Observations on the Germanic Verscharfung

§1 The conditions under which IE *-j- and *-w- underwent Verscharfung to *-jj- and *-ww- in Germanic, yielding -ddj-, -ggw- in Gothic and -ggj-, -ggw- in Old Icelandic, remain obscure. Despite attempts by Neogrammarians such as KLUGE (Beiträge zur Geschichte der germanischen Konjugation, 127 ff.) and HIRT (Idg. Gr. 5, 102 ff.) to relate the appearance of *-jj- and *-ww- to the position of the IE accent, no purely phonological explanation for the Germanic facts appears to be possible within the framework of "classical" Indo-European. Likewise unconvincing is MEILLET's attempt (MSL 22, 61 ff. (1922)) to explain Verscharfung as the result of expressive gemination: it would clearly be inadmissible to suppose that a form like the gen. pl. of the word for 'two' (cf. Go. twaddje, OI tvaggja) was subject to such a development 1).

Modern treatments of Verscharfung have rather sought to discover a "morphological" basis for the phenomenon, or to explain it in terms of the laryngeal theory. The outstanding example of the former approach is KURYLOWICZ' view (Lg. 43, 445 ff. (1967)) that sequences of the type *-CvijV- and *-CvwV- arose in Germanic as secondary full-grades to inherited zero-grades of the form *-CijV- and *-CwV-: a verb like 'hawan 'chop' (= OI haggva, ONG hawon) would thus have replaced an earlier *hawan, the original participle of which (*hawana-) exhibited an apparent zero-grade allomorph *hwan-. The basic difficulty with this interpretation lies in the fact that zero-grade forms of the required type are frequently not attested at all (the participle of *hawan, for example, is reconstructable as *hunana-), and in many cases Verscharfung is encountered in derivationally isolated words in which the root shows an invariant full-grade (cf., e.g., OI klegg-.
Observations on the Germanic Verscharfung

The initial attempt to relate the appearance of Gmc. *-jj- and *-ww- to the former presence of an IE laryngeal was made by H.L. SMITH, Lg. 17, 93 ff. (1941). SMITH supposed Verscharfung to have resulted from earlier sequences *-HI- and *-HY- when the accent immediately followed; modifications of this analysis were subsequently offered by STURTEVANT, The Indo-Hittite Laryngeals, § 75, and AUSTIN, Lg. 22, 109 ff. (1946), Lg. 34, 203 ff. (1958). W.P. LEHMANN, PIE Phonology, 36 ff., proposed to derive Gmc. *-ww- from IE *-yH-, and Gmc. *-jj- from *-yH- or *-HI-, depending on the quality of the preceding vowel. More recently, LINDEMAN has suggested that the gemination of *-i- and *-u- in the neighborhood of a laryngeal took place not in the Germanic period, but in Indo-European itself (Les origines de la 'Verscharfung' germanique (1969)).

These theories have not been generally accepted. There are, to be sure, a substantial number of Germanic forms with Verscharfung in which the former presence of a laryngeal in the neighborhood of the affected glide can safely be assumed (cf. OI byggva, byggja 'dwell' beside Skt. inf. bhavātum 'be', aor. abhīt < *bheuh₂; Gō. weddja, OI veggr 'wall' beside Lith. vėsūt 'wind', Ved. ptc. vītā- 'wound' < *yēth₂; OI Frigg (divine name) beside Ved. pīrītāi 'delights', superl. pārīśhā- 'dearest' < *pre₂h₂ - or *pre₂h₂-i-, etc.). But there are difficulties as well. Consonantal reflexes of laryngeals, including gemination, are hardly attested outside Anatolian; even in the few extra-Anatolian examples where a laryngeal can be shown to have affected a neighboring consonant - the change of *tk₂ to *th in Indo-Iranian, for example - the result is a single phoneme, not a geminate. LINDEMAN, who attributes

the lengthening of *-i- and *-y- to the Common IE period, does so at the cost of assuming a sporadic rule for the parent language.

