



Jaan Puhvel

JAAN PUHVEL

EPILECTA INDOEUROPAEA

Opuscula Selecta
Annis 1978–2001 Excusa
Imprimis ad Res Anatolicas Attinentia

Innsbruck 2002

Philol 331.20^A(104)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Puhvel, Jaan:

Epilecta Indoeuropaea : opuscula selecta annis 1978–2001 excusa
imprimis ad res Anatolicas attinentia / Jaan Puhvel. –
Innsbruck : Inst. für Sprachen u. Literaturen, 2002
(Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft ; Bd. 104)
ISBN 3-85124-684-5

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

JUL 23 2002



2002

INNSBRUCKER BEITRÄGE ZUR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

Herausgeber: Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Meid
Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck
Abteilung Sprachwissenschaft

Herstellung: Grasl Druck und Neue Medien, A-2540 Bad Vöslau

Bestell- und Auslieferungsadresse:
A-6020 Innsbruck, Elisabethstraße 11
Telefon und Telefax: (+43-512) 56 19 45

Preface

Similar in kind to the antecedent „Analecta“ (IBS 35, 1981), this collection is culled from the years 1978-2001, a time when much of my scholarly effort went into larger-scale works. Still, these papers may hopefully be found varied and viable enough to rate as more than a farrago of bits and pieces, of parerga and paralipomena. In the total the Anatolian dimension has increased appreciably (some might think alarmingly), but this is to be expected in tandem with the advances on this frontier. The mythological component, on the other hand, is marked by a measure of „closure“ in the wake of the summation published in English in 1987 („Comparative Mythology“) and later in a variety of other languages.

Across the board these selections aspire to showcase time-honored, textually based comparative philology, neither hopelessly old-fashioned nor unduly newfangled. New discovery that speaks for itself („only connect“) takes precedence over the type of „illumination“ which rides the crest of brittle theory, be it poetics, semiotics, intertextuality, „Indo-Hittitology“, glottalics, or nostratics; such nostrums, and the outright snake oil that occasionally lubricates the Indo-European marketplace, will be found in short supply and get even shorter shrift within these covers.

Only minor corrections have been made in the text. Notes are appended at the back (referred to by numbers in the margins). They comprise new data or insight, some outright rectifications and an occasional riposte or dollop of *esprit d'escalier*.

J.P.

Table of Contents

1. The meaning and source of Hittite <i>šuwaru</i>	1
2. On the origin and congeners of Hittite <i>aššu-</i> 'good'	3
3. Baltic-Anatolian lexical isoglosses	9
4. The meaning of Hittite <i>auli-</i>	16
5. On the polyphonic <i>pè</i> value of the Hittite <i>pît</i> sign	21
6. „Spider“ and „mole“ in Hittite	24
7. The warrior at stake	30
8. Scales in Hittite	39
9. All our 'yesterdays'	43
10. Homeric questions and Hittite answers	47
11. Sober thoughts on Latin <i>ēbrius</i>	58
12. The origin of Etruscan <i>tusna</i> („swan“)	62
13. Hittite athletics as prefigurations of Ancient Greek games	66
14. On the source of Hittite <i>halzai-</i>	72
15. On terms for 'nit' in Baltic and Balto-Finnic	75
16. 'Shoulder' and 'corner' in Hittite	79
17. Who were the Hittite <i>hurkilas pesnes</i> ?	83
18. <i>Huidar</i> and <i>vitnir</i> : Creatures and critters in Anatolia and Iceland	88
19. Whence the Hittite, whither the Jonesian vision?	92
20. 'Engendrér' et 'enfanter' en hittite	108
21. Hidden infixation in the Hittite verb	113
22. Philology and etymology, with focus on Anatolian	118
23. Hittite etyma for Greek obscuriora	128
24. Hittite regal titles: Hattic or Indo-European?	131
25. An Anatolian turn of phrase in the Iliad	142
26. Verba delendi: Pentagonese in Hittite	145
27. Ash and soap in Hittite	148
28. Names and numbers of the Pleiad	152
29. Embedded Anatolianisms in Greek epic	157
30. The East Ionic and Hittite iteratives	161

31. Homeric and Hittite similes compared	169
32. On the origin of Gothic <i>ulbandus</i> 'camel'	178
33. Anatolian: autochthon or interloper?	181
34. Shaft-shedding Artemis and mind-voiding Ate:	
Hittite determinants of Greek etyma	194
35. A Hittite calque in the Iliad	199
36. The Tocharian word for 'elephant'	202
37. Paranormal incidence of Hittite supines	205
38. West-Indo-European affinities of Anatolian	210
39. After Dumézil, what?	220
40. „Signet of steel“	229
41. The fate of Hittite dictionaries	235
42. Laryngeal-suffixed infix verbs in Hittite	244
43. Computing in Latin and Hittite	247
44. Three Hittite-Greek etymological pairings	249
45. Update on labiovelars in Hittite	252
46. Latin <i>furor</i> : help from Hittite	257
47. On terms for „amber“	260
48. Memory, shmemory, lest we forget Mnemosyne:	
The vocabulary of memory and mindfulness in antiquity	264
49. The mausoleum ban of the Bronze Tablet:	
Hittite <i>parkiya-</i> equals Greek φράσσω	268
50. Ivory and elephant in Hittite	274
51. Remarks on the Anatolian sources of Armenian <i>laxur</i>	276
52. Remarks on Indo-European wedding terminology	280
53. Of loons and legumes	282
54. Latin <i>guttur</i> and Hittite <i>kuttar</i> : an amicable separation	286
55. Constraints on historicity in the Book of Kings	289
56. Nomen proprium in Hittite	293
57. <i>Genus</i> and <i>sexus</i> in Hittite	299
58. More on Hittite <i>kusduwai-</i>	304
Notes	307

Bibliographical Data

1. (Op. 162) Written in 1978, published in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 101 (1981), pp. 213-214.
2. (Op. 156) Written in 1979, published in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94 (1980), pp. 65-70.
3. (Op. 170) Written in 1979, published in *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae. Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser* (Wiesbaden, 1982), pp. 175-185.
4. (Op. 181) Written in 1979, published in *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Leiden, 1984), pp. 433-437.
5. (Op. 168) Written in 1980, published in *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann* (Innsbruck, 1982), pp. 317-319.
6. (Op. 166) Written in 1980, published in *Bono Homini Donum. Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns* (Amsterdam, 1981), pp. 237-242.
7. (Op. 171) Written in 1980, published in *Homage to Georges Dumézil* (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph No. 3 [1982]), pp. 25-33.
8. (Op. 172) Written in 1980, published in *Folklorica. Festschrift for Felix J. Oinas* (Bloomington, 1982), pp. 193-196.
9. (Op. 190) Written in 1982, published in *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald* (Tübingen, 1987), pp. 315-318.
10. (Op. 177) Written in 1982, published in *American Journal of Philology* 104 (1983), pp. 217-227.
11. (Op. 185) Written in 1983, published in *Studia Linguistica Diachronica et Synchronica* (Berlin, 1985), pp. 693-696.
12. (Op. 180) Written in 1983, published in *American Journal of Philology* 105 (1984), pp. 209-212.
13. (Op. 195) Written in 1983, published in *The Archaeology of the Olympics* (Madison, 1988), pp. 26-31.
14. (Op. 196) Written in 1983, published in *Languages and Cultures, Studies in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé* (Berlin and New York, 1988), pp. 525-527.
15. (Op. 205) Written in 1983, published in *Symposium Balticum* (Hamburg, 1990), pp. 365-368.

16. (Op. 197) Written in 1984, published in *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwartz* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1988), pp. 255-258.
17. (Op. 187) Written in 1985, published in *Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag* (Berlin and New York, 1986), pp. 151-155.
18. (Op. 188) Written in 1985, published in *Die Sprache* 32 (1986), pp. 54-57.
19. (Op. 210) Written in 1986, published in *Sprung from Some Common Source* (Stanford, 1991), pp. 51-66.
20. (Op. 193) Written in 1986, published in *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 41 (1987), pp. 159-163.
21. (Op. 194) Written in 1986, published in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 100 (1987), pp. 238-242.
22. (Op. 216) Written in 1986, published in *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures* (Berlin and New York, 1992), pp. 261-270.
23. (Op. 200) Written in 1987, published in *Hanjamana. Centennial Tribute to the Memory of J.J.S. Taraporewala* (Calcutta, 1989), pp. 30-32.
24. (Op. 210) Written in 1988, published in *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 17 (1989), pp. 351-361.
25. (Op. 198) Written in 1988, published in *American Journal of Philology* 109 (1988), pp. 591-593.
26. (Op. 212) Written in 1988, published in *Studia ... Memoriae A.J. Van Windekens dicata* (Leuven, 1991), p. 221-223.
27. (Op. 223) Written in 1990, published in *Iranian and Indo-European Studies. Memorial Volume of Otakar Klíma* (Praha, 1994), pp. 215-218.
28. (Op. 211) Written in 1990, published in *Semitic Studies. In Honor of Wolf Leslau* (Wiesbaden, 1991), Volume 2, pp. 1243-1247.
29. (Op. 206) Written in 1990, published in *Homer and Hittite* (IBS VKS 47, 1991), pp. 9-12.
30. (Op. 206) Written in 1990, published in *Homer and Hittite* (IBS VKS 47, 1991), pp. 13-20.
31. (Op. 206) Written in 1990, published in *Homer and Hittite* (IBS VKS 47, 1991), pp. 21-29.
32. (Op. 221) Written in 1990, published in *Linguistica* 33 (1993), pp. 187-189.
33. (Op. 228) Written in 1990, published in *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 22 (1994), pp. 251-263.
34. (Op. 217) Written in 1991, published in *Historische Sprachforschung* 105 (1992), pp. 4-8.

35. (Op. 219) Written in 1991, published in *Historische Sprachforschung* 106 (1993), pp. 36-38.
36. (Op. 220) Written in 1992, published in *Historische Sprachforschung* 106 (1993), pp. 39-41.
37. (Op. 224) Written in 1992, published in *Miscellanea di studi linguistici in onore di Walter Belardi* (Roma, 1994), pp. 161-165.
38. (Op. 225) Written in 1992, published in *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch* (Wiesbaden, 1994), pp. 315-324.
39. (Op. 230) Written in 1992, published in *Indo-European Religion after Dumézil* (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph No. 16 [1996]), pp. 147-155.
40. (Op. 238) Written in 1994, published in *Archivum Anatolicum* 2 (1996), pp. 61-66.
41. (Op. 262) Written in 1994, published in *Acta Iranica. Textes et Mémoires, Vol. XIX. Monumentum Marcelle Duchesne-Guillemain* (Leuven 1999 [2001]), pp. 653-661.
42. (Op. 229) Written in 1995, published in *Kurylowicz Memorial Volume* (Cracow, 1995), Part One, pp. 177-179.
43. (Op. 250) Written in 1995, published in *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 26 (1998), pp. 161-162.
44. (Op. 237) Written in 1995, published in *Historische Sprachforschung* 109 (1996), pp. 166-168.
45. (Op. 252) Written in 1996, published in *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen* (Innsbruck, 1998), pp. 211-215.
46. (Op. 245) Written in 1996, published in *Mír curad* (Innsbruck, 1998), pp. 607-609.
47. (Op. 256) Written in 1997, published in *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica* (Budapest, 1999), pp. 347-350.
48. (Op. 257) Written in 1997, published in Endel Tulsing (ed.), *Memory, Consciousness, and the Brain* (Philadelphia, 2000), pp. 3-6.
49. (Op. 254) Written in 1998, published in *Historische Sprachforschung* 112 (1999), pp. 69-74.
50. (Op. xxx) Written in 1998, for publication in the Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Hittitology.
51. (Op. 253) Written in 1998, published in *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 19 (1998), pp. 33-36.

52. (Op. 259) Written in 1998, published in *Orpheus* 8 (1998), pp. 97-98.
53. (Op. xxx) Written in 1999, for publication in testimonial volume for H.A. Hoffner.
54. (Op. xxx) Written in 1999, for publication in testimonial volume for Hannah Rosén.
55. (Op. xxx) Written in 1999, for publication in the Proceedings of the Symposium on the Kalevala and the world's traditional epics (Turku, Finland).
56. (Op. xxx) Written in 2000, for publication in testimonial volume for Fiorella Imparati.
57. (Op. xxx) Written in 2001, for publication in the Proceedings of the Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Helsinki, Finland).
58. (Op. xxx) Written in 2001, for publication in testimonial volume for Erich Neu.

The Meaning and Source of Hittite šuwaru

Up to now a noun *šuwaru*, tentatively identified as some plant substance, and a randomly homophonous adjective and adverb *šuwaru-* ('full[y]', vel sim.) have been postulated. Instead the contexts of the latter allow an interpretation 'weighty, hefty, mighty' and 'heavily, mightily, greatly', pointing to an etymological and morphological kinship with Lithuanian *svarūs* 'heavy'. The seeming noun forms can likewise be interpreted by assuming quasi-nominalized and adverbial uses of the neuter adjective.

Albrecht Götze in 1930¹ posited the noun equation *šūwaru* = *šūšINIG* 'tamarisk', on parallelistic grounds which were rightly judged insufficient by Hans Güterbock.² In the passage at issue (*KUB X 27 I 28-31*: *nu šehelliyaš kuit wātar n-ut ištū DUGKUKUBI udanzi anda-ma-kan šūwaru tarnai* 'what [is] cleansing water, that they bring with a jar, but in addition he *šūwaru tarnai*') Güterbock assumed instead a soluble substance *šūwaru* which is being "let" (*tarna-*) into the water. For most other occurrences of *šūwaru* which had surfaced in the meantime Güterbock postulated an entirely different, randomly homophonous adjective or adverb meaning 'legitimate, truly'. R. Stefanini³ tried to restore unity, positing for *šūwaru-* a basic adjectival sense 'blooming, luxuriant' (with concomitant adverbial 'abundantly') and a nominalized neuter 'bud, shoot, scion', also in special botanical use, with a hapax legomenon derivative in *KUB IX 28 III 20-21* *šūwaruilli ištūyanza* 'bound with š.', denoting some plant fiber. O. Carruba,⁴ however, reverted essentially to Güterbock's stance, only with significant refinements, seeing in the noun *šūwaru-* some vegetal cleansing agent like mallow (cf. *hašš-*, *karšani-*) and in the adjective-adverb a meaning 'full(y)',⁵ with *šūwar-u-* a secondary *u*-stem from a verbal noun **šūwar* (cf. *šu-* 'full', *šuwai-* 'fill'). Carruba's views have been endorsed on the whole by H. Mittelberger,⁶ R. Stefanini,⁷ and J. J. S. Weitenberg,⁸ and there the state of the art apparently rests for the time being.

Yet the normal verbal noun of *šuwai-* would be **šūwawar*, and **šūwar* would have to be either haplogenic (as perhaps in

kamaršūwar < **katmar-šūwawar* 'shit-fullness'⁹) or based on the root-stem *šu-* directly (as possibly in the medial 3 sg. pret. and imp. *šuttati*, *šuttaru*, which are, however, more probably mere inner-Hittite phonetic reductions of fuller forms exemplified by *šuwattati*, *šuwattari*). The *u*-stem *šūwar-u-* is derivationally strange and not much helped by Carruba's parallel *iwaru-* 'gift' (alleged **i-war*, verbal noun from the root of *p-at-*, *p-iya-* 'give'). A meaning 'full(y)' is not so much a function of being filled as akin to the 'truly' advocated by Güterbock and hence practically equivalent to 'very much, greatly' (cf. 'full well' = 'very well').

Leaving aside for the moment the question of the "noun" *šūwaru-*, and keeping in mind the high proportion of ancient inherited items among Hittite adjectival *u*-stems (e.g., *alpu-* 'smooth': Lith. *alpūs* 'weak', *panku-* 'total': Skt. *bahū-* 'much', *parku-* 'high': Arm. *barjr* 'high', *dampu-* 'rough': OCS *topū* 'obtuse'¹⁰), we can postulate an equation Hitt. *šūwaru-*: Lith. *svarūs* 'heavy'. An adjectival meaning 'weighty, hefty, heavy, mighty' and an adverbial (neuter) sense 'heavily, mightily, greatly, very much' do justice to most contextually meaningful adjectival-adverbial occurrences of *šūwaru-* and are inappropriate to none:

KBo XVII 74 IV 41-42 (Old Hittite): *šūwāru kue GAL. HIA akkuškanzi [ta] apūš-pat akuanzi* 'what cups they are used to drinking heavily, those very ones they drink' (similarly, *ibid.*, 33-34).

KUB XXX 10 Rs. 7-8 (Old Hittite): *PUTU-uš šūwāru mayanza [DUMU DEN.ZJU Ū DNIN.GAL 'sun-god, mighty-grown son of Enlil and Ningal' (similarly *šūwaru mayanza* in XXXI 127 I 10-11).*

KUB XXI 38 Vs. 3: *SAG.DU-i] ŠA ŠEŠ-KA TI-tar šūwaru* 'to the person of your brother, life very much!' (greeting formula like, e.g., *ABoT 44 I 55-56 ziga PUTU-uš huēš* 'thou sun-god, live!').

KUB XXIII 85, 7-8: *kiša]n-ma kuwat memanzi akkantaš-wa L⁰ HADANU [š]uwaru-pat L⁰ HADANU zik-ma-mu-za*

⁹ On this term see my contribution to *Florilegium Anatolicum* (Paris, 1979).

¹⁰ For *alpu-* and *dampu-* see my interpretations in *JAOS* 97 (1977), 599, and *Revue hittite et asianique* 33 (1975), 59-62.

¹ *Neue Bruchstücke zum grossen Text des Hattušiliš und den Paralleltexen* (MVAeG 34.2), 64-65.

² *Oriens* 10 (1957), 357-358.

³ *Athenaeum* N.S. 40 (1962), 3-10.

⁴ *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišurijanza* (StBoT 2, Wiesbaden, 1966), 13-16.

⁵ Foreshadowed by E. Laroche's 'pleinement' (*Dictionnaire de la langue louvite* [Paris, 1959], 88).

⁶ *Kratylos* 12 (1967), 157.

⁷ *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 54 (1969), 157-160.

⁸ *Anatolica* 4 (1971-72), 167-169, 170-172.

¹⁰ *HADANU* ēšta 'why do they say thus: "An in-law through a deceased person (remains) very much an in-law"? You were my in-law' (but do not acknowledge it).

Bo 1780 Vs. 11: *šuwaru šaḥan* 'heavily crammed' (cf. 1262/v Vs. 2 *šuwaru šāḥi* 'he stuffs heavily'; 249/t, 4-5 *šuwaru* [...] *šāḥi*).

KUB XXX 106 III 33-34: nu ^DKumarbiš aru^Dšuwaru-pat *kuit* ^DU-ni IGI-anda aggarar šanḥeškizzi 'that Kumarbi high-and-mightily plans death against the storm-god' (jingle-like adjectival quasi-dvandva containing *aru* 'high').

The status of *šuwaru*- as a possible noun is more problematic. Those who hold that it signifies some arboreal or vegetal substance might pay heed to the utter absence of any determinative (such as is found with the alleged parallel ^{GIS}ŠINIG, or ^{GIS}painu in KBo XVII 103 + KUB XLVI 48 Vs. 19 ^{GIS}painu *šāḥi*). Unless there is clear proof, it seems inadvisable to go on postulating a nominal homophone *šuwaru*- otherwise unrelated to the adjective. In fact all the attestations can be interpreted in line with the adjectival or adverbial ones:

KUB X 27 I 28-31 (quoted above): *anda-ma-kan šuwaru tarnai* 'but in addition he lets flow heavily,' i.e., makes a further ample ablution, using true cleaning power on top of the more symbolic "holy water" (cf., e.g., KUB X 63 I 21 *nukan ešḥar ANA GAL katta tarnai* 'he lets the blood flow down into the cup').

KBo XIX 144 I 11-12 *kuit-ma-at watar nu ŪL kuitki* [...] *anda-ma-kan šuwaru ki* 'the water which (is) there, not any ..., but in addition heavily ...'; ibid. 15 [nu-ššikan SAL ŠU.GI *šuwaruaz* ¹¹ w[atar] (?) 'for him the old woman heavily water ...'.

KBo XV 25 Vs. 7-8 nu ^DWišuriyandan wappuwaš [IM-it *šuwaruwitt-a warapmi* 'I scrub W. with mud of the bank and with the heavy kind' (i.e., the compacted, submerged, sedimental variety).¹²

KUB XLIV 50 I 10...]ga ^Dšuwaruui¹³ *piran pap-paraški* [zi] '... sprinkles with heavy stuff'.

¹¹ For adverbial *šuwaruaz* (rather than the purely adjectival ablative **šuwarawaz*) beside *šuwaru* cf., e.g., *aššuwaz uit* 'the oracular bird' came favorably' (KUB XVIII 5 I-II passim) besides, e.g., KUB XXIV 8 II 7-8 *aššu šaštan šeški* 'sleep well in bed!'.
¹² For the distinction between shore-mud and deep spring-mud see, e.g., A. Goetze, *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi* (New Haven, 1938), 6-7.
¹³ For such quasi-nominalized use of the neuter adjective, vacillating between adjectival and nominal declension forms, cf., e.g., RS 25.421 *aššuyit šuwanza* 'full of good stuff' and KUB VIII 80, 15 *aššauit šarā šunneš* 'has filled up with good stuff'.

KUB XII 29 I 3 LÚ] ^DU *šuwarū dai* 'the man of the storm-god takes (or: puts) heavily' (the object of the verb may be in the preceding lacuna; cf. ibid. 4 L]U ^DU *watar ANA EN.SISKUR* 'the man of the storm-god water to the sacrificer ...').¹⁴

The occasional gloss-wedge (KUB XLIV 50 I 10 just quoted; fragmental KUB XXXVI 2b II 2 *n-aš* **šuwaru-pat*; possibly to be restored in KUB XXIII 85, 8 quoted above) gives some indication of Luwianism. But *šuwarū* also occurs in Palaic context (KUB XXXII 18 I 5), and *šuwaru*- in mixed Hittite-Palaic environment (KBo XIX 155, 5 *Jaruš šuwaru* [š 'high-and-mighty'), which raises the possibility that it is a Palaicism. Palaic is noted for its archaic linguistic traits within Anatolian and may have helped preserve an ancient inherited term for 'heavy' which in standard Hittite has been generally replaced by *nakki*-. The living term *nakki*- has taken on the usual additional side-meanings which flow from 'heavy' ('difficult, troublesome' on the one hand, and 'important, respected, honored' on the other; cf. Luw. *nahhuwa*- 'consider important'), whereas *šuwaru*- hews close to the basic semantic range (as do on the whole Lith. *svarūs* and OHG *swār*, while Goth. *swērs* 'respected, honored' and Lat. *sērius* 'weighty, grave' have specialized secondary meanings). In Gothic and Latin the semantic centerfield is held by *kairus* and *gravis* respectively, and Indo-Iranian (with Vedic *gūrū*- and Avestan *gouru*-) and Greek (with *barūs*) have no sure trace of a cognate of *šuwaru*-. Thus the Baltic-Anatolian comparison is basic, with Lithuanian having both the living verbs *sveřti* 'heave, weigh' and *svirti* 'be preponderant' (with various derivatives) and the adjective *svarūs*, while Anatolian has preserved only the old *u*-stem adjective. The situation is similar to Lith. *alpti* 'become weak', *alpus* 'weak' vs. Hitt. *alpant* 'swooned', *alpu* 'smooth', or Lith. *gūsti* 'practise', *gudrūs* 'clever' vs. Hitt. *kutruwa*- '(expert) witness', or conversely Hitt. *ark*- 'copulate with', *arki*- 'testicle' vs. Lith. *eřžilas* 'stallion', *aržūs* 'lustful'. We can thus posit another exclusive Lithuanian-Hittite *u*-stem match (besides *alpus* : *alpu*-), comparable to such other binary *u*-stem pairs as Hitt. *parku*- : Arm. *barjr*, Hitt. *dampu*- : OCS *topŭ*, Lith. *kartūs* 'bitter' : Skt. *kaṭū*- 'biting', and Lith. *gurdūs* 'slow' : Gk. *bradūs* 'slow'.

¹⁴ KUB IX 28 III 20-21 *šuwaruilit išḫianza* may well mean 'heavily bound', from a *šuwaru-ili*- derived from the adverbial *šuwaru* in the manner of *karuili*- from *karū* (cf. *karūllyaz*, *karuwilyaza* 'anciently').

On the Origin and Congeners of Hittite *aššu*- 'good'

The Greek *u*-stem adjective *ēvς* 'good, brave, noble' and the Vedic *vásu*- 'good, excellent' belong to the basic fund of Indo-European vocabulary. Before the advent of Anatolian data neither was particularly well endowed with cognates: *ēvς*, with its adverb *ēv* 'well', was comparable with **su*- 'well' (Skt. *su*-, Avestan *hu-jyāti*- 'well-being', Gk. *ó-vvς* 'healthy', Celtic *su*-, OCS *sŭ-dravŭ* 'healthy', etc.) and readily connectible as **(e)s-ú-* or **E_s-ú-* with the root **(E)es-* 'to be' (cf. e.g. Skt. *s-ánt-* 'being, real, true, good'). *Vásu*-, on the other hand, with its irregular *u*-stem accent and frequent nominal meanings (masc. 'god', fem. 'night', neut. 'goods, wealth') was matched by Avestan *vohu*- 'good' and some Western debris (e.g. Germanic *Wisu*-, Celtic *Vesu*- in names, OIr. dat. sg. *feib* < **weswāi* 'for excellence'); its tie-in with the root **wes-* 'dwell, be' (Goth. *wisan* 'be') also lay close at hand. The Homeric formulaic expression *dāwtog éáwv*, *dwrtḡres éáwv* 'giver(s) of goods', matching the Vedic *dātā vásu*, *dātā vásūnām*, Avestan *vohunam dātārō*, might point to the possibility of a Proto-Greek **FeséFwv* > **ééwv* > (analogical) *éáwv*; but the lack of digammatic traces in the meter would argue rather for lexical variation vis-à-vis Indo-Iranian, i.e. **eséFwv* from a neuter **esó¹*.

A triumphant tertium comparationis for **E_sú-* dawned early on the hittitological horizon. Already Hrozný²) connected Hitt. *aššu* 'goods' with the root *es-* 'be', comparing Akk. *bušū* 'goods' from *bašū* 'be', and Friedrich³) tied in *aššu*- 'good' with Gk. *ēvς*, *ēv*; this etymology has since become canonic. Subsequently Palaic *wašu* 'well', Luwian *wašu*- 'good; well-being', and Hieroglyphic *wasu* 'well-being, blessing' have entered the Anatolian picture. Discounting the notion of some kind of 'w-movable' within Anatolian⁴), this branch would seem to match both IE **E_sú-* and **wésu* within its dialect variation.

¹) For an elaborate attempt to strengthen the case for **wesu*- beside **esu*- in Greek, with reference to Mycenaean *we(j)-*, see F. Bader, *Études de composition nominale en mycénien I: Les préfixes mélioratifs du grec (Incunabula Graeca 31, Roma 1969)*, esp. 9-21, 100-103.

²) *Hethitische Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi (Boghazköi-Studien 3, Leipzig 1919)*, 103.

³) *Indogermanische Forschungen* 41 (1923), 370-372.

⁴) As in e.g. Luw. *wašḥa*-, Hieroglyphic *washā*- vs. Hitt. *išḥa*- 'lord, master' according to H. Kronasser, *Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer* (Vienna 1956), 1. 201.

Yet to this relative neatness Anatolian also adds new and disturbing elements. The oft-repeated connection of Hitt. *hues-* 'live' with IE **(H)wes-* 'dwell' might seem to threaten the connection of **wesu-* with the same **wes-*; but on the one hand this etymology of *hues-* is far from clinched (in view of Luw. *huit-*)⁵, and on the other the tie-in of **wesu-* with **wes-* 'dwell' is not particularly convincing to begin with⁶). Much more significant is the fact that both Hittite *aššu-* and Luwian *wašu-* are not merely adjectival (or nominal) petrifacts hypothetically connected with verbal roots (like Gk. *ἐὺς* and Vedic *vásu-*) but have beside them primary verbs *ašš-* and *waš(š)-* which mean approximately 'be good':

Bo 3182 Rs. 4-6 *maḥḥan* DINGIR.MEŠ-aš *antuhšašš-a* *āššāri* [... DINGIR.MEŠ-aš *ZI-anza* and]a QATAMMA SIG₅-anza *ēštu* [EN SISKUR.SISKUR-ya-]kan QATAMMA *āššiyanza* *ēštu* 'as [...]' 'is good' for gods and men, let the gods' spirit within likewise be good, let the sacrificer likewise be dear' (lacunae filled after the parallel KBo XXII 126 Vs. 4-6 [with 3 pl. pres. *āššantari* in line 4] and KUB XLIII 58 III 4-7).

KUB XVII 12 III 13-15 YĀ-ya-wa LĀL *maḥḥan* 'waššāri EN.SISKUR-ya-wa-kan ANA DINGIR-LIM QATAMMA *waššāru* 'and even as oil (and) honey are good, so, too, the sacrificer shall be good to the deity'.

KUB XXIV 7 I 43 YĀ DÜG.GA *n-at waštari* 'good oil; it is good'.

The hapax gegrammenon gloss-wedge with *waššāri* is an indication of Luwianism, although there is nothing necessarily Luwoid about the form itself or the parallel *waštari*. The standard explanation⁷) holds that *ašš-* and *waš(š)-* are somehow denominatively related to *aššu-* and *wašu-*, and that the mediopassive Hitt. *aššiya-* 'be dear' is likewise denominative from *aššu-*. Kammenhuber⁸) was considerably more cogent in admitting the collaterality of primary verb and *u*-stem adjective (i.e. Hitt. *aššu-*: IE **es-* 'be' as IE **wesu-*: **wes-* 'feast', as Luw. *wašu-*: *waš[š]-*, as Hitt. *huišu-* 'live, raw':

⁵) Cf. J. Tischler, *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*, Lieferung 2 (Innsbruck 1978), 264-266.

⁶) J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern 1959), 1171 and 1175, connected *wesu-* instead with a different root **wes-*, allegedly 'feast, make merry', also mixing in **wes-* 'feed, pasture' (Hitt. *weši-* 'pasture').

⁷) E.g. E. Neu, *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen* (StBoT 5, Wiesbaden 1968), 192, 20; N. Oettinger, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 34 (1976), 136.

⁸) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 77, (1961), 169-170.

hues- 'live', etc.); but she commingled postulated Indo-European and productive Anatolian levels of derivation and left the synchronic Hittite verb *ašš-* quite unexplained. Since an attempt to explain *ašš-* as imitational of Luwian *waš(š)-* (Oettinger, loc. cit. in fn. 7) need hardly retain us, I shall concentrate my efforts rather upon understanding the primary verb *ašš-* and by extension the verb *aššiya-*, the adjective *aššu-*, and other derivatives.

The inner-Hittite data themselves cast considerable doubt on the derivation of *aššu-* from IE **Esú-*; unlike Greek, a tie to the verb 'be' ought to be still palpable, since a productive relationship persists between basic verbs and *u*-stem derivatives (e.g. *huišu-* from *hues-* [just quoted], *ḥarpu-* 'hostile' from *ḥarp-* 'separate', *ḥatku-* 'tight' from *ḥatk-* 'squeeze, shut', *šarku-* 'prominent' from *šark-* 'rise'). Hence the exceptionless geminated spelling *aššu-* is difficult to justify vis-à-vis the constant participle *ašant-* which can also have a meaning 'true' akin to Skt. *sánt-* (e.g. KUB XXXIII 109 I 5 *ašanza memiaš* 'the matter [is] true', beside RV 7.104.12 *sác cāsac ca vácasī* 'the true and the false word'). A chain of semantic developments 'being' > 'real' > 'true' > 'good' is indicated by Gk. *ἐὺς*, where the meaning 'good' veers off in the direction of 'brave, noble'. Hitt. *aššu-*, on the other hand, does not basically denote that which is intrinsically and objectively good (as would inherently IE **Esú-*) but rather that which is felt to be agreeable, and by consequence DÜG.GA 'good' does not cover *aššu-* but rather *lazz(a)i-* 'good, sound'. It is therefore advisable to start with the sense 'favored, dear' which is so prominent with *aššu-*, e.g.:

KBo III 22 Vs. 2 (OHitt.) ¹IM-unni *āššuš* *ēšta* 'he was dear to the storm-god'.

KBo XXII 2 Rs. 4-5 (OHitt.) *ūk-wa a[tt]i-m[i]* [*natt*]a *āššuš* 'I (am) not dear to my father'.

KUB XIX 26 I 17 *kuiš-a antuwahḥaš ITTI LUGAL SAL.LUGAL āššuš* 'what man (is) in favor with king (and) queen'.

From 'favored, dear' the meaning developed to 'favorable, agreeable' (e.g. KUB XXVI 12 II 25 [*š*]umēšš-aš *āššuš kuedanikki* 'he [is] favorable to one of you'; KBo XVII 65 Vs. 55 *mašiwān ANA EN SISKUR.SISKUR āššu* 'as much as [is] agreeable to the sacrificer') and thence to 'good' in a "utilitarian" sense. In the last-mentioned meaning it resembles Akk. *ṭābu*, but an Old Hittite bilingual (KUB I 16 II 17 *n-an parā āššuui hui[ttiyanneškinun* 'I have constantly singled him out for good [treatment]') has rather Akk. *ana damāqqim* (KUB I 16 I 17, from *damāqu* 'favor,

well-being'), and a vocabulary passage (*KBo* I 44 + XIII 1 IV 12) glosses *āššu* with Akk. *busumu* 'pleasant, agreeable'⁹). In the concrete sense 'goods, possessions' *āššu* is expectably matched by Akk. *buššu* in the duplicate text *KBo* XXVI 23, 1 (cf. Gk. *τὰ ὄντα*).

For the semantic sequence 'favored, dear' > 'good' > 'goods' one need but compare Lat. *bonus* < **duenos* (literally 'favored'; cf. *beā* < **dweyā* 'favor, make happy', Vedic *dīvas-*, *duvoyā* 'favor', *duvasyāti* 'show favor, honor'). Hence a mediopassive verb *ašš-* 'be favored' can be considered basic, attested rarely in the root form but commonly as a primary derivative *aššiya-* 'be dear', with the participle *aššiyant-* 'dear, beloved' (cf. e.g. the mediopassive *parkiya-* beside *park-* 'rise'). The *u*-stem derivative *aššu-* is wholly parallel to *parku-* 'high', which latter is derived from *park-* (cf. Toch. A *park-* 'rise'), rather than *parkiya-* being "denominative" from *parku-*; there simply are no "u-less" denominative verbs from *u*-stems. The further noun *aššul-* 'favor, well-being' is also well accounted for as a deverbative abstract noun from *ašš-* (cf. e.g. *imiul-* 'mixture' from *im[m]iya-* 'mix', or *waštul-* 'offense, sin' from *wašt[a]-* 'miss the mark, act calamitously, sin'). The causative *aš(ša)nu-* is regularly deverbative from *ašš-*, as is incidentally *tepnu-* 'belittle, humiliate' from **tep-* (cf. Skt. *dabh-nu-* 'hurt, abandon') besides *tepu-* 'small'. *Aš(ša)nu-* means basically 'favor, keep happy, propitiate, set aright, treat gently, massage (racehorses)'; from the meaning 'make good' developed a sense of 'carry out well, bring off, dispose (of), be done with', as in English 'he made good his escape'. It is not a causative to *eš-* 'sit'¹⁰) and is fundamentally unrelated to Hieroglyphic *as(a)nu(wa)-* 'set down, establish, install'; Hittite did not need to form such a causative since it had the transitive verb *ašaš-* with its own causative *ašešanu-* in the sense of 'set(tle), establish'. The essential correctness of this interpretation of *aš(ša)nu-* is shown by the semantic near-equations *aššu-* = *aššiyant-* = *aššanuwant-* and *aššiyanu-* = *aš(ša)nu-*:

KUB XXXI 127 I 8–9 *ḫandanza-kan antuḫšaš tuk-pat āššuš* 'the righteous man is dear to thee'.

⁹) Cf. H. Otten, *StBoT* 7 (1968), 19, 21–22.

¹⁰) As claimed by e.g. A. Götze, *Madduwattaš* (Leipzig 1928), 103, and H. Kronasser, *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache* (Wiesbaden 1966), 443–444. Later on Goetze (*Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 17 [1963], 62) did in fact advocate a "denominative" derivation of *aš(ša)nu-* from *aššu-* (on the analogy of *tepu-*: *tepnu-*); cf. also Neu, op. cit. in fn. 6, p. 18.

KUB XXIV 3 I 40–41 *parā ḫandanzaš-a-kan antuḫwaḫḫaš tuk-pat ANA ʾUTU Arinna aššiyanza* 'the providential man is dear to you, sun-goddess of Arinna'.

KBo XIII 2 Rs. 18 *antuḫšani-kan kuiš aššanuwanza* 'who is dear to the population'.

KUB XXX 10 Rs. 22–23 *nu-]mu LUGAL-an āški DINGIR-YA ŪL aššanuwandan anduḫšan le iššatti* 'at the king's gate, my god, do not make me a persona non grata'.

KUB XXXI 42 II 22–23 *namma-kan BEL]U.MEŠ-NI pangawe QADU DAM.MEŠ-ŠU[NU] [DUMU.MEŠ-ŠUNU DUMU.DUMU.MEŠ-]ŠUNU āššiyannuḡgaweni [ŪL]* 'and we also do not constantly propitiate our lords collectively with their wives, their sons, and their grandsons'.

KBo XIV 142 I 58 *ANA ʾHepat aššanummaš* 'for propitiation of Hebat'.

ašš- points to a reconstruction **ans-* or **ṇs-*, if we compare e.g. *daššu-* < **donsu-* or *ḫaššu-* < **Honsu-*, with **ṇs* > *šš* rather than *nz*¹¹). Thus *ašš-* can be connected with IE **ans-*, **ṇs-* 'favor' (e.g. Old Norse noun *āst*, verb *unna* 'favor'), which Jucquois¹²) once proposed as the etymon of *aššiya-* 'be dear' alone.

The Luwian (and possibly also Hittite) *waš(š)-* often runs parallel to *ašš-*; in *KUB* XXIV 7 I 43 (quoted above) *waštari* is followed in line 44 by *āš]šiyattari*. A striking accordance is seen in the Luwian sequence (*KUB* XXXV 45 II 10) *DINGIR.MEŠ-aššazati waššarahit-tati ḫuitummanahit-tati* matching Hittite (*KUB* XXXIII 62 II 10) *DINGIR.MEŠ-aš aššiyunit DINGIR.MEŠ-naš miūmnit* 'through the favor (and) the kindness of the gods', where the Luwian abstract *waššarahit-* corresponds to the Hittite verbal noun *aššiyawar* 'favor' from *aššiya-* 'be dear'. The Luwian word is a denominative abstract with a suffix *-aḫi(t)-* (cf. e.g. *adduwalaḫit-* 'badness' besides Hitt. *idalawatar*), pointing to a noun or adjective **waššara-* 'good(ness), kind(ness)' comparable to the Hieroglyphic *wasara-* (instr. sg. *wasarati* 'with goodness, well'), with its derivative *wasaranu-* 'make agreeable', besides *was-* 'be agreeable', *wasu* 'well-being, blessing'¹³).

The Indo-European **wes-* seen in Luwian *waš(š)-* and underlying IE **wésu-* has nothing to do with **wes-* 'dwell' or **wes-* 'feed, pasture'; it is rather the ablaut variant (*A*)*wés-* of **áws-* (< **Aéw-s-*)

¹¹) Cf. e.g. N. Oettinger, *StBoT* 22 (1976), 24.

¹²) *Revue hittite et asianique* 22 (1964), 89–91.

¹³) Cf. e.g. E. Laroche, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites* I (Paris 1960), 88–89.

seen in e.g. Lith. *aũšta* 'it dawns' besides Vedic *vas-* 'shine' (RV infinitive *váštave*, etc.). The sense 'be good' is an outgrowth of 'be bright, be radiant' and thence 'be beneficial, be kind' (cf. OCS *veselŭ* 'joyous' with Luwian **waššara-* 'kind'). It is not surprising that within the semantic range of kindness, goodness, well-being, and wealth many derivatives of Anatolian *ašš-* (cf. Hieroglyphic *aza-* '[be] love[d]') and *waš(š)-* came to run parallel; but precisely at the core a distinction remains, for Hitt. *aššu-* has the basic meaning 'favored, dear' which is not found in the Anatolian outcomes of **wésu*. The diathesis of *aššu-* is primarily passive ('endowed with favor'), whereas **wésu* is inherently active ('radiant'). Gk. *εὖς*, on the other hand, expressing objective, real good, has no recognizable cognate in Anatolian.

Baltic-Anatolian Lexical Isoglosses

The Baltic and Anatolian branches occupy disparately extreme positions within the twofold (absolute : relative) time spread of the Indo-European speech continuum. Baltic, notably Lithuanian, is the latest attested of all Indo-European subgroups (around 1500 of the common era), whereas Anatolian, especially Hittite, dates from around 1500 b. c. e. This spread of three millennia is, however, greatly mitigated by the fact that Baltic is the most conservative and slowly developing of all surviving Indo-European groupings, whereas Hittite, a rapidly evolving language of migratory and transitory empire-builders, is notably archaic mainly by virtue of being an archivally preserved serendipitous flash in a prehistoric darkness. As relative linguistic evolution slows, the time gap contracts. In terms of attested Baltic language it is not difficult to see its prehistoric ancestor virtually *in situ* around the time when Anatolian was spoken in Asia Minor. Geographically, too, it ought to be stressed that Anatolian, like Greek, belongs to the eastern group of Indo-European, as opposed to the western continuum of Italic-Celtic-Germanic. Although neither Greek nor Anatolian participate in the narrow isoglossal innovation patterns which swept much of the eastern Indo-European core area, such as the so-called *satem* phenomena of palatalization of guttural stops and of *s*, they remain firmly in the fringes of that area; after all, Baltic, too, is a kind of eastern fringe form, since it carries through the *satem* developments to a lesser extent than do Slavic and Indo-Iranian.

It is clear from these general considerations that any isoglosses between Baltic and Anatolian are of the order of shared eastern Indo-European or proto-Indo-European archaisms rather than common innovations. Any diffusional spread from one to the other (such as from Iranian to Slavic, for example) is pretty well ruled out by the lack of immediate geographic contiguity and would in any event require a *terminus ante quem* of about 1200 b. c. e.

The topic of Baltic-Anatolian linguistic relationships got a bad name from Pierre Joseph Gabrys's book *Parenté des langues hittite et lituanienne et la préhistoire* (Geneva 1944). The as yet inadequate state of Hittite philology in general and its comparativistic exploitation in particular, combined with the author's own lack of competency in Indo-European linguistics coupled with grandiose fantasies of prehistoric archeology, led to scholarly disaster. Gabrys could not help but scoop up general similarities between Lithuanian and Hittite by virtue of both being archaic Indo-European languages, and occasional visible binary points of accordance as well; but for a judicious identification of one-to-one isoglosses vis-à-vis the rest

of Indo-European the means were lacking. Walter Porzig's solid treatise *Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets* (Heidelberg 1954) devoted some attention to Slavic-Anatolian interrelations but none specifically to Baltic-Anatolian accordances. However, great strides in the exegesis of Hittite during the last quarter century now enable us to remedy to some extent both Gabrys's manhandling of the topic and Porzig's neglect of it. As test examples I have chosen two instances of morpho-lexical isoglosses, one binary Lithuanian-Hittite, and the other ternary, Lithuanian-Slavic-Hittite, and hope to make the point that careful and specific comparison of the Baltic and Anatolian language groups offers significant enrichment to Baltic, Anatolian, and Indo-European linguistics.

The first case concerns *u*-stem adjectives. These, basically deverbative, are clearly of proto-Indo-European age, as is shown by a number of correspondences where the underlying root may or may not survive in living verbal use in any given language:

Skt. *bahú-* 'much', Gk. *παχύς* 'stout', Lat. *pinguis* 'fat', Lith. *bingius* 'stout-hearted', Hitt. *panku-* 'total'.

Skt. *purú-* 'much', Avest. *pouru-* 'much', Gk. *πολύς* 'much', Goth. *filu* 'much', OIr. *il* 'much' (root **pel-E-* 'fill').

Skt. *laghú-* 'swift', Avest. *ragu-* 'swift', Gk. *ἐλαχύς* '(s)light', Lat. *levis* 'light', OCS *ligŭ-kŭ* 'light', Lit. *lengvŭs* 'light'.

Skt. *gurú-* 'heavy', Avest. *gouru-* 'heavy', Gk. *βαρύς* 'heavy', Lat. *gravis* 'heavy', Goth. *kaurus* 'heavy'.

Skt. *prthú-* 'wide', Avest. *parəθu-* 'wide', Gk. *πλατύς* 'wide', Gaul. *litu-* 'wide', Lith. *platus* 'wide'.

