

HIRDĀ MĀNĀSĀ

*Studies presented to Professor
Leonard G. Herzenberg
on the occasion of his
70-birthday*

EDITED BY NIKOLAI N. KAZANSKY
WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF
EUGENIA R. KRYUCHKOVA, ALEXANDER S. NIKOLAEV, ANDREY V. SHATSKOV



SAINT PETERSBURG
«NAUKA»
2005

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

К юбилею профессора Леонарда Георгиевича Герценберга (Н. Н. Казанский).....	7
Список трудов Л. Г. Герценберга (А. С. Николаев).....	13

ОБЩИЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ИНДОЕВРОПЕЙСКОЙ РЕКОНСТРУКЦИИ

<i>W. R. Schmalstieg.</i> The recurring nature of linguistic changes.....	23
<i>J. K Kusmenko.</i> Geschichte der Quantität in den germanischen Sprachen.....	30
<i>A. С. Николаев.</i> К действию закона Рикса в древнегреческом языке.....	38
<i>М. Н. Боголюбов.</i> К сакскому спряжению.....	73
<i>X. Tremblay.</i> Die Bildung des chotansakischen agentiven Präteritums (Beiträge zur vergleichenden Grammatik der iranischen Sprachen IX).....	75
<i>W. Lehmann.</i> Merger: The Sanskrit <i>nu</i> -verbs.....	81
<i>H. С. Melchert.</i> Latin <i>īnsolēscō</i> , Hittite <i>šulle(šš)</i> - and PIE Statives in <i>-ē-</i>	90
<i>E. Rieken.</i> Kopulativkomposita im Hethitischen.....	99
<i>A. В. Шацков.</i> Хеттские прилагательные на <i>-ant</i>	104
<i>Б. Б. Ходорковская.</i> К вопросу о ранней истории латинского перфекта на <i>-vī</i> . Античные грамматики о группе глаголов <i>meminī, ōdī, nōvī</i>	131
<i>D. Petit.</i> Le participe du verbe «être» en vieux prussien.....	141
<i>N. Oettinger.</i> Hysterokinetische n-Stämme als Nomina agentis: Zu gr. ἐρσῆν 'Männchen' und anderem.....	146

ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКАЯ РЕКОНСТРУКЦИЯ И ЭТИМОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

<i>В. Н. Топоров.</i> Ночь и день: их противостояние и их взаимная тяга. Об и.-е. <i>*nok^w-t- (*nek^w-t-) & *dejn-/*din- (*dejen-)</i> и <i>*dejn-/*din- (*dejen-) & *nok^w-t- (*nek^w-t-)</i>	153
<i>И. А. Герасимов.</i> К вопросу о рефлексах и.-е. 'солнца'.....	176
<i>A. Liberman.</i> Mannus-Script: The Origin of the Germanic Word for 'man'.....	185
<i>G.-J. Pinault.</i> Tocharian 'woman'.....	201
<i>M. Peters.</i> Ladies, die nicht kneten wollen.....	215

<i>Н. Н. Казанский.</i> К этимологии древнегреческого <i>νήπιος</i>	232
<i>I. Yakubovich.</i> Carian monument.....	240
<i>А. В. Грошева.</i> Индоевропейское наследие в латинских названиях деревьев.....	252
<i>А. Е. Кузнецов.</i> Древняя этимология латинского <i>prodigium</i> (Varro Fr. 440 Funaioli).....	273
<i>Е. Р. Натр.</i> Albanian <i>gjerb</i> ‘gulp, slurp’.....	283
<i>Н. Л. Сухачев.</i> Семантика слова и его этимология: рум. <i>Crăciun</i> ‘рождество’.....	285
<i>А. И. Фалилеев.</i> ГАЛАТИКА.....	301
<i>В. Л. Цымбурский.</i> Эя и Троя (Прагреки в Северо-Западной Анатолии и происхождение топонима <i>Αἴα</i>).....	308
<i>J. L. García-Ramón.</i> Av. <i>Yuxtāspa</i> und av. ap. <i>Vištāspa</i> , griech. <i>Ζεῦξιππος</i> , <i>Ἴππόλυτος</i> (bzw. <i>Λύσιππος</i>).....	323
<i>R. Schmitt.</i> Iranische Personennamen auf den Siegelabdrücken aus Daskyleion.....	332

ЯЗЫК, ТЕКСТ, КУЛЬТУРА

I

<i>A. Bernabé.</i> El “gran viaje del alma” hitita y las laminillas órficas. Nuevas consideraciones.....	343
<i>J. A. Álvarez-Pedrosa.</i> Die Auffassung der Natur in den hethitischen Ritualen. Das Ritual gegen Impotenz <i>CTH 406</i>	364
<i>Е. Р. Крючкова.</i> «Царь» и «бог» у индо-греков по эпиграфическим данным.....	378
<i>S. Fritz, J. Gippert.</i> Armeno-Ossetica: Zum historischen Hintergrund des Nartenepos.....	385
<i>Т. В. Топорова.</i> О модели «локус – имя собственное» в скандинавской мифопоэтической модели мира.....	421
<i>А. Б. Черняк.</i> Секст Помпей и его жаргон (Vell. II 73,1 <i>studiis rudis, sermone barbarus</i>).....	439

II

<i>G. Buddruss.</i> “Māra’s Mühlenbau”. Analyse eines Prasun-Textes aus dem afghanischen Hindukusch.....	446
<i>З. А. Юсупова, А. Гармиани.</i> К изучению лурских диалектов курдского языка.....	470
<i>И. А. Смирнова.</i> Строки Хафиза в газели курдского поэта Маляе Джезири.....	475
<i>Л. Э. Найдич.</i> Стихотворение «Поэт Фирдуси» Генриха Гейне.....	479
Типштр-яшт в переводе В. С. Соколовой (подготовка текста Е. Р. Крючковой).....	491
Index verborum.....	507

H. Craig Melchert

LATIN *īnsolēscō*, HITTITE *šulle(šš)-* AND PIE STATIVES IN *-ē-**

Latin *īnsolēscō* first appears in Old Latin (Cato the Elder) in the sense ‘to become overbearing, arrogant’. A physical sense ‘to swell’ (intr.) is attested only late (Tertullian & St. Jerome). The adjective *īnsolēns* 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 Ernout, Meillet 1959: 378f. and Walde, Hofmann 1938: 428 vs. 704f.). The first derives *īnsolēns* in the above sense from *īnsolēns* ‘unaccustomed; unusual’ (to *soleō*) via ‘beyond the usual standard’ > ‘excessive’ and so on. The verb *īnsolēscō* would have been formed under the influence of *inolēscō* based on a false segmentation of *exolēscō* as *ex-solēscō*. The physical sense is late and secondary. On the other hand, per Pokrovskii (1898 [1959]: 353; 1899: 230ff.; 1927) the meaning ‘to swell’ is original for *īnsolēscō* (and *īnsolēns* 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 Kümmel *LIV*² 610 hesitantly adopts the second, positing a PIE stem **suH-éh₁-*), but one must agree with Ernout-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 *šulle-* (with variants *šulliye-/šullā(i)-* and the rare extended stem *šullešš-*) 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 *tēl=u* which *šulle-* translates in the Hurro-Hittite Bilingual means ‘über die Maßen/Grenzen (des Erlaubten) hinausgehen; schwellen; sich aufblasen (< sich vermehren)’. A careful review of the total evidence shows that this is also the true sense of Hittite *šulle-*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 heard 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 Theo 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 *tēlu*, without which I would never have been led to reexamine the Hittite facts. I remain, of course, solely responsible for the views expressed here.

¹ The use of *šulle-* in the Bilingual had already led others to suggest alternatives to ‘quarrel’ in that context. Hoffner (1998a: 69ff.) consistently renders the verb as ‘become discontented’ and properly emphasizes that it refers to acts of ingratitude and greed (see further below). Ünal (1994: 863) correctly translates KBo 32.14 iii 16 (the first citation below) as ‘wurde sehr dünnelhaft’, but then adds in a footnote ‘wörtlich: “streitsüchtig”.’ He retains the latter meaning for the instances in the parable of the ungrateful deer and man.

As one would expect in view of the fact that the standard interpretation has stood for more than eighty years, many instances of *šulle-* (and its derived noun *šullatar*) are compatible with either ‘to quarrel, become angry’ or ‘to become arrogant, disrespectful’. However, in at least one passage in the Hurro-Hittite 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 man whom his lord makes an administrator. In that city he secretly increased his taking (in) of tribute.)’ *n=aš mekki šullet n=ašta namma URU-an anda ŪL auši* ‘He became very arrogant. He no longer looked at (= no longer had regard for) the city². (They were able to denounce him before his lord, and he began to pour out the tribute that he had swallowed.)’

It is clear that the moral of this parable (which describes a dog that steals a baked item from an oven, soaks it in oil, and eats it) involves a corrupt and venal official, who betrays the trust of his lord and illicitly uses his position for his own self-enrichment. In this context Neu’s interpretation of the cited Hittite (1996: 178) is a complete non sequitur: the official leaves the city as the result of a quarrel, does not visit the city again, but is somehow apprehended and returned to face justice. Neither the supposed quarrel nor the disappearance of the official has anything to do with the moral of the story, and Neu derives a reference to the official’s disappearance only by inventing a meaning ‘visit’ for *anda auš-* ‘look at’. The meaning of the latter in this context clearly is rather the already attested ‘have regard for, pay attention to’³. The corrupt official no longer has any regard for the welfare of the city entrusted to his care. This sense for *anda auš-* is confirmed by the other instance in the Bilingual (KBo 32.14 iii 4; Neu 1996: 83), where an ungrateful son no longer has regard for his father (contra Neu 1996: 174f.)⁴.

The sentence *n=aš mekki šullet* describes the official’s immoral act. One might have expected *waštaš* ‘sinned’, but other passages from the Bilingual show that *šulle-* describes a particular kind of delict, namely the sin of ingratitude and disrespect towards a benefactor. In KBo 32.14 ii 1–5 (Neu 1996: 75) we find: ‘(A mountain drove a deer away from its body. The deer went forth to another mountain.)’ *n=aš warkešta n=aš šullēt* ‘He grew fat, and he became arrogant. (He began to curse back at the mountain.)’⁵.

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=aš šullet* ‘He sought to become upstart’) of a man who curses back at the home city that nurtured him. While Neu’s ‘suchte Streit’ is by no means impossible for this passage, ‘became arrogant, upstart’ 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 *šulle-* and variants. In many cases the one offended is the Hittite king. Typical is KBo 16.17+2.5 iii 28–31 from the Annals of Mursili: ‘(Aparru, a man of Kalasma, came to Hattusa before My Majesty. I picked him out and made him a lord. I gave him the land of Kalasma 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 auš-* (and its opposite *parā auš-* ‘overlook, ignore’) see Sommer (1932: 232) ad KUB 19.55 l.e. 2–3.

⁴ See already Oettinger (1992: 11), who correctly translates ‘kümmert 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 Ünal (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 “exegesis” the man curses his new home city that had welcomed him as a refugee (thus with Beckman and Hoffner).

oath.)' *n=aš šulliēt [nu=m]u kūrurriaḫta nu=za=kan KUR URU Kalāšma [1-ē]t-ta neyat n=at LUGAL-uēznaš iwar taparta* 'He grew arrogant and became hostile to me. He united the land of Kalasma as his own and ruled it in the manner of a kingship'.⁶ 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 Hittite king, as in the Treaty of Mursili with Kupanta-Kurunta (KUB 6.41 i 46): '(I wrote to them as follows: "Mashuiluwa was an oath-man to me.)' *nu=war=aš=mu=kan šüllāit nu=wa=mu ARAD.MEŠ=YA kattan ḫarnamniy[at]* "He became disrespectful towards me and caused my servants to rebel against me". (cf. *ibid* i 31–32). Mursili also once uses our verb in his familiar complaint that those who had honored his predecessors have disrespected him (KBo 5.8 iv 9–10; Annals): '(Formerly [the people] of the land of Kalasma 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=ššan šulliyēr nu=mu namma ÉRIN.MEŠ ŪL pešker* '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/III against his nephew Urhi-Tešub in his so-called "Apology" (lines iii 68–72 and 76–79; for the text see Otten 1981: 22): *LÚ-nili=šši watarna ḫḫun šulliyat=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] *mān=war=aš=mu=kan šulliyat kuwapi ŪL mān ḫandān LUGAL.GAL ANA LUGAL.TUR katterraḫḫer kinun=aš=mu=kan šulliyat kuit n=an=mu DINGIR.MEŠ DI-ešnaza katterraḫḫer* '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 Urhi-Tešub owed him everything he had, but also that the impropriety of Urhi-Tešub's behavior towards him is confirmed by the gods' judgment in the dispute⁷.

Another set of occurrences of *šulle-* refer to acts committed against the gods of the Hittites by foreigners. The famous Hittite 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 Hittite gods.

We may begin with the Kaskeans, whom we know the Hittites 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 lands of the goddess].)' *nu LÚ.MEŠ URUGašga šuller* 'The men of Kaska have become arrogant. (They boast of their might and strength, while they have belittled you, the gods.)' Since the Hittite kingdom was established by the gods, all depredations by the Kaskeans against it, whether specifically against temples and religious institutions or not, were viewed as hubristic acts of sacrilege (KUB 4.1 ii 11–15): *šumeš=a DINGIR.MEŠ ŠA KUR URUGašga šulletten n=ašta ŠA KUR URUHATTI DINGIR.MEŠ KUR-az arḫa šuwatten šumeš=a=za KUR-SUNU datten § LÚ.MEŠ Gašga=ya šuller* '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

⁶ See the *CHD L-N* 361b for the restoration and interpretation of *1-ētta nāi-*.

⁷ So also KUB 26.58 Vo 5a: *[nu=mu]=kan URUUrḫ i-ḏU-upaš kuwapi DUMU.ŠEŠ=YA šulliyat* 'When Urhi-Tešub, my nephew, behaved disrespectfully towards me.'

you¹ have taken away their cities from the men of Hatti, and you¹ have driven them out of their fields and their vineyards.)’

A prayer of Mursili II to the Sun-goddess of Arinna begins by insisting that only the land of Hatti, and no other country, properly honors the goddess (KUB 24.3+ i 6'-22'). In spite of this piousness, however, the gods have now unleashed a plague upon Hatti, and others have taken advantage of the situation (KUB 24.3+ ii 26–28): *nu kuriwana[(š KUR.KUR-TIM kue)] arahzanda KUR^{URU}Mittanni KUR^{URU}[(Arzauwa)] nu hūmanza šull(i)ēt* ‘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.)’⁸. 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!)’ *waršiyanda šullanda KUR.KUR.ḪI.A <<ANA>> KUR^{URU}Hatti=ma tariyan KUR-e* ‘Rested are the disrespectful lands, but the land of Hatti is an exhausted land. (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 reverent Hatti and the impious and disrespectful territorial lands.

The prayer of Mursili to Telipinu (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 *sacrilege* (KUB 24.1+ iii 18–19): *nu KUR.KUR.ḪI.A LÚ.KÚR kue šullanta huršallanta* ‘The enemy lands that are disrespectful and *rebellious*, (that are not reverent towards you Telipinu 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 *šullanta* with *huršallanta* (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 *ḫAr-ša-al-lan-za* translates Akkadian *šabsu* ‘enraged’⁹. 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 *ḫAršallant-* likewise could mean both ‘rebellious’ and ‘angry’. If we read the adjective as *huršallant-* (as permitted by the ambiguous spelling with the sign *ḫar/hur*), we may tentatively derive the word from a PIE **h₂uers-* ‘rise’¹⁰.

Other instances of the verb *šulle-* are compatible with either a meaning ‘arrogant, disrespectful’ or ‘quarrelsome’. KBo 12.70 Ro¹ 7–8 contains an injunction regarding behavior towards one’s mother: *AMA-aš=ma=ta x-x[] nu=šši=kan lē šulliyaši* ‘Your mother [...] you. Do not be disrespectful towards her.’ The immediate contexts of the examples in KUB 36.114 rt. col. 6 and 14 (*mān šulleši=ma* ‘But if you become upstart...’ and *kuiš šullezzi=ma...* ‘But whoever becomes upstart...’) are lacking. However, given the Hittite preoccupation with loyalty to the king and fear

⁸ For the sense of *kuriwana-* see Puhvel (1997: 265f.). 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 that of “vassalhood”.

⁹ As Harry Hoffner kindly points out to me, the alleged example of *ḫAršallant-* in KUB 33.86 + 8.66 iii 3 (Hedammu myth) almost certainly does not exist (contra Siegelová 1971: 57&75). Collation confirms the reading of the published autograph, which shows that the partial sign following *ḫAr-* before the break has two vertical strokes, thus eliminating a sign *ša*.

¹⁰ Cf. Vedic *varṣ-* ‘sich ermannen, sich (tatendurstig) erheben’ (especially perf. ptc. (*ud*)*vāvrṣāná-*), as per Kümmel (2000: 474ff.) and *LIV*² 691. Cf. English ‘rise’ in ‘to get a rise out of someone’ and also probably Hitt. *karp(iya)-* ‘become angry’ < *karp-* ‘lift, raise’ and *karp(i)-* ‘anger’ (with Kronasser 1966: 103 contra Puhvel 1997: 99).

of usurpation of the throne, a sense ‘become upstart’ 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 *šullešš-* refer to the proper behavior of an envoy (KUB 9.15 ii 10–15 and ii 19–21): ‘(Let the one sent ahead from the great [place]¹¹ speak to the men of the city with [their] approval. Let them set him on the road with approval. Let them give him well to eat and drink.)’ *šullēšzi=ma=aš lē kuitki walaḫzi ḫurdai lē kuinki* ‘Let him not in any way become overbearing. Let him not strike or curse anyone’... ‘(But let the sun not find him in the city. It is not proper.)’ *mān=aš šullišzi=ma* ‘But if he becomes overbearing...’. The royal envoy is subject to the leaders of the town and is not to overstep his proper bounds. To do so would be a moral offense (*natta āra*).