A more fundamental problem arises from the frequent difficulty of determining whether a reconstructed laryngeal originally preceded or followed the glide which it is alleged to have geminated. The verb *hauwom poses a dilemma of this kind: while Toch. B kaut- 'split' and Lat. caudex suggest a root-form *keH₂u-, the acute intonation of Lith. kūti 'strike' and the vocalism of OCS kouj, kovati 'point' rather to *keH₂-.

Similarly, OI skeggja 'axe' seems to contain an i-extended form of the root *skeH₂ - 'cut' (cf. Skt. caus. chāyatai beside ptc. cāhāt- 'cut off'), but OIr. sōjan 'knife' presupposes a zero-grade *skeH₂- rather than *skH₂-i-. Other such cases will be discussed below; taken together, they help explain why the theories just discussed fail so conspicuously to agree on the precise environments in which Verscharfung took place.

In what follows I should like to outline a solution to the problem of Verscharfung which appears to account satisfactorily for the attested Germanic forms, but which avoids the necessity of assuming that IE sequences of glide + laryngeal or laryngeal + glide were converted to Germanic geminate glides by a process of direct phonetic assimilation.

We may begin by observing that sequences of the type *-VHI- and *-VHY- apparently yielded *-VH- and *-VH- in Germanic, as elsewhere in Indo-European. Examples of this treatment are numerous: cf. *skējan 'sow' (= Gō. stōjan, OHS sδen) < *skeh₂-i-e/o-, *dējējan 'suckle' (= OHS tāen) < *dheh₂-i-e/o- or *dheh₂-i-e/o- (cf. §7), *stōrjan 'judge' (= Gō. stōjan) < *stōk₂-e/o- or *stōh₂-e/o-, *laigon 'lick' (= Gō. bi-laigon) < *loH₂-i-e/o-, etc. Any theory of Verscharfung which attributes the gemination of *-i- and *-y- to a preceding laryngeal, therefore, must
immediately encounter grave difficulties; from an aprioristic point of view, SMITH's attempt to trace Gmc. *-wu- to IE *-H₂- is less attractive than a theory like LEHMANN's, which derives *-wu- from IE antevocalic *-WH-. (To be sure, LEHMANN traces Gmc. *-jH- to both *-H₂- and *-jH-; this, as we shall see below, is an error.)

Let us now consider in detail the assumptions needed to explain a form like OI byggva, -ja in terms of the laryngeal theory. The formal structure of this verb is clear: it is a weak present in *-i-/*ija-, possibly of denominative origin, containing the root of Ved. bhavati 'is' < *bheuh₂eti. To derive Gmc. *beuwi- from *bheuh₂-eie-⁵, laryngealists have typically posited a direct phonetic gemination of *-uh₂- to *-uw-, but this assumption is gratuitous. Before the loss of intervocalic *-h₂-, Pre-Gmc. *bheuh₂-eie- would have had the syllabic structure *bheu-h₂e-ie-, with the diphthong *-eu- contained entirely within the first syllable. The loss of intervocalic *-h₂- would initially have produced a hiatus; the resulting form, after the usual Germanic sound changes, would have had the syllabic structure *beu-i-, which we may represent by writing *beu'-i-. Note now that there is no need to suppose that such a sequence would automatically have developed further to *beuwi-, with a transfer of the second element of the diphthong to the following syllable. Rather, it may be suggested that the hiatus between *-eu- and *-a- was eventually filled by a euphonic glide *-w-, there would thus have arisen a stem-form *beuw-, in the sequence *-ewi- contrasted with phonologically possible *-euwi- < IE *-syi-. Subsequently, intervocalic *-uw- could have been reinterpreted as a phonological geminate, and *beuw- would have assumed the shape *beuw- (> *bīuw- > OI byggvi-⁶).

