

On Labiovelars in Hittite Author(s): Jaan Puhvel

Source: Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 94, No. 3 (Jul. - Sep., 1974), pp. 291-

295

Published by: American Oriental Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/600063

Accessed: 02/03/2011 11:58

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <a href="http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publish

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Journal of the American Oriental Society.

ON LABIOVELARS IN HITTITE

JAAN PUHVEL

University of California, Los Angeles

The Indo-European labiovelars were preserved in Hittite in all positions, including the preconsonantal one, except for the delabialization of the initial media (* g^w -> /g-/). A strict application of the so-called Sturtevant's Law in etymological postulations, coupled with a new sifting of the evidence, provides an inventory of the reflexes of all three Indo-European orders of labiovelars in most positions. The standard connection of Hitt. šakuwa 'eyes' with Gothic sathwan 'see', etc., is rejected; šakui- /zag*i-/ and Luwian tawi- /dawi-/ 'eye' are reconstructed as a Proto-Anatolian * $dyag^w$ i-, pointing to an IE * $dhyogh^w$ - or * $dhyagh^w$ -seen also in Gk. $\sigma \acute{a}\varphi a$ 'clearly', $\sigma o\varphi \acute{o}\varsigma$ 'insightful, wise'. The delabialization of * g^w - is seen as the converse of the situation in other Indo-European languages, where precisely the media shows the most pronounced tendencies to full labialization.

THE HITTITE OUTCOME of the Indo-European labiovelar stop series is still hazy and confused. E. H. Sturtevant¹ postulated in his "Indo-Hittite" rewrite basic retention of labiovelarity for the tenuis (kwis: Lat. quis), except when delabialized by dissimilation (hwek-), but assumed regular develarization of the prevocalic media and aspirate. Yet later² Sturtevant himself withdrew the etymologies which alleged that "IH gw and g'w (read: IE * q^w and qh^w) yielded Hitt. w," and their survival in H. Kronasser's work3 is merely a sign of sad superannuation, with comparisons such as wemiyazi 'find': Gk. βαίνω 'come'; walahzi 'strike': Gk. βάλλω 'throw'; huelpi- 'young animal': Gk. $\delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi \acute{v}_{\varsigma}$ 'womb'; huitar 'wildlife': Gk. βίος 'life'; warani 'burn': Gk. θερμός 'warm'. The same is true of Kronasser's perpetuation of Sturtevant's related idea that wenzi 'rape' is the true outcome of IE *ghwen- 'smite', whereas 3 sg. kuenzi 'kill' is a back-formation from 3 pl. kunanzi, with analogical restoration of the labiovelar. The notion, also endorsed by H. Pedersen,4 that the prevocalic Hittite labiovelar reflex was /kw/ (or $/g^{w}/$, the latter from $*g^{w}$ and $*gh^{w}$ and possibly subject to develarization to w), whereas the preconsonantal one was a vocalized /ku/ (or /gu/), can in my view not be upheld. It seems plausible that labiovelars were preserved in Hittite also in preconsonantal positions, and that *kunanzi* thus represents /gwnantsi/; in this respect Hittite behaves like Greek (- $\nu\iota\psi$ < *- nig^w s) and unlike preconsonantally delabializing languages such as Latin ($nix < *snigh^w$ s). F. O. Lindeman⁵ has considered the same question and reaches a similar conclusion.

I likewise submit that the so-called Sturtevant's Law, in both its parts (Hittite intervocalic double writing points to Indo-European tenuis, and conversely consistent single spelling indicates Indo-European media or aspirate), is not to be disregarded in etymological postulations. It has been fashionable to make light of it, as did, e.g., Kronasser, but he also purposely blinded himself to other important signposts in Hittite, such as the laryngeals. I therefore believe that the standard comparison of Hitt. šakuwa 'eyes' with Goth. saihwan 'see' (and from there with either s-movable + IE * ok^{w} - 'see', or with IE * sek^{w} - 'follow') is flawed beyond redemption. Likewise, the muchdebated ekuzi 'drink' cannot contain IE $*k^w$; the old connection with Lat. aqua 'water', going back to B. Hrozný, consistently contradicted by E. Benveniste,6 and even doubted7 but lately reem-

¹ Language 6 (1930), 218-228; A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language (Philadelphia, 1933), 119-124.

