

Sonderdruck aus

# INDOGERMANISCHE FORSCHUNGEN

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR INDOGERMANISTIK  
UND ALLGEMEINE SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

Begründet von Karl Brugmann und Wilhelm Streitberg

Herausgegeben von  
WOLFGANG P. SCHMID

91. BAND 1986



WALTER DE GRUYTER · BERLIN · NEW YORK

Die Indogermanischen Forschungen erscheinen jährlich im Gesamtumfang von 24 Bogen. Preis des 91. Jahrganges 126,- DM.

Alle für die Indogermanischen Forschungen bestimmten Aufsätze und kleineren Beiträge (größere Arbeiten nicht ohne vorherige Anfrage) sowie alle Rezensionsexemplare sind an Prof. Dr. Wolfgang P. Schmid, Schladeberg 20, 3403 Friedland 5, OT. Niedernjessa, zu richten.

## Inhalt

### XCI. Band

I. Aufsätze:	Seite
Swiggers P. Le mot comme unité linguistique dans la théorie grammaticale au dix-huitième siècle . . . . .	1
Žuravljëv Vladimir K. Zwei Paradoxa der modernen Komparativistik . . . . .	27
Luraghi Silvia. On the Distribution of Instrumental and Agentive Markers for Human and Non-Human Agents of Passive Verbs in Some Indo-European Languages . . . . .	48
Huld Martin E. On the Unacceptability of the Indo-European Voiced Stops as Ejectives . . . . .	67
Lindeman Fredrik Otto. Eine phonologische Bemerkung zur „Vokalisierung“ der „Laryngale“ im Indogermanischen . . . . .	79
Kimball S. E. The Anatolian Reflexes of the IE. Syllabic Resonants . . . . .	83
Melchert H. Craig. Hittite <i>uwaš</i> and Congeners . . . . .	102
Oettinger Norbert. Avestisch <i>hāiriš-</i> ‚Frau‘ syn- und diachron. . . . .	116
Stephens Laurence D., Woodard Roger D. The Palatalization of the Labiovelars in Greek: A Reassessment in Typological Perspective . . . . .	129
Uguzzoni Arianna. Sulla vicenda delle labiovelari in greco: esiti e processi . . . . .	155

## Re: Copying in the USA:

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Walter de Gruyter & Co. · Berlin · New York for libraries and other users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) Transactional Reporting Service, provided that the base fee of \$ 02.00 per copy is paid directly to CCC, 21 Congress St., Salem, MA 01970.

0019-7262/86/\$02.00

© by Walter de Gruyter & Co. · Berlin · New York

Alle Rechte des Nachdrucks, der photomechanischen Wiedergabe, der Übersetzung, der Herstellung von Mikrofilmen und Photokopien, auch auszugsweise, vorbehalten.

© 1986 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin - Printed in Germany

ISSN 0019-7262

Archiv-Nr. 3 109004921

Satz und Druck: Hubert & Co., Göttingen. Bindearbeiten: Th. Fuhrmann KG, Berlin 42

Indexed in Current Contents

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft

Diesem Heft liegt ein Prospekt  
des Verlages Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, bei.  
Wir bitten um Beachtung

