

Return of Wackernagel: The Weak Affix *-nī-* in Sanskrit Ninth Class Presents¹

Kazuhiko Yoshida
kyoshida@bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp

keywords: Sanskrit, nasal-infix presents, vocalized laryngeals,
i-liaison, Hittite, analogy, typology

Abstract

Although the reflex of vocalized laryngeals in final syllables in Sanskrit is still debated, it is generally admitted that it appears as *ī* in internal positions. An apparent exception to this view is found in the weak affix *-nī-* of Sanskrit ninth class presents (i.e. nasal-infix presents from a diachronic viewpoint), where the outcome of vocalized laryngeals is not an expected *ī* (*-ni-C < *-nH₂-C*), but a long *ī* (*-nī-C*). This *ī* is secondary and cannot be accounted for in phonological terms. Among various attempts to explain this idiosyncrasy, Wackernagel ascribes its long quantity to a tendency towards the same vowel length in both strong and weak forms. Although his view was later criticized by Jamison, it is now endorsed by typological evidence from Hittite. Hittite mediopassive verbs in *-ttari* created from the nasal-infix class cannot receive a straightforward explanation unless the vowel length in strong forms has been extended to their corresponding weak forms. This phenomenon is completely parallel to what Wackernagel argues regarding the weak affix *-nī-* of Sanskrit ninth class presents. Thanks to this finding, Wackernagel's view still remains the best explanation that we have.

1. Problem

The formation of the ninth class presents in Sanskrit is entirely regular from a descriptive point of view and calls for no particular discussion. Macdonell

¹ The present paper is part of that given at the Indo-European Roundtable held at Kyoto University on August 17, 2012. For comments and suggestions I am grateful to Brent Vine, Werner Knobl, Aurelijus Vijiūnas and Adam Catt. I hope the title of this paper is congenial to the honorand of this volume who is well known for his many contributions to Indo-Iranian studies but not so widely known for being a fan of Star Wars films.

(1910: 348) states that “Nearly forty verbs belong to this class in the Saṃhitās. The stem is formed by adding to the root, in the strong forms, the accented syllable *-nā́*, which in the weak forms is reduced to *-nī* before consonants and *-n* before vowels.” This morphological behavior of the ninth class present is illustrated by the root *grabh-* ‘seize’ as follows.²

| Active | | Middle | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Sg. | Pl. | Sg. | Pl. |
| 1. <i>grbh-nā́-mi</i> | <i>grbh-nī-más(i)</i> | <i>grbh-n-é</i> | <i>grbh-nī-máhe</i> |
| 2. <i>grbh-nā́-si</i> | <i>grbh-nī-thá(na)</i> | <i>grbh-nī-śé</i> | [<i>grbh-nī-dhvé</i>] |
| 3. <i>grbh-nā́-ti</i> | <i>grbh-n-ánti</i> | <i>grbh-nī-té</i> | <i>grbh-n-áte</i> |

From a diachronic point of view, however, the above paradigm displays a feature which requires special attention, as shown in the following paragraph.

It is well known that the Sanskrit ninth class presents are historically characterized by nasal infixes and root-final laryngeals. They go back to the shape **-né-H-* in the strong form and **-n-H-* in the weak form. Thus, the strong stems and the weak stems followed by the vowel initial endings are regularly derived from their protoforms; e.g. the active present 3 sg. *grbh-nā́-ti* < **ghṛb-né-h₂-ti* and the 3 pl. *grbh-n-ánti* < **ghṛb-n-h₂-énti*, respectively.³ However, the affix *-nī-* found in the weak forms with the consonant initial endings (e.g. active pres. 1 pl. *grbh-nī-más(i)*, 2 pl. *grbh-nī-thá(na)*, middle pres. 2 sg. *grbh-nī-śé*, 3 sg. *grbh-nī-té*, 1 pl. *grbh-nī-máhe*) presents us with a serious problem. The relevant forms are all supposed to go back to **ghṛb-n-h₂-C-*. Although the issue of reflexes of vocalized laryngeals in Sanskrit is still partially controversial, it is generally admitted that the vocalized laryngeals became *i* regardless of the kind of laryngeals; e.g. **dhh₁-to-* ‘put’ > Skt. *hitá*, (*su-*, *dur-*)*dhita-*, Gk. θετός, **sth₂-to-* ‘standing’ > Skt. *sthítá-*, Gk. στατός, **dh₃-ti-* ‘gift’ > Skt. *díti-*, Gk. δόσις.⁴ In this respect, the long *ī* included in the weak affix *-nī-* is puzzling. Instead, *-ni-* with short *i* would be phonologically expected in these forms.

