A. Shatskov

Some remarks on Hittite infix verbs of the type *harni(n)k-*[1]

There is a specific group of verbs in Hittite with an infix -*ni(n)*-. The verbs are *harnink-* 'to destroy', *hunink-* 'to batter, bash', *istarnink-* 'to make ill', *ninink-* 'to mobilize, set in motion' and *sarnink-* 'to compensate, exchange'.[2]

hunink-, *harnink-* and *istarnink-* are derived from *huek-* 'to stab', *hark-* 'to perish' and *istark-* 'to ail' respectively. Puhvel (HED 3 : 382) claims that *hunink-* does not follow the derivational model of the other 2 verbs, since *hark-* 'to perish' and *istark-* 'to ail' are intransitive, and infix -*ni(n)*- makes transitive verbs out of them. On the other hand, *huek-* 'to stab' is transitive, so that *hark-/harnink-* pattern cannot be applied here. However, Puhvel's objection does not seem to be valid, since -*nu*-causatives, whose function is approximately the same as that of -*ni(n)*- infix (cf. *harnink-* and *harganu-* both meaning 'to destroy'), may be derived from both the transitive and intransitive verbs (s. Kronasser 1966: 451 ff.).[3] That is, *hunink-* follows the same derivational pattern as *hunink-* and *istarnink-*.

The non-causative counterparts of *sarnink-* and *ninink-* had not been preserved in Hittite. There are 2 verbs, *sark-* and *nenk-*, reminiscent of *sarnink-* and *ninink-*, but *sark-* is very poorly attested, perhaps means 'to raise, rise'[4] and may be non-existent[5], while *nenk-* means 'to drink one's full, get drunk'. For this reason *sarnink-* and *ninink-* cannot be straightforward derivatives after the pattern of *istark-* : *istarnink-* and are almost certainly unrelated to *sark-* and *nenk-*.

For *sarnink-* we have a secure etymon in Latin, *sarcio* 'to repair', so that -*ni(n)*- may only be an infix in the Hittite verb. *ninink-* shares the general appearance and morphonological

peculiarities with the verbs containing an etymologically certain infix -*ni(n)*-, therefore it is very likely to be an infix verb as well.

These verbs correspond to Skt. class 7 *yunakti* etc. In Indo-Aryan, infix is ablauting: Sg. *yunakti* : Pl. *yuñjanti* (*-*ne*- : -*n*-). Hittite verbs also seem to have a kind of ablaut. We usually have /ni/ in Sg. and /nin/ in Pl. with exceptions of 1st Sg. Pret. and 2 Pl. Pres. and Pret. The spelling is very consistent, vacillation occurs only in the spelling of the endings. In the iteratives and derivatives the infix usually has form /nin/ (e.g. *istarningai-* 'ailment'), with 2 apparent exceptions: *sarnikzel-* 'compensation' and hu-[u-]ni-ki-is-sa-[ar] KBo 1.51 Rs. 15.

Below is the conjugation of *harnink-* in Ind. Act.

	Pres.		Pret.	
	Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.
1	harnikmi	(sarninkweni)	harninkun	(istarninkwen)
2	harniksi	harnikteni	harnikta	harnikten
3	harnikzi	harninkanzi	harnikta	harninkir

Ptc. harninkant-

3-consonantal clusters are lacking in this paradigm, with the exception of 1 Pl. Pres. and Pret. The spellings like ni-ni-in!-ku-u-e-ni KUB 50.6 III 43, iš-tar-ni-in-ku-en KUB 3.45 Vs. 4, šar-ni-in-ku-e-ni KUB 22.57 Vs. 4, har-ni-in-ku-[e-ni KUB 33.120 III 3 point to a cluster /nkw/.

Sometimes second /n/ of the infix can be omitted even in those contexts where it is usually preserved. G. Hart (1977: 134) pointed out several occurrences for -*ni(n)*- verbs (e. g. har-ni-ku-un, ni-ni-kan-zi). This loss is attested also in the same position in other verbs with a similar stem, such as li-ku-wa-an-ni (HT 1 I 34, KUB 9.31 I 42) and ša-ah-hu-un (KBo 5.9 I 20).

The verbs with a stem ending in -*nk*- and -*nh*-, namely *lenk-*, *he(n)k-*, *henk-*, *hamank-*, *nenk-*, as well as *sanh-*[6] and *unh-* show both -VnCC- and -VCC- spellings, e. g. li-ik-zi (KBo 6.2 IV 3) and li-in-ga-zi (KBo 6.3 III 75). H. Craig Melchert (1994: 124) accepts the phonological reality of *n*-less forms in these verbs, while assuming the underlying /linktsi/, /ninktsi/ etc. In this view we deal with sporadic phonetic process of deleting /n/ before a 2-consonantal cluster.

Due to correspondence in the general shape, function and unique way of derivation between Hittite and Indo-Aryan infixes they must have been related. While Hittite general pattern Sg. -*ni*- Pl. -*nin*- does not fully match Indo-Aryan Sg. -*ná*-, Pl. -*n*- and reconstructed on its basis PIE *-*né*-/-*n*-, it is still tempting to compare Hittite forms of the infix immediately to Indo-Aryan ones. From the Indo-European point of view, *harnink-* is supposed to continue the following pattern: 3 Sg. *h₃r-né-g-ti : 3 Pl. *h₃r-n-g-énti[7] or the like. Therefore quite a few researchers tried to trace back Hittite -*ni*-/-*nin*- immediately to PIE *-*né*-/-*n*-.

---

[1] I would like to cordially thank Prof. H. Craig Melchert and I. Yakubovich for reading and commenting on the earlier drafts of this article.

[2] Suggested *hinink-* 'to pour' to my mind does not exist, both forms belong to *hink-* 'to grant'.

[3] Cf. derivation of -*áya*-presents in Sanskrit, s. Kulikov *Vedic type patáyati revisited* (to be printed).

[4] According to HEG Lf. 13 901 ff., only -*sk*-duratives are attested. KUB 31.127 I 8ff. handanza=kan (9) antuhsas tuk=pat assus n=an zik=pat šar-ki-iš-ki-ši ᵈUTU-uš "der gerechte Mensch (ist) dir teuer und ihn erhebst du immer wieder, o Sonnergott", KUB 24.7 IV 25f. MUŠEN *HURRI*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ araiskanzi (26) [...] šar-kiš-kán-zi n=at nepisi ']die Steinhühner erheben sich [...] steigen immer höher und zum Himmel ['.

[5] The attested -*sk*-iteratives can also be derived from *sarkiya- or *sarkess- (from *sarkess- only the second one, since in KUB 31.127 *sarkisk-* is transitive), cf. Oettinger 1979: 245.

[6] The forms are presented according to CHD; the issue whether there were 2 homonymous verbs *sanh-* is not to be discussed here; for the problem cf. Puhvel 1979: 299 ff., CHD S 171.

[7] Rix 1998: 267.

The first one to suggest it was E. Benveniste, who claimed that the spelling -ni-in-CV(C)- (e. g. har-ni-in-kán-zi) reflects a secondarily syllabic /n/ between consonants (E. Benveniste 1932: 161 f.). E. Kurałowicz (1958: 220–1) explained this spelling as an attempt to preserve graphic consistency of the paradigm. This point of view was further supported by J. Puhvel (1960: 25–6) and C. Watkins (1969: 34). Other scholars proposed an invariable infix /nin/ with loss of the second /n/ before consonantal clusters /kC/ due to difficulties in graphic representation of such clusters, cf. e. g. Pedersen 1938: 145, Sturtevant 1951: 127, Kronasser 1966: 435–7, Lindemann 1976: 115–6 and Strunk 1973: 59. 1 Pl. Pres. and Pret. fit this pattern since the sequence /nkw/ could be easily written, e. g. šar-ni-in-ku-e-ni. K. Strunk also pointed to 1 Sg. Pret. (e. g. har-ni-in-ku-un) which should have had /ni/ 'grade' along with other forms of Singular but in fact has /nin/. Thus Hittite forms of the infix differ from the Indo-Aryan not only in shape but also in distribution.[8] This makes impossible the immediate derivation of Hittite -ni-/-nin- form PIE *-né-/-n-.

