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Hittite nai-, nê-, Sanskrit nī-,  
and the PIE Verbal Root *(s)neh₁-

ALWIN KLOEKHORST AND ALEXANDER M. LUBOTSKY

Ever since Hrozný 1917:29 n. 3, the Hittite verb nai-, nê-a(n) 'to turn, to send' has been etymologically connected with Skt. nī- 'to lead'. The root of these two verbs is commonly reconstructed as *neih₁/3-.¹ In the following, we will argue that this reconstruction cannot account for the formal peculiarities of the Hittite forms and that an alternative solution is called for. First, however, we will give a treatment of the semantics of both verbs.

1 Semantics of Hitt. nai-, nê- and Skt. nī-

In Hittite, the basic meaning of the middle verb nê-a(n) is 'to turn (oneself) in a certain direction':

(1) [(n-aš-za-kan GÛB-la)] nêja  
‘He turns to the left.’ (KUB 42.99 i 9–10 with dupl. KUB 12.51 i 17)

(2) nu-ya-za-kan EGIR-pa nāiḥḥut ANA KURᵀᴹ-LA=ma-ya-kan anda lē uŋāši  
‘Turn back; don’t come into my land!’ (KUB 41.17 ii 16–8)

The active verb nai-¹ means ‘to turn (something/someone) in a certain direction’:

(3) kēl mene ššīt duyān kēll-a mene ššīt duyān nējanzi  
‘They turn the one’s face in one direction, and the other’s face in the other direction.’ (KBo 6.26 i 36–8)

(4) n-ašta gišhuğannin EGIR-pa nejanzi  
‘They turn the carriage around.’ (IBoT 1.36 iii 68)

When the object of nai-¹ is a human being, the verb can also be translated ‘to send’, a meaning that is easily derived from ‘to turn in a direction’:
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(5) āppa·m-an·kan ZI-it UL nēanzi

‘They shall not turn/send him back of their own will.’ (KUB 23.72 rev. 23)

(6) man·kan *UTUS BELI·JA BELU kuinki parā naitti . . .

‘If you, My Majesty, my lord, were to send forth some lord . . . ’ (HKM 46 rev. 15–6)

Whenever nai-i takes words like ‘strings’, ‘strands of yarn’, ‘cords’, ‘bracelets’, etc. as its object, it means ‘to tie (around)’, a meaning that must have derived from ‘to turn in a direction’ through an intermediate meaning ‘to wind, to twist’:

(7) nušan NAGGA tepu SIG istaggai anda ḫulāliēzzi n-at-šan ANA BELUTIM kunni ANA QATI-ŠU GIR-ŠU nai

‘He enwraps a piece of tin with a string and ties it around the hands and feet of the patients.’ (KUB 27.67 ii 34–5)

(8) EGIR-ŠU·ma-zā 2 ḤAR.ŠU²LA 2 ḤAR.ＧĪRMEŠ nai

‘Afterwards he ties onto himself two bracelets and two anklets.’ (KUB 12.51 i’ 22)

(9) nu NAkuyaNA KU.ＢＡＢＢＡＲ²LA ijanzi . . . n-aš-kan ANA GU₄, MAḤ UDU.ŠIR GÚ-ṣi anda nejanzi

‘They make beads of silver . . . and tie these around the neck of a bull and a ram.’ (KUB 24.12 iii 12–5)

(10) nušmaš-šan ḤAR.ＳＡＧ SÅ₄, ŠÍG.ＢＡＢＢＡＲ taruppan GÚ·ŠUNU anda nejanza

‘A red headband with white wool braided into it is tied around their necks.’ (KUB 9.28 iii 11–3)

The reduplicated derivative of nai-i, nanna/i-i, usually has animals as its object, and means ‘to drive’. This verb is the original intensive/imperfective of nai-i and therefore must originally have meant ‘to repeatedly turn back and forth’, i.e. ‘to lead an animal by constantly adjusting the direction in which it walks’.²

(11) nu ANŠE·in nannianzi

‘They drive a donkey.’ (KBo 22.2 obv. 7–8)

²Since nanna/i- often has multiple animals as its object, it may also have had a distributive meaning. The -ške/a-imperfective naške/a- is attested in a few forms only, from MH times onwards, whereas nanna/i- is attested in OS texts already. This indicates that naške/a- must be a new formation that is formed according to the synchronically productive pattern, whereas nanna/i- was the original imperfective of nai-i.
Occasionally, nanna/i- occurs intransitively, and then means ‘to drive, to ride in a vehicle’:

(13) *INA URUDU* Ku[(nnū)] *nannabhun* nu ḫaršiḫarši udaš

‘I was driving to the ruins of Kunnū when a thunderstorm broke.’ (KBo 4.2 iii 40–1)

In Sanskrit, the verb n¯ı- means ‘to lead, to guide’, but also ‘to conduct, to direct’, and is very often used with preverbs specifying the direction (‘to direct up, along, around, down, etc.’), which is also true of its Avestan cognate. For Proto-Indo-Iranian, we can reconstruct two idioms (cf. *EWAia* II:19):

(a) ‘to direct, to drive a horse’: Skt. á´ svam. nayat (RV 8.17.15+) ∼ YAv. aspa . .
    naiiente (Yt 10.42) ∼ OP. asam frāṇayam (DB 1.87);

(b) ‘to bring (away) the fettered [captive]’: Skt. nayatā [2pl.] baddhám (RV 10.34.4) ∼ YAv. bastm naiieiti (V 5.8), bastm upanaiieni (Yt 9.18) ∼ OP basta anayatā (DB 1.82).

All these meanings are directly comparable to that of the Hittite intensive/imperfective nanna/i-, and therefore can be regarded as having developed out of the meaning ‘to (repeatedly) turn (somebody/something) in a certain direction’.3

The semantic connection between Hitt. nai-, nē- and Skt. n¯ı- and its Iranian cognates is thus well-founded. Let us now look at the formal side of this etymology.

2 Hittite: the material

In Hittite, the verb under discussion shows active as well as middle forms. The oldest attested middle forms (from Old Hittite original texts) show the stem nē-: 3sg. pres. mid. nēa, 3pl. pres. mid. nēnda. The same stem is found in the OH attestations of the participle, nēnt-. In MH times, a -i- develops between the e and the a, yielding 3sg. nēja, 3pl. nejanta.4 Only in NH times do we find attestations of forms of the first and second person, which show a stem nejia- (1sg. pres. mid. nejabhari, 2sg. pres. mid. nejattati, 1sg. pret. mid. nejabhāt), which is clearly secondary.

---

1 In RV 6.75.6ab rāṭhe tīṣṭhan nayati vājīnah puru yatna-yatna kāmāyate suṣārṭitāh ‘Standing on the chariot, the excellent charioteer directs the prize-winning horses in front (of him) wherever he wishes’, the element of turning the horses is eminently clear.

4 Note that in the course of time the OH long e is regularly shortened to ē.
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In its active forms, the verb is inflected as follows (for each form, the oldest attestation is given):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pres.</th>
<th>pret.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg. 1</td>
<td>nehi (MH)</td>
<td>nēhun (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>naitti (MH)</td>
<td>naitta (MH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nāi (MH)</td>
<td>naiš (MH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl. 1</td>
<td>naiyani (MH)</td>
<td>neiyaun (NH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>naištani (MH)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>neanzi (OH), nei (MH)</td>
<td>naier (NH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of these forms follow the pattern of the dāi/tiianzi-class, i.e. the hi-inflected class that in principle shows an alternation between stems ending in °Cai- (in sg. pres. and sg./pl. pret. forms)1 and stems ending in °Ci- (in pl. pres. forms), like pai-/pi- ‘to give’, dai-/ti- ‘to place’, etc.

Admittedly, not all forms of nai- fully fit the dāi/tiianzi-class, but most of these can easily be accounted for: the 1pl. and 2pl. pres. forms with the strong stem nai- are trivial replacements of earlier *niu/eni and *ništeni (compare, for instance, 2pl. pres. paraišteni ‘you blow’ << original *parišteni); the NH 1pl. pret. form neiyaun, which replaces earlier *naiyen, shows a stem neia- that is clearly taken over from the NH 3pl. pres. form neianzi. The only truly problematic form is 3pl. pres. act. nēanzi with its nē-, whereas we would expect it to contain the stem ni- (*niianzi). Some scholars, the most notable of which is Jasanoﬀ (2003:197), regard the form nēanzi as an original form going back to *néih/3-nti, which would show that this verb reﬂects an *o/e-ablauting PIE “*h₂e-present”.

