

Bartholyoshka's Law: *sǵ^h > Indic h (or Indo-Iranian *j^h)¹ and A Few Indo-European, Indic, Iranian, Greek, Albanian, etc. Etymologies

Bartholyoshka Kanunu: *sǵ^h > Hintçe h (veya Hintçe-Farsça *j^h) ve Birkaç Hint-Avrupa Dili ile Hintçe-Farsça-Yunanca-Arnavutça vb. Etimolojiler

Es entspringt [...] der mir recht nüchtern erscheinenden Überzeugung, daß Wörter nicht fertig vom Himmel fallen
[Thieme 1985: 539 n. 17].

Alexis Manaster Ramer

Venice, California/USA

manasterramer@gmail.com

orcid: 0009-0009-4174-1335

Atf Citation

Ramer, Alexis Manaster (2024). Bartholyoshka's Law: *sǵ^h > Indic h (or Indo-Iranian *j^h) and A Few Indo-European, Indic, Iranian, Greek, Albanian, etc. Etymologies. *BABUR Research*, 3 (1), 193-204.

Gönderim Submitted

16.01.2024

Revizyon Revision

10.02.2024

Kabul Accepted

12.02.2024

Yayın Tarihi Publication Date

07.06.2024



Abstract

More than a century ago Bartholomae proposed a sound change of Indo-European *sǵ^h between vowels to Indic h (presumably via Indo-Iranian *j^h) based on just two examples (one uncertain, the other almost certainly wrong). A generation later Scheffelowitz insisted on a different reflex of *sǵ^h in Indic, namely **jjh**, and he provided not even one example. At the same time there were and are numerous examples of words with **h** between vowels in Indic (at least one of them with a cognate in Iranian that show **z** < *j < *j^h) and without etymologies. I provide seven etymologies that seem practically certain and one less so. In the process I also provide for the first time etymologies of one Greek and two Albanian words that also come from etyma with the *sǵ^h cluster. And, as usual, I argue that the story of the misanalysis of all these Indic, Iranian, Greek, and Albanian data by earlier scholars demonstrate serious methodological defects in historical linguistics (and in science generally) that should be acknowledged and then repaired. The repair should involve a revolution leading to what I call Indo-European Linguistics with a Human Face.

Keywords: Indo-European languages, sound change, etymology, historical linguistics

Öz

Yüzyıldan fazla bir zaman önce Bartholomae, biri belirsiz diğeri ise neredeyse tamamen yanlış olan iki örneğe dayanarak Hint-Avrupa dillerindeki *sǵ^h sesinin, ünlüler arasında Hintçe h'ye (muhtemelen Hintçe-Farsça *j^h aracılığıyla) dönüştüğünü öne sürdü. Bir nesil sonra gelen Scheffelowitz, Hintçede *sǵ^h'nin farklı bir refleksi olan "**jjh**" üzerinde ısrar etti ancak tek bir örnek vermedi. Aynı zamanda, Hintçe'de ünlüler arasında "**h**" bulunan (en azından bir tanesi İran dillerinde **z** < *j < *j^h gösteren bir soydaşı olan) ve etimolojisi olmayan çok sayıda örnek kelime vardı. Pratikte kesin olarak gördüğüm yedi etimoloji ve kesinliğini daha az gördüğüm bir etimoloji çalışması yaptım. Bu çalışmada, *sǵ^h kümesiyle kökten gelen bir Yunanca ve iki Arnavutça kelimenin etimolojilerini de ilk kez sunuyorum. Her zaman olduğu gibi, sunduğum bütün Hintçe, **Farsça**, Yunanca ve Arnavutça verilerin daha önceki akademisyenler tarafından yanlış analiz edilme öyküsünün, tarihsel dilbilimde (ve genel olarak biliminde) kabul edilmesi ve onarılması gereken ciddi metodolojik kusurları gösterdiğini savunuyorum. Bu onarım, benim İnsan Yüzlü Hint-Avrupa Dilbilimi olarak adlandırdığım bir devrimi içermektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Hint-Avrupa dilleri, ses değişimi, etimoloji, tarihsel dilbilim

¹ If it were not for the need to have a Turkish as well as an English title, I would have called this article "More Judeo-Christian than Bartholomae?", but I see no way of rendering this pun in Turkish. Also, many thanks to Alexander Nikolaev and Michael Weiss for bibliographic assistance.

