AN INDO-EUROPEAN WORD FOR 'DREAM'

CALVERT WATKINS

For Einar Haugen the study of language has always and quite naturally included the study of texts; there is for him no cleavage between linguistics and philology. Nor could there be in a scholar who has so eloquently taught of the relations of language and society — that society which produces texts — and of language as a social fact. In such a spirit I offer to him in friendship and homage this small token of Indo-European 'comparative philology'.

In an exemplary article of 1950, part of the series prefiguring his Greek etymological dictionary, Hjalmar Frisk established both the original sense and the etymology of Greek *húpar*. In its first attestation in Greek, twice in the Odyssey, *húpar* is the 'true dream' as opposed to *ónar* the 'false dream':

> *ouk ónar, all' húpar esthlón, hó toi tetelesménon estai*
> [It is not a false, but a real and true dream, which will be fulfilled for you] (Od. 19.547)
> *epeì ouk ephámēn ónar émmenai, all' húpar édē*
> [Since I said it was no false dream, but a true and present one] (Od. 20.90)

We have the lexical representation of the doubtless ancient traditional doctrine of the Gates of Horn, through which pass dreams which will come true (*étuma krainousi*), and the Gates of Ivory, through which come false dreams which will never be fulfilled (*épe' akráanta phérontes*), which appears a few lines later in book 19 (562 ff.).

It is clear that in Germanic, an original word for 'false dream' came to mean 'dream' in general; Engl. *dream*, Old Norse *draumr*, Germ. *Traum* (Gmc. **draugma-*) are related to the family of Germ. *Trug*, *trügen* and Avestan *druxš* 'the lie', IE **dhreugh-*. Just so Gk. *ónar*, *óneiros*[1] and their lone certain cognate, Armenian *anurȷ̌*[2], came to mean simply 'dream', and the contrasting *húpar* acquired in post-Homeric times the more 'rational' meaning of 'reality, waking state'.

---

[1] Other forms (beside the neuter *óneiron*) are the dialectal *ánar* and *ánairon · óneiron. Krêtes* (Hsch.), as well as the personified *Ónoire* in Sappho 63 LP.

[2] Albanian Tosk *éndërrë*, Geg *ândërr* is sometimes included here as well (Pokorny, as against Walde-Pokorny). According to Hamp 1960 we might have "**ándrr- < *ánr- < *Vnr-* (which is not in all respects certain)". If this etymology were correct, it might localise *ónar* etc. as a 'Balkan' word.

This interpretation of the Greek word *húpar* by Frisk can be, I think, even more firmly anchored in the textual attestation itself. For the epithet of *húpar* at Od. 19.547 is *esthlón*, and *esthlós* in several significant passages in Homer means not just 'good', but also 'true'. There is a clear semantic nexus between the two notions in the English expression *twelve good men and true*. In Homer *esthlós* appears several times in the context of prophesying. In Odyssey 24.311 birds on the traveler's right are of good omen: *esthloì esan órnithes iónti, dexioí*. The 'good' or favorable omen, prophesy or dream is not only that which promises good, but that which is fulfilled, and proves 'true'. Agamemnon's bitter attack on the seer Calchas (Il. 1.107) is particularly remarkable:

> *esthlòn d'oúte tí pō eípas épos oút' etélessas*
> [Never have you said a good word, or brought it about].

The triple collocation *esthlòn* ... *(w)épos* ... *etélessas* is exactly comparable to that of Od. 19.547 already cited: *húpar esthlón* ... *tetelesménon*. The true ('good') dream will be accomplished, just as the true ('good') word will be accomplished.

Etymologically *esthlós* is an adjective in -*lo*- to a stem *esth*- which has been related since Brugmann to Vedic *édhate* (**es-dh*-) 'prospers, thrives (of mortals under divine favor)' and the group of Greek *eús* (**es-u*-), Hittite *aššu*- 'good'.[3] While the Greek dialect forms in -*sl*- (Aeol. *éslos*, Dor. *eslós*, Arc. *heslos*) show simplification of the cluster -*sthl*-, the Hesychean gloss *ellós· agathós* may reflect a genuine **es-lo*-.[4]

More important is the ultimate derivation of **es-dh*- from **es*- 'to be, exist in reality'. From this root we have not only other adjective forms in the meaning 'good' (**es-u*-, **su*- etc., perhaps **es-lo*-), but participial forms where the notion 'true' predominates, via that of 'existing, real'. This is notably the case of the group of Old Norse *sannr*, Skt. *satyá*-, Lat. *sōns*, and Hitt. *ašant*-, which I have discussed elsewhere (1967).

Homeric *húpar esthlón* at Od. 19.547, from which all the subsequent uses of *húpar* in Greek literature derive (Leumann 1950:126), is thus a noun phrase meaning 'real, true dream'.

It is the establishment of meaning which permits etymology, and not vice-versa. With the meaning '(true) dream' for Greek *húpar* Hjalmar Frisk could then point to the Indo-European root for 'sleep' **swep*-/**sup*- with its frequent associated meaning 'dream': Gk. *húp-nos* 'sleep' (*en húpnōi* 'in a dream'), Lat. *somnus* 'sleep' (**swep-no*-), *somnium* 'dream', Sanskrit *svápnah* 'sleep; dream', Old Norse *svefn* 'sleep; dream',

[3] Mayrhofer 1956- s.v. *édhate* cites (after I. Scheftelowitz) Younger Avestan *azdiia*- 'well-fed, fat' (add *anazdiia*- 'ill-fed, thin', both of cattle), and Armenian *azdoy* 'efficace, attivo, forte' (Ciakciak). The Iranian forms are phonologically plausible, but semantically not compelling since the meaning of the terms is not certain, and cattle are not people. The Armenian comparison is phonologically, morphologically, and semantically very uncertain, and best left out.

[4] Specht 1944:256 and Belardi 1950 (neither with correct conclusions). An **es-lo*- might be compared with the Tocharian A gerundive *nasāl* < **(n)es-lo*- and/or the Hittite 1 sg. ipv. *ešlit*, *ešlut*; cf. Watkins 1969:200 and Kammenhuber 1969:323.

OEng. *swefn* 'sleep; dream', and other forms. The reconstructed form for *húpar* is an old zero-grade *r*-stem nominative (-accusative) **sup-r̥*.

Frisk was also able to point at the end of his article to the Hittite verb *šuppar-iya-*, for which the meaning 'sleep' had been plausibly suggested; first tentatively by Ehelolf, 1933 and then more firmly by Sturtevant, 1936 (on the basis of the Indo-European etymology. Cf. also Friedrich, 1947). The Hittite verb in form must be a denominative, and Frisk rightly saw that the underlying Hittite noun **šuppar* was 'ablautlich sogar identisch' with Gk. *húpar* (**sup-r̥*). Since the publication of Frisk's article came the appearance of Friedrich's authoritative dictionary (1954), which codified the meaning 'sleep' for the Hittite verb[5]; now in Frisk 1954-1970 the Hittite comparison rightfully occupies the first place in the list of cognates of Gk. *húpar*. At the same time Frisk represents the semantic point of contact by an asterisked form: *húpar* is glossed '*Schlaf; Traum'.

Here again we can demonstrate the equation Gk. *húpar*: Hitt. *šuppar-iya-* even more tightly. Not only are they identical in form, but also in meaning. The postulated semantic bridge **Schlaf* can be dispensed with, for the contexts in which the Hittite verb appears show that it must mean not just 'sleep', but specifically 'dream'.

The most unequivocal example is that cited by Ehelolf 1933, where he first hesitantly suggested the meaning 'sleep'. The passage is from an unpublished text, Bo 706 Rs. 24ff.: [now KUB XXXVI 89 Rs. 56'-57']

> ZI-*ni-wa-ra-za-an-kán tar-ni* URU*ne-ri-iq-qa-an* URU-*an*
>   d*te-ši-mi-wa-kán a-aš-ši-ya-an-ti*
> *gi-nu-wa ša-ni-iz-zi-uš ti-eš-ḫu-uš šu-up-pa-ri-ya-an-za e-eš-ta*
> *a-ra-a-i* URU*ne-ri-iq-qa-aš* d U-*aš* d*te-ši-mi-eš?-wa-ta*
>   GEŠTIN-*aš mu-ri-eš*
> *mi-li-it ma-a-an kán-kán^{an}-za*
> [Let it into your mind, the city Neriq. In Tešimi's beloved
> lap you have dreamt sweet dreams.
> Arise, Storm God of Neriq! Tešimi's grapes
> hang for you like honey.]

The participle *šuppariyanza* (in stative construction with the copula) has the plural *tešḫuš* 'dreams' as inner object. The sense of the verb must be 'to dream', rather than 'to sleep' *tout court*, which is Hittite *šeš*- or the athematic middle *šup*-.

The verb has been restored by Laroche 1965 in KUB VIII 48 Vs. 1: an important fragment of the Hittite version (translation) of the Akkadian Gilgamesh epic.[6] It supplies the lost beginning of tablet VII of the Assyrian version, recounting the Dream of Enkidu.[7] The conclusion of the Assyrian tablet VI, leading into the episode of the Hittite version, is as follows (tr. Speiser):[8]

[5] Cf. Kammenhuber 1969:292, who equates *šuppariya*- in meaning with *šup*- 'sleep'.

[6] Cf. Friedrich 1966:29 and Neu 1968:157, who has assured the restoration by reading the sign -*up*- on a photograph.

[7] Cf. E. A. Speiser 1955:85.

[8] The Assyrian text may be found in Thompson 1930:42, 45.

(190) Down lie the heroes on their beds of night.
Also Enkidu lies down, a dream beholding.
Up rose Enkidu to relate his dream,
Saying to his friend:
"My friend, why are the great gods in council?"

This or similar wording[9] is picked up by the Hittite passage. It has been edited by Friedrich 1929 and more recently by Laroche 1968.

Vs. 1   [*šu-]up-pa-ri-ya-u-wa-aš-ta-ti nu lu-uk-ke-eš-ta*
[*nu* ᵈE]N.[K]I.TU₄-*uš A-NA* ᵈGIŠ.GIM.MAŠ E ᴵR-*pa me-mi-iš-ki-[iz-zi*¹⁰
[ŠE]Š-*ni-mi ki-e-da-ni-wa-za-kán* GE.-*an-ti ku-in* U[-*an? u-uḫ-ḫu-un*
nu-wa ᵈ*A-NU-uš* ᵈEN.LÍL-*aš* ᵈ*E.A-aš* ᵈUTU A.√ᴱ-*ya a-[ra-an-ta-at*

["... we were asleep/in a dream." And it became light.
And Enkidu answered to Gilgamesh:
"My b(rother),[11] what dream did I see this night?
Anu, Enlil, Ea, and the Sun God of Heaven w(ere standing) ...]

While the verb *šuppariya-* could equally refer to the state of sleeping or the state of dreaming, it is clear that the episode itself, and the general context, refers to a dream. It is also a 'true dream', accurately and pathetically foretelling to Enkidu his death. The Hittite preterite *šuppariyawaštati* must have a stative sense 'we were asleep/in a dream'; it corresponds to the Akkadian statives 3 pl. *utulu*, 3 sg. *utul* (lines 190, 191 above) from *utūlu* 'lie down' (*Chicago Akk. Dict.*), 'liegen, schlafen' (*Akk. Handwb.*). The latter significantly describes the verb in our Gilgamesh passage as a 'Traumdeuter'.

The only other occurrence of *šuppariya-* known to me is too fragmentary to permit of an interpretation. KUB XX 86 V ff. (ritual, cited by Ehelolf 1933): *a-pi-e-da-ni iš-p[a-an-ti* (10) *na-aš-ma-aš šu-up-pa- i-y[a-* (11) ᴸᵁHAL *ḫu-u-ma-an pi-[* (12) *a-pi-da-ni* UD-*ti ʔe-[* (13) GIM-*an-ma ne-k -u[z me-ḫur* 'that ni[ght ... (10) or he sleep[s/ dream[s... (11) the seer all... (12) the day... (13) but when [it becomes] night [time...' But the earlier two passages are enough to establish a meaning 'dream' for the Hittite verb *šuppariya-*.

Since the verb is a denominative in form (of the older type in -*iya-* with middle endings, cf. Watkins 1969:72,7), the underlying noun **šuppar*[12] must itself have

_____

[9] The Hittite version derives from an archetype older than the Assyrian version of the time of Assurbanipal, which gives our most complete text. On the textual tradition see the discussion by Kammenhuber 1967.

[10] Or *memišk[it* 'answered'. There does not appear to be room for Friedrich and Laroche's *memišk[iuwan daiš* 'began to answer' either here or at line 11, despite KUB XVII 3 I 5.

