The Journal of
INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES

CARLOTTA VITI
Areal Perspectives in the Semantic Field of Color in the Modern Indo-European Languages of Europe 1

WILLIAM WARREN MALANDRA
The Stranger in a Strange Land 95

JOANNA SZKLARZ
The Duel Between Rostam and Esfandīār as the End of the Age of Heroes in Ferdowsī's *Shāhnāma* 107

GIULIO IMBERCIADORI
On the Etymology of Vedic *sáktu-* 'coarsely ground meal' .. 133

ELWIRA KACZYŃSKA
The Indo-European Origin of Thracian *pitúē* 167

MARTIN HULD
Lions and Dragons and Hounds, Oh My! 189

MARCOS MEDRANO DUQUE
The Fate of PIE *(-)*sp-* in Continental Celtic and Towards a Comprehensive Classification of the Evolutions of PIE **p* in Celtic 199

JIES REVIEWS 253

Volume 52, Numbers 1 & 2 **Spring/Summer 2024**

On the Etymology of Vedic *sáktu-* 'coarsely ground meal'

Giulio Imberciadori
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
Giulio.Imberciadori@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

The Vedic word *sáktu-* m. 'coarsely ground meal (of any type)' has so far resisted any etymological analysis. After a detailed philological discussion, I propose connecting Ved. *sáktu-* with the Latin word *seges, -etis* f. 'sown field; field; crop, harvest' and analyzing the Vedic form as the *u*-substantivization of an adjective **seg-t-ó-* 'belonging to / being in / derived from grain(s)', which in turn represents a derivative of the *t*-stem abstract PIE **seg-ét-* f. '(act of) sowing'. The paper also addresses the question whether the underlying root PIE **seg-* 'sow, seed' should be regarded as identical with the homophonous root PIE **seg-* 'pin, fasten, hang'. I conclude that both roots are best kept separated on semantic grounds.

Introduction

This paper aims to shed light on the prehistory of the Vedic word *sáktu-*, which is generally deemed to be etymologically obscure. The paper is structured as follows. In section §1, I review the attestations of *sáktu-* in Vedic Sanskrit as well as the semantics of its Middle and Late Indic cognates, in order to understand the primary meaning of this word in Indo-Aryan. Section §2 is concerned with a synchronic and diachronic analysis of the Latin noun *seges, -etis*, which I argue to be the closest cognate of *sáktu-* outside Indo-Aryan and to belong to a Proto-Indo-European (PIE) root **seg-* 'sow, seed'. In section §3, I address the question whether PIE **seg-* 'sow, seed' should be regarded as identical with the homophonous root PIE **seg-* 'pin, fasten, hang'. After having concluded that this is unlikely for semantic reasons, in section §4 I propose a derivational scenario which could plausibly account for the etymology of Ved. *sáktu-* and Lat. *seges*. Section §5 summarizes the findings of the paper.[1]

[1]If not stated differently, the translations of the literary passages are my own.

1. Vedic *sáktu-*

1.1. (Selected) Attestations and meaning

The masculine noun *sáktu-* is a hapax in the *Rigveda* (*RV*), where it occurs in 10.71.2a; see (1). The *RV* hymn 10.71 is devoted to *Jñāna-* 'Wisdom', and *sáktu-* occurs in a *pāda* where the poet refers to the creation of *vā́c-* '(sacred) Speech' by the wise men.[2]

(1) *RV* 10.71.2
sáktum iva títaunā punánto *yátra dhī́rā mánasā vā́cam ákrata*
átrā sákhāyaḥ sakhyā́ni jānate bhadráiṣāṃ lakṣmī́r níhitādhi vācí

For this passage, the translations in (2) have been proposed.

(2) Translations of *RV* 10.71.2
i. Griffith (1897: 484):
"Where, **like men cleansing corn-flour in a cribble**, the wise in spirit have created language,
friends see and recognize the marks of friendship: their speech retains the blessed sign imprinted."
ii. Geldner (1951: Vol. III, 249):
"Wo die Weisen mit Nachdenken die Rede gebildet haben, **so wie Schrotmehl durch ein Sieb reinigend**,
da erkennen die Genossen ihre Genossenschaft. Deren gutes Zeichen ist ihrer Rede aufgeprägt."
iii. Jamison and Brereton (*RVT*: 1497):
"When the wise have created Speech by their thought, **purifying [her] like coarse grain by a sieve**,
in this they recognize their companionship as companions. Their auspicious mark has been set down upon Speech."

Both translations of *sáktu-* as 'corn-flour' (Griffith) and 'Schrotmehl [i.e., coarsely ground meal]' (Geldner) are in line with Monier-Williams' gloss of this word as 'coarsely ground meal, grit, groats' (1872: 1132c.) and with Uhlenbeck's gloss 'gröblich gemahlene geröstete gerstenkörner, grütze' (see *KEWA*: 324). The meaning 'Schrotmehl' was later accepted by Mayrhofer (*EWAia*: Vol. II, 683), whereas Einoo (1985: 21–22) pleaded for 'gemahlene *dhānās* [ground parched grains]'. By

[2]See, generally, Renou (1967: 141–142).

contrast, Jamison and Brereton's translation 'coarse grain' (see (2.iii)) relies on Grassmann, who glossed *sáktu-* as 'Korn, ausgedroschenes aber noch nicht gereinigtes Getreide' (1873: 1440) and was partially followed by Renou (1937: 10, "désignation des certains grains"). The *Altindische Grammatik* (*AiGr*) oscillates between the meanings 'Grütze' and 'Korn', with 'Grütze' occurring in Vol. II.2, 8 and 399, and 'Korn' in Vol. II.1, 268–269.

Based on *RV* 10.71.2, a decision between the meanings 'coarsely ground meal' and 'coarse grain' is difficult, since both could plausibly fit the context. The same, however, is not true for the only attestation of *sáktu-* in the Atharvaveda (Paippalāda recension, *AVP*). In *AVP* 2.71.3c–d, in fact, the movement of the *sáktu-* through the air is referred to by the verbal root *dhvaṁs-* (3.sg.subj.pf.act. *prati dadhvasat*); see (3). Since the core meaning of *dhvaṁs-* is 'fall to pieces, scatter, spray' (see *EWAia*: Vol. I, 799–800; *MW*: 522a.), this verb appears to be semantically more suitable to describe the movement of meal — i.e., of a powder-like substance — rather than the movement of grains or seeds — which are solid. Accordingly, the occurrence in *AVP* 2.71.3c tips the scales in favor of translating *sáktu-* as 'coarsely ground meal' rather than 'coarse grain'.

(3) *AVP* 2.71.3 (*sūkta* against hostile magic)
*punah kr̥tyām krtyākr̥te ' godhevāvaṭam *anv ayat*
saktur ⁱva saktupreṣ¡yaṃ *' pratīcī* ***prati ⁺dadhvasat***
"[Führe] die Zauberei wieder zum Zauberer, wie ein Waran dem [Wasser]loch entlang geht;
wie Schrotmehl auf einen Mehlknecht wird sie [die Zauberei] zurückgewandt **zurückstieben**."[3]

Coming back to *RV* 10.71.2, the translation of *sáktu-* as 'coarsely ground meal' is further supported by its association with *títau-* m. 'sieve', as coarse meal is typically refined through sieving — cf., e.g., *OED*: Vol. IV, 347 s.v. *flour* ("finer portion of meal […] which is separated by bolting") and also Gk. κρίμνον n. 'coarse barley meal', which likely belongs to the word family of Gk. κρίνω 'sieve', κριτός 'separated', etc. (see *GEW*: Vol. II, 20).

[3]Text edition and translation after Zehnder (1999: 159–160).

Interestingly, the Vedic attestations discussed so far do not show any reference to the type of plant or cereal which the *sáktu-* is made of. Based on this observation, one may deduce that *sáktu-* could refer to any kind of meal. This assumption is confirmed by the post-*RV* derivatives of *sáktu-* presented in (4). The fact that their first compound members contain an explicit mention of the plant or cereal from which the *-saktú-* is obtained demonstrates that *-saktú-* alone was semantically not specific enough. Note further the oxytone stress of the second compound member *-saktú-* (as opposed to the barytone stress of the simplex *sáktu-*), which is likely due to the compositional nature (Tatpuruṣa) of the forms in (4).[4]

(4) Some post-*RV* derivatives of *sáktu-* (typically employed as *pluralia tantum*)
i. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (*ŚB*): *gavedhukā-saktú-* 'meal prepared with Coix barbata' and *yava-saktú-* 'coarse barley meal'.[5]
ii. *Maitrāyani Saṁhitā* (*MS*): *kuvala-saktú-* 'meal prepared with the fruits of the jujube', *karkandhu-saktú-* 'id.', and *badara-saktú-* 'id.'.[6]

The assumption that Ved. *sáktu-* could refer to different types of meal is further supported by its Middle and New Indic cognates, which designate the (coarsely ground) meal derived from barley, wheat, maize, rice, etc.; see (5). In Sanskrit, *saktu-* specialized its meaning to 'barley meal'.[7]

(5) Middle and New Indic cognates of *sáktu-*[8]
- Pali *sattu-* (~ *satthu-*) m. 'barley meal, flour';[9]
- Prakrit *sattu-*, °*ua-* m. 'parched barley flour';
- Sindhī *satũ* m. 'parched grain';

[4]See Macdonell (1916: 454): "determinatives […] accent the last member (usually on its final syllable)".
[5]See Eggeling (1897: 158 [*ŚB* 9.1.1.8]); *EWAia*: Vol. II, 683; *MW*: 847c.
[6]See Amano (2009: 524 [*MS* 2.3.9.1], 652); *EWAia*: Vol. II, 683; *MW*: 296c, 256a, 719c.
[7]See *MW*: 1132c and further Weber (1865: 218), who defines *sáktu-* as "the powder of flour **of barley and other grain**, first fried and than [sic] ground" (emphasis mine).
[8]See *CDIAL*: 13070.
[9]See also *PTSD*: 673.

