

Sonderdruck aus

# ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR VERGLEICHENDE SPRACHFORSCHUNG

BEGRÜNDET VON ADALBERT KUHN

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON  
CLAUS HAEBLER  
UND GÜNTER NEUMANN

95. BAND

1. Heft 1981

VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT IN GÖTTINGEN

ISSN 0044-3646

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

## INHALT

E.F.K. Koerner, Schleichers Einfluß auf Haeckel: Schlaglichter auf die wechselseitige Abhängigkeit zwischen linguistischen und biologischen Theorien im 19. Jahrhundert . . . . .	1
C.-P. Herbermann, Moderne und antike Etymologie . . . . .	22
N. Boretzky, Das Indogermanistische Sprachwandelmodell und Wandel in exotischen Sprachen . . . . .	49
E.P. Hamp, Refining Indo-European Lexical Entries . . . . .	81
St. Zimmer, Idg. *ukson- . . . . .	84
B.D. Joseph, Hittite <i>iwar</i> , <i>wa(r)</i> and Sanskrit <i>iva</i> . . . . .	93
U. Roider, Griech. θυμός „Mut“ - ai. <i>dhūmāḥ</i> „Rauch“ . . . . .	99
D. Disterheft, The Indo-Iranian Predicate Infinitive . . . . .	110
P. Thieme, Der Name des Zarathustra . . . . .	122
W. Thomas, Zu skt. <i>tokharika</i> und seiner Entsprechung im Tocharischen . .	126
J.A.C. Greppin, Some Comments on Arm. <i>eluzanem</i> ‘extract’, <i>ett</i> ‘place’ and <i>etjewr</i> ‘horn’ . . . . .	134
F. Starke, Die keilschrift-luwischen Wörter für „Insel“ und „Lampe“ . . .	141
A. Heubeck, Weiteres zur lykischen Verbalflexion . . . . .	158

Beiträge werden an Prof. Dr. Claus Haebler, Kerßenbrockstr. 16, 4400 Münster, oder an Prof. Dr. Günter Neumann, Thüringer Str. 20, 8700 Würzburg, erbeten. Professor Haebner redigiert Band 95, Professor Neumann Band 96–97. Besprechungen können nur solchen Werken zugesichert werden, welche ein Herausgeber erbeten hat.

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

## Hittite *iwar*, *wa(r)* and Sanskrit *iva*<sup>\*)</sup>

In an article in *RHA*, Jean Przyluski (1934a) suggested that the Hittite postposition *iwar* ‘like, as’ is to be connected with Sanskrit *iva* ‘like, as’, and this etymology has generally been accepted, e.g. by Mayrhofer (1956). (The Tocharian forms *iwar* (A) and *iver* (B) from Common Tocharian \**iwär* and Indo-European \**iyor* can also be added to this word-group<sup>1)</sup>). At the same time, Przyluski proposed that the Hittite particle of direct discourse *-wa*, with apparent sandhi variant *-war* before vowel-initial enclitics (e.g. *nu-wa-za* versus *nu-war-an*) should also be considered part of the *iwar/iva* group, and in a later article (1934b) proposed the segmentation *i-war/i-va*, taking the *i-* to be the zero-grade of the pronominal stem found for example in Skt. *ay-am*.

For Przyluski, the *r/Ø* alternation found in *iwa-r/iva-Ø* was a consequence of the addition of an IE neuter ending \*-r (as in the neuter abstract nouns in *-atar* in Hittite) which was “susceptible en Hittite . . . de former des adverbes” (p. 16). Although the motivation for the addition of this ending is not clear and there are actually very few adverbials in *-r* in Anatolian<sup>2)</sup> this suggestion can be strengthened somewhat by a consideration of other examples of adverbial \*-r elsewhere in Indo-European, such as those mentioned by Watkins (1973 : 205): Goth. *hwar* ‘where’ < \**hwa-r* < IE \**kʷo-r*, *þar* ‘there’ < \**þa-r* < IE \**to-r*, and maybe Gmc. \**hē₂-r* ‘here’ < \**ke-* plus an *r*-form of the demonstrative stem \**e/o-*. Thus Przyluski’s inclusion of Hittite *wa(r)* in with *iwar/iva* has the formal advantage of reducing two unexpected *r/Ø* alternations (*wa/war* and *i-va/i-war*) to a single one.