On the other hand, as R. Viredaz (1976: 168 f.) and G. Hart (1977: 134 f.) have shown, three-consonantal sequence was often spelled in some other verbs, e. g. ha-ma-an-ga-zi. Thus graphical expression of /nkC/ presented no difficulty, and therefore second /n/ in the uniform infix /nin/ should not have been necessarily deleted.

G. Hart (1977: 138) and N. Oettinger (1994: 320 f.) proceed from generalized full grade *-ne-, which is preserved in some forms as /ni/, while in other forms it has developed into /nin/ due to a certain phonological process. G. Hart describes it as an insertion of /n/ before /k/ in a sequence *nasal-vowel-k-vowel* and adduces some examples like za-ma-an-kur but za-ma-kur-te-it 'beard'[9] or tu-ni-ik, G. Sg. tu-ni-in-ga-aš, a kind of bread.[10] N. Oettinger (l.c.) notes that this approach cannot explain the regularity of /nin/ in certain forms. He points out to the fact that the variant /nin/ is present in those forms where we have /n/ also in the ending or following suffix (e. g. endings 1 Pl. Pres. *-wani*, 3 Pl. Pret. *-anzi*, 1 Sg. Pret. *-un*, Part. suffix *-ant-*). However, one can adduce several counterexamples, e. g. 2 Pl. Pres. *-teni* (*harnikteni*) that generalized /ni/ and derivatives, (e. g. Iter. *-esk-* or *istarningai-*) that generalized /nin/.

So far the *-ni-/-nin-* vacillation cannot reflect the original *-ne-/-n- ablaut, but it also cannot be due to difficulties in spelling of the uniform suffix /nin/.

The clue to this problem could be the diachronic distribution of the relevant forms of *link-* type verbs. Forms without /n/, e. g. li-ik-ta, are attested throughout the history of the Hittite language whereas forms containing /n/, e. g. li-in-ik-ta, appear only in the Middle Hittite period. The only possible exceptions are ga-a-an-ga-ah-hi KBo 17.1 IV 17 and ga-a-an-ga-

ah-hé KBo 17.3 IV 13, cf Kimball 1999: 115. However, the New Hittite form ga-an-ga-i (KUB 7.60 II 4-6) points to extended stem *kanka-* (type II 2 a in Oettinger's classification, cf. Oettinger 1979 420). Thus ga-a-an-ga-ah-hé could actually reflect a rare stem variant *kanka-*, even though there is no support for the existence of this allomorph in Old Hittite.[11]

All the other relevant Old Script forms show lack of *-n-* in this context:
li-ik-zi KBo 6.2 IV 3
ša-ah-zi KBo 22.1 obv. 17
li-ik-ta KBo 9.73 obv. (2)
sa-ah-ta KUB 43.33 obv. 4, 5
ha-ik-ta-ri KUB 36.100 + KBo 7.14 Vs. 19
hé-ik-ta KBo 20.10 I 4-6, 10
ni-i-ik KUB 43.31 left col. 6
ša-ah-te-[-ni?] KBo 16.45 obv. 6[12]

Similar spellings from later periods occur usually in texts stemming from Old Hittite or at least Middle Hittite originals.[13]

Thus in Old Hittite almost no spellings like -nCC- was attested. They were introduced in the Middle Hittite period. This fact can be explained in several ways. It could be an Old Hittite spelling tradition which was changed in Middle Hittite to make the paradigm more uniform. In *link-* and other verbs with radical *-n-* this /n/ was reintroduced, while paradigm of *-nin-*-verbs remained unchanged. Then the distribution of *-ni-/-nin-* forms has nothing to do with spelling (otherwise there would have been forms like **harninkta as well) and is conditioned phonologically. Since the paradigm of *harnink-* etc. is consistent, this would imply that in these verbs there was a regular insertion of a /n/ in front of a velar between

---

[8] Besides 1 Sg. Pret. (e. g. har-ni-in-ku-un instead of expected *harnikun, reflecting the original full grade), it could be supported by 3 Sg. Pret. ni-ni-in-ga-aš KUB 53.15 IV! "30" "33" as compared with ni-ni-in-ki-ta KUB 14.1 obv. (45). Of course last /n/ here can be occasional (cf. har-ni-ik-ša KUB 19.30 I 11), but it shows that /nin/ could be used in 3 Sg. Pret as well.

[9] -n- in this word is etymologically unexpected, cf. Skt. *śmaśru-*.

[10] This phenomenon is quite widespread in Hittite, though is not a regular process, s. Melchert 1994: 171 ff., Kimball 1999: 318 f., cf. Carter 1977/78, Justeson, Stephens 1981, Oettinger 1994. In most examples of nasal perseveration, -n- appears before dental. However we must keep in mind that not all of these verbs have satisfactory etymology, so in some cases this -n- may be original.

[11] I. Yakubovich suggested that that the spelling -Vn-ga-aC- may actually imply a thematic stem (developed after 3 Pl. Pres.). This concerns not only *kank-*, but also other verbs with a similar stem. The verbs of *link-*-type seem to have free variants -IK- and -GA- (-IK- /-KAT- before endings starting with -t-), while some other verbs , e. g. *hark-* (e. g. always har-ak-du and never *har-ga-du), never show vacillation. One could also imagine a spelling like *li-in-ka-zi, but to my knowledge it is not attested, so there seems to be some kind of a constraint (perhaps due to a teaching practice?).

[12] Dating is based on CHD and www.hethiter.net. Attribution of some of these fragments does not coincide. The konkordanz at www.hethiter.net doubts whether KBo 9.73 and KUB 43.33 are Old Hittite or Middle Hittite. KBo 16.45 is Middle Hittite according to CHD.

[13] Out of more than 60 occurrences only about five are in the texts that were with all certainty composed in the New Hittite period. hi-ik-mi KBo 22.118, KUB 33.27; hi-ik-zi KBo 39.8, KBo 17.88, KBo 23.91, KBo 2.3, KBo 22.117, KBo 22.189, KUB 17.18, KUB 9.28, KUB 35.54, Bo 4530, IBoT 1.36, KUB 35.58; hi-ik-ta KBo 20.74 KBo 30.57 KBo 21.13 KBo 16.82, KBo 27.37, KUB 58.48; ha-ik-ta KUB 57.26, KBo 23. 91; ha-ik-ta-ri KUB 36.101; u-uh-zi KBo 40.343, u-uh-ta KUB 31.77; li-ik-zi KUB 40.88, KBo 8.41, KBo 3.29, KUB 36.127; li-ik-ta KUB 14.1, KBo 4.14, KUB 26.32; li-i-ik KBo 4.14; li-ik-du KBo 4.14; li-ik-te-en KBo 16.27; le-e-ek-te-en 942/z; sa-ah-mi KBo 17.61; sa-ah-zi KBo 24.1, KUB 41.4, 1191/z, KUB 24.6, KUB 33.27 (sa-ah[-zi); sa-ah-ta KUB 33.10, KUB 33.5, KUB 7.8, KBo 3.8; sa-a-ah KUB 17.10; sa-ah-du KUB 7.41, KBo 3.8; sa-a-ah-te-en KUB 29.1; ki-ik-zi KUB 12.5; ta-me-ek-zi KUB 23.1; ha-ma-ak-mi KUB 50.89; ha-ma-ak-zi KUB 24.9 KBo 13.109; ha-mi-ik-ta KBo 3.8, KBo 22.128, ha-ma-ak-ta KUB 51.33, KUB 26.91, 1230/z, Bo 7248; ha-am-ma-ak-ta KUB 38.23; ha-mi-ik KBo 22.128; ha-mi-ik-ta-at KBo 22.128, KBo 3.8.

vowels. However, /n/ was not inserted in *nega-* 'sister', *nakke-* 'to be honored, important' and many others.

