

## ‘Widow’

1. The word for ‘widow’ is one of the first words that were recognised as Indo-European. It is found already in Cœurdoux’s letter. After some discussion its reconstruction and etymology seemed certain. When I considered to write a short note on the Greek cognate, it soon appeared to me that the handbooks contradict each other and that some of them contain clear mistakes. One major problem even seemed not to have been noticed. No less than four Sanskrit words have recently been shown not to be cognate. So there is reason to reconsider the whole problem.

The relevant words are:

Skt. *vidhāvā*, Av. *viḍava* < \**uidheuā*;

OCS *вѣдова*, OPr. *widderwī* < \**uidheuā*;

Alb. Tosc. *ve*, Geg. *vej(ë)* < \**uidheuā*;

Lat. *vidua*;

Goth. *widurwo*, OHG *wituruwa*, OE *wuduwe*, *widwe* etc.;

OIr. *fedb*, W. *gweddw*, MC *guedden*.

Further: Gr. *ῥίθεος*, Lat. *viduus*.

The Albanian form (not mentioned by Pokorny; added by Hamp, IF 67 (1962) 150) was already explained by Jokl (1923, 51 f.). Both *d* (*h*) and *w* disappeared in intervocalic position; the first vowel, preceding the penultimate stress, disappeared; final *ā* became *ë*. This gave \**vëë*, which became T. *ve*, but Geg. *vejë* with *j* as a Hiatusilger.

2. It has long been thought that Gr. *ῥίθεος* ‘unmarried young man’ was cognate, but difficulties of form and meaning caused hesitation. The latest etymological dictionary of Greek, by Chantraine, ends with: “Donc étymologie douteuse.” Even more negative s.v. *χήρη*: (‘widow’) “auquel il est impossible de rattacher *ῥίθεος*.” EM s.v. *viduus* express doubt as well.

The Greek word may represent \**ῥιθιθεος*. The formal problem is the *ῥ*-. One suggestion was that the *ῥ*- was a prefix. The idea goes back to Pott (1883, 177) who understood it as ‘noch ledig’ and compared *ῥ-δη*. This idea was taken over by Prellwitz 1931, 126, who compared Bulg. *javdovica* ‘widow’. In the latter the meaning ‘noch’

is, of course, impossible. Sturtevant 1939, 149, who could not decide whether  $\eta$ - continues  $\bar{e}$  or  $\bar{a}$ , operated with a prefix  $\gamma e/o-$ , which before word initial preconsonantal laryngeal was lengthened to  $\bar{e}-$  or  $\bar{a}-$ . The  $\bar{a}-$  he compared semantically with  $d\bar{i}-viduus$ . If it was  $\bar{e}-$ , he could not interpret the meaning. (This is strange as it would be the same prefix as  $\bar{a}-$ .)

As to the original colour of the vowel, Frisk and Chantraine note that the  $\alpha$ - of Kerkidas is a hyperdorism, because Sappho has  $\eta$ -. But Sturtevant notes that the form in Sappho may be an epic form. Thus, I think we cannot be sure in this matter.

It is hard to argue about prefixes as their meaning, and their very existence, is mostly hard to establish. But there are prefixes in some later languages, and there seems to be some evidence for PIE prefixes. I call prefix a morpheme that occurs only prefixed to another form. Thus negative  $\eta$ - and  $ni$ - are not prefixes, as  $ne$  and  $ni$  occur as independent words. Two prefixes must be acknowledged for PIE. One is the  $*h_1 e$ - which is the augment and the deictic element which is found in pronominal forms (Gr.  $(\acute{\epsilon})\kappa\epsilon\iota$  etc.); these two forms may be identical in origin; they are strictly limited to the use indicated. The other is the  $s$  mobile, of which the meaning is unknown. Here we are only concerned with prefixes consisting of one vowel, for which see Pok. 280. I shall briefly reconsider the evidence. Recent surveys are EWAia s.v.  $\acute{a}$  and Lloyd-Springer s.v.  $\bar{a}$ -.

$*a$ -. There is no evidence for a prefix of this form.

Greek has the  $\acute{a}$ -copulativum (from  $*sm$ -) in  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$  etc. (with a variant called intensivum in  $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\delta\nu\nu\omicron\nu\ \mu\omicron\lambda\upsilon\phi\epsilon\rho\nu\nu\omicron\nu$  Hes., as in Skt.  $s\acute{a}cetas$  'wise'). Another  $\acute{a}$ - from  $*\eta$  has been assumed in  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$  etc., which is defended by Chantraine. However, if this  $*\eta$ - is the zero grade of  $*en$  'in', there was an initial laryngeal, and  $*h_1\eta$ - would have given  $\acute{\epsilon}v$ - in Greek (Rix 1970; Beekes 1969, 132 f.). (That negative  $\eta$ - did not have a preceding laryngeal is shown by the type  $\nu\eta\lambda\epsilon\acute{\eta}\varsigma < *\eta-h_1leu$ -, as  $**h_2n-h_1leu$ - would have given  $*\alpha\nu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon F$ -. Because of the vocalism of  $\acute{a}$ -,  $\acute{\alpha}v$ - only  $h_2$  is possible.) Therefore this idea must be given up.

$*e$ -. There is no evidence for a prefix  $e$ -. ( $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$  is secondary for  $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega < *h_1g*hel$ -,  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega < *h_1ger$ -). See above on the augment and the pronominal  $e$ -.

$*o$ -. The only PIE word for which a prefix  $o$ - has been assumed is the word for 'branch', Gr.  $\acute{\omicron}\zeta\omicron\varsigma$ , Arm.  $ost$ , Goth.  $asts$ , which would be  $*o-sd-o$ -, with the root of 'to sit'. This idea must be given up. Direct reconstruction leads to  $*Hosdo$ -. There is nothing that indicates that