2. Previous studies: summary and some criticisms

A number of explanations have been put forth to account for the affix *-nī-*

² Cf. Macdonell (1916: 138-9).

³ Cf. LIV (2001: 201).

⁴ For the recent discussions on vocalized laryngeals in Sanskrit, a convenient summary with previous literature is available in Mayrhofer (2005: 106-110). In Old Iranian vocalized laryngeals disappeared word-internally as in Avestan *asti-* ‘guest’ (< Proto-Indo-Iranian **atHthi-*; cf. Skt. *átithi-*), but seem to have been occasionally preserved elsewhere, e.g. Avestan 1 pl. middle ending *-ma'dī* < **-medhh₂* (cf. Skt. *-mahī*, Gk. *-μεθα*). For a succinct summary on this problem, see Mayrhofer (2005: 117-123). For the earlier studies on reflexes of laryngeals in Indo-Iranian, Mayrhofer (1981) supplies us with a useful summary.

in the ninth class presents. For example, based on the observation that there are examples in which short *i* (< *ə) is replaced by long *ī* (e.g. *mīmīte* ← **mimite*; cf. √*mā* ‘measure’), Wackernagel (1896: 20) argues that the *ī* of the affix -*nī*- receives an analogous explanation. He states that “Die Übertragung war möglich, weil auch neben *ī* in der starken Stufe *ā* steht, und wurde begünstigt durch den Trieb nach gleicher Quantität in starken und schwachen Formen.”

Kuiper (1947: 203) suggests that a vocalized laryngeal sometimes appears as *ī* in the neighborhood of nasals as in *vr̥ṇīmāhe* ‘we choose’. As pointed out by Jamison (1988: 224), however, *aniti* ‘breathes’ (< **h₂enh₁ti*), *vamiti* ‘vomits’ (< **u₂emh₁ti*), etc. are apparent counterexamples to his suggestion. It seems difficult to find a way of explaining the different outcomes of the vocalized laryngeal on purely phonological grounds.

An exhaustive treatment of the problem of the development of vocalized laryngeals in Sanskrit including the weak suffix -*nī*- in the ninth class presents is found in Jamison (1988). Her cardinal claims are summarized as follows.

- (1) A vocalized laryngeal becomes *ī* in final syllables ending in a consonant (**H_j* > *ī* / __C#), but *ĩ* elsewhere (**H_j* > *i* / __#, __CCV, CV).
- (2) Internal *ī* (← **H_j*) is found primarily in a few verbal categories and can be explained as secondary.

According to Jamison (1988: 220), the sound change **H_j* > *ī* / __C# shown in (1) yields the verbal endings, 2 sg. -*īs*, 3 sg. -*īt* of root imperfects, root aorists, and *s*-aorists to set roots. E.g. impf. *abravīt* ‘said’ < **e-mleu_h₂-t*, root aor. *agrabhīt* ‘seized’ < **e-ghrebh₂-t*, *s*-aor. *asāvīt* ‘generated’ < **e-sēu_h₁-s-t*. Later, the *īs*, *īt* endings have been secondarily extended to anit roots as seen in *āsīs* ‘you were’ (< **e-h₁es-s*), *āsīt* ‘was’ (< **e-h₁es-t*). This sound change is observed almost exclusively in the *īs* and *īt* endings.⁵

