

On Indo-European 'wine'

1. The Indo-European word for 'wine' is mostly considered as a loan. The forms which are found in the separate languages are then considered as independent loans; cf. e.g. ERNOUT-MEILLET s.v. *vīnum*: "des reflets plus ou moins indépendants les uns des autres." Of course it is possible that they were independent loans, but the expression "plus ou moins" shows that the (possible) relation between these forms has not been studied.

Recently GAMKRELIDZE and IVANOV, in their monumental work (1984, 2, 647 ff.), argued that the word was Proto-Indo-European. They think that the Germanic and Slavic forms were not loans from Latin (648 n.2). They stress, however, that the fact that related but not identical forms occur in Greek, Latin and Anatolian (even if the Germanic and Slavic forms were loans) prove that the word was PIE (648 n.3). This is indeed probable, though not decisive. For independent loans would also give related but different forms. A decisive argument would be found, I think, if we could show that the different forms can be explained from PIE morphology. In any case we have the task, when we find related forms in Indo-European languages, to try and explain their relation within the Indo-European framework.

GAMKRELIDZE and IVANOV reconstruct **uoino-*, **ueino-*, **ui(o)no-*, but they do not explain the relation between these forms. I think that this reconstruction is not correct, and that a plausible interpretation has become possible now that the Anatolian forms have been explained.

2. I will not pronounce myself on the question whether the

Germanic and the Slavic forms are loans or not.

Nor will I discuss Alb. *venë*, Tosc. *verë*, which would go back to **uoin-ā*.

The Greek form seems to go back to **uoinos*. (But see below.)

Arm. *gini* can derive from **uoini̇io-* or **ueini̇io-*. As we cannot decide between them, the existence of a form **uein-* is not certain. If Armenian continues **uoin-*, the identity with Greek **uoin-* makes it probable that **uoin-* was already PIE. The Albanian form, if from **uoinā*, would confirm this.

The Italic forms are more difficult. Latin *vīnum* can go back to **uoi-*, **uei-* or **uiH-*; and the other Italic forms (Fal. *vi[no]m*, 600 BC; *vīno*, 300 BC; Umbrian *vinu*, several times in the older part of the tables; Volscan *vīno*; Lepont. *vinom*; thus according to BLÜMEL, 1972, 26) may or may not be loans from Latin. I think the possibilities can be narrowed down. If the form was **uoino-*, the other languages cannot be loans from Latin, as Lat. *-oi-* developed too late into *ī* to explain the *i* of the other languages; nor can they directly continue PIt. **uoino-*. If the Latin word goes back to **ueino-* (as is supposed by GAMKRELIDZE-IVANOV), the other languages cannot be loans either, as *-ei-* became *ī* only in the course of the second century BC (BLÜMEL l.c.); nor can they continue PIt. **ueino-*, as in Faliscan, Umbrian and Volscan *-ei-* became *ē* (BLÜMEL 33 f.). Therefore the form must have been **uiHno⁻¹*. (This possibility is kept open by GAMKRELIDZE-IVANOV, 648 n.3. They point out that in that case even Celtic and Baltic could have inherited their forms, all 'Old European' languages having **uīno-*. I shall not pronounce myself on this point. In general, however, I would hesitate to accept this.) In this case the

Italic forms can be loans from Latin. I see no way to decide this, but I think it improbable that the word was borrowed from Latin: there is no reason why this dialect alone would have had this word for 'wine'.

For Anatolian I can cite MELCHERT, 1984, 12 n.17: "Hitt. *wiyana-*, HLuv. *wi(y)ana-*, and CLuv. *winiyant-* all point to a Common Anatolian **wiyana-* (the last with syncope of *iya* to *i* (3.2.2.), the usual transfer to the *i*-stems, and addition of the common *-ant-* suffix). CANat. **wiyana-* cannot represent **woino-*, which would have yielded **wena-* (4.2.1.)." For this form **uiono-*, **uiHono-* or **ueiono-* could be considered. **ueiono-* is impossible if MELCHERT 31 ff. is correct in assuming that every intervocalic *y* was lost in Hittite. (Note that I do not distinguish \underline{y} : *u* etc.; *u* indicates the phoneme /u/.) If it is correct that Italic had a laryngeal, this confirms the reconstruction **uiHono-*. As h_2 between vowels was probably retained as *-hh-* in Hittite (OETTINGER 1979, 547 sect. 474), and as h_3 probably behaved like h_2 (BEEKES 19aa), the laryngeal will have been h_1 .

