and may have spread from there to the word for ‘moon, month’. The nominative was **-ōt* with a long vowel¹² that then spread through the whole paradigm.

We may suggest a somewhat similar scenario for Balto-Slavic. The gen.sg. **meh₁ns-es* was interpreted as the genitive of a hysterodynamic *s*-stem, in spite of the fact that there are hardly any traces of this inflection left in Balto-Slavic languages. It seems conceivable that the word for ‘dawn’, which was a prominent hysterodynamic *s*-stem in PIE (nom.sg. **h₂éus-ōs*, acc.sg. **h₂eus-ós-m*, gen.sg. **h₂us-s-és*), has influenced the Baltic word for ‘moon, month’. [[157]]

3. Verbs.

As we have seen above with PIE **dh₁-ens-* ‘dense’, it can sometimes happen that a derivative in **-ens-* becomes a verbal root. In the following we shall look at a few IE verbal roots in *-ens-* from this perspective: can they possibly have the same origin?

3.1. PIE **d^huens-* ‘to scatter, sprinkle’

- PIIr. **d^huans-*: Skt. *dhvaṃs-* ‘to pulverize, crumble’ (RV); Pres. I *dhváṃsate* (AVP+), Pres. X *dhvasayaḥ* (RV); a-aor. *-dhvasán* (RV VIII¹), pf. *-dadhvase* (RV), *dhvastá-* (AVP+); *ava-dhvaṃsá-* m. ‘sprinkling’ (AV); *dhvasáni-* adj. ‘sprinkling (cloud)’ (RV); *dhvasirá-* ‘covered with dust’ (RV); *dhvasrá-* ‘obscured’ (RV+); *dhvasmán-* m. ‘polluting’ (RV)
- ?ToB *tānts-* ‘to scatter, disperse, tear off’ < **d^huns-* (Adams 2013: 307f.); [[158]]

⁹ Either phonetically, or analogically (see about Germanic below).

¹⁰ Cf. already Pokorny 1959: 731: “*mēnōt*, Gen. *mēneses*, woraus *mēnes-*, *mēns-*, *mēs-*, *mēn-*”.

¹¹ A similar case would be the PGerm. *n*-stem **nefan-* ‘nephew’ on the basis of the nom.sg. **nefō* < PIE **nepōt*.

¹² Type **nepōt* with secondary lengthening after the model of the stems in a resonant.

- PGerm. **dunsta-* (OE *dūst* n. ‘powder, dust’, MDu. *donst, dunst* ‘fluff, pollen’, etc.)

As duly recognized by Mayrhofer (EWAia: 800), **d^huens-* must be related to the PIE root for ‘to shake’, **d^heuH-* (Skt. *dhūnoti* ‘to shake, move to and fro quickly’ (RV+), YAv. *auui frā-δauuaite* ‘to rub’, Gr. *θύω* ‘to dash, rush’, OIc. *dýja* ‘to tremble’, etc.). Mayrhofer (loc.cit.) analyzes **d^huens-* as **d^hu-en-s-*, presumably assuming two suffixes or enlargements, which does not help in elucidating its formation, however.

In my view, we must seriously consider the possibility that the root contains the suffix **-ens-*, i.e. **d^huH-ens-*. In Sanskrit, the laryngeal would probably disappear quite early in this position or, at least, not be recoverable.¹³ In Germanic we cannot see the difference, and in Tocharian, the laryngeal would probably be lost in full grade **d^huHens-* and then eliminated in zero-grade.

The root **d^huens-* does not look like an archaic verbal root, all finite forms being relatively productive¹⁴, so that it can easily be of denominal origin. [[158]] Semantically, this also makes sense: a derivative of the root **d^heuH-* ‘to shake, rub’ with the suffix **-ens-* would mean ‘shaken, rubbed off = dust, powder’, and the denominal verb would mean ‘to dust, to powder’.

3.2. PIE **kēns-* ‘to declare’

- Skt. *śams-* ‘to praise, recite, declare’ (forms in the RV are: Pres. I *śamsāmi*, is-aorist *ásamsīt*, mediopass. aor.: *śamsi*, pass. *śasyáte*, caus. *śamsaya*, ta-ptc.: *śastá-*, inf. *anu-śáse*, *vi-śáse*); *śastí-* f. ‘song of praise’; *prá-śasti-* f. ‘praise, fame; instruction, guidance’; *uktha-śamsín-* ‘praising’, *śamstar-* m. ‘reciter’; *śamsya-* ger. ‘to be recited’, *śastí-* f. ‘song of praise’, *śásman-* n. ‘praise’; *śamsa-* m. ‘praise, judgment’.
- PIr. **sanh-*: Av. *saṃh-* ‘to declare’: pres. YAv. *saṃhāmi*, OAv. *sāṃghaitī*, aor.opt. OAv. *saxiiāt*, inf. *sastē*, *sazdiiāi*, ta-ptc. YAv. *aiβi.sasta-*; OAv. *sqstra-* n. ‘teaching’, *sāṃghana-* n. ‘teaching, doctrine’, *sāṃghu-* m. ‘preaching, doctrine’, Av. *fra-sasti-* f. ‘fame, reputation, prestige’; YAv. *sasti-* f. ‘praise’; OAv. *sāṃgha-* m. ‘declaration, judgment’ || OP *ṣanh-* ‘to declare, announce, call’: pres. *aṣaⁿha*, pass. *ṣa⁽ⁿ⁾haya^{mahaiy}*, inf. *ṣa⁽ⁿ⁾stana^{iy}*.
- Lat. *cēnsēō* ‘to estimate, think; decide’.

The IE root **kēns-* ‘to declare’ can hardly be separated from two other, semantically very close, roots, viz. **kéH-* and **kéHs-*. The former root, which must be the underived basis of the latter, is attested in Old Persian *ṣā-* ‘to proclaim’ (3sg.pres. *ṣātiy*, 2sg.subj. *ṣāhaya*, 2sg. impv. *ṣādiy*) and Alb. *thom* ‘to say’. If Gr. *ἄκῆν* ‘silently’ belongs here¹⁵, the color of the laryngeal must be **h₁*. The root **kéHs-* is found in Skt. *śās-* ‘to teach, chasten, command, order’, Av. *sāh-* ‘to teach, instruct, command’; ToA

¹³ Cf. Lubotsky 1997: 149ff. A possible trace of the laryngeal may be seen in the *jagatī* line RV 10.113.7c, if we scan 3sg. middle pf. *dadhvase* as *[dadh^hvase]*: *dhvāntām tāmó¹ ṛ^{va} dadh^hvase haté-*. This scansion, however, creates a short 8th syllable, which is irregular. Most probably, we simply have an 11-syllable *jagatī* line here, cf. Oldenberg, Noten II: 335.

¹⁴ Denominal verbs that are plain thematic, without a specific denominal suffix, are admittedly rare, but not unknown: for instance, Skt. *dyótate* ‘to shine’ (RV+) is clearly derived from a nominal *t*-stem (Hitt. *šīuatt-* c. ‘day’, Skt. *dyút-* f. ‘shine’, *vi-dyút-* f. ‘lightning’). Note that this verb even attests root aorist: 2.3sg. *ádyaut*, ptc. *dyutant-* (in *dyutád-yāman-* ‘with shining driving’ (RV), *dyutá(d)dyu-* ‘with shining days’ (MS)), ptc.med. *dyútāna-*, *dyutāná-* (RV+).

¹⁵ Gr. (Pi.) *ἄκῆ*, *ἄκῆ* ‘id.’ can be hyperdorisms, cf. García-Ramón 1993: 127.

kāṣ-iññ- ‘to scold, chasten’ (< **kHs-*), Goth. *hazjan* ‘to praise’ (< **kHs-ie-*), OHG *harēn* ‘to cry, call’ (< **kHs-eh-*).

Assuming the suffix **-ens-* allows us to analyze **kens-* as **kh_i-ens-* and directly relate it to the other two roots. The noun **kh_i-ens-* may have had the meaning ‘smth. said, pronounced → statement, pronouncement’, and the verb derived from it ‘to give a statement’, which is quite appropriate for the Latin and Indo-Iranian verbs. This noun **kh_i-ens-* may live forth in PIIr. **ćansa-*, attested in Skt. *śáṃsa-* m ‘praise, opinion, judgment’ (RV+); OAv. *sāṅgha-* m. ‘pronouncement, judgment’, YAv. *saṅha-* m. ‘prescription’; and, possibly, Khot. *saṃja-* ‘document’ (if from **sanha-čt-*, cf. Bailey 1979: 417). Of course, formations in *-a-* have always been productive in Indo-Iranian, so that it is difficult to prove that **ćansa-* is very old, but the precise correspondences in semantics and formulaic [[159]] diction between Indo-Aryan and Iranian point to the archaic nature of this word. Suffice it to mention the compounds and formulas given by Mayrhofer (EWAia: s.v.): Skt. *duḥ-śáṃsa-* ‘wishing evil, malicious’ (RV+) ~ YAv. *duš.saṅha-* ‘slandering’; Skt. *várdhān naḥ śáṃsam* ‘he will strengthen our praise’ (RV 5.41.9) ~ OAv. *vərəzdāiš sēṅghāiš* ‘with strong teachings’ (Y 46.19); Skt. *uru-śáṃsa-* ‘of far-reaching authority’ (RV) ~ OP **varu-ṣanha-* (Hdt. ὀροσάγγαι ‘benefactors of the king’); Skt. *nārā-śáṃsa-* m. epithet of fire (“who receives men’s praise”), *nārā ... śáṃsam* (in tmesis); *naráṃ ná śáṃsaḥ, śáṃso naráṃ* (RV+) ~ YAv. *nairiū.saṅha-* m. N. of a god, of the divine messenger, N. of the fire as a god, also gen.sg. *nairiēhe ... saṅhahe*, acc.sg. *nairīm ... saṅhəm*.

