MICHAEL WEISS

Life Everlasting: Latin iūgis “everflowing”,
Greek υγης “healthy”, Gothic ajukdüþs “eternity”
and Avestan yauuaēji- “living forever”

Summary: It is argued that Latin iūgis “everflowing”, Greek υγης “healthy”, Cypriote υφας ζαν “forever and ever”, Gothic ajukdüþs “eternity” and Avestan yauuaēji- “living forever” are all reflexes of a PIE collocation of the acrostatic neuter -i- stem *h₂oīn “life, eternity” and the root *gīh₂ “life, to live”. The delabialization of a labio-velar after ū is shown to have been a Proto-Indo-European change¹.

1. Latin iūgis “everflowing”

The Latin -i-stem adjective iūgis “everflowing” is said to be a derivative of iugum “yoke” according to W-H and E-M². W-H compare it formally to ON eykr “beast of burden, horse” which they derive from *iōugis³. This

¹ After I had written the majority of this text, I was happy to discover that Ferdinand DE SAUSSURE had anticipated many of the ideas sketched out herein. In a brief and brilliant note on the etymology of υγης (MSL 7, 1892, pp. 89–90) where he proposed the widely accepted etymology < *h₂su-gʻiib₂h₂ēs, DE SAUSSURE also suggested an alternative etymology comparing υγης to Aves. yauuaēji- “living forever”. He then went on to hint at the possibility of comparing ɔι-ζης “vigorouss”, iūgis “everflowing”, and Cypriot υφας ζαν “forever and ever”. Yet the details of his comparison, when they are provided at all, are rather different, and have clearly failed to convince. I hope that the arguments presented here will further the wider acceptance of DE SAUSSURE’s basic insight. Many thanks for much valuable advice and criticism are due to Wayles BROWNE, Jay JASANOFF, H. Craig MELCHERT, Alan NUSBAUM, Gudrún BÖRHALSSDÓTTIR and Calvert WATKINS. Naturally, I alone am responsible for any errors of fact or opinion that remain.


³ The reconstruction of the pre-form of ON eykr seems to be unambiguous. DE VRIES, however, ANEW, p. 107, posits a preform *jaukijaz < *jougišos. If DE VRIES’ reconstruction *jaukijaz were, in fact, possible, one could assume that Germanic inherited a τόμος type noun *jaukaz “yoking” < *iōgus, cf. Ved. Skt. yóga- “yoking”. From this noun a
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traditional comparison is, however, seriously flawed. First, it is an interesting fact that *iūgis* is used in Classical Latin, with one exception, only of water\(^4\). The examples are: Cic. Nat. Deorum 2,25 *ex puteis iugibus* “from everlasting wells”; Div. 1,112 *puteo iugī* “an everlasting well”; Div. 2,31 *aquae iugīs* “everlasting water”; Sallust Iug. 89,6 opposed to *pluvia* “collected rain-water”; Horace Sat. 2.6.2 *iugīs aquae fons* “a fountain of overflowing water”; Epist. 1,15,16 *puteosne perennes iugīs* “everlasting enduring wells”. Cf. also Festus’ *aquam iugem*, and the Gloss *iugis aqua ἄεναιον ὑδωρ* “overflowing water”. On the theory that *iūgis* is related to *iugum*, this apparent specialization of meaning is inexplicable.

There is not one example of *iūgis* that in any way supports its supposed original adjectival meaning “yoked”. Even granting that this is an argument from silence, and that the specialization of *iūgis* in the meaning “overflowing” could have been pre-literary, one would still have to overcome a considerable semantic distance starting from an original adjective *iōugis* “of the yoke”, via a more generalized meaning “continuous”, to arrive finally at a respecialized meaning “overflowing”. To argue from the other side, one may also note that the verb *iungo* does not seem to show up in the meaning “to make continuous” before Pliny The Younger (Ep. 4.9.10). Nor do any of the

\(^4\) The earliest occurrence of *iūgis* (Plautus Pseud. 84: *thensesaurus iugis*) happens to be used metaphorically of a treasury.
indubitable members of the family of iunco show any trace of semantic specialization in this direction.

A step in the right direction was taken by DANIELSSON, who is reported to have thought that iūgis should be connected with aevum “span of life”. W-H presumably rejected this etymology for two reasons. First, because they did not see or believe that aevum “lifetime”, Goth. aīw- “time, eternity”, Skt. āyu- “life”, etc., and iuvenis “young man”, Gothic jūggs “young”, Aves. gen. sing. yaoś “vitality”, etc. can all be related as exemplars or derivatives of a PIE neuter -u-stem *h₂oju “vitality, eternity”. Second, they may have been leery of this suggestion because there is no evidence at all for the PIE or Latin suffix -gi- which is apparently required for DANIELS-

---

5 Grammatische und Etymologische Studien p. 49, according to W-H, I, p. 727, but I have read this footnote very carefully and found no mention of iūgis, although various words of the *h₂oju-family are discussed.

6 *h₂oju- must be reconstructed as a -u-stem of the *dōru, gōnu type, i.e. as an originally acrostatic o/e ablauting paradigm. The o-grade is guaranteed by Greek οῦ (Warren COWGILL, Lg 36, 1960, pp. 347-50). The e-grade is suggested by Grk. οἷς “forever” < *h₂ejei most probably interpreted as the dative of this -u-stem. In Indo-Iranian the original weak stem *h₂eju- was replaced by *h₂eju-, the source of the Aves. gen. sg. yaoś. Cf. Ved. Skt. nom./acc. sg. dāru gen. s. dāh < P.In.-Ir. *dāru, dārā.

It seems necessary to assume that both “vital force” and “eternity” were possible meanings of *h₂oju already in the proto-language. The former proto-meaning seems secure, since *h₂ju-h₂on- “young man” (Ved. Skt. yuvā, Lith. jūnas “young”, OCS. juna “young”, Latin juvenis, OIr. oac “young” < *h₂ejuh₂ako-, Goth. jūggs “young” < *h₂ejuh₂eko- etc.) can only be explained as a derivative formed with the possessive suffix *h₂on-. (K. HOFFMANN, MSS 6, 1955, pp. 35-40) from a base noun meaning “vital force”. But the meaning “eternity” must also have been ‘ursprachlich’ to judge from the semantic agreement of atē “forever”, and the Aves. dative or directive (ʔ) yamau “forever”. Furthermore, COWGILL’s etymology of Grk. οὐ “not” and Arm. ʾox “not” as extracted from *ne...h₂oju (kēid) “not...ever” requires an early meaning “eternity”. This double meaning strikes one as rather odd. It is not, however, unparalleled. Lithuanian vičkas means “vital force”, but OCS večas means “human life, eternity” and traces of the meaning “vital force” are also found, according to B. UNBEGAI, in the Old Russian bez veča “invalid” literally “without force” and in the verb uvčit’ “mutilate” literally “deprive of vital force”. See B. UNBEGAI, Une parallèle semantique greco-slave, in FS KRAHE, p. 173-176. But the interpretation of the OR juncture bez veča is not certain. AVANESOV, II, p. 294, translates večas, in this context by Russian uvčiti “damage”. The semantic development of *h₂oju can perhaps be understood if one assumes that the original meaning was “life”. In certain case forms, e.g. the dative, the meaning “for life” may then have acquired the meaning “for ever, for eternity”. From here the meaning ‘eternity’ was generalized to the entire paradigm.
SON’s etymology. But if the morphological details could be made to work, this etymology would be far more appealing on semantic grounds, for the family of *h₂posé is very apt for describing an overflowing fountain, cf. e. g. Greek χρήνης τ’ ἀενάου “overflowing fountain” (Hes. Op. 595) and χρήνη ἀειρόος “overflowing fountain” (Soph. OC. 469).