- 1965, Études de linguistique anatolienne, RHA. 23/76 (per, parn, p.52-54).
- 1966, Dictionnaire de la langue louvite, Paris, Maisonneuve.
- 1979, Les représentants lyciens de l'anatolien *appa*: p.347-352 of O. Carruba (ed.), *Studia Mediterranea* Piero Meriggi dicata, Vol. II, Pavia.
- Lohmann, J.F., 1933, Hethitisch *appizzis* „hinten befindlich“ und Verwandtes, IF. 51, p.319-328.
- Meillet, A., 1910/11, Notes sur les formes verbales indo-européennes, MSL. 16 (II.-Sur l'élargissement \*-eu-), p.242-246.
- Morpurgo Davies, A., 1984, Mycenaean and Greek prepositions: o-pi, e-pi etc., p.287-310 of A. Heubeck and G. Neumann (eds.), *Res Mycenaeae*. Akten des VII internationalen mykenologischen Colloquiums in Nürnberg vom 6.-10. April 1981.
- Neu, E., 1974, Der Anitta-Text = Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten, 18, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- 1980, Studien zum endungslosen „Lokativ“ des Hethitischen = Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge und kleinere Schriften, 23, Innsbruck.
- Pedersen, H., 1945, Lykisch und Hittitisch = Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabsnernes Selskab, Historiske-filologisk Meddelelser, 30/4, Copenhagen.
- Puhvel, J., 1972, „Bartholomae's Law“ in Hittite, KZ. 86, p.111-115.
- Schindler, J., 1973, Bemerkungen zur Herkunft der idg. Diphthongstämme, Sprache 19, p.148-157.
- 1975, L'Apophonie des r/n-stems indo-européens BSL.70, p.1-225 = p.210-223 of C. Watkins (ed.), *Harvard Indo-European Studies II*, Cambridge, Mass.
- 1977, Notizen zum Sieversschen Gesetz, Sprache 23, p.56-65.
- Schwyzer, E., 1959, Griechische Grammatik, Vol. I, Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion, 3rd ed., Munich, Beck.
- Tischler, J., 1977, Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar mit Beiträgen von Günter Neumann, Lieferung I = Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 20, Innsbruck.
- Watkins, C., 1970, On the family of *arceō*, ἀρχέω and Hittite *hark-*, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74, p.67-73.
- 1981, Notes on the plural formations of the Hittite neuters, p.253-279 of C. Watkins (ed.), *Harvard Indo-European Studies IV*, Cambridge, Mass.

Rutgers University,  
Camden College of Arts and Sciences,  
Camden, New Jersey 08102,  
U.S.A.

S. E. Kimball

Hittite *uwaš* and Congeners\*

The Hittite word *uwaš* 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 [– –]<sup>1</sup> 2 LÚ. MEŠ *hul-  
huliyanteš nu-zza išhamaiškizzi* (dupl. *išhamiškanzi*)  
URU *Neš[as]<sup>KI</sup> TÚG.HI.A* URU *Nešaš<sup>KI</sup> TÚG.HI.A tiya-mmu tiya  
nu-mmu annaš-maš katta arnut tiya-[mmu t]iya  
nu-mmu uwaš-maš katta arnut [t]iya-mmu [t]iya  
ug-uš punuškimi [kī k]uit walkuwan [išham]ai[šte]ni UMMA  
ŠUNU-MA*

'The Hurrian has not yet come. Four years before (?)<sup>1</sup> two men (are) struck down. One sings (dupl. 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 *uwa-* bring down to me, bind (them) on me, bind!"

\* 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.

<sup>1</sup> This lacuna is normally restored as [*pa-iz-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-[mu t]iya* of line 14, there is not enough space for [*pa-iz-zi*]. The resulting syntax is also peculiar, since we are left with 2 LÚ. MEŠ *hulhuliyanteš* 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).<sup>2</sup>

This text is attested only in Neo-Hittite manuscripts,<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> It is likely that the reply of the singers contains a na-

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> The statement of Watkins that the primary manuscript is in 'old ductus' is mistaken.

<sup>4</sup> For my restoration of [*kī k]uit walkuwan [išham]ai[šte]ni* and interpretation of *walkuwan*, compare *kī kuit walkuwan hašhun* 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 'exegesis' of the song like that which explains the cow's crumpled horn. Unfortunately, this portion of the text is badly 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 Hrozný, who interprets it as a 'chant de guerre', taking LÚ.MEŠ *hulhuliyanteš* as 'fighters, warriors' (cf. KBo. I 42 II 29, where the verbal noun *hulhuliyawar* imprecisely translates Akk. *mundahšu* 'fighting'). The 'clothes' requested are thus battle-dress. Van Brock argues that *hulhuliyant-* 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 argumentation is less than compelling. In view of *šekkant-* 'knowing' and *\*Wišuriyant-* '(the) oppressing (one)' (cf. Carruba, StBoT. 2, 1969, p. 49 ff.), it cannot be in principle excluded that *hulhuliyant-* has an active sense 'fighting, fighter'. Syntactically, however, the old interpretation of *hulhuliyanteš* as a substantivized participle (with LÚ. MEŠ 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 predicative (as often in Hittite): 'Two men are *h*-ed'. Since the root *\*h<sub>2</sub>welh<sub>2</sub>-* in Hittite always means either 'strike' or 'fight' (*walh-* and *hulli/a-*),<sup>5</sup> it seems safest to ascribe only those meanings to

