Sonderdruck aus

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR VERGLEICHENDE SPRACHFORSCHUNG

BEGRIINDET VON ADALBERT KUHN
HERAUSGEGEBEN VON
CLAUS HAEBLER
UND GÜNTER NEUMANN

95. BAND
1. Heft 1981

VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT IN GÖTTINGEN
ISSN 0044-3646

,,Kuhns Zeitschrift", 1907 mit „Beizügen Beiträgen" vereinigt, ist die älteste heute noch bestehende sprachwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift.

**INHALT**

E. F. K. Koerner, Schlechters 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. Boretsky, Das Indogermanistische Sprachwandelmodell und Wandel in exotischen Sprachen .................................................. 81

E. P. Hamp, Refining Indo-European Lexical Entries ..................................... 84

Sr. Zimmer, ldg. *ukson- ............................................................. 93

B. D. Joseph, Hittite *iwar, *wa(r) and Sanskrit *iva .................................. 99

U. Roeder, Griech. θόος „Mut“ - ai. ḍhūmah „Rauch“ .................................. 110

D. Disterheft, The Indo-Iranian Predicate Infinitive .................................. 122

P. Thieme, Der Name des Zarathustra ......................................................... 126

W. Thomas, Zu stkt. tokhariaka und seiner Entsprechung im Tocharischen .... 126

J. A. C. Greppin, Some Comments on Arm. eluenan „extract“, etl „place“ ... 134

and etjeur „horn“ ............................................................................. 134

F. Starke, Die keilchrift-luwischen Wörter für „Insel“ und „Lampe“ .............. 141

A. Heubeck, Weiteres zur lykischen Verbalflexion .................................... 158

Beiträge werden an Prof. Dr. Claus Haeberl, Kerstenstr. 16, 4400 Münster, oder an Prof. Dr. Günter Neumann, Thüringer Str. 20, 8700 Würzburg, erbeten. Professor Haeberl redigiert Band 95, Professor Neumann Band 96–97. Besprechungen können nur solchen Werken zugeschickt 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*)

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 *iwar (B) from Common Tocharian *iwar and Indo-European *iwar can also be added to this word-group). At the same time, Przyluski proposed that the Hittite particle of direct discourse *wa, with apparent sandhi variant *wa(r) before vowel-initial entities (e.g. *nu-wa-za versus *nu-wa(r)-an) should also be considered part of the *iwar/iva group, and in a later article (1934b) proposed the segmentation *iwa(r)/i-va, taking the i- to be the zero-grade of the pronominal stem found for example in Skt. ay-ana.

For Przyluski, the r/∅ alternation found in *iwa(r)/iva-∅ 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 Anatolian1) 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 (1975: 205): Goth. *hvar 'where' < *hwar < IE *kwar, par 'there' < *pra- < IE *pra- and maybe Gmc. *hêr 'here' < *he- 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/∅ alternations (wa/warz and i-va/i-va(r) to a single one.

Despite this formal advantage, Przyluski's suggestion regarding *wa(r) has never been taken seriously2). One reason for this, it

1) Although I could not find the Tocharian forms in any Tocharian sources available to me, they are cited by Jasnow (1977: 187).

2) For example, one can cite the Hittite postposition *šar 'on' and the Luvian local particle *tar (perhaps to be equated with Gothis *par?).

3) 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 (\textit{wa(r)}) should be the same morpheme as a particle meaning 'like, as' (\textit{iwar/iwa}). The most Przyluski said was that \textit{wa(r)} means 'thus' and so serves "à indiquer que les paroles rapportées ont été dites 'ainsi'" (p. 225). Since \textit{wa(r)} often co-occurs with the adverb \textit{kiššan 'thus'} (especially in the common expression \textit{kiššan memai . . . -wa(r) . . . 'speaks thus: " . . ."}), it is unlikely that his interpretation of the ultimate meaning of \textit{-wa(r)} can be maintained.