To my mind, the apparent suffix -gi- finds its closest match in the Germanic *aigu-ki- “eternal” found in Gothic ajukdups “eternity” and OE éce, æce8 “eternal” < *aigu-ki.9 Now it is surely not coincidence that both iügis

---

7 Furthermore, words for “river” or “water” are sometimes derived from the semantically related root *gʰi₂h₂ “live”, e.g. Ved. Skt. jīri- “flowing water”, Paelignian and Umbr. biam “fountain”, (VETTER 212, 234). Furthermore *gʰi₂h₂-yeh₂, h₂-op-s “living water” may have been a PIE idiom for “fresh, i.e. not stagnant water” in view of the semantic agreement of e.g. Ved. Skt. jirāđānu- “pouring forth quick drops”, Latin aqua viva “fresh water” (Varro, R. 1.11.2, etc.), the Serbo-Croatian idioms živa voda “spring” literally “living water”, and the folkloric živica voda “the living one, the water” (Wayles BROWNE p.c.), Russian voda živoja “running water, spring water” (AVANESOV I, p. 451), and OE cwic wæter “fresh water”. It therefore seems at least as plausible to derive the Indo-Iranian *iaiṣṭā “stream, watercourse”. (OP yauviyā “canal”, Mod. Pers. jıī “watercourse, canal”, Kati yu, “canal”, Ved. Skt. yavyā “stream”, e.g. RV. 8.98.8 vār na... yavyābhīs “wie ein Gewässer durch Bäche” (GELNER)) from *h₂yəu-ιεβ₂, an *-iĕb₂ derivative of *h₂-poiu, as to derive it from the scantily attested root *yū “to go, move” (yoni- “way” > “womb” etc.). Formally, one could compare Ved. vāśavya- n. “wealth” derived from vāsu- “good”.

8 CAMPBELL, p. 100, considers æce (Vespasian psalter, Rushworth Gospel, Kentish charters) to be the regular outcome of < *æci- < *æyec- < *æyeki- < *aikuyi-, but he regards éce (Caedmon éri) as unexplained.

9 The comparison of Latin iügis and Gothic ajukdups was made already by BENVENISTE in his classic article BSL 37, 1938, pp. 103-112. The reconstruction of an -i-stem adjective seems to me the simplest hypothesis to account for the correspondence of Goth. ajukdups and OE éce for the following reasons: Goth. ajukdups is formed with the feminine de-adjectival abstract suffix -duþi- (= Latin -ius, -itius etc.). The adjective at the base of this abstract could have been a thematic stem *aikupa-. For the syncope of a thematic vowel before the suffix -duþi-, cf. manaz-duþs “abundance” from the thematic base manags “many” and mikil-duþs “greatness” from the thematic base mikils “great”. On the other hand, the base adjective could also have been an -i-stem *aiku- which would certainly have lost its -i- before the suffix -duþi-, just as the -i-stem adjective gamains “common, unclean” lost its -i- to make the abstract gamain-duþs “fellowship”. The base adjective could not, however, have been *aikujiya- since this could only have formed the abstract *aikui-duþs. Cf. Gothic andi-laus “endless” < *andi-jalaus-, see KRAUSE, p. 91. As for OE éce, it could reflect either an -i-stem or an -i-a-stem but not, of course, an -a-stem. In view of these facts, one could imagine that Gothic and OE inherited from Proto-Germanic a thematic adjective *aiku- “eternal”. In Gothic this adjective served as the base of the abstract ajukdups but
and ajukdups apparently show an otherwise unparalleled suffix *-gi- added to what in Germanic is certainly, in Latin possibly, a form of PIE *h₂ōju. This comparison is very supportive of DANIELSSON’s basic insight, but the question remains: what is this apparent suffix *-gi-?  

I propose that the putative *-gi- suffix is not a suffix at all, but rather a form of the root *g²eih₂-/g²ih₂- “live”. Since neuter -u-stems of the *doun type show a zero-grade form as the first member of compounds, e.g. Ved. Skt. ānubādha- “bending the knees”, Greek δρυτόμος “wood-chopper”, one would expect *h₂ōju to appear as *h₂i₂u- in this position. A root-noun of the root *g²ih₂- is attested in Avestan ārəzərī- “living honestly”. Therefore a bahuvihi combining *h₂i₂u- and *g²ih₂- meaning “having a life for life (= for ever)” or “having a life which is eternal” would in the first instance be expected to be *h₂i₂u-g²ih₂-s. I believe it is this PIE compound that underlies

was itself lost. In the ancestor of OE *ajuka- was substantivized, and from this unattested substantive *ajuka- or *ajukaz “eternity” an adjective “ajukija- “eternal” was derived, the direct ancestor of ece. But it is far simpler to suppose that both Gothic and OE inherited an adjective *ajuki- from Proto-Germanic which in Gothic was the base for the abstract ajukdups and in OE became by sound change ece.

Since the reconstruction of a thematic stem *ajuka- is unlikely, the traditional comparanda, i.e. Germanic adjective in -ka-, e.g. Gothic ibaks “backwards” and the adverbs anales “suddenly”, alakjo “all” and PIE adjectives in -go- become rather less interesting. A particularly favored comparandum, the Rig Vedic 1,116,1 hapax *árbhaga- “young” seems to be nothing more than a ‘volksprachlich’ variant of the much better attested arbhakā-. See MAYRHOFER, EWAI, p. 120 and HOFFMANN, Aufsätze p. 137, where other Skt. examples of variation between -ka- and -ga- are listed.

10 One might point to the Lithuanian dveigys “two years old”, treigys “three-years-old” ketvergis “four years old” etc. which cannot be separated from OCS trize “three years old”, and Old Serbian dviz “two years old”. But the Serbian form reflects a Proto-Slavic *dvože, or *dveže and must, in turn, go back to *dveig(h)zo- with a palatal *-g(ʰ). This form cannot be the result of Bdc palatalization. See LUNT, p. 19. One is tempted to compare the Hittite synonym daivga- “two years old” which is presumably a compound of da- < *dyob₃, “two” and iuka- < *jugom “yoke” in the meaning “span of time” which is also found in Sanskrit yugam, but there seems to be no way to make this work phonologically. Next come to mind OHG zwig “branch” OE twig “twig” < *dveig(h)zo-, (but *dveikō- is also possible) Albanian degë “branch” < *dveighe₂h. Yet this apparent suffix -go- seems to be closely related to the Greek numerical adverbs in -χα, e.g. δ.pay “in two”. See BRUGMANN II 1, p. 513–514. While a branch can easily be designated as “the thing that splits in two”, it is not easy to see how the sense “X-years old” could somehow be derived from these fractional adverbs. I can see no easy solution to the problem of dveigys etc. Yet these forms can hardly be taken as evidence for a PIE suffix -gi.
not only Latin *iūgis* and Germanic *ajuki*, but also Greek ὑγιής “sound, healthy” and Avestan *yauaējah* “having eternal life”. But in order to arrive at a “suffix” *-gis*, which is apparently required for Latin and Germanic, from a root noun *-gih₂*, one must explain both the replacement of the labiovelar by a velar and the apparent loss of the laryngeal.

2. The Missing Laryngeal

As for the apparent loss of the laryngeal, a number of possible scenarios could be sketched out. First, one might compare the cases where a laryngeal between sonorant and a consonant in the second member of a compound or after a syllable of reduplication seems to have been lost. Thus one finds in Sanskrit sūsūti “easy birthing” from *h₁su-sub₂-ti* vs. the simplex sūti TS “birth”. In Greek, one finds πύμπλαμεν “we fill” and ἰλάσκομαι “I am propitious” instead of phonologically expected *πύμπλημεν* < *piohl₁-mes* and *ἰλῆσκομαι* < *sisíh₂-see*. By application of this rule one would expect *h₂iu-g₁h₃-s* to become *h₂iu-g₁is*.

Second, one might consider invoking a related rule of laryngeal loss: the so-called veogvοs rule whereby a laryngeal between a sonorant and a vowel was lost in the second member of a compound or after a syllable of reduplication, e.g. veogvοs “new-born” < *neuo-g₁h₂-o*, Goth. niuklaubs “childish” from *neuo-g₁h₁-o-ko* — by dissimilation, Skt. jajne “I am born” < *gēg₁h₁-b₂ai*, Grk. ἵγνυς “within the head” or “brain” < *en-k₁h₂-ös*. By the veogvοs rule, all prevocalic forms (i.e. the singular gen., dat., inst., loc.) of *h₂iu-g₁h₃* would become *h₂iu-g₁i*.