[11] For the Hittite vocative [ŠE Š-*ni-mi* (**nani-mi?*) restored by Laroche compare his 1969 paper, where he gives also *atti-me* 'my father!' KBo XII 70 Vs. 10. The ending -*i* reflects the old Indo-European thematic ending **-e*; for the phonetics cf. Hittite 2 sg. ipv. -*ški* → IE **-ske*. This ending must be older in Hittite than the -*a* of *-ḫa-(a-)mi* 'my lord!' which shows simple truncation of nominative -*s* (*išḫāš-miš*), like the later Greek type *tamíā* or Modern Greek *Petro, Niko*. To Laroche's literature on the Hittite vocative add Watkins 1966, where a more satisfactory interpretation of the *u*-stem vocative type LUGAL-*u-e* (**-u-ei*) is proposed. The Hittite possessive vocative -*me*, -*mi* may be identical to the Latin vocative *mi*.

[12] Cf. Schindler 1966:74, against Kammenhuber 1969:292.

meant 'd am'. It was supplanted in use by the new and doubtless borrowed *tešḫaš*, *zašḫaiš* 'c am, vision in a dream'. The noun *šuppar* is thus identical in form and meaning w h *húpar* in its earliest usage in Greek. Each of these words is formally unpredictab in its own tradition; together they require the positing of an Indo-European n ter noun *sup-r̥*, a derivative of the root *swep- 'to sleep', but with the meaning 'dr n' — perhaps at the outset a secondary semantic function — alone attested in its scendants.

The nominat e-accusative *swépōr*, gen. *supnés (and loc. *swopén) with a meaning 'sleep' assumed Pokorny and followed by Mayrhofer 1961 and Schindler 1966, is a purely theoretica onstruct. If there ever was an Indo-European heteroclitic *r/n*-stem neuter for 'sleep', must have been replaced in its primary semantic function very early — still in Inc -European times — by *swépnos/*swópnos/*súpnos. All three preforms must be recognized. However one chooses to account for them,[13] it is clear that the Indo-European word for 'sleep' was a thematic *animate* (masculine) stem in *-no-. For the neuter *supr̥ our evidence is that the meaning 'dream' alone was preserved in Indo-Eurot an, to be inherited into Greek and Hittite. A parallel to the semantic history is furnis ed by Old Ch. Slav. *sŭnŭ 'sleep; dream', but Czech *sen* only 'dream', with renewal of th primary function 'sleep' as *spaní (from *sŭpaníje).

In part of the Indo-Eurc ean speaking area this old word *supr̥ for 'dream' was replaced by a new, quasi-adj ctival derivative *swépniyom, literally 'that of the sleep' (*swépnos). So we have Lat. omnium, *Skt.* (AV) *svápnyam, duṣvápnyam,* Žem. Lith. *sapnỹs,* and Old Ch. Slav. *sŭnij* (with the vocalism of *sŭnŭ). See Schindler 1966, who suggests that *swépniyom may be a tabu replacement. He also rightly takes Gk. *enúpnion* (in apposition to *theío. ʼneiros* Od. 14.495, Il. 2.56) as a hypostasis from *en húpnōi.* Elsewhere we have in vations like Germanic *draugma- and the quite obscure Celtic forms like Old sh *aislinge* and Middle Welsh *breidwyt,* Welsh *breuddwyd.*

Despite Schindler 1966 the prefc m of Gk. *ónar, óneiros* and Armenian *anurǰ* is probably another such geographicai / limited formation, even if an old one. The dialectal distribution of the word is hat of the numerous other Greco-Armenian isoglosses; in view of the close relation of these two languages a lexical item found in them alone cannot without further ado be pushed back into Common Indo-European.[14]

---

[13] Cf. Schindler 1966 for a full discussion (witl some questionable conclusions), as well as Hamp 1970. In my view it is noteworthy, and scarcely cidental, that the same unexplained variation in root ablaut appears before the suffix *-no- also in e words for 'wagon' and for 'price (ransom, sale value of a person)'. Cf. *wegh-nos (OIr. *fén) but gh-nos (ON *vagn);* *wes-no- (Latin acc. *uēnum,* gender unknown), *wós-nos (Gk. *ônos),* *wos-nā (Gk. *ōné,* Aeol. *ónna),* *we/os-nóm (Ved. *vasnám),* *wēs-no- (Arm. *gin),* and *us-no- (underlying deno inative OHitt. *ušneškatta).* These probably represent extensions in *-no- to old apophonic root uns, rather than reflexes of old *r/n*-stems. In the same sense Mayrhofer 1956- s.v. *vasnám.* The ot appears in Hittite *waši 'buys, acquires', perhaps in lat. *uīlis 'cheap' (*wes-li-, Szemerényi 195 and in Pers. *bāzār 'market' < Iran. *vahā-čarana- (Benveniste 1969:1.126). For the latter the Vedic collocation *vasnám acarat* (RV 4.24.10) — the only Rig Vedic attestation of *vasnám* — should be n ted.

