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S. E. Kimball
Hittite عواش and Congeners*

The Hittite word عواش is to my knowledge attested only once in the published corpus. As such, it is but one of many hapax legomena in the language. It is, however, better known than most, because it occurs in a very famous text, the so-called ‘Song of Nesa’ or ‘Soldatenliedchen’, KBo. III 40 Rs 12–16:

Hurlaš nawi uizzi nu parā MU. 4. KAM [—]+ 1 2 LÚ. MEŠ ḫul-
ḫuliyaneteš nu-zza ʾišhamatiškizzi (dupl. ʾišhamatiškanzi)
URU NešaššI TŪG.H.I.A tiya-mmu tiya
nu-mmu annaš-maš katta arnut tiya-fmmu ṭiyya
nu-mmu ʿawaš-maš katta arnut [ṭiyya-mmu [ṭiyya
ug-uš punuškimi [kī k]uit walkuwan [ʾišham]aššišteš]ni UMMA
ŠUNU-MA

‘The Hurrian has not yet come. Four years before (?)\(^1\) two men (are) struck down. One sings (duple, they sing):

“Clothes of Nesa, clothes of Nesa, bind on me, bind!
Those of my mother bring down to me, bind (them) on me, bind!
Those of my ʿawaš bring down to me, bind (them) on me, bind!”

---

\(^{1}\) A version of this paper was first presented at the Second East Coast Indo-European Conference, held at Harvard University, June 1–3, 1983. I am grateful to several participants for useful comments and suggestions.

\(^{2}\) This lacuna is normally restored as [pa-iš-z]i, but there is no trace of the zi in the published autograph, and based on the sure restorations of the following two lines, especially tiya-fmmu ṭiyya of line 14, there is not enough space for [pa-iš-z]. The resulting syntax is also peculiar, since we are left with 2 LÚ.-MEŠ ḫulḫuliyaneteš as a complete clause with no introductory conjunction. In view of the expression (piran) parā UD.KAM-an for ‘the day before’ (see KUB. XXIX 4 I 54, IX 15 II 27, XV 36 Vs 11, etc.), I wonder whether parā MU.4.KAM does not mean simply ‘four years before’. We probably have here the only Hittite means of expressing what would be in idiomatic English: ‘Four years before the Hurrian comes, two men (are) struck down’.

I ask them: “What is this monstrosity you’re singing?” — They say...

Hrozný, AO. 1 (1929) p. 297, terms this passage ‘le plus vieux chant indo-européen’. While later scholars have differed with his interpretation of the contents, none has disputed the claim of its antiquity. As the oldest piece of Indo-European poetry extant (as well as virtually the only example of native Hittite verse), this short text has received considerable attention. See among others Güterbock, JAOS. 84 (1964), p. 110; Van Brock, RHA. 22 (1964), p. 135; Ivanov, To Honor Roman Jakobson, 1967, p. 977 ff.; Watkins, Lg. 45 (1969), p. 239 ff.; and Oettinger, KZ. 92 (1978) p. 74–75 (these works are cited below by author only).\(^2\)

This text is attested only in Neo-Hittite manuscripts,\(^3\) but it is certain that its composition dates from Old Hittite times. Furthermore, it occurs as part of a text (CTH. 16) which appears to be a collection of unrelated bits of Hittite traditional ‘lore’ whose significance was already becoming obscure in Old Hittite. E.g., the same text contains the story of the ‘bull with the crumpled horn’, where the bent horn is ‘explained’ by a story about the prehistoric crossing of the Taurus Mountains: see Otten, ZA. 55 (1963) p. 156 ff. Likewise, note the reaction of the Old Hittite narrator to the ‘Song of Nesa’: he finds it little more than gibberish.\(^4\) It is likely that the reply of the singers contains a na-

---

\(^{2}\) Ivanov in particular analyzes the text from the point of view of comparative Indo-European poetics. This aspect cannot be fully treated here, but I would point out that the work of McNeill, AnSt. 13 (1963) p. 237 ff., and Durnford, AnSt. 21 (1971) p. 69 ff., suggests that Hittite versification was based on stress patterns, not on number of syllables. I therefore follow Durnford in analyzing the poem as consisting of three lines of four stresses each, rather than six lines of alternating length as suggested by Ivanov. Further evidence is available confirming some of Durnford’s conclusions about syntactic stress in Hittite. I hope to discuss this topic in detail elsewhere.