---

11 The example of ἰλάσκομαι was pointed out by M. PETERS (Armenian Lecture, University of Vienna, Fall 1991). True, one could explain πύμπλαμεν and ἰλάσκομαι as super-zero-grades, but one expects rather *πύμπλημεν* since this is a root ending in the first laryngeal, cf. plēnus “full” < *pleh₂-no*. The Vedic examples of this phenomenon are discussed by F.B.J. KUIPER, Sprachre 7, 1961, pp. 24ff. See also MAYRHOFER IG 1/2, p. 150.

12 See MAYRHOFER IG 1/2 p. 129, who, however, would limit this rule to the *h₁*. In view of ἵγνυς, this seems to be incorrect.

13 In addition, one might note that the vocative and the neuter nom. acc. s. *h₂ju-g₁h₂* would have susceptible to the so-called ‘in pause’ laryngeal loss. Cf. the Ved. vocative Yami “O Yami” RV 10,10,14, and OCS Ženo “o woman” < *g₁ena < *g₁ena₂*, Umbrian Prestot-a “O Praestota” < *a₁ < *ah₂.
Finally, one ought to consider whether either Latin iūgis and Gothic ajukdups, OE ēce really require the laryngeal of *gʰih₃-s to be lost phonologically. Neither Latin nor Germanic maintained a category of long -i-stems, and it is hard to see what else Latin and Germanic could have done to long -i-stem adjectives besides absorbing them in the regular -i-stem category. Compare the fate of *neptih₁s “granddaughter” (Skt. naptih “granddaughter” etc.) in Latin and Germanic. In the former *neptih₁-s simply was incorporated into the -i-stem paradigm as neptis “granddaughter”. In Germanic, *neptih₁-s was either treated as a feminine -i-stem, for example, ON nipt “a female relative, sister”, OHG nift “granddaughter, step-daughter”, or transferred to the -ii₃-paradigm in order to mark more clearly its feminine gender, for example, ON acc. s. (hapax, Helgakvida 2.28) nipti, OHG nifia. An adjective inherited from PIE and ending in -i could hardly have escaped a similar morphological transfer. Thus the -i-stem adjective *ajuki- could simply be another example of the same morphological phenomenon.

There are, then, a number of possible scenarios which could explain the apparent loss of laryngeal. Similar possibilities exist to give a convincing explanation for the change from labiovelar to velar.

3. The Loss of the Labial Element of a Labiovelar after U in PIE

The simplest hypothesis is to suppose that, already in PIE, a labiovelar lost its labialiality by dissimilation after *u. Thus according to this rule *h₂ju-gʰih₃-s would have become *h₂ju-gih₃-s. This idea was first proposed by DE SAUSSURE for PIE, yet it has never been taken seriously as an Indo-European, as opposed to a specifically Greek, phenomenon. Nevertheless, I believe it is quite probably correct. To demonstrate this will require a review of the possible examples and counter-examples.

PIE *gʰou-kolo- < *gʰou-keolo-

---

14 For ON see CLEASBY-VIGFUSSON, p. 455, and NORÉN, p. 270. For OHG see WELLS, p. 440. In OE feminine -i-stems and -ii₃-stems are indistinguishable. See CAMPBELL, p. 242.

15 MSL 6, 1889, pp. 161–162.
The best example of this rule is the word *g'ou-k'olos “neatherd” attested by Greek βουκόλος “neatherd”, Myc. qo-u-ko-ro, and the Celtic forms, OIr. bóchail, buachail “bubulcus”, MWelsh bugeil “shepherd, boy”, Cornish bugel, MBret. buguel, bugel, Vann. bugul “boy” which apparently reflect a Proto-Celtic *g'oukoli. The second member of this compound, a derivative of the root *k*el(ph) to go round (Greek πέλομαι “I am”, Skt. carati “he wanders”, Latin colo “I inhabit” etc.) originally began with a labiovelar as is established by Greek ἵππος-πόλος “horse-herd” (Hom.+) etc. The simplest hypothesis to account for these data would assume that the dissimilation of the labiovelar after u was a PIE phenomenon rather than that the same dissimilation occurred twice independently.

There are, to my knowledge, no other clear cases of this rule. This is not really surprising, since the original labiovelar would have been irretrievably merged with a velar in the cases where u invariably preceded. One would therefore predict that velars would be particularly common in non-Schwebeablauting roots of the shape *CevisK*. On the other hand, if u did not invariably precede, then the labiovelar could have been restored analogically. One would then predict that only roots of the shape *uvK* - *uvK* - or roots of the shape *CevisK* with Schwebeablaut would have evidence for a labiovelar

---

16 PEDERSEN VGKS, p. 127. VENDRYES LEIA, p. B–107. Thanks to Jay JASANOFF for calling the Celtic forms to my attention. The i-stem is curious, and quite possibly more archaic than the Greek thematic stem. Perhaps the compound was originally *g'ou-k'oli- with the well-known substitution of i-stem inflection for thematic inflection in the second part of a bahuvrihi. Cf. Latin anima (Naevius +) “breath of life” but semianimus (Enn. +) “half-alive”, as well as semianimus (Sallust +) “id”. Of course, one would then have to suppose that *g'ou-k'oli- was originally a bahuvrihi, “whose circuit is cows”.

17 A third conceivable alternative, that the Brittonic forms are borrowed from Irish, seems rather unlikely. Avatars of g'oukoli are attested in every Brittonic language, and what would have been the cultural motivation for the borrowing?

18 One is tempted to try to explain the strange case of Gothic aubns “oven” < *áknos ONorw. ogn, OSw. ogn, ughn ODan. ogn “oven” < *áknios vs. OHG ovän OE. ofen “oven” MLG ouen and Greek ἵνος “oven” by this rule. On the other hand, Mycenaean has i-po-no determinative POT (Uc 160, Kn 233 Docum.², p. 548) which is thought with some degree of probability to be the equivalent of 1st millennium Greek ἵνος. If this is correct, then ἵνος would seem not to have a labiovelar at all, and the whole family remains difficult to account for under any theory. In any case, SZEMERÉNYI’s multiple dissimilation and borrowing account (Scripta Minora IV p. 2236–2237) fails to convince me.

19 Furthermore, it is only the ‘centum’ languages which can provide examples.
following u. These predictions are, in fact, confirmed. Consider the apparent counter-examples:

A. False Reconstructions

i. *bblege⁴⁵u. “flow”

The reconstruction of *bblege⁴⁵ to explain the alternation of fluo and fluxi²⁰ is supported by no comparative evidence. An analogical explanation for fluxi is not difficult to find. For example, one may start from confluges “confluences” which could have been created on any one of several analogies, e.g. contāmen²¹ “contamination” < *kom-tag-s-men : contāgēs “contact” or exāmen “a swarm” < *eks-ag-s-men: ambāgēs “circumlocution” :: flūmen : X, X = flūgēs²². The creation of a form with a non etymological -g- is precisely paralleled by the case of strāgēs a “confused mass”, strāgulus “clothes used as blankets”. The root meaning of these words is “strewage” and they must therefore be connected with the root of sternus, sternulus, strāvi, strātus “I strew” *stehg⁴⁻ (Grk. aor. ἐστορεσα by metathesis < *e-steh₂g- etc.). But since there is no evidence for -g- extended *steh³g-, one would prefer to offer an inner-Latin explanation for strāgēs and strāgulus²³. In light of what has been said just above, it is clear that these forms were created on the analogy ex-ā-men: ambāgēs vel sim. :: stra-men “straw” : X, X = strāgēs. Once a -g- had been introduced into con-flāgēs, it was quite simple for this to spread to other parts of this family on the basis of analogies of various sorts, e.g., fruges

²⁰ W-H, I, p. 519.

²¹ Contāmen is not actually attested until Tertullian, but its prior existence must be supposed on the basis of the verb contāminare (Ter. and Acc. +). See PERROT, p. 48-49.

²² Contāgēs is, of course, singular with both fifth declension (e.g. contāgē (Lucr. 3.734) and third declension forms (e.g. contāge (Lucr. 4.336, etc)). Ambāgēs is a pluralé tantum in archaic texts. Singular forms apparently do not appear before Ovid, e.g. Met 8.161 ambāge. Perhaps the precisiest formal model would have been frāmen “sacrificial mush” < *frēg-s-men : frēgēs :: flāmen : flūgēs. The only problem is that frāmen is not attested before Arnobius. But it may, in fact, be a much older form which Arnobius took from some work on religious antiquities.

