

- Giannakidou, A., and Merchant, J. 1999: 'Why Giannis Can't Scrub his Plate Clean: On the Absence of Resultative Secondary Predication in Greek', in *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics* (Athens: Ellinika Grammata), 93–103.
- Jackendoff, R. 1990: *Semantic Structures* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT Press).
- Krifka, M. 1998: 'The Origins of Telicity', in Rothstein (1998), 197–236.
- Levin, B., and Rappaport Hovav, M. 1996: *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax Lexical-Semantics Interface*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT Press).
- Mateu, J., and Rigau, G. 1999: 'Universals of Lexico-Syntactic Typology and Parametric Variation', paper presented at the annual conference of the Society of Generative Linguists in the Old World, Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Berlin.
- Panitsa, G. 2001: 'Aspects of Aspect: Acquiring Grammatical Aspect in Modern Greek: The Interaction of Aspect with Aspectual Adverbials in Children's Grammars', in *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 13 (London: Department of Phonetics and Linguistics, University College London), 405–24.
- Rothstein, S. (ed.). 1998: *Events and Grammar* (Dordrecht: Kluwer).
- 2000: 'Incrementality and the Structure of Accomplishments', talk delivered at the Paris Conference on Tense and Aspect, 15–18 November 2000.
- 2001: 'What are Incremental Themes?' *ZAS Working Papers in Linguistics*, 22: 139–57.
- Sag, I., and Szabolcsi, A. (eds.). 1992: *Lexical Matters* (Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications; distributed by University of Chicago Press).
- Shopen, T. (ed.). 1985: *Language Typology and Syntactic Descriptions*, iii. *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Snyder, W. 1995: 'Language Acquisition and Language Variation: The Role of Morphology' (Ph.D. diss., MIT).
- Strigin, A., and Demjjanow, A. 2001: 'Secondary Predication in Russian', *ZAS Working Papers in Linguistics*, 25: 1–79.
- Talmy, L. 1985: 'Lexicalization Patterns: Semantic Structure in Lexical Forms', in Shopen (1985), 57–149.
- Tenny, C. 1987: 'Grammaticalizing Aspect and Affectedness' (Ph.D. diss., MIT).
- 1992: 'The Aspectual Interface Hypothesis', in Sag and Szabolcsi (1992), 1–27.
- 1994: *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax–Semantics Interface* (Dordrecht, Boston, and London: Kluwer Academic Publishers).
- Tortora, C. 1998: 'Verbs of Inherently Directed Motion are Compatible with Resultative Phrases', *Linguistic Inquiry*, 29/2: 338–45.
- Vendler, Z. 1957: 'Verbs and Times', *Philosophical Review*, 56: 143–60; repr. in Vendler, *Linguistics in Philosophy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967), 97–121.
- Verkuyl, H. J. 1989: 'Aspectual Classes and Aspectual Composition', *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 12: 39–94.

The 'Swimming Duck' in Greek and Hittite

Joshua T. Katz

There has been considerable squabbling in the secondary literature over the Greek word for 'duck'. At first glance, Att. νήττα/Ion. νήσσα looks as though it might be related to Lat. *anas*, gen. *anatis* and the names for this animal in so many other Indo-European languages, in which case it, too, would go back, somehow, to PIE $*h_2énh_2-t-$, $*h_2nh_2-t-$ (*vel sim.*).¹ Connecting the Greek word to *anas* and superficially similar forms throughout the family (e.g. Skt. *āti-* and Mod. Germ. *Ente*) is, however, not at all simple, in the first place because both $*h_2en-$ and (by the 'Lex Rix') $*h_2n-$ should have yielded $*ān-$, with an initial alpha. In an article published in 1991, Helmut Rix reconsiders the whole question and comes to the interesting and attractive conclusion that νήττα has been influenced by the verb meaning 'swim', νήχω, νήχομαι (\leftarrow PIE $*(s)neh_2-$ 'bathe, swim'²). The purpose of the present paper is to suggest some modifications to Rix's scenario and to show that

This paper, a version of which was presented at the 206th Meeting of the American Oriental Society in Philadelphia in March 1996, expands on and revises a passing suggestion in Katz (2001: 210, with n. 16). It is a pleasure to dedicate a small and 'anatine' Graeco-Hittite etymology to Anna Morpurgo Davies, whose contributions to Greek and Anatolian linguistics have been astounding. For helpful comments I am grateful to Gillian R. Hart, P. Oktor Skjærvø, Brent Vine, Calvert Watkins, Michael Weiss, and especially H. Craig Melchert; I hereby acknowledge with thanks support from the National Science Foundation, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Institute for Advanced Study.

¹ For the repertoire of descendant forms in Indic, Iranian, Italic, Germanic, Baltic, and Slavic, as well as supposedly in Greek, see e.g. Rix (1991) and J. A. C. Greppin in Mallory and Adams (1997: 171), the latter of whom reconstructs a second word for this bird in Proto-Indo-European and beyond, $*pad-$ ('"duck, teal?"'), and notes that the 'species indicated by PIE "duck" . . . is not certain although the mallard is by far the best attested species'. Buck (1949: 178) lists many of the major Indo-European words for 'duck', some of which are obviously unrelated to $*h_2énh_2-t-$ and to each other (e.g. *lacha* in Irish, *hwyad* in Welsh (whose etymology has proved especially controversial: see Lockwood 1981: 181–3, Lindeman 1983, Hamp 1989: 196–7, and now also Hamp 1998–2000), *kaczka* in Polish, and, of course, *duck* itself).

² For the evidence for this root and its *s*-mobile (discussed at the end of this paper), see now Th. Zehnder in Rix (2001: 572–3). See also García Ramón (2000b: 122–3 and *passim*).

the Hittite word for 'duck', *lah(h)anza(n)*-(MUSEN), which no one has tried to connect to **h₂énh₂-t-*, in fact goes back to much the same sort of pre-form as the Greek.

The Proto-Indo-European word for 'duck' contains a root **h₂énh₂-* not found outside this feminine noun,³ whose basic form Rix reconstructs as nom. **h₂é/ónh₂-t-s*, gen. **h₂nh₂-t-és*.⁴ In Rix's opinion, this same amphikinet paradigm underlies *νήττα* as well, according to the following series of developments, which are complicated enough to make the chart worth reproducing verbatim from the end of his paper (Rix 1991: 198):

Nominativ	Genetiv
I. <i>*h₂ónh₂-t-s</i> oder <i>*h₂énh₂-t-s</i>	<i>*h₂nh₂-t-és</i>
II. <i>*h₂ñh₂-t-s</i>	<i>*h₂nh₂-t-ós</i>
III. <i>*s₃nh₂-t-s</i>	<i>*sn₂h₂-t-ós</i>
IV. (<i>*sánat-s</i> →) <i>*snāt-s</i>	<i>*snāt-ós</i>
V. <i>*snāt-ia</i>	<i>*snāt-iā-s</i>
VI. <i>*snāk^h-ia</i> > <i>*nātt^sa</i>	<i>*snāk^h-iā-s</i> > <i>*nātt^sās</i>
VII. <i>vāσσα/vήσσα/vήττα</i>	<i>vāσσās/vήσσας/vήττης</i> .

The crucial step is the third: it is not possible to arrive at a Greek form with an initial nu from **h₂(e)nh₂-*, at least not without considerable difficulty,⁵ but since ducks are conventionally associated with swimming⁶ and since the inherited root that means 'bathe, swim' begins **(s)n-* (which, with or without the sibilant, would reduce in Greek to *#v-*), we have to

³ I do not understand the attempt of Hamp (1989: 197; see also Hamp 1998–2000) to reconcile **h₂énh₂-* with the well-known root **h₂énh₂-* 'breathe' (cf. e.g. Gk. *ἀνεμος* 'wind' and Lat. *animus* 'soul').

⁴ I have nothing to add to Rix's cautious and ultimately indecisive discussion (Rix 1991: 190–1, with special reference to M. Mayrhofer) of the relative antiquity of the *t*-stem (as above) and its clear by-form in *-ti-* (as e.g. in Skt. *ātī-*). Hamp (1990: 16–17) argues that 'for Indo-European we can justify only a Wurzelnomen **anāt*' (17).

⁵ There is a large literature on the Lex Rix (see in the first place Rix 1970)—mostly pro, occasionally contra. Suffice it to say that I am wholly unconvinced by the objections of Fredrik Otto Lindeman to the law in general and by his own analysis of *νήττα* as the regular outcome of **h₂nh₂-t-ih₂* (e.g. Lindeman 1990: 19 and *passim* (response by Rix 1991: 192–4), 1994: 43–4 and *passim*, and 1997: 53–7). Meißner (1998) has ingenious but in my view often improbable alternative explanations for some major examples of the Lex Rix, whose validity seems to him *sub iudice*; he writes of the 'extremely problematic' Greek word for 'duck' that it 'can easily be subject to onomatopoeic changes which significantly reduce its value as evidence' for the law (39–40).