\(^{3}\) The statement of Watkins that the primary manuscript is in ‘old ductus’ is mistaken.

\(^{4}\) For my restoration of [kī k]uit walkuwan [ʾišham]aššišteš]ni and interpretation of walkuwan, compare kī kuit walkuwan āštân at KBo. XXII 2 Vs. 2 and see the other examples of impatient questions cited by Otten, StBoT. 17 (1973) p. 16. The word walkuwan, which occurs only in these two passages, appears
tive Hittite ‘exegeis’ of the song like that which explains the cow’s crumpled horn. Unfortunately, this portion of the text is brady broken. In any case, all internal evidence supports the idea that the text of the song is very ancient indeed.

Modern analysis of the song begins with Hrozny, who interprets it as a ‘chant de guerre’, taking LU.MES ḫuḫliyaṭeš as ‘fighters, warriors’ (cf. KBo. I 42 II 29, where the verbal noun ḫuḫliyayawar impressively translates Akk. mundaḫšu ‘fighting’). The ‘clothes’ requested are thus battle-dress. Van Brock argues that ḫuḫliyaṭant- means rather ‘killed, slain’ and suggests that the text is not a war-chant, but a funeral dirge. This overall interpretation has been followed by Ivanov and Watkins, and it is consistent with the translations of Güterbock and Oettinger, although the latter’s views on this point are not made explicit.

Actually, Van Brock’s argument is less than compelling. In view of šekkant- ‘knowing’ and Wišuriant- ‘(the oppressing (one)’ (cf. Carruba, SToBoT. 2, 1969, p. 49ff.), it cannot be in principle excluded that ḫuḫliyaṭant- has an active sense ‘fighting, fighter’. Syntactically, however, the old interpretation of ḫuḫliyaṭantęš as a substantivized participle (with LÚ. MES as mere determinative) is difficult. One must then not only supply a verb ašanzi but also assume a rather awkward nominal sentence: ‘Two warriors (are present)’. It seems far more natural to take the sentence-final participle with Van Brock as predicatival (as often in Hittite): ‘Two men are ḥ- ed’. Since the root *h₂wel₃h₂- in Hittite always means either ‘strike’ or ‘fight’ (wall₃ and ḫull₂a-), it seems safest to ascribe only those meanings to

to refer to something strange and shocking, probably with the connotation of ‘unnatural, monstrous’.

5 For both wall₃- and huḫliyaṭa- *h₂wel₃h₂- see Oettinger, Stammbild. p. 264, and Melchert, Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology (forthcoming) I, Sect. 1.2.1. with note 33. The suggestion of Van Brock that huḫliyaṭa- might mean ‘put in a shroud’ and be a syncopated form of huḫliyaṭa- ‘wrap’ is far-fetched. We have the testimony of the lexical entry for a stem huḫliyaṭa- ‘fight’. The form is also the expected result of a reduplicated stem in -ya- from *h₂wel₃h₂-:

*h₂wel₃h₂-wel₃h₂-ya- > huḫliyaṭa- with regular treatment of *w₂k₂ before consonant (see Eichner, MSJ. 31, 1973, p. 73, and Melchert, op. cit. Sect. 3.1.3) and regular loss of *h₂ before *š- (cf. šeṭe- ‘steal’ < *stialtete-). It is also doubtful that the reduplicated stem would have a perfectivizing sense ‘strike (dead)’. The example -za...anda huḫliyaṭ (KUB. XXIII 97 I 32) suggests that here

the reduplicated ḫuḫliyaṭa-, as already suggested by the lexical passage. Hence my translation: ‘Two men (are) struck down’.

The men are not dead, but seriously (in their minds mortally) wounded, which also accounts for the fact that they can sing the song—something which they could hardly do if they were already dead. Nevertheless, there is evidence that the topic of the song is funereal. Watkins has already pointed out the special role of the mother in the Hittite funeral, citing the passage KUB. XXX 28 Rs 11–12 from the Ritual for Hamrištara (CTH. 488): annaš-wašši [. . . nu]-war-an-za S.U. H.L.A-It IŠBAT nu-war-an-pehušši ḫis mother has . . . to/for him. She has taken him by the hands and accompanied him’. One may compare also the Hittite expression annaš šibat- ‘day of one’s mother’ for ‘day of one’s death’, discussed in detail in Puhvel, KZ. 83 (1969) p. 59ff. While I cannot accept some details of his analysis, Puhvel’s basic claim seems secure: this Hittite expression reflects the inherited PIE view of death as a return to one’s forefathers, who receive the newly deceased into their company. This idea seems directly continued in the ritual passage just cited.