It is, however, highly questionable that nēanzi is old. In the three verbs that derive from nai-, namely nanna/i- ‘to drive’ (with reduplication), penna/i- ‘to drive (there)’ (containing the preverb pē- ‘thither’) and ünna/i- ‘to drive (here)’ (containing the preverb ū- ‘hither’),6 the 3pl. pres. act. forms all show the stem ni- and not the stem ne-: nannianzi (not **nanne(i)anzi), pennianzi (not **penne(i)anzi) and ünnianzi (not **ünne(i)anzi). According to Jasanoﬀ, this fact can be explained by assuming that in these forms “*-e- was converted to *-e- (> -i/-j-) by a sound law proper to internal syllables” (Jasanoﬀ 2003:118), e.g. *pē + néanzi > *pēnnianzi > pennianzi. Yet, such a sound law simply did not exist in Hittite: for instance, *h2pōih2ud’eh2mi yielded Hitt. pēhutem ‘I bring’ and not **pēhutimi. Jasanoﬀ’s explanation therefore cannot be correct.

Since we see no scenario by which the stem °nianzi as attested in nannianzi, pennianzi and ünnianzi can be derived from nēanzi, these forms must in our view be original, and therefore prove that the paradigm of nai- itself originally contained a 3pl.

---

1Note that ai monophthongizes to e before h, hence the 1sg. forms in “Cēbh.”

2Cf. Kloekhorst 2008:145–7 for the reason why the derivatives nanna/i-², penna/i-² and ünna/i-² inflect according to the ména/i-class, whereas nai-² inflects according to the dāi/tiianzi-class.
yielding */náie/ > analogy with this latter form the diphthong in the form *n¯eanzi n¯eanzi

**nai-** as we would etymologically expect a single *nai- n¯etti that would have been regularized, in this case to *nóih. This means that the preform *nóih would go back to *nóih/3-ui, *niH/3-enti.

Despite its wide acceptance, some details of this reconstruction are formally problematic. The largest problem is that, according to our present-day knowledge of the historical phonology of Hittite, a preform *nóih would not have regularly yielded Hitt. nai. Instead, we would expect that the diphthong *oi would in front of the laryngeal have undergone monophthongization to e (cf. e.g. ḫeʾaʾuš ‘rains’ < *ḫ2eih3-eu-). This means that the preform *nóih should have yielded pre-Hitt. */néi/, which in its turn (with morphological replacement of the sg. ending *-e by -i) should have yielded OH **/néi/, spelled **nai-i. Of course, one could argue that in the course of the prehistory of Hittite analogical pressure may have played a part in the development of the 3sg. form. For instance, since in the 3sg. form the diphthong *oi would regularly have been retained as a diphthong (*nóih-th3ei > naiti), one could argue that by analogy with this latter form the diphthong in the 3sg. form may have been restored, yielding */náic/ > nai. Yet we would rather expect that in a paradigm in which both the 1sg. form (nēbib) and the 3sg. form (**néi) show a stem *nē-, it is rather the 3sg. form that would have been regularized, in this case to *néit. We therefore find it difficult to believe that the reconstruction of the strong stem of nai- as *nóih/3- is correct.

Another problem regarding the reconstruction *nóih/3-ei, *niH/3-enti is that the derivatives of nai-, namely nanna/i-, penna/i-, and ünna/i-, all show a geminate -ni-, whereas we would etymologically expect a single -n-: e.g. *h3pöi + *n(o)ih3-i should have yielded **pēnai/i-, not penna/i-.

Thus e.g. LIV 450-1 (**“ne-nōH/-niH.””); Kloekhorst 2008:399. Scholars who take the 3pl. pres. act. form nannai to be original reconstruct *nóih/3-ei, *niH/3-enti (e.g. Jasanoff 2001:197). Although, as was argued above, the form nannai is likely to be secondary and the reconstruction of an e-grade in the plural stem thus is unnecessary, we want to stress that the arguments that follow are independent of the question of which ablaut grade was original in the plural forms of this verb.


According to Melchert 1994:154, the gemination in nanna/i-, penna/i- and ünna/i- is caused by a develop-
All this makes clear that the reconstruction *nóih₁/₃-ei, *nih₁/₃-énti is beset with problems and that we have to look for an alternative analysis of nai-i.

4 Analysis of dái/tijanzi-verbs

As has already been mentioned above, nai-i inflects according to the dái/tijanzi-class. Most members of this class have a good Indo-European etymology, and can clearly be analyzed as containing a stem that consists of a verbal root enlarged by an i-suffix. For instance, dái/i- ‘to put, to place’ must contain the verbal root *dʰeh₁- to which an i-suffix is added; išpai-i/išpi- ‘to be satiated’ must contain the verbal root *spēh₁- + an i-suffix; etc.