Skt. *mrdú-* 'soft' (*mrd-* 'squeeze'), Gk. *βλαδύς* 'weak', Lat. *mollis* 'soft', OCS *mladŭ* 'soft'.

Skt. *muhu* 'suddenly', Avest. *mərəzu-* 'short', Gk. *βραχύς* 'short', Lat. *brevis* 'short' (Goth. *ga-maiurgjan* 'shorten').

Skt. *svādú-* 'sweet', Gk. *ἡδύς* 'sweet', Lat. *suavis* 'sweet'.

Skt. *amhú-* 'narrow' (Gk. *ἄγχω* 'constrict'), Goth. *aggwus* 'narrow', OCS *ozŭ-kŭ* 'narrow'.

Skt. *dhr̥sú-* 'bold' (*dhr̥s-* 'dare'), Gk. *θρασύς* 'bold', OCS *drŭzŭ* 'bold'.

Skt. *babhrú-* 'brown', OHG *bibar* 'beaver', Lith. *bėbrus* 'beaver'.

Skt. *tanú-* 'thin' (*tan-* 'stretch'), Gk. *ταυ-* (in compounds) 'slim', Lat. *tenuis* 'slender'.

Skt. *vásu-* 'good', Avest. *vohu-* 'good', Gaul. *Vesu-*, Germanic *Wisu-*, Luwian *wašu-* 'good', Palaic *wašu* 'well'.

Gk. *εὖς* 'good, brave', *εὖ* 'well', and in compounds Skt. *su-* 'well', Avest. *hu-*, Gk. *ὕ-* (*ὕγιής* 'healthy'), Celtic *su-*, OCS *sŭ-* (*sŭdravŭ* 'healthy').

Other attestations happen to be restricted to two groups:

Indo-Iranian and Greek: Skt. *āsú-* 'swift', Avest. *āsu-* 'swift', Gk. *ώκύς* 'swift'. Skt. *urú-* 'broad', Avest. *vouru-* 'broad', Gk. *εὐρύς* 'broad'.

Indo-Iranian and Gothic: Skt. *tr̥sú-* 'greedy', Avest. *taršu-* 'dry', Goth. *þaursus* 'dry'.

Sanskrit and Lithuanian: Skt. *katú-* 'biting', Lith. *kartùs* 'bitter'.

Sanskrit and Hittite: Skt. *a-dbhu-ta-* 'not to be slighted, wondrous', Hitt. *tepu-* 'slight'.

Greek and Lithuanian: Gk. *βραδύς* 'slow', Lith. *gurdùs* 'slow'.

Greek and Hittite: Gk. *δαρύς* 'thick', Hitt. *daššu-* 'strong'.

Gk. **αἰσχύς* 'ugly' (replaced by *αἰσχροός*), Hitt. *išku-na-* 'make ugly, stain'.¹

Old Church Slavic and Hittite: OCS *topŭ* 'dull, obtuse', Hitt. *dampu-* 'rough, uncouth'.²

Armenian and Hittite: Arm. *barjr* 'high', Hitt. *parku-* 'high' (*park-* 'rise'; cf. Tocharian A *pärk-* 'rise').

Still others are found in one single group, without any living verbal root connection: Skt. *yahú-* 'young, vigorous', Avest. *yazu-* 'young, vigorous'. Gk. *αμβλύς* 'blunt', *δρυός* 'bitter', *ὀξύς* 'sharp'. Even when a palpable root tie exists (e.g. Skt. *rjú-*, Avest. *ərəzu-* 'straight' besides Skt. *rj-* 'stretch', or Skt. *van̥kú-* 'crooked' from *vañc-* 'totter') there is no significant productivity of this type in most branches of Indo-European.

Not so in Hittite and Lithuanian. In both of these languages there is productive formation of *u*-stems from verbs. Hittite has an occasional isolated specimen (*idalu-* 'bad'), but mostly there is full correlation: *aššu-* 'favored, dear, good' from *ašš(iya)-* 'be favored',³ *harpu-* 'hostile' from *harp-* 'separate', *hatku-* 'tight' from *hatk-* 'squeeze, shut', *huešu-* 'raw' from *hueš-* 'live', *šarku-* 'prominent' from *šark-* 'rise'. Among the numerous Lithuanian formations (e.g. *gražus* 'beautiful', *gardus* 'tasty', *skanus* 'tasty', *gausus* 'plentiful', *slidus* 'slippery') there are, however, several which constitute a unique Baltic-Anatolian lexical isogloss:

alpūs 'weak' is from the verb *alpti* 'swoon' and matches Hitt. *alpu-* 'smooth, rounded'; Hittite lacks a finite verb but has the participial fossil *alpant-* 'swooned, weak (sick child); mild (cheese)'.⁴

svarūs 'heavy' is from *sveřti* 'heave, weigh' and matches Hitt. *šuwaru-* 'weighty, hefty, mighty', adverbial neuter *šuwaru* 'mightily, greatly, very much'; Hittite lacks any trace of a verb.⁵

1 KBo IV 2 I 44–45 *kāš-wa* GIM-an *hāš* GAD.ĤI.A *iškunanta parkunuzzi* 'as this soap cleanses stained cloths'. On the base-meaning 'make ugly' of Gk. *αἰσχῶνο-*, referring to staining or defacing both literally and figuratively ('tarnish, defile'), and the similar additional abstract sense of the Hittite etymological match *iškuna* (*hḫ*)-, *iškuna* (*hḫ*)- ('stigmatize, degrade, demean, demote'), see my remarks in *Indogermanische Forschungen* 83 (1978), 138–143.

2 On this pair see my treatments in *Revue hittite et asianique* 33 (1975), 59–62, and *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 97 (1977), 599.

3 On this derivation of *aššu-* and the severing of its customary tie to Gk. *εὖς* see my article in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94 (1980), 65–70.

4 See references in fn. 2 above; nom.-acc. sg. neut. *alpān*, epithet of GA.KIN.AG 'cheese', is found in KBo XXIV 40 Vs. 8 and 279/d V 12.

5 For this interpretation of *šuwaru-* see my remark in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 36 (1979), 57 and the detailed treatment in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 101 (1981), 213–214.

gudrūs 'wise, clever' besides *gūdras* is from the verb *gūsti* 'practise, become used to' and matches the thematized Hitt. *kutruwa-* '(expert) witness'; Hittite has no trace of a verb.⁶

iškūs 'clear' besides *aiškūs* may be matched with the Hittite denominative verb *išku-na-hh-* 'proclaim' (cf. Lat. *dē-clārā-*);⁷ other cognates would be OCS *iskra* 'spark', OCS *jasnū* 'clear' < *(j)ěsnū < *ays(k)no- and Hitt. *ašara-*, *ešara-* 'white, bright' < *esra- < *ays(k)ro-.⁸

aržūs 'lustful' has likewise no trace of a verb within Lithuanian, the only nominal cognate being *eržilas* 'stallion'; elsewhere there is Arm. *orj* 'male' and the word for 'testicle' in several Indo-European languages (e. g. Gk. *ōpχis*, Avest. *arəzi-*, Hitt. *arki-*). Hittite has the verb *ark-* 'mount, copulate with',⁹ besides a compound *arga-tiya-* 'go into (sexual) frenzy, stoop to rage' (noun **orgho-*); further derivatives

6 This etymology, proposed by H. Pedersen (*Archiv Orientalní* 5 [1933], 177–179), was unjustly rejected by V. Mažulis (*Rakstu krājums vēltījums Dr. J. Endzelīnam* [Riga 1959], 173–180) and by E. Benveniste (*Hittite et indo-européen* [Paris 1962], 110–111): „il faudra abandonner ce rapprochement et laisser à hitt. *kutru-* la chance d'une meilleure étymologie"; a misapplication of *ars nesciendi*. From *kutruwa-* (nom. sg. *kutruwaš* in *KBo* XV 25 Vs. 35) are derived *kutruwah(h)-* 'summon as witness' and *kutruwai-* 'bear witness' with its abstract nouns *kutruwatar* (dat.-loc. sg. *linkiya kutruwanni* 'for witnessing the oath' in *KUB* XIV 14 Vs. 4; *kutruwanni* 'in witness' in *KBo* XII Vs. 8) and *kutruēššar* (dat.-loc. sg. *kutruēšni* 'at the [place of] witness' in *KUB* XLI Rs. 11); nom. pl. *kutruwaneš* or *kutru(w)eneš* besides the normal *kutruēš* is reminiscent of e. g. nom. sg. *arkammaš*: acc. pl. *argamanuš* besides *argamuš*.

7 This comparison hinges on interpreting the Old Hittite passage *KUB* I 16 III 41–42 *huhhaš-miš* [*Laba*]man DUMU-šan URUŠanahuitti *iškunahhiš* as 'my grandfather proclaimed his son L. (as his successor) at S.' (leading to rebellion by rival sons and factions). Alternatively one can translate 'my grandfather demoted his son L. to S.' (i. e. rusticated him to a provincial town for being the ringleader of the rebellious sons whom they had led astray' [*ibid.* 41 *edi nair*]), in which case *iškunahh-* belongs rather with *iškuna-* and Gk. **αλοχός* (see fn. 1 above). Worse than either of these approaches is N. Oettinger's separation of *išhuna(hh)-* 'treat shabbily' (vel. sim.) from *iškuna(hh)-* 'designate, make spotty', the latter allegedly cognate (< **skunéh-*, root **skew-H-*) with Vedic *skauti*, *skunāti*, *skunóti* 'poke, rake, tear, mangle', sometimes used technically (*ā-skunóti*) of ear-slashing or perforation of domestic animals for marking purposes (*Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* [Nürnberg 1979], 156–158); the latter specialized sense is a weak reed on which to hang an already Indo-European meaning 'to mark'; in this case its reapplication from cattle to royal offspring would most likely have been negative ('brand, denounce' rather than 'designate'), thus agreeing more with the sense 'stigmatize, demote'. No better is H. Eichner's advocacy of the same connection with Vedic *sku-* (*Die Sprache* 25 [1979], 205–206); he allows 'regressive assimilation' *išhunahh-* < *iškunahh-* but postulates an improbable semantic range 'to mark' > 'designate; brand, demean, degrade; set limits for, put in one's place, defy; stain'.

8 For the latter comparison see my remark in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 100 (1980), 167.

9 See my treatment of *ark-* in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 95 (1975), 262–264.

are visible elsewhere (e. g. Old Norse *argr* 'passive homosexual' < **orghos* 'mountee', and the secondary verbs Gk. *ōpχeĩtau* 'makes lascivious motions, dances', Russian *jěrzajet* 'fidgets, wriggles, moves in coition', Vedic *rgḥāyāte* 'is impetuous, rages'),¹⁰ but Hittite stands alone in preserving the Indo-European finite verb prototype, and Lithuanian in perpetuating the *u*-stem adjective. Thus Hittite indicates that the Lithuanian adjectives *alpūs*, *svarūs*, *gudrūs*, *iškūs*, and *aržūs* are probably not inner-Baltic derivatives but may go back to Indo-European itself; in the first four instances it does so by supplying the fossilized matches *alpu-*, *šūwaru-*, *kutruwa-*, and *iškunahh-*, and in the last case by providing the underlying verb which Lithuanian itself has lost. The Baltic and Anatolian branches of Indo-European are thus unique in having kept the deverbative *u*-stem formations alive and productive, while at the same time practising extreme conservatism in preserving existing specimens which happen to be common to both, even when the living verb has disappeared in one branch or the other.

The other test case involves certain verbs meaning 'say, speak' in Hittite, Slavic, and Lithuanian. Such verbs are notoriously prone to lexical innovation. Thus in Hittite the standard term is *mema-*, but especially in Old Hittite there exists a patently archaic suppletive verb made up of the two stems *te-* and *tar-*, thus in the present *temi*, *teši*, *tezzi*, *tarueni*, *teteni* or *tarteni*, *taranzi*; the participle is *tarant-* 'spoken', and the iterative is *taraški-* or *taršik(k)-*, i. e. /tarski-/. The stem *te-*, i. e. /de-/, has been connected with IE **dhē-* 'put; do' since the earliest days of hittitology,¹¹ with reference to the similar side-meaning of OCS *děti* 'put; say'; thus Hitt. *dai* 'puts' and *tezzi* 'speaks' are homorhizal verbs reflecting Indo-European perfect and root aorist stems respectively, comparable to the Slavic bifurcation in stem formation (OCS present *dějo* 'I put', but Slovene *dem* 'I say' [Hitt. *temi*], ORuss. *dě* 'quothe he' [Hitt. *tet*]). V. Machek¹² (following J. Zubatý) assumed an ancient shift of meaning 'do' > 'say' (comparing French *fit-il* = *dit-il*) and pushed both semantic and formal differentiation back to Indo-European itself, with common survivals in Slavic and Hittite. Yet the proto-meaning of **dhē-* was not 'do' (which is a secondary development in e. g. Italic, Slavic, and Germanic) but 'put, place', as still in Hittite, Greek, and Indo-Iranian. A development 'put' > 'speak' in individual languages is of course no more strange than English 'put it' (= express, formulate)

10 This interpretation of *argatiya-* is published in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 36 (1979), 57–58.

11 F. Hrozný, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 56 (1915), 29; *Die Sprache der Hethiter* (Leipzig 1917), 2; C. Marstrand, *Caractère indo-européen de la langue hittite* (Christiania 1919), 147. The abortive alternative connection of *te-* with IE **dey-* 'shine' (e. g. E. H. Sturtevant, *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language* [Philadelphia 1933], 62, 100) found its latest avatar in Y. Arbeitman (*Revue hittite et asiatique* 31 [1973], 104–105), with reference to Skt. *bhāti* 'shine' vs. Gk. *φαι* 'speak'; even worse, Arbeitman alternatively resurrected E. Risch's unlikely derivation *tezzi* < **terzi* (*Die Sprache* 7 [1961], 97), with loss of *r* before a stop, thus really identical with *tar-*.

12 *Archiv Orientalní* 17.2 (1949), 137.

or Latin *ponere* in the sense 'state, assert',¹³ cf. e. g. *KBo V 11 I 4 nu nāšili kiššan tezzi* 'he puts it thus in Hittite'. In Hittite the evolution 'put' > 'speak' may be the verbal parallel of the nominal development 'thing' > 'word' (as in *uttar*; cf. Goth. *wahts* 'thing') and its converse 'word' > 'thing' (*memiyan*-; cf. e. g. *KUB XXI 42 IV 25-28 memian ... tardi* followed by *uttar ... memai*). Indo-European origin should be traced rather to formulae of the type **yews-dhē* 'apply (religious) law' (Avest. *yaoždā* 'purify ritually'; Lat. *iusta facere* 'give proper burial', but also *iūdic* 'laying down the law', with **deyk-* 'aim' replacing *dhē*-), **kred-dhē* 'place trust, put faith in' (Avest. *zrazdā* 'faithful'; Lat. *credere* 'bestow confidence, entrust'), or **enter dhē* 'put away; do in' (Vedic *antár dhā* 'hide; do away with'; Lat. *interficere* 'consume [food]; kill';¹⁴ but also Avest. *antarə mrū*-, Lat. *interdicere* 'remove by verbal means, forbid, ban', with 'speak' replacing **dhē*-). Out of such usages might have evolved a meaning 'speak' through an overlap of the *dromena* and *legomena* of ritual activity.¹⁵

If thus one of the building blocks of the Hittite suppletive verb 'to speak' may be of Indo-European date, such origin can be affirmed *a fortiori* for the stem *tar*-. Lithuanian and Hittite are the only languages showing a primary verb *tar*-.¹⁶ (Lith. *tar̃ti* 'say', *tariù* 'I say', *tarmė* 'utterance'), while elsewhere there is only some questionable nominal debris (e. g. Old Prussian *tārin* 'voice' or OCS *trutorŭ* 'sound, noise'). Unlike its Hittite suppletion partner which may have originated in ritual language, *tar*- is probably a more basic verb for 'speak', the emphatic or solemn meanings of which ('declare, pledge', etc.) result from iterative or archaizing usage (cf. English *bespeak*, German *versprechen*).¹⁷

We can thus see millennial vistas of language history: a unique Hittite verb for 'speak', which was obsolescent already by 1300 b. c. e., had been hammered together of two different Indo-European stems which still live on in Modern Slavic and Baltic exclusively and respectively, as in Slovene *dem* and Lithuanian *tariù* 'I say'. This situation is noteworthy but not unique: harking back for a parting shot to the *u*-stems, we found two exclusive pairs: Hitt. *dampu*- 'rough, uncouth'

13 Cf. W. Couvreur, *De hettitische H* (Louvain 1937), 182.

14 Cf. my remarks in *Journal of the Department of English, University of Calcutta* 14 (1978-79), 41-43 (= S. K. Chatterji Memorial Number).

15 Cf. W. Porzig, *Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets* (Heidelberg 1954), 189, who saw the source of **dhē*- 'say' (< 'put') in solemn dedicatory formulae.

16 H. Eichner's connection (in *Flexion und Wortbildung* [Wiesbaden 1975], 93) of Hitt. *tar*- with IE **dher*- 'hold' in the sense of 'maintain, assert' lacks plausibility; the occasional alternative spelling *dar*- is no indication of /dar-/.

17 There is little probability in E. Benveniste's reinterpretation (*Hittite et indo-européen* [Paris 1962], 119-122) of Gk. *τορός* as 'clear, exact' (rather than 'piercing, loud'), distinct from *τορέω* 'pierce' and directly connectible with Hitt. *tar*-, thus pointing to an alleged IE **ter*- 'utter with precision'; cf. the critique of M. Mayrhofer, *Die Sprache* 10 (1964), 193, and J. de Roos, *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J. C. Kamerbeek* (Amsterdam 1976), 323-331.

besides OCS *topŭ* 'dull, obtuse', and Hitt. *alpu*- 'smooth, rounded' besides Lith. *alpūs* 'weak'. Hittite *dampu*- and *alpu*- formed an antonymous pair 'rough': 'smooth' 3500 years ago, but their only attested cognates once again live on in Modern Slavic and Baltic respectively: Russian *tupój* 'dull, stupid' and Lithuanian *alpūs* 'weak'.

Lithuanian has acquired a reputation as a repository of archaic linguistic curiosities which find their matches most often in Old Indic. This popular notion has had time to take root and flourish because Lithuanian and Sanskrit have been compared for about 175 years. As Anatolian philology matures we are seeing that Baltic-Anatolian common archaisms are no less significant. This study marks merely a modest inception of exploration.

THE MEANING OF HITTITE *AULI*-

Jacques Duchesne-Guillemin has left a luminous mark in Anatolian studies with his "Études hittites", conceived in the dark years 1941-1946 and published in the latter year in the *Transactions of the Philological Society* (pages 73-91). In that pioneering work he furnished explanations and etymologies of sixty-three words and word groups, a large number of which have stood the test of a later era of hittitology; to single out a sample, the connection of *lammar* with Latin *numerus* (page 85) has weathered both the practitioners of *ars nesciendi*¹ and subsequent (re-)discoverers², to become a *locus classicus* of insight into Anatolian and Indo-European word study³. Yet for all our progress, Hittite remains largely uncharted ground from whose bourn not every traveller returns laden with nuggets. Some thoughts on one vexing item of the Hittite lexicon are offered here in tribute to the achievement of our honoree.

The meaning of *auli*- has remained a puzzle. Albrecht Goetze had an initial, fundamental insight when he contributed the dual glosses 'a part of the body' and 'celebration, festival (or the like)' to E. H. Sturtevant's *Hittite Glossary*⁴, later adding the nuance of 'sacrifices (or similar)'⁵. Subsequent scholarship has failed to come to grips with that duality. C.-G. von Brandenstein⁶ and O. R. Gurney⁷ opted rather for an animal name, matching Akkadian *ayalu* 'stag' or designating fattened, perhaps castrated sacrificial animals respectively. J. Friedrich in his dictionary (1952) rejected the 'feast' notion and was content with the hesitant gloss 'an animal or body part of an animal'. The more recent treatments by H. M. Kümmel⁸ and C. Burde⁹ concentrated on the meaning 'body part' of (sacrificial) animals of both sexes and of (ailing) human beings

¹ A. Kammenhuber, *Corolla Linguistica* (Wiesbaden 1955), p. 105: "ohne Etymologie".

² G. Neumann, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 209 (1955), p. 171.

³ Cf. J. Tischler, in *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* (Innsbruck 1979), p. 262.

⁴ Philadelphia 1936, p. 32.

⁵ *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 61 (1941), p. 302.

⁶ *Orientalia* N.S. 8 (1939), p. 78-79.

⁷ *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 27 (Liverpool 1940), p. 59-60.

⁸ *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 3 (Wiesbaden 1967), p. 104-105.

⁹ *Ibidem* 19 (1974), p. 41, 59.

(in medical texts); Kümmel was not even sure whether a body part or a specific (inner?) organ is involved, while Burde inclined towards an inner organ containing or producing some liquid substance. Nothing was said of a sense '(sacrificial) feast'. The general *non liquet* was reinforced by E. Neu¹⁰, and by J. Tischler¹¹ who suggested the un-Occam-like possibility of two homonymous words *auli*-.

Quite a few of the attestations of *auli*- are devoid of usable context; I shall systematically review the rest. That *auli*- is cut from an animal is seen in *KBo* XV 33 III 11-12: *nu-ššan* ^{LÚ}EN.É-TIM ŠA UDU.ŠIR ŠA GUD.MAḥ-ya *auliya* GÍR.ZABAR-it QATAM dāi 'the master of the house with a bronze dagger lays hand on the a. of a ram and of a bull'. The removed *auli*- is ritually manipulated in *KBo* XV 9 IV 15-16 (emended from duplicate *KBo* XV 11 III 10): *nu* 1 MÁŠ.GAL ūnniyanzi [*nu-šši-kan aul*]in danzi n-an ANA DINGIR. MEŠ dapiandaš [*waḥnuwanzi n-]an arḥa piššiyanzi* 'they drive up a he-goat, take the a. from him, wave it to all the gods, and throw it away'. In *KUB* XI 26 II 10 and *KBo* XI 49 VI 15-16 *aulin karappanzi* 'they remove the a.', followed *ibid.* 11 and 18 respectively by reference to blood (*išḥanī*). The corresponding accusative plural with 'flesh' determinative (formally nom. pl. *a-ú-li-iš* or *a-ú-liš* besides *a-ú-li-eš*, used by syncretism for acc. pl. *a-ú-li-uš*) is seen in *KUB* XVII 24 III 3-5 *nu* ^{LÚ}MUḤALDIM UDU *ḥuekzi* [...] ^{UZU}*auliš šiyezzi* ^{LÚ}[...] ANA EN.SISKUR *akuwanna pāi* 'the cook slaughters a sheep, presses the a., the ... gives the sacrificer to drink' (similarly *KUB* XXVII 66 III 2 ^{UZU}*auliš šiyaizi*[i, *ibid.* 8]šiyaizi, *ibid.* 13 ^{UZU}*auliš š[iy]aizi*). While it does not necessarily follow that the offerant drinks what is squeezed out of the *auli*-, it is certainly a possibility. The human *auli*- can occur in the singular (*KBo* XXI 21 III 11 SIG₅-in *auli-šši anda* 'well in [his?] a.'), but mostly it is construed as an accusative plural with impersonal subject and in partitive apposition with the person affected:

KUB VIII 36 III 12-15: [*mān antuḥši auleš* EGIR-an *peššiyazzi* [*mān antuḥši ŠĀ-i auleš kattan šarā* [...]zzi *mān-za-kan antuḥšan au*][ēš [... *ku*]it *pedan epzi* 'if he (viz. a ^{LÚ}AZU or 'medicine man') neglects a person's a., if he upsets a person's a. internally, (or) if it (i.e. illness) seizes a person's a. some place'.

KBo XXI 74 III 6 [*mān* UKÛ-an *auliš kuitki AŠRA epzi* 'if it seizes a person's a. some place'; *ibid.* 9-10 *nu* UKÛ-an *kuit* [AŠRA] *auliš ḥarzi n-an apāt AŠRA* ['the place where it holds a person's a., that place ...'.

¹⁰ *Kratylos* 13 (1968), p. 69.

¹¹ *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (Innsbruck 1977), p. 94-95.

*KBo XXI 21 III 3-4 an*durza naššu auliš našm[a ...] [...] ištarakkiyazi našma a[n- 'internally either a. or ... ails, or ...'.

So far all the evidence points to a fleshy, squeezable inner organ of animals or humans, male or female, grammatically either singular or plural.

In other instances, however, the plural of *auli-* involving domestic beasts cannot possibly refer to parts of their bodies. Thus *KUB XVII 21 II 18-19* describes an evacuation of invaded territory: *auliuš-a-kan GUD.MAḪ.ḪI.A ŠE* ^{GUD}AB ŠE UDU.ḪI.A ŠE MÁŠ.GAL.ḪI.A ŠE *kuez arḫa nannier* 'whence they drove away a. of fatted bulls, fatted cows, fatted sheep, fatted he-goats'. Lest there be doubt about the syntax, *ibid.* III 26 makes explicit *auliušš-a ŠA* GUD.MAḪ.ḪI.A ..., with the genitival prepositional akkadogram *ŠA*. These multiples of *auli-* are matched by *KBo XXV 178 I 2 UDU.ḪI.A-aš auliūš* with probable genitive complement, 'of sheep'. *KUB XXIV 3 II 11* has in addition the ovine determinative: ^{UDU}auliūš-kan GUD.ḪI.A UDU.ḪI.A 'a. of cattle (and) sheep', as does *ibid.* 15 ^{UDU}auliūšš-a (the latter syntactically nom. sg.). Here the meaning must be something like 'sacrificial contingents', i.e. groups of victimal animals on the hoof which can be either driven or 'dragged' (*KBo XIX 152 I 6 auliš huittiyanta*). From there the next semantic step is to 'sacrificial occasion, sacrifice', as in *KUB XXIV 1 II 3-6 EZEN.ḪI.A-i-tta EZEN ITU EZEN.ḪI.A MU-aš mēanaš gimmantāš ḫamišḫandaš zenandaš auliš mukišnašš-a EZEN. MEŠ INA KUR* ^{URU}Hatti-pat ēš(šan)zi 'for you they perform feasts in the land of Hatti — feast of the month, feasts of Newyear, sacrifices of winter, spring, fall, and feasts of ritual'. This meaning probably inheres also in the repeatedly attested *auliš tarupta* 'the sacrifice is wrapped up (= concluded)' (*KBo XXIII 56 IV 7; 23/n, 7; KUB XI 18 III 7; VAT 7497 II 4*); it also makes intelligible *KUB XLVIII 123+XV 28+IBoT III 125, III 22-23 SAL.LUGAL-za-kan kui[n a]ulen INA* ^{URU}Zithar[a] aušta nu [...] *auliš ḫantaittari* 'the sacrifice which the queen saw at Z., (thāt) sacrifice is (oracularly) fixed'.

There remains *KBo XII 89 II 9 auliš arḫa paiddu* 'let a. go away!', in a repetitional sequence (7-10):] ḫarki arḫa paiddu nu-wa-šši-ka[n ...] [...] arḫa paiddu [...] *auliš arḫa paiddu* [...] *taḫruppiš* (?) *arḫa paiddu* 'let white (?) go away, let his (?) ... go away, let a. go away, let ... altogether (?) go away!'

In order to allow a metonymy from 'internal organ' to 'sacrificial contingent or occasion', *auli-* must have afforded a pivotal, perhaps even comprehensive anatomical spectacle at sacrifices. Heart (*kard-*) and liver

(*leši-*) being eliminated, the prime candidate would be 'spleen', the body's spongy reservoir for storing excess blood and regulating its volume in circulation. The spleen has an illustrious history in early folk belief, religion, and medicine, as is exemplified by Greek: σπλήν (< *splēghen-) has beside it a secondary (neuter) plural σπλάγχνα (< *splāghn-; cf. Avestan *spərəzan-*) as a *pars pro toto* term for 'internal organs', especially heart, liver, lungs, and kidneys which were eaten initially and preferentially by sacrificers (e.g. *Iliad* 1.464 and *Odyssey* 3.9 σπλάγχνα πάσαντο). Hence σπλάγχνα also meant metonymically 'sacrificial feast', as for example in Aristophanes, *Equites* 410: Διὸς σπλάγχνοισι 'at the feast of Zeus'. These Greek meanings match closely a postulated development of *auli-* from 'spleen' to (in the plural also comprehensively) 'internal organs' to 'sacrificial contingent or occasion'. There are even scribal attempts to differentiate the literal, fleshy sense (^{UZU}auli-) from the metonymous one (^{UDU}auli-), since sheep were the most typical ingredients of animal sacrifice.

Metaphorically σπλάγχνα came to denote emotions, especially anxiety, and σπλήν likewise evolved in the direction of 'bad temper, depression, melancholy', as in Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae* 3: τὸν σπλήνα ... ἐκβαλεῖν 'throw forth the spleen'. The *auliš* which is ordered to 'go away' in *KBo XII 89 II 9* (quoted above) may therefore also represent some kind of negative emotion akin to English 'spleen'; painful abstractions are regularly conjured to 'beat it' in Hittite, as for example in *KBo XII 126 I 20-21* [nu a]lwanzata ... n-at EGIR-pa BELI-ŠU paiddu 'the witchcraft ... let it go back to its master!'

About the etymology of *auli-* little can be said. Just like the Germanic term for spleen (English *milt*), *auli-* stands apart from the Indo-European mainstream (Greek and Iranian quoted above, also Skt. *plihān-* < *[s]plīghen-, Lat. *liēn* < *[s]plīghen-, Arm. *p'aycaln* < *phaighen < *[s]plaighen-, Old Irish *selg* < *spelghā, OCS *slēzena* < *[s]pelghenā, Lith. *blužnis* < *blghn-). The spelling *a-ū-li-* may point to a reconstruction *aweli-¹² (cf. e.g. *a-ū-ti-* beside normal *awiti-*), although no credible 'unreduced' attestation is found¹³. As an *i*-stem, *aweli- matches such other terms for body parts as *arki-* 'testicle', *leši-* 'liver', *šakui-* 'eye', and may like they be of ancient Indo-European origin. An ultimate tie-in with the mainline 'spleen' words is conceivable, once the latter are

¹² Cf. H. Kronasser, *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache* (Wiesbaden 1966), p. 78.

¹³ Goetze's alleged *awili-* (loc. cit. in fn. 5) was a misreading for *awiti-*; *KUB XXIV 14 IV 11 a-wi-li-en*, booked by H. Ertem, *Boğazköy metinlerine göre Hititler devri Anadolu'sunun faunası* (Ankara 1965), p. 257, is Hattic.

stripped of secondary ablaut, *s* movable (with unvoicing effect on following stop), and similar deformations, and reduced to a basic **bl̥gh-* best mirrored by Baltic (Lith. *blužnis*, Old Prussian *blusne*). If **awel-* reflects **Awel-*, then **bl̥gh-* can possibly be accounted for as **Awl̥-gh-*, on the assumption that *Aw* could yield Indo-European **b*, for which a primary origin is unlikely due to rarity. In that case *auli-* may yet be at the very root of the common Indo-European term for 'spleen'.

On the polyphonic *pè* value of the Hittite *pít* sign

In *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* (Innsbruck 1979, p. 209—217) I had occasion to reassert the largely rejected alternative reading *pè* for the cuneiform sign usually transcribed in Hittite as *pít* or *pát*. I suggested *pè-da-* 'dig' (rather than *pád-da-*) and possibly *-pè* for the particle usually rendered as *-pát*, while doubting old suggestions that some "*pè-da-*" readings be considered allographic for *pí-e-da-* 'carry, bring', preferring to view them rather as forms of *píd-da-*, *pí-it-ta-* 'render, bring, pay'. I arrived at roughly the following distribution of spellings:

1. OHitt. rarely *pí-it-ta-*, usual *pít-ta-*, *píd-da-* 'run, fly'.
2. OHitt. occasionally *pí-it-ta-*, usual *píd-da-*, *pít-ta-* 'render, bring, pay', denominative from *pí-it-ta*, *pí-(i)-e-it-ta* < **piyatta* 'giving(s), gift(s)'.
3. OHitt. once *pí-e-da-*, usual *pè-da-* 'dig'.
4. Usual *pí-e-da-*, *pí-da-* 'carry, bring'.

The possibilities of near-synonymy between 2. and 4. are obvious (cf. *KBo* III 34 II 35 *nikumanza uwatar pí-it-ta-iz-zi* 'naked he brings water' with *KUB* XIII 4 III 32—34 *nu nekumanza ... nu watar ... pí-e-da-a-ú* 'naked ... let him bring water'). A visual, graphic overlap of the homophonous 3. and 4. may have been avoided by the scribes through the device of *pè-da-* vs. *pí-(e)-da-*.

As further data bearing on the interrelations of 2. and 4., and on the status of the reading *pè* which affects 3., we can adduce various forms of a compound term denoting an implement for 'bringing forward', construed in the manner of a "free" elliptic genitive of the type *kardiyaš-šaš (iya-)* '(do) one's heart's (viz. desire)', matching Akk. *ša libbi-šu (epēšu)*:

KUB XXIX 4 I 18: 1-EN *pí-ra-an pí-e-du-na-aš* ŠA NA₄ 'one proffering platter (lit. 'of bringing forward') of stone'; cf. ibid. 40: 1 *kat-ta-an ti-ya-an-na-aš* 1 *pí-ra-an pí-e-d[u-na-aš]* 'one depositional tray (lit. 'of putting down') (and) one proffering platter'.

KUB XLII 11 Vs. 3: *pí-ra-an pí-e-du-ma-aš* AN.BAR GE₆ '[] proffering platter(s) of black iron'.

KUB XLII 26 Vs. 5: 6 *pí-ra-an pí-du-m[a-aš]*.

KUB XII 1 III 1: 3 *pí-ra-an pít-tu-na-a-a[š]*; cf. ibid. IV 8: 7 GAM-an *ti-ya-u-wa-aš* ŠA-BA 1 KA_xUD AM.SI 'seven depositional trays, among them one of ivory'.

KUB XLII 69 Vs. 18: *pí-r[a-an] píd-du-na-aš* GUŠKIN '[] proffering platter(s) of gold'.

These ritual plates were evidently made of costly material (gold, ivory, meteoric iron, [semi-precious] stone), and a comparison¹ with the earthen dish for offerings which the Greeks called *κέραυς* is hence hardly entirely apposite. For our purposes we have genitives of verbal action nouns: *pí-e-du-na-aš*, *pí-e-du-ma-aš*, *pí-du-m[a-aš]*, *pít-tu-na-a-a[š]*, *píd-du-na-aš*, and further *ti-ya-an-na-aš* besides *ti-ya-u-wa-aš*.

¹ H. Kronasser, *Die Umsiedelung der schwarzen Gottheit* (SÖAW 241.3 [Wien 1963]), p. 43.

The latter reflect the attested neuter nominatives *tiyatar* and *tiyauwar* from the secondary weak-grade stem *tiya-* of the verb *dai-* 'place, put'. Of the longer string the most expectable variant is *pi-e-du-ma-aš* or *pi-du-m[a-aš]* which matches the nominative *pi-e-tum-mar* (*KUB XVI 7 Vs. 17*) from *pi-(e)-da-*, parallel to *ú-tum-mar* (*KUB XXII 40 II 36*) from the pendant verb *ú-da-* 'bring', both containing *da-* 'take'. To understand its make-up we need to study the plural present paradigms of *da-*, *peda-*, and *uda-*:

First person: *dummeni* (*tummeni*), *pedum(m)eni* (*petum(m)eni*), *udum(m)eni* (*utummeni*).

Second person: *datteni* (*tatteni*), *pedatteni* (*pitatteni*), *udatteni*.

Third person: *danzi*, *pedanzi* (*pidenzi*), *udanzi* (*utinzi*).

The root being *da-* < IE **dō-* < **deA^w-*, we can reconstruct the base-paradigm as

**dA^w-wé-*

**déA^w-te-*

**dA^w-ént-*

For the full-grade stem-vocalism in the second person plural cf. e. g. the nasally infixed paradigm *šarnink-*:

šarninkueni < **sr-n-k-wé-*

šarnikteni < **sr-n-ék-te-*

šarninkanzi < **sr-n-k-ént-*

Accordingly the *u*-vocalism of *dummeni* represents the vocalized *o*-coloring laryngeal, or rather the syllabification of its labial component, with *dum(m)eni* < **du-weni* < **dA^w-wé-*. Similarly a verbal abstract noun with full-grade root-vocalism is seen in **dāwar* < **dō-wr* (gen. *da-a-ú-wa-aš* in *KUB XVII 18 III 20*), whereas one from an unaccented compounded form of the verb would be *(pe-)dum(m)ar* < **du-war* < **-dA^w-wr*. In the deviant genitive *pi-e-du-na-aš*, on the other hand, we have a more marginal, less productive variant **pedur* with the allomorph *-ur* in the nominative, thus **-dA^w-ur*, comparable in declension-type to e. g. *šehur* < **dhýéE-ur*² (genitive *šehunaš*); in this instance there was no secondary elimination of *r/n* declension (unlike the productive *-war/-mar* types with their genitives in *-waš/maš*).

These considerations account for all morphological discrepancies but not for the forms transliterated as *pít-tu-na-a-aš*, *píd-du-na-aš*. It is impossible to tie them in with *pít-ta-*, *píd-da-* 'render, bring, pay', since the latter is itself a denominative **pi(ya)ttaye-* ultimately derived from *pai-*, *piya-* 'give'; it would at best have yielded **pittawar*, gen. *pittawaš*, or more archaically possibly gen. **pittaunaš*, like *haršaunaš* from *haršawar* (verb *har(a)š-*, *haršiya-*). No support for a genitive **pittunaš* is found in *aniūr* 'ritual gear', a reduction product of the verbal noun *aniyauwar* (cf. infinitive *aniyawanzi*), which has a new, secondary *r*-stem paradigm (gen. *aniuraš*, dat.-loc. *aniuri*). The resulting aporia has been formulated by Silvin Košak³: "If the word (i. e. *pi-ra-an pít-tu-na-a-aš*) is to be equated with the *piran pedunaš*, then the present spelling cannot be reconciled with the verb *peda-* unless the reading BE for the first sign is recognized for the Hittite syllabary". Since there is no doubt that the "if" of Košak's initial protasis is to be granted, the case for a reading *pè* is now this much stronger: there is not only *pè-da-* 'dig' but also *pi-*

r)a-an pè-du-na-aš, *pi-ra-an pè-tu-na-a-aš*, and thus we have proof that some forms of *pi-(e)-da-* admitted a spelling with *pè-*; but typically they were of the shape *pè-du-* where no formal confusion with forms of *píd-da-* was possible. This addition to the skimpy dossier of *pè* also strengthens further the surmise that the particle routinely transcribed as *-pát* (or even *-pít*) is in reality *-pè*.

² Cf. *Florilegium Anatolicum* (Mélanges Emmanuel Laroche [Paris 1979]), p. 302.

³ *Linguistica* 18 (Ljubljana 1978), p. 106—107.

"SPIDER" AND "MOLE" IN HITTITE

The trilingual vocabulary passage KBo I 44 + XIII 1 I 49-51 reads as follows in the Sumerian, Akkadian, and Hittite columns:¹

49. [G]U.ŠAKÁN?	QÚ-U D ² SUMU[QAN]	D ² SUMUQAN-aš ha-an-za-na-aš
50. [G]U.ZI	QÚ-U ET-T[Ú-TI]	a-u-wa-wa-aš ha-an-za-na-aš
51. [...].DIŠ	QÚ-U NU-NA-[TI]	ha-aš-mu-ša-al-li-ya-aš ga-pa-an-za

Akkadian qū(m) means either "hemp, string, thread" or denotes some metallic container (of bronze?), but chances are that only the first of those homophones is treated in this passage, Akkadian being the semantic basis of the dictionary. Because GU.ŠAKÁN conveys the sense of "strand of sheep wool" and Akk. qū ettuti means "spider's web, cobweb", it would seem that Hitt. hanzanaš should also mean "thread, yarn", of a deity of the Telipinus circle and of an auwawa- respectively (both in the genitive), and that accordingly auwawa- ought to be "spider". In line 51 the Akkadian may show a form of nunnu, a loanword from Sumerian denoting some copper implement, and Hittite has hašmušalli-, which is a hapax legomenon; but I would disagree with Otten and Von Soden (1968:16) that the metallic Akk. qū is more probable here. Rather than endorsing

¹Cf. the edition by H. Otten and W. von Soden in *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 7 (Wiesbaden, 1968), 11.

their connection of gapanza with kappi- "small" (where both ga- and -p- diverge in spelling), one might seek a tie-in of gapanza with gapina-/kapina- "thread, yarn", thus a near-synonym of hanzana-, whether gapant- be an erroneously collapsed spelling for *gapinant- or a derivational variant.

However, since 1953² hanzana- has been rendered as "black",³ and the helpful Bojan Čop, ever ready with an etymology, has compared it with Gk. ἄσπετος (< *ngi-) "mud, filth" and Skt. āsita- "dark, black".⁴ The grounds for this identification would at first glance seem cogent, since the sense is extracted from strings of color adjectives describing wool and taking in five "canonic" hues:

HT 1 II 20-21 = KUB IX 31 II 46-47: SÍG ZA.GÌN SÍG SA₅ SÍG SIG₇. SIG₇ SÍG GE₆ SÍG BABBAR-ya "blue wool, red wool, yellow wool, black wool, and white wool".

KUB VII 54 II 17-18: SÍG SA₅-ma-wa SÍG ZA.GÌN SÍG GE₆ SÍG HAZERTI SÍG BABBAR-ya "red wool, blue wool, black wool, green (= yellow) wool, and white wool".

For all of these sumerograms we have Hittite equivalents, some with plausible Indo-European etymologies:

Blue: ZA.GÌN = andara- < *amdra- < *md(h)ro- (cf. Slavic *modro, Czech modrý "blue").

Red: SA₅ = mida-, midi- (cf. Gk. μύλος, Lat. minium "red ochre", with d : l : n variation of "Mediterranean" origin).

Yellow(-green): SIG₇ (.SIG₇) = HAZERTI = haḫlawant-.

Black: GE₆ = dankui- < *dhngw- (cf. Old Norse dǫkk, German dunkel "dark").

²E. Laroche, *Revue d'assyriologie* 47, p. 41.

³Already A. Goetze, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 1 (1947), 312, saw in it a color adjective.

⁴*Linguistica* 10 (Ljubljana, 1970), 95-96.

White: BABBAR = *harki-* (cf. Gk. ἀργός "bright, white") or *ašara-*, *ešara-* < **esra-* < **aysro-* (cf. OCS. *jasno* < **[j]ěsnъ* < **ays(k)no-*; cf. *iskra* "spark", Lith. *aiškus*, *iškus* "clear").

Now in a couple of "wooly" contexts we find, in the exclusionary slot for GE₆, the form *ha-an-za-na-aš* rather than the expected *dankui-*:

KUB XXIX 4 I 31: *síg sa₅ síg za.gìn síg hanzanaš síg sig₇.sig₇ síg babbar danzi* "red wool, blue wool, *hanzana-* wool(s), yellow wool, white wool they take".

Ibid. 32-33: *nu namma síg za.gìn síg sa₅ síg hanzanaš síg sig₇.sig₇ síg babbar-ya danzi* "and also blue wool, red wool, *hanzana-* wool(s), yellow wool, and white wool they take".

5 KUB XXIX 8 I 33-34: *síg sa₅ síg za.gìn síg hanzanaš síg sig₇.sig₇* "red wool, blue wool, *hanzana-* wool(s), yellow wool".

It is of course tempting to posit here GE₆ = *hanzana-*, and elsewhere one can find close proximities of *hanzana-* with "white" which may point to antonymy: KBo VIII 95 Vs. 8 (fragmentary) GAD.DAM *hanzana[-* besides *ibidem* 7 GAD.DAM BABBAR (describing an article of clothing); KBo X 37 I 39-40 *ašaran ... [...GIM-an hanzanaš [... -]az arha tuḫšan-* [*za* "white ... as the *hanzanaš* from (or: by means of) ... (is) cut off".

But such an interpretation is hardly compelling. Rarely are all five colors listed ("white" is missing even in KUB XXIV 8 I 33-34 just quoted), and shorter lists abound (e.g., KUB XVII 8 IV 4 "red, black, yellow"; KUB VII 29, 7-8 "yellow, red, blue"; KBo IV 2 I 63-64 *ašaraš mitiēš paddani-ššan kue kitta* "white [and] red [strands of wool] which lie in the basket"; VBoT 24 I 23 *síg antaran síg midann-a* "blue wool and red wool"). Considering expressions such as (KUB XXIV 9 I 43) *síg* (= *hulanan*) *antarantan kapinan QATAMMA iyazi* "she makes likewise blue wool into thread", one may compare the corresponding plural in paragraph 126 of the Law Code (KBo VI 10 II 15-16 *takku gapinuš ša 1 tūg kuiški tāyezzi* "if anyone steals the yarns for a garment") and translate *síg₇ hanzanaš* (rather than *síg hanzanaš*) as acc. or nom. pl.

