

Skt. *uttāná-*

In vol. 96 (1982/3) 206 n.2 of this journal I suggested that Skt. *uttāná-*, Av. *ustāna-* ‘stretched out upwards’ continues $*(ud-)t\eta H-nó-$. It appears that I have not been clear enough on some points, and that there is more evidence.

For earlier theories I refer to my previous note. As to Insler’s suggestion (Gāthā’s 1975, 116) that it is an aorist participle I have two objections. 1) A dissimilation $*-tnāna- > -tāna-$ is ad hoc. I would expect that the form (with or without dissimilation) would have been changed into $*-tanāna-$. 2) A middle aorist participle in a compound, such as *uttānāhastā-*, Av. *ustānazastā-* ‘with the hand stretched out upwards (for prayer)’ (which may well be of PIIr. date), is extremely rare if it exists at all (Macdonell, Ved. Gr. 171; AiGr. II 1, 43).

On the other hand a verbal adjective in *-to-* or *-no-* is what you expect. Then *tā-* must be from $*t\eta H-$, and after a laryngeal you expect *-na-* (AiGr. II 2, 728 sub e).

The problematic point is of course the laryngeal, as the root is mostly *aniṭ*. Now there is more evidence for the laryngeal than I indicated in my note. 1. Greek *tanaós* is from $*t\eta h_2-eu-o-$ (in any case the second *a* requires a laryngeal). 2. The Celtic forms, going back to $*tanaw(i)os$, also require a laryngeal. Cf. L. Joseph, Ériu 33, 1982, 39 f.¹⁾ 3. The accentuation of the Baltic adjectives too requires

¹⁾ Joseph objects to colouring of *-e-* across the morpheme boundary (in $*t\eta h_2-eu-$). It should be pointed out that colouring of adjacent vowel is what we expect phonetically. The objection means that J. expects that the *-e-* was analogically restored. This is of course possible, but it should be demonstrated. J. mentions Celtic forms with *-aRe-*, which should have had $-R h_1 e-$. This he thinks improbable, because h_1 is much less frequent than h_2 . But h_1 exists, and the objection is not decisive (as J. admits). Also the forms must perhaps be explained differently (they have no etymology). On the other hand, Gr. *kámatos*, *thánatos* are almost certain evidence for the assumed development. (Thus J.’s explanation of Gr. *témenos* (p. 37) from $*temh_2-enos$, without colouring, must be rejected.) – J.’s own solution (p. 45) is “that a tendency towards assimilation in *TeRa-* ... has been helped along by ... derivatives to $h_2 eRH$ -roots”. This influence seems to me far-fetched, as such roots are rare, and rather an admission that there is no solution. And we would then have to assume the same assimilation for Greek, but the same assimilation in two languages is too improbable. On the other hand my solution is phonetically and morphologically without problem.

a laryngeal, Lith. *tėvas*, Latv. *tiēvs* < **tenHuo-*. (In KZ 96, 206 I suggested that Sanskrit and Latin both continue **tṛHu-*, but they do not provide *independent* evidence.) 4. Skt. 1 sg. pf. med. *tatane* is unexpected for **tatne*. It can be explained from **te-tṛH-*²). 5. Skt. *tāyámāna-* is unexplained. It may continue **tṛH-ya-*. 6. For Skt. 3 sg. pf. med. *tate* a root *tā-* has been assumed. For this root there is no evidence, but it can be understood from *tṛH-* > *taH-*. Of course, the form *tate* must be a late creation from *tH-*, a secondary zero grade from *taH-*. Note that *all* three aberrant verb forms can be explained from a root enlarged with a laryngeal. 7. *uttāná-* < **ud-tṛH-nó-*, then, is the last piece of evidence. – Of course, it is well known that roots with and without a final laryngeal existed side by side.

University of Leiden
Postbus 9515
NL-2300 RA Leiden

Robert S. P. Beekes

²) Kortlandt suggests (IF 86, 1981, 125) that it represents **tetn-h₂e* > **tatana* with **-a* replaced by **-ai*. However, as there are three problematic forms from this root (see 5) and 6) below), it seems preferable to explain them in the same way.