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1 Introduction

Prosody of PIE non-primary derivatives

- What were the prosodic properties of synchronically derived non-primary formations in Proto-Indo-European (PIE)?

  - With these terms understood in the following sense:
    - Prosodic properties $\approx$ ablaut, stress
    - Non-primary $\approx$ denominal, deverbal derivatives (traditionally “secondary,” “tertiary,” etc.)
    - PIE $\approx$ snapshot of the moment before Anatolian split from rest of IE.
1 Introduction

Ablaut in PIE non-primary derivatives

- Given a primary base with non-zero-grade root and non-zero-grade suffix (e.g., neuter *–es-, *–men-stems).
- Suppose a PIE speaker wanted to add a stress-attracting suffix (e.g., possessive ADJ */–é/ó–/, denominative v-forming */–yé/ó–/).

What happened to the vowels in the base?

Austen Yates, ’24

This is Achilles.

Achilles won imperishable *k̑léw-os.

Now Achilles is *k̑léw-øs–e–/é/ó–/.
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Ablaut in PIE non-primary derivatives

- Given a primary base with non-zero-grade root and non-zero-grade suffix (e.g., neuter *–es-, *–men-stems).
- Suppose a PIE speaker wanted to add a stress-attracting suffix (e.g., possessive ADJ */–é/ó–/, denominative v-forming */–yé/ó–/).

○ What happened to the vowels in the base?

→ More concretely — what would occur in this context?

This is Achilles.
Achilles won imperishable *kléw-os.
Now Achilles is ___________.

( ← *kléw-ôes– + –ô–)
1 Introduction

Vowel deletion in IE non-primary derivatives

(1) Vowel deletion patterns in Indo-European (schematic):

b. *klēw-əs– ‘fame’ ⇒ *kleu-s-ó– ‘famous’
c. *klēw-əs– ‘fame’ ⇒ *klu-s-ó– ‘famous’

• Attested IE languages support as many as three possible answers:¹

a. NON-DELETION: no base vowels are deleted.

b. BOUNDED DELETION: only the vowel in the stem-final suffix of base is deleted.

c. ITERATIVE DELETION: suffixal vowel(s) in the base and root vowel are deleted.

Vowel deletion in IE non-primary derivatives

(2) Vowel deletion patterns in Indo-European (attested):

a. *témh₁x-₀es-– ‘darkness’ ⇒ *temh₁-es-ó– ‘dark’

b. *wét-₀es– ‘year’ ⇒ *wet-s-ó– ‘having a year’

c. *kéu₁h₁x-₀es– ‘swelling’ ⇒ *k₁uh₁-s-ó– ‘swollen’

• Attested IE languages support as many as three possible answers:¹
  a. **NON-DELETION**: no base vowels are deleted.
  b. **BOUNDED DELETION**: only the vowel in the stem-final suffix of base is deleted.
  c. **ITERATIVE DELETION**: suffixal vowel(s) in the base and root vowel are deleted.

1 Introduction

Vowel deletion in IE non-primary derivatives

(2) Vowel deletion patterns in Indo-European (attested):

a. *témhₓ-o*/es– ‘darkness’ \(\Rightarrow\) *temhₓ-es-ó– ‘dark’ ²
   > Ved. támas– ‘id.’
   > OAv. təmah– ‘id.’

b. *wét-o*/es– ‘year’ \(\Rightarrow\) *wet-s-ó– ‘having a year’

c. *k̑éuhₓ-o*/es– ‘swelling’ \(\Rightarrow\) *k̑uhₓ-s-ó– ‘swollen’

• Attested IE languages support as many as three possible answers:
  a. **NON-DELETION**: no base vowels are deleted.
  b. **BOUNDED DELETION**: only the vowel in the stem-final suffix of base is deleted.
  c. **ITERATIVE DELETION**: suffixal vowel(s) in the base and root vowel are deleted.

² cf. Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 136
1 Introduction

Vowel deletion in IE non-primary derivatives

(2) Vowel deletion patterns in Indo-European (attested):


b. *wét-øs– ‘year’ ⇒ *wet-s-ó– ‘having a year’
   > Gk. ἔτος ‘id.’
   (Myc. we-to)

   Ved. vatsá– ‘calf’

c. *k̑éuhₓ-øs– ‘swelling’ ⇒ *k̑uhₓ-s-ó– ‘swollen’

• Attested IE languages support as many as three possible answers:

  a. NON-DELETION: no base vowels are deleted.

  b. BOUNDED DELETION: only the vowel in the stem-final suffix of base is deleted.

  c. ITERATIVE DELETION: suffixal vowel(s) in the base and root vowel are deleted.

---

1 Introduction

Vowel deletion in IE non-primary derivatives

(2) Vowel deletion patterns in Indo-European (attested):


b. *wét-∅es– ‘year’ \( \Rightarrow \) *wet-s-∅– ‘having a year’

c. *k̑éuhₓ-∅es– ‘swelling’ \( \Rightarrow \) *k̑uhₓ-s-∅– ‘swollen’

> Ved. śávas– ‘power’
> OAv. sauuah– ‘benefit’

Attested IE languages support as many as three possible answers:

a. **NON-DELETION:** no base vowels are deleted.

b. **BOUNDED DELETION:** only the vowel in the stem-final suffix of base is deleted.

c. **ITERATIVE DELETION:** suffixal vowel(s) in the base and root vowel are deleted.

---

1 Introduction

Vowel deletion in IE non-primary derivatives

(2) Vowel deletion patterns in Indo-European (attested):


b. *wét-o/s– ‘year’ ⇒ *wet-s-ó– ‘having a year’

c. *k̑éuhₓ-o/s– ‘swelling’ ⇒ *k̑uhₓ-s-ó– ‘swollen’  
   > Ved. šávas– ‘power’          Ved. śūṣá– ‘powerful’
   > OAv. sauuah– ‘benefit’

• Narrow question for today:
  ○ Was Ved. śūṣá– derived as in (2c) via ITERATIVE DELETION?

