inserito nella triade come un soggetto ben conosciuto in tutta l’area baltica, riguardante la relazione del dio del tuono con un fabbro che ha forgiato il sole (cfr. le versioni scandinave, finlandesi, estoni, bielorussie ed al.). Tuttavia, la ricostruzione della triade degli dei lituani permette proprio in questo modo di scoprire un frammento essenziale del sistema mitologico lituano antico.

*Traduzione dal russo di Cristina Casarosa*

60 E’ possibile che al terzo posto nel panteon lituano si trovasse il Sole (Saulë), dal quale partiva la linea discendente Luna - Stella - Alba ecc. Cfr. il posto di Svaistix negli elenchi prussiani o le liste lettoni del tipo Deews... Perkūnis... Saule... Svaigene... Tehus... Mescha tehws Waldgott, Semnes tehws Landgott etc. Stender (LPG, pp. 626-627). Molto curiosa è la presenza del dio del bosco dopo Perkon (Saulë, Svaigene qui sono secondari, in quanto presi dallo schema cosmologico che si reggeva totalmente sul folclore), dato che anche Mirdžany (la divinità lituana del bosco) è collocato subito dopo Divirikos-Perkun. Considerando le analogie lettoni, possiamo tentare di interpretare Zvornas, dall’aggiunta alla «Cronaca» di Giovanni Malala come la stella serale - Zverinë (cfr. Svaigene in Stender). In tal caso si può ricostruire l’inizio dell’elenco degli dei nel panteon lituano antico in questo modo: Dīo sūpremo (Dīvas), Perkins, Saulē (Mēnuo), Zverinë... Mēdeina... E’ molto curioso il fatto che nel folclore lettone si conservi in modo abbastanza completo il motivo dell’ostilità di Devs (che spesso coincide dal punto di vista funzionale con) nei confronti del Sole: v. N. Biezais. Die Gottesgestalt..., pp. 40 ss. Cfr.: BW, 34019: Tris dieninas, tris nakmens / Saulë ar Diews iemsadā; / Sāules meita pārlauzuse / Dīva dēla zobenu oppure BW, 33761: Dīeva dēls kāldināja / Sāules meitas vainada... ed al. E’ singolare che al Sole venga contrapposto proprio il dio del tuono (indipendentemente dal fatto che abbia l’aspetto di Deiws o di Perkons). Cfr. fatti analoghi: A.M. Hocart. Kings and Councillors. Cairo, 1936.
child as a new-comer that explains this semantic development may be illustrated also by a similar use of another root in Latvian tam delī (/metās) atskrēja 'a son (/daughter) has been born (literally: has run up) to him'. The meaning 'to be born = to come' unites North-Western Indo-European (Baltic and Germanic), Southern Anatolian (Luvian), some Eastern Indo-European dialects (Albanian, Greek, Iranian). It was supposed that this meaning (as also the archaic semantic function 'to appear = to come - about the plants' associated to it in Baltic, Germanic and Italic) derives from the earlier one 'to come, arrive' attested in Tocharian (A kum-, B kām-) and in the Western Indo-European dialects: Umbrian benest 'to enter'; Latin venio, con-venio = Oscan kām-bened 'convenit' = Gothic ga-giman 'come together, meet' (Old English ge-cuman 'to come, to go to', Old High German ka-gueman 'to come?' < Indo-European *kom- + *gʷem-), Gothic qums 'arrival, presence, Second Coming', ga-qum-b- 's-synagogue, assembly; assembling' = Latin con-ven-ti-o. The latter can be traced back to an old Indo-European nominal stem *gʷem-ti- formally identical to the Eastern Baltic infinitive: Lithuanian giini-ti, Latvian dzimt. The meaning 'to come' may be considered archaic as different from the general meaning 'to go, to stirle, to step' developed later only in some dialects of Eastern Indo-European (mainly in Indo-Aryan, Armenian and Greek). The absence of a corresponding special root having the meaning 'to come' in some Indo-European dialects (as in Hittite and Slavic) may be counterbalanced by the use of the general verb of motion ('to go') in a combination with a pre-semantic parallels in a similar use of the different roots for 'white light' in the meaning of 'world' in Slavic and Tocharian.
verb of the centripetal direction (as Balto-Slavic *prei- in Lithuanian 
pr(i)e + eimu or Old Church Slavic pri- + iiti). As Luwian has a similar 
prefix verb awu- cognate to Hittite uwa- ‘to come’< *au- + ei-10 it 
can be supposed that other special meanings should have 
developed in the word that had fulfilled this function earlier. To 
such relatively new meanings that of the birth and of the arrival of 
the gods (and maybe some other special types of arrivals and their 
features) might have belonged. The semantic variant referring to a 
sudden attack is attested both in Latin (ad-uen-t-0)11 and Gothic (bi-
ing)12 and may either be associated originally to a certain ‘quan-
tum jump’ stage in description of the growth or birth or points to an 
unpleasant part of it as also some Luvian negative contexts men-
tioned above possibly do.