"strands" of the previously mentioned blue and red wool in the passages quoted.⁵ Altogether it seems that Akk. *qū ettuti* and Hitt. *auwawaš hanzanaš* as "cobweb" are well matched, and that *auwawa-* definitely means "spider".

Apart from the man's name ^I*A-wa-u-wa-a* (KBo XV 28 Vs. 2), other attestations have the spelling *a-u-wa-u-wa-* and occur in descriptions of rhyta:

Bo 2583 II 8-9: *BIBRA GUŠKIN-ya-šmaš auwawaš KAŠ-it šūwandan piran pe harkanzi* "they hand them a gold rhyton *auwawaš*, filled with beer".

KBo XVI 100, 4-7: *[n-an IŠTU BIBRI auwawaš[it] [...] EGIR-ŠU-ma D_Huwaššannan D_{UT}[u-un] [...] auwawašit-pat TUŠ-aš ekuzi n[-an] [...] l]āḫui nu EGIR-ŠU ŠA GUD BIBR[A* "her (?) from a rhyton *auwawašit* ..., and again the goddess H. (and) the solar deity ... *auwawašit* he toasts (in) sitting (position), ... he pours, and again a rhyton of bovine (design) ...".

KBo XVI 101, 2: *auw]auwaš*; *ibid.* 6: *[GUŠKIN auwawašan*.

Since we are in the domain of theriomorphic designs, it is not to be ruled out that parallel to the bovine type (ŠA GUD) there may have been a line of goldware described as "spiderware", whether from spindly shapes or decorative motifs; *auwawaš* (qualitative genitive) and *auwawašit* (instrumental case) would thus mean "of arachnoid shape" or "with arachnoid decoration".

auwa(u)wa- is plausibly a (Luwoid) phonetic variant of *akuwakuwa-*, on the lines of *lala(k)ueša-* "ant" or *tar(k)uwa-* "dance".⁶ *akuwakuwa-* has been rendered for half a century as "frog, toad",⁷ mainly with ref-

⁵This newly established noun *hanzana-* "thread, yarn, strand" may have some connection with *GIŠhanza* (in a list of wooden objects, KUB VII 13 Vs. 6), dat.-loc. sg. *GIŠhanzani* (KUB XXXIV 78, 7, fragmentary; in paragraph 144 of the Law Code [KBo VI 10 III 11] *GIŠhanzan[i]* figures in the context of a garment being cut [*tuḫšari*]).

⁶Cf., e.g., G. Neumann, *IF* 76 (1971), 261; J. Puhvel, *JAOS* 94 (1974), 294-95.

⁷E. Forrer apud P. Kretschmer, *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 1 (1929),

erence to onomatopoeic terms in other languages such as the Greek frog-cry *κοῦξ* or Latin *coaxō* "croak". A. Kammenhuber's "toad" or "mole"⁸ is no improvement, and J. Tischler's argument⁹ that the creature had to make some characteristic sound to rate such a name is contradicted by, e.g., *lala(k)ueša-*. G. Neumann's comparison¹⁰ of *akuwakuwa-* with Hesychius's βάβαροι • ὑπὸ ἡλεῶν τέττιγες; ὑπὸ Ποντικῶν δὲ βάτραχοι is phonetically even more apposite for *awawa-*; but "cicada" and "frog" are semantically far enough apart to admit a third alternative of random reduplicative onomatopoeia (nor is any chirping or croaking required, any more than an ant had to say *la-lak-*).

akuwakuwa- is known for its *hatteššar* "hole, lair", seen in Bo 2738 I 7-8 *akuwakuwaš hattešni*, with duplicate Bo 7230, 7 *akukuwa<š> ha[t-*. There is also the seeming haplographic *akuwaš* in Bo 2738 I 17 *akuwaš AMA-aš GUD-uš*, paralleling a preceding passus preserved in the duplicate Bo 2499 I 3 *lalawēšnaš* ("swarm of ants") *AMA-aš GUD-uš*.¹¹ The association with ants points to an insect, and the "lair" agrees with the underground habitation patterns of certain spectacular mygalomorph spiders such as tarantulas. We can therefore with some confidence posit the common denominational formula *a(k)uwa(k)uwa-* as the Hittite word for "spider".

Another tiny animal, of ominous import, bears the Hittite name *ašku-*:

795/c Rs. 1-2: *aškuš uizzi [...]* *aki* "(if) an *aškuš* comes, (so-and-so) will die".¹²

KUB XXXIV 22 I 5-6: *takkuw-ašta aškuēš* ^{GIŠ} *PISAN-az* [*watkuanzi*] SAG.GEME.İR.MEŠ-*kan maušk[anzi* "if *aškuēš* (nom. pl.) jump from a wooden

310; C. H. Carruthers, *Language* 6 (1930), 160.

⁸Hethitisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg, 1975), 54.

⁹Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar (Innsbruck, 1977), 12.

¹⁰Untersuchungen zum Weiterleben hethitischen und luwischen Sprachgutes in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit (Wiesbaden, 1961), 82.

¹¹Cf. H. Otten, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 66 (1976), 94-5.

¹²Cf. H. Otten, *op. cit.*, in fn. 1, p. 31.

drain, servants will fall".

Ibid. 7-9: *takkuw-ašta aškuēš ŠAPAL* ^{GIŠ} *GU.Z[A parā]* *watkuwanzi nu apāt* ^{GIŠ} *SÚ.A [...]* *arha pippattari* "if *aškuēš* jump forth from under a throne, that seat will be overturned".

Ibid. 2-3: *n-ašta ašk[uēš ...]* *parā hanti watkuanzi* [*i* "*aškuēš* jump forth separately".

J. Friedrich¹³ saw in *ašku-* either a noxious insect or some kind of mouse, and H. A. Hoffner¹⁴ added as creepy-jerky possibilities grasshopper, lizard, frog, and toad. Clearly the uniform portentousness of the creature points to exceptionally sinister characteristics. Some "death beetle" is conceivable, but most probable is "mole", i.e., the blind, chthonian permutation of the mouse whose daylight emergence would be ominous and whose subterranean burrowings were literally conducive to collapse and downfall.¹⁵ If so, the Hittite view of the mole chimes with the Roman one and is at variance with the beneficent, folk-medical traits of the mole found in, e.g., Greek and Indic lore.¹⁶ The word *ašku-* may then be related to the (further derived or compounded?) Gk. (ἀ)σκάλοψ > (metathetic) ἀσπάλαξ "mole", Ἀσκληπιός (mole-god), ἀσκάλαβος "gecko". The *u*-stem *ašku-* is also reminiscent of Skt. *ākhū-* "mole", the explanation of which via *ā* + *khā-/khan-* "dig" leaves a lot to be desired.

We thus have vaguely cognate terms for "mole" stretching from India via Anatolia to Greece (vs. Latin *talpa*), and broadly similar words for "spider" reaching from Anatolia (*akuwakuwa-*) to Greece (Mycenaean *a-wa-ra-ka-na*, Gk. ἀράχνη) to Italy (Lat. *arānea*).

¹³*Bibliotheca Orientalis* 5 (1948), 50; *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1952), 36.

¹⁴*Alimenta Hethaeorum* (New Haven, 1974), 91-92.

¹⁵Cf., e.g., Pliny's account of a town in Thessaly undermined by moles (*Natural History* 8.104).

¹⁶Cf., e.g., J. Puhvel in W. D. Hand (ed.), *American Folk Medicine: A Symposium* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1976), 33-34; *Pharos* 39 (1976), 21.

With *Aspects de la fonction guerrière chez les Indo-européens* (1956; German edition 1964) and its revamped version *Heur et malheur du guerrier* = *The Destiny of the Warrior* (1969), Georges Dumézil inaugurated a systematic investigation of the Indo-European warrior type by matching the Roman "epic" of Tullus Hostilius with Vedic myths surrounding Indra, more specifically the combined "third vs. triple" and killing-of-kin themes (Horatii vs. Curiatii, Trita Āptya vs. Trīśiras) and the episode of the treacherous ally (Namuci, Mettius) over whom the hero prevails with the aid of succorous deities (Sarasvatī — Aśvins, Quirinus — Ops) and whom he slays in the end by cruel and unusual, thus "sinful" means. Dumézil also stressed the "solitude and liberty" characteristics of the Indo-European warrior, as exemplified by Indra's epithet *ēka-* 'one, alone, unique,' his avyayībhāva adverb *yathāvaśām* 'as one wills,' and his noun *svadhā* 'one's own law, autonomy.' The latter's cognate relationship with Latin *sodālis* 'member of a secret society'(1) pointed up the warrior's ambivalent role as single champion or part of a self-centered corps or coterie, both a society's external defender and its potential internal menace.

As symptomatic of such a mythic warrior's "life story" Dumézil singled out "negative peaks" or perhaps nadir-episodes, a structured set of misdeeds or failings in which the hero compromises his career by offending all three levels of society by murderous/sacrilegious, cowardly/unwarriorlike, and venal/adulterous acts respectively. Thus Indra, spared censure in Vedic hymns for the simple reason that one does not dwell on the seamy side of one's object of celebration, has his antisocial proclivities fully aired in Brāhmaṇic, Epic, and Purāṇic texts,

(1) This interpretation of *sodālis*, both substantive and etymological, is spectacularly reinforced by the Publicola-inscription from Satricum: *steterai popliosio ualesiosio suodales mamartei* 'the Männerbund of Publius Valerius set up (=dedicated) to Mars' (cf. *Lapis Satricanus* [The Hague, 1980], esp. the remarks of C. de Simone [pp. 71-94] and H.S. Versnel [pp. 95-150]).

especially Book Five of the *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* where Indra's killing of his fellow god Tvaṣṭar's son Trīśiras and of Vṛtra (replacing Namuci), and sexual possession of Ahalyā in the disguise of her husband Gautama, cause him to be divested of his splendor, might, and looks (*tejas, balaṃ, rūpaṃ*) which are transferred to Dharma, Māruta (= Vāyu), and the Nāsātya (= Aśvin) twins respectively (and subsequently deposited in the wombs of the queens Kuntī and Mādri, engendering the Mahābhārata heroes Yudhiṣṭhira, Bhīma + Arjuna, and Nakula + Sahadeva). Dumézil saw a parallel in the Avestan "first king" and culture hero Yima who when sinning lost his regal glory (*xvamaḥ*) in staggered portions which were successively reinvested in Mithra, Thraetaona, and Kṛsāspa. Similar three low points in the sagas of Starcatherus in Saxo Grammaticus (regicidal human sacrifice inspired by Odin, uncharacteristic cowardice in battle, "contract" killing for gold of a king in his bath) and of Herakles in Diodorus Siculus (killing of his own children in rage brought on by Hera, ruseful defenestration of Iphitus, adultery with Iole) supplied Germanic and Greek reinforcements of the typology.

This work, attractively presented, closely reasoned, and full of intriguing parallelisms, has proven notably popular with oversimplifying systematizers and interlopers in comparative mythology. The "three sins of the warrior" in fact threatens to become an epigonous cliché not unlike the "three functions" themselves. Ancient Greece, that most treacherous of foraging grounds for mythologically inclined Indo-Europeanists, is being assiduously combed by a brave new cast of *chercheurs*. Françoise Bader (*Revue des études grecques* 89.36-37 [1976]) interprets the crew of Penelope's suitors as a warrior band with tri-functional names (Antinoos indicates "intelligence," Eurymakhos "fight," while Amphinomos and Ktesippos point to division of cattle and horses!) and spends 72 pages to show how out of a single verb (IE **swer-*) can be squeezed a tripartite set of Greek usages (divine, warlike, pastoral "watch"; *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 66.1.139-211 [1971]). Bernard Sergent, in various articles and the announced *thèse de doctorat*, declares open season on all *tripertita* in Ancient Greece. Cisatlantic scholars foist the Nessos-garment of the triple-sinning Indo-European warrior on a variety of Greek heroes and an occasional villain: Achilles (C. Scott Littleton, in *Myth and Law Among the Indo-Europeans* 238 [1970]), Bellerophon and

Patroclus (Steven Lowenstam in *Archaeological News* 6.3.72-76 [1977]), Aegisthus (D. A. Miller in *Arethusa* 10.259-269 [1977]), Ares (U. Strutynski in *Arethusa* 13.217-231 [1980]). Some even essay a rudimentary form of "source criticism" as when Lowenstam sets Dumézil straight by rejecting the Starcatherus parallel (while endorsing Indra: Herakles) and patronizingly concludes: "In the final analysis, I agree with Dumézil's reconstruction, but further substantiation would be welcome."

Substantiation has been available for some time, in *Mythe et épopée* II (1971) and III (1973). The hero as stakes in a game of gods – such is the title Dumézil has bestowed on his treatment of the "parallel lives" of Starcatherus, Śiśupāla, and Herakles in *ME* II, 13-132, a work which makes the earlier study seem a superficial sketch. Yima and Indra have been excluded from the dossier, the former without explanation *in loco*. In *Heur et malheur* 94-95 = *Destiny of the Warrior* 103-104 Yima's non-warrior status was explained via the doctrinal "demilitarization" of the Zoroastrian reform, whereas now (*ME* II, 356-358 = *The Destiny of a King* 110-112 [1973]) Yima stands apart altogether, charged rather with a single (albeit triply compartmentalized), all-encompassing "sin of the sovereign" radically different in kind from the "three sins of the warrior." Indra's eviction is explicit: the *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* account is pronounced a secondary, artificial mythological extension of the epic theme of the three sins (*ME* II, 20, 129-130) which latter Dumézil finds rather tucked away in the figures of Śiśupāla + Jarāsandha in the *Mahābhārata*. These refinements started from a realization that peculiar concordances of the mortal careers of Starcatherus and Herakles, from the setting of their fates by antagonistic deities of the "first two functions" (Odin-Thor, Hera-Athena) to their quasi self-immolational death using the services of a young assistant (Hatherus, Philoktetes), outweigh the single theme of the three sins.

The resulting study of three heroic careers attains important new levels of penetration in the Starcatherus part, giving their due also to Old Icelandic sources for Starkadr (especially the *Gautrekssaga*). It also analyzes in depth for the first time the strange figures of Śiśupāla and his supplementary analogue and overking Jarāsandha. The Herakles part, however, remains as before somewhat sketchy and inconclusive. Dumézil nevertheless triangulates the Scandinavian, Indic, and Greek traditions and reaches the startling conclusion that the Scandinavian-

Greek isotheme bundle constitutes the strongest axis, with the Scandinavian-Indic one a clear second, and the Greek-Indic one an almost nonexistent third. Thus the Starcatherus story, despite its late attestation, is the common denominator and hence the purest reflector of Indo-European inheritance. Rather than a triangle, the whole is a triptych, with Scandinavia as centerpiece and India and Greece as side panels.

Some of the discrepancies and "loose ends" in the Herakles saga are readily explicable as culturally conditioned innovations. Unlike Starcatherus and Śiśupāla with their innate enormities (supernumerary arms [+ eye in Śiśupāla]) which are corrected in childhood by divine intervention, Herakles is "normal" for the simple reason that he conforms to the Greek norm which eschews congenital monstrosity in Olympian heroes, reserving hand-related and ocular irregularities for the former gods of the Titan generation (Hekatonkheiroi, Kyklopes). Rather than undergo decapitation in the manner of Starcatherus or Śiśupāla, Herakles has a mysterious apotheosis by fire on a mountain, in conformity with the classical heroic pattern. In contradistinction to the ultra-royalists Starcatherus and Śiśupāla who nevertheless become regicidally entangled (counting Jarāsandha as alter ego of Śiśupāla), Herakles has no similar extreme proclivities; apart from his strained service to Eurystheus, his legend conforms to the general obsolescence of human sacrifice in classical Greece,⁽²⁾ unlike the persistence of ritualistic murder in pagan Scandinavia and its vestigial reminiscences in both Vedic legendry and ritual and in the laws of Manu.

But interest centers on the "game of gods" in which the hero is the "stakes" (perhaps one might call him rather the pawn in a divine tug-of-war), and here, too, Herakles is notably discrepant. Unlike Starcatherus buffeted in the tension-field between Odin and Thor, and Śiśupāla, human replica of Rudra-Śiva, face to face with Kṛṣṇa, an avatar of Viṣṇu, Herakles is the victim/beneficiary of the attentions of two female deities, Hera and Athena. This feature, too, can be explained as a Greek innova-

(2) Apart from the expiatory role of the *φάρμακος* and some stray accounts (such as that of Plutarch [*Themistocles* 13] concerning the sacrifice of three prisoners of war to Dionysus Omestes in order to assure victory at Salamis). For Minoan and Mycenaean cultures there is both archeological evidence (cf. e.g. Y. Sakellarakis, *National Geographic* 159, No. 2, 205-222 [1981]) and legendary data (e.g. consignments of Athenian youths to the Minotaur, Iphigenia done in at Aulis and herself wielding the knife at Tauris, Achilles slaying Trojan captives on the pyre of Patroclus).

tion, attributable to the role that the Olympian offshoots of the Aegean goddesses typically play in the careers of individual heroes (e.g. Athena with Odysseus); Zeus is in such cases above the fray, or in this instance working for his son through the proxy of his head-born daughter, with Olympian household tensions replacing inherited Indo-European antagonisms.

Since Indo-European structures are involved in this epic plot, neither sectarian oppositions between Odin-cult and Thor-worship in Viking Scandinavia, nor the Vaiṣṇava/Śaiva split of Hinduism, nor the absence of any such historical schism in the Olympian system are of relevance (the Olympian: chthonian dichotomy does not enter). Dumézil is naturally prone to applying the trifunctional analysis and to extrapolating from such typecasting. Thus Odin is essentially of the "first function," Thor "second function," as are Hera and Athena respectively, chiefly on the basis of the anecdotal Judgment of Paris, while Rudra and Viṣṇu are not "functionally integrated" (still, Vasus, Rudras, and Ādityas sum up the formulaic roster of the tripartite pantheon [RV 10.128.9], and Rudr[iy]as = Maruts are clearly warrior deities). Dumézil is of course aware of the functional shifts and slippages in Germanic theology, with Odin's warlike preoccupations and Thor's impingements on the rain-related concerns of the husbandmen. He is also quite willing to admit further complexity in Odin, latching on to the comparisons made by Jan de Vries and others between Odin and Rudra. Thus a different, extrafunctional opposition of "dark" (Odin, Rudra) and "light" (Thor, Viṣṇu) deities is set up, one that is more serious for the tripartite system than was Dumézil's one-time distinction of "first" and "last" gods, since it cuts across such stalwarts of trifunctionality as Odin and Thor. Dumézil realizes that this "dark": "light" opposition lies at the heart of the antagonisms that victimize the hero, and yet he is unable to find any trace of it in Hera: Athena, leaving this ἀνορία for others to solve (ME II, 123).

For further understanding of this saga we might expunge all reference to the "first function" and treat it as purely internal to the warrior class, with the "dark": "light" opposition basic to the inner tensions of that class. Such threadbare distinctions as the "chivalrous" vs. "brute" warrior (Indra vs. Vāyu, Arjuna vs. Bhīma, Achilles vs. Herakles; cf. e.g. *Destiny of the Warrior* xi) should likewise be deemphasized as superficial: e.g. Gregory Nagy (*The Best of the Achaeans* 323-328 [1979]) singles out

the "meaningful" distinctions between Bhīma and Arjuna, only to show that Achilles partakes of a mélange of both (swift as the wind [cf. Vāyu!], a loner like Bhīma, yet possessed of splendid armor like Arjuna); such kind of treatment at least suffices to reveal flaws in the distinction itself; Thor is called "a kind of Vāyu or Bhīma" (i.e. a "solitary" champion) in ME II, 88, and yet Vāyu's alleged pre-Vedic "brute warrior" character had supposedly turned into that of a "first" (or "initial") god by Vedic times (*Destiny of the Warrior* 59). In short, we should clear the boards also of that non-basic differentiation.

For "dark" and "light" I would rather substitute a "demonic" vs. "culture god" opposition between deities of the warrior class. It is the difference between a figure of monstrous ancestry or attachments and one who makes the world safe against monsters, a kind of nature: culture tension in which the warrior is caught up. Rudra with his three eyes and four arms, one-eyed Odin born of the giantess Bestla and riding an eight-legged horse, Hera born of Titans, with one-eyed Kyklopes and hundred-armed Hekatonkheiroi for uncles and herself the parthenogenous mother of the monster Typhoeus — all these fit the "demonic" slot. The hero has definite onomastic associations with this kind of deity: Śiśupāla echoing (Rudra) Paśupati, Starcatherus-Starkadr being a compound of Hatherus-Hödr (name of both the hero's young deliverer from life and the fate-god himself, close to Odin), and Herakles meaning "possessing Hera's κλέος". The contrasting deity is one who prunes the wild by holding down the monstrous (Indra or Trita Āptya slaying Trisīras, Thor cutting back on giants, Athena Nike with the Gorgon's head on her breastplate) and furthering normal nature (Indra and Thor releasing waters, Trita Āptya being "watery" in his very clan-name, Athena nurturing both plants [olive] and the young [Erikhthonios]). Vāyu may well originally belong on the "wild" side, and Indra has become too much of an all-round warrior god to admit full and sharp polarization; but Viṣṇu is a good candidate for the "culture god" type, not only in his Kṛṣṇa-avataṛ but also in that of Rāma, who after all married the Furrow, Sītā, and whose story is homologous to the Indra-myths of the Veda, as Hermann Jacobi showed almost a century ago. Viṣṇu's Norse parallel, Vidar, is typically a strong-arm/foot god second only to Thor himself, one who will not desist from monster-extermination even in the last straits of eschatology, as he forces apart and shatters the jaws of the wolf Fenrir who has

devoured Odin. The warrior hero is thus somehow genetically and inherently demonic, and his career is marked by the drama between this ancestral burden and the rehabilitational and "civilizing" efforts under the figurative (and in one case literal) aegis of the opposing deity. Thor performs on Starkadr a rough form of plastic surgery, Kṛṣṇa relies on more miraculous instant normalization of the infant Śiśupāla, Athena's services to Herakles range from nurture to armament. In line with European heroic tradition, the Norse and Greek strongmen even acquire the finer skills of poetry and music, whereas India lays more stress on the purely demonic. Herakles shows traits reminiscent of the Thor type, perhaps preserving some of the features that have been otherwise lost due to Athena's female gender, such as active monster-killing and the episodes of transvestitism which also characterize Thor and Achilles. In the fullness of time, the god Odin who ordained Starkadr's three life-spans takes him back unto himself by the offices of Hödr; Zeus arranges for Hera to formally "adopt" the deified Herakles on whose begetting he had spent three symbolic night-spans. Śiśupāla's end comes instead at the hands of Kṛṣṇa, upon which he is absorbed into the godhead of his killer by a Viṣṇuic salvation miracle; this thematic reversal is as understandable in classical India as is the reclaiming of the hero by Odin in Viking Scandinavia; both accounts are simply true to their sectarian environments. The hero's career is in all instances tragic, due to the flaws inherent in his demonic nature or inflicted by the gods vying for his soul, but the resolutions differ: reconciliation in Europe, redemption in India.

Ancillary matter to this great tableau has been accumulating during the 1970s. Akin to the "three sins" is the theme of the "three charges against the warrior," as when the Romans Camillus (μισόδημος according to Plutarch, like the populace-hating Starchatherus) and Coriolanus are accused of sacrilege/usurpation, irregularities in the disposal of military spoils, and opposition to populist measures (ME III, 231-235, 242-248). Dumézil himself has compared with the three sins the excessive revenge that the Ossetic hero Batraz exacts for the murder of his father Xaemyc, with successive cruelties against the Boratae (third-estate clan), the AExsaertacgkatae (warrior estate), and the heavenly powers themselves (angels, spirits), until his death reconciles him to God (*Romans de Scythie et d'alentour* 50-58 [1978]). Daniel Dubuisson (*Annales Économies Sociétés Civilisations* 34.

464-489 [1979]) has tabulated what he considers the "three sins of Rāma" (i.e., the unethical slaying of Vālin, the brahmanicidal killing of Rāvaṇa, and the repudiation of Sītā), thereby to a degree affirming Jacobi's thesis of the Indraic sources of the characters and plot of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Franklin E. Horowitz (*Studia linguistica* 29.99-109 [1975]) has essayed a linguistic equation of Gk. σχέρλιος, with a plausible base-meaning 'unflinching, self-centered, reckless' (describing Achilles in *Iliad* 22.41), with Skt. *kṣatrīya-* as derived from the root **segh-*, thereby reopening to question Dumézil's interpretation of *sāhas-* as a "first-function" concept of 'might,' vs. the *ōjas-* of the war-god; B. Oguibenine ("Complément à l'image du guerrier indo-européen," *Journal asiatique* 226.257-290 [1978]) has entered the debate on the same topic. Perhaps most interesting of all, David J. Cohen (*Celtica* 12.113-124 [1977]) has challenged Dumézil's claim (ME II, 130) that "of the numerous great warriors of Irish sagas, none is the subject of a tale which even remotely recalls those that have been studied" (viz. Starkadr, Śiśupāla, Herakles). Suibhne Geilt in the *Buile Suibhne* is an Irish warrior whose life of wandering and poetry is dramatically highlighted by his unprovoked outrages against St. Rónán, his strange cowardly flight from the battle of Magh Rath, and his violent death in the house of St. Moling on an accusation — albeit false — of adultery, accompanied by last rites administered by St. Moling who had long anticipated Suibhne's coming and was thus fatally foreordained to attend to the final stages of his life. Here Rónán, the church-builder and "constructive" figure in association with kings, clearly occupies the "culture god" slot, and Suibhne's frenetic hatred of him has much in common with Śiśupāla's onslaught on Kṛṣṇa. Moling, on the other hand, figures as the ingatherer of the spent soul of this Sweeney Agonistes in the manner in which Odin arranges for the return of his own: reconciliation of the poet-warrior to his god rather than miraculous transfusional salvation, in line with Scandinavia and Greece rather than India. Cohen also finds an inverted variant of the theme of the "three sins" in the *Bórama Laigen*, which details St. Columb's description of three Irish kings who had gone to heaven, viz. Daimin Damargait who never hassled the church, Ailill who in the nick of time had thought better of fleeing from battle, and Feradach who was beguiled by gold until he repented of his hoarding on his deathbed and at last sought divine grace. Here the pitfalls which the

first two "saved" rulers avoided match the first two sins of Suibhne, whereas Feradach's last-minute immunity to *auri sacra fames* looks rather like the antidote that might have saved Starcatherus from his third sin, the mercenary murder of king Olo in return for gold.

Thanks to Dumézil we are at last hot on the tracks of a truly Indo-European hero-typology, one that mirrors an epic myth once current in traditions from Iceland and Ireland to Iran and India, greatly at variance with the ritualistic and psychoanalytic prototypes postulated for the "average" hero figure by the likes of Lord Raglan, Otto Rank and Joseph Campbell.

SCALES IN HITTITE

Weighing and scales were important matters and implements in the commercially-advanced cultures of the Ancient Near East and receive appropriate attention in Armas Salonen's *Die Hausgeräte der alten Mesopotamier I* (Helsinki, 1965), pp. 279 ff. In the Hittite archives, too, there is enough material for an adequate understanding of terms and practices.

As we have few Hittite economic records but an enormous mass of religious and legal texts, there is expectably less reference to actual and practical than to ritualistic, symbolic, or exemplary weighing. Formal weighing was apparently performed preferentially in sight of the all-seeing sun-god, the guarantor of justice:

KBo XVII 95 III 6-10: LÜAZU-ma-z GIŠ.RÎN ZIBANA dāi n-aš ANA LUGAL manninkuwan tiyezi nu ANA LUGAL A.BĀR pāi nu-ššan LUGAL-uš A.BĀR ANA GIŠ.RÎN ZIBANA dāi LÜAZU-ma-kan GIŠ.RÎN ZIBANA DUTU-i menahhanda epzi 'the medicine man takes the scales, he steps close to the king and gives lead to the king; the king places the lead on the scales, and the medicine man takes the scales before the sun-god'.

In *KBo XV 10 I 9-10* the officiator 1-NUTUM GIŠ.RÎN ZIBANA ŠA GIŠ dāi, 'takes a set of scales (made) of wood'; later in the same ritual (II 41-42) true valuables rather than lead weights occur:

[nu-šš]an ANA GIŠ.RÎN KÛ.BABBAR GUŠKIN NA₄. ĦIA xx.MEŠ <is>huwāi nu [DUTU-i] [menahh]anta 6-ŠU gankir 'on scales he scatters silver, gold (gem)stones, and . . . ; before the sun-god they weighed (them) six times'.

Symbolism thickens in the royal funerary texts, where human clay is pitted against worldly wealth:

KUB XXX 15 + XXXIX 19 Vs. 26-28: nu SALŠU.GI GIŠNUN[UZ] ZIBANA [dāi] nu-ššan 1-eaz' KÛ.BABBAR GUŠKIN

NA₄. *HI.A-ya hūmanduš dāi* [l-]edaz-ma-ššan šaluinan dāi 'the old woman takes a pair of scales; on one (scale) she places silver, gold and all (manner of gem)stones, but on the other she places clay-mortar.' A little later (34-35) the scales themselves are broken in a further gesture of vanity of vanities.

In the Old Hittite Prayer of Kantuzilis we find exposed instead the moral clay feet of a crooked merchant:

KUB XXX 10 Rs. 12-13: LUDAM.GAR-ša [...] *DUTU-i GIS_{elzi} harzi nu GIS_{elzi} maršanuzzi* 'the merchant holds the scales before the sun-god and (yet) falsifies the scales'.

Actual weighing occurs in the ritual *IBoT I 6 VI 13* where someone 'has weighed' (*arha kanganuz[zi]*) amounts of metals, and in *KUB XXI 27 III 42*, where Queen Puduhepa is dedicating to a deity a life-size gold statue of her husband Hattusilis (*arha-ya-an-[ma-]kan kanganumi* 'I shall have it weighed').

The king's very life-span is symbolically hung in the balance in *KBo XXI 22 Vs. 18-19: kāsa GIS_{elzi}.RĪN karpiyemi nu Labarnaš taluqauš MU.HI.A-us ušneškimi* 'behold, I pick up scales and I put up for weighing the long years of Labarnas' (followed [19-20] by the same procedure for the queen, Tawanannas).

Finally, there is the obscure paragraph 169 of the Law Code:

KBo VI 13 I 6-8: takku A.ŠĀ-LAM kuiški wāši ta ZAG-an paršiya NINDA_{haršin dāi t-an} DUTU-i paršiya GIS_{elzi} mit-wa taknā aršikkīt 'if someone buys a field and breaches the boundary, he (viz. the wronged party) takes a bread and breaks it to the sun-god (and says): "He has planted my scale in the earth" '.

This last expression is not only formulaic but probably also idiomatic for something like 'tip the scales against one, give one a raw deal'. It is reminiscent of the weighing of the fates of antagonists which Zeus performs in Homeric poetry, and especially of Hector's scale dipping all the way to Hades in *Iliad* 22.209-213. Is the Hittite idiom based on some similar mythic tradition (much as the *tagnaš* *DUTU-uš*, the chthonian

replica of the witnessing sun-god, is paralleled by the routine threats of the thwarted Homeric *ἥλιος* [παντοπτης] to go and shine amidst the dead in Hades)? Or is the Homeric formula a poetic conceit spun from some idiom analogous to the Hittite, fortified by a ritualistic tradition of weighing the fates of kings and heroes? In either case we are clearly in the realm of locution rather than literal scale-planting, and nowhere close to the symbolic scale-breaking of the mortuary rituals.

The vocabulary involved deserves comment. The sumerograms *GIS_{elzi}.RĪN* and *GIS_{elzi}.NUNUZ* are often extended akkado-graphically with *ZIBANA* (also *ZEPANA*, *ZIPANITUM*) and correspond to Akkadian *gišrinnu* and *zibānitu*. The corresponding Hittite word for 'scales' is the *i*-stem neuter noun *GIS_{elzi}* or *GIS_{elzi}*. 'Weigh' is *kank-*, *gank-*, literally and etymologically 'hang', and *gankuwar* means 'weight' (rather than 'hanging'); Latin *pendō* 'hang; weigh' : *pondus* 'weight' is a fair parallel. The verb *uš(ša)niya-* (iterative *ušneški-*), which means basically 'put up for sale' (cf. Latin *vendō* < *vēnundō* < **wesnom dō*), is used in the sense of 'put up for weighing, commit to price-determination, set up as stakes, place in the balance'.

Interest centers above all on *elzi*. The form can be neuter singular or plural, and in the latter capacity represent a former dual as well. The singular would mean 'scale' of a twin-scale instrument like the Greek *τάλαντα*, while the plural would denote the whole contraption, '(pair of) scales'. Akkadian *ZIBANA* may formally be a dual, and the quoted 1-*NUTUM GIS_{elzi}.RĪN ZIBANA* 'a set of scales' contains Akkadian *ištēnūtu* 'unit, set' which is normally used with pluralia (or dualia) tantum. It is therefore tempting to see in *elzi* an Indo-European neuter dual root-noun **elt-ī* of the type found e.g. in **wī-(d)kmt-ī* 'twenty' (Avestan *vīsaiti*, Doric *ἑξήκοντα*), or in Vedic *akṣt*, Avestan *aši*, OCS *oči* 'eyes', or Avestan *uši*, OCS *uši* 'ears'. The root is **Él-t-*, and its ablaut variant **El-ét-* is seen in Old Irish *leth*, Welsh *lled* 'half' (< **letom*) and in Old

Irish *leth*, Latin *latus* 'side' (< **letes-*); the relation is similar to that between Hittite *arp-* 'bad luck' and Vedic *rāpas* 'infirmity, affliction', or Hittite *ard-* 'saw' and Vedic *rādati* 'gnaw, cut through', or Hittite *ḫalzai-* and Gothic *laþōn* 'call', or Hittite *ṣanḫ-* 'flush' and Vedic *snāti* 'bathe'. The meaning of *elzi* is thus 'two bilateral halves', and we may compare Latin *bilanx* 'having two scales' (lances) in *bilanx libra* 'pair of scales, balance', or Italian *bilancia* 'scales'. For a unit-dual involving the same etymon, reference might be made to Old Irish *leth-sūil* '(one) eye' (literally 'half-eye'), which is a singular back-formation from the dual (*di*) *sūil* 'eyes'. In a similar way the neuter singular "*i-stem*" *elzi* may have come about via abstraction from the dual become plural. It had much to relate to, for unlike most other Indo-European languages where the kind is rare or nonexistent, Hittite crawls with neuter *i-stems* (*armizzi*, *ešri*, *etri*, *ḫali*, *kišri*, *lišši*, *luzzi*, *meni*, *warri*, *wašši*, etc., etc.).

If this explanation is true (*ἑτερον*), Hittite has preserved an archaic Indo-European word for 'scales', of interest to cultural history, and pointing once again to the one-time presence of the dual number in Anatolian, as in the rest of archaic Indo-European.

6

All our 'yesterdays'

In a short monograph of his later years Karl Brugmann (1917) pointed out that Indo-European possesses a common etymon for 'yesterday' but not for 'today' or 'tomorrow'; for the latter, parallel transparent means of expression predominate, as is still the case with the English terms. Thus 'today' is typically made up of some demonstrative pronominal element and a word for 'day', as in Skt. *a-dyā*, Hitt. *anisiwat(ti)* or *kedani siwatti*, Arm. *ays-awr*, Gk. *σήμερον* (< **κτε-ήμερον*)¹, Alban. *sot* (< **kyā-dīti*), Lith. *šiañ-dien*², OCS *dīni-si*, Russian *segó-dnja*, Irish *in-diu*, Welsh *he-ddyw*, Lat. *hodiē* (Faliscan *foied*), Gothic *himma daga*, OSax. *hiu-diga*, OHG *hiutu*³, ON *i-dag*. Equally consistently, 'tomorrow' is derived from or cognate with 'morning', e.g. Skt. *śvās* (cf. Avest. *sūrəm* 'early in the morning'), Hitt. *lukkatti (siwatti)* or *lukkatta (siwatti)* (*lukat-* 'morning'), Arm. *valiv (val* 'early'), Gk. *αὔριον* (**awsr-* 'dawn', as in Lith. *aušrā*, cognate with *ἠώς*⁴), Lith. *rytōj (rytas* 'morning'), Russian *zá-vtra (útro* 'morning'; cf. OCS *za ustra*, cognate with Gk. *αὔριον*), Irish *im-bārach*, Welsh *a-vory* (Welsh *bore* 'morning'), Lat. *crās* (whether cognate with Avest. *sūrəm* 'early' or with Ved. *sārvarī* 'dusk', Hitt. *karū* 'early', *kariwariwar* 'at daybreak'⁵), Goth. *du maúrgina* (whether root-related with Lith. *mārgas* 'bright, variegated' or OCS *mrakū* 'dimness, darkness').

Occasionally a pendant relationship 'evening': 'yesterday' is found, e.g. Lith. *vākaras* : *vākar*, or Russian *vēčer* : *včera*, or German dialectal *jennabend* or archaic *nächt* 'yesterday'; cf. 'eve of' = 'day before'. But in the main, except in Baltic and Slavic, the overpowering association of 'tomorrow' with 'morning' has been unable to dislodge, let alone supplant the ancient terms for 'yesterday', not only in archaic but also in heavily innovated forms of Indo-European.⁶

Klaus Strunk (*IF* 73. 1968: 309–310) has suggested that the archaism of words for 'yesterday' ties in with the ancient abilities of the Indo-European verb to denote past time, and that conversely the later nature of terms for 'tomorrow' is related to the gradual devising of future tense expression in the individual languages. If Proto-Indo-European was incapable of expressing 'tomorrow' lexically as well as grammatically, such a semantic lacuna would have robbed any word for 'yesterday' of some of its antonymity, since its only contrast term would be 'today'; it could have expressed the past only as related to the present, not as also opposed to the future, in a binary rather than ternary semantic structure. It is, however, improbable that verbal grammar is to blame for this state of affairs. More probably we are dealing with a shift in conceptual emphasis, from objective side-view of event-sequences to the subject's own time-immersion, from a 'third-person' to a 'first-person' approach. Clearly there must always have been objective means of expressing '(on) the next

7

day', such as Hitt. *parā* UD. KAM-ti or Skt. (*a*)*paredyūs*; here days are simply lined up in calendaric fashion, as when Wulfila translates Luke 7.11 ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ ἐξῆς 'it came to pass the day after' (ἐξῆς literally 'in sequence') by *warþ in þamma afardaga*. But in *Corinthians* 1.15.32 (φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν) the first-person speaker is very subjectively involved, and 'the next day' turns into 'tomorrow': *matjam jah drigkam, unte du maurgina gaswiltam* 'let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die!'. Anticipation of the morning after identified the morrow with the coming day and launched the innovational term.

By contrast, then, the old term for 'yesterday' should have been 'dispassionate', with no hint of a 'dreadful past' or emotional involvement with 'all our yesterdays'; it must have meant simply 'the other day'. Its well-known inventory of forms comprises Skt. *hyās*, Pahlavi *dīk*, Persian *dī(g)*⁷, Gk. (ἐ)χθές, χθις, Elean σερός, Alban. *dje*, OIr. *in-dé*, Welsh (*yd*)*doe*, Lat. *heri* (*hesternus*), Goth. *gistradagis*, OE *geostra*, *giosterdæg*, OHG *gestarōn*, ON (*i*) *gær* or (*i*) *gjār*. Brugmann (1904: 72) postulated for the first part the demonstrative pronominal stem **gho-* or **ghi-*, and Vittore Pisani (1925: 637–643) in a youthful opus supplied a full reconstruction **gh(e)-diēs*, variations on which have subsequently entered the handbooks.⁸ As an alternative to such glimpsing of the etymon of Lat. *diēs*, already Brugmann (1904: 72, fn. 10) suggested that a suffix *-yo-* might be involved, denoting appurtenance or adjacency to '(to-)day'; Franz Specht (1944: 201–205) later came up with a formula **gh-yes* containing the equivalent of the primary neuter comparative suffix, and saw its hypertrophied expression in **gh(y)es-t(e)r-* (Goth. *gistra-*, Lat. *hesternus*) with the secondary comparative suffix. Specht was also aware that these suffixes can have a binary contrastive meaning, as in Ved. *nāvyas-* 'new' vs. *sānyas-* 'old', or in Lat. *noster* vs. *vester*. For **gh-* he stuck with the pronominal explanation, trying weakly to explain Gk. χθές and the Celtic forms via some sort of deictically marked allomorph **gh-t-*; the meaning would thus have been something like 'this (day) as opposed to today', i.e. 'the other day'.

Jan Otrębski (KZ 84. 1970: 85–87) inverted the semantic problem completely by insisting that, in view of OCS *včera* 'yesterday' beside *večerŭ* 'evening', the base meaning had to do with either 'shine' or 'get dark', hence connecting either Goth. *skeinan* 'shine', Gk. *οκιά* 'shadow' or a root **(s)ghei-(s)-* metathesized ad hoc into **ghesi* (Lat. *heri*).

No further progress was possible without squarely confronting the matter of the initial consonantism, which is part and parcel of the 'thorn' problem. Here the many 'modern' treatments starting with Paul Kretschmer's article (1931/32) have been of uneven value. Some theoreticians, enamored of their own phonological circularities, have either spawned monstrosities⁹ or reverted to ground zero.¹⁰ Others have chosen to stay mostly reportorial (J. Gunnarsson, NTS 43. 1971: 52–55). Even those who record the most plausible reconstruct, **(dh)gh(y)es*, either leave it unanalyzed (Merlingen 1957: 60) or pronounce it unanalyzable (J. Schindler, *Die Sprache* 23. 1977: 32). With this formula the inventory can be presented as follows:

**dhghyes* > OIr. (*in*)-*dé*.

**dhghiyes* > Welsh (*yd*)*doe*.

**dhgh(y)es* > Gk. χθές¹¹ (cf. e.g. **dhghōm* > χθών¹²).

**(dh)ghyes* > Elean σερός, Skt. *hyās*.

**(dh)ghyes-tro-* > Goth. *gistra*.¹³

**(dh)ghyēs* > ON (*i*)*gær*.

**(dh)ghiyēs* > ON (*i*) *gjār* (Gunnarsson, NTS 43. 1971: 54–55).

**(dh)gh(y)es* > Alban. *dje*.

**(dh)gh(y)esi* > Lat. *heri*.

The pattern is consistently that of the locative case of an *s*-stem noun **dhghyes-*. This noun may contain the primary 'comparative' suffix *-yes-* (as suggested by Specht) appended to a root **dhgh-* in the weak grade. The word basic to the derivation can have belonged to any stem class (cf. Gk. ταχ-ύς, *θαχ-ύος > θασσο(σ)-, or *κῦδαρ, κῦδιω(σ)-). The noun in question is in all probability the etymon of English *day*,¹⁴ reconstructible variously as **dhōgho-* (Goth. *dags*, ON *dagr*, OHG *tac*), **dhōghes-* (OE *dæg*), **dhōghr-* (OE *dōgor* 'day', ON *dōgr* 'day or night'), **dhōghn-* (ON *dōgn* 'day and night, 24-hour period').¹⁵ The commonly assumed cognate is Ved. *āhar-*, *āhan-*, *āhas-*, Avest. (gen. pl.) *asnām* 'day', where an originally marginally accented paradigm (**dhōghr*) : (*dh*)*ghn-és* (cf. *āsryk* : *asnás* 'blood') may have been rehabilitated in Indo-Iranian as a columnal *āhar* : *āhnas*, perhaps abetted by the synonymous rhyme-term **ayar-*, **ayan-* (Avest. *ayarə*, gen. *ayan*); it can likewise involve a 'movable dental' in the manner of Ved. *āśru* vs. Gk. δάκρυ 'tear', or Lith. *ilgas* vs. Ved. *dīrghá-* 'long', or Ved. *amā* 'at home' vs. *dām-* 'house'.

An opposition **dhōghos* or **dhōghr* : **(dh)gh(i)yós* (with **(dh)gh[i]yēs* as suffixless locative) is quite parallel to Gk. κῦδος or *κῦδαρ : *κῦδος. The 'comparative' suffix involves in origin not a balanced binary pair of opposites but signals the marked member of the opposition, even as in Greek εἰς vs. ἄτερος (Ionic ἔτερος) reflect IE **sems* vs. **smtero-* (cf. Homeric χωλός δ' ἔτερον πόδα 'lame in one foot' [vs. the other]). In the same way **(dh)gh(i)yos* denoted the one of two adjacent days which contrasted with 'now', thus 'the other day' (cf. Gk. θατέρα 'on the morrow'). The meaning 'yesterday' (rather than 'the next day') is presumably a conventional one, due in large measure to the pre-emption of futurity by the 'morrow' words. The traces of an alternative meaning 'the next day' in Germanic need not be desperately explained away (thus e.g. Brugmann 1917: 10–15; Strunk, IF 73. 1968: 309–310); thus Wulfila's (*Matthew* 6.30) *himma daga . . . gistradagis* translating σήμερον . . . αὔριον speaks of hay that is on the stalk one day and ends up in the oven the next day, and the Eddic (*Hamdismál* 30) *nū eða i gær* wonders whether death will come 'now or the next day'; *himma daga . . . gistradagis* opposes **dhōgho-* to a doubly characterized figura etymologica **(dh)ghyestro-dhōgho-*, reminiscent of the manner in which French *aujourd'hui* twice contains derivatives of the etymon of Lat. *diēs*. The literal meaning is, however, 'on the day which is the other day in relation to now'.