---

1 Introduction

Vowel deletion in PIE non-primary derivatives

(3) Vowel deletion in PIE non-primary derivatives:
      > Gk. κύος ‘fetus’  Ved. śūṣá– ‘powerful’
   b. *k léw-о ś– ‘fame’ ⇒ *klu-s-ó– ‘famous’
      > Gk. κλέος ‘id.’  Ved. śrávas– ‘id.’  OIr. clú ‘id.’

• A (i) specific claim:

  i. Ved. śūṣá– was historically derived as in (3a) via BOUNDED DELETION from a
1 Introduction

Vowel deletion in PIE non-primary derivatives

(3) Vowel deletion in PIE non-primary derivatives:

a. *k̑uhₓ-øjes– ‘swelling’ \( \Rightarrow \) *kuhₓ-s-ó– ‘swollen’
   > Gk. κύος ‘fetus’
   > Ved. śūṣā– ‘powerful’

b. *k̑léw-øyes– ‘fame’ \( \Rightarrow \) *kleu-s-ó– ‘famous’
   > Gk. κλέος ‘id.’
   > Ved. śrávas– ‘id.’
   > OIr. clú ‘id.’

• A (i) specific claim and a (ii) broader proposal:

  i. Ved. śūṣā– was historically derived as in (3a) via BOUNDED DELETION from a neuter *–øyes-stem with root zero-grade (cf. Vine 2022: 445).

  ii. BOUNDED DELETION was the regular synchronic pattern in PIE non-primary derivatives formed with stress-attracting suffixes, as in (3b).
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Vedic śūṣá–, śūṣá–, and their historical relationship

Ved. śūṣá– and śávas–: attestation & meaning

- Ved. śūṣá– is attested 23x in the Ṛgveda (9x in Family Books).
  - With the sense ‘powerful’, e.g., in RV IX.97.54a.
  - But more often ‘empowering, fortifying,’ esp. as modifier of the poetic act (± overt noun).

(4) RV I.154.3 (tr. Jamison & Brereton 2014: 331):

prá víṣṇave śūṣāṁ etu mánma
girikṣīta urugāyāya víṣṇe
yá idāṁ dīrghám práyataṁ sadhásthām
eko vimamé tribhír ít padébhīḥ

Let my fortifying thought go forth to Viṣṇu, the mountain-dwelling, wide-ranging bull, who alone with just three steps measured out this dwelling place here, long and extended.

1 cf. Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 236
2 Vedic śávas–, śúśá–, and their historical relationship

Ved. śúśá– and śávas–: attestation & meaning

• Ved. śúśá– is attested 23x in the Ṛgveda (9x in Family Books).
  – With the sense ‘powerful’, e.g., in RV IX.97.54a.
  – But more often ‘empowering, fortifying,’ esp. as modifier of the poetic act (± overt noun).

• Clearly connected with very well-attested Ved. śávas– ‘power’ (> 150x in RV).
  → Occurs in figura etymologica with its derivative.¹


prá manmahe śavasānā́ya śūsáṁ
āṅgūsáṁ gírvaṇase aṅgirasvát
suvṛktibhi stuvatá ṛgmiyáya
árcāma arkám náre víśrutáya

We think up a fortifying song for the forceful one who longs for hymns, just as the Aṅgirases did. A chant with the good twists of a praiser we chant to the one worthy of chant, to the widely famed superior man.

¹ cf. Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954: 236
2 Vedic śávas–, śūṣá–, and their historical relationship

Ved. śávas– and OAv. savah–

- Ved. śávas– directly reflects a formation of at least Proto-Indo-Iranian (PIIr.) date in view of its cognate OAv. savah–.
- Different meaning in Avestan, likely due to semantic broadening.
  - ‘benefit’ per Humbach
  - ‘opulence’ per Kellens & Pirart (1988: 185)
  - ‘salvation’ per Insler (1975: 109)


\[
\text{tat̰ və̄ nə̄ hazaōšā̊ŋhō vīspā̊ŋhō daiddiāi sauuō ašəm vohū mananīhā uxūa yāiš ārmaitiš yazəmnā̊ŋhō nəmaŋhā mazdā rafə́rə́m cagə́dō}
\]

In order that all of You, who are in harmony, grant us that benefit, (we are worshipping) truth with good thought, (as well) the statements with which right-mindedness (is associated), worshipping (them) in reverence to the Wise One who extends support.
2 Vedic śávas–, śūṣá–, and their historical relationship

PIIr. *cáuH-as– and *cáuH-as–

(7) **Word-formation in Proto-Indo-Iranian:**

a. *cáuH-as– ‘power’ \sim *cáuH-s-á– ‘powerful’
   > Ved. śávas– ‘power’ Ved. śūṣá– ‘powerful’
   > OAv. sauuah– ‘benefit’

- Thus plausible to reconstruct a prototypical neuter *–as-stem, PIIr. *cáuH-as– ‘power’.
- And beside it a thematic adjective *cáuHs-á– ‘powerful’.
- Semantics compatible with the derivational relationship at this stage.
2 Vedic šávas–, šūṣá–, and their historical relationship

PIIr. *ćuH-s-á– and *ćáuH-as–

(7) Word-formation in Proto-Indo-Iranian:

a. *ćáuH-as– ‘power’ \(\not\rightarrow\) *ćuH-s-á– ‘powerful’

b. *támH-as– ‘darkness’ \(\Rightarrow\) *tamH-as-á– ‘dark’
   > Ved. támas– ‘id.’
   > OAv. təmah– ‘id.’
   > Ved. tamasá– ‘id.’
   > OAv. təmaŋha– ‘id.’

c. *wáč-as– ‘speech’ \(\Rightarrow\) *wač-as-á– ‘skillful at speech’
   > Ved. vácas– ‘id.’
   > OAv vácah– ‘id.’
   > Ved. vacasá– ‘id.’

d. *twáy-as– ‘trembling’ \(\Rightarrow\) *tway-as-á– ‘associated with trembling’
   > YAv. θβaiiaŋha– ‘danger’

- But formally, derivation in (7a) cannot be the result of synchronic PIIr. word-formation.
- Productively derived, morphologically parallel formations do not exhibit iterative deletion (nor bounded deletion) but rather **non-deletion** — e.g., in (7b–d).
2 Vedic śávas–, śūṣá–, and their historical relationship

PIIr. *ćuH-s-á– and *ćáuH-as–

(7) Word-formation in Proto-Indo-Iranian:

a. *ćáuH-as– ‘power’ ⇒ *ćuH-s-á– ‘powerful’

   > Ved. támas– ‘id.’
   > OAv. təmah– ‘id.’