3.3. PIIr. **srans-*

- Skt. *sraṃs-* ‘to fall down, slip off’ (in the RV only a-aor. *srasema* and root-nouns *ava-srás-* f. ‘slipping down’, *vi-srás-* f. ‘decay, dissolving’; in the AV followed by pres. I middle 3sg.impv. *sraṃsatām* (AVP), caus. *sraṃsayāmi*, redupl. aor. *asísrasat*, ta-ptc. *-srasta-*, and nouns *sanisrásá-* ‘defective, crippled, weak’; *asthisraṃsá-* ‘causing the bones to fall asunder’);
- ?PIr. **(h)rah-*: OAv. 3pl.caus.act. *rāṅghaiēn* ‘to deflect’ (Y 32.12); YAv. *raṅgha-* ‘suffering of epilepsy (?)’ (Yt 5.93); (*haca*) *ṅraṅhibiia* du. ‘corners of the mouth (?)’ (P 27 (28)).

The Iranian cognates are unfortunately very uncertain. Mayrhofer (EWAia: s.v.) and Cheung (2007: s.v. **(h)rah*) hesitatingly connect Av. *rah-* ‘to alienate, deflect’, but this root has no nasal and an initial laryngeal (see Beekes 1979). From the point of view of semantics, PIIr. **srans-* clearly belongs together with Skt. *sridh-* ‘to fail, err’ (RV) < PIE **sleid^h-* (OE *slīdan* ‘to slide, slip’, Lith. *slýsti* ‘to slip, slide, glide’, etc.) and Skt. *srīv-* ‘to be aborted, miscarried’ (RV+). As I argued elsewhere (Lubotsky 2011: 119f.), these roots are enlargements of PIE **sel-* ‘to jump’, and **srans-* can also be seen as an enlargement of the same root with the suffix *-ens-*.

4. Conclusions.

Let us now summarize our findings. The IE nominal suffix **-ens-* is found in **ǵ^hh₂-ens-* ‘goose’, **ǵ^{wh}r-ens-* ‘heat’, **dh_i-ens-* ‘dense, strong’, **trh₂-(e)ns* ‘across’, **meh_i-ns-* ‘moon, month’. Furthermore, the same suffix can be recognized in the verbal roots **dh_i-ens-* ‘to teach, make capable’, **d^hu(H)-ens-* ‘to pulverize’, **kh_i-ens-* ‘to recite, declare’, and IIr. **sr-ans-* ‘to fall down, slip off’, all of which are then likely to be of denominal origin. [[160]]

What was the meaning of the suffix? As far as we can see, the suffix had an adjectival function, except for **ǵ^{wh}r-ens-* ‘heat’, which may have then developed out of ‘hot (sun)’. In **ǵ^hh₂-ens-* ‘goose’ (=

‘gaping’), the adjective is agentive, whereas it is patientive in **dh₁-ens-* ‘dense, strong’ (= ‘bound’), **trh₂-(e)ns* ‘across’ (= ‘crossed over’) and **meh₁-ns-* ‘moon, month’ (= ‘measure, measured time’). For the denominal verbs it is, of course, much more difficult to decide what was the meaning of the basic noun, but, as we have seen above, **d^hu(H)-ens-* ‘to pulverize’ is likely to be based on ‘powder’ = ‘rubbed off’, and **kh₁-ens-* is based on ‘statement’ = ‘pronounced’. It seems then that the meaning depends on the transitivity of the verb: if the verb is transitive, the *-ens*-derivative is patientive; otherwise, it is agentive. This distribution is also found with the Hittite participles in *-ant-* and is usually assumed to be original for the IE **-nt*-participles.

These considerations make it probable that the two suffixes, **-ens-* and **-ent-*, once belonged to one and the same paradigm, with an alternation *s/t* that we also find in the suffix of the IE perfect participle **-uos/-uot-*. As was argued by Kortlandt (2002 = 2010: 397, who developed the earlier suggestion of Bojan Čop), Indo-Uralic **ti* has become assibilated to **si*. This would mean that the suffix **-ens* started as **-ensi* < **-ent-i* and reflects the original locative of the Indo-Uralic participle.