Notes

¹ Resembling σῆρες, Myc. *ssa-we-te* (< *κῖα-Feres) '(in) this year'.

² Besides Alban. *si-vjet* (< *kyéy-wetesi), Lith. *ši-met* '(in) this year' (cf. M. Huld, KZ 98. 1985: 102–103). Cf. e.g. Finnish *tänä vuonna* (< *vuodna), Estonian *tänavu(de)* (< *tänä voodena*) '(in) this year', besides Finnish *tänä päivänä*, South Estonian *täämbä* 'to-day' (all in the essive case).

³ Parallel to Lat. *hodiē* and OHG *hiutu*, German *heute* stand Lat. **hōri* or **hōrō* (< *hō-iōr-) and OHG *hiuru*, German *heuer* (< *hiu jāru) '(in) this year' (cf. Lat. *hōrnus*, *hōrnōtinus* 'this year's', like German *heurig* from *heuer*); the ongoing innovational process is seen in Lat. *hōc annō* > Spanish *ogaño* 'this year'.

⁴ Perhaps also with ἡρι-, ἡέρι- 'early', ἄρι- 'dimness, mist', αὔρη 'morning breeze' (cf. P. Kiparsky, *Language* 43. 1967: 624–626).

- ⁵ The Hittite words, however, are better connected with cognates of English 'grey' such as ON *grýandi* 'dawn'; cf. Milton's 'while the still morn went out with sandals gray'. From Lat. *māne* 'early in the morning' (cf. *crās māne* 'early tomorrow morning') are derived the Romance words for 'tomorrow'. Cf. Lat. *heri* > French *hier* (Italian *ieri*, Spanish *ayer*), vs. *aujourd'hui* or *demain* (**dē māne*).
- ⁶ 'Avest. *zyō*' of many sources is a lively ghostword.
- ⁷ E.g. **gh(i)d(f)es* and **ghi-diwes* in E. Schwyzler (1939: 631 and 326 respectively).
- ⁸ **gžhyés* in E. Benveniste, *BSL* 38. 1937: 144.
- ⁹ **ghies* in J. Kuryłowicz, *BSL* 68. 1973: 102.
- ¹⁰ The detail of Gk. *χθιζά* remains unclear; both Skt. *a-dyā* 'today' and *πρωιζά* = *πρώην* 'the day before yesterday' have afforded material for comparison; on different chronological levels. Most likely, however, is **dhghis-* as zero grade (samprasāraṇa) suffix variant of **dhgh(y)es-*, with suffix as in *κρυβδα* 'secretly' (cf. Specht 1944: 205). *χθιζός* is a secondary adjectivization of *χθιζά* (cf. *χθεσι-νός*).
- ¹² Metatheses of dental and guttural, postulated in such clusters for Greek and Celtic, seem to have operated sporadically also in non-contact environments: Gk. *δάκτυλος* < **δατκύλος* < **ταδυλός* (cf. J. Puhvel, *IF* 81. 1976: 26; Puhvel 1981: 350), or Toch. B *kantwo* 'tongue' < **dnghw-*. Cf. the similar instances of labial and guttural (Gk. *σκεπ-* < **spek-*; Lith. *kūmstė* 'fist' < **pnk^{Wst}-*).
- ¹³ Matched by Lat. *hesternus* < *(*dh*)*gh(y)es-iro-no-* (cf. Skt. *hyāstana-* and Gk. *χθεσιωός*).
- ¹⁴ The possibility of such a tie-in was first hesitantly suggested by W. Brandenstein (*Glotta* 25. 1936: 29) and worked out in more detail in a study by M. Durante (1950: 248); Durante (1950: 247) brilliantly connected Gk. *φθέγγομαι* 'produce voice' with Lith. *žvėngiu* 'neigh' as reflecting (*dh*)-*ghweng-*.
- ¹⁵ Cf. also the *vrddhi*-like derivational long grade in Goth. *fidur-dōgs* 'four days old', comparable to Skt. *śatā-śāradas* 'of a hundred autumns'.

References

- Brugmann, Karl, 1904. *Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Abhandlungen der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse 22/6) (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Brugmann, Karl, 1917. "Zu den Wörtern für 'heute', 'gestern', 'morgen' in den indogermanischen Sprachen", *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse* 69/1 (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Durante, M., 1950. "Le spiranti dentali indoeuropee", *RL* 1: 243–249.
- Kretschmer, Paul, 1931/1932. "Χθζω", *Glotta* 20: 65–67.
- Merlingen, Weriand, 1957. "Idg. 'p' und Verwandtes", in: *Gedenkschrift für Paul Kretschmer*, edited by H. Kronasser (Wien: Wiener Sprachgesellschaft), 2: 49–61.
- Pisani, Vittore, 1925. "Antico indiano 'hyās' e 'cyās'", *Rendiconti della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 6/1: 637–643.
- Puhvel, Jaan, 1981. *Analecta Indoeuropaea* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck).
- Schwyzler, Eduard, 1939. *Griechische Grammatik* (München: Beck).
- Specht, Franz, 1944. "Das indogermanische Wort für 'gestern'", *KZ* 68: 201–205.

HOMERIC QUESTIONS AND HITTITE ANSWERS

Curiously specific lexical and substantive accordances between Greek and Hittite have long been observed; the "Anatolian connection" in fact dates back to P. Kretschmer's *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* of 1896, before J. A. Knudtzon, let alone F. Hrozný, had surmised the true nature of the Hittite language. I am concerned in particular neither with general Indo-European archaic similarities (of the type ἀργι- : *harki-* "white," πῦρ : *pahhur* "fire," or σκῶρ : *sakkar* "excrement"), nor with blatant technical loanwords or areal culture terms such as ἀμάρη : *amiyara-* "ditch, channel," βύρσα : *kursa-* "hide, skin," or νίτρον : *nitri-* "sodium carbonate," nor even with clearly old but unique matches (e.g., κατά, κασί-γνητος : *katta, katti-smi*, or the multiplicative suffix -άκις : *-anki*). I am interested rather in all accordances, etymological and other, whenever they might entail contextual values beyond the merely formal or barely semantic, so as to elucidate not merely the Greek and Hittite lexica but also shed light on the cultures and literatures which the languages sustain. In particular, as the title intimates, I hope to look into sober Hittite prose to find answers to some *Quaestiones Homericae* which the near-century since Wilhelm Schulze's youthful days has not yet fully unraveled. To some, such a tack may smack of *obscurum per obscurius*, but hopefully in this manner at least some *Homerische Wörter* still dangling in the wake of Manu Leumann can be brought closer to elucidation. I have previously in various publications¹ tried similar pairings (e.g., Gk. αἰσχύνω : Hitt. *iskuna-* [literally "make ugly"], Gk. σοφία "insight" : Hitt. *sakui-* "eye," Gk. δάκτυλος : Hitt. *kalulupa-* "finger") and would commend attempts such as R. Gusmani's confrontation of Homeric ἦρα φέρειν "gratify" with Hitt. *warri-* "help."² Here, as always, excesses need to be

¹ Collected in *Analecta Indoeuropaea* (Innsbruck 1981); cf. pp. 373–78, 313–21, 349–52.

² *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 6 (1968) 17–22.

resisted, such as O. Szemerényi's wholesale derivation of Greek words and names from Hittite sources: ἄσκεω "work with materials, fashion" from Hitt. *anisk(i)-* (iterative of *an[n]iya-*, "work"),³ διοσκεῖω "look earnestly" from Hitt. *usk(i)-* (iterative of *au[s]-*, *u[wa]-* "see"),⁴ or Ἀσκληπιός from Hitt. **assulāpiya-* "health-giver."⁵ The studies that follow attempt a less flimsy and more considered approach.

1. στεῦτο δὲ διψᾶων

An Indo-Iranian and Greek isolexeme **steu-* "laut preisen" figures among Pokorny's roots (*IEW* 1035) on the basis of Skt. *stāuti*, Avest. *staoiti* "praise" and Gk. στεῦται "(rühmt sich,) verspricht prahlend." J. Wackernagel found the common semantic denomination in "feierliche öffentliche Kundgebung."⁶ The "praise" meaning of Indo-Iranian is not in doubt, although "celebrate" may be slightly more accurate. But the precise synchronic and more remote historical sense of the mostly Homeric third person singular middle present στεῦται (preterit στεῦτο) is less easy to ascertain. Menace is implicit in Hektor's reported intent to cut down the mastheads of Achaean ships (*Il.* 9.241 στεῦται γὰρ νηῶν ἀποκόψειν ἄκρα κόρυμβα), and equally viciously Laomedon had threatened to lop off the ears of his divine wall-builders (*Il.* 21.455 στεῦτο δ' ὅ γ' ἀμφοτέρων ἀπολεψέμεν οὖσα χαλκῷ) when they asked to be paid on completion. In a more benign vein, Thetis had promised Achilles new armor by Hephaistos (*Il.* 18.191 στεῦτο γὰρ Ἥφαίστοιο πᾶρ' οἰσέμεν ἔντεα καλά). In rare imitation of such Homeric usage, the Persian enemy threatens Greece with the yoke of servitude (Aeschylus, *Persae* 49: στεῦται . . . ζυγὸν ἀμφιβαλεῖν δούλιον Ἑλλάδι). As opposed to this construction with future infinitives, a sense of "declare, claim" occasionally appears with aorist or present infinitives (*Od.* 17.525 στεῦται δ' Ὀδυσσεύς ἀκοῦσαι "he claims he has heard of Odysseus," or Apollonius Rhodius 2.1204 στεῦται δ' Ἥελίου γόνος ἔμμεναι "he boasts that he is the offspring of Helios").

Yet older than these infinitive constructions must be such seemingly semi-pleonastic passages as στεῦτο γὰρ εὐχόμενος νικησέμεν (*Il.* 2.597) and στεῦτ' ἀγορεύων Τρωσὶ μαχήσεσθαι (*Il.* 5.832-33). The first

³ *Mélanges . . . P. Chantraine* (Paris 1972) 252-53.

⁴ *Gnomon* 43 (1971) 665.

⁵ *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 94 (1974) 154-55.

⁶ *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen 1916) 202.

is supposed to mean "he declared boasting[ly] that he was going to win," and the second, "made a promise saying he was going to fight the Trojans." Yet here the true *verba dicendi* are εὐχομαι and ἀγορεύω, and στεῦτο is somehow auxiliary or circumlocutional.

An aporia is reached in *Il.* 3.83: στεῦται γὰρ τι ἔπος ἑρέειν κορυθαίολος Ἑκτωρ: Hektor has not said a word, and a translation as a *verbum dicendi* is entirely out of place; it must mean rather that in Agamemnon's perception he is about to speak, and therefore Agamemnon, to hear him out across the battle-line, imposes quiet and a momentary cessation of hostility.

Such a sense is even clearer in the construction with a participle alone in *Od.* 11.584 στεῦτο δὲ διψᾶων, πῖειν δ' οὐκ εἶχεν ἐλέσθαι. Here Tantalus is thirsting but cannot get to drink. He is not saying anything, and Odysseus merely reports his somewhat distant and fleeting visual observation of him (ἑσείδων) in the underworld. στεῦτο διψᾶων must mean literally "he was manifest being thirsty," that is, "he was visibly (or plainly) thirsting." The participial construction with στευ- is thus parallel but antonymical to that with λανθάνω "escape notice, be unseen" (λάθε βιώσας).

We can now see the stages of epic formula reduction and consolidation:

1. στεῦται + participle "is manifest doing" = "plainly does."
2. στεῦται (+ participle of *verbum dicendi*) + (future) infinitive "plainly (says) he will do."
3. στεῦται + infinitive "declares (claims, boasts, promises, threatens) he will do (does, has done)."

Hence στεῦτο . . . εὐχόμενος and στεῦτ' ἀγορεύων mean "he openly boasted" and "he openly stated," and στεῦται . . . τι ἔπος ἑρέειν amounts to "he is visibly about to say something" (cf. the usual φαίνεται + infinitive).

If στευ- thus means "be manifest," where does this leave Pokorny's **steu-* "laut preisen" and Indo-Iranian **stu-*? It is entirely conceivable that the original meaning of Indo-Iranian **stu-* is likewise a medial-intransitive "be(come) manifest," so that, for example, *RV* 10.22.2 *ihá śrutá Índro asmé adyá stáve* "here Indra [is] heard of, by us today he is celebrated" means originally "here Indra [is] heard of, to us [dat. or loc. *asmé!*] today he is manifest"; there is a correlation of aural-oral fame with a "visibility" quotient, the godhead being not only *includus* but *spectabilis*, as an avatar should. The development of a productive transitive paradigm of **stu-* in the sense of "celebrate, praise" (unlike the

Greek medium tantum) may have occurred in early Indo-Iranian hymnic-poetic diction via elliptic formula-reduction similar to the Homeric. In a medial-intransitive Indo-Iranian construct **(šru- +) stu-* "be (heard of and) manifest" **šru-* was incapable of secondary activation into "celebrate" due to the preexistent transitive meaning "hear"; but *stu-*, denoting in stative fashion visual and by extension cognitive celebrity (cf. IE **weyd-* "see" > "know"), first acquired de facto diathetic passivity in contexts such as *RV* 6.26.7 *tvāyā yāt stāvante . . . vīrās* "that through you heroes have visibility" > "that by you heroes are celebrated." From there the way was clear to an active paradigm (*RV* *stoṣi* "thou praisest" vs. *stavase nas* "thou art celebrated by us," or Avestan *staoiti*, with a new, secondary, post-*RV* middle *stutē* patterned on the active). *RV* *stuti-* "hymn of praise" would thus mean originally "celebrity" (> "celebration"), vs. *śrūti-* "auditory lore."

The Hittite tertium of this comparison, *istuwa-*, harmonizes with these conclusions. The medium tantum *istuwa-* means "be(come) manifest, be exposed, get out in the open," as in *KUB* XXX 10 Rs. 19 *nu-mu-ssan sēr assul natta isduwari* "over me (divine) favor is not manifest," or *KUB* XXIII 11 III 7 *nu-smas(s)ta uttar arha isduwati* "the plot was exposed on them," or *KBo* III 1 II 11 *nu uttar isduwāti* "word got out." The reduplicated gloss-wedged noun *dusdumi-* means "evidence, manifest, voucher" or the like, so that *KUB* XIII 35 I 4-6 [*nu*] *UNUTUM kuit kedani pieskit n-at ŪL siyaeskit nu-ssi dusdumis ŪL ēsta lalamies-si* can be rendered "what object he had given to whom, that he had never documented; he had neither voucher nor receipt." The Luwian-type adjective *dusdumassi-* means "evidentiary," so that *ibid.* 15-16 *ANŠU.KUR.RA-wa ANŠU.GİR.NUN.NA kui[n h]arkun nu-wa-mu* ^{GIS}*L[EU]* *dusdumassa siyan ēsta* comes out in translation "as for the horse and mule that I had, there were wooden voucher-tablets as documentation." In any event *dusdumi-* denotes visible proof (not oral testimony or hearsay).

Hitt. *istuwa-* was connected with Gk. *στεῦται* by E. H. Sturtevant,⁷ who tried not to worry about Skt. *stu-* and correctly saw a basic meaning φαίνεται in *στεῦται* ("looks as if he will"). This etymology lay long dormant, but those few who have recently mentioned it, C. Watkins,⁸ H. Eichner,⁹ N. Oettinger,¹⁰ and J. Tischler,¹¹ seem comfortable with

⁷ *Language* 4 (1928) 4-5; 6 (1930) 31.

⁸ *Indogermanische Grammatik* III/1 (Heidelberg 1969) 115-16.

⁹ H. Rix, ed., *Flexion und Wortbildung* (Wiesbaden 1975) 99.

¹⁰ *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 34 (1976) 112.

¹¹ *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*, Lieferung 3 (Innsbruck 1980) 437-38.

such base-meanings for Indo-European **stew-* as "durch Worte hervorheben" (Eichner), "verkünden" (Oettinger), "laut preisen, öffentlich verkünden" (Tischler). Yet not only do the Greek and Hittite semantics favor a visual term, but their media tantum forms also harmonize with ancient layers of Indo-Iranian morphology: thus the Rig-Vedic non-thematic 3 sg. pres. midd. *stāve* "is celebrated" closely matches Gk. *στεῦται* or *στεῦτο*, which latter is to the Avest. *staota* what, e.g., Gk. *κεῖται* is to Avest. *saēta* beside *RV* *śāye*; on the other hand, the Rig-Vedic thematic variant *stāve* (beside *stāvate*) can be closely paired with Hitt. *istuwa-ri*. Thus, formally Indo-Iranian has the full range of medial-voice archaisms, whereas single items survive separately in Greek and Hittite. These point to a basic Indo-European middle paradigm imposed by the semantics of the root **stew-* itself, rather than a mere intransitive-stative formal offshoot of a transitive verb "proclaim." The isolated fringe areas of the spread of **stew-* (Greek and Anatolian) have kept the original meaning intact, whereas the productive Indo-Iranian center has developed an active-voice paradigm as a secondary development. Thus Hitt. *istuwa-* supports and elucidates the revised interpretation of the Homeric verb *στευ-*.

2. Διὸς ἱρὰ τάλαντα

Only once in Homer do we find a scene of weighing from everyday life, in the simile of a poor but scrupulous spinster who, holding weights and wool-ration, balances scales evenly on both sides (*Il.* 12.433-35 ὥς τε τάλαντα γυνή χερνῆτις ἀληθής, ἥ τε σταθμὸν ἔχουσα καὶ εἴριον ἀμφὶς ἀνέλκει ἰσάζουσα). All other occurrences of τάλαντα "scales" involve symbolic weighing on Zeus' golden fate-scales, the ἱρὰ τάλαντα (*Il.* 16.658) on which he places two doom-lots (δύο κῆρε [*Il.* 8.70]) and "tilts" them (κλίνεισιν) as the dispenser of war (ταμῆς πολέμοιο [*Il.* 19.223-24]). When Zeus stretches his scales (ἐτίτανε τάλαντα) and lifts them (ἔλκε), the losing side's doom sinks (ρέπει) and settles to the earth (ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ ἐξέσθην, with incorrect dual), while the fortunes of the victor are lifted to high heaven (πρὸς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἄερθεν [*Il.* 8.69-74]). The mere thought of such potential fatality fazes Hektor and turns him to flight (*Il.* 16.658 γινῶ γάρ Διὸς ἱρὰ τάλαντα), and in due time his own fate is so weighed and takes a chthonian dip to Hades (*Il.* 22.209-13).

One may wonder whether this Homeric formula is a poetic conceit spun from idiomatic material, based on a set of polarized opposites no

stranger than the German "himmelhoch jahzend, zum Tode betrübt." More probably, however, half of the locution, the *in malam partem* one of sinking to the earth, has independent significance, is so to speak the marked member of the opposition, while the more trivial half about rising to the heavens may well be a mere occasional stylistic pendant to it; when Hektor's doom sinks to Hades, nothing at all is said about Achilles' side of the scales.

Can scales and weighing in Hittite¹² shed light on the Homeric material? As there are few economic records but an enormous amount of religious and legal texts, there is little reference to mundane weighing but considerable material on ritual and symbolic use of scales. Formal weighing was done preferentially in sight of the all-seeing sun-god, the guarantor of justice, as we can glimpse in *KUB XXX 10 Rs. 12-13* *LÜDAM.GAR-sa* [. . .] *DU¹³TU-i GIŠēlzi harzi nu GIŠēlzi marsanuzzi* "the merchant holds the scales before the sun-god and (yet) falsifies the scales." In *KBo XVII 95 III 6-10* a ritual involves lead being placed on scales by the king and taken before the sun-god. In *KBo XV 10 II 41-42* true valuables (silver, gold, gemstones) are weighed on scales before the sun-god six times. In the royal funerary texts (*KUB XXX 15 + XXXIX 19 Vs. 26-28*) a sorceress weighs the same valuables against clay-mortar, thus symbolically pitting human clay against worldly wealth, and later the scales themselves are broken in a further gesture of vanity of vanities.

The king's (and queen's) very life span is symbolically hung in the balance in *KBo XXI 22 Vs. 18-19 kāsa GIŠ.RĪN karpiyemi nu Labarnas taluqaus MU.HI.A-us usneskimi* "behold, I pick up scales and put up for weighing the long years of the monarch!" Such a living second-millennium Anatolian ritual tradition of weighing the lives of rulers may have relevance to the Homeric mythical-literary theme of Zeus placing on scales the fates of heroes.

Most obscure, and potentially most important, is paragraph 169 of the Hittite Law Code: *KBo VI 13 I 6-8 takku A.ŠĀ-LAM kuiski wāsi ta ZAG-an parsiya NINDA¹⁴harsin dāi t-an DU¹⁵TU-i parsiya GIŠēlzi-mit-wa taknā arsikkīt* "if someone buys a field and breaches the boundary, he [i.e., the wronged party] takes bread and breaks it to the sun-god [and says]: 'He has planted my scale [-tray] in the earth.'" This latter formulaic legalism seems idiomatic for "he has tipped the scales against me," "he has given me a raw deal"; expressing such sentiments of getting the short end of the stick and suffering miscarriage of justice we

¹² Cf. J. Puhvel, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 38 (1981) 352-53.

thus find phraseology closely akin to the Homeric ἐπὶ χθονὶ ἐξέσθην "(the loser's doom-scale) settled to the earth" and ὥχετο δ' εἰς Ἀΐδαο "ended up in Hades." Possibly the Hittite expression may also have some mythical background, much as the *tagnas* *DU¹⁶TU-us*, the chthonian replica of the witnessing sun-god, is paralleled by the routine threats of the thwarted Homeric Ἥλιος (Παντόπτης) to go and shine amidst the dead in Hades. But more probably we have merely common phraseology from using a twin-scale, center-mounted weighing contraption (= the Latin *bilanx libra*); it has been preserved in the legal sphere in Hittite while surviving in mythical-literary imagery in Homeric Greek. Thus, once again Greek and Hittite reinforce one another: Greek helps elucidate an obscure paragraph of the Hittite Law Code, while conversely Hittite illuminates an otherwise somewhat outlandish formula of the Homeric text.

3. ἦϊων θημῶνα

The word ἦϊα occurs once in the *Iliad* (13.103; stags as "food" for wolves) and half a dozen times in the first half of the *Odyssey* ("provisions," especially for a journey). The one remaining Homeric occurrence, however, appears in a simile and means rather "chaff": *Od.* 5.368-69 ὥς δ' ἄνεμος ζαῖς ἦϊων θημῶνα τινάξῃ καρφαλέων, τὰ μὲν ἄρ τε διεσκέδασ' ἄλλυδις ἄλλη "as a gale wind scatters a heap of dry chaff and spreads it all over . . ." (even so Poseidon's monster-wave smashes the planks of Odysseus' raft). How can the same word mean both "provisions" and "chaff"? Hesychius had no trouble, glossing βρώματα, ἄχυρα, ἐφόδια, but Frisk and Chantraine in their etymological dictionaries posit two unrelated and obscure homophones.

The Hittite word for "chaff," the neuter noun *ezzan* (or *izzan*), likewise occurs once in an elaborate simile, in a great cathartic ritual conjuring the infernal powers: *KUB XLI 8 II 15-17 izzan GIM-an IM-anza pittenuzzi n-at-kan aruni parranta pedai* "even as the wind makes chaff fly and carries it over the sea . . ." (even so let it sweep away the blood-defilement of this house and carry it over the sea!). Such closely parallel Homeric-Hittite similes are surely no nonce creations but highly traditional formulaic lore, albeit literarily embedded in one case and ritually employed in the other. The Homeric simile, applied to a violent storm at sea, uses only land-based descriptive matter, whereas the Hittite ritual, taking place on an inland plateau hundreds

of miles from any large bodies of water, conversely speaks of the sea. But even such discrepancy (and seeming inappositeness) points to a fund of tradition rather than instant whimsy; the Hittite ritual petrifact harks back to a time of yore when its inheritors still dwelt on a litoral.

In the Ullikummi myth, the expression *ezzan* GIM-an *arha* *pussai*- "pound like chaff" serves to denote extreme physical violence. In the funerary rituals *ezzan* is burned repeatedly. But there are several occurrences of *ezzan* alone or in the asyndetic combination *ezzan* GIS-*ru* "chaff (and) wood" which point to an alternative meaning, something like "(stored) holdings, (material) goods"; thus in *KUB* I 1 IV 82-83 Hattusilis III speaks of those who covet the *ezzan* GIS-*ru* of Ishtar's storehouse and threshing floor ("chaff" would hardly be worth their trouble), and the Edict of Telipinus (*KUB* XI 6 II 6-7) interdicts the disposal of a prince's *izzan* GIS-*ru*. A badly broken simile in the Hittite *Gilgamesh* (*KUB* VIII 50 II 4-7) describes the hero's pitiful wailing, comparing it to what issues forth when "they bring off the *izzan* from a woman's house." In the listing *KBo* XX 64 Rs. 5-6 *ezzan* GIS-*ru* *hahhal* ("brush") precede YĀ.NUN LĀL KASKAL-as "butter (and) honey for the road," which brings us very close indeed to the "journey provisions" denoted by ἥϊα in the *Odyssey*.

In both Homer and Hittite a word for chaff (alternatively combined with "wood" in the latter) was thus also symbolic of or idiomatic for "stuff." We may compare the sumerographic expression IN.NU.DA-as *iwar* "like straw" (= amply, profusely), and further Gk. ὕλη "wood" > "stuff, material, matter," or even "scratch" denoting both poultry food and money in American English.

Etymology is of subordinate interest in this instance, but perhaps ἥϊα can be reconstructed as *ēsiyo- and the -zz- of *ezzan* explicated as either a product of *-sy- in *esy- or as matching IE *s in an *eso- (same s : z variation as in, e.g., *zena*- "autumn" beside Russian *osen*'), or in *zamankur* "beard" beside *samankurwant*- "bearded").

4. ποτὶ ζόφον ἡερόεντα

Words for "dusk" are numerous in Greek (ζόφος, δνόφος, *δνέφας [in ἰο-δνεφής], κνέφας, ψέφας), but ζόφος stands out not only by its probable cognate relationship to ζέφυρος but also by being used in Homer (along with the epitheton ornans ἡερόεις "murky") as a designation for "west," in antonymy with ἠώς "dawn" and/or ἥελιος "sun,"

e.g., *Il.* 12.239-40 εἴτ' ἐπὶ δεξι' ἴωσι πρὸς ἡῶ τ' ἥελίον τε, εἴτ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ τοί γε ποτὶ ζόφον ἡερόεντα "whether (the ornithomantic birds) go to the right eastward, or to the left westward," or *Od.* 10.190 οὐ γὰρ ἴδμεν ὅπῃ ζόφος οὐδ' ὅπῃ ἠώς "we don't know in which direction either west or east is." Perhaps even a compass correction to "northwest" is in order, judging from *Il.* 9.5 where Ζέφυρος blows from Thrace along with Βορέης (cf. Aristotle, *Politics* 1290a, 19).

Hittite has wind-related terms for the four *halhaltumari* "corners" (i.e., cardinal points), but these are mostly hidden under sumero- and akkadography. The same cover hides ŠÚ.A DUTU-as "seat (= setting) of the sun" = "west" and SET DUTU-as "start(ing point) of the sun" = "east." Yet we do possess one precious passage which may illuminate not only Hittite terminology but the Homeric ζόφος as well: *KUB* XXXVI 89 Rs. 12-14 ^{1D}Marassantas-wa annallaza ipattarmayan ārsas DUTU-as-ma-war-an wahnut nu-war-an DUTU-i DINGIR-LIM-an arsanut URU^UNer[ikki-war-an]manninkuwan arsanut "the Halys river once upon a time flowed ipattarmayan, but the storm-god turned it and made it flow toward the sun of the gods, and made it flow close to Nerik." A glance at a map of Turkey indicates that this passage has no reference to the great bend of the Halys but to a directional oddity much farther downstream toward the Black Sea, in the area of the Gasgas, the classical Paphlagonia. It contains an aetiological mythologem of direction reversal by the Halys near Nerik, probably relating to the 140° turn from northwest to east that the lower course of the Kızıl Irmak still makes at its confluence with the Devrek near the town of Kargi. While DUTU-i DINGIR-LIM-an = *istanui siunan* means "east(ward)" (cf., e.g., *KUB* XLI 23 II 18 *siunan* DUTU-ui "o gods' sun!"), ipattarmayan must be "(north)west(ward)." Elsewhere ipatarma(yan), with gloss-wedges, describes ornithomantic directions (*KUB* XVI 57 Vs. 4 and 6; *KUB* XXII 17 I 3).

ipat(t)arma(yan) (cf., e.g., *arha*[yan] "apart") may be a compound ipa-tarma-, where tarma- means "nail, peg, stake," often in ritual and magical uses and here apparently for cardinal "point" (in place of *halhaltumari* "corner"); Luwian has a matching *tarmi*-. The "west" word proper would then be ipa-. Because gloss-wedges point to a Luwianism, the closest comparison is with Hieroglyphic Luwian ipami- "west" in the newer reading (formerly *apami*-),¹³ and a more remote cognate might be Gk. ζόφος < *Hyobho*- (beside **Hibho*- in

¹³ Cf., e.g., J. D. Hawkins, *Anatolian Studies* 25 (1975) 151.

South Anatolian /iba-/). The same word may also occur in the Hittite ornithomantic adjective *ipa(r)wassi-* describing a direction or reference point in augural context, thus perhaps “northwest(erly).” In this manner the Homeric ζόφος vs. ἥλιος finds not merely a close parallel in Anatolia but perhaps also an etymological cognate.

5. κειμήλιά τε πρόβασίν τε

In the Telemachy (*Od.* 2.75) the young prince lashes out at the suitors’ conspicuous consumption of his family’s substance: ἐσθήμενα κειμήλιά τε πρόβασίν τε “eating away at stored goods and livestock alike.” This well-known dichotomy of inert vs. walking wealth resembles both the Old Norse distinction of *liggjanda* vs. *ganganda fé* and the Roman house search *lance et licio* “with platter and tether,” for removal of two types of larcenous items. The neuter plural πρόβατα, dat. pl. πρόβασι “livestock,” and the secondary singular πρόβατον “sheep” are paralleled by Hittite *iyant-* “sheep,” literally “going (one).” All this is well known and noncontroversial, but C. Watkins¹⁴ has further combined κειμήλιά τε πρόβασίν τε chiastically with the Hittite asyndetic binomial *iyata tameta*, comparing *iyata(r)* with πρόβασις as a term for “moveable wealth” and trying to see in *tameta(r)* the inert variety, thus a match for κειμήλια. Yet the close philological study which I have made of both these words for the *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* compels rejection of Watkins’ attempt. *iyatar* is indeed an abstract noun from *iya-* “go,” but in the special sense of “grow” (similarly *huwai-* “grow,” literally “run”), as in *KBo VI 34 + KUB XLVIII 76 III 43–45 n-asta apell-a IŠTU A.ŠĀ-ŠU ZÍZ-tar ŠE-AM sarā le uizzi n-asta UGU zahhali iyataru* “from his field wheat (and) barley shall not come up, but let weed grow up!” *iyatar* is thus “vegetal growth, fertility, fecundity” and more resultatively “plenty, prosperity”; *KUB IV 5, 13–14 nu nepisaza iy[ata] hūman heyauwani[skizzi]* means “from heaven growth rains down all over” (livestock dropping from the sky would be too much metonymy). Similarly *iyatnuwant-* “luxuriant” and *iyatniya-* “be in growth” are used exclusively of vegetation (*uktūri iyatniyant-* “evergreen”), while ^(SIC)*iyatar* means literally “wool-growth,” that is, thick wool. Similarly *tameta(r)* signifies “fat of the land, abundance” (likewise “raining from the sky” in *KUB IV 5, 15–17 + KBo XII*

¹⁴E. Neu and W. Meid, eds., *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* (Innsbruck 1979) 282–83.

73, 2), and *tametarwant-* is “abundant, profuse, luxuriant.” The semantic shift away from literal fatness to fertility of the land resembles that of the Homeric πῖαρ ὑπ’ οὔδας “fat under the soil” or οὔθαρ ἀρούρης. Yet a door-socket can still be described as *tametarwanza* “well-greased” (*KBo XXI 6 Vs. 4*), and the plausible etymon is Gk. (mostly Homeric) δημός “fat,” with *tameta(r)* as verbal noun from a stative denominative stem **tame-* < **d̥m̥m-ē-* or **dām-ē-* “to be fat.” Thus Hittite *iyata tameta* fails to match the Homeric κειμήλιά τε πρόβασίν τε but is an archaic, probably irreversible binomial in its own right (even spelled *iyatada[meta]* in the Old Hittite text *KUB XLVIII 6, 6*), expressing not a binary dichotomy of two kinds of wealth but rather a nominalized version of the biblical injunction (*Genesis 1:28*) which the LXX phrases as αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε, and which Jerome rendered as *crescite et multiplicamini*. The final word of this study is thus that we should not only try to find Hittite answers to Homeric problems but also know when to stop short.

Sober thoughts on Latin *ēbrius*

Unlike more open-minded and dynamic fields of learning, it seems to take comparative linguistics anywhere from twenty-five to thirty years to acknowledge, absorb, and assimilate new ideas or solutions. It was in 1955¹ that Werner Winter resurrected Abel Juret's comparison of Hittite *eku-* 'drink' with Lat. *ēbrius* 'drunk'², but there has been no indication of acceptance save from the present *gratulatio*³, merely some voices of summary rejection.⁴ As even such a generation-long time allotment is about to expire, there is some urgency in piercing at last the stolidity which has stifled this suggestion, and attempting to elaborate and fine-tune it with a view to wider acceptance.

The combination of *eku-* and *ēbrius* is one of those optimally satisfying instances of etymology where two important yet obscure items are drawn from their separate isolations and made to illumine one another. "Officially" in Latin scholarship *ēbrius* is still perfectly opaque: "on ne trouve ailleurs rien qui y réponde" said Ernout-Meillet, and the page or so of fine print in Walde-Hofmann is merely a pedantic way of inducing the same inference. Hittite *eku-* has had an acknowledged cognate in the phonologically ambivalent Tocharian (A and B) *yok-* 'drink' (IE **e* or *ē* + any labiovelar) since 1925⁵, and has additionally been connected with Latin *aqua* since earliest Hrozný⁶ throughout Sturtevant⁷ down to recent times,⁸ with very few demurrers.⁹ Our *Jubilar*, following Juret, suggested instead a common root **ēgh^wh-* 'drink' and reconstructed *ēbrius* as **ēgh^whriyos*, a *-yo-* derivative from a verbal noun with either *-r-* or *-r/n-* suffix.

As tenaciously as many scholars have clung to the tie-in of *eku-* with Lat. *aqua* 'water', *ēbrius* has been kept away from any watery connotation and habitually glossed as 'drunk' = 'intoxicated'. Yet the base-meaning of *ēbrius* is rather 'having drunk one's fill', as in

quom tu satura atque ebria eris 'when you have had enough to eat and drink' (Terence, *Hecyra* 5:2:3). The Hittite sequence (*KUB XXXIII* 62 III 10–11) *sumes ezzastin nu-za ispittin ekuten-ma nu-za nikten* 'eat and be sated, drink and be filled!' appears in shorter shape simply as (*IBoT* III 148 III 10–11) *ispiyanza ninkanza ēs* 'be (thou) sated and filled!'; here *ni(n)k-* (used exclusively with drink) can alternate with *has(s)ik(k)-* (cf. *KUB XVII* 10 I 19–20 *eter n-e ŪL ispiyer ekuyer-ma n-e-za ŪL hassikkir* 'they ate but were not sated, and they drank but were not satiated'), but *has(s)ik(k)-* alone (not in juxtaposition with *ispiya-*) can also pertain to eating, and *ispiya-* by itself rarely also goes with *eku-*. Thus *ni(n)k-*, *has(s)ik(k)-*, and *ispiya-* amongst them variously cover the full primary ranges of Old Latin *satur esse* and *ēbrius esse*. Drunkenness enters into the semantic picture only secondarily but runs away with Latin *ēbrius* and affects Hittite *ni(n)k-* as well in its independent usages, excessive ingestion of intoxicant beverages being in most cultures a more imposing phenomenon than overeating. Accordingly we should indeed look for a simple root 'drink' in *ēbrius*, rather than something more picturesque like 'soaked', 'soused' or 'plastered'.

Winter's postulation of a noun **ēgh^wh-r-*, presumably a neuter **ēgh^wh-ŕ(-n-)*, would have a parallel in **ed-ŕ* from the root **ed-* 'eat', seen in the Hesychian gloss *ἐῖδαρ · βρώμα*, unless it be some variant of the heteroclititic Homeric *εἶδαρ* 'food' < **ed-wŕ* (plural *εἶδατα*; cf. the Luwian infinitive *aduna* 'to eat'). Incidentally it would also be possible to postulate **ēgh^w-wr-* for *ēbrius*, since **gh^w* + *w* would be indistinguishable from **gh^w*.

However, Hittite offers an even better parallel in the neuter noun *e-id-ri* 'food, meal, dish' (cf. Lithuanian *ėdrà* 'fodder'). Despite the long vowel in the Baltic, Slavic, and Latin paradigms of IE **ed-*, there is no reason to assume this for Hittite (*e-id-mi* = Vedic *ádmi*), and by the same token Hittite *eku-* should also be reconstructed as **ēgh^w-*, unless proven otherwise. The initial of Latin *ēbrius* offers by itself no proof of radical vocalism. What we can postulate is a noun **ēgh^wri* 'drink' paralleling Hitt. *edri* and yielding **ebri* (> **ebre*, like *mare*; cf. *febris* < **dhegh^wri*). *ēbrius* might be theoretically explicable as a *vŕddhi* derivative from **ebri*, parallel to Sanskrit *Ādityá-* from *Āditi-* or German *schwager* from *schwäher* (**swēkúros* from **swēkúros*), thus 'drink-prone, given to drink'; but then it would be strictly a relic form and would not account for the derivation of its antonym *sōbrius*.

sōbrius 'without drinking, not (having) drunk' is in fact crucial for a proper appreciation of *ēbrius*. It cannot be an ablauting compound made up of *sē(d)-* or *se-* and *ēbrius*, because no such Latin negative compounds exist. Apart from its use as a verbal prefix 'apart' (*sēd-itiō*, *sē-cēdo*, *sē-cerno*, *sē-clūdo*, *sē-grego*, *sē-iungo*, *sē-ligo*, *sē-moveo*, *solvō* [*< *se-luō*], *seorsum* [*< *sē-vorsom*]), *sē(d)-*, *se* once functioned as a preposition with the ablative 'apart from, without' (not unlike *sine*), as in Old Latin *sē fraude* 'without deceit'. Prepositional expressions such as **sē dolō(d)* 'without guile', **sē iugō(d)* 'without join', **sē cūrā(d)* 'without care', and **se corde* 'without mind', were hypostasized into *sēdulō*, *sēdulus* 'earnest(ly)', *sēiugis* 'disjoined', *sēcūrus* 'carefree', and *socors* 'mindless, stupid'. In the hypostasis, *o-* and *ā-*stems ended up as either *-o-* or *-i-*stems, whereas a neuter consonant stem merely received the animate marker *-s*; cf. the same phenomena in privative possessive compounds: *inermis* (*o*-stem *arma*), *infāmis* (*ā*-stem *fāma*), *iners* (consonant stem *ars*). Ablauting *o*-grade is seen not only in *socors* but in the parallel hypostatic *extorris* (*< *ex terrā[d]*). A **se ebrīd*, however (not **sē[d] ebrī[d]*), had no matched pattern of hypostasized derivation and ended up being treated ambivalently as either a vowel-stem **sēbrios* (on the analogy of *sēdulos*, *sēcūros*) or as a consonant-stem **sōbris* (cf. *socors*, *extorris*; no *i*-stem marking was possible, since it was already an *i*-stem).

From **sēbrios* was abstracted *ēbrios* 'drunk', much as the adjectives *decor(is)* and *decōrus* are secondary to *indecor(is)* and *indecōrus* (privative compounds with the nouns *decus*, *decor*). In its turn **sōbris* adjusted itself into *sōbrios*. In this manner a sober appreciation of the opposition of Lat. *ēbrius* : *sōbrius* sheds light on their common Indo-European root **egh^w-*, preserved in the Hittite primary verb *eku-* 'drink'.

Notes

1. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 72: 173–174 (1955).
2. *Revue hittite et asianique* 2: 251–252 (1934), *Revue des études latines* 15: 79 (1937); cf. J. Friedrich, *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch* 20: 321 (1936), and H. Otten, *Archiv für Orientforschung* 15: 81 (1945–51).
3. J. Puhvel, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94: 294 (1974) = *Analecta Indoeuropaea* 265 (Innsbruck 1981).
4. E. g. A. Kammenhuber, *Materialien zu einem hethitischen Thesaurus*, Lieferung 3, Nr. 5, p. 8 (Heidelberg 1976).
5. H. Pedersen, *Le groupement des dialectes indo-européens* 40 (Copenhagen 1925).
6. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 56: 28 (1915), *Die Sprache der Hethiter* 42–43 (Leipzig 1917).
7. *First in Language* 6: 219–20 (1930).
8. E. g. H. Kronasser, *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 3: 177–78 (1966); H. Eichner, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31: 82 (1973); A. J. van Windekens, *Le tokharien comparé avec les autres langues indo-européennes* 1: 601–602 (Louvain 1976).
9. Notably and consistently by E. Benveniste (*Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 33: 142 [1932]; *Hittite et indo-européen* 96–97 [Paris 1962]); also A. Kammenhuber, op. cit. in fn. 4, p. 7.

THE ORIGIN OF ETRUSCAN *TUSNA* ("SWAN")

On a large fourth century Etruscan bronze mirror published by E. Gerhard in 1867¹ and re-edited by A. J. Charsekin,² the circular center-piece depicts Atunis (Adonis) in the embrace of Turan (Venus). Behind Turan's back is a draped, bejeweled, and winged female figure holding an alabastron in one hand and a bodkin in the other, with the name Zirna inscribed next to her. On the left, a huge bird emerges from behind Atunis and cranes its neck above the head of the somewhat runty Atunis so that its beak almost nudges Turan's tiara. Next to the bird stands the name Tusna (see Figure 1).

The bird is a swan. Named swans are not exactly common; even Leda's and Lohengrin's birds were just "the Swan." Thus *tusna* is presumably the Etruscan word for "swan."³

Words for "swan" are frequently akin to terms for whiteness; collocations like *niveos cycnos*, *candidior cycnis* (Vergil), and *albus olor* (Ovid) were poetic commonplace, while conversely a *niger cycnus* to the Romans was the quintessential *rara avis in terris* (Juvenal 6.165). Greek κύκνος itself is cognate with Skt. *śukrá-* "shiny, white." Similarly OHG *albiz* and Russian *lebed* "swan" are etymologically akin to Lat. *albus* "white." There is accordingly some probability that *tusna* may have to do with whiteness. In that case, it perhaps represents a loan from an Umbrian **dōsnō* < **lousnā*, with *d* < *l* in the manner of Umbrian *fameñias* < **famedias* < **famelias* besides Oscan *famelo*, Lat. *familia*. The reverse development *d* > *l* is well known (Lat. *lingua* "tongue," *lacruma* "tear," *lēvir*, "husband's brother," *oleō* beside *odor*, *solium* beside *sedeō*), and the *d*:*l* fluctuation is endemic in areal context (Umbr.

¹*Etruskische Spiegel* IV, nr. 322.

²"Etruskische Inschriften in den Museen der UdSSR," *Zur Deutung etruskischer Sprachdenkmäler* (Frankfurt 1963) 70-81, with plates I-XII. This item (nr. 9, p. 77, and plates VI-VII), now in the Hermitage Museum in Leningrad, seems to have badly deteriorated since Gerhard's days, with several of the names of ancillary figures circling the rim corroded away. For an unimpaired version and a discussion, see also A. J. Pfiffig, *Religio etrusca* (Graz 1975) 275-77.

³Calling Tusna along with Zirna merely a "mythological name" (C. de Simone, *Die griechischen Entlehnungen im Etruskischen*, vol. II [Wiesbaden 1970] 100) is hardly illuminating.



