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1. μάχομαι ‘fight’, μισθός ‘reward’

Svensson (2006: 295, n. 1) urges as “strong evidence” for PIE *a the correspondence set Lith. magu̯, magėti ‘please’, OCS mogo, mošti ‘be able’, Ved. ámahe (RV 7.92.2) ‘verschafft’ (‘gives, grants(?) takes(?)’ – Monier-Williams 1899: 146c s.v.; mahe ‘is able’ – Svensson, l.c.), OHG magēn ‘be able’, Gk. μάχομαι ‘fight’. The same set was apparently also discovered independently by Zehnder (LIV₂: 422) who supplies the semantic bridge linking ‘is able’ with ‘verschafft’ and cites as well the Ved. optative sám mahema ‘zustande bringen’.

The only guarantee of PIE *a in this set is Gk. μάχομαι ‘fight’, which is sufficiently distant semantically from the other words in Svensson’s comparison for Beeke (2010 s.v.) to find it “isolated” and probably of substrate origin. If we reject PIE *a and reconstruct instead *mh2eg₁h₁⁻¹.² for the Greek word we expect to find a zero grade derivative *mh₂g₁tō which as a neuter substantive would mean

---

* I am grateful for the critical remarks of two anonymous reviewers that prompted me to seek, in one case, better support for my solution and, in another, a better solution, as well as correcting some errors and inadequacies.

1 My PIE has only two series of velar/tectal sounds, viz. prevelar *k₁, *g₁ etc. conditionally reflected as palatovelars and plain velars and *k₂, *g₂ etc. positionally labialized in PIE and conditionally reflected as labiovelars and plain velars (Woodhouse 1998; 2005; MS). Though it is tempting to follow Kortlandt’s (1978: 238; 1979: 58; etc.) use of the traditional tritectal symbols for palatovelars and labiovelars for these two entities, such usage
*something that was fought’ and/or *something that was gained by fighting3 and would yield, by Beekes’ law,4 Proto-Indo-Iranian (PII) *mīżə-tó > Gothic mīžda /mīžda/ (for the phonemic interpretation see Beekes 1988a: 234; for the environment in which *H > GAv. i, ibid. 85–87) n. ‘reward, prize’, i.e. ‘something that was gained by fighting’, as well as RV mīdhá/mīlhá n., not only, as in Gothic, ‘prize in a contest, reward’ but also ‘contest, strife’, i.e., ‘something that was actually fought’5 (for the formal development cf. PIE *lig₁-tó > PII *rij²-tó- > Ved. rīḍhā-, cf. on the Iranian side Khot. rīštā ‘licks’, Mayrhofer, EWAia, 2 s.v. REH), i.e. a semantically and formally exact comparandum with Gk. μάζωμαι.

It is no secret that the existing etymology of Ved. mīḍhā, Gothic mīžda links these words with Gk. μιζόμενος m. ‘wages, reward’, Gothic mīzdo f. ‘id.’, OCS mzdə f. ‘id.’ as an IE inheritance, yet it is clear that if the etymology presented here is to be accepted then since *h₂ does not normally coalesce with PIE *i in Greek, Germanic and Slavic the cited equivalents in these languages must be loans from PII just as it is accepted that Anatolian Indo-Aryan (AIA) *mīzdʰá is the source of Hurrian/Akkadian mištannu ‘reward for capture of a fugitive’ (EWAia, 2 s.v. mīḍhā).

The semantics of this situation seem particularly satisfying: if it is conceded that the capture of a fugitive will generally involve some sort of struggle then the first recorded meanings of our mištannu / mīžda- group – AIA ‘reward for capture of a fugitive’ and Ved. ‘contest, strife’ and ‘prize, reward’ – all involve the idea of ‘strife, struggle’ that is surely present in Gk. μάζωμαι, whereas the loan equivalents

---

2 On *mˌh₂eg₁ > *mˌmag₁ - rather than **mˌmag₂- , I agree with Schrijver (1991: 172) that “every syllable in IE. had a non-syllabic onset (words could not begin with vowels)”; see also Reynolds/West/Coleman 2000 and discussion in Woodhouse (2011: 152–56).
3 Cf. Ved. nṛṛtā- n. ‘dance, performance’, i.e. ‘something danced/performed’, to Ved. particip. nṛṛyant-, perf. nṛṛtura ‘dance, perform’, Ved. pártá- n. ‘gift’, i.e. ‘something given’, to Ved. imperat. pārdhi ‘give!’, Ved. ghrṭā- n. ‘ghee, clarified butter’ whether as ‘something dripped (on the fire)’, to Ved. jigharti ‘drip, sprinkle’, or ‘something gained/achieved by heating’, to Ved. ghrṭā- ‘heat, glow’, and several others (see, e.g., Macdonell 1910: 120f); the last of the above, Ved. ghrṭa– to ghrṇā-, provides a particularly close parallel because the corresponding verb is attested only outside Vedic, e.g. Gk. ἀόμαι ‘warm oneself’, OCS gręjati gręjǫ ‘warm, heat’ etc. (Mayrhofer EWAia 1, s.vv. GHAR, ghrarm-, ghrṛ-, ghrṇa-).
4 See Beekes 1988b: 35; defended by Schrijver (1991: 161–172); further developed by Woodhouse (2011: 152, 155–164); appealed to without acknowledgement by Kümmel (LIV₂: 401 s.v. *le₄h₁-3).
5 This of course is not to be confused with post-Vedic and lexicographic mīḍhā- ‘urine; faeces’ < *h₂mīg₁-tó (EWAia, 2 s.v. MEH ‘harnen’).
in Greek, Germanic and Slavic seem to have lost the specific idea of ‘struggle’ and signify merely a reward for good behaviour or services rendered.

This is in marked contrast with existing attempts at a deeper etymology of the group which leave much to be desired and – significantly – are all ignored by Beekes (2010 s.v. μισθός). They include such suggestions as the suffixing of PIE *dʰʰ₁tʰ ‘place’ to the root of either Ved. mināṭi ‘exchange’, i.e. PIE *meiH- (Meier-Brügger 1989: 59f. and n. 5, 6 with lit.), which captures only half the semantics, or Ved. māyas ‘refreshment, enjoyment, pleasure, delight’, Lat. mǐtis ‘mild, soft’, Lith. mielas, mîtis ‘dear, tender’, SCR. mīo mīla ‘dear’ (EWAia, 2 s.v. mīdhā). For this latter the Balto-Slavic acute makes mandatory the laryngeal that Mayrhofer’s *mei(H)- indicates as optional, making it phonologically identical with Meier-Brügger’s but with still weaker semantics. Phonologically, these attempts leave unexplained both the *s in the alleged protoform and the short non-acute root vowel of OCS mzdā, Russ., Czech, USorb. mzda, which would somehow have to have escaped Hirt’s law.

There is however one detail of the phonology of my new suggestion that requires further attention, namely whether *h₁ or *H in general between consonants yielded PII *i sufficiently early to appear in the above European words looking in all other respects as if they derived directly from PIE, as has hitherto been commonly believed. In order to achieve this I believe we can hardly do better than find a demonstration, independent of Hurrian/Akkadian mištannu, that PIE *H > *i in the oldest layer of Indo-Iranian⁶ available to us, viz. AIA.

Mayrhofer (1960: 137–139; 1966: 22, n. 4) sought to provide such a demonstration by equating the AIA onomastic component -atti with Ved. átithi- ‘guest’ < PII *atHthi- and still thought this worth a mention in 1986 (when the corresponding fascicle of EWAia (p. 58) appeared), despite Kammenhuber’s (1968: 168f.) characterization of the equation as “unbewiesen”. Mayrhofer was of course aware of, and evidently not bothered by, the peculiarly Iranian syncopation of the target *i < *H, which is odd given that AIA has no other exclusively Iranian features but several Indo-Aryan ones (n. 6 above) and the same suffix is found in non-AIA names such as Te-ú-wa-at-ti.⁷ One might argue that the

---

⁶ In the sense that we have no data for the Indo-Iranian branch of IE that is older; and while it may be true that AIA contains no exclusively Iranian features (see Mayrhofer 1966: 22–24) and that Kammenhuber’s (1968: 145) argument for an Iranian presence in AIA is entirely based on non-linguistic cultural considerations, specifically mythology, viz. the absence in AIA materials of a sharp contrast between the two groups of gods, the āśura (Mitra, Varuṇa) and the devā (the two Nāsatyās and Indra), it nevertheless remains the case that in Hurrian/Akkadian mištannu we have direct reflection of the cluster preserved in GAv. mīžda but simplified in all our Vedic and later Sanskrit texts.

⁷ The e < *eloi of our Vedic and Sanskrit texts was still ai in AIA, as in a-i-ka- ‘one’ in a-i-ka-wa-ar-ta-an-na ‘for one lap of the course’ (e.g. Kammenhuber 1968: 201; Mayrhofer EWAia, 1 s.v. ēka-).
required syncope is due to enclosure of the putative *i between similar consonants (for other examples of this phenomenon see Woodhouse 2008: 262), but Mayrhofer’s demonstration still remains unconvincing. It would be nice, after all, to have an example in which \( i < *H \) is actually preserved.