Despite this formal advantage, Przyluski’s suggestion regarding *wa(r)* has never been taken seriously<sup>3)</sup>. One reason for this, it

<sup>\*)</sup> I should like to thank Rex Wallace for his assistance in certain aspects of research for this paper, and for his comments on earlier versions of this paper.

<sup>1)</sup> Although I could not find the Tocharian forms in any Tocharian sources available to me, they are cited by Jasanoff (1977: 167).

<sup>2)</sup> For example, one can cite the Hittite postposition *sér* “on” and the Luvian local particle *-tar* (perhaps to be equated with Gothic *þar*?).

<sup>3)</sup> Though, as noted above, the *iwar/iva* connection has gained acceptance.

seems, is the fact that he gave no compelling functional reasons for why a particle introducing direct discourse (*wa(r)*) should be the same morpheme as a particle meaning 'like, as' (*iwar/iva*). The most Przyluski said was that *wa(r)* means 'thus' and so serves "à indiquer que les paroles rapportées ont été dites 'ainsi'" (p. 225). Since *wa(r)* often co-occurs with the adverb *kiššan* 'thus' (especially in the common expression *kiššan memai . . . -wa(r) . . .* 'speaks thus: ". . .)'), it is unlikely that his interpretation of the ultimate meaning of *-wa(r)* can be maintained.

Consequently, the accepted etymology for *-wa(r)* now connects it within Hittite to the verb *weriya-* 'call', and outside Hittite to Greek *ἐρέω* 'will say', Latin *ver-b-um* 'word', etc.<sup>4</sup>). This is an attractive etymology from a functional standpoint, for verbs of saying often come to be discourse introducers, cf. the colloquial English use of *say* in this function as in *Say, have you heard the latest news?* and the parallels between verbs of saying and complementizers in Bantu languages discussed by Lord (1976). However, the *r/Ø* fluctuation in *wa/war* essentially goes unexplained in this etymology. Such fluctuations do occasionally occur in Hittite — Friedrich (1960: 33) for instance, cites *paprāta* as an occasional variant of *paprātar* 'defilement' and *pian* for *piran* 'before' — but they seem to be sporadic, whereas the *wa/war* alternation, as noted above, is regular in the language, conditioned by the following segment<sup>5</sup>.

Thus, each proposed etymology for *-wa(r)*<sup>6</sup> has a shortcoming. The one (Przyluski) has a good formal basis (especially when other examples of IE adverbial \*-r are considered) but a weak functional basis, while the other (Friedrich et al.) seems to have just the opposite problem. An etymology is needed, therefore, which addresses both the formal and the functional side of the question.

<sup>4</sup>) For example, see Friedrich (1952: 240), Kronasser (1956: 156), Pokorny (1959: 1162), and Kammenhuber (1959: 22, regarding Palaic *-war*).

<sup>5</sup>) Nonetheless, Friedrich (1962: 33) cites this as the source of the *wa/war* alternation. It should be noted that Friedrich (1962: 149 Anm.) cites a few exceptions to the regular distribution of *wa* and *war*, e.g. *-wa-aš* (KBo V 6 IV 12) and *-wa-at* (KUB XIII 4 II 37). These represent a sporadic loss of *r* and so seem to be more akin to the *paprāta(r)* and *pi(r)an* phenomenon than does the rule-governed distribution of *-wa* and *-war*.

<sup>6</sup>) I am ignoring Sturtevant's (1930) suggestion of linking *-wa* with Doric *γὰ* and *-war* with Common Greek *γὰς* because of general problems with a "correspondence" of Greek *γ* to Hittite *w*. Sturtevant's idea of segmenting *-wa-r* just like *γὰ-q* may not be too far from the truth, though.

Accordingly, one could either look for some more regular phonological motivation for the *r/Ø* alternation in *-wa/war* or else seek a better functional basis for connecting *wa/war* with *iva/iwar*.

