

Whitley Stokes / Adalbert Bezzenberger
Wortschatz der keltischen Spracheinheit

(August Fick, Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen, 2. Teil). 5., unveränderte Auflage (Nachdruck der 4. Auflage von 1894).
1979. VIII, 337 Seiten, Leinen DM 90,-

Die Sammlung, seit langem vergriffen, liegt nun in einem unveränderten Nachdruck wieder vor. Sie enthält in alphabetischer Folge belegte urkeltische und auch die als urkeltisch (bzw. vorkeltisch?) angesetzten Grundformen, dazu spätere Formen und die in einem hibernischen und einem gallobritischen Ast des Keltischen nachweisbaren Wörter.

Heinrich Tiefenbach · Althochdeutsche Aratorglossen

Paris lat. 8318. Gotha Membr. II 115. (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse III/107)
1979. 71 Seiten, kartoniert DM 18,-

„Als Ausgangspunkt der rund 20 Handschriften, die althochdeutsche Aratorglossen enthalten, bezeichnet Tiefenbach das alemannische Gebiet, wahrscheinlich St. Gallen im 9. Jh. Weitertradiert wurden sie im mitteldeutschen Raum (2. Hälfte 10. Jh.). So wird das Nebeneinander von rheinfränkischen und alemannischen Dialektmerkmalen in den Pariser Glossen erklärt, die Tiefenbach (nach einem Vergleich mit den Glossen zu Bedas Matthäuskommentar, BM Add. 23931, 10. Jh.) im sprachlichen Übergangsgebiet um Speyer ansiedeln möchte. – Dazu kommen noch 7 neugefundene, außerhalb der Tradition stehende bairische Aratorglossen aus dem 9. Jh. in Gotha Membr. II 115 (Bergmann Nr. 267 a). Tiefenbach veröffentlicht sie, nach genauer Beschreibung und Bestimmung, zusammen mit den Pariser Glossen in einem alphabetischen Register.“ Germanistik

**Frank-Günter Berghaus · Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse
der altenglischen Interlinearversionen des Psalters
und der Cantica**

1979. 134 Seiten mit zahlreichen Textabb. und 18 Tafeln, engl. brosch. DM 36,-. (Palaestra 272)

Im Verlauf der Untersuchung werden einige bisher nur ungenügend abgesicherte Erkenntnisse älterer Forschung bestätigt, etliche gängige Vorstellungen über genetische Zusammenhänge im Material modifiziert. Darüberhinaus gelingt es dem Verfasser, zu neuen, teilweise überraschenden Ergebnissen zu gelangen.

Die an diesem Gegenstand entwickelte neue Untersuchungsmethode (vollständige Kollation der gesamten Überlieferung bei Einsatz der Datenverarbeitung) ist nicht auf den einzelnen Anwendungsfall beschränkt, sondern ermöglicht es, überlieferungsgeschichtliche Zusammenhänge auch bei solchem Material zu erkennen, das bis jetzt jedem methodisch gesicherten Zugriff getrotzt hat.

IN VORBEREITUNG:

Hermann Jacobsen · Arier und Ugrofinnen

Reprint der Ausgabe von 1922. Mit einem Verzeichnis der finno-ugrischen Wörter und Wortformen, einer Bibliographie und einem Nachwort.
1980. Etwa 304 Seiten, kart. etwa DM 65,-.

Heinz Bechert (Hrsg.) · Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung

1980. Etwa 240 Seiten, kart. etwa DM 76,-
(Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil. hist. Kl. III/117).

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

in Göttingen
und Zürich

Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung 93/2

Sonderdruck aus

**ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR
VERGLEICHENDE
SPRACHFORSCHUNG**

BEGRÜNDET VON ADALBERT KUHN

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

CLAUS HAEBLER

UND GÜNTER NEUMANN

93. BAND

2. HEFT 1979

VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT IN GÖTTINGEN

ISSN 0044-3646

Die 1852 von Adalbert Kuhn begründete „Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung“, die seit 1877 den Gesamtbereich der indogermanischen Sprachen berücksichtigt, widmet sich vor allem der historischen Sprachwissenschaft und den mit ihr verknüpften Fragen. So möchte sie der Verbindung von Textinterpretation und sprachwissenschaftlicher Analyse dienen, neuentdeckten Sprachdenkmälern zur Veröffentlichung helfen, aber auch neuen methodischen Ansätzen Gehör verschaffen. „Kuhns Zeitschrift“, 1907 mit „Bezzensbergers Beiträgen“ vereinigt, ist die älteste heute noch bestehende sprachwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift.