The exact reconstruction of the ablaut patterns of these verbs has been a matter of some controversy. Although it is generally assumed that their weak stems (ti-, išpi-, etc.) contain the zero-grade of the root + *i- (*dʰeh₁-i-, *spēh₁-i-, etc.), the reconstruction of their strong stems (dái-, išpai-, etc.) was for a long time, and still is, debated. For instance, Melchert (1984:73; 1994:65) and Jasanoff (2003:102) reconstruct these strong stems as *CóC-i- (*dʰeh₁-i-, *spēh₁-i-, etc.), whereas Oettinger (1979:46) reconstructs them as *CóC-i- (*dʰoh₁-i-, *spoh₁-i-). But neither reconstruction accounts for a number of verbs belonging to the dái/tijanzi-class. For instance, the strong stem of the verb arni-/ari- ‘to (a)rise’, which must contain the root *h₃er- as found in e.g. Gk. ἦς-νυµαι ‘to stir, to rise’ (cf. LIV² 299), can reflect neither the structure *CóC-i- (a stem *h₃ér-i- should have yielded ** ámbri-i-, and not arni- as attested), nor the structure *CóC-i- (*h₃ér-i- should have yielded **(h)amīi-i-). Similarly, the strong stem forms of the verb ḥalzai-/ḥalzi- ‘to call, to scream’, which according to Puhvel (HED 3:63) contains the root *h₂let- as found in Goth. laptor ‘to call’, can reflect neither the structure *CóC-i- (*h₂let-i- should have yielded ** ámbletzzi-i-, and not ḥalzai- as attested), nor the structure *CóC-i- (*h₂lōt-i- should have yielded ** ámblezzi-i-).

The honorand of this volume (Oettinger 1979:xxviii; 2004:400) was the first to argue that arai- and ḥalzai- should reflect *h₃roi- and *h₂tōi- respectively, an analysis that was extended by Kloekhorst (2006) to all dái/tijanzi-class verbs. In this view, all strong stems in -ai- should rather be reconstructed as *CC-ói-i, i.e. with zero-grade in the root and with o-grade in the suffix: dái- < *dʰh₁-ói-i, išpai- < *sp₁-ói-i, etc. This new category, *CC-ói-i/*CC-ói-énti, can in this way be viewed as the “ḥi-conjugation variant” of athematic i-presents like Skt. kšeṣa/kṣiyánti < *tk-śīi-/*tk-i-énti.¹¹

¹¹The < in ḥalzai- < *h₂tōi- was taken over from the weak stem ḥalzi- < *h₂lōt-i.

¹²The < in ḥalzai- < *h₂tōi- was taken over from the weak stem ḥalzi- < *h₂lōt-i.

¹³Cf. LIV² 644 n. 1 for this analysis of Skt. kšeṣa.
5 New analysis of nai-

Within the daś/tiṣanji-class, the verb nai- has always taken a special position, since it was the only verb that, if one follows the generally accepted reconstruction *noih₁/₃/*ni₃, does not contain an i-suffix, but the -i- of which instead was part of the root. But since the reconstruction *noih₁/₃/*ni₃ cannot formally be correct, it is worthwhile to examine whether nai- can reflect a structure similar to the other daś/tiṣanji-class verbs.

If we apply the analysis *CC-oï/*CC-i- to nai-/*ni-, we arrive at two possible reconstructions:

a) *Hn-(o)i- (similar to pai-/pi- ‘to give’ < *h₃p-oi-/*h₅p-i-, zai-/zi- ‘to cross’ < *h₅t-oï-/*h₅t-i-, etc.).

b) *nH-(o)i- (similar to daś-/ti- ‘to put’ < *h₄l₁-oï-/*h₄l₁-i-, ištai-/išbi- ‘to bind’ < *sh₂-oï-/*sh₂-i-, etc.; note that mai-/mi- ‘to grow’ < *mh₂-oï-/*mh₂-i- shows that the sequence *RHV- indeed regularly yielded Hitt. RV-).

To our mind, the second structure is especially attractive, since it would directly account for the geminate -mn- in the derivatives nanna/i-, penna/i- and ūnna/i-, which can now be reconstructed as *ne-nH(o)i-, *h₂pói + *nH(o)i- and *h₃mh₂- oï-/*nH(o)i-, respectively.