⁶ Rix (1991: 190 n. 18) points to two pieces of Classical evidence for the folk-etymological connection between these water birds and their habitual aquatic activity: Athen. 9, 395 ε τῆς δὲ νήττης καὶ . . . ἀφ' ὧν καὶ τὸ νήχεσθαι . . . ἐρηται and Varro, *LL* 5. 78 'dicta . . . anas a nando'. See also Isid. *Etym.* 12. 7. 51–2 'Ans [sic] ab assiduitate natandi aptum nomen accepit. . . Anseri nomen ans dedit per derivationem, uel a similitudine, uel quod et ipsa natandi frequentiam habeat' (see Maltby 1991: 33 and 38).

do—thus Rix—with a 'volksetymologisch motivierte Dissimilation' (Rix 1991: 198) of **h₂ . . . h₂* to **s . . . h₂*.⁷ The outcome of this alteration, **snāt-*, is then recharacterized with the feminine suffix **-ia* (< PIE **-ih₂*)—hardly a surprise given that **h₂(e)nh₂-t-* is grammatically feminine and, I would add, that many cultures view ducks as in the first place female⁸—and the resulting **snāt-ia* is supposedly further changed to **snāk^h-ia* under the influence of the verb *νήχω*, which has in the meantime acquired a velar. Finally, the pre-form **snāk^h-ia* would indeed yield *νήττα* in Attic and *νήσσα* in Ionic.⁹

There are a lot of steps here, including one (the replacement of **snāt-* by **snāk^h-*) that may be unnecessary (see below), but the idea that the word for 'swim' is involved is insightful and intuitively correct.¹⁰ Still, although Rix is right to object to Martin Peters's attempt to explain the lack of an initial vowel in *νήττα* as a 'nicht ad hoc' loss of the first laryngeal (so that PIE **HR₂H₂C-* develops into Gk. *RE₂C-*), it is hard to agree with Rix that the fact that **h₂* and **s* are both spirants makes his own suggested dissimilation especially likely.¹¹ I propose instead that speakers of pre-Greek

⁷ Compare Rix (1991: 194: a 'Dissimilation, für die man zudem ein semantisches Motiv anführen kann'); and (1991: 195: 'Ebensogut wie von einer semantisch motivierten Dissimilation könnte man so auch von einer phonetisch gestützten Volksetymologie reden').

⁸ Perhaps no other bird except the goose is quite so prototypically female. In English, for example, female members of the family Anatidae are called *duck* and *goose*, but these are also the generic terms (rather than their mates, the marked *drake* and *gander*); cf. e.g. *cat* (vs. *tom-cat*), *cow* (vs. *bull*), and *sheep* (vs. *ram*) as opposed to *bitch* (vs. *dog*), *vixen* (vs. *fox*), and *she-wolf* (vs. *wolf*). It is worth noting that not only are all reflexes of PIE **h₂(e)nh₂-t-* feminine (this is not surprising, for the word is a *t*-stem), but so, too, are almost all other basic words for 'duck' in Indo-European, regardless of source (e.g. OE *duce* (vs. (ME) *drāke*), Ir. *lacha* (vs. *bardal*), W. *hwyad* (vs. *ceiliog hwyad*), and Mod. Gk. *πάπια* (vs. *αρσενική πάπια*)); the obvious exceptions are Fr. *canard* (vs. *cane*) and Sp. *pato* (more usual than *pata*).

⁹ On the pseudo-Boeotian accusative plural form *vāσσās* in Ar. *Ach.* 875, see Rix (1991: 186 n. 1), Colvin (1999: 167 and 179), and Katz (2000).

¹⁰ Rix (1991: 197) writes that 'Die Umbildung war individuell, aber sie ist semantisch so gut motiviert, wie es nur wünschbar ist', adding in a footnote that Pierre Chantraine in his etymological dictionary s.v. *νήσσα* (see now Chantraine 1999: 752–3) denies that there could be a connection between this noun and the verb 'swim' ('ni démontrable ni probable' (753)). The same idea is to be found in a passing remark of C. J. Ruijgh ap. Schrijver (1991: 95: 'vāσσα might alternatively reflect **vāχ-ya*, of *vāχω*'); compare also Beekes (1987: 5 n. 5: *νήττα* 'cannot continue **h₂nh₂-t-*. The word must have had **neh₂-* (and it was not cognate with the other "duck"-words); otherwise Beekes (1985: 63–4)). Meier-Brügger (1993) follows up on Rix's article and affirms his belief in the old etymology (due in the first place to G. Curtius) of Gk. *νήσος* 'island' as 'schwimmend(e Erde)' (though if I am reading his one-page note rightly, he moves from reconstructions in the first paragraph with **-k^h₂-* to the implication in the second paragraph that we have to do instead with **-t₂-*; on these two clusters, see n. 13); see also now Leušina (1999: 83 and *passim*).

¹¹ See Peters (1980: 26 n. 18) and Rix (1991: 194). Note also the idea of Griepentrog (1995: 299 n. 22): perhaps 'uridg. **anH₂t-* mit grundsprachlichem *a*'.

replaced the inherited word for ‘duck’, $*h_2énh_2-t-$, with a phonologically similar and structurally identical form $*(s)néh_2-t-$ ‘swimmer’ (compare the comment of Ruijgh in n. 10) and that this, once recharacterized as feminine, $*(s)nāt-ia$ (as though from an anachronistic PIE $*(s)neh_2-t-ih_2$), developed directly into $νηττα$. There are numerous parallels for renaming something in the natural world with reference to a salient trait, some of which, as in the kind of transferred epithet that I suggest, involve the maintenance of the original name’s morphology.¹² Note that it may even be the case that $*(s)nāt-ia$ is the immediate precursor of $νηττα$, despite Rix’s belief that the $-t-$ is first replaced by the velar in (the pre-form of) $νήχω$: certainly the reconstruction $*(s)nāk^h-ia$ cannot be summarily excluded, for no one disputes that intervocalic $*-k^{(h)}i-$ yields $-ττ-$ in Attic and $-σσ-$ in Ionic; but certainly, too, the precise conditions under which PIE $*-ti-$ yields $-ττ-/σσ-$ (as e.g. in $κρείττων/κρέσσων$ ‘better, stronger’) rather than only $-σ(σ)-$ (as e.g. in $τόσ(σ)ος$ ‘so much’) remain controversial, and I find rather more intriguing than Rix does Peters’s idea that names of female creatures that contain the suffix $*-ia$ show the former (‘nicht-lautgesetzlich’) treatment.¹³ For my purposes, though, it matters little whether the word for ‘duck’ goes back to $*(s)nāt-ia$ or a remade $*(s)nāk^h-ia$ (or, for that matter, to $*(s)nāk^ht-ia$ (cf. $ἄνασσα$ ‘queen’, which probably comes from $*uanaKt-ia$)); anyone who does not accept the former can simply say that the noun ‘duck (← swimmer)’ gains the same velar extension as the verb ‘swim’, $νήχω$.¹⁴

¹² For the retention of a similar inflectional category in a roughly comparable sort of transference, see Watkins (1978: 10–11) on Gk. $ἄλφι, ἄλφιτ-$ ‘barley (← the white stuff)’, which owes its stem $*-it-$ to a Proto-Indo-European word for some kind of grain, $*sép-it$ (> Hitt. $šēppit$, gen. $šēppittas$).

¹³ The most important discussion of $*-k^{(h)}i-$ vs. $*-t^{(h)}i-$ in Greek remains Peters (1980: 140–3 and 287–91); handy overviews may be found in e.g. Lejeune (1972: 103–11), Rix (1992: 90–3), and Sihler (1995: 189–94), and see also the further literature cited in Meier-Brügger (1992: ii. 113–14). For the justification for $*-ti-$ (specifically $*-t-i-$, with a morpheme boundary) in the word for ‘duck’, see Peters (1980: 141–3), though even he admits (see 142 n. 96) that the force of the best parallel for $νηττα/νήσσα$, namely $μέλιττα/μέλισσα$ ‘bee’ (< $*mēlit-ia$; the preference of some scholars—e.g. Sihler 1995: 193, with n. 1—for a more complicated pre-form involving the root ‘lick’ strikes me as unnecessary), is vitiated somewhat by the existence in synchronic Greek of a clear stem $μελιτ-$ ‘honey’; Rix (1991: 196–7) provides a clear and careful account of the issues, giving Peters a great deal of credit before coming down in favour of his own solution for the word for ‘duck’ that involves the sequence $*-k^{h}i-$.

¹⁴ On the ‘sens déterminé’ of the archaic presential formant $-χ(ω)$ in this and some other Greek verbs, see most notably Chantraine (1932: 77–85) (81–4 specifically on ‘l’opposition délicate’ (82) in Homer between $νέω$ “nager” sans qu’un but soit envisagé’ (81) and $νήχω$ ‘nager vers un but’ (82)); see also Chantraine (1958: 330–2) and García Ramón (2000b: 123). As for the form of the verb $νέ(ε)ω$, it is generally believed that it owes its $-ε-$ to influence from the semantically very similar verb $πλέ(ε)ω$ (García Ramón 2000b: 122–3 n. 12 notes

One may well ask why it is worth spilling ink over what would appear to be little more than a minor adjustment of Rix’s scenario, one that amounts largely to the positing of an old noun $*(s)néh_2-t-$. The answer is that a very similar pre-form provides, in my view, the etymology of the word for ‘duck’ in another archaic Indo-European language, and one to which Greek has obvious geographic and cultural proximity. Hittite is the language, $lah(h)anza(n)$ ^(MUSEN) the word—but neither Rix nor anyone else has ever suggested a connection with Gk. $νηττα$.

Hittite texts present us with a few dozen names for birds, and yet it is striking how little of the ornithological terminology of ancient Anatolia appears to have cognates elsewhere in the Indo-European world: Hitt. $hāraš$, gen. $hāranaš$ ‘eagle’ (< $*h_3er-on-$) is unique, or virtually so, in having a clear pedigree.¹⁵ Now, the word $lah(h)anza(n)$ does not on its surface much resemble $νηττα$ or $*(s)néh_2-t-$ (or, for that matter, $anas$ or $*h_2énh_2-t-$), and so I can hardly claim transparency for the derivation I am about to put forth. Nevertheless, as we shall see, a Graeco-Anatolian isogloss for the ‘swimming duck’ has its attractions.

Let us begin with the meaning of $lah(h)anza(n)$, which not everyone has agreed does designate a duck. In his *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*, Johann Tischler reports that various researchers have imagined it to be a stork, a seagull, and even a kind of fish; he himself remains neutral, defining it simply as ‘ein Vogel’, while noting that the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* considers it an ‘Entenart’.¹⁶ And indeed, the editors of this dictionary, Hans G. Güterbock and Harry A. Hoffner, assemble the textual evidence and make an excellent case that this creature does really belong to the family Anatidae:

the existence of an unpublished 1984 Madrid master’s thesis by G. Merinero Cortés entitled ‘Los grupos léxicos de $*snāy$ $*plew-$: contribución al estudio del vocabulario indoeuropeo’.

