

ISSN 0350–185X  
UDK 808

СРПСКА АКАДЕМИЈА НАУКА И УМЕТНОСТИ  
И  
ИНСТИТУТ ЗА СРПСКИ ЈЕЗИК САНУ

## ЈУЖНОСЛОВЕНСКИ ФИЛОЛОГ

КЊ. LXXV, СВ. 2

Уређивачки одбор:

*др Јасна Влајић-Појовић, др Рајна Драгићевић, др Најда Иванова,  
др Владан Јовановић, др Александар Лома, др Алина Маслова,  
др Софија Милорадовић, др Мирослав Николић, др Слободан Павловић,  
др Предраг Пијер, др Слободан Реметић, др Јелица Сијојановић,  
др Срејто Танасић, др Зузана Тојолињска, др Анајолиј Турилов,  
др Викџор Фридман*

Главни уредник  
Рајна Драгићевић

БЕОГРАД  
2019

ОРСАТ Л. ЛИГОРИО\*  
Универзитет у Београду  
Филозофски факултет  
Одељење за класичне науке  
Београд

## PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN 'EAT' AND 'MOUTH'

PIE  $*h_1o\varrho-s-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-s-$ ) 'mouth' is derived from PIE  $*h_1ed-$  'to eat', as an *s*-stem *o*-grade postverbal, assuming that  $*dC$  yields  $*\varrho C$  (=  $*h_1C$ ), which is a well-known phenomenon of the Glottalic Theory.

*Keywords:* Proto-Indo-European, Etymology, Glottalic Theory.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Ever since it has been established that, within the Glottalic Theory, PIE  $*dC$  under specific conditions yields PIE  $*\varrho C$  (=  $*h_1C$ ), it has been possible to recover cognates which otherwise wouldn't be deemed comparable with their respective Proto-Indo-European etyma; cf. e.g. PIE  $*du-$  'two',  $*dekm$  'ten' and PIE  $*\varrho u-i+\varrho km-t-i-$  (=  $*du-i+dkm-t-i-$ ) 'twenty' (> Av. *vīsaiti* id., G ep. ἐξείκοσι /ἐ(φ)ίκοσι/ id., etc.) (KORTLANDT 1983: 97) (= 2010: 100).

In this paper, I propose to consider whether, by the same token, PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-$  'mouth' is to be compared with PIE  $*h_1ed-$  'eat' on the premise that PIE 'mouth' is in fact to be reconstructed as  $*h_1oh_1-s-$ .

### 2. PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN 'EAT' AND 'MOUTH'

Typically, PIE 'mouth' is reconstructed as  $*h_3oh_1-s-$  (NIL 387); cf. Hitt. *aiš* 'mouth' (gen sg *iššaš*), CLuw. *āaš* 'mouth', Skt. *āś-* 'mouth', Av. *āh-* 'mouth', L *ōs* 'mouth', and OIr. *á* 'mouth'.

PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-$  is an ablauting *s*-stem; it ablauts in both the root and the stem.

---

\* orsat.ligorio@gmail.com

In the root, 1. the full *o*-grade, PIE  $*h_3oh_1-$ , is reconstructed by NIL 1a. on the basis of *a-* in Hitt. *aiš* and  $\bar{a}$ - (hyper-plene) in CLuw.  $\bar{a}aš$ , where the root is followed by the full grade *s*-stem, PIE  $*h_3oh_1Vs-$ , eventually resulting in a hiatus (which is due to PIE  $*Vh_1V$  yielding PANat.  $*V\?V$ , q.v. KLOEKHORST 2008: 71), 1b. on the basis of  $\bar{a}$ - in Skt.  $\bar{a}s-$  and Av.  $\bar{a}h-$ , where the root is followed by the zero-grade *s*-stem, PIE  $*h_3oh_1s-$ , eventually resulting in an acute length, and 1c. on the basis of  $\bar{o}$ - in L  $\bar{o}s$  and  $\acute{a}$  in OIr.  $\acute{a}$ , where the root is followed either by the zero-grade *s*-stem, PIE  $*h_3oh_1s-$ , eventually resulting in an acute length, or by the full grade *s*-stem, PIE  $*h_3oh_1Vs-$ , eventually resulting in a contracted length; 2. and, the zero-grade, PIE  $*h_3h_1-$ , is reconstructed on the basis of Hitt. gen sg *iššaš*, where, according to RIEKEN 1999: 185ff., the root is followed by the full *e*-grade *s*-stem, PIE  $*h_3h_1es-$ .

