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Latin *insolēscō* first appears in Old Latin (Cato the Elder's *Eloct.* in the sense 'to become overbearing, arrogant'). A physical sense 'to swell' (mtt.) is attested only late (Terullian & St. Jerome). The adjective *insolēns* in the meaning 'excessive, arrogant, insolent' obviously is connected with the verb, but the formal relationship is not entirely clear.

The standard handbooks give two competing etymologies (see Ernest, Meillet 1959: 378f. and Walde, Hofmann 1938: 428 vs. 704f.). The first derives *insolēns* in the above sense from *insolēns* 'unaccustomed, unusual' (to *soleo*) via "beyond the usual standard" > 'excessive' and so on. The verb *insolēscō* would have been formed under the influence of *solēscō* based on a false segmentation of *ex-solēscō*. The physical sense is late and secondary. On the other hand, per Pokrovski (1898 [1959]: 153; 1899: 230ff; 1922) the meaning 'to swell' is original for *insolēscō* (and *insolēns* in the sense 'arrogant' etc.). The root is that of English 'to swell' and other Germanic forms. The more common moral sense in Latin of 'become arrogant' or the like is derived through the quasi-universal notion of 'to become puffed up' (with pride, self-importance). Some scholars have opted for one account or the other (Haverling 2000: 378 cites only the first, while Martin Kimmelm LI 4 6106010 adopts the second, positing a PIE stem *suylH-eh1-*, but one must agree with Ernst-Meillet that the Latin facts alone seem insufficient to justify a firm choice between the alternatives.

I believe that new evidence from Hittite can help decide the issue. The Hittite verb *sulē*-(with variants *sulīy-*/ *sulīly-*) and the native extended stem *sulēs-*) is conventionally interpreted as 'to quarrel, start a quarrel, be(come) contentious' (thus e.g. Friedrich 1952: 196f. 'streiten, zanken, in Streit geraten', following Sommer 1922: 42f.; Sommer, Falkenstein 1938: 41). However, Giorgieri (2001: 132f.) has argued persuasively that the Hurrian verb *ht-**-** in which *sulē- *translates in the Hurro-Hittite Bilingual means 'über die Maßen/Grenzen (des Erlaubten) hinausgehen; schwellen; sich aufblasen (< zich vermehren)'. A careful review of the total evidence shows that this is also the true sense of *Hittite sulē*.-

---

1 I thank Alexander Nikolaev for his kind invitation to take part in this tribute to Professor Leonard Herzenberg. I am grateful to various members of the audience who based a preliminary oral version of this paper at Harvard University May 1, 2003, for several helpful suggestions, to Brent Vine for valuable references and counsel on the Latin aspects of the problem, and to Harry Hoffner and Norbert Oettinger and Thus van den Hout for crucial improvements to the Hittite analysis. Above all, I am indebted to Mauro Giorgieri for sending me an offprint of his article on Hurrian *ht-* without which I would never have been led to reexamine the Latin facts. I remain, of course, solely responsible for the views expressed here.

2 The use of *sulē- *in the Bilingual had already led others to suggest alternatives to 'quarrel' in that context. Hoffner (1998a: 69f.) consistently render the verb as 'become discontented' and properly emphasizes that it refers to acts of ingratitude and greed (see further below). Utan (1994: 86f.) correctly translates *Kbo 6c 32,14* in 16 (the first citation below) as "wurde sehr dünklich", but then adds in a footnote "wörtlich: "gewöhnlich"." He retains the latter meaning for the instances in the parable of the ungrateful deer and man.

---

*H. Craig Melchert, 2001*
As one would expect in view of the fact that the standard interpretation has stood for more than eighty years, many instances of *sull* (and its derived noun *sullator*) are compatible with either ‘to quarrel, become angry’ or ‘to become arrogant, disrespectful’. However, in at least one text, the Hinittite Bilingual, the former meaning makes no sense (KBo 32.14 iii 13–19; for the text see Neu 1996: 85): ‘It is not a dog. It is a toon whom his lord makes an administrator. In that city he secretly increased his taking (in) of tribute.’ 