²³ W-H, II, p. 600 compare Lith. strōga săulės “sunbeam” but this can only be from *steh₂gęh₂ with a different laryngeal.
fructus :: -flugēs : X, X = fluctus \(^{24}\) and then ductus “leadership” : duxi “I led” or luctus “mourning” : luxi “I mourned” :: fluctus : X, X = flūxi \(^{25}\).

ii. *bhaku̯kos “flying insect”

POKORNY’s lemma *bhakwkos, p. 163, reconstructed to account for the comparison of Latin fūcus “drone” and Old English bēaw “gadfly”, Low German bau “gadfly” is far from certain \(^{26}\). The name of a flying insect could easily be at least partly onomatopoetic, and E-M’s derivation of fūcus from *bhokos, a derivative of the root *bhe- “bee” (OCS bčela < *bhikeleb₂, Lith. bitis, OHG bini) is much more satisfactory semantically \(^{27}\).

iii. *lukwkos “wolf” > Sabellic lupo- > Latin lupus

It is often assumed that Latin lupus “wolf” is a lone word from some Sabellic language where *kʷ became p. This Sabellic word, in turn, would seem to be derived from the same metaphesized form of the PIE wolf word that lead to Greek λύκος, i.e. *lukwkos. If this account were true, then it would seem that Sabellic *lupo- would argue in favor of the retention of the labial element of a labiovelar after u in PIE. But this account is far from compelling. First of all, it is known that the Samnite and presumably Sabellic word for wolf was the tabuistic hirpo-, i.e. “the hairy one”. Second, why should the early Latins have required a loan-word for “wolf”, an animal which was presumably no more common in rural Samnium than in rural Latium? Pace Horace’s lupus in Sabina, the wolf seems to have been not merely familiar to the early Latins, but even to have served almost as a totem for at least the Romans. One only need think of the famous 5th century B.C.E. statue of the Lupa Capitolina, or the denarii minted by the Italic allies during the Social

\(^{24}\) Long ū because of Ital. flutto. See SOLMSEN, p. 129, n. 1.

\(^{25}\) The pf. pass. ptc. fluctus (attested by the grammarian Priscian) was replaced by fluxus on the analogy clau-si “I closed” < *klaud-sai: clau-sus “closed” < *klaud-go- (vel sim. cf. also pressi, pressus; cessi, cessus etc.).: flu-ksi : fluk-sus.

\(^{26}\) OE bēaw and Low German bau (if this form is real: I have yet to find it in any Low German lexicon) would seem to reflect a Proto-Germanic *baumaz. If one must have an etymology for such a word, one might compare the onomatopoetic root *bhjew- (POKORNY, p. 97) said to be the source of Persian būm “owl” and MHG buc “blow”. One might also compare English buzz, bumblebee etc.

\(^{27}\) See MEILLET, MSL 14, 1906–1908, pp. 476ff.
War showing the Italic bull goring the Roman wolf. See plates 3 and 8 in A. Alföldi, Die Struktur des voretruskischen Römerstaates, Heidelberg, 1974. Instead it is perhaps more likely that *lupo- is the genuine Latin reflex of PIE *lup- “dog-like animal”. Cf. Aves. urupi- “dog” < *lupi-, etc.\(^{28}\) In any case, whatever may be the correct account of Latin lupus, no serious and compelling phonological argument can be drawn from a word whose meaning made it particularly liable to tabu deformations and replacements.

**B. Roots of the shape \(*\text{m}e\text{k}h\)\(^{-}/\) \(*\text{n}k\)\(^{-}\).**

\(i. *\text{m}e\text{k}h\)\(^{-}/\) \(*\text{n}k\)\(^{-}\) “speak”

The Greek reduplicated aorist εἰπον “I said” < *e-\(\text{m}e\text{k}h\)\(^{-}\)om = Skt. ávocam “I said” could have had its labiovelar restored at any time on the basis of the -s- stem noun (f)ἐπος “word” since the etymological connection between εἰπον and ἐπος was never obscured. The Greeks, no doubt, felt the figura etymologica of the idiom ός ἐπος εἷπειν “to exaggerate a little”, e.g., (Aesch. Pers. 714 etc.).

\(ii. *\text{me}g\)\(^{-}/\) \(*\text{ug}\)\(^{-}\) “wet”

The most difficult apparent counter-example is the case of Latin ùvidus “wet” and its derivatives. But this too is only an apparent counter-example. According to W.-H, ùvidus and its family are to be derived from a root \(*\text{me}g\)\(^{-}\) “wet”.\(^{29}\) The labiovelar is established by ON voke̞va < *\(\text{m}\)o\(\text{g}\)\(^{-}\)eb₂ “wetness”. But this form also shows that the real full-grade of this root was \(*\text{me}g\)\(^{-}\). This is confirmed by OIr. fúal “urine” < *\(\text{m}\)o\(\text{g}\)\(^{-}\)ō. Thus the labiovelar could easily have been restored in the zero-grade \(*\text{ug}\)\(^{-}\). A pre-form \(*\text{ug}\)\(^{-}\)-ido- with a restored labiovelar, would become in Latin ùvidus and then by syncope ùdus.\(^{30}\) From ùdus a hyperarchaic ùvidus could have been created.

---

\(^{28}\) See POKorny, p. 1179.


\(^{30}\) I have reconstructed the pre-form of Latin -idus as *-ido- on the basis of gelidus “cold”. As Alan Nussbaum has pointed out to me, a pre-form *gel-edo- would have given Latin t'golīdus since l was velar before e, cf. Herculēs < *Hercēlēs with the anaptyctic vowel u. The e of Umbrian kaleruf, keleru “cal(li)dos”, “with a white spot on the forehead” = Latin calidus (Plt. +) “id.” is hardly decisive, since e is sometimes written for i in Umbrian. See MEISER, p. 43. As for Latin soled “solid” CIL I.1529.12, this too is ambiguous.
It is also possible that ʰúṣu and the hyperarchaism ʰúṣudus could be the regular outcome of *₁ue/og²-idô- with full-grade in the correct position. For the proposed syncope and its result, cf. brúma “the shortest day of the year” < *mreqhúismo- or *mreqhúismo-.\(^{31}\)

It is, indeed, difficult to decide whether a full- or zero-grade should be expected in any given *-ido- formation. On the one hand, one finds clear full-grades in synchronically motivated forms like rúbudus “red”. On the other hand, since *-ido- seems in some instances to be the Latin replacement of a PIE CALAND suffix *-mo- e.g. crúdus “raw” < *kruuidô- < *kruh₂-idô- “raw” vs. Aves. x্রúma- “raw”, núdus “naked” < *₁ne/og²-idô- vs. Hitt. nekuma(nt) “naked”, Aves. magna- “naked” by metathesis from *₁nagma-, one would not be surprised to find the zero-grade characteristic of adjectives in *-mo- in at least some archaic *-ido- formations.

in the light of such archaic spellings as tempestatebus. Perhaps the strongest evidence for original -edo- is Grk. μακεδόνας (Hom. +) “tall”. This adjective seems to be a thematization of the -n-stem Μακεδόνας “Macedonian” which may be analyzed, following Peters, as an individualizing -n-stem derivative of an adjective *-edo-. The suffix of this inferrable adjectival *mak-edo- from the Calandish root *mak- / mák- (cf. μήκος (Hom. +) “length”, μεγάς (Hom. +) “long, big”, μεγάς (Hom. +) “tallest” would be exactly comparable to the Latin CALAND suffix -ido- if from *-edo-. See Peters’ discussion, p. 178 n. 131. Nevertheless I have opted for the reconstruction *-ido-.

\(^{31}\) Secondary sequences of -e˘C seem to have become -i˘C in both initial and non-initial syllables. Other examples are núdus < *neg²-idô- (or *neg²-odo-, cf. Gothic naqaps “naked”) and exclúdo “I deny access to” < *eks-kleudô < *eks-klaudo.