   Ved. tamasá– ‘id.’
   OAv. təmaŋha– ‘id.’

c. *wáč-as– ‘speech’ ⇒ *wač-as-á– ‘skillful at speech’
   > Ved. vácas– ‘id.’
   > OAv vácah– ‘id.’

   Ved. vacasá– ‘id.’

   OAv vácah– ‘id.’

d. *twáy-as– ‘trembling’ ⇒ *tway-as-á– ‘associated with trembling’
   > YAv. ἰβαιιαŋha– ‘danger’

⇒ If the derivational relationship in (7a) once existed, it must have been established prior to Proto-Indo-Iranian (as traditionally assumed).
2 Vedic śávas–, śūṣá–, and their historical relationship

*ćáuH-as– beyond Indo-Iranian

- Yet whether *ćáuH-as– can be reconstructed back further than Proto-Indo-Iranian is questionable.
- No exact cognates elsewhere in IE.
- Previously suspected that *ćáuH-as– is a Neubildung in Indo-Iranian.¹
  - Older “State II” root shape preserved in Ved. śvātrá– ‘swollen (w/ power)’.
    - Innovative “State I” full-grade *ćáuH-as– back-formed from derivatives with root zero-grade (e.g., Ved. śūrá–, YAv. sūrā– ‘strong’).

(8) RV VIII.63.5 (tr. Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1150):

\[
\text{ād ū nú te ánu krátuṁ sváhā várasya yájyavaḥ śvātrám arká anūṣata índra gotrásyā dāváne}
\]

And therefore, following the intention of your will, those eager to sacrifice (have cried out) “hail!”; their chants have cried out to (you), who are swollen with strength, Indra, to give of the cowpen.

2. Vedic śāivas-, śūṣā-, and their historical relationship

*ćáuH-as- beyond Indo-Iranian

- PIE root is thus reconstructed as “State II” *k̑weh₁- by LIV²: 339–40 n. 1.

(8) RV VIII.63.5 (tr. Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1150):

ā́d ū nú te ánu krátum
sváhá várasya yájyavaḥ
śvátrám arká anūṣata
índra gotrásyā dāváne

And therefore, following the intention of your will, those eager to sacrifice (have cried out) “hail!”; their chants have cried out to (you), who are swollen with strength, Indra, to give of the cowpen.

2 Vedic śávas–, śūṣá–, and their historical relationship

*ćáuH-as– beyond Indo-Iranian

- PIE root is thus reconstructed as “State II” *k̑weh₁– by LIV²: 339–40 n. 1.
- Alternatively, Vine (2022: 456) suggests it was a “zero-grade root,” i.e., *k̑uhₓ–.
  - Same implications for PIIr. *ćáuH-as– (viz., a Neubildung).
  - But better accounts for formal properties of its other IE derivatives.

(8) RV VIII.63.5 (tr. Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1150):

\[ \text{ād ū nú te ánu krátum sváhā várasya yájyavaḥ svātrám arká anuṣata índra gotrásyā dāváne} \]

And therefore, following the intention of your will, those eager to sacrifice (have cried out) “hail!”; their chants have cried out to (you), who are swollen with strength, Indra, to give of the cowpen.
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Zero-grade roots in IE

(9) A PIE root whose primary derivatives exhibit root zero-grade in morphological contexts associated with non-zero-grade.

- Reconstructible for PIE is a set of prosodically exceptional ZERO-GRADE ROOTS.
Zero-grade roots in IE

(10) Zero-grade forms of PIE root *bʱuhₓ– in full- or *o-grade contexts:

a. *bʱúhₓ-t > Ved. á-bhūt ‘became’, Gk. ἔ-φῡ ‘became; grew’, OCS by ‘was’; Lat. fūt ‘id.’

b. *bʱe-bʱúhₓ-h₂e >(>) Ved. babhúva ‘I have become’; Gk. πέφῡκε ‘I am’

c. *bʱúhₓ-mn > Ved. bhúma ‘earth’, Gk. φῦμα ‘growth’

• Reconstructible for PIE is a set of prosodically exceptional ZERO-GRADE ROOTS.

• Best known example is PIE *bʱuhₓ– ‘become’ (cf. Jasanoff 1997).
  – Zero-grade for full-grade in root Aorist in (1oa), neuter *–men-stem in (1oc).
  – Zero-grade for *o-grade in Perfect in (1ob).
3 PIE *kʰuᵹ – a zero-grade root and its derivatives

Zero-grade roots in IE

(11) Neuter *–es-stems derived from PIE ZERO-GRADE ROOTS:

a. *srihᵹ(̑)– ‘freeze, shiver’ ⇒ *srihᵹ(̑)-os > Gk. ῥῖγος, Lat. frīgus ‘cold, frost’
b. *puhᵹ– ‘rot’ ⇒ *pūhᵹ-oes > Gk. πύος, Lat. pūs ‘pus’
c. *dʰuh₂– ‘(produce) smoke’ ⇒ *dʰūh₂-oes > Gk. θύος ‘burnt offering’
d. *duhᵹ– ‘revere’ ⇒ *dūhᵹ-oes > Ved. dūvas ‘gift’

• Reconstructible for PIE is a set of prosodically exceptional ZERO-GRADE ROOTS.
• Best known example is PIE *bʰuhᵹ– ‘become’ (cf. Jasanoff 1997).
  – Zero-grade for full-grade in root Aorist in (10a), neuter *–men-stem in (10c).
  – Zero-grade for *o-grade in Perfect in (10b).
• Vine (2022) adduces further examples, including the PIE roots in (11) which exhibit zero-grade in regularly full-graded neuter *–es-stems (cf. Schindler 1975: 264–5).
Zero-grade roots in IE

(11) Neuter *–es-stems derived from PIE ZERO-GRADE ROOTS:

a. *srihₓ(˘) – ‘freeze, shiver’  ⇒  *srihₓ(˘)-os  > Gk. ῥῖγος, Lat. frīgus ‘cold, frost’
b. *puhₓ– ‘rot’  ⇒  *púhₓ-os–  > Gk. πύος, Lat. pūs ‘pus’
c. *dʱuh₂– ‘(produce) smoke’  ⇒  *dʱúh₂-os  > Gk. θύος ‘burnt offering’
d. *duhₓ– ‘revere’  ⇒  *dúhₓ-os–  > Ved. dúvas ‘gift’

• Vine (2022) identifies a cluster of properties shared by *bʱuhₓ– and roots in (11).