- Lahnda *sattṹ* f. 'flour of parched unripe wheat';
- Panjabi *sattū* m. 'flour of parched grain';
- Maraṭhi *satuā* 'flour of maize and other grain';
- Sinhalese *hat*, *at* 'coarsely ground rice or barley', *atu* 'unhusked rice', etc.

This situation is best accounted for by assuming that the older and more general meaning 'coarsely ground meal (of any type)' underwent a progressive specialization to '(coarsely ground) meal (of a specific kind)', depending on which cereal(s) was / were more readily available to the respective communities. As for a comparable semantic specialization, one may refer to PDE *meal*: although this word originally meant 'the ground one' (PGerm. **meḻua*-) and must have therefore designated any kind of meal or flour, it is now usually employed with reference to the meal obtained from a cereal other than wheat, as opposed to *flour* (see *OED:* Vol. VI, 267 [Letter M] s.v. *meal*).

Finally, it is worth remarking that, mostly from Middle Indic onwards, *sáktu*- often becomes associated with the process of parching and can thus refer either to a type of parched meal or to a meal derived from parched grains (see (5) above). This semantic feature, however, is hardly archaic for at least two reasons. First, the association with the process of parching is not exceptionless, as shown by the forms in (5) and by the discussion in Monier-Williams (1872: 1132c). Second, there is (at least) one other word in Indo-Aryan, whose association with parching is certainly secondary, namely, the *plurale tantum* Ved. *dhānā́*-. Although the latter form is usually translated as 'geröstete Getreidekörner, parched grains' (see, e.g., *EWAia*: Vol. I, 787), the Iranian and Baltic cognates clearly point to an original meaning 'grains',[10] which even partially survives in Vedic.[11] Consequently, it is conceivable that the practice of parching the *sáktu*- was not inherited but arose only secondarily within the history of Indo-Aryan.

[10]See OAv. YAv. *dānō.karš*(*a*)- (a type of ant, literally 'carrying grains'), Khot. *dānā*- 'grain, corn', Lith. *dúona* f. (1) 'bread', Latv. *duõna* f. 'slice of bread', etc. (*NIL*: 125; *ALEW*: 278–279).
[11]See the references in Einoo (1985: 27 nr. 3).

1.2. Previous etymological explanations

As for its etymology, Ved. *sáktu-* m. 'coarsely ground meal' is deemed obscure by most scholars.[12] In *Nirukta* 4.10, *sáktu-* is connected with the verbal root *sac-* 'be united with, adhere, cling', as the *sáktu-* is claimed to be "difficult to wash" (see Sarup 1966: 59). Among modern scholars, the only etymological proposal I am aware of comes from Grassmann (1873: 1440),[13] who briefly hinted at a possible connection between *sáktu-* and the verbal root *saj-* 'fasten, pin, hang sth. [acc.] on sth. [loc.]' (see in detail §3.1 below). However, in light of the meaning 'coarsely ground meal' of Ved. *sáktu-*, both these etymological attempts can be hardly regarded as convincing.

In the remainder of this paper, I will therefore advance an alternative explanation of Ved. *sáktu-* and propose that this word is cognate with Lat. *seges, -etis*. Accordingly, the next section is devoted to the semantic and etymological analysis of this Latin word.

2. Latin *seges*

2.1. Synchronic meaning(s)

Although the feminine noun Lat. *seges, -etis* synchronically means both 'sown field; field' and 'crop, harvest (especially of corn)' (see *DELL*: 611), the attestations presented in (6) make it clear that its primary meaning was 'sown part of the field, sown field'.

(6) (Selected) Attestations of Lat. *seges* with the meaning 'sown field; field'

i. Festus 431 (Lindsay 1965): *seges dicitur* ***ea pars agri*** *quae* ***arata et consita*** *est. A serendo videlicet*
"*seges* is said [to be] **that part of the field** which has been **ploughed and sown**. Evidently from *serendo* ['sowing']".[14]

ii. Varro *Rust.* 1.29.1: *seges dicitur* ***quod*** *aratum* ***satum est****, arvum quod aratum necdum satum est, novalis, ubi satum fuit, antequam secunda aratione novatur rursus*
"*seges* is said [of that] ploughed [land] **which has been sowed**, *arvum* [of that] ploughed [land] which has not

[12]See Renou (1937: 10); *AiGr*: Vol. II.2, 667–668; *EWAia*: Vol. II, 683, where *sáktu-* is cautiously taken to be a foreign word ("Fremdwort").
[13]Followed by *KEWA*: 324 ("vielleicht").
[14]See also Varro *Ling.* 5.6.37 (de Melo 2019: Vol. I, 274–275): *seges ab satu* "*seges* [comes] from *satus* ['(act of) sowing']".

yet been sowed, *novalis* [of that ploughed land] which has been sowed before it was again renewed by a second ploughing".

iii. Varro *Rust.* 1.29.3: *quod est inter duos sulcos elata terra dicitur porca,* ***quod ea seges frumentum porricit***
"What is between two furrows, the raised soil, is called *porca*, **because that** [part of the] **field presents the corn**".

The latter occurrence in (6.iii) offers the key to understanding how Lat. *seges* developed its secondary meaning 'crop, harvest'. This happened through a metonymic shift, by which *seges* passed to designate not only the sown (part of a) field, but also its product, namely, the crop. The latter then became the main meaning of *seges* in Classical and Late Latin — see (7) — and is also presupposed by the Romance descendants of this word.[15]

(7) (Selected) Attestations of Lat. *seges* with the meaning 'crop, harvest'

i. Colum. *Rust.* 2.20.1: *sed* ***cum matura fuerit seges****,* [...] *celeriter demetatur*
"But **when the crop will be ripe**, [...] it should be quickly mowed".

ii. Ov. *Ars* 1.349: ***fertilior seges*** *est alienis semper in agris*
"**The crop** is always **more copious** in other people's fields".

Accordingly, the etymological analysis of Lat. *seges* should start from the meaning 'sown field'.

2.2. Diachronic analysis

The traditional etymology of Lat. *seges* connects it with the Celtic — especially Brittonic — forms reported in (8).[16]

[15]Apparently only attested in Sardinian, see, e.g., Nuorese *sèghed/te* m. 'stubble' (*DULS*: s.v. *stoppia*; *RoEW*: 642).

[16]See *LEW*: Vol. II, 509–510; *EDLIL*: 552; *NIL*: 604; de Melo (2019: Vol. II, 789). A position of skepticism is taken by Ernout & Meillet (*DELL*: 611–612).

(8) Celtic cognates of Lat. *seges*[17]
i. Nominal: MW *he* 'scattering, dispersing' (adjective) and *heon* pl. 'sowings, seed corn'.
ii. Verbal: MW *heu* 'sow, spread' (1.sg. *heaf**, 3.sg. *he*) < Pre-PCelt. **seg-(i̯)e/o-*.

This Italo-Celtic connection led scholars to set up a PIE root **seg-* 'sow, seed', which I will further discuss in §3 below. Moreover, Lat. *seges* was argued to belong to the same morphological type as Lat. *teges*, *-etis* f. 'covering' or Ved. *sravát-* f. 'river' and consequently traced back to a pre-form **seg-et-* (see *AiGr*: Vol. II.2, 159–160; Leumann 1977: 373). As for the meaning, de Vaan in *EDLIL* (2008: 552) proposed a development 'seed' ⟹ 'sown land'.

Although I basically agree with the traditional etymology of Lat. *seges*, in the following I will address some formal, morphological, and semantic issues which, in my view, help better understand the prehistory of this word.

Beginning with the formal viewpoint, it is worth recalling that the reconstructed pre-form **seg-et-* would be expected to yield Lat. ˣ*segit-* instead of *seget-* due to the Latin vowel weakening. Accordingly, the second *-e-* in *seget-* is in need of an explanation, which can be of two kinds: either the weakening **-e-* > *-i-* was blocked by the so-called *alacer* rule[18] or the second *-e-* in the weak stem *seget-* was analogically introduced from the nom.sg. *seges* (< **seg-et-s*), whose second *-e-* regularly continued Pre-Lat. **-e-* in a final syllable closed by two consonants (see *OHCGL*: 129 with fn. 11; Meiser 1998: 71).