Thus the overall interpretation of Van Brock and others is correct: the men mortally wounded in battle are asking by

as elsewhere the sense is rather iterative ‘fight, struggle, vie with’ (with the preverb anda and reflexive particle perhaps adding the nuance of wrestling or grappling). In our passage the effect is ‘beaten, laid low’ (by repeated blows).

6 His assembled evidence for annaš being elliptical for annaš aṭṭaš is weak. The plural S.U.H.L.A-it does not require two persons, since it is commonplace in such acts of tenderness for one person to clasp both hands around those of another. That the cited form aṭṭa is a dual, let alone an elliptical dual for aṭṭa anna, is highly unlikely. If -a were a dual ending, it would have to continue PIE. *a- and it should function as a nom.-acc. However, all cited examples are genitive or dative. Since ad-du for ad-da-aš requires only omission of a single horizontal stroke, the few cases of ada are surely errors for regular adaš. The reality of ḫuḫša in the famous ḫuḫša ḫanšša is also very questionable. The nom.-acc. ḫuḫša ‘eyes’ may easily be a collective plural in *eh₂. On ḫašša ḫanšša see Melchert, RHA. 31 (1973) p. 65ff. My arguments presented there concerning the syntax of this phrase have to my knowledge still not been addressed by those who insist on interpreting it as a dual. I repeat my contention that there is no good evidence for a dual in -a < *-a in Hittite.
means of a traditional formula for their funeral shrouds. That these are referred to as the clothes of one’s mother is consistent with the facts just presented for her special role in the funeral. We also know (from the Anitta Text) that Neša (Kaniš), not Hattuša, was the traditional ancestral home of the people we call the Hittites. It is therefore natural that the funeral shrouds also be called ‘clothes of Nesa’.

We are left with the third line of the song. Since its structure is entirely parallel to that of the preceding line, it has been clear to everyone that uesta is the gen. sg. of a noun referring to a close relative, parallel to annaš. Hrozný translates uesta as ‘son’. This is based on the erroneous view that there is another attestation of the noun uesta in KUB. VII 57 1 5. Here the form uesta is rather pret. 2nd sg. of uesta ‘come’: read [k]uit[!] -wa uesta DUMU.LÜ.LÜ1[luš]-äš ‘Why have you come, oh son of mortality?’. Ivanov (followed by Watkins) interprets uesta as ‘forefather, ancestor’ purely from the context. While such a reference is plausible, there is in fact no textual evidence in Hittite for the participation of ancestors in the funeral rites (as there is for the mother). We also already know the Hittite term for at least paternal ancestors: ḫunna(ḫ) - grandfather; forefather’ and ḫanna- ‘grandmother’. To be sure, Oettinger attempts to save this interpretation by equating of uesta to ḫunna-. Following a suggestion of H. Eichner, he claims that uesta is the form taken by ḫunna in the ‘Nesite dialect’ of Hittite, which loses ḫ. To be consistent, he also interprets anna- in this text as standing for ḫanna- ‘grandmother’. This ‘Nesite dialect’ is pure fiction. Except for uesta itself, every other morpheme in this text may be interpreted as an ordinary Hittite form. In fact, we have

seen evidence that anna- must have its usual meaning of ‘mother’. Rather than invent an entire dialect to explain one hapax, it seems more reasonable to admit that the meaning of uesta has not yet been determined, as does Güterbock, who leaves the term untranslated.

We need further evidence. I can offer no new instances of the noun uesta-, but I have found what I believe to be a direct derivative which does give us a clue to the meaning of the base noun. The crucial passage is KUB. I 15 II 1-3. In order tojustify the restorations I have made and to clarify the context, I also cite the parallel VAT. 7481 IV 13-17 (see KBo XX, p. VIII, n. 15):

KUB. I 15 II 1-3: [(SAL.ta-wa-nan)]n uwa- lan10 [(AN.BAR- aš)]18 DAG-ti paardu dušgaraz-pat [(eš])u t[(a-z)] dāi t-aš- kan paizzi

VAT. 7481 IV 13-17: aššuš- aš [(halu-gaš)] wemški[(du)] [(mayant)i]n 4UTU-lilnin [(SAL-ta-wa)] mn̄mn̄n̄ nan vilin [(AN.- AR-a)] 4G5DAG-ti paardu . . . .11 ‘May a good message find them, His virile Majesty and the uwa-la-ewali- tawannanna. May it go to the throne of iron.’

such a replacement in the 2nd sg. inv. of hi-verbs in final -i. Second, since dāi- ‘place’ is not used with articles of clothing in Hittite, there is no reason to suppose that tiya belongs to dāi- in the first place. Third, there is other evidence for an active transitive verb tiya- : KUB. XIII 11 IV 11, XLI 49, 67, and FHG. 13 III 10. All of these passages, so the lexical meaning is indeterminate, but these examples cannot be assigned to tiya- ‘step, stand’, which is consistently intransitive. In view of these facts and the funereal context (the ‘clothes’ are shrouds), I follow the suggestion of C. Watkins (personal communication) that transitive tiya- means ‘bind’ (= *dh₂-ye- to the root of Grk.-dēme ‘strap’ and Skt. dāman-‘bond’). Such a verb stem must already be assumed for Hittite because of the derivative tiya-mmār ‘rope, cord’ < *Bindung.

The Sign I read as LA does not have its usual form in Hittite manuscripts, but this shape is well attested: see Labat, Manuel d’épigraphie akkadienne, p. 58. This form could also be read as AD/AT (Labat p. 100). The signs LA and AT are also confused in their usual shapes at Boğazköy. However, the rules of Hittite orthography exclude AT here. If the Hittites wished to write /uwa-land/ they would have written ú-wa-tila-an (VCV/ always written -(C)CV-CV-, never -(C)V-CV). A spelling ú-wa-at-an would be highly aberrant.

The reading ú-wa-la-an is thus assured.

11 See for the restorations also KBo. XX 67 IV 24-25, etc.

---

7 Ivanov cites as a possible cognate of Hitt. uesta- a Lyc. wuse ‘man’ (for which see Meriggi, Fest. Hirt 2, p. 270f.). However, most uses of Lyc. wuse point to a pronominal form, perhaps an indefinite of some kind: see Neumann, Lyk. p. 388 with references. The adjective wuwalhi, alleged to mean ‘descendant’, belongs rather to uesta ‘cow’; see Neumann, Gedok. Kronasser, p. 152-153. There is thus no good evidence for a Lyc. wuse as a term of relationship.

8 In some passages like those cited by Puhvel, the plural of uesta ‘father’ also seems to function in the meaning ‘forefathers’.

9 This includes the 2nd sg. inv. tiya, which Oettinger alleges is a dialect form of dāi- ‘place’, replacing regular inv. dāi. First, there is no other evidence for
This passage is part of the ‘invocation of the mountains’ in the ‘Monthly Festival’ (CTH. 591). Although the manuscripts are Neo-Hittite, the text is clearly Old Hittite. The mountains are to bring blessings upon the royal couple, whose titles are in some manuscripts accompanied by epithets. That of the king is well-known: mayant- is an extension in -ant- of the poorly attested (\(^{1}\))māya-. Both mean ‘grown (man)’ with the particular connotation of ‘fully grown, in one’s prime, vigorous, virile’. Both mayant- and its derivatives are sometimes written with the Sumerogram KAL (now read GURUŠ) ‘strong, manly’. In the strange and interesting text Bo. 6483 māya- refers to the male retainers of the god Pirwa, who apparently has a ‘Männerbund’ much like the Vedic god Indra. I therefore do not think my translation ‘virile’ is overdone. The king is to be a man par excellence, the ideal man. We may assume that the queen is likewise to be the model woman. The question then becomes: by what quality would the Hittites define the ideal woman? Obviously, there are several possibilities. However, in a male-dominated society (which we may safely assume the Hittites to have had), the role of woman has typically been defined in terms of her capacity to bear children. A woman should above all be fertile. In the case of the queen, the powerful consideration of providing for the succession would make fertility an even more urgent desideratum. There is thus a very strong chance that uwala- means fertile.