¹⁵ Zinko (1987) provides a handy account of Hittite bird names. On eagles in Hittite and other Anatolian languages, see now Katz (2001). As for other birds, Fortson (1996) (and briefly already ap. Watkins 1995: 286 n. 16) proposes that the hapax $huwalaš$ (KUB 43. 60 Ro. i. 14) is cognate with *owl* (rejected as ‘gratuitous’ by Puhvel 2001: 141), and Greppin (1975) makes the somewhat less straightforward suggestion that the hapax $tarlān$ ^(MUSEN) (KUB 8. 62 Ro. i. 6) means ‘stork’ (like Arm. *tareln* (see Greppin 1978: 17 and 21–2), which he sees as an Anatolian borrowing), in which case (though he does not actually say so) it could perhaps have the same basic root as Eng. *stork* (compare Zinko 1987: 10–11, who mentions the quasi-equation but prefers a different interpretation of *tarlā-*). Finally, it is widely believed that Hitt. $hanzana$ means ‘black’ and is cognate with such Indo-European words for ‘blackbird’ as Mod. Germ. *Amsel* (see e.g. Oettinger 1980: 45, with reference to B. Čop in n. 5, and most recently Ofitsch 1999; Puhvel 2001: 137 maintains his long-standing opposition to this idea).

¹⁶ See Tischler (1990: 12–13), but compare also Tischler (1982: 44: ‘ein Vogel, Art Ente’) and now (2001: 90: ‘ein Vogel; “Ente”?, “Storch”?, “Möwe”?’).

Certain factors aid in determining the identity of this bird: (1) it was a sea or seashore bird; (2) there was a period of time each year (winter?) when it was absent from Hatti and the look-alike (?) MUŠEN HURRI (shelduck, scientific name: *Tadorna tadorna*) was present; (3) the males had a head color (represented by gold overlay on models) different from the females, while the body coloration of both could be represented by silver overlay. . . . The *lah(h)anza(n)-*, like the MUŠEN HURRI, was a member of the duck family.¹⁷

We shall see that the translation of *lah(h)anza(n)-* simply as ‘duck’—an animal for which there does not otherwise seem to be any proper Hittite word¹⁸—is as linguistically felicitous as it is philologically appropriate.

There are already a number of derivations of our word in the scholarly literature, all from the past two decades. In 1986, Norbert Oettinger, stating that the bird in question is a gull, proposed a pre-form **leh₂-on-*, invoking as a comparison the etymologically obscure Greek word *λάρος* ‘sea-mew’ (supposedly from **la₂-ro-*).¹⁹ Although from a phonological point of view a nominative **leh₂-on-s* would indeed yield something written *lah(h)anz(a)* (with a purely graphic final vowel; but see below on the various endings of the word), Oettinger’s idea is unlikely to be correct: for one thing, as others

¹⁷ Thus Güterbock and Hoffner (1980: 7), who give a full accounting of the passages in which the word is attested on pp. 6–7 (and see now also Puhvel 2001: 8–9 and Kassian, Korolëv, and Sidel’tsev 2002: 530–4, 828–9, and *passim*, as well as Aykut 1992: 94–5). Their first point is implied by an eschatological text, *KUB* 43. 60 (Ro. i. 12–13 ‘If it is from the sea, let the *lahanza* bring it . . .’), edited by Watkins (1995: 284–90) (see also Fortson 1996: 71–2 and Katz 2001); the second and third are clear from the royal funerary ritual of the *šalliš waštaiš*, recently re-edited by Kassian, Korolëv, and Sidel’tsev (2002), in which ducks—both live ones (when available; if not, then shelducks) and decoys made out of metal-plated wood, wool, and dough—play a conspicuous role in the ceremonies on the 13th day (and also, it now seems, on the second: see van den Hout 1995: 205 and 211 and Kassian, Korolëv, and Sidel’tsev 2002: 121–2). Aside from *KUB* 43. 60, whose subject is the mortal soul, the lone attestation of the word outside the funeral rites is in *KBo*. 1. 34 Ro. 8, a fragmentary vocabulary list: the apparent association of ducks with death may well not be coincidental (compare Watkins 1995: 288 and see also Katz 2001: 210 n. 16). As for the relationship between *lah(h)anza(n)-* and MUŠEN HURRI, which is indeed usually said to mean ‘shelduck’ (for the wider Near Eastern background, see notably Landsberger 1966: 262–8 and Salonen 1973: 143–6 and 298; specifically for Hittite, see e.g. Beckman 1983: 90–1, 101 (‘probably the *Tadorna casarca*, a member of the duck family known in English as the “sheldrake”’), and 314), Taracha (2000: 147) notes that one can ‘jedoch entgegen CHD . . . wohl nicht schließen, daß *lah(h)anza(na)* . . . dem HURRI-Vogel äußerlich ähnlich ist’.

¹⁸ Many scholars translate MUŠEN.GAL (lit. ‘big bird’) as ‘duck’: see e.g. Hoffner (1967: 23 and 36) and Beckman (1983: 90–1 and 314); Tischler (2001: 246) gives it as “Gans”?, “Ente”?.

¹⁹ See Oettinger (1986: 29 n. 42). Taracha (2000: 146–7) accepts Oettinger’s suggestion on the not especially well-supported assumption that *lah(h)anza(n)-* has the same referent as the bird described in *KUB* 58. 104 Ro. ii 24, which he imagines as some sort of ‘Seeschwalbe’ (see 147, with n. 71): 1 *hapaš* MUŠEN KÜ.BABBAR ‘1 silberner “Vogel des Flusses”’ in his transcription and translation (80–1).

have noticed, a better Hittite comparandum for *λάρος* than *lah(h)anza(n)-* may be *lari(ya)-* ‘gull (?)’, a word attested in *KBo*. 10. 24. iii. 11’ as the nominative plural *lariēš* (the duplicate *KBo*. 30. 5 Vo. iii. 1’ has *la-a-r[i]*, with *plene*-writing of the first syllable) and specified on the next line as *arunaš* ‘of the sea’.²⁰ The following year, in 1987, Christian Zinko, too, plumped for a reconstruction **leh₂-on-*, thinking of *lah(h)anza(n)-* as some sort of bog-bird and, unlike Oettinger, actually assigning a meaning to the root **leh₂(u)-*, namely ‘pour’ (cf. Hitt. *lāh(h)u(wai)-* < PIE **lēh₂-u-*).²¹ Most recently, Jaan Puhvel has suggested, with just a touch of diffidence, that our word may mean ‘loon’ and be cognate with the name of this bird in Old Norse, *lómr* (Eng. *loon* (dialectal still *loom*) is a Scandinavian borrowing): he reconstructs *lómr* as **laA₁mos* (i.e. **la²¹h₂mos*) and *lah(h)anza(n)-* as **laA₁m-s*; as for the root, it is in his view perhaps that of Skt. *√rā-* ‘bark’ and Lat. *lātrāre* ‘id.’, that is to say, another root of the form conventionally written **leh₂-*.²² Against this derivation it may be pointed out that Puhvel does not even try to justify the very peculiar-looking (extended) root **lah₂(-)m-* and, furthermore, that there is no clear basis for his assumption that PIE **-m̥s#* yields Hitt. *-anz(a)* rather than, say, *-uš*;²³ in addition, Puhvel invokes as a morpho-phonological parallel for the inflectional type the word *šumanza(n)-*, but as noted below, Melchert has now shown that the extraordinarily heavy weight that this one form has borne in explanations of the various nouns in *-anza(n)-* is wholly unwarranted.

One other etymology of *lah(h)anza(n)-* has made it into print in the past decade, that of H. Craig Melchert in a 1994 paper on reflexes of the

²⁰ See Neumann (1986: 380) and Watkins (1995: 141 n. 16), the latter of whom suggests that *lari(ya)-* refers to the ‘abundant blackheaded gull, *Larus ridibundus*, whose present winter range covers almost all of central Anatolia as well as its littoral’. I note that even closer to *lari(ya)-* is the Greek *i*-stem *λάρις**, a variant of *λάρος* employed in the 3rd cent. BC by the epigrammatist Leonidas of Tarentum: *AP* 7. 652. 5 and 654 (5–6 ἀλιζώοις λαρίδεσσιν ἢ κέκλαυμαι is reminiscent of *lariēš* | *arunaš túhhandat*). It is often said that Arm. *lor* ‘quail’ (in the first place an *i*-stem) is somehow the same word as *λάρος* (both borrowed from a non-Indo-European source?): for assessments of the chances (not great) that this is so, see e.g. Solta (1960: 421–2) and Greppin (1978: 81–2).

²¹ For the root, see now M. Kümmel in Rix (2001: 401), who registers it as ?2.**leh₂-*, with a question mark. Zinko (1987: 9–10) points to Oettinger’s own analysis of Lat. *lāma* ‘marsh, bog’ (see Oettinger 1979: 424, with reference to R. Schmitt-Brandt), as well as to words in Baltic and Slavic, in arguing that the ‘Benennung erfolgte nach dem Lebensraum des Vogels, dem Wasser (Sumpf, Tümpel), vielleicht auch nach seinem Nest bzw. Brutstätte (Höhle, Grube)’ (10); Tischler (1990: 13) registers his tentative approval.

²² See Puhvel (2001: 8–9, as well as 12, where the root—listed as 1.**leh₂-* by M. Kümmel in Rix 2001: 400–1—is labelled ‘onomatopoeic’) and also (2002: 282–3). I note that while it is likely that ON *lómr* goes back to **leh₂-* ‘bark’, this etymology is not in fact assured (see de Vries 1961: 365–6).

²³ On the development of **-m̥s#*, see notably Melchert (1994a: 182), with references.

feminine gender in Anatolian. Concentrating on the phenomenon known as ‘i-Motion’, Melchert argues that this develops out of the Proto-Indo-European feminine suffix **-ih₂-* and tries to explain in some detail its inflectional patterns throughout Anatolian.²⁴ What is interesting for our purposes is his observation that the lack of clear examples of a feminine counterpart to participial **-e/ont-* in Hittite (unlike in Luwian, Lycian, and Lydian) ‘could be due to phonological loss’—specifically, masculine **-e/ont-* and feminine **-nt-ih₂-* might well have fallen together as *-anz(a)-*—and the suggestion that there may in fact be a few relics of **-nt-ih₂-*, first among them the word in which we are interested, which he defines as ‘a migratory bird, probably a duck’ and derives from **leh₂-nt-ih₂-* ‘the traveling one’.²⁵

In the earliest versions of the present paper and in Katz (2001: 210 n. 16), where I first put forth my own etymology of *lah(h)anza(n)-*, I followed Melchert’s suggestion closely, agreeing with the morphology (a feminine participle) but proposing a root other than (yet another) **leh₂-*. However, in his 2003 paper, which he kindly made available to and discussed with me prior to publication, Melchert reconsiders the whole question of the origin of the small and chaotically inflected set of nouns in *-anza(n)-*. By far the most discussed of the seven known words in this class is *šumanza(n)-*, allegedly ‘cord, binding’ and cognate with Gk. *ὑμήν* ‘membrane’—but Melchert shows that the previously established alternative meaning ‘(bul)rush’ is valid for all occurrences of *šumanza(n)-* (as first suggested to him by Harry Hoffner) and that the Hittite has nothing to do with *ὑμήν*. Among the ‘serious consequences’ of this is, in Melchert’s words, that ‘there is no basis for taking animate *n*-stems with secondary nom. sg. in **-Vn+s* as a source of the *-anzan*-type nor for any of the complex scenarios by which these stems allegedly were altered to the attested inflection’.²⁶ Now, the assumption that *šumanza(n)-* goes back to something like **suh₁-mēn + s* has played a large role in the etymologies of *lah(h)anza(n)-* hitherto proposed (including Puhvel’s (see above) and Melchert’s own (see n. 25)), which either do not engage with the question of why there are *n*-stem

²⁴ See Melchert (1994b), whose observations follow the lead of Oettinger (1987).

²⁵ See Melchert (1994b: 233: ‘perhaps nom. sg. **-ntih₂* > **-antī* > **-anti* > *-anz(a)*’, with n. 4: ‘I suggest that [*lah(h)anza(n)-*] may be a transferred epithet “the traveling one”, specifically a feminine participle (virtual) **leh₂ntih₂-* (this would not exclude the comparison with Grk. *λάρος* ‘gull’ made by Oettinger . . .). The original nom. sg. **leh₂ntih₂*, acc. sg. *leh₂ntīm* (Stang’s Law), weak **leh₂nt-* . . . would have led to a very irregular paradigm *lahhanz(a)*, **lahhanzin*, **lahhant-*. I would assume that this was reshaped after the type of *šumanz(a)*, *šumanzan-* “cord”.’

²⁶ Thus Melchert (2003: 131). The account of *-anza(n)-* that everyone had used as a helpful foil is Oettinger (1980) (55 on *lah(h)anza(n)-*).

forms in the paradigm or somehow regard the inflection of *šumanza(n)-* as secondarily responsible for them. As Melchert demonstrates, however, once one examines *šumanza(n)-* and the rest of the forms in *-anza(n)-* with unprejudiced eyes, it becomes nearly certain that the original nominative singular is [-antsa], not [-ants] (as otherwise almost universally believed), and that it is to this asigmatic (!) base that a suffix **-(H)on-* is added.

What this all means is that any account of *lah(h)anza(n)-* must take seriously the origin of the *n*-stem inflection. Melchert’s and my first attempts to see an old feminine participle in this word fail in the morphological details because it is difficult to imagine *any* reasonably archaic suffix(es) that would have been a natural addition to a participle in **-nt-ih₂-*, much less have yielded Hittite forms in [-a(n)]. Instead, I now tentatively accept Melchert’s current account of the ‘most likely derivation’ of the words in *-anza(n)-*: an ‘original pattern of verbal adjective (**lahhant-* “traveling, migrating”) → action noun (**lahhant-i-* “traveling, migration”) → new thematic adjective (**lahhanty-o-* “traveling, migrating”) → “individualizing” noun (**lahhantyo-on-* “the migrating one” > “shelduck”).²⁷

The question that remains is, ‘What is this verbal adjective “**lahhant-*” (*vel sim.*) that Melchert, in both his original paper and (2003), translates as “traveling”? Is there really a root **leh₂-* ‘travel’? Certainly there is no other evidence for such a primary verb, which means, incidentally, that a participial form of a verb known anyway only from Anatolian would be doubly isolated. Instead, Melchert has in mind a comparandum in Hittite itself, a noun, whose semantics, however, has heavy martial overtones that would not seem to be especially compatible with the behaviour of ducks, migrating birds though they may be: *lāhha-*, generally said to mean in the first place ‘military campaign’.²⁸ The other Hittite words based on this—the denominative verb *lah(h)iyai-*, for example—likewise seem to have to

²⁷ Thus Melchert (2003: 136), who on pp. 136–7, with n. 11, also provides two alternative series of derivations, including one with the ‘Hoffmann-suffix’, which ‘would allow direct derivation of the possessive adjective from the action noun: **lahhant-* “traveling, migrating” → **lahhant-i-* “traveling, migration” → **lahhanti-h₂on-* “traveling, migrating” (then secondarily substantivized perhaps via a transferred epithet)’ (137). I note that since MUŠEN HURRI appears to mean ‘shelduck’ (see above, with n. 17), Melchert’s translation ‘shelduck’ for *lah(h)anza(n)-* is over-specific and incorrect.

²⁸ Definitions include the following: ‘1. military c[a]mpaign, 2. journey, trip, voyage’ (Güterbock and Hoffner 1980: 4; full textual discussion on pp. 4–6), ‘Feldzug; Reise’ (Tischler 1990: 8), and ‘war(path), field-expedition, (military) campaign’ (Puhvel 2001: 1; full textual discussion on pp. 1–6). Puhvel (2001: 5) tries to explain the nuances as follows: ‘*lahh(a)-* occupies a semantic interspace between KARAŠ “army” and KASKAL “road, trek” and means “military on the move”, hence “warpath, warfare”, especially far-flung expeditionary campaigning rather than generalized hostilities.’

do principally with war,²⁹ and all putative relatives elsewhere in Anatolian, too, have more to do with power than with simple travel.³⁰ In sum, one does not need to state the case as forcefully as Puhvel now does to see that the idea of the *lah(h)anza(n)* - as a 'travelling duck' is at least not obvious.³¹

In theory, it would be possible to imagine that *lāhha-* gained its typical martial sense rather late and that the meaning '(any old) trip', though synchronically marginal, is actually archaic. In order to evaluate this, we would need to find a cognate outside Anatolian and examine its meaning. As it happens, despite numerous attempts to etymologize the word, no consensus has been reached. Nevertheless, most scholars fall into one of two camps: those who are not convinced by any of the extra-Anatolian congeners that have been proposed and those who think that there is one in Greek, namely *lā(F)ós*. Now, if there are no cognate forms, then there is, of course, no reason to doubt the usual view of the semantics of *lāhha-*; but, in fact, the very same thing holds if *lāós* is related, for on most accounts, the basic meaning of the Greek word wholly supports the idea that *lāhha-* is at heart a military term.³²

²⁹ Güterbock and Hoffner (1980: 7) gloss the verb as 'to attack, make war on, operate against' when it is transitive and 'to travel, go on an expedition, wander, roam, march, operate, go to war' when it is intransitive (full textual discussion on pp. 7–9); compare Tischler (1990: 11: 'ins Feld ziehen, marschieren; reisen') and Puhvel (2001: 2: 'go to war, wage war, (go on) campaign; make war on, attack, take on, confront; brave (natural obstacles, notably mountains)'). Note especially *lāhhuš lahhišk-*, a *figura etymologica* meaning 'conduct campaigns'. The other relevant Hittite words are *lahhiyatar* (Güterbock and Hoffner 1980: 10: 'military expedition, campaign, military obligation'), (^{LU})*lahhiyala-* (Puhvel 2001: 5 translates this as 'warlord', but Güterbock and Hoffner 1980: 9–10 argue for the largely non-military 'traveler (?)'; see the clear discussion of postulated *'Kriegsheld, Feldherr' vs. attested 'Reisender' in Tischler 1990: 8–9, with particular reference to G. Neumann), and *lahhema-* (Puhvel 2001: 5, following R. H. Beal, has 'military field action, raid, maneuver', but Güterbock and Hoffner 1980: 10 suggest 'errand (?)'). It is unclear whether such reduplicated forms as *lahlahhiya-* 'be agitated' and *lahlah(h)ima-* 'agitation' belong in this group as well: Oettinger (2001: 461) thinks they do, Puhvel (2001: 12) thinks they do not, and Tischler (1990: 13–14) is basically neutral (but slightly negative).

³⁰ For a full account of forms and bibliography, see Tischler (1990: 8–9).

³¹ See such statements in Puhvel (2001: 1–6) as 'The *CHD*, glossing *lahh(a)* - by "journey, trip, voyage" and *lahhiyai-* by "travel", ignored the always inherent or implicit military sense' (2).

³² The connection between *lāhha-* and *lāós* goes back to Sturtevant (1931: 120) and has received substantial support over the decades, notably from Heubeck (1969: 543–4, with n. 30). For a bibliographical overview of the many ideas that have been put forward, see Tischler (1990: 9–11), who himself believes that *lāhha-* is '[e]tymologisch nicht befriedigend gedeutet' and states that the Graeco-Hittite comparison is 'sowohl semantisch als auch morphologisch unbefriedigend[]' (9). Puhvel (2001: 5–6) gives consideration to two of the etymologies of *lāhha-*: the link with *lāós* (which 'continues to claim primacy' (5)) and the implausible idea of Roberto Gusmani (see most notably Gusmani 1968: 14–17), for which Puhvel himself then proposes a variation, that the dative-locative singular *lāhhi* is effectively

The literature on the two basic words for 'people' in Greek, *lā(F)ós* (Att. *λεώς*) and *δῆμος*, is unusually large because it is by no means just linguists, curious about their derivations and semantic relationship, who are interested in them: Hellenists of all sorts work to understand Greek societal structures, and the status of *ra-wo-* (only in compounds, notably *ra-wa-ke-ta* (~*lāγέτας* 'hero (*vel sim.*)')) and *da-mo-* in the Mycenaean age (especially at Pylos) and of *lāós*, *lāoí* and *δῆμος* in Homer is no small issue.³³ One common view holds that originally, the *da-mo-/δῆμος* was the normal populace ('Volk'), while the *ra-wo-/lāós* was the troops ('Kriegsvolk'). The starkest and most cited exposition of this opinion is that of Alfred Heubeck, who writes, 'Wir vermuten also . . . , dass es im Bereich des mykenischen Wanaks von Pylos zwei Bevölkerungsklassen gegeben hat: 1. den *lāwos*, dem alle militärischen Aufgaben obliegen und der die höchsten Beamten des Staates stellt . . . , und 2. den *dāmos*, der mit Ackerbau und Viehzucht, aber auch mit dem Handwerk und dem (niedrigen?) Kultdienst befasst ist.'³⁴ To be sure, the idea that the word *ra-wo-/lāós* denotes a warrior class in our earliest documents has come under attack, notably by James T. Hooker for Pylos and Michel Casevitz for Homer,³⁵ and it is certain that Heubeck has somewhat overstated the case. Nevertheless, it is also certain that *da-mo-/δῆμος* has no special military connotation whereas Homeric *lāós* (though perhaps not *ra-wo-*) often does. In view of this, I, for one, find the connection between *lāós* and *lāhha-* semantically very satisfactory.

From a morphological point of view, the equation is admittedly not exact: *lāhha-* would seem to reflect **lōh₂-o-*, whereas *lā(F)ós* must go back

the same as the isolated Homeric form *δαί* 'in battle' (note that J. Schindler ap. Oettinger 1979: 447 connects *δαί* to the Hittite verb *zāh(h)* - 'strike, fight'; see also e.g. Melchert 1994a: 96). The latest word on *lāós* is Bietenhard (2002), who argues unconvincingly that it is a Semitic borrowing.

³³ Morpurgo Davies (1979) provides an elegant account of the titles borne by members of Mycenaean society and 'used to indicate different human groups' (87; see 93, 96–8, and 107 on *ra-wa-ke-ta*). For attestations and full surveys of the secondary literature, see Aura Jorro (1985–93: i. 152–5) (on *da-mo* and derivatives) and (1985–93: ii. 228–34) (on *ra-wa-ke-ta* and (at least potentially) related forms; a notable bibliographical omission is Trümper 1986: 26–9 and 159–62, on the correspondence between *ra-wa-ke-ta* and alphabetic *lāγέτας*), as well as Schmidt (1982) (on *δῆμος*) and (1991) (on *lāós*).

³⁴ See Heubeck (1969) (quotation on p. 539). Among the dozens of other important contributions, I single out Benveniste (1969: ii. 89–95); Milani (1991) provides a recent overview. I have been unable to obtain a copy of A. Dihle's 1946 Göttingen dissertation, '*Λαός, ἔθνος, δῆμος*: Beiträge zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Volksbegriffs im frühgriechischen Denken'.

³⁵ See Hooker (1987: 261–4) (a no-nonsense account of *ra-wa-ke-ta* and the force that Dumézilian trifunctionality has exerted on scholars' understanding of its sense) and Casevitz (1992) ('la fonction guerrière n'est au vrai qu'un des aspects partiels de *λαός*' (198, with reference to an earlier paper)).

to **leh₂u-*. Provided that the two words are indeed related, as I am inclined to believe, we probably have to do with an extended root **leh₂-(u-)*,³⁶ whose meaning would seem to be something like ‘plunder’³⁷—if, as Heubeck has argued, *λαῖος* is etymologically linked to the Greek word for ‘booty’, Att. *λεία*/Ion. *ληΐη* (and its cretic-avoiding (?) epic by-form *ληϊς*, gen. *ληϊδος*).³⁸ The noun *λαῖος* is, then, the substantivization of an adjective **leh₂-u-ó-* ‘having plunder’, while *λεία* (< PGk. **lāuīa* < PIE **leh₂-u-īo-*) is either a genitival derivative of the word for ‘troops’ (‘that of the troops’) or, perhaps, a gerundive (‘that which is to be plundered’). Note, too, that the denominative verb *ληΐζομαι* ‘seize as booty’ has a cognate in Anatolian if indeed CLuv. (z) *lawarr(iya)* ‘strip, despoil’ comes from a virtual pre-form **leh₂-uōr-īé/ó-* rather than being connected to Hitt. *duwarni/a-* ‘break’.³⁹

Let us return now to *lah(h)anza(n)-*. We have seen that Melchert’s derivation of this word from, in Proto-Indo-European terms, something like **léh₂-ont-* with the meaning ‘travelling (as an army?)’ is morphologically very attractive but semantically less so. Is it possible to do better? I suggest that it is, specifically by starting out with a participle **(s)néh₂-ont-* ‘swimming’. This is semantically thoroughly unproblematic, of course, and has in

³⁶ Alternatively, we might posit an underlying *u*-stem, **leh₂-u-*. Because all the Greek and Anatolian forms discussed in this paragraph except *lāhha-* presuppose a **-u-*, it does not seem likely that *λαῖος* contains the (unanalysable?) Proto-Indo-European suffix **-u-* (on which see most recently García Ramón 2000a).

³⁷ García Ramón (2000a: 66 n. 9) suggests instead that the root is actually the one (mentioned above) that means ‘pour’: ‘vorstellbar, wenn man bereit ist, anzunehmen, daß das Heer sich über das Schlachtfeld ergießt, d.h. “sich ausbreitet” (vgl. hom. [προ]χέοντο oft in der Ilias, z.B. B 465 ἐς πεδίον προχέοντο Σκαμάνδριον)’.

³⁸ For the basic idea, see Heubeck (1969: 542). Heubeck prefers to connect *λεία* to *λαῖος* rather than to (ἀπο-)λαύω ‘have the benefit of’ (on which see most recently Blanc 2000), as has been more widely supposed; however, Michael Weiss, to whom I owe special thanks for his advice on the material in this paragraph, suggests that all three words belong together (compare already Prellwitz 1892: 175). The troublesome forms *λάων* and *λάε* in Hom. *Od.* 19. 229–30 should probably be left aside since the sense ‘seize as prey’ (Aristarchus glosses *λάων* as ἀπολαυστικῶς ἔχων, ἐσθίων (Hesych. λ 472)) may not be right—Leumann (1950: 233–6) and Nussbaum (1987: 230–2) argue for ‘scream’, Prier (1980) and J. Russo in Russo, Fernández-Galiano, and Heubeck (1992: 89) for ‘gaze’—and a derivation from **l(e)h₂-(u-)* would in my view be anything but straightforward even if it were.

³⁹ For the traditional connection of (z) *lawarr(iya)* with *duwarni/a-*, see in the first place Carruba (1966: 17–18), as well as e.g. Oettinger (1979: 151) and Melchert (1994a: 238, 270, and 274). I first learnt the idea about *ληΐζομαι* from Michael Weiss in 1995; he has some doubts, however, that it is really right, noting that the consistent *-rr-* in Luwian (?—but see Starke 1982: 362 on (ar-ha) *la-wa-(ri-)it-ta* in KBo. 18. 147 Vo. 5’, as well as Tischler 1990: 47–8) is hard to explain. García Ramón (2000a: 66–7 n. 9) discusses the semantic nexus *λαῖος* ~ *lāhha-* ~ (z) *lawarr(iya)* as well, citing a personal communication from Melchert (who in turn tells me that he owes to Weiss and Ed Brown his understanding that the definition of (z) *lawarr(iya)* is ‘strip, despoil’ rather than ‘break’ or ‘destroy’, as it is often glossed, e.g. in Melchert 1993a: 126 and 1994a: 238 and *passim*).

addition the not insignificant advantage of establishing a root-connection with Gk. *νηττα* and thereby offering a single explanation for a pair of problematic words for one and the same creature in two neighbouring languages. The problem with my solution is obvious: why should **(s)neh₂-* yield a Hittite form with an initial *l-*?

As is well known, there are two generally accepted examples of Hittite words that begin with an *l-* even though they continue PIE **#(C)n-* (where *C*=a consonant regularly lost in this context in Anatolian).⁴⁰ The first is *lāman*, *lamn-* ‘name’, which acts in the wider linguistic literature as a *Paradebeispiel* of regressive dissimilation.⁴¹ If someone knows just one word of Hittite, it is likely to be *lāman*, which in spite of its *l-* is obviously related to the words for ‘name’ in every other branch of Indo-European: Lat. *nōmen*, Toch. A *ñom*, B *ñem*, etc. The details of the Proto-Indo-European paradigm are much disputed, but it is probably proterokinetic, with the alternating stems **h₁néh₃-mŋ-* and **h₁nĥ₃-mén-*.⁴² Since there is simply no trace of initial **h₁-* in Anatolian, we are in effect dealing with the dissimilation of an initial **n-* before another nasal (or two).⁴³ The second example is Hitt. *lammar*, *lamn-*, a noun that indicates a small unit of time (standard translations include ‘moment, instant’ and ‘hour’) and can also be used adverbially to mean ‘instantly, immediately’: this word is usually taken to reflect an *r/n*-stem **nóm-ŋ*, **ném-n-* to the root **nem-* ‘allot’⁴⁴ and compared with Lat. *numerus* ‘number’ and the Old Latin adverb *numerō* ‘immediately’.⁴⁵ Notice that the dissimilation is datable to pre-Hittite times, quite possibly to Common Anatolian: the Hieroglyphic Luwian cognate of Hitt. *lammar* (dat.-loc. *lamnī*) is attested in the dative-locative as *la-mi-ni-* (KARAHÖYÜK 2) ‘at the moment’.⁴⁶ It is possible that Oettinger is right to see yet another example of the same phonetic process in the background

⁴⁰ Rosenkranz (1988) offers an idiosyncratic and wholly unbelievable alternative account of the forms in question.

⁴¹ See e.g. Anttila (1989: 74).

⁴² See e.g. Melchert (1994a: 67 and 82–3, with literature); see also the discussion and many references in Tischler (1990: 27–9).

⁴³ I cannot accept the ‘conjecture (and no more)’ of Hamp (1988) that PIE **#h₁n-* regularly yields Hitt. *#l-*; thus also Melchert (1994a: 169: ‘not credible’).

⁴⁴ The root **nem-* may perhaps survive in Hittite as a verb *lam-*, sometimes spotted in KUB 41. 23 and said to mean something like ‘become mixed’: see Oettinger (1979: 525–6), as well as e.g. Tischler (1990: 26) and Puhvel (2001: 50–1).

⁴⁵ See in the first place Duchesne-Guillemin (1946: 85) and Neumann (1955: 171); see also Tischler (1990: 30) and Puhvel (2001: 58).

⁴⁶ See Nowicki (1981: 253–4). Melchert (1994a: 82) writes, ‘Given [this] example, I see no reason to take HLuv. *la-m(a)-ni-ya-* “call upon” as a borrowing from Hittite *lam(ma)niye-* “name, call”’. Notice that the words for ‘name, designation’ in Luwian (HLuv. *á-ta_{4.5}-ma-(n)za*), Lycian (*adāman-*), and Lydian (*ētamv*) all begin with a vowel, reflecting the old weak stem, just like OIr. *ainm*: a generalized **h₁nĥ₃-mŋ(-)* gives in the first instance

of the much-discussed prohibitive negative particle *lē*, but the details are uncertain.⁴⁷

Can we specify the conditions of this phonological change more precisely? Melchert, observing the parallelism between the words for ‘name’ and ‘moment’, suggests that the dissimilation takes place in Common Anatolian ‘in the presence of two following nasals’.⁴⁸ But even if this (or the further specification of the two nasals as **m* followed by **n*) did accurately describe the situation, it is unclear to me how it could be defended: if the change is sporadic (as distant dis- and assimilations very frequently are), then the most that one could say is that the more nasals there are in a given string, the more likely it is that one of them will be changed (the ‘tongue-twister principle’); and if the change should in fact turn out to be (quasi-)regular, then it is surely an unreasonable rule that generates *l . . . N_iN_j* from **n . . . N_iN_j*, while blocking this same dissimilation in **n . . . N*. Solely on theoretical grounds, then, the usual description of the phenomenon as CANat./Hitt. *(*)#l . . . N < PIE *(C)n . . . N* is perfectly satisfactory,⁴⁹ and note that Melchert elsewhere refers to it simply as dissimilation before a ‘proximate nasal’.⁵⁰

Given that there is thus a non-*ad hoc* way to derive an initial *l-* in Hittite from PIE **n*, I propose that the pre-form **lahhant-* that seems (with Melchert) to underlie the Hittite word for ‘duck’ goes back not to a semantically problematic (if phonologically uncontroversial) construct **lēh₂-ont-*

**ānman*, later **ādman*, and finally *ādaman* with anaptyxis (see Melchert 1994a: 83) and so evidently does not meet the conditions of the dissimilation.

⁴⁷ There are two schools of thought on *lē* (for a summary, see Tischler 1990: 50–2): some see it as going back to an imperative **lēh₁*, ‘let (off), leave!’ (the essence of this idea is to be found already in Pedersen 1938: 163), while more think it reflects a negative of the form **nē* (cf. e.g. Lat. *nē*), the old prohibitive negative **mē* (cf. e.g. Gk. *μή*), or some sort of cross between the two. Morpurgo Davies (1975: 157 n. 4), in her classic article on negation in Anatolian, very tentatively favours **nē* as the source, and Oettinger (1994: 310) now ingeniously suggests that the dissimilation arises from **nē* ‘in den häufigen Verbindungen *lē-man* (modal/irreal) und *lē-mu* “mich nicht, mir nicht”’ (see also 310 n. 10 and 330).

⁴⁸ Thus Melchert (1994a: 82).

⁴⁹ To be sure, some scholars (e.g. Duchesne-Guillemin 1946: 85, Oettinger 1994: 310–11, and Kimball 1999: 336–7) restrict the dissimilation to specifically **n . . . m*. But if the change is indeed (quasi-)regular, then it is hard to believe that a language would have dissimilation of **n . . . m* but not of **n . . . n*. In any case, it will become clear that my etymology of *lah(h)anza(n)-* presupposes the more general rule.

⁵⁰ Thus Melchert (1994a: 169). I note in passing that there is a great deal of evidence in Anatolian for sporadic phenomena that involve nasals and liquids, which are, after all, the sounds cross-linguistically most frequently involved in non-adjacent assimilation and dissimilation (the classic account of the latter remains Grammont 1895): for examples and discussion, see e.g. Kronasser (1966: 58–61), Melchert (1994a: 169, 171, and 317), Oettinger (1994: 310–13 and *passim*), and Kimball (1999: 336–7).

‘travelling’, but rather to the semantically straightforward **(s)nēh₂-ont-* ‘swimming’. The question that remains concerns the status of the initial **s-* in the root that I write as **(s)nēh₂-*, though scholars have traditionally not put the sibilant into parentheses. Why is our word not, say, **slah(h)anza(n)-*? There are at least two possible answers to this question. The first is that the root does indeed have an *s*-mobile and that Anatolian (which does not to my knowledge provide evidence for any verb that means ‘swim’) inherits the *s*-less variant. Until recently, this might not have been thought an especially satisfying solution, for it seemed that in every language in which the root is attested, the sibilant either appears (cf. Skt. *√snā-* and YAv. *snā-* ‘bathe, wash’, OIr. *snaid* ‘swims’, and perhaps Umbr. *snata* ‘wet (?)’) or would in any case have been lost by regular phonological change (cf. Gk. *νῆχω* ‘swim’, Lat. *nāre* ‘id.’, and MW *nawf* ‘swim(ming)’, as well as Arm. *nay* ‘wet’, if the last really does belong). However, it is now generally agreed that Toch. B *nāsk-* ‘bathe’ goes back to **ṇh₂-skē/ó-*, and since Tocharian retains the inherited sequence **#sn-*, we thus have proof that the root is indeed **(s)nēh₂-*, with optional **s-*.⁵¹ The problem is that Puhvel and Sara E. Kimball have argued persuasively that the Hittite verb *sanḥ-* ‘flush, rinse’ goes back to a generalized zero-grade **ṇh₂-*,⁵² so for *lah(h)anza(n)-* to reflect an *s*-less pre-form it is necessary to accept a very early split in Anatolian between **sn(e)h₂-* (as in *sanḥ-*) and **(s)nēh₂-* (surviving only as ‘duck’)—which, given the semantic distance between ducks and flushing, is of course possible. It is, however, the other scenario that I am weakly inclined to favour: Anatolian does inherit the full form **sneh₂-* from Proto-Indo-European, but the sibilant in the consonant cluster **#sn-* is then lost by regular phonological change before Hittite and perhaps even by Common Anatolian times, a supposition for which there are no counter-examples. Melchert observes as ‘noteworthy’ that Hittite has an ‘apparently systematic lack of /sn-/’,⁵³ and I know of no evidence for an initial sequence *sn-* in any other Anatolian language either.⁵⁴

In conclusion, I suggest that Hitt. *lah(h)anza(n)-* does indeed mean ‘duck’ and develops more or less directly, along the lines now proposed by

⁵¹ See e.g. Van Windekens (1976: 312, with reference to work going back to 1937–8!), Schrijver (1991: 169), Adams (1999: 334), García Ramón (2000b: 122–4), and Th. Zehnder in Rix (2001: 572); compare also Hackstein (1995: 173).

⁵² See Puhvel (1979: 299–300) and Kimball (1992 [1994]: 90–1 and *passim*), as well as Kimball (1999: 243–4).

⁵³ See Melchert (1994a: 111).
⁵⁴ Note, though, that no Proto-Indo-European root in **sn-* or **(s)n-*, with the exception of the one for ‘bathe, swim’, seems to make an appearance in Anatolian. Whatever the etymology of the obscure Lycian word *sñta* ‘ten (?)’ may be (see Eichner 1992: 89–91 and Melchert 1993b: 64, both with references), it surely does not go back to PIE **sn-*.

Melchert, from a fossilized participial form $^{*}(s)n\acute{e}h_2-ont-$ 'swimming'. This idea builds on and reinforces the essentials of Rix's derivation of the name of the same bird in Greece, $\nu\eta\tau\tau\alpha$. Despite appearances, the etymology does not have grave morpho-phonological difficulties and captures one of the creature's most salient properties: it swims.⁵⁵

REFERENCES

- Note. Where reprint information is given, references in the text are to the first printing.
- Adams, D. Q. 1999: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B* (Amsterdam: Rodopi).
- Anreiter, P., and Jerem, E. (eds.). 1999: *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica: Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag* (Budapest: Archaeolingua).
- Anttila, R. 1989: *Historical and Comparative Linguistics*, 2nd edn. (Amsterdam: Benjamins).
- Arbeitman, Y. L. (ed.). 1988: *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwartz: Studies in Anatolian, Italic, and Other Indo-European Languages* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters).
- Aura Jorro, F. 1985–93: *Diccionario micénico* (2 vols.; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas).
- Aykut, İ. 1992: 'Boğazköy metinlerinde geçen anlamları bilinen ve bilinmeyen kuş isimleri (KUB XXXVIII–LVIII ve IBoT IV)', *Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi* [pub. 1993]: 87–98.
- Beckman, G. M. 1983: *Hittite Birth Rituals*, 2nd edn. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Beekes, R. S. P. 1985: *The Origins of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck).
- 1987: 'The PIE Words for "Name" and "Me"', *Die Sprache*, 33: 1–12.
- ⁵⁵ Kassian, Korolëv, and Sidel'tsev (2002: 531 and 533), who are inclined to accept Melchert's analysis of the Hittite word as 'migratory (bird)', write that my etymology (as sketched in Katz 2001: 210, with n. 16) is 'not very plausible . . . for the following reasons: 1) why should just this kind of ducks [sic] be called according to their manner of swimming while the most distinctive feature of *lahhanzan*-ducks is the fact that they migrate (what [sic] serves as an argument in favour of the derivation from $^{*}lahhai-$ "to travel, etc."). 2) the correspondence IE $^{*}n-$ — Hitt. $l-$ is abnormal. Of course, we have Hitt. *laman* vs. IE $^{*}n\acute{o}m\eta$, $^{*}\eta\acute{m}en-$ and Hitt. *lammar* vs. Lat. *numerus*, but we explain it with the dissimilation $n-m > l-m$ (cf. AHP [=Melchert 1994a]: 82, 171); for *lah(h)ant-* this explanation is not possible' (533, footnote omitted). Their first objection cannot be taken seriously: people do in fact think of ducks as swimmers, and anyway, there is no need for the etymology to be based on the implication that the *lah(h)anza(n)-* is migratory. The second point is a bit trickier (though I note that the reference to Melchert is misleading since he does not restrict the dissimilation to $^{*}n . . . m$ rather than $^{*}n . . . N$): I grant that *lāman* and *lammar* both show dissimilation before an [m] at the onset of the next syllable whereas my etymology of *lah(h)anza(n)-* requires dissimilation before an [n] in the next syllable's coda, but see my comments above, with n. 49.

- Benveniste, É. 1969: *Le Vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* (2 vols.; Paris: Minuit).
- Bietenhard, H. 2002: 'Zur Etymologie des griechischen Wortes $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}s$ /Volk', *Museum Helveticum*, 59: 1–11.
- Blanc, A. 2000: ' $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu\acute{o}s$, $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{o}s$ et $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega$: sémantique et étymologie', *Glotta*, 76 [pub. 2002]: 162–7.
- Buck, C. D. 1949: *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages: A Contribution to the History of Ideas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Carruba, O. 1966: *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišurijanša* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- and Meid, W. (eds.). 2001: *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch—Anatolico e indoeuropeo: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Pavia, 22.–25. September 1998* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck).
- Giorgieri, M., and Mora, C. (eds.). 1995: *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia* (Pavia: Iuculano).
- Casevitz, M. 1992: 'Sur le concept de "peuple"', in Létoublon (1992), 193–9.
- Chantraine, P. 1932: 'Deux notes sur des formes verbales grecques', *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 33: 77–90.
- 1958: *Grammaire homérique*, vol. i, 3rd edn. (Paris: Klincksieck).
- 1999: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*, new edn. (Paris: Klincksieck).
- Colvin, S. 1999: *Dialect in Aristophanes and the Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Duchesne-Guillemin, J. 1946: 'Études hittites', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, [45] [pub. 1947]: 73–91.
- Dunkel, G. E., et al. (eds.). 1994: *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch: Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich* (Wiesbaden: Reichert).
- Eichner, H. 1992: 'Anatolian', in Gvozdanović (1992), 29–96.
- Forssman, B., and Plath, R. (eds.). 2000: *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik: Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen* (Wiesbaden: Reichert).
- Fortson IV, B. W. 1996: 'Hittite $\eta u w a \lambda a \acute{s}$ ', *Die Sprache*, 38 [pub. 1998]: 71–5.
- García Ramón, J. L. 2000a: 'Homerisch $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ "Fahrtwind", $\theta\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ "ungestüm", $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ "verderblich": Zur Funktion der -o-stufigen $^{*}\mu\acute{o}$ -Bildungen im Griechischen', in Hintze and Tichy (2000), 63–77.
- 2000b: 'Indoiranische Wurzelpräsentia und iterativer Verbalcharakter', in Forssman and Plath (2000), 119–39.
- Gvozdanović, J. (ed.). 1992: *Indo-European Numerals* (Berlin: de Gruyter).
- Grammont, M. 1895: *La Dissimilation consonantique dans les langues indo-européennes et dans les langues romanes* (Dijon: Darantière).

- Greppin, J. A. C. 1975: 'A Note on Hitt. *tarlā*', *Revue hittite et asianique*, 33 [pub. 1977]: 55–7.
- 1978: *Classical and Middle Armenian Bird Names: A Linguistic, Taxonomic, and Mythological Study* (Delmar, NY: Caravan).
- Griepentrog, W. 1995: *Die Wurzelnomina des Germanischen und ihre Vorgeschichte* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck).
- Gusmani, R. 1968: 'Confronti etimologici greco-ittiti', *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici*, 6: 14–28.
- Güterbock, H. G., and Hoffner, H. A. 1980: *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, vol. iii, fasc. 1 (Chicago: Oriental Institute).
- Hackstein, O. 1995: *Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsensstambildungen des Tocharischen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Hamp, E. P. 1988: 'On *H₂n- in Hittite', *Listy filologické*, 111: 144.
- 1989: 'On Some Celtic Bird Terms', *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 43: 196–8.
- 1990: 'OHG *sëzzal* and *satul*: Suffixes, Vokalentfaltung and Schwa in Germanic', *North-West European Language Evolution*, 15: 11–22.
- 1998–2000: 'Ravenna Anas', *Études celtiques*, 34 [pub. 2001]: 55.
- Heubeck, A. 1969: 'Gedanken zu griech. *λαός*', in *Studi linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani* (2 vols.; Brescia: Paideia), ii. 535–44; repr. in *Kleine Schriften zur griechischen Sprache und Literatur*, ed. by B. Forssman, S. Koster, and E. Pöhlmann (Erlangen: Universitätsbund Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1984), 453–62.
- Hintze, A., and Tichy, E. (eds.). 2000: *Anusantatyai: Festschrift für Johanna Narten zum 70. Geburtstag* (Dettelbach: Röhl).
- Hoffner, Jr., H. A. 1967: *An English-Hittite Glossary* (*Revue hittite et asianique*, 25/80; Paris: Klincksieck).
- Hooker, J. T. 1987: 'Titles and Functions in the Pylian State', in Killen *et al.* (1987), 257–67; repr. in *Scripta Minora: Selected Essays on Minoan, Mycenaean, Homeric and Classical Greek Subjects*, ed. by F. Amory, P. Considine, and S. Hooker (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1996), 263–73.
- van den Hout, T. 1995: 'An Image of the Dead? Some Remarks on the Second Day of the Hittite Royal Funerary Ritual', in Carruba *et al.* (1995), 195–211.
- Kassian, A., Korolëv, A., and Sidel'tsev, A. 2002: *Hittite Funerary Ritual šalliš waštaiš* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).
- Katz, J. T. 2000: Review of Colvin (1999), in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 00.04.05.
- 2001: 'Hittite *ta-pa-ka-li-ya-(aš)*', in Carruba and Meid (2001), 205–37.
- Killen, J. T., Melena, J. L., and Olivier, J.-P. (eds.). 1987: *Studies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek Presented to John Chadwick* (Minos, 20–2; Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca).
- Kimball, S. E. 1992 [1994]: 'The Phonological Pre-history of Some Hittite *mi*-Conjugation Verbs', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 53: 75–97.
- 1999: *Hittite Historical Phonology* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck).

- Kronasser, H. 1966: *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*, vol. i (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Landsberger, B. 1966: 'Einige unerkannt gebliebene oder verkannte Nomina des Akkadischen: 6. *kurkû* = "Gans"', *Die Welt des Orients*, 3: 246–68.
- Lejeune, M. 1972: *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*, new edn. (Paris: Klincksieck).
- Létoublon, F. (ed.). 1992: *La Langue et les textes en grec ancien: actes du Colloque Pierre Chantraine (Grenoble—5–8 septembre 1989)* (Amsterdam: Gieben).
- Leumann, M. 1950: *Homerische Wörter* (Basel: Reinhardt).
- Leušina, L. T. 1999: 'Νηρεΐς "Nerej" i νῆσος "ostrov" (voprosy slovoobrazovanija)', in Zajtsev *et al.* (1999), 80–6.
- Lindeman, F. O. 1983: 'Welsh *hwyad*', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 30: 303–5.
- 1990: 'Indo-European "Laryngeals" and Fallacious Reasoning: An Illustrative Example', *Historische Sprachforschung*, 103: 17–19.
- 1994: 'Phonology and "Laryngeals": Some Critical Observations on "Lex Rix"', *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 99: 42–9.
- 1997: *Introduction to the 'Laryngeal Theory'* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck).
- Lockwood, W. B. 1981: 'Wortkundliche Parerga', *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 38: 179–86.
- Mallory, J. P., and Adams, D. Q. (eds.). 1997: *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn).
- Maltby, R. 1991: *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds: Cairns).
- Meier-Brügger, M. (ed.). 1991: *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, vol. ii, fasc. 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- 1992: *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft* (2 vols.; Berlin: de Gruyter).
- 1993: 'Zu griechisch νῆσος', *Historische Sprachforschung*, 106: 302.
- Meißner, T. 1998: 'Rising Problems in Greek', *Oxford University Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology & Phonetics*, 3: 37–43.
- Melchert, H. C. 1993a: *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon* (Chapel Hill, NC: self-published).
- 1993b: *Lycian Lexicon*, 2nd edn. (Chapel Hill, NC: self-published).
- 1994a: *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (Amsterdam: Rodopi).
- 1994b: 'The Feminine Gender in Anatolian', in Dunkel *et al.* (1994), 231–44.
- 2003: 'Hittite Nominal Stems in *-anzan-*', in Tichy *et al.* (2003), 129–39.
- Milani, C. 1991: 'Miceneo *ra-wo-*, omerico *λαός*', in *Studia Linguistica Amico et Magistro Oblata: Scritti di amici e allievi dedicati alla memoria di Enzo Evangelisti* (Milan: Unicopli), 233–47.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. 1975: 'Negation and Disjunction in Anatolian—and Elsewhere', *Anatolian Studies*, 25: 157–68.
- 1979: 'Terminology of Power and Terminology of Work in Greek and Linear B', in Risch and Mühlestein (1979), 87–108.