According to the proposed interpretation of Luvian zam- in this 
branch of (Southern) Anatolian the Indo-European verbal stem 
*gwe-em- ‘to come’ can be found that is cognate to the stem of the 
Tocharian A kum-, B kâlam-, Gothic qimam, Latin veniō. In Luvian-
Tocharian-Germanic-Italic group of dialects is known only in 
such a verbal stem. In the Eastern Indo-European dialectal group 
this stem coexists with another synonymous one, *gwe-em < *gweH2.13 
The same situation can be reconstructed for the prehistoric stage of 
the development of Eastern Baltic. The results are seen particularly 
clearly in Latvian where the past stem gājā- has been included into 
the paradigm of the verb eimu ‘I go’ as a suppletive past tense form 
(some Lithuanian dialects have a cognate verb gū-ti)14, an oppo-
nition is just like that of Old Indian Aorist d-gam > d-gana: Present ĕ-
mi15. It has been supposed that the Latvian form gāju continues di-
rectly the ancient root aorist of the type of the Old Indian 
*d-gā-16. 

Especially archaic might be dialectal Latvian forms like 3 Person 
Singular gā that might be traced back either to a root aorist or pos-
sibly to a more ancient form preceding the development of aorist as 
a special category17. A later opposition of the two tenses developed 
from an earlier difference of the verbs belonging initially to two main 
series of forms the second one becoming a source of root aorists in 
Eastern Indo-European and of the barytone (past tense) stems in 

a long vowel + *-j- in Balto-Slavic. In Indo-Iranian-Greek-Armenian 
group of dialects both stems behave as aoristic ones. From them an 
aorist is formed with an augment and secondary endings: Greek ē-
βα, Ionian-Attic ε-βη = Old Indian ē-gā18; Homeric Greek ε-βην = 
Vedic ē-gana = Old Armenian ēkn < *e-gwe-em, cf. also a probable unique 
trace of a similar form in Tocharian B 1 Person Plural ekmen19. 
The reduced grade of the root in Latvian dzimnu (: dzemnu), archaic 
Lithuanian ginau has been compared to that in Armenian e- kun20. In 
Eastern Indo-European to form the present usually a suffix is added to 
the stem *gwe-em- or some modifications of the second stem *gweH-
such as a reduplication) are made21.

9 An important difference between Luvian and Hittite consists in the absence 
of the correlative verb with prefix pri- in Luvian: the Hittite opposition uwa- ‘to 
come’: psei- ‘to go’ (the paradigm of the latter includes only some traces of the primitive 
root-verb ḫ-< *-si-) corresponds semantically to Luvian awi-< ḫ-. According to the 
Nostratic reconstruction by Illich-Svitlych (1971, I, p. 266), the meaning ‘to come’ had 
been initially the main one of the verb that developed into Indo-European ‘pri- ‘to go’.

10 On the phonemic development connected to the loss of laryngeals see: 
Melchert 1994, p. 66.


13 According to Pedersen Old Irish ha- ‘to die’ (< gwe-) goes back to the same 
stem. In that case again a comparison to Luvian negative contexts is probable.


parallel one may cite Dardic Khowar preterite aiti, hai < Old Indian a-st-i, 

17 Endzelins 1951, pp. 875, 877, 882, 977; Rudzite 1964, p. 137; Kazlauskas 
and; Ivanov 1981, pp. 61-62; 186-189 with further references.