The corrupt official no longer has any regard for the welfare of the city entrusted to his care. This sense for *anda aut* is confirmed by the other instance in the Bilingual (KBo 32.14 iv 3; Neu 1996: 83), where an ungrateful son no longer has regard for his father (contra Neu 1996: 174). The sentence *n=al melki sulli* describes the official’s immoral act. One might have expected *wazatt* ‘sinned’, but other passages from the Bilingual show that *sull* describes a particular kind of delict, namely the sin of ingratitude and disrespect towards a benefactor. In KBo 32.14 i 1–5 (Neu 1996: 75) we find: ‘(A mountain drove a deer away from its body. The deer went forth to another mountain.)’ 

That the sin is one of ingratitude is made clear by the mountain’s reaction (ibid. ii 9–13): ‘When the mountain heard, he felt ill inside (or in his heart). The mountain cursed back at the deer: “The deer whom I made fat is now cursing back at me!”’ The exegesis of the parable (KBo 32.14 ii 19; Neu 1996: 77) uses the same expression (man=es sulli ‘He sought to become upset’) of a man who curses back at the house city that nurtured him. While Neu’s ‘siste Sritte’ is by no means impossible for this passage, ‘became arrogant, upset’ fits much better the obvious theme of the parable — the ingratitude of those who have achieved prosperity or success towards those who “helped them on the way up”.

The theme of an inferior or subordinate who oversteps his proper bounds and shows disrespect to his betters runs through all the other instances of *sull* and variants. In many cases the one offended is the Hinittite king. Typical is KBo 16.17+2.5 iii 28–31 from the Annals of Murri: “(Aparnu, a man of Kalasama, came to Hattusa before My Majesty. I picked him out and made him a lord. I gave him the land of Kalasama to administer. Then I put him under

---

2 On the use of the present tense in a past narrative to express an open-ended condition see Melchert (1998: 416f).
3 For this sense of *anda aut* (and its opposite *paru aut* — ‘overlook, ignore’) see Sommer (1932: 232) ad KUB 19.55 i 2–3.
4 See already Oettlinger (1992: 11), who correctly translates ‘stummert sich nicht mehr um’ in both passages, Beckman (1997: 216) who likewise renders ‘no longer looks/looked after’, and Hoffner (1998a: 71), who interprets the first as ‘no longer watches over the city’.
5 I follow Usul (1994: 862), Beckman (1997: 216), Hoffner (1998a: 69), and others against Neu (1996: 75&121) in assuming that the deer curses the new mountain that had nurtured him. Likewise in the *aergens* the man curses his new home city that had welcomed him as a refugee (thus with Beckman and Hoffner).
oath."

\[ n=at \text{ sulliyr} \ nu=mu \ kārūnāỹīka \ nu=za-kan \ KUR \ URU \ Kalāšina \ [1-3]-tya \ neysat \ n=at \ LUGAL-uṣṣanat \ iwar \ taparia \ 'He grew arrogant and became hostile to me. He united the land of Kalasha as his own and ruled it in the manner of a king'.\]

In this passage we find explicit evidence for ingratitude and for self-aggrandizement as well as disrespect.

In other cases the focus is on personal disrespect towards the Hititte king, as in the Treaty of Murshili with Kupanta-Kurunta (KUB 6.41 i 46): ‘(I wrote to them as follows: ‘Mashtulwawa was an oath-man to me.’) nu=war-al=mu=kan sullītīt nu=wa=mu ARAD.MES-YYA kattan harānman(l)at ‘He became disrespectful towards me and caused my servants to rebel against me’.\'(cf. ibid i 31-32). Murshili also once uses our verb in his familiar complaint that those who had honored his predecessors have disrespected him (KBo 5.8 i v 9-10; Annals): ‘(Formerly the people of the land of Kalasha were subjects to my father and grandfather. With their troops they went on campaign with my father and grandfather. They kept on going on campaign with me.)\’ n=at=mu=šan sullītīt nu=mu nammà ERIN.MES ŬL petek ‘They (then) became upstart towards me, and they no longer gave me troops.’