A. J. Pfiffig, *Religio etrusca* (Graz 1975), Abb. 121, p. 276.

tuder: Etr. *tular* "boundaries"; Gk. Ὀδυσσεύς: Ὀλυτεύς, δάφνη: λάφνη, λαβύρινθος: Myc. *da-pu₂-ri-to-jo*, Hittite *tabarna*: *labarna*-). This **lousnā* is formally comparable to the early Latin *Losna* which appears on a Praeneste mirror (*CIL* 1².549, 14.4095 *Poloces Losna Amuces*) where it designates the moon goddess and linguistically antedates the later *Lūna*. In origin **lousnā* is an early Italic feminine form of the Indo-European adjective **lowksno-* or **lewksno-* "shiny, white" (Avest. *raoxšna-*) which has yielded astral terms in several languages (Old Prussian *lauxnos* "stars," OIr. *lūan* < **lowksnos* "moon," OCS *luna* < **lowksnā* "moon"). The adjective originally qualified a base-word for "star" or "moon" (as in Skt. *candrā-mas-*, literally "bright moon"), becoming subsequently elliptic. In the same way it may have occurred in an Italic combination **lousnā (avis)* (= an Avestan *raoxšnā vīš*) "white bird," which, borrowed from Umbrian, had an ephemeral future in Etruscan *tusna* but gave way in Latin to the Greek-origin *cycnus* (Lucretius, Cicero; itself partly supplanted by the ornithonym *olor* [< **elor*] in Augustan poets and later prose), perhaps for the obvious reason that the form which became *lūna* had in the meantime been preempted by the outcome of the parallel elliptic collocation **lousnā (*mēnsā)* (vel sim.), parallel to Gk. **σελάσνᾱ (*μήνσᾱ)*. The root involved, IE **lewks-* (Gk. λευκός "white"), shows other traces of an initial *l* > *d* change in Greco-Italic context (e.g., Hesychius' δευκέες· λαμπρόν), perhaps originating dissimilatorily in the name Πολυδεύκης (< **Πολυλεύκης*; cf. Etr. *Pul(u)tuke*, *Pultuce*, Old Latin *Podlouquei* [Lavinium], *Poloces* [Praeneste], Latin *Pollux*).

Forms such as *tusna*, *tusnu*, *tuśnu*, *tusnui*, *tuśnui*, *tusnus* occur as cognomina in Etruscan inscriptions;⁴ whether they have mere homophonic relevance to the topic of this note or represent a person's name meaning "Swan" cannot be determined (but cf. Gk. Κύκνος⁵ and Russian *Lebedev*). In any event the cluster *sn* was common and stable in Etruscan (*rasna*, *snute*), and the language was readily able to accommodate and preserve an early Italic **lousnā* > Umbrian **dōsnō*⁶ > Etr.

⁴References in M. Pallottino (ed.), *Thesaurus Linguae Etruscae I. Indice lessicale* (Roma 1978) 348, 351, or H. Rix, *Das etruskische Cognomen* (Wiesbaden 1963) 154.

⁵Incidentally occurring on two Etruscan scarabs as *Kukne* (cf. C. de Simone [note 3 above] vol. I, p. 86).

⁶Attested Umbrian has no initials in *l-*; those that had not become *d-* appear as *v-* (e.g., *Vufiune* < **Leudhyon-*). There is no example in the Umbrian remnants themselves of word-initial *d-* < **l-*; but the well-documented medial instances and the paral-

tusna or *tusnu* (for phonemic lack of *d* and *o*; incidentally **dōsnō* would have been written *tusna* or *tusnu* in the defective Umbrian alphabet as well).

Tusna would not be the only example of a borrowed animal name in Etruscan: on a fifth century Etruscan carnelian gem (Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris) the likeness of a suckling lioness is accompanied by the legend *leu*.⁷

Specific borrowings from Umbrian into Etruscan would not be limited to the postulated **dōsnō* either: there is, for example, Umbr. *kletra* "litter" which appears as Etr. *cletram*. Lexical interchange was clearly a two-way street.

9

els from the Mediterranean orbit give it strong plausibility. The paucity of the corpus does not raise high expectations of finding one (and hence mitigates the *e silentio* factor); after all, despite **l-* being a common initial phoneme in Italic, the presumably normal Umbrian *v-* < **l-* is present only in a handful of attestations (*Vufiune*, *Vuvcis*, *vutu*, *vapeře*).

⁷Cf., e.g., C. de Simone (note 3 above) vol. I, p. 89. Nor is this the only swan on Etruscan mirrors: Gerhard's nr. 110 (uninscribed) depicts a figure with an earring, loosely draped in a veil-like sheet and holding up a mirror in her left hand, riding side-saddle backwards on a very disgruntled-looking swan, with her right arm around the swan's twisted neck (see D. Rebuffat-Emmanuel, *Le miroir étrusque d'après la collection du Cabinet des Médailles* [Rome 1973], Plate 56). In the toilet scene of *ES* 213 (British Museum), Turan on the right has a swan peeking out from behind her, besides the dove on her left shoulder (see *Studi etruschi* 48 [1980] 177).

Hittite Athletics as Prefigurations of Ancient Greek Games

This chapter has to do with continuity, not forward in time from the traditional Olympic signpost zero of 776 B.C.E., but rather in retrograde fashion into an even dimmer past. Tales of origins are prone by nature to strike a stance *ab ovo*, and thus the Olympic Games were supposedly first launched in modest fashion, as extensions of cultic observances, with the *stadion*, something like a 200-meter foot race, as the sole athletic event. Perhaps this periodic Elean occasion truly had small beginnings and became a Panhellenic and indeed universal success by a singular conjunction of historical fortuity and shrewd promotion, similar to, but more lasting than, the parallel Pythian competitions at Delphi. But we should not equate the expansion of the Olympic Games with the development of Greek athletics. Apart from such combinatory specifics as the pankration and pentathlon, most of the common and customary events were included already in the Homeric tradition, as part of Achilles' one-man promotion following the cremation of Patroclus in *Iliad* 23—namely, horse racing, boxing, wrestling, running, jousting, weight-throw, archery, and spear-throw. There is no reason to assume that the Greeks suddenly turned athletic during the "Dark Ages," and the Homeric situation may be safely projected back to the Mycenaean period. Here written records fail us, apart from such indirect pointers as the Linear B chariot tablets from Knossos, and iconography is more explicit on Cretan bull-acrobatics than on normal athletics.

This retreat into prehistory would thus seem to reach a swift dead end, were it not for the written second-millennium records of another Indo-European conqueror nation newly ensconced in the cultural sphere of the Eastern Mediterranean and Asia Minor. Even a cursory look into the Hittite texts, especially the abundant tablets concerning rituals, brings to light evidence of clear relevance to what went on at Patroclus'

funerary games in the northwestern corner of Asia Minor. Even as the cremation rites that precede the games are replicated in minute detail by the mortuary rituals for Hittite royalty, at least six of the eight athletic events that follow the cremation have clear parallels in Hittite texts. The ones I cannot document at the moment are athletic horse racing and spear-throw, although horses, chariotry, and spears are abundantly in evidence in military contexts and there are the famous hippological training manuals. Evidence for running, archery, jousting, weight-throw, boxing, and wrestling is reviewed below.

The description of a rite of spring (*KUB X 18*)¹ begins as follows (I, 1–18):

When the king in the spring comes from Tahurpas to the Antahsum-festival (named after a plant) in Hattusas, as he arrives at Tippiwas, a tent and a *baitylos* (a sort of cultic stone) have already been left in place.

Then the king steps down from the chariot and in Hattusas performs proskynesis. He also goes inside the tent and washes his hands. The king comes out of the tent and in front of the *baitylos* pours wine. Then the king steps into the chariot.

He goes up to the upper *baitylos*. The bodyguards run (*pittianzi*), and he who wins, that one seizes the ass-bridle. Then the king steps down from the chariot, and before the *baitylos* breaks a breadloaf and libates.

The colophon to the same tablet (VI, 12–18) sums up the contents:

First tablet finished. When in the spring during the Antahsum-festival he comes from Tahurpas to Tippiwas, the bodyguards have a race (*pittianzi*). He also comes to Hattusas, and in the palace compound the grand assembly (takes place).

This "earliest mention of an *agōn* in cuneiform literature"² thus involves a foot race by the royal entourage, with the victor becoming what is designated sumerographically as *ŠA KUŠKA.TAB.ANŠU*, "he of the ass-bridle," a title comparable to our "marshal" from Old High German *marahscale*, literally "horse-keeper." That this was no menial appointment but rather a significant honorific is shown by the fact that it was the childhood title of the youngest son of Mursilis II, the future king Hattusilis III. Thus, a royal appointment and title constituted what Homer calls *takhuētōs aethla*, "prizes of swiftness," while Achilles (*Il.* 23.740–51) posted a silver crater, a fat ox, and a half-talent of gold as rewards for his runners.

An Old Hittite text (*KBo* III 34, from perhaps 1600 B.C.E.) describes an archery contest (II, 33–34): “When they vie in shooting (*sieskanzi*) before the king, to him who scores a hit they give wine to drink . . . but to him who does not score they give (some kind of) cup, and naked he brings water.”

The last feature is prescribed in a later text (*KUB* XIII 4 III, 32–34) as penal humiliation for malfeasance by temple officials. In our passage it is perhaps a more playful form of sanction in a mellower setting, possibly even a mirthful matter comparable to the lesser Ajax’s ordurous discomfiture in his foot race against Odysseus, as he slips and falls face down into the excrement of slaughtered oxen (*Il.* 23.775–81). A cup as the booby-prize for the scoreless shot recalls Achilles’ boxing trophies: an unbroken mule for the winner, and a two-handled cup for the battered loser (*Il.* 23.645–56).

At the games in memory of Patroclus, Achilles calls for a joust with spears. Whichever partner first draws blood will be awarded the silver-studded Thracian sword of Achilles’ late enemy Asteropaios, but both combatants get to divide the weapons taken from Sarpedon, and Achilles will throw a party for them in his tent (*Il.* 23.798–810). Ajax and Diomedes volunteer, and matters are on the point of getting serious when the referees, fearing a killing, stop the fight, with Diomedes ahead on points and being awarded the sword of Asteropaios.

The Hittite parallel (*KUB* XVII 35 III, 9–15) is more in the nature of a ritual mock combat:

They divide the young men into two halves and name them: one half of them they call Men of Hatti, and the other half they call Men of Masa. Men of Hatti have bronze weapons, whereas Men of Masa have weapons of reed. They wage battle. The men of Hatti are victorious; they take a captive and consign him to the deity.

This agonistic text has suffered various comparisons, from historical reminiscences of the Hittite conquest of Asia Minor³ to folkloristic, Mannhardtian instances of ritual battles between the forces of summer and winter (or light and darkness, fertility and sterility), in ancient and modern Europe.⁴ The most cogent parallels are those which, in contrast to the literary stylization of Homer, are anchored directly in cultic and mythic material, even if localized aetiologies may have conferred on them a quasi-historical tinge. Of this kind is Herodotus’ account (2.63) of ritual battles of votaries versus priests at Papremis in the Nile Delta, involving wooden clubs and genuine head-bashing, or the cult myth of the Attic Apatouria, detailing a combat of the Boetian Xanth(i)os “Fair-haired” and the Athenian (really Messenian Neleid) Melanthos “Dark” in a border dispute about Oinoe-Eleutherai or Panakton-Melainai, presum-

ably masking a myth of divine combat between the fair Apollo and Poseidon *kuanokhaitēs*. In the same way the Hittite ritual involving Hatti and Masa (the latter in western Asia Minor) may in the end be a localized mummery of a divine battle myth of deity against adversary, such as the Storm-god versus Illuyankas, or Zeus versus Typhoeus, or Apollo contra Python. Modern parallels would be the “good versus evil” folk plays pitting Christians against Turks in the Balkans. The “good” party naturally emerges victorious, and the Hittite adversary’s reed weapons seem to doom him to engineered defeat from the start.

Boxing and wrestling, Homer’s *pygmakhīē* and *palaismosynē*, are well documented in Hittite. The former is consistently expressed by the sumerogram GEŠPÚ, meaning “fist” and by extension “force,” so that the Hittite term is still hidden. “Wrestling” is denoted by either the noun *hulhuliya-* (a reduplication of *hulaliya-*, “to wind”) or the akkadogram KIT-PALU (an error for *kitpulu*), the literal verbal meaning of both stems being “entwine, wind around, embrace.” Occasionally GEŠPÚ and *hulhuliya* occur in immediate juxtaposition, so that one is left to wonder whether the meaning is an asyndetic “boxing (and) wrestling” or rather a quasi-compositional “boxing-wrestling,” something like the Greek pankration. An example would be (*KUB* XXV 23 I, 21–22) “they eat (and) drink, they fill cups, they go in for GEŠPÚ *hulhuliya* (“directive” case), they keep entertaining (*duskiskanzi*).” In a somewhat different context (*KUB* XVII 35 II, 26), “they entertain the deity (*duskanzi*, same verb in nondurative usage), they go in for *hulhuliya*, they throw the stone (NA₄-*an siyanzi*).” The weight-toss expressed by the last phrase corresponds to Achilles’ *solos auto-khoōnos*, the “self-poured,” natural lump of iron which will itself be the victor’s valuable prize as a source of the metal (*Il.* 23.826–35). The incipient Iron Age still prized this metal as a mostly meteoric rarity, out of which Homer shaped a nice poetic conceit. Among the Hittites, too, iron was still a prized material for special gifts.

This brings us to the most elaborate, though unfortunately fragmentary, Hittite account of an athletic event (*KBo* XXIII 55 I, 2–27). A military gathering in the iconic presence of the solar deity seems to be the occasion. Throughout there is a dichotomy of “ours” (*anzel*) and “the enemy’s” (sumerogram ŠA LÚKÚR). In the first scene the enemy’s man falls down, but ours stays up; when he hits, the enemy’s man is down, and all our troops applaud. In the sequel some wild animals (two leopards and two bears) are introduced, and later on bulls and black rams are mentioned in a sacrificial context. Thereafter “they put on the wrestlers (LÚ.MEŠ KITP[ALU]):”

Ours and the enemy’s man prostrate themselves to the deity three times, and then they proceed to wrestle (KITPALU *ti[yanzi]*). When

our man topples (his opponent), they applaud, he (i.e., the opponent) prostrates himself to the deity, and our man squats. But afterwards the men likewise get into fisticuffs (GEŠPÚ). And after that they go to *tarpa* (*tarpa tiyanzi*). Four rams go to *tarpa*. Afterwards bulls (?) go to *tarpa*. After that they go before the deity.

What is the mysterious *tarpa*- to which men go after wrestling and boxing, followed (or accompanied?) by rams and bulls? There are no further attestations. The construction with the "directive" case is the same as with the agonistic terms *hulhuliya tiya*-, *KITPALU tiya*-, *GEŠPÚ tiya*- and the similar *argatiya*-, "turn to rage," *kāri tiya*-, "go to favor, humor." One can think of some kind of rodeo-type animal games,⁵ but there is no other evidence of active participation by animals in the games. On the Homeric evidence domestic beasts figured rather as contest prizes, in combination with women and vessels. Thus, Achilles' first prize for horse racing was a woman plus tripod, followed by an untamed horse, a cauldron, two talents of gold, and a bowl (*Il.* 23.262-70). The wrestling champion got a tripod valued at twelve heads of cattle, and to the loser went a woman worth a mere four (*Il.* 23.702-5). Cattle were thus a form of value-unit, and so were sheep, as in many other cultures (cf., e.g., Latin *pecua*: *pecūnia*). It is hence conceivable that Hittite *tarpa*- denotes the awarding of prizes in terms of bulls and rams, and that men and beasts proceed to the award ceremony (*tarpa tiyanzi*). *Tarpa*- would then be the "pleasure part" of the event, the distribution, celebration, and enjoyment of winnings, perhaps even etymologically cognate with the Greek *térpomai*, "to delight," which crops up so often in the Homeric vocabulary of sports: e.g., δίσκοισιν τέρποντο καὶ αἰγανέησιν ἰέντες (*Od.* 17.168); ἐτέρφθησαν φρέν' ἀέθλοισι (*Od.* 8.131); ἐτέρφθητε φρέν' ἀέθλοισι (*Od.* 17.174).⁶ It may thus be possible to throw even some etymological bridges from the Greek to the Hittite vocabulary of athletics: *tarpa*- would correspond to Greek *térpsis*, "enjoyment, delight," Sanskrit *típti*- "satisfaction").

In any event it seems clear that many of the organized events which gradually were incorporated into the Olympic Games were neither new nor specifically Greek: they were fully present in the Hellado-Anatolian orbit of the second millennium before the common era. Their upswing, though, definitely owes a great deal to the new presence of Indo-European-speaking aristocratic warrior cultures, in contradistinction to the earlier Eastern Mediterranean and Near Eastern civilizations.

Notes

1. References are to: *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* (KUB) and *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* (KBo), in publication since 1921 and 1923 respectively.

2. H. Ehelolf, "Wettlauf und szenisches Spiel im hethitischen Ritual," *SB Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl.* (1925) 267-72, esp. 269.
3. Ehelolf (supra n. 2) 271; A. Goetze, *Kleinasien* (Munich, 1957) 163.
4. A. Lesky, "Ein ritueller Scheinkampf bei den Hethitern," *Arch RW* 24 (1926) 73-82 = *Gesammelte Schriften* (Bern and Munich, 1966) 310-17.
5. As H. A. Hoffner did in *BibO* 35 (1978) 247.
6. On *térpomai* in this and other uses, see J. Latacz, *Zum Wortfeld "Freude" in der Sprache Homers* (Heidelberg, 1966) 174-219.

On the source of Hittite *halzai-*

The closing of many a lustrum has failed to dim Edgar Polomé's luminous study 'On the source of Hittite *h*' (*Language* 28. 1952: 444–456). The good sense that it embodied still seems fresh, uncannily resistant to winds of fashion, and continues to fructify research, not excluding the small token of sincere homage which is appended below.

The profusely attested Hittite verb *halzai-*, *halziya-* roughly matches the various semantic layers of English 'call': (1) 'call out, cry, shout'; (2) 'cry for, crave' (e.g., pardon); (3) 'proclaim, recite, read aloud'; (4) 'call, summon, invoke, invite'; (5) 'call (by name)'. There is little doubt that (1) is basic, and that the other meanings are offshoots thereof.

In view of Luwian *halta-*, *halti(ya)-* of the same meaning, the Proto-Anatolian form is **halt-*. The Hittite stem *halz-* presupposes generalized affrication originating before a front vowel, thus pointing to the chronological anteriority of **haltiya-* < **H₁tyó-*, a primary formation with **-yo-* suffix like, e.g., *assiya-* < **H₂syó-* 'be favored' or *parkiya-* < **bhrg_hyó-* 'be high'. This stem survives in the third person singular medio-passive present form *halziya* (e.g., *KUB XXX 24 II 17 nu UD.KAM-as NAPTANU GAL halziya* 'the day's big meal is called').

Rejecting the many attempts since Hrozný to derive the *h-* of *halziya-* from an Indo-European guttural stop (with *Sirene des Gleichklanges* ranging from Czech *hlásati* to OHG *gelzōn* 'cry out'), Polomé (1952: 451) toyed in passing with the possibility of onomatopoeia (as had Walter Couvreur [1937: 59] before him and Bojan Čop would do still later [1970: 96–97]) but also stated that "otherwise Abel Juret's comparison with Goth. *lapon* 'kalein', OHG *ladōn* -ēn 'invite, call' deserves due recognition, since the Hittite word means 'summon' as well and may reflect PIE **xol-t-y-*, alternating with **(x)l-ot-* > Gmc. **lap-*." Juret's blanket notoriety as a madman has made it difficult to secure even minimum credit for his occasional brilliant insights, such as the connection of Hitt. *eku-* 'drink' with Lat. *ēbrius* (cf. Puhvel 1984: 267–268, 1985: 693–

695). Polomé's attempt to do justice has found few takers apart from the present *gratulator* (Puhvel 1965: 88), and Johann Tischler (1977: 140) lumped Juret's suggestion with all the other "un glaubhafte" approaches to *halzai-*.

The comparison Anat. **halt-* : Gmc. *lap-* makes excellent sense in terms of root structure (*H₁el-t-* : *H₁l-t-* : *H₁l-ét-*), with Anatolian showing a typical predilection for the first full grade or zero grade (cf., e.g., Hitt. *arpa-* 'misfortune' : Ved. *rāpas-* 'affliction'; Hitt. *ard-* 'saw' : Ved. *rādati* 'gnaw, cut through'; Hitt. *palhi-* 'wide' : Lat. *plānus* 'flat'; Hitt. *sanh-* 'flush' : Ved. *snāti* 'bathe'). The Germanic verb is denominative from a noun **Hlotā* (type of Gk. *tomē*, Lat. *toga*) seen in Runic *lapu*, ON *lōð*, OE *laðu* 'call, summons, invitation', and the semantic specificity of 'invite' is colored thereby (cf. Luw. *haltatt-* and Hitt. *halziyawar* 'calling, invocation'). The same precise meaning 'invite' has developed in Hittite in such usages as *nu wakanna halziyari* 'there is an invitation to (have a) bite' (*KUB XXV 24 II 13*) or *GAL-is-za¹ UTU-us EZEN-an iet nu-za¹ LIM DINGIR.MEŠ halzayis* 'the great sun-god gave a party and invited the thousand gods' (*KUB XVII 10 I 19–20*).

An Anatolian-Germanic isogloss of this quality can normally be self-sustaining, but we do in fact have the good fortune of an independent tertium in the Old Latin noun *lessus* 'wailing, lamentation' quoted from the Laws of the Twelve Tables by Cicero, *De legibus* 2.59: *mulieres genas ne radunto neve lessum funeris ergo habento* 'women shall not tear their cheeks nor have a keening on account of a funeral'. And Cicero continues: 'hoc veteres interpretes Sex. Aelius L. Acilius non satis se intellegere dixerunt, sed suspicari vestimenti aliquid genus funebris, L. Aelius (sc. L. Aelius Stilo) lessum quasi lugubrem eiulationem, ut vox ipsa significat. Quod eo magis indico verum esse quia lex Solonis id ipsum vetat.' Thus the word was obsolete before Cicero's time, but Stilo glossed it by *lugubris eiulatio* rather than some kind of mourning attire, and Cicero concurs. In *Tusculan Disputations* 2.55 he has more to say: 'ingemescere non numquam viro concessum est, idque raro, eiulatus ne mulieri quidem; et hic nimirum est *lessus*, quem Duodecim Tabulae in funeribus adhiberi vetuerunt.' Here *lessus* is a cogent emendation for the corrupt *fletus* or *pessus* of the manuscripts. *lessus* is thus the archaic word for the current onomatopoeic *ēiulatio* or *ēiulatus*. As a relic of **Hlet-tu-* (of the type *re-cessus*, *sensus*, *cultus*, with full-grade root vocalism) it meant basically '(out)cry'. A meaning 'howl' likewise inheres in Hittite *halziya-* and the iter-

ative-durative *halzissa-* (*KUB* IX 31 II 12 *nu* UR.BAR.RA-*ili halzissai* 'he howls like a wolf'); human ululation in ritual context is well documented from Old Hittite onward, e.g., *hu-u-u halzissanzi* (*KBo* XVII 18 II 4), *i-i halzissāi* (*KBo* XVII 43 I 11), *a-ha-a halzissanzi* (*KBo* XXV 154, 2, 3, 6 and often), *wa-ú-ya 3-ŠU halzianzi* (*KUB* I 14 II 4).

It appears that by the three independent witnesses reconstructible as **Hltyó-*, **Hlotā*, and **Hlet-tu-* from Anatolian, Germanic, and Latin respectively an Indo-European root for 'cry' is cogently inferrable. Our *Jubilar* did well in giving Juret's brilliant lucid interval its rightful due.

References

- Couvreur, Walter
1937 *De hettitische H; een bijdrage tot de studie van het indo-europeesche vocalisme* (Bibliothèque du Muséon 5) (Leuven: Le Muséon).
- Čop, Bojan
1970 "Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung VIII", *Linguistica* (Ljubljana) 10: 89–106.
- Polomé, Edgar G. C.
1952 "On the source of Hittite *h*", *Language* 28: 444–456.
- Puhvel, Jaan
1965 "Evidence in Anatolian", in: Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for laryngeals* (Janua Linguarum, Series Maior 11) (The Hague/London/Paris: Mouton & Co.), 79–92.
- 1984 *Hittite etymological dictionary* 1–2 (Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 1) (Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers).
- 1985 "Sober thoughts on Latin *ēbrius*", in: Ursula Pieper–Gerhard Stickel (eds.), *Studia linguistica diachronica et synchronica Werner Winter sexagenario ... oblata* (Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter), 693–696.
- Tischler, Johann
1977 *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft).

ON TERMS FOR 'NIT' IN BALTIC AND BALTO-FINNIC

Nits are not common in present-day sanitized environments. In older stages, however, man's everyday familiarity with the eggs of lice and related vermin is mirrored by the neatly stratified and remarkably cohesive terminology denoting them in practically all attested Indo-European and Finnic languages. Picking our way through this terminology affords notable insights into areal, genetic, and diffusional linguistics.

Lith. *glinda* and Latv. *gnīda* do not quite match up, despite a patent affinity. The Latvian word, however, is very close in form to Russ. *gnīda* and likewise to the Scandinavian terms, ONorse *gnit*, Swed. *gnet*. There is thus a lexical isogloss comprising Slavic, North Baltic, and North Germanic. We can even posit an IE proto-form **ghnidā* and root-connect it with the verb seen in OEngl. *gnīdan*, Swed. *gnida* 'rub, scratch'. But granted the areal contiguity of the three witnesses, straight independent derivation from Indo-European seems rash. It is possible that the Russian term influenced or replaced a Proto-Baltic one via Latgale, nor is it to be ruled out that the Varangians picked up some fresh lice in Russia and also brought the term back to native shores. Germanic has otherwise OEngl. *hnitu*, Engl. *nit*, OHG (*h*)*niz*, German *Niss(e)*, which can be subsumed under an IE formula **knidā*, while Greek shows κόνις (gen. κονίδος), and Albanian has (Geg) *thënrī* and (Tosk) *thërrī*. If the Greek form goes back to a **knids*, it might in its first-syllable vocalism be influenced by the word κόνις, meaning 'dust',¹ and the root-connection would be with Gk. κνίζω 'scratch'. Thus again there are three witnesses (Germanic, Greek, Albanian), but at least two non-contiguous ones. Root-association can work both ways: Gk. κόνις may have undergone another attraction process (from 'scratch' to dust and dirt), despite the living presence of the verb κνίζω, whereas the North Germanic *gnit*, unless influenced by Slavic, was perhaps attracted from a **knit* to the verb *gnida*. This would render the entire proto-form **ghnidā* suspect and leave us with a **knid-* reflected by Germanic, Greek, and Albanian, vs. a merely Slavic (and possibly also Baltic) **gnid-*, where nothing lets us decide between an Indo-European **g* or **gh*. One may in fact suspect that **gn-* is here a (Balto-)Slavic dialect variant of IE **kn-*, since initial *kn-* in both Russian and Baltic is rare and of secondary or borrowed origin.

What then of Lith. *glinda*? It would be easy enough to dismiss it via nasal infix and dissimilation, i.e. **gni-n-d-* > *glind-* (such dissimilation of two successive nasals is common enough, as in e.g. Hitt. *laman* vs. Lat. *nōmen* 'name'). In this way the Baltic proto-form could be brought close to Slavic, obviating the hypothesis of a fresh influx of

eastern vermin via Latgale. But it does not work. Instead, the Lithuanian form must be ancient, for it opens up rather astonishing vistas.

Lith. *glinda* cannot be separated from the Latin word for 'nit', *lēns* (gen. *lendis*; cf. French *lente*), also *lendina* (pl. *lendines*), *lendix*, *lindex* (with a guttural suffix as in *pūlex* 'flea', *cīmex* 'bug', *culex* 'gnat'). Since Latin normally tolerates initial inherited *cl*- and *gl*-alike (*clamor*, *glans*), the absence of initial guttural is exceptional. Conversely, however, Lith. *glinda* may itself be partially transformed under the influence of Slavic (and by extension Latvian) *gnīda*, in which case the proto-form of the Baltic and Latin terms can be posited as **lind-* < **nind-*, and the guttural of the other languages is to be considered "movable". That this group of words was subject to "prefixing" (expressive or tabuistic or whatever) is seen in the Celtic and Armenian words for 'nit' with their *s*-movable, OIr *sned* (fem.), Welsh *nedd* (pl.), Breton *nez* (< **s[k]nidā*), and Arm. *anic* which can represent anything from **s(k)nnids* to simple **nids* with a prothetic vowel.² The reconstruction of a non-prefixed, non-infixed stem **lid-* < **nid-* (beside the **lind-* < **nind-* reflected by Lithuanian and Latin) is proper for Skt. *likṣā* < *litkā* < *lid-kā* (with a guttural suffix like Lat. *lindex*; the variant *nikṣā* is found in lexicographers, Hindi has *likh*, but *nikh* is also found in Modern Indo-Aryan). The Iranian equivalents are Ossetic *lisk*, Persian *rišk*, Pushto *riča*.³ Lithuanian *glinda* is thus the pivotal central form which ties together all the various Indo-European terms for 'nit', reflecting something of all the ramifications.

Thus from India to Ireland, from Iceland to Ionia, from Latium to Lithuania, all nits were linguistically related. Not so when we cross the Indo-European language boundary in the Baltic area. The various Balto-Finnic idioms share a common word for 'nit' which is epitomized by Finn. *saivar*.⁴ Cognates include Lappish *čiwros*, Mordvian (Ersa) *šarko*, Mari *šarye.ñā*, Udmurt *šerāl*, and Komi *šeral*. The Estonian equivalent is first attested by Göseken in 1660⁵ as *sair* or *sahrick*, and later by Wiedemann⁶ as *saeras* (pl. *saerad*) or *saere* (pl. *saered* or *saereded*). Modern dialectology has recorded a great number of variants,⁷ especially in the plural (also *saerad*, *saerjad*; *saivred*, *saivarid* [from the Finnish-like north coast dialect]; *saerved* [with metathesis of *v* and *r*]; *sagurad* [from the western islands]). All this material is from North Estonian. The South Estonian dialects, which but for a variety of historical accidents could have ended up as a distinct language, had instead the word *ting*, pl. *tingud*. It is first attested by Gutsclaff in 1648,⁸ when he glossed *tengo* with *Gnisse* (the initial *g*- in his German dialect or idiolect may be due to some form of combined Russian-Latvian-Scandinavian influence). The word *ting* has gained entry into the northern-based modern standard Estonian as well, relegating *saere* to a quaint lexical specimen.

What is the origin of *ting*? Mägiste (*op.cit.* 3178) called it "etymologisch unklar" and Raun⁹ characterizes it as "descriptive" (of what, one wonders). It is of course a palindrome of *gnit* which happens to be the archaic Scandinavian word for 'nit'. But words are not

borrowed spelled backwards. Even so a borrowing from early Swedish might have been plausible for the west coast of Estonia, not the land-locked southern dialects. There is, however, the possibility of a metathetic borrowing from the Russian *gnīda* or the Latvian *gnīda*, with transposition of the initial cluster with guttural and the subsequent dental. The *d* would naturally appear as *t* (cf. e.g. *toom* < German *Dom*), and the cluster *gn* (which Estonian would not have tolerated as initial) was in other positions corrupted to *ng*. The seventeenth-century form *tengo* might directly reflect the Russian plural *gnīdy* as the plural marker *-d* had dropped in South Estonian. The subsequent plural *tingud* and the singular *ting* might be normalizations on the basis of the Estonian standard.

How plausible is the metathesis? It is certainly not unparalleled. A very similar case is found in Greek, where δάκτυλος 'finger' comes from *δακτύλος which in its turn is a metathesis of *τακδυλός.¹⁰ The chance to eliminate by dislocation a troublesome initial cluster was certainly one triggering factor. The native Estonian word was likewise subject to metathetic deformation (*saivred* : *saerved*). The reverse metathesis of dental : guttural to guttural : dental is seen in e.g. Tocharian B *kantwo* < **dngħw-* (Engl. *tongue*) and the similar variation of labial : guttural and guttural : labial is present in Lith. *kūmstė* < **pnk^wst-* (OCS *peštī*, Engl. *fist*) and Lith *kepū* < **pek^wō* (OCS *pekō* 'I bake') and in Gk. ἀρτοκόπος < *άρτο-πόκος 'bread-baker', σκέπτομαι < *σπέκτομαι (Lat. *speciō*), or ἀσκόλωψ beside ἀσπάλαξ 'mole', seen in the name of the god Ἀσκληπιός. Similarly the Greek term for 'flea', ψύλλα, is metathetic for **plus-* seen in Skt. *plūṣi-* and Lith. *blusā* (and Engl. *flea*). So is Lat. *pūlex* < **pusli-* < **plusi-*. I would thus suggest that the Russian word *gnīdy* entered South Estonian speech from the Pskov area of Russia and was transformed to **tingu* by metathesis on Estonian territory. Thus both Latvian and South Estonian were infested by Russian terminology for lice-eggs, while Lithuanian and North Estonian basked in the relative purity and pristine archaism of their respective Indo-European and Finnic lexical ingredients.

NOTES

1) Cf. J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern, 1959), 608; D.J. Georgacas, *Glotta*, 36 (1957), 164. Albanian also has an unexpected vowel in the first syllable which may reflect **o*.

2) It is not likely that *anic* represents (along with Gk. κούζ and Alb. *thēni*) a proto-form **kōnid-* (with regressive dissimilatory loss of *s* < **k-* before *-c*), as suggested by E.P. Hamp, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 76 (1960), 278.

3) Cf. T. Burrow, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 79 (1959), 89. Skt. *likṣā* (with *l-* from IE **n-*) has nothing to do with the verb *rikhāti* or *likhāti* 'scratch' with IE **r-*; the latter's cognates are Gk. ῥέειω 'rend, tear', Lat. *ricinus* 'louse', Lith. *érkė* 'louse', Albanian *ergjis* 'small louse', Arm. *orjil* 'nit'.

4) Cf. E. Itkonen - A.J.Joki, *Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja* 4 (Helsinki, 1969), 948-49; J. Mägiste, *Estnisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Helsinki, 1982), 2666.

- 5) H. Göseken, *Manuductio ad linguam Oesthonicam* (Reval, 1660), 311.
- 6) F.J. Wiedemann, *Ehstnisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (St.Petersburg, 1869), 1100.
- 7) Cf. A. Saareste, *Eesti keele mõisteline sõnaraamat* 3 (Stockholm 1962), 266-267.
- 8) J. Gutsclaff, *Observationes grammaticae circa linguam Esthonicam*.
- 9) A. Raun, *Eesti keele etimoloogiline teatmik* (Rome 1982), 177.
- 10) Cf. J. Puhvel, *Analecta Indoeuropaea* (Innsbruck 1981), 350.

' SHOULDER' AND 'CORNER' IN HITTITE

Terms for body parts in Hittite come in several type-varieties. There are the blatant Indo-European matches, such as *kard-* 'heart', *ēšhar* 'blood', *hastai-* 'bone', *genu-* 'knee', *pata-* 'foot', *kessar(a)-* 'hand', *arki-* 'testicle', *arra-* 'arse'. Others are only moderately more difficult to bring into line, e.g. *harsar* 'head' (: Ved. *śīṛṣán-*, Hom. *κηράτι-*), *sankuwai-* 'fingernail' (s-movable + **onh-w-* seen in Lat. *unguis*), *zamangur* 'beard' (Skt. *śmāśru-*), *a(y)liss-* 'mouth' (Lat. *ōs*). Still others have more restricted isoglossal equivalents, e.g. *lesi-* or *lissi-* 'liver' (Arm. *leard*) or *iskis-* '(lower) back, lumbar region' (Gk. *ἰσχίον*). Some terms have changed "locus" and in consequence dislocated others, as when *par(a)sna-* 'loins' corresponds to Lat. *perna* 'haunch' and Skt. *pārṣṇi-* 'heel', or *anassa-* '(upper) back' (?) may match Lat. *umerus* and Skt. *āṁsa-* 'shoulder', or *paltana-* '(upper) arm' has as cognates OCS *plešte* and Milr. *leithe* 'shoulder'. Others have undergone a metonymous shift (*pesna-* 'man, male' beside Lat. *pēnis* < **pesni-*; cf. Hitt. *pes-* 'to rub') or differing semantic specialization starting from the underlying verbal root (*istaman[a]-* 'ear' vs. Gk. *στόμα(τ)-* 'mouth'). A predilection for *i*-stem formations is evident in a number of terms, besides *arki-* (cf. Gk. *ὄρχις*) and *lesi-* also e.g. *sakui-* 'eye', *aui-* 'spleen', *meni-* 'face', *puri-* 'lip', *taggani-* 'breast, chest'. The whole subject needs a new monograph, in the distant wake of such tentative preliminaries as Sedat Alp's 1957.

A further group of body-words originates in babble-talk, with the onomatopoeic and reduplicative proclivities of such utterance: *lala-* 'tongue', *lalu-* 'penis', *laplipa-* 'eyelash', *titita-* 'nose', *tetana-*

'hair', *titan-* 'tit'. Here it is easy to claim "Elementarverwandtschaft" and leave it at that, but more nuanced inspection is needed. Some forms are only by chance of "reduplicative" appearance, such as *kalulupa-* 'finger', which is cognate with Gk. δάκτυλος and involves the numeral 'ten' (cf. J. Puhvel, 1981 [originally 1976]). Others have more than "elementary" cognates or parallels elsewhere or show clear derivation from verbal roots. Thus *hūwahhurtl-*, *huhhurtl-*, or *hurhurta-* 'windpipe' has a very specific match in Arm. *xaxurt*⁶ of the same meaning. *pappassala-* 'esophagus' is clearly derived from *pas-* 'to swallow'. The word *hah(ha)ri-* 'lungs, diaphragm' is typologically reminiscent of the Sanskrit and Pāli terms for 'lung', *phupphusa-* and *papphāsa-*, which are from verbs similar to Gk. πῦσσω 'blow, puff' and Russian пы́хат 'pant, puff'. The Hittite for 'blow', *parai-*, has a reduplicated variant *parip(a)rai-*; hence some of the reduplications may originate secondarily in the underlying verbs.

It is therefore possible to go beyond the "Lallwort" explanation, to account for reduplication as etymologically non-crucial, and to find proper Indo-European matches for words such as *gakkartan(n)i-* 'shoulderblade' (OHG *herti* 'shoulderblade'; cf. M. Poetto, 1979: 206).

A similar approach may be taken to the obscure body part *halhaldana-*, upon which the Sea placed a container in KUB XXXVI 44 I 7-8 (*nu-za arunas* DUGHAB.HAB [...] [...] *halhaldāni-ssi dais* 'placed on his *h.*'). Elsewhere there is the variant form (acc. sg.) *halhalzanan*, in the sequence 'bone(s) (= stature?), *h.*, eyebrows, eyelashes' (KUB XXIV 12 III 5-6; similarly [*halh*] *Janzanan* *ibid.* II 31-32), and a possible instr. sg. [*hal*] *halzanit* in KUB VII 55 Vs. 6-7 (ŠA ŠAH *pankunit euwas* [*hal*] *halzanit tuikkus war[-* 'of a barley-with-milk[-fed] pig [they?] burn limbs along with *h.*'). Luwian has acc. sg. *halzānin* (KUB XXXV 48 II 16) and *halhalzanin* (KUB XXXV 12 III 2; XXXV 45 II 23; XXXV 33 III 4-5) or *halhalzānin* (XXXV 73, 10), always preceded immediately by 'bone(s)'.

halhaldana- is clearly the oldest form, with *z* in *halhalzana-* showing a Hittite affrication of the dental. In this case Luwian also has *z*, rather than the expected **halhaltana-*. At the same time Luwian exhibits the unreduplicated variant *halzānin* (unless it be due to scribal haplography of the *hal* sign), and Hittite shows a

dissimilatory [*halh*] *Janzanan*. The term may thus be Luwoid to a point, but with Hittite phonetic adjustments which have reverberated back onto Luwian itself. As a body part on which a vessel is carried, and which is mentioned in the same breath with limbs and bones, *halhaldana-* is most probably 'shoulder'. We might note from above that both inherited 'shoulder' words, *anassa-* and *paltana-*, have somewhat shifted meanings ('upper back' and 'upper arm' respectively). Hence, besides *gakkartan(n)i-* 'shoulderblade', *halhaldana-* may be the Hittite 'shoulder' word proper, with the same suffixal segment as *paltana-*. When Ullikummi is affixed ANA DUpelluri ZAG-ni UZUZAG.LU-ni 'onto Upelluri's right shoulder' (H.G. Güterbock, 1951: 156), the sumerogram may be read *kunni halhaltani* rather than *kunni paltani*. (*hal*) *haltana-* is reminiscent of words such as Avest. *arəθna-* and Skt. *aratnī-* 'elbow', thus perhaps pointing to a proto-form **Helt(no)-*.

This explanation of *halhaldana-* also solves the mystery of *halhaltumar(i)-* 'corner'. Rather than some deverbative reduplicative root etymology *hal-hal-t-umar* 'the place where something bends', from a **hal-* extracted from *haliya-* 'bend, kneel' (H.C. Melchert, 1983: 13-14), *halhaltumar-* is an offshoot of (*hal*) *halt(ana)-* 'shoulder', with a denominative abstract-forming suffix *-umar* < **-uwar* < **-(u)wr* (cf. e.g. *ārrumas* < *ārruwas* < **arr-uwas*, and the denominates *miumar*, *hilammar*). Like Hitt. *halhaldana-*; Luw. *halhalzani-*, *halhaltumar(i)-* bears mitigated marks of Luwoid character (paralysis of *r/n* heteroclisis [gen. pl. *halhaltumaras*], trend to secondary *l*-stem derivation [nom. pl. c. *halhaltumariēs*]). Much as Gk. γωνία 'corner, angle' is palpably derived with an abstract suffix from γόνυ, or OHG *ancha* 'nape, shank', *anchal* 'heel, knuckle, ankle' are cognate with Lat. *angulus*, OCS *pglŭ*, Arm. *ankiun* 'angle, corner, nook', *halhaltumar-* is an offshoot of the Anatolian term for 'shoulder'. While Greek picked the bent knee, Anatolian chose square shoulders as the image of angularity. The typical 4 *halhaltumari* are not merely the mundane corners of a house or a hearth, they also denote the 'four corners of the universe', i.e. cardinal points in terms of movements of the sun and the winds. The cosmic giant Upelluri reminisced to Ea how unbeknownst to him heaven and earth were once built and cut apart on him, unlike the

acute shoulder-pain which Ullikummi's grafting is causing him (*kuitki* UZU.ZAG.LU-an GIG=zi = *kuitki halhalzanan istarakzi* 'something ails the shoulder': cf. H.G. Güterbock, 1952: 28); we are not far from the rectangular shoulders of Atlas sustaining the four corners of the earth and firmament.

REFERENCES

- Alp, Sedat. 1957. "Zu den Körperteilnamen im Hethitischen", *Anatolia* 2: 1-48.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1951. "The Song of Ullikummi: Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth", *JCS* 5: 125-161.
1952. Continuation of the same in *JCS* 6: 8-42.
- (1952a. Both parts together issued as a *separatum*: *The Song of Ullikummi: Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth*. 60 pp. New Haven. The American Schools of Oriental Research).
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1983. "A 'New' Proto-Indo-European *-men Suffix", *Die Sprache* 29/1.
- Poetto, Massimo. 1979. "Some Parts of the Body and Secretions in Hittite", in (Edd.) E. Neu & W. Meid. *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*. Innsbruck: IBS 25.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1976. "'Finger' in Hittite, Greek, and Latin", *IF* 81: 25-28.
1981. Reprint of Same in *Analecta Indoeuropaea: Delectus operum minorum plerumque Anglice aliquando Francogallice editorum annos 1952-1977 complectens*. Pp. 349-353 (and the addition of new fn. "74" on p. 417). Innsbruck: IBS 35.

Who were the Hittite *hurkilas pesnes*?

In the midst of the archaic Hittite ritual of Zuwi a narrative occurs, preceded, punctuated, and followed by a refrain from the mouth of the presiding magician, roughly "The person whom I treat, I call out his name." Extensive parts of every line-end are broken, making full restoration difficult. Nothing in the trite and broken therapeutic rite itself prepares one for the onset of the story, as the protagonists introduce themselves (*KUB* XII 63 Vs. 21): *hurkilas LÚ.MEŠ wēs* 'men of *hurkil* we (are)'. In the next two lines the house (= temple) of the storm-god speaks to those men: "What I say [you shall do], and this I give, and you shall bring it to pass." The men answer (24-27): "Say it to us, we shall do it." "The long (*talugaus*) roads shorten [and the short ones] lengthen (*taluganuttin*), the high (*pargawus*) mountains shorten (*manikuandahtin*) and the short ones (*manikuan-dus*) [heighten], catch a wolf by the hand (*kissarta*), catch a lion with the knee (*ganut*; cf. Greek *gnúks*), the river (*ÍD-an* = *hapan*) [...], use the *zuwāluwal* (a ritual tool) on a snake and take him to the King's Gate (*LUGAL-was āska*, the royal tribunal), and [his judgment shall be rendered]." After the refrain (28) the story resumes (29-34): "The men came back, and they spoke thus: 'We aren't up to it (*ŪL-za suwaweni*). The long [roads, we cannot shorten them], and the short roads, we cannot lengthen them (*ŪL-as daluganula*), the high mountains, [we cannot shorten them,] the small (*kappaus*) mountains, we cannot heighten them (*ŪL-us parganula*).¹ A wolf by the hand they had not [caught], the river and the boulder (*kuwankunurr-a*; cf. *kunkunuzzi* 'rock?') they had given up on (*pessir*), and it had not been crushed (*harratta ŪL*), a snake [they had not used the *zuwāluwal* on, and him to the King's Gate] they had not brought, and his judgment had not been rendered (*hannessa-set hannat ŪL*). The case was aggravated (*uttar na[kkesta]*)." (Refrain)

¹ Strange first person plural modal ending *-la*, comparable to first person singular "imperative" ending *-(l)u*.