In connection with her claim in (2), Jamison (1988: 214ff.) considers that the only regular phonological outcome of internal **H_j* is *ĩ* and attempts to give morphological explanations to the internal *ī* that occurs in the position where *ĩ* is expected. For example, passives (/ -*ya*-presents) to roots in -*ī* represented by *mī-yāte* ‘is fixed’ to √*mi* (*mitā-*), *cī-yāte* ‘is gathered’ to √*ci* (*citā-*), *śrī-yāte* ‘is resorted to’ to √*śri* (*śritā-*) show lengthening, which she argues is clearly morphologically conditioned, functioning as a mark that there is a morpheme break before the -*y*-. In this regard it should be noted that acc. sg. *vr̥k(i)y-ām* of the

⁵ As for the prehistoric interactions between the auslauts of root aorists and sigmatic aorists, see Narten (1964: 53f.) with references.

\bar{i} -stem noun $vṛkī́$ ‘she-wolf’, instr. sg. $dev(i)y-ā́$ of $devī́$ ‘goddess’, acc. sg. $dhiy-am$ of the root noun $dhī́$ ‘thought’, etc. do not have an \bar{i} . The product of a vocalized laryngeal also shows length in this position; e.g. $dī-yāte$ to $\sqrt{dā-}$ ‘give’ (< $*deh_3-$), $dhī-yāte$ to $\sqrt{dhā-}$ ‘put’ (< $*dheh_1-$), $sthī-yāte$ to $\sqrt{sthā-}$ ‘stand’ (< $*(s)theh_2-$). An exactly similar analysis is applied to denominative verbs to \bar{i} -stem nouns represented by $arāṭī-yāti$ to $ārāṭi-$ ‘disfavor’, $kavī-yāti$ to $kavī-$ ‘sage’, $rayī-yāti$ to $rayī-$ ‘property’, $sakhī-yāti$ to $sākhi-$ ‘companion’. The reflex of a vocalized laryngeal has undergone lengthening here as well; e.g. $mahī-yāte$ to $māhi$ ‘great’ (< $*meḡh_2-$), $janī-yāti$ to $jāni-$ ‘woman’ (< $*ḡenh_1-$). In these morphological categories the long \bar{i} is due to a secondary lengthening from $*ī$ (< $*H$) which is used to show that there is a morpheme boundary before the $-y-$.

Jamison’s explanation of the \bar{i} in the ninth class presents ($grbh-nī-té$) and third class (reduplicated) presents ($mī-mī-te$ ‘measures’, $śī-śī-te$ ‘sharpen’) is somewhat different from the one given for the passives and denominatives.⁶ She attempts to elucidate the \bar{i} in these verbal categories in relation to the so-called i -liaison (the connecting vowel i). The i -liaison is virtually obligatory before perfect endings beginning with a consonant in later Sanskrit (e.g. $cakarītha$ ‘you made’, $cakrīma$, etc.). It must have originated in the inflection of $seṭ$ roots (e.g. $ūdi-ma$ ‘we spoke’ < $*(v)u-udH-me$, $tasthi-ma$ ‘we stood’ < $*(s)te-stH-me$), but this useful cluster breaker was soon reanalyzed as part of the ending and transferred to $aniṭ$ roots (e.g. $ās-ītha$ ‘you were’ < $*h_1e-h_1es-th_2e$, $tatn-iṣe$ ‘you stretched’ < $*te-tn-soi$). This liaison vowel is always short.⁷ On the other hand, the vocalized laryngeals in ninth class and reduplicated presents are part of the stem. Jamison (1988: 224) claims that the $*ī$ is lengthened to make it clear that there is a morpheme boundary after the $*ī$, i.e. that the $*ī$ is not an i -liaison.

The above explanation of the \bar{i} in the ninth and third class presents shares a feature in common with the one given to the passives and denominatives in that the lengthening in both cases is morphologically conditioned, and is not a phonological process. But I find myself reluctant to accept her view on the \bar{i} in the ninth and the third class presents for the following two reasons. Firstly, the long \bar{i} in the weak stems of the ninth class presents and reduplicated presents is regular throughout all the periods of Sanskrit, whereas in Vedic Sanskrit i -liaison was still underway and is observed only when the preceding syllable is long.⁸ Thus, $tatán-tha$ ‘you stretched’ and $jagan-ma$ ‘we went’, for example, lack the

⁶ Because both $mī-mī-te$ (< $*mī-mh_1-toi$) and $śī-śī-te$ (< $*kī-kh_3-toi$) have root-final laryngeals, a short \bar{i} (< $*H$) would be expected (cf. their corresponding strong forms $mī-mā-ti$ < $*mī-mēh_1-ti$ and $śī-śā-ti$ < $*kī-kēh_3-ti$).

⁷ This connecting i is interpreted as an example of vowel epenthesis by Kobayashi (2004: 136).

⁸ Cf. Macdonell (1910: 356).

connecting *-i-* in contrast to *tatn-iṣe*, *jagm-ire* ‘they went’, *tatārd-itha* ‘you split’, *ās-itha* ‘you were’, etc. which have the *-i-* after heavy syllables. Particular noteworthy are reduplicated presents such as *mīmī-te* and *śiśī-te* where an *ī* is observed, but the preceding syllable is light. Secondly, the connecting *-i-* is attached to stems only when both strong and weak stems end in consonants as seen in *cakart-itha* ‘you cut’, *cakart-ire*, *jaghān-tha* ‘you smote’, *jaghn-imá*. In this respect, the preforms such as **grbhñī-té*, **mīmī-te*, etc. legitimately posited by Jamison were very unlikely to be reinterpreted as including the connecting *-i-* because their corresponding strong stems ended in vowels (**grbhñā-ti*, **mīmā-ti*).

The interpretation in the preceding paragraph inevitably makes it difficult to account for the *ī* in the ninth and the third class presents in connection with *i*-liaison. However, worthy of close examination is the following remark by Jamison (1988: 223): “The internal *ī* cannot be the result of simple paradigm levelling in either category, because neither paradigm (= the paradigm of the ninth or third class presents [KY]) has any slots where *-ī-* would be regular. The second and third sg. act. imperfect, where *-īs*, *-īt* are found in the paradigms discussed above, have strong forms with *ā* (*ágrñāt*, *ásiśāt*.)” Although this remark is correct, it may legitimately be questioned whether there is any case where only the vowel length is analogically transferred within a paradigm. If there is such a case, it will provide us with a basis on which we can assume that the vocalized laryngeal **ī* (<**H*) in the weak stem of the Sanskrit ninth and third class presents has copied the vowel length from the corresponding strong stem. In this respect an instructive case is found in the Hittite nasal-infix verb, to which the following section will be devoted.

3. Typological evidence from Hittite

The 3 sg. mediopassive (= middle) present endings reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European are unaccented **-or* and accented **-ór*.⁹ These two endings are inherited intact in early Proto-Anatolian. The unaccented **-or* and accented **-ór* changed to **-o* (< **-or*) and **-óri* (← **-ór*) in late Proto-Anatolian after the final *-r* loss, which occurred unless **-r* was immediately preceded by an accented vowel. The final *-i* of **-óri* is transferred from the active. The accented **-óri* is reflected in e.g. *iš-kal-la-a-ri* ‘tears up’ with scriptio plena *-a-* in the ending.¹⁰

⁹ In most handbooks, e.g. Fortson (2010: 93), **-tor* is also reconstructed in addition to **-or*. But it is unlikely that the ending **-tor* existed in Proto-Indo-European because the encroachment of **t* of the 3 sg. active on the corresponding 3 sg. mediopassive ending was still in progress in the historical period of Hittite as shown in detail in Yoshida (2007); e.g. *ḫalziya* ‘is called’ in Old Hittite manuscripts → *ḫalziyattari* ‘id.’ in a Neo-Hittite copy of an Old Hittite text, *ḫāliya(ri)* ‘kneels’ in Neo-Hittite copies of Old Hittite manuscripts → *ḫaliyattat* ‘knelt’ in a Neo-Hittite historical text.