In order to determine which laryngeal was present in *nH-(o)i-, we have to look at the middle paradigm of this verb.

6 New analysis of ne-a(r)i

If nai-/*ni- indeed reflects *nH-oï-/*nH-i-, this has consequences for the reconstruction of the middle paradigm as well. As we have seen above, the middle stem ne- is generally reconstructed as *neih₁/₃, with e.g. 3sg. nēa < *neih₁/₃-o and 3pl. nēanda < *neih₁/₃-nto. Yet since the active stem nai- cannot reflect *noih₁/₃, these reconstructions cannot be correct either.

In view of the active paradigm *nH-oï-/*nH-i- there are in principle two possible reconstructions for the middle paradigm ne-a(r)i. The first possibility is that the middle paradigm uses the same stem as the active paradigm, albeit with a different ablaut grade. This would mean that ne-a(r)i reflects *nH-öi-, which automatically means that the laryngeal must have been *h₁: 3sg. nēa < *nh₁-öi-o, 3pl. nēanda < *nh₁-öi-nto. The second

---

12The only other daś/tiṣanji-verb that was always thought to have a special structure as well is pai-/pi- ‘to give’, which was often reconstructed as *pe + *ai-/*i-, i.e. a univerbation of the preverb *pe- + the verbal root *ai- (or *ha-i-) as found in Gk. ἀδεία- ‘to take’ and TochB ai-, TochA e- ‘to give’. Yet, in Kloekhorst 2008 it was argued that this verb, too, is an ordinary daś/tiṣanji-class verb that is derived from the root *hep- as attested in Hitt. épp- ‘to take’ and Skt. ap- ‘to take’ and thus reflects *hp-öi-/*hp-i-.

13Since a preform *h₂n-(o)i- should probably have yielded Hitt. *h₂an(o)i-, nai- could then only reflect *h₂n-(o)i- or *h₂n-(o)i-.

possibility is that the middle paradigm uses a different stem. Since there are in Hittite several verbs that show an active vs. middle pair in which the active stem is derived but the middle stem is underived (e.g. act. *us$i-eh/-$i, *us$i-a$- ‘to clothe’ vs. mid. *se-$i(ri)$ ‘to wear’ vs. mid. *zi-na$ra(-ri) ‘to cook’ vs. *te$he-$, or mid. *ar-ta$ra(-ri) ‘to stand’ vs. *he$he-$ vs. act. *rau$ra-$ari- ‘to (a)rise’ vs. *he$he-(o)i-), we may assume that the middle stem *ni- in fact consisted of the bare root *neH-. If so, we again need to assume that the laryngeal was *bh₁: 3sg. *nēa < *nebh₁-o, 3pl. *nēanda < *neh₁-nto.

Whichever reconstruction is the correct one (although we certainly prefer the latter), it is clear that the laryngeal must be *bh₁. We can now reconstruct a root *nebh₁- with an active paradigm of the shape *nh₁-o$e-i, *nh₁-i$e$n-it > Hitt. nāi, *nianz, and a middle paradigm of the shape *nebh₁-o, *nebh₁-nto > Hitt. nēa, nēanda.

7 New analysis of Skt. ni- and its Iranian cognates

Our new analysis of Hitt. nai$ and ne$-n(ri) has consequences for the formal interpretation of Skt. ni- and its Iranian cognates.

The Sanskrit root ni- ‘to lead, to bring’ attests the following formations in the RV: thematic present, both active and middle (nāyati, nāyate);16 signfic archaic aorist, both active and middle (2pl. inj. act. naśta, 3pl. med. anesata, subj. act. nēsati and impv. nesi); and perfect (nināya, 3sg. opt. ninīyāt). Less important are intensive (ati-nenīyāmāna-), desiderative (2sg. niniśasi), and passive (nīyate), which do not look archaic. In Iranian, we also find a thematic present (YAv. nai$iti ‘to lead’, OP 3sg. impf. anaya, 3sg. impf. med./pass. anayatā ‘id.’) and a signfic archaic aorist (OAv. 3sg. subj. act. naš$at).

