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Three Hittite Etymologies*

1. kinuntu(r)iyla-, nuntu(r), etc.

Friedrich, HW 2, Erg. 15, lists an adjective kinuntu(r)iyla-
“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 [karu]-iyl[az] kinuntu(r)iyalas “from the past (and) present . . .”. See now also KUB XLI 22 III 4–5 lek[iyaz] ħur[leya]-iyyaz HU[L-waza . . .] / karu[iyaz] kinuntu[r]iyalas . . . “from the oath, curse, evil [ ], past (and) present . . .”. KBo XXI 12, 13 begins karu[iyaz] kinuntu[r]iyal( ), followed by several obscure forms which leave the syntax uncertain. The comparable Luwian form nunantu(r)iyla is cited by Laroche is found only in broken contexts, but note the passage in which the shorter stem nunantu(r)- occurs (KUB XXXV 54 III 1–3): a[duvalsa utarša] / bališša paqratt[a(nza)] / yuvela [nunantu(r)i]a “the evil words, the evil, the impurities (?), the past (and) present . . .” (see Laroche, DLL 153, for transcription and translation).

As pointed out by Laroche, the base of the adjectives kinuntu(r)iyla- and nunantu(r)iyla- is the adverb “now” (kinun in Hittite, nānum in Luwian). The contrast between nunantu(r)- and nunantu(r)iyla- shows that the -ala- is a secondary suffix. One can divide nunantu(a)-ala- (with -ala- as in Hittite išt[i]-ala- “belonging to the liver”, Bigad-ašša “ancestral”). The remaining nunantu(r)ri “present” (with the usual Luwian transfer of an a-stem to the i-declension) may be compared formally with Hittite nunutar- (see below). Alternatively, in view of Hittite nunu(š)tar(a)- “quick, hastening”, one may analyze kinuntu(r)iyla- and nunantu(r)iyla- as kinun-/nunun-tar-yə-la- (cf. Laroche, DLL 154). In either case, we are left with kinun/nunun “now” plus a -tar(a)- suffix. We may also include here the family of words meaning “haste, hurry” (nuntar-, nuntargi-, nuntaryaysha-), built on a stem nunutar(a): *num “now” + tar(a). The semantics are straightforward: “present(ly)”, “soon, at once”, “in a hurry”. For the connection of nunutar(a)- and related forms with nununtarri etc. see Kronasser, Etymologie der Hethitischen Sprache (EHS) 274.

Kronasser analyzes Hittite nunutarasi “soon, quickly” as the frozen genitive of an r-stem nunutar- “haste”, following a tentative suggestion of Friedrich, ArOr 6 (1934) 372. This leaves the function and source of the -tar- unidentified. I agree that nunutaras 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 *nuntarasi “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 γεθις ἐβη “he went yesterday” (Iliad A 424) or ὑπερ ὁ δεός . . . ἐβη πολῶς “whenever the god comes in might” (Euripedes B 300). For further examples see Schwyzzer, Gr. Gram. 2, 178–179 and Wackernagel, Syntax 2, 65f. This usage is also attested in Hittite: KUB XVII 10 II 38 ḫetepniš lēšaniyanza už “Telipinu came in a rage”).

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 nunutaras still reflect this pattern (see those collected by Friedrich, ArOr 6 (1934) 371). Typical is the omen text Bo 164 Rs 10: BI-āš UKU-āš nuntarasi aki “That man will die present(ly)/soon”. The predicate nunu(n)taras aki is the equivalent of Akkadian arīšu imāti. In this and several other examples nuntarasi may be interpreted as agreeing with the subject, but in KUB XV 3 I 19, where the subject is eni IZI 8A GİR.MES-ŠU “that burning of his feet”, one must assume that nuntarasi has been fixed as an adverb (unless one chooses to read something other than the neuter paḫbur “fire” for IZI in this non-literal use).

The adverb nunutarasi “soon, quickly” may thus be explained from an adjective nunutar- “present”. The other piece of evidence cited for nuntarasi as the genitive of a r-stem *nunutar- is the phrase nunutarasi LAMA-i (KUB I 11 49). Friedrich tentatively translates this as “dem Schutzgott der Ehe”. The genitival interpretation at first appears unavoidable, especially when one compares in preced-

---


1 The syntax remains the same if one prefers the earlier interpretation of “hastening” for lēšaniyan-: “Telipinu came in haste”.
ing lines combinations like ZI-aš arnumnasd, LAMA-rí “the protective god of fulfilling one’s wish” (II 28) or NÍTE.HÍA-aš ššánuwaasi, LAMA-i “the protective god of anointing the body” (II 36–37). However, one also finds, immediately preceding nuntaraš LAMA-i, the phrases šanteqāššašs ššaš LAMA-i (II 47) and tarpatashaš ššaš LAMA-i (II 48). Whatever their meaning, šanteqāššaš and tarpatashaš are Luvian adjectives in -(a)šš- functionally equivalent to a modifying genitive. They should appear 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 arnumnasd LAMA-aš to ZI-aš arnumnasd LAMA-i, the scribe neglected to change the case of the adjective in šanteqāššaš ššaš LAMA-aš, producing the ungrammatical šanteqāššaš ššaš LAMA-i instead of correct šanteqāššaš ššaš LAMA-i. In the same way, then, nuntaraš ššaš LAMA-i may reflect nuntaraš ššaš LAMA-aš “the present/prompt protective god” (adjective + noun). 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 *nutar- “haste”. I suggest this alternative because the abstract noun *nutar- is problematic morphologically. First, the productive abstract suffix in Hittite is not -tar, but -t̂ar (exclusively so in denominatives; see Kronasser, EHS 294f., and also Eichner, MSS 31 (1972) 59–60). Second, the abstract suffix -t̂ar is heteroclitic (oblique stem -ann- < -ann-). A genitive nuntaraš is thus unexpected. It is also awkward semantically to derive an abstract “haste” directly from *num “now” (one expects *nutar- 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 *num “now” plus the IE oppositional suffix -tero-: cf. Lat. ater, Gr. ἀτρός “which

3) Friedrich, AROR 6 (1934) 372, raises the possibility that the adverb nuntaraš (spelled nu-un-tar-āš) was pronounced nuntaras, while the genitive of the putative noun (spelled nu-un-tar-āš in the single occurrence KUB II 1-2 49) was nuntaras. This distinction is highly dubious. While CVc.VC is the more common spelling for the sequence /CVcVC-/j, one also finds instances of CVc.VC where the second vowel is assuredly real; e.g. ša-kwa-aš-šar-an, ša-kwa-šar-šu, šu-up-pi-išš-šar-āš.

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

The vocalism of -tara- may be derived from either *taro- or *taro-. For the zero-grade compare the Skt. adverbial ending -tra in kil-tra “where” and anāy-tra “elsewhere” with Gr. ἀκτόρα- “belonging to another”. Skt. anātrām (RV āstrām) “inwards” is also cited for the zero-grade, versus Gr. εστραγ “idem”. Av. katārī “which of two?” and OCS kotoryj “which” (beside kotoryj) may point to *taro-, 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 *tero- in its older local function appears as -era- in Hittite kattera- “low(er)”: see Benveniste hitt. et i.-c. 102f.

As already indicated, the semantic development from “present” to “fastening” is rooted in the adverbial use of the nominative nuntaraš. Hence the derivative su(n)tarrija- “fastening, swift” and its abstract su(n)tarrijaššaš “haste”. The verb su(n)tarri “hasten” (intr.) requires additional comment. First, from an a-stem *su(n)tarra-, we would properly expect a causative/locative *su(n)tarrašš: cf. aravašš “set free” < aravašš “free”. There are, however, other examples of -nu- added to an a-stem: maršanu “falsify” < maršaš “false” (beside maršašš) and arimpanu “weigh down” < arimapa “burden”. The presence of kartinmu- beside karimmiyanu “to anger” (< karimmiya- “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 su(n)tarri-, compare the use of wahnumtu- “turn” in KBo IV 4 II 7, KUB XLV 20 II 4 and elsewhere.

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

2. wizz-a, wiwida-

In the Treaty of Mursili II with Targasmani, KBo V 4 Ra 29, we find the phrase: [nu]-la-kkan miš šakwaššišrit Z(a)-UL kwaciš [wiwida] wiwidaš (wiš-ši-i-dš-š-š). The same expression appears to recur in Rs 36 (with the verb spelled ši-i-wiš-šš-aš) and in Rs 41, where the verb form is ši-i-zu-aš (see Friedrich, Staatsw. 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 wizzzi cannot easily be reconciled with the thematic conjugation of wid-. In arriving at a sense for wiwidade/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: michdrängt’s = roughly “I have the urge (to)”. I suggest a similar meaning for wiwidade/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 wiwidade/wizzai- occurs in one other passage, KUB IV 8 V 5–9 (Hymn to Iskur-Adad):


“He (the Storm-god) strikes also (at) the beasts of the field, for whom, nevertheless (-ṣ), 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) 71 ff. My interpretation of the first paragraph, particularly that of tak akkwantaua, is by no means assured, but the sense of the second paragraph and hence that of wewidade/wizzai 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.