Ingratitude and disrespect are also the focus of the complaints of Hattusili II/II against his nephew Urih-Teshub in his so-called ‘Apology’ (lines III 68-72 and 76-79; for the text see Otten 1981: 22): LŪ-uri-šī su-tarnam \[ ku \ sullītīt=wa=mu=kan ‘I conveyed to him like a man: “You have disrespected me.” (You are a great king, while I am king of the one fortress that you have left me. Come, let Ishtar of Samuha and the Storm-god of Nerik decide the legal dispute between us.’)\’ ‘If someone says thus: “why did you formerly install him in the kingship, why do you now write to him of enmity?”’ I would answer mün=wa=al=mu=kan sullītīt kawapi ŬL mün handan LUGAL GAL ANA LUGAL TUR kattarābār kurr=at=al=mu=kan sullītīt kurr n=at=mu=šin DINGIR.MES DI-ešnata kattarābār. ‘If he had not at some point disrespected me, would they have accordingly subjected a great king to a minor king? But because he did now disrespect me, the gods subjected him to me in the legal dispute.’ Hattusili implies not only that Urih-Teshub owed him everything he had, but also that the impropriety of Urih-Teshub’s behavior towards him is confirmed by the gods’ judgment in the dispute.

Another set of occurrences of sullīte refer to acts committed against the gods of the Hititates by foreigners. The famous Hititte willingness to incorporate the gods of other peoples into their pantheon does not mean that everyone was viewed as equal. There is an unmistakable tone of moral outrage in the following passages that non-Hittites would have the effrontery to disrespect the Hititte gods.

We may begin with the Kasseans, whom we know the Hitites considered uncivilized. An evocation ritual (KUB 4.1 i 16-17) makes explicit the charge of insolence: ‘(Now the men of Kaska have taken them [the gods of the goddesses].)’ nu LŪ.MES ŪR-Gašga tallūr ‘The men of Kaska have become arrogant. (They boast of their might and strength, while they have belittled you, the gods.’ Since the Hititte kingdom was established by the gods, all depredations by the Kasseans against it, whether specifically against temples and religious institutions or not, were viewed as hubristic acts of sacrilege (KUB 4.1 ii 11-15): sumed=za DIRINGIR.MES ŠA KUR ŪR-Gašga sumettīt n=at=ša KUR ŪR-\[YYA \] DIRINGIR.MES KUR=az arba towaetten sumed=za-za KUR.SUNU daten ŠA LŪ.MES Gašga-ya tallūr ‘You, the gods of the land of Kaska have become arrogant. You have driven the gods of the land of Hatti from the land, and you have taken their land for yourselves. The men of Kaska have also become arrogant, (and

\[ ^{4}\text{See the CHU L-\[361\text{h for the restoration and interpretation of I-\[\text{Ito nūr}. }}\]

\[ ^{5}\text{So also KUB 26 88 V} 94: [nu=mu-šan] \text{[šš] u} 10: ‘U-upaat kawapi DUMU.ŠE\[YYA \] sullītīt ‘When Urih-Teshub, my nephew, behaved disrespectful towards me.’} \]}
you have taken away their cities from the men of Hatti, and you have driven them out of their fields and their vineyards."

A prayer of Mursili II to the Sun-goddess of Arinna begins by assuring that only the land of Hatti, and no other country, properly honors the goddess (KUB 24.3+i 6-22). In spite of this piouness, however, the gods have now unleashed a plague upon Hatti, and others have taken advantage of the situation (KUB 24.3+i 26-28): "nu kurtawau[is] KUR UDU[ittanni KUR UDU[(Arzuwa)] nu kumantu Sullit[enti] 'The territorial lands that lie around (us) - Mittanni and Arzawa - each has become disrespectful. (They do not honor the gods; they have broken their oaths; they seek to despoil the temples)." To the dismay of the Hittites, these actions seem to have gone unpunished, while pious Hatti has suffered, a fate that evokes an anguished protest (ibid. ii 32-35): 'Let the plague, strife, famine, and evil fever into Mittanni and Arzawa!' waɾšyaɾnuɾa Sullianda KUR KUR.KI A <MAA> KUR UDU Hattiuma taɾกรมon KUR-e 'Rested are the disrespectful lands, but the land of Hatti is an exhausted (and. Release the exhausted. Yoke the rested!).' While there is no explicit qualifier here for Hatti, the chiasmus makes quite clear that the contrast here is between the pious and revereent Hatti and the impious and disrespectful territorial lands.