Any phonological solution to this question, however, would have to be of an *ad hoc* nature — one either has to resort to a generalization of the sporadic process evident in *paprātar/paprāta*, or else admit a special treatment of *-r + consonant* in enclitic particles. Thus, although the details regarding adverbial \*-r in Indo-European are not necessarily clear, it seems safer to relegate a sporadic process to the realm of morphology, and adopt Przyluski's suggestion linking *wa(r)* with the adverbial formation found in *i-war* and its cognate *i-va*, thereby reducing the two ill-understood *r/Ø* alternations to one (albeit still ill-understood) alternation. All that is needed, then, is a way to overcome the functional problem posed by connecting *wa(r)* with *iwar/iva*.

Fortunately, a consideration of the use of *iva* in Vedic Sanskrit provides the solution to the functional problems, as do two typological parallels suggesting a connection between a particle of discourse and a particle with the meaning 'like, as'.

Macdonell (1971: 219–220) reports that *iva* in Vedic, besides being used to mean 'like, as' in similes, also can be used to modify "a statement not intended to be understood in its strict sense, meaning *as it were*". It chiefly follows adjectives, adverbs, prepositions or verbs. This use of *iva* is rare in V[edic] but very common in B[rāhmaṇas]". Among the examples Macdonell cites are: *ihá,iva śr̥nve* (RV 1.37.3) 'I hear close at hand as it were' and *rebhati,iva* (AB) 'he chatters, as it were/he seems to chatter'.

In this usage, *iva* serves to add an element of the speaker's (or narrator's) intention in using the words he does; it represents an insertion of an aspect of the speaker's point of view, something additional the speaker wanted understood through his words. As such, it is functionally quite close to a particle such as Hittite *wa(r)* which inserts into a discourse the actual words of a speaker<sup>7</sup>). Both particles, therefore, inject into the discourse elements of what the speaker had in mind — one overtly, as it were, by giving

<sup>7</sup>) Laroche (1957: 165) describes the function of the cognate Luvian particle *-wa-* in similar terms: "le suffixe *-wa-* signale l'insertion dans un récit, d'une conversation, d'un message, de questions . . . *-wa-* peut servir à diriger l'interprétation, en caractérisant, par sa présence, le contenu du discours".

the exact words and the other covertly, by signalling an implicit meaning the words have. Thus, while one introduces the words in which a thought is encoded, the other introduces the thought behind the words. From a functional standpoint, then, they, can be viewed as nearly equivalent particles.

Moreover, it is not at all surprising that a word such as *iva* with a basic meaning of 'like, as' should have a use that parallels that of a quotative particle. At least two similar phenomena can be cited which offer typological support for the development proposed here. First, in colloquial English, the word *like* is often used to introduce sentences, a usage generally felt to be an element of rather inarticulate speech, for example: *Like, you know what I'm trying to say, I mean the time we all went down to the bar for a few drinks*<sup>8</sup>). In a similar, though opposite development, the Sanskrit particle of direct quotation, *iti*, can, according to Gonda (1966: 96), be used in the meaning 'like', e.g. *tvam ambayā putra iti pratigr̥ītah* 'you have been received by my mother like a son'.

These additional considerations regarding the use of *iva* and functionally similar particles such as English *like* or Sanskrit *iti* provide added support for the proposal that *wa(r)* should be considered part of the "family" represented by Hitt. *iwar*, Skt. *iva*, and Toch. *iwar/iver* instead of being taken to go with *weriya-, ver-b-um*, etc.<sup>9</sup>). What is especially interesting, then, about the Hittite *wa/war* alternation under the analysis advocated here is that an original morphological distinction, by which a particle \*-ue/o (Hitt. -*wa*, Skt. [i]-*va*) was opposed to \*-uo-r (Hitt. -*war*, Hitt. and Toch. [i]-*war*) through the addition of the adverbial \*-r suffix, was transformed into a phonologically-determined allo-morphy of -*wa* before consonants versus -*war* before vowels —

<sup>8</sup>) This usage is surely related to what *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (1978: 757) refers to as a nonstandard use of *like* "as an expletive to provide an emphasis or pause: *He was like over the hill before he saw the other car. The accident was like horrible*".