From a morphological point of view, I find it attractive to align Lat. *seges* with Lat. *teges* f. 'covering' and Ved. *sravát-* f. 'river'. As persuasively argued by Nussbaum (2004: 5; 2017: 261–263), these forms go back to feminine *t*-stem abstracts with the structure R(*e*)-*ét-* in their strong stem and can thus be descriptively labeled as "pseudo-hysterokinetic" (my own

[17]See *GPC*: s.v. *he*[1], *heon*; *KPV*: 562–563; *EDPC*: 326.
[18]I.e.: "a short vowel in an open medial syllable may retain its original quality if it is identical to that of the vowel of the initial syllable, and if only one consonant separates them" (*OHCGL*: 128); see *in nuce* Leumann (1977: 100, 373).

terminology). The most secure examples of this noun category occur beside simple thematic presents. They are reported in (9).[19]

(9) "Pseudo-hysterokinetic" *t*-stem abstracts and simple thematic presents co-occurring with them
i. Ved. *srav-át-* f. 'river' (*RV*) ~ *sráv-a-ti* 'flows'.
ii. Ved. **jar-át-* f. 'old age' (→ *RV jarád-aṣṭi-* 'reaching old age', *jarad-víṣ-* 'causing old age')[20] ~ *jár-a-te* 'ages'.
iii. Ved. *vah-át-* f. 'river' or 'carrier / conveyor' (?) (*RV* 3.7.4b)[21] ~ *váh-a-ti* 'carries'.
iv. Lat. *teg-et-* f. 'covering' ~ *teg-i-t* 'covers'.

Remarkably, a simple thematic present could be reconstructed beside Lat. *seges* as well, if MW *heu* 'sow' is traced back to **ség-e/o-* rather than **ség-i̯e/o-*. Although no choice can be made on purely formal grounds,[22] I hold that the morphological pattern in (9) decidedly tips the scales in favor of a pre-form **ség-e/o-*.

If the above discussion is correct, it follows that the feminine abstract PIE **seg-ét-* — i.e., the ancestor of Lat. *seges* — originally meant '(act of) sowing' (cf. MW *heu* 'sow'). I propose that the latter meaning led directly to the primary semantics of Lat. *seges* — i.e., 'sown field' — by means of a resultative concretization. This concept refers to the semantic process through which verbal abstracts at times assume a meaning that corresponds to the result of the underlying verbal action, thus becoming *nomina resultativa* like NHG *Verletzung* 'wound' or PDE *opening* (see Stüber 2015: 85–86, 96–98). Since the result of 'sowing [seeds in a field]' is a field with seeds in it — namely, a 'sown field' —, the assumption of a resultative concretization

[19]I leave open the question concerning the origin of these R(*e*)-*ét-* abstracts: whereas Nussbaum (2004: 50) and Vijūnas (2009: 5, 212–213, 216) take them to be "de-thematic", one cannot exclude that these abstracts were only secondarily re-analyzed as derivatives of the simple thematic presents with which they co-occurred. On the derivation of nominal forms from characterized verbal stems, see, most recently, Hackstein (2019).
[20]See Scarlata (1999: 248–249).
[21]See *WRV*: 1245 ['Fluss']; *AiGr*: Vol. II.2, 159 ['Fluss' or 'Fahrzeug']; *RVTC ad loc.* and *RVT*: 479 ['carrier / conveyor']. Ved. *vahát-* is not treated in *EWAia*: Vol. II.
[22]See *KPV*: 563, with reference to MW 1.sg. *gweaf**, 3.sg. *gwe* 'weave, plait' < PIE **u̯ég-i̯e/o-*.

straightforwardly fills the semantic gap between PIE **seg-ét-* and Lat. *seges*.

Summing up, the derivation of Lat. *seges*, *-etis* f. 'sown field; field (⇒ crop, harvest)' from the PIE *t*-stem abstract **seg-ét-* f. '(act of) sowing' is not only formally possible, but also morphologically and semantically plausible.

3. One or two Proto-Indo-European roots **seg-*?

The discussion above points to the reconstruction of a PIE root **seg-* 'sow, seed'. This root is in fact set up by Pokorny (*IEW*: 887–888) but is not present either in the *LIV*[2] or in the *LIV*[2] *Add.* What one finds in the *LIV*[2] (p. 516), instead, is a homophonous root PIE *seg* (= [1]**seg-* in the following), which is glossed as 'heften, anhängen'. Except for *KPV*: 563, the relationship between these two roots has not been discussed in detail so far. Since, however, this point is crucial for the proposed etymology of Ved. *sáktu-* and Lat. *seges*, the present section addresses the question whether the two roots PIE **seg-* should be regarded as identical or not. In §3.1, I will first review the evidence on which the reconstruction of PIE [1]**seg-* is based, in order to identify the primary semantics of this root. In §3.2, I will argue that the primary semantics of PIE [1]**seg-* is not compatible with the meaning 'sow' of PIE [2]**seg-* and that these roots should not be regarded as one and the same in origin.

3.1. Proto-Indo-European [1]**seg-*

Crucial for the reconstruction of the PIE root [1]**seg-* is the evidence from Indo-Iranian, where the verbal root Ved. *saj-* exhibits a core meaning 'fasten, pin, nail, hang sth. [acc.] on sth. [loc.]', as shown by the *RV* attestations in (10).[23]

(10) Some occurrences of *saj-* in the *RV*

i. *RV* 1.191.10a–b: ***sū́rye viṣám ā́sajāmi dṛ́tiṃ*** *súrāvato* ***gṛ́hé***
"**I fasten the poison on the Sun**, **the skin** [containing it] **on the house** of the possessor of liquor [Indra]".[24]

[23]See further *MW*: 1132c; Gotō (1980, 1987: 320–323); *EWAia*: Vol. II, 688–689; Werba (1997: 249–250).

[24]Translation according to *RVT*: 398. On this disputed passage, see further *RVTC ad loc.*

ii. *RV* 1.33.3a: ***ní*** *sárvasena* ***iṣudhím̐r asakta***
"In voller Wehr **hat er** [Indra] **sich die Köcher umgehängt**".[25]

The present stem Ved. *sáj-a-* (see (10.i)) finds a semantic and formal match in Iranian, where the 1.sg.impf.act. OP *frā-hajam* 'I hung out [for display]' — spelled <f-r-a-h-j-m> in the Behistun inscription — refers to rebels' skins stuffed with straw by the king Darius (see Kent 1950: 212; *EDIV*: 128–129).

In Indic, the root *saj-* secondarily developed an intransitive meaning 'hang (down), be hanging', which eventually further evolved to 'adhere, stick, be attached to': cf. the verbal adjective *saktá-* 'stuck [+ loc.]' (*AVP* 4.14.6a–b)[26] and the nominal derivatives *ni-ṣk-á-* m. 'choker' and *ni-ṣaṅg-í-* 'quiver', which occur already in the *RV* (1.126.2a, 10.103.3a, etc.).[27] As shown by forms like Ved. *ni-ṣaṅg-í-* 'quiver' or the perfect *sa-sañj-a* (*Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa* 24.1.7), the verbal root *saj-* also had a nasal-infixed variant *saṅg-* ~ *sañj-*. In theory, Ved. *saṅg-* ~ *sañj-* could be traced back to an inherited nasal-infix present PIE **s-né-g-* / **s-n̥-g-*. This, however, is unlikely, since Ved. *saṅg-* ~ *sañj-* can have plausibly arisen within Indo-Aryan, for example after a proportional analogy with verbal roots like Ved. *yuj-* 'yoke' (cf. verbal adjective *yuk-tá* ~ 3.pl.pres.act. *yuñj-ánti*) (see also *LIV*[2]: 516 fn. 1).

Outside Indo-Iranian, the present stems Ved. *sáj-a-* and OP *-haj-a-* find an exact match in Lith. 1.sg.pres. *seg-ù* (infinitive *sèg-ti*), whose meaning 'fasten, pin' (cf. also Lith. *sagýti* 'button, pin', OPr. *sagis* m. 'clasp', etc.) perfectly aligns with the Indo-Iranian meaning.[28] Therefore, the diverging semantics of Latv. *segt* 'cover' (cf. also Latv. *segtùvės* pl.f. 'coat worn by priests', Lith. *ap-sègti* 'envelop, cover', etc.) is best regarded as secondary and most likely arose through a semantic specialization 'fasten' ⇒ 'fasten one's clothes' ⇒ 'cover (oneself)' — cf. Lith. *už-sègti* 'fasten; refl. fasten one's clothes' (*LED*: 1148). As for the absence of Winter's lengthening (cf.

[25]Translation after Geldner (1951: Vol. I, 39).
[26]See Zehnder, Leach & Hellwig (2022). For further attestations in the *MS*, see Amano (2009: 402, 406).
[27]On Ved. *niṣká-* 'choker', see Oberlies (1992).
[28]On these forms, see *ALEW*: 1015, 1031–1032; *LED*: 1121–1122, 1148–1149.

Lith. *sègti*), this may have been generalized from the present **ség-e/o-*, where **-e-* always occurred in an open stressed syllable.[29] For a different explanation, see Derksen in *EDBIL* (2015: 391 with further references), who reconstructs a pre-form **seng-n-* and assumes blocking of Winter's lengthening by the cluster **-ngn-*.

The last branch that, in my view, offers solid evidence for the reconstruction of the PIE root [1]**seg-* is Celtic.[30] In particular, the nominal forms (i) MIr. *seimm* n.(/m.) 'rivet [a kind of nail]', MW *hem* f. 'id.' (< **seg-smen-*) and (ii) MW *hoel* f. 'nail, pin' (< **seg-leh$_2$-*) perfectly align with the semantics 'pin, fasten, hang' of Indo-Iranian and Baltic, therefore suggesting that the latter was the primary meaning of PIE [1]**seg-*. In addition, some Celtic substantives with a core meaning 'snare, net' have also been argued to belong here etymologically.[31] If this is correct, the meaning 'snare' probably arose from 'instrument for fastening / hanging [things]' vel sim.

Traditionally, the Slavic lexemes OCS *pri-sęgǫ* 'touch', *pri-sęgnǫti* 'id.', *pri-sęga* f. 'oath' (cf. Russ. *pri-sjagát'* 'make an oath'), Russ. *sjagnút'* 'reach for, attain', etc. have been deemed to be derivatives of PIE [1]**seg-* (see *RuEW*: Vol. III, 62–63; *EDSIL*: 449; *NIL*: 604). Nevertheless, these forms point to a basic meaning 'touch, grasp' ⟹ 'reach for, attain' (whence eventually 'make an oath')[32], which is difficult to reconcile with the primary semantics 'pin, fasten, hang' of PIE [1]**seg-*. Zehnder (*LIV*^{2}: 516 fn. 3) proposed accounting for the basic meaning 'touch, grasp' by starting from a medial semantics 'sich an etwas anklammern'. This, however, is not compelling, and I thus prefer to side with Klingenschmitt (1982: 185 fn. 26), who questioned the appurtenance of the Slavic forms at hand to PIE [1]**seg-* on semantic grounds.[33]

[29]On the absence of Winter's lengthening in open stressed syllables, see Neri (2017a: 212–214 with fn. 37, 38).

[30]See Klingenschmitt (1982: 185 fn. 26); *KPV*: 563; *NIL*: 605; *EDPC*: 327, 331 (with further references); Stifter (2017: 1191–1192).

[31]The relevant forms are: (i) MIr. *sén* (gender unknown) 'net (for catching birds), trap' < **seg-nV-*; (ii) MW *hoenyn* m. 'snare, trap, net' < **sog-nV-* + individualizing suffix *-yn* < **-isno-*; and (iii) OIr. *súainem* m. 'rope, cord' < **sog-nV-* + agentive suffix *-em* < **-i̯i̯amon-*.

[32]Cf., semantically, Gk. ὄμνυμι 'swear' ← PIE **h$_2$emh$_3$-* 'seize, grasp' (*LIV*^{2}: 265–266).

[33]So also *ESJS*: 141 s.v. *dosęšti*, with alternative — though tentative —

Finally, Puhvel in *HED* (2021: 12) suggested connecting the Hittite verb *šeku*(*we*)-, *šikuwāi*- 'sew / put together, close up (?)' with the PIE root [1]**seg*-.[34] Semantically, this would be unproblematic, since a development 'pin, fasten (with a pointed object)' ⇒ 'sew' is plausible. Formally, the Hittite sequence -*ku*(*w*)- — and especially the absence of dissimilation in the 1.pl.pret. *še-ku-ú-e-en* (not [x]*še-ku-me-en* vel sim.) — requires the reconstruction of a labiovelar, which is why Puhvel sets up the underlying root as PIE **seg*^{w}-. This reconstruction, however, is potentially troublesome with respect to one of the Celtic forms discussed above, namely, MW *hoel* f. 'nail, pin'. To be sure, since some scholars argued PIE **g*^{w} to have delabialized to **g* before any consonant in Pre-Proto-Celtic (see Pedersen 1909: 109; Jackson 1953: 470), one may be tempted to posit a development PIE **sog*^{w}-*leh*$_{2}$- > PCelt. **soglā*- > PBritt. **hoi̯l* > MW *hoel*.[35] Nevertheless, those scholars did not provide any example of Pre-Proto-Celtic delabialization involving the specific sequence PIE *-*g*^{w}*l*-. On the other hand, Stifter (2017: 1189) claimed the PIE labiovelars to have delabialized only before Pre-PCelt. **i̯*, **u̯*, **u*, and **n*.[36] If this is correct, PIE **sog*^{w}-*leh*$_{2}$- should have yielded PCelt. **soblā*- > PBritt. **hoβl* > MW [x]*hofl* instead of *hoel*.[37] As for Schrijver (1995: 353), he is not explicit about the fate of PIE *-*g*^{w} before **l* in Celtic, since none of his examples for the development of PCelt. *-*bR*- in Brittonic contains a PCelt. **b* < PIE *-*g*^{w}. Despite this, it is remarkable that, for PIE *-*k*^{w}, Schrijver (1995: 360) assumes the following developments: (i) PIE / PCelt. *-*k*^{w}*r*- > (M)W -*br*-, cf. W *gobr* 'wage';[38] (ii) PIE / PCelt. *-*k*^{w}*l*- > (M)W -*bl*-, with question mark (no examples). Accordingly, he apparently excludes a delabialization of (at least) PIE **k*^{w} before **r* and **l* in Celtic. In

---

etymological analyses.

[34]On the attestations and meaning of Hitt. *šeku*(*we*)-, *šikuwāi*-, see *CHD*: 363; Corti (2022: 190 with fn. 42, 192). This verb is not treated in *EDHIL* and is left without etymology in *HEG*: 984–985.

[35]On the inner-Brittonic development, see Schrijver (1995: 355).

[36]The delabialization before **u* / **u̯* likely took place already in the proto-language. For the delabialization before Pre-PCelt. **i̯*, see also Cowgill (1980: 65); Sims-Williams (1982: 204–216, especially 216, 227); McCone (1996: 42).

[37]On the inner-Brittonic development, see Schrijver (1995: 353).

[38]See also *EDPC*: 397.

the absence of positive evidence for a development PIE *-$g^{w}l$- > PCelt. *-*gl*- (instead of *-*bl*-), it is therefore advisable to trace MW *hoel* f. 'nail, pin' back to *sog-leh_2- rather than *sog^{w}-leh_2-. This, in turn, means that Hitt. *šeku*(*we*)-, *šikuwāi*- 'sew / put together, close up (?)' is unlikely to belong to PIE ^{1}**seg*-.

Summing up, the PIE root ^{1}**seg*- is most securely continued in Indo-Iranian, Baltic, and Celtic. These branches coherently point to a primary transitive semantics 'pin, fasten, hang'.

3.2. Reconstructing two different Proto-Indo-European roots

Whereas most scholars did not take an explicit position concerning the relationship between the PIE roots ^{1}**seg*- 'pin, fasten, hang' and ^{2}**seg*- 'sow, seed',[39] Pokorny (*IEW*: 887–888) pleaded for the reconstruction of two distinct PIE roots and argued ^{2}**seg*- 'sow, seed' to be only continued in Italic and Celtic.[40] By contrast, Schumacher in *KPV* (2004: 563, 746) proposed reconstructing one single root PIE **seg*-, which would have undergone the following semantic development: 'pin, fix [heften]' ⇒ 'push / press in [eindrücken]' ⇒ 'put in [einsetzen]' ⇒ 'sow'.[41] As for the last part of the development (i.e., from 'push / press in' onwards), Schumacher referred to the putative semantic parallel offered by the PIE root *seh_1- ⟶ (i) Hitt. *šai*- 'impress, seal' ~ (ii) Goth. *saian* 'sow', Lith. *sė́ti* 'id.', etc.[42]

Despite the ingenuity of this proposal, I maintain that the semantic gap between PIE ^{1}**seg*- 'pin, fasten, hang' and ^{2}**seg*- 'sow, seed' remains hard to fill. Crucially, the survey in §3.1 has shown that the derivatives of PIE ^{1}**seg*- provide no support for the assumption of an intermediate meaning 'push / press in', whence 'sow' could eventually arise. Against this claim one may adduce two Vedic forms not mentioned in §3.1 — namely, *ā-sañj*- and *āsaṅgá*- —, which according to Gotō (1980: 23–24) meant 'den Feind in die Enge treiben, bedrängen' and 'Bedrängnis', respectively. Nevertheless, the latter meanings

[39] See Klingenschmitt (1982: 185 fn. 26); *LIV*^{2}: 516; *NIL*: 605 fn. 4; *EDIV*: 128–129; *LIV*^{2} *Add.*: 75.
[40] So also *EDPC*: 328.
[41] See also *EDLIL*: 552; de Melo (2019: Vol. II, 789).
[42] See, e.g., *LIV*^{2}: 517–518 (with further references).

can have easily arisen within Indic, for example from an older semantics 'adhere, stick to [the enemies]' (cf. Ved. *saktá-* 'stuck' in §3.1). Accordingly, there is no independent evidence for the assumption that PIE [1]**seg-* originally meant 'push / press in' beside 'pin, fasten, hang'.

In conclusion, I find it preferable to side with Pokorny and reconstruct two homophonous roots PIE [1]**seg-* 'pin, fasten, hang' and [2]**seg-* 'sow, seed'. Notably, if Ved. *sáktu-* m. 'coarsely ground meal' really belongs to PIE [2]**seg-* — as I will argue in detail in the next section —, the latter root can be no longer deemed to be "nur lat. und kelt." (so *IEW*: 887).

4. Bridging the gap between Vedic *sáktu-* and Latin *seges*

4.1. Is Vedic *sáktu-* a primary *tu*-stem?

The easiest way to connect Ved. *sáktu-* with the PIE root [2]**seg-* 'sow, seed' would be (i) to segment it as *sák-tu-* and (ii) to trace it back to a primary *tu*-stem **ségtu-*, as cautiously proposed — though without any root connection — by Renou (1937: 10, "un suffix *-tu-* est probable"). In this case, however, PIE **ségtu-* would be expected to mean '(act of) sowing' (verbal abstract), and this would be semantically distant from the meaning 'coarsely ground meal' of Ved. *sáktu-*. To be sure, one may hypothesize a three-steps development '(act of) sowing' ⇒ (concretization, see §4.2 below) 'seed, grain' ⇒ (metonymy) '(coarsely ground) meal', thus assuming a shift [SOURCE] ⇒ [PRODUCT] comparable with that of Lat. *seges* 'sown field; field' ~ 'crop, harvest' (§2.1 above). Nevertheless, a primary *tu*-stem **ségtu-* would be morphologically isolated among the derivatives of PIE [2]**seg-* 'sow, seed'.

On the other hand, a segmentation *sák-t-u-* would enable to establish a closer morphological link with the independently reconstructible *t*-stem PIE **segét-* f. '(act of) sowing' (> Lat. *seges*, §2.2). Moreover, this analysis would require the reconstruction of an intermediate morphological step between PIE **segét-* and Ved. *sáktu-*, and this, in turn, would allow to plausibly fill the semantic gap between these two forms by means of a derivational process. In the next section, I will therefore explore the potential of this alternative analysis.

4.2. Deriving Vedic *sáktu-* from Proto-Indo-European **seg-ét-*

My first assumption is that the PIE *t*-stem abstract **seg-ét-* f. '(act of) sowing' was inherited not only in Italic (where it led to Lat. *seges*, §2), but also in Indo-Iranian. Whereas in Italic PIE **seg-ét-* was concretized as a *nomen resultativum* (§2.2), I propose that this abstract underwent a different semantic concretization in the prehistory of Indo-Iranian. Specifically, PIE **seg-ét-* acquired the same meaning as the prototypical direct object of the underlying verbal root [2]**seg-* 'sow, seed', thus becoming a *nomen objecti* with the semantics 'seed, grain'.[43] This concretization process is typologically well attested, as shown in (11).

(11) Concretization of abstracts as *nomina objecti*[44]
i. PIE *(*s*)*ker-* 'peel' → *(*s*)*kér-mn̥* '(act of) peeling' > Ved. *cárman-* n. 'skin'.[45]
ii. PIE **sper-* 'scatter, sow' → **spér-mn̥* '(act of) sowing' > Gk. σπέρμα n. 'seed'.
iii. PIE **seh₁-* 'impress; sow' → **séh₁-mn̥* '(act of) sowing' ~ **séh₁-ti-* 'id.' > Lat. *sēmen* n. 'seed' ~ NHG *Saat* f. '(act of) sowing; seed'.[46]

As for the semantics 'seed, grain' assumed above for the concretized abstract **seg-ét-*, it is worth recalling that the interchange between the meanings 'seed' and 'grain' is trivial: cf., e.g., the NHG compound *Samen-korn* n. 'seed, grain (especially of cereals or herbs)' or Fr. *graine* f. 'seed' < Lat. *grāna* pl.n. 'grains, seeds, kernels' (see Buck 1949: 505; *RoEW*: 327).

Next, I propose that **seg-ét-* f. 'seed, grain' functioned as the derivational base of a thematic adjective **seg-t-ó-*, for which I reconstruct a genitival meaning 'belonging to / being in / derived from grain(s)'.[47] Regarding this derivational step, two comments are called for.

[43]On the concept of *nomen objecti*, see Stüber (2015: 94–96).
[44]On this process, see, generally, Panagl (1985: 217–219; 2002: 66–69); Stüber (2002: 34, 36–37, 224–225; 2015: 84, 85, 94–96).
[45]See Melchert (1983: 16).
[46]See Stüber (2002: 36).
[47]On the prototypical meaning of genitival derivatives, which express the semantic functions of the genitive ('belonging to X'), locative ('being in / at / on X'), and ablative ('coming from X') cases, see Nussbaum (2009); Neri (2017b: 16–17 with fn. 9).

First, the genitival meaning of **seg-t-ó-* suggests that this adjective was not derived directly from the weak stem of the substantive **seg-ét-* f. 'seed, grain', as one would then expect a possessive rather than genitival meaning, i.e., 'having grain(s)' vel sim. (see, e.g., Hackstein 2013: 99–100; *OHCGL*: 293). Accordingly, the adjective **seg-t-ó-* is best taken as a delocatival derivative and — specifically — as a hypostasis in **-ó-* derived from an endingless loc.sg. **seg-ét* 'in / on the grain'. The stressed suffix **-ó-* automatically triggered zero-grade of the preceding morpheme, as in the case of the postpositional locative PIE **ud-ér* 'in the water' → adjective **ud-r-ó-* 'being in the water, belonging to water, aquatic' → (substantivization) Ved. *udrá-* m. 'otter', Gk. ὕδρος m. 'water-snake', etc. (see Lipp 2019: 102). It follows that the adjective **seg-t-ó-* must have primarily meant 'being in / on the grain(s)' (locatival value), but very soon acquired a more general meaning 'belonging to / being in / derived from grain(s)'. As Nussbaum (2009: 1) reminds us, the blur of the pure genitival ('belonging to X'), locatival ('being in / on / at X'), and ablatival ('coming from X') value is a typical feature of genitival derivatives.

Second, I contend that the proposed derivation substantive **seg-ét-* 'seed, grain' → adjective **seg-t-ó-* 'belonging to / being in / derived from grain(s)' finds a structural parallel in the derivation of the secondary adjectives **sreu̯-t-ó-* 'streaming' and **sreu̯-t-i̯ó-* 'id.' from the substantive **sreu̯-ét-* f. '(act of) streaming'. Although these adjectives are not directly attested, they are presupposed by the respective substantivizations **sréu̯-t-o-s-* and **sreu̯-t-i̯éh₂-*; see (12).

(12) Morphological parallel for the derivation subst. **seg-ét-* → adj. **seg-t-ó-*[48]
PIE subst. **sreu̯-ét-* f. '(act of) streaming' (> Ved. *sravát-* f. 'river', see (9) in §2.2 above);
→ adj. **sreu̯-t-ó-* 'streaming';[49]

[48]On the forms in (12), see *AiGr*: Vol. II.2, 159, 615, 840; *EWAia*: Vol. II, 784; Derksen (1996: 220, 229, 230); *ALEW*: 1110; *LED*: 1271–1272.

[49]The semantics'streaming' of the adjective **sreu̯-t-ó-* leaves open the choice between the two following analyses: (i) **sreu̯-t-ó-* meant primarily 'having streaming' (possessive) and was therefore derived from the weak stem of the substantive **sreu̯-ét-* f. '(act of) streaming'; (ii) **sreu̯-t-ó-* meant primarily

→ (*s*-substantivization)[50] **sréu̯-t-o-s-* n.:
> Ved. *srótas-* n. 'river' (*RV*), YAv. **θraotah-* n. 'id.' (→ *θraotō.stā-* 'being in the streams'), OP *rautah-* n. 'river' (> NP *rōd* 'id.'),
> Lith. *sriaũtas* m. (2) 'stream, river', (with *métatonie rude*) Latv. *straũts* m. 'id.';
→ adj. **sreu̯-t-i̯ó-* 'belonging to / being in / coming from streaming ⇒ streaming';
→ (h_2-substantivization) **sreu̯-t-i̯éh₂-* f. > Ved. *srot(i)yā́-* f. 'stream' (*RV*).

Concerning the derivation in (12), a skeptical may object that the substantive **sréu̯tos-* does not necessarily presuppose an adjective **sreu̯-t-ó-* (← substantive **sreu̯-ét-*), since this form could be alternatively segmented as **sréu̯-to-s-* (rather than **sréu̯-t-o-s-*) and regarded as the *s*-substantivization — with insertion of the full-grade in the root morpheme — of the verbal adjective PIE **sru-tó-* 'streaming' (> Ved. *srutá-* 'id.'). Though this objection is certainly true, one should not forget the evidence provided by the coexisting substantive **sreu̯ti̯éh₂-*. Since there is no morphological pattern by which **sreu̯ti̯éh₂-* could be derived directly from the verbal adjective **sru-tó-*, this form necessarily presupposes an adjective **sreu̯ti̯ó-* 'streaming'. Considering then that (i) **-i̯o-* is a well-known genitival suffix and (ii) a substantival base **sreu̯-ét-* is independently attested, the most straightforward analysis of the adjective **sreu̯ti̯ó-* is **sreu̯-t-i̯ó-*, as in (12). Consequently, whereas the adjective **sreu̯-t-ó-* 'streaming' might have never existed, the reconstruction of the adjective **sreu̯-t-i̯ó-* 'id.' is secured. It follows that (at the least) this latter can be invoked as a structural parallel for the adjective **seg-t-ó-* 'belonging to / being in / derived from grain(s)'.

'belonging to / being in / coming from streaming' (genitival) and thus represents a thematic hypostasis of an endingless loc.sg. **sreu̯-ét.* The latter scenario would provide an even closer parallel to the derivation **seg-ét-* → **seg-t-ó-* proposed above.

[50] Type Gk. τέμενος n. ('the cut one' ⇒) 'cut off piece of land; sacred precinct, temple' — see Klingenschmitt (2000: 193 fn. 7); Schaffner (2001: 79); Neri (2003: 81 fn. 197; 2017b: 115 fn. 116); Nikolaev (2003: 190–191); Imberciadori (2022: 86).

Finally, my last assumption is that the genitival adjective **seg-t-ó-* generalized its ablatival value 'derived from grain(s)' and was then substantivized as a barytone *u*-stem **ség-t-u-* m. (or **sóg-t-u-*), with the meaning 'substance derived from grains [through milling]'. This was the direct ancestor of Ved. *sáktu-* m. 'coarsely ground meal', via automatic voicing assimilation /-gt-/ → [-kt-] (cf. Ved. *bháj-a-ti* 'assigns' ~ *bhak-tá-* 'received'). As for the derivational process at hand (*u*-substantivization), some examples are presented in (13).

(13) Examples of *u*-substantivization[51]

i. Adj. **ḱe/olh₂-ó-* 'pointed, sharp' (→ Ved. *śará-* m. 'a kind of reed; arrow') → subst. **ḱé/ólh₂-u-* f. 'sharpness' (> Ved. *śáru-* f. 'arrow, spear').[52]

ii. Adj. **bʰeh₂-no-* 'shining' (> OIr. *bán* 'white') → subst. **bʰeh₂-nú-* m. 'the shining one' (> Ved. *bhānú-* m. 'ray of light').[53]

iii. Adj. **tep-no-* 'hot' (→ YAv. *tafnah-* n. 'heat') → subst. **tep-nu-* m. 'the hot one' (> YAv. *tafnu-* m. 'fever', → Ved. *tapnú-* 'burning').[54]

iv. Adj. **leu̯k-s-no-* 'shining' (> YAv. *raoxšna-* 'id.') → subst. **leu̯k-s-nu-* n. 'the shining one' (> YAv. *raoxšnu-* n. 'light').[55]

v. Adj. **h₂ei̯d-s-to-* 'hot' (→ OE *āst* m. 'kiln', *EDPG*: 14) → subst. **h₂ei̯d-s-tu-* m. 'the hot one' (> Lat. *aestus*, *-ūs* m. 'heat').[56]

vi. Adj. **si-nó-* 'bent, curved' (→ Lat. *sīnum* n. 'large and round drinking-vessel with swelling sides') → subst. **s(é)i̯-nu-* n. 'the bent, curved one' (> OGheg *gjī* n. 'breast') ~ **si-nu-* m. 'the bent, curved one' (> Lat. *sinus*, *-ūs* m. 'curvature; breast').[57]

[51]For a general discussion of this process, see Nussbaum (1998: 527–528); Neri (2003: 51–53 fn. 117, 346); Höfler (2017: 150–159).
[52]See *EWAia*: Vol. II, 616, 619; *IEW*: 552–553; Steer (2021: 78–80), with a different morphological analysis.
[53]See Nussbaum (1998: 527).
[54]See Rau (2009: 131); Harðarson (2018: 255).
[55]See Höfler (2017: 158).
[56]See Nussbaum (1998: 527).
[57]See Neri in *DPEWA* s.v. *gji*.

vii. Adj. **bork*^{w}*-ó-* ‘full, swollen’ (→ Alb. *m-bars* ‘make pregnant’) → subst. **bórk*^{w}*-u-* n. ‘the full, swollen one’ (> OGheg *bark* n. ‘belly’).[58]
viii. Adj. **ǵerh*$_2$*-ó-* ‘old’ (> Arm. *cer* ‘old; old person’) → subst. **ǵérh*$_2$*-u-* m. ‘the old one’ (> Gk. γέρυς m. ‘old man’, Hsch. γ 446 [Latte & Cunningham 2018]).[59]

Concerning the semantic development ‘substance derived from grains [through milling]’ ⇒ ‘coarsely ground meal’, two parallels from other Indo-European languages can be mentioned, namely, Lat. *farīna* f. ‘meal, flour’ and PSl. **bŏršĭno* n. (c) ‘meal, flour (⇒ food)’; see (14). Both represent substantivizations of genitival adjectives in **-īno-* and **-ino-*, respectively, which were independently derived from an inherited base **b*^{h}*ár-*(*e*)*s-* n. ‘cereal’ — continued (among others) in Lat. *far*, *farris* n. ‘spelt’ and ON *barr* n. ‘cereal’, cf. also Goth. *bariz-eins* ‘made of barley’.[60]

(14) Derivation of Lat. *farīna* and PSl. **bŏršĭno*
PIE **b*^{h}*ár-*(*e*)*s-* n. ‘cereal’:
> Pre-Lat. **fars-* > **farr-* n. ‘spelt’;
→ adj. **farr-ĭno-* ‘belonging to / being in / derived from spelt’ > (*mamilla* rule) **far-īno-* ‘id.’;
→ subst. **farīnā-* (‘substance derived from spelt [through milling]’ ⇒) ‘spelt meal’ > Lat. *farīna* f. ‘meal, flour’;
→ adj. **b*^{h}*ar-s-inó-* ‘belonging to / being in / derived from cereal(s)’;
→ subst. **b*^{h}*ar-s-inó-* n. (‘substance derived from cereals [through milling]’ ⇒) ‘meal, flour’ > PSl. **bŏršĭno* n. (c) ‘meal, flour (⇒ food)’ > OCS *brašĭno* n. ‘food’, Russ. dial. *bórošno* n. ‘rye flour’, SCr. *brašnó* n. ‘meal’, etc.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I proposed a new etymology for the Vedic word *sáktu-* m. ‘coarsely ground meal (of any type)’, which had

[58]See Neri in *DPEWA* s.v. *bark*.
[59]See Neri (2003: 109 fn. 282) — but one should recall that γέρυς might also be an inner-Greek creation based on πρέσβυς m. ‘old man’, see *GEW*: Vol. I, 301; *DELG*: 217.
[60]See Vaillant (1974: 592); *EDSIL*: 57; *EDLIL*: 201; *EDPG*: 52; Buck (1949: 361).

resisted any diachronic analysis so far. I argued Ved. *sáktu-* to be etymologically related to Lat. *seges, -etis* f. 'sown field; field (⟹ crop, harvest)' and to go back to a *t*-stem abstract PIE **seg-ét-* f. '(act of) sowing' (type Ved. *srav-át-* f. 'river'). I suggested that PIE **seg-ét-* was concretized with the meaning 'seed, grain' (cf. Gk. σπέρμα n. 'seed') in the prehistory of Indo-Iranian and that its endingless loc.sg. **seg-ét* functioned as the derivational base of a genitival adjective *seg-t-ó-* 'belonging to / being in / derived from grain(s)' (cf. PIE **sreu̯-t-(iu̯)ó-* 'streaming'). This adjective generalized its ablatival value and was substantivized as **ség-t-u-* m. 'substance derived from grains [through milling]' (type YAv. *tafnu-* m. 'fever'), which regularly yielded Ved. *sák-t-u-* 'coarsely ground meal' through a semantic development comparable with that of Lat. *farīna* f. 'meal, flour' or PSl. **bŏršĭno* n. 'meal, flour (⟹ food)'. Finally, I reconstructed the underlying root as PIE ^{2}**seg-* 'sow, seed' and argued it to be distinct from the homophonous root PIE ^{1}**seg-* 'pin, fasten, hang' on semantic grounds; see (15).

(15) Proposed etymology of Ved. *sáktu-*
PIE root ^{2}**seg-* 'sow, seed' (≠ PIE ^{1}**seg-* 'pin, fasten, hang');
→ *e*/*o*-present **ség-e*/*o-* 'sow' > MW *heu* 'id.';
→ *t*-stem abstract **seg-ét-* f. '(act of) sowing':
> Lat. *seges, -etis* f. 'sown field; field (⟹ crop, harvest)' (*nomen resultativum*);
> (in the prehistory of Indo-Iranian) **seg-ét-* 'seed, grain' (*nomen objecti*);
→ delocatival adj. **seg-t-ó-* 'belonging to / being in / derived from grain(s)';
→ (*u*-substantivization) **ség-t-u-* m. 'substance derived from grains [through milling]' > Ved. *sáktu-* m. 'coarsely ground meal (of any type)'.[61]

[61]As a final remark, I will mention here an alternative morphological explanation of Ved. *sáktu-*, which was kindly suggested to me by Georges-Jean Pinault during the "17. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft" in Basel (September 9–12, 2024) — namely, the analysis as a genitival formation in *-u-* derived directly from the concretized abstract **seg-ét-* 'seed, grain'. On genitival derivatives in *-u-*, see, most recently, Pinault (2024, especially p. 4 on Ved. *dásyu-* 'enemy of the gods').

Acknowledgments

Thanks go to Chams Bernard, Guido Borghi, Romain Garnier, Olav Hackstein, Stefan Höfler, Athanaric Huard, Alessandro Parenti, Georges-Jean Pinault, Rosa Ronzitti, and — especially — Sergio Neri and Alexander Nikolaev for their valuable comments and remarks as well as to the editors of *JIES* for their helpful assistance. I am also grateful to the organizers of the "17. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft" (Basel, September 9–12, 2024), who gave me the opportunity to present an earlier version of this work. The responsibility for all remaining errors is mine alone.

Abbreviations

Languages, dialects, and authors
Alb. – Albanian; Arm. – Armenian; Gk. – Greek; Goth. – Gothic; Hitt. – Hittite; Hsch. – Hesychius; Khot. – Khotan-Saka; Lat. – Latin; Latv. – Latvian; Lith. – Lithuanian; MIr. – Middle Irish; MW – Middle Welsh; NHG – New High German; NP – New Persian; OAv. – Old Avestan; OCS – Old Church Slavic/Slavonic; OE – Old English; OGheg – Old Gheg; OIr. – Old Irish; ON – Old Norse/Nordic; OP – Old Persian; OPr. – Old Prussian; PBritt. – Proto-Brittonic; PCelt. – Proto-Celtic; PDE – Present Day English; PGerm. – Proto-Germanic; PIE – Proto-Indo-European; Pre-Lat. – Pre-Latin; Pre-PCelt. – Pre-Proto-Celtic; PSl. – Proto-Slavic; Russ. – Russian; Ved. – Vedic; W – Welsh; YAv. – Young Avestan

Texts
AVP = Paippalāda Recension of the Atharvaveda
MS = Maitrāyani Saṁhitā
RV = Rigveda
ŚB = Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa

Sources
AiGr II.1 – Wackernagel 1957
AiGr II.2 – Wackernagel & Debrunner 1954
ALEW – Hock et al. 2021
CDIAL – Turner 1962–1966
CHD – Güterbock, Hoffner & van den Hout 2002
DELG – Chantraine 1999
DELL – Ernout & Meillet 2001
DPEWA – Demiraj, Hackstein et al. 2021–
DULS – Rubattu 2006
EDBIL – Derksen 2015
EDHIL – Kloekhorst 2008

EDIV – Cheung 2007
EDLIL – de Vaan 2008
EDPC – Matasović 2009
EDPG – Kroonen 2013
EDSIL – Derksen 2008
ESJS – Hanzíková et al. 1992
EWAia – Mayrhofer 1992–2001
GEW – Frisk 1960–1972
GPC – Thomas, Bevan & Donovan n.d.
HED – Puhvel 2021
HEG – Tischler 2006
IEW – Pokorny 1959–1969
KEWA – Uhlenbeck 1899
KPV – Schumacher 2004
LED – Smoczyński 2018
LEW – Walde & Hofmann 1938–1956
LIV^2 – Rix et al. 2001
LIV^2 *Add.* – Kümmel 2023
MW – Monier-Williams 1872
NIL – Wodtko, Irslinger & Schneider 2008
OED – Murray 1978
OHCGL – Weiss 2020
PTSD – Rhys Davids & Stede n.d.
RoEW – Meyer-Lübke 1935
RuEW – Vasmer 1953–1958
RVT – Jamison & Brereton 2014
RVTC – Jamison n.d.
WRV – Grassmann 1873

References

Amano, Kyoko
2009 *Maitrayani Samhita I-II. Übersetzung der Prosapartien mit Kommentar zur Lexik und Syntax der älteren vedischen Prosa.* Hamburg: Buske.

Buck, Carl D.
1949 *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. A Contribution to the History of Ideas.* Chicago: University Press.

Chantraine, Pierre
1999 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots* [*DELG*], 2nd edn. Paris: Klincksieck.

Cheung, Johnny
2007 *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb* [*EDIV*]. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Corti, Carlo
2022 Reflections on some Hittite Colophons from Hattuša. *Die Welt des Orients* 52(2): 181–197.

Cowgill, Warren
1980 The etymology of Irish *guidid* and the outcome of *$g^{w}h$ in Celtic. In: Manfred Mayrhofer, Martin Peters and Oskar E. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wien, 24.–29. September 1978*, 49–78. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

de Melo, Wolfgang
2019 *Varro: "*De lingua latina*". Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Vols. I-II. Oxford: OUP.

de Vaan, Michiel A. C.
2008 *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages* [EDLIL]. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Demiraj, Bardhyl, Olav Hackstein et al.
2021– *Digitales Philologisch-Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altalbanischen (15.–18. Jh.)*. https://www.dpwa.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary/?lemmaid=9538 (last accessed Sept 15, 2025)

Derksen, Rick
1996 *Metatony in Baltic*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
2008 *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon* [*EDSIL*]. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
2015 *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon* [*EDBIL*]. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Eggeling, Julius Tr.
1897 *The Satapatha-Brāhmana. According to the Text of the Mādhyandina School*, Vol. IV. London: Frowde.

Einoo, Shingo
1985 Altindische Getreidespeise. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 44: 15–27.

Ernout, Alfred and Antoine Meillet
2001 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots* [*DELL*], 4th edn. Paris: Klincksieck.

Frisk, Hjalmar
1960–1972 *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [*GEW*]. 3 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

Geldner, Karl F. (trans.)
1951 *Der Rig-Veda*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.

Gotō, Toshifumi
1980 Ai. *utsaṅgá-* und Verwandtes. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 39: 11–36.
1987 *Die „I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen. Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia*. Wien: ÖAW.

Grassmann, Hermann
1873 *Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda* [*WRV*]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Griffith, Ralph T. H. (trans.)
1897 *The Hymns of the Rig Veda*, 2nd edn., Vol. II. Benares: Lazarus.

Güterbock, Hans G., Herry A. Hoffner and Theo P. J. van den Hout
2002 *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* [*CHD*], Vol. *Š*, fasc. 3. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Hackstein, Olav
2013 Indogermanisch **h₁ḱ-u̯-o-s*, **h₁eḱ-u̯-o-s* ‚Pferd, Hengst, Stute': Genusindifferenz als morphologische Persistenz. In: Adam I. Cooper, Jeremy Rau and Michael L. Weiss (eds.), *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Alan J. Nussbaum, on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, 94–104. Ann Arbor – New York: Beech Stave.
2019 From possessive to agentive. The emergence of agentivity in possessive adjectives. In: Adam A. Catt, Ronald I. Kim and Brent Vine (eds.), *QAZZU warrai. Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Kazuhiko Yoshida*, 106–122. Ann Arbor – New York: Beech Stave.

Hanzíková, Ludmila et al.
1992 *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského* [*ESJS*], Vol. III: *Dělo – gospod'*. Praha: Academia.

Harðarson, Jón A.
2018 Germanisch **truwa-*, **trewwa* und **trewwija-* und ihre indogermanische Grundlage. In: Olav Hackstein and Andreas Opfermann (eds.), *Priscis Libentius et Liberius Novis. Indogermanische und sprachwissenschaftliche Studien. Festschrift für Gerhard Meiser zum 65. Geburtstag*, 229–263. Hamburg: Baar.

Hock, Wolfgang et al.
2021 *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [*ALEW*], version 2.0. https://alew.hu-berlin.de/ (last accessed Sept 15, 2025)

Höfler, Stefan
2017 *Der Stier, der Stärke hat. Possessive Adjektive und ihre Substantivierung im Indogermanischen.* Ph.D. dissertation: Wien.

Imberciadori, Giulio
2022 The bright Ligurians. *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 57(1): 81–97.

Jackson, Kenneth
1953 *Language and History in Early Britain. A Chronological Survey of the Brittonic Languages 1st to 12th c. A.D.* Edinburgh: University Press.

Jamison, Stephanie W.
n.d. *Rigveda Translation: Commentary* [*RVTC*]. http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/ (last accessed Sept 15, 2025)

Jamison, Stephanie W. and Joel P. Brereton (trans.)
2014 *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India* [*RVT*], Vols. I-III. Oxford: OUP.

Kent, Roland G.
1950 *Old Persian Grammar, Texts, Lexicon.* New Eaven, CT: AOS.