I think a better argument for the presence of AIA \( i < *H \) can be based on two phonological conclusions. The first is that the so-called law of palatals has evidently taken place before the recording of AIA material, as is shown by AIA \( pa-an-za-‘5’ \) in \( pa-an-za-wa-ar-ta-na \) ‘for five laps of the course’ (e.g. Kammenhuber 1968: 204; Mayrhofer EWAia, 2 s.v. \( pāñcā \)), which reflects both the palatalized backvelar as \( z \) and the change of PIE *e to PII a, a process that clearly postdates the palatalization. The second of our two conclusions is one probably achieved more recently, viz. that the palatal in Ved. \( duhitār- \) ‘daughter’ < \( *d^hug^zh\text{ıtēr} - < *d^hug^zh\text{tēr} \) is due to palatalization of the erstwhile backvelar (attested in Lith. \( dūktē \) ‘id.’, OCS \( d\text{̀}ʃtī \) ‘id.’ etc.) by the following \( i < *h_{z} \).8 This last statement may seem surprising to scholars aware of Kortlandt’s repeated references (e.g. 1978: 238; 2005: 4) to “neutralization” of his two velar series (reaffirmed 2012: 1f.) after *u, but, as I argue elsewhere (MS), first, the process was not one of neutralization but delabialization and, secondly, labiovelars were not uniformly labialized in the satem languages and certainly not in the environments reflecting PIE \( *d^hu\text{¿}g^zh\text{tēr}- */d^hu\text{¿}g^zh\text{tr}' \) in the dialects ancestral to Indo-Iranian, Balto-Slavic and almost certainly Albanian. Therefore the palatal in Ved. \( duhitār- \) cannot be the result of delabialization because the consonant was not labialized to begin with. Since the outcome of the palatalization by \( i < *H \) in \( duhitār- \) is the same as the palatalization of \( *g^h_{z} \) by \( i/*e \) under the law of palatals, e.g. Ved. \( hānti \) ‘slays’ < \( *g^h^ʃenti \), it is reasonable to assume that it was part of the same process. This is of course difficult to verify for Indo-Aryan alone but GAv. 1. sg. mid. \( /\text{auji}/ < *h_{z}e\text{ug}.h_{z} \) (Beekes 1988a: 85) attests exactly the same process and has precisely the reflex of the aspirated backvelar palatalized under the law of palatals by a following front vowel (here \( i < *h_{z} \) (e.g. \( j\text{ʃady̞ái}/ < *g^h^ʃen'-, Beekes 1988a: 72)9 and not that of an original prevelar or palatovelar (e.g. /\text{hazah}/ < *šeḡes', ibid.); and despite the greater persistence of \( i < *H \) in Indo-Aryan than in Iranian (see, e.g., Beekes 1988a: 85–87; Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 28) it can hardly be doubted that this palatalization was a single process affecting both branches simultaneously. Thus since the law of palatals has already occurred by the time of AIA, it is reasonable to assume the change \( *H > i \) is also in place by this time.

---

8 I agree with Mayrhofer’s (EWAia, 1 s.v. \( OC \)) acceptance of Tichy’s suggestion that the pf. participle \( \text{okivāms-} \) ‘be pleased’ is a late form for \( *\text{okvāms-} \) and I note that despite pp. \( \text{ucitā-} \) no one seems inclined to reconstruct a \( št \) root.

9 Unfortunately the Sanskrit example “jan-” given there is an error for \( \text{han-}. \)
I think further support for this assumption can be found in the AIA occurrences of an onomastic element usually equated with the Vedic DN Mitra and generally agreed to figure in the DN Mi-it-ra-aś-śī-il which is recorded, along with other DN referable to Vedic Varuṇa, Indra and the two Nāsatyās, near the end of the lists of gods guaranteeing both versions of a contract or treaty between Šuppiluliuma I of Hatti and the Mitanni king KUR-tiwaza (Mayrhofer 1966: 14f., 22 n. 4; 1974: 13; Kammenhuber 1968: 143f.). Kammenhuber (1968: 144f.) points out that Thieme’s idea that these were special contract gods works well for Mitra, whose name (allegedly) means ‘contract’, and also for Varuṇa and the two Nāsatyās, but not for Indra. This therefore begs the question whether the DN Mitra means ‘contract’ at all, let alone whether this was the original meaning of the name.

It seems to me that Mayrhofer’s preference for deriving this Vedic DN from Ved. mitrā- m. ‘contract’ and his Ved. root MAY ‘befestigen’ (EWAia 2, s.vv.), i.e. ‘the one that binds’, is incompatible with Macdonell’s judgement that the name must originally have meant ‘ally’ or ‘friend’, for the word often means ‘friend’ in the RV., and the Avestic Mithra is the guardian of faithfulness. As the kindly nature of the god is often referred to in the Veda, the term must in the beginning have been applied to the sun-god in his aspect of a benevolent power of nature (Macdonell 1917: 79).

Let us examine some Rigvedic contexts in which this judgement is borne out. All but one of the hymns deal with Mitra plus some other god, usually Varuṇa, and often with yet other gods as well, such as Aryaman, Agni, Savitṛ and so on. It will be convenient to consider the solitary hymn in which Mitra is addressed alone after we have examined contexts that associate Mitra with plenty and abundance in company with these other gods. In the texts and fragments reproduced below I have sometimes thought it wise in the interests of clarity to present forms from the Pada text, i.e. before the Classical Sanskrit rules of sandhi, i.e. phonetic word combination, are applied; the symbol _ indicates where this has been done.