In the stem, 1. the full *o*-grade, PIE  $*h_3oh_1os-$ , can be reconstructed on the basis of  $\bar{a}š$  in CLuw.  $\bar{a}aš$ ; 2. the full *e*-grade, PIE  $*h_3oh_1es-$  or  $*h_3h_1es-$ , on the basis of  $\bar{i}š$  in Hitt. *aiš* and  $\bar{i}šš-$  in Hitt. *iššaš*; 3. and, the  $\emptyset$ -grade, PIE  $*h_3oh_1s-$ , on the basis of  $\bar{s}$ - in Skt.  $\bar{a}s-$  and Av.  $\bar{a}h-$ . (L  $\bar{o}s$  and OIr.  $\acute{a}$  may reflect either the full *o*-grade *s*-stem, PIE  $*h_3oh_1os-$ , or the  $\emptyset$ -grade *s*-stem, PIE  $*h_3oh_1s-$ ; the exact grade cannot be determined because, based on the data, it is unclear whether the length in L  $\bar{o}s$  and OIr.  $\acute{a}$  is a contracted length, as though from PIE  $*h_3oh_1os-$ , or an acute length, as though from PIE  $*h_3oh_1s-$ . (Incidentally, the length in Skt.  $\bar{a}s-$  and Av.  $\bar{a}h-$  must be an acute length, and not the contracted one, because one would expect Skt.  $\bar{a}s-$  and Av.  $\bar{a}h-$  to scan disyllabically if it truly were a contracted length — and they do not. In the Rigveda and the Avesta they in fact scan monosyllabically; cf. e.g. Skt. abl sg  $\bar{a}sás$  (= 2 syllables) in RV VII 99, 7 or OAv. gen sg  $\bar{a}ñhō$  (= 2 syllables) in Y 31, 3. See GRASSMANN 1873: 190 and KELLENS-PIRART 1988: 113. Therefore, Skt.  $\bar{a}s-$  and Av.  $\bar{a}h-$  point to PIIr.  $*Hās-$ , not  $*Haas-$ .)

Based on Hittite (nom sg *aiš*, gen sg *iššaš*), RIEKEN 1999: 185ff reconstructs a proterokinetic paradigm; following Rieken, NIL posits the proterokinetic paradigm for Proto-Indo-European as well (nom sg  $*h_3óh_1s-\emptyset$ , gen sg  $*h_3h_1és-os$ ).

PIE nom sg  $*h_3óh_1s-\emptyset$  is reflected in L nom sg  $\bar{o}s$  and OIr. nom sg  $\acute{a}$  provided these stand for PIE  $*h_3oh_1s-\emptyset$ ; alternatively, if they stand for  $*h_3oh_1os-\emptyset$  or  $*h_3oh_1es-\emptyset$ , L  $\bar{o}s$  and OIr.  $\acute{a}$  coincide with CLuw.  $\bar{a}aš$  and Hitt. *aiš* (qq.v.).

PIE gen sg  $*h_3h_1és-os$  is reflected in Hitt. gen sg *iššaš* provided NIL is right to reconstruct *iššaš* as  $*h_3h_1és-os$ .

(PIE  $*h_3h_1és-os$  would regularly yield Hitt. *ešaš* /*ésas*/. Rieken assumes that *ešaš* /*ésas*/ developed into *iššaš* /*isás*/ under the influence of the /*gráits*, /*grítás*/-type nouns; in this scenario, the accent in /*ésas*/ is shifted forward leaving *e* unstressed in the protonic position, where it regularly yields *i*; see KLOEKHORST 2008: 97. However, this explanation accounts only for the *i-* of Hitt. *iššaš*, not for the  $\bar{s}š-$ .)

PIE nom sg  $*h_3óh_1-s-ø$  is reflected in Anatolian and Indo-Iranian as well, though not exactly.

In Anatolian, it is reflected as  $*h_3oh_1-os-ø$  and  $*h_3oh_1-es-ø$  in CLuw. nom sg  $\bar{a}aš$  and Hitt. nom sg  $aiš$ , respectively.

(In Cuneiform Luwian, the full *o*-grade was presumably introduced into the strong proterokinetic stem following other kinetic *s*-stems, such as the hysterokinetic or amphikinetic ones, which have the full grade instead of the zero-grade in the strong stem; on the other hand, in Hittite, the full *e*-grade must have been introduced into the strong proterokinetic stem from the weak proterokinetic stem, PIE  $*h_1h_1-és-$ . See KLOEKHORST 2008: 167. Therefore, the full grade in both  $*h_3oh_1-os-ø$  and  $*h_3oh_1-es-ø$  is secondary; if so, CLuw. nom sg  $\bar{a}aš$  and Hitt. nom sg  $aiš$  point to PIE nom sg  $*h_3oh_1-s-ø$ .)

In Indo-Iranian, PIE nom sg  $*h_3óh_1-s-ø$  is reflected as PIIr.  $*Hās-$ ; cf. Skt.  $\bar{a}s-$  and Av.  $\bar{a}h-$ .

(In both Sanskrit and Avestan, the Proto-Indo-European nominative singular was remade into a presumably non-ablauting stem, PIIr.  $*Hās-$ , which is recorded in the weak stem cases only, viz. genitive / ablative singular (Skt. abl  $\bar{a}sás$ , OAv. gen  $\bar{a}ñhō$ ) and instrumental singular (Skt.  $\bar{a}sā$ , OAv.  $\bar{a}ñhā$  (*Lentoform*), YAv.  $\bar{a}ñha$ ).

The strong proterokinetic stem, PIE  $*h_3óh_1-s-$ , is also reconstructed by NIL in a number of derivatives; cf. e.g. PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-en-$  (Skt.  $\bar{a}sán$  ‘in the mouth’), PIE  $*pro(H)+h_3oh_1-s-n-o-$  (L *pronus* ‘leaning forward, bending down, inclined’), PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-eh_2-$  (L  $\bar{o}ra$  ‘coast’), PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-i-o-$  (Skt.  $\bar{a}syā$  ‘mouth; throat’), PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-t-o-$  (Lith.  $\bar{u}ostas$  ‘river mouth; haven’, Latv. *uosts* ‘river mouth; haven’), PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-t-eh_2-$  (Lith.  $\bar{u}ostā$  ‘river mouth; haven’, Latv. *uōsta* ‘river mouth; haven’), PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-t-i-o-$  (L  $\bar{o}stium$  ‘entrance’), PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-t-i-eh_2-$  (L  $\bar{o}stia$  ‘river mouth’), etc.

However, PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-$  can *ceteris paribus* be reconstructed as  $*h_1eh_3-s-$  or  $*h_1oh_1-s-$  as well; thus e.g. ZUCHA 1988: 135 and MATASOVIĆ 2000: 39, 2009: 44, respectively.

(PIE  $*h_1eh_3-s-$  is also reconstructed by e.g. KLOEKHORST 2008: 166 or KROONEN 2013: 394, who in fact reconstructs it as  $*h_{1/3}eh_{1/3}-s-$ .)

Hitt.  $aiš$  and CLuw.  $\bar{a}aš$  point to PAnat.  $*\lambda o^2-s-$ , Skt.  $\bar{a}s-$  and Av.  $\bar{a}h-$  to PIIr.  $*Hās-$ , and L  $\bar{o}s$  and OIr.  $\acute{a}$  to PICelt.  $*\bar{o}s-$ .

PIIr.  $*Hās-$  and PICelt.  $*\bar{o}s-$  point to non-Anat. IE  $*H\bar{o}s-$ .

Due to laryngeal colouring, PIE  $*h_1eh_3-s-$  develops into  $*h_1oh_3-s-$ ; thus, the choice between PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-$ , PIE  $*h_1eh_3-s-$ , and PIE  $*h_1oh_1-s-$  effectively becomes the choice between PIE  $*h_3oh_1-s-$ , PIE  $*h_1oh_3-s-$ , and PIE  $*h_1oh_1-s-$ .

In Proto-Anatolian, PIE  $*h_3oh_1s-$ , PIE  $*h_1oh_3s-$ , and PIE  $*h_1oh_1s-$  all merge into  $*\rho o\lambda s-$  since both PIE  $*h_1o-$  and PIE  $*h_3o-$  develop into PANat.  $*\rho o-$  and PIE  $*-h_1s-$  and PIE  $*-h_3s-$  develop into PANat.  $*\lambda s-$ ; see KLOECKHORST 2008: 75, 78.

In non-Anatolian Indo-European, PIE  $*h_3oh_1s-$ , PIE  $*h_1oh_3s-$ , and PIE  $*h_1oh_1s-$  all merge into  $*H\bar{o}s-$  since both PIE  $*h_1o-$  and PIE  $*h_3o-$  develop into non-Anat. IE  $*Ho-$  and PIE  $*-oh_1s-$  and PIE  $*-oh_3s-$  develop into non-Anat. IE  $*-\bar{o}s-$ .

Therefore, PANat.  $*\rho o\lambda s-$  and non-Anat. IE  $*H\bar{o}s-$  can point to PIE  $*h_3oh_1s-$ , PIE  $*h_1eh_3s-$  ( $*h_1oh_3s-$ ), or PIE  $*h_1oh_1s-$ .

(Some authors reconstruct PIE  $*h_3eh_1s-$  as well, e.g. SCHRIJVER 1991: 55, RIEKEN 1999: 185, DE VAAN 2008: 489, and KROONEN 2013: 394 (who in fact reconstructs  $*h_{1/3}eh_{1/3}s-$ ). This, however, is an incorrect reconstruction because PIE  $*h_3e-$  develops into PANat.  $*Ho-$  (> Hitt.  $ha-$ , CLuw.  $ha-$ ) (v. MELCHERT 1987, KLOECKHORST 2006: 85–96, 2008: 75); cf. e.g. PIE  $*h_3eu-i-$  ‘sheep’ > Hitt.  $h\bar{a}ui-$  id., CLuw.  $h\bar{a}ui-$  id.)

Based on the data, it is impossible to determine which reconstruction is the correct one: PIE  $*h_3oh_1s-$ , PIE  $*h_1eh_3s-$  ( $*h_1oh_3s-$ ), or PIE  $*h_1oh_1s-$ .

However, if we interpret  $*h_1oh_1s-$  as  $*h_1o\lambda s-$  and assume that  $*h_1o\lambda s-$  is the correct reconstruction for PIE ‘mouth’, it becomes possible to derive PIE  $*h_1o\lambda s-$  from PIE  $*h_1od-s-$ , where, attractively,  $*h_1od-$  seems to be the *o*-grade of the PIE root  $*h_1ed-$  ‘to eat’ (> Ved.  $\acute{a}tti$  id., G  $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$  id., L  $ed\bar{o}$  id., Go.  $itan$  id., Lith.  $\acute{e}sti$  ‘feed’, OCS  $jasti$  id., etc.) (LIV<sup>2</sup> 230).

Compare PIE  $*h_2eu-$  ‘to see; to hear’ (Hitt.  $au-i$ , L *audio*, etc.) and PIE  $*h_2ou-s-$  ‘ear’ (G  $o\acute{\upsilon}\zeta$ , L *auris*, OCS *uxo*, etc.) (SZEMERÉNYI 1960: 242) or PIE  $*h_3ek^u-$  ‘to look’ (Skt.  $\acute{i}k\acute{s}ate$ , G  $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha$ , etc.) and PIE  $*h_3ok^u-s-$  ‘eye’ (Skt.  $ak\acute{s}$ -) (LIV<sup>2</sup> 297, NIL 370).