further analysis in a prefix + *sed-* is correct. Semantically 'a thing (for birds) to sit on' is as doubtful as 'the thing that sits on (a tree)'. It is not really obvious that a branch is denoted as a sitting place for birds; this is not exactly typical of a branch. \**nisdos* is quite different. A 'nest' is typically 'the place on which birds sit'. The word therefore proves nothing for 'branch'. The proponents of the theory should at least produce one semantic parallel from other languages. To denote a branch as 'sitting on' is not obvious either, while 'growing out' or the like is (cf. *sprout* etc.). Also the combination of *o-*, if it means 'towards' (see below), with 'to sit' seems a contradiction. The etymology is a relic of early etymological attempts that should now be given up. – In the separate languages, several Greek words were considered to contain a prefix *o-*. Beside *ó-copulativum* (from \**ση-*; but see Ruijgh, *Mnemosyne* 4, 1961, 200 f.: analogical from *όμ-*) there would be a prefix meaning 'nahe bei, an, zu, mit' in (*ó*)*κέλλω*, *ότρύνω*, *όσχος*, *όαρ*, *όψον*. All these words are highly dubious and no conclusion can be based on them.<sup>1)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> The best instance seems *όκέλλω* beside which we find *κέλλω*. The word is always connected with *έλομαι*. This is certainly wrong. The first verb means 'run (a ship) aground', the second 'urge, exhort, command' (see LSJ). It is clear that the two notions are quite different and have nothing to do with each other. The two have been connected under the meaning 'to drive' (Germ. 'treiben'). Thus, even LSJ give as first meaning of *κέλλω* 'to drive', but then goes on to specialize that it *always* means (trans. and intr.) 'run (a ship) aground, on shore, to land, (cause to land), put (seamen) to shore, into harbour'. Thus 'to drive' is pure phantasy, for the sake of the etymology. (In fact you don't have to drive a ship to the shore, you rather have to diminish the speed, so as not to wreck the ship.) The forms of the two verbs have nothing in common either: we find (*ó*)*κέλλω* (very rare), *κέλσω* (*κελῶ*), *έλσαι* and *όκειλαι* against *έλομαι* (*κέκτομαι*), *κελήσονται*, aor. (*έ*)*κέκλετο*, *έκελήσατο*. It is clear that the link between the two verbs was made, long ago, from a desire to connect two roots *kel-*. The etymology should be given up.

Thus we are left with (*ó*)*κέλλω* 'to run a ship aground'. The form with initial vowel is found in poetry, while prose (Hdt., Attic) has the form without. This may point to a dialectal difference. (I do not think that the vowel was removed in artificial epic language.)

The word has no etymology. It is a typical technical, nautical term, for which Indo-European ancestry is not very probable. Further Indo-European words do not show an interchange between forms with and without 'prothetic vowel' (see Beekes 1969, 72 f. and 75 f.; as to *άεσα* and *άστν*, they are not cognate, see Beekes 1988, 24). I therefore suggest that the term is of non-Indo-European origin. A well-known loanword in this field is the verb *κυβερνάω*. Substratum words do show forms with and without initial vowel; cf. *όσταφίς* : *σταφίς*. See Furnée 1972, 375 f.; such a vowel is more often *o-* than *e-* or *a-*. (I think that *όλόπτω* : *λέπω* belongs here, too; see Beekes 1971).

Outside Greek only Arm. *yogn* 'much' is mentioned. The analysis is improbable.<sup>2)</sup>

Melchert (Stud. in Hitt. Hist. Phon. 1984, 168 and KZ 101 (1988) 223 n.6, 224 with n.7) finds a prefix *o-* (i.e. *h<sub>2</sub>o-* or *h<sub>3</sub>o-*) in Hitt. *hamank-* 'intertwine, wrap around' (cf. Germ. *mengen*), *hatk-* 'close' (\**teg-* 'cover'; after Sturtevant) and *halk-* 'gather, collect' (\**leg-* 'gather'). This is quite hypothetical; nothing suggests such an analysis. As there is no solid evidence for a prefix *o-* in the other Indo-European languages, the analysis should be given up.

Thus, no reliable evidence for a prefix *o-*, either in PIE or in the later languages, remains.

\**ā-*. There is no specific evidence for *ā-*, but OHG *uo-*, Slav. *ja-* and Skt. *ā* can go back to *ā*. See below on these forms.

\**ē-* is found in OHG *â-*, OE *æ-* (Angl. *ē-*), OFr. *ē-*. See Lloyd-Springer s.v. *â-* and Lloyd 1978. It means 'von ... weg, fort; fehlend, verkehrt'.

For Greek one cites *ἡβαιός* (unreliable; see Frisk and Chantr.) and *ἡρέμα*.<sup>3)</sup> – Lat. *hērēs* does not contain a prefix.<sup>4)</sup>

For Slavic a few forms with *ja-* are cited, of unclear meaning; see Vasmer s.v. It is assumed to continue *ē-*, *ō-* or *ā-*, but the Old Church Slavic forms without *j-* seem to forbid *ē-*.

Sanskrit *ā* can continue these three forms. (Of course, *ā* is not a prefix, but it is mentioned because it is often etymologically connected with the supposed prefix(es) *ē-* and *ō-*.

Thus, the best instance of an IE prefix *o-* disappears. (In the original language the *o-* may have been a prefix, or a laryngeal, but we cannot know.)

<sup>2)</sup> *yogn* will contain (the preposition) *o-*. The idea that *-ogn* contained a prefix *o-* depends on the comparison with Skt. *āhanás-* 'schwellend, strotzend, geil, üppig'. This word has no certain cognates in Indo-Iranian (EWAia). As further cognates have been suggested Lith. *ganà* 'sufficient' and Gr. *εὐθενέω*. As to the meaning the connection is possible but not evident. However, *āhanás-* must be a compound with *ā*, while Armenian has short *o-*. There is no indication that *ā* has a cognate with a short vowel. Moreover, *yogn* is an *n*-stem, so the root will rather be *-(o)g-*, while the root of the Sanskrit word is *han-*. In that case the words cannot be cognate. EWAia does not mention the Armenian word any more.

<sup>3)</sup> *ἡρέμα* is quite obscure; see Beekes 1969, 163 and 262 (with two possible etymologies, between which I cannot decide). The word must have had *Hr-*. There is no evidence for a prefix.

<sup>4)</sup> I agree with Dunkel 1987 that *hērēs* and *χηρωσταί* derive from \**ǵheh<sub>1</sub>ro-h<sub>1</sub>ed-*. The Latin *ē* must then be analogical after forms where *-h<sub>1</sub>ed-* followed a consonant; the long vowel must have originated in the nominative.

$\bar{o}$ - is found in OHG *uo*-, OE  $\bar{o}$ - ‘down (away from); after, late; added, supplementary’ (Lloyd 1978, 249).

For Greek  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ,  $\acute{\omega}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\acute{\omega}\chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  are given, but these are all unreliable.<sup>5)</sup> Not here  $\chi\eta\rho\omega\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ ; see n. 4.

Slav. *ja*- and Skt.  $\acute{a}$  could be  $\bar{o}$ .<sup>6)</sup>

Thus only  $\bar{e}$ - and  $\bar{o}$ - or  $\bar{a}$ - can be considered.<sup>7)</sup>

We now return to  $\acute{\eta}\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ . *o*- and  $\bar{o}$ - are not relevant. As there was no *a*-, *e*-, only  $\bar{e}$ - and  $\bar{a}$ - would remain. Here the meaning of the West-Germanic form does not fit. Slav. *ja*-, found with the word for ‘widow’ in Bulg. *javdovica*, is unclear. For Greek no reliable evidence remains. So I conclude that it is very unlikely that  $\acute{\eta}\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  contains a prefix ( $\eta$ -).

If the  $\eta$ - was not a separate element, it formed part of the root.