Because of our new interpretation of the Hittite forms, we assume that the IIr. zero-grade stem *niH- (as attested in the Skt. ta-participle nītā- and YAv. a$i$ñ, nīñi- ‘leading towards’, etc.) must have been the result of a laryngeal metathesis of *nh₁-i-C° to *nih₁-C°.18 The Skt. perfect (2sg. pf. ninētha, 3sg. pf. nināya) can now be reconstructed as *ne-nbh₁-o$e-, and is thus formally identical to the Hittite intensive/imperfective nanna/ī- < *ne-nbh₁-o$e-. The IIr. thematic present and the aorist can now be reconstructed as PIE *nh₁-e$e- and *nh₁-e$n-it, respectively, although it cannot be excluded that on the basis of the metathesized zero-grade *niH- new full and lengthened grades have been created and that the present and aorist instead reflect IIr. *naiH-a- and *naiH-s-, respectively.

As seen above, the meaning of the IIr. root *niH- ‘to lead’ is directly comparable to the meaning of the Hittite intensive/imperfective nanna/ī- ‘to drive’ < ‘to repeatedly turn back and forth’. It therefore cannot be coincidental that the Skt. perfect nināya is

---

16Under the influence of *ye$- the original stem *us$i/- was in pre-Hittite analogically changed to *us$i/-, which regularly yielded Hitt. /u$S$e/-/s$, spelled u$S$e/-/s$, cf. Kloekhorst 2008:1006–7.
17The forms apparently pointing to an athematic present (2pl. act. net$ha [RV 10.126.2] and 3du. impf. med. anītman [RV 1.121.5]) are late and most probably nonce.
18For other Iranian forms, see Cheung 2006:278.
19See Lubotsky 2011:110 for a discussion of this phenomenon.
formally identical to Hitt. nanna/i-, both reflecting *ne-nh₁oi-. We consequently assume that this intensive formation was the source of the Indo-Iranian verb.¹⁹

8 Other IE cognates: the root *(s)neh₁-

It is generally assumed that Hitt. nai-¹, ne-² and Indo-Iranian *niH- have no other IE cognates. But our new reconstruction of these verbs has shown that they contain a root *neh₁-, which to our mind is identical to the verbal root *(s)neh₁- that in LIV ² 571–2 is glossed as “spinnen”. This latter meaning cannot be the correct basic meaning of this root, however. Although in Celtic, Italic and Greek the root *(s)neh₁- indeed can be used in the meaning ‘to spin’, this is not always the exclusive meaning: in Old Irish, the basic meaning of the verb mūd is rather ‘to twist, to bind, to tie’; and in Latin, the verb neō can also mean ‘to weave’ (only in Greek does the verb νέω exclusively mean ‘to spin’). In Germanic, the verbal root *neh₁- is not used in the meaning ‘to spin’ at all, but only has the meaning ‘to sew’ (cf. OHG näen ‘to sew’, PGerm. *nēplo ‘needle’). Especially this latter fact is relevant: a meaning ‘to sew’ can hardly be derived from an earlier meaning ‘to spin’. The proto-meaning to all these verbs must instead have been ‘to turn, to twist, to wind’ (cf. Pokorny 1959:973, who glosses *(s)neh₁- as ‘Fäden zusammendrehen, mit dem Faden hantieren’, daher ‘weben, spinnen’ und ‘nähen’”). The meaning ‘to spin’ can easily be derived from this proto-meaning since spinning is the act by which one “draw[s] out and twist[s] the fibres of some suitable material, such as wool or flax, so as to form a continuous thread” (definition as given by the OED; emphasis ours). The meaning ‘to sew’ can be derived from this proto-meaning because sewing refers to the turning back and forth of the needle (the ‘turner’) by which the thread is sewn into the cloth. The meaning ‘to weave’ can likewise be derived from it because this verb refers to the turning back and forth of the warp thread into the weft.

Since the proto-meaning ‘to turn, to twist, to wind’ is exactly the meaning of the Hittite verb nai-¹, which also takes ‘threads’, ‘yarns’, etc. as its object, there can to our mind be no doubt about the original identity of these verbs. The connection between Hitt. nai-, ne- and Ir. *niH- and *(s)neh₁- is further strengthened by the fact that the latter also has forms with an i-suffix, i.e. *(s)neh₁-i-, cf. Lith. nūtis, Latv. niits ‘(warp) thread’, and SCR. nīt, Russ. nīt’ ‘thread’ < *nh₁-i-ti- (with laryngeal metathesis).²⁰

9 More cognates: the root for ‘to churn’

In Indo-Iranian and Baltic, we find a root with the meaning ‘to churn’, traditionally reconstructed as *neiH-, but considered unrelated to the Skt. root ni- ‘to lead’ (EWAia

¹⁹Kümmel’s judgement of the Skt. perfect nin´¯aya as a “Neubildung” (Kümmel 2000:282) was based on the idea that the original meaning of ni- was ‘to lead, to direct’. In view of the newly found original semantics of this verb, ‘to (repeatedly) turn’, there is according to Kümmel (pers. comm.) no objection anymore against regarding the perfect (‘having turned someone in a certain direction’) as an old formation.