PIE  $*h_1od-s-$  yields PIE  $*h_1o\lambda s-$  by  $*dC$  developing into  $*\lambda C$  (=  $*h_1C$ ).

PIE  $*dC$  develops into PIE  $*\lambda C$ : 1. where  $*C$  is PIE  $*k$ , cf. Skt.  $d\acute{a}\acute{s}v\acute{a}ms-$  ‘devout, pious’ < PIE pt pf act  $*de-d\acute{k}-uos-$  (KLINGENSCHMITT 1982: 129), G  $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\alpha$  (Ion.  $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\eta\kappa\omicron\nu\alpha$ ) ‘thirty’ < PIE num card  $*tri-h_2+d\acute{k}om-t-h_2$ , G  $\pi\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\nu\alpha$  ‘fifty’ < PIE num card  $*penk^ue+d\acute{k}om-t-h_2$ , G  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{o}\nu$  ‘hundred’ < PIE num card  $*d\acute{k}m-t-om$  (KORTLANDT 1983: 97) (= 2010: 105); 2. where  $*C$  is PIE  $*u$  (i.e.  $*y$ ) and the following syllable starts with a dental, cf. G  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\sigma\iota$  ‘twenty’ (ep.  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\iota\kappa\omicron\sigma\iota$  / $\acute{\epsilon}(\acute{\Phi})\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\sigma\iota$ , Dor. Boeot.  $\acute{\Phi}\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\tau\iota$ ) < PIE num card  $*du-i+d\acute{k}m-t-i-$  (KORTLANDT 1983: 97) (= 2010: 100), Skt.  $\acute{a}vidhat$  (scanned long,  $\acute{á}vidhat$ ) < PIE 3sg ind aor act  $*h_1e-dui+d^h_1e-t-\emptyset$  (LUBOTSKY 1994), OCS  $v\acute{i}tor\acute{u}$  ‘second(ary)’ < PIE nom msg  $*dui-tor-o-s$  (DERKSEN 2008: 532), Skt. adv  $v\acute{i}tar\acute{a}m$  ‘further’, Av. adv  $v\acute{i}tar\acute{e}m$  ‘further’ < PIE acc nsg  $*dui-ter-o-m$ , OPhr.  $v\acute{i}taran$  ‘second’ (?) < PIE acc fsg  $*dui-ter-eh_2-m$ ; 3. where  $*C$  is PIE  $*r$ , cf. CLuw.  $ya-a-ar$  ‘water’, Skt.  $v\acute{a}r-$  id. < PIE  $*uod-r-$  (LUBOTSKY 2013).

Also, PIE *\*dC* develops into PIE *\*ʔC* where *\*C* is an obstruent (most likely PIE *\*t*) in a number of verbal roots which appear to show the *\*...d- ~ \*...h<sub>1</sub>-* variation, cf. PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>ed-* (Hitt. *hāt-<sup>i</sup> / hāt-* ‘dry up, become parched’, G ἄζω ‘dry up’) (LIV<sup>2</sup> 255) ~ PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>1</sub>-* (Pal. *hāri, hānta* ‘be hot’, Av. *āt(ə)r-* ‘fire’) (LIV<sup>2</sup> 257); PIE *\*med-* (OIr. *midithir* ‘to measure; judge’, YAv. *vī-mad-* ‘healer; physician’, G μέδω ‘rule’, Go. *mitan, miton* ‘measure; consider’, etc.) (LIV<sup>2</sup> 423) ~ PIE *\*meh<sub>1</sub>-* (Skt. *mā-* ‘measure; measure out, assign’, L *mētior* ‘measure’, etc.) (LIV<sup>2</sup> 424); PIE *\*(s)pend-* (L *pendō* ‘weigh; pay’, Lith. *spęsti* ‘set a trap’) (LIV<sup>2</sup> 578) ~ PIE *\*(s)penh<sub>1</sub>-* (G πένομαι ‘exert oneself, toil’, Lith. *pinti* ‘twist’, OCS *pęti* ‘stretch’, Arm. *henum* ‘weave’, Go. *spinnan* ‘spin’, etc.) (LIV<sup>2</sup> 578); PIE *\*tend-* (L *tondeō* ‘cut hair, shear’, G τένδω ‘gnaw at’) (LIV<sup>2</sup> 628) ~ PIE *\*temh<sub>1</sub>-* (G ep. *τάμνω* ‘cut’, MĪr. *tamnaid* ‘cut’, L *temnō* ‘scorn, despise’) (LIV<sup>2</sup> 625). See LUBOTSKY 2013: 162f (and, now, also GARNIER 2014).

If the present proposition is true, it would suggest that PIE *\*dC* develops into *\*ʔC* before PIE *\*s* as well.

### 3. CONCLUSION<sup>1</sup>

PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔs-*) ‘mouth’ can regularly be derived from PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>ed-* ‘to eat’.

PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>ed-* [1] ablauts into either the zero grade, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>d-* [2], or the full *o*-grade, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>od-* [6], and thence forms an *s*-stem, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>d-s-* [3] / *\*h<sub>1</sub>od-s-* [7], where, before the zero-grade stem, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>d-s-* / *\*h<sub>1</sub>od-s-* allomorphs into PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>ʔs-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>h<sub>1</sub>-s-*) [4] / *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔs-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-*) [8], which is reflected regularly as PANat. *\*ʔʔs-* [5] / *\*ʔoʔs-* [9–11], PIIr. — / *Hās-* [12–14], and PICelt. — / *\*ōs-* [15–17]; the full *o*-grade allomorph, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔs-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-*), is also reflected in its various derivatives in Indic [18–21, 28–30], Latin [22, 23, 26, 27, 31, 36–40], Proto-Germanic [24, 25], and Baltic [31–35].