(i) Root zero-grade forms attested in full- and/or *o-grade morphological contexts.
(ii) Similar phonological shape: “core sequence CiH(C)...or CuH”
(iii) Lack of reconstructible non-zero-grade forms.
(iv) Schwebeablaut in einzelsprachlich formations and/or categories associated with inserted full-/*o-grades (e.g., vr̥ddhi-derivatives)
3 PIE *kʰuᵩ–: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

**Zero-grade roots in IE**

(11) Neuter *–es-stems derived from PIE ZERO-GRADE ROOTS:

a. *srihᵩˈɡ– ‘freeze, shiver’ ⇒ *srihᵩˈɡ-os > Gk. ῥῖγος, Lat. frīgus ‘cold, frost’

b. *puhᵩ– ‘rot’ ⇒ *púhᵩ-’es– > Gk. πύος, Lat. pūs ‘pus’

c. *dʱuh₂– ‘(produce) smoke’ ⇒ *dʱúh₂-os > Gk. θύος ‘burnt offering’

d. *duhᵩ– ‘revere’ ⇒ *díuhᵩ-’es– > Ved. dívas ‘gift’

• Vine (2022) identifies a cluster of properties shared by *bʱuᵩh– and roots in (11).
  
  (i) Root zero-grade forms attested in full- and/or *o-grade morphological contexts.
  
  (ii) Similar phonological shape: “core sequence CiH(C)...or CuH”
  
  (iii) Lack of reconstructible non-zero-grade forms.
  
  (iv) Schwebeablaut in einzelsprachlich formations and/or categories associated with inserted full-/*o-grades (e.g., vr̥ddhi-derivatives) — e.g.:
  
  • *bʱeuhᵩ– > Ved. bhavisyáti ‘shall (be)come’ (Jasanoff 1997: 175–6)
  
  • *bʱwehᵩ– > Alb. bot ‘someone, stranger’; botë ‘world, humanity’ (Kashima 2019; cf. LIV² 98–101)
3 PIE *kuhₓ–: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

**PIE *kuhₓ– as a zero-grade root**

(12) Derivatives of PIE *kuhₓ– ‘swell’:

b. *kuhₓ-Ś– > Gk. κυέω, Lat. in-ciēns ‘(be) pregnant’; Oss. ræ-syj/suj–, Ved. sváyati ‘swell’
c. *kéuhₓ-is-to– > Ved. śáviṣṭha–, Av. səuuista– ‘strongest’
d. *kéuhₓ-ro– > Ved. śávīra– ‘strong’; W cawr ‘giant’
e. *kwehₓ-tr-ó– > Ved. śvātrá– ‘swollen (with strength)’

• PIE root ‘swell’ shares these properties:

  (i) Root zero-grade in reflex of neuter *–men-stem in (12a) (vs. regular full-grade).
3 PIE *ₖᵽʰᵹ–: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

PIE *ₖᵽʰᵹ– as a zero-grade root

(12) Derivatives of PIE *ₖᵽʰᵹ– ‘swell’:

b. *ₖᵽʰᵹ-Ś– > Gk. κυέω, Lat. in-ciēns ‘(be) pregnant’; Oss. ræ-syj/suj–, Ved. sváyati ‘swell’
c. *ₖᵽʰᵹ-is-to– > Ved. śáviṣṭha–, Av. səuuīsta– ‘strongest’
e. *ₖᵽᵉₜₗᵹ-tr-ó– > Ved. śvātrá– ‘swollen (with strength)’

• PIE root ‘swell’ shares these properties:
  (i) Root zero-grade in reflex of neuter *–men-stem in (12a) (vs. regular full-grade).
  (ii) Phonologically contains a “core sequence... CuH”
3 PIE *kūhₓ–: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

PIE *kūhₓ– as a zero-grade root

(12) Derivatives of PIE *kūhₓ– ‘swell’:

b. *kuhₓ-Ś– > Gk. κυέω, Lat. in-ciēns ‘(be) pregnant’; Oss. ræ-syj/suj–, Ved. svāyati ‘swell’
c. *kéuhₓ-is-to– > Ved. śāviṣṭha–, Av. səuuista– ‘strongest’
d. *kéuhₓ-ro– > Ved. śāvīra– ‘strong’; W cawr ‘giant’
e. *kwehₓ-tr-ó– > Ved. śwātrá– ‘swollen (with strength)’

 PIE root ‘swell’ shares these properties:

(i) Root zero-grade in reflex of neuter *–men-stem in (12a) (vs. regular full-grade).
(ii) Phonologically contains a “core sequence... CuH”
(iii) Inherited-looking verbal material with only zero-grade root, e.g., (12b) (cf. LIV²: 339–40).

¹Differently Jasanoff (2021) on Ved. svāyati, but if it continues a “Narten i-present” (cf. Ved. sphāya–) vrddhi may be involved.
3 PIE *k₃uhₓ–: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

PIE *k₃uhₓ– as a zero-grade root

(12) Derivatives of PIE *k₃uhₓ– ‘swell’:

a. *k₃uhₓ-men– > Gk. κὐμα ‘wave’ (cf. Eng. swell)
b. *kuhₓ-Ś– > Gk. κυέω, Lat. in-ciēns ‘(be) pregnant’; Oss. ræ-syj/suj–, Ved. sváyati ‘swell’
c. *kéuhₓ-is-to– > Ved. śáviṣṭha–, Av. səuuista– ‘strongest’
d. *kéuhₓ-ro– > Ved. śávīra– ‘strong’; W cawr ‘giant’
e. *kwehₓ-tr-ó– > Ved. śvātrá– ‘swollen (with strength)’

PIE root ‘swell’ shares these properties:

(i) Root zero-grade in reflex of neuter *–men-stem in (12a) (vs. regular full-grade).
(ii) Phonologically contains a “core sequence... CuH”
(iii) Inherited-looking verbal material with only zero-grade root, e.g., (12b) (cf. LIV²: 339–40).
(iv) Schwebeablaut in einzelsprachlich formations and/or categories associated with inserted full-/ *o-grade – e.g., (12c–e).