[14] Cf. footnote 2 above. Note especially, for the form, e parallelism of Gk. *êmar, hēméra* (*āmr̥,

If there was an Indo-European word for 'dream' the likeliest candidate is *supṛ.

It should be clear from the semantic contexts of Gk. *húpar* and Hitt. *šuppariya-* that there can be no question of deriving (irregularly!) Latin *sopor* from *supṛ, as suggested first by Sturtevant 1936 and still maintained by Frisk 1954-. Latin *sopor* is in the first place masculine, as against the neuter *húpar*; and it means from the earliest times either 'sleep' as a state, or particularly 'sleepiness' as an active, operative force. In Plautus we find the following instances of 'sleep' as state: Amph. 303-306 *homines quattuor in soporem conlocastis ... quattuor uiros sopori se dedisse autumat*; Rud. 916 *lucrum praeposiui sopori*[15] *et quieti*. For 'sleep' as an active force, of animate gender and syntactically the agent-subject of a transitive verb, we have Cas. 169 *sopor manus caluitur*; Most. 704 *neminem sollicitat sopor*. Contrast *somnus*, in Plautus the subject only of *est*. The same sense of *sopor* as an active force, 'virtus dormitiva', predominates in Virgil: Aen. 2.253 *sopor complectitur artus*; 3.511 *s. inrigat artus*; Georg. 4.190 *s. occupat artus*.

It is this active force of the base noun *sopor* which accounts for the 'causative'-transitive force of its old long-vowel denominative derivative *sōpīre* 'put to sleep' (cf. Watkins 1962:20); *sōpīre* has nothing to do with the Vedic causative *svāpáyati*, or the Germanic causative group of ONorse *svefja* 'put to sleep, still' (Gmc. *swabjan), or the Germanic long vowel causative ONorse *sæfa* 'kill, sacrifice' (Gmc. *swōbjan). On the latter verb see the discussion of de Vries 1956:1.416-417, who points out that it and *sóa* are 'nicht zufällig als die rituellen Bezeichnungen für die Opferhandlung gewählt'. We have an original tabu-verb 'to still, quiet (the sacrificial animal)' which only later acquires the generalized meaning 'kill'. The formation must be *einzel-sprachlich* (cf. Lat. *mactāre* > Span. *matar*); Rigvedic *svāpáyati* has a wholly secular meaning of 'putting to sleep' in warriors' slang, as persuasively argued by Hoffmann 1965. This development via fighters' slang can be directly compared with that of *homines in soporem conlocare* (Plaut. *Amph.* 303 above), said by a slave to his two fists. In RV 9.17.54 *ásvāpayan nigútaḥ snehāyac ca* 'er schläferte die Schmäher ein und liess sie kleben (liegen) lassen' (Hoffmann) the transitive *snehāyat* (RV *hapax leg.*), the actual subject of Hoffmann's article, could just as well be punningly — and etymologically — translated into colloquial American English as 'he snowed them'.

Virgil's *nec sopor illud erat, sed ...* (Aen. 3.173) is clearly a conscious Homeric echo (*ouk ónar, all' ...*), as the construction proves and all commentaries agree. The passage is isolated, and *sopor* in Latin is not a word for 'dream'. Silius Italicus 3.198 *neque enim sopor ille*, which the Virgil commentators (Henry, Conington-Nettleship, Williams) cite as a parallel, is not one; while the phrase may well be a verbal echo

---

*āmer-), Arm. *awr* (*āmōr) with Gk. *ónar*, *óneiros* (*onṛ, *oner-yo-), *ánairon*, *Ónoire* (*onṛ-yo-), Arm. *anurj* (*onōr-yo-) with unexplained *a-* for *o-* as in *ateam* 'I hate' : Lat. *odium*. The word for 'day' is restricted to these two languages. The forms are further discussed in Beekes 1969:20, 46, 87, where however the postulated inflexion for 'dream' nom. *-ōr, acc. *-er-m̥ is difficult to reconcile with the neuter gender of Greek nouns in *-ar*.

[15] Note the phonetic palindrome in *-posiui sop-*, iconographic to the antithesis in the context.

of the Virgilian passage, *sopor* there clearly means 'sound, real sleep', not 'dream'.

Claudian (cited by Forcellini), a non-native speaker of any sort of Latin writing a defunct literary language at the beginning of the fifth century A.D., uses *sopor* rightly as active 'sleep' (*largitur...pocula...inriguus...sopor*) in Pan. de VI cons. Honor., Praef. 10, but a few lines later as 'dream' (*fingere nil maius potuit sopor*), *ibid.* 25. The validity of this as evidence for Latinity, to say nothing of Indo-European semantics, is nil. We may continue to derive *sopor* from a doubtless old animate stem **swep-os-*, with the same suffix as *torpor*, *tepor*, etc. probably replacing a still earlier root athematic animate noun **swep-* / **swop-* / **sup-*.

Harvard University

REFERENCES

Belardi, W.
    1950   "Etimologie greche", *Doxa*, 3, 204.
Beneviste, E.
    1969   *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit).
Ehelolf, H.
    1933   "Heth. *milit* 'Honig'", *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 36, 4-5.
Friedrich, J.
    1929   "Die hethitischen Bruchstücke des Gilgameš-Epos", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie u. verwandte Gebeite, Neue Folge* 5, 16ff.
    1947   "Zum hethitischen dexikon", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 1, 294.
    1954   *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg: Winter).
    1966   *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, 3. Ergänzungsheft (Heidelberg: Winter).
Frisk, H.
    1950   "Zur griechischen Wortkunde", *Eranos*, 48, 131-135.
    1954—1970   *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg: Winter).
Hamp, E. P.
    1960   "Mythical Prothetic Vowels in Albanian", *Annali. Instituto orientale di Napoli. Sezione linguistica*, 2, 185-190.
    1970   "Lat. über again", *Glotta*, 68, 143.
Hoffmann, K.
    1965   "Idg. *sneigyh*". *Müncher Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 18, 19.
Kammenhuber, A.
    1967   "Die hethitische und hurrische Überlieferung zum 'Gilgameš-Epos'", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 21, 45-58.
    1969   "Hethitisch", *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, 1. Abt. 2.Bd. 1. u. 2. Abschn. 2 Lfg. (Leiden: Brill).
Laroche, E.
    1965   "Notes lexicographiques", *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale*, 59, 85.
    1968   "Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription. Ile partie. Mythologie d'origine étrangére," *Revue hittite et asianique*, 82, 17.
    1969   "Vocatif et cas absoln en anatolien". *Studi in onore di Piero Meriggi. Athenaeum* (Pavia), 47, 173ff.
Leumann, M.
    1950   *Homerische Wörter.* (Basel: F. Reinhardt).
Mayrhofer, M.
    1956   *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (Heidelberg: Winter).

1961 Rev. of *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, lieferung 10-13 (rendh - — ̩urughi̩o), by Julius Pokorny, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 18, 22-23.

Neu, E.
1968 *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen. Studien zu den Boghazköy-Texten*, 5. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).

Pokorny, J.
1948/1949–1969 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern: Francke).

Specht, F.
1944 *Der Ursprung der indogermanischen Deklination* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht).

Speiser, E. A.
trans. 1955 "Akkadian Myths and Epics". Ed. J. B. Pritchard. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Second ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Sturtevant, E. H.
1936 "Two Hittite Words", *The Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 56, 282-284.

Szemerényi, O.
1954 "The Indo-European Cluster *sl* in Latin", *Archivum Linguisticum*, 6, 36.

Thompson, R. C.
1930 *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

de Vries, J.
1956 *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte*. Second ed. (Berlin: de Gruyter).

Watkins, C.
1962 *Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies).
1966 "The Indo-European word for 'day' in Celtic and related topics". *Trivium* (Lampeter, Cardiganshire, Wales), 1, 115-116.
1967 "Latin *sōns*." Eds. W. Arndt et al. *Studies Presented to G. S. Lane* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press), 186-194.
1969 *Formenlehre*. 1. Teil. *Geschichte der indogermanischen Verbalflexion*. Ed. Jerzy Kuryłowicz. *Indogermanische Grammatik*. 3. Band. (Heidelberg: Winter).