We may account for the two stems wissa- and wivida- by assuming an unreduplicated Hittite stem *wid-/*wew- and an original athematic present: *wew-i. This would yield regularly a third singular present *wesszi [wetiis]: cf. esszi to ed- “eat”. The attested form wejizzi represents the generalization of wess- from the third singular as the basic verb stem and transfer to the hi-conjugation: compare again esszi “eats” for esszi and also isparzi “escapes” beside isparzi < *isparzi. For the hi-conjugation in the reduplicated stem wividad(ə) beside athematic *wizzai, compare wewakti beside unreduplicated wexzi “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 *yedh- “strike, hit” (Skt. vadhati “strikes, destroys”, Hom. edhov “striking, uprooting”, Gr. ἀθάνοι “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 Ṟ-s-ariotic, avadhiti, etc.). In Greek, Homer shows only the participle ἐδόξον/ἐδόξος. The gloss in Hesychius ἐδόξον ἀθάνοις ἐκβάλει 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 ἐδον, 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 9–19+). That is, the original present paradigm had fixed root accent and lengthened grade in the singular, full grade in the plural: *yedhithi: *yedhipi and ptc. *yedhipi-. Hittite *wesszai/wessai would represent the third singular (cf. again esszai < *esli = Lat. est, Olith. est). Homeric ἐθον now appears in a different light. So long as one assumed a thematic verb, ἐθον could be taken as its regular participle. However, Hittite ἐθον 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. ἔω “going”. Homeric ἐθον thus appears to preserve the root vocalism and accent of *yedhipi (with the usual elimination of the

Narten herself calls this type “proterodynamic”. For the use of “acrostatic” and related terminology see the definitions in Eliech, MSS 31 (1972) 91.

4) Narten, herself calls this type “proterodynamic”. For the use of “acrostatic” and related terminology see the definitions in Eliech, MSS 31 (1972) 91.
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Three Hittite Etymologies

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 gimmu tarra “make retribution, avenge” (see Sommer, loc. cit., and von Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch sub gimmu).

However, already in the other passages discussed by Sommer, the meaning “revenge, retribution” is not entirely apt. In KUB XXX 3 II 31 and 51 we find the expression n-at ANA DINGIR.MEŠ kattawatar namma kišaru and in KUB IV 1 I 22f n-aš ANA DINGIR.MEŠ mukku kattawatar ēkādu. 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 kurtimmiyāt-ta “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 dandukīnaš-ā DUMU-aš utkūri ūlīsena ēkā man-āša mān [anšuwaḫḫa] idāluwa inan arta man-at-ši bāttu kattawatar. Sommer, HAB 51, translates: “Wenn auch der Menschensohn ewig lebend wäre, so dürfte, auch wenn ein böses inan-Leiden den Menschen (gegen ihm) 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 durchseichtig”. 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 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, Rahe suchen”, the equation of kattawatar with “revenge, Rahe” is false. Compare the frequent Hittite expression eškar šanḫ- “seek blood”, i.e. “seek revenge for (someone’s) death”. As is shown by KUB XI 1 I 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 15.f.) 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 eškar 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: kurin[jal] šam[me]šiḫanda antuḫḫaš kattawatar zik-[pat] ŠUTU-nš šarninkiškikš “You, the Sun-god, make good the complaint of the bereaved and oppressed man”. Since šarninkiš is “make restitution for, make good” this example confirms that kattawatar is not “retribution”, but that for which restitution is demanded.

5) On the possible relationship of lengthened-grade iterative-causatives with acrostatic presents, see the article by G. Klingenschmitt “Zum Ablaut des iŋg. Kausativen” KZ 92 (1978) 1–13. For Klingenschmitt, the original shape of the lengthened-grade iterative-causatives is represented by the type of Lat. nōpū “put to sleep” (< *nōpūei-o). I wish to thank Dr. Klingenschmitt for making available to me a copy of the article in advance of publication.
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* šan-h- plus *kattawanlašiš*, 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 apēdeni uddani aršani(ex)n | mam-man-za-kan kuiški Ė-ir
tam[iš] arut | ma zik ŪL aršaniše | nu ammuq-a apē
ušar kattawatar kisat

“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.”

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 idātu- “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 hōd “quarrel”, Old Irish caith “fight; host” and in various personal names8). Among Hittite u-stems, oblique stems in -aw- are associated with adjectives. This and the parallel with idātu-: idalawatar

---

3) 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…”

4) Čop, *Slav. Rev.* 8 (1955) 63, also deduces an unattested Hitt. *katu*-parallel to idātu-, ašša-, etc., but he offers no etymology.

5) Laroche, *RHA* 76 (1965) 67, assigns *kattawatar* to the root of Greek nóros “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.
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 PIG *o/* (and *a/*) 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/*.

However, while the Proto-Germanic (and therefore Pre-Gothic) 'umlaut' assumption remains unconvincing, 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 languages*. 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'...

---