These *hurkilas pesnes*² (line 21) or *pesnes hurkilas* (lines 22, 23) are matched elsewhere only by the Luwian accusative plural *hurkilassinza LÚ.MEŠ-inza* in the uninformative, enumerative Hittite passage KUB XXXV 148 IV 3. They seem to act out an exemplary tale as overly confident but not too bright ogre-types who come to grief, not unlike the Indic demons or the Norse giants who are typically outwitted in their dealings with gods. There may be humor involved: the first two tasks are close to absurd in the literal sense, and the expressions which set them forth may have been simply proverbial ones for "go the extra mile" and "leave no stone unturned", in short, do your darnedest with respect to the various more feasible feats of capture that follow. The overearnest fellows, however, take them literally, and when the impossibility sinks in, are too downcast even to proceed to the rest of the list: they simply give up and report back as failures.

Yet just who might these 'men of *hurkil*' be? There is nothing to indicate supernatural status. *hurkil* or *hurkel* is the well-known neuter noun which in the Law Code and elsewhere designates a man's illegal sexual relations with bovines and sheep (likewise pigs and dogs, although this is not explicitly termed *hurkil*), and with a variety of relatives (mother, daughter, son, sister, stepmother, free women and their mother in the same locality [without apparent benefit of wedlock], brother's wife, mother-in-law, wife's sister, female cousin). It thus involves somewhat selective sanction against bestiality and incest. Equines are explicitly exempted from the ban ("if a man errs with a horse or a mule, there is no offence"), which recalls the fact that bestiality with horses occurred in ancient Indo-European royal rituals from ancient India to medieval Ireland. The Hittite perpetrator "does not become priest", which seems to place the practice squarely and restrictively in the warrior class. The potential victims of statutory rape are all female, with the exception of the son sodomized by the father. Rape as such does not seem to be the target of this legislation; what matters is the degree of kinship and "status", thus factors of incest and perhaps miscegenation (unfree and "deportee" women are explicitly left to the mercies of the Hittite male). Everything is formulated from the vantage point of the man. There is occasional reference, in the Code and elsewhere, to bovines leaping at men or "doing abomination", in which case the bovine is killed but the man is lustrated with a sheep as substitute offering; a misbehaving swine gives "no offence". But nothing is said from

² LÚ-(na-) = *pesna*- 'man, male', synecdochic from the original meaning seen in Latin *pēnis* (< **pesnis*), root-connected with Hittite *pes*- 'to rub', Cf. Latin *mās* 'male' (originally 'membrum virile'), related to Sanskrit *mās-* as *membrum* < **mēmsro-* is to Sanskrit *māmsá-* 'flesh'.

the standpoint of the passive partner in sodomy, and this silence is meaningful, for homosexual rape, statutory or other, is not dealt with from the bugger's perspective either. The whole subject, apart from its incestuous aspect, clearly did not interest Hittite legislation.

The wages of *hurkil* was death, subject, however, to the king's discretion. Frontier chiefs were also advised to use local option in border towns, where ancient customary law varied between death and banishment, and there is evidence of lustrational practices in the wake of *hurkil*.³ The word also occurs on "calamity lists" together with such staples as sorcery, bloodshed, perjury, defilement, and disease. The common semantic denominator is 'capital sex crime'.

Etymologically *hurkil*⁴ clearly reflects Indo-European **Hwerǵh-* 'constrict, throttle, strangle', seen in Lithuanian *veřžti* and Middle High German *er-wergen*. Its *o*-grade occurs in Gothic *ga-wargjan daupau* 'condemn to death', literally 'cause to be strangled to death', and in **Hworǵhós* 'strangler' or **Hwóǵhos* 'strangled one, gallowsbird, rascal', either or both seen in Old Norse *vargr*, Old English *wearg*, Old Saxon and Old High German *warg* 'robber, criminal'. The zero grade **Hwerǵh-*, as in *hurkil*, appears in Old English *wyrgan*, Old High German *wurgen*, German *er-würgen* 'strangle'. A nominal derivative with an *l*-suffix, as in *hurkil*, is present in Old Norse *virgill*, Old English *wurgil* 'rope', and in Middle High German *würgel* 'strangler'. Gothic *launa-wargs* translates Greek *akháristos* 'ungrateful', literally 'reward-robber' (Shakespeare's King Lear terms ingratitude "thou marble-hearted fiend"!). In Old Norse, *mordvargr* was a man outlawed for murder, and *vargr í véum* was a temple-robber. In Old Norse also, *vargr* came additionally to mean 'wolf' (besides *úlfr*); the associations are clear, if we reflect that in the *Völsungasaga* Sigmund in wolf shape bit Sinfjötli through the windpipe, and Egil Skallagrímsson in his own saga in the same way killed the berserk Atli on whom weapons had no effect. Such traits of the Norse warrior, as either *úlfhedinn* 'wolf-shaped' or *berserkr* 'bear-shirted', whether involving assumed lycanthropic transformation or mere animal disguise, recall the various theriomorphic or bestiovestite functionaries in Hittite texts, such as LÚ.MEŠ UR.BAR.RA 'wolf-men', LÚ *hartagga-* 'bear-man', LÚ.MEŠ UR.ZÍR 'dog-men', LÚ.MEŠ UR.MAH 'lion-men'. The line from the Norse *mordvargr* to 'wolf' is further paralleled by paragraph 37 of the Hittite Law Code, where the abductor of a woman, by killing more than one member of a rescue

³ Some material was gathered and discussed by H. A. Hoffner in *Orient and Occident. Essays Presented to Cyrus H. Gordon* (Kevelaer 1973), pp. 81–90.

⁴ Cf. my earlier treatment of this term in *Die Sprache* 17 (1971), pp. 42–45, reprinted in *Analecta Indoeuropaea* (Innsbruck 1981), pp. 216–219.

posse, effectively forfeits the right to wergeld and is pronounced an outlaw: *zik-wa UR.BAR.RA kisat* 'thou art become a wolf'.⁵

In light of the above, the *hurkilas pesnes* seem to be 'men of strangulation', assigned (however abortively) to throttling wolves with their bare hands, subduing lions with their knees, and putting the squeeze on snakes (their riverine exploit remains opaque). There is nothing in the text to indicate any overt criminality, but they are made out to be ineffective and ludicrous, and their 'case' (*uttar*) was compromised as a result of their nonperformance.

Is this a burlesque account of an obsolete legal tradition? The word *hurkil*, after all, is a juridical expression for 'capital sex crime', and 'strangulation' is our own semantic reconstruct. If so, were these ambiguous 'men of strangulation' in fact some kind of sex-related miscreants fit to be strung up (in Indo-European terms **Hwórgḥōs*), but who were given a chance to redeem themselves in (poetic) justice by becoming **Hworǵhós*, i.e. to show their mettle by strangling animals as a form of substitute atonement? In that case they must have been the opposite of macho men, thus effeminate, and most probably passive homosexuals. The Hittite Law Code is silent on the topic, but it is possible that this old tale resonates with echoes of ancient customary law with respect to catamites, and that it perpetuates *hurkil* in a context where it means 'sex crime that is a hanging matter', with specific reference to passive homosexuality.

Lest the above seem far-fetched, Old Germanic data need once more be adduced. The murderous contempt which those societies harbored for the submissive partners in pederasty is amply documented. Tacitus' account (*Germania* 12) of cowardly, unwarlike, and bodily heinous persons being sunk into the mud of marshes and covered with hurdles (*ignavos et imbelles et corpore infames caeno ac palude, iniecta insuper crate, mergunt*) is well matched by the Iron Age corpses preserved in Danish and North German peatbogs, some with ropes around their necks, others weighed down with stems and branches.⁶ In Old Norse, the word *argr* pretty well summed up what Tacitus paraphrased by *ignavus et imbellis et corpore infamis*, for it denoted 'unmanly, effeminate', with a side-meaning of 'cowardly', as seen in the Finnish loanword *arka* 'timid' from Germanic **arga*.⁷ In form, *argr* reflects an Indo-European **órǵhos* 'the fucked one', vs. *orǵhós* 'copulator', seen in the Greek denominative verb *orkhéomai* 'dance'

⁵ On the Germanic material, cf. such studies as Mary R. Gerstein, *The Outlaw as Werewolf*, in G. J. Larson et al. (ed.), *Myth in Indo-European Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1974), pp. 131–156, or Michael Jacoby, *Wargus, vargr* 'Verbrecher' 'Wolf.'

⁶ See P. V. Glob, *The Bog People*. Ithaca, N. Y., 1969.

[Uppsala 1974.

⁷ See Folke Ström, *Nid, ergi* and Old Norse Moral Attitudes. London 1974.

(literally 'act like an **orkhós*', performing coital motions, as in archaic Doric pederastic gymnasium inscriptions from Thera). The underlying verb is attested in Hittite *ark-*, as in *KUB XLI 8 IV 29* 'the ram mounts (*arga*) the ewe'.⁸

The opposition **órǵhos* vs. *orǵhós* as passive vs. aggressive homosexual formally parallels that of **Hwórgḥos* vs. *Hworǵhós*, the strangled vs. the strangler. The first pair does not survive in either Germanic or Hittite (only as *órǵhos* in Old Norse *argr*), while the latter, with formal elimination of the accentual opposition, lives on in rich ambivalence in the Old Norse *vargr*.⁹ In Hittite, **Hwórgḥos* superseded **órǵhos* as a term for a despised pervert and was itself innovated into *hurkilas pesnas* 'man of strangulation', with a renewed ambiguity, articulated in the ancient tale we have studied (to paraphrase, "We may be *hurkilas pesnes*, but give us a chance to prove our manhood by some strangling of our own!").

The possibility that the story alludes to the potential (though in this instance botched or sabotaged) rehabilitation of catamites is itself reinforced by Old Germanic evidence. Ammianus Marcellinus (31.9.5) described a Germanic tribe as follows:

Hanc Taifalorum gentem turpem ac obscenae vitae flagitiis ita accepimus mersam, ut apud eos nefandi concubitus foedere copulentur maribus puberes, aetatis viriditatem in eorum pollutis usibus consumpturi. Porro siqui iam adultus aprum exceperit solus, vel interemerit ursum immanem, colluvione liberatur incesti.

"We have learned that these Taifali are a shameful lot, so mired in deprived practices that among them young boys are coupled with the men in a bond of unspeakable cohabitation, to waste the flower of their youth, perversely used by those men. Yet if someone, upon growing up, alone catches a boar or kills a huge bear, he is freed from the stain of unchastity."

Catching a wolf and lion in Anatolia, a boar and bear in Germania (lions must have been few and far between in those northern forests), potentially vindicating *hurkilas pesnes* from penal retribution in one instance, rehabilitating a catamite *colluvione incesti* in the other—these are hardly trivial accordances. They are strong evidence of a common cultural, in this instance Indo-European heritage.

⁸ Details in Jaan Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary I–II* (Berlin 1984), pp. 142–143.

⁹ The combination of *argr* and *vargr* was potent abuse adding insult to injury, as when a poet (later murdered by Christians) described the German missionary Thangbrand, who operated in Iceland from 997 to 999, as *argan goðvarg* (*Kristni Saga* 9).

Huidar and vitnir: Creatures and critters in Anatolia and Iceland

In the Hittite *Gilgameš*, the common Akkadian collective expression *būl šēri* 'beasts of the field' is rendered by *gi]mras hu-u-i-tar* (*KUB VIII 62 I 2*), where *gim(ma)ra-* denotes 'rangeland, steppe' (perhaps in its wintry aspect, hence cognate with *gim[mant]-* 'winter' and Greek χειμερινός 'wintry'), even as Akk. *šēru* means 'back' and figuratively 'back country, outback, hinterland, open range'. The terms *būlu* and *huidar* (the latter a neuter *r/n*-stem) are semantic "collectives" which can potentially shade over into individualization, even as the Late Latin *creatūra* (originally 'creation') becomes both an all-inclusive term for living beings (*cum resurget creatura* in the "Dies irae" hymn) and singly 'creature, critter'. The Hittite expression is, however, no mere loan calque on the Akkadian, as it has an independent and significant lexical history of its own. In the sun-hymn where the god rises from the sea (which Šamaš never did), the sun-god typically judges man and animal alike (*KUB VI 45 III 15–17*):

ŠA DUMU.LÚ.ULU.LU-TI UR.ZÍR-mas ŠAH-as *gimrass-a hu-id-na-as DINAM UD-tili zik* ^DUTU-us *hanneskisi* 'on humankind, dog, pig, and beasts of the field you the sun-god daily render judgment' (with the somewhat corrupt duplicate *VI 46 III 55–56 gimras DI-sar hu-it-ta-as* [sic] *UD.KAM-li zik* ^DUTU-us *hanniskisi*).

In *KUB XXXVIII 3 II 8–9* *kimrass-a hu-u-i-tar* is described as engraved on an iconographic depiction along with the king's name; the comitatively used instrumental case occurs in *KUB XXIV 2 II 15 gimras hu-u-id-ni-it* 'along with the beasts of the field'. Used singly, *huidar* means roughly 'fauna' (*KUB XXXIII 57 II 11 kuēlla hu-u-id-na-as* 'of every kind of beast'; *KBo XXV 180 Rs. 10 hu-u-id-na-as dapias* 'of all wildlife'), seen in a hunting context when the gods in anger hide all game (*hu-u-i-tar hūman*) from the hunter Kessi (*KUB XXXIII 121 II 12–14*). In *IBoT II 9 + KUB LII 102 I 8–11 arunass-a* [*hu-u-i-ta-[ar]* *hūman* 'all sea-creatures' include six fish, frogs, and a snake. Besides the singular *huidar*, the neuter plural *huidār* occurs in e.g. *KBo X 23 III 9–10 hu-u-i-ta-a-ar hūmanda* 'all beasts', *KBo X 24 I 10–11 ke hu-u-i-ta-a-ar* 'these animals', and the Old Hittite *ABoT 5 + II 17 hu-i-ta-a-ar-ra*, with the later copy *KBo XXII 224 Vs. 3 hu-i-da-a[-ar]*. The contexts¹ involve likenesses of wild animals (panther, lion, wolf, boar, bear, stag) in precious materials

¹ Cf. the philological apparatus in Itamar Singer, *The Hittite KILAM Festival* (*StBoT* 27–28 [Wiesbaden, 1983–84]), 1: 92–94, 2: 12, 16, 34, 52, 98.

(silver, gold, lapis lazuli), comprehensively denoted as *huidār* or sometimes (*KBo X 25 VI 4–5*) *DINGIR.MEŠ-nas* [*hu-u-i-tar* 'gods' creatures']. This need signify no more than votive icons of animals, but V. V. Ivanov² has compared such Baltic and Slavic expressions as Latvian *dieva vēršī* 'god's bulls', *dieva zuosis* 'god's geese', *dieva suns* 'wolf' (literally 'god's son'), or Old Russian *zvěri divii* 'wild beasts' (etymologically cognate with *siunas* < **dyew-*), where 'god's' implies 'not belonging to any man', thus 'wild'.

There is also the specific Hittite combination (*KUB XXXVI 2d, 43*) *taknas hu-u-i-tar* [*hūman*]³ 'all critters of the earth', or perhaps rather 'of the soil', judging from the omen text *KUB VIII 1 III 8–10*:

hēwēs [*kē*]sa BURU.HI.A SIG₅-anta *daganzipas* [*hu-i-da-a-ar parāi n-apa halkin karapanzi* 'rains will occur, crops will thrive, (but) critters of the soil will blow in, and they will devour the grain'. Ibidem *II 17* a locust-swarm (*m]asas*) will 'blow in' (*parāi*), and in *III 3* its sumerographic equivalent (*BURU₆*) will 'arise' (*arāi*), raising the likelihood that the Akkadian original's *itebbi* (from *tebū* 'rise') has been misperceived as if from *edēpu* 'blow'⁴. In any event this involves agricultural pests, and a similar meaning is indicated by the vocabulary text *KUB III 94 II 18*, where *hu-u-i-tar(-za)* matches Akk. *šīru*, probably to be emended to *šīhu* 'critters, vermin'⁵.

There remains the exhortation in the Farewell Address of Hattusilis I (*KUB I 16 II 46*): *hu-ú-e-id-na-as mān pankur-seme* [*t 1-EN*] *ēdsu* 'like (of) a *huidar*, let your family be united!'. The close parallel of another edict by the same king (*KBo III 27 Vs. 15–16* *İR.MEŠ-a-mman UR.BAR.RA-as mān pangu[r]* *1-EN ēstu* 'let my subjects, like a wolf's family, be united!') leaves little doubt that *huidar* here specifically means 'wolf(pack)'⁶.

This exhausts the dossier of *huidar*, except for the derivative *huidnant-* which steps in as the animate-gender subject of a transitive verb (*KBo IX 114, 7-w]ar-an ammel hu-id-na-an-za aniyaddu* 'let my menagerie deal with him!' or 'let my beasts work him over!'), and the obscure ^{UZU}SA *hu-i-id-na-i-ma-as* 'sinew of the *huidnaima-*', after previous mention of a killed panther (*UG.TUR*) in the medical passage *KUB XLIV 61 Rs. 17*⁷.

² *Problemy slavjanskij etnografii* (Moskva, 1979), 152–153.

³ Cf. Emmanuel Laroche, *Revue hittite et asiatique* 26 (1968), 35.

⁴ Cf. Jaan Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* 1–2 (Berlin and New York, 1984), 123.

⁵ Cf. H. A. Hoffner, *Alimenta Hethaeorum* (New Haven, 1974), 87. On the other hand, in *KUB IV 4 I 11a LİL-as* (= *gimras*) *hu[idni]* matches ibidem 12b (Akk.) *buli*.

⁶ Ferdinand Sommer (*Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I.* [München, 1938], 77) extracted from the acephalic [*ú-e-it-na-as* a word **wetna-* for 'wolf'; but 'wolf' is rather *ulip(pa)na-*, which also accounts for complementations such as *UR.BAR.RA-ni*, leaving **wetna-* without any further support.

⁷ Cornelia Burde, *Hethitische medizinische Texte* (*StBoT* 19 [Wiesbaden, 1974]), 20.

We have found in *huidar* a general sense of undomesticated 'creatures', especially 'beasts of the field', 'critters of the soil', and most specifically 'wolf(pack)'. It is a heteroclitic noun like e. g. *watar*, plural *uidār*, derivative *witenant*-, having nothing to do with the abstract noun suffix *-(a)tar*, genitive *-(a)nnas*; the reason for nonassimilation of *t/d + n* is precisely that it is etymological **d*, not **t* (cf. e. g. *udne*, *wetenas* beside Greek οὔδαζ, οὔδαρ). Of the various root-etymologies peddled for more than a half-century, and chronicled by Johann Tischler⁸, none is illuminating (usually tied in with *huīs*- [Luwian *hui-*] 'live', or *huwai-* 'run', or Indo-European **Hwē-* 'breathe, blow', or **Hweyd-* 'know'). Essentially, *huidar* remains unexplained.

In the circumstances, a collocation may be essayed with the equally opaque Old Icelandic *vitnir*. As a simple noun it is attested twice in the *Poetic Edda*, both times referring to the cosmic wolf Fenrir: *at vitni at vega* 'to fight the *vitnir*' (*Grímnismál* 23), and *vitnis vígi at* 'at the killing of the *vitnir*' (*Vafþrúðnismál* 53). Clearly *vitnir* does not mean merely 'wolf' (for which there are two terms, *úlfr* and *vargr*) but must have some more generic meaning like 'creature'. This is seen from the numerous compounds, notably *hróðvitnir*, literally 'slaver-creature', for 'wolf' (the fettered Fenrir's slaver was copious enough to form the river Vón, according to Snorri's *Gylfaginning*), and *grafvitnir*, literally 'grave-creature', for 'snake'. These attestations match closely the specific Hittite nuances of *huidar* as 'wolf(pack)' and '(soil) critters'. Other compounds seem to be part of the arcane allusive art of poetic kennings: *sporvitnir* 'track-creature' for 'horse', *blindvitnir* surprisingly for 'eagle', *þjóðvitnir* 'popular creature' whimsically and ironically for Fenrir, *miðvitnir* 'halfway creature' for 'giant', *mjóðvitnir* 'mead-creature' for 'dwarf' (brewing mead from Kvasir's blood in Snorri's *Skáldskaparmál*), *móðvitnir* (perhaps 'slime-creature') likewise for 'dwarf', and, strangely, *málvitnir* for 'sword'. Notable swords did of course have names and "personalities", hence *vitnir* is understandable; *mál*- can formally be 'speech, voice, council' (Gothic *maþl*) or 'sign, token, right moment' (like Greek *καίρος*; *mál er mér at ríða* 'it is time for me to ride' in *Helgaqviða Hundingsbana* 2.49), 'mealtime' (Gothic *mēl*); perhaps the poet's conceit was one of timeliness, of a weapon that came in handy at a crucial juncture.

Vitnir, like *huidar*, is unexplained within its own language: deriving it from *vita* 'know', or *vita* 'observe' (Gothic *witan*), or *vitia* 'visit' is about as enlightening as connecting *huidar* with assorted similar-sounding verbs. But, leaving aside root-meaning as a primary consideration, it is possible to confront *huidar* and *vitnir* directly as archaic inherited nouns (like e. g. *watar* and *vatn* from **wodr* and **wodnom*). By this token they reflect

something like **Hwedr* and **Hwedniyos* respectively, the latter a derivative formed on the *n*-stem, of the type *hirðir* < **kērdhiyos* (Gothic *hairdeis* 'shepherd'). Once an archaic heteroclit **Hwedr/Hwedn* has been established, with a meaning 'creature(s), critter(s), wildlife', speculation about root-meaning becomes an interesting but secondary issue; noun formation and specific semantics have already preempted the focus in clinching the connection.

⁸ *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (Innsbruck, 1978), 269-271.

Whence the Hittite, Whither the Jonesian Vision?

Much has been made of Sir William Jones as the founder of Indo-European linguistics, too much perhaps, for it little matters in the end whether he was prefigured or understudied or even scooped by the likes of Nathaniel Halhed or James Burnett Lord Monboddo. In scholarship as in commerce, packaging is paramount, and Jones with his marvelous felicity for *callida iunctura* ended up stealing the show and running away with the credit for the past two centuries. Attendant vagaries have sunk into oblivion, but the revelatory dictum about the "common source, which, perhaps, no longer exists" stands out in bold relief.

If Jones really was the founder of Indo-European linguistics, he was an unwitting one. His Third Anniversary Discourse of February 2, 1786, has set off bicentennial fireworks, but he had barely taken the helm of his new Asiatick Society when in his First Discourse of 1784 he reiterated one of his guiding principles, which might send right-thinking linguists up the wall: "I have ever considered languages as the mere instruments of real learning, and think them improperly confounded with learning itself." Such downplaying of mere linguistics may nowadays sound extreme and misguided, but perhaps our own formalistic excesses could use a bit of Jonesian corrective. He reminds us that there is more to language than phoneme counting and structural analysis, that language is also a means to great ends, for conveying the culture that sustains it.

It may be worthwhile to recall that Jones was in equal measure the founding father of Indo-European comparative mythology, for in that same year of 1784, in his paper "On the Gods of Greece, Italy, and India," later published (like his 1786 discourse) in the first volume of *Asiatick Researches* (1788), he enunciated an equally compelling charter for the comparison of mythic traditions: "When features of resem-

blance, too strong to have been accidental, are observable in different systems of polytheism, without fancy or prejudice to colour them and improve the likeness, we can scarce help believing, that some connection has immemorially subsisted between the several nations, who have adopted them."

The only segment of latter-day Indo-European researches where prophetic resonance failed Jones is archeology. Here he could have used a bit of cross-fertilization by a nearly coeval, equally seminal mind in the New World, namely, Thomas Jefferson, who with his excavations of Indian mounds in Virginia had laid the foundations of archeological stratigraphy. Jones frequently saw Benjamin Franklin in England and France and was a great supporter of the American cause, sympathies that delayed his appointment to the judicial vacancy in Bengal for five years and more than once tempted him to emigrate westward. When Jones finally sailed from Portsmouth for Calcutta in April 1783, Jefferson's arrival in Le Havre for his five-year stint as Franklin's ambassadorial successor was as yet fifteen months in the future. They might still have met down the years, for Sir William and Lady Jones had planned a grand tour of the United States on their way back from India, but illness and death intervened a decade later. Had Jones and Jefferson truly interacted, rather than merely known of each other, Jones might in the end have made a first-rate professor for the new University of Virginia. Instead he courted early death in the pestilential swamplands of Bengal, most of the time fighting off the administrative encroachments of Lord Cornwallis, who had repaired from the debacle at Yorktown to the governor-generalship of India. Small world indeed, even in the days when a galleon took five months to sail from England to India.

So much for Jones' own *légende des siècles*. But his millennial vision survived, persisted, and flourished. In a scientific revolution such as the one that ensued, a crucial ingredient of any viable theory is its power of prediction. It not only subsumes what is at hand but cogently anticipates as yet unrealized additions to its matrix. Jones had drawn in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Persian, and with reservations about external intermixture also Germanic and Celtic. His conspicuous omission of Balto-Slavic was soon corrected from Franz Bopp onward, and Jacob Grimm's law presently breached the Germanic barrier to full membership. On the other hand, it took much of the nineteenth century before Caspar Zeuss fully habilitated Celtic (although Jones related it to Sanskrit in his letters subsequent to the discourse), and a good many decades were needed before the sanskrito-

centrism started by Friedrich Schlegel was in full and final retreat. Even later, in 1875, Armenian was successfully detached by Heinrich Hübschmann from its misclassification as an Iranian dialect, and when at the end of the century Tocharian emerged from the caves of Kucha and Turfan in Chinese Turkestan, it readily found its niche as derived from that "common source, which no longer exists" (dispensing with Sir William's cautionary "perhaps").

Thus, up to our own century, the basic Jonesian hypothesis rendered unblemished service to the evolving discipline, no matter what family-tree or wave schemes were supposed to refine it further. Not so since the addition of Hittite and Anatolian generally. Neogrammarians with tidy minds, basking in the afterglow of Karl Brugmann's compendious *Grundriss*, were understandably not thrilled to have their circles upset by any further intruders, especially by Assyriological upstarts. Therefore Johan Knudtzon was hooted off the stage when in 1902 he first claimed Indo-European status for Hittite. After the material became plentiful from Boğazköy, another Assyriologist bearing Greek gifts, Bedřich Hrozný, could no longer be dismissed outright.

Since about 1915 the strange spectacle of Indo-Europeanist reaction to Hittite has played itself out, and much of it has not been a pretty picture. In the early days only one leading Indo-Europeanist, Ferdinand Sommer, had the fortitude to plunge into firsthand Hittite philology to help steer its comparative component away from well-meaning Assyriologists like Hrozný and past ingenious but sometimes misguided idea men such as Emil Forrer. Others were content to sit by, waiting for the Hittitological product to be served up in pre-processed gobs for easy consumption. In addition to the hagiology of the sainted Émile Benveniste, there exists other lore, not necessarily apocryphal, for example, that Benveniste never even learned to read cuneiform and hence was incapable of primary research in Hittite. Benveniste and Jerzy Kuryłowicz, the leading mid-twentieth century Indo-Europeanists, made up in dazzling cleverness what they may have lacked in firsthand grounding, but the Anatolian component of their great syntheses was nevertheless largely secondhand.

And herein lies the rub: secondhand refined matter may be all right, but hand-me-down raw material is risky stuff. The fact remains that Hittite has been and still is like unrefined ore that is as yet literally emerging from the ground. The bulk is large, it has doubled in the last 35 years, and Hittitology today is not the same as it was at midcentury. We have much more, we know much more,

and we can benefit from the 70 years of availability and research, rather than behaving like bedazzled discoverers. Hittitology has not been and is not yet a mature subcomponent of Indo-European studies, but we are on our way. I still vividly recall my revulsion to the second edition of Edgar Sturtevant's *Comparative Grammar of Hittite* in 1951. The first edition in 1933 had been a useful pioneering work. The theoretical Indo-Hittite aberration had not yet become oppressive, and the author clearly retained some interest in firsthand philology. The new version was like some idiosyncratic ghostscape of Indo-Hittite wisps, littered with half-baked approximations and reconstruction gone haywire and laced with laryngeals and *shwa secunda*.

Slowly the realization dawned on me that the way out of such debacles would not come from further forced annexation of Hittite, or premature syntheses that misapplied Hittite, but must come from within Hittite itself. Indo-Europeanists simply had to start doing in earnest and in depth what Sommer tried; they had to become Hittitologists as well. Sanskrit had arrived on silver platters—predigested by Pānini and taught by pundits to Sirs Charles Wilkins and William Jones; a millennial tradition was there for the plucking. Hittite has proved a much pricklier fruit and not as attractively packaged.

Such has been my own toil for the past thirty-five years, during the second half of Hittitology up to now. Whatever these decades have taught me, one tenet stands out: Beware of all purveyors of alleged *Fernwirkungen*, or distant influences, be they "Indo-Hittitologists" from Forrer to Sturtevant to Cowgill, or "Nostraticists" of assorted stripes, most recently Henrich Wagner. Composed in Ireland without benefit of specialized libraries, Wagner's *Das hethitische vom Standpunkte der typologischen Sprachgeographie* (Pisa, 1985) finds odds and ends to compare in Georgian, Sumerian, Akkadian, and elsewhere, ending up claiming for Hittite some kind of substratally bastardized or creolized status that he cannot in good conscience derive from archaic Indo-European. Quite the contrary, in my experience, the more one delves into Hittite, the more profoundly Indo-European it reveals itself, in direct agreement with the basic Jonesian vision. It may be that Wagner and I are at opposite poles of the innovation vs. retention game, but so be it: a straight-line Indo-Europeanist of the genetic persuasion cannot be otherwise.

The notion that Hittite is not pure Indo-European but somehow para-Indo-European is laid to rest merely by reciting some of the most basic root verbs. The paradigms of **es-* 'to be', **ey-* 'to go', and

**ed-* 'to eat' in Hittite are perfect matches for the best-preserved specimens elsewhere: Hittite *ēsmi, ēssi, ēszi* cover Old Lithuanian *esmi, esi, esti*; Luwian and Hittite *iti, yanzi, idu, iyandu, iyant-* correspond to Vedic *ēti, yānti, ētu, yāntu, yānt-*; and Hittite *edmi, ezsi, adanzi, ezdu, adandu, adant-* fit exactly over Vedic *ādmi, ātsi, adanti, attu, adantu, adánt-*. I rest my case right there, for I know of no better definition for an Indo-European language. Those who lament that some other basic vocabulary sounds strange, that 'to do' is *iya-* and 'to give' is *piya-*, with little to compare elsewhere, might be reminded that French, for example, remains a Latin-based language, despite showing *il va* and *il mange* for Latin *it* and *est*. Old Iranian has lost practically all traces of Indo-European **ed-* 'eat', but that does not compromise its Indo-Iranian character.

But what about that notion dear to Indo-Hittitologists that Hittite with its early date of attestation is too simple in morphology to qualify as a certifiable Indo-European language, that it shows up unencumbered by the sine-qua-non paraphernalia of other members of the club, such as feminine gender, aorist and perfect tenses, future formations, and subjunctive and optative moods? Before faulting it on this issue, one should rather consider its dialectal position within Indo-European and keep in mind all that it has retained.

Hittite is a typical Indo-European fringe dialect, one of those that were spun off and isolated before the collapse of a terminal continuum. Others of the kind were Tocharian and Western Indo-European, although the latter formed its own subcontinuum with an extreme in Italic and gradually mitigated variants in Celtic and Germanic harking back toward the heartland via Baltic. The Center was the common cradle of Indo-Iranian and Slavic-Baltic, with the likely addition of Armenian, and an honorary membership in this *satem* club saved for Greek. It is fair to say that Greek is a *satem* language in everything but primary palatalizations, and it has plenty of combinatory ones in its makeup. The many similarities between Greek and Armenian are due precisely to their contiguity on the southern fringe of the Late Indo-European continuum. The image of Common Indo-European was shaped in the wake of Jones mainly by juxtaposing such members of Late Indo-European as Sanskrit and Greek with their elaborate verbal morphologies. Hittite simply forces a corrective and at the same time points the way to several criteria:

- A feature shared by Hittite with another fringe dialect or dialects (Western Indo-European or Tocharian) is Early Indo-European.

- A feature shared by Hittite with both fringe and central dialects is Common Indo-European and by definition also goes back to Early Indo-European.
- Early or Common Indo-European features missing in Hittite count as losses.
- Exclusive Central Indo-European features missing in Hittite are immaterial.
- Specific Hittite similarities with Greek, Armenian, Slavic, or Indo-Iranian are suspect of areal, diffusionary, culture-bound origin.

Armed with these tenets, let us take a brief tour d'horizon of Hittite language and culture.

The Hittite noun has an inventory of cases that can easily qualify as Common Indo-European; by distinguishing ablative and instrumental it is on a par with Indo-Iranian or Armenian, and by compromising or partly syncretizing only one case (the locative) it resembles the level of archaism in Slavic and Italic. Hittite retains such significant features as an alternative collective neuter plural in animate nouns, of the Greek *kúkloi* : *kúkla* or Latin *loci* : *loca* kind: *alpus* : *alpa* 'clouds', *aniyaddus* : *aniyatta* 'outfits, gear', *suppalēs* : *suppala* 'livestock', *war-sulis* : *warsula* 'drops', *waspēs* : *waspa* 'garments'. Much has been made of the fact that the plural paradigm appears truncated and on the verge of collapse, with even the few discrete case endings (animate nominative *-es*, accusative *-us*, dative *-as*) subject to frequent confusion and with no credible dual forms in sight.

The disappearance of the dual is no surprise, for this Common Indo-European category, best retained in the Center (Indo-Iranian, Slavic, and Baltic), was generally on the run elsewhere, as in Classical Greek, surviving only in the noun in Old Irish, only in the second and third persons of Greek, and only in the first and second persons active in Gothic. It is gone in Italic and Armenian and nearly so in the Tocharian verb but is curiously hypertrophied in the Tocharian noun, even subdivided into a dual and a paral number. There is formal proof that Hittite, rather than intrinsically lacking the dual, actually lost it, because it has kept the ancient compositional device of the *devatā-dvandva*, the original double-dual pairing of divine names, mechanically transforming it into a double-plural compound: just as in Latin the *Dyāvā-Prthivī* 'Heaven-Earth' construction is matched by *Veneres Cupīdinesque* 'Aphrodite-Eros', even so in Hittite the paired demons of dread, 'Fear' and 'Fright', resembling the Greek *Dēmos* and *Phobos*, appear as a plural sequence *Nahsarattes Weritemes*.

Ancient matter survives in the genitive plural ending *-an* from **-ōm* (as in *siunan-antuhsas* 'man of the gods, prophet'), but the so-called *pada* endings of the plural (of the Sanskrit *-bhis*, Latin *-bus* kind) have indeed been regressively suppressed in Hittite, as for that matter the corresponding Greek ending *-phi* disappears from Classical Greek.

Apart from the dative-locative ending, the Hittite plural paradigm is formally no more curtailed than the Greek, but syntactic decay is farther advanced. Several factors may have conspired here. Strictly speaking, full congruence in nouns and verbs is a luxury that can be dispensed with. This is notorious in the verb, where, for example, Lithuanian has no third person dual or plural, using the singular exclusively, or Scandinavian has made the third person plural obsolete. Hittite, like Greek, uses the singular verb exclusively with a neuter subject, whether singular or plural, and may have initiated a converse process of indicating animate number largely by the verb only.

The formal distinction of nominal neuter singular and plural is also a sometime thing in Hittite, tied in with the fate of the neuter plural marker *A₂*, the *a*-coloring laryngeal that disappeared in Hittite, unlike the *A₁* that shows up as the denominative verbal factitive morpheme in *newah₂* 'to make new' (Latin *novā-* from *novo-*). This laryngeal could either lengthen the vowel, as in Vedic *trī*, neuter plural of 'three', or vocalize as shwa, seen in Greek and Latin *tria*. Thus we have *āssū* 'goods' (like Vedic *vasū*) but *genuwa* 'knees' (like Latin *genua*). This *A₂* is the same morphophoneme that underlies the creation of the Common Indo-European feminine morphemes, notably **-ā* formed by its fusion with a preceding thematic vowel, or **y* + *A₂* with its various outcomes (as in Sanskrit *pātnī* vs. Greek *pótnia*). In Hittite the same would have yielded **-ā* and either **-ī* or **-iya*. It is not impossible that such feminines once existed in Anatolian but failed to maintain themselves as distinctive noun classes, being absorbed into the standardized *a* and *i* stems by the time of our documents.

Perhaps the plene-spelling *ishās* beside *ishas* 'lord' really does mark an old distinction of grammatical gender, as in *ʾIsharas linkias ishās* 'the goddess Isharas, mistress of the oath'. The creation of the marked feminine *ishassaras* 'lady' is purely secondary, like our *mistress*. The profusion of *i* stems and *-iya-* stems in Hittite, both nominal and adjectival, may owe something to a prehistoric absorption of a large body of feminine forms. The grammatical suppression of the feminine gender recalls dislocations of the brittle three-gender system in later times, whether the disappearance of the neuter in the Romance

languages or of the feminine in Scandinavian. The feminine was always marginal in the system, as shown by such phenomena as the two-ending adjectives in Greek, which lacked it altogether. Conversely the step from a neuter plural to a feminine singular remained an easy one, as when Latin *folia* ended up as Italian *una foglia* or Spanish *una hoja* or French *une feuille*.

If Hittite has folded up the fragments of a formal feminine, it has on the other hand remained alert to archaic functional nuances of the basic animate : neuter or acting : inert opposition, the type that in archaic Indo-European syntax precludes neuter nouns from serving as subjects of transitive verbs for lack of an agent case, an animate nominative. One need not delve into glottogony or adduce the loaded term "ergative" to appreciate how, for example, Old Latin and Russian express "the thunderbolts killed the man" or "the tree killed the man." The subjects *fulmina* in the *Leges Regiae* and *dévevo* in Tolstoy, respectively, are neuter and occur in the instrumental case, *hominem fulminibus occisit* and *čelověka dérevom ubilo*, literally 'it killed the man by bolts (or by the tree)'.

Hittite, by the same token, has taken the instrumental ablative ending in *-anza* (as in *nepisanza* 'from heaven'), has reinterpreted it from paradigmatic to derivational status (as if it were an animate nominative *-nt-* stem), and uses it to form transitive-verb subjects of neuter nouns: *nu-wa-mu apāt wātar pesten . . . witenanza ēšhar . . . parkunuzi* 'give me that water . . . water cleanses blood(shed)', going back to an impersonal 'by water it cleanses bloodshed' (i.e., 'by water there is a cleansing of bloodshed'). Similarly *ēšhar* 'blood' itself, when subject, shows up in the construction *nu Hatti-ya apās ishānanza arha namma zinnesta* 'this blood has furthermore finished off Hatti', literally 'by this blood it has put an end to Hatti' (i.e., 'by this blood it has come to an end for Hatti'). The very fact that these so-called animate derivatives in *-ant-* practically never occur outside their nominative subject position reinforces this interpretation and allows a glimpse into the functioning of early Indo-European syntax. It does incidentally strengthen the speculations of André Vaillant, A. N. Savčenko, and others, that the Indo-European nominative ending *-s*, both singular and plural, is identical in origin with the ablative (*-genitive*) *-s* as a primitive ergative agent case.

Hittite is also a bona fide marvel of Indo-European noun formation, not only in the usual inventory of vowel and consonant stems but also in the preservation and proliferation of the *r/n* heteroclites. These strange neuter nouns, with an *r* stem variant in the nomina-

tive-accusative and an oblique stem ending in *-n-*, are clearly Common Indo-European, for they persist in relics from Vedic *ásrg* 'blood' and *yákr̥t* 'liver' to Greek *éar* and *hēpar* to Latin *aser* and *iēc̣ur*, and from Greek *pūr* and *húdōr* to English *fire* and *water*. Hittite not only has *ēšhar*, *paḥhur*, and *watar* but also a whole system of verbal nouns using the suffixes *-tar*, *-sar*, and *-war* with such declension. That these are not isolated aberrations is clear from the fact that Indo-Iranian and Greek have derived quite a few of their infinitives from frozen oblique cases of the same types of nouns. Benveniste was the first to exploit these formations for the origins of Indo-European noun formation in 1935, and justly so; they are among the choicest gifts of Hittite to Indo-European linguistics.

In the pronominal declension we need only remind ourselves of the extraordinary similarities of the interrogative-relative-indefinite *kuis*, *kuiskuis*, *kuisa*, *kuiski*, *kuwat* /k^wat/, *kuwapi* /k^wabi/ to the Latin *quis*, *quisquis*, *quisque*, *quisquam*, *quod*, and (c)*ubi*; this set can only be common inheritance, in Anatolian and Italic respectively, from Early Indo-European. As is usual in pronominal systems, rank innovations tend to coexist with pieces of extreme archaism.

The verb is where the voice of the Indo-Hittitologist has been most often heard in the land. He simply cannot derive anything like that from standard Indo-European, and in a simplistic application of family-tree reasoning he jumps from a primary to a secondary degree of relationship. We already saw that basic root verbs are perfectly matched with Vedic or Lithuanian. Marked nonthematic present stems such as nasal-infixed ones are present in nonproductive fashion, as in Sanskrit (Hittite *sarnikzi* 'he repairs' beside Latin *sarcit*).

The main surprise has been the paucity of ordinary vowel-thematic stems of the trite Sanskrit *bhāratī* type, which occur only in some derivative categories (presents with **-ye-* and duratives with **-ske-* suffix). Inordinate efforts have been expended on explaining the glottogenic sources of thematic conjugation, as in Calvert Watkins' *Geschichte der indogermanischen Verbalflexion*, largely on the basis of venturesome forays into the Hittite *-hi* conjugation and the mediopassive voice alike. Even a summary report on all that has been cogitated, assumed, argued, and advanced in this line, ever since Kurylowicz and Christer Stang started comparing the origins of the perfect tense and the middle voice in the early 1930s, would require a sizable monograph. To my thinking a good deal of this has been misplaced ingenuity.

In understanding the Hittite verb, neither glottogony nor agoniz-

ing over discrepancies vis-à-vis the Greco-Indic type of verbal system is called for. The Indo-European perfect tense and mediopassive diathesis appear indeed to have their joint source in some kind of stative formation with its own set of markers, typologically comparable to the Semitic stative (earlier called "permansive"), but it is misguided to assume that Hittite somehow displays this primordially in the raw. Rather the Hittite verbal system should be looked at with a cold eye in terms of individual innovation and originality, the way we do with Italic, Germanic, or Tocharian.

The *-hi* conjugation is a stative perfect whose present-tense meaning is emphasized by the addition of the deictic *-i* by analogy of the normal present: just as IE **woyde* (Vedic *vēda*, Greek *oīde*, or Gothic *wait*) means 'he is enjoying insight', Hittite *ārki* reflects **orḡhe*, 'he is engaged in coition'. In Luwian, without the re-marking by present deixis, the same formation has become preterital. The mediopassive, deponential or other, directly resembles the rest of Indo-European mediopassives, both marginal and central: *kitta* 'he lies' exactly matches Greek *keīto* or Sanskrit *śēta*, but an earlier level, without the *t* that smacks of active-ending analogy, is found in *arga* from **orḡho* 'he cohabits' or in *kisa* 'he becomes' from **geso* (cognate with Latin *geritur*). With the facultative addition of the increment *-ri*, thus *ki-sari*, Hittite joins those marginal dialects (Italic, Celtic, Tocharian) that have made a virtue of the *r*-increment in most forms of the mediopassive present, unlike Indo-Iranian, Greek, and Gothic, where its disuse prevailed. Here again Hittite is right at the crossroads of cross-Indo-European developments and not some strange cousin once or twice removed.

As regards the absence of formal moods in Hittite, let us be reminded that the Indo-European subjunctive was a brittle construct built on thematic-vowel oppositions only, one that crashed in Post-Vedic Sanskrit, survived only in broken-down uniformity in Greek, and yielded some future-tense elements in Latin. Its absence from Hittite is no more surprising than from Slavic or Germanic. The optative is more problematic, being otherwise attested from practically every other branch of Indo-European, from Celtic to Tocharian. But the injunctival use of the indicative (rather than imperative) in Hittite prohibition shows archaic syntactic patterning. The hypertrophy of third-person imperatives, on the one hand, and of modal particles in subordinate clauses, on the other (as in Greek), largely compensates for the formal suppression of both optative and subjunctive.

Much of the above is neither new nor original, but it needs to be

stressed over and over. Sir William's basic postulate has well taken care of Hittite, with little modification.