Formally, uwala- is open to two analyses. Since the suffix -(a)la- comes to form agent nouns in Hittite (cf. laḫḫiyala- ‘traveler, campaigner’ from laḫḫiya- ‘travel, go on campaign’), one could analyze uwala- as a derivative of uwa- ‘come’. However, from a basic meaning ‘one who comes’ I can see no way to derive either ‘fertile’ or any other plausible epithet of the queen. The suffix -(a)la- originally forms adjectives from nouns, and this function is also preserved in Hittite. Therefore uwala- may also be viewed as the adjective of our noun uwa-, just like at-tal ila- ‘paternal’ from ata- ‘father’.

If we look at the words for ‘fertile’ (of humans) in Indo-European languages, we find that there are essentially three means of deriving this concept. Several languages derive ‘fertile’ from the verb ‘to bear’: Eng./Ital. fertile, 12 Grk. phorós and gónimos. Since Hitt. uwala- is denominative, this avenue leads us nowhere. The most common derivation of ‘fertile’ is from nouns which express the result of bearing. Thus Eng. fruitful (and Germanic cognates), W. ffrwythalon, Ir. tochtúil, Lith. vaisiš, Pol. plodny (and cognates), and Skt. bahuṣhalaṇa- are all based on the respective words for ‘fruit’ (both of trees and in the general sense of ‘product’). Similarly, LLat. prōlīficus is built on prōlēs ‘offspring’. It is obvious that Hitt. uwa- does not mean ‘fruit’. 13 It is in principle possible that it means ‘offspring’, but this would not fit well in the context of our song: it is unlikely that the Hittites would refer to shrouds as the clothes of one’s offspring. Furthermore, note that prōlīficus is not a simple adjective from prōlēs, but contains the suffix -icus ‘making, producing’. It is not easy to see how an uwala- meaning simply *(of/ pertaining to offspring) would come to mean ‘fertile’.

Latin shows yet another means of deriving the sense ‘fertile’. Both fecundus and fētus are derived from the PIE root *dheh₁(ī)- ‘suck; suckle’. The notion of fertility in a female (animal or human) is derived from the condition of a mother’s lactating breasts. Here we have a derivation applicable to Hitt. uwala-. The original sense of uwala- was ‘suckling, nourishing’ from uwa- ‘nurse’ (in its original sense of ‘one who suckles’). 14 Thus uwa- in our passage does not refer to another relative in addition to anna-, but rather reinforces the latter. It is true, of

---

12 Lat. fētus itself is apparently not used of humans, but both the Italian and English forms descending from it are.

13 In view of the frequency with which ‘fruitful’ (of earth) is applied secondarily to animals and humans, it is conceivable that the alternate epithet of the queen ewal- means originally something like ‘rich in barley’ < ewa- ‘barley’.

14 Properly, uwala- should have meant ‘(of/pertaining to a nurse)’, but the shift to ‘having the qualities of a nurse’, hence ‘nurturing, fertile’ is an easy one. Compare the range of use of ‘maternal’ and ‘paternal’.
course, that infants are not always nursed by their mothers, and in classical Greek and Roman society, it was in fact normal among the upper classes to have infants nursed by servants. However, there is good evidence that the inherited Indo-European tradition was for mothers to nurse their own infants: see Schrader, Realexikon d. idg. Altertums sub Amme. If one reads the passages from Tacitus referred to there, one receives the impression that the latter’s testimony about practice in early Rome and among the Germani may not be entirely objective (Tacitus clearly believes in mothers’ nursing their own). However, it is really inconsequential for our purposes whether the early Romans or Germanic tribes carried out the practice as faithfully as Tacitus implies. After all, we know nothing about contemporary Hittite practice in this regard. The point is that there was a tradition that mothers nurse their own children.

It also seems clear that the use of عائلة in our passage has an affective value. By stressing the role of the mother (anna-) as nurse (وعاء), the sense of intimacy (one might almost say of tenderness) in the song is increased. Compare the use of both terms in Latin burial inscriptions: CIL. VI 2134 matri piae nutrici dulcissimae (note the epithets!), 34143 b matri et nutriti. I realize that there is a danger of reading too much into ancient texts based on our modern sensibilities about such matters, but I believe that the emotional content of both our passage and that from the funeral ritual is evident from the texts themselves. The interpretation of عائلة as ‘nurse’, based on the apparent meaning ‘fertile’ of its derivative عالاء, fits naturally into the funereal context of the song, particularly given the special role of the mother in the Hittite view of death.

