

# Ten New Etymologies between the Old Anatolian and the Celtic Languages

Jouna Olavi Pyysalo

## Abstract

The article contributes to the most important problem of Indo-European etymology (viz. the Indo-European cognates of Old Anatolian vocabulary) by offering ten correspondences between the Old Anatolian and the Celtic languages: 1. Hitt. *hap-* ‘reichlich vorhanden sein’: OIr. *ana-* ‘richness, property’; 2. Hitt. *šinura-* ‘mittellos, arm’: OIr. *sēna-* ‘nier, désavouer, rejeter’; 3. CLu. *manai-* ‘(beschreibt Vorratskörbe)’: OIr. *me'nistir-* (f.) ‘coffre contenant les ustensiles du culte’; 4. Hitt. *mani-* ‘Eiter’: OIr. *me'n bligi-* (pr.) ‘il foisonne, il fourmille’; 5. Hitt. *maniti-* ‘Wachstum (?)’: OIr. *muine* ‘Berg’; 6. CLu. *nani-* ‘reinigen’: Mlr. *cruth necht* ‘roter Weizen’; 7. Hitt. *ninga-* ‘Regen’: OIr. *nin-* ‘cloud, wave’; 8. Hitt. <sup>KUŠ</sup>*šala-* ‘Teil des Zaumzeugs’: OIr. *selan-* ‘corde, laisse de chien’; 9. Hitt. *šant-* ‘wertvolles Gegenstand’: OIr. *sét-* ‘trésor’; 10. Hitt. *da-* ‘all, ganz, gesamt’: OIr. *dá* ‘in full’.

## 1. Hitt. *hap-* (vb1.) ‘reichlich vorhanden sein’

1.0 LITERATURE: Pedersen (VGK 2, 585), Tischler (HEG 1, 157f.), Delamarre (DLG. 45), Kloekhorst (HIL. 346-347), ZAIR (2012, 53, 208).

1.1 One of the key problems of Old Anatolian reconstruction is the definition of the laryngeal of a root on the basis of colouring. While ‘ $h_1$ ’ is straightforwardly postulated for the vocalism PIE \* $e$  \* $ē$ , the demarcation between ‘ $h_2$ ’ and ‘ $h_3$ ’ is contested in the laryngeal theories that assume at least three items. In the *revisionist laryngeal theory* à la Eichner 1988, ‘ $h_3$ ’ is considered to be lost in all environments in Old Anatolian. On the other hand, in the *orthodox laryngeal theory* à la Melchert 1994, ‘ $h_3$ ’ is allegedly preserved in the root-initial position and postulated for correspondences with a dominant  $\delta$ -colouring.

1.2 In practice, the orthodox laryngeal theory mechanically replaces the early roots Neogr. \* $aC-$  and Neogr. \* $oC$  with LT \* $h_2eC-$  and LT \* $h_3eC-$ . In Old Anatolian data, this means that on the basis of the laryngeal Hitt. *h* and Indo-European ‘o-colouring’ the orthodox theory postulates the following root:

LT *h<sub>3</sub>ep-* ‘Reichtum’ (IEW 780)

Hitt. *hap-* (vb1.) ‘reichlich vorhanden sein’ (Hitt. *hapzi* [3sg])<sup>1</sup>  
Lat. *op-* (f.) ‘Reichtum’ (WH 2, 215, Lat. *ops* [sgN]).

1 For the root, see Szemerényi 1954, 275f.

1.3 It is generally recognized that the orthodox theory is unprovable (see Melchert 1987), because the correspondences with an alleged  $h_3$ - can always be reconstructed with  $*h_2oC$ -. Indeed, a single laryngeal is reconstructed in monolaryngealism (Zgusta 1951, Szemerényi 1970, Tischler HEG 1, ix-x, Pyysalo 2013<sup>2</sup>) with PIE  $*h$  ( $\approx$  LT  $h_2$ ) and in Eichner's revisionist theory. The views of monolaryngealism and the revisionist theory can be presented in an even stronger way, according to which the orthodox laryngeal theory is not merely unprovable, but false. This state of affairs is caused by the fact that the current discussion is usually based on incomplete data. When the complete data with Indo-European /a/ and/or /ā/ or is added to Indo-European /o/ and/or /ō/, PIE  $*h$  ( $\approx$   $h_2$ ) becomes proven instead of  $h_3$ .

1.4 In the quoted data, the orthodox reconstruction LT  $*h_3ep$ - is falsified by the  $*n$ -extension of the root, best attested in  $*e/_o$ - neuter:

PIE $*h_3aepn^e/_o$ -	
RV. <i>ápnas</i> -	(n.) 'Besitz, Habe, Reichtum' (WbRV. 78)
RV. <i>ápnasvant</i> -	(a.) 'einträglich, ertragreich' (WbRV. 78)
LAv. <i>afnāhvant</i> -	(a.) 'reich an Habe, Besitz' (AIWb. 99, <i>afnāhvantəm</i> ).

The vowel PIE  $*e$  is proven for the extension and the root by the Celtic  $a$ -, which corresponds to RV.  $a$ - in

PIE $*h_3aepno$ - 'Reichtum' (LEIA A-72, WP 1, 175)	
OIr. <i>ana</i> -	(m.) 'richness, property' (DIL 40, <i>anai</i> [pN])
RV. <i>apna-rāj</i> -	(a.) 'über Reichtum gebietend' (WbRV. 78)
Cymr. <i>anaw</i> -	(sb.) 'wealth, riches, gift, treasure' (GPC 1:323) <sup>3</sup>
OIr. <i>ane-dennid</i> -	(sb.) 'opifice' (LEIA A, 72-73).

The Celtic  $a$ - is only possible if there was an original ablaut PIE  $*o/e$ , as indicated in

PIE $*h_3aop$ -	→	Hitt. <i>hap</i> -, Lat. <i>op</i> -, etc. (PIE $*o$ -grade)
PIE $*h_3aep$ -no-	→	OIr. <i>an</i> -, RV. <i>apna</i> -, etc. (PIE $*e$ -grade).

A catalogue of forms with an erroneous ' $h_3$ ' for the actual PIE  $*h$  ( $\approx$   $h_2$ ) has been provided (e.g., in Pyysalo 2013, 156-162), leaving only a few candidates of ' $h_3$ '. These ambiguous items no longer suffice for the postulation of an o-colouring laryngeal, and it is thus possible to greatly simplify the fundamental assumptions of the laryngeal theory.<sup>4</sup>

2 The reconstruction follows the rules of revised monolaryngealism presented in Pyysalo 2013.

3 Note that Zair (2012, 208) is correct in stating that MidCymr. *anaw* 'wealth' and Cymr. *anaw* 'musician, singer, poet' are different words that 'must be considered separately' (thus also GPC against LEIA and DLG).