<sup>5)</sup>  $\acute{\Omega}\kappa\epsilon\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  is clearly non-Indo-European, cf.  $\acute{\Omega}\gamma\acute{\eta}\nu$ ,  $\acute{\Omega}\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ .  $\acute{\omega}\chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  has no etymology (that with Skt. *vy-ā-ghra*- ‘tiger’ should be remembered as a curiosity only).  $\acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ‘cry’ (of wild animals) compares with Skt. *raṭi*, *ruvāti* ‘to roar, bellow’, OCS *rovō*, *ruṭi*. That it is cognate with  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  is, of course, quite uncertain. As PIE had no initial *r*-, it must have a root  $*HreuH$ -. Chantraine suggests a prefix *Ho*- before *HreuH*-, but the supposed meaning of *o*- (‘towards’) does not fit here. So rather  $*h_3reuH$ - with expressive lengthening (Frisk). Thus, there is no Greek evidence for a prefix  $\omega$ - (thus Chantraine s.v.  $\acute{\omega}\chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ).

<sup>6)</sup> Schindler 1969, 160ff. reconstructs  $*\bar{o}-h_2ui-o$ - for ‘egg’, as a compound with  $*\bar{o}$ , meaning ‘das beim Vogel Befindliche’. The interpretation is hardly acceptable. The meaning is quite unconvincing. (I am not sure that  $*h_2\bar{o}uiom$  would not do. Sievers’ law does not seem too serious a problem. Full grade  $*h_2eu$ - for ‘bird’, which Schindler does not accept, is unavoidable for Latin and for Arm. *haw*, *o*-grade because of Gr.  $\omicron\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ , which is undoubtedly cognate with the bird-word (it cannot be derived from  $*\omega\acute{\iota}\gamma$ -, as then the word for ‘egg’ would also have  $\omicron\acute{\iota}$ -).

<sup>7)</sup> To summarize the results for PIE, we find no evidence for a short vowel. We have:

$\bar{e}$ - in WGm.  $*\bar{e}$ - ‘von weg, fort; fehlend, verkehrt’;

possible in Skt.  $\acute{a}$  ‘towards’ etc.

$\bar{o}$ - in WGm.  $*\bar{o}$ - ‘down (away from); after, late; added, supplementary’;

possible in Slav. *ja*- (meaning uncertain; a.o. annähernd?);

possible in Skt.  $\acute{a}$  (see above);

$\bar{a}$ - possible in WGm.  $*\bar{o}$ -, Slav. *ja*-, Skt.  $\acute{a}$  (see above).

It is easy to connect the first two as  $*h_1eh_1/h_1oh_1$ ; thus Pok. 280, who takes them as instrumentals of the pronominal stem  $*h_1e$ -. But there are objections. 1) This stem  $h_1e$ - has no variant  $h_1o$ -; nor is it clear why two variants would be in use. 2) An instrumental does not easily explain the meanings (one expects it to mean ‘in that way, thus’ like Greek  $\tau\acute{\omega}$ ). 3)  $\bar{e}$ - and  $\bar{o}$ - in West-Germanic do not seem to have had the same meaning. Skt.  $\acute{a}$ , of course, is an independent word, not a prefix, so that it is very improbable that this form or one of these forms was a prefix in PIE.

This leads to the idea that it was a lengthened prothesis. This is not a new idea. It was first given by Froehde (1884, 328), who thought it was *a-*, lengthened for unknown reasons. De Saussure 1884, 740, assumed prothetic *é-*. However, he thought that the length was due to a rhythmical law of Greek (every sequence of three non-final short syllables becoming long – short – short). This, as we now know, is not correct. Maybe it was for this reason that his explanation was not accepted. Boisacq s.v. n.1 had the same idea, perhaps independently. The third was Čop 1956, 228, who assumed a prothetic *á-*, “vor  $\mu$  ganz natürlich.”

As this solution has been found many times now, while it is not even mentioned by Chantraine, it should receive due attention. Although on the one hand prothesis was freely adopted, on the other hand it was not taken seriously, perhaps for this very reason. We now know that the Greek prothetic vowels continue initial laryngeals, and a form *\*h<sub>1</sub>uidheuos* > *\*εFιδεFος* is not problematical. Frisk accepted this solution: “ $\eta$ - erklärt sich unschwer als metrische (rhythmische?) Dehnung eines prothetischen *é-*.” The form with three initial short vowels could not enter the hexameter, so that one vowel, preferably the first, had to be artificially lengthened. The word is predominantly poetic, and can therefore be an artificial form taken from archaic poetry. This means, of course, that the form was no longer alive and represents a precious archaism. Metrical lengthening of *ε*, *ο* we have in the case of *ώλεσικάρπος*. In our case we have the complication that *\*ευθεος* would give an unparallelled sequence. So metrical lengthening is necessary for the hexameter, and nothing stands in the way of this explanation. A rhythmical lengthening, if this means a real fact of the language as in the comparatives in *-ωτερος*, is to my mind without parallel and should not be assumed. – On the meaning of the word see section 3.

Thus we should reconstruct the word for ‘widow’ as *\*h<sub>1</sub>uidhewā* (or rather *-eh<sub>2</sub>-*). It remains possible, however, that the prothetic vowel was *á-*. In that case we have *h<sub>2</sub>-*.

3. For a long time it was supposed that the word for ‘widow’ was derived from an adjective ‘bereft of, deprived of, without’. This adjective seemed to be found in Skt. *vidhú-* and Lat. *viduus*.

This situation has changed. Mayrhofer 1968 has shown that the Sanskrit word, occurring once in the Rígvēda, designates the moon. It could still be ‘the lonely one’, but there is nothing to prove that. Mayrhofer prefers ‘einteiler’, from *\*vi-dh-u-* (i.e. *\*vi-dhh<sub>1</sub>-u-*).

Thus, this word disappears.<sup>8)</sup> However, we shall see that this is not a problem. On the contrary, the existence of an *u*-stem would be surprising; see section 8 a.

As for Latin, it has been argued that *viduus* was derived from *vidua*. It appears first in poetical language and only in post-Augustan times in prose. Though the evidence may not be absolutely certain, the adjective is unreliable. (That *viduus* ‘widower’ is late and derived from the feminine is, of course, a different matter. It seems that one does not always clearly distinguish between the adjective and the masculine substantive.)