INHALT

Nachruf auf Fritz Mezger	177
M. Back, Die Rekonstruktion des idg. Verschluslautsystems im Lichte der einzelsprachlichen Veränderungen	179
St. W. Jamison, Remarks on the expression of agency with the passive in Vedic and Indo-European	196
J. F. Vigorita, The Trochaic Gāyatrī	220
W. Thomas, Nachtrag zur Sanskrit-Udānavarga-Ausgabe	242
F. Starke, Zu den hethitischen und luwischen Verbalabstrakta auf <i>-šha-</i>	247
H. C. Melchert, Three Hittite Etymologies	262
F. Cercignani, The Development of the Gothic Short/Lax Subsystem ...	272
E. Hauzenberga-Šturma, Zur Frage des Verbalaspekts im Lettischen ...	279
Register (von H. Nowicki)	317

Beiträge werden an Prof. Dr. Claus Haebler, Kerßenbrockstr. 16, 4400 Münster, oder an Prof. Dr. Günter Neumann, Thüringer Str. 20, 8700 Würzburg, erbeten. Professor Neumann redigiert Band 92-94. Besprechungen können nur solchen Werken zugesichert werden, welche ein Herausgeber erbeten hat.

Preis dieses Bandes 80,— DM (einschl. 6,5% MwSt.) • Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft.

Herstellung: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

verhältnismäßig selten sind, in vielen Fällen allerdings wegen der Besonderheiten der Stammbildung bei unzureichendem Belegmaterial nur sehr schwer nachgewiesen werden können⁶¹), ist die bisherige Ansicht, daß uranatol. *a*-Stämme (die im Heth. erhalten bleiben) im Luw. in die *i*-Deklination überführt wurden, sicher stark zu modifizieren⁶²).

Nicht zuletzt unterstreicht luw. *-šha-* damit die bereits von R. Gusmani (a.a.O. S. 261) geäußerte Ablehnung einer Verknüpfung dieses Suffixes mit dem vermeintlichen Suffix *-šhi-* hurritischer Herkunft⁶³). Darüber hinaus dürfte die oben vorgeschlagene Analyse von *lulijašha-* deutlich gemacht haben, daß die Existenz eines denominalen *-šha*-Suffixes stark bezweifelt werden muß. Heth. *lušalašha-* (Berufsbezeichnung), *kuštarušha-*¹ n. (Geschirrtail), und *išhā-* „Herr“ (zum langvokalischen Stammauslaut vgl. N. Oettinger, StBoT 22, S. 30) sind ohnehin wegen ihrer Bedeutung, ihres Genus bzw. ihres Stammauslautes anders zu beurteilen⁶⁴).

Institut für Indogermanistik,
Phonetik u. Slavische Philologie
Georg-Voigt-Str. 8
6000 Frankfurt 1

Frank Starke

⁶¹) Da z.B. Sg. N. A. n. *-an* der *a*-Stämme auf die *i*-Stämme übertragen wurde, läßt sich praktisch kein neutraler *a*-Stamm sicher feststellen, sofern nicht oblique Kasus belegt sind.

⁶²) So dürfte z.B. luw. *anni-* „Mutter“ kaum direkt aus einem uranatol. **anna-* (> heth. *anna-*) abzuleiten sein (A. Kammenhuber, HbOr, S. 258, 282), da es sich um einen *i/ia*-Stamm handelt, wie der für diese Stammklasse charakteristische Ablativ *anniāti* (statt **annāti*) und die weiblichen PN **Annimaššani-*, **Anniyašu-*, **Anniyianni-* (mit *i* statt *a* in der Kompositionsfuge) zeigen. Das Problem werde ich an anderer Stelle ausführlich behandeln.

⁶³) Vgl. dazu jetzt V. Haas-G. Wilhelm, Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna (= AOAT S 3), 1974, S. 137.

⁶⁴) Der Vollständigkeit halber sei noch darauf hingewiesen, daß auch in *šešha-* „anordnen, befehlen“ kein *-šha*-Suffix verbaut ist, sondern ein halbkonzonantischer Stamm der *šhi*-Konjugation (Typ: *tarna-* „lassen“) vorliegt. Zur Rückführung auf ein redupliziertes Perfekt und etymol. Verknüpfung mit *išhā-* „Herr“ vgl. Stammbildung § 379.

Three Hittite Etymologies*

1. *kinuntar(r)iyala-*, *nuntaraš*, etc.

Friedrich, *HW* 2. *Erg.* 15, lists an adjective *kinuntariyala-* “jetzig(?) , gegenwärtig(?)”, citing *KBo* IX 146 Vs 28 and Laroche, *DLL* 74. There is no basis for Friedrich’s doubts about the meaning, since the cited passage *KBo* IX 146 Vs 28 reads *[k]aru[il]iyaz kinuntarriyalaz* “from the past (and) present . . .”. See now also *KUB* XLI 22 III 4–5 *lenkiyaza hur[teya]tiyaza HU[L-waza . . .] / karuiliyaza kinuntari[yalaza . . .]* “from the oath, curse, evil [. . .], past (and) present . . .”. *KBo* XXI 12, 13 begins *karuiliyatta kinuntarriyal* (!), followed by several obscure forms which leave the syntax uncertain. The comparable Luvian form *nanuntarriyala-* cited by Laroche is found only in broken contexts, but note the passage in which the shorter stem *nanuntarri-* occurs (*KUB* XXXV 54 III 1–3): *ad[duwalza utarša] / hallišša paprat[ta]nza / puwatilza [n]anuntarriš[a]* “the evil words, the —, the impurities(?), the past (and) present . . .” (see Laroche, *DLL* 153, for transcription and translation).