The same explanation may in principle be applied to other instances of Verschreibung in which an antevocalic laryngeal historically followed an ɪ- or u-diphthong. We shall consider the clearest such examples in §§; for ease of exposition, however, it will be useful to discuss first the extension of the above hypothesis to the more difficult case of forms like *hauwan.

§4 We have seen above that the extra-Germanic cognates of *hauwan point partly to a root *keh₂-u- and partly to a root *keuh₂-u-. In my view the most satisfactory explanation for root-variants of this kind was proposed by WINTER, Evidence for Laryngeals, 192 ff. Noting the frequency with which reflexes of *-i- and *-u- appear in the daughter languages as zero-grades to full-grade sequences of the type *-eH₂- and *-eH₂-, WINTER conjectured that an IE metathesis rule converted inherited *-H₂- and *-H₂- to *-iH- and *-uH- before a following consonant?⁷. Indo-European would thus have had roots, or root-like complexes, of the form *TeH₂-, *TeH₂-, with zero-grades *TeH- and *TeH-. This situation, naturally unstable, could easily have led to the analogical replacement of *TeH₂-, *TeH₂- by new full grades of the type *TeH-, *TeH-. Gmc. *hauwan, I would suggest, was originally a present in *-u- to a root which may be reconstructed as *keh₂-u-. There is considerable reason to believe that u-presence in Indo-European were historically characterized by an alternation between full-grade and zero-grade root-forms (cf. Ved. tarate 'conquers' (< *terk₂-u-) beside thematized tarātati 'id.', Hitt. tarhazati 'is able' (< *terk₂-u-), or Gk. ὕππω, Toch. B 3 sg. hātm 'lives' (< *g²keh₂-u-) beside Ved. ὑππῶ, Lat. uīvit, etc. (< *g²keh₂-u-)). The present stem of *keh₂-u- was thus perhaps originally *keh₂-u-/kh₂-u- with coloration and metathesis this yielded *kah₂-/*kh₂-, the first term of which was replaced by analogical *kauh₂- in the dialectal period. The attested forms of *hauwan ultimately point to a full-grade
thematic present *kauh₂-e/o-*, which gave *hauwa*- via the intermediate stages *kauh₂- and *hauwa*-).

§5 In the following lexical items, the geminates *-jj- and *-ww-* can plausibly be attributed to the former presence of a sequence of the type *- Awake*- (*A = any vowel,  *V = i or u,  *H = any laryngeal*), where *-Un-* may be original, as in *beowian*- or the replacement of earlier *-NH*- as in *hauwan*.

Oi bygg, OE byrow, etc. 'barley' (< *hauwa*-) the late IE preform was probably a thematic adjective *beuh₂-0-*, with the same root as OE byggva; for the semantics compare Gk. *μετάφημα* 'plant' and perhaps also Arm. buis 'sprout’. Note also OE byō, 1 pl. byggum, the preterite of bōa 'dwell' (< *bhuh₂-e1-o-), which indirectly presupposes a perfect 3 sg. *beawwe < *bhe­bhouh₂e₁*.

OE byggva, OE ceowan, OHG kiuwan 'dwell', which was the basis for a thematic present *bhuh₂-e/o-*. Here too belongs OE tyggva 'chew', which owes its initial consonant to the influence of the synonymous verb *tēglap.*

OE clāg 'clay' (< *klażja*-): a nasal-infix present *glaż−n-e₁−i₁*, presupposing a root *glaż−*, is reconstructable for dialectal Indo-European on the basis of OIr. *glinim*, MW glynah 'I stick (to)' and OHG klēnaun 'stick, smear’. Gmc. *klażja*- continues a deverbative thematic noun *głaż−o*.

Oi sjeegovu 'axe' (< *skażjōn*-): a zero-grade *skih₂-z* is attested in Ved. ohyāt('it') 'cuts off' and, as noted above, in OIr. scian 'knife'; *skażjōn*- contains the corresponding o-grade *skožha*-.* The underlying root is probably best reconstructed as *skih₂-z* (cf. Skt. ptcp. *ṣāhā*-), to which an i-element parallel to the *-u- of *gōgh₂-z−*; *tērkh₂-z−*, *keh₂−z−*, etc. was added in the present (see note 14 below). The full-grades *skih₂-z* and *skožha-z* would then have been created in the usual way to the zero-grade *skih₂-z*, itself the product of metathesis from earlier *skh₂-i₁*.