 $^{^2}$ A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language, revised edition (New Haven, 1951), 57.

³ Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen (Heidelberg, 1956), 67.

⁴ Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen (Copenhagen, 1938), 174.

⁵ Revue hittite et asiatique (abbrev. RHA) 23 (1965), 29-32.

⁶ E.g. Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris (abbrev. BSL) 33 (1932), 142; Hittite et indo-européen (Paris, 1962), 96.

⁷ Op. cit. 47.

braced⁸ by Kronasser, must be finally rejected. By corollary, no credence need be given such latter-day alternatives as V. Pisani's combination of *eku*- with his newly-isolated Sanskrit root *ac*-'draw (water)'.⁹ Other etymologies, assuming a voiced labiovelar, must be found for *ekuzi* and *sakuwa*.¹⁰

In the sequel I will give what seem to me cogent instances of the Hittite reflexes of $*k^w$, $*g^w$, and $*gh^w$ respectively, in both initial and medial positions.

Initial prevocalic $*k^w$ is not controversial, in view of the incontrovertible series of reflexes of * k^wi -, * k^wo - exemplified by kuis / k^wis /, kuwat /kwad/, and kuwapi /kwabi/ ('who', 'why', and 'whither, when' respectively; cf. Lat. quis, quod, [-c]ubi). Of expected intervocalic -kku(w)- I have no case so far, but medial preconsonantal *- k^w is present in nekut- /nekwt-/ 'evening', nekuz mehur 'eventide, in the evening', nekuz(z)i 'evening falls'. The Greek cognate should have shown * $v \acute{o} \psi$ from IE * $nok^w ts$, but instead manifests its retention of preconsonantal labiovelarity by anticipatory labialization of the vowel in $v \dot{v} \xi$ (this is the prefigurative coloration analogous to the postfigurative absorption of labiality in, e.g., $\gamma v v \dot{\eta}$ vs. Boeotian $\beta \alpha v \dot{\alpha} < *g^w n n \dot{\alpha}$). Another example of a medial preconsonantal *- k^w - may be seen in tekkuššai-/dekwsai-/, tekkuš(ša)nu-/dekwsnu-/ 'show, present', if cognate with Avest. daxš- 'teach', daxšta- 'sign, characteristic'. The Avestan words are otherwise isolated (unrelated to Skt. dákṣ- 'be able', daśasyáti 'oblige, serve,' Lat. decus, IE *dek-) but point clearly to a labiovelar (cf. the homophone Avest. daxša- 'conflagration' < IE *dhegh*-), whereas the standard comparison of $tekku\check{s}(\check{s})$ - with IE * $dey\hat{k}$ - 'point, show' must operate with an unexplained suffixal *-us-.

Medial prevocalic *- k^w - (or possibly *-kw-, which can be expected to yield an indistinguishable

reflex in Hittite) after r is seen in tarku(wai)-'dance', 3 sg. tarkuzi, 3 pl. tarkuwanzi, iterative tarkuišk-. The basic stem is thus /tarkw-/, forming a primary verb form from a probable IE *ter-kwwhich can be seen also in Toch. B tärk- 'turn', Lat. $torque\bar{o}$ (causative * $tork^w\acute{e}y\bar{o}$) 'twist', and perhaps Mycen. to-ro-qe-jo-me-no. The alternative reconstruction connects Skt. tarkú-, Gk. ἄτρακτος 'spindle', and a variety of nouns in other languages with a presumable root-meaning of 'twist' (OCS trakŭ 'belt, strap', Toch. A. tark- 'earring'), and introduces the "pure velar" problem (*k plus a potential noun formant *u) and derivational aporia: Hitt. tarkuwai- and Lat. torqueō would have to be explained as denominative. perhaps *trku-āye- and *trku-eye- respectively, while Hitt. tarkuzi has to be lamely described as "quasi-denominative". The very attestation of the primary verb in Hittite, silently supported by Toch. B tärk-, argues for IE *terkw-.

Initial $*g^w$ seems to be regularly delabialized before vowels and r; in support of this contention stand the following etymologies:

kištari /gistari/ 'be extinguished', from IE *gwes-; cf. Skt. jásate 'be exhausted', Toch. AB käs- '(be) quench(ed)', Lith. gèsti 'be extinguished', Goth. qistjan 'ruin', etc. This item was a puzzle to both Sturtevant and Kronasser, 12 but it does not stand alone, since it bears connecting with kašt- /gast-/ 'hunger', kišduwant- 'hungry', kištant- 'famine', kištanziya- 'suffer famine'; cf. Toch. A kaṣt, B kest 'hunger', OHG quist 'destruction'. For the Hittite a: e ablaut, cf., e.g., Gk. $\sigma \beta \tilde{\omega} \sigma \alpha \iota$: $\sigma \beta \acute{\varepsilon} \sigma \iota \varsigma$, and for the meaning, Lat. sitis 'thirst': Gk. $\sigma \theta l \sigma \iota \varsigma$ 'wasting', Skt. kṣiti- 'destruction'.

karapi /grabi/, 3 pl. karipanzi /gribant⁸i/ 'devour, consume, destroy', from IE *g*r-ébh-, seen in Gk. (Hesych.) βράπτειν · ἐσθίειν, Lith. gróbas 'gut', besides *g*r-ógh- in Engl. craw, OIr. brāgae 'neck', and *g*vér-H- in Skt. giráti 'devour', Gk. -βόρος 'devouring', Lith. gérti 'drink', etc. ¹³

kariyazi /gariyat⁸i/ 'stop, pause, rest', karuššiyazi /garusiyat⁸i/ 'fall silent, acquiesce'; cf. Lith. gùrstu 'subside, die down', Toch. A. kur-, B kwär-'become feeble, age', Goth. qairrus 'gentle', Armen. aorist koreay 'die out'. 14

⁸ Acta Baltico-Slavica 3 (1966), 77-78.

⁹ Pratidānam presented to F. B. J. Kuiper (The Hague, 1968), 102.

¹⁰ In his recent discussion, "Aspects du consonantisme hittite. 3. La règle de Sturtevant et le consonantisme du hittite," Hethitica .1 (Louvain, 1972), 86-128, G. Jucquois lists "exceptions" to the rule (90-95), including ekuzi and šakuwa, but readily admits that "tant la valeur de la règle que le poids des exceptions dépend essentiellement dans ce cas-ci de la qualité des étymologies proposées."

¹¹ A. Goetze, Language 27 (1951), 471.

¹² E. H. Sturtevant, A Comparative Grammar (1933), 122; H. Kronasser, op. cit. 66.

¹³ Cf. B. Čop, Linguistica 5 (Ljubljana, 1964), 42.

¹⁴ Cf. B. Čop, Univerza v Ljubljani, Zbornik Filozofske fakultete 2 (1955), 393-397; Linguistica 6 (1964), 69.

It seems to me that these examples cannot be lightly dismissed, and that thus the normal outcome of initial $*g^w$ - is /g-/.

Medial preconsonantal *-gw- is found in nekumant- /negwmant-/ 'naked', nekumantai- 'disrobe', nikumandariya- 'lay bare'. There is additionally the curious variant (KUB XXI 18 IV 10) ašiwantatar nekmuntatar, matched in the Akkadian parallel text (KBo I 1 Rs. 63) by muškinutta u errišutta 'poverty and denudation'. nekumant-/nekmunt- probably represent dissimilatory dislocations of a *negwno- suffixed by -nt-, comparable to Skt. nagná-, Gk. $\gamma v \mu v \delta \zeta$, with the same unique e-grade vocalism as in nekut-, vs. *nogw- in the rest of Indo-European. Gk. $\gamma v \mu v \delta \zeta$ is metathetic from *mogwnós (cf. Avest. mayna-) < *nogwnós, with the same anticipatory absorption of labiality as in $v \delta \xi$. 17