¹⁰ A detailed prehistory of the *r*-ending in Anatolian and other Indo-European languages is exhaustively presented in Yoshida (1990: 102ff.).

Among the Proto-Anatolian 3 sg. present mediopassive endings *'-o and *-óri, the former, which was undercharacterized as the 3 sg. present mediopassive, needed to be more clearly marked as such. To save this situation, the *r*-less *'-o underwent one of the following three different morphological changes in the individual histories of the Anatolian languages.

- (3) *'-o → *-to(ri)
- (4) *'-o → *-oto(ri)
- (5) *'-o → *-o-ri

One is *'-o → *-to as seen in Old Hittite *šuppiyaḥḥati* 'cleaned' which was later replaced by *šuppiyaḥtari* 'cleans'. An identical transformation is observed in Classical Sanskrit *śete* (< *-to-i) 'lies' in contrast to Vedic *śaye* (*-o-i). A second morphological change is *'-o → *-oto, which presupposes the prior existence of the first morphological change, i.e. *'-o → *-to, as was correctly pointed out by Watkins (1969: 86). This change is illustrated by later Hittite *ḫalziyadari* 'calls' which replaced Old Hittite *ḫalziya*. The new form is comparable to the Sanskrit type *jusate* 'enjoys' (< *-o-to-i). The outputs which resulted from the application of these two morphological replacements came to be further extended by *-ri*, which was originally proper to a descendant of the accented *-óri. The element *-ri*, which was virtually limited to the 3 sg. of the *a*-class mediopassive in Old Hittite, gradually spread to the 3 sg. of both the *ta*- and *ata*-classes in Middle Hittite and became almost obligatory in Neo-Hittite. A third morphological change is the attachment of *-ri* directly to the undercharacterized *'-o. This change is not accompanied by the encroachment of **t* of the 3 sg. active, as illustrated by Old Hittite *eša* 'sits' which was later replaced by *ešari*.

As for the accented *-óri, on the other hand, it is faithfully preserved in Hittite. Notice that the mediopassives in *-a-(a)-ri* with occasional scriptio plena *-a-* consistently resisted the intrusion of the active *-t*, as illustrated by *iš-kal-la-a-ri* 'tears up', *iš-du-wa-a-ri* 'becomes evident', *ša-ḫa-a-ri* 'pollutes', *tu-ug-ga-a-ri* 'is of importance'.¹¹ There are no definite cases of the 3 sg. present mediopassive verb with an original accented ending *-ór having undergone the morphological change *-ari* → *-ttari* or *-ari* → *-attari* throughout the whole historical period of Hittite. Since the accented ending *-ári* was uniquely characterized as the 3 sg. present mediopassive by its accent and the element *-ri*, there was no motivation for either of the above transformations.

There is, however, a problematic case against the observation made in the

The scriptio plena *-a-* occasionally found in the ending *-(C)a-a-ri* reflects the position of the accent.

¹¹ See Yoshida (1990: 96f.) for additional examples.

last paragraph that the accented ending *-ári* was preserved intact: nasal-infix presents. Nasal-infix presents reconstructed for Proto-Anatolian as well as Proto-Indo-European are characterized by an accented *é*-grade infix in the 3 sg. active (**-né-C-ti*) and an accented *ó*-grade ending in the 3 sg. mediopassive (**-n-C-óri*). If our analysis is correct, the 3 sg. pres. mediopassive of this class would have the accented ending *-ári*, i.e. spelled *-Ca-a-ri* with optional scriptio plena *-a-*. Contrary to our expectation, however, the actual form has *-attari*, e.g. *zinnattari* ‘is finished’, not the expected **zinnāri* (← **ti-n-h₁-ór*). The attested *zinnattari* must be accounted for by the loss of final *-r* and the transformation shown in (4), i.e. **-o* → **-oto(ri)*. But the protoform **ti-n-h₁-ór* does not meet the condition for the final *-r* loss.