Thus, it would seem that there is no reliable evidence for the supposed adjective. However, we must now consider *ἡίδεος*. Here we come to Chantraine’s objection that it is difficult to derive the word for ‘young man’ from the one for ‘widow’. Hermann (1918) suggested that it could first have come to mean ‘Jungfrau’, but I fail to see how this could have happened. It is much easier to assume that an adjective ‘verwitwet, alone’ was derived from the word for ‘widow’ and that the masculine of the adjective came to indicate the ‘lonely’ boy. But, as the young man about to marry is not ‘verwitwet, verwaist’ (and as there is in Greek no trace of the adjective, while in Latin it exists), I would rather suppose that *ἡίδεος* directly continues the adjective of which the feminine was used for ‘widow’. The adjective might have lost its negative meaning and have indicated simply ‘ledig’ (which is used in German to indicate the young man who has not yet married). But it must be admitted that this remains uncertain. In any case it is possible to explain (the meaning of) the Greek word.

Even if there is no direct evidence for the adjective, it remains probable, I dare say certain, that ‘widow’ was derived from an adjective, for four reasons.

a) The Sanskrit and Avestan words are mostly used as adjectives. In Avestan it occurs only once, in *vaδu vidava* F 2 f., which translates into German as ‘Wittfrau’. The Sanskrit word is often found with *strī-*, *yoṣit-*, *nārī-*. This situation is exactly parallel with Gr. *χήρη*, where the adjective from which it was derived still exists.<sup>9)</sup>

<sup>8)</sup> Skt. *vidhura-* (ep. class.) means ‘distressed, depressed’ and is a younger form of *vithurá-*, and is not related (KEWA and Mayrhofer 1968).

<sup>9)</sup> Chantraine s. v. notes that it occurs twice with *γυνή*, once with *μήτηρ*, and three times alone. In fact the situation is as follows. In B 289 it is an adjective of *γυνή*, but in Z 432 it is a predicate, but looks rather like an adjective (cf. *ὀρφανικός*) than as a substantive: *μη παῖδ’ ὀρφανικὸν θήης χήρην τε γυναῖκα*. In X 499 it is an adjective with *μήτηρ*. Z 408 has *ἡ τάχα χήρη | σεῦ ἔσομαι*. Here “I, who

b) It is hardly possible to imagine a substantive from which 'widow' would have been derived. It cannot have been derived from a word for 'widower', for, it is generally acknowledged that 'widow' was primary, 'widower' secondary. We can see that for 'widower' different formations were coined in the separate languages, and we know that the position of a 'widow' was very difficult in ancient societies. As E. Fraenkel (1935, 50) put it, "der Witwer aber ist erst eine Erfindung eines jüngeren Zeitalters."

c) Then there are several parallels to show that a word for 'widow' is often an original adjective. First, there is Greek *χήρη* (Hom.). This case is again interesting in that the adjective *χήρος* is attested only later (Euripides), though to my mind Hom. *χήρῳ* already points to *χήρος*. But Chantraine correctly points out that the substantive is the feminine of "un ancien adj. \**ghē-ro-*" (i.e. \**gheh<sub>1</sub>ro-*, root *gheh<sub>1</sub>-* 'verlassen', on which see Ruijgh-Van Krimpen 1969). Schrader-Nehring gives Lith. *šėirė*, which is cognate with OCS *sirъ* 'left alone'; OE *lāf* idem; OIc. *ekkja* < \**aina-k-*.

d) The formal analysis of \**uidheuā*, or Skt. *vidhāvā*, leads to an adjective. An *ā*-stem that indicates a female/woman cannot have been derived from an *o*-stem substantive (nor from a consonant-stem, in which case we get an abstract noun), but only from an *o*-stem adjective (AiGr II 2 § 139-141, 149; Risch 1974, 15 f.; Meillet 1950, 116). Thus \**h<sub>1</sub>uidheuā* (-*eh<sub>2</sub>-*) is the feminine of an adjective \**h<sub>1</sub>uidhenos*. Now the full grade -*eu-* points to an older *u*-stem. (This is confirmed by the Celtic forms, discussed in the next section.) So the original adjective was \**h<sub>1</sub>uidhu-/eu-*, which will have had a meaning like *χήρος* and Lat. *viduus*, i.e. 'deprived of, bereft of, without'.

4. It is mostly suggested that all forms derive from \*(*h<sub>1</sub>*)*uidheuā* (e.g. Pokorny, Lehmann). This is incorrect. EM and Chantrains state that the Germanic and Celtic forms go back to \**h<sub>1</sub>uidhuā* (henceforth I add the laryngeal). This is correct for Celtic but not for Germanic. The Latin form could go back to both -*eu-* and -*u-*.

---

will soon be the widow of you" (and not of somebody else) is ridiculous. It clearly means 'who will be bereft of you' (everybody else would be tolerable). In X 484 and Ω 725 (καδ'...) λείπεις χήρην ἐν μεγάροισι the adjectival meaning seems clearly present: not 'you leave me as a widow in the palace', but 'you leave me alone/bereft'. Thus, in all instances the adjectival origin of the word seems clear.



This is not correct either. In this section we shall consider Latin and Celtic, the Germanic forms are discussed later (section 6).

As to Lat. *vidua*, *viduus* (I shall use the latter form here), it is correct that *-uus* can go back to both *-euos* and *-uos*. However, single *-u-* is impossible as *-dhu-* resulted in *-b-*. Thus Sommer 1914, 65, 224 and Sommer-Pfister 1977, 170. Leumann (1977, 167 f.) does not mention the development. The (only) example given is *lumbus* ‘loin’ < *\*londhuos*, OHG *lentī* < *\*londh(u)iō*, OCS *lędvъje*, an etymology accepted by WH and EM. Goto 1985, 84 ff. discusses this group. (His connection with ‘land’ and other words is far fetched and quite uncertain, however.)

There is another example, not mentioned in this context (but see Sommer-Pfister 139 n.3), i.e. *plēbēs* < *\*pleh<sub>1</sub>dhueh<sub>1</sub>s*, cf. Gr. *πληθὺς*. Here EM hesitate and consider a loanword. But the etymology cannot reasonably be doubted. The meanings ‘a/the mass of people’ are identical, which is not trivial. The first four phonemes are identical (*\*pleh<sub>1</sub>-*), both words have a stem in a laryngeal (and a nominative in *-s*). The only difference is full : zero grade (*h<sub>1</sub> : eh<sub>1</sub>*) in the suffix, which is not problematical, and *b : dhu*. As there is at least one Latin word showing *dhū > b* (and no counterevidence), the etymology is impeccable.<sup>10</sup>) Thus Lat. *viduus* seems to continue *-eu-*. See however note 11 for a different solution.

The Celtic forms, however, require *\*h<sub>1</sub>uidhuā*. This is the form reconstructed by all Celtic handbooks, Pedersen 1909, 63, 360; Lewis-Pedersen 1937, 4, 12; Thurneysen 1946, 46. Cornish *-eu* is a later development. The group [*ðβ*] derives from a sequence *-dɰ-*. Irish had syncope, but syncope of the *-e-* (of *\*h<sub>1</sub>uidheuā*) cannot be invoked, as the syncope dates from after the apocope (Thurneysen

<sup>10</sup>) One might wonder why *dhū* did not, like *dū*, become *u* (as in *suānis*), because *dh* mostly became *d*. There is a parallel for the different development in that *dī* became *ī* (*peior* < *\*pediōs*) while *dhī* became *di* (*medius*). Apparently *dh* had not merged with *d*, and the intervening aspiration prevented the assimilation. Later *dh* became *d*, and there were new clusters *dī*, *dū*. These did not develop like the earlier clusters. Now *dū* became *b*, but *dī* did not have a parallel development, as there is no sound parallel to *b*. Later *dī* became *di* (and *tū* became *tu*; note that *tū* did not become *p* at stage 5). (Initial *dū-* retained its stop character and became *b-*). Thus:

PIE	1.	<i>dī</i>	<i>dū</i>	<i>dhī</i>	<i>dhū</i>	<i>ndū</i>	<i>ndhū</i>	<i>tū</i>
PIt.	2.	<i>ī</i>	<i>ū</i>					
	3.			<i>dī</i>	<i>dū</i>		<i>ndū</i>	
	4.				<i>b</i>	<i>mb?</i>	<i>mb</i>	
	5.			<i>di</i>				<i>tu</i>

(I know no example of original *ndū*).

1946, 68), through which the word would have become disyllabic, and syncope is not found in disyllabic forms. Thurneysen 68 considers the possibility of a very early syncope especially for *fedb*, but the evidence adduced is unconvincing: *céol* 'music' would derive from \**kiwolo-*, but there is no support for this reconstruction (thus Vendryes s. v.). Further Thurneysen mentions three verbal forms, but the history of these forms is very complicated and not reliable enough to establish a sound law for which there is no further evidence. Moreover, Kortlandt (1986, 90) pointed out that intervocalic *u* in unstressed syllables would have disappeared. In British syncope is found of a non-initial short vowel preceding the stress (Lewis-Pedersen 1937, 76 f.). As the stress was on the penultimate, \**h<sub>1</sub>uidhewā* cannot have lost its middle vowel. So both Irish and British require \**h<sub>1</sub>uidhuā*. (The fact that Pokorny, as a Celticist, does not mention this, may have been the reason why many handbooks do not state it.)

5. Thus we arrive through reconstruction at two forms. \**h<sub>1</sub>uidh-euā* and \**h<sub>1</sub>uidhuā*. The question must now be answered how the co-existence of the two forms can be explained. It is impossible that one of the two forms was the PIE form, as it would be inconceivable that it was replaced by the other in one or more languages.

We saw that the word for 'widow' is the feminine of an adjective. This adjective now seems to have had two forms, one in *-uos* and one in *-euos*. As ablaut in *o*-stems is excluded, the ablaut points to an original *u*-stem. That different ablaut forms were converted into *o*-stem adjectives is known from other adjectives, even within a single language. In Greek we have *κενός, κεινός* < \**kenwos* beside *κενέος* < \**kenewos*. We have Gr. *ταναός* < \**tnh<sub>2</sub>-eu-os*. OIr. *tanae* < \**tnh<sub>2</sub>-eu-ios* beside Lith. *tėvas* < \**tev<sub>h</sub><sub>2</sub>-u-os*.

Thus, we arrive at the conclusion that PIE had an adjective \**h<sub>1</sub>uidh-eu-/ -u-* meaning 'bereft, deprived of, without', the feminine of which was used to indicate the 'widow'. The question arises whether we can find what this feminine looked like. We must therefore look at the Germanic forms now.

6. We shall first have a look at Goth. *widurwo*. This form cannot go back to \**h<sub>1</sub>uidhuā*, as the group *-Cw-* remains, even in Sievers' condition: *gatwo, weitwops, waurstwa, ūhtwo, nidwa, bandwa, -o, fjabpwa, bidagwa, ahwo, arhwo, taihswa, manwus, sparwa* etc. It is apparently for this reason, and because other languages point to *-eu-*, that all handbooks give the form in *-ewā* as the protoform of the Germanic words (e.g. Prokosch 1938, 91, Lehmann s. v.).

It is strange that, as far as I have seen, no handbook remarks that this protoform is problematical. As all handbooks state, *-e-* in internal syllable was retained or became *-i-* in the Germanic languages. As for Gothic, Krause (1968, 90) mentions, that *a* in a second syllable before a strongly stressed third syllable may become *u* before *mm* in a compound: dat. sg. *ainummehun* beside *ainamma*. This concerns *a*, not *e*, and in very special circumstances; it cannot explain *widurwo*. I looked through all Gothic words given by Lehmann 430-454, but there is no other word with *-urw-* (nor one with *-iw-* < *-ew-*). Yet we know what the development of *-ew-* in this position was, from the *u*-stems, which have nom. pl. *-jus* < *\*-iwiz* < *\*-eues*, and the gen. pl. *-iwe* < *\*-eu-(ei)om*. This demonstrates that *-ew-* became *-iw-* in Gothic. (Note that a development to *-urw-* would not have been embarrassing in an *u*-stem inflexion.) Thus, *widurwo* cannot derive from either *-eu-* or *-u-*.

Before discussing the other Germanic forms we shall present the solution. Van Wijk s.v. *wedurwe* gives the PGm. form as *\*widurwōn* and, as far as I saw, only Boisacq drew the right conclusion, positing PIE *\*widuṛyā*. This form with antevocalic *-urw-* can only represent PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>widhuH-*. We shall look at the consequences of this reconstruction in the next section.

We shall now have a look at the other Germanic languages. We have:

OHG *witruwa*, *-ewa*, *-awa*, *-wa*;

OS *widruwa*, *widowa*;

OLFr. *widowa*;

MDutch *wēdurwe*, *wēdewe*, *weenw-tje*;

OE: WS *wuduwe*, *wuderwe*, *weodurwe*, *widurwe*, *wyduwe*; Angl. *widwe*;

OFr. *widwe*.

The OHG forms are easily understandable if we start from *witruwa*, by weakening of *u* to *e*, assimilation to *a*, and syncope. On the other hand, if one assumes an original *\*witruwa*, a secondary vowel is improbable: it is only found between *r* or *l* and *w*, and the vowel is mostly *o* (Braune-Mitzka.1976, 61-70).

In Old Saxon *o* is a variant of *u*.

Middle Dutch has *e* as weakening of *u*, which is normal. (*i* in open syllable became *ē*.) *weenw-* shows regular loss of intervocalic *d* (*-tje* is the diminutive ending). (Modern Dutch *wēdurwe* has *u* again through influence of the *w*.)

The Old English forms for 'widow' are discussed by Brunner 1965,

114 n.6. He assumes that *i* became *u* through umlaut in common Old English, and that Angl. *widwe* lost *u* through an early syncope (i.e. before the *i* was changed to *u*). Ausgleich gave *widuwe* and *weoduwe* with normal velar umlaut. He does not mention *widewe*. There are several problems, to my mind. First, the syncope assumed is rare and late according to p. 133 f., while in our form it would have to be common Old English (before *i* > *u*). Then, the Ausgleich between forms of different dialects seems difficult, even more so as the result (*widuwe*) was subject to the change into *weoduwe*. Lastly the change into *widewe* is difficult. Campbell 1983, § 385 states that of two short unstressed vowels the first became *e* when the second vowel was a back vowel (*nabula*, *nafela*). But it is questionable whether the final vowel of 'widow' was a back vowel at the time.

Campbell 1983, § 218 does not give a full discussion of 'widow', but seems (I am not quite sure what his view is) to assume that *wi* > *wu* before *u* was not general, and that *weoduwe* derives from original *\*widuwe*. This supposes much more complicated dialectal differences. A solution along these lines seems more probable to me.

Whatever the details, it seems clear that *\*widuwe* was the original form, and this agrees with the other Germanic languages.

Thus the West-Germanic forms go back to the same form as the Gothic one, PGm. *\*widuwōn*. We remarked already that *-e-* was preserved in all Germanic languages so that it is impossible to start from *\*widewōn*.

7. Germanic points to a form *\*h<sub>1</sub>uidhuh<sub>2</sub>-* (I think that it is safe to assume that the laryngeal was the feminine marker *h<sub>2</sub>*). How is this form to be interpreted? The form is evidently based on the adjective in *-u/-eu-* from which the adjectives in *-uos/-euos* were derived. It seems obvious to interpret the (PGm.) form *\*h<sub>1</sub>uidhuh<sub>2</sub>-* also as an adjective, just as *\*h<sub>1</sub>uidheuā*. This means that *\*h<sub>1</sub>uidhuh<sub>2</sub>-* was the feminine of *\*h<sub>1</sub>uidhu-*.<sup>11</sup>) No doubt the form had ablaut *-h<sub>2</sub>-/-eh<sub>2</sub>-*.

<sup>11</sup>) In this connection we might consider the possibility that Celtic *\*h<sub>1</sub>uidhuā* is not the feminine of a form in *-os* but of an *u*-stem. The same may hold for Latin, where *\*h<sub>1</sub>uidhu<sub>2</sub>* > *\*vidū* may have been replaced by *vidua* (cf. analogical *quia* beside regular *quī*). Thus Italo-Celtic and Germanic would continue a form in *-uh<sub>2</sub>*. (Cf. EM "il est naturel de supposer qu'il [the vocalism] est le même qu'en germanique et en celtique.") - The question whether *uā* belongs to an *u*-adjective or a *uo*-adjective is perhaps not a real one, because the feminine (in *-ā*) is not, originally, derived from the *o*-stem, but combined with it (*-ā* is neither the *o*-stem *-o* + *h<sub>2</sub>*, nor *-e* + *h<sub>2</sub>*, as the *o*-stems did not have a stem in *-e*; see

The feminine of *u*-stems normally has the form *-uih<sub>2</sub>*. The forms in *-us* are doubtful. The Sanskrit forms in *-ūs* were probably formed after the substantives. Since J. Schmidt 1889, 57 ff., however, feminines in *-uh<sub>2</sub>* have been claimed. The forms for which such a feminine has been claimed are Gr. *πρέσβα*, *αἰπήν* (ntr. pl. *αἰπά*), *πολλή* (ntr. pl. *πολλά*). (I leave other forms, like *ἔερσα*, *ἑάων*, out of account as being too uncertain). I still consider *πρέσβα* as acceptable (but note that Furnée 1972, 301 and 389, claims that the word is non-Indo-European on account of its variant stems), just as *αἰπή* (for *\*αἰπά* < *\*αιπφα* < *\*-p-uh<sub>2</sub>*). I have nothing to add to my discussion 1969, 156, 158 ff. (I still consider it more probable that *πότνα* was coined on *πρέσβα* than *vice versa*. That *πότνα* continues *\*potni* seems to me out of the question: this form would simply have been replaced by *πότνια*, not by an entirely aberrant form.)

As to *πολλή*, it is clear that *πολύς* continues an archaic PIE inflexion which differed from the normal proterodynamic pattern of *u*-stem adjectives.<sup>12)</sup> As to the form *πολλ-*, I agree with J. Schmidt that it results from *\*pol-u-h<sub>2</sub>*. Szemerényi 1974 rightly stresses the importance of the neuter plural *πολλά*. A survey of the Homeric forms may be useful.

	<i>πολύς</i>	<i>πολλός</i>	<i>πουλύς</i>	ntr. <i>πολύ</i>	<i>πολλόν</i>	<i>πουλύ</i>	<i>πολλή</i>
	<i>πολύν</i>	<i>πολλόν</i>	<i>πουλύν</i>	<i>πολύ</i>	<i>πολλόν</i>	<i>πουλύ</i>	<i>πολλήν</i> , <i>πουλύν</i>
	<i>πολέος</i>			<i>πολέος</i>			<i>πολλῆς</i>
		<i>πολλῶ</i>			<i>πολλῶ</i>		<i>πολλῇ</i>
pl.	<i>πολέες</i>	<i>πολλοί</i>			<i>πολλά</i>		<i>πολλαί</i>
	<i>πολέας</i>	<i>πολλούς</i>			<i>πολλά</i>		<i>πολλάς</i>
	<i>πολέων</i>	<i>πολλῶν</i>			<i>πολλῶν</i>		<i>πολλάων</i> , <i>-έων</i>
	<i>πολέσι</i>	<i>πολλοῖσι</i>			<i>πολλοῖσι</i>		<i>πολλῇσι</i>
	<i>πολέσσι</i>						
	<i>πολέεσσι</i>						

Beekes 1985, 184 ff.; cf. Rix 1976, 136. Perhaps we are approaching here the origin of the adjectival system *-os*, *-(e)h<sub>2</sub>*. I. e.

nom.	<i>-u(s)</i>	fem. <i>-u(e)h<sub>2</sub></i>
gen./erg.	<i>-u-os</i>	
was replaced by		
nom.	<i>u-os</i>	fem. <i>-u(e)h<sub>2</sub></i> .

That is, the feminine remained as it was, while masc. *-u(s)* was replaced by *-uos*.

<sup>12)</sup> The Greek *-o-* of the root, as well as the Germanic and Celtic *-e-*, must be old. This brings me to the assumption that the inflexion was of the static type, with *-o-* in the nom. sg. and *-e-* elsewhere (cf. my earlier explanation 1985, 98). As another static adjective I suggested *\*nog<sup>w</sup>/neg<sup>w</sup>-*; 1990, 239. From this system the *-o-* and the *-e-* can be easily explained. I assume the Sanskrit zero grade to be an adaptation to the normal proterodynamic pattern. Cf. *\*dōm(s)*, gen. *dem-s*, replaced by Av. *nətmō* < *\*dmas*.