4 For the fully general method of elimination of ' $h_3$ ', see Pyysalo 2013, 174-5.

Finally, it should be mentioned that LEIA's etymology already quoted by Walde has been denied by Zair (2012, 53), according to whom  
 “OIr. *anai* (m. pl. *io*-stem) ‘wealth’; MW. *anaw* (m.) ‘wealth, bounty, gift’; Gaul. *Anauus* (p.n.) cannot come from *\*h<sub>3</sub>pn-ayō-* as implied by LEIA (A-73 s.v. *anair*), which compares Lat. *opes* ‘wealth’, Skt. *apnah* ‘possession, work’. This would give OIr. *\*úanai* (Joseph 1980, 35).”

While admittedly true in the sense that it is acceptable that *\*opn* (see e.g. MidIr. *cúan* ‘haven, port’) and *\*upn* (see e.g. OIr. *súan* ‘sleep’) yielded Goidelic *úa*, this argument is circular, because Celtic *a-* proves that the root began with PIE *\*h* (= LT *h<sub>2</sub>*), not with ‘*h<sub>3</sub>*’.<sup>5</sup> Hence, there is no reason to abandon the etymology, as is done by Zair (2012, 208).<sup>6</sup>

## 2. Hitt. *šinura-* (a.) ‘mittellos, arm’

2.0 LITERATURE: Tischler (HEG 2, 1053-4).

2.1 Despite its unknown internal and external connections, it can be proven that the Hittite adjective

Hitt. *šinura-* (a.) ‘mittellos, arm’ (HEG 2, 1053-4)

is a compound requiring a segmentation Hitt. *šin-ura-*.

2.2 The second part of the compound is internally confirmed by the compatibility of Hitt. *-ura-* ‘Mittel’ with the respective free morphemes in Hittite:

Hitt. *ura-* (vb.) ‘zu Hilfe kommen, helfen’ (HHand. 187, *urra-*)

Hitt. *uura-* (c/n.<sup>?</sup>) ‘Hilfe’ (HHand. 190, in Hitt. *uuarra halzai-*).

2.3 In spite of the lack of a direct internal parallel for Hitt.  $\sqrt{\text{šin-}}$  ‘-los’, it can be externally compared to Italic in:

PIE  $\sqrt{\text{sin-}}$  ‘ohne, -los, usw.’

Lat. *sine* (prepAbl.) ‘ohne’ (WH 2, 542)

Lat. *sin-cēro-* (a.) ‘unvermischt, ohne Fehler, rein, echt’ (WH 2, 541)

Hitt. *šin-ura-* (a.) ‘*makû* = mittellos, arm’.<sup>7</sup>

5 For the *\*o*-grade of the root, see the antonyms OIr. *sommae* ‘rich’ and OIr. *doimm* ‘poor’ (EtDiPC 359).

6 The root PIE *\*haepn-* is supported by frequent gemination in its oldest attestations: see OGaul. *annauus*, OGaul. *annau-sonius*, and OGaul. *annu-sonius* (DLG 45).

7 None of the etymological suggestions quoted by Walde and Hofmann (WH 2, 542-543) have the correct root vocalism, and therefore only Hitt. *i* = Lat. *i* is acceptable.

2.4 In addition, the following parallels can be attached to the root:

- (a) Old Latin preserves an \**e*-grade variant of the preposition in  
 OLat. *seine* (prepAbl.) ‘ohne’ (WH 2, 541);
- (b) OLat. *seine*, in turn, can be compared to a Celtic formation  
 OIr. *sēna-* (vb.) ‘deny, disown, reject (DIL. 536)  
 OIr. *sēna-* (f.) ‘rejeter’ (LEIA S, 84, *a sēna* ‘la rejeter.’)  
 OIr. *sēnad* (m.) ‘denying, disowning, rejecting’ (DIL. 536)

Formally, PIE \**sein-* directly produces the Italo-Celtic roots. The comparison is semantically unproblematic since the relation of the meanings is paralleled in

- Gr. *ἐτό-* (adv.) ‘in vain’ (GEW 1, 583, οὐκ ἐτός)
- Lat. *uetā-* (pr.) ‘verbieten’ (WH 2, 776, *uetō, uetāre*).

Naturally it remains possible that additional cognates will be identified in other branches.

### 3. CLu. *manai-mi-* (<sup>GKL</sup>pt.) ‘(rituell) gereinigt?’

3.0 LITERATURE: Tischler (HEG 2, 118, HHand. 99).

3.1 A Luwian adjective

- CLu. *manai-* (a.) ‘(beschreibt Vorratskörbe)’

appears twice with ‘Vorratskorb’ (<sup>G</sup>PISAN) in CLu. <sup>G</sup>PISAN SA<sub>3</sub> *ma-an-na-[išʷ]* and CLu. <sup>G</sup>PISAN *ma'-an-na-iš*.

3.2. A hint of the meaning of the adjective has been preserved in participles derived from the stem:

- CLu. *manai-mi-* (<sup>GKL</sup>pt.) ‘(rituell) gereinigt?’ (HEG 2, 118, HHand. 99)
- Hitt. *manai-mi-* (pt.) ‘(rituell) gereinigt?’ (HHand. 99).

Thus, CLu. <sup>G</sup>PISAN *ma'-an-na-iš* means ‘(ritually) pure container’ or something similar.

3.3 In the absence of Indo-European etymology, I would like to quote an originally identical Celtic noun with two meanings given by Vendryes:

- OIr. *me'nistir-* (f.) ‘coffre contenant les ustensiles du culte’ (DIL. 457)
- OIr. *me'nistir-* (f.) ‘objet sacré’ (LEIA M, 29).

The original semantics can be readily understood if both refer to a ritually pure (i.e., holy) container, the same as in Old Anatolian.<sup>8</sup>

3.4 From a theoretical point of view, the difference between the root vowels of CLu. *manai-* and its Celtic counterpart can be explained in two different ways: (a) According to the so-called Čop's Law<sup>9</sup> (see Melchert 1994, 74f, 252), 'P[roto]-A[natolian] voiced stops become geminates in Luwian after a short accented \*/é/' (that is to say, PIE \*éC<sub>1</sub> -> CLu. aC<sub>1</sub>C<sub>1</sub>). In addition to stops, Melchert (1994, 258) sought to extend this rule to PIE \*n, quoting the first-person plural ending 'CLu. \*-wén(i) -> \*wanni- (> *unni* via syncope)', on the basis of which PIE \**menoi-* yields CLu. *mannai-*.

(b) According to the traditional explanation, the Proto-Indo-European \**e/o*-ablaut is still reflected in some fragments of the data. In this case it is possible to postulate CLu. *manai-* ≡ PIE \**monoi-* and OIr. *meini-* ≡ PIE \**meni-* without the assumption of the ambiguous Čop's rule and the unprovable hypothesis of the Old Anatolian accent. As it is simpler (Occam's razor), I find this explanation more satisfying.

#### 4. Hitt. *mani-* (c.) 'Eiter : pus, suppuration'

4.0 LITERATURE: Tischler (HEG 2, 119), Puhvel (HED M, 43-44), CHD (L/M, 163).

4.1 Hittite preserves a noun  
Hitt. *mani-* (c.) 'Eiter : pus, suppuration' (Hitt. *ma-ni-iš*).

4.2 No Old Anatolian cognates (or other related forms) have been confirmed for the isolated item.

4.3 According to the traditional etymology (see Knobloch and Čop *ap.* Tischler HEG 2, 119 and Puhvel HED M, 44), the form is related to a Pokorny-root (IEW 699-700, WH 2, 30), including

Lat. <i>mānā-</i>	(pr1.) 'fließen, rinnen, strömen' (WH 2, 30f.)
Cymr. <i>mawn-</i>	(.) 'Torf : turf, peat' (GPC 2, 4341, LEIA M, 60)
Vann. <i>mān-</i>	(.) 'Moos, Flechte' (IEW. 699, LEIA M, 60)
OCelt. <i>manapio-</i>	(VN.pl.) 'an der ostküste Irlands' (ACSS. 2, 401)
OCelt. <i>manapia-</i>	(ON.f.) 'Stadt in südlichen Irland' (ACSS. 2, 400).

Regarding this etymology, however, note the following details:

8 DIL translates OIr. *me'nistir-* as "A box or case used to carry vessels and other insignia used in the Divine Service, or sometimes relics".

9 For the original formulation of the rule, see Čop 1970.

(a) The semantic fields of the roots meaning ‘liquid’ (in the broad sense) are usually linked to connotations of numerous flowing substances like ‘water’, ‘oil’, ‘salve’, ‘urine’ and so forth. Thus, the etymology is theoretically possible, despite the slight differences of the meaning.

(b) Formally, however, the comparison is unacceptable. Even if we neglect the less relevant disagreement of the suffixes (Lat. *mān-ā-* vs. Hitt. *man-i-*), the root vocalisms Lat. *ā* : Hitt. *a* are incompatible, because PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>n* is preserved throughout in Old Anatolian. This is proven by numerous examples, such as:

- PIE *\*mehan-* ‘time, age’ (see Pyysalo 2013, 33)  
 Hitt. *meḥn-* (n.) ‘Zeit’ (HEG 2, 171, *me-eḥ-ni* [sgL])  
 Go. *aldō-min-* (m./n.) ‘γῆρας : old age’ (GoEtD. 25)
- PIE *\*lēahn-* ‘Lache, Morast, usw.’ (see IEW 653-4)  
 Oicl. *lōn-* (f.) ‘Strandmeer’ (ANetWb. 366)  
 Latv. *lāni-* (f.) ‘Morast’ (ANetWb. 366, *lānis*)  
 Hitt. *laḥni-* (c.) ‘ein drinkbar Substanz’ (HEG 2, 14, *la-aḥ-ni-iš*)
- [N]  
 Hitt. *laḥnit šeḥ-* (vb.) ‘mit Laḥni- bespringen’ (HEG 2, 14, *la-aḥ-ni-it*)
- PIE *\*ueha-uoha-* (see Pyysalo 2013, 130f.)  
 Hitt. *ueḥ-* (vb1A.) ‘sich wenden, drehen, bewegen’ (HHand. 200)  
 Umbr. *ue-* (vb.) ‘wenden’ (WbOU. 835-836, *uetu* [3sg])  
 Hitt. *uah-* (vb1A.) ‘sich wenden, drehen, bewegen’ (HHand. 200)  
 Hitt. *uahnu-* (cs.) ‘wenden, drehen, usw.’ (HHand. 191, *uahnument*).

Old Anatolian personal names also preserve examples of /h<sub>2</sub>n/:

- Kpd. *tarahnu-* (Ic.) ‘-(?)’ (NOMS. 1273B, *ta-ar-Aḥ-nu*)  
 Kpd. *duḥni-* (Ic.) ‘-(?)’ (NOMS. 1358, *du-ūḥ-ni-iš*)  
 Hitt. *uḥna-* (Ic.) ‘roi de Zalpuwa’ (NOMS. 1413, *u-uh-na-aš*).

Similarly, Old Anatolian place names appear with /h<sub>2</sub>n/:

- Hitt. *ḫarahna*[...] (URU.) ‘-(?)’ (OGH. 83, *ḫAR-aḥ-na*[...])  
 Hitt. *karahna-* (URU.) ‘-(?)’ (OGH. 177-180, *ga-ra-aḥ-na-aš*)  
 Hitt. *tarahna-* (KUR URU.) ‘-(?)’ (OGH. 405, *ta-ra-aḥ-na*)  
 Hitt. *ziḥnua-* (URU.) “Im > Taruka” (OGHErg. 194, *zi-iḥ-nu-ua*).

Thus, the counterpart of Lat. *√mān-* would have been Hitt. *\*maḥn-*. In the absence of the laryngeal in Hitt. *√man-*, the root represents PIE *\*mōn-* whereas Lat. *√mān-* stands for PIE *\*mēahn-*. Consequently there is no Indo-European etymology for Hittite.

4.4 Despite this, an Indo-European etymology without the laryngeal and with a stem in *\*-i-* is attested in Celtic:

OIr. *me'nbligi-* (pr.) 'il foisonne, il fourmille' (LEIA M, 30, DIL —).

A segmentation OIr. *mein-bligim*, glossed *scato* (i.e., 'hervorquellen'), is confirmed by the verb MidIr. *bligi-* 'melken' (IEW. 723). Accordingly, we can compare the first member OIr. *me'n-*, describing a liquid product, directly with Hittite. The underlying PIE root can be strengthened by noting the existence of additional forms in several languages:

PIE <i>*meni-</i>	<i>*moni-</i>	(sb.) 'Eiter, Salbe, usw.' (vb.) 'mästen'
Hitt. <i>mani-</i>		(c.) 'Eiter : pus, suppuration' (HEG 2, 119, <i>ma-ni-iš</i> )
Alb. <i>manj-</i>		(vb.) 'mästen' (WH 2, 7, Alb. <i>manj</i> [1sg])
OSax. <i>meni-</i>		(sb.) 'Bach, Fluß : brook' (ASächsWb. 51)
OInd. <i>manīka-</i>		(n.) 'eye-salve, collyrium' (MonWil. 787) <sup>10</sup>
OIr. <i>me'nbligi-</i>		(pr.) 'il foisonne, il fourmille' (LEIA M, 30).