Medial prevocalic *- g^w - after r is attested in tarkuwa- 'glaring, baleful, fierce', e.g., in the expression (KUB XXIV 7 III 20-21) arha tarkuwa austa 'looked glaringly', with nom.-acc. plur. neuter used as adverb or inner accusative; tarkuwant- of the same meaning (tarkuwanda IGI.HI.Awa 'baleful eyes'); tarkuwalliya- 'glare at, glower at', e.g., UR.MAH mahhan arha tarkuwalliskinun 'I kept glowering like a lion' (KBo X 2 III 1-2, matched by -|aklamušu 'I frowned at' in the Akkadian version $KBo \times 1 \text{ Rs. } 3$), or the verbal noun targulliyauwar (KBo XIII 1 I 48, glossed by Sumer. IGI.HUS 'raging eye' and Akkad. nekelmū).18 The etymon of tarkuwa- is seen in Skt. tárjati 'threaten', Gk. τάρβος 'alarm, terror', and Lat. torvus 'staring, fierce'. Particularly striking are the usage parallels between Hittite and Latin: tarkuwa aušta: torva tuentem (Vergil,

Aeneid 6.467); UR.MAH mahhan tarkuwalliškinun: torva leaena (Vergil, Ecloques 2.63). A potential problem is the derivation of torvus from IE * $terg^{w}$ - ($v < *g^{w}$ after r and before vowel). since the parallel post-nasal position shows retention of velar occlusion (inguen, unguen vs. Gk. $d\delta \dot{\eta} v$, Skt. $a\tilde{n}j$ -). Yet this difficulty has not fazed numerous authorities from endorsing the connection.19 Even if the problem is valid, as arguō may indicate (see below), it need not apply to torvus, since most probably torvus represents the weak grade * trg^w - (like Gk. $\tau\acute{a}\rho\beta o\varsigma$) with onetime intersyllabic *- g^w - which may in pre-Latin have passed to *-w- after *r (unlike after *n). There is no contradiction in M. Leumann's (loc. cit.) alleged parallel example ervum 'vetch' which he pairs with Gk. $\delta \rho o \beta o \varsigma$ 'vetch', since an *er(o) g^{wom} also shows one-time intervocalic position of *- g^w -; but the words are probably "Mediterranean" in origin and only marginally relevant to Indo-European phonology. The important matter is that tarkuwa- has found solid Indo-European integration, and that its integrity vis-à-vis tarku(wai)-'dance' is now beyond question.20

E. Laroche²¹ has well demonstrated that the meaning of arkuwai- and arkuwar is not simply 'pray' and 'prayer', but rather 'plead, exculpate oneself' and 'plea, apology' respectively. Laroche suggests that the etymon is to be sought in Lat. arguō 'assert, prove, accuse', argumentum 'representation, proof', pointing to an IE *araw. and that the trite standard connection of arquō with argentum 'silver' (i.e., 'shining, clear') leaves to be desired. Already J. Duchesne-Guillemin²² connected arkuwai- with arguō but was not ready to ditch the routine etymology and remained puzzled by the parallel presence of Hitt. harki- 'white' with laryngeal, the true cognate of argentum. Lat. $argu\bar{o}$ shows that prevocalic *- g^w is not deoccluded after consonantal r, unlike torvus $(< *trg^wos)$ which we studied above.

¹⁵ Cf. E. Laroche, in *Ugaritica* VI (Paris, 1969), 371.
16 Cf. F. O. Lindeman, *RHA* 23 (1965), 32; W. Cowgill, in W. Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeals* (The Hague, 1965), 156.

¹⁷ I prefer this formulation of the pre-labiovelar coloration to E. P. Hamp's more sweeping "rule" (Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society [1970], 486-487; Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 29 [1971], 72), "o > v after nasal and before a rounded consonant" (\ref{ovu}), \ref{ovv} , \ref{ovv} , \ref{ovv} , \ref{ovv} , etc.). The parallelism with the post-labiovelar vowel coloration in \ref{ovvv} should not be ignored.

 $^{^{18}}$ Cf. F. Imparati and C. Saporetti, Studi classici e orientali 14 (1965), 50, 79; H. Otten and W. von Soden, Das akkadisch-hethitische Vokabular KBo I 44 + KBo XIII 1 (StBoT 7, Wiesbaden 1968), 10, 14.

¹⁹ E.g. A. Meillet, Mémoires de la Société de linguistique
13 (1905-6), 216-217; F. Sommer, Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre (Heidelberg, 1914), 186;
M. Leumann, Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.2.1, München 1963), 125.
20 Cf. G. Neumann, Indogermanische Forschungen 76 (1971), 262.