²See Kümmel 2000: 544 and LIV² on innovative “State I” full-grades in Indo-Iranian like (12c).
⁴Possibly a vrddhi-derivative (from an erstwhile zero-graded *–ter-agent noun?)
(12) Derivatives of PIE *kuh₅– ‘swell’:

b. *kuh₅-Š– > Gk. κυέω, Lat. in-ciēns ‘(be) pregnant’; Oss. ræ-syj/suj–, Ved. svāyati ‘swell’
c. *kéuh₅-is-to– > Ved. śāviṣṭha–, Av. səuuista– ‘strongest’
d. *kéuh₅-ro– > Ved. śāvīra– ‘strong’; W cawr ‘giant’
e. *kweh₅-tr-ó– > Ved. śvātrá– ‘swollen (with strength)’
f. *kúh₅-o/es–

• Thus likely that ‘swell’ was a ZERO-GRADE ROOT in PIE, i.e., *kuh₅–.
3 PIE *ₖᵘʰₓ–: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

**PIE *ₖᵘʰₓ– as a zero-grade root**

(12) Derivatives of PIE *ₖᵘʰₓ– ‘swell’:


b. *ₖᵘʰₓ-Š– > Gk. κυέω, Lat. in-ciēns ‘(be) pregnant’; Oss. ræ-syj/suj–, Ved. svāyati ‘swell’

c. *ₖéuhₓ-is-to– > Ved. śáviṣṭha–, Av. səuuista– ‘strongest’

d. *ₖéuhₓ-ro– > Ved. śávīra– ‘strong’; W cawr ‘giant’

e. *ₖwehₓ-tr-ó– > Ved. śvātrá– ‘swollen (with strength)’

f. *ₖúhₓ-o/e-s–

Thus likely that ‘swell’ was a zero-grade root in PIE, i.e., *ₖᵘʰₓ–.

Root zero-grade is expected in a synchronically derived neuter *–es-stem, as in (12f).
3 PIE *ₚuₚₜₓ–: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

PIE *ₚuₚₜₓ– as a zero-grade root

(12) Derivatives of PIE *ₚuₚₜₓ– ‘swell’:

b. *ₚuₚₜₓ-Š– > Gk. χύεω, Lat. in-ciēns ‘(be) pregnant’; Oss. ræ-syj/suj–, Ved. svāyati ‘swell’
c. *ₚéuₚₜₓ-is-to– > Ved. śáviṣṭha–, Av. səuuīsta– ‘strongest’
d. *ₚéuₚₜₓ-ro– > Ved. śāvīra– ‘strong’; W cawr ‘giant’
e. *ₚweₚₜₓ-tr-ò– > Ved. śvātrā– ‘swollen (with strength)’
f. *ₚuₚₜₓ-%es– > Gk. χύος ‘fetus’

• Thus likely that ‘swell’ was a ZERO-GRADE ROOT in PIE, i.e., *ₚuₚₜₓ–.
• Root zero-grade is expected in a synchronically derived neuter *–es-stem, as in (12f).
  – Just such a pre-form is continued in Greek.
3 PIE *₃kuₙ — a zero-grade root and its derivatives

Gk. κύος — attestation & meaning

→ Single literary attestation of Gk. κύος occurs in a fragment of Aristophanes.
   - figura etymologica with κυέω ‘be pregnant’
   - Refers to the “baby bump”, i.e., the ‘swelling’ associated with a fetus in utero.

(13) Ar. Fr. 622 (tr. Henderson 2008: 421–2):
ήτις κυοῦσ’ ἐφάνη κύος τοσοῦτον
‘a pregnant woman showing so much belly’
Attested in two late (≈ 3rd c. CE), fragmentary inscriptions found on Keos.

- Refers directly to the source of ‘swelling’, i.e., the fetus in utero (likewise IG XII 5, 646, probably).

(14) SEG 25:957 (Keos, ca. 3rd c. CE; cf. Sokolowski 1969):

1. ος· ἂν δὲ μ [ή] βο[υλομένη ἐγκυος γίγνεσθαι ἢ κινή]
καταμηνήν ἢ [ἀτοκεῖον ἐπιτελῇ ἢ διαφθείρῃ τὸ]
κύος, καθαρή μ[ή ἐστω ἔως ἂν τεσσαρακοσταία]
vac. καθαρμ[οὺς ποιῇ].

If a woman, because she does not want to become pregnant, should disrupt her menstrual cycle or make use of a contraceptive or abort a fetus, let her not be ritually pure until on the 40th day...she performs purificatory rites...’
Hesych. κ 4633 (ed. Latte & Cunningham 2020: 695):
κύος· κύημα. τὸ ἐν γαστρί (Ar. fr. 622 K.–A.)

- Also known to later lexicographers.
  - Glossed by Hesychius with κύημα ‘fetus; sprout (of, e.g., cabbage)’
  - ‘That which is in the belly’ per Aristophanic scholia.
3 PIE *k̑uhₙ—: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

Gk. κύος — attestation & meaning

(15) Hesych. κ 4633 (ed. Latte & Cunningham 2020: 695):
κύος· κύημα. τὸ ἐν γαστρί (Ar. fr. 622 K.–A.)

• Also known to later lexicographers.
  – Glossed by Hesychius with κύημα ‘fetus; sprout (of, e.g., cabbage)’
  – ‘That which is in the belly’ per Aristophanic scholia.

• To account for its root zero-grade Stüber (2002: 66) takes κύος as an analogical formation based on κυέω ‘be pregnant’ — but:
  – Neuter *–es-stems are “largely unproductive” in Greek (Meissner 2005: 120).
  – When (rarely) a novel transparent deverbal formation is deemed necessary, highly productive –(η)μα is employed
3 PIE *kʰuh₂–: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

Gk. κύος — attestation & meaning

(15) Hesych. κ 4633 (ed. Latte & Cunningham 2020: 695):

κύος· κύημα. τὸ ἐν γαστρί (Ar. fr. 622 K.–A.)

- Also known to later lexicographers.
  - Glossed by Hesychius with κύημα ‘fetus; sprout (of, e.g., cabbage)’
  - ‘That which is in the belly’ per Aristophanic scholia.

- To account for its root zero-grade Stüber (2002: 66) takes κύος as an analogical formation based on κυέω ‘be pregnant’ — but:
  - Neuter *–es-stems are “largely unproductive” in Greek (Meissner 2005: 120).
  - When (rarely) a novel transparent deverbal formation is deemed necessary, highly productive –(η)μα is employed — and this is attested for κυέω in (15).
3 PIE *k̑uhₓ-: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

Gk. κύος — attestation & meaning

(15) Hesych. κ 4633 (ed. Latte & Cunningham 2020: 695):

κύος· κύημα· τὸ ἐν γαστρὶ (Ar. fr. 622 K.–A.)

- Also known to later lexicographers.
  - Glossed by Hesychius with κύημα ‘fetus; sprout (of, e.g., cabbage)’
  - ‘That which is in the belly’ per Aristophanic scholia.
- To account for its root zero-grade Stüber (2002: 66) takes κύος as an analogical formation based on κυέω ‘be pregnant’ — but:
  - Neuter *–es-stems are “largely unproductive” in Greek (Meissner 2005: 120).
  - When (rarely) a novel transparent deverbal formation is deemed necessary, highly productive
    – (η)μα is employed — and this is attested for κυέω in (15).

⇒ More likely, κύος is an archaism preserved in Hesychius (and marginally elsewhere), a
direct reflex of PIE *k̑uhₓ-/es– ‘swelling’.
3 PIE *ₖ₁ʰₓ–: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

**PIE *ₖ₁ʰₓ– and its derivatives**

(16) Derivations of PIE *ₖ₁ʰₓ-s-ó–:

a. \[^{\text{x}}\text{kéu}_{₁}^{ₖ}h_{ₓ}-e_{s}-\text{‘swelling’}\] \(\Rightarrow\) \[^{\text{*}}\text{kú}_{₁}^{ₖ}h_{ₓ}-o_{s}-\text{‘swollen’}\]
   > Ved. śávas– ‘power’
   > OAv. sauuh– ‘benefit’

b. \[^{\text{*}}\text{kú}_{₁}^{ₖ}h_{ₓ}-e_{s}-\text{‘swelling’}\] \(\Rightarrow\) \[^{\text{*}}\text{kú}_{₁}^{ₖ}h_{ₓ}-o_{s}-\text{‘swollen’}\]
   > Gk. κύος ‘fetus’
   > Ved. śūṣá– ‘powerful’

• If the neuter *–es-stem derived from *ₖ₁ʰₓ– ‘swell’ in PIE was *ₖ₁ʰₓ- /e_{s}–:
  – Traditional derivation of *ₖ₁ʰₓ-s-ó– in (16a) cannot be maintained (= (2c) above).
  – On chronological grounds, *ₖ₁ʰₓ-s-ó– was instead derived as in (16b).
3 PIE *kuh\textsubscript{x}–: a zero-grade root and its derivatives

PIE *kuh\textsubscript{x}– and its derivatives

(16) Derivations of PIE *kuh\textsubscript{x}-s-\textsubscript{ό}–:

a. \textit{\textasciitilde}{\textit{k\textsubscript{\text epsilon}uh\textsubscript{x}}-\textsubscript{\textepsilon}es– ‘swelling’} \Rightarrow *kuh\textsubscript{x}-s-\textsubscript{ό}– ‘swollen’
   > Ved. \textit{\textepsilon}avas– ‘power’
   > OAv. sauuu\textit{\textepsilon}h– ‘benefit’

b. *\textit{k\textsubscript{\textupsilon}uh\textsubscript{x}}-\textsubscript{\textepsilon}es– ‘swelling’ \Rightarrow *kuh\textsubscript{x}-s-\textsubscript{ό}– ‘swollen’
   > Gk. \kappa\upsilon\upsilon\textit{\textepsilon}c ‘fetus’
   > Ved. \textit{\textepsilon}us\textit{\textepsilon}a– ‘powerful’

· If the neuter *–es-stem derived from *\textit{k\textupsilon}uh\textsubscript{x}– ‘swell’ in PIE was *\textit{k\textupsilon}uh\textsubscript{x}- %es–:
  – Traditional derivation of *kuh\textsubscript{x}-s-\textsubscript{ό}– in (16a) cannot be maintained (= (2c) above).
  – On chronological grounds, *kuh\textsubscript{x}-s-\textsubscript{ό}– was instead derived as in (16b).

⇒ PIE *kuh\textsubscript{x}-s-\textsubscript{ό}– does not require iterative deletion, only bounded deletion.
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Vowel deletion in IE non-primary derivatives redux

(1) Vowel deletion patterns in Indo-European (schematic):

a. *kléw-ṃ/s– ‘fame’ ⇒ *klés-ó– ‘famous’
b. *kléw-ṃ/s– ‘fame’ ⇒ *kleu-s-ó– ‘famous’
c. *kléw-ṃ/s– ‘fame’ ⇒ *klu-s-ó– ‘famous’

• Recall — reflexes of as many as three vowel deletion patterns are attested in IE languages: ¹

  a. NON-DELETION: no base vowels are deleted.
  b. BOUNDED DELETION: only the vowel in the stem-final suffix of base is deleted.
  c. ITERATIVE DELETION: suffixal vowel(s) in the base and root vowel are deleted.

Vowel deletion in IE non-primary derivatives redux

(1) Vowel deletion patterns in Indo-European (schematic):
   b. *kléw-oes– ‘fame’ ⇒ *kleu-s-ó– ‘famous’
   c. *kléw-oes– ‘fame’ ⇒ *klu-s-ó– ‘famous’

   Recall — reflexes of as many as three vowel deletion patterns are attested in IE languages:
   1. NON-DELETION: no base vowels are deleted.
   2. BOUNDED DELETION: only the vowel in the stem-final suffix of base is deleted.
   3. ITERATIVE DELETION: suffixal vowel(s) in the base and root vowel are deleted.

   Which was the regular synchronic pattern in PIE non-primary derivatives formed with stress-attracting suffixes?

4 The diachrony of vowel deletion in IE

Vowel deletion in IE non-primary derivatives redux

(1) Vowel deletion patterns in Indo-European (schematic):

b. *kléw-oes– ‘fame’ ⇒ *kleu-s-ó– ‘famous’

- It is generally thought that the deletion patterns are chronologically ordered.¹

4 The diachrony of vowel deletion in IE

Vowel deletion in IE non-primary derivatives redux

(1) Vowel deletion patterns in Indo-European (schematic):
   a. \(*\text{k̑léw-}^0\text{/}e^s–\) ‘fame’ \(\Rightarrow\) \(*\text{k̑lew-es-}^0\)– ‘famous’ \(\leftarrow\) youngest
   b. \(*\text{k̑léw-}^0\text{/}e^s–\) ‘fame’ \(\Rightarrow\) \(*\text{k̑leu-s-}^0\)– ‘famous’
   c. \(*\text{k̑léw-}^0\text{/}e^s–\) ‘fame’ \(\Rightarrow\) \(*\text{k̑lu-s-}^0\)– ‘famous’ \(\leftarrow\) oldest

- It is generally thought that the deletion patterns are chronologically ordered.\(^1\)
- Main contenders for PIE status are (1b) and (1c), since (1a):
  - Is easily innovated — derivatives can be analogically rebuilt from existing base at any time.
  - Tracks with the diachronic trajectory of ablaut in IE inflection.

\(^1\) cf. Höfler 2015, 2017, i.a.
Bounded deletion in IE non-primary derivation

(17) BOUNDED DELETION in IE non-primary derivatives of neuter *–es-stems:

a. *wét-/-es– ‘year’
   > Gk. ἔτος (Myc. we-to) ‘id.’
   ⇒ *wet-s-ó– ‘having a year’

   Ved. vatsá– ‘calf’

b. *pék̑-/-es– ‘wool’
   > Lat. pecūs ‘id.’
   > Gk. πέκαος ‘id.’
   > Lat. pexus ‘woolly’
   ⇒ *pek̑-s-ó– ‘having wool’

   2

See Ernout & Meillet 2001: 491, Höfler 2017: 307–8; but non-application of iterative deletion may be phonotactically motivated.

Robust support across the IE languages for BOUNDED DELETION in non-primary derivation:

– In possessive adjectives derived with */–%/– from neuter *–es-stems like (17).


2
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Bounded deletion in IE non-primary derivation

(18) BOUNDED DELETION in other IE non-primary derivatives:

a. \(*{(h_x)rot-eh}_2– ‘wheel’\) ⇒ \(*{(h_x)rot-h}_2-ó– ‘wheeled’\)
   > Lat. *rota ‘wheel’
   > Ved. rátha– ‘chariot’
   > YAv. *raθa– ‘chariot’

b. \(*sok^w-h_2-ói– ‘comrade’\) ⇒ \(*sok^w-h^2_2-y-ó– ‘having comrades’\)
   > Ved. *sákhā(y)– ‘friend’
   > Lat. socius ‘ally’
   > ON seggr ‘warrior’

   > Lat. *lūmen
   > YAv. *raoxšna– ‘bright’

Robust support across the IE languages for BOUNDED DELETION in non-primary derivation:

- In possessive adjectives derived with \(*/-é/ó–/ from neuter \(*-es- stems like (17).\)
- In possessive adjectives derived with \(*/-é/ó–/ from other nominal bases like (18).

Bounded deletion in IE non-primary derivation

(18) **BOUNDDED DELETION in other IE non-primary derivatives:**

a. \( *\text{(h}_x\text{)}\text{rot-eh}_2 \)– ‘wheel’ \( \Rightarrow \) \( *\text{(h}_x\text{)}\text{rot-h}_2\text{-}\text{ó} \)– ‘wheeled’
   
   > Lat. *rota* ‘wheel’
   
   Ved. *rátha*– ‘chariot’

b. \( *\text{sok}_w\text{-h}_2\text{-ó} \)– ‘comrade’ \( \Rightarrow \) \( *\text{sok}_w\text{-h}_2\text{-y-ó} \)– ‘having comrades’
   
   > Ved. *sákhā(y)*– ‘friend’
   
   Lat. *socius* ‘ally’
   
   ON *seggr* ‘warrior’

c. \( *\text{lēuks-men} \)– ‘light’ \( \Rightarrow \) \( *\text{leuks-mn-ó} \)– ‘having light’
   
   > Lat. *lūmen*
   
   YAv. *rāoxšna*– ‘bright’

• Robust support across the IE languages for **BOUNDDED DELETION in non-primary derivation:**
  
  – In possessive adjectives derived with \( */-\text{ó}/ \) from neuter \( *-\text{es}-\) stems like (17).
  – In possessive adjectives derived with \( */-\text{ó}/ \) from other nominal bases like (18).
  – See further Yates 2019 on \( *-\text{oi}-\) stems; Yates 2020, 2022 on internally derived \( *-\text{mon}-\) stems;
    Yates to appear on τοµή-type formations.
Iterative deletion in IE non-primary derivation?

(19) ITERATIVE DELETION in IE non-primary derivatives:

a. \(^{*}h₁rëudʰ\)–/es– ‘redness’ ⇒ \(^{*}h₁rødʰ\)–s–ó– ‘red’¹
   > Lat. robur ‘strength; oak’
   > Gk. ἕρευθος ‘redness’
   > Lat. russus ‘red(-haired)’
   > OIr. ruis ‘elder-tree’

b. \(^{*}wëd\)–/es– ‘water’ ⇒ \(^{*}ud\)–s–ó– ‘having water’²
   > Gk. ὕδος ‘water’
   > Ved. útsa– ‘wellspring’
   > Armenia. get ‘river’

C. \(^{*}nek\)–(e)w– ‘death’ ⇒ \(^{*}ŋk\)–w–ó– ‘having death’³
   > – (⇒ Gk. νέκυς, YAv. nasau– ‘corpse’) – (⇒ TA oṅk, B eṅkwe ‘man’)

• Proposed reanalysis of Ved. śūṣá– weakens the empirical basis for ITERATIVE DELETION.
• Other oft-cited examples like (19) are amenable to alternative analyses, in some cases manifestly superior:
  – See Rau 2003: 109–11 for analysis of (19c) as \(^{*}–wo\)-adjective (cf. antonym \(^{*}gʷih₃\)–wó– ‘living’).