Both the *\*e*-grade (OIr. *me'n-*) and *\*o*-grade (Hitt. *mani-* = Alb. *manj*) are unambiguous, but OInd. *manīka-* can represent either PIE *\*e* or *\*o*.

### 5. Hitt. *maniti-* (c.) 'growth, increase (?)'

5.0 LITERATURE: CHD (L-N, 174f.), Tischler (HEG 2, 125), Puhvel (HED M, 58-59).

5.1 Hittite preserves a noun

Hitt. *maniti-* (c.) 'Wachstum (?)' (Hitt. *ma-an-ni-it-ti-en* [sgA]).

In addition, the noun appears deified in

Hitt. *maniti-* (d.) '-(?)-' (HEG 2, 125, *ma-an-ni-it-ti-iš* [sgN]).

5.2 Although no Old Anatolian parallels have been preserved, an approximate meaning can be inferred from the context in KUB 17.10 i:

<sup>d</sup>*te-li-pi-nu-ša ar-ḫa i-ia-an-ni-iš ḫal-ki-in* <sup>d</sup>*im-ma-ar-ni-in* (10)  
<sup>š</sup>*a-al-ḫi-an-ti-en, ma-an-ni-it-ti-en iš-pi-ia-tar-ra pé-e-da-aš* (11).

The (slightly improved) translation of Kloekhorst (HIL. 819)

10 For the compound OInd. *manīka-*, compare RV. *ānīka-* (n.) 'Angesicht, Aussehen, Glanzerscheinung' (WbRV. 57) and RV. *prāṭīka-* (n.) 'erscheinende Gestalt, Antlitz' (WbRV. 869). The forms appear with PIE *\*-haku-* 'eye, face, etc.' (IEW. 775-777), which leaves the meaning 'salve' for OInd. *mani-* in OInd. *manīka-* 'eye-salve'.

‘And/But <sup>god</sup>Telipinu- marched away: grain, <sup>god</sup>Imarni-, greatness, *maniti*- and satisfaction he [Telipinu] carried off.’  
allows one to infer that Hitt. *maniti*- refers to a positive concept, generally translated approximately as ‘increase, growth’ or something similar.

5.3 To my knowledge, no external etymology has been proposed. Therefore, I would like to point out the existence of the Celtic items meaning ‘mountain’ (see IEW. 726, 748) in

OBrit. <i>monedo-rig</i> -	(PNm.) ‘Berg+König’ (ACSS. 2, 623, monedorix [sgN])
Pict. <i>moned</i> -	(.) ‘Berg’ (ACSS. 2, 623)
OBret. <i>monid</i>	(.) ‘Berg’ (ACSS. 2, 623)
MidIr. <i>moned</i> -	(.) ‘mountain’ (DIL, 467, ACSS. 2, 623).

The respective \**e*-grade in

Cymr. <i>mynydd</i>	(.) ‘mountain, great amount’ (GPC 2, 4596)
---------------------	--

suggests that we are dealing with a root meaning ‘to rise, to ascend, to advance’, which would make perfect sense for Hittite.<sup>11</sup>

5.4 Derivationally speaking, one should observe the following:

(a) If we assume, despite numerous exceptions, that Sturtevant-Mudge’s rule is universally valid, then the geminate in Hitt. *ma-an-ni-it-ti*- implying PIE \**t(h)* is incompatible with PIE \**d(h)* preserved in Celtic. This is not a counterargument against the general etymology, because the Hittite form certainly did not mean ‘mountain’, and a slight difference in meaning is thus to be expected.

(b) In addition, Hittite has /*il*/ in the second syllable, whereas the Celtic items point to PIE \**e*. This can be interpreted as Hittite representing PIE \**monit(h)ei*-, in contrast to PIE \**moned(h)o*- required by Celtic. This difference is of minor importance, however, since both formations can be derived from a root PIE \**mon*- \**men*- ‘plentiness’, as attested in

HLu. <i>mana</i>	(adv.) ‘much (?)’ (CHLu. 10.14.14, <i>ma-na</i> )
Li. <i>māž-mena</i> -	(f.) ‘kleine Menge’ (LiEtWb. 422).

11 Jackson (1953, 347-56) treats the *d* of OBrit. *monedo-rigi*- as representing *ð* (from PCelt. \**monīyo*-). I am not completely happy with this, due to MidIr. *moned*- ‘mountain’ occurring in Scottish toponyms. Admittedly it is possible that MidIr. *moned* is Pictish, as mentioned by DIL and Matasović (EtDiPC 277), but simultaneously the dental of MidIr. *moned*- can be directly compared to OBrit. *monedo*-, therefore implying PIE \**d(h)*. Regardless, the old connection between ‘mountain’ and PIE \**moni*- ‘neck’ can be sustained even if Hittite words belong here.



6. CLu. *nani-* (GKL<sub>vb.</sub>) ≈ ‘reinigen’

6.0 LITERATURE: Laroche (DLL. 74), Tischler (HEG 2, 274).

6.1 The Cuneiform Luwian stem

CLu. *nani-* (GKL<sub>vb.</sub>) ≈ ‘reinigen’ (DLL. 74, HEG 2, 274)

appears in a context

[*na*]m-ma DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup> f<sub>du-ut-tari-ia-ti-iš</sub> GKL<sub>na-ni-ti</sub> [3sg] *gán-ga-ti-ti*

that can be translated as

‘Now to the deity <sup>female</sup>*dutariadi-* purifies the *gangadi*-grain.’

6.2 No confirmed Old Anatolian parallels have been confirmed for the verb, except for the formal match with

Hitt. *nani-* (vb.) ‘drive, ride, draw, etc.’.

This connection, however, has recently been denied by Tischler (HEG 2, 273), due to the different meanings of the verbs.