Szemerényi's explanation of the form is untenable, but  $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda'$  is easily explained from (a static form)  $*pol(H)-u-h_2$  (the laryngeal was lost when in antevocalic position). For the development of  $ly > ll$  see H. van den Oever's dissertation (in prep.). The neuter plural and the feminine originally had the same form. I see no objection in the reshaping of the feminine form in  $-a$  into a normal  $\bar{a}$ -stem.

It must be admitted that the evidence found hitherto was "very poor" (Kuiper 1942, 17). I think that 'widow', the 'bereft-fem.',  $*h_1uidhuh_2-$  is unassailable.

The form most probably had ablaut  $-h_2/-eh_2-$ . This ablaut occurs in both protero- and hysterodynamic inflexion. (There were adjectives with hysterodynamic inflexion, Skt. *mádhus*, gen. *mádhvas*; Skt. gen. *mahás*.) As the hysterodynamic forms in Sanskrit are found in the substantives (*śvaśrūḥ*), it is perhaps more probable that the adjective was proterodynamic, as were the feminines in  $-ih_2$ .

We still have to explain the coexistence of  $*h_1uidhuh_2$  and  $*h_1uidheuā$ . I think that PIE only had the  $u$ -stem adjective with the feminine in  $-uh_2$ . In the western languages the latter form was preserved. Other languages replaced the adjective by  $*h_1uidheuos$  and then replaced the feminine by  $*h_1uidheuā$ , which was used to indicate the 'widow'. This is not surprising as Greek replaced the adjective by  $\chi\eta\rho\omicron\varsigma$  and used its feminine for 'widow'. I consider this a direct continuation of the PIE situation.

#### 8. What remains of further relations of this word?

a) We have seen that Skt. *vidhú-* and *vidhura-* are not cognate. We have seen that the Sanskrit word for 'widow' was derived from an adjective in  $-euos$ ; it would therefore be surprising if the same language still had the  $u$ -stem form of the adjective. Thus, the fact that *vidhú-* does not belong here fits better with the interpretation of the forms concerned.

Skt. *vidhyati* 'to pierce' was also usually connected with it, but the meaning shows that it has nothing to do with our word. Thus Mayrhofer 1968, 103 n.3.

b) It has for a long time been assumed that Skt. *vindháte* 'leer sein' contained the root seen in 'widow'. However, it is now generally accepted that Skt. *vidh-* rests on an Indian development of *vi dhā-* (lastly Hoffmann 1969). The word appears to mean 'to distribute'. It has therefore nothing to do with the word for 'widow' (see Mayrhofer 1968).

c) Lat. *dīvidō* has long been connected with 'widow'. Thus EM state s.v. *viduus* that it is "sans doute" cognate, though s.v. *dīvidō* this is "possible". It seems useful to have a closer look at the verb. It contains \**dis-*. It is important to know whether Umbr. *vetu*, *vef* are cognate as they could continue a root form \**ueidh-*. The first form is discussed by Meiser 1986, 180 ff.: its interpretation is quite unclear, a meaning 'separate' is improbable. The interpretation of *vef* as 'partes' is possible but uncertain (Ernout 1961, 135). So only *dīvidō* remains. We must ask what the exact meaning of *dīvidō* is. Usually it is glossed as 'to separate' and 'to distribute'. I find no discussion of the relation between these two aspects. It seems to me that it has exactly the meaning of Dutch *verdelen* (Germ. *verteilen*). This means literally 'make (something) into parts (*delen*)'. From this basis it can mean 'to separate' and, if the parts are meant as shares for people, 'to distribute'. (Eng. *divide* also has both meanings, but is of course the heir of the Latin verb.) Now the question is whether a root with this basic meaning is cognate with 'widow'. I think that this is impossible. A widow was not made into parts. Here one uncritically started from the meaning 'to separate', but this is not the central meaning of the Latin verb. Also, the widow was not separated from her husband; this would indicate a divorce. Then, it seems to me that the basic meaning of the verb is exactly what one would expect if it arose from \**vi dheh<sub>1</sub>-* 'to place apart'. The old idea that it arose from this syntagm, therefore, seems very attractive (Prellwitz 1892, 113). As has been pointed out (now Mayrhofer 1968, 103 n. 4), it would have developed independently from the Indo-Aryan verb. If this is correct, it means that the syntagm \**vi dheh<sub>1</sub>-* is of PIE date. (Melchert, *Studies in Hitt. Hist. Morph.* 1984, 157 f., thinks that Hitt. *widā(i)-* 'to bring' was derived from a noun \**ui-dhh<sub>1</sub>-eh<sub>2</sub>-*, which is quite uncertain. On Luwian cf. Watkins, *Sprache* 32 (1986) 325 f.)

d) Thus, no cognates of the word for 'widow' remain. This is unproblematical, of course. Mayrhofer (1968, 105) suggests that the word contains the adverb \**vi-*. This seems improbable to me because then only *-dh-* remains for the root. A root \**dhH-*, the zero grade of a verbal root, is improbable, as PIE probably did not yet have verbal compounds, and as the meaning (at least if the root was one of the roots *dhH-* we know) is incompatible with 'widow'.

e) One might try Myc. *ewisu-*. Mycenaean has *wisowopana* and *ewisuzoko*, *ewisu*\*79ko. The first word probably contains *wiswo-*, Gr. *ῥωος*, but all other elements are obscure. It has been assumed (lastly Ruijgh 1987) that *ewisu-* contains the same root as *wiswo-*.

This is improbable. Of course, the underived form in *-u* may live on in a language, but then only in archaic or fossilized forms, as in *Στενύ-κληρος* beside *σεν(φ)ός*. (Both Mycenaean forms are found in Pylos.) But the presence versus absence of *ε-* forbids the equation. Hom. *ἔιση* is an artificial form of the epic language, for a number of reasons (Beekes 1969, 65 f. and esp. 289). We now have a root *\*εφιθ-* in Greek as a candidate for the Mycenaean word, but I have no suggestion for the interpretation. It would be surprising, however, if Greek had preserved the *u*-stem beside the *o*-stem *ἥθεος*.

Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden  
Vakgroep Vergelijkende Taalwetenschappen  
NL-2300 RA Leiden

Robert S. P. Beekes

### Bibliographie

Single names (Boisacq, Chantraine, Frisk etc.) and abbreviations (EM, EWAia, KEWA, WH) refer to the well-known etymological dictionaries.