In (RV) 5.62.9a and in 7.61.3b Mitra and Varuṇa are addressed with the epithet (dual) sudāṇu ‘bestowing abundantly, bounteous, munificent’, in the first instance + gopā ‘guardians’ (9b). In 5.67.4cd, Mitra, Varuṇa and Aryaman are described with the same epithet (pl.) followed by _amhōs cid uru-cākrayaḥ ‘granting ample assistance even to resolve anxiety’. In 7.66.5b the same epithet (pl. sudāna-vah_) is applied to Mitra and presumably Varuṇa and the other gods mentioned in 7.66.4bc, viz. Aryaman, Savitṛ and Bhaga. In 8.25.11b the same epithet (pl.) must refer not only to Mitra and Varuṇa, who are the focus of stanzas 1–9, but also to Aditi, the two Nāsatyās and the Maruts, who are all mentioned in 8.25.10.
In 5.70.2ab a request is addressed to Mitra and Varuṇa: … vāṃ samyāg ... | _īṣam aśyāma dhāyase ‘... from you two may we gain complete refreshment for sustenance’. In 7.64.2cd we find ilām no mitrāvaruṇā ṣatā ṛṣṭim āva divā invataṁ jīradānā ‘send down to us food and rain, Mitra and Varuṇa, you who send down in abundance’. In 10.132.2a Mitra and Varuṇa are (du.) dharayāt-kṣitī ‘sustainers’ of kṣitī-, the latter signifying anything from a single habitation to whole nations.

In 1.41.1b, 2 we find … váruṇo mitrō aryamā ...|| yāṃ bāhūteva piprati pānti mártym rīṣāḥ | áriṣṭah sārvā edhate || ‘every mortal, whom Varuṇa, Mitra and Aryaman as if by the armful fill (or enrich) and protect, thrives safe from harm’. 7.62.3ab has vi nah sahāsraṁ ṣurūdho radantu _rāvāno vāruṇo mitrō agniḥ ‘may holy Varuṇa, Mitra (and) Agni bestow on us a thousand refreshments/boons’.

In RV 3.59, the one hymn entirely devoted to Mitra himself, he is described as one supporting people (carsañūdhāta-, 6a) as supporting all the gods (devāṁ viśvān bibharti, 8c), and as a provider of food according to desired ordinances (iṣa ṛṣṭā-vrata ākah, 9c) to the man whose sacrificial food is grass (jānāya vrktā-barhiṣe, 9b). In this last example we can perhaps see the idea of a ‘contract’ or perhaps rather a ‘contractor’ or ‘ordainer’, coming to the fore; but equally we can see a meaning such as ‘apportioner’ being appropriate.

Also in this hymn (3.59.4b) Mitra is described as being born a vedhās-, an epithet of uncertain meaning and etymology which Macdonell (1917: 81) renders ‘disposer’, a translation that for me lacks clarity. Like Mitra himself, this word also occurs in several RV contexts suggesting once again ‘liberally bestowing plenty and abundance’. While these contexts do not necessarily prove that this is the original meaning of the word, they do show that the word is compatible with this meaning. Some of these contexts now follow (the stem form vedhās, without hyphen, has been inserted in place of the target word in the translations that follow, sometimes functioning as a substantive, sometimes as an adjective):

1.72.1: nī kāvyā vedhāsāḥ śāśvatas kar hāste dádhāno nāryā purūṇī| agnir bhuvad rayi-pātir _rayiṇāṃ satrā cakraṇām amṛtāṇi viśvā|| ‘he has humbled the higher powers of every vedhās, bestowing many gifts for men into (their) hand, has Agni, and has become treasure-lord of treasures, having forever prepared all the worlds of the immortals.’

1.156.5: ā yō viyāya sacāthāya dāivyā indrāya viṣṇuḥ sukṛte sukṛttarāḥ| vedhā ajinvat tri-sadhasṭā āryam rtāsyā bhāgē yājamānam ā _abhajat|| ‘heavenly Vishnu, vedhās, triple-throned, who came for companionship to Indra (one of greater benevolence to one already benevolent), has assisted the respectable man and caused the worshipper to share in his portion of holy law.’
1.181. 1d, 7a: in 1d the twin Aśvins are addressed as vāsu-dhitī ávitārā janānām ‘treasure-bestowers, protectors of humankind’ and in 7a as vedhasā (du.).

4.2.20: etā te agna ucāthāni vedhó _avocāma kavāye tā jusasva| út _so-casva krṇuhī vāsyasno mahō rāyāh puruvāra prá yandhi|| ‘We have sung these praises to you, the vedhās, the poet (or sage), Agni, do enjoy them; blaze up, make us richer and grant great riches, you who are rich in gifts.’

6.14.1–2ab: agnā yó mártyo dúvo dhīyaṁ jujóṣa dhītibhiḥ| bhásat _nú śa prá pūrvyā īṣaṁ vurīta ávase|| agnir id _hí prácetā agnir vedhástama īṣih| ‘Whatever mortal has pleasure in granting his gift and devotion to Agni through his prayers, let him in consequence eat before the rest (and) may he choose his food for enjoyment! For Agni is indeed attentive (or observant or mindful), Agni is a (or the) most vedhās seer.’

6.16.20, 22: – 20: sá hi viśvā _āti pārthivā rayiṁ dáṣat_mahi-tvanā| vanván _ávato ástrtah| ‘For he gave riches while conquering all the regions of the earth, (being) through his greatness untroubled and invincible.’ – 22: prá vaḥ sakḥāyo agnāye stómaṁ yajñāḥ ca dhṛṣṇuyā| árca gáya ca vedháse|| ‘(Bring) forth, friends, for your Agni, laud and sacrifice, each of you offer praise and sing for your vedhās.’