The only reasonable way of explaining why final *-r* was lost in the prehistory of *zinnattari* is to assume that its preform **tinór* (< **ti-n-h₁-ór*) copied the vowel length from its corresponding active **tinǎ́ti* (< **ti-né-h₁-ti*; Old Hittite *zinnizi*) before the loss of final *-r* occurred in Proto-Anatolian. It is furthermore necessary to reformulate the rule of final *-r* loss. An original version put forth by Yoshida (1990: 102ff.) is that Proto-Anatolian final *-r* remained after an accented vowel. A new proposal made by Yoshida (2011: 105) is that final *-r* remained only after an accented short vowel (= after an accented mora). In other words, it dropped after an accented long vowel, which is reinterpreted as a sequence of accented and unaccented morae.¹² According to the present analysis, the 3 sg. mediopassive **tinnó̄r* with the analogically extended vowel length came to meet the structural description for the new version of the rule of final *-r* loss, so that it became **tinnó̄*, to which the productive mediopassive 3 sg. ending *-ttari* was later attached.

Typologically speaking, the analogical extension of vowel length within the verbal paradigm included in the above discussion of the Hittite nasal-infix present is completely parallel to what Wackernagel referred to as ‘Trieb nach gleicher Quantität in starken und schwachen Formen’ in his interpretation of the weak affix *-nī-* in Sanskrit ninth class presents. It seems to me that this typological evidence from Hittite makes Wackernagel’s view the best explanation that we have.¹³

4. A remaining issue

In the preceding sections, an effort has been made to show that the weak

¹² Yoshida (2011) argues that in Proto-Anatolian the basic units that carry accents are morae. Adiego (2001) has also presented a different piece of evidence for this view.

¹³ As in the ninth class presents, it is to be argued that the reduplicated presents *mi-mī-te*, *śi-śī-te*, etc. have received the long quantity of vowels from the corresponding strong forms *mi-mā-ti* and *śi-śā-ti*.

affix *-nī-* in Sanskrit ninth class presents has received its long quantity of the vowel from the strong stems. A question may naturally be raised why the weak forms of the fifth class presents (e.g. *śṛṇuté* ‘hears’) and of some reduplicated class verbs (e.g. *juhuté* ‘sacrifices’) have a short *ū*, resisting the analogical influence from their corresponding strong forms with a long vowel (e.g. *śṛṇóti*, *juhóti*) unlike the nasal infix-class. In other words, we may wonder why forms such as **śṛṇūté*, **juhūté* with long *ū* are absent.¹⁴

This problem may be solved by considering the relative date when the analogy inside the paradigm occurred. The prehistory of the strong and weak affixes of the ninth, fifth and third class presents (*grñité*, *śṛṇuté*, *juhuté*) can be traced in the following manner.

| (6) PIE | Common Ilr | Sanskrit |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>*-neH-</i> : <i>*-nH₂-</i> → | <i>*-nā-</i> : <i>*-ni-</i> → | <i>*-nā-</i> : <i>*-nī-</i> → <i>-nā-</i> : <i>-nī-</i> |
| <i>*-neu-</i> : <i>*-nu-</i> → | <i>*-nau-</i> : <i>*-nu-</i> → | <i>*-nau-</i> : <i>*-nu-</i> → <i>-no-</i> : <i>-nu-</i> |
| <i>*-eu-</i> : <i>*-u-</i> → | <i>*-au-</i> : <i>*-u-</i> → | <i>*-au-</i> : <i>*-u-</i> → <i>-o-</i> : <i>-u-</i> |