OE sceawian, OHG sceowān 'gaze' (< *skauwōn*): a set root *(s)keuh*- is indicated by Ved. *ṣāhā−* 'intention', *ṣāhā−* 'id.' (VS), *ṣauvate* 'intends' (SB); other cognates, such as OIr. *cūjī cuti* 'feel, notice', are ambiguous. The Germanic verb, an o-grade iterative of the type seen in Gk. *καωάω* and Lat. *caueo* (< *kouh₂−e₁−e₁*), the parallel formation in *-e₁−e₁* is represented by Gk. *κωβα* and Lat. *caueō* (< *kouh₂−e₁−e₁-*).

Go. gen. pl. twaddje, OE tweggja, OHG xeuio 'duorum' (< *tważjōn* (< ūn)) the correct explanation for this much-discussed form has been seen by Lühr, Mss 35, 75 (1976), who, following Hoffmann, *Aufsätze zur Indogermanistik II*, 561, Anm. 2, refers it to an IE gen. du. *xewh₂−e₁* (cf. Ved. *sveghō*).
The regular reflex of *داعئ-ه-ؤ in Germanic would have been *twadjan, from which the attested forms differ only in having substituted the regular ending of the gen. pl. for the obsolete *-ؤ of the dual (cf. nom. *تءئ (Go. *twaئ) for expected *تءئ). OI béggi j 'ambörum' is to be explained in the same way: béggi j 'triium' is an analogical formation (cf. Go. prije).

Go. -waddjus, OI veggr 'wall' (< *wajjus): a root *yeihژ- / *uёх- underlies Ved. vajjatu, ptcp. vijā- 'weave', Lith. vėją, vėji 'wind', and OIr. femaid 'finish, "wind up"'. Gmc. *twadju- is doubtless the replacement of an earlier root noun *yоihژ-e, gen. *yоihژ-о, the acc. sg. of which (*yоihژ-о) was probably the point of departure for the creation of the Germanic u-stem.

§6 The forms just cited represent only a small fraction of the total number of Germanic words which show Verscharfung, but they constitute a clear majority of the cases for which an IE root can accurately be reconstructed. It is significant that no certain counterexamples to the proposed development *-AUHA- > *-AUWA- > *-AWWA- are known. Thus, Gothic *hl'awa- 'raw' (cL OHG (h)l'о, (h)jо, MD jо) < *kl'ouh-о- is comparatively slight, since the *-w- of this word can readily be attributed to the influence of the parallel stem *hl'оwa- (cf. Dutch raw, MNG рё, Finn. loanword) nёvus (with *-e < *-а- < *-w-.)< *квоhъ-о-). It is likely that sequences of the type *-AUHA- developed directly to *-AWA-, rather than *-ĀWA- in Germanic; in descriptive terms, Verscharfung after long vowels is simply not encountered.

A more puzzling case is that of Go. sanjwan 'hurry' beside OE snēwan 'hurry' and OI snēa 'wind, turn'.

§7 Not all instances of Verscharfung reflect earlier sequences of the type *-AUHA-. In two well-known forms Gmc. *-jj- appears to have developed from an original sequence *-čj-, in which the first element became non-syllabic following the loss of a preceding laryngeal. In schematic terms we may represent this development as *-A(U)HUWA- > *-AUWA- > *-AWWA-; the words in question are the following:

Crim. Go. ada, OI egg, OHG eй (gen. pl. etiero) 'egg' (< *аjja-): Although the Indo-European shape of this word remains problematic, the Germanic forms are probably best referred to a stem *gjоhъ-ео- (perhaps, as SCHINDLER points out to me, the replacement of an earlier *гjоhъ-о-; cf. also Serbo-Croatian jaja, OCS (j)ajъa). Pre-Gmc. *gjоhъ-ео- would initially have yielded *gjоо-, whence, with Osthoff's Law, *аjja- > *аjja-.

Go. daddjan, OSw. daggia 'suckle' (< *dajjan): the unextended root *дёхъ- is found in Ved. adhёт (AV) 'suckled'. The corresponding present dхажді, *te is probably best taken as reflecting a metathesized full-grade *дёхё-, itself built to a zero-grade *дёхъ--, < *dхъ-е, with an enlargement *-i- (cf. ptcp. dхата-, OIr. deamad 'suckles' < *dхъ-a-нъ-, perhaps also OSw. dъа 'suck')14). Germanic and Slavic have taken the metathesized full-grade as the point of departure for the creation of an iterative-causative *dohкъ-,ео-/о-. In Slavic this regularly yielded dojа, dojіо 'suckle'; in Germanic the phonetic development was presumably *dоhъ-,ё о-/о- > *daитъа- > *даитъа whence, with regular loss of *-j- before *-t-,

historically original participle *сёвъана- (< *сёвъо-о-/о-), and the related lexical item seen in OE сёвъа 'hurry' and OI сёа 'wind, turn'.13).
§8 The Germanic groups *-ijj- and *-uww- call for special discussion. The sequence *-uww-, in the clearest cases, is attributable to the analogical influence of related full-grade forms in which Verscharfung can in principle be explained as in §5: representative examples are OI ptcp. brugginn 'brewed', wk. vb. brugga 'brew' (cf. OE brēowan); OI ptcp. hnugginn 'humbled' (cf. pres. hnēggwa); Norw. dial. snugga 'snort' (cf. MHG snouwen); Sw. t'ugg 'shaggy hair' (cf. OI rugga 'choose carefully').

*-uww- of Go. skuggwa 'mirror', or skuggi 'shadow' (cf. skugg-sja 'mirror') is probably due to the influence of ~skawwon 'look' (= OHG scouwon), whether or not the latter word and ~8ku1lJwan- are etymologically connected (see FEIST. Vpr'gl. Wb. d. got. Spr. 3.435).

In one instance *-UWW- appears to be the phonologically regular development of earlier *-U-. This is the Germanic word for 'owl', reconstructable as *uwwalôn- or *uwwilôn- on the evidence of OI qēla, OE ǣla and OHG ǣla. The *-U- of pre-Gmc. *uwallôn- (*uwillôn-) is almost certainly of onomatopoetic, rather than laryngeal origin; it is not improbable that at the same time that sequences of the type *-uww- were phonologically reinterpreted as containing a geminate *-WW-, the group *-U- was phonologically reinterpreted as *-UWW-. A similar explanation will account for Gmc. *-jj- in the divine name *Frījō- (cf. OI Frigg, OE Frīg) and the irregular preterite 3 pl. *ijjun 'went' which underlies Go. idda, iddasēun. *Frījō- is probably best taken with KURY-LOWICZ, op. cit. 449, from a io/o-adjective *prēh₁-e/o-, the feminine of which would initially have yielded *Frījō- in Germanic; alternatively, it is possible to envisage a substantivized "gerundive" *prēh₁-eih₂- 'die zu liebende' (cf. Ved. déya- 'to be given', jāyya- 'to be conquered', etc.) or a feminine thematic adjective *prēh₁-eh₂-, both of which would regularly have given *frēi₂jō- > *frēi₂jō- > *Frījō-. (Gmc. *frēja- 'free' (= Go. freja) and *frējōn 'love' (= Go. frējon), of course, show the normal antevocalic treatment of the zero-grade *prēh₁-.) According to COWGILL, Lg. 36. 483 ff. (1960), Go. idda is Verschärfung to an original 3 pl. *ijjun < *ijjun < *ēiγ, which replaced earlier *ēiγ under the influence of paradigmatically related forms.