One passage containing *šulle-* 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’): [*namma zik* ¹*Man(apa)*]-^d*U-aš ANA* ¹*PÉŠ.TUR-wa* /⁵ [*LÚ.KÚR-nili*¹² *lē tiy*]*aši nu=war=an=kan lē k[ueši]* ¹³ /⁶ [...]x x [*PÉŠ.TUR*]-*waš LÚ.KÚR-nili lē tiya[(zi)]* /⁷ [*nu=t*]*ta=kkan lē kuenzi mān=ma=wa=tta* ¹*Mašḫu[iluwaš]* /⁸ []x x x *LÚ.KÚR-nili tiyazi nu=tta=kkan kuenz[i]* /⁹ [*nu apad*]*da šer* ¹*PÉŠ.TUR-luwaš ANA* ^d*UTU*^{SI} *LÚ.KÚR* /¹⁰ [*nu=war*]=*an* ^d*UTU*^{SI} *zahḫiškemi mān=ma=wa zik* /¹¹ x[]x ¹*Manapa*-^d*U-aš šulliyaši nu ANA* ¹*PÉŠ.T[UR-wa]* /¹² [*LÚ.KÚR-l*]*i tiyaši nu=war=an=kan kueši nu=wa=za zik* /¹³ [¹]*Manapa*-^d*U-aš ANA* ^d*UTU*^{SI} *LÚ.KÚR nu=tta zahḫiškemi* /¹⁴ [*n*]*u apadda=ya memias*¹⁴ ‘[Furthermore, you] Manapa-Tarhunta [shall not approach] Mashuiluwa as an enemy, and you shall not k[ill] him. [Mashuilu]wa shall not approach [you] as an enemy, and he shall not kill you. But if Mashuiluwa does [] approach you as an enemy and kills you, Mashuiluwa will on that [account] be My Majesty’s enemy, and I, My Majesty, will continually attack him. But if you [] Manapa-Tarhunta become upstart, and you approach Mashuiluwa [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.’

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: 61ff.), followed by Beckman (1996: 79f.), assumes that the hypothetical act of *šulliya-* by Manapa-Tarhunta in line 11 is matched by one by Mashuiluwa in line 8. He thus reads and restores the beginning of line 8 as: [*šu-ul-li-y*]*a-zi nu* and likewise assumes that the name of Mashuiluwa stood at the beginning of line 11, understanding respectively: ‘But if Mashuiluwa quarrels with you...’ and ‘But if you, Manapa-Tarhunta, quarrel with Mashuiluwa...’. 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 *-y]a-zi nu* (though this is by no means the only possibility), but there is not remotely enough space to restore the three signs *šu-ul-li-* before them (one may easily compare the same sequence in line 11). Likewise, the partial sign

¹¹ That is, the capital city. See the *CHD L-N* 130 for this and the meaning of *maliyašḫa-*.

¹² With Del Monte (1980: 61) I restore *LÚ.KÚR-nili* to fill the space. The duplicate KUB 19.50+ iii 28 (i.e. KUB 40.39, 10’) has *LÚ.KÚR-l[i]*.

¹³ I restore *kueši* after line 12’ below with Del Monte (1980: 61). The duplicate KUB 19.50+ iii 29 (i.e. KUB 48.74, 10’ + 40.39, 11’) has *ku-en-[i]* followed by an erasure.

¹⁴ The text as it stands is a conflation of the two common formulas *nu apadda=ya ŠAPAL NIEŠ DINGIR-LIM kittari/kittaru* ‘That (nt. nom.-acc. sg.) too shall be placed under oath’ and *apāšš=a memias ŠAPAL...* ‘That matter (anim. 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 Mashuiluwa, in any of its attested spellings¹⁵.

The overall structure of the paragraph also argues decisively against the notion of mutual acts of *šulliya-*. 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 *šulliyaši* in line 11 is directed not at Mashuiluwa, but rather as in other cases at the higher authority, i.e. Mursili the king. For Mashuiluwa to ignore the prohibition would again be an act of disrespect¹⁶.

Most instances of the derived noun *šullatar* either positively support or are compatible with the meaning ‘become arrogant’ that we have assigned to *šulle-*¹⁷. The ablative of cause *šullannaz* 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: 17): [*takku* ARAD-*an na*]šma GĒME-*an šullannaz kuiški kuerzi* ‘If someone kills [a male] or female slave on account of š.’. The standard interpretation is ‘quarrel, dispute’, but nothing demands this meaning. As indicated by Hoffner (1997: 166) *šullannaz* ‘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 *šulle-* and *šullatar* one may compare German *Übermut*). The same remark applies to the theft of a door in §127 (KBo 6.10 ii 17; Hoffner 1997: 116)¹⁸.