It was Hyllested & Joseph (2022: 17 n. 25) that made me remember—and laugh out loud when I saw the bit about “formations containing isolated roots such as **uisǵh-i(i)o-* > Alb. *vithe* ‘haunch, especially of a horse’ ~ Gk. *ισχίον* ‘hip-joint; loins, haunch’ (Mann 1952: 39)”². This is what in Polish we would call *kpić czy o drogę pytać*. This is a ROOT!/? It is not TOTALLY obvious to Those Who Must Copy and Recopy (and Occasionally Lily-gild) that this is a COMPOUND!/? It is not known to ANYONE in this ENTIRE field that I solved this one years ago!/? Obviously, those scholars I share my discoveries with do not think much of them and so do not share with them with others. And please do not start with your oh-so-helpful recommendations that I publish more because I have published more than most (moreover, despite a two-decade break), and all that I publish is consistently IGNORED, too—just the way this will be when I do publish it in the next few months (I am writing this on 3 May 2024). For, aside from a moment of pure unadulterated hilarity, Hyllested & Joseph have given me an additional reason to publish what follows. Because I see now that there is a whole new audience of scholars eager to ignore it, so I want to make it easier for them to do so.

A sound law whereby PIE *-*sǵh-* > **-h-** in Indic was first proposed by BARTHOLOMAE (1891: 40), though this is hardly remembered.³ However, while he had at best one maybe-valid (and maybe not) example (namely, some forms of the root √*sah*, which keep getting rediscovered, e.g., Klingenschmitt 1982: 129), there are quite a number of words with medial or final **h** that have no etymologies at all but would like to—and would if I were ever permitted to be heard stating both them and the sound law they now make certain. Of course, in a field in which the *coryphei* are not just allowed but loudly applauded when heard imperiously rejecting proven results while themselves promulgating sound laws that, in the worst case I have documented so far (Manaster Ramer 2022) have zero definite examples and one definite COUNTEREXAMPLE (for which of course a second sound law is promulgated that is no less loudly approved), one cannot have very much hope. But at least more than zero.

Now before I give the examples, let me point out that, in his critique of Bartholomae, Scheftelowitz (1927) writes something that would be absolutely astounding if it were not for the fact that NOTHING academics to get up can surprise me anymore. First, he asserts that **jh-** is the (sole) reflex of word-initial **sǵh-* based on **jhara-** ‘water fall’ (apparently only lex. but of course found in later Indic) and **jharant-** ‘flowing

² And yes, I have read very little else of that article, having started at the end, as I often do—to make sure that the authors did not omit to (do their duty to) omit any mention of my work on Albanian and of any work of Eric Hamp’s that is “daring” (even if Hyllested used to cite some of both, but that was a different time and a different Hyllested).

³ I myself had forgotten after so many years where I had read this and found it very difficult to find any mention of it by Googling for it. The prevalent custom of *damnatio theoriae* in this field is not as funny anymore as it must once have seemed to those who started it.

or falling down', forgetting the much more common forms of these words with **kṣ-** (EWA I 428f.) that point to a rather different initial consonantism than *sg^h-. But anyway I am not concerned with word-initial reflexes here. So what about the medial position? "Im Inlaut haben wir", opines Scheftelowitz entirely *a priori*, "für idg. *zgh* dem *cch*⁴ entsprechend *jjh* zu erwarten", so one might then *erwart* him to provide at least one or two examples of this. One would be foolish. He does in fact cite two words with **-jjh-**. But not from ***-sg^h-**. Now, imagine if I did that, not that I ever would. But serious scholars are allowed what humorous ones are not. One of the two examples is **jajh-** (according to Scheftelowitz, the tradition also preserves the form **jajhjh-**), where, even if we were to accept (though we absolutely should not!) his reading of the hapax occurrence of this as 'flying' (it surely is 'laughing' [Benfey] or something like that, in a simile for of the Maruts' thunder and lightning)⁵, the etymology would be, as Scheftelowitz himself gives it:

jajjh- = idg. *ǵngh-sk-* : ai. *Jamhas* „Flügel“, lit. *žengüü* „schreite“ [...], got. *gaggan*

I can find no ***-sg^h-** here anywhere. The other example Scheftelowitz cites is **ujjh-** 'to leave, abandon, quit', which he gives no explicit etymology for but which he himself relates to "*ūhati* „wegschaffen“, *apa-ūhati* „aufgeben“, Pt. Pass. *ūḍha*, *vāhate* „drängt“". This is the standard theory (EWA III 30), too (and it is not very convincing)⁶, but in any case there is again no trace ***-sg^h-** that I can detect. In short, Scheftelowitz leaves us with no examples of ***-sg^h-** at all! So this is yet another case (Nussbaum 1999 much later provided another one, as discussed in Manaster Ramer 2022) of a sound law being asserted without any definite (or actually any at all) examples.

The following list of examples of Bartholyoshka's Law is not exhaustive, and is preserved in descending order of obviousness:

1. **viha-** 'sky' (in: **vihan̄ga-** etc.) < *(**h₂**)**ui-sg^h-o-** 'held/holding asunder' is an allusion to the familiar myth according to which the sky and the earth were once touching (therefore could have sex and produce children as a result), till separated by Indra (who therefore becomes their LAST child). How can the Greek⁷ and Albanian words reflecting *(**h₂**)**u-isg^h-i(i)o-** NOT be derived from this?