The IE suffix **-ens/-ent-* might be identified with the Uralic nominal suffix **nt* (Collinder 1960: 269), cf. the Proto-Samoyed present participles in **ntV* (Mikola 1988: 259), the Saami absolute gerund, etc. This Uralic participle suffix may or may not be identical to the suffix **nt* for deverbative verbs, which “usually implies a continuative mood of action or a non-perfective aspect” (Collinder 1960: 277).

References

- Adams, D. 2013: *A dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and greatly enlarged edition*. Amsterdam - Atlanta.
- AiGr. III: A. Debrunner - J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik III. Deklination der Nomina, Zahlwörter und Pronomina*, Göttingen 1930.
- Bailey, H.W. 1979: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge.
- Beekes, R.S.P. 1979: GAv. *uzirāidyāi* and *rārāša-*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 38: 9-20.
- Beekes, R.S.P. 1982: GAv. *mā*, the PIE word for ‘moon, month’, and the perfect participle, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 10: 53-64.
- Brugmann, K. 1911: *Vergleichende Laut-, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre der indogermanischen Sprachen. 2. Band, 2. Teil: Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch*. Strassburg. [[161]]
- Cheung, J. 2007: *Etymological dictionary of the Iranian verb*. Leiden - Boston.
- Derksen, R.H. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*. Leiden - Boston.
- Collinder, Bj. 1960: *Comparative grammar of the Uralic languages*. Stockholm.
- Garcia-Ramon, J.L. 1993: Lat. *cēnsēre*, got. *hazjan* und das idg. Präsens **kéns-e-ti* (und **kns-éje-ti* ?) “verkündigt, schätzt”, Stativ **kns-eh₁-* “verkündigt, geschätzt sein / werden”, *Indogermanica et Italica (Fs Rix)*, G. Meiser et alii (eds.). Innsbruck, 106-30.
- Gąsiorowski, P. 2010: The Germanic reflexes of PIE **-sr-* in the context of Verner’s Law. *The sound of Indo-European. Phonetics, phonemics, and morphophonemics*, Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead et al. (eds.), Copenhagen, 117-128.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2008: *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*. Leiden - Boston.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2010: Initial stops in Hittite (with an excursus on the spelling of stops in Alalah Akkadian), *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 100: 197-241.

- Kortlandt, F. 1978: I.-E. palatovelars before resonants in Balto-Slavic, *Recent developments in historical phonology*, Jacek Fisiak (ed.). The Hague, 237–243.
- Kortlandt, F. 1985: Long vowels in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 21(2), 112–124.
- Kortlandt, F. 2002: The Indo-Uralic verb. *Finno-Ugrians and Indo-Europeans: Linguistic and Literary Contacts*, R. Blokland and C. Hasselblatt (eds.). Maastricht, 217–227.
- Kortlandt, F. 2010: *Studies in Germanic, Indo-European and Indo-Uralic*. Amsterdam.
- Kortlandt, F. 2013: Palatovelars before syllabic resonants: another look. *Baltistica* 48(1), 13–17.
- Kroonen, G. 2013: *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden.
- Kubisch, Ph. 2012: *Paippalāda-Saṃhitā, Kāṇḍa 20, Sūkta 1–30. Kritische Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. PhD dissertation Bonn.
- Lubotsky, A. 1997: The Indo-Iranian reflexes of PIE *CRHUV. *Sound Law and Analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, A. Lubotsky (ed.). Amsterdam - Atlanta, 139–154.
- Lubotsky, A. 2011: The origin of Sanskrit roots of the type *sīv-* ‘to sew’, *dīv-* ‘to play dice’, with an appendix on Vedic *i*-perfects. *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Indo-European Conference*, St. W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, Brent Vine (eds.), Bremen, 105–126.
- Matasović, R. 2014: *Slavic nominal word-formation. Proto-Indo-European origins and historical development*. Heidelberg. [[162]]
- Mayrhofer, M. EWAia: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg 1986–1996.
- Mikola, T. 1988: Geschichte der samojedischen Sprachen, *The Uralic languages*, D. Sinor (ed.), Leiden, etc., 219–263.
- Nikolaev, A. 2010: *Issledovanija po praindoevropejskoj imennoj morfologii*. St. Petersburg.
- Oldenberg, H., *Noten: R̥gveda: Textkritische und exegetische Noten*. 2 vols. Berlin 1909–1912.
- Pokorny, J. 1959: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern - München.
- Schindler, J. 1972: *Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen*, PhD dissertation Würzburg.
- Zair, N. 2012: *The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Celtic*, Leiden - Boston.