²⁰Skt. mṛi- `piece of cloth wrapped round the waist’ (AV+) may also belong here and reflect *nh₁-i-ui-.
The most important forms are: Skt. náva-níta- ‘fresh butter’ (KS+), níta-mišrá- ‘not yet entirely made into butter’ (TB+); netra- ‘string by which the churning-stick is whirled around’ (Br.+); Khot. niyaka- ‘fresh butter’, n(y)e ‘buttermilk’; Shûnī nay-, nīd ‘to churn’, nîm-dîorg ‘churnstaff’; Yid̃ya nîya ‘sour milk’; Wakhi pvnxe ‘to churn’, etc.;[1] Latv. sviestu nīt ‘to churn butter’, pa-nijas, pa-ninas ‘buttermilk’.

The main reason to regard the roots for ‘to lead’ and ‘to churn’ as unrelated was their apparent semantic incompatibility, but since churning denotes the action by which the churning-stick is repeatedly turned back and forth, while, as we have seen, the root for ‘to lead’ derives from an original meaning ‘to turn’, there can be no doubt that these forms belong to one and the same root.

**10 More cognates: ‘snake’ and ‘sinew’**

The word for ‘snake’ that can be reconstructed as *n(e)h₁-tr- (Lat. natrix, OIr. nathir, Goth. nadr, Ols. nadr, OHG nättra) has been connected with the root *(s)neh₁- before. Yet its original meaning was not ‘who spins round’ (thus de Vaan 2008:402), but must in view of our findings above rather have been ‘the one who turns back and forth’, referring to the undulatory locomotion of snakes, by which mode the body of the snake alternately flexes to the left and right in order to move forward.

Also the word for ‘tendon, sinew’ that can be reconstructed as *(s)neh₁-ur/n- (Skt. sn̄avan-, Av. sn̄uuvra, Gk. νεύρον, Lat. nervus, Arm. neard, ToB s̄uauura) has been identified as a derivative from *(s)neh₁- before, and originally must have meant “thread” (compare Eng. thread that is derived from P Germ. *brè- ‘to twist, to turn’).

**11 Conclusions**

We have seen that the Hittite verb nai-, nē-, Sanskrit nī-, and PIE *(s)neh₁ means:

Ii:25–6). The most important forms are: Skt. náva-níta- n. ‘fresh butter’ (KS+), níta-mišrá- ‘not yet entirely made into butter’ (TB+); netra- ‘string by which the churning-stick is whirled around’ (Br.+); Khot. niyaka- ‘fresh butter’, n(y)e ‘buttermilk’; Shûnī nay-, nīd ‘to churn’, nîm-dîorg ‘churnstaff’; Yid̃ya nîya ‘sour milk’; Wakhi pvnxe ‘to churn’, etc.;[1] Latv. sviestu nīt ‘to churn butter’, pa-nijas, pa-ninas ‘buttermilk’.

The main reason to regard the roots for ‘to lead’ and ‘to churn’ as unrelated was their apparent semantic incompatibility, but since churning denotes the action by which the churning-stick is repeatedly turned back and forth, while, as we have seen, the root for ‘to lead’ derives from an original meaning ‘to turn’, there can be no doubt that these forms belong to one and the same root.

**10 More cognates: ‘snake’ and ‘sinew’**

The word for ‘snake’ that can be reconstructed as *n(e)h₁-tr- (Lat. natrix, OIr. nathir, Goth. nadr, Ols. nadr, OHG nättra) has been connected with the root *(s)neh₁- before. Yet its original meaning was not ‘who spins round’ (thus de Vaan 2008:402), but must in view of our findings above rather have been ‘the one who turns back and forth’, referring to the undulatory locomotion of snakes, by which mode the body of the snake alternately flexes to the left and right in order to move forward.