²¹ École Pratique des Hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses, Annuaire 72 (1964-65), 13-20; Revue de philologie 42 (1968), 242-243.

²² Transactions of the Philological Society (1946), 85.

As I remarked above in discussing tarku(wai)'dance', sequences of guttural +w are hard to
distinguish in treatment from labiovelars and thus
afford supportive data for the Hittite reflexes of
the latter. In the case of the media, danku(wa)i'dark' was connected with IE *dhengwo- seen in
ON dokkr 'dark' already by E. Benveniste.²³ It
is thus likely that medial post-nasal prevocalic
* $-g^w$ - would also appear as -ku(w)- in Hittite. Of
intervocalic * $-g^w$ - I have no case, any more than
with * $-k^w$ -; one would likewise expect -ku(w)-.

We come now to *ghw. The initial of kuenzi /gwentsi/ 'kill', 3 pl. kunanzi /gwnantsi/, from IE *ghwen- (Gk. $\theta \varepsilon i v \omega$, $\varphi \delta v o \varsigma$, Skt. hánti, etc.) affords firm evidence of word-initial treatment. Medial attestation is of brittler kind. Post-nasal prevocalic development is indirectly inferrable from šanku(wa)i- 'fingernail', in case it contains s-movable + *ongh-w- seen in Lat. unguis. Intervocalic and medial preconsonantal *-ghw- can be isolated by fresh etymological approaches to ekuzi and šakuwa.

ekuzi /egwtsi/ 'drink', 3 pl. akuwanzi /agwantsi/, has been plausibly connected with Toch. AB yok- 'drink' ever since H. Pedersen,24 but Tocharian leaves us in the lurch regarding both series and order of the guttural stop. The plausible tertium of this comparison was, however, adduced by A. Juret,25 viz. Lat. ēbrius (<*ēghwriyos) 'drunk', and was ably upheld by W. Winter;26 to me it seems by far the best solution of the etymology of ekuzi. In the iterative akkušk- /akw-sk-/ the double spelling of the guttural stop is a mark of its morphophonemic unvoicing before s in a new derivative conjugation stem, whereas in ekuzi /egwtsi/ the probable phonetic [kw] was merely a conditioned paradigmatic variant of /gw/. We may also note F. O. Lindeman's suggestion²⁷ that the "odd" allographs e-ukzi and 3 sg. pret. e-uk-ta are simply alternative attempts at expressing [ekwt-].

For šakuwa /sagwa/ 'eyes' I will try a wholly new tack. It looks like a neuter plural, possibly

hiding an old animate dual, but a singular is found in nom. IGI.HI.A-iš (KUB XXXIV 85, 7), acc. IGI.HI.A-in (KUB XXXIII 113 I 11), and especially in KUB XII 58 I 12 šakuiš²⁸ which means 'spring, fountain', just as do words for 'eye' in Semitic also (e.g. Akkad. inu[m]). The variant form which always means 'fountain' is šakuni-/sagwni-/,29 and the verb 'well up' is a denominative šakuniya-, vs. šakuwai- 'watch, observe'. The Luwian for 'eye' is tawi-, nom. sg. da-a-u-i-iš (KUB XXXV 49 IV 9), nom.-acc. pl. neut. da-au-wa (KBo VII 38 I 1 and II 15), genitival adjective tauwašši- 'of the eye, ocular'.30 Luwian has a proneness to lose guttural articulations (e.g., initially in iššari-, Lycian izre-, vs. Hitt. keššera-'hand'),31 including the guttural component of labiovelars (e.g., medially after r in tarwai- vs. Hitt. tarkuwai- 'dance', iterative tarwišk- vs. tarkuišk-).32 Assuming the same variation in inter-

²³ BSL 33 (1932), 142. E. Laroche, RHA 28 (1970), 54, posits * $dhng^w$ - as the reconstruction of dankui- and Germ. dunkel, without motivating the IE labiovelar (rather than *g + w).

²⁴ Le groupement des dialectes indo-européens (Copenhagen, 1925), 40-41.

²⁵ RHA 2 (1934), 251-252.

²⁶ Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 72 (1955), 161-175.