The prayer of Mursili to Telipina (KUB 24.1+ with duplicate 24.2) repeats the same theme. He insists again at length that only Hatti shows proper reverence towards the god (KUB 24.1+i 19-ii 19) and again asks the gods to remove the plague from pious Hatti and send it to the enemy lands, whose wickedness is once more characterized explicitly as saɾerliγe (KUB 24.1+i iii 18-19): "nu KUR.KUR.KI A LU.KUR KEESU sullanta harṣallanta 'The enemy lands that are disrespectful and rebellious, (that are not reverent towards you Telipina and the gods of Hatti, that desire for themselves to burn up your temples).' The entire context of both prayers shows that these lands are not 'quarreling and at odds' (thus Puhvel 1991:186) but upstart and impious. It is true that the asyndetic pairing of sullianda and harṣallanta (as normally read) seems to argue for a sense 'angry, contentious', because there can be no doubt that the second adjective is attested with a similar meaning. In the lexical text KBo 1.42 ii 37 and iii 10-11 ƙar-ƙar-si-laa-la-yan-za translates Akkadian šabagā "enraged. As shown by German 'sich empören', however, it is not difficult for the same word to mean both 'become angry, indignant' and 'rebel, starting from a basic sense 'rise, be aroused'. I suggest that Hittite harṣallanta- likewise could mean both 'rebelling' and 'angry'. If we read the adjective as harṣallanta- (as permitted by the ambiguous spelling with the sign har/ha), we may tentatively derive the word from the PIE *H₃-gers- *rise10.

Other instances of the verb sulde- are compatible with either a meaning 'arrogant, disrespectful' or 'quarrelsome'. KBo 12.70 Ro 7-8 contains an injunction regarding behavior towards one's mother: AME-ama-za-za X8 [ ] ma-zi=η=kan li sulli[la] 'Your mother [ ] you. Do not be disrespectful towards her.' The immediate contexts of the examples in KUB 36.114 rt. col. 6 and 14 ma₃=su₃-si₃=su₃ ‘But if you become upstart...’ and kus-su₃-si₃=su₃ ‘But whoever becomes upstart...’ are lacking. However, given the Hittite preoccupation with loyalty to the king and fear

---

10 For the sense of kurtawau- see Puhvel (1997: 265ff.). The crucial point is that the word refers to a land that was viewed as somehow dependent or in a position of inferiority, though perhaps not of "fawninghood."

11 As Harry Hoffner kindly points out to me, the alleged example of ƙar-si-laa-la- in KUB 33.86 = 8.66 iii 3 (Hedemann myth) almost certainly does not exist (contra Siegloov 1971: 578:55). Collarius confirms the reading of the published autograph, which shows that the partial sign following ƙar- before the break has two vertical strokes, thus eliminating a sign le.
of usurpation of the throne, a sense ‘become upset’ or the like seems rather more likely than ‘become quarrelsome’ in the overall context of this so-called ‘Protocol of Dynastic Succession’.

The only usable examples of the suffixed stem sullešt- refer to the proper behavior of an envoy (KUB 19.15 ii 10–15 and ii 19–21): ‘(Let the one send ahead from the great [place]13) šuklu to the men of the city with their [their] approval. Let them set him on the road with approval. Let them give him well to eat and drink.) sullešti=n=mav=at lē kuuki walабa š̄ur=ati lē kuksi ‘Let him not in any way become overhearing. Let him not strike or curse anyone’. ‘(But let the sun not find him in the city. It is not proper.) mān=at sullešti= at mu ‘But if he becomes overhearing...’.

The royal envoy is subject to the leaders of the town and is not to overpower his proper bounds. To do so would be a moral offense (natta šīna).

One passage containing sulle- appears to contradict our claim that the verb refers always to an act of disrespect towards a superior. By the received interpretation, the following text describes an action taken by two men of equal standing mutually against each other (KBo 19.70, 4–14): [nanna zik ḫur(m-apal)]=u=št- tantrwa iš LūKūr-nil37 lē š̄iyak nu=war=an=kan lē ƙwari 15 iš x x (PES.TUR-waš) LūKūr-nil37 lē š̄iyat(zi) iš [nuš̄=akkan lē kuwari mān=ma=wa=ta ḫarṣiqluwaš] iš [lx x Lu LūKūr-nil š̄iyat nu=sa=kan kuwaši] iš [nu apدادša šer PES.TUR-lašat ANA iš UTU10 LūKūr iš [nu=war=an=uniš]10 zaḥš̄iškemı̂ n=mān=ma=wa zik 15 lx x Manapa-u=št suliyatı̂ su ANA PES.T(U)R-waš]10 [L. LūKūr-nil š̄iyati nu=war=an=kan kuwiši nu=wa=wa zik 15 iš]10 Manapa-u=št-utanš̄.aš š̄iyatı̂ su ANA iš UTU10 LūKūr nu=sa=ta zaḥš̄iškemı̂ iš [nu apدادša sa memiaš]14. Furthermore, you Manapa-Tarhunta [shall not approach] Mashušluwa as an enemy, and you shall not kill [him]. [Mashušluwa] shall not approach [you] as an enemy, and he shall not kill you. But if Mashušluwa does [ṣ] approach you as an enemy and kills you, Mashušluwa will on that [account] be My Majesty’s enemy, and I, My Majesty, will continually attack him. But if you [ ] Manapa-Tarhunta become upset, and you approach Mashušluwa [as an enemy], and kill him, you Manapa-Tarhunta will be My Majesty’s enemy, and I, My Majesty, will continually attack you. And that matter too shall be placed under oath.3

This paragraph from the treaty of Mursili with Manapa-Tarhunta is one of several regulating the mutual behavior of the Hittite king’s vassal rulers. Del Monte (1980: 61f.), followed by Beckman (1996: 79f.), assumes that the hypothetical act of suliyatı̂ by Manapa- Tarhunta in line 11 is matched by one by Manashašluwa in line 8. He thus reads and restores the beginning of line 8 as: [ṣu-ul-li-ša]-zi ıntu and likewise assumes that the name of Mashušluwa stood at the beginning of line 11, understanding respectively: ‘But if Mashušluwa quarrels with you...’ and ‘But if you, Manapa-Tarhunta, quarrel with Mashušluwa...’. The published autograph shows that the restoration and readings are quite impossible. The first three partial signs of line 8 may certainly be read as š̄ya-zi ıntu (though this is by no means the only possibility), but there is not remotely enough space to restore the three signs š̄u-ul-li- before them (one may easily compare the same sequence in line 11). Likewise, the partial sign

---

13 This is, the capital city. See the CHD L-M 130 for this and the meaning of malṣāššaš Saunders.
14 With Del Monte (1980: 61) I restore LūKūr-nil to fill the space. The duplicate KUB 19.50+ iii 28 (i.e. KUB 40.39, 10) has LūKūr-R-šiš.
15 I restore kuwiš after line 12' below with Del Monte (1980: 61). The duplicate KUB 19.50+ iii 29 (i.e. KUB 48.34, 10 = 40.39, 11) has ku-er-[iš] followed by an erasure.
16 The text as it stands is a confusion of the two common formulas nu apدادša š̄APAL RIES DINGIR- LIM kuruškumuru ‘That (at. nom.-acc. sg.) too shall be placed under oath’ and apدادša š̄APAL... ‘That matter (ann. nom. sg.) too...’.
following the break at the beginning of line 11 is quite incompatible with any sign that could represent the ending of the name Masuhuliuwa, in any of its attested spellings.