6.22.3, 10, 11: – 3: tám īmaha indraṁ asya rāyāh puru-vírasya nrvátaḥ puru-kṣóḥ| yó āskṛdhoyar ajāraḥ svār-vān tám ā bhara harivo mādayādhyaï|| ‘We implore the same Indra for some of that wealth fitting for men and consisting of many heroes and much food, and which is abundant, undecaying, celestial; bring it, lord of bay horses, for gladdening.’ – 10: ā samvátaṁ indra ṇaḥ svastim śatrutāryāya brhatim ámrdrāṁ| yāya dāsāni _āryāni vrtrā kāro vajrīnt sutúkā nāhusāni|| ‘(Bring) hither, Indra, for the overcoming of our foes, uninterrupted prosperity, abundant and inexhaustible, through which do you, wielder of the thunderbolt, make our neighbouring enemies, both barbarous and esteemed, flee swiftly.’ – 11: sá no niyúdbhīḥ puruhūta vedho viśvā-vārābhīr ā gahiprayajiyo| nā yā dévo várate ná devá ābhir yāhi táyam ā madryadrīk|| ‘Come hither to us, much invoked, adorable vedhās, with your team of horses which bestow all treasures and which neither the ungodly nor any god restrains, come with them quickly to me!’

8.43.11, 33: – 11: uks-ānnāya vaśānnāya sóma-prṣthāya vedháse| stó-mair vidhema _agnāye|| ‘Let us honour ox-eating, cow-eating, vedhās
Agni bearing Soma on his back, with our praises.’ – 33: tát te sahasva īmahe dātraṃ vát na upa-dāśyati tvád agne vāryam vásu|| ‘We pray to you, Mighty Agni, for the allotted portion that does not fail, a precious treasure from you.’

9.26.3: tám vedhāṃ medhāyā-_ahyan pávamānam ádhi dyávi| dharnasim bhūri-dhāyasam|| ‘Through wisdom they have sent him, the vedhās, the purified (Soma), the strong, the nourisher of many, to the sky.’

9.102.4: jajñānám saptá mātāro vedhām aśāta śriyē| ayām dhruvó rayīnām ciketa vát|| ‘When he (Soma) was just born the seven mothers taught him as a vedhās for glory; and so he, being strong, set his mind on wealth.’

From the above, and especially since several of the above contexts refer to Agni, who is hailed e.g. in RV 1.27.6 with the words vibhaktā_asi ‘you are the distributor (or apportioner), I assume that Macdonell’s “disposer” means much the same as ‘benefactor, dispenser, distributor, apportioner; Zuteiler’. This suggests that vedhās-, with guṇa root and the same suffix as apās- ‘active’ (beside āpas- ‘work’), tyajās- m. ‘descendant’ (*‘the one who remains behind’) and other agent adjectives and substantives (Macdonell 1910: 114), can indeed be reconnected with the newly formed Vedic root vidh- which Mayrhofer (EWAia 2 s.v. VIDH) glosses ‘zuteilen, Genüge tun, zufriedenstellen’, finding the first two of these meanings also combined in the nasal present vindhe (RV 1.7.7; contra Monier-Williams 1899: 967c s.v. vidh/2).

Now it is true that Mayrhofer (l.c. et s.v. vedhās-) rejects this connection of vedhās- with vidh on the basis of (i) the newness of the root (< preverb vi ‘apart’ + *dʰh₁, ‘place, bestow’) and (ii) an alleged connection of vedhās- with GAv. vazdah- ‘constant’ (*‘beständig’, Bartholomae 1904 s.v.), a connection for which there is only phonological support. There are several things against Mayrhofer’s rejection. First, the absence of an accent on the alleged preverb vi (see RV 8.43.11 and cf. vi in 7.62.3, both quoted above) and the existence of the acknowledged nasal present vindhe indicate that vidh had become regarded by Vedic speakers as an ordinary root from which new derivatives could be made. Secondly, Epic Sanskrit has vedhas- ‘creator’, a meaning that can be seen as a natural outcome of being a ‘benefactor’ (cf. Eng. to make a person something, to make them what they are in a positive sense, i.e. by giving them the appropriate assistance, opportunities etc. and so being their benefactor). Consequently I propose that the connection of vedhās- with vidh is sound.

Having now arrived at the possibility that the original meaning of the DN Mitrā may well be ‘apportioner; Zuteiler’, rather than ‘contract’, we are in a position
to suggest derivation instead from Mayrhofer’s Ved. root  \( MĀ^2 \) ‘messen, abmessen, zumessen, zuteilen’ (EWAia 2 s.v.) < PIE *meh₁-₁, with Mitrā- m. < *mēh₁-tró- again by Beekes’ law with the same agent suffix as in a-trá- (< *ad-trá-) ‘eater’, \( vr-trā- \) ‘foe’ (Macdonell 1910: 124).\(^\text{10}\)

Thus we have our second example (after Hurrian/Akkadian \( mištannu \)) of AIA \( i < \) PIE \( *H \)\(^\text{11}\) and thus as much support as I am able to muster for my new explanation of the origin of Gk. \( μυθός \) etc.

Such can be the benefits of rejecting PIE \( *a. \)

Additional remark. The apparent root \( *mīdh \) seen by Mayrhofer (l.c.) also in the apparent perf. act. participle RV \( mūdhvāns \), f. \( mūdhyuṣī \) ‘bestowing richly, bountiful, liberal’ < *‘rich in rewards/rewarding’, which Monier-Williams (1899: 818b s.v. \( mih \)) treats as an adjective that has taken on a participial inflection, has presumably been backformed from RV \( mūdhā \) n. ‘reward’ with the meaning ‘apply/bestow a reward or rewards’ in the same proportion as RV \( yugā \) n. ‘yoke’ bears to \( yuṣ \) ‘apply a yoke or yokes’. The lack of reduplication is only a small peculiarity: Macdonell (1910: 235f.) lists corresponding unreduplicated participles for three other roots, viz. \( vidvāns \) ‘knowing’ and \( dāśvāms \) ‘worshipping’ (cf. \( dāśā- \) *act of worshipping’ in \( puro-dāśa- \) m. ‘oblation; prayer’) and possibly \( sāhvāms \) ‘having overcome’ (no doubt influenced, however, by reduplicated \( sāsahvāms \) ‘having conquered’ from the same root, cf. \( sahā- \) ‘powerful, mighty’), and there may be some significance in the fact that the first two are also glossed with present participles.

2. \( βούλομαι \) ‘want, wish’ : Slavic \( *gölı́ \) ‘bare, naked’, with a note on \( λόεω \) ‘wash’

Greek \( βούλομαι \) ‘wish, want, prefer’ is without extra-Greek IE congeners, judging by Beekes’ (2010 s.v.) treatment. Kümmel (LIV\(_2\) s.v. \( *gölίel₁⁻₁ \) n. 1) agrees, unless OCS \( želēti \) ‘wünschen, begehren’ is cognate. Kümmel (LIV\(_2\): 246) mentions the latter s.v. \( *h₁g^\text{vh}el > \) Gk. \( θέλω \) ‘wish, want’ but is inclined to believe

---

\(^{10}\) This is not to say that Mitrā- ‘contract’ may not be cognate, though with a different basic meaning of ‘apportioning (benefits and responsibilities)’ rather than the bleak one of ‘binding’ the participants to something none of them may want. After all, the NHG synonym \( Vertrag \) seems originally to have had the notion ‘what each takes and bears for himself’ (see Kluge/Seebold 1999 s.v.; Wasserzieher 1963: 429), which seems to agree with the idea of apportionment; and our Latin-based equivalents \( contract \) literally ‘a drawing together’ and \( covenant \) literally ‘a coming together’ suggest that agreement on the scope of each party’s contribution is the original basis of a contract, not a ‘binding’ coercion.

\(^{11}\) Incidentally, Finnish \( mitta \) ‘measure, measurement’ seems likely to be loan from PII \( *mitā- \) ‘measured’ < PIE \( *mhitō- \) again by Beekes’ law (Beekes 1988b: 35) > RV (pəri-/vi-) \( mita-, \) Pali \( mita- \).
that the OCS word really belongs with RuCS želěti ‘trauern’ (LIV2 s.v. *ĝeHl/-l). This agrees with Kümmel’s cross-reference to *ĝeHl/-l s.v. *ĝelh/- (n. 1) but not with Derksen’s (2008: 555) separation of these two CS homonyms by deriving the RuCS word from PIE *ĝelH- and the OCS one from PIE **ĝelor**-” (Derksen citing, for unclear reasons, the later Gk. form θέλω ‘wish, want’). The laryngeal in *ĝelH- accounts for the acute in Lith. gélti ‘ache’ and, also, according to Kortlandt (1985: 117), in SCR. žaliti ‘mourn, grieve, regret’, Cz. želiti ‘regret, deplore, grieve’ – assuming the Dutch scholar had in mind this shape and not *ĝeHl-.

Since the semantic shift from ‘want, wish’ to ‘pine, be ill, feel pain, feel sorrow, grieve’ has been rehearsed elsewhere (e.g. Woodhouse 2003) it is clear that there is no semantic prohibition against Kümmel’s tentative suggestion of a connection between Gk. βούλομαι ‘wish, want, prefer’ and RuCS želěti ‘regret, grieve’ and therefore, more to the point, the question arises whether Derksen’s separation of the Slavic forms into two homonymous roots of differing origin is justified.

The first nail in the coffin of this separation is the fact that there does not seem to be anything obligatory about the alleged laryngeal in SCR. žaliti, Cz. želeti. First, SCR. žaliti can have its short falling tone by shortening in trisyllabic forms in the same way as sīce and mládost (Kortlandt 2002: 1, 17) and this supports the idea that this verb is a denominative from Slavic žalb ‘grief, regret, pity’ which by all accounts lost its laryngeal in the lengthened grade of the original root noun (Kortlandt 1985: 117; Derksen 2008: 553f.), bearing in mind that the reassignment of a verb from the normal denominative ē-stem class to the i-stems is not uncommon in Serbo-Croat (Leskien 1914: 473, 465). Secondly, the root syllable of Cz. želeti, which does not necessarily reflect the Czech přehláska, appears to have the same tone as that of, say, Cz. žena ‘woman, wife’, which is not usually thought of as having an acute.