²⁷ RHA 23 (1965), 31.

²⁸ Cf. A. Goetze, The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi (New Haven, 1938), 6.

²⁹ Cf. H. Kronasser, Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache, vol. 1 (Wiesbaden, 1966), 124. B. Čop, Zbornik (see fn. 14) 2 (1955), 399-402, has a separate but improbable etymology for šakuni-, viz. * $s(w)ok^wo-$, cf. Gk. $\delta\pi\delta\varsigma$, OCS $sok\tilde{u}$ 'juice'; cf. Linguistica 5 (1964), 34.

³⁰ Cf. E. Laroche, Dictionnaire de la langue louvite (Paris, 1959), 96; RHA 16 (1958), 106-109; P. Meriggi, Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 53 (1957), 194; RHA 18 (1960), 92; B. Čop, Linguistica 5 (1964), 35-36; 7 (1965), 102-103.

³¹ This phenomenon was discussed by E. Laroche in BSL 58.1 (1963), 79, who tried to pin it down to a palatal environment (cf., e.g., Hitt. kimra-, mekki- with Luw. imri-, mai-) but exempted the labiovelars (Hitt. kui-: Luw. kui-) and paid no heed to orders of stops. Laroche was disputed by V. Ivanov, Symbolae linguisticae in honorem Georgii Kurylowicz (Wrocław, 1965), 131-134, who pointed out retention pairs such as Hitt. kišai-: Luw. kiša-, and assumed instead that IE *ĝh was the specific guttural subject to elimination in Luwian. Neither formula does full justice to all the data. A later inconclusive review of the material is found in B. Čop, Indogermanica minora, I (Slovenska Akademija Znanosti in Umetnosti, Razred za Filološke in Literarne Vede, Razprave VIII, Ljubljana 1971), 1-29.

³² Cf. G. Jucquois, Orbis 16 (1967), 175-176; this example happens to involve the voiceless variety. G. Neumann, Untersuchungen zum Weiterleben hethitischen und luwischen Sprachgutes in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit (Wiesbaden, 1961), 53, has also adduced aruwai- 'adore, worship' vs. arkuwai- 'pray'; but what was said

vocalic position, tawi- may be equated with Hitt. šakui- in the same way as Luwian tiwat- 'sun' belongs with Hitt. šiwatt- 'day'. The latter word group, including Hitt. šiu(ni)-, šiwanni- 'god' (Lydian \(\frac{1}{ivs}\), \(\frac{8}{iunali}\)- 'divine' (KBo X 24 III 14; Lyd. \(\gammaivalis\), 33 and a siwant- 'poor' ('unrich', cf. Lat. dives 'rich'),34 goes back to IE *dyew-. Thus Hittite \dot{s} and Luwian t stand for the voiced palatalization product of *dy, and significantly this s, when medial, is spelled singly in ašiwant-; something like phonetic [z] or [dz] or [ž] may be postulated for Hittite.³⁶ Analogously šakui- /zagwi-/ and tawi- /dawi-/ should point to a Proto-Anatolian *dyagwi-, which in its turn could be an IE * $dyog^w$ - or * $dhyogh^w$ -. The phonetic parallel with Gk. $Z\varepsilon\dot{v}_{\zeta}$, dialectally $\Delta\varepsilon\dot{v}_{\zeta}$ ($<*\Delta_{\iota}\varepsilon\dot{v}_{\zeta}$) is obvious, as is the voiceless dental analogue $\delta\sigma\sigma\varsigma$,

above about the true meaning of arkuwai- ('plead') and its etymology (Lat. arguō) places the comparison in jeopardy, including the alleged connection with an IE *erkw- (Skt. arc-, etc.). Cf. also the fluctuation in words such as Hitt. lala(k)ueša- 'ant'. A trend to deocclude the guttural is spotted in Luw. mannahunna- vs. Hitt. maninkuant- 'short', and in Palaic ahu- vs. Hitt. eku- 'drink'.

³³ The Lydian "arrow" sign is transliterated as c in R. Gusmani, *Lydisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1964), 29, 32-33.

³⁴ Cf. G. Jucquois, *RHA* 22 (1964), 87-89; E. Laroche, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21 (1967), 174; O. Szemerényi, *Kratylos* 11 (1966), 218.