The overall structure of the paragraph also argues decisively against the notion of mutual acts of *sulliyo*. Note that only two acts are mentioned in the prohibitions: the two vassals are not to approach each other as enemies and not to kill each other. One would thus likewise expect only two corresponding hypotheticals. The action expressed by *suliyali* in line 11 is directed not at Masuhuliuwa, but rather as in other cases at the higher authority, i.e., Mursili the king. For Masuhuliuwa to ignore the prohibition would again be an act of disrespect.

Most instances of the derived noun *sullitar* either positively support or are compatible with the meaning ‘become arrogant’ that we have assigned to *sulle*.

The ablative of cause *sullomnza* appears in several of the opening paragraphs of the Hittite Laws relating to killing and bodily injury, as e.g. in §2 (KBo 6.3 i 4; see Hoffner 1997: 123; [takku ARAD-an nuna] 1/GEMI-an sullomnza kušku qanerz1 If someone kills (a male) or female slave on account of i.” The standard interpretation is ‘quarrel, dispute’, but nothing demands this meaning. As indicated by Hoffner (1997: 160), *sullomnza* ‘denotes an intentional, but unpremeditated and impulsive action’. A sense ‘out of wantonness, recklessness’ thus fits just as well (for a range of meaning comparable to that of Hittite *sulle* and *sullitar* one may compare German *Übertut*). The same remark applies to the theft of a donkey in §127 (KBo 6.10 ii 17; Hoffner 1997: 116).

Also amenable either to a meaning ‘quarrel, anger’ or ‘wantonness, recklessness’ are the instances of *sullitar* in the Ritual for the Infernal Deities (KBo 10.45 i 45–47; see Otten 1961: 120): DUMULU.U2.LU 1/U.LU zluráx suwamnu 1/UL-1₃ mulaqum suwamnu 1/If the human have not come willfully, I have not come in anger/wantoness.”

The remaining two examples of *sullitar* from the Laws positively affirm a sense ‘wantonness’ or the like. Both significantly appear in a section whose common theme is sexual offenses (see Hoffner 1997: 213ff.). The first is KBo 6.26 i 28–30 (Laws, §164; Hoffner 1997: 132): takku éppatrimmeri kušku 1/piazi to *sullitar* išši [eššu NINDA hušar našma 1/GEDIN].1/If someone goes to commandeer (something) and commits a wanton act, that is, opens either (the home-owner’s) sacrificial bread or libation wine…’. The received interpretation is that in the act of commandeering some object a quarrel breaks out, as the result of which the home-owner’s cultic materials are unlawfully tampered with. But the asylum between the *sullitar* išši clause and that following it argues that the second is an elaboration of the first (see Hoffner 1997: 12 for this use of asylum in the Laws). Here *sullitar* refers to a wanton act of sacrilege.

As per Hoffner (1997: 216), the violation of a boundary was also viewed by the Hittites as a sacrilegious act, as in §169 (KBo 6.3 i 6–9): takku AŠA-LAM kušku wulši to ZAG-an paršu, NINDA hušar diš-ti4 4/UTU1-i paršu 1/GEDIN 1/mi=ti-mu (gěnré aristkktu nu teši) 1/UTU3-i 4/UTU1-1/UL-1₃ *sullitar*.1/If someone buys a field and violates the boundary, he shall take a levied

---

13 Del Monte implicitly conceives this in that he does not even attempt to offer a reading in his transcription. Just what could have stood in the two gaps in the texts is a very difficult question, because the emphatically expects nothing in either case. In particular, I know of no instance where the means of orthotonic personal pronoun and personal name in opposition is broken by any element. I insist only that there is no possibility for the previously suggested restorations.

14 There is no matching expression for Masuhuliuwa because the present treaty is directed only at Manisa-Tarhunta. The corresponding application to Masuhuliuwa would have stood in his treaty.

15 Three examples of the dative-locative singular *sulliyo* definitely belong to a homonymous noun *sullitar* ‘hostagethood’ and are irrelevant to our inquiry: KUB 19.39 iii 10, KBo 14-4 i 14, and ABo 76 60 obv. 9. Likewise the examples *sullinni* at KBo 5.8 ii 2 and *sullida* at KUB 19.49 ii 68 belong to a separate verb *sulliiyas* ‘impose hostages upon, give as a hostage’.