The pre-form underlying brúma is unclear. On the one hand, one might reconstruct *mreqhúmo- not a superlative, but simply a positive “the short one”. On the other hand, one might reconstruct a superlative *mreqhúismo- provided that the syncope of *e˘C < *e˘ghúC was before the loss of s with compensatory lengthening in the sequence *VsDV, and thus that the development was *mreqhúismo- > *brei̯simo- > *brei̯simo- > *brúmo- and with substantivization *brúma. This chronology is supported by the examples of iuglans (Cic. +) “walnut” < *diúžglans < *diouéglans < *diouesglans originally “Jupiter’s nut” presumably a calque on Grk. διοῦς βάλανος (Thpr. +) “sweet chestnut” and audio “I hear”, if from *auzi̯-dio- < *auzi̯-diō- cf. Grk. αἰσθάνομαι < *āis̯θάνομαι “I perceive”, Ved. Skt. āvih “apparent”. In these two cases, however, the *y is not from a labiovelar.

\(^{32}\) Schindler has suggested in lectures at the University of Vienna 1991 that the surprising full-grade in *neg²-mo- may be ascribed to the NARTEN characteristics of this root. Cf. Lith. nuogas “naked” < *nog²-os.
The verb "vesco "be wet", only attested a few times\textsuperscript{33}, and the noun \textquotedblleft weto" (hapax)\textsuperscript{34} must have been formed secondarily to \textit{vidus} on the model of \textit{rubidus} "red" : \textit{rubescro} "be red" : \textit{rubor} "redness".

It is also worth mentioning a third conceivable possibility: \textit{vidus} etc. are derived not from \textit{meg} at all, but from the root \textit{mub}/\textit{ub} also meaning "wet". This root is found in Vedic \textit{vār} n. (disyllabic) "water", Aves. \textit{vār} "rain", ON \textit{ūr} n. "water", and Latin \textit{ūrina} "urine" and \textit{ūrinor} "to dive" (\textit{est mergi in aquam} "it means to be plunged into water" Varr. L.L. 5, 126) and, according to \textsc{WATKINS}, in Luvian \textit{wa-ar} "water", and Old Irish \textit{fír} "milk"\textsuperscript{35}. \textit{ub}-\textit{ido-} would regularly become \textit{uiddo-} > \textit{uudus}. Cf. \textit{crīdus} < \textit{kruiddo-} < \textit{kruub}-\textit{ido-}\textsuperscript{36}. The explanation of \textit{vidus} etc. would be as before.

But, against this hypothesis one may argue that the root \textit{mub}-\textit{ido-} has no evidence for a \textsc{caland} system, whereas \textit{meg}-\textit{i}-\textit{ug} clearly does. And since the suffix \textit{-ido-} is the productive \textsc{caland} suffix in Latin, it is more plausible to suppose it was suffixed to the well established \textsc{caland} root \textit{mub}-\textit{i}-\textit{ug}.

On the other hand, it does not seem impossible to derive \textit{umor} "moisture" (\textit{Enn. +}), \textit{umidus} "moist" and \textit{ūligō} "waterlogged ground" (\textit{Cato +}) from the root \textit{mub}-\textit{i}-\textit{ug}. The family of \textit{umor} is supposed by \textsc{W-H} to be derived from a lost adjective \textit{ūmos} "moist"\textsuperscript{37}. Although \textsc{W-H} cite no par-

\textsuperscript{33} Lucr. 1.306; Hor. S. 2.6.70.

\textsuperscript{34} The existence of \textit{weto} is particularly suspected since it is clearly invented in the service of Varro's etymology of \textit{wea: weae ab weore} L.L. 5.104.

\textsuperscript{35} Calvert \textsc{WATKINS}, \textit{Two Anatolian Forms}, in \textit{FS HOENIGSWALD}, p. 399-404.

\textsuperscript{36} F. \textsc{MEZGER}, \textit{KZ} 62, 1935, p. 22.

\textsuperscript{37} \textsc{W-H}, II, p. 815. Perhaps this adjective is not quite lost in Italic. R. \textsc{SCHMITT-BRANDT}, \textit{Zwei verkannte Reklametexte aus Latium}, in \textit{FS MEID}, p. 327, following \textsc{PISANI} has seen this word in the well-known Faliscan text (\textsc{VETTER} 242) inscribed on a drinking vessel which he reads: \textit{pro pramod pramed umom pramed pramed umod} etc. He interprets this to mean "before lunch (pro pramod cf. Latin \textit{pran-dium} "lunch") first of all (pramed) juice (umom), after lunch (pramed) first of all (pramed) juice (umom)!" In other words "Drink all the time". This seems to me plausible and quite in tune with the Faliscan Weltanschauung expressed in another well-known Faliscan inscription (\textsc{VETTER} 244)\textit{ foiea vino pippa foa carefo} "Today I'll drink wine, tomorrow I'll have none." Incidentally \textsc{VETTER} 242 is quite probably meant to be poetry. The meter + - - , + - , + - (where + stands for a stressed syllable and - for an unstressed syllable) and the alliterative pattern, i.e. C, C,
allel for the derivation of an -s-stem substantive from a thematic adjective, one
might note the parallel of Latin squalus “unkempt” (Enn. scen. 311), squālor
(Plautus +) “dirtiness”, squālidus (Enn. +) “filthy”38. If W-H are correct in
this, one must ask what are the possible sources of *ūmos?

W-H suppose that *ūmos is from either *uğśmos, *uğśemos, or *ouğś-
mos. The last reconstruction can certainly be eliminated since it requires an
unparalleled neo-full-grade. But one might rewrite the first two reconstruc-
tions *uğśmos and *uğśi/emos, both of which would adequately account for
*ūmos. For the s-extended root, one could compare Skt. ukṣati “sprinkles”.

Yet there are some facts which, to my mind, favor the derivation of
*ūmos from *uh₁mo-. First, it should be noted that úmidus etc. is not an exact
synonym of úvidus39. That which is úmidus has some moisture to it, but
that which is úvidus / údus is permeated with moisture. Thus in Old Latin,
at least, úmor can refer to the soggy ground of a swamp, e.g. Pacuv. trag. 203
stagnorum umorem. úmectus is applied by Cato Agr. 40.1 to damp places suit-
able for growing elms, and úmidus can mean “sappy” e.g. Cic. Verr. 1.45 ex
lignis viridibus atque úmidis “from green and sappy wood”. This distinction
was still felt by Seneca nat. 2,25 cum sint (nubes) umidae, immo udae “when
clouds are moist, nay rather soaked”. On semantic grounds one would there-
fore prefer to explain ulīgō as a derivative of the family of *ūmos rather than
as a ‘Sabine’ derivative from a pre-form *uğśid(o).40. This is further suppor-
ted by the parallelism *ūmos: úmidus: ulīgō and ēumus “smoke” : fūmidus
“smoky” : fūlīgō “soot”. Since the formation fūlīgō has external parallels
(Skt. dhūli- f. “dust”, Mfr. dāil “desire” (for the meaning cf. θυμός “desire,

Cp, is certainly related to the meter and alliterative pattern found in some South Picene in-
scription e.g. Tetis tokam ailes “the tomb of Titius Allius”.

38 Alan NUSSBAUM compares Greek πηρός (Hom. +) “disabled” vs. πηρος -eos “loss
of strength” (παρος Alc.). Another example may be δολι-χός (Hom. +) “long” < *dolb,i-
gho- vs. νόσίεξες (Pl. +) “perpetual” < *en-delh,ghes-. Cf. Aves. drājaha “length” <
delh,ghes-. Of course the great variety of allomorphs occurring before *-gho- makes this ex-
ample somewhat more uncertain. Examples of this process are also found in Slavic, e.g.
OCS ljuto -ese “terrible thing” < OCS ljuto “terrible”, OCS divo -ese “miracle” < diva
“wild”. See ARUMAA III, p. 44.

39 Despite Varro L.L. 5.109, úvidum enim quod humidum “úvidum” is the same as
“humidum”.

will"), Lith. dūlis “mist” < *dhuh₂li-) whereas ulīgo has none, one may suppose that ulīgo was created on the analogy fūmus: fūligō: *ūmos: X, X = ulīgo.1 Much less likely, to my mind, is an inherited *ub₁-li-. The reconstructable *ūmos can, following PISANI, be compared to Lithuanian ūmas “quick”, but in East Aukš. and Zemait. dialects still with the meaning “fresh, not dried out”42. Since no derivative of the root *ūeg₂/*ug₂ could possibly yield Lith. ūmas, one is led perforce to reconstruct *ub₁,mо- as the ancestor of both the Latin and Lithuanian forms. Finally, if one accepts that ūmidus is a derivative of *ub₁,mо- one can easily explain the unetymological ū of ūpidus, without recourse to the theory of hyper-archaism, as a simple contamination with the bedeutungsverwandt ūmidus.