6.3 As no accepted etymology exists, I would like point out the Indo-European root

PIE √*nik-* (IEW. 761) ‘Getreide durch Schwingen reinigen, schwingen, worfeln’

PIE \**n(e)ikšah-*

Li. *niekó-* (vb.) ‘(Getreide) schwingen, worfeln’ (LiEtWb. 502)

Latv. *niēkā-* (vb.) ‘Grütze in einer Mulde schwingen’ (GEW 2, 123)

Gr. νικάω (pr.) ‘Getreide schwingen, worfeln’ (GEW 2, 123)

PIE \**n(e)iklo-*

Gr. νίκλο- (n.) ‘Getreideschwinge’ (GEW 2, 123)

Gr. νεῖκλο- (n.) ‘Getreideschwinge’ (GEW 2, 123)

PIE \**nikto-*

OIr. *cruith-necht-* (.) ‘wheat : Weizen’ (DIL. 162, LEIA C, 254-5)

Cymr. *gwe-nith-* (.) ‘wheat: Weizen’ (GPC 1, 3099)

Corn. *gwa-neth-* (.) ‘froment : Weizen’ (LEIA C, 255)

Cymr. *nithio-* (.) ‘winnow, sift’ (GPC 2, 4655)

Bret. *niza-* (.) ‘worfeln : vanner le grain’ (LEIA C, 255).

Formally speaking, the Centum and the Satem languages define a plain velar for the extension PIE √*ni-k-*, whereas CLu. *nani-* (← PIE \**nō-ni-*) is a reduplication from the unextended root PIE √*ni-* ‘schwingen, Getreide durch Schwingen

reinigen'.<sup>12</sup> Semantically speaking, the resemblance of the meanings of the Luwian and Indo-European verbs ('Getreide durch Schwingen reinigen') is striking, and it leaves no doubt regarding the original connection between the items.

6.4 In terms of derivation, it should be noted that the verb Hitt. *nei-*, *nai-*, *ni-* (vb2A.) 'wenden, lenken, leiten, richten, schicken' (HEG 2, 253-7) is the obvious starting point of CLu. *nani-*, which is apparently an intensive formation ('schwingen') of the primary meaning ('wenden'). Consequently, a connection with

Hitt. <i>arḫa nani-</i>	(vb.) 'herbeitreiben' (HEG 2, 272, <i>ar-ḫa na-an-ni-e-er</i> )
Hitt. <i>nania-</i>	(vb.) 'treiben' (HEG 2, 272, <i>na-an-ni-ia-u-en-i</i> )

is supported by the data after all.

## 7. Hitt. *ninga-* (c.) 'Regen'

7.0 LITERATURE: Tischler (HEG 2, 331), CHD (L-N, 443f.), Melchert (1994, 165-166), Kloekhorst (HIL. 701-2).

7.1 Hittite preserves the respective nominal and verbal stems  
 Hitt. *ninga-* (c.) 'Regen' (HEG 2, 333, U]D<sup>2</sup> x<sup>KAM</sup> *ni-in-ga-aš*[.....])  
 Hitt. *ninga-* (vb.) 'sich sättigen' (Hitt. *ni-in-ká-an-du* [3pl]).

7.2 In addition, there is a shorter stem  
 Hitt. *nin-* (vb.) 'sich satt trinken' (KUB 43.58. ii 47, *ni-in-zi* [3sg]).

On the basis of context, the stem belongs to Hitt. *ning-*, but the explanations differ:

(a) Kloekhorst (HIL. 701-702) suggests that '[...] the MS attestation *ni-in-zi* [...] resembles verbs like *har(k)-*, with loss of *-k-* in a cluster *\*-RkC-*.' I don't find such an *ad hoc* rule to be credible, because according to the existing rule a velar is not lost in environment *-NkC-*, but the cluster is written without nasal. In this case, a third-person singular without nasal is actually attested in KUB 13.4 iii 37 and KBo 22.134 iv 21:

Hitt. *ning-* (vb1.) 'sich satt trinken' (HEG 2, 331-2, *ni-ik-zi*).

On this basis, Kloekhorst's suggestion is less attractive.

(b) On the other hand, CHD (L-N, 443f.) would like to emend the attested form *ni-in-zi* into *ni-in<ik>-zi* or *ni-in<ga>-zi*. This is unconfirmed, because in terms of

<sup>12</sup> Admittedly this is a 'Wurzeletymologie', but when properly postulated the device is legitimate and helpful in reconstruction.

Proto-Indo-European it remains possible to interpret Hitt. *nin-* as an archaic stem without a velar extension (or ‘root determinative’) present in Hitt. *nin-g-*.

7.3 The question whether Hitt. *nin-zi* is a scribal error or reflects an archaic stem without extension *-K-* can be settled by an external comparison with Celtic, where the following root has been preserved:

PIE $\sqrt{nin-}$	‘cloud, wave’
OIr. <i>nin-</i>	(sb.) ‘cloud, wave’ (DIL 477-478, <i>nin</i> )
OIr. <i>ninach-</i>	(a.) ‘cloudy’ (DIL 478). <sup>13</sup>

Although Vendryes (LEIA N, 4) does not report an Indo-European etymology, OIr.  $\sqrt{nin-}$  can be readily equated with Hitt. *nin-*.

7.4 In a wider context, the different approaches to Hitt. *nin-* reflect the difference between internal methodologies and the comparative method briefly outlined below:

(a) Often, if not always, internal methodologies seek normalization with regard to a synchronic standard, usually a dominant paradigm or a stem. Typical tools for normalization are synchronic rules, emendations and other irregular explanations, depending on the data at hand.

(b) The comparative method begins with an external comparison of Indo-European data in order to identify potential parallels and to confirm their PIE origin, if possible. This approach attempts to preserve the actual variation of the attested languages and to reproduce the derivation of the proto-language. In this case, therefore, the comparative method results in the following root matrix:

PIE $\sqrt{nin-}$	(sb.) ‘water, cloud, wave, rain, drop, etc. (vb.) ‘drink (one’s fill)’
	PIE $\sqrt{nin-}$
Hitt. <i>nin-</i>	(vb.) ‘to quench one’s thirst’ (KUB 43.58. ii 47, <i>ni-in-zi</i> )
OIr. <i>nin -</i>	(sb.) ‘cloud, wave’ (DIL 477-8, <i>nin</i> ) <sup>14</sup>
	PIE $\sqrt{ninK-}$
Hitt. <i>ninga-</i>	(c.) ‘Regen’ (HEG 2, 333, UJD? x <sup>KAM</sup> <i>ni-in-ga-aš</i> [...])
Hitt. <i>ninga-</i>	(vb.) ‘sich sättigen’ (HEG 2, 331, <i>ni-in-ká-an-du</i> [3pl])
	PIE * <i>ninbĥ-</i>
OIr. <i>nimb-</i>	(sb.) ‘cloud, a drop’ (DIL 478, LEIA N, 17)
Lat. <i>nimbo-</i>	(m.) ‘Sturz-, Sturmregen,
Regenwolke’ (WH 2, 168).	

13 Note that several incompatible meanings are preserved for OIr. *nin(ach)-* and only the relevant one is quoted here (see LEIA and DIL).