As pointed out by Laroche, the base of the adjectives *kinuntar(r)iyala-* and *nanuntarri(yala)-* is the adverb “now” (*kinun* in Hittite, *nānun* in Luvian). The contrast between *nanuntarri-* and *nanuntarriyala-* shows that the *-ala-* is a secondary suffix. One can divide *nanuntarri-ala-* (with *-ala-* as in Hittite *lišši(y)-ala-* “belonging to the liver”, *ḫuḫad-alla-* “ancestral”). The remaining *nanuntarri* “present” (with the usual Luvian transfer of an *a*-stem to the *i*-declension) may be compared formally with Hittite **nuntara-* (see below). Alternatively, in view of Hittite *nu(n)tarryia-* “quick, hastening”, one may analyze *kinuntariyala-* and *nanuntariyala-* as *kinun-/nanun-tar-ya-la-* (cf. Laroche, *DLL* 154). In either case, we are left with *kinun/nanun* “now” plus a *-tar(a)-* suffix. We may also include here the family of words meaning “haste, hurry” (*nuntarnu-*, *nuntarriya-*, *nuntarriyašha-*), built on a stem **nuntar(a)-*: **nun* “now” + *tar(a)-*. The semantics are straightforward: “pre-

sent(ly)” > “soon, at once” > “in a hurry”. For the connection of **nuntar(a)-* and related forms with *nanuntarri-* etc. see Kronasser, *Etymologie der Hethitischen Sprache (EHS)* 274.

Kronasser analyzes Hittite *nuntaraš* “soon, quickly” as the frozen genitive of an *r*-stem **nuntar-* “haste”, following a tentative suggestion of Friedrich, *ArOr* 6 (1934) 372. This leaves the function and source of the *-tar-* unidentified. I agree that *nuntaraš* as attested is an indeclinable form functioning as an adverb: “soon, quickly”. I suggest, however, that it is not the genitive of an *r*-stem noun “haste”, but rather the nom. sg. comm. of an adjective **nuntara-* “present”. The sense “soon, quickly, in haste” developed from the “adverbial” use of the nominative with intransitive predicates. This construction is well-known in older Indo-European languages, particularly Greek. Compare *χθις* *ἔβη* “he went yesterday” (*Iliad* A 424) or *ὅταν ὁ θεὸς . . . ἔλθῃ πολὺς* “whenever the god comes in might” (*Euripides* Ba. 300). For further examples see Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* 2. 178–179 and Wackernagel, *Syntax* 2. 65f. This usage is also attested in Hittite: *KUB* XVII 10 II 38 *ṽTelipinuš lēlaniyanza uit* “Telipinu came in a rage”¹).

In all the examples above, the adjective agrees grammatically with the subject, but it does not express an inherent attribute, but rather an attendant circumstance. The attested examples of *nuntaraš* still reflect this pattern (see those collected by Friedrich, *ArOr* 6 (1934) 371). Typical is the omen text *Bo* 164 Rs 10: *BI-aš UKÜ-aš nuntaraš aki* “That man will die present(ly)/soon”. The predicate *nu(n)taraš aki* is the equivalent of Akkadian *arḫiṣ imāt*. In this and several examples *nuntaraš* may be interpreted as agreeing with the subject, but in *KUB* XV 3 I 19, where the subject is *eni IZI ŠA GİR.MEŠ-ŠU* “that burning of his feet”, one must assume that *nuntaraš* has been fixed as an adverb (unless one chooses to read something other than the neuter *paḫḫur* “fire” for *IZI* in this non-literal use).

The adverb *nuntaraš* “soon, quickly” may thus be explained from an adjective **nuntara-* “present”. The other piece of evidence cited for *nuntaraš* as the genitive of a *r*-stem **nuntar-* is the phrase *nuntaraš* *ṽLAMA-i* (*KUB* II 1 II 49). Friedrich tentatively translates this as “dem Schutzgott der Eile”. The genitival interpretation at first appears unavoidable, especially when one compares in preced-

*) Abbreviations of Hittitological works are those of J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch (HW)*, Heidelberg 1952, and its *Ergänzungshefte (Erg.)* 1–3, Heidelberg 1957, 1961 and 1966.

¹) The syntax remains the same if one prefers the earlier interpretation of “hastening” for *lēlaniyant-*: “Telipinu came in haste”.

ing lines combinations like ZI-aš *arnummaš* 'LAMA-ri "the protective god of fulfilling one's wish" (II 28) or NÍ.TE.ĪI.A-uš *iškiyanuwaš* 'LAMA-i "the protective god of anointing the body" (II 36-37). However, one also finds, immediately preceding *nuntaraš* 'LAMA-i, the phrases *hanteyaššaššiš* 'LAMA-i (II 47) and *tarpattaššiš* 'LAMA-i (II 48). Whatever their meaning, *hanteyaššašši-* and *tarpattašši-* are Luvian adjectives in -(a)šši-, functionally equivalent to a modifying genitive. They should agree in case with the modified noun, but note that here they are nominatives! This may be explained by assuming that the basic form of the list of gods was the nominative, and that the scribe failed to make the proper case adjustments when putting the list into the dative. That is, since the genitive modifier does not change in going from ZI-aš *arnummaš* 'LAMA-aš to ZI-aš *arnummaš* 'LAMA-i, the scribe neglected to change the case of the adjective in *hanteyaššaššiš* 'LAMA-aš, producing the ungrammatical *hanteyaššaššiš* 'LAMA-i instead of correct *hanteyaššašši* 'LAMA-i. In the same way, then, *nuntaraš* 'LAMA-i may reflect *nuntaraš* 'LAMA-aš "the present/prompt protective god" (adjective + noun)².

Thus *nuntaraš* in all its occurrences may be analyzed as the original nominative of an adjective **nuntara-*, "present", rather than as the genitive of an abstract noun **nuntar-* "haste". I suggest this alternative because the abstract noun **nuntar-* is problematic morphologically. First, the productive abstract suffix in Hittite is not -tar, but -ātar (exclusively so in denominatives; see Kronasser, *EHS* 294f., and also Eichner, *MSS* 31 (1972) 59-60). Second, the abstract suffix -ātar is heteroclit (oblique stem -ann- < -atn-). A genitive *nuntaraš* is thus unexpected. It is also awkward semantically to derive an abstract "haste" directly from **nun* "now" (one expects **nuntar-* to mean something like "now-ness", "the present (time)").

On the other hand, if one assumes an adjective **nuntara-* "present", its formation is straightforward. We have **nun* "now" plus the IE oppositional suffix -tero-: cf. Lat. *uter*, Gr. *πότερος* "which

²) Friedrich, *ArOr* 6 (1934) 372, raises the possibility that the adverb *nuntaraš* (spelled *nu-un-tar-aš*) was pronounced /nuntars/, while the genitive of the putative noun (spelled *nu-un-ta-ra-aš* in the single occurrence *KUB* II 1 II 49) was /nuntaras/. This distinction is highly dubious. While -CV-rV-VC- is the more common spelling for the sequence /-CVrVC-/ , one also finds instances of -CVr-VC- where the second vowel is assuredly real: e. g. *ša-ku-wa-aš-šar-an*, *ša-ku-wa-šar-it*, *šu-up-pi-iš/eš-šar-aš*.

of two?", Gr. *ἀγρότερος* "rural, rustic" (versus "urban"), etc.; see Brugmann, *Gr.* 2. 421. We have seen that in the case of *kinuntariyala-* the opposite member of the pair is explicitly present in *karuili-*.

The vocalism of -tara- may be derived from either *-tro- or *-toro-. For the zero-grade compare the Skt. adverbial ending -tra in *kū-tra* "where" and *anyā-tra* "elsewhere" with Gr. *ἄλλοτρε-ιος* "belonging to another". Skt. *antrām* (RV *āntrām*) "inwards" is also cited for the zero-grade, versus Gr. *ἐντετα* "idem". Av. *katārō* "which of two?" and OCS *kotoryj* "which" (beside *koteryj*) may point to *-toro-, but other explanations have been advanced for these forms (see Brugmann, *Gr.* (2nd ed.) 2. 323 with references). The zero-grade at least seems sure. In contrast with -tara-, the suffix *-ero- in its older local function appears as -era- in Hittite *kattera-* "low(er)": see Benveniste *hitt. et i.-e.* 102f.

As already indicated, the semantic development from "present" to "hastening" is rooted in the adverbial use of the nominative *nuntaraš*. Hence the derivative *nu(n)tarriya-* "hastening, swift" and its abstract *nuntarriyašša-* "haste". The verb *nuntarnu-* "hasten" (intr.) requires additional comment. First, from an *a*-stem **nuntara-*, we would properly expect a causative/factitive **nuntarahh-*: cf. *arawahh-* "set free" < *arawa-* "free". There are, however, other examples of -nu- added to an *a*-stem: *maršanu-* "falsify" < *marša-* "false" (beside *maršahh-*) and *aimpanu-* "weigh down" < *aimpa-* "burden". The presence of *kartimnu-* beside *kartimmiyanu-* "to anger" (< *kartimmiya-* "be angry") also shows that the disappearance of the stem-final *a* in *nuntar-nu-* is not a compelling argument against assuming a base **nuntara-*. For the intransitive sense of the formal causative *nuntarnu-*, compare the use of *wahnu-* "turn" in *KBo* IV 4 II 7, *KUB* XLV 20 II 4 and elsewhere.

Hittite **nuntara-*, Luvian *nanuntarri-* and related forms thus provide evidence for the existence of the IE oppositional suffix *-tero- in Anatolian.

2. wizza-, wiwida-

In the Treaty of Mursili II with Targasnalli, *KBo* V 4 Rs 29, we find the phrase: *[nu]-tta-kkan mān šakuwaššarit ZI-it ŪL kuwatqa* ~ *wiwidāi* (*wi₅-ū-i-da-a-i*). The same expression appears to recur in Rs 36 (with the verb spelled ~ *ū-i-wi₅-ta-[a-i]*) and in Rs 41, where the verb form is *ū-iz-za-i* (see Friedrich, *Staatsv.* I 64 and 66). Friedrich leaves the verb untranslated, but in his commentary,

Staatsv. I 91, he rejects any connection with *wida-* "bring". By the time of his dictionary, *HW* 256, he does suggest identification with *wida-* "bring", though with considerable hesitation. The sense "bring" certainly does not fit the passage cited, and the form *wizzai* cannot easily be reconciled with the thematic conjugation of *wida-*.