Hitt. عائلة is thus a disyllabic animate a-stem with the sense of an agent noun: ‘one who suckles, nurse’. The most likely source for such a form is an agent noun of the *tomos type. 16

However, one cannot assume simply *aus- (∗owó-), because this would lead to Hitt. *aus-. One needs a preform *ausu *aus-as, where the laryngeal makes the u tautosyllabic, creating a diphthong which regularly monophthongizes to u in Hittite. Loss of the intervocalic laryngeal and insertion of w into the hiatus produces the attested form: *ausu > *aus- > *aus-. 17

The hypothetical root *auh- ‘give milk, suckle’ is attested elsewhere in PIE, namely in the traditional base *auhô- of the word ‘breast, udder’ (Skt. udhara, Grk. oushara, Lat. iber, etc.), which may now be interpreted as *auh- ‘be pregnant’ (of swine) and related words. 20 The Italic river names Osphena and Ausidus, and the Russian verb úditi ‘to ripen’ (of grain). The Lithuanian words need not detain us long. Since

17 See Melchert, Studies ... I, Sect. 2.1.5.
16 This reconstruction is also compatible with the derivation of the Latin adjective ubera ‘abundant, rich (in)’ and cognates proposed by Szemerényi, Glotta 34 (1955) p.283 ff., since *auhô- would lead to the same results as *auh-. Obviously, the semantic development to ‘abundance’, quite possible from ‘to swell’, is even easier from ‘to give milk’. One need think only of the use of *auh- in Sanskrit.
19 We would thus have discovered the verbal root behind another PIE noun for a body part, as already done for *testicula and *arm: see Watkins, BSL. 70 (1975) p.11 ff., with reference to Benveniste, BSL. 52 (1956) p.60 ff.
20 These consist of pándhre ‘abdomen’ (‘of humans’), omentum (‘of swine’), its related verb pándhri ‘have a swelling udder’ (‘of swine and dogs’, and probably védaras ‘intestine, belly’. Fraenkel, Lit. Etym. Wb. sub pándhre. includes dadas as derived from *budh-, but sub védaras itself also cites with apparent approval its connection with Skt. udhara- ‘belly’. Obviously, both of these derivations cannot be correct. If Védaras does belong with pándhre, it seems to point to a base *wehô-. For possible *wehô- beside *enô- see further below.
they all show a base ūdr- and refer specifically to the swollen bellies of domestic animals, it is clear that these words are all secondary to the noun ‘udder’. They tell us nothing about the sense of the verbal root on which ‘udder, breast’ is based.

As for the river names Oufens and Aufidus, Krahe, BzN. 5. p. 108 f., cites as evidence for equating the two names such pairs as turgēns/turgidus ‘swollen’. This comparison suggests that Oufens is the participle not of a primary verb, as Krahe implies, but of a stative verb in -ēre. Statives in -ēre are in origin denominative to root nouns: see Jasaioff, Stative and Middle in Indo-European 1978, p. 120 ff. Furthermore, as the epithet of a river, Oufens is just as likely to mean ‘swollen’ in the sense ‘overflowing’ (with water) as it is ‘distended, puffed up’. Thus Oufens also offers no solid evidence for a primary meaning ‘swell, be distended’ for *euh-(dh)-.

The rare Russian verb ūdit'22 is attested only in reference to ripening grain, and it is glossed variously as ‘ripen, mature, fill up with juice’ as well as ‘grow fat, gain body’.23 It is difficult to determine whether the verb is an old iterative or a denominative, but in either case the attested usage again does not require a meaning ‘swell’ for *euh-(dh)-. As the glosses above already show, ripening grain not only swells, but also fills with liquid: cf. also Vergil, G. 1.315 cum frumenta in uiridi stipulâ lactentia turgent ‘when the grain full of sap/milk swells on the green stalk’. All reflexes of the root *euh-(dh)- are thus consistent with a basic meaning ‘give milk/liquid’ hence ‘suckle’. For a similar (in fact rhyming) root, compare *seu-h- ‘give liquid; suck’ (Grk. ἕδει ‘rains’, Lat. sūgō ‘suck’).