Based on the data, it seems unnecessary to reconstruct a full grade *s*-stem in Proto-Indo-European.

Even though PANat. *\*ʔoʔs-* is reflected as *\*ʔoʔes-* in Hitt. *aiš* and as *\*ʔoʔos-* in CLuw. *āaš*, these forms, *\*ʔoʔes-* and *\*ʔoʔos-*, are secondary to PANat. *\*ʔoʔs-*; see sec. 2. Therefore, they do not warrant the reconstruction of a full grade *s*-stem in Proto-Indo-European; cf. e.g. Hitt. *nēpiš-* and CLuw. *tappaš-* next to PIE *\*neb<sup>h</sup>-s-* ‘heaven’. Likewise, the reconstruction of a full grade cannot be justified by PICelt. *\*ōs-* either, because it is simpler to derive it from the zero-grade, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔs-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-*); cf. PIIr. *\*Hās-*.

<sup>1</sup> Numbers in square brackets refer to lines in the Appendix (see below).

Moreover, the zero-grade *s*-stem must be reconstructed on the basis of *šš* in Hitt. gen sg *iššaš* as well because the geminate can only be explained as arising from the cluster *\*-h<sub>1</sub>s-*; cf. Hitt. *āššu-* from PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>o-h<sub>1</sub>s-u-* (KLOECKHORST 2008: 223). (The *i-* in Hitt. *išš-* is a prothesis.)

The exact paradigm, static or kinetic, is difficult to reconstruct because the data seems to be conflicted: the supposed strong stem, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>od-s-*, is suggestive of a static noun and the supposed weak stem, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>d-s-*, of a kinetic noun (hysterokinetic or amphikinetic).

The structure of the strong stem, PIE *\*CoC-s-*, is conspicuous, though; it reappears in other *s*-stem neuters which designate body parts, such as PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>ou-s-* ‘ear’ or PIE *\*h<sub>3</sub>ok<sup>u</sup>-s-* ‘eye’.

#### 4. MISC

In the *o*-grade, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>ed-* ‘eat’ apparently formed an *us*-derivative as well, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>od-us-* [41] ‘mouth’, perhaps originally a participle (as e.g. PIE *\*h<sub>3</sub>d-ont-* ‘biter’ > ‘tooth’, from PIE *\*h<sub>3</sub>ed-* ‘to bite’), which was apparently subjected to allomorphy as well,<sup>2</sup> producing PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-us-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-us-*) [42], whence a derivative was formed, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-us-t(H)-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-us-t(H)-*) [43], which, still further derived, is attested as PIE *h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-us-t(H)-o-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-us-t(H)-o-*) [44] in Indo-Iranian [45–47] and Slavic [48], as PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-us-t(H)-i-o-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-us-t(H)-i-o-*) [49–50] in Slavic [51], as PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-us-t(H)-r-o-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-us-t(H)-r-o-*) [52–53] in Avestan [54], and as PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-us-t(H)-eh<sub>2</sub>-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-us-t(H)-eh<sub>2</sub>-*) [55] in Old Prussian [56].

---

<sup>2</sup> The allomorphy must have originated in the strong stem, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>d-uos-*, and was then spread by analogy to the weak stem, PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>od-us-*, since *\*h<sub>1</sub>od-us-* would supposedly have remained unaffected by *\*dC* developing into *\*ʔC*.

## APPENDIX

- PIE root *\*h<sub>1</sub>d-* ‘eat’<sup>3</sup> [1]
- ∴ *ø*-grade *\*h<sub>1</sub>d-* id. [2]
- ⇒ *ø*-grade *s*-stem *\*h<sub>1</sub>d-s-* ‘mouth’ (< ‘eat’) [3]
- ∴ allomorph *\*h<sub>1</sub>ɔʔ-s-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>h<sub>1</sub>-s-*) id. [4]
- > Hitt. *iš-* id. (e.g. in gen sg *iššāš /iš-ša-a-aš/*)<sup>4</sup> [5]
- ∴ *o*-grade *\*h<sub>1</sub>od-* id. [6]
- ⇒ *ø*-grade *s*-stem *\*h<sub>1</sub>od-s-* ‘mouth’ (< ‘eat’) [7]
- ∴ allomorph *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-s-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-*) id. [8]
- > PANat. *\*ʔoʔ-s-* id. [9]
- >> Hitt. nom sg *aiš /a-i-iš/* n. (c.) id.<sup>4</sup> [10]
- >> CLuw. nom sg *āaš /a-a-aš-ša/* n. id.<sup>4</sup> [11]
- > PIIr. *\*Hās-* id. [12]
- > Skt. *āś-* n. id., ‘face’, abl sg *āsás*<sup>5</sup> [13]
- > Av. *āh-* n. id., gen sg *āṅhō*<sup>6</sup> [14]
- > PICelt. *\*ōs-* id.<sup>7</sup> [15]
- > PIIt. *\*ōs-* id. (L *ōs* n. id., gen sg *ōris*)<sup>8</sup> [16]
- > PCelt. *ās-* (OIr. poet. *á* id., gen sg *á* (in *fer há* ‘man of the mouth’ (= ‘tooth’))<sup>9</sup> [17]
- ⇒ *n*-stem derivative *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-s-n-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-n-*) id. [18]
- ⇒ *e*-grade *n*-stem noun *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-s-en-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-en-*) [19]
- loc sg *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-s-en-ø* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-en-ø*) ‘in mouth’ [20]
- > Skt. *āsán* id. (in adj *āsánn-iṣu-* ‘having arrows in the mouth’)<sup>5</sup> [21]
- ⇒ *o*-stem derivative *\*pro(H)+h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-s-n-o-* (= *\*pro(H)+h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-n-o-*) ‘facing forward’ (< ‘with mouth, face forward’) [22]
- > L adj *pronus* ‘leaning forward, bending down, inclined’<sup>10</sup> [23]
- ⇒ *o*-stem noun *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-s-o-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-o-*) ‘river mouth, estuary’ (< ‘mouth’) [24]
- > PGM. *\*ōsa-* id. (ON *óss* m. id., Far. *ósi* m. id., Nw. *os* m. / n. id., ‘hole in the ice’, OE *ōr* n. ‘edge’, *ōra* m. id.)<sup>11</sup> [25]
- ⇒ *eh<sub>2</sub>*-stem noun *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-s-eh<sub>2</sub>-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-eh<sub>2</sub>-*) ‘edge’ (< ‘mouth’) [26]
- > L *ōra* f. id., ‘coast’ [27]
- ⇒ *i*-derivative *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-s-i-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-i-*) id. [28]
- ⇒ *o*-stem noun *\*h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-s-i-o-* (= *\*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-i-o-*) [29]
- > Skt. *āsyā*<sup>o</sup> id., ‘throat’ (in adj *āsyá-daghná-* ‘reaching up to the mouth’)<sup>5</sup> [30]



- ⇒ *t*-derivative  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-s-t-$ ) ‘mouth; river mouth’  
(< ‘mouth’) [31]
- ⇒ *o*-stem noun  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-o-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-s-t-o-$ ) id. [32]  
> Lith. *úostas* m. id., ‘haven’, Latv. *uosts* m. id., ‘haven’<sup>12</sup> [33]
- ⇒ *eh*<sub>2</sub>-stem noun  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-eh_2-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-s-t-eh_2-$ ) id. [34]  
> Lith. *uostà* id., ‘haven’, Latv. *uōsta* f. id., ‘haven’<sup>12</sup> [35]
- ⇒ *i*-derivative  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-i-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-s-t-i-$ ) id. [36]  
⇒ *o*-stem noun  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-i-o-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-s-t-i-o-$ ) id. [37]  
> L *ōstium* n. id., ‘entrance’ (< ‘mouth’) [38]  
⇒ *eh*<sub>2</sub>-stem noun  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-s-t-i-eh_2-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-s-t-i-eh_2-$ ) id. [39]  
> L *ōstia* f. id.<sup>7</sup> [40]
- ⇒ *us*-stem  $*h_1od-us-$  ‘mouth’ (< ‘eat’) [41]  
.. allomorph  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-us-$ ) id. [42]
- ⇒ *t(H)*-derivative  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-$ ) ‘mouth;  
lip’ (< ‘mouth’) [43]  
⇒ *o*-stem noun  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-o-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-o-$ ) id. [44]  
> PIIr. *\*Hausť<sup>h</sup>a-* ‘upper lip’ (< ‘mouth; lip’) [45]  
> Skr. *ósťha-* m. id.<sup>13</sup> [46]  
> YAv. *aošta-* m. id.<sup>14</sup> [47]  
> PSl. *\*usta* ‘mouth’ (OCS pl *usta* n. id., Ru. pl *ustá* n. id.,  
‘lips’, Cz. pl *ústa* n. id., Slk. pl *ústa* n. id., Pl. pl *usta* id.,  
SCr. pl *ústa* n. id., Sln. pl *ústa* n. id., Bulg. *ustá* f. id.)<sup>15</sup> [48]
- ⇒ *i*-derivative  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-i-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-i-$ ) ‘mouth;  
estuary’ (< ‘mouth’) [49]  
⇒ *o*-stem noun  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-i-o-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-i-o-$ ) id. [50]  
>> PSl. *ustīje* id. (Ru. *ust’e* n. id., ‘mouth; orifice’,  
Cz. *ústí* n. id., Slk. *ústie* n. id., Pl. *ujście* n. id.,  
Sln. *ústje* n. id., SCr. *ûšće* n. id., Bulg. *ústie* n. id.,  
‘opening’)<sup>16</sup> [51]
- ⇒ *r*-derivative  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-r-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-r-$ ) ‘mouth; lip’  
(< ‘mouth’) [52]  
⇒ *o*-stem noun  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-r-o-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-r-o-$ ) ‘lip’  
(< ‘mouth; lip’) [53]  
> Av. *aoštra-* m. ‘lower lip’ (< ‘lip’)<sup>14</sup> [54]
- ⇒ *eh*<sub>2</sub>-stem noun  $*h_1o\acute{o}l-us-t(H)-eh_2-$  (=  $*h_1oh_1-us-t(H)-eh_2-$ )  
‘mouth’ [55]  
> OPr. *austo* id.<sup>12</sup> [56]

<sup>3</sup> IEW 287, LIV<sup>2</sup> 230, NIL 208, 387.

<sup>4</sup> KLOEKHORST 2008: 166.

<sup>5</sup> MAYRHOFER 1992: 181.

<sup>6</sup> BARTHOLOMAE 1903: 345.

<sup>7</sup> PICelt. \**ōs-* can reflect PIE \**h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-os-* as well; cf. CLuw. *āaš* above.

<sup>8</sup> SCHRIJVER 1991: 55, DE VAAN 2008: 436.

<sup>9</sup> MATASOVIĆ 2009: 44

<sup>10</sup> DE VAAN 2008: 489.

<sup>11</sup> KROONEN 2013: 394.

<sup>12</sup> DERKSEN 2015: 481. (Derksen takes Lith. *úostas* ‘river mouth; haven’ and Latv. *uosts* ‘river mouth; haven’ together with OP *austo* ‘mouth’ [56] and derives both from PIE \**Hous-t-* (> Skt. *óṣṭha-* ‘upper lip’) ascribing the aberrant vocalism of the East Baltic forms to the influence of PIE ‘mouth’, \**h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-* (or, as he reconstructs it, \**h<sub>3</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-*), whereas, in this paper, PIE \**Hous-t-* is taken to be a derivative of \**h<sub>1</sub>ed-* (·· \**h<sub>1</sub>eʔ-*) ‘eat’ and reconstructed as \**h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-us-t(H)-* (= \**h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-us-t(H)-*) [43], whence OP *austo* would later arise, and Lith. *úostas* and Latv. *uosts* are taken to be descendents of a different derivative of \**h<sub>1</sub>ed-* (·· \**h<sub>1</sub>eʔ-*) ‘eat’, PIE \**h<sub>1</sub>oʔ-s-t-* (= \**h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-s-t-*) [31], seen also e.g. in L *ōstium* ‘entrance’ [38].)

<sup>13</sup> MAYRHOFER 1992: 282.

<sup>14</sup> BARTHOLOMAE 1903: 44.

<sup>15</sup> DERKSEN 2008: 509.

<sup>16</sup> DERKSEN 2008: 510.

## ABBREVIATIONS

*	— reconstructed form	→	— forms
:	— <i>is in ablaut with</i>	←	— <i>is formed from</i>
::	— <i>is in ablaut gradation with</i>	>	— <i>regularly yields</i>
..	— <i>is an allomorph of</i>	<	— <i>regularly derives from</i>
⇒	— <i>derives into</i>	>>	— <i>irregularly yields</i>
⇐	— <i>is derived from</i>	<<	— <i>irregularly derives from</i>
1, 2, 3	— tres verbi personae	ind	— indicativus
acc	— accusativus	loc	— locativus
act	— activum	m	— masculinum
adj	— adjectivum	n	— neutrum
adv	— adverbium	nom	— nominativus
aor	— aoristum	num	— numerale
c	— commune	pf	— perfectum
card	— cardinale	pl	— pluralis
f	— femininum	pt	— participium
fut	— futurum	sg	— singularis
gen	— genitivus		
Anat.	— Anatolian	OE	— Old English
Arm.	— Armenian	OIr.	— Old Irish
Av.	— Avestan	ON	— Old Norse
Boeot.	— Boeotian	OPhr.	— Old Phrygian
Bulg.	— Bulgarian	OPr.	— Old Prussian
CLuw.	— Cuneiform Luwian	Pal.	— Palaic
Cz.	— Czech	PAnat.	— Proto-Anatolian
Dor.	— Doric	PGm.	— Proto-Germanic
ep.	— epic	PICelt.	— Proto-Italo-Celtic
Far.	— Faroese	PIE	— Proto-Indo-European
G	— Greek	PIIr.	— Proto-Indo-Iranian
Go.	— Gothic	PIt.	— Proto-Italic
Hitt.	— Hittite	Pl.	— Polish
IE	— Indo-European	PSl.	— Proto-Slavic
L	— Latin	Ru.	— Russian
Latv.	— Latvian	SCr.	— Serbo-Croatian
Lith.	— Lithuanian	Skt.	— Sanskrit
MIr.	— Middle Irish	Slk.	— Slovak
Nw.	— Norwegian	Sln.	— Slovenian
OCS	— Old Church Slavonic	YAv.	— Young Avestan

## REFERENCES

- BARTHOLOMAE, Christian. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1904.
- DERKSEN, Rick. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2008.
- DERKSEN, Rick. *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2015.
- DE VAAN, Michiel. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2008.
- GARNIER, Romain. »Nouvelles considérations sur l’effet Kortlandt«. *Glotta* 90: pp. 139–159.
- GRASSMANN, Hermann. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1873.
- IEW = POKORNY, Julius. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bd. 1. Bern — München: Francke, 1959.
- KELLENS, Jean, Eric Pirart. *Les textes vieil-avestiques*. Vol. I. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1988.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, Gert. *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1982.
- KLOEKHORST, Alwin. Initial Laryngeals in Anatolian. *Historische Sprachforschung* 119, 2006: pp. 77–108.
- KLOEKHORST, Alwin. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2008.
- KORTLANDT, Frederik. Greek Numerals and PIE Glottalic Consonants. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 42, 1983: pp. 97–104.
- KORTLANDT, Frederik. *Studies in Germanic, Indo-European, and Indo-Uralic*. Amsterdam — New York: Rodopi, 2010.
- KROONEN, Guus. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2013.
- LIV<sup>2</sup> = RIX, Helmut (ed.) & al. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben : die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert, 2001<sup>2</sup> (Bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer.)
- LUBOTSKY, Alexander. RV. *ávidhat. Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch : Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich*. (Eds. George E. DUNKEL, G. MEYER, Salvatore SCARLATA, Christian SEIDEL. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.) 1994: 201–206.
- LUBOTSKY, Alexander. The Vedic Paradigm for ‘Water’. *Multi Nominis Grammaticus : Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, (Eds. Adam I. COOPER, Jeremy RAU, Michael WEISS. Ann Arbor — New York: Beech Stave Press.) 2013: 159–164.
- MATASOVIĆ, Ranko. *Kultura i književnost Hetita*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2000.
- MATASOVIĆ, Ranko. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden — Boston: Brill, 2009.
- MAYRHOFER, Manfred. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Bd. I. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1992.
- MELCHERT, H. Craig. Reflexes of \**h*<sub>3</sub> in Anatolian. *Die Sprache* 33, 1987: pp. 19–28.