In arriving at a sense for *wiuidai/wizzai*, we may note first of all that it is construed impersonally: "If somehow it does not __ you wholeheartedly". The immediate context deals with what will happen if T. does not promptly and unflinchingly come to the aid of the Hittite king. The basic meaning of our sentence must be: "If the spirit doesn't move you". A closer equivalent to the Hittite phraseology is the impersonal use of *drängen* in German: *mich drängt's* = roughly "I have the urge (to)". I suggest a similar meaning for *wiuidai/wizzai* in the Targasnalli Treaty: "If it doesn't press/urge you wholeheartedly" = "If you do not have the wholehearted urge (to help me)".

The verb *wiuidai/wizza-* occurs in one other passage, *KUB* IV 8 Vs 5-9 (Hymn to Iškur-Adad):

*n-aš LÍL-ašš-[a(?) hui]ar / wewi[dai nu] SI.HI.A-ar /
kuedani-p[at(?) ta]k(!)takuw[a]nta / § L^UHUL-aš-ma-za
kuiš UL memmai / n-an SI.HI.A-it wez[za]i*

"He (the Storm-god) strikes also (at) the beasts of the field, for whom, nevertheless (-pat), his horns are covered. But he strikes with his horns the wicked man who refuses."

For a different restoration and translation, see Laroche, *RA* 58 (1964) 71f. My interpretation of the first paragraph, particularly that of *tak akkuwanta*, is by no means assured³), but the sense of the second paragraph and hence that of *wiuidai/wezzai* seems clear enough. Laroche suggests "chasse" for the verb, but with an instrumental of "horns" a meaning such as "strike, pierce, stab" is surely more likely.

³) I read in line 7 *[ta-a]k(!)-ta-ku-w[a-a]n-ta*, the neuter plural participle of a verb *dak(ku)dakuwa-*, which also occurs in *KUB* XXXV 148 III 40f (for a transliteration see Neu, *StBoT* 5 (1968) 162). In the latter instance the action of the verb is performed on various domestic animals in their respective dwelling places, suggesting a meaning "enclose" or "shelter". I assume a basic meaning "cover" and interpret our passage to mean that while the Storm-god also sends down lightning on the beasts of the field, they are not harmed by it, because for them "his horns are covered/sheathed".

We may account for the two stems *wizza-* and *wiuidai-* by assuming an unreduplicated Hittite stem **wid-/wed-* and an original athematic present: **wed-ti*. This would yield regularly a third singular present **wezzazzi* /wetsti/: cf. *ezzazzi* to *ed-* "eat". The attested form *we/izzai* represents the generalization of *wezz-* from the third singular as the basic verb stem and transfer to the *hi*-conjugation: compare again *ezzai* "eats" for *ezzazzi* and also *išparzai* "escapes" beside *išparzazzi* < *išpart-*. For the *hi*-conjugation in the reduplicated stem *wiuid(a)-* beside athematic **wezzazzi*, compare *wewakki* beside unreduplicated *wekzi* "demands" (however this pattern is to be accounted for).

We thus have a Hittite stem *wed-/wid-* with an athematic present and a basic meaning "strike, pierce", also used impersonally to mean "press, urge". The obvious IE etymon is **wedh-* "strike, hit" (Skt. *vadhati* "strikes, destroys", Hom. *ἔθων* "striking, uprooting", Gr. *ὠθέω* "drive, urge"). The Hittite evidence for an athematic present is not contradicted by the oldest forms of the verb elsewhere: Skt. *vadhati* is post-Vedic (the RV has only the *iṣ*-aorist, *avadhīt*, etc.). In Greek, Homer shows only the participle *ἔθων/ἔθοντες*. The gloss in Hesychius *ἔθει· φθελει· ἐρεθίζει* is hardly probative for the conjugation-class of the verb (on this gloss and the correct meaning of the Homeric forms see K. Fr. W. Schmidt, *KZ* 45 (1913) 231-235).

The vocalism and accent of *ἔθων*, when taken together with the Hittite evidence for an athematic present, argue that we are dealing with an original "acrostatic" lengthened-grade present of the type described by Narten, *Pratidānam* 9-194). That is, the original present paradigm had fixed root accent and lengthened grade in the singular, full grade in the plural: **uédhti*: **uédhnti* and ptc. **uédhnt-*. Hittite **wezzazzi/wezzai* would represent the third singular (cf. again *ezzazzi/ezzai* < **ēdti* = Lat. *ēst*, OLith. *ést*). Homeric *ἔθων* now appears in a different light. So long as one assumed a thematic verb, *ἔθων* could be taken as its regular participle. However, Hittite now points to an athematic present, for which we would expect a participle with zero-grade of the root and accent on the suffix: cf. *ίών* "going". Homeric *ἔθων* thus appears to preserve the root vocalism and accent of **uédhnt-* (with the usual elimination of the

⁴) Narten herself calls this type "proterodynamic". For the use of "acrostatic" and related terminology see the definitions in Eichner, *MSS* 31 (1972) 91.

zero-grade of the participial suffix in Greek). The lengthened-grade iterative-causative $\acute{\omega}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ may also support the reconstruction of an acrostatic present. Compare Arm. *oute*- "eat" < $*h_1\acute{o}deje/o$ -⁵).