More likely, there was a Proto-Hittite or Old Hittite phonetic process that caused loss of /n/ before -CC-, but starting from Middle Hittite /n/ was restored[14] in verbs with radical -*n*- and *hamank-*, whose origin is not clear, while in -*nin*-verbs it didn't happen.[15]

In this respect, forms of the 1 Pl. deserve special discussion. This sequence of consonants could be easily spelled, while phonetically it must have been 3-consonantal (/nkw/) cluster that was definitely preserved in Old Hittite. That seems to contradict the claim that the 3-consonantal clusters of this type were prohibited, and support the assumption that the lack of -nkC- spellings is due to orthographical issues. Still, as J. Justeson and L. Stephens (1981 : 369) point out, "/kw/ is usually syllable initial, 1 Pl. would not necessarily be comparable to the other cases, where the /k/ would be syllable final."[16]

This rule can contribute to the problem of infix' shape. Its underlying form could be then /nin/, while the variant /ni/ before 2 consonants is phonetically regular. The rule allows explaining distribution of infix forms with and without second /n/. Otherwise we have to accept that in each separate form we are dealing with an insertion of /n/, which is a sporadic process; therefore a substantial variation would be expected.

The origin of this second /n/ in /nin/ is unclear and certainly unetymological. The best explanation for it is still the nasal anticipation/perseveration, (s. Hart 1977: 138, Oettinger 1994 : 320f.), but the consistent spelling of the second -*n*- is unexpected in case of an irregular phonological process, as noted earlier. We must concede that at some moment the phonetic variant /nin/ must have become grammaticalized, perhaps because of derivatives. Underlying suffix /nin/ may be further supported by consistently spelled -*i*- (*harnink-* etc.) < e/_nK-. N. Oettinger (1994 : 321[65]) mentions that this could be a proof for uniform infix, but he discards this possibility on the grounds that the spread of marginal echo-nasalized variants throughout the paradigm is hard to justify.

The same distribution is found in derivatives. Second /n/ in the infix /nin/ is often spelled in those words where the stem is followed by a vowel (cf. *istarningai-* 'ailment', *sarninkwa-* 'to be fulfilled, *nininkessar* 'mobilization?'). But in case of *sarnikzēl* 'compensation' second *n* of the infix is omitted in 3-consonantal cluster. An interesting case is *istarningai-*. It is attested in 2 texts, KUB 29.1 (I 47 *istarningais*, II 32 *istarningain*) and KBo 18.151 (Vs. 5, 12 *istarnikaīn*). If N. Oettinger (1979 139[10]) is correct, assuming that *istanikaīn* is older and genuine variant, it contributes to our understanding of the relative chronology of this development. Then the allomorph /nin/ penetrated into derivatives only in the Middle Hittite period, due to reanalysis of /ni/ as /nin/ with deleted second n before 2-consonantal clusters. Form *hunikissar* (KBo 1.51 Rs. 15) proves that this process hasn't been completed and /nin/ didn't spread into all the words. However, the data is not sufficient, and absence of the second /n/ of the infix in *istarnikaīn* could be due to a pure chance, cf. *ninikanzi* etc.

The rare absence of *n* where it was expected (e.g. *ninikanzi*) may indicate the instability of /n/ before a velar. The instability of /nkC/ and /nhC/ clusters could be further seen in forms like ha-ma-an-zi (IBoT 2.122 7), ni-in-zi (KUB 43.58 II 47) and ša-an-zi (KUB 27.29 I 9), which may show that /n/ was actually pronounced here.[17] However, these examples could be just scribal errors (cf. ni-ni<-ik>-ta-ri KUB 24.14 IV 18b, [n]i-ni-ik-<ta->at KUB 53.15 IV! "31").

The most plausible scenario for the history of this suffix is as follows:

At some moment, the generalized strong stem infix *ne started turning into /nin/, with /e/ being raised to /i/ before /nK/. It is likely to be triggered by nasal perseveration, but in the outcome the change was morphological. In Old Hittite, second -*n*- in -*nin*- was deleted before 2-consonant cluster[18], just as in verbs with radical /n/ like *likzi* etc. In Middle Hittite, the radical /n/ in *linkta* was analogically restored, while in -*nin*-verbs it was not (cf. also derivative *sarnikzēl*). The spellings *linkta* and *likta*[19] are phonetic and orthographic (i. e. following Old Hittite spelling tradition) respectively.

References

HED – J. Puhvel, 1984.

HEG – J. Tischler, 1977.

Benveniste, E, Sur le consonantisme Hittite. Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris 33, 1932, 136–143.

Carter, Ch., The Hittite writing of [ŋk] and [ŋg] and related matters. Journal of the American Oriental Society 99 (1977–78), 93–4.

---

[14] The exact reasons for its restoration are not clear. In general it may be related to the 'etymological restoration' of /n/ in clitics before initial /m/ and /s/ of clitics in Middle Hittite, cf. Kimball 1999: 324, 333.

[15] Alternative to deletion of /n/ before 2-consonantal clusters could be an explanation that /n/ in position before combination of *K* and *h* plus *vowel* was pronounced as /ŋ/. That could explain the vacillation of spellings in the New Hittite period. In Old Hittite, /ŋ/ was consequently omitted in spelling, and in Middle Hittite it was reintroduced for some reasons.
 While such an explanation presents phonetic grounds for competing forms like *likta* and *linkta,* it does not seem to work with -*nin*-verbs, which never have spellings like **harninkta. In case /nin/ was an underlying suffix, the second /n/ or /ŋ/ should have been at least sometimes spelled in Middle Hittite and on, as we see in forms like *linkzi*, *hinkzi* etc. If it was /ni/ rather than /nin/ or /niŋ/ that was pronounced in *harnikmi*, then we return to the problem of distribution of /ni/ and /nin/ variants. To my mind this problem can be solved only by postulating the above-mentioned rule for Old Hittite.

[16] For this resyllabification cf. a contact law in Vennemann 1988: 40 – 'A syllable contact A$B is the more preferred, the less the Consonantal Strength of the offset A and the greater the Consonantal Strength of the onset B:'. The Consonantal Strength of /k/ is greater than that of /n/ and /w/ (op.cit. 9). Therefore the syllable division /n$kw/ rather than /nk$w/ should be preferred. Cf. some examples, given by Vennemann – German *Tatra* /ta$tra / as compared to *Wartha* /var$ta/ (op. cit. 41) and Icelandic *vö . kva* 'to water' (op. cit. 51).

[17] More examples are given by Melchert 1994: 124, 166. He considers this to be a sporadic phonological process.

[18] From a synchronic point of view; in fact, there may always have been only /ni/ in these forms, which were not affected by nasal perseveration, and later were reinterpreted as containing /nin/ with loss of the second /n/.

[19] K. Yoshida (2001: 168 ff.) argued that the final vowel is empty. If this is true, then /linkt/ must have been restored anyway, and perhaps /likt/ as well, since there was a constraint on final consonantal clusters (s. Melchert 1994: 179, Kimball 1999: 303).

Hart, G., On the origin of Hittite nasal infix verbs of the type šarnikzi/šarninkanzi. Archivum Linguisticum 8 (1977), 133–141.

Justeson, J./Stephens, L., Nasal + obstruents clusters in Hittite. Journal of the American Oriental Society 101 (1981), 367–370.

Kimball, S., Hittite Historical Phonology, Innsbruck 1999.

Kronasser, H., Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache, Wiesbaden 1966.

Kurylowicz, J., Le Hittite. Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists, Oslo 1958.

Lindeman, F., L'apophonie radicale au présent-imparfait actif des verbes athématiques en indo-européen. Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris 71/1 (1976), 113–121.

Melchert, H. C., Anatolian Historical Phonology, Amsterdam/Atlanta 1994.