Klingenschmitt, Gert
1982 *Das altarmenische Verbum.* Wiesbaden: Reichert.
2000 Mittelpersisch. In: Bernhard Forssman and Robert Plath (eds.), *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen*, 191–229. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Kloekhorst, Alwin
2008 *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* [*EDHIL*]. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Kroonen, Guus
2013 *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic* [*EDPG*]. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Kümmel, Martin J.
2023 *Addenda und Corrigenda zu LIV².* http://www.martinkuemmel.de/liv2add.html (last accessed Sept 15, 2025)

Latte, Kurt and Ian C. Cunningham
2018 *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, Vol. I: A–Δ. Berlin–Boston: de Gruyter.

Leumann, Manu
1977 *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: Beck.

Lindsay, Wallace M.
1965 *Glossaria Latina,* Vol. IV: *Placidus, Festus*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Lipp, Reiner
2019 Proto-Indo-European *-*r*/*n*- stem suppletion and the locatives of heteroclitic neuters. In: Ronald I. Kim (ed.), *Diachronic Perspectives on Suppletion*, 97–142. Hamburg: Baar.

Macdonell, Arthur A.
1916. *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Matasović, Ranko
2009 *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic* [*EDPC*]. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Mayrhofer, Manfred
1992–2001 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* [*EWAia*], Vols. I-III. Heidelberg: Winter.

McCone, Kim
1996 *Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change*. Maynooth: The Department of Old Irish of St. Patrick's College.

Meiser, Gerhard
1998 *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, 2nd edn. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Melchert, H. Craig
1983 A 'New' PIE **men* Suffix. *Die Sprache* 29: 1–26.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm
1935 *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* [*RoEW*], 3rd edn. Heidelberg: Winter.

Monier-Williams, Monier
1872 *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special References to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Murray, James. A. H. (ed.)
1978 *The Oxford English Dictionary [OED]: Being a Corrected Reissue with an Introduction, Supplement and Bibliography of a New English Dictionary on Historical Principles, Founded Mainly on the Material Collected by the Philological Society and the Philological Society (Great Britain)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Neri, Sergio
2003 *I sostantivi in* -u *del gotico: morfologia e preistoria*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
2017a *Wetter. Etymologie und Lautgesetz*. Perugia: Culture Territori Linguaggi. http://www.ctl.unipg.it/issues/CTL_14.pdf (last accessed Sept 15, 2025)
2017b *Elementi di morfologia flessiva nominale indoeuropea*. Perugia: Culture Territori Linguaggi.

Nikolaev, Alexander
2003 Rund um att. γραῦς, hom. γρηῢς: zur Deutung einiger altgriechischer Personennamen. In: Nikolai N. Kazansky (ed.), *Colloquia classica et indogermanica* 3, 179–198. Sankt-Petersburg: Nauka.

Nussbaum, Alan J.
1998 Severe problems. In: Jay H. Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert and Lisi Olivier (eds.), *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, 521–538. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
2004 A *-t-* Party: Various IE nominal stems in *-(o/e)*t-*. *16th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, Los Angeles, November 5–6, 2004. Handout.
2009 Genitivalia. *28th East Coast Indo-European Conference*. University of Iceland, Reykjavik, June 2024. Handout.
2017 Agentive and other derivatives of "τόμος-Type" nouns. In: Claire Le Feuvre, Daniel Petit and Georges-Jean Pinault (eds.), *Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages / Adjectifs verbaux et participes dans les langues indo-européennes. Proceedings of the Conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies (Indogermanische Gesellschaft), Paris, 24th to 26th September 2014*, 233–266. Bremen: Hempen.

Oberlies, Thomas
1992 Ved. *niṣká* 'Brustschmuck': Studien zur Wortkunde des Kāṭhaka II. *Historische Sprachforschung* 105(1): 9–12.

Panagl, Oswald
1985 Zum kategorialen Bedeutungswandel von Verbalabstrakta. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 35(3/4): 213–222.
2002 Verbalabstrakta. Onomasiologische Vielfalt und semantischer Wandel. In: Mechthild Habermann, Peter O. Müller and Horst H.

Munske (eds.), *Historische Wortbildung des Deutschen*, 59–74. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Pedersen, Holger
1909 *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, Vol. I: *Einleitung und Lautlehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Pinault, Georges-Jean
2024 Avatars and derivatives of the PIE root **des-* 'to dwell, sit' in Indo-Iranian and beyond. *17. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. University of Basel, September 9–12, 2024. Handout.

Pokorny, Julius
1959–1969 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [*IEW*], Vols. I-II. Bern – München: Francke.

Puhvel, Jaan
2021 *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* [*HED*], Vol. XI: *Words Beginning with* SE, SI, SU. *Indices to Volumes 6–11*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Rau, Jeremy
2009 *Indo-European Nominal Morphology: The Decads and the Caland System*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Renou, Louis
1937 *Le suffixe* -tu- *et la constitution des infinitifs*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
1967 *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes*, Vol. XVI. Paris: Boccard.

Rhys Davids, Thomas W. and William Stede
n.d. *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary* [*PTSD*]. https://gandhari.org/dictionary?section=ptsd (last accessed Sept 15, 2025)

Rix, Helmut et al.
2001 *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*, 2nd edn. [*LIV*^{2}]. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Rubattu, Antoninu
2006 *Dizionario universale della lingua di Sardegna* [*DULS*], 2nd edn. https://www.limbasardasudsardigna.it/sar/images/Documenti/Didatica_e_Ainas/Ditzion%C3%A0riu%20Universale%20Rubattu.pdf (last accessed Sept 15, 2025)

Sarup, Lakshman
1966 *The* Nighantu *and the* Nirukta*, the Oldest Indian Treatise on Etymology, Philology and Semantics. Critically Edited from Original Manuscripts and Translated for the First Time into English,

with Introduction, Exegetical and Critical Notes, Three Indexes and Eight Appendices. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Scarlata, Salvatore
1999 *Die Wurzelkomposita im Ṛg-Veda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Schaffner, Stefan
2001 *Das Vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Schrijver, Peter
1995 *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Schumacher, Stefan
2004 *Die keltischen Primärverben: Ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon* [*KPV*]. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Sims-Williams, Patrick
1982 The development of the Indo-European voiced labiovelars in Celtic. *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 29: 201–229.

Smoczyński, Wojciech
2018 *Lithuanian Etymological Dictionary* [*LED*]. Berlin: Lang.

Steer, Thomas
2021 "*Die Pfeile des Gottes*". *Zur Bedeutung, Lautgeschichte und Etymologie von griechisch κῆλα*. Hamburg: Baar.

Stifter, David
2017 The phonology of Celtic. In: Jared S. Klein, Brian D. Joseph and Matthias A. Fritz (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics: An International Handbook*, Vol. 2, article 68, 1188–1202. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter.

Stüber, Karin
2002 *Die primären* s*-Stämme des Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
2015 *Die Verbalabstrakta des Altirischen*, Vol. I. Bremen: Hampen.

Thomas, Richard J., Gareth A. Bevan and Patrick J. Donovan
n.d. *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru. A Dictionary of the Welsh Language* [*GPC*]. http://www.welsh-dictionary.ac.uk/ (last accessed Sept 15, 2025)

Tischler, Johann
2006 *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* [*HEG*], Vol. II.2.2: *S/2*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Turner, Ralph L.
1962–1966 *A Comparative Dictionary of Indo-Aryan Languages* [*CDIAL*]. London: OUP.

Uhlenbeck, Christianus C.
1899 *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der altindischen Sprache* [*KEWA*]. Amsterdam: Müller.

Vaillant, André
1974 *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, Vol. IV: *La formation des noms*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Vasmer, Max
1953–1958 *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [*RuEW*]. Heidelberg: Winter.

Vijūnas, Aurelijus
2009 *The Indo-European Primary* T*-Stems*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Wackernagel, Jacob
1957 *Altindische Grammatik*, Vol. II.1: *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition* [*AiGr*]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wackernagel, Jacob and Albert Debrunner
1954 *Altindische Grammatik*, Vol. II.2: *Die Nominalsuffixe* [*AiGr*]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Walde, Alois and Johann B. Hofmann
1938–1956 *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [*LEW*]. 3 vols. 3rd edn. Heidelberg: Winter.

Weber, Albrecht
1865 Ueber Haug's Aitareya-Brâhmaṇa. *Indische Studien* 9: 177–380.

Weiss, Michael L.
2020 *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin* [*OHCGL*], 2nd edn. Ann Arbor – New York: Beech Stave.

Werba, Chlodwig H.
1997 *Verba Indoarica: Die primären und sekundären Wurzeln der Sanskrit-Sprache*, Vol. I: *Radices primariae*. Wien: ÖAW.

Wodtko, Dagmar S., Britta S. Irslinger and Carolin Schneider
2008 *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon* [*NIL*]. Heidelberg: Winter.

Zehnder, Thomas
1999 *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Eine Sammlung altindischer Zaubersprüche vom Beginn des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.* Idstein: Schulz-Kirchner.

Zehnder, Thomas, Robert Leach and Oliver Hellwig
2022 *Atharvaveda Paippalada Zurich Edition Book 4.* https://www.atharvaveda-online.uzh.ch/edition/04 (last accessed Sept 15, 2025)