To sum up, there are numerous possibile scenarios to account for the apparent counter-example of ūpidus.

C. ‘Schwebeabiations’ Roots

i. *h₁eug₂*h₂- / h₁eug₂h₂- “speak solemnly”

The root *h₁eug₂h₂-, as is well known, happens to be attested only in the Schwebeabiations form *h₁μoɡ₂h₂- in the languages which establish the final labiovelar; Latin voveo “I vow”, Umbr. vufru “votive”, vufrates “consecrated”43

---

1 This analogy may have worked when there still existed an adjective fūmus “smoky” besides fūmus “smoke”. This adjective may be inferred from Lith. dūmai “smoke” with accentual paradigm i which points to a Proto-Balto-Slavic barytone accent. This may suggest that the accent of Lith. dūmai is the result of a nominalizing accent shift. Cf. Grk. λευκός “bright” vs. λέεινος “name of a fish”, i.e. “whitefish”. Skt. dūmā- “smoke”, on the other and, would then show nominalization without accent shift.

42 V. PISANI, Rund im Lith. ūmas, in FS KNOBLOCH, p. 307, and FRAENKEL LEW, p. 62. Cf. also ūmiena “fresh raw meat”.

43 I also find PETERSSON’s suggestion (PBB 38, 1912, pp. 322-323) that OE wōgian “to oo” is from *uōɡ₂̆b₂̆je- rather plausible. The co-occurrence of a verb formed with aghstened ō grade root and the suffix -eb₂̆je- besides an ō grade iterative with the suffix -eje- in Latin voveo is paralleled by Grk. ποντόμαι “I fly about” vs. ποντόμαι “I fly her and thither”. Yet his proposal that *kʷ < PIE *kʰ ‘lost its labiality before a Germa- ő, seems rather unlikely. *kʰ > PIE *kʷ was clearly retained before ō. Cf. e.g. OE _Core, OHG hwōsata “cough” < *kʰe₂̆bs-, skt. kāṣate “he coughs” and with no convincing etymology Gothic hvōta “threat”. Instead, I would suggest that the labiovelar was entirely lost in, for example, the root aorist *h₁eug₂-to (G. Aves a₂̆g₂̆’dā, Ep. Greek eũkτo) in Germanic the delabialized form was generalized to the entire verbal paradigm. As
D. The Common Occurrence of Velars after u-

Another piece of evidence pointing to the validity of this rule is the common occurrence of velars after u, e.g. *leuk- “shine” (Skt. rucāyati “he kindles”, Greek λευκός “bright”), *jugam “yoke” (Skt yugám, Grk. ζυγόν), *h₂eug- “shine” (Alb. agim “dawn”, Grk. ὀύγη “light of the sun”), *dhug₂-ter “daughter” (Skt. dūhitā, GAves. dūg đā, Grk. δυνάτη). Examples can be multiplied at will. It is quite possible that some of these velars were originally labiovelar, though this will probably always remain unprovable.

4. The Refashionings of *h₂iu-gi(h₂)-s

There seems to be no serious objection to supposing that PIE *h₂iu-gi(h₂)-s would have regularly become Late PIE *h₂iu-gi(h₂)-s. But *h₂iu-gi(h₂)-s has not survived anywhere entirely intact. In each language where reflexes are attested they have been to some extent renewed.

A. Latin iūgis

In Latin, PIE *h₂iu-gi(h₂)-s would have regularly become *iūgis with a short first syllable. There are a number of conceivable explanations for the long vowel. For example, one could assume that *h₂iu- has been replaced at some point in the pre-history of Latin by *i(u)- on the basis of the comparative and superlative *h₂ieu-ios and *h₂ieu-ist-o-. The onetime existence of such full-grade forms in Italic is supported by the Umbrian fifth declension for the semantics, one might note the Latin idiom Ov. Met. 14.35: ut tua sim voveo “I vow to be yours”, Calvert WATKINS points out the semantic parallel of spondeo “to promise solemnly” and “to contract to give or take in marriage”.

Another similar set of forms is the family of the root *h₂megʰ-. / *h₂meb- “to pierce”. A labiovelar is clearly shown by Greek ὀφεῖς (Hesych.) “ploughshare”.<h₂megʰ-nis with failure of a laryngeal to vocalize adjacent vowel to -o-. On the other hand, Hittite 3s. bukzí, 3pl. bukanzí “slaughter” can only be explained as having generalized the delabialized stop which arose phonologically in the zero-grade plural, i.e., buk- < *h₂megʰ-. This analysis was first proposed by B. COPP, RHA 13, 1955, p. 69, who, however, thought that the dissimilation was an inner-Anatolian development. The other members of this family, OP avarajam “I poked out”, OPruss. wagwis “ploughshare”, Latin vōmer “id.”, OHG waganso “id.”, etc., are rather more.
iovie- "youth" which seems one way or another to have been formed after a primary comparative *ioyios and the probable superlative Ioviste (Fest. p. 105 M). = Skt. yavistha first identified by Watkins. It is also possible to imagine that already in PIE the first member of *h2iub-gi(h3)s was replaced by a directive *h2iub-e-44. *h2iub-gi(h3)s would have yielded *iuguis and then by syncope iugis (cf. crudus < *kruyido-). One might also think to compare the long u of Latin neuter -u- stems if this can be considered of any antiquity. Further scenarios could probably be imagined.

B. Germanic *ajuki-

In Germanic *h2iub-gi(h3)s would have regularly become *iuki-. One cannot, however, simply say that Germanic has replaced the reduced compounds form *h2iub- with a simplex *aju- < *h2oju-, since intervocalic i was

---

44 As Jay JASANOFF has suggested to me, the directive case may be reconstructed as *h2e(i). This is most directly reflected in Greek adverbs like xartá "downward" < *kat-h2e (with unaspirated stop presumably by analogy with katos < *kati- preserved in xostíntoς "brother"), ává "up(ward)", and with added particle i chiai "to the ground" < *dghmb2ei. The directive morpheme, when added to the thematic vowel, would, in the first instance, have given *o-h2e. This sequence then became by a PIE apocope rule *oh2. Cf. the first person singular primary thematic ending *oh2 < *o-h2e, and the thematic nominative-accusative dual ending *oh1 < *o-h2, and the thematic dual accusative *oh2 which gave the Hittite directive case ending -a, e.g. aruna "to the sea" and which was apparently generalized to all paradigms thematic and athematic, as well as to the directional adverbs like anda and the infinitive-supines like ad-anna. In the case of the directional adverb, this was particularly easy in that they were paradigmatically related to 'localival' adverbs like andan. And these latter were synchronically indistinguishable from neuter thematic nouns, as STARKE, p. 133 has shown.

H. Craig MELCHERT has pointed out to me that the o-vocalism of the directive case is supported by the evidence of the Lycian infinitive in -ne, e.g., tane "to put", originally the directive case of a verbal noun, since Proto-Anatolian *o > Lycian e, but Proto-Anatolian *a > Lycian a. See H.C. MELCHERT, Relative Chronology and Anatolian: The Vowel System, in Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie, ed. R. BEEKES, Innsbruck, 1992, pp. 43-44. It is interesting to note, however, that Lycian seems to have three infinitives ending in -a: erijeina 29,7 in MELCHERT's Lycian Lexicon, tāna 58,4 "to put", and zaxāna 44a, 54 "to fight". Could these have something to do with the original athematic ending *h2e? The absence of a laryngeal reflex is obviously problematic for this account, but there may be ways of explaining this.

In Latin too, the thematized form of the directive has been generalized in forms like quō "whither" etc. Cf. the same innovation in Greek xetω "downward" and ἀνω "upward".
lost in all positions in Proto-Germanic. Instead, as Gudrún DóRHALLSDÓTTIR has suggested (p.c.), aju- may be from aivu- with generalization of the pre-vocalic allomorph *aiv-V- < *h₂aiu-V- to all cases including the nominative-accusative. A similar generalization of the pre-vocalic stem form of an -u-stem is responsible for the geminate nasal of ON þunnr, OE þynne “thin”. Cf. Skt, tanū- “thin”. *aivu- then became *aju- with loss of w before u (cf. Goth. juggs “young” < *jwunugaz), but this new intervocalic j arose too late for the Proto-Germanic j-deletion rule.