- Neumann, G. 1955: Review of H. Krahe (ed.), *Corolla Linguistica* (1955), in *Göttin- gische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 209: 169–81.
- 1986: Review of I. Singer, *The Hittite KILAM Festival* (1983–4), in *Indoger- manische Forschungen*, 91: 377–80.
- Nowicki, H. 1981: 'Bemerkungen zur hier.-luw. Inschrift von Karahöyük-Elbistan', *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 95: 251–73.
- Nussbaum, A. J. 1987: 'Homeric *ἐπελήκειον* (θ 379) and Related Forms', in Watkins (1987), 229–53.
- Oettinger, N. 1979: *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* (Nürnberg: Carl).
- 1980: 'Die *n*-Stämme des Hethitischen und ihre indogermanischen Aus- gangspunkte', *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 94: 44–63.
- 1986: *'Indo-Hittite'-Hypothese und Wortbildung* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck).
- 1987: 'Bemerkungen zur anatolischen *i*-Motion und Genusfrage', *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 100: 35–43.
- 1994: 'Etymologisch unerwarteter Nasal im Hethitischen', in Rasmussen (1994), 307–30.
- 2001: 'Hethitisch *-ima-* oder: Wie ein Suffix affektiv werden kann', in Wilhelm (2001), 456–77.
- Ofitsch, M. 1999: 'Heth. *ḫanzana-* und nhd. *Amsel*', in Anreiter and Jerem (1999), 269–76.
- Pedersen, H. 1938: *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen* (Copen- hagen: Levin & Munksgaard).
- Peters, M. 1980: *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften).
- Prellwitz, W. 1892: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache mit beson- derer Berücksichtigung des Neuhochdeutschen und einem deutschen Wörterver- zeichnis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Prier, R. A. 1980: 'That Gaze of the Hound: *Odyssey* 19. 228–231', *Rheinisches Museum*, 123: 178–80.
- Puhvel, J. 1979: 'Some Hittite Etymologies', in *Florilegium Anatolicum: mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche* (Paris: de Boccard), 297–304; repr. in *Analecta In- doeuropaea: Delectus Operum Minorum Plerumque Anglice Aliquando Francogal- lice Editorum Annos 1952–1977 Complectens* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwis- senschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1981), 365–72 [additional notes on p. 417].
- 2001: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, vol. v (Berlin: de Gruyter).
- 2002: 'Of Loons and Legumes', in *Epilecta Indoeuropaea: Opuscula Selecta Annis 1978–2001 Excusa Imprimis ad Res Anatolicas Attinentia* (Innsbruck: Insti- tut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck), 282–5; also in G. Beckman, R. Beal, and G. McMahon (eds.), *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 325–8.
- Rasmussen, J. E. (ed.). 1994: *In Honorem Holger Pedersen: Kolloquium der Indoger-*

- manischen Gesellschaft vom 25. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen* (Wiesbaden: Reichert).
- Risch, E., and Mühlestein, H. (eds.). 1979: *Colloquium Mycenaeum: actes du Sixième Colloque International sur les Textes Mycéniens et Égéens tenu à Chaumont sur Neuchâtel du 7 au 13 septembre 1975* (Neuchâtel: Faculté des Lettres; Geneva: Droz).
- Rix, H. 1970: 'Anlautender Laryngal vor Liquida oder Nasalis sonans im Griechi- schen', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 27: 79–110; repr. in *Kleine Schriften: Festgabe für Helmut Rix zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. by G. Meiser (Bremen: Hempen, 2001), 35–66.
- 1991: 'Nochmals griech. *νήττα/νήσσα/νᾶσσα*', *Historische Sprachforschung*, 104: 186–98; repr. in *Kleine Schriften*, 93–105.
- 1992: *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre*, 2nd edn. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).
- 2001: *LIV: Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Pri- märstammbildungen*, 2nd edn. (Wiesbaden: Reichert).
- Rosenkranz, B. 1988: 'Zu hethitisch *lāman* "Name" und *lammar* "Stunde"', in Arbeitman (1988), 259–81.
- Russo, J., Fernández-Galiano, M., and Heubeck, A. 1992: *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. iii (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Salonen, A. 1973: *Vögel und Vogelfang im alten Mesopotamien* (Helsinki: Suoma- lainen Tiedeakatemia).
- Schmidt, M. 1982: 'Δῆμος', in Voigt (1982), 275–8.
- 1991: 'Λαός', in Meier-Brügger (1991), 1633–44.
- Schrijver, P. 1991: *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin* (Am- sterdam: Rodopi).
- Sihler, A. L. 1995: *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Solta, G. R. 1960: *Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen: Eine Untersuchung der indogermanischen Bestandteile des armenischen Wortschatzes* (Vienna: Mechitharisten-Buchdruckerei).
- Starke, F. 1982: Review of Güterbock and Hoffner (1980), in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 39: 356–63.
- Sturtevant, E. H. 1931: 'Changes of Quantity Caused by Indo-Hittite *h*', *Language*, 7: 115–24.
- Taracha, P. 2000: *Ersetzen und Entsühnen: Das mittelhethitische Ersatzritual für den Großkönig Tuthalija (CTH *448. 4) und verwandte Texte* (Leiden: Brill).
- Tichy, E., Wodtko, D. S., and Irslinger, B. (eds.). 2003: *Indogermanisches Nomen: Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut: Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft/Society for Indo-European Studies/Société des Études Indo-Europé- ennes*, Freiburg, 19. bis 22. September 2001 (Bremen: Hempen).
- Tischler, J. 1982: *Hethitisch-deutsches Wörterverzeichnis mit einem semasiologischen Index* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck).

- Tischler, J. 1990: *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*, fascs. 5/6 (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck).
- 2001: *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch mit dem Wortschatz der Nachbarsprachen* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck).
- Trümper, C. 1986: *Vergleich des Mykenischen mit der Sprache der Chorlyrik: Bewahrt die Chorlyrik eine von Homer unabhängige alte Sprachtradition?* (Bern: Lang).
- Van Windekens, A. J. 1976: *Le Tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*, vol. i (Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale).
- Voigt, E.-M. (ed.). 1982: *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, vol. ii, fasc. 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- de Vries, J. 1961: *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Leiden: Brill).
- Watkins, C. 1978: "Let us Now Praise Famous Grains", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 122: 9–17; repr. in *Selected Writings*, ed. by L. Oliver (2 vols.; Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1994), ii. 593–601.
- (ed.). 1987: *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985): Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6–9, 1985* (Berlin: de Gruyter).
- 1995: *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Wilhelm, G. (ed.). 2001: *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Zajtsev, A. I., et al. (eds.). 1999: *Linguistica et Philologica: Sbornik statej k 75-letiju professora Jurija Vladimiroviča Otkupščikova* (St Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta).
- Zinko, C. 1987: 'Bemerkungen zu hethitischen Vogelnamen', *Grazer Beiträge*, 14: 1–22.

15

Names in *-e* and *-e-u* in Mycenaean Greek

John Killen

It is clear that Mycenaean Greek, like its later Classical counterpart, contains a large number of compound personal names in *-ēs*: *a-pi-me-de*, /*Amphimēdēs*/, *e-u-me-ne*, /*E(h)umenēs*/, etc. Many more of the *-ēs* names in Mycenaean, however, are more or less certainly of non-Greek origin: names in *-e* derived from the pre-Hellenic language(s) of Crete and the Greek mainland which have been assimilated into Greek declensional patterns by being treated as *s*-stems. The clearest examples include names like the theonyms *a-re* and *pa-de* and the personal names *i-ka-se*, *qo-ja-te*, *si-nu-ke*, *su-ke-re*, *su-se*, and *wa-je*, none of whose forms can readily be explained in terms of Greek. As has often been observed, more of these—and other—non-Greek names are attested at Knossos than at the principal mainland sites at which we have tablets: Pylos, Mycenae, and Thebes.¹ Of the names just mentioned, only *a-re* is attested on mainland records, by way of such derivatives as the names *a-re-i-jo* and *a-re-i-ze-we-i*.

It is also sometimes suggested—though this is less generally agreed—that Mycenaean has examples of a further type of *-ēs* name familiar in Classical Greek: shortened (hypocoristic) names formed from one of the two elements of a compound name in *-ēs*. Examples of the type in Classical Greek include *Κράτης*, derived from *Τιμοκράτης* *vel sim.*, *Φέρης*, derived from *Φερέλαος* *vel sim.*, and *Μένης*, derived from *Εὐμένης* *vel sim.* or *Μενεκράτης* *vel sim.*;² and among those who have argued for the existence of similar names in Mycenaean are O. Landau (1958: 167 n. 1) and G. Neumann (1983: 332–3). For instance, both Landau and Neumann suggest that the name

I am extremely grateful to Professor C. J. Ruijgh and Dr T. Meißner for their very helpful comments on a draft of this paper. Any remaining errors are of course entirely my own responsibility.

¹ See e.g. Landau (1958: 268); Heubeck (1961: 31); Ilievski (1978: 12).

² On the inflexion of such names in later Greek, including the increasing popularity in the 5th cent. at latest of the type *Κράτης*, *Κράτητος* in place of the expected *Κράτης*, *Κράτεος* (Attic *-ους*), see Risch (1987: 284). See also Ruijgh (1996: 214).