14 Based on the meaning, it is theoretically possible that Gr. *vivo-* (n.): ‘ἐλέωνος’, calamint; νεκάρτιον (LSJ. 1177) also belongs here, but it has not been possible to find a convincing parallel.

The dynamics between the internal and the external approaches are deeply embedded in Indo-European linguistics, and therefore they are unlikely to ever disappear. Personally, however, I favour the comparative method for the following reasons:

- a. No inconsistent synchronic rules, emendations or other irregular devices are required (Occam's razor); only regular formations appear.
- b. The Indo-European data is maximally compared, utilized and reconstructed, providing the field with explicit reconstructions of the proto-language.
- c. The reconstructed root (here PIE  $\sqrt{nin-}$ ) and its extensions (here PIE  $\sqrt{ninK-}$  and PIE  $\sqrt{ninb\acute{h}i-}$ ) are morphologically arranged in a manner that reflects the original PIE derivation.

### 8. Hitt. $\acute{s}ala-$ (<sup>KUŠ</sup>c.) 'Teil des Zaumzeugs'

8.0 LITERATURE: Laroche (DLL 84), Tischler (HHand. 140, HEG Š, 752-3).

8.1 Hittite preserves a noun  
Hitt.  $\acute{s}ala-$  (<sup>KUŠ</sup>c.) 'Teil des Zaumzeugs' (HHand. 140,  $\acute{s}a-a-la-a\acute{s}$ ).

8.2 An identical stem is also documented in Cuneiform Luwian:  
CLu.  $\acute{s}ala-$  (<sup>KUŠ</sup>n.) 'Teil des Zaumzeugs' (DLL. 84,  $\acute{s}a-a-la$  [p1NA]).

In order to establish whether Hitt.  $\acute{s} \equiv$  CLu.  $\acute{s}$  stands for an etymological PIE  $*s$  or PIE  $*T_1$ , an external parallel is required.

8.3 In the absence of any Indo-European etymology, I would like to quote some Indo-European parallels preserved in Celtic and in Germanic:

OIr. <i>selan-</i>	(sb.) 'halter, rope, leash' (DIL, 535, LEIA S, 79)
OIcl. <i>seli-</i>	(m.) 'Geschirr, Seil' (ANetWb. 469)
OIcl. <i>sili-</i>	(m.) 'Geschirr, Seil' (ANetWb. 469).

Formally the items imply PIE  $*s-$ , which therefore also appears in Hitt.  $\acute{s} \equiv$  CLu.  $\acute{s}$ . In terms of meaning, the items belong to a semantic field of 'bind(ing)' from which various bound objects have been derived. A parallel for such extensions is available, for instance, in:

PIE $*haus-$	'binden'
Hitt. <i>huša-</i>	( <sup>KUŠ</sup> c.) 'Teil des Geschirres/Zaumzeuges' (HHand.
57)	
Gr. ὄσκλος	(n.) 'the eyelets of a sandal' (LSJ. 1905, GEW 2, 974)

OIcl. <i>vasa-</i>	(vb.) ‘sich einmischen, s. abgeben mit’ (ANetWb. 647)
ModNorw. <i>vase-</i>	(sb.) ‘Wisch, Laubbündel’ (ANetWb. 647)
MidLG. <i>wase</i>	(.) ‘Reisigbündel’ (ANetWb. 647)
ModNorw. <i>vasa-</i>	(vb.) ‘verwickeln, vermischen’ (ANetWb. 647)
OPers. <i>avastā-</i>	(f.) ‘leather’ (OldP. 173, <i>avast</i> [ā]y[ā] [sgL]).

8.4 Internally the root contained in OIr. *selan-* is common Celtic as apparent from the compound PCelt. *\*ad-sel-* ‘joint’ attested in.

MidIr. <i>aisil-</i>	(sb.) ‘joint’ (DIL 31, EtDiPC 44, LEIA A-94, <i>aisil</i> ) <sup>15</sup>
MidBret. <i>esel-</i>	(m.) ‘joint’ (EtDiPC 44, MidBret. <i>esel</i> [sgN])
Corn. <i>esel-</i>	(m.) ‘joint’ (EtDiPC 44, Corn. <i>esel</i> [sgN])

In terms of PIE reconstruction, the formations Hitt. *šala-*, CLu. *šala-* ≡ PIE *\*sōlo-*, MidIr. *·sil-* ≡ PIE *\*selo-*, OIr. *selan-* ≡ PIE *\*selēahno-*, OIcl. *seli-* ≡ PIE *\*sol̥io-* and OIcl. *sili-* ≡ PIE *\*sel̥io-* imply a root PIE  $\sqrt{s\acute{e}l-}$   $\sqrt{s\acute{o}l-}$   $\sqrt{sl-}$  ‘bind’, supplementing the traditional root inventory of Pokorny (IEW), where no such item is currently available.

## 9. Hitt. *šant-* (sb.) ‘wertvoller Gegenstand’

9.0 LITERATURE: Tischler (HHand. 143).

9.1 Hittite preserves a noun

Hitt. *šant-* (sb.) ‘wertvoller Gegenstand’ (in Inventar).

9.2 The formal identity with the participle

Hitt. *šant-* (pt.) ‘zornig’ (HEG Š, 839, *ša-a-an-za* [sgN])

is semantically distant, whence Hitt. *šant-* ‘wertvoller Gegenstand’ has no recognized cognates in Old Anatolian.

9.3 Despite the uncertainty surrounding Hitt. *šant-* ‘wertvoller Gegenstand’, an external etymology has been preserved in Celtic:

OIr. <i>sét-</i>	(m.) ‘object/unit of value, chattel, etc.’ (DIL. 539)
OCelt. <i>sentī-</i>	(.) ‘Kostbarkeit, Wertgegenstand’ (ACSS. 2, 1502).

<sup>15</sup> The item MidIr. *aisil-* ‘part, division’ is perhaps to be separated from MidIr. *asil-* ‘joint’ with two different prefixes, PCelt. *\*as-sel-* and PCelt. *\*ad-sel-*.

Formally Hitt. *šant-* ≡ PIE *\*sǝnt-* and OIr. *sét-* ≡ PIE *\*sǝnto-* (i.e., only *\*e/o-* ablaut and slightly different suffixes) are required in this etymology.

Semantically speaking, the Celtic meaning ‘Wertgegenstand’ is not helpful in specifying the ambiguous meaning of Hittite ‘wertvoller Gegenstand’, but the semantic match is perfect.