16 Like Sommer (1922–42, note 1), I can make no coherent sense of the difficult passage with *sullinnas* in KBo 4.14 iii 26.
loaf and break it to the Sun-god (sayej): "You have [...ed my sakes to the ground."
And he shall say: "Sun-god, Storm-god, (it was) not wantonness!" The violator makes an offering of atonement and protests that he did not commit the offense with reckless intent.

One instance of *sullatar is wholly different from all others, that from the trilingual hymn to Iskur-Adad (KUB 4.4 obv. 2-9; see Laroche 1964: 75&76): dammetawaransu LUGAL-un UR.SAG-ur kinnamantum armabanna hamiekbanantu sullanni hamisbandat=ma ake astyanum hamisbandat=ma ake astyanum bandat dšatutti 'You the bountiful king, here, make the winter for impregnation, the spring for sullatar, and the flower of spring for the sake of love.' While Pulver (1991: 72) translates 'the spring for strife,' this meaning is quite impossible for this context, as already seen by Laroche (1964: 78, note 1)21. As Laroche correctly insists, we are dealing with the cycle of propagation. He attempts to salvage the accepted sense of *sullatar by assuming a tentative development from 'faith de se débatter' to 'élosion'. We may now dispense with this artifice. If the winter is for impregnation, then the spring logically can only be for the resultant state - being/becoming swollen (with child)22. This evidence for a physical sense for *sullatar also suggests that the parallel between the deer becoming physically fat in the parable (waršuktu) and becoming puffed up/swollen with conceit (šullē) was not lost on the Hitittes23.

The direct evidence for a physical sense in any case does not assure us that the attested meaning 'become arrogant' or the like for *sulle- is in fact derived from a concrete meaning 'become swollen, puffed up.' The original inscription of the stem is *sulle-* (NB the participle *sullēnt*). For the later stems *sulliy- and (1x) *sullittu-j* see Oettinger (1979: 291ff). Hitittic *sulle-*/*sullata- directly reflects a PIE stem *ṣuH-h₂-eh₂- 'become swollen', belonging to the class of PIE 'statives in -eh₂,' first established by Calvert Watkins (1973). As he showed, the class is well represented in Hitittic by examples such as *nakke- 'be important, troublesome' < *be heavy' (cf. now Oettinger 2002: xxii), standing beside *nakkešš- 'become important, troublesome' just like Latin ruber 'be red' beside rubescere 'to become red'. The "fertile" sense of *ṣuH-h₂-eh₂- is not an obstacle. As per Watkins (1973: 67), the focus on entry into a state is well elsewhere in the class (cf. OHG ailen and Hitittic miyophante both 'grow old'). A further Hitittic example is *arwe- 'declare oneself free', as established by Hoffner (1998b)24. The rarity of the expected renewal to *sullešt- is probably due to the alternate replacement by *sullītye-. The formal derivation of Hitittic *sulle- from PIE *ṣuH-h₂-eh₂- is straightforward: cf. *ṣuH₂jʰ- > *arwe- 'to help' (see Melchert 1994: 55, 79, 126f., and 132 with refs 21).

21 The corresponding Akkadian appears to be divergent (see Laroche 1964: 78); one Hubbally likhītu nakkītu aššu 'the summer for gathering the living beings' (translation with the CAD sub tabūtu 1.b). Int. cf. note 22 below.

22 Not merely the cited paragraph, but also the entire hymn focuses on the role of the Storm-god as the promoter of life, growth, and abundance (see Laroche 1964: 70 and translation ibid. 74-75). 'Strife' has no place here.

23 Though it hardly seems necessary, I may cite as parallels for such a unique German (see Grimm, Deutsches Wörterbuch sub geschwellen and schwollen [II.1.e]) and Italian gonfiare.