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

<sup>5</sup> For both *walh-* and *hulli/a-* < *\*h<sub>2</sub>welh<sub>2</sub>-* 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 *hulhuliyant-* might mean 'put in a shroud' and be a syncopated form of *hulaliya-* 'wrap' is far-fetched. We have the testimony of the lexical entry for a stem *hulhuliyant-* 'fight'. The form is also the expected result of a reduplicated stem in *-ya-* from *\*h<sub>2</sub>welh<sub>2</sub>-*: *\*h<sub>2</sub>wl<sub>2</sub>-h<sub>2</sub>wl<sub>2</sub>h<sub>2</sub>-ye/o-* > *hulhuliyant-* with regular treatment of *\*wR* before consonant (see Eichner, MSS. 31, 1973, p. 73, and Melchert, op. cit. Sect. 3.1.3) and regular loss of *\*h<sub>2</sub>* before *\*y* (cf. *tāye-* 'steal' < *\*steh<sub>2</sub>ye-*). It is also doubtful that the reduplicated stem would have a perfectivizing sense 'strike (dead)'. The example *-za...anda hulhuliyat* (KUB. XXIII 97 III 2) suggests that here

the reduplicated *hulhuliyant-*, 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 Hamrišhara (CTH. 488): *annaš-wa-šši [... nu-w]ar-an-za ŠU.ĪI.A-it IŠBAT nu-war-an-pehuteš* 'His mother has ... to/for him. She has taken him by the hands and accompanied him'. One may compare also the Hittite expression *annaš ši watt-* 'day of one's mother' for 'day of one's death', discussed in detail by Puhvel, KZ. 83 (1969) p. 59 ff. While I cannot accept some details of his analysis,<sup>6</sup> 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).

<sup>6</sup> His assembled evidence for *annaš* being elliptical for *annaš attas* is weak. The plural ŠU.ĪI.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 *\*atta* is a dual, let alone an elliptical dual for *\*atta anna*, is highly unlikely. If *-a* were a dual ending, it would have to continue PIE. *\*-ō*, and it should function as a nom.-acc. However, all cited examples are genitive or dative. Since *ad-da* for *ad-da-aš* requires only omission of a single horizontal stroke, the few cases of *adda* are surely errors for regular *addaš*. The reality of *huhha* in the famous *huhha hanniš* is also very questionable. The nom.-acc. *šakuwa* 'eyes' may easily be a collective plural in *\*eh<sub>2</sub>*. On *hašša hanzašša* see Melchert, RHA. 31 (1973) p. 65 ff. 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* < *\*-ō* 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 *uwaš* is the gen. sg. of a noun referring to a close relative, parallel to *annaš*. Hrozný translates *uwa-* as 'son'. This is based on the erroneous view that there is another attestation of the noun *uwa-* in KUB. VII 57 I 5. Here the form *uwaš* is rather pret. 2nd sg. of *uwa-* 'come': read *[k]uit(!)-wa uwaš* DUMU.LÚ.ULÚ<sup>LU</sup>-aš 'Why have you come, oh son of mortality?'. Ivanov (followed by Watkins) interprets *uwa-* as 'forefather, ancestor' purely from the context.<sup>7</sup> 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: *huhha(nt)-* 'grandfather; forefather' and *hanna-* 'grandmother'.<sup>8</sup> To be sure, Oettinger attempts to save this interpretation by equating *uwa-* to *huhha-*. Following a suggestion of H. Eichner, he claims that *uwa-* is the form taken by *huhha-* in the 'Nesite dialect' of Hittite, which loses *h*. To be consistent, he also interprets *anna-* in this text as standing for *hanna-* 'grandmother'. This 'Nesite dialect' is pure fiction. Except for *uwaš* itself, every other morpheme in this text may be interpreted as an ordinary Hittite form.<sup>9</sup> In fact, we have

<sup>7</sup> Ivanov cites as a possible cognate of Hitt. *uwa-* a Lyc. *uwe* 'man' (for which see Meriggi, *Fest. Hirt* 2, p. 270 f.). However, most uses of Lyc. *uwe* point to a pronominal form, perhaps an indefinite of some kind: see Neumann, *Lyk.* p. 388 with references. The adjective *uwehi*, alleged to mean 'descendant', belongs rather to *uwa* 'cow': see Neumann, *Gedenk. Kronasser*, p. 152–153. There is thus no good evidence for a Lyc. *uwe* as a term of relationship.

<sup>8</sup> In some passages like those cited by Puhvel, the plural of *atta-* 'father' also seems to function in the meaning 'forefathers'.

<sup>9</sup> This includes the 2nd sg. imv. *tiya*, which Oettinger alleges is a dialect form of *dāi-* 'place', replacing regular imv. *dāi*. First, there is no other evidence for

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 *uwa-* 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 *uwa-*, 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 to justify 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: [(<sup>SAL</sup>*tawanan*)]*nan uwalan*<sup>10</sup> [(AN.BAR-aš<sup>G</sup>)]<sup>IS</sup>DAG-ti *paiddu dušgaraz-pat* [(ešd)]*u t[(a-z)] dāi t-aš-kan paizzi*

VAT. 7481 IV 13–17: *aššuš-aš* [(*halugaš*)] *wemiški*[(*ddu*)] [(*mayanta*)]*n* <sup>4</sup>UTU-šummin [(<sup>SAL</sup>*tawa*)]*nnannan ewalin* [(AN-AR-a)]<sup>IS</sup>DAG-ti *paiddu* ...<sup>11</sup> 'May a good message find them, His virile Majesty and the *uwala-/ewali-* tawannanna. May it go to the throne of iron...'

such a replacement in the 2nd sg. imv. 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 1 IV 11, XLIII 49, 6&7, and FHG. 13 III 10. All of these passages are broken, 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' (= \**dh<sub>1</sub>ye-* to the root of Grk. *-dēma* 'strap' and Skt. *dāman-* 'bond'). Such a verb stem must already be assumed for Hittite because of the derivative *tiya-mmār* 'rope, cord' < \*'bindung'.

<sup>10</sup> 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 /uwadan/ they would have written *ú-wa-tla-an* (/VCV/ always written -(C)V-CV-, never -VC-V). A spelling *ú-wa-at-an* would be highly aberrant. The reading *ú-wa-la-an* is thus assured.

<sup>11</sup> See for the restorations also KBo. XX 67 IV 24–25, etc.

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 (<sup>LÚ</sup>)*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. *lahhiyala-* 'traveler, campaigner' from *lahhiya-* '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 *atal(l)a-* 'paternal' from *atta-* '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*,<sup>12</sup> 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. *ffrwythlon*, Ir. *torthúil*, Lith. *vaisùs*, Pol. *plodny* (and cognates), and Skt. *bahuphalada-* are all based on the respective words for 'fruit' (both of trees and in the general sense of 'product'). Similarly, LLat. *prōlificus* is built on *prōlēs* 'offspring'. It is obvious that Hitt. *uwa-* does not mean 'fruit'.<sup>13</sup> 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 *prōlificus* is not a simple adjective from *prōlēs*, but contains the suffix *-ficus* '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 *fēcundus* and *fētus* are derived from the PIE. root \**dheh<sub>1</sub>(i)-* '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. *uwa-la-*. The original sense of *uwala-* was 'suckling, nourishing' from *uwa-* 'nurse' (in its original sense of 'one who suckles').<sup>14</sup>

Thus *uwa-* in our passage does not refer to another relative in addition to *anna-*, but rather reinforces the latter. It is true, of

<sup>12</sup> Lat. *fertilis* itself is apparently not used of humans, but both the Italian and English forms descending from it are.

<sup>13</sup> 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 *ewali-* means originally something like 'rich in barley' < *ewa-* 'barley'. As in the other examples, this word meaning 'fertile' of earth was then applied to humans. I hasten to emphasize that this derivation is quite speculative, being based in part on the mere phonological similarity to *ewa-*. Since the signs Ú and E are quite similar, and the substitution of an *i*-stem for an *a*-stem would be banal, one may even question whether *ewali-* is a genuine variant or merely a NH corruption of *uwala-*.

<sup>14</sup> 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, *Reallexikon 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 *uwa-* in our passage has an affective value. By stressing the role of the mother (*anna-*) as nurse (*uwa-*), 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!), 34143b *matri et nutrici*. 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.<sup>15</sup> The interpretation of *uwa-* as 'nurse', based on the apparent meaning 'fertile' of its derivative *uwala-*, fits naturally into the funereal context of the song, particularly given the special role of the mother in the Hittite view of death.

Hitt. *uwa-* 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 *tomós* type.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Compare also the manifestly impassioned plea of the dying Hattušili I concerning his funeral (KUB. I 16 III 69–73). It seems likely that in our emotional response to death we are not far removed from our Indo-European ancestors.