9.4 Two etymological starting points can be pointed out for PIE *\*sǝnt-* ‘Wertgegenstand’ and PIE *\*sǝnto-* ‘idem’:

(a) Holder (ACSS. 2, 1502) provided a single entry OGaul. *sent-* with the meanings ‘Kostbarkeit, Wertgegenstand, fibula’. In so doing, he implied a direct connection between OGaul. *sent-* and the items

Lat. <i>sent-</i>	(m.) ‘Dornstrauch : thorn bush’ (WH 2, 516) <sup>16</sup>
OIr. <i>sét-</i>	(.) ‘épingle, broche, bijou’ (LEIA S-99, <i>*i-</i> stem).

While this is certainly correct for the (attested) meaning

OGaul. <i>sent-</i>	(f.) ‘fibula : brooch’ (OGaul. <i>sentem</i> ),
---------------------	---

the connection with ‘Kostbarkeit, Wertgegenstand’ (see OIr. *sét-* ‘trésor’) is not completely satisfactory.

(b) Vendryes posits two separate entries, **2 sét** ‘trésor’ and **3 sét** ‘épingle’; the former can be associated with Hitt. *šant-* ‘wertvoller Gegenstand’ and the latter with Lat. *sent-* ‘Dornstrauch’ (and OGaul. *sent-* ‘fibula’). I find this to be a superior approach, since it makes it possible to derive OIr. *sét* ‘trésor’ and Hitt. *šant-* ‘wertvoller Gegenstand’ from a different PIE root without a collision of the semantic fields. For the latter root, a credible origin is available in:

PIE $\sqrt{s-}$ ‘good’	
PIE <i>*os-</i>	
Hitt. <i>aš-</i>	(vbM.) ‘gut sein’ (HHand. 25, <i>a-aš-ša-a-ri</i> [3sg])
PIE <i>*s<sup>e</sup>/nt-</i>	
Hitt. <i>šant<sup>o</sup>-</i>	(.) ‘wertvoller Gegenstand (in Inventar)’.
OIr. <i>sét-</i>	(m.) ‘trésor, fortune, richesse, bétail’ (LEIA S, 99).

## 10. Hitt. *da-* (a.) ‘gesamt, ganz, all’

10.0 LITERATURE: Tischler (HHand. 157, 163, 166, HEG T, 126-8).

<sup>16</sup> The contexts of Hitt. *šenti-* (GtSc.) ‘ein von Köchen benütztes Gerät’ (see Tischler HEG S:990) make it possible that the object in question is a sharp wooden stake, used in cookery. Note, however, Laroche’s comparison with Hur. *šint-* and ALP’s comparison with Hitt. GtS<sup>zinti-</sup> *apud* Tischler HEG Š:990, suggesting that a detailed study of the data is required in the future.

- 10.1 Hittite preserves a stem  
 Hitt. *da-* (a.) ‘gesamt, ganz, all’ (HHand. 157).
- 10.2 Despite the absence of direct parallels in Old Anatolian, there are two extensions with an identical meaning, viz.  
 Hitt. *dan-* (a.) ‘= *dapi(a)* : gesamt, ganz, all’ (HHand. 163)  
 Hitt. *dapi-* (a.) ‘gesamt, ganz, all’ (HHand. 166).
- 10.3 The problem of Indo-European etymology is solved (for the problematic early suggestions, see Tischler HEG T, 127f.) once it is noted that there are three Old Irish stems that perfectly match the Hittite:
- PIE  $\sqrt{dha-}$  ‘gesamt, ganz, all, voll, groß’ (ABLAUT \**dhae-* \**dhao-*, \**dhaē-*, \**dhaō-*)  
 PIE  $\sqrt{dhan-}$   
 Hitt. *da-* (a.) ‘gesamt, ganz, all = *dapi(a)*’ (HHand. 157)  
 OIr. *dā* (adv.) ‘in full’ (DIL. 182-3)  
 PIE  $\sqrt{dhan-}$   
 Hitt. *dan* (a.) = *dapi(a)* ‘gesamt, ganz, all’ (HHand. 163)  
 Hitt. *dan ata-* (c.) ‘Großvater’ (?) (HHand. 163)  
 OIr. *dana* (adv.) ‘in full’ (DIL. 182-3)  
 OIr. *dano* (adv.) ‘in full’ (DIL. 182-3)  
 OIr. *done* (adv.) ‘in full’ (DIL. 182-3)  
 CLu. *danama-* (GKLpt.) ‘all, jeder’ (DLL. 90, HHand. 163)  
 PIE  $\sqrt{dhap-}$   
 Hitt. *dapi-* (a.) ‘gesamt, ganz, all’ (HHand. 166, HEG T, 126-8)  
 Hitt. *dapi(a)-* (a.) ‘gesamt, ganz, all’ (HHand. 166)  
 OIr. *dāa* (adv.) ‘in full’ (DIL. 182-3)  
 Hitt. *dapiant-* (a.) ‘gesamt, ganz, all’ (HHand. 166).
- 10.4 Regarding these comparisons, note the following:
- (a) The slight difference between the Hittite and Irish meanings is only a minor one, since a Later Anatolian personal name can be interpreted meaningfully if we translate  $\delta\alpha\pi\mu\iota-$  as ‘full’ in  
 Lyc.  $\alpha\rho\mu\alpha\delta\alpha\pi\mu\iota\varsigma$  (PNc.) if ‘(born under a) full moon (?)’ (VLFH 211).<sup>17</sup>
- (b) The comparison with Hittite implies that the hiatus in OIr. *dāa* reflects a lost (voiceless) labial PIE \**p(h)*.
- (c) In a violation of Sturtevant-Mudge’s rule, Hitt. *dapi(a)-* is written without geminate throughout, thus implying PIE \**b(h)* vs. PIE \**p(h)* required by Celtic. As is well known, this would not be the first exception of its kind.

<sup>17</sup> For the second part of the compound, see Lyc.  $\alpha\rho\sigma\alpha\delta\alpha\pi\epsilon\mu\iota\varsigma$  (PN.) ‘-(?)’ (VLFH 211).