<sup>9</sup>) This proposal regarding Hittite *wa(r)* naturally should be extended to the particles in other Anatolian languages which are assumed to be cognate with *wa(r)*, e.g. Palaic *war* (c.f. Kammenhuber [1959: 22]), Luvian -*wa* (cf. Laroche [1957: 162ff.]), Hieroglyphic Luvian -*wa* (cf. Kronasser [1966: 70]). The fact that these languages do not show an alternation between *wa* and *war* as in Hittite would thus represent a different generalization of one of these morphological alternates in each language.

this appears, therefore, to be an instance of the *phonologization* of an originally morphologically-determined alternation<sup>10</sup>).

Departement of Linguistics  
204 Cunz Hall  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA

Brian D. Joseph

### References

- American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (1978), Wm. Morris ed., Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co.
- Friedrich, J. (1952) *Hethitisches Wörterbuch: kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Friedrich, J. (1960) *Hethitisches Elementarbuch. 1. Teil. Kurzgefasste Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Gonda, J. (1966) *A Concise Elementary Grammar of the Sanskrit Language with Exercises, Reading Selections, and a Glossary*. (Translated from the German by Gordon B. Ford, Jr.). University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press (Alabama Linguistic and Philological Series No. 11).
- Jasanoff, J. (1977) "The r-endings of the IE Middle", in C. Watkins, ed. *Indo-European Studies III*. Cambridge, Mass.: Department of Linguistics, Harvard University, pp. 163–186.
- Kammenhuber, A. (1959) "Esquisse de Grammaire Palaite". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 54:18–45.
- KBo = *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*. Leipzig/Berlin.
- Kronasser, H. (1956) *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kronasser, H. (1966) *Etymologie der Hethitischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- KUB = *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*. Berlin.
- Laroche, E. (1957) "Comparaison du luvite et du lycien", *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 53:159–97.
- Lord, C. (1976) "Evidence for syntactic re-analysis: from verb to complementizer in Kws", in S. Steele, C. Walker, & S. Mufwene, eds. *Diachronic Syntax*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 179–91.
- Macdonell, A. (1971) *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Bombay: Oxford University Press.

<sup>10</sup>) The opposite development, of a phonologically-based alternation becoming *morphologized* is fairly common — Germanic Umlaut is a classic example.

- Mayrhofer, M. (1956) *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. (Band I: A-Th)*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Pokorny, J. (1959) *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke Verlag.
- Przyluski, J. (1934a) "Sanskrit *iva*, hittite *iwar*", *Revue Hittite et Asianique* 3: 225–226.
- (1934b) "Les noms abstraits en hittite", *Revue Hittite et Asianique* 4: 15–17.
- Sturtevant, E. (1930) "The Gutturals in Hittite and Indo-European", *Language* 6: 213–28.
- Watkins, C. (1973) "Etyma Enniana", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 77: 195–206.

## Neuerscheinungen

**Heinz Bechert  
(Hg.)**

**Die Sprache der ältesten  
buddhistischen Überlieferung**

The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, II). Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Klasse III/117. 1980. 193 Seiten, kartoniert DM 66,—

**Heinz Bechert  
(Hg.)**

**Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhi-  
stischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden**

Begonnen von Ernst Waldschmidt. Im Auftrage der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. 3. Lieferung. 1982. VII, 80 Seiten, kartoniert etwa DM 52,—

**Hans von Kamptz**

**Klassifikationen  
der homerischen Personennamen**

Neudruck der Jenaer Dissertation von 1958. 1982. Etwa 384 Seiten, Leinen etwa DM 72,—

**Rudolf Güngerich**

**Kommentar zum Dialogus des Tacitus**

Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Heinz Heubner. 1980. 215 Seiten, kartoniert DM 52,—

**Jürgen Sprute**

**Die Enthymemtheorie  
der aristotelischen Rhetorik**

Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Klasse III/124. 1982. Etwa 232 Seiten, kartoniert etwa DM 50,—

**Dimitrios Z. Nikitas Eine byzantinische Übersetzung  
von Boethius**

**»De hypotheticis syllogismis«**

Hypomnemata 69. 1982. 207 Seiten, kartoniert etwa DM 42,—

**Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht · Göttingen und Zürich**