3. *kattawatar*

Hittite *kattawatar* has been taken to mean "revenge, retribution, reparation" (thus Friedrich, *HW* 106, following Sommer-Falkenstein, *HAB* 50). This interpretation is based primarily on the passage in the Testament of Hattusili, *HAB* II 22/I 21, where Hittite *kattawatar šanḫ-* is translated by Akkadian *gimilla turru* "make retribution, avenge" (see Sommer, loc. cit., and von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* sub *gimillu*).

However, already in the other passages discussed by Sommer, the meaning "revenge, retribution" is not entirely apt. In *KUB* XXIV 3 II 31 and 51 we find the expression *n-at ANA DINGIR.MEŠ kattawatar namma kišaru* and in *KUB* IV 1 I 22f *na-at ANA DINGIR.MEŠ mekki kattawatar ēšdu*. In these examples *kattawatar* is not "revenge", but "the object of revenge": the *-at* in each case refers to depredations against Hatti by foreign enemies. Sommer is able to explain this usage by pointing to the use of the abstract *kartimmiyatt-* "anger" as "the object of anger".

Not so easily solved is the passage in Kantuzzili's Prayer, *KUB* XXX 10 Vs 22-23: *mām-man dandukišnaš-a DUMU-aš uktūri huišwanza ēšta man-ašta mām [an]tuwahḫaš idāluwa inan arta man-at-ši natta kattawatar*. Sommer, *HAB* 51, translates: "Wenn auch der Menschensohn ewig lebend wäre, so dürfte, auch wenn ein böses inan-Leiden den Menschen (gegen ihn) aufstünde, das keine (genügende) Vergeltung für ihn (bedeuten)". The idea of retribution is quite foreign to the context, and Sommer himself admits to finding the passage "noch nicht ganz durchsichtig". The real sense of these lines is found in the rather free translation of Goetze in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd edit. (1969) 400: "Were man to live forever, it would not concern him

⁵) On the possible relationship of lengthened-grade iterative-causatives with acrostatic presents, see the article by G. Klingenschmitt "Zum Ablaut des idg. Kausativs" *KZ* 92 (1978) 1-13. For Klingenschmitt, the original shape of the lengthened-grade iterative-causatives is represented by the type of Lat. *sōpiō* "put to sleep" (< $*suōpie/o$ -). I wish to thank Dr. Klingenschmitt for making available to me a copy of the article in advance of publication.

greatly even if he had to endure grievous sickness". For the Kantuzzili prayer, then, we arrive at a meaning for *kattawatar* of "object of worry/concern". One may note that this meaning could also be applied to the examples in *KUB* XXIV 3 and IV 1 cited above, but not to the occurrence in the Testament of Hattusili.

How are we to reconcile "revenge, retribution" and "object of concern"? What is the common denominator? First of all, we must return to the basis for the interpretation "revenge", the phrase *kattawatar šanḫ-*. Despite the apparent equivalence of this phrase and "seek revenge, Rache suchen", the equation of *kattawatar* with "revenge, Rache" is false. Compare the frequent Hittite expression *ēšhar šanḫ-* "seek blood", i.e. "seek revenge for (someone's) death". As is shown by *KUB* XI 1 II 4-5 and other instances, "blood" refers here to that of the murder victim, not that of the murderer. In other words, what is "sought" from the Hittite point of view is not vengeance (or the death of the murderer), but the "blood" of the victim, the object of vengeance. Thus *kattawatar šanḫ-* should also mean: "seek the object of vengeance". Hence *kattawatar* itself is "cause of/grounds for vengeance", not "vengeance" or "retribution".

It is important to note that *kattawatar* has legal connotations. In several instances the legal context is overt (*KUB* IV 1 I 23, XIII 7 I 15f.) and in *KUB* XXXI 127 I 37 it is implied. This leads me to suggest as a basic meaning for *kattawatar* "dispute, quarrel", especially "(legal) grounds for a quarrel, (just) complaint". This meaning fits all examples of *kattawatar* of which I am aware. In *KUB* XXIV 3 and IV 1 seen above, the offenses against Hatti are to be the grounds for the gods' righteous wrath. The phrase *kattawatar šanḫ-* in *HAB* means "seek the grounds for a quarrel", i.e. for retaliation, just as *ēšhar šanḫ-* is "seek (the victim's) blood". In the Kantuzzili prayer, the idea is that man would have no just grounds for complaining about serious illness, if he were assured of living forever.

Other passages support the interpretation of *kattawatar* as "grounds for a quarrel, complaint". In *KUB* XXXI 127 I 36-38 it is said of the Sun-god, the supreme judge and law-giver: *kurim[ma]š dam[me]šḫandaš antruhšaš kattawatar zik-[pat]* ^aUTU-uš *šarninkiškiši* "You, the Sun-god, make good the complaint of the bereaved and oppressed man". Since *šarnink-* is "make restitution for, make good" this example confirms that *kattawatar* is not "retribution", but that for which retribution is demanded.