24 Since the focus of the hymn is on the abundance of animal and plant life, one could also entertain the possibility that *sullatar here reflects il semantic development similar to that shown by the German verb invenieren, which previously meant 'swell', but now usually rather 'toem with (abundance)' or English 'teeming', which previously meant 'pregnant, gravid' (e.g. *teem, women*), but now rather 'abounding, swarming' ("teeming, multitudes"). In that case, the Akkadian 'gathering' of creatures might also be a way of expressing 'multitude', still so far then from Hitittic *sullēʷt* 'abundance.'

25 Since swelling/puffing up is also frequently associated with anger (cf. again German geschwellen as well as Latin nimidos), one could suppose that Hitittic *sulle- at times means 'become angry', as previously assumed. However, since no instance of the verb demands this sense, I prefer not to add it further complication.

26 Indeed LIP25 (incorrectly) defines the class as fletives.

27 I personally remain puzzled by the vowel length in *sulle-. < *uW-. (NB the several examples of plebe spelling in our verb stem), but this is not a problem unique to *sulle-. CF. also kikātu- 'food' beside Greek kikēs 'battered son' and kikāra- 'root' next to Latin sarculatus 'shodd, tied'.

---

Note: The text is a transcription of a page from a document, with references to other works and notes on the etymology and context of specific terms.
Hittite *sole- supports the hypothesis that Latin inherited a stem *suH-e: become swollen\(^2\). The Latin adjective (putatively participle) *insolēns seems to imply a verb stem *insolē. Use of a preverb *in(to) to underscore entry into a state is typologically common (cf. German einschlafen 'fall asleep') and well attested in Latin (e.g. illucēsēns beside lucēsēns 'grow bright, dawn'). However, as stressed by Haverling (2000: 457), in early Latin "actional" prefixes are added only to (suffixed) "dynamic" verbs. The pattern there is that of uxorō 'be silent beside conticēsēns 'fall silent, stop talking'. Only later do we find conticō in the sense 'fall silent'. Addition of in- 'into' to a stem *sole- in pre-Latin would be unparalleled (see already the remark of Ernout, Meillet 1959: 379).

I see two possible solutions to this problem. First, Latin inherited *soleō < *suH-eh-; *become swollen, puffed up*. Note crucially that according to the Hittite evidence the meaning here is dynamic. This fact would have distinguished this stem from virtually all other Latin verbs in ēre — of 48 examples listed by Haverling (2000: 410–422) only puteō 'stink' in the sense 'rot' and sectās 'push forth' are not static in meaning. Thus already in Old Latin *soleō would have been renewed as *insoleō like illucēsēns beside lucēsēns 'grow bright, dawn'. The ēre would be unique because the dynamic/prescriptive sense of *soleō was virtually so.

One could assume alternatively that there never was a verb *insoleō. Inherited *soleō was renewed as *soleō (perhaps precisely due to its dynamic meaning), which could then take the actional prefix in pre-Latin, producing *insoleō. The adjective *insolens was then back-formed on the model of opalēscō and opalēs (for the original relationship of which see Watkins 1973: 87).

The formal derivation of *insoleō is problematic. Per Schrijver (1991: 205ff.) *CRH4 leads to Latin Carīf. A stem *suH-eh- would thus lead in the first instance to *insalaē. Evidence of various compounds of the root of alēre 'nourish' (alēscō, insalaē, sub-alēs) argues that medial -alē- would have led to -alē-, thus *insalaē- > *insalaē- > attested insalē- (see Ernout, Meillet 1959: 23, who properly reject the alleged simplex olēscō of Festus as an invention).

Thanks to the new evidence of Hittite *sole-/*salōr 'become arrogant' and vitātur 'swollenness, wantonness', we may add *suH-eh-; *become swollen, puffed up* to the assured list of PIE verbal stems in *eh- established by Watkins (removing the question mark of LID\(^3\) 610) and derive Latin *insoleō/*insoleō from the same ultimate source, reaffirming Pokrowskii's suggestion of more than a century ago.
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\(^2\) Whether the derived sense 'become puffed up with conceit; become arrogant' is already PIE is impossible to determine. The quasi-universal status of this semantic development could be used to argue for or against.

\(^3\) LID: 610