- NIL = WODTKO, Dagmar, Britta IRSLINGER, Carolin SCHNEIDER. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2008.
- RIEKEN, Elisabeth. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999.
- SCHRIJVER, Peter. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam — Atlanta, GA, 1991.
- SZEMERÉNYI, Oswald. *Etyma Latina I*. (1–6). *Glotta* 38, 3–4, 1960: pp. 216–251.
- ZUCHA, Ivo. *The Nominal Stem Types in Hittite*. Oxford: University of Oxford, 1988. (PhD Dissertation)

Орсат Л. Лигорио  
 Универзитет у Београду  
 Филозофски факултет  
 Одељење за класичне науке

### ПРАИНДОЕВРОПСКИ ‘ЈЕСТИ’ И ‘УСТА’

#### С а ж е т а к

Пие.  $*h_1oh_1-s-$  ( $= *h_1o\varrho-s-$ ) ‘уста’ (> хет. *aiš id.*, клин. лув. *āaš id.*, стинд. *ās- id.*, ав. *āh- id.*, лат. *ōs id.*, итд.) изводи се од пие. коријена  $*h_1ed-$  ‘јести’ (> стинд. *atti id.*, грч. ἔδμεναι *id.*, лат. *edō id.*, гот. *itan id.*, стсл. *jasti id.*, итд.), као поствербал *s*-основâ степена  $*h_1od-$ , под претпоставком да, у оквиру глоталне теорије, пие.  $*dC$  ( $= *^2dC$ ) даје пие.  $*\varrho C$  ( $= *h_1C$ ), што бива и у којекаким другим случајевима, као нпр. у пие.  $*\varrho u-i+\varrho km-t-i-$  ( $= *h_1u-i+h_1km-t-i-$ ) ‘двадесет’ (> ав. *vīsaiti id.*, грч. ἐπίκοσι /ἐ(ρ)ίκοσι/ *id.*, итд.), од пие.  $*du-i+dkm-t-i-$  (тј. од пие.  $*du-$  ‘два’ и  $*dek̑m$  ‘десет’), или у пие.  $*\varrho o\varrho-r-$  ( $= *uoh_1-r-$ ) ‘вода’ (> клин. лув. *ua-a-ar id.*, скр. *vār- id.*, итд.), од ие.  $*uod-r-$  ‘вода’ (> хет. *wa-a-tar*, итд.).

Кључне ријечи: праиндоевропски, етимологија, глотална теорија.

Орсат Л. Лигорио  
 Филозофски факултет Белградског универзитета  
 Одделение класических наук

### ПРАИНДОЕВРОПЕЈСКИЕ ‘ЕСТЬ’ И ‘РОТ’

#### Резюме

Праие.  $*h_1oh_1-s-$  ( $= *h_1o\varrho-s-$ ) ‘рот’ (> хетт. *aiš id.*, клинопис лув. *āaš id.*, др.-инд. *ās- id.*, авест. *āh- id.*, лат. *ōs id.*, и т.д.) выводится от ие. корня  $*h_1ed-$  ‘есть’ (> др.-инд. *atti id.*, греч. ἔδμεναι *id.*, лат. *edō id.*, гот. *itan id.*, ст.-слав. *jasti id.*, и т.д.) в качестве поствербала *s*-основ степени  $*h_1od-$ , с предположением, что, в рамках глотальной теории, праие.  $*dC$  ( $= *^2dC$ ) дает праие.  $*\varrho C$  ( $= *h_1C$ ), а такое бывает и в разных иных случаях, как напр. в ие.  $*\varrho u-i+\varrho km-t-i-$  ( $= *h_1u-i+h_1km-t-i-$ )

‘двадцать’ (> авест. *vīsaiti id.*, греч. эп. ἑξήκοντι / ἑξ(ῆ)ῑκοσὶ / *id.*, и т.д.) от праие. *\*du-i+dḱm-t-i-* (т.е. праие. *\*du-* ‘два’ и *\*deḱm* ‘десять’), или в ие. *\*uor-r-* (= *\*uoh<sub>1</sub>-r-*) ‘вода’ (> клинопись лув. *ua-a-ar id.*, санскр. *vār- id.*, и т.д.), от ие. *\*uod-r-* ‘вода’ (> хетт. *wa-a-tar*, и т.д.).

*Ключевые слова:* праиндоевропейский, этимология, глоттальная теория.