Also the word for ‘tendon, sinew’ that can be reconstructed as *(s)neh₁-ur/n- (Skt. sn̄avan-, Av. sn̄uuvra, Gk. νεύρον, Lat. nervus, Arm. neard, ToB s̄uauura) has been identified as a derivative from *(s)neh₁- before, and originally must have meant “thread” (compare Eng. thread that is derived from P Germ. *brè- ‘to twist, to turn’).

**11 Conclusions**

We have seen that the Hittite verb nai-, nē-, Sanskrit nī-, and PIE *(s)neh₁ means:

Ii:25–6). The most important forms are: Skt. náva-níta- n. ‘fresh butter’ (KS+), níta-mišrá- ‘not yet entirely made into butter’ (TB+); netra- ‘string by which the churning-stick is whirled around’ (Br.+); Khot. niyaka- ‘fresh butter’, n(y)e ‘buttermilk’; Shûnī nay-, nīd ‘to churn’, nîm-dîorg ‘churnstaff’; Yid̃ya nîya ‘sour milk’; Wakhi pvnxe ‘to churn’, etc.;[1] Latv. sviestu nīt ‘to churn butter’, pa-nijas, pa-ninas ‘buttermilk’.

The main reason to regard the roots for ‘to lead’ and ‘to churn’ as unrelated was their apparent semantic incompatibility, but since churning denotes the action by which the churning-stick is repeatedly turned back and forth, while, as we have seen, the root for ‘to lead’ derives from an original meaning ‘to turn’, there can be no doubt that these forms belong to one and the same root.

**10 More cognates: ‘snake’ and ‘sinew’**

The word for ‘snake’ that can be reconstructed as *n(e)h₁-tr- (Lat. natrix, OIr. nathir, Goth. nadr, Ols. nadr, OHG nättra) has been connected with the root *(s)neh₁- before. Yet its original meaning was not ‘who spins round’ (thus de Vaan 2008:402), but must in view of our findings above rather have been ‘the one who turns back and forth’, referring to the undulatory locomotion of snakes, by which mode the body of the snake alternately flexes to the left and right in order to move forward.

Also the word for ‘tendon, sinew’ that can be reconstructed as *(s)neh₁-ur/n- (Skt. sn̄avan-, Av. sn̄uuvra, Gk. νεύρον, Lat. nervus, Arm. neard, ToB s̄uauura) has been identified as a derivative from *(s)neh₁- before, and originally must have meant “thread” (compare Eng. thread that is derived from P Germ. *brè- ‘to twist, to turn’).

**11 Conclusions**

We have seen that the Hittite verb nai-, nē-, Sanskrit nī-, and PIE *(s)neh₁- cannot formally reflect a root *(s)neh₂-, as is usually stated, but must be reconstructed differently: active nai-, nīanzi < *(s)nh₁-o-ei, *(s)nh₁-i-énti; middle nēa, nēanda < *(s)nh₁-o, *(s)nh₁-nto. This means that also its Sanskrit cognate, nī-, must be reconstructed differently: present náyati < *(s)nh₁-e-; participle nītā- < *(s)niHtá- < *(s)nh₁-tó- (with laryngeal metathesis), perfect nináya < *(s)ne- *nh₁-o-e. The basic root of all these forms is *(s)neh₁-, which is identical to the root *(s)neh₁- that is usually translated as ‘to spin’. But on the basis of this new connection with the Hittite and the Sanskrit verbs, we want to propose the following semantics of the root *(s)neh₁-. When used intransitively (in the middle), its basic meaning was ‘to turn oneself in a certain direction’, when used transitively (in the active), its basic meaning was ‘to turn someone/something in a certain direction’ (both meanings are attested as such in Hittite). When the root had yarns or threads as its object, it meant ‘to turn back and forth, to twist, to wind’ (attested in Hittite and Old Irish). In some languages (notably the ones spoken in Europe) the meaning ‘to twist yarns’ developed into ‘to spin’ (Celtic, }

Italic, Greek), whereas in Germanic the meaning ‘to turn a thread back and forth’ was specialized into ‘to sew’ (i.e. ‘to turn back and forth the thread into a cloth’) and in Latin into ‘to weave’ (i.e. ‘to turn back and forth the warp thread into a weft’). The intensive derivative of this root, *ne-nh₁-oï-, had the meaning ‘to repeatedly turn back and forth’ and was especially used with animals as its object and then denoted ‘to lead an animal by constantly adjusting the direction in which it walks’, i.e. ‘to drive, to lead’ (attested in Hittite and Indo-Iranian).
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