<sup>16</sup> If one prefers to reconstruct a specifically feminine preform in *\*eh<sub>2</sub>*, this would also lead to an *a*-stem in Hittite: cf. *ḫašša-* 'hearth' with nom. sg. *ḫaššaš* < *\*h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>2</sub>seh<sub>2</sub>* (= Lat. *āra*) + *-s*.

However, one cannot assume simply *\*ou-ó-* (*\*owó-*), because this would lead to Hitt. *\*awa-*. One needs a preform *\*ouh<sub>1/3</sub>ó-*, 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: *\*ouh<sub>1/3</sub>o-* > *\*uh<sub>x</sub>a-* > *\*u-a-* > *uwa-* (cf. *uwanzi* 'they come' < *\*au-h<sub>1</sub>y-enti*).<sup>17</sup>

The hypothetical root *\*eu-h<sub>1/3</sub>-* 'give milk, suckle' is attested elsewhere in PIE., namely in the traditional base *\*ēudh-/ōudh-/ūdh-* of the word 'breast, udder' (Skt. *ūdhar*, Grk. *oūthar*, Lat. *ūber*, etc.), which may now be interpreted as *\*euh<sub>1/3</sub>-dh-*.<sup>18</sup> Since Hitt. *uwa-* 'nurse' is an agent noun, it argues that the word for 'breast' is not a semantic prime, but is based on a verbal root 'give milk, suckle'.<sup>19</sup>

There is one apparent problem with this analysis. It has already been suggested that the verbal concept underlying 'breast' is 'to swell, be(come) distended'. The body part would be named not for its function, but on account of its shape. The evidence presented for this interpretation consists of Lith. *ūdróti* 'be pregnant' (of swine) and related words,<sup>20</sup> the Italic river names *Oufens* and *Aufidus*, and the Russian verb *údit* 'to ripen' (of grain). The Lithuanian words need not detain us long. Since

<sup>17</sup> See Melchert, *Studies*... I, Sect. 2.1.5.

<sup>18</sup> This reconstruction is also compatible with the derivation of the Latin adjective *uber* 'abundant, rich (in)' and cognates proposed by Szemerényi, *Glotta* 34 (1955) p. 283 ff., since *\*ouh<sub>1</sub>dh-* would lead to the same results as *\*oudh-*. 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 *duh-* in Sanskrit.

<sup>19</sup> We would thus have discovered the verbal root behind another PIE noun for a body part, as already done for 'testicle' and 'arm': see Watkins, BSL. 70 (1975) p. 11 ff., with reference to Benveniste, BSL. 52 (1956) p. 60 ff.

<sup>20</sup> These consist of *paūdre* 'abdomen' (of humans), 'omentum' (of swine), its related verb *paūdróti* 'have a swelling udder' (of swine and dogs), and probably *védaras* 'intestine, belly'. Fraenkel, *Lit. Etym. Wb.* sub *paūdrè*, includes *daras* as derived from *\*ēudh-*, but sub *védaras* itself he also cites with apparent approval its connection with Skt. *udāra-* 'belly'. Obviously, both of these derivations cannot be correct. If *védaras* does belong with *paūdrè*, it seems to point to a base *\*weh<sub>1</sub>-dh-*. For possible *\*weh<sub>1</sub>-* beside *\*euh<sub>1</sub>-* 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 Jasanoff, Stative and Middle in Indo-European 1978, p. 120 ff.<sup>21</sup> 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<sub>x</sub>-(dh)-*.

The rare Russian verb *údit'*<sup>22</sup> 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'.<sup>23</sup> 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<sub>x</sub>-(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 uiridī stipulā lactentia turgent* 'when the grain full of sap/milk swells on the green stalk'. All reflexes of the root *\*euh<sub>x</sub>-(dh)-* are thus consistent with a basic meaning 'give milk/liquid' hence 'suckle'. For a similar (in fact rhyming) root, compare *\*seu-h<sub>x</sub>-* 'give liquid; suck' (Grk. *hūei* 'rains', Lat. *sūgō* 'suck').

Hitt. *uwa-* and *uwala-* are not the only reflexes of *\*euh<sub>x</sub>-(dh)-* in Anatolian. In Cuneiform Luvian we find the adjective *ušan-*

<sup>21</sup> An original root noun beside the attested *r/n*-stem would not be surprising: cf. Hitt. *wēid-* 'water' beside *wātar/weten-/wetan-*.

<sup>22</sup> There is no positive evidence for the doublet *úder'* 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).

<sup>23</sup> In addition to these definitions, given by Dal', Tolkovij Slovar' Zhivogo Velikorusskago Jazyka, see also Fedorova, Slovar' russkix govorov novosibirskoj oblasti (Novosibirsk 1979), who glosses *údit'* as 'ripen' and 'fill with juice'.

*tari-*, attested in the Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi (CTH. 409) IV 7-11: *namma-za-kan* GUD *ušantarin* SI *ēpzi nu menai* <sup>d</sup>UTU *BELI-YA* *kāš mahhan* GUD-*uš* *ušantariš* *n-aš-kan* *ušantari* *ḫaliya anda nu-za-kan* *ḫāli*[[*it*]] GUD.NITÁ-*it* GUD.ĀB-*it* *šunneš-kizzi* *kāš-a* EN SISKUR *QATAMMA* *ušandariš* *ēšdu* '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 *ušandarainzi* DINGIR. [MEŠ(?)] 'fertile gods(?)' at KUB. XXXV 84 II 12.

The meaning 'fertile' (or 'pregnant') for *ušantari-* is evident from the ritual passage, and Goetze and Sturtevant, Tunn. 75, had already related the word to the CLuv. verb *ušā(i)-* via a participle *\*ušant-*.<sup>24</sup> A stem *\*ušant-* is reasonably certain, but Sturtevant's further analysis of *\*ušant-* as 'impregnated' < *u* + *šāi-* '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 *\*šiya-* (cf. *piya-* 'give' beside Hitt. *pāi-/piya-*). Second, the meaning 'I prevented, hindered' for the attested *ušaiḫa* (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 *\*ušant-*. It could indeed be a participle 'nourished, suckled' (whence *ušantari-* 'nourishing, suckling, fertile') to a denominative verb *\*ušā(i)-* 'nourish, suckle'. Whether the attested verb *ušā(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. *ḫuišnu-* 'cause to live' as 'rescue'), but this is very speculative. The denominative verb *\*ušā(i)-* 'nourish, suckle' presupposes a

<sup>24</sup> Sturtevant further compares Hitt. *gimmandariya-* 'spend the winter' and similar forms, suggesting a base *\*gimmandari-* to which he compares *ušantari-*. However, Hittite verbs in *-ariya-* are more likely simply *-ya*-verbs based (originally) on nouns in *-ar* (from which the complex suffix *-ar(i)ya-* is then abstracted). Cluvian shows several adjectives or nouns in *-ari-*: *ḫuwallari-*, *it-mari-*, *gaḫari-*, *tiwari-* and especially *manantari-*. Our adjective *ušantari-* 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 *\*euh<sub>x</sub>-(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 *\*uh<sub>x</sub>dh-s-o-* to the *s*-stem seen in Skt, *ūdhas-*. Compare for the formation Skt. *útsa-* 'spring, well' to the base of Grk. *húdōs* 'water' and *vatsá* 'calf' to that of Grk. *étos* 'year'. Compare in fact. CLuv. *ušša-* 'year' which appears to continue *\*utso-*.<sup>25</sup> I certainly would not insist on this particular derivation, but CLuv. *ušantari-* 'fertile' evidently is another reflex of *\*euh<sub>x</sub>-(dh)* 'suckle' in Anatolian, via *\*uša-* and *ušant-*.

In conclusion, I would like to venture one further speculation. We have seen evidence from Hitt. *uwa-* 'nurse' and *uwala-* '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<sup>26</sup> that Ved. *vār* (*vāar*) 'water', Av. *vār-* 'rain' and CLuv. *wār* 'water' (attested in the 'plural' *wārša*) all reflect a noun *\*wéh<sub>1</sub>-r*, while OIr. *fīr* '(cow's) milk' is based on a derived adjective *\*weh<sub>1</sub>r-ó-*. Since Vedic *vār* is also used to mean 'milk', this specialized use is likely old. Mechanically, of course, *eu-h<sub>1</sub>-* 'give milk' and *\*weh<sub>1</sub>-*, the base of 'water, milk' may easily be forms of the same root (whether one adds a further initial *\*h<sub>1</sub>* is immaterial). We may thus be dealing with a single PIE root *\*eu-h<sub>1</sub>-* ('state II' *\*weh<sub>1</sub>-*) 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. Jasanoff has called my attention to Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, p. 139, where Lyc *uwe* appears to equate to

<sup>25</sup> With our current knowledge, it seems possible to suppose that a cluster of voiced aspirate plus *\*s* leads to simple *š*, while voiceless stop plus *\*s* produces geminate *šš*. In principle, of course, one could derive *\*uša-* from *\*uh<sub>x</sub>s-o-*, but one then loses the direct comparison with *ūdhas*.

<sup>26</sup> In a paper presented at the same conference cited in note \* above.

Grk. *tois oikéois* 'kin, family' (following wife and children). This apparent equation does not argue against the analysis of Hitt. *uwa-* given above, since the Lycian form may easily continue the corresponding action noun *\*ouh<sub>1</sub>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. *uwa-* itself means rather 'child, offspring, son'. I believe the meaning of *uwala-* 'fertile' and the funereal context of *uwa-* argue for *\*ouh<sub>1</sub>ó-* 'one who suckles, nurse'.

Curriculum in Linguistics,  
320 Dey Hall,  
University of North Carolina,  
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514,  
U.S.A.

H. Craig Melchert

## Avestisch *hāiriš-* 'Frau' syn- und diachron

Zusammenfassung: Synchron bezeichnet *hāiriš-* die 'Frau' und bedeutet 'menschliche Frau unter gebärendem bzw. stillendem Aspekt'. Diachron gehört es zu keilschriftluwisch *\*asrija-* 'Frau' und läßt ein uridg. Paradigma mit Nom. *\*ésō(r)* und Gen. *\*sr-és* vermuten.

1. Bei einem Begriff wie 'Frau' muß, das zeigt die etymologische Erfahrung, mit jeweils ganz unterschiedlichen Benennungsmotiven gerechnet werden<sup>1</sup>. Daher kommt hier der Feststellung der synchronen Bedeutungsnuancen als der Etymologisierung 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. *hāiriš-* 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'<sup>2</sup> zwischen „Bezeichnung“ und „Bedeutung“ unterschieden. Beispielsweise ist bei gr. βροτός und ἄνθρωπος die „Bezeichnung“, nämlich 'menschliches Wesen' identisch, die „Bedeutung“ dagegen insofern verschieden, als βροτός 'Mensch als Nicht-Gott', ἄνθρωπος dagegen 'Mensch als Nicht-Tier' meint. Bei G. Frege (Über Sinn und Bedeutung, 1892) hatte es statt „Bedeutung“ „Sinn“ und statt „Bezeichnung“ „Bedeutung“.

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. z.B. aus dem Lateinischen *mulier* 'Frau, Ehefrau' < \*'die zartere' (\**m̥liesi-*, F. Sommer) neben *femina* 'Frau' < \*'die mit einem Gesäuge versehene' (\**d<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>-men-eh<sub>2</sub>-* nach J. Schindler bei G. Pinault, in: Benveniste aujourd'hui. Actes du Colloque International du C. N. R. S., Paris 1984, II S. 111 mit A. 10).

<sup>2</sup> E. Coseriu, Die lexematischen Strukturen. Abgedruckt in: Strukturelle Bedeutungslehre (ed. H. Geckeler) 1978, S. 254–273.