Consequently, the accepted etymology for \textit{-wa(r)} now connects it within Hittite to the verb \textit{weriya 'call'}, and outside Hittite to Greek \textit{ēgō 'will say'}, Latin \textit{ver-b-um 'word'}, etc.\footnote{For example, see Friedrich (1952: 240), Kronasser (1956: 156), Pokorny (1959: 1162), and Kammenhuber (1959: 22, regarding Palaić \textit{-war}).} 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 \textit{say} in this function as in \textit{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 \textit{r/θ} fluctuation in \textit{wa/war} essentially goes unexplained in this etymology. Such fluctuations do occasionally occur in Hittite — Friedrich (1960: 33) for instance, cites \textit{paprāta} as an occasional variant of \textit{paprātar 'defilement'} and \textit{pian} for \textit{piran 'before'} — but they seem to be sporadic, whereas the \textit{wa/war} alternation, as noted above, is regular in the language, conditioned by the following segment\footnote{Nonetheless, Friedrich (1962: 33) cites this as the source of the \textit{wa/war} alternation. It should be noted that Friedrich (1962: 149 Ann.) cites a few exceptions to the regular distribution of \textit{wa} and \textit{war}, e.g. \textit{-wa-āq} (KBo V 6 IV 12) and \textit{-wa-at} (KUB XIII 4 II 37). These represent a sporadic loss of \textit{r} and so seem to be more akin to the \textit{paprāta(r) and pi(r)an} phenomenon than does the rule-governed distribution of \textit{-wa} and \textit{-war}).

Thus, each proposed etymology for \textit{-wa(r)}\footnote{I am ignoring Sturtevant’s (1930) suggestion of linking \textit{-wa} with Doric \textit{γα} and \textit{-war} with Common Greek \textit{γαν} because of general problems with a "correspondence" of Greek \textit{γ} to Hittite \textit{w}. Sturtevant’s idea of segmenting \textit{-wa-r} just like \textit{γα-γ} may not be too far from the truth, though.} has a shortcoming. The one (Przyluski) has a good formal basis (especially when other examples of IE adverbial \textit{*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.

Accordingly, one could either look for some more regular phonological motivation for the \textit{r/θ} alternation in \textit{-wa/war} or else seek a better functional basis for connecting \textit{wa/war} with \textit{iwa/iwar}.

Any phonological solution to this question, however, would have to be of an \textit{ad hoc} nature — one either has to resort to a generalization of the sporadic process evident in \textit{paprātar/paprāta}, or else admit a special treatment of \textit{*r} + consonant in enclitic particles. Thus, although the details regarding adverbial \textit{*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 \textit{wa(r)} with the adverbial formation found in \textit{i-war} and its cognate \textit{i-va}, thereby reducing the two ill-understood \textit{r/θ} alternations to one (albeit still ill-understood) alternation. All that is needed, then, is a way to overcome the functional problem posed by connecting \textit{wa(r)} with \textit{iwa/iwa}.

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

Macdonell (1971: 219–220) reports that \textit{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 \textit{as it were}. It chiefly follows adjectives, adverbs, prepositions or verbs. This use of \textit{iva} is rare in \textit{V[edic]} but very common in \textit{B[rahmana]}'. Among the examples Macdonell cites are: \textit{ihā iva śṛṅve} (RV 1.37.3) 'I hear close at hand as it were' and \textit{reḥhate iva} (AB) 'he chatters, as it were/he seems to chatter'.

In this usage, \textit{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 \textit{wa(r)} which inserts into a discourse the actual words of a speaker\footnote{Laroche (1957: 165) describes the function of the cognate Luvi particle \textit{-wa} in similar terms: "le suffixe \textit{-wa- signale l'insertion dans un recit, d'une conversation, d'un message, de questions . . . -wa- peut servir à diriger l'interprétation, en caractérisant, par sa présence, le contenu du discours"}.}

Both particles, therefore, inject into the discourse elements of what the speaker had in mind — one overtly, as it were, by giving
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 *išwa 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*). 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 ambaya puṭra iti privatīghitah 'you have been received by my mother like a son'.

These additional considerations regarding the use of *išwa 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. *wa(r), Skt. *išwa, and Toch. *wa(r)/suer instead of being taken to go with *veriga-, *ver-b-um, etc.*). What is especially interesting, then, about the Hittite *wa(ra) alternation under the analysis advocated here is that an original morphological distinction, by which a particle *-ye/o (Hitt. *wa(r), Skt. [*i]-wa) was opposed to *-yo-r (Hitt. *war(r), Hitt. and Toch. [*i]-war(r) through the addition of the adverbial *-r suffix, was transformed into a phonologically-determined allomorphy of *wa(ra) before consonants versus *war(r) before vowels —

---

* 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".

* 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 (cf. Kammhuber [1959: 22]), Luwian *wa(r) (cf. Laroche [1957: 162 ff.]), Hieroglyphic Luvaic *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.

---

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

---
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