It should be noted that the contrast between long and short vowels in strong and weak affixes is only observed in the ninth class at the stage of Common Indo-Iranian, when the strong suffixes of the fifth and third classes had a diphthong **au*. In the period between Common Indo-Iranian and Sanskrit, the long quantity of the vowel in the strong suffix **-nā-* was extended to the weak suffix **-ni-*, so that **-ni-* was replaced by **-nī-*. This analogical change was anterior to the monophthongization of **au > o*. The existence of *grñité* with long *ī* in contrast to the lack of **śṛṇūté*, **juhūté* with long *ū* is best explained by assuming this relative chronology.¹⁵

5. Conclusion

Jamison (1988) argues that a vocalized laryngeal **H₂* becomes *i* word-internally except in final syllables in Sanskrit. I find myself in full agreement with her in that internal *ī* (← **H₂*) is secondary and due to morphologically conditioned lengthening. As for the weak affix *-nī-* of Sanskrit

¹⁴ In this respect Jamison (1988: 224) has made an important remark “The alternation between long and short vowels/syllables in strong and weak forms is one of the most immediately perceptible phenomena of Sanskrit athematic inflection, and the categories in question violate this fundamental principle. Alternations like *grñāti* : **grñité*; *śísāti* : **śísīti* would conform far better than the attested ones to the patterns established by forms like *śṛṇóti* : *śṛṇuté*; *juhóti* : *juhuté*, etc.”

¹⁵ As we have seen in section 3, the copying of vowel length assumed in the prehistory of Hittite occurred at a relatively early stage of Proto-Anatolian, i.e. before the loss of final *-r* at the latest. It is interesting that the change from **-ni-* to **-nī-* also goes back to an early stage, presumably to Common Indo-Iranian.

ninth class presents, however, my historical account is different from hers. Jamison claims that the **ī* is lengthened to make it clear that there is a morpheme boundary after the **ī* unlike an *i*-liaison which is always part of the ending. This claim is not easy to accept for the following two reasons. Firstly, the long *ī* in the weak stems of the ninth class presents is regular throughout all the periods of Sanskrit, whereas in Vedic Sanskrit *i*-liaison was still underway and is observed only when the preceding syllable is long. Secondly, the connecting *-i-* is attached to stems only when both strong and weak stems end in consonants. The preforms represented by **gr̥bhñī-té* was very unlikely to be reinterpreted as including the connecting *-i-* because its corresponding strong stem ended in a vowel (**gr̥bhñá-ti*).

I would rather be in a position very close to the one that was advanced by Wackernagel in 1896, who ascribed the long quantity of the affix *-nī-* to a tendency for the same vowel length to be shared by both strong and weak forms. His view has now found typological support in Hittite nasal-infix verbs. Hittite *zinna-* ‘be finished’ is a verb representative of this class. Its 3 sg. mediopassive present should have been **zinnāri* (← **ti-n-h₁-ór*), but the attested form is *zinnattari*, which has obviously undergone the loss of final *-r* and the attachment of the productive ending *-ttari*. The only reasonable way of explaining why final *-r* was lost in the prehistory of *zinnattari* is to assume that its preform **tinór* (← **ti-n-h₁-ór*) copied the vowel length from its corresponding active **tinǎ́ti* (← **ti-né-h₁-ti*) before the loss of final *-r*. This analogical extension of vowel length within the verbal paradigm is completely parallel to what Wackernagel stated in his interpretation of the weak affix *-nī-* in Sanskrit ninth class presents.

References

- Adiego, Ignacio-J. (2001) Lenición y acento en protoanatolio. In: Onofrio Carruba et al. (eds.) *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch (Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Pavia, 22.-25. September 1998)*, 11-18. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Fortson, Benjamin W. (2010) *Indo-European language and culture: An introduction*. Second edition. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. (1988) The quantity of the outcome of vocalized laryngeals in Indic. In: Alfred Bammesberger (ed.) *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*, 213-226. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Kobayashi, Masato (2004) *Historical phonology of old Indo-Aryan consonants*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

- Kuiper, F. B. J. (1947) Traces of laryngeals in Vedic Sanskrit. In: *India antiqua: a volume of Oriental studies presented by his friends and pupils to Jean Philippe Vogel, C.I.E.*, 198-212. Leyden: E. J. Brill.
- LIV (2001) *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen, unter Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, and Brigitte Schirmer. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix.* Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Macdonell, A. A. (1910) *Vedic grammar.* Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Macdonell, Arthur A. (1916) *A Vedic grammar for students.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred (1981) Laryngalreflexe im Indo-Iranischen. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 34: 427-438.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred (2005) *Die Fortsetzung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Indo-Iranischen.* Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Narten, Johanna (1964) *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Wackernagel, Jakob (1896) *Altindische Grammatik I: Lautlehre.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Watkins, Calvert (1969) *Indogermanische Grammatik III/1. Geschichte der Indogermanischen Verbalflexion.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Yoshida, Kazuhiko (1990) *The Hittite mediopassive endings in -ri,* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Yoshida, Kazuhiko (2007) The morphological history of Hittite mediopassive verbs. In: Alan Nussbaum (ed.) *Verba docenti: Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by students, colleagues, and friends*, 379-395. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.
- Yoshida, Kazuhiko (2011) Proto-Anatolian as a mora-based language. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 109/1: 92-108.

ヴァッカーナーゲルの帰還

— サンスクリット現在第9類動詞にみられる接辞 *-nī-* —

吉田 和彦

kyoshida@bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp

キーワード： サンスクリット、鼻音接中辞現在、母音化した喉音、
i-リエゾン、ヒッタイト語、類推、類型論

要旨

印欧祖語に再建される喉音 (laryngeals) がサンスクリットにおいて母音化する
場合、語末音節における反映形についてはなお議論されている。しかしなが
ら、語中においては i で現れると一般に認められている。この一般的な見
方の明らかな例外となるのは、現在第9類動詞の弱語幹にみられる接辞 *-nī-*
である (サンスクリット現在第9類動詞は比較言語学的には鼻音接中辞で特
徴づけられていた)。この接辞 *-nī-* は、音法則によって予想される *-ni-* では
なく (*-ni-C < *-nH-C*)、長母音 *ī* を持っている。この *ī* は二次的な形態的要
因によってもたらされたと考えられる。この特異性を説明しようとするさま
ざまな試みのうち、ヴァッカーナーゲル (Wackernagel) は 1896 年の研究のな
かで、接辞 *-nī-* にみられる長母音は強語幹と弱語幹の母音の長さを同一に
しようとする作用に起因すると述べた。この彼の見方は、のちにジャミソン
(Jamison) によって批判を受ける。しかしながら、ヒッタイト語にみられる
つぎの類型論的な根拠は、ヴァッカーナーゲルの見方に強い支持を与える。
ヒッタイト語の鼻音接中辞を持つ動詞クラスからつくられる3人称単数現在
中・受動態動詞は *-āri* ではなく、*-ttari* という語尾を持つ。この事実は、ヒ
ッタイト語の先史において、強語幹に特有の鼻音接中辞の長母音の長さが対
応する弱語幹に広がったと考えない限り、容易に理解することができない。こ
の言語学的解釈は、サンスクリット現在第9類動詞弱語幹接辞 *-nī-* について
ヴァッカーナーゲルが示した見解とまったく並行的である。この新たに発見
されたヒッタイト語からの根拠により、1世紀以上前に提案されたヴァッカ
ーナーゲルの見方は、なおこの問題についての最善の説明といえる。

(よしだ・かずひこ 京都大学大学院文学研究科)