In *KUB XXXI* 42 II 7 and 16 (and parallels), the troops of a given city swear to their own destruction if they fail to treat offenses against the Hittite king as *kattawatar*, i.e. "grounds for a fight", and do not attack his enemies forthwith (cf. von Schuler, *Orientalia* 25 (1956) 226 and 230). *KUB XIII* 7 I 15-17 offers another instance of *kattawatar šanḫ-* plus *kattawanalliš*, which stands parallel to *BEL DIN-ŠU* "opponent at law" and may be rendered as "plaintiff" or "disputant".

Finally, there is the letter *ABoT* 65 Rs 4-7:

*nu apēdani uddani aršanie[nun] | mam-man-za-kan kuiški É-ir
tam[ai]š arnut | man zik ŪL aršanieše | nu ammuq-a apāt
uttar kattawatar kišat*

"I was envious/vexed about that matter. If someone else had carried off a house(hold) for himself, wouldn't you be envious/vexed? For me too that matter became grounds for a quarrel."⁶⁾

We do not know enough about the affair to know whether *kattawatar* implies an actual lawsuit or merely insists on the justness of the writer's complaint, but the sense of *kattawatar* "complaint, grounds for a quarrel" is clear.

Formally, *kattawatar* is an abstract in *-atar*, reminiscent in particular of *idalawatar* "evil". The latter is derived from *idālu-* "bad, evil" via the oblique stem *idalaw-*. If we analyze *kattawatar* similarly, we arrive at a stem **katu-*⁷⁾. This may be compared with Germanic and Celtic **katu-* "fight, quarrel", which appears in Old Norse *hođ* "quarrel", Old Irish *cath* "fight; host" and in various personal names⁸⁾. Among Hittite *u*-stems, oblique stems in *-aw-* are associated with adjectives. This and the parallel with *idālu-*: *idalawatar*

⁶⁾ Compare Rost, *MIO* 4 (1956) 347: "Auch mir wurde diese Sache ein Grund zur Vergeltung". Just whose house is being referred to is uncertain. Perhaps the house taken was that of the writer, in which case we should understand the rhetorical question as: "If someone else had taken a house of yours for himself . . ."

⁷⁾ Čop, *Slav. Rev.* 8 (1955) 63, also deduces an unattested Hitt. **kattu-* parallel to *idālu-*, *aššu-*, etc., but he offers no etymology.

⁸⁾ Laroche, *RHA* 76 (1965) 57, assigns *kattawatar* to the root of Greek *κόρος* "spite; anger", rejecting a connection with **katu-*. This is based, however, on the erroneous definition of *kattawatar* as "vengeance". We have now seen that the formal agreement of the Germanic/Celtic and Hittite *u*-stems is matched semantically as well.

suggest that *kattawatar* "(grounds for) a quarrel, complaint" is originally an abstract "hostility" derived from an adjective **katu-* "hostile, bellicose". For the existence of such an adjective beside the noun **katu-* "fight" compare Greek *καρὺς* "strong" beside Skt. *krātu-* "strength".

4216 Garrett Road, K-31

H. Craig Melchert

Durham, N. C. 27707

The Development of the Gothic Short/Lax Subsystem

In recent years there have been repeated claims and suggestions that the asymmetric Proto-Germanic short/lax subsystem resulting from the identification of PIE */o/ (and */ə/) with */a/ became symmetric in consequence of certain early vowel modifications (or 'umlauts'), which turned the opposition */i/ ≠ */e/ into a variation */i ~ e/ and the phoneme */u/ into a variation */u ~ o/.

Marchand, who first elaborated this theory in modern terms, maintains that the postulation of a PGmc. */i ~ e/ parallel to */u ~ o/ "offers a neater picture of Proto-Germanic" and "yields a better explanation of the situation in Gothic", for which he assumes a prehistoric obliteration of the phonetic difference between PGmc. */i/ and */u/ on the one hand and */e/ and */o/ on the other, as well as (implicitly) the subsequent rise of the generally accepted variations */i ~ e/ and */u ~ o/ with consonantal determinants for */e/ and */o/¹⁾.

However, while the Proto-Germanic (and therefore Pre-Gothic) 'umlaut' assumption remains unconvincing²⁾, the alleged variation */i ~ e/ cannot be ascribed to any stage of Proto-Germanic, since the opposition */i/ ≠ */e/ was preserved throughout the prehistory of all the North and West Germanic languages³⁾. But this is not all, for a parallel situation would seem to have obtained in Gothic. It is the purpose of the present article to argue that even the postulation of a Pre-Gothic */i ~ e/ with consonantal determinants for */e/ is by no means necessary or indeed desirable, since Gothic itself appears to have always retained, like the other Germanic languages, the original opposition */i/ ≠ */e/.

As is well known, the Pre-Gothic reflexes of PGmc. */i/, */e/, and */u/ in accented syllables were affected by the 'breaking'

¹⁾ See J. W. Marchand, "Germanic Short */i/ and */e/: Two Phonemes or One?", *Lg.*, 33 (1957), 353–354 and cf. J. Kurylowicz, "The Germanic Vowel System", *BPTJ*, 11 (1952), 53–54.