4 The diachrony of vowel deletion in IE

Iterative deletion in IE non-primary derivation?

(19) ITERATIVE DELETION in IE non-primary derivatives:

a. *h₁réudʰ-øs– ‘redness’
   ⇒ *h₁rudʰ-s-ó– ‘red’
   > Lat. robur ‘strength; oak’
   > Gk. ἔρευθος ‘redness’
   > Lat. russus ‘red(-haired)’
   > OIr. ruis ‘elder-tree’

b. *wéð-øs– ‘water’
   ⇒ *ud-s-ó– ‘having water’
   > Gk. ὕδος ‘water’
   > Ved. útsa– ‘wellspring’

   > Arm. get ‘river’

   > Gk. ὑδος ‘water’
   > Arm. get ‘river’

   > Gk. νέκυς, YAv. nasau– ‘corpse’

   > – (⇒ TA onik, B enkwe ‘man’)

   > (⇒ TA onik, B enkwe ‘man’)

   *Proposed reanalysis of Ved. śūṣá—weakens the empirical basis for ITERATIVE DELETION.

   Other oft-cited examples like (19) are amenable to alternative analyses, in some cases manifestly superior:


4 The diachrony of vowel deletion in IE

Iterative deletion in IE non-primary derivation?

(19) **ITERATIVE DELETION** in IE non-primary derivatives:

a. *h₁réudʰ-əs– ‘redness’  ⇒  *h₁rudʰ-s-ó– ‘red’
   > Lat. *robur ‘strength; oak’
   > Gk. ἔρευθος ‘redness’

b. *wéd-əs– ‘water’  ⇒  *ud-s-ó– ‘having water’
   > Gk. ὕδος ‘water’
   > Arm. *get ‘river’

c. *nek̑-(e)w– ‘death’  ⇒  *ŋk̑-w-ó– ‘having death’
   > – (⇒ Gk. νέκυς, YAv. nasau– ‘corpse’)
   > – (⇒ TA oṅk, B eṅkwe ‘man’)

• Proposed reanalysis of Ved. śūṣá– weakens the empirical basis for **ITERATIVE DELETION**.

• Other oft-cited examples like (19) are amenable to alternative analyses, in some cases manifestly superior:

The diachrony of vowel deletion in IE

Iterative deletion in IE non-primary derivation?

(19) **ITERATIVE DELETION in IE non-primary derivatives:**

d. *h₂eug-ö̞es*– ‘strength’ ⇒ *h₂ug-s-ö̞–* ‘having strength’ ⇒ *h₂ug-s-o-n–* ‘the strong one’
   > Ved. ójas–, OAv. aojah– ‘id.’
   (⇒ Lat. augustus ‘magnified’)
   Ved. ukšán– ‘ox’
   OE oxa ‘ox’

e. *pó̞k-u̞*– ‘livestock’ ⇒ *pó̞k-w-ö̞–* ‘having livestock’ ⇒ *pó̞k-w-o-n–* ‘one with livestock’
   > Ved. pása– ‘id.’
   > Lith. pėkus ‘herd’
   > Goth. faihu ‘property’
   Ved. sván/šún– ‘dog’
   Lith. šuõ ‘dog’
   Hitt. LÚ kuwan– ‘dog-man’

· If the etymologies in (19d–e) are correct, resulting derivatives would have become lexicalized already in PIE (viz., ‘ox’, ‘dog’).

---

Iterative deletion in IE non-primary derivation:

\[(19)\]  
**ITERATIVE DELETION** in IE non-primary derivatives: 

\[d. \quad \text{*}h₂eug-\text{es}– 'strength' \Rightarrow \text{*}h₂ug-s-\text{ó}– 'having strength' \Rightarrow \text{*}h₂ug-s-o-n– 'the strong one'
\]
> Ved. ójas–, OAv. aojah– ‘id.’ –
> (⇒ Lat. augustus ‘magnified’) Ved. ukšán– ‘ox’
> OE oxa ‘ox’

\[e. \quad \text{*}p\text{ó}k-\text{u}– 'livestock' \Rightarrow \text{*}p\text{k}-w-\text{ó}– 'having livestock' \Rightarrow \text{*}p\text{k}-w-o-n– 'one with livestock'
\]
> Ved. pása– ‘id.’ –
> Lith. pěkus ‘herd’
> Goth. faihu ‘property’
> Ved. šván/šún– ‘dog’
> Lith. šuõ ‘dog’
> Hitt. LÚ kuwan– ‘dog-man’

⇒ Overall, the likeliest diachrony of vowel deletion in IE non-primary derivatives:

- **ITERATIVE DELETION** as a possible pre-PIE process, with (debatable) traces surviving as archaisms for PIE speakers (as perhaps \((19d–e)\)).
- **BOUNDED DELETION** in synchronic PIE.
- **NON-DELETION** emerged *einzelsprachlich* (e.g., in Proto-Indo-Iranian).
Roadmap

► Introduction
► Vedic śávas–, śūṣá–, and their historical relationship
► PIE *kʰuḥ–: a zero-grade root and its derivatives
► The diachrony of vowel deletion in IE
► Conclusions & discussion
Conclusions

(20)

PIE *kuhₓ– ‘swell’ (= zero-grade root)

⇓

PIE *kúhₓ-₀/ᵉ– ‘swelling’ > Gk. κύος ‘fetus’

⇓

PIE *kuhₓ-s-ó– ‘swollen’ > Ved. śūṣá– ‘powerful’

• Two main claims:

(i) Ved. śūṣá– was derived historically as in (20).

(ii) A PIE speaker would probably have called Achilles *kleu-s-ó– (viz., with BOUNDED DELETION).

This is Achilles.

Achilles won imperishable *kléw-os.

Now Achilles is *kleu-s-ó–.

(← *kléw-₀/ᵉ– + -₀/ᵉ–)
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