The second nail in the coffin follows from the fact that the Czech verb appears to be the only verb of this shape with the ‘regret’ meaning in a modern Slavic language while within Czech it does not have beside it any contrasting similar form having the ‘wish, want’ meaning. Likewise between OCS and RuCS there seems to be a neat cleavage between these two related meanings. From these facts it appears we have essentially a single verb in Slavic, the verb surfacing in any given language with one or other of the possible stem suffixes and one or other of the two indicated meaning types.

Possibly this verb represents a conflation of two different etyma, possibly not. Possibly all the Slavic forms are cognate with Lith. gélti but lost the laryngeal early through analogy with the (originally root) noun *gěli- < *ĝelH-. Equally possible is that all the Slavic verbs are cognate not with Lith. gélti and Gk. βούλομαι but with Gk. θέλω instead. This would not be the only instance of Baltic and Slavic differing in their retention of PIE etyma (see e.g. Woodhouse 2012a: 151).

If the second of these possibilities is accepted, then the close semantic connection between ‘desire’ and ‘lack’ encapsulated in our English gloss want suggests

---

Publikacja objęta jest prawem autorskim. Wszelkie prawa zastrzeżone. Kopiowanie i rozpowszechnianie zabronione.
Publikacja przeznaczona jedynie dla klientów indywidualnych. Zakaz rozpowszechniania i udostępniania serwisów bibliotecznych.
the possibility of connecting Gk. βούλομαι (and of course Lith. gėlti) with Slavic
*ɡȍlь ‘bare, naked’, i.e. ‘lacking in some kind of covering’. Filling out the semantics
on the Slavic side are associated words such as Russ. gol’ ‘the poor’, Russ. dial.
golotá ‘id.; nakedness’ and, best of all, Slovak holota ‘emptiness, poverty, nakedness’. In view of the facts (1) that for ‘poverty’ here one can substi-
tute ‘want’, and (2) that Slavic also possesses *nâɡь ‘naked’, continuing what
appears to be the original PIE etymon for this meaning (nicely summarized by
de Vaan 2008 s.v. nūdus), it would seem that there are good reasons for supposing
that the primary meaning of *ɡȍlь may not always have been ‘nudity, nakedness’,
but ‘needy, wanting, lacking’ and the like.

Derksen’s (2008 s.v.) reconstruction of *ɡȍlь as *ɡoIH- represents bitectal
*ɡ₂oIH- and can without difficulty be equated with Kümmel’s Peters-inspired
*ɡ*elh3- for βούλομαι (LIV₂: 208f. s.v.). There are however some formal difficulties
on the Greek side of this equation which will now be addressed.

The process by which Peters’ *h₃ generates *o in the root syllable of βούλομαι
is said to be a regular metathesis, thus *-elh3e- >* -elo- > -ole- in Pamphylian
βολεμεννς (Peters 1980: 349 n. 52; 1986: 310). But the lengthened root vowel of
βούλομαι is usually explained in terms of a nasal present and it is hard to see how
an apparent o-grade could become the basis of such a present (Beekes 2010 s.v.
with nothing concrete to add).

I think a solution can be found if we begin with the meaning ‘council’ of βοιλή, which word, I suggest, is a derivative of βούλομαι. A council is a gathering that
encourages its members to voice in turn their favoured or desired course of action.
It is conceivable that this might encourage the use of an iterative middle form of
the associated verb, specifically *g*ɔl*ɔh3e-i*el-o- > *g*ɔlo-i*e*l-o- > *βολο-ε*l-o-, a verb
of unusual structure in early Greek, there being, according to Tucker (1990: 275),
only two other verbs recorded in Homer with stem final radical o, i.e. *h₃, the re-
maining o-stem verbs being derived from o-stem nominals, which are generally
agreed to be a later phenomenon within PIE. The two other verbs with stems in
radical o are represented by 3rd pl. ἀρόωσιν ‘plough’ (Od. 9.108), which appears
to have essentially retained its original shape, and λό̂(e) ‘washed’ (Od. 10.361)
thought to be metathesized from *lewo- < *leu*₃- (Beekes 2010 s.v. λούω) like Pamphylian βολεμεννς mentioned above, which would thus constitute a third
example of the type.

I propose that the medial segment of *βολο-ε*l-o- early tended to undergo the
contraction of *o*e > oν evidenced in Il. 6.508 λούσαται ‘to be washed’ and of
*oo > oν as in Od. 10.240 νοῦς < νοός ‘mind’ yielding in both cases an apparent
contracted thematic stem *βολον-. This underwent metathesis, in the same way as
*lewo- > λό(ε), yielding in the first instance βολο- in which the apparently
thematic o induced thematic e in βοιλε- in those forms of the paradigm in which
this theme was characteristic.
This derivation raises the prospect that, while Pamphylian βολεμενος may indeed exemplify the kind of metathesis required in the above explanation of βολομαι, the derivation of the essentially active meaning of λοεσω, cf. impf. λοεσων 1. sg. (Od. 4.252), might better begin and end with the causative/iterative *lou-ει-elo-, given that washing, like knocking, frequently requires a series of repeated similar actions.