§9 No theory of Verschärfung can account directly for the large number of Germanic words with *-ww- or *-jj- which either lack convincing etymologies or continue IE roots whose set or anitic character is not known. On the basis of the forms discussed in §§3-8, however, the following conclusions can safely be ventured. Gmc. *-ww-, where not analogical, is in every clear case attributable to an earlier non-geminate *-w- preceded by *-u- or a w-diphthong; *-jj- can similarly be traced to earlier *-j- preceded by *-u- or an i-diphthong. Typically, the diphthong in sequences of the latter type is original and the following glide is the replacement of a lost laryngeal (cf. *hauwan < *hauwan < *hauh₁-e/o-, *waiju- < *waiju- < *waihu₁-); occasionally, the glide is original and the preceding diphthong has arisen by contraction across a laryngeal hiatus (cf. *dajjān < *daijan < *daih₁-eio/). Very little in this formulation is entirely new. We have followed LEHMANN in deriving *-ww- and *-jj- in the majority of instances from sequences of the form *-AUHA-. Our treatment differs from his in two main respects: by assuming that laryngeals were lost without directly causing gemination in Germanic we have been able to account for cases like *dajjan, *Frījō- and *uwalôn- with no loss of generality; and by assuming that interconsonantal *-kw- and *-kh- were metathesized to *-w₂- and
why we should expect them to have been treated with complete uniformity in the daughter languages. As a somewhat parallel case, compare the ultimate history of sequences of the form "-VHV-", which coalesced with the inherited long vowels in Italic, Celtic and Armenian, but which remained disyllabic in Indo-Iranian and yielded "trimoric" long vowels in Germanic.

7) According to J. SCHINDLER (personal communication), metathesis only took place when a consonant preceded as well. But BEEKES' assertion, op. cit. 330, that metathesis was restricted to cases where the preceding consonant was a stop is directly refuted by Hitt. *suku -(a) - 'pour' < *su-(h)- (cf. note 11).

8) The full-grade of the Germanic verb, which matches that of OCS kou 'I forge' < *kauh₂-, is thus comparable to the full-grade of Gwów, although the latter form has not undergone metathesis. Elsewhere I shall attempt to show that the u-presents of Indo-European were characterized by an thematic 3 sg. in *-e rather than *-i, and that their tendency to appear as thematic presents in the daughter languages simply reflects the fact that *-e was the 3 sg. thematic ending as well.

9) In principle, such doublets can be explained in a number of ways. The *-u- of putus may have been extracted from the nasal present *pu-na-h₂-ti (= Ved. punāti 'purifies'); the short vowel of gordu was perhaps extended from the antevocalic allomorph *h₂ru- < *bhu₂- or adopted by analogy to the zero-grade in *-u- of anīt roots. In yet other cases, uncertainty between "-u- and "-u- (or *-i- and *-v-) is best accounted for by supposing an original anīt root to which a laryngeal enlargement was optionally added.

10) The intonation of Serbo-Croatian Ežišë, Šerti could as easily reflect a pre-Slavic present *kumi as an earlier *kauh₂-mi or *kauh₂-ge/-o-.

11) More extended treatments of Verschärfung, of course, allow many further instances of the development *-AWA- > *-AWA-, but few of these will bear close scrutiny. Three additional examples are perhaps worthy of mention:
   a) OI išqa 'notch' < *išu₂-): a connection is possible with Ved. lūnāti 'cuts off', presumably reflecting an IE root *lau₂-.
   b) OI išqa, yaggr 'dense wool' (< *rau₂- (r)au₂-): the corresponding OI verb ryga 'tear out wool', along with Lit. rūdju, ruvuti 'tear out' and OCS rauq, ruvati 'id.' (cf. ryža, ruvati 'dig'), can most easily be derived from a set root *rau₂-; here may also belong Lat. rūsa in rītā caead 'things remaining on a plot of land after it has...
been cleared'. The -ū- of Lat. ē-, dē- obriswa 'dug up' would then have to be explained separately (cf. note 9).