## Abbreviations

a.	adjective
A	accusative
A.	active
Abl.	ablative
ACSS. 1	Holder 1896
ACSS. 2	Holder 1904
adv.	adverb
AIWb.	Bartholomae 1904
Alb.	Albanian
ANEtWb.	Vries 1961
ASächsWb.	Holthausen 1954
Bret.	Breton
c.	<i>genus communis</i>
CHD	Güterbock & Hoffner 1983ff.
CHLu.	Hawkins 2000
CLu.	Cuneiform Luwian
Corn.	Cornish
cs.	causative
Cymr.	Welsh
<sup>d</sup>	god (DINGIR)
DIL	Marstrander (et al.) 1913ff.
DLG	Delamarre 2003 <sup>2</sup>
DLL.	Laroche 1959
EtDiPC	Matasović 2009
f.	feminine
GEW 1	Frisk 1960
GEW 2	Frisk 1972
<sup>GKL</sup>	<i>Glossenkeil</i> (indicating Cuneiform Luwian)
Go.	Gothic
GoEtD.	Lehmann 1986
GPC	Bevan & Donovan 2003ff.
Gr.	Greek
HED	Puhvel 2004
HEG	Tischler 1977ff.
HHand.	Tischler 2001
Hitt.	Hittite
HIL	Kloekhorst 2007
I	man (LÚ)
IEW	Pokorny 1959
Kpd.	Cappadocian
KUR	land
<sup>KUŠ</sup>	leather (object)
L.	locative
Lat.	Latin
Latv.	Latvian
LAv.	late(r) Avestan
LEIA	Vendryes, Bachellery & Lambert 1959ff.



Li.	Lithuanian
LiEtWb.	Fraenkel 1962-65
LSJ.	Liddell & Scott 1940
LT	the Laryngeal Theory
Lyc.	Lycian
m.	masculine
M.	medium
MidBret.	Middle Breton
MidIr.	Middle Irish
MidLG.	Middle Low German
ModNorw.	Modern Norwegian
MonWil.	Monier-Williams 1993
n.	neuter
N	nominative
Neogr.	Neogrammarian (reconstruction)
NOMS.	Laroche 1966
OBrit.	Old Brittonic
OCelt.	Old Celtic
OGH.	Monte & Tischler 1978
OGHErg.	Monte 1992
OIcl.	Old Icelandic (Old Norse)
OInd.	Sanskrit
OIr.	Old Irish
OLat.	Old Latin
OldP.	Kent 1953
ON	name of a place ( <i>Ortsname</i> )
OPers.	Old Persian
OSax.	Old Saxon
Pict.	Pictish
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
pl	plural
PN	personal name
pr.	present
pref.	prefix
prep	preposition
pt.	participle
RV.	Rig-Veda
sb.	substantive
sg	singular
Umbr.	Umbrian
URU	town/city
Vann.	Vannes
vb	verb
VGK 2	Pedersen 1913
VLFH	Kronasser 1956
VN	name of a people ( <i>Volksname</i> )
WbOU.	Untermann 2000
WbRV.	Grassmann 1996

WH 1	Walde & Hofmann 1938
WH 2	Walde & Hofmann 1938
WP 1	Walde & Pokorny 1927

## References

- Bartholomae, C. 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Čop, B. 1970. 'Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung VII'. *Linguistica* 10, 90-92, 95-102).
- Bewan, G. A. & Donovan, P. J. 2003. *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru. A Dictionary of the Welsh Language*. Ail. Argraffiad – Second edition. [= GPC]. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Delamarre, X. 2003. *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise. Une approche linguistique des vieux-celtique continental* [DLG]. Paris: Editions errance.
- Eichner, H. 1988. 'Anatolisch und Trilaryngalismus'. In A. Bammesberger (ed.) *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*. Heidelberg: Winter, 123-151.
- Fraenkel, E. 1962-65. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I-II*. Heidelberg-Göttingen: Winter, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Frisk, H. 1960-1972. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I-III*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Grassmann, H. 1996. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*, 6. überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von Maria Kozianka. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- Güterbock, H. G. & Hoffner, H. A. 1983–. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Hawkins, J. D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Holder, A. 1896. *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz. Erster Band A – H*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Holder, A. 1904. *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz. Zweiter Band I – T*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Holthausen, F. 1954. *Altsächsische Wörterbuch* [= ASächsWb.]. Niederdeutsche Studien 1. Köln: Böhlau
- Jackson, K. H. 1953. *Language and History in Early Britain, A Chronological Survey of the Brittonic Languages First to Twelfth Century a.D.* Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Joseph, L. S. 1980. *Problems in the development of the Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic*. PhD. Thesis. Harvard University.
- Kent, R. G. 1953. *Old Persian. Grammar. Texts. Lexicon*. 2nd rev. ed. American Oriental Series, 33. New Haven (Connecticut): American Oriental Society.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2007. *The Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Dissertation. University of Leiden.
- Kronasser, H. 1956. *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Laroche, E. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'institut français d'archéologie d'Istanbul, vol. VI. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Laroche, E. 1966. *Les Noms des Hittites*. Études Linguistiques 4. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Lehmann, W. P. 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary Based on the Third Edition of Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache by Sigmund Feist*. Leiden: Brill.

- Liddell, H. G. & R. Scott, 1940. *A Greek-English Lexicon, revised by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Marstrand, C. J. S. (& al.). 1913-76. *Dictionary of the Irish language*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
- Matasović, R. 2009. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic* [= EtDiPC]. Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series 9. Leiden & Boston: Brill
- Melchert, H. C. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3. Amsterdam-Atlanta GA: Rodopi.
- Monier-Williams, M. 1993. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Monte, G. F. del & J. Tischler. 1978. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 6. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Monte, G. F. del. 1992. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Supplement*. Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 6. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Pedersen, H. 1913. *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen* 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Pokorny, J. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I*. Tübingen/Basel: Francke.
- Puhvel, J. 2004. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary Vol. 6, Words beginning with M*. Trends in Linguistics. Documentation, 1. Berlin, New York & Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Pyysalo, J. 2013. *System PIE: The Primary Phoneme Inventory and Sound Law System for Proto-Indo-European*. Publications of the Institute for Asian and African Studies 15. Helsinki: Unigrafia.
- Szemerényi, O. 1954. 'The Latin Adjectives in -ulentus'. *Glotta* 33, 266-282.
- Szemerényi, O. 1970. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Tischler, J. 1977-. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 20. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck
- Tischler, J. 2001. *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch*. Innsbruck: Institute für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Untermann, J. 2000. *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Handbuch der Italischen Dialekte 3. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Vendryes, J., E. Bachellery & P.-Y. Lambert. 1959-. *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien*. Dublin-Paris: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Vries, J. de. 1961. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Leiden: Brill.
- Walde, A. & J. Pokorny. 1927-32. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Herausgegeben und bearbeitet von Julius Pokorny. Berlin: de Gruyter & Co.
- Walde, A. & J.B. Hofmann. 1938. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Walde, A. & J. Pokorny. 1932. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen II*. Berlin: de Gruyter & Co.
- Zair, N. 2012. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic*. Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages and Linguistics 7. Leiden & Boston: Brill
- Zgusta, L. 1951. 'La théorie laryngale'. *Archiv Oriental* 19, 428-472.