Leaving linguistics and turning to Hittite culture, it is noteworthy that traits common to Indo-European peoples distinguish the Hittites from their Near Eastern neighbors. For example, although circumcision was known, it was not a standard custom. A medical text (KUB XLIV 61 Rs. 24-27) makes this explicit: "If a man is not circumcised, the physician forces back the foreskin, applies salve, and then draws the foreskin forward. Until the patient gets well, he keeps salving it." Thus this Egypt-centered religious and cultural practice, unknown among the original speakers of Indo-European and Uralic languages, had made at best limited inroads in second-millennium Anatolia.

As regards Hittite nonmaterial culture at large and religion in particular, the second Jonesian postulate comes into play. Indo-European comparative mythology, run into the ground during the nineteenth century, has enjoyed a measure of rehabilitation in the latter half of the twentieth. Here the subdivisions differ, for linguistic history and cultural evolution or archaism are not necessarily congruent. What can be reconstructed of Indo-European myth and religion is built largely on Indo-Iranian, Roman, and Germanic bases, thus on East-West polarities quite irrespective of any late dialectal Center. Here the nature of documents and traditions tends to outweigh the grammatical character of their linguistic vehicles, although the lexical element may indeed be of paramount importance.

At first glance the Hittite material may not look promising. In fact it is a commonplace that Hittite offers relatively little for comparative Indo-European mythology, that its exuberant, hypersyncretic polytheism reflects in the main the interaction of autochthonous Anatolian Hattic traditions with successive Hurrian and other Mesopotamian overlays. The storm god of Hatti and the sun goddess of Arinna assimilated to the Hurrian Teshub and Hebat, and the myths of Illuyankas and Telipinus, let alone such imported goods as the Ullikummi and Gilgamesh epics, are not data that endear Hittite to the Indo-European mythologist. As in the case of Greek tradition, one has to look beyond all the new syntheses and discover the underlay.

Even then it is wise to eschew genetic comparison with the adjacent branches of Indo-European, the Greek and the Armenian, both of which have themselves been feeding at the immemorial Anatolian trough. If the funeral rites for Patroklos and Hektor in the *Iliad* seem

to follow to the letter the mortuary texts of Hittite royalty, if almost every event in Achilles' sports promotion at the same cremation can be matched in the Hittite texts, and if Zeus's use of fate scales to settle the doom of heroes replicates the ceremonial Hittite weighing of the lives of royalty, all such matter belongs in an Anatolian, not an Indo-European cultural sphere.

Nevertheless this is an aspect worthy of serious study, for to that extent Hittite participates in the roots of Classical Greek culture. Hesiodic theogony derives from the same Hurrian sources as the Hittite Kumarbi-Ullikummi literature. Homeric poetry, composed in Asia Minor, reverberates uncannily to Hittite models. In Hittite law the wronged party in a land deal sues the culprit before the sun god by saying, "He has planted my scale in the earth." When Zeus's scales tip against one party, that one's lot is said to sink to the earth. When Agamemnon in his "Trojan oath" jointly invokes Zeus and Helios, he echoes Hittite tandem worship of the storm god and the sun god (you swore by the gods of the opposite party, in this case the Trojans of Asia Minor).

Poetic similes match: Hittite: "Even as the wind makes chaff fly and carries it over the sea, let it sweep away blood-defilement"; Greek: "As a gale wind scatters a heap of dry chaff and spreads it all over, the monster-wave smashes Odysseus' raft." Here the attentive reader might interject: "Wait a minute! What business do the Hittites have with maritime similes, being centered on a high plateau in the interior of a subcontinent?" The answer is that there is other cogent evidence of a one-time Hittite homeland on a littoral. Whereas in Hurrian, Mesopotamian, and even Egyptian sources the sun is said to rise from the mountains and even in later Iranian-based lore the sun god Mithras was born from a rock, in the Hittite sun prayers the sun god of heaven rises from the sea. The name of this god in Old Hittite is Sius, etymologically identical with Vedic Dyaus and Greek Zeus, showing a fusion of day god and sun god, rather than sky god and storm god as in Greek and Roman tradition. The Luwian name of the sun god, Tiwaz, equals the Hittite word for 'day', *siwaz*. This tradition points to an eastern littoral, which can hardly be other than the Caucasian shore of the Caspian. The additional tradition of the solar deity in water, *Sius weteni*, reminds one of the Iranian myth of the solar nimbus, *xvarnah*, being guarded in the mythical Sea of Vou-rukaša by the deity Apam Napāt 'Child of Waters'. This god, cognate with the Vedic Apām Nápāt, the Roman Neptūnus, and the Irish Nechtan, is the archetypal "fire-in-water" deity with a solar tinge,

the Vedic *svâr* of Apâm Nápât. The Old Iranian form *Naptya* seems to survive in the Greek loanword *náphtha* as the quintessential fire-in-water substance, raising visions of oil seepage and oil flares on the shores of the Caspian during the early stages of Hittite and Indo-European migrations.

For all their syncretistic overlays of Akkadian Šamaš-motifs, the Hittite sun hymns have other features of Indo-European significance. Animals are implied to have divinely relevant souls and personalities, for the sun god is said to judge dog, pig, and beasts of the field along with mankind; we may compare the Iranian "Bovine's Lament," where the Soul of the Ox cries out to Zarathuštra against the cruelty of warriors who wish to butcher it. There was a comprehensive Hittite term for gods' creatures (*siunas huidar*), *huidar* being a neuter collective noun distinct from *antuhsatar* 'mankind'. In addition to 'beasts of the field' (*gimras huidar*) it denoted 'critters of the soil' (*tagnas huidar*), 'creatures of the sea' (*arunas huidar*), and specifically a wolfpack (*huednas pankur* = *ulipnas pankur* 'wolf's family'). This heteroclitic noun has a clear Indo-European cognate in the Old Norse *vitnir*, which can be reconstructed as **Hwedniyos* and refers to the cosmic wolf Fenrir in Eddic poetry: *vitni at vega* 'to fight the *vitnir*'. It is also used in kennings such as *hróðvitnir* 'slaver-creature' for 'wolf' (the chained Fenrir's slaver formed the river Vón), and *grafvitnir* 'grave-creature' for 'snake'. Whatever the root meaning, the ancient noun type itself assures a very basic Early Indo-European term and concept, preserved only in Anatolia and Iceland.

The Hittite Law Code is a treasure trove for the searching Indo-Europeanist. Since we hit upon the topic of wolves and Anatolian-Norse isoglosses and isothemes, let these features also serve as cases in point. In paragraph 37 of the code, the abductor of a woman, by killing more than one member of a rescue posse, forfeits the right to wergeld. This means that he cannot offer *sarnikzel* 'reparations'; he cannot do what Roman law calls *damna sarcire* 'make good damages'; instead he is pronounced an outlaw by the words "Thou art become a wolf," *zik-wa ulipnas kistat*. There are, to be sure, various theriomorphic or bestiovestite functionaries in Hittite texts, called *pesnes ulipnes* 'wolf-men' or *pesnes hartagges* 'bear-men', as well as 'dog-men' and 'lion-men', but here the meaning is different. Both kinds of usage are uncannily paralleled in Old Norse tradition. Martial ecstasies went by the names *úlfheðnar* 'wolf-shapes' or *berserkir* 'bear-shirts', and a man outlawed for murder was a *morðvargr*, *vargr* being a synonym for *úlfr* 'wolf'. But *vargr* comes by this sense secondarily,

as seen in the parallel term *vargr í véum* 'temple-robber' and in Old English *wearg*, Old German *warg*, which means 'robber' or 'criminal'. Similarly Gothic *launawargs*, which translates Greek *akháristos* 'ingrate', is literally 'reward-robber'. The Proto-Germanic **wargaz* can be reconstructed as either an Indo-European **Hworǵhós* 'strangler' or **Hwóǵhós* 'strangled one, gallowsbird, rascal'; ambivalent poetic (and legal) justice is implicit in the accentual opposition that Germanic has regrettably neutralized. The root is that of German *würgen* or Lithuanian *veržti* 'constrict, throttle, strangle'. A nominative derivative with an *-l*-suffix is present in Old Norse *virgill* and Old English *wurgil* meaning 'rope' and in Old German *würgel* 'strangler'. Hittite has also a cognate in the noun *hurkil*, which enables us to close the semantic circle and tighten the noose around meaningful Indo-European legal antiquities.

The term *hurkil* in the Law Code and elsewhere designates a man's illegal sexual relations with bovines and sheep and with a variety of relatives (mother, daughter, son, sister, stepmother, brother's wife, mother-in-law, wife's sister, female cousin, and so forth). It involves somewhat selective sanction against bestiality and incest. Equines are explicitly exempted from the ban, which recalls the fact that bestiality with horses occurred in ancient royal rituals from India to Ireland. The Hittite perpetrator "does not become priest," a statement that seems to place the practice squarely and restrictively in the warrior class. The potential victims of statutory rape are all female, except for the son sodomized by the father. Rape as such does not seem to be the target of this legislation; what matters is the degree of kinship and "status," thus factors of incest and perhaps miscegenation (unfree and "deportee" women are explicitly left to the mercies of the Hittite male). Everything is formulated from the vantage point of the man. Nothing is said from the standpoint of the passive partner in sodomy, and this silence is meaningful, for homosexual rape, statutory or other, is not dealt with from the bugger's perspective either. The whole subject, apart from its incestuous aspect, clearly did not interest Hittite legislation.

Yet it may matter in another context involving *hurkil*. Interspersed in one of the innumerable ritual texts we find a narrative (KUB XII 63 Vs. 21–34) that includes a dialogue between self-styled 'men of *hurkil*' (*hurkilas pesnes*) and the "house" of the storm god, whose bidding they are ready to perform. They are told to shorten long roads, lengthen short ones, lower high mountains and heighten

low ones, catch a wolf by the hand and a lion with the knee, and bring a snake to the royal tribunal to be judged. Upon their return the men confess their failure on every point, and the story concludes that "the case was aggravated."

It sounds like a folk tale about overly confident ogre types, something like the Norse giants who come to grief in their dealings with gods. But nothing indicates supernatural status. Some of the tasks are absurd in the literal sense and may rather be figurative and proverbial ("lengthen short roads" = "go the extra mile"; "lower high mountains" = "leave no stone unturned"), in short, "do your darnedest" with the more feasible feats like catching wolves and lions. But the overearnest fellows take them literally, are fast demoralized when the impossibility sinks in, and report back as failures. They are clearly depicted as ineffectual and ludicrous.

In legal terms the wages of *hurkil* was normally death, subject to the king's discretion and sometimes local option in border areas. If we put together the legal meaning of "capital sex crime" and the etymological sense of "strangulation," the *hurkilas pesnes* seem to have been some kind of sex-related miscreants fit to be strung up but given a judicial chance to redeem themselves, to show their mettle by strangling animals as a form of substitute atonement. They were the opposite of macho men, thus effeminate, and most probably passive homosexuals. Although the Law Code is silent on the topic, it is possible that this old tale resonates with echoes of ancient customary law with respect to catamites.

Here again Old Germanic data support the conclusion. Those societies harbored murderous contempt for submissive partners in pederasty. Tacitus describes how cowardly, unwarlike, and bodily heinous persons were plunged into the mud of marshes and covered with hurdles as a form of suffocation. The hundreds of throttled Iron Age corpses found preserved in Danish and German peatbogs offer grisly confirmation. The key term for this kind of man in Old Norse was *argr* from IE **órghos* 'fuckee', vs. **orǵhós* 'fucker', with the same accent opposition as in **Hwórghos* vs. **Hworǵhós*, 'strangled one' vs. 'strangler'; *argr* and *vargr* are in fact attested rhyme pairs in Old Icelandic, choice terms of aggravated obloquy. But the real clincher to the Hittite tale is in the story that Ammianus Marcellinus (31.9.5) tells of the Germanic tribe of the Taifali:

"They are a shameful lot, so mired in depraved practices that among them young boys are coupled with the men in a bond of

unspeakable cohabitation. . . . Yet if someone, upon growing up, alone catches a boar or kills a huge bear, he is freed from the stain of unchastity."

Catching a wolf and lion in Anatolia, a boar and bear in Germania, potentially vindicating *hurkilas pesnes* from penal retribution in one instance, rehabilitating a catamite *colluvione incesti* in the other—these are hardly trivial accordances. They are strong evidence of a common cultural, in this instance Indo-European, heritage.

This kind of close accordance between Hittite and a widely separated tradition, with "features of resemblance, too strong to have been accidental," truly shows the genuine Indo-European underpinnings of the oldest layers of Hittite tradition. No less than in language, Hittite myth and law are in their origins direct descendants of William Jones's "common source," which indeed "no longer exists" but which we are increasingly raising from oblivion.

La racine verbale prolix **ġenE-/ġnē-*, qui exprime la création d’êtres vivants aux sens à la fois physique et social et même juridique, et qui est attestée de façon multiple dans presque toutes les langues indo-européennes, n’a laissé aucune trace verbale en hittite. Cette absence ne signale aucune singularité «indo-hittite». Plutôt, le champ sémantique en question a subi toutes sortes de renouvellements et remplacements successifs (rappelons-nous seulement le latin *genere* > *gignere* > *generāre* > *ingenerāre* > *engendrere*); outre l’anatolien, le balte et le slave ont perdu les verbes de cette racine aux sens de ‘faire naître’ ou ‘naître’: le lituanien a pour ‘naître’ *giñti* de la racine **gʷem-* ‘venir’, et pour ‘engendrer’ le causatif *gaminti*. Le slave a créé des verbes dénommatifs à partir du nom *rodŭ* ‘descendant’, qui a le même sens et la même origine étymologique que le hittite *hardu*. Le hittite emploie à l’occasion l’expression DUMU.MEŠ *iya-* ‘faire des enfants’, mais autrement c’est le verbe *has(s)-* qui a rempli le vide et qui nous occupera ici.

D’où vient ce verbe d’origine obscure? Avant d’en aborder l’étymologie, examinons ses significations précises. Il veut dire ‘enfanter’ au sens absolu, par exemple SAL-*za* (= *kuanza* < **gʷon-s*) *hāsi* ‘la femme accouche’, mais avec un objet les sexes se confondent totalement: *nu-za* DUMU.NITA *hasta* peut-être également ‘il engendra un fils’ ou ‘elle mit au monde un fils’. En l’absence de genre grammatical féminin, seul le contexte, le sujet explicite, révèle la nuance précise. Il est donc clair que le sens de *has(s)-* a dû être aussi imprécis que celui de **ġenE-*, mais avec des limitations sévères imposées par la grammaire même du hittite: pour des raisons obscures *has(s)-* n’a pas de formes finies moyennes ou passives, de manière que le hittite manque de verbe pour ‘naître’ à la façon du sanscrit *jāyate* ou du grec γίγνεται ou du latin *nascitur*. Le participe est passif,

ainsi *hassant-* ‘né’, et il n’y a pas de nom d’agent qui corresponde au sanscrit *janitār-/janitrī* ou au latin *genitor/genetrix*, donc pas de terme général pour les parents, seulement *attas annas* avec leurs variations d’ordre ou d’ellipse (un peu comme *los padres* en espagnol, vis-à-vis de *i genitori* en italien). L’outillage formel de ce verbe est donc assez déficient.

Quelques langues possèdent des termes spécifiques pour l’engendrement et l’enfantement, comme *genere/parere* en latin, *ussatjan/gabairan* en gotique, *beget/bear* en anglais, *zeugen/gebären* en allemand, ou *avla/föda* en suédois. Le terme marqué féminin dans ces langues signifie proprement ‘couver’ (latin *parere*; cp. le lituanien *perėti* ‘couver’) ou ‘porter’ (germanique **beran*; cp. le latin *partum gerere*) ou ‘nourrir’ (le suédois *föda* a les deux sens de ‘nourrir’ et de ‘donner naissance’). Le hittite ressemble plutôt au grec, où le verbe d’origine assez obscure τίκτειν, τεκεῖν a usurpé les emplois actifs et transitifs de l’indo-européen **ġenE-* et s’emploie sans distinction de sexe: ὅς μιν ἔτικτε et ἡ μιν ἔτικτε se lisent dans l’Iliade à sept lignes d’intervalle (22: 421, 428) au sens de ‘qui l’engendra’ et ‘qui l’enfanta’. En védique aussi, les deux verbes *jan-* et *sū-* s’emploient sans grande distinction pour le père et la mère, tandis qu’en Iran dualiste *jan-* exprime la bonne naissance, mais *hu-* est spécialisé pour la mauvaise création démoniaque. En accadien, la distinction est plus nette: *banū* est le verbe primaire pour ‘engendrer’, tandis que *alādu* signifie surtout ‘enfanter’; les recouvrements (surtout *alādu* pour ‘engendrer’) sont plutôt secondaires.

D’autres traits de *has(s)-* se prêtent encore à la comparaison. Le verbe *has(s)-* même, comme son causatif *hassanu-*, a quelquefois le sens de ‘faire naître’, tout comme *ulludu* de *alādu* exprime en accadien l’activité d’une sage-femme (qui s’appelle en hittite *has[sa]nupallas*). Le nom abstrait *hassatar* ‘procréation, enfantement’ a un sens concrétisé ‘descendants, famille’, surtout ‘famille noble, famille royale’ (*salli hassatar* ‘grande famille’), d’où aussi le nom *hassu-* pour ‘roi’, tout comme le préfixe vieil anglo-saxon *cyne-* ‘royal’, ou le vieux norrois *konr* ‘prince’ de **ġnyos*, ou le mot germanique pour ‘roi’, **kuningaz*. Il s’agit de généalogie privilégiée: *hassant-* veut dire ‘bien né’, au sens emphatique, tout comme *asant-* signifie ‘réellement existant, entièrement vrai’. Un prince *hassanza* fut non seulement engendré par le roi; il était aussi né de la reine même, donc au premier rang (*hantezzis*), au lieu d’être enfanté au second rang (*dan pedas*) de façon morganatique.

Mais *hassatar* comme synecdoque est à peu près 'matrice', synonyme de *sarhuwant-*. Ce processus de concrétisation rappelle le mot *genzu* qui signifie quelque organe intérieur abdominal des deux sexes mais a lui-même l'air d'une métonymie, car son sens alternatif est 'gentillesse, affection'; il constitue un reste de la racine **genE-*, tout comme 'gentil' en français et 'kind' en anglais' (cp. le védique *jantú-* 'gens'). Lorsque Mursilis II décrit comment son père Suppiluliumas complut à la reine-veuve de Tutankhamen, il dit que *attas-mis genzuwalas ēsta*, ce qui se traduit très bien en anglais comme 'my father was a gentleman'. En illustration de ce sens de 'matrice' pour *hassatar*, citons le passage rituel *KUB XXIV 13 II 14-16: arha-ta-kkan ansan ēsdu alwanzatar SAL-annaza hassannaza UZUŪR-za ginuwaz* 'que le sortilège soit essuyé de toi, de la matrice de la femme et du genou de la chair' (ce dernier est une expression pour le membre viril, tout comme *birku* 'genou' en accadien; les doubles ablatifs apparaissent par attraction pour un génitif suivi d'ablatif, comme par exemple *tuetaza memiyanaz* au lieu de *tuel memiyanaz* 'par ta commande').

L'autre nom d'action déverbatif, *hassumar*, s'est orienté vers l'acte sexuel même, envisagé du point de vue masculin; il figure dans le titre du rituel de la fête *hassumas (IBoT I 29)*, où un jeune prince hittite, dans une initiation de puberté, mange et se couche assisté de douze prostituées. Des expressions comme *hassumar parkunumar* sont probablement aussi métonymiques pour 'lustration du phallus' (avec la même construction que par exemple *arkuwar tiyauwar* 'déposition d'appel'); pour ce mot le hittite dispose de nombreux synonymes, non seulement *genu* mais aussi *hapus-*, *lalu-* et *pisnatar*, ce dernier un nom abstrait concrétisé dérivé de *pesna-* 'mâle', qui est lui-même une métonymie du vieux mot indo-européen qu'on voit dans le latin *pēnis* (d'une racine **pes-* 'frotter' encore attestée en hittite). Donc les développements sémantiques font un chiasme: membre viril (**pesno-*) > mâle (*pesna-*) > masculinité (*pisnatar*) > membre viril. Au sens abstrait, *DUMU.MEŠ-tar hassumar* est 'l'engendrement de fils', tandis qu'un rituel contre l'impuissance se prescrit 'quand un homme manque de *hassatar*' (*LÚ-ni [= pesni] kuedani hassatar NU.GÁL*).

On sent bien que la notion de création charnelle est à la base du verbe *has(s)-*, davantage encore que dans la racine **genE-*. Cette constatation oriente la recherche des origines. La variante *hansannas* et le louvite *hamsa-* 'petit-fils', correspondant au hittite *hassa-* 'descendant', montrent

que la proto-forme a été **hams-*. L'expression tant discutée *hassa hanzassa* doit être en partie du louvite hittitisé, contenant un adjectif génitif dans une sorte de figure étymologique, au cas directif, signifiant mot à mot 'à la descendance de la descendance', c'est-à-dire 'pour toute génération', à la façon itérative du latin *in saecula saeculorum* (*hassa* reflète le développement normal de **ms* ou **ns*, tandis que *hanzassa* < **hamsassa* montre le résultat hittite du même groupe de consonnes secondaire ou tardif, dans ce cas dans un emprunt au louvite).

La forme verbale *hasi* ou *hassi* remonte à **Homsey*, et le nom *hassa-* à **Homso-*; le vocalisme radical *a* est dû au degré *o* (comme en grec γέγονα et γόvos) et ne préjuge pas une coloration par la laryngale indo-européenne. Nous avons donc affaire à une racine suffixée trilitère benvenistienne **Hém-s-*, *Hm-és-*. Elle se rencontre ailleurs dans un nom-racine redoublé **Hme-H(m)s-* qui est le mot pour 'chair' (c'est le sanscrit *mās* ou thématisé *mānsá-*, l'arménien *mis*, l'albanais *mish*, le gotique *mimz*, le vieux prussien *mensa*, le vieux slave *męso*, le tokharien B *misa*). Une extension hétéroclitique neutre **HmeHmsr* apparaît sous une forme thématisée dans le latin *membrum* (< **mēmsro-*) qui désigne à la fois les produits et l'outil de l'œuvre de chair. Le degré zéro **HmH(m)s-* (> **mās-*) a donné le latin *mas-* dans le diminutif *masculus* et le génitif *maris*, avec *mās* dû à l'allongement des monosyllabes. En latin, où la distinction de *genere* et de *parere* est rigide à l'époque archaïque, ce nom-racine d'agent pour 'créateur charnel' s'est polarisé du côté du mâle, vis-à-vis de *fēmīna* 'celle qui allaite'. Nous avons donc une étymologie du mot 'mâle' à côté de 'femelle' qui est foncièrement transparente. En hittite, au contraire, le sens de cette racine est resté ambigu. Dans le contexte du mot 'membre', rappelons-nous le curieux passage *KUB XLIII 60 I 22-23: nu-ssi-ssan kue āssū 8-andas happesnas ser hāssan* 'les bonnes choses qui lui sont nées à la base de huit membres' (le mot *happessar* est d'ailleurs lui-même un nom abstrait concrétisé, 'attachement, joint', devenu 'partie attachée, membre'). Que signifie cette phrase? On pourrait amender le 8 du texte en ajoutant un neuvième petit coin au signe de nombre et lire ainsi 'neuf parties du corps' (ÚR.HIA), expression toute faite qui se rencontre ailleurs dans des descriptions anatomiques hittites, sans égard au total qui est actuellement énuméré et qui peut être douze ou même treize. Mais il s'agit ici peut-être d'une formule différente de la phraséologie de l'accouchement, comparable à l'expression védique *aṣṭāpādī* 'à huit pieds' pour une vache grosse de veau. Les huit membres sont ceux de la mère et du fœtus pris ensemble, et

l'expression veut dire qu'il y a eu une bonne issue, que l'enfant est né bien formé avec quatre membres, et que la mère avec les siens est saine et sauve, toute d'une pièce. Ainsi *has(s)*- exprime plus que simplement 'faire naître'; il s'agit de la formation même de l'embryon, de la bonne création physique.

Hidden Infixation in the Hittite Verb

Three score and six years separate William Jones' Calcutta discourse of 1786 from the day in 1852 when Ferdinand Dümmler's Verlagsbuchhandlung in Berlin issued the first volume of this *Zeitschrift*, edited by the Privatdocent Theodor Aufrecht and the Gymnasiallehrer Adalbert Kuhn. Indo-European scholarship has just observed its own bicentennial, and for two thirds of these two centuries one hundred volumes of *KZ* have stored up many of its glories. The round number limping behind the true *śatásāradam* reflects sluggish past eras, and for a while the abbreviation *KZ* acquired additional sinister connotations, yet nothing detracts from the honors of this premier serial publication of our discipline.

In that very first volume, Kuhn was busy launching such subsequently notorious tidbits of comparative mythology as *Saranyū-*: *Ἐριυνύς* and *Gandharva*: *Kentauros*, but was equally preoccupied with matters of pure linguistics. Volume 2, published in 1853, saw the appearance of his two-part landmark study "Über die durch nasale erweiterten Wortstämme", where he helped lay the groundwork for Saussure's subsequent interpretation of the nasal infix verbs by pointing out such Vedic correlations as *mathnāti*: *mathāyati* and *stabhnoti*: *stabhūyati*. Much has been done since about the elucidation of these verbs, but, as regards Hittite, we seem to be still groping around for firm morphophonemic ground much as Kuhn or Georg Curtius were for Vedic or Greek five generations ago. With this in mind the following remarks take note of the occasion and in a sense hark back to the beginnings.

Even the seemingly neat package of five Hittite infix verbs (*sarnik-*, *harnik-*, *istarnik-*, *hunik-*, *ninik-*) of the type 3 sg. *sarnikzi*: 3 pl. *sarninkanzi* is still embroiled in controversy. The early believers in a uniform infix *-ne(n)-* (Holger Pedersen,¹⁾ Edgar H. Sturtevant,²⁾ Heinz Kronasser³⁾) have been posthumously enlisting willing re-

¹⁾ *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen* (Copenhagen, 1938), 145-146.

²⁾ *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Revised Edition (New Haven, 1951), 127.

³⁾ *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*, Band 1 (Wiesbaden, 1966), 436.

cruits (e.g. Klaus Strunk,⁴⁾ Frederik O. Lindeman⁵⁾), while the assumptions by Émile Benveniste⁶⁾ and Jerzy Kuryłowicz⁷⁾ that *-ni-k-*: *-nin-k-* are graphic ways of dealing with gradational *-ne-k-*: *-n-k-*, endorsed by myself⁸⁾ and Calvert Watkins,⁹⁾ seem to be out of favor. A middle course was taken by Norbert Oettinger,¹⁰⁾ who admits ancient paradigmatic ablaut reflected by *-ni-k-*: *-nin-k-* but attempts to explain the latter by an anaptyxis (**-nk-* > **-enk-* or **-nek-* > *-nenk-* by paradigmatic analogy). However one tries to account graphemically or phonetically or analogically for the shape *-nin-k-*, functionally it stands for a weak grade, vs. regular *-ni-k-* in "strong" forms. If *-ni-k-* were merely the outcome of "nasal reduction" before another consonant (e.g. *sar-ni-ik-ta*), one should expect at least an occasional "full" spelling **sar-ni-in-kat-ta* or **sar-ni-ni-ik-ta* (as in e.g. *ha-ma-an-kat-ta* and *ha-ma-na-ak-ta* beside *ha-ma-ak-ta*). That such an exceptional ablaut scheme in an unproductive paradigm was on the way to breakdown is on the other hand indicated by the consistent first person singular preterits *sarninkun*, *har-ninkun*, *nininkun*.

Three further Hittite verbs, *hamank-/hamenk-* 'tie, bind', *tamenk-* 'stick to, stick together', and *galank-* 'soothe, satiate', can be explained as belonging to, and themselves spreading further light on this Hittite equivalent of Pāṇini's seventh Sanskrit verbal class. In all Hittite verbs of this kind the root-suffix is a palatovelar consonant, unlike Sanskrit and Latin where any stop or *s* is found (*yunákti*, *bhinátti*, *unap*, *pináṣti*; *iungō*, *findō*, *pinsō*). Hittite *hamank-* and *tamenk-* were cogently connected by Nadia Van Brock¹¹⁾ with Greek ἄγχω 'constrict' (Latin *angō*) and Sanskrit *tanákti* 'coagulate' respectively. They point to roots **Aem-ġh-* and **tem-k-*, and nasal infix presents **Am-n-éġh-ti/Am-m-n-ġh-ónti* and **tm-n-ék-ti/tm-m-n-k-ónti*. The

⁴⁾ IF 78 (1973), 63.

⁵⁾ BSL 71 (1976), 115–116.

⁶⁾ *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen* (Paris, 1935), 162.

⁷⁾ *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists* (Oslo, 1958), 221.

⁸⁾ *Laryngeals and the Indo-European Verb* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960), 26.

⁹⁾ *Indogermanische Grammatik* III/1 (Heidelberg, 1969), 34. Also e.g. Manuel Garcia Teijeiro, *Los presentes indoeuropeos con infijo nasal y su evolución* (Salamanca, 1970), 107.

¹⁰⁾ *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* (Nürnberg, 1979), 137; similarly Rémy Viredaz, BSL 71 (1976), 165–173, and Gillian R. Hart, *Archivum Linguisticum* 8 (1977), 133–141.

¹¹⁾ RHA 20 (1962), 31–36.

Hittite outcomes would have been **hamnekzi/hamankanzi* and **tamnekzi/tamankanzi*. Of these, *ha-ma-an-kán-zi* exists, and became early the fulcrum for new analogical paradigms (cf. Skt. *yūñjāti* and Lat. *iungō* from **yu-n-g-*), thus *hamangahhi* after the model of *ganhahhi*, and *hamankun* following the type of *linkun* (both verbs with radical rather than infixed *n*). But at some point the weak grade was recreated by the pattern of *sarnikzi/sarninkanzi*, thus **hamnekzi/hamnenkanzi*, followed by the phonetic change *mn* > *m(m)* (cf. e.g. *Suppiluliuma-* with *-umna-* suffix), resulting in **ham(m)ekzi/ham(m)enkanzi*. The first is reflected by the 3 sg. pret. *ha-mi-ik-ta*, whereas the weak forms came to coexist as alternatives with *hamank-* (*ha-ma-an-kán-zi*: *ha-me-in-kán-zi*, *ha-ma-an-kán-za*: *ha-me-in-kán-za*), creating the illusion of *a* : *e* ablaut. Thus *hamikta* represents **hamnekt(a)*, whereas *ha-ma-na-ak-ta*, *ha-ma-an-kat-ta*, *ha-ma-ak-ta*, *ha-am-ma-ak-ta* stand for *hamankt(a)*.

By contrast, *tamenk-* does not show analogical formations based on **tamankanzi*; rather the homogenized paradigm **tamnekzi/tamenkanzi* underlies attested forms. 3 sg. *ta-me-ik-zi* and *da-mi-ni-ik-zi* reflect **tam(n)ekzi*, while 3 pl. *ta-me-ni-kán-zi* (KBo XX 116 Rs. 10) and its duplicate *ta-mi-[i]n-kán-zi* (KUB XXV 48 + XLIV 49 II 28)¹²⁾ add up to **tam(n)enk-*, as do the weak forms generally (*da-me-in-kir*, *dam-me-en-kán-t-*).

In the case of *galank-* the attestations are limited to the 3 sg. imp. *ka-la-an-kad-du*, the participle *k/galankant-*, and the noun *galaktar* (*galattar*, *kallaktar*) denoting a soothing substance. The formula yields **gl-n-éġ-ti/gll-n-ġ-ónti* > **galanganzi*, to be interpreted like *hamankanzi*, cognate with such nominal derivatives as Gk. γάλας 'milk' (soothing nutrient above all), Vedic *jálāṣa-* 'soothing' (< **gal-aġso-*), or Lith. *glėžnas*, Old Norse *klökkur* 'slack, tender' (< **glengwo-*). *Galaktar* is not a verbal noun derived from *galank-* (which would be **galankatar*) and is hence not a nasal-reduced **gal-anktar*, being perhaps more directly equatable with Gk. γάλα(κτ-) and Lat. *lact-* 'milk'.

Such visible débris of the Hittite equivalent of the infixed Indic ninth (*punāti*) and fifth (*śṛṇóti*) verbal classes as *tarna-* and *tepnu-* has been readily identified and codified,¹³⁾ and suffixed *-nu-* verbs

¹²⁾ ZA 71 (1981), 130.

¹³⁾ E.g. in Oettinger, op. cit. in note 10, 150–165. On *tepnu-*: Skt. *dabhnóti* see also Harold J. Koch, in *Laugeschichte und Etymologie* (Wiesbaden, 1980), 223–237.

starting with *arnu-* are a productive category with transitive-causative meaning (*harganu-* matching *harnink-* 'destroy'). But there may be more to the inventory than meets the eye.

The verb *hallanniya-* is rare but tolerably defined as meaning 'lay waste, ravage' by such occurrences as *KUB IV 3 Vs. 8-10 nu-za-kan LÚKÚR-as GİR-ŠU anda tarnatti nu A.ŠÀ-as-tis hallanniyattari istalkiyattari* 'you let the enemy's foot in, and your field will be laid waste (and) levelled'. The iterative *hal-la-an-ni-es-ki-* (*KBo XIX 112, 17*) describes the depredations of the monster Hedammu. *Hal-lanniya-* is a "durative" from a verb *hall(a)-*, typically forming its own iterative, in the manner of *walh-*: *walhanniya-*: *walhanniski-* 'strike'. The stem *hall(a)-* is equatable with Gk. ὀλλῶμι (< *ὀλ-vō-) 'destroy'. A root *Oel-A^w- would form an infixed present *O_l-n-eA^w- > *halnā- > *halla*-¹⁴), whereas in Greek *ὀλνῶμι was supplanted by *ὀλνῶμι (cf. στόρνῶμι beside Skt. *stṛṇāti*). The preconsonantal weak grade *O_l-n-A^w- resulted in *halnu- > *hallu- (e.g. 1 pl. *halnuweni > *halnumeni; cf. Gk. ὀλλυμεν).¹⁵) From this weak grade was derived a noun *halluwai-* 'violence, brawl' (e.g. *KUB XXXIII 96 IV 10-11 + XXXVI 7a IV 47-48 dassus-war-as halluwais dassus[-ma-war-as] zahhāis* 'strong [is] the violence, strong [is] the battle'), and from the noun a denominative verb *halluwai-* (*halluwai- + -ye-*) 'resort to violence, brawl', which was also used transitively like *hallanniya-* (*KUB VIII 51 II 22 nu ^DHuwawain halluwa[nzi]* 'they fight Humbaba'). The derivational string quite matches e.g. *zah(h)-* 'beat': *zahhai-* 'battle': *zahhiya-* 'do battle, fight'. For the root-connection with Gk. ὀλλῶμι one may compare οὐλόμενος 'ruinous', applied to Achilles' wrath and quarrel with Agamemnon.¹⁶)

¹⁴) On the probability of *ln > ll see e.g. Jaan Puhvel, *Analecta Indoeuropaea* (Innsbruck, 1981), 212.

¹⁵) For this development cf. e.g. 1 pl. *dum(m)eni* < **du-weni* < **dA^w-wé-* of *da-* 'take' < IE **dō-* < **deA^w-* (see Jaan Puhvel, *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann* [Innsbruck, 1982], 318, and *Laryngeals and the Indo-European Verb*, 37).

¹⁶) But *hallu-* 'deep', which Harold J. Koch (*Glotta* 46 [1976], 216-222) implausibly compared with Gk. ὀλλῶμι as a denominatively infixed verb (like Hitt. *tepnu-* from *tepu-*) from a corresponding *u*-stem (with reference to the Homeric formula αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος 'steep ruin'), does not even exist. The dossier points rather to a noun *halluwa-* meaning 'hollow, pit', cognate with Lat. *alv(e)us* 'hollow, cavity', secondarily adjectivized into 'deep' by juxtaposition with *hariya-* 'valley', in antonymy to *parku-* 'high' (mountains); cf. Lat. *valles cavae*, or Yeats' *hollow lands and hilly lands*.

In this manner phonetic changes have concealed the character of Hittite infixed verbs – be it *mn* > *m(m)* or **ln* > *ll*. Well over a century after Kuhn and Curtius worried about similar obfuscating cluster developments in Greek, we are slowly groping for comparable illumination for Hittite. The first and the hundredth volumes of *KZ* are therefore pretty much alike – as long as a forefront remains in Indo-European studies.

Philology and etymology, with focus on Anatolian

In a Hittite ritual (*KUB XXIX 7 + KBo XXI 41*), the officiating priestess goes through a series of symbolic acts. These supply visible analogies to the lustrational ends that are pursued in the accompanying utterances. In one such episode (Rs. 36–41) she is handed an onion which she describes as wrapped in its skin in such a way that one layer does not let go of another. She then proceeds to peel the onion and ends up holding a mere *kākin dawanin*, hapax legomena of inferential meaning, perhaps 'lousy stump' or the like. The moral is that a package of evil, perjury, curse, and pollution, while peskily lumped together, can likewise be picked apart and neutralized. To me this sacerdotal activity suggests another analogy, that of Anatolian word study. Very often many layers of philological dissection go into laying bare some wretched piece of etymology.

But it is better to do it this way, stratum by sticky stratum, than to mix a cocktail of a modicum of semantic similarity and a dash of external compatibility, stirring it as need be with the swizzle stick of Indo-Hittite circularity. Or to engage in dragnet type activities, grandiose sweeps through Pokorny or some Nostratic nostrum or roster, to catch in one swoop all that Anatolian may offer for prehistoric lexicology. Or to lay down such rigid principles as seem to guide the etymological codas in the new *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, namely that all primary verbs had better be Indo-European, whereas nouns, whenever the least bit opaque, must needs be mysterious loanwords.

For etymology of dead languages is ninety per cent philological drudgery. In the Anatolian instance that ratio rises to ninety-eight per cent. This may seem like low-fat milk to etymological speculators, but the reasons are compelling. The relationship of philology to etymology in the case of Anatolian at large, and Hittite in particular, is special and unique.

Unlike for example Greek, where the philological cud has been chewed over for ages, and where even such a major event as the advent of Mycenology was just a moderate ripple, Hittitology still resembles a *selva oscura* where it is all too easy to lose one's way. In addition to a large corpus of texts, there is a whole culture out there to be fathomed and

understood, but little to understand it by except the texts themselves. This constitutes a tantalizing challenge, unlike for example Gothic or Tocharian, where the near-absence of native text material reduces the corpus to mainly formal linguistic interest. Comparativism inevitably obtrudes, but instead of a straight jump to Indo-European as in the case of Armenian, or a first-stage confrontation of co-equal dialects as in Tocharian or Greek, we have a main body of evidence which is yet anchored in obscure complexities that must be taken into account. For Anatolia is a subcontinent in its own right, in addition to being appended to the culture cradles of the Near East and contiguous to passageways of Kurgan peoples and other obscure denizens of prehistory.

Hittite etymology is a three-tiered enterprise. First the inner-Anatolian evidence needs to be checked and assessed. Secondly all connections involving contiguity and extralinguistic factors require attention (loan-word relationships, cultural realia, and so forth). Only in a tertiary dimension, if still relevant, can one then engage in Indo-European linguistic comparison.

But before even getting to any of those three tiers, the onion will already have to be half-peeled. By that time the successful philologist (as William Jones would have said) has already faced several peculiar difficulties.

The first task is to determine just what a word means, and not merely that, but to chart its semantic history. It may involve not only basic but abstracted, technical, and tropic nuances. The verb *ep(p)-* means 'to seize', like Latin *capiō*, but *-za ep(p)-* is 'to begin', like Lat. *incipiō*. *Arnu-* is 'to move along', but *katta arnu-* signifies 'to conclude, to terminate'. *Auli-* is the anatomical organ 'spleen', but metonymically it means a sacrificial offering of entrails (like Greek *σπλάγχνα*), and metaphorically it has an abstract connotation akin to that of Greek and English *spleen*. Thus a thorough conversancy with actual textual usage is indispensable, and reliance merely on those texts that have been predigested by editors hobbles the scholar who needs to have a handle on the total history of a word. In the case of rare items, conjectural determination from close context, rather than bulk processing of attestations, can be entirely cogent. For example, the verb *hallanniya-* in the iterative *hallanneski-* describes the depredations of the monster Hedammu. In another occurrence we read (*KUB IV 3* Vs. 8–10) *nu-za-kan* ^{LÜ}*KÚR-as GÌR-ŠU anda tarnatti nu A.ŠĀ-as-tis hallanniyattari istalkiyattari* 'you let the enemy's foot in, and your field will be x-ed and levelled'. Clearly *x = hallanniya-* is what an enemy does to your crop as the field is being flattened, thus 'lay waste,

destroy'. *Hallanniya-* in turn is a "durative" from a *hall(a)-*, not otherwise attested but inferable from the similar derivational chain of a verb meaning 'to strike': *walh-* : *walhanniya-* : *walhanniski-*.

Hall(a)- is a semantic dead end of internal reconstruction, just a rare quasi-synonym added to the impressive Hittite collection of verbs in the area of 'strike, smite, destroy', covering some of the Hittites' favorite activities (*harnik-*, *hasp-*, *huek-*, *kuen-*, *walh-*, *zah-*, etc.). Such hypertrophy contributes to the terrible semantic lopsidedness of the attested Hittite lexicon, where many of the key words of Buck's *Selected synonyms* simply have no equivalents, while others suffer from surfeit. We have the names of some two hundred different kinds of bakery products centered on 'bread', but do not even know the word for 'fish', merely its sumerogram *KU₆* and its *u*-stem complement (Otten's suggestion that it was *parhu-* has been disproved by Berman – Hoffner 1980: 48–49). Well, if not 'fish', what about 'perch', 'pike', 'herring' and the like? We only know that a certain fish (*kās-wa KU₆-us*) was called 'bull of the sea' (*arunas GUD.MAH-as*; 'bull', too, is merely sumerographic). It helps to know that high mountain ranges separated the Hittite heartland from maritime fishing grounds, that the Tuz Gölü or 'Salt Lake' was unfit for fish, and that fish in the mountain streams of Anatolia were, with some apparent justification, considered poisonous. Thus the culinary proclivities and availabilities of the Hittites have left a clear imbalance in their lexicon.

But back to our test case of *hall(a)-*! At this point only linguistic considerations can help us farther, and bring us to the second major roadblock, namely formal obscurity. We know about Hittite phonology less than Georg Curtius did about Greek five generations ago, before palatalizations and other cluster developments had been fully understood. What is the origin of the consistently geminated *ll* in *hall(a)-*? Chances are that it comes from a consonant cluster, especially one that is conspicuous by its nonattestation, such as **ln*. Even as in Greek **ln* suffered loss (**στάλνᾱ* > Aeolic *στάλλᾱ*, Ionic *στήλη*), *hall(a)-* may therefore reflect a **hálnā-*. This **hálnā-* is directly comparable with the Proto-Greek infix-verb **ōlnōmi* 'I destroy', reflected by the reshaped Aeolicism *ōllōmi* (like *στόρνῶμι* beside Skt. *strñāti*), where the proper Ionic form should have been **oūλωμι* (cf. the Homeric participle *οὐλόμενος* 'ruinous'). Thus in this lucky instance the three tiers are telescoped: a small dossier allows concentrated semantic determination, extralinguistic interference is scant, and plausible phonological reconstruction lands in the lap of a good Indo-European typological match.

Much peskier are those items where sumerograms tease us with an unpleasant version of hide-and-seek. For the thousands of *LUGAL*, sometimes with a *u*-stem determinative, there is not one sure *hassus*-and, were it not for some derivatives like *hassuwai-* 'to become king', that vocable might still be hidden from us. *Pata-* 'foot' took until *KUB XXXIV* and *KBo XVII* to reveal itself behind *GĪR*. *Pesna-* also came out of *KBo XVII* as the reading of *LÚ* or *LÚ-na-* 'man, male', derived from the root *pes-* 'to rub' and creating a curious chiasmic string of metonymies in Hittite: 'penis' > 'man' : *pisnatar* 'manhood' > 'penis'. But in other instances, like those of 'woman', 'daughter', and 'son', where *SAL*, *DUMU.SAL*, and *DUMU* still leave us in the lurch, it is good philological form to practise *obscurum per obscurius* and turn for help to the minor varieties of Anatolian. Thus Cuneiform Luwian *wana-* or *wanatti-* or *unatti-* (along with Hieroglyphic *WOMAN-nati-*) have been proposed as Anatolian attestations of IE **g^wen-* 'woman' (Starke 1980: 74–86). After all that has been written on the subject of **g^wen-* by Meid (1966: 271–272), Schindler (1972: 33), Campanile (1976–1977: 21–28), and Hamp (1979: 1–7), I can only conclude that Hittite *SAL-(an)za*, gen. *SAL-nas* stand for Proto-Anatolian **guan-s*, gen. **guanas*, from something like **g^won-s*, gen. **g^wñós* (whether that yielded Hittite **kuanza* as with other labiovelars, or **wanza* as in Luwian, or **kanza* as in *kist-* from **g^wes-* and perhaps in Lydian *kāna-* – cf. Gusmani 1985: 127–132). There is no use postulating an *n*-stem **kuenan-* or **kuanan-* on the extended model of Gothic *qinō* or the Gaulish *bricht bān* or 'magic of women' against which Saint Patrick needed protection. Nor is there a trace in Hittite of the laryngeal feminizing morpheme *-A* which yielded stems like **g^wenā-* or **g^wnā-* in many languages.

The Larzac inscription likewise at length supplies a Gaulish *duxtir* for 'daughter', making up for insular substitutions (Irish *ingen* and Welsh *merch*), even as Oscan *futir* did for Latin *fīlia* in the case of Italic. In this instance, too, Luwian points the way in Anatolian, via Hieroglyphic *tuwatara* (Hawkins 1978: 112–116) and Lycian *kbatra* < **twatra* < **tu(g)atra*, on the same principle of *kw* from *tw* as is seen in, e.g., German *quer* and *quark* vs. Swedish *tvär* and Russian *tvoróg*. But for 'son' we are still at sea, having merely *DUMU* or *DUMU-la-*. Melchert's *ayawala-* (1980: 90–95) hardly fills the bill, and Lycian *tideimi* is a transparent Luwian **titaimi-* 'suckling' not very unlike Latin *fīlius*. The end result is a very mixed bag: archaic etyma for 'woman' and 'daughter', an ancient metonym for 'man', obscure innovation for 'son'.

In such instances, too, we can effect the leap from a Pan-Anatolian linguistic level straight to Indo-European, thereby curtailing a bit the three-tiered etymological enterprise. But as soon as we are dealing with complex etyma, formulaic units rather than single lexemes, and in particular culture-bound items, the full force of areal complexities comes into play.

Take as an example the tablet *KBo* IV 11. It contains outlines of two rituals involving virtually the same cast of divinities, in Hittite, but with intermingled cue-lines for liturgic chanting in the Luwian dialect of the city of Istanuwa, a Heliopolis named for the solar deity, Istanus. That the place had a Luwian tinge is shown by the variant name Astanuwa which alternates with Istanuwa in the text, with Luwian-type *a*-coloration. Both rituals start by libating to and toasting the storm-god of Istanuwa and the solar deity of Istanuwa (or Astanuwa), followed by assorted divine small fry, many of them obscure (such as Suwasuna, Wandu, Siuri, Iyasalla, Immarsiya). Because past tenses occur in some passages, some kind of narrative is occasionally indicated, most probably the type of intercalated cult myths which are common in Hittite rituals of Hattic deities, especially relating to the storm-god and the moon-god. But other chants are patently lyrical, full of alliterative iterations and Luwian variants of the same ancient formulas as occur in Hittite prayers, notably lines 54–55: *ayatar pāiu [...] dametta duwanta wāsu piddu*, which translates into Hittite as *iyatar pāu dameta tiyer āssu paiddu* ‘growth may he give, abundance they have made, let good come!’ We do not know where Istanuwa was located, but it was plausibly in the Luwian-speaking territories west and southwest of Hatti proper. In the southwest, there was also the solar deity of Lystra in classical Lycaonia south of Iconium (the modern Konya of the whirling dervishes), known as ^DUTU-*liya*^{URU} *Lusna* ([*KUB* XVII 19, 9]). It is tempting to read ^DUTU-*liya*, also found as a theophorous man’s name ^{ID}UTU-*liya* (*KUB* LV 54 *passim*), as **Sāweliyas*, an Indo-European Anatolian equivalent of the Homeric Ἥλιος, or possibly as **Hāweliyas*, the Ahhiyawan-Mycenaean form of the sun-god’s name.

The tandem invocation of the storm-god and the solar deity, followed by lesser divinities, is reminiscent of the passage in Book 3 of the *Iliad* where Agamemnon arranges a showdown joust between Aleksandros-Paris and Menelaos, in order to settle title to Helen and put an end to the ten-year mess at Troy. Oath-ceremonies take place which bind the parties to abide honorably by the outcome. Agamemnon invokes divine witnesses as follows (*Il.* 3: 276–280):

Zeῦ πάτερ, Ἴδηθεν μεδέων, κύδιστε, μέγιστε,
Ἥελιός θ', ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούεις,
καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ γαῖα, καὶ οἱ ὑπένερθε καμόντας
ἄνθρώπους τίνυσσον, ὅτις κ' ἐπίορκον ὁμόσση,
ὕμεις μάρτυροι ἔστε, φυλάσσετε δ' ὅρκια πιστά.
‘Father Zeus, who rule from Ida, most famed and great,
and Sun, who see all and hear all,
and Rivers, and Earth, and you who in the netherworld
punish dead men who have forsworn themselves,
you be witnesses and guard faithful oaths!’

This is not a Greek oath but a Trojan one, Anatolian in kind. It involves Idaean, not Olympian Zeus. The whole is evocative of the closing formulas in Hittite state treaties where the oath-taker swears by the witnessing gods of the other party. Hittite polytheism with its absorptional and syncretistic capacity tends to swell such lists to monstrous proportions, but they have rather fixed boundaries, regularly starting with the chief solar and storm divinities and ending with the likes of mountains, rivers, springs, clouds, heaven, earth, and sea. The Greek passage with its invocation of storm-god, sun-god, rivers, and earth is therefore an abbreviated piece of Asianic liturgy, well suited to forge further links between the Homeric-Trojan and Luwo-Hittite traditions. This, coupled with the names Helios and ^DUTU-*liyas*, is philological etymology of an extended kind, transcending proto-lexemes but forging *etyma* in the truest sense of the word.

Having attempted to survey various facets of the topic of philology and etymology in Anatolian, let me in conclusion rehearse one specific item of the Hittite lexicon which embodies many of them, and where some of my preaching may emerge in practice. Our task is to find out the truth, the etymon, about the verb *has(s)-*.

The profuse Indo-European verbal root **ĝenE-/ĝnē-*, which denotes the creation of living beings in a sexual and social and even legal sense, and which is well attested in almost all Indo-European languages, has left no verbal trace in Hittite. Besides Anatolian, Baltic and Slavic lack verbs from this root: in Lithuanian ‘to be born’ is *gimti* from the root **g^wem-* ‘to come’, and ‘to beget’ is its causative *gaminti*. Slavic has derived denominative verbs from *rodŭ* meaning ‘gender; kin’, which has the same etymology as Hittite *hardu* ‘brood’. Hittite sometimes uses the verbum vicarium *iya-* (*DUMU.MEŠ iya-* ‘to make children’), but otherwise it is *has(s)-* that fills the slot.

Our first task is to define the precise meanings of *has(s)-*. It means 'to give birth' in an absolute sense, as in SAL-za *hāsi* 'the woman gives birth'. But without a gendered subject the sex distinction blurs: *nu-za DUMU.NITA hasta* can be either 'he begot a son' or 'she bore a son'. Thus the basic sense of *has(s)-* must have been as general as that of **ġenE-*, but with severe limitations imposed by Hittite grammar itself. For reasons that are not clear, *has(s)-* has no middle or passive forms, so that Hittite has no verb for 'to be born', to match Skt. *jāyate* or Gk. *γίγνεται* or Lat. *nascitur*. The participle is passive, *hassant-* 'born', and there is no agent noun to resemble Skt. *janitār-/jānitṛī* or Lat. *genitor/genetrix*, thus no general term for 'parents', merely the asyndetic *attas annas* with variations of precedence or ellipsis (somewhat as *los padres* in Spanish, vs. *i genitori* in Italian). The formal inventory of *has(s)-* is hence rather defective.

Some languages have specific verbs for begetting and bearing children, e.g. *genere* : *parere* in Latin, *ussatjan* : *gabairan* in Gothic, *zeugen* : *gebären* in German, or *avla* : *föda* in Swedish. The marked feminine term in these languages means either 'to hatch' (Lat. *parere*; cf. Lith. *perėti* 'hatch') or 'to bear' (cf. Lat. *partum gerere*) or 'to feed' (Swedish *föda* means both 'feed' and 'give birth'). Hittite rather resembles Greek, where the verb *τίκτειν*, *τεκεῖν* of obscure origin has usurped the active and transitive meanings of **ġenE-* and is used without regard to sex: *ὄς μιν ἔτικτε* and *ἥ μιν ἔτικτε* are found in the *Iliad* seven lines apart (22:421, 428) for 'who begot him' and 'who bore him'. In Vedic, too, the verbs *jan-* and *sū-* are used without much differentiation for father and mother. In dualist Iran, *jan-* describes good birth, whereas *hu-* has turned in malam partem for demonic creation. In Akkadian, the distinction is sharper: *banū* is the primary verb for 'to beget', while *alādu* is mainly 'to bear'; overlaps (especially *alādu* for 'beget') are secondary in nature.

Other features of *has(s)-* can also be elucidated by typological comparison. Like its causative *hassanu-*, *has(s)-* itself sometimes means 'cause to be born, help to birth', even as Akk. *ulludu* from *alādu* describes the actions of a midwife (who is called in Hittite *has[su]nupallas*). The abstract noun *hassatar* 'begetting, birth' also has a concrete sense 'offspring, family', especially 'noble family, royal family' (*salli hassatar* 'great family'). Hence there is also the noun *hassu-* for 'king', comparable to the Old Norse *konr* 'prince' from **ġnyos*, or the Germanic word 'king' from the same root. It is a matter of privileged genealogy: *hassant-* means 'well born' in the emphatic sense, even as *asant-* is 'truly being, wholly true'. A *hassanza* prince was not only begotten by the king; he was also

born of the queen, thus of first rank (*hantezzis*), rather than sired at the second level (*dan pedas*) in morganatic fashion.

But *hassatar* is metonymically also 'womb', synonymous with *sarhu-want-*. This recalls the term *genzu* which denotes some internal lower abdominal region or organ of both sexes but itself reeks of synecdoche, for its other meaning is 'kindness'. It is a remnant of the root **ġenE-*, even as *kind* is in English. When Mursilis II describes how his father Suppiluliumas humored the widowed queen of Tutankhamen, he says that *attas-mis genzuwalas ēsta*, where an etymological translation 'my father was a gentleman' is not far off the mark. To illustrate this sense of 'womb' in *hassatar*, let us quote KUB XXIV 13 II 14–16 *arha-ta-kkan ansan ēsdu alwanzatar SAL-annaza hassannaza^{UZU}SU-za ginuwaz* 'let the hex be wiped off you, from the woman's womb and the knee of the flesh' (this latter is an expression for membrum virile, even as *birku* 'knee' is in Akkadian; the double ablatives appear by attraction for genitive + ablative, as in *tuetaza memiyanaz* in lieu of *tuel memiyanaz* 'at your behest').

The other deverbative action noun, *hassumar*, denotes the sex act itself, from the male point of view. It occurs in the title of the feast called EZEN *hassumas* (IBoT I 29), where a young Hittite prince eats and sleeps with twelve prostitutes in a puberty ritual. Expressions such as DUMU.MEŠ-tar *hassumar* means 'begetting of sons', with the same construction as *arkuwar tiyauwar* 'plea-presentation'. The concretizing metonymy operates here, too, for *hassumar parkunumar* probably means 'lustration of the phallus', adding another item to the hypertrophied Hittite inventory of terms that includes *genu*, *pisnatar*, *hapos-*, and *lalu-*.

Physical creation is clearly at the semantic nucleus of *has(s)-*, even more than of **ġenE-*. This insight determines further etymological research. The variant *hansannas* for *hassannas*, and Luwian *hamsa-* 'grandson', corresponding to Hitt. *hassa-* 'progeny, descendant', prove the proto-form to have been **hams-*. The much-discussed expression *hassa hanzassa* must be in part Hittitized Luwian, containing a genitival adjective **ham-sassa* in a kind of figura etymologica in the directive dative case, literally 'to progeny's progeny', i.e., 'down the generations', an iterational hyperbole not unlike Lat. *in saecula saeculorum*.

The third person singular *has(s)i* goes back to **Homsey*, and the noun *hassa-* to **Homso-*. The root vocalism *a* is due to the inherited *o*-grade (as in Greek *γένονα* and *γόνοϛ*) and does not indicate coloration by a laryngeal. The root is therefore **Hēm-s-*, *Hm-ēs-*. It is found elsewhere in a reduplicated root-noun **Hme-H(m)s-* which is the word for 'flesh'

(Skt. *mās* or thematized *mānsá-*, Arm. *mis*, Alb. *mish*, Goth. *mimz*, OPr. *mensa*, OCS *męso*, Toch. B *misa*). A neuter *r*-stem extension **HmeHmsr* appears thematized in Lat. *membrum* (< **mēmsro-*) which denotes both the products and the tools of carnal creation. The zero grade **HmH(m)s-* (> **mas-*) resulted in Lat. *mas-* in the diminutive *masculus* and the genitive *maris*, with *mās* due to the lengthening of monosyllables. In Latin, where the distinction of *genere* and *parere* is rigid, this agental root noun for 'carnal maker' has been polarized as 'male', vs. *fēmīna* 'she who suckles'. In Hittite, on the contrary, the semantic thrust of this root has stayed ambivalent. In the context of *membra*, let us recall the curious passage KUB XLIII 60 I 22–23: *nu-ssi-ssan kue āssū 8-andas happešnas ser hāssan* 'the good things that have been born to her on the basis of eight members'. What might it mean? It is easy enough to tamper with the reading and emend the "eight" by adding another wedge to the number sign to yield "nine body parts" (ÚR.HI.A), a comprehensive expression found elsewhere in anatomical descriptions, regardless of the total actually listed which can be twelve or even thirteen. But here it may be a different formula of the phraseology of childbirth, comparable to the Vedic term *aṣṭāpādī* 'eight-footed' describing a cow with calf. The eight members are those of the mother and foetus combined, and the passage announces the happy issue of a normal, well-formed child, and a mother in good shape. Thus *has(s)-* expresses more than the act of birth; it has to do with the formation of the embryo, with physical creation as such.

Hopefully these stray glimpses into the ongoing workshop of the *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* have helped to elucidate the tenet of this paper: Do philology until it hurts. Only then is there hope for true etymological illumination.

References

- Berman, Howard—Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.
1980 "Why *parḫu-* is not the Hittite word for 'fish'", *JCS* 32: 48–49.
- Campanile, Enrico
1976–1977 "Sulla preistoria del paradigma di *bé* e *ben* in irlandese antico", *Incontri Linguistici* 3:21–28.
- Gusmani, Roberto
1985 "Lydisch *kāna* und luwisch *wana-*", *Festschrift für Johann Knobloch* (Innsbruck), 127–132.
- Hamp, Eric P.
1979 "Indo-European **gʷen-H₂-*", *KZ* 93: 1–7.
- Hawkins, J. D.
1978 "The Luwian word for 'daughter'", *KZ* 92: 112–116.

- Lejeune, Michel
1984 "Deux inscriptions magiques gauloises", *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, 703–713.
- Meid, Wolfgang
1966 "Idg. **gʷen-* Frau?", *KZ* 80: 271–272.
- Melchert, H. Craig
1980 "The Hittite word for 'son'", *IF* 85: 90–95.
- Schindler, Jochem
1972 "L'apophonie des noms-racines indo-européens", *BSL* 67: 31–38.
- Starke, Frank
1980 "Das luwische Wort für 'Frau'", *KZ* 94: 74–86.

Hittite Etyma for Greek Obscuriora

For all the labor expended during the last century, and in the wake of the etymological dictionaries of Boisacq, Chantraine, and Frisk, "*unerklärt*" and "*ohne Etymologie*" remain distressingly frequent summations in the Friskian vocabulary. I am not thinking of puzzling *hapax legomena* or exotically opaque noun items but of reasonably well-known verbs attested from the Iliad onward, such as *paúō* 'stop', *ēpúō* 'cry out', and *nēēō* 'pile up'. Their hiatic shapes reflect the havoc that the phonological upheavals of Greek have created for etymology, but even the mastery of those complications by Georg Curtius and others more than a century ago did not bring solutions. Clearly the inventory of thitherto attested cognate languages failed to turn up lexical matches.

It is here that the new material from Hittite comes in. These are rich philological data which must be sifted, savored, and appreciated down to minute formal and semantic nuances, before being thrust into confrontation with potential extra-Anatolian cognates. I have tried previously¹ to define and illustrate what I think are viable approaches in this regard, as well as express reservations about what seem to be lamentable and cavalier shortcuts in the procedures of some scholars who practice Greek—Hittite lexical matching, notably O. Szemerényi and A.J. Van Windekens. In the lines that follow, inscribed to the centenary memory of Irach Taraporewala, I shall attempt to extract *ēpúō* and *nēēō* from their obscure isolation with the help of Hittite etyma.

Loudness is a concomitant component of *ēpúō* (cf. *Iliad* 13.521 *bríēpuos* 'loud-shouting'), but it is not the semantic kernel; that is rather the nuance 'cry out to' in order to compel attention, thus 'summon', and more specifically a medial 'call to account', with a juridical tinge (Arcadian *apuesthō o adikēmenos ton adikenta* 'let the wronged party call the wrongdoer to account'). The *ēpúta kēruux* 'crier herald' of *Iliad* 7.384 is back-formed from *ēpúō* (aorist *ēpūsa*) (cf. *autē* from *aūsai* 'cry out'), which allows the verbal stem to be posited as **(H)āpus-(ye/o-)*. This stem matches the Hittite verb (*appa*) *hap(p)us(s)-*,² the meaning of which in the Hittite law code is 'reclaim' (from Lat. *reclamā-* 'cry out'!) in the sense of 'recover for use' (cf.

'reclamation project'), so that the participle *happusant-* means 'second-hand' (KBo VI 26 II 48 *ŠA TÚG happusandas 12 GÍN KÜ. BABBAR* '[the price] of a second-hand dress [is] twelve shekels silver', vs. thirty shekels for a *TÚG SIG* 'fine dress'). From there the term has become conventionalized as roughly 'do over, rerun', and in administrative lingo 'bring up, make up for, resume, reschedule', used especially referring to old rituals and neglected festivals or offerings (which they then frequently 2-*ŠU hapussanzi* 'make up for twofold'). In this way a subtle semantic technicalization has made the Hittite verb veer away from the 'outcry' of its outset, even as 'loud(ly)' is no longer an intrinsic part of the semanteme of English 'claim' (which can be internalized or made on a piece of paper). Greek *ēpúō* has stayed closer to the 'hue and cry' of the primary setting, but there too the legal summoning process was evolving away from shouted decibels to mere process-serving. There are lessons here for the vagaries of evolution of abstract and technical vocabulary, a proper appreciation of which will nevertheless let us glimpse the underlying proto-form.³

Nēēō is a mere wreck of a verb, inferrable from the Iliadic imperfect 3 sg. *nēei* (*Iliad* 23.169, where Achilles 'piled' flayed animal corpses around Patroklos' body on the pyre) and 3 pl. *nēeon* (*ibid.* 139 and 163 *nēeon hūlēn* 'they piled wood' for the pyre; *Iliad* 24.276 'they piled' on a wagon the ransom for Hektor's corpse), and indirectly from the aorist *nēēsas* (*Iliad* 9.358 *nēēsas eū nēas* 'after loading up the ships'). The Homeric *enēneon* (*Iliad* 7.428 *nekroūs purkaiēs epenēneon* 'they piled corpses on the pyre'; *Odyssey* 1.147 *siton parenēneon* 'they piled up food') is not a reduplicated aorist but a more archaic imperfect **en-e-Hnes-* with preverb and augment, from **en-nēō* 'pack in, load up'. As such it may be compared with the Hittite verb (*anda*) *han(n)es(s)-* which has a technical sense of 'plaster' in medical and constructional contexts, and also a figurative meaning 'lay in profusely, pile on' (e.g. blessings such as wealth and lordliness). Just as a wall was something 'poured' (*kutt-*; cf. Gk. *khutē gaia* 'earth-heap'), and a fortress or stronghold was literally a 'jamming' (*sahessar*)⁴, *haneswar* was a 'packing' or 'piling' of material on surfaces so as to cover them, perhaps earlier mortar on earth buttresses, later on 'plastering' in a more refined sense. The constructional variation between Greek and Hittite ('pile corpses on a pyre': 'ply a wall with plaster') is of a well-known type (cf. e.g. Lat. *mactare victimam deo* 'sacrifice a victim to a god' besides *mactare deum victimam* 'ply a god with sacrifice')⁵ which creeps into Greek itself ('pile corpses on a pyre', but also 'load up ships' [with whatever]). In Hittite, too, plastering of body-parts, houses, walls, water-tanks, and drainpipes is done with material in the instrumental case (wax,

clay, mortar, etc.), but in the figurative exhortations the older construction lingers: 'pile on long years, pile on wealth!'). In this manner **en-nēō* and (anda) *han(n)es-* point jointly to an IE **Hnes-* with the meaning 'pile on, pack in', even as Gk. *āpūō* and Hitt. *hap(p)us-* presuppose a **Hāpus-* 'cry out', similar in stem type to Gk. *odússasthai* 'be wroth' and Hitt. *hatuk-* 'be terrible' pointing to **Hodug-*.⁶ The constructional variation may be present in *āpūō* and *hap(p)us-* as well, for the thrust in Hittite is 'cry out for' > 'lay claim to' (something that is due), whereas in Greek it is 'cry out against' > 'call to account' (someone about something owed). These examples indicate how deeply the semantics of etymology may be hidden in the thickets of textual philology.

Notes

¹"Homeric Questions and Hittite Answers", *American Journal of Philology* 104 (1983) 217-227.

²The alternative scriptio difficilior *ha-ap-pu-us-* clinches the case for etymological **p* under "Sturtevant's law" (its converse being less reliable, for a single spelling, however consistent, is always suspect as a scriptio faciliior; therefore e.g. Hitt. *hapus-* 'penis' is nevertheless best connected with *hap(p)essar* 'attachment, limb', cognate with Lat. *aptus* 'joined', *cōpula* 'bond').

³A.J. Van Windekens (*Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J.A. Kerns* [Amsterdam, 1981] 336) compared *hap(p)us(s)-* with Gk. *paúō* 'stop', positing a proto-meaning 'put off, tarry'; but the Hittite attestations are the very semantic opposite of 'put off, omit, overlook, neglect', they relate to the rehabilitation of disuse and mismanagement.

⁴Cf. my remarks on this subject in *Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche* (Paris, 1979) 301 = *Analecta Indoeuropaea* (Innsbruck, 1981) 369.

⁵See further Jaan Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* 1-2 (Berlin, 1984) 267.

⁶Cf. Jaan Puhvel, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 37 (1980) 203.

HITTITE REGAL TITLES: HATTIC OR INDO-EUROPEAN?

Hittite rulers were often accorded the honorific designation *Ta-ba-ar-na*, usually preceding a throne name in akkado-graphic shape (e.g. *Tabarna* 'Hattusili'), or combined with the sumerogram LUGAL 'king', as in *IBoT* I 30, 2 *Tabarna-kan* LUGAL-us DINGIR.MEŠ-as *āssus* 'T. the king (is) dear to the gods'. *Tabarna* sometimes alternates with the paradigmatically inflected variant form *La-ba-ar-na-as* (with phonetic d/l fluctuation, as in e.g. English *tongue* vs. Latin *lingua*), e.g. *ibid.* 3-4 *nu-za* ^{LÚ}*Labarnan* LUGAL-un ^{LÚ}*maniyahhatallan* *iyat* 'he made Labarnas the king ruler' (near parallel *KUB* XXXVI 89 Rs. 49 ^{LÚ}*La-pár-na-an* LUGAL-un ^{LÚ}*maniyahatallan* DÜ-at), or *KUB* XXIX 1 I 24-25 *nu-mu-za* LUGAL-un *Labarnan* *halziyer* 'they have called me king Labarnas'. But in common usage it can alone refer to the king, as in *KUB* XLIII 63 Vs. 12-13 *nu Labarnan ... ēsri-sset newāh* 'renovate Labarnas' icon!'. In the earliest Hittite history Labarnas appears as the name or nameless title of the king and his designated successor.

A feminine pendant, regularly preceded by the sumerographic classifier for 'woman,' is ^{SAL}*Ta-wa-(an-)na-an-na-as*. It is generally thought to be an analogous queenly title, and in fact the two terms occur in tandem through much of Hittite history and literature, from royal seals to cult lists (e.g. *KUB* XI 4, 3-4 *ANA* ^{SAL}*Tawanna*[*nna* ...] *ANA* ^{LÚ}*Labarn*[*a*] to ritual contexts (e.g. *KBo* XXI 22 Vs. 18-20 *Labarnas ...* ^{SAL}*Tawanannas*). Even as the "solar" title ^{UTU} starts to eclipse Labarnas in latter Hittite, the feminine term remains, e.g. *KBo* XVII 88 III 21 ^{UTU}*-summi* ^{SAL}*Tawanannai* 'to our majesty and to T.' The pair also occurs in Palaic rituals, e.g. *KUB* XXXV 165 Vs. 5 *Tabarnas* ^{SAL}*Tawanannas*, *ibid.* Rs. 10 *Tabarnani* ^{SAL}*Tawanani*, *KBo* XIX 153 III 12 *Tabarni* ^{SAL}*Tawananni*, *KBo* XIX 152 I 17 *Tabarnai* ^{SAL}*Tawanannaya*. It is also present in Hattic-Hittite bilinguals,

e.g. KUB II 2 II 42 (Hatt.) *Tabarna katti*: *ibid.* 44 (Hitt.) *Labarnas* LUGAL-us; *ibid.* III 27 (and dupl. KBo XXI 110 Vs. 10-11) ^D*Wasül Tabarnan kätte*: *ibid.* 28-29 (Hitt.) *iyata tamēta Taba[rnai]* LUGAL-i; *ibid.* III 30 (Hatt.) ^{SAL}*Ta-wa-an-na-an-na-an ka-tah* (dupl. Vs. 12 ^{SAL}*Ta-wa-na-an-na-an kat-ta-ah*): *ibid.* 32 (Hitt.) ANA SAL.LU[GAL. Because of these relatively archaic rituals, and the known Hattic influence upon Palaic, the conventional wisdom is that the words *Tabarnas/Labarnas* and *Tawanannas* are Hattic in origin. Such was also the assumption in Shoshana Bin-Nun's monograph *The Tawananna in the Hittite Kingdom* (Heidelberg, 1975), although she started sweeping away certain cobwebs by arguing that Tawananna in early Hittite history was not a title of queenship. Since it is nevertheless paired with 'king' in seemingly early Hattic, Palaic, and Hittite rituals, Bin-Nun thought that Tawananna was in origin a priestly title of the Hattic ruler's queenly sister-wife, and that brother-sister marriage was compatible with both early Anatolian and invading Indo-European practice (as still in Hittite-period Hayasa [Armenia]), being only later proscribed by the Hittites. Despite appeals to mythic and legendary incest-marriage, from Zeus and Hera in Greece to Clothru and her brothers in Ireland, and Achaemenian and Hellenistic pockets of dynastic endogamy, Bin-Nun's sweeping thesis will not work for patriarchal, patrilocal, strongly exogamic early Indo-European social organization. This in spite of her undoubted merit in exorcising the ghosts of a postulated matrilineal or matrilineal social organization in early Hittite society, as promoted by Kaspar Riemschneider on certain Soviet Russian models. In order to understand just who Tawanannas originally was, a new overview is needed, which I shall attempt to supply.¹

The dynastic history of the Old Kingdom, as pieced together from the Annals and the Political Testament of Hattusilis I, the Edict of Telipinus, and various more fragmen-

1. Attestational data were stockpiled by Hatice Gonnet, "La titulature royale hittite au II^e millénaire avant J.-C.", *Hethitica* III (Louvain, 1979), 3-108. The article by Jacqueline Manessy-Guitton, "Les noms du roi en hittite", *Etudes indo-européennes* 21-24 (Lyon, 1987), 25-42, did little to advance the discussion.

tary records, begins with a figure whom Telipinus calls Labarnas and who Hattusilis refers to as *huhhas* 'grandfather'. Clearly the crown jumped a generation here, for Telipinus in his stereotyped litanies of the early rulers proceeds straight from Labarnas to Hattusilis. In his Testament Hattusilis makes some allusive reference to the intervening generation, mainly in terms of the trouble it saw and caused. He speaks of two sons of Labarnas who had been "led astray", a junior namesake whom Labarnas either designated as his successor against prevailing opposition or himself rusticated for being disloyal (depending on how one translates the verbal preterite *iskunahhis*, whether 'proclaimed' or 'demoted'), and Papahdilmah whom a rival faction installed as its candidate. Papahdilmah seems to have been successful; Hattusilis may have been his son. But it does not appear that those intervening sons actually reigned. Hattusilis never claims regal paternity, describing himself instead in the Annals (KBo X 2 I 3) as ŠA Tawannanna DUMU ŠEŠ-ŠU 'son of Tawannannas' brother'. Tawannannas was accordingly his paternal aunt, and consequently a daughter of king Labarnas. The invocation of her person as the definition of the king's filiation indicates that she was the link of legitimacy through the intermediate generation which had yielded no king, that in the absence of an immediate regal father Hattusilis had to define himself via his grandfather and the latter's daughter.

It thus appears that Tawannannas was originally a daughter of the sovereign who served as intermediary to succession whenever direct male descent failed. The title seems to have been an appointive, personal, lifetime one, in this respect resembling the Princess Royal in British court practice, who starts out as the sovereign's daughter but can live on to be the sister or even the aunt of succeeding rulers. The Tawannannas would normally provide for the succession by supplying the king with a grandson or a nephew, in Indo-European terms a *'népôt'*. In the case of Hattusilis' aunt she may herself have been childless but qualified to fill the dynastic lacuna with a nephew of her own. Further complexities, difficult to unravel and chronologize due to the allusive retrospection of the

Testament, mark the royal soap opera of Hattusilis' mature career. Styling himself Tabarna or Labarnas, and in the end stages of a long life, Hattusilis has finally settled on a successor and reflects ruefully on his earlier failures. Whatever sons he may have had were clearly not royal timber, and one of them, Huzziyas, was removed after turning rebellious. Hattusilis adopted the son of a sister and named him Labarnas, but later disowned him and states that the mother was a snake (*annas-sis* MUŠ-as; she does not seem to have been Tawanannas, probably because, like her brother Hattusilis, she had no royal father who could have made her that). But it looks like Hattusilis' own daughter did become Tawanannas, and had a son lined up for succession, before things once again turned sour with a vengeance. Not only was she banished, but on a grim tablet (*KBo* III 27) she earned the "snake" epithet as well (Vs. 27), coupled with a drastic *damnatio memoriae* (*ibid.* 6-10: "In the future let no one speak Tawanannas' name. Let no one speak her sons' and daughters' name. If any of the sons of Hatti speak them, they shall cut his throat and hang him at his gate"). So much for the much-touted humanity of the Hittites. It looks like Hattusilis' daughter had in the bargain given the entire Tawanannas-concept a bad name, and the old king had to circumvent her in designating the young Mursilis (evidently another son's son) as his successor. Henceforth the title Tawanannas disappears for a while from Hittite history, but the *de facto* influence of the king's sister or daughter remains and acquires new and sinister connotations. Mursilis himself had a sister Harapsilis, who might have been Tawanannas, except that she never had a royal father to appoint her, and besides the grandfather had banned the title. Rather than biding her chance, with some self-effacing mate, to serve as an incubation vessel for a potentially needed heir presumptive, Harapsilis conspired with her husband Hantilis. They killed Mursilis and took over as king and queen. This was of course a new departure, unconstitutional on top of being regicidal. In a sense it perpetuated nepotic succession, for an heir apparent would still be the son of the former king's sister. But any new son-in-law could also fancy replicating the pattern by murder-

ing the king and his male progeny, and taking his place. This is precisely what Hantilis' son-in-law Zidantas did. He had helped Hantilis and mother-in-law Harapsilis murder Mursilis, and managed to bide his time. But when Hantilis was on his last legs (*siunis kikkissūwan dāis*, literally 'began turning into a god'), Zidantas killed Hantilis' son Pisenis and the latter's sons, and became king. His own son Ammunas saw the pattern and, rather than waiting for some brother-in-law to rub him out, committed prophylactic parricide on Zidantas. It worked, for Ammunas (whose wife's name is incidentally recorded as Tawanna on the rosters of sacrifices to departed royalty) seems to have ruled extensively and expired without being murdered.

Ammunas was succeeded by his bastard son Huzziyas (a slave- or prostitute-born *pahhurzi*), after the clandestine murders of his presumable first and second heirs apparent, Tittis and Hantilis with their families. Huzziyas thereupon directed his murderous attentions to the First Sister, Istapariyas, and her husband Telipinus, but the latter managed to depose and banish him. Having thus become king after his father-in-law, thwarting a low-life intruder, but without murdering his predecessor or the latter's progeny, Telipinus in his Edict tried to salvage and constitutionalize the best of the brave new pattern, including the accession via marriage of which he had been the beneficiary, but to take murder out of the royal succession. Thus a first-rank queen-born son would be first in line, followed by a second-place concubine-born son, followed by a husband chosen for a first-rank daughter.

The Edict may have had long-range beneficial effects, but it looks as if in Telipinus' family there was murder as usual. Killing overtook both his wife Istapariyas and his son Ammunas (namesake of his maternal grandfather), and Telipinus was succeeded by his daughter Harapsekis, after an interlude involving the interloper Tahurwailis, another *pahhurzi* of the old Ammunas, whom Telipinus lists merely as a common conspirator, but whose treaty with Kizzuwatna (*KBo* XXVIII 109, 7 'Tahurwaili LUGAL.GAL) and great seal (*Bo* 69/200 *Tabarna Tahurwaili*) prove that he actually ruled.

After Telipinus the historical records fail, in the gap separating the Old and New Kingdoms. When they pick up again in the early days of the Empire, Hurrian names are in evidence in the royal family, as in the case of the wife of Tuthaliyas, Queen Nikalmati (SAL.LUGAL in *KBo* XX 34 Rs. 13). This royal pair were the parents of a son and a daughter. The son succeeded as king Arnuwandas I, while the daughter Ašmunikal seems to have been a beneficiary of the revived Tawanannas institution. In any event the great seal of this reigning brother-sister pair reads "Tabarna Arnuanta, Great King, son of Tuthaliya ... Tawananna Ašmunikal, Great Queen, daughter [of Nikalmati] and daughter of Tuthaliya". Ašmunikal also had her individual seal where she is termed "Great Queen, daughter of Nikalmati". The precedence or preponderance of metronymy stands out here as a new feature. Evidently Ašmunikal as Tawanannas became ruling queen after Nikalmati's death but before her brother's accession. This arrangement was a recipe for trouble. Unlike such self-effacing queens as Hastayar, wife of Hattusilis in the Old Kingdom, Nikalmati was clearly a meaningful partner of Tuthaliyas outside the purely procreative sphere, laying the foundations of marital regal teamwork. But their son came to have his sister rather than a wife as ruling queen. Succession does not seem to have been a problem, for the male line prevailed; the original purpose of the Tawanannas to be a standby for alternative nepotic progeny was either defunct or in abeyance, and only in the absence of a qualified male successor could she be of service under Telipinus' rule, to be given a husband who could be king. The Tawanannas position, which had been a lifetime, personal noninherited one for a king's daughter, was evidently used this once as a springboard to influence and eventual queenship for the royal daughter Ašmunikal, apparently in a power play by the Hurrian queen, Nikalmati, to insure two-pronged domination of the Hittite throne in both the male and the female line. It is not probable that Nikalmati singlehanded reached into an antiquarian bag of tricks to restore the Tawanannas. Most probably there was a Tawanannas already in the previous royal generation (of which we

know little), for Tuthaliyas seems to have had a sister, Ziplantawiyas who as potential or actual Tawanannas may have been undercut by wife Nikalmati, and who had fought back with sorcery against the royal couple, as is shown by an extant ritual of counter-magic (*KBo* XV 10).

We do not know what Arnuwandas thought of all this, nor what he did for a wife. At least another Tuthaliyas followed Arnuwandas, a second Hattusilis also lurks there somewhere, but the historical fog clears a bit only with the accession of Suppiluliumas around 1375. There is evidence in that interim of a queen Taduhepa, apparently a dowager whom Suppiluliumas inherited, perhaps a royal daughter who had been made Tawanannas and who subsequently had become ruling queen on the Ašmunikal model. In any event she was not Suppiluliumas' wife and disappears early in his reign, perhaps in the natural course of events. Suppiluliumas is also paired with a queen Hinti, who must have been his wife rather than a hand-me-down Tawanannas, for he cannot have inherited more than one of the latter in succession. Suppiluliumas' relationship to his predecessor is uncertain, but Hinti seems to have been of the royal line; perhaps Suppiluliumas acceded by marrying her under Telipinus' rules of succession. Hinti had not been Tawanannas (the position being filled by Taduhepa) and was hence easier to dispose of. Suppiluliumas ultimately banished her to Ahhiyawa. In mature years he married a Babylonian princess on whom he bestowed the title Tawananna and whose real name is not known (unless it be the hapax Malnigal). Her seal at Boğazköy reads simply ^{SAL}Tawananna SAL.LUGAL GAL, and his and her joint seal impression found at Ugarit has her down as ^{SAL}Tawananna SAL.LUGAL GAL DUMU.SAL LUGAL ^{KUR}KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{KI} 'T., great queen, daughter of the king of Babylonia'. This was clearly another radical breach of tradition, but Suppiluliumas made it stick, leaving this quarrelsome and covetous foreign Tawanannas for his sons to handle. Mursilis II, who attained the kingship in suspiciously short order after the deaths of his older brothers Arnuwandas II, Telipinus, and Šarri-Kušuh, accused her of causing the death of his wife Gassulawiyas and assembled

dossiers of her wrongdoing, from curses, slanders, and sorcery to stealing silverware; he finally brought her down by legal proceedings. Another queen of mysterious origin, Tanuhepa, floats through the reigns of Mursilis II, his son Muwatallis, and the latter's hapless son Urhi-Tesub or Mursilis III, before being at length deposed and apparently killed. It is not clear how she got going as ruling queen for life, but in view of Suppiluliumas' precedent it can hardly have been other than as a royal consort of Mursilis II. That precedent was certainly honored by Urhi-Tesub's uncle and usurping successor Hattusilis III, who had married a Hurrian priest's daughter, Puduhepa, and was enthroned jointly with her. She is the most famous of Hittite ruling queens, influential enough to participate actively in foreign affairs, affixing her own seal to the peace treaty with Egypt recorded at Karnak. But she is never referred to as Tawananna on seals; the title may have fallen into obsolescence in the wake of the Babylonian woman, unless its use was merely haphazard, even as Suppiluliumas and Mursilis II did not employ the designation Tabarna. After Puduhepa nothing more is heard of Hittite queens during the last kings Tuthaliyas III, Arnuwandas III, and Suppiluliumas II.

Tawanannas thus started out as a king's formally designated First Daughter (not necessarily the eldest), the one who would secure dynastic succession via a grandson of the king in case the immediate male line faltered. To this end she was installed *sine die*, in fact for life, and could hence end up as the sister or aunt of subsequent male-line rulers, or as mother of her own ruling progeny. Such a system would work well only with saintly and devoted daughters and sisters; in the Hittite instance it faltered early on, with the disloyalties of the sister and daughter of Hattusilis I and the murderous bent of the sister and brother-in-law of Mursilis I. The regicidal period twisted the discredited institution into passing the throne down via marriage in the female line (as in Egypt), until that was mitigated and regulated in the Edict of Telipinus. In the early days of the New Kingdom the attempt to revitalize the formal role of Tawanannas was apparently fueled by Hurrian-based

tendencies to brother-sister rule, but these were drastically cut short by Suppiluliumas who imported an alien wife as queen, made her Tawanannas by a kind of constitutional coup, and equated the lifetime position with wifehood and queenship, thereby destroying its distinctiveness.

What is the source of the Tawanannas institution? It can of course be foisted on some kind of Hattic antecedents, as any *obscura* can be explicated *per obscuriora*. But caution is in order. If a Hittite royal name is mentioned in a Hattic-Hittite bilingual ritual, this does not automatically make it Hattic, for Hittite kings are involved, not Hattic royalty. Even *Hattusilis* (though based on a Hattic-origin toponym) is no more "Hattic" than *e.g.* *karuilis* 'former, ancient' or *Hantilis* 'Foremost' or *Suppiluliumas* 'Holywell'. The royal aristocracy was of Indo-European extraction and from the Old Kingdom onward had strictures against half-breed *pahhurzes* as royal pretenders, recalling the *ārya: śūdra* dichotomy in India (*e.g.* Prince Vidura in the *Mahābhārata*, son of a *śūdrā* mother, was disqualified from kingship despite being an avatar of the god Dharma). Therefore, despite Hattic elements in the ritual sphere of kingship (*e.g.* the deified throne *Halmasuiz*), it is less likely that the personal titles were Hattic, which was the language of the religious rather than the aristocratic or legal sphere.

Could Tabarnas and Tawanannas be Indo-European? It is always perilous to apply genetic reconstruction to family structures, keeping in mind that the model which best fits the postulated Indo-European situation goes by the typological name of "Omaha III". But the nepotic angle in royal genealogy, including the skewing of generations from "daughter's son" to "sister's son", and the pivotal role of a king's daughter for dynastic welfare, are well known in other ancient Indo-European traditions. The theme of the daughter as validator of royal succession is paralleled notably in Celtic lore, in the very Irish sagas that Bin-Nun tried to use to cement the idea of brother-sister marriage. There the high king Eochaid of Tara is threatened by his sons, but his daughter Clothru saves him by carnal intervention which not only neutralizes the sons but

gives the king a grandson to carry on the line. Clothru is but a filial variant of Eochaid's quintessential daughter Medb, the transgenerational mainspring of royal power, who confers and assures dynastic continuity by marrying successive pretenders. The Celtic princesses perform under idealized saga conditions what the Tawanannas were originally there for but mostly botched in early Hittite history.

In any event *Tabarnas* and *Tawanannas* can be formally explained as Indo-European. For the first a reconstruction **Dhabhronos* has already been suggested by Heiner Eichner (in H. Rix [ed.], *Flexion und Wortbildung* [Wiesbaden, 1975], 81), tied in with the denominative verb *tapariya-* 'be in charge, command', compared with OCS *dobrŭ* 'ἀγαθός, καλός' and Latin *faber*, Armenian *darbin* 'smith', and translated as 'Herr über die Tüchtigen', with the Indo-European "Herrschersuffix" *-no-* as in Latin *dominus*. I would modify that to the heroic or divine augmentative suffix seen in e.g. Latin *Quirīnus* and *Neptūnus* and in the Germanic **Wātōnos* which yielded the Norse *Óðinn*. *Tabarnas* thus means simply 'The Brave'², with the suffix attested not only in Armenian *darbin* (< **dhabhrinos*) but also in the Russian name of *bogatŭri Dobrynja* (< **Dhabhrŭnyo-*); cf. e.g. *Perynja* designating Perŭn's hill sanctuary at Novgorod, incidentally established by Dobrynja, uncle to the Vladimir who was styled 'the Sun' much like the Hittite kings more than two millennia earlier. There is also the family name *Dobrŭnin*, formed like *Seljanŭn* 'Peasant'.³

Tawananna can be traced back to **Dowonōnā* with the same kind of augmentative suffix, seen in e.g. Latin *Bellōna* or Celtic *Mātrōna* 'Mother' or **Rīgantōna* 'Queen' (Welsh *Rhiannon*). It is derived from **dowono-*, ablaut variant of **dwenō-* attested in

2. Once frozen as a title, *Tabarnas* (LUGAL-us) was succeeded as a living descriptive epithet by *hastali-* 'brave, heroic' in the stereotypical combination UR.SAG-(l)is LUGAL-us 'heroic king'.

3. Johann Tischler's article "Labarna" (*Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag* [Wiesbaden, 1988], 347-358) argued for primacy of an etymologically opaque *Labarna-* and influence of the verb *tapar-* on the secondary phonetic variant *Tabarna-*. This is neither enlightening nor helpful; where fluctuation obtains, *d > l* is much more common than the reverse (cf. e.g. *lingua*, *Ulysses*).

Latin *bene*, *bonus*, cognate further with *beāre* 'to favor, to bless' (< **dweyā-*) and with Vedic *dúvas-* 'gift, honor'. Such a **dowono-* is actually attested in Hittite in the adverbially used neuter plural adjective *ta-a-wa-na* which means 'well' like *āssu* and Latin *bene* (KUB XXIII 72 Vs. 47, and especially Rs. 24: ANA ^DUTU-ŠI *tāwana hatrānzi wahnuwanzi-ma-at-kan ŪL* 'they report [it] well in writing to my majesty and do not distort it'). A Latin equivalent of *Tawananna* would have been **Bonōna* (cf. *Bonōnia* > *Bologna*), and the meaning is thus approximately 'Beata' or 'La Favorita', not inappropriate for a special royal daughter. It is hence entirely conceivable that Indo-European regal titles survived in Hittite and were subjected to new vicissitudes in their Anatolian environment.