C. Avestan yauuaēği-:

In the case of Avestan yauuaēği-45 “having eternal life” one may say, descriptively, that the first member of an expected *yw-fi- < *h₂iu-gib₂-s has been replaced by the dative of the noun aīiu, yaoś46. One may venture to suppose that the second member of the compound *yw-fi- would have been recognizable as identical with the root noun jī-, still quite clearly preserved in e.g., ēraža-jī- “living honestly”. The first member, on the other hand, would have been difficult to relate to the paradigm of aīiu, yaoś, especially since neither the nom. acc. nor the genitive occurs in the meaning “eternity”, but only in he sense “life, lifetime”. But the meaning of the compound clearly called for a first member “eternal”. Therefore the compound was renewed by replacing the semi-obscure first member with dative form yauuaē. Since yauuaē occurred stereotypically in the phrase vispāi yauuaē “for all time”, it had precisely the right flavor. The same replacement of the stem of the noun aīiu, yaoś by the dative is seen in the abstract yauuaētāt- “eternity”47.

45 yauuaēği- occurs once in the Yasna Haptanhāiti 39.3 amōṣong yauuaēğiō yauuaēsumō “immortal, having eternal life, having eternal advantage” and two more times (Y.4.4., Yt.19.11) in Y.Av. in passages derived from the YH locus. See NARTEN YH, p. 260.

46 It is clear that yauuaē is synchronically a dative since it occurs repeatedly modified by an unambiguous dative in the phrase Gothic vispāi yauuaē “for all time” Y.28.8, 40.2, 41.2 etc. On the other hand, nothing rules out the possibility that yauuaē was originally a directive *h₂eju-h₂e(t) “unto eternity”.

47 yauuaētāt survives in Pahl. jāvedān “eternally”, > Arm. LW yavēt “imme”, yavī-tean “in Ewigkeit” (HÜBSCHMANN, I, p. 198) and Modern Persian jāved “eternal” (HORN, p. 93). It must therefore be considered sprachwirklich. I know of no other traces of the compound yauuaēği- in other or later branches of Iranian, although the family of *āiu does survive, e.g. Oss. ēmbaj “person of the same age” < *hamāyu-, Sogd. ’yb “age”, Khoresm.
D. Greek ύγιής

The etymological dictionaries, following DE SAUSSURE, agree in deriving Greek ύγιής “healthy, sound” from *h₁su-g₂ib₂ēs, a compound of the adverb *h₁su- “well” and an -s- stem built to the root *g₂ib₂.⁴⁸ The compound is supposed originally to have meant “having a life which is good”. Yet this etymology is not unproblematical.

First, one may note that the Greek idiom εὖ ζωῆν which would have to be a descendent of the underlying syntagm from which ύγιής was supposedly derived does not mean “to be healthy” but rather “to be well-off”, “to live in high fashion”. Consider e.g. Od.19.78–79 = 17.422–3:

Herōn δὲ δμοίες μάλα μυρίοι, ἀλλα τε πολλὰ/οἰσνὸν τ’ εὖ ζωουσί καὶ ἀφνειοὶ καλέονται
“There were many thousands of slaves and a lot of other things /
among which they live in high fashion and are considered rich.”

and Hom. H. Apoll. 529–30:

οὐτε τρυγυφόρος ἥδε γ’ ἔπηρατος οὔτ’ εὐλεῖμων /
ώς τ’ ἀπὸ τ’ εὖ ζωῆν
“Nor is this lovely (land) corn-bearing or well-meadowed /
so that one could live well from it.”

and Hom. H.Aphr. 105-106 where Anchises requests:

⁴⁸ CHANTRAINE, DELG s.v., FRISK, GEW s.v. and DE SAUSSURE, MSL 7, 1892, pp. 89–90.
δηρὸν ἐν ζώειν καὶ ὀρᾶν φάος ἡλίοιο / 
όλβιον ἐν λαοῖς καὶ γῆρας οὐδὲν ἱκέσθαι

to live well for a long time and to see the light of the sun / 
and to reach the threshold of old age."

Second, PIE *h₂su- regularly gives Greek εὐ- e.g. εὐ-μενής “well-disposed” = Skt. su-máñās < PIE *h₂su-menēs “well-minded”. Although the failure of the initial laryngeal to vocalize can be justified49, one may wonder why ὑγιής alone escaped analogical restoration.

It seems worthwhile then, to explore the possibilities of DE SAUSSURE’s second proposed explanation of ὑγιής. No one these days seems to read past the first paragraph of DE SAUSSURE’s note. If anyone did (s)he would see that DE SAUSSURE also suggested that ὑγιής could be compared with Aves. yauuæf-. It is not suprising that this suggestion has never been taken seriously, since DE SAUSSURE did not spell out the details. One might fill in the gaps as follows:

In Greek, PIE *h₂jiu-gi(h)b₃j- “having a life which is with, of vitality” would regularly have become *ὐγι-50. But it seems that Greek sometimes extended root nouns in the second member of compounds with a hysterokinetic s-stem suffix -ης, and thus *ὐγι- became ὑγιής. For a parallel to the re-

49 PETERS, Die Sprache 32,2, 1986, pp. 365–382, has proposed an ingenious and convincing way to eliminate the problematic initial laryngeal in end-accented compounds. One can hardly deny that such a phenomenon did exist. But one might quibble with the example ἄναφος (Etm) < *h₂k-krp₃s, since the reconstruction with an initial laryngeal is not certain. First of all, even granting the validity of the BENVENISTEan root structure hypothesis, it is by no means clear that it applies to particles. One might cite such apparent violations as *pe/o “away” (Hittite pē, Slavic po), “de “towards” (Grk. ὅ, Aves. -dā) etc. It is therefore not necessary on theoretical grounds to reconstruct *h₂LOSS. In fact, as Alan NUSSBAUM has pointed out to me, an initial laryngeal would seem to be ruled out for this word by forms like Vedic jman “on earth” < *dbṛhm-en. If *LOSS had begun with a laryngeal one would have expected *ksaman < *dbṛhm-LOSS. See now Helmut RIX’s discussion of áxaròs which reaches similar conclusions (Nochmals griech. νητα/νήσσα/νάσσα, KZ 104, 1991, pp. 193–194.)

50 Initial *h₂j became /h/ in Greek, as is shown by the example of ἀγιος “holy” < *h₂ag-LOSS, ~ Skt. yaj- “worship”, but 1 s. perf. mid. ijē where the long vowel is the result *h₂i-b₃j, as SCHINDLER, Princeton East Coast Indo-European Conference 1986, has shown. Cf. also PETERS, Sprache 22,2, 1976, pp. 157–161 on Attic ημ. What has not been hither-to clear is which initial laryngeals plus j became /h/. If DE SAUSSURE’s second etymology of ὑγιής is accepted, it becomes clear that at least *h₂j- became /h/.
placement of a root-noun by a hysterokinetic -ς-stem as the second member of a compound, one may compare the various compounds in -φυής, e.g. εὐφυής “broad-growing” (epithet of barley) (Od. 4.604); ὑπερφυής “monstrous”, “extraordinary” (Hdt. +) ~ Lat. superbus “haughty”; δυφυής “of a double nature” (Hdt. +) etc. Since there is no Greek simplex *φύος “being” or any trace of such an -ς-stem formation anywhere in PIE, these compounds can only be Greek replacements of PIE compounds with second member in *bhuhρς, i.e. the root noun of the root *bhuhρ- “be, become”. Cf. e.g. Skt. prabhūs “excellent” < PIE *pro-bhuhρ- and also Latin probus “excellent in quality” < *pro-bhuo- < *pro-bhuhρό. The analogies involved may have been as follows: 1. -γεν- : -γενής :: -φυ- : Χ, Χ= -φυής; 2. *φυς- : -φυής :: *-γις : Χ, Χ = -γιής.