Hitt. uwa- and uwal- are not the only reflexes of *euh-(dh)- in Anatolian. In Cuneiform Luvian we find the adjective uṣan-

tari-, attested in the Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi (CTH. 409) IV 7–11: namma-za-kan GUD uṣantarîn Sl ēpī nu menai dUTU BELI-YA kāş mahānum GUD-uš uṣantarîš n-āš-kan uṣantarî šal-îya anda nu-za-kan šāhī[ti] GUD.NITÂ-ît GUD.ĀB-ît šunneš-kizzi kāš-â EN SISKUR QATAMMA uṣandarî šēdu ‘Then one takes the fertile cow by the horn and says: ‘Sun-god, my lord, as this cow is fertile and is in a fertile corral and fills the corral with bulls and cows, so also let this celebrant be fertile.’’ The adjective is confirmed as Luvian by uṣandarainzi DINGIR. [MEŠ(?)] ‘fertile gods(?)’ at KUB. XXXV 84 II 12.

The meaning ‘fertile’ (or ‘pregnant’) for uṣantari- is evident from the ritual passage, and Goetze and Sturtevant, Tunn. 75, had already related the word to the CLuv. verb uṣā(i)- via a participle *uṣant-.24 A stem *uṣant- is reasonably certain, but Sturtevant’s further analysis of *uṣant- as ‘impregnate’ < u + šā- ‘press down’ hence ‘impregnate’ (cf. Lat. comprimere) is not likely. In the first place, as a hi-verb in final -i- Hitt. šāi/siya- ‘press’ would surely be continued in Luvian as *siya- (cf. piya- ‘give’ beside Hitt. pāi-piya-). Second, the meaning ‘I prevented, hindered’ for the attested uṣailha (KUB. XIV 3 III 60) is also false. Since the object in this passage is not the enemy, but the land to be protected, a meaning ‘defend’ is required.

We are left with two analyses for *uṣant-. It could indeed be a participle ‘nourished, suckled’ (whence uṣantari- ‘nourishing, suckling, fertile’) to a denominative verb *uṣā(i)- ‘nourish, suckle’. Whether the attested verb uṣā(i)- may be cited as evidence for this stem is dubious. One could conceive of a semantic shift ‘nourish’ > ‘sustain’ > ‘defend’ (cf. the use of Hitt. ḫušnu- ‘cause to live as rescue’), but this is very speculative. The denominative verb *uṣā(i)- ‘nourish, suckle’ presupposes a

21 An original root noun beside the attested rīn-stem would not be surprising: cf. Hitt. weid- ‘water’ beside wātarweiten-wetan.

22 There is no positive evidence for the doublet ādit- cited in the literature. This form appears to be based on nothing more than a speculation of Dal’, who is the source for the word (see note 23).

23 In addition to these definitions, given by Dal’, Tolkovj Slovar’ Zhivogo Velikorusskago Jazyka, see also Fedorova, Slovar’ russkix govorov novosibirskoj oblasti (Novosibirsk 1979), who glosses ādit- as ‘ripen’ and ‘fill with juice’.

24 Sturtevant further compares Hitt. gimmudariya- ‘spend the winter’ and similar forms, suggesting a base *gimmudari- to which he compares uṣantari-. However, Hittite verbs in -ariya- are more likely simply -ya-verbs based (originally) on nouns in -ar (from which the complex suffix *-ariya- is then abstracted). Cluvian shows several adjectives or nouns in -ari-: ḫuwallari-, itmari-, ḥabarari-, tiwari- and especially manantari-. Our adjective uṣantari- undoubtedly belongs to this rather ill-defined group.
base *uša- ‘nourishing, suckling’. The stem *ušant- could also be a direct extension in -ant- of such an adjective *uša-.

In either case we are led to a preform *uša- ‘nourishing, suckling’. I believe that derivation from *euh₁-(dh)- is reasonably sure, but the formal details are quite uncertain, given our present knowledge of Luvian phonology and morphology. I cite here only one possibility. Since a suffix *-so- is unlikely, perhaps we have here an adjective in *-o- to an s-stem noun, i.e. a virtual *uh₁dh-s-o- to the s-stem seen in Skt, ūdhos. Compare for the formation Skt. āśa- ‘spring, well’ to the base of Grk. hūdós ‘water’ and vatsā ‘calf’ to that of Grk. éos ‘year’. Compare in fact. CLuv. ušša- ‘year’ which appears to continue *utso-. I certainly would not insist on this particular derivation, but CLuv. ušantari- ‘fertile’ evidently is another reflex of *euh₁-(dh) ‘suckle’ in Anatolian, via *uša- and ušant-.