3. Thus we have **uih₁no-* and **uih₁ono-*. This requires that **uoino-* developed from **uoih₁no-*. As far as Greek is concerned, this is probably no difficulty. It has been assumed that after *-o-* a laryngeal was not vocalized (recently PETERS 1980,3,61 n.30,85,95). I am not convinced that this is correct (BEEKES 1981, 114), because I see no phonetic explanation for this development. But it seems that between \underline{i} and consonant a laryngeal was not vocalized neither in Greek, nor in other languages). Thus the Greek thematic optative seems to show that *-oih₁-C-* resulted in *-oiC-*. Thus a development **uoih₁no-* > **uoino-* in Greek seems probable. We must assume the same development for Armenian, and probably for Albanian.

4. Now assuming that the word is PIE the ablaut of the stem cannot be explained from an *o*-stem. Also, the different formations, *-os*, *-om*, *-i₂os*, *-ā*, rather point to a consonant stem. It seems clear, then, that the word was originally an *n*-stem in PIE. On this assumption, I think, we can explain the different forms. As neuter (pure) *n*-stems are uncertain for PIE (BEEKES 19bb), and as a neuter (**uē/oih₁-n*, gen. **uih₁-ēn-s*) cannot explain **uih₁n-*, the word must have been masculine or feminine, and therefore hysterodynamic (see my *Origins*, passim). Thus I reconstruct:

nom. **uēih₁-ōn*, older **uēih₁-n*
 acc. **uih₁-ēn-m*
 gen. **uih₁-n-ōs*

Italic generalized the zero grade of the root (perhaps first creating **uih₁-ēn*, **uih₁-ēn-m*), and then made an *o*-stem from **uih₁-n-*.

Anatolian introduced the *o*-vocalism of the nominative suffix into the accusative, which gave **uih₁on-*. This form may have been introduced into all oblique cases (after which the nominative may have taken over the zero grade of the root, giving **uih₁-ōn*). On these reshufflings see *Origins* 158 ff. In any case later an *o*-stem was derived from the stem **uih₁on-*, which explains Anat. **wiyana-*.

An *o*-stem of the type **uoih₁-no-* must have been made analogically. (If there is no evidence for **ueih₁-*, we might consider to start from **uoih₁-ōn* instead of **ueih₁-ōn*.)

If a form **ueih₁-n-* existed, this can be explained easily from the old nominative **ueih₁-n-*. As this form was an absolute case, it is probable that neuters were derived from it. Thus **ueih₁nom* would be perfectly understandable.

5. It may further be observed that all words for 'wine' are derivatives from the *n*-stem. Therefore the *n*-stem may have designated the plant, the 'vine', and the derivatives the 'wine'. This would make the connection with the root **uei(H)*- 'to turn, twist' easier. But that would mean that the plant was PIE but not the product, which is improbable.

6. Thus all forms can be accounted for on the basis of typical IE morphology.

This means, of course, that PIE origin of the word is very probable, also because the words in the non-IE languages can be easily derived from IE forms; cf. GAMKRELIDZE-IVANOV 648 ff.

Note:

1) MELCHERT 1984, 12 n.17 writes: "Umbrian and Faliscan *uīnu* beside Latin *vīnum* point to a Common Italic **wīnum*: see MEILLET-ERNOU, *Diet. étym. sub vīnum*." But I cannot read this in ERNOU-MEILLET.

Bibliography:

- BEEKES, R.S.P. 1981 Review of PETERS 1980. *Kratylos* 26, 106-115.
- " 1985 The Origins of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection. Innsbruck.
- " 19aa The Nature of the PIE laryngeals. VII Int. Congress for Historical Linguistics, Pavia 1985.
- " 19bb The PIE words for 'name' and 'me'. *Die Sprache*.
- BLÜMEL, W. 1972 Untersuchungen zu Lautsystem und Morphologie des vorclassischen Lateins. München.
- GAMKRELIDZE, T.V. - IVANOV, V.V. 1984 *Indoevropskij jazyk i Indoevropcy*. Tbilisi.

- MELCHERT, H. Craig 1984 Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology. Göttingen.
- OETTINGER, N. 1979 Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns. Nürnberg.
- PETERS, M. 1980 Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen. Wien.