Oettinger, N., Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums, Nürnberg 1979.

Oettinger, N., Etymologisch unerwarteter Nasal im Hethitischen, in: J. E. Rasmussen (ed.), In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen. Wiesbaden 1994, 307–330.

Pedersen, H., Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen, Copenhagen 1938.

Puhvel, J., Laryngeals and Indo-european Verb, Los Angeles 1960.

Puhvel, J., Some Hittite etymologies. In: Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélenges offerts à Emmanuele Laroche, Paris 1979, 297–304.

Puhvel, J., Hittite etymological dictionary. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam 1984.

Rix, H. (ed.), Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben, Wiesbaden 1998.

Strunk, K., Methodisches und Sachliches zu den idg. Nasalpräsentien (Skt. 7. Klasse). Indogermanische Forschungen 78 (1973), 51–74.

Sturtevant, E., A comparative grammar of the Hittite language. Revised edition, New Haven 1951.

Tischler, J., Hethitisches etymologysches Glossar, Innsbruck 1977.

Vennemann, Th., Preference Laws for Syllable Structure, Berlin/New York/Amsterdam 1988.

Viredaz, R., L'infixe nasal en Hittite. Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris 71/1 (1976), 165–173.

Watkins, C., Indogermanische Grammatik, Band III/I, Heidelberg 1969.

Yoshida, K., Observations on Some Cuneiform Spellings: Epithetic or Graphic? Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Washington 2002, 165–176.

A. Shatskov
Institute for Linguistic Studies,
St. Petersburg, Russia

Peter Stein*

Träume im antiken Südarabien

Sie trat ins Freie und erblickte über sich zwei Säcke voll Korn.
Eine Frau überreichte ihr einen Sack mit frischem Gebäck. Doch
als sie wieder ins Haus zurückkehrte, gewahrte sie, daß sie ledig-
lich ein Häufchen Teig aufgelesen hatte. Da fand sie dieses plötz-
lich auf einem funkelnden Teller vor, und es bat sie, doch Feuer zu
machen, auf daß es zubereitet werde.

Diese freie Übertragung einer weiter unten noch ausführlich vorzustellenden sabäischen Minuskelinschrift (siehe Appendix) stellt die bislang einzige Schilderung eines Traumes dar, die wir aus dem antiken Südarabien besitzen. Daß es sich tatsächlich um einen Traum handelt, wird durch den (oben nicht zitierten) einleitenden Satz dieses Textes eindeutig bestimmt, welcher lautet *ḥg-n k-ḥlmt 'tt k-* „Folgendermaßen hat die/eine Frau[1] geträumt: (...)". Auch wenn das dabei verwandte Verbum, *ḥlm,* sich in den altsüdarabischen Inschriften bislang nicht nachweisen läßt, sind nominale Derivate dieser Wurzel, namentlich das Nomen *ḥlm* „Traum", bereits anderweitig bekannt und von der Forschung im Sinne eines provozierten Traumes zur Erlangung einer göttlichen Vision (SD 68: „oracular dream") gedeutet worden. Ausgehend von diesen, nachfolgend vorzustellenden Belegen will der vorliegende Beitrag versuchen, die aus den altsüdarabischen Inschriften entnehmbaren Aussagen über Träume insgesamt zusammenzuführen und auszuwerten. Es sei an dieser Stelle betont, daß sich diese Untersuchung praktisch ausschließlich auf sabäische Belege stützen kann;[2] das Fehlen entsprechender Textbeispiele aus den benachbarten Regionen mag dabei allerdings der verhältnismäßigen Spärlichkeit der entsprechenden Textkorpora zuzuschreiben sein.

---

[1] Siehe hierzu unten den Kommentar zur Inschrift.

[2] Der einzige mögliche Beleg aus einer qatabanischen Inschrift ist ambivalent, siehe unten Bsp. (14). In den minäischen und ḥaḍramitischen Inschriften sind bislang keine Belege für die im Folgenden zu diskutierenden Schlüsselwörter zu finden.