	Seite
Lillo Antonio. A Datum for the Chronology of Vocalisation of Nasal Sonants in Greek . . . . .	186
Pârvulescu Adrian. Hom. κέλευθος, path' . . . . .	189
Morenilla-Talens Carmen. Komische ἐγκλιμίζω, ἐμμακεδονίζω, ἐντροπινίζω und ἐγκοισυρόομαι . . . . .	196
Zamboni Alberto. Tra latino e neolatino: l'evoluzione nelle medie aspirate indoeuropee e le successive ristrutturazioni del consonantismo . . . . .	205
Stephens Laurence. The Shortening of Final -o in Classical Latin: A Study in Multiple Conditioning and Lexical Diffusion of Sound Change . . . . .	236
van Loon Jozef. Die umgelauteten Diphthonge des Gemeingermanischen . . . . .	259
Draye Luk. Nochmals zum brabantischen Adverb <i>brā</i> . . . . .	266
Orel Vladimir E. Marginalia to the Polish-“Jatvingian” Glossary . . . . .	269
Schmid Wolfgang P. Die „Germanismen“ im sog. Polnisch-Jatvingischen Glossar . . . . .	273
Kilian Lothar. <i>Aurajoki</i> und alteuropäische Hydronymie . . . . .	287
<b>II. Besprechungsaufsätze:</b>	
Palmitis Mykolas L. New Contributions to “Proto-Nostratic” . . . . .	305
Stein Peter. Zu den französischen Kreolsprachen . . . . .	318
<b>III. Besprechungen:</b>	
Szemerényi Oswald. Richtungen der modernen Sprachwissenschaft. Teil II: Die fünfziger Jahre (Peter Kosta) . . . . .	326
Bußmann Hadumod. Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft (Johann Knobloch) . . . . .	334
Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Linguists (Wolfram Euler) . . . . .	336
Copeland James. New Directions in Linguistics and Semiotics (Rüdiger Schreyer) . . . . .	339
Villar Francisco. Ergatividad, Acusatividad y Genero (Karl Horst Schmidt) . . . . .	344
von Seefranz-Montag Ariane. Syntaktische Funktionen und Wortstellungsveränderung (Ira Gorzond) . . . . .	347
Bammesberger Alfred. Studien zur Laryngaltheorie (Fredrik Otto Lindeman) . . . . .	349
Goebel Hans. Dialektometrie (Dieter Stellmacher) . . . . .	352
Mattheier Klaus (Hg.). Aspekte der Dialekttheorie (Dieter Stellmacher) . . . . .	353
Niebaum Hermann. Dialektologie (Peter Wagoner) . . . . .	356
Jamison Stephanie W. Function and Form in the -āya-Formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda (Elmar Seebold) . . . . .	358
Van Windekens A.J. Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes, Vol. II 2: La morphologie verbale (Werner Thomas) . . . . .	361
Anreiter Peter P. Bemerkungen zu den Reflexen indogermanischer Dentale im Tocharischen (Werner Thomas) . . . . .	368
Tischler Johann. Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar, Liefg. 4 (Erich Neu) . . . . .	375
Singer Itamar. The Hittite KILAM Festival, Part One (Günter Neumann) . . . . .	377
Camaj Martin. Albanian Grammar, with Exercises, Chrestomathy and Glossaries (Norbert Boretzky) . . . . .	381
Duhoux Yves. Introduction aux dialectes grecs anciens (Rüdiger Schmitt) . . . . .	383

<b>Blümel</b> Wolfgang. Die aiolischen Dialekte (Wolfgang P. Schmid) . . . . .	385
<b>Schwyzer</b> Eduard. Kleine Schriften (Wolfram Euler) . . . . .	389
<b>Vester</b> Eline. Instrument and Manner Expressions in Latin (Otta Wenskus) . . . . .	392
Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory (Otta Wenskus) . . . . .	393
<b>Panhuis</b> Dirk G.J. The Communicative Perspective in the Sentence (Otta Wenskus) . . . . .	397
Wörterbücher der deutschen Romanistik (Gustav Ineichen) . . . . .	399
<b>Tristram</b> Hildegard L.C. Tense and Time in Early Irish Narrative (Karl Horst Schmidt) . . . . .	401
<b>Liberman</b> Anatoly. The Scandinavian Languages, Vol. I (Heinrich Beck) . . . . .	403
Current Topics in English Historical Linguistics (W. Elmer) . . . . .	405
<b>Nielsen</b> Hans F. Old English and the Continental Germanic Languages (Claus-Dieter Wetzel) . . . . .	409
<b>McLaughlin</b> John. Old English Syntax (W. Elmer) . . . . .	415
<b>Stark</b> Detlef. The Old English weak verbs (Petra C. Herzog) . . . . .	416
<b>Kyes</b> Robert L. Dictionary of the Old Low and Central Franconian Psalms and Glosses (Heinrich Tiefenbach) . . . . .	418
<b>Kölling</b> Birgit. Kiel UB.Cod. MS.K.B.145. Studien zu den althochdeutschen Glossen (Heinrich Tiefenbach) . . . . .	421
<b>Meineke</b> Eckhard. Saint-Mihiel Bibliothèque Ms.25. Studien zu den althochdeutschen Glossen (Heinrich Tiefenbach) . . . . .	422
<b>Spang</b> Rolf. Das Flußgebiet der Saar (Albrecht Greule) . . . . .	425
Hungaro-Slavica 1983 (István Fodor) . . . . .	427
<b>Tovar</b> Antonio, <b>Larrucea de Tovar</b> Consuelo. Catálogo de las lenguas de la América del Sur (Jean Caudmont) . . . . .	432