35 The formula *dyew-> siw- is preferable to *di-> si-($\dot{s} = [z]$ or $[d^z]$), as suggested by e.g. J. Kurylowicz, Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists (Oslo, 1958), 223. N. van Brock, Glotta 46 (1968), 118, suggests a development *dyu-> * $\dot{s}u$ -> (analogical) $\dot{s}iu$ - in $\dot{s}iu(n)$ -, vs. * $\dot{d}iw$ -> (analogical) $\dot{s}iw$ - in $\dot{s}iwatt$ -, $\dot{s}iwann$ -.

36 Cf. also E. Benveniste, Hittite et indo-européen (Paris, 1962), 8-9.

Cretan $\delta \tau \tau \sigma \varsigma$ (< $*\delta \tau \iota \sigma \varsigma$), or $\mu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \varsigma$, Boeotian $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \tau \tau o \varsigma$ (< * $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \theta \iota o \varsigma$). Opting for the formula * $dhyogh^w$ - (or, for that matter, * $dhyagh^w$ -), I propose as cognates the Homeric $\sigma \acute{a} \varphi a$ 'clearly', the later adjective $\sigma \alpha \varphi \eta \zeta$ 'clear', and the Homeric $\sigma o \varphi i \eta \varsigma$ (hapax, genitive, *Iliad* 15.412) 'insight, skill', with adjective $\sigma o \varphi \delta \zeta$ 'wise' (first attested in Hesiod). $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \varphi a$ is formed like, e.g., $\sigma \tilde{\iota} \gamma a$ 'silently'. The idea of 'sight' is inherent in these words, even down to the translation of $\sigma o \phi i \alpha$ as Latin prudentia (*pro-vid-) as one of the cardinal virtues. Formally the correspondence is sound: Initial * $\theta\iota$ - in $\sigma\acute{a}\varphi\alpha$ or $\sigma\~{\eta}\mu\alpha$ (Skt. dhy $\'{a}man$ -) is to medial *- θ_{i} - in $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \sigma o \varsigma$ (Hom. partly $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma o \varsigma$) what initial $\tau \iota$ - in $\sigma \dot{\epsilon} \beta \alpha \varsigma$ (Skt. $ty \dot{\alpha} j a t i$) is to medial *- τ_{l} - in $\ddot{\theta}\sigma\sigma\varsigma$ (Hom. partly $\ddot{\theta}\sigma\sigma\sigma\varsigma$). The guttural analogue * $\kappa \iota$ - is seen in $\sigma \tilde{\eta} \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ 'this year' (Attic $\tau \tilde{\eta} \tau \varepsilon \zeta$, Mycen. za-we-te) and $\sigma \varepsilon \acute{v} o \mu \alpha \iota$ 'rush' (Hom. ἔσσυτο, λαο-σσόος 'host-prodding'; Skt. cyávate, άcyuta), the * τF - parallel in σ άχος 'shield' (Hesiod, Scutum 13 $\varphi \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon - \sigma \sigma \alpha \varkappa \dot{\eta} \varsigma$ 'shield-bearing'; Skt. tvác- 'skin', Hitt. tuekka- 'body') and σείω 'shake' (Hesiod, Scutum 54 δορυ-σσόος 'shakespear'; Skt. tvésati). σάφα and σοφία have hitherto been notoriously unexplained, and I hope that their combination with Hitt. šakui- and Luw. tawi- in a reconstruction *dhyoghw- or *dhyaghw- will be found of interest to Hellenists, Anatolianists, and Indo-Europeanists alike. The root meaning obviously has to do with clarity, limpidity, and translucency.

In conclusion, we have found that labiovelars remain intact in Hittite in all positions, except for the delabialization of the initial media. We might note that the Hittite situation is the converse of that in Old Irish and non-Aeolic Greek, where precisely the media (* g^w) shows the most pronounced tendencies to full labialization (OIr. ben, Gk. $\beta io\varsigma$, etc.), whereas the tenuis and the aspirate are delabialized in all (OIr. cethir, gonaid) or some (Gk. $\tau i\varsigma$, $\theta \varepsilon iv\omega$) environments.