12) I can see no reason to suppose that OS hrewan and OE hryggwa 'rue, be sorrowful' are derived from this root.

13) BEEKES too has seen that *hrawa- is an embarrassing form for a laryngeal theory of Verscharfung, but his assessment of their importance is in my view greatly exaggerated.

14) It will be argued elsewhere that parallel to the u-presents discussed above, Indo-European had a series of presents marked by an enlargement *-ī- *-ī-. These too, I shall claim, were characterized by an alternating full- and zero-grade root and by 3 sg. in *-ē; the type is well-preserved in Hitt. 3 sg. dāt "put's < *dhākī-ī-, 3 pl. tiyanai < *dhāki-ī-enti.

15) Strictly speaking, we must assume that the rule ̣ + 0 / -ū- applied twice, once to produce *daṭijan, which would have been realized phonetically as [daṭi:n], and a second time to produce *daṭijan. But it is at least as likely that *daṭijjan would have been simplified directly to *daṭijan.

16) So KURYLOWICZ, op. cit. 448. Both KURYLOWICZ and LINDEMAN have recognized the second character of Gmc. *-ūw-.

17) This analysis would require us to discard the standard, though hardly compelling, comparison of the Germanic forms with Gk. παύω 'gentle'; cf. BEEKES, op. cit., 330.

18) Representative of this group are Go. blīggwa 'strike' and its relatives, OS hrewan, OE hryggwa 'rue' (cf. note 12), and OE ēwāh < 'whey'. The family of Go. trīggwa, OE treggwa and OHG gtrīw < 'true' is doubtless connected with Lith. drūtas 'strong' and OFr. drowet 'believe', but the relationship between these forms and the Indo-European word for 'true', which lacked a laryngeal, is very uncertain. If our findings are correct, the traditional equation of OE ēwāh and OE ēwāw 'dew' with the laryngealless root of Ved. ēāwās 'runs' must be abandoned.

The etymology of the Hittite mi-verb tāša- 'steal' is well-known: related lexical items outside Anatolian are Ved. śāyá-, etāyá-, Av. tātī- 'thief', OCS taq 'I conceal', sāta 'thief' and Gk. ἔρωμαι 'be in want (of)'. POKORNY refers these forms to a root *sētā- 'heilich und etwas bringen, hehlen, stehlen'; most modern scholars would dispense with the long diphthong and write simply *sēta-g(ī)-.

It has long been suspected that the final glide of roots in *-ē-g(ī)- originated in the present, whence it was subsequently extended to other forms. Favoring such an interpretation is the fact that roots of this structure often have full- or zero-grade presents in *-ē-o- (cf. OSw. dīa, Latv. dēju < *dehō(ī)- < *sēhō(ī)- < *sauhō(ī)-, itself metathesized from earlier *sēhō(ī)-/*sauhō(ī)- (cf. the Hittite doublet tāgwa- 'pour', pointed out to me by SCHINDLER, and probably also *sēhō 'urine' < *sēhō-). From a semantic point of view, however, a derivation of the Germanic words from the anit root of Ved. āmāti, Gāv. hunaotī 'presses (soma) would be equally acceptable.

A Note on Hittite tāša- 'steal'

The cognate of Ved. śāyā- is 3 sg. śāyā, 3 pl. śātānai, while OCS spēq 'I succeed' (< *spēhā- < *sēhā-) is matched by 3 sg. śēpā, 3 pl. śēpītāni 'become sated'. I shall show elsewhere that this inflectional pattern is an archaism, and ultimately points to an IE type 3 sg. *sēh-ī-, 3 pl. *sēh-ī-enti (or *sēh-ī-órr). For the moment it is sufficient to note that the expected present of *sēta-g(ī)- in Hittite would have been not 3 sg. tāgessi, pl. tāgansai, but 3 sg. *tāti, pl. *tīgansai.