In conclusion, I would like to venture one further speculation. We have seen evidence from Hitt. āwa- ‘nurse’ and uwa-la- ‘fertile’ to suggest that the Indo-European word for ‘breast, udder’ is built on a verbal root ‘to give milk/liquid’, hence ‘suckle’. C. Watkins has recently suggested that Ved. vār (vāar) ‘water’, Av. vār- ‘rain’ and CLuv. wār ‘water’ (attested in the ‘plural’ wārsa) all reflect a noun *wēh₁-r, while OIr. fir ‘(cow’s) milk’ is based on a derived adjective *wēh₁-r-ō-. Since Vedic vār is also used to mean ‘milk’, this specialized use is likely old. Mechanically, of course, eu-h₁- ‘give milk’ and *w-eh₁-, the base of ‘water, milk’ may easily be forms of the same root (whether one adds a further initial *h₁ is immaterial). We may thus be dealing with a single PIE root *eu-h₁- (‘state II *w-eh₁-’) whose basic meaning was ‘excrete liquid’, with a very early specialized use as ‘give milk’.

Addendum: Regarding Lyc. uwe as a term of relationship, J. Jasanooff has called my attention to Friedrich, Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler, p. 139, where Lyc. uwe appears to equate to

Grk. τοῖς οἰκείοις ‘kin, family’ (following wife and children). This apparent equation does not argue against the analysis of Hitt. āwa- given above, since the Lycian form may easily continue the corresponding action noun *ūh₁-o- *suckling’, concretized to ‘that which is suckled, nourished’, hence ‘kin, family’. Compare Grk. gónos ‘begetting’ and ‘offspring’ and Hitt. hašša- ‘child, offspring’ < ‘begetting’. The difference between ‘child, offspring’ and ‘kin, family’ is not significant: cf. Buck, 2.43 and 19.23, for both ‘child’ and ‘kin, family’ derived from ‘bear, be born’. The Lycian word does reopen the question of whether Hitt. āwa- itself means rather ‘child, offspring, son’. I believe the meaning of uwa-la- ‘fertile’ and the funereal context of āwa- argue for *ūh₁-ō- ‘one who suckles, nurse’.

Curriculum in Linguistics, H. Craig Melchert
320 Dey Hall, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514, U.S.A.
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25 With our current knowledge, it seems possible to suppose that a cluster of voiced aspirate plus *s leads to simple ś, while voiceless stop plus *s produces geminate śś. In principle, of course, one could derive āśa- from *uh₁-s-o-; but one then loses the direct comparison with ūdhos.

26 In a paper presented at the same conference cited in note * above.
Avestisch hāridšti 'Frau' syn- und diachron


1. Bei einem Begriff wie 'Frau' muß, das zeigt die etymologische Erfahrung, mit jeweils ganz unterschiedlichen Benennungs- motiven gerechnet werden. Daher kommt hier der Feststellung der synchronen Bedeutungsnuancen als der etymologischer vorgeschaltetem Schritt besonderes Gewicht zu; nur von ihnen nämlich können wir Hinweise auf die vorherige semantische Entwicklung erwarten.

Nun gehören aber bekanntlich Begriffe, die Teile eines Gegensatzpaares bilden, zu besonders stark ausgeprägten Wortfeldern. Daher setzt auch die Bedeutungsbestimmung eines Wortes für 'Frau' wie av. hāridšti zunächst die Untersuchung des Wortfeldes um die sich anziehenden Gegensätze 'Frau' und 'Mann' voraus.

1.1. E. Coseriu hat in einem Aufsatz des Titels 'Die lexematischen Strukturen' 2 zwischen 'Bezeichnung' und 'Bedeutung' unterschieden. Beispielsweise ist bei gr. βρώτος und ἄθρωτος die 'Bezeichnung', nämlich 'menschliches Wesen' identisch, die 'Bedeutung' dagegen insofern verschieden, als βρώτος 'Mensch als Nicht-Gott', ἄθρωτος dagegen 'Mensch als Nicht-Tier' meint. Bei G. Frege (Über Sinn und Bedeutung, 1892) hatte es statt 'Bedeutung' ',Sinn' und statt 'Bezeichnung' 'Bedeutung'.
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