²⁾ See F. Cereignani, "Early 'Umlaut' Phenomena in the Germanic Languages", *Lg.*, 56 (1980) and "Alleged Gothic Umlauts", *IE*, 84 (1979), forthcoming.

³⁾ See F. Cereignani, "Proto-Germanic */i/ and */e/ Revisited", *JEGP*, 78 (1979), forthcoming.

ARCHAEOLOGIA HOMERICA

Die Denkmäler und das frühgriechische Epos. Im Auftrage des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Herausgegeben von Friedrich Matz † und Hans-Günter Buchholz. Das Werk ist auf 3 Bände (22 Lieferungen) berechnet.

- A/B** SPYRIDON MARINATOS
KLEIDUNG (A) HAAR- UND BARTTRACHT (B)
1967. Zus. 114 S. m. 25 Textabb. u. 12 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 35,— DM einz. kart. 39,— DM
- C** ERWIN BIELEFELD / SCHMUCK
1968. 70 S. m. 8 Textabb., 1 Farbtaf. u. 5 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 22,— DM, einz. kart. 25,— DM
- E** HANS-GÜNTER BUCHHOLZ — JOSEPH WIESNER † / KRIEGSWESSEN
Teil 1: Schutzwaffen und Wehrbauten. 1977. 234 S. m. 66 Textabb., 1 Falttaf. u. 22 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 86,— DM, einz. kart. 96,— DM
Teil 2: Angriffswaffen: Schwert, Dolch, Lanze, Speer, Keule. 1980. Etwa 112 S. m. zahlr. Abb. u. 3 Taf., Subskr. etwa 38,— DM, einz. kart. etwa 42,— DM
- F** JOSEPH WIESNER / FAHREN — REITEN
1968. 144 S. m. 25 Textabb. u. 6 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 46,— DM, einz. kart. 52,— DM
- G** DOROTHEA GRAY / SEEWESSEN
1974. 166 S. m. 29 Textabb. u. 17 Kunstdrucktaf., 1 Farbtafel u. 1 Faltkarte, Subskr. 60,— DM einz. kart. 68,— DM
- H** WILL RICHTER
DIE LANDWIRTSCHAFT IM HOMERISCHEN ZEITALTER
Mit einem Beitrag: Landwirtschaftliche Geräte, von Wolfgang Schiering
1968. 162 S. m. 9 Textabb. u. 4 Kunstdrucktaf. Subskr. 46,— DM, einz. kart. 52,— DM
- J** HANS-GÜNTER BUCHHOLZ — GERHARD JÖHRENS — IRMGARD MAULL / JAGD UND FISCHFANG
Mit einem Anhang: Honiggewinnung.
1974. 199 S. m. 56 Textabb. u. 6 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 58,— DM, einz. kart. 65,— DM
- K** ROBERT JAMES FORBES
BERGBAU, STEINBRUCHTÄTIGKEIT UND HÜTTENWESEN
1967. 43 S. m. 16 Textabb., Subskr. 13,50 DM, einz. kart. 16,— DM
- L/I** FELIX ECKSTEIN
HANDWERK I: DIE AUSSAGEN DES FRÜHGRIECHISCHEN EPOS
1974. 48 S. Subskr. 16,80 DM, einz. kart. 19,80 DM
- N/I** KLAUS FITTSCHEN / BILDKUNST I: DER SCHILD DES ACHILLEUS
1974. 28 S. m. 8 Textabb. u. 10 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 14,80 DM, einz. kart. 16,50 DM
- O** HEINRICH DRERUP
GRIECHISCHE BAUKUNST IN GEOMETRISCHER ZEIT
1969. 136 S. m. 59 Textabb. u. 8 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 41,— DM, einz. kart. 47,— DM
- P** SIEGFRIED LASER / HAUSRAT
Mit Anhang I: Beleuchtungsgerät, von Ulf Jantzen und Renate Tölle und Anhang II: Die Elfenbeinthrone von Salamis, Zypern von Vassos Karageorghis
1968. 106 S. m. 17 Textabb. u. 8 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 32,— DM, einz. kart. 36,— DM
- Q** GERDA BRUNS / KÜCHENWESEN — MAHLZEITEN
1970. 69 S. m. 13 Textabb., 8 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 22,— DM, einz. kart. 25,— DM
- U** MAX WEGNER / MUSIK UND TANZ
1968. 85 S. m. 4 Textabb. u. 6 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 26,— DM, einz. kart. 30,— DM
- V** EMILY TOWNSEND VERMEULE / GÖTTERKULT
1974. 179 S. m. 17 Textabb. u. 14 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 62,— DM, einz. kart. 70,— DM
- W** MANOLIS ANDRONIKOS / TOTENKULT
1968. 140 S. m. 11 Textabb. u. 12 Kunstdrucktaf., Subskr. 42,50 DM, einz. kart. 47,50 DM
- X** ALFRED HEUBECK / SCHRIFT
1979. IV, 205 S. m. 56 Textabb., Subskr. 64,— DM, einz. kart. 70,— DM

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

in Göttingen
und Zürich