As for the semantic development, “healthy” seems, to my mind, to be a natural development from an original sense “having a life which is with vitality (to it)”. Note that in Greek, as opposed to Avestan and possibly also Latin, the first member of the compound has not been replaced by the dative or directive, which as we have hypothesized above was the original locus of the meaning “eternity”. Therefore the absence of ‘temporal’ meaning in Greek is conveniently explained. Furthermore, if the original meaning of the compound was “having a life which is vital”, one could understand how the meaning could easily develop to “vital, young”. And, in fact, this meaning is attested by the Hesychian gloss ἤγιος ὑσιδοφόρος Κρήτης “safe; young in Cretan”. The development of this meaning from *h₂su-gʰibh₂ēs, although conceivable, seems somewhat more difficult. For these reasons, then, DE SAUSSURE’s second alternative seems to be preferable to the standardly accepted derivation of ὑγιής from *h₂su-gʰibh₂ēs.

E. Cypriot < u-wa-i-se /za ne >

Another archaic piece of evidence for the collocation of *h₂οἷ and *gʰibh₂ may be found in the famous Cypriot expression ἤζεις ζαν < u-wa-i-se /za ne >⁵¹. The meaning of this expression is not really in doubt. It is to be translated approximately “forever and ever”. The first member of this phrase

⁵¹ Also suggested already by DE SAUSSURE in the same MSL article mentioned in note 1.
was correctly taken by WATKINS from *h₂juũai + *s. Since WATKINS has not himself given a detailed account of his opinion, it is unclear what exact morphological analysis he is proposing. Presumably, he takes *h₂juũai, i.e. *h₂ju-₃h₂ei as the directive of *h₂oũ. For the zero-grade root and suffix, one may compare Grk. χαμαί “to the ground, on the ground” < *dhũm₃-h₂uí₃. The -s could be explained as a so-called adverbial -s. More particularly, one might note the frequent occurrence of an added -s in directive adverbs, e.g. Syrac. πuí “whither” (Sophron 75), υĩs “as far as” (SIG,1, Abu-Simbel). On the other hand, if one chooses to vocalize the final syllabogram <se> as /se/ with a real rather than a dummy vowel, one might compare the Attic-Ionic adverbial suffix -œ. This too has an appropriate directive meaning. Cf. e.g. πóso “whither” (Hom.); ἀλλοε “elsewhither” (Hom. +); ἔκειœ “thither” (Hom. +).

Yet I cannot follow WATKINS in interpreting <za-ne> as γνῦ “earth” acc. sg. Formally, there is no objection. The spelling <za> for <ga> is well attested on the Idalion bronze. But syntactically and phraseologically, there seem to me to be serious difficulties. WATKINS offers the translation “forever on earth.” Presumably this is based upon the modern English idiom never on earth as in e.g. Never on earth have I seen such rudeness! But the English idiom is not really comparable. On earth seems to me to be a so-called ‘negative polarity’ item. It cannot occur except under the scope of a negative or a WH-word. The sentence *Forever on earth I have see such rudeness! meaning “I have always seen such rudeness” sounds to my ear distinctly ungrammatical. Furthermore, even if one grants that such an idiom could exist, one would have to ask how would it be expressed in the case syntax of Ancient Greek? One could expect either a locativial dative, or a prepositional

52 An opinion reported O. MASSON, BSL 78/1, 1983, p. 277, and Peters, p. 63. This explanation is far more satisfying than all previous attempts to explain u-wa-i-se as a preverb u and some form of h₂oũ since the evidence for the preverb u in Greek was always shaky, and after Strunk’s article Kyp. (e)ů für ūni eine vox nihil? in FS Risch, it can hardly be considered to exist anymore.

53 One might also compare the directive syntax of Attic ēit eit (Aesch. +) “forever”.

54 It seems clear that <za-ne> cannot be integrated into the surrounding syntax. Strunk attempts to do this, and is forced to assume that <za-ne> is used ‘katachrestically’ in line 28.

55 As in What on earth do you mean by that statement?!
phrase εὖ + dative\(^{56}\). But I fail to see how an accusative <za-ne> could mean anything other than "throughout the earth" or "everywhere". A translation "forever and everywhere" is clearly not wanted in this context.

One is left then with the old connection of <za-ne> with βίος "life". But this connection is somewhat more difficult to justify formally now than it was in pre-laryngeal days\(^{57}\). The problem lies in the set nature of the root \(g^2iβ3\). One may suppose that Greek inherited besides \(g^2iβ3os\) βίος, a feminine \(g^2iβ3eβ2\). Formally, these would be pair of the τόμος "a slice" – τομη "cutting" type, but since PIE had a tendency to avoid adding a thematic vowel to a sequence -e/oH, the zero-grade of the root was substituted for the expected o-grade\(^{58}\). The existence of such a noun is supported by the Paelignian and Umbrian bia "fountain" < originally "the live one". Cf. Note 7\(^{59}\). In most Greek dialects a pre-form \(g^2iβ3eβ2\) could only give \(βια\). Yet it is not clear that this would necessarily have been the outcome in Cypriot. First of all, Cypriot sometimes syncopated sequences of \(iβι\). For example, *\(k^2ρiβ\)a "heart" seems to become /kordza/ to judge from the Hesychian gloss χορζία (probably for χορζα): χαρδία Πάφιοι, "heart, in Paphian dialect". Another example may be seen in the Cypriot equivalent of πέδιον "flat surface", πέσον: χωρίον Κύπριοι "place, in the Cypriot dialect", if ος is correctly interpreted as another attempt at spelling /dz/. This Cypriot syncope is highly reminiscent of the syncope of \(iβι\) seen in Mycenaean, e.g. \(k^2a\)zo "bronzen" < *\(k^2b\)alkiio-. There seems to be no objection to assuming that these two syncopes are in fact one phenomenon dating back to a neighborly relationship between Mycenaean and Arcado-Cypriot. If this is the case, then the syncope of \(iβι\) was before the development of labiovelars to

---

\(^{56}\) Also conceivable is a locational genitive, cf. ἵνα γῆς "where in the world" (Eurip. Andr. 168).

\(^{57}\) FRAENKEL IF 60, 1950, pp. 142–144, for example supposed that <za-ne> was from \(g^2iβ3m\). Whereas acc. sg. βίος was from \(g^2iβ3m\) with analogical replacement of a < *a. The problems with this are obvious to all who believe in three distinct vocalic reflexes (e, a, o) of the three laryngeals in Greek.

\(^{58}\) A phenomenon pointed out to me by Alan NUSSBAUM. For example, from \(\text{"ro}θ\text{h}_2\) "wheel" (Latin rotu) is derived by means of the possessive suffix -o. \(\text{"ro}θ\text{h}-0\) "having a wheel" > *\(\text{ro}θ\text{h}_2-0\) "chariot" (Skt. rathah), not *\(\text{ro}θ\text{h}_2-0\).

\(^{59}\) Possibly, also by Grk. βία "bodily strength", Skt. jīya "power". I don’t see why these must be from a separate root.
labials, since in Mycenaean syncope is already attested, but the labiovelars are still unchanged. In fact, even if the Cypriot and Mycenaean syncope cannot be connected, one need only assume that the Cypriot syncope was before the development of labiovelars, and the development of labiovelars was a very late Cypriot specific change since Cypriot and the closely related Arcadian dialect do not agree in all details. Therefore one would expect that a labiovelar before *i whether of PIE origin or from syncopated *iiV should have the same outcome in Cypriot, i.e. the labial element should be lost and the remaining velar should be palatalized. One would therefore expect *gʰiβh₂θh₂ to become *gʰiwa > *gʰiwa > *giwa > *dzwa <za>.

It seems then that <za-ne> can be interpreted as the phonologically regular outcome of *gʰiwa in Cypriot. Syntactically, the whole phrase ψεαο(e) ζον can be interpreted as an asyndetic combination⁶⁰. ζον may be interpreted as an accusative of extent of time, “throughout life, for a lifetime”. The whole phrase might be translated “forever and a lifetime”. Compare the English idiom forever and a day. Or “for a lifetime” might have developed the sense “forever”. The whole expression might then be translated “forever and ever”. Cf. the biblical Hebrew idiom le’olam va’ed “forever and ever”. In either case the PIE compound *h₂iugih₃s lurks somewhere in the pre-history of the expression⁶¹.
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