⁴ I.e., parallel **-chh-** < ***-sk-**.

⁵ This is not just a matter, as per EWA, of "dialektischer Lautgestalt" for what is otherwise **jaks-** in Vedic. There, of course, must have been dialectal variants in Vedic times because Pāli **jaggh-** cannot be derived otherwise. However, the form **jajjh-** and even more obviously the variant **jajhjh-** were chosen deliberately for the onomatopoeic effect, since it is the sound of a woman laughing that is the simile in this passage. This of course is not the sort of thing that the learned etymologists (e.g., EWA I 562) would dirty their minds with.

⁶ It seems to me, on the other hand, that, whereas **ūh-** is from ***Hu-ug^h-**, there is an outside chance that **ujjh-** is actually from ***Hut-sg^h-**. To this extent then Scheftelowitz would be vindicated for having realized that the usual etymology of this last contradicts the known sound laws. But if the form is dialectal (what I call *PRE-kritic*), then all bets are off.

⁷ Beekes (2010: 603) cannot leave ill enough alone and so, just after saying "No etymology", he adds that "[o]ne might assume a Pre-Greek pre-form". One may of course assume whatever one likes, so long as one realizes what assuming makes of one (and of u and me).

The word refers to the width of that part of the animal. One would have to put blinders on the OTHER end of the horse (or both ends, I suppose) not to see this—not to mention that the idea of this as a compound, to be sure rather half-horsed but at least with the boundary in the right place, can be found in Barić (1923: 141), endorsed by Çabej (1976: 410, French resume 548), and duly repeated by Tokalli (2017: 284, 1576), though of course one has to make the effort (in my case without actually knowing the language more than to shop for vegetables or order in a restaurant) to read Albanian to discover this fact and then Serbo-Croatian (which is much easier) to find out exactly what (rather fantastic) pre- and postpounds Barić had in mind. If one does, though, one is rewarded by discovering that **bythë** ‘arse’ is apparently a second compound of this family (and perhaps only preserved in Albanian out of all of Indo-European, though maybe that is only an illusion due to no one having looked?) with the same postpound but a different prepound (this time identified correctly by Barić with Albanian **mbë**)—and so perhaps originally meaning (this part is mine, as is the postpound) something like ‘holding (*or maybe*: held)⁸ around (from both sides or the like).⁹

2. **kalaha-** (m.) ‘strife, contention, quarrel, fight [...]’ is considered in *EWA* (I: 321) to be unexplained but “Vielleicht doch” onomatopoeitic. We should be thankful that at least (unlike what most authors would say if they were in his position) Mayrhofer does sometimes qualify nonsense with “Vielleicht”. To me, any such comments seem bizarre when there is nothing specific that points to the conclusion, that is, when it is at least as likely that it is precisely the opposite. For example, whereas Mayrhofer (in my judgment entirely correctly) rejected the vast majority of the essentially random and unsupported non-IE etymologies this field has suffered so much from, those who favor them could surely easily find some foreign origin for this word, surely with **ka-** as a prefix. As for me, if the original meaning was ‘violence without murderous weapons, abuse, beating, kicking’ (quoted in *M-W*) and, of course, if Bartholyoshka’s Law is valid, then the etymology is simply **kará-** ‘hand’ plus my **-ha-** < ***-sǵ^h-o-**, in short, ‘hand grabbing’, crucially referring to precisely the use of nothing worse than hands (maybe not even fists). By the way, most though not all of the examples we propose involve compounds with this same zero grade of $\sqrt{\text{seǵ}^h}$.

⁸ And if so, perhaps erotically suggestive—as indeed could be the other word, too, one referring to taking a hold of another person’s rear end and the other to spreading it. However, I myself have repeatedly urged caution in such matters, e.g., re Greek **παρθένος** and PIE $\sqrt{*yebh}$ (= ***iebh**, or as traditionally written, as if it made a profound difference, ***iebh**), and I say here again that we should at least try not to project our Modern preoccupations with sex onto people with preoccupations no less obsessive but not identical.

⁹ I do not know enough to say anything definite about the final **-e** vs. **-ë**, nor yet about Orel’s (1998: 44) idea that **bythë** is not PARALLEL to **vithe** but rather a compound of **mbë** plus **vithe** itself (though I do not like it). His counter-etymology deriving **vithe** from a verb meaning ‘weave’ (p. 510) though, seems to me nothing less than bizarre—but again I do not know enough to be QUITE sure. This may be the place to note that Meyer (1891: 472), who is sometimes credited with connecting the two words, says no more than this (s.v. **viðe**): “Die Bedeutungen berühren sich mit denen von *būðe biðe*”.

3. **varāhā-** but also **varāhu-** (m.) 'a boar, hog, pig, wild boar [...]' seems to be taken to have no clear etymology, though Mayrhofer for once does not know offer an explicit judgment (*EWA* II: 514-515).¹⁰ Now, no less bizarre than the assumption WITH NO SPECIFIC BASIS of an expressive or onomatopoetic origin for words which the author simply does not the origin of (see above) is the common idea that such words can simply be taken to be foreign without any real (or even unreal) evidence (as is done over and over, in what I regard as a fundamentally flawed approach, by Lubotsky 2001, de Vaan 2000, and others), it is my own (of course, to YOU, quite absurd) view that a foreign origin can be asserted only when there is some actual evidence for it, e.g., Engl. **blitzkrieg** is foreign not because it looks weird (though that of course sometimes can be decisive) but above all because we can tell where it came from. By contrast Engl. **adze**, no matter how strange it looks, is (as seems obvious to me, though again not to YOU) entirely native. In my view, then, because of the rare alternating accent, the words at issue here look like a beautiful illustration of the theory (which I have developed, independently of and going rather further than Wheeler [1885, 1903], who of course is generally ignored, too) of a contrast between two types of Indo-European compounds ending in verbal nouns, those accented on the last syllable being agentive ("active") vs. those accented on the first member or the penult of the second being non-agentive (non-"active", incl. but not limited to "passive")¹¹. The first element would be **valá-** (*EWA* II: 524 s.v.), here clearly meaning 'fence' (rather than the more common 'cave, cavern'), which is obviously possible given the basic sense of "enclosure" = 'Einschließung' (*EWA*). This is moreover supported by my own analysis of **vṛnda-** (***vṛ-m—da-** 'one furnished with a fence'). If our theory is right, then the non-agentive **varāhu-** would mean 'held (back), subdued by fences', whereas

¹⁰ *EWA* (II: 514) refers with no comment to *KEWA* (II: 524, III: 150, 163) and to Christol (1987: 57f.), the latter arguing for a connection via a metathesis in a secret language or language game to the Celtic etymon which Christol himself writes as ***ghorwo-**, though actually it would begin with ***g^h-**. His argument though is no more than that "[c]omme la forme celtique est motivée, la déformation est probablement indo-iranienne". This is (as almost always when the concept of PROBABILITY is invoked in this field) mathematical nonsense, and anyway it rests on nothing more than the inability of Indo-Iranists to come up with an etymology for the word. As anyone with a brain, a heart, and courage can see, that is not a robust method of argumentation—and of course all others are welcome to it.

¹¹ Thus, **bhāgá-dughá-** is really 'one who deals out portions, distributer', whereas **kāma-dúgha-** (misleadingly glossed as "milking desires,' yielding objects of desire like milk, yielding what one wishes") and **madhu-dúgha-** (glossed just as badly as 'milking (i.e. yielding) sweetness') are really ones that are 'milked of what is desired' respectively 'of sweetness' but literally ones that 'having (an unspecified agent) milking (them) of' those things. There are perhaps a hundred of the latter kind of compound in Vedic, some not seen as compounds at all, most regarded as merely accentual "Einzelausnahmen" (as taught by Wackernagel and Whitney). For the record, as for me, it was in the 1990's that I first realized **marúd-vṛdha-** literally meant 'having the Maruts increasing/swelling (it)' and so refers to a river swollen by a rain storm. The passive sense arises immediately from that of having someone as agent. This is why we call these de-agentive *bahuvrīhi*'s. Given this basic meaning, these compounds can in principle denote any participant in an action or situation other than the agent. Needless to say, I have failed utterly to get any kind of hearing for these discoveries, too.

the agentive **varāhā-** would on the contrary be ‘one that overcomes fences’. To be sure, we are not absolutely clear about the vowel length. The first could easily have an inst.sg. prepound ***uorHóh₁-sg^hu-**, but the length in the second one would either have to reflect a prehistoric use of the instrumental for the object of this verb or perhaps more simply the influence of the non-agentive on the agentive (the latter perhaps indeed created on the basis of the former). Why any of this should make sense to the Gentle Reader is that, along with the wholly unstoppable rat, the boar even now destroys more food plants than any other creature in NW South Asia (Roberts 1977: 166):

They can be very destructive of farm crops [...], trampling far more than they consume. Wheat is particularly subject to their depredations at two stages. When freshly sown and until it sprouts, they will open dead straight furrows with their snouts[,] eating all the grain deposited by the seed drill, doing this so precisely that it is hard to imagine such parallel open furrows were not made mechanically. Again when the ripening wheat grains are at the milky stage, provided the ears are not awned, Wild pigs like to chew the panicles but show no interest in it once the grain sets hard. [...] In 1970 near Khanewal, a one acre experimental plot of awnless wheat [...] was sown [...]. When the grains were half ripe, the plot was visited for five or six successive nights by an ever-increasing number of Wild Pigs until the entire acre was reduced to a tangled quagmire, whilst the adjoining bearded wheat crop was left upstanding and untouched.

The wild boar, therefore, would have been the animal par excellence that the early OI speakers would have tried to thwart by means of fences, and at the same time, the one that would quite often have strong enough to overcome these, hence the unusual alternation—depending on whether one wanted to accentuate the positive (the wish more than anything else that the fences might work) or the negative (the sobering reality that they mostly did not). I would like to add that Rudra is in my view simply the personification of this double plague, wild boar + rat, which the Reader can easily verify by going through the various features mentioned in the Vedas, each of which fits one or the other animal, not to mention the later iconography: the god with the supposed elephant head clearly has a boar’s head and anyway rides a rat—and then the name means ‘thief’ (***ludró-**), of human food that is. Of course, if my etymology of the name of the wild boar is right, then Bartholyoshka’s Law applied in (at least in a part of) Iranian because of Avestan **varāza-**, Modern Persian **gurāz**, etc. However, it is still early days (what I referred to above as *Pre-Break*), so I will only remark that none of the examples of actual **-zg-** cited by Scheftelowitz from Iranian, as if they were at all relevant, reflect ***-sg^h**, as opposed to ***-sg^{(o)h-}**. The mind boggles.

4. **vehát-** (f.) ‘barren cow, cow that miscarries’, of course also regarded as “Unklar” (*EWA* II: 587), is immediately explained as a compound consisting of a root noun from $\sqrt{\text{veṣ}}$ (PIE $\sqrt{*ueis}$ or maybe $*ueHis-$, which would mean it was a thieme and not a root) plus $*-sg^h-et$, hence ‘one that holds (back) activity/production’ or ‘whose production is held back’, which would also make this a welcome new example to the archaic agentive $*-et$ (see notably Weiss 2018). Than which I would think nothing could be more perfect, though of course the Gentle Reader’s right to be wrong extends to finding fault here too—or ignoring me altogether. He or she may find that so easy, having done it so often, as to find it boring, though.

Next, it is a strange and wonderful fact that the names of two Vedic meters have something to do with a region of anatomy involving the neck and the shoulders/back. We thus have:

5. **uṣṇīh-** (f.) ‘... N[ame] of a Vedic metre (consisting of twenty-eight syllabic instants, viz. two Pādas with eight instants, and one with twelve; the varieties depend on the place of the twelve-syllabled Pāda) [...]’, **uṣṇīhā-** (f.) ‘the Uṣṇīh metre ...’ (f. pl.) ‘the nape of the neck’

as well as

6. **kakúbh-** (f.) ‘a peak, summit; space, region or quarter of the heavens ...; N[ame] of a metre of three Pādas (consisting of eight, twelve, and eight syllables respectively; so called because the second Pāda exceeds the others by four syllables) [...]’ \approx **kakúd** (f.) ‘a peak or summit ...; chief, head ... any projecting corner or projection (as of a plough) ... the hump on the shoulders of the Indian bullock ... the hump (of a man) ... N. of a metre [...]’ (\approx (m. n.) **kákuda-**) as well as **kakuha-** (adj.) ‘lofty high, eminent, great’ \approx **kakubhá-**

The former would be a compound consisting of a word I have reconstructed previously—as either $*uṣṇi-$ ‘space around the ears’ or maybe it is really just as the loc.sg. of $*uṣn-$ ‘ear(s)’—plus $*-h-$ < $*-sg^h-$ ‘reaching for, grabbing’. Which would seem to me (but what do I know?) a perfect kenning for the part of the body above the shoulders reaching up and to the space between the ears. This is evident when you consider my etymology of **uṣṇīṣa-** (dating back to 2007 and constantly brought by me to the attention of Those Who Will Not Hear), but of course I am crazy to even suggest that. Why would you consider my etymology of anything? Forget I

said anything.¹²

The second is just a bit less trivial. The consonantal stems **kakúbh-** and **kakúd-** must be two different results of a rather obvious dissimilation (followed by leveling), as has long been recognized. The question is which is the oldest form. Suppose the etymon was ***kaku-sǵ^h**- ‘grabbing/reaching *kaku*’. This would have given ***kahuh-** (word-final ***kakuk!**). Dissimilation of the three *k*’s in this ***kakúk** would have given

¹² **uṣṇīṣa-** ‘anything wound round the head, turban, fillet [...]’, regarded as etymologically “Unklar” (EWA I: 238), is immediately analyzed as a compound whose postpound was the zero-grade ***iṣa-** from **√yās** (PIE **√*iōh₃s** ‘to tie, gird’) and whose postpound was either ***uṣ-ṇi-**, a stem derived from PIE ***h₃eus-** ‘ear’ via the same ***-ni-** suffix as is found in several other body part terms (***pērs-ni-**, ***pes-ni-**, etc.) or possibly (as my drafts indicate Alexander Nikolaev pointed out to me, so it is not as though I deliberately hid this etymology from the SERIOUS scholars) either a ptotic (loc. sg.) ***uṣ-ṇ-i** of an **n**-stem or (though other data suggest that this is not the correct choice) just the bare stem **uṣ-ṇ-** itself (in the latter case the postpound would have been in the non-GRUMUṢṬI form, of course). The accentuation of the compound is once again (as in so many of our etymologies) that of a non-active (here simply passive, patientive) deverbal *bahuvrīhi* meaning something like ‘tied around the ears ~ around the ear part of the head’. This is anyway the same ***uṣṇi-** that can be found in **uṣṇih-** and also in **kapuṣṇikā-** ‘a tuft of hair on each side of the head’ (which is how we can tell that the prepound was more likely ***uṣṇi-** than **uṣṇ-**). To this of course we must add **śrīṅgoṣṇīṣa-** (lex.) is supposed to mean ‘lion’, with **uṣṇīṣa-** clearly a metaphorical reference to a mane. However, the only way to make sense of this word is to assume that, while it may have come to denote any maned animal, including the lion, it originally must have referred to an animal that had prominent horns (**śrīṅga-**) as well as a striking mane or “turban” (The word itself then would have to be a rare example of a *bahuvrīhi* based on a *dvandva* (and so meaning ‘having X and Y’), such as **somendrá-**, **stómaprṣṭha-**, etc. And as for the semantics, this would have to be an example of a word whose meaning came to be forgotten once the speakers of Old Indic had lost contact with the referent. It comes as no surprise then that Northern India, in particular the slopes of the Himalayas, is home to just such an animal, the amazing tahr (*Hemitragus jemlahicus*):



If this conjecture is correct, we get further proof of four things that should not need any more proof in the 21st century but apparently still do: (i) the speakers of Old Indic did enter India from the North(west) but then, as they descended south and east, often forgot the realities of life in that region, and so (ii) again what the later Indian sources tell us about life of the Vedic-speaking peoples is often going to be incorrect in many respects and must now be revised to fit *our* understanding of those realities, (iii) the Old Indic data given to us by the indigenous lexicographers and grammars often *are* real even if the words do not appear in any preserved text, but at the same time (iv) they are often preserved imperfectly (in this case as to meaning, in others perhaps also as to form). This means that—despite major discontinuities in the Indian intellectual tradition at several key points, which we may deduce from (a) the misparses of the ṚV-Saṁhita at the time the *padapāṭha* was created, (b) the diaskeuasis, i.e., the creation of the current (mis)pronunciation of the Vedas, (c) the way in which much of Pāṇini’s meaning was lost together with certain aspects of the pronunciation of the text of his grammar (Kiparsky 1979, one of my absolute favorite books), and several other, less obvious but no less real such disruptions—there was also a continuous collective lexicographic memory spanning thousands of years that we have no direct knowledge of but that can be reconstructed from a significant number of examples of this very sort (most apparently unstudied till now). Oh, and one more: (v) that you can run from super firepower but you cannot hide. Yes, YOU!

***kakúp** (whence the new stem *kakúbh-*) in general, but *kakút* in certain special positions, e.g., before a labial (as in **kakúdmant-** ‘high, lofty’) or before another dental stop (in the sole *RV* occurrence in this position, 84.4.16 **kakúd divás**), whence the stem **kakúd-**.¹³ The original **-h-** is preserved, as expected, before a vowel, in **kakuhá-**. This account is contrary to usual ideas about the direction of change from **-bh-** to **-h-** in this word, but, then, the latter had no basis for them other than a gratuitous assumption that this is the same process as the **bh ~ h** alternation in $\sqrt{\text{gra(b)h-}}$. Of course, the big unknown—to you—is the ***kaku-**, though, given Lat. **cacūmen**, though here we run into the (non-) issue that there was evidently also ***kaḱ** with a palatovelar, which I take to be the source of the Trojan name **Cassandra**¹⁴, literally ‘one who constantly raises her hands (over her head)’, in a well-known gesture of lamentation. Of course, yes, go ahead and look down on me with that supercilious sneer that you picked up in graduate school and have been perfecting ever since. But these two are two different theisms referring to something raised high (though at least one of them can apparently also refer to horizontal extremities).

7. ***uhū-** (hapax, in the plural at *RV* 4.45.5 **uhúvas**), epithet of the divine geese and hitherto so “unklar” (*EWA* I: 239) that neither authoritative Geldner nor the omniscient Jamison & Brereton ventured to translate it at all. Of course, there have been various stabs in the dark (which Mayrhofer does not even bother summarizing), but now this can be explained as related to Arm. **oski** (this presumably from some unknown centum source), representing ***h₁us-ghū-**, a compound of $\sqrt{*h_1euṣ}$ (OI $\sqrt{oṣ}$) ‘to burn’ and $\sqrt{ghēu}$ (OI \sqrt{hav}) ‘to pour’ and/or $\sqrt{ghēuH}$ (OI \sqrt{hav}) ‘to call (the gods to come get their oblations)’, which to my dull wits seems like a perfect kenning for ‘molten gold’, which to my dull wits seems like a perfect epithet for the *Aśvins*’ carrier birds, which to my dull wits is alluding to the appearance of the first light after the dark night (crucially, before the sundisk itself is seen!) and hence to the pre-dawn LIQUID sacrifices (designed as they were to make sure the sun would appear at all). And/or to a brand new

¹³ I am not sure that the last word has been said about the vrddhi OInd. **kākúd-** (*RV* 1.8.7, 6.41.2, 8.69.12), which refers to some part of the anatomy described as swelling when one drinks large quantities of liquids and taken to be parallel to the belly (**kukṣīh**).

¹⁴ Namely, from Old Indic **ákra-** (which I interpret as ‘distant, inaccessible’, referring to the gods) and **akrá-** (which an Ancient Indian commentator saw as ‘rampart’ but which I take to mean ‘cresting wave’)—one of my earliest discoveries in IE (c. 2006) and of course still being ignored too—we can deduce that there were not only (the usually assumed) words of the form ***HVK-r-o-** but also ***HVK-r-o-** (the former apparently to do more with acuity, the latter more with height). Moreover, because the two could not avoid being conflated in the centum languages, many of the words routinely taken to come from the former actually come from the latter. Of course, you will prefer to leave **akrá-** as a “mehrmals bezeugtes ved. Wort von unklarer Bedeutungsbestimmung” and **ákra** as “„gleichfalls ganz dunkel!”” and further to agree with Mayrhofer that, since he ADMITS having no idea what either word meant, that he is entirely right to assert that the two are “[u]verwand[t]!” (*EWA* I 40f.). I will say again: there are two entirely different approaches to science (and to life) that you see contrasted here—and you are all still on the wrong side—as is understandable since you all mistake (as I too was taught) HEIGHT on the totem pole for ACUITY.

proof of a not-so-new sound law and to a brand new (set of) etymologies. In short, to a not-so-new-but-hitherto-unheard loud call for a brand new spring in a field long since frozen in the same old interminable repetitions and occasional slight pessimizations and globally for an *Indo-European linguistics with a human face*. And yes, you MAY call it the *Varsovia/Venice/Varna Spring*. Thank you for noticing.

What's that? You do not accept these etymologies? Of course not. This is completely logical. The police exist not to catch the criminals nor the courts to convict them. Doctors exist to neither diagnose nor treat patients, too. So why should Indo-European historical linguists who cannot themselves explain the history of these words accept mine? Better leave them unexplained. But you see, hairdressers generally do cut or style SOMETHING. It may not be the best shearing or the finest coiffing, but at least it is SOMETHING. These may BE the worst of all etymologies—except for all the others, notably except for those that have not been done, no matter how badly, at all. But of course, as Voltaire, did not QUITE write (so I paraphrase him slightly), *tout me persecute dans ce monde, jusq'aux étymologies qui n'existent pas*.

And as I have said before and no doubt will again, if I am spared long enough, the man who killed three wives for insurance without leaving any physical evidence was hanged. If it had only been two, he would have walked. But it WAS three. We have seven etymologies based on the sound law discussed here—and hundreds out there (and thousands yet to be anywhere) not involving this sound law. Pure coincidence of course. So sorry to have mentioned it and trespassed on your time. What's that? You never heard what I said and never read what I wrote? No, of course not. Чукча не читатель. И тем более не слушатель.

There are almost certainly more examples, but some I have not worked out (not to my standards), some I may not have identified, and some are words so short and phonologically and/or semantically unspecific it is hard to be sure. F.ex.:

8. *áha* (indecl.) '... (as a particle implying ascertainment, affirmation, certainty, &c.) surely, certainly...; (as explaining, defining) namely...; (as admitting, limiting, &c.) it is true, I grant, granted, indeed, at least...' (M-W) is etymologically "Nicht zu klären" (EWA). However, under the newly proposed sound law, this could possibly come from **h₁e-sǵ^h-ṃ* 'I grasped, I understood' (compare. Grk. ἔχω in the sense of '[to] possess mentally, understand'), which seems to give just the right meaning. And wouldn't the archaic athematic 1sg. ending **-ṃ* be nice, too?

The problem here is one I have often written about (because it is so often studiously ignored by linguists pretending to know what they cannot in principle ever know, least of all with their prevalent approach and attitude), and it is one occasionally commented on by the official scholarship, too, e.g., when Mayrhofer comments on Old Indic *áka*- 'unhappiness, pain, trouble' that "[ü]berzeugende außerarische

Verbindungen mit dem kleinen, vieldeutigen Wortkörper *ak⁰* sind nicht geglückt” (EWA I 39). Christol by the way deserves to be cited here too, for pointing out (which so few scholars do) that “[i]l peut s’agir bien sûr d’une rencontre accidentelle” (p. 58), though it is also evident that he did not understand what that means. In any case, the (essentially MATHEMATICAL) problem is much more complex than such remarks seem to be suggesting—but it is very real and very much more frequent problem than seems to be generally accepted. Not MY problem; YOURS. I am *der Mann ohne Probleme*.

And yes I do realize that I have not received a license from the *urvájra*’s that would authorize me to PROPOSE even minor (forget about major) additions or changes to the accepted lore. Apparently it has been lost in the mail or in the ever-thickening fog of lore. But anyway the question really is whether you, oh Gentlest of Readers, need a license to CONSIDER them or to even admit that I exist. Or will you just keep waiting for me to die, reassuring yourselves and each other that it is all as it should be because (as per Karl Kraus) “[j]e näher man ein Wort ansieht, desto ferner sieht es zurück”—but of course only if it is me (or Thieme) doing the looking—in this, the best of all possible worlds.

References

- Barić, H. 1923. Etimološki i gramatički prolozi. *Arhiv za arbansku starinu, jezik i etnologiju* 1: 138-159
- Bartholomae, Chr. 1891. *Studien zur idg. Sprachgeschichte II*. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden ** Boston: Brill.
- Çabej, Eqrem. 1976. *Studime etimologjike në fushë të shqipës*, II (A-B). Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave.
- Christol, Alain. 1987. Un verlan indo-iranien? *LALIES* 5: 57-64.
- De Vaan, Michiel. 2000. The Indo-Iranian animal suffix *-ācá*. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 43: 279-293.
- EWA = Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992-2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Geldner, F. K. 1951-1957. *Der Rig-Veda*. Cambridge [et al.]: Harvard Univ. Press [et al.].
- Hyllested, Adam & Brian Joseph. 2022. Albanian. In: Thomas Olander (ed.) *The Indo-European Languages: A Phylogenetic Perspective*, 223-245. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. & Joel P. Brereton. 2014. *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*. Oxford Univ. Press.
- KEWA = Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1956-1980. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1979. *Pāṇini as a Variationist*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press ** Pune, India: Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, University of Poona.

- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1982. *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 2001. The Indo-Iranian substratum. In: C. Carpelan [et al.] (eds.) *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations. Papers presented at an international symposium held at the Tvärminne Research Station of the University of Helsinki 8-10 January 1999*, pp. 301-317. Helsinki: Société Finno-ougrienne.
- Manaster Ramer, Alexis. 2022. More *inebra*: An unnoticed meaning of PIE $\sqrt{*kelH}$ and a bit more. *Studia Uralo-altaica* 56 (*Siberica et Uralica: In memoriam Eugen Helimski*): 293-315.
- M-W = Monier-Williams, Sir Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Mann, Stuart E. 1952. Indo-European consonants in Albanian. *Language* 28: 31–40.
- Meyer, Gustav. 1891. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der albanesischen Sprache*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Nussbaum, Alan. 1999. **Jocidus*: An account of the Latin adjectives in *-idus*. In: Heinz Eichner [et al.] (eds.) *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, 377-419. Praha: Enigma.
- Orel, Vladimir. 1998. *Albanian Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden ** Boston: Brill.
- Scheftelowitz, J. 1927. [KZ =] *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 54: 224-253.
- Thieme, Paul. 1985. Radices postnominales. In: Bernfried Schlerath (ed.), *Grammatische Kategorien: Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, 239-248. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Topkalli, Kolec. 2017. *Fjalor etimologjik i gjuhës shqipe*. Tiranë: Botimet Albanologjike.
- Weiss, Michael. 2018. Veneti or Venetes? Observations on a widespread Indo-European tribal name. In: Lucien van Beek [et al. (eds.)] *Farnah: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Sasha Lubotsky*, 349-357. Ann Arbor ** New York: Beech Stave.
- Wheeler, Benjamin I. 1885. *Der griechische Nominalaccent*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Wheeler, Benjamin I. 1903. The so-called mutation in Indo-European compounds. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 34 (= *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association Held at New Haven, Conn., July, 1903. Also of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast Held at San Francisco, Cal., Dec., 1902*), 68-70.