Also amenable either to a meaning ‘quarrel, anger’ or ‘wantonness, recklessness’ are the instances of *šullatar* in the Ritual for the Infernal Deities (KBo 10.45 i 45–47; see Otten 1961: 120): DUMU.LŪ.U₁₉.LU ŪL *innarā uwanun ŪL=ma šullanni uwanun* ‘I the human have not come willfully. I have not come in anger/wantonness.’

The remaining two examples of *šullatar* from the Laws positively affirm a sense ‘wantonness’ or the like. Both significantly appear in a section whose common theme is *sacral* offenses (see Hoffner 1997: 213ff.). The first is KBo 6.26 i 28–30 (Laws, §164; Hoffner 1997: 132): *takku āppatriwanzi kuišk[i p]aizzi ta šullatar iēzzi [n]aššu NINDA ħaršin našma* ^{GIŠ.GĒŠTIN} *išpanduzi k[in]uzi* ‘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 asyndeton between the *šullatar iēzzi* clause and that following it argues that the second is an elaboration of the first (see Hoffner 1997: 12 for this use of asyndeton in the Laws). Here *šullatar* 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 6.13 i 6–9): *takku A.ŠĀ-LAM kuiški wāši ta ZAG-an paršiya* ^{NINDA} *ħaršin dāi t=an* ^dUTU-*i paršiya* ^{GIŠ} *elzi=mit=wa tagnā aršikket nu tezzi* ^dUTU-*uš* ^dU-*aš ŪL šullatar* ‘If someone buys a field and violates the boundary, he shall take a leavened

¹⁵ Del Monte implicitly concedes this in that he does not even attempt to offer a reading in his transliteration. Just what *could* have stood in the two gaps in the texts is a very difficult question, because one emphatically expects nothing in either case. In particular, I know of no instance where the nexus of orthotonic personal pronoun and personal name in apposition is broken by *any* element. I insist only that there is no possibility for the previously suggested restorations.

¹⁶ There is no matching expression for Mashuiluwa because the present treaty is directed only at Manapa-Tarhunta. The corresponding application to Mashuiluwa would have stood in *his* treaty.

¹⁷ Three examples of the dative-locative singular *šullanni* definitely belong to a homonymous noun *šullatar* ‘hostagehood’ and are irrelevant to our inquiry: KUB 19.39 iii 10, KBo 14.4 i 14, and ABoT 60 obv. 9. Likewise the examples *šullānun* at KBo 5.8 ii 2 and *šulla[i]* at KUB 19.49 i 68 belong to a separate verb *šullā(i)-* ‘impose hostages upon; give as a hostage’.

¹⁸ Like Sommer (1922: 42, note 1), I can make no coherent sense of the difficult passage with *šullannaz* in KBo 4.14 iii 26.

loaf and break it to the Sun-god (saying): “You have [...]ed my scales 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 *šullatar* is wholly different from all others, that from the trilingual hymn to Iškur-Adad (KUB 4.4 obv. 2–9; see Laroche 1964: 73&75): *dammatarwanza LUGAL-uš UR.SAG-iš kimmantan armaḥḥanni ḥamiešḥantan šullanni ḥamišḥandaš=ma alel āššiyanni ḥandaš ēšša[tti]* ‘You the bountiful king, hero, make the winter for impregnation, the spring for *šullatar*, and the flower of spring for the sake of love’¹⁹. While Puhvel (1991: 72) translates ‘the spring for strife’, this meaning is quite impossible for this context, as already seen by Laroche (1964: 78, note 1)²⁰. As Laroche correctly insists, we are dealing with the cycle of procreation. He attempts to salvage the accepted sense of *šullatar* by assuming a tentative development from ‘fait de se débattre’ to ‘éclosion’. We may now dispense with this artifice. If the winter is for impregnating, then the spring logically can only be for the resultant state — ‘being/becoming swollen’ (with child)²¹. This evidence for a physical sense for *šullatar* also suggests that the parallel between the deer becoming physically fat in the parable (*warkešta*) and becoming puffed up/swollen with conceit (*šüllēt*) was not lost on the Hittites²².

The direct evidence for a physical sense in any case assures us that the attested meaning ‘become arrogant’ or the like for *šulle-* is in fact derived from a concrete meaning ‘become swollen, puffed up’²³. The original inflection of the stem is *šulle-/šulla-* (NB the participle *šullant-*). For the later stems *šulliya-* and (1x) *šullā(i)-* see Oettinger (1979: 291ff.). Hittite *šulle-/šulla-* directly reflects a PIE stem **súlH-eh₁-* ‘become swollen’, belonging to the class of PIE “statives in *-eh₁-*” first established by Calvert Watkins (1973). As he showed, the class is well represented in Hittite by examples such as *nakke-* ‘be important; troublesome’ < *‘be heavy’ (cf. now Oettinger 2002: xxii), standing beside *nakkešš-* ‘become important; troublesome’ just like Latin *rubēre* ‘be red’ beside *rubēscere* ‘to become red’. The “fientive” sense of **súlH-eh₁-* is not an obstacle. As per Watkins (1973: 67), the focus on entry into a state is well attested elsewhere in the class (cf. OHG *altēn* and Hittite *miyaḥunte-* both ‘grow old’). A further Hittite example is *arawe-* ‘declare oneself free’, as established by Hoffner (1998b)²⁴. The rarity of the expected renewal to *šullešš-* is probably due to the alternate replacement by *šulliye-*. The formal derivation of Hittite *šülle-* from PIE **súlH-eh₁-* is straightforward: cf. **urh₁i-* > *ūrri-* ‘to help’ (see Melchert 1994: 55, 79, 126f., & 132 with refs.)²⁵.

¹⁹ The corresponding Akkadian appears to be divergent (see Laroche 1964: 78): *ana š[ab]aši šiknāt napišti arpu* ‘the summer for gathering the living beings’ (translation with the CAD sub *šabāšu* l.b). But cf. note 22 below.

²⁰ 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.

²¹ Though it hardly seems necessary, I may cite as parallels for such a usage German (see Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* sub *geschwellen* and *schwellen* (II.1.e)) and Italian *gonfia*.

²² Since the focus of the hymn is on the abundance of animal and plant life, one could also entertain the possibility that *šullātar* here reflects a semantic development similar to that shown by the German verb *strotzen*, which previously meant ‘swell’, but now usually rather ‘teem with (abundance)’ or English ‘teeming’, which previously meant ‘pregnant, gravid’ (e.g. ‘teeming women’), but now rather ‘abounding, swarming’ (‘teeming multitudes’). In that case the Akkadian ‘gathering’ of creatures might also be a way of expressing ‘multitude’, not so far then from Hittite *šullātar* ‘abundance’.

²³ Since swelling/puffing up is also frequently associated with anger (cf. again German *geschwellen* as well as Latin *tumidus*), one could suppose that Hittite *šulle-* at times does mean ‘become angry’, as previously assumed. However, since no instance of the verb demands this sense, I prefer not to add this further complication.

²⁴ Indeed *LIV*² 25 (incorrectly) defines the class as fientives.

²⁵ I personally remain puzzled by the vowel length in *-ūr-* < **-wR-* (NB the several examples of plene spelling in our verb stem), but this is not a problem unique to *šülle-*. Cf. also *kūrka-* ‘foal’ beside Greek *κύριος* ‘bastard son’ and *šūrka-* ‘root’ next to Latin *surculus* ‘shoot, bud’.

Hittite *šulle-* supports the hypothesis that Latin inherited a stem **suḷH-eh₁-* ‘become swollen’²⁶. The Latin adjective (putatively participle) *īnsolēns* seems to imply a verb stem **īnsoleō*. 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. *illucēscō* beside *lucēscō* ‘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 *taceō* ‘be silent’ beside *conticēscō* ‘fall silent, stop talking’). Only later do we find *conticeō* in the sense ‘fall silent’. Addition of *in-* ‘into’ to a stem **soleō* 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* < **suḷH-eh₁-* ‘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 *scateō* ‘gush forth’ are not stative in meaning. Thus already in Old Latin **soleō* would have been renewed as **īnsoleō* like *illucēscō* beside *lucēscō* ‘grow bright, dawn’. The case would be unique because the dynamic/fientive sense of **soleō* was virtually so.

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

The formal derivation of *īnsolē(sce)re* is unproblematic. Per Schrijver (1991: 205ff.) **CRHV* leads to Latin *CaRV*. A stem **en-suḷH-eh₁-* would thus lead in the first instance to **īnswalē-*. Evidence of various compounds of the root of *alere* ‘nourish’ (*ad-olēscō*, *ind-olēs*, *sub-olēs*) argues that medial *-alē-* would have led to *-olē-*, thus **īnswalē-* > **īnswolē-* > attested *īnsolē-* (see Ernout, Meillet 1959: 23, who properly reject the alleged simplex *olēscō* of Festus as an invention).

Thanks to the new evidence of Hittite *šulle-/šulla-* ‘become arrogant’ and *šullatar* ‘swollenness; wantonness’, we may add **suḷH-eh₁-* ‘become swollen, puffed up’ to the assured list of PIE verbal stems in **-eh₁-* established by Watkins (removing the question mark of *LIV*² 610) and derive Latin *īnsolēns/īnsolēscō* from the same ultimate source, reaffirming Pokrowskii’s suggestion of more than a century ago.

REFERENCES

- Beckman, Gary. 1996. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (Writings from the Ancient World 7). Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- . 1997. Excerpt from the Hurro-Hittite Bilingual Wisdom Text. In: *The Context of Scripture. Canonical Compositions, Monumental Inscriptions and Archival Documents from the Biblical World* (edd. William Hallo and K. L. Younger), 1.216–217. Leiden: Brill.
- CAD = *The Akkadian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute. 1956ff.
- CHD = *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute. *Volume L-N* (1980–89), *Volume P* (1994–1997), *Volume Š* (2002–) (edd. Hans G. Güterbock, Harry A. Hoffner, and Theo P. J. van den Hout).
- Del Monte, Giuseppe. 1980. Neue Bruchstücke zum Manapa-^dU-Vertrag. *Orientalia NS* 49.58–66.
- Ernout, Alfred & Antoine Meillet. 1959. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*.⁴ Paris: Klincksieck.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1952. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.

²⁶ 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.

- Giorgieri, Mauro. 2001. Hurritisch *te-li-(i-)ip-pa'* hethitisch *nu-...ma-ak-nu-ut* in der hurritisch-hethitischen Bilingue aus Boğazköy. In: *Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalistische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Thomas Richter et al.), 125–138. Saarbrücken: SDV.
- Haverling, Gerd. 2000. *On Sco-Verbs, Prefixes and Semantic Functions. A Study in the Development of Prefixed and Unprefixed Verbs From Early to Late Latin*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Hoffner, Harry. 1997. *The Laws of the Hittites*. Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill.
- . 1998a. *Hittite Myths* (Writings from the Ancient World 2). Second edition. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- . 1998b. On the Denominative Verb *arawē-*. In: *Mir Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins* (ed. Jay Jasanoff et al.), 275–284.
- Kronasser, Heinz. 1966. *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache* (Bd. 1). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Kümmel, Martin. 2000. *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen. Eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums in den altindoiranischen Sprachen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1964. Un hymne trilingue à Iškur-Adad. *RA* 58.69–78.
- LIV² = Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben. Zweite Auflage* (ed. Helmut Rix). Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Melchert, Craig. 1994. *Hittite Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam; Atlanta: Rodopi.
- . 1998. Aspects of Verbal Aspect in Hittite. In: *III. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri. Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology* (ed. Sedat Alp & Aygül Süel), 413–418.
- Neu, Erich. 1996. *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 32). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Narr.
- . 1992. Achikars Weisheitssprüche im Licht älterer Fabeldichtung. In: *Der Äsop-Roman. Motivgeschichte und Erzählstruktur* (ed. N. Holzberg), 3–22. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- . 2002. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nachdruck mit einer kurzen Revision der hethitischen Verbalklassen (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie Band 7). Dresden: Verlag der TU Dresden.
- Otten, Heinrich. 1961. Eine Beschwörung der Unterirdischen aus Boğazköy. *ZA* 54.114–157.
- . 1981. *Die Apologie Hattusilis III* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 24). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Pokrovskii, Mikhail M. 1898 [1959]. Материалы для исторической грамматики латинского языка [reprinted in: *Избранные работы по языкознанию* (Москва: «Издательство Академии Наук СССР»), 171–368].
- . 1899. Beiträge zur lateinischen etymologie und stammbildungslehre. *KZ* 35.226–253.
- . 1927. Notes d'étymologie latine. *Izvestiia Akademii Nauk SSSR Ser. 6, Vol. 21*. 127–150.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1991. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 3: Words beginning with H*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 1997. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 4: Words beginning with K*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1991. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam; Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Siegelová, Jana. 1971. *Appu-Märchen und Hedammu-Mythos* (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 14). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1922. *Hethitisches II* (Boghazköi-Studien 7). Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- . 1932. *Die Aḫḫijavā-Urkunden* (ABAW NF 6). Munich: Beck.
- Sommer, Ferdinand & Adam Falkenstein. 1938. *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I (Labarna II)* (ABAW NF 16). Munich: Beck.
- Ünal, Ahmet. 1994. Hethitische Mythe und Epen. In: *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* (ed. O. Kaiser). Band III/4. *Mythen und Epen II*, 802–865. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Walde, Alois and Johann Hofmann. 1938. *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*.³ Heidelberg: Winter.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1973. Hittite and Indo-European Studies: the denominative staves in *-ē-*. *TPS* 1971. 51–93.