- Beekes, R. S. P. (1969): The development of the PIE laryngeals in Greek. The Hague.  
 - (1971): A European substratum word. *Orbis* 20, 132-137.  
 - (1988): PIE *RHC-* in Greek and other languages. *IF* 93, 22-45.  
 - (1990): *Vergelijkende taalwetenschap*. Utrecht.  
 Braune, W. - Mitzka, W. (1967): *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*. Tübingen.  
 Campbell, A. (1983): (= 1959) *Old English Grammar*. Oxford.  
 Čop, B. (1956): Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung I. *KZ* 74, 228-232.  
 Dunkel, G. (1976): *heres, χηρωσταί*: indogermanische Richtersprache. *FS H. Hoenigswald*, 91-100.  
 Ernout, A. (1961): *Le dialecte ombrien*. Paris.  
 Fraenkel, E. (1935): Rev. of Lohmann, J. *Genus und Sexus*. *IF* 53, 49-54.  
 Froehde, F. (1884): *Griechische wort- und formerklärungen*. *BB* (Beiträge z. Kunde d. idg. Spr.) 7, 322-332.  
 Furnée, E. J. (1972): *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des vorgriechischen*. The Hague.  
 Hermann, E. (1918): Sachliches und Sprachliches zur indogermanischen Grossfamilie. *Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Gött., Ph.-hist. Kl.*, 204-232.  
 Hoffmann, K. (1969): Ved. *vidh, vindh*. *Die Sprache* 15, 1-7 (KS 238 ff.).  
 Goto, F. (1985): Altind. *rāndhra-* und uridg. *\*lendh-*. *MSS* 44, 77-92.  
 Jokl, N. J. (1923): *Linguistisch-kulturhist. Unters. aus dem Bereiche des Albanischen*. Berlin.  
 Kortlandt, F. H. H. (1986): Posttonic *\*w* in Old Irish. *Ériu* 37, 89-92.  
 Krause, W. (1968): *Handb. des Gotischen*. München.  
 Kuiper, F. B. J. (1942): Notes on Vedic Noun-Inflexion. *Med. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wet.* 5, 4, 161-256-



- Leumann, M. (1977): Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre. München.
- Lewis, H. – Pedersen, H. (1937): A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar. Göttingen.
- Lloyd, A. L. (1978): OHG *â*-, OE *æ*-: a problem that won't go away. FS H. Hoenigswald, 243–253.
- Lloyd, A. L. – Springer, O. (1988): Etym. Wörterb. des Althochdeutschen. Göttingen/Zürich.
- Mayrhofer, M. (1968): Vedic *vidhú-* 'vereinsamt' – ein indogermanischer Mythos? FS W. Brandenstein. 103–105.
- Meillet, A. (1950): Les dialectes indoeuropéennes. Paris.
- Meiser, G. (1986): Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache. Innsbruck.
- Pedersen, H. (1909): Vergl. Gramm. der keltischen Sprachen. Göttingen.
- Pott, A. F. (1883): Latein und griechisch in einigen ihrer wichtigsten lautunterschiede. KZ 26, 113–242.
- Prellwitz, W. (1892): Etym. Wörterb. der griechischen Sprache. Göttingen.
- (1931): Hervorhebende Partikeln in der indogermanischen Wortbildung. Glotta 19, 89–127.
- Prokosch, E. (1938): A Comparative Germanic Grammar. Baltimore.
- Risch, E. (1974): Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache. Berlin.
- Rix, H. (1970): Anlautender Laryngal vor Sonant im Griechischen. MSS 27, 79–111.
- (1976): Hist. Gramm. des Griechischen. Darmstadt.
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1987): A propos de *φισφο-* (*wi-so-wo-*), *έφισυ-* (*e-wi-su-*) et Hom. *έ(φ)εισάμενος*. Minos 20, 533–544.
- Ruijgh, C. J. – Krimpen, N. van (1969): L'histoire et la préhistoire de *κίχάνω*: problèmes morphologiques et sémantiques. Mnemosyne 4, 113–136.
- Saussure, F. de (1884): Une loi rythmique de la langue grecque. Mém. Ch. Gaux, 737–748.
- Schindler, J. (1969): Die indogermanischen Wörter für 'Vogel' und 'Ei'. Die Sprache 15, 144–167.
- Schrader, O. – Nehring, A. (1917–1923): Reallexikon der indogerm. Altertumskunde. Leipzig.
- Sommer, F. (1914): Handb. der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre. Heidelberg.
- Sommer, F. – Pfister, R. (1977): idem I.
- Sturtevant, E. H. (1939): Sanskrit *á* 'near' is cognate with Latin *ā* 'from'. Lg. 15, 145–154.
- Szemerényi, O. (1974): Greek *πολύς* and *πολλός*. KZ 88, 1–31.
- Thurneysen, R. (1946): A Grammar of Old Irish. Dublin.

Add. Neumann's Indo-European etymology of κυβερνάω (KZ 100, 1987, 64–9) does not convince me. He connects it with κύβις 'turning pillar' which is derived from the root  $*k^{w}erp/b-$  (Pok. 631). Note that the only evidence for the root form  $*k^{w}erb-$  is Gr. κύβις, and that Gr. καρπός 'Handwurzel' is also supposed to derive from this root, showing a quite different development of  $*k^{w}rp-$  (the connection is of course doubtful). A development  $*kurb-nā > *kurbavā/kurbivā > *kurbavā/kurbivā > *kurbavā/kurbivā > *kurbavā$  (from which the verb was derived) implies too many unusual developments to be acceptable. To these must be added  $b > m$  for Aeol. and Cypr. κυβερν- (in two dialects). On the other hand the word shows clear characteristics of a Greek substratum word ( $-m$ ,  $b/m$  and perhaps  $k/g$  because of Latin *gubernāre*; see on all these aspects E. J. Furnée, Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen, The Hague (Mouton) 1972 passim).

### Zu κυβερνάω

In dem oben auf dieser Seite abgedruckten ‚Addendum‘ von R. S. P. Beekes finde ich κυβερνάω nicht zutreffend beurteilt: a) Das ‚Steuer eines Wasserfahrzeugs‘ ist in den idg. Sprachen durchweg mit eigenen Mitteln benannt worden; da den ältesten Griechen ein Kahn (ναῦς) bekannt war, wäre nicht einzusehen, warum sie das Wort für das unentbehrliche Lenkungsmittel hätten aus einer Substratsprache entlehnen sollen. b) Der Lautwandel  $b > m$  ist in den beiden an ihm beteiligten Dialekten sporadisch und jung. c) Entsprechendes gilt für das  $g$  in lat. *gubernare*; es in die Zeit der Wortprägung hinaufzudatieren, wäre ein Anachronismus. d) Meine Deutung in KZ 100 rechnet nicht mit ‚many unusual developments‘, sondern nur mit zwei – auch sonst häufigen – Veränderungen: der Metathese des  $r$  und der Anaptyxe eines Vokals. L. Threagill, The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions I, 1990, 477 sagt: ‚When part of a cluster of three consonants,  $q$  or  $l$  may sometimes move to other position in the word‘.

G. N.