3. othé ‘wound’

Kümmel (LIV₂: 307) reconstructs *h3uath2 with *a based on Lith. votis (accent paradigm [AP] 4) ‘nasty sore’, Latv. vâts ‘(suppurating) wound, gash’ but these East Baltic words do not require *ā either, since East Baltic makes no distinction at all between traditional pre-Baltic *uā- and *uō- (Woodhouse 2011: 173). Moreover, the substitution of analogical *ā-grade for inherited *ō-grade in other contexts is also a well known phenomenon in Baltic (Stang 1966: 39–44).

Beside Lith. votis is the older variant vóitis (AP 1), which Derksen (1996: 147f.) thinks is the original form because the spread of AP 4 in i-stems is a well known phenomenon in Lithuanian. Both this variant and Latv. vâts point to an internal laryngeal within the root, and the Greek word is surely compatible with this. Smočzyński (2007: 767f.) agrees with an internal laryngeal but his connection of the Baltic words with Lat. uânis ‘empty’, Ved. vâyati ‘fade away’ is semantically less appropriate. This encourages the setting up of *h5uuh1oth2 for Baltic and *h5euh1th2- > Gk. *δετα > oþta by contraction, as above (βολομαι). This in its involvement of all three laryngeals is, as far as I know, comparable only with my suggestions *h3eih1h3 and *h5h3ēih3- for linking Hitt. ḫēu / hē(y)aw ‘rain’ with Gk. ἀιονάω ‘moisten’, both of which were seemingly eclipsed by an anonymous reviewer who proposed *h5ei- instead (Woodhouse 2012b: 229f.). Such over-laryngealization of the root (or both roots) may be the reason for its (their) poor retention rate in IE languages.

4. ειλη ‘warmth, heat of the sun’

Beekes (2010 s.v.) derives the variants of this ειλη, χελη, βέλα = χέλα unproblematically from PIE *suel(H)- but finds the forms ειλη, χελη with lengthened root vowel an insoluble problem “[u]nless there is an unknown phonetic development”.

I think the solution is as follows. The more interesting Greek dialect forms of ἥλιος ‘sun’ are derived from *seh5με-ελ- by Beekes (2010 s.v.) who takes care to point out the insuperable structural differences, and therefore the impossibility of direct relationship, between this and our target word representing *suel(H)-. But since the target word means ‘heat from the sun’ and is therefore likely to call
to mind the word for ‘sun’, if not actually be frequently combined with it in speech, there is surely a distinct possibility that somewhere in the Greek speech area the somewhat similar ‘sun’ word will have communicated something of its rhythm to the ‘heat from the sun’ word, *suel(\textit{H})-x *seh,u-el- resulting in *seu-el(\textit{H})- from which, with the usual lapse of consonantal *u and the usual contraction, the target forms εἶλη and (with psilosis) εἶλη result.

5. ὅνυξ ‘nail’ and delabialization by *l in North and East Germanic

In order to account for the Cowgill’s law conversion of the root vowel *o > u, Derksen (2008: 355 s.v. nagò) assumes a root final labiovelar. Two years later, Beekes (2010 s.v.) is more circumspect, allowing something like the choice offered by Vine (1999: 559) between original labiovelar (in Greek alone, according to Vine) and plain velar converted to labiovelar by a u-suffix attested in Balto-Slavic derivatives. Vine, admitting that evidence for such a u-stem is absent from Greek, is prepared to invoke instead the labiality of the initial laryngeal as part of the trigger, relying here on Hamp’s example προμιός of alleged non-contiguous triggering *n (Vine 1999: 555), for which, however, Vine (p. 558) appears to prefer Dunkel’s explanation of inherited parallel forms with *o : *u.

I think the labiovelar solution, with the original labiovelar delabialized in Greek by the newly arisen preceding u (§ 1 above), is correct and cannot be denied by any of the cognates mentioned by Derksen, viz. Lat. unguis (surely reflecting the labiality of the labiovelar), Ofr. ingen and OHG nagal, cf. OHG singan beside Goth. siggywan, ON synyva, synjá ‘sing’. These last items raise the question of the non-labiality of Goth. ga-nagljands ‘having nailed’, ON nagl l-stem ‘nail’, which I think is taken care of by the following -l- much as in Gothic fl- is delabialized to fl- except when PIE *o follows (Woodhouse 2000). A similar dual treatment of labiovelars before l can then be detected in the retention of labiality before PIE *lo in PGm. *hwehwlan / *hwegwlan > ON hjól, hvel, OE hweól, hwoegul, hweowol ‘wheel’ (thus Orel 2003: 199 s.v. *xwegwlan ~ *xwexwlan).

Vine is also puzzled by the retention of the root initial laryngeal in the o-grade, contra de Saussure’s law, which is perhaps not critical – Beekes (2010 s.v. οὐλή e.g.) consistently writes “Saussure Effect”, not “Law”.
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