18 According to astūddhīya, to Panini the aorist from gā- was the main root 
type (Katre 1987, pp. 168, 177, 24.45; 24.77) whereas the aorist from gam-iga- (ib., p. 
827, 6.4.98) was described in connection to the Vedic dialect (ib., p. 178, 2.4.80) see on 
these aorist forms in Vedic: Elizarenkova 1960, p. 70. Vedic ēken ēgū ‘the god 
Savitru has come’ (RVI, 35, 8) presents an exact semantic parallel to the Luvian 
contexts cited above.

19 Ivanov 1981, p. 187. Van Windekens 1976, p. 242) called the enigmatic pre-
fix of this form intensive, Winter (1952, pp. 188, 190) suggested a collective meaning.


Starting with Benveniste a laryngealist reconstruction (1) *Hzω-rem : (2) *Hzω-eh- has been accepted. An argument in favor of the hypothesis on the complex structure of the stem *Hzωem may be found in Tocharian: if (contrary to what is said in the textbooks) there has been no metathetic change in Tocharian B kā-n-m-ask-, this causative form presents an evidence for a suffix function of the last part of the verbal stem following the nasal affix (being itself interpreted as a suffix according to de Saussure’s discovery in his Mémoire). In Tocharian B the nasal infix is inserted into the form identical to archaic Greek βασκα, Old Indian gā-ccha-(ti) < *gʷm-sk‘e, but its position is after the first phoneme of the root: *gʷe-n-m-sk‘e-. As to the stem in *eh- *gω-eH- a correspondence to it may be found in the same semantic field: Indo-European *iy(y)-eH > Hitite iya- ‘go, ride, stride’, Tocharian B iyā- ‘to arrive’, A yā-, Lithuanian iōja, jōjo, jūti ‘to ride’, Old Church Slavonic jadōn, jaxati.

Less evident seems the initial laryngeal. The probably oldest form of the root may be seen in the second part of an archaic compound *prei(i)gωu- > Greek πρεθύς ‘venerable, elder’; cf. possibly also Mycenaean pe-re-ku-ta. The stem *gωu- > gu- attested also in some archaic Old Indian compounds may have reflected a hypothetical stage before the rise of labiovelars and the change of the phonemic status of the vowel *u becoming a sonant. The root *gu- has been later transformed into *gω-

1.2. The previous discussion has been based on the assumption that in Luvian Indo-European labiovelars became palatalized. The evidence for this conclusion is solid enough. It seems possible to suggest that Hieroglyphic Luvian zal-al- ‘carriage, vehicle’ and Cuneiform Luvian verbal noun zal-war-im ‘riding in a chariot’ as well as the underlying verb zal-ayi derive from the root having undergone an early palatalization of the initial labiovelar (*Kʷel- > *zel- > *zal-); an old shape has been preserved in Hitite ku(wa)y-ju-ku(wa)llai- ‘to turn’. Synchronously the noun zal-al- is supposed to be derived with the suffix -al-, but historically an old reduplication (intensive *zal-za-; cf. possibly onomatopoetic al-al- ‘to produce noise’, or normal *za-zal-) might have been transformed so that the end of the syllable (and not its beginning as in the usual Indo-European procedure) is repeated. A cognate reduplicated term for a wheeled vehicle is attested in Eastern Indo-European (Old Indian cakra ‘wheel’, collective Plural cakra; Avestan cakra- ‘wheel’, Middle Persian chrčxr, Parthian czxr, Modern Persian (Farsi) čark, Eastern Iranian Ossetic cālx, Khwarazmian czxr ‘wheel’, Sogdian cyfr ‘cakra, circle’; Greek Homeric κύκλος ‘ring, circle’, Mycenaean personal name ku-ke-re-u; Phrygian kıkln tıır eṙkōn tıı ēstron. Phrōyes

---

22 Benveniste 1955, p. 156; Burrow 1959, chapter VII, §1; Watkins 1969, p. 71, §50. One of the first to suggest the analysis *gʷe- + ţ- was Būqa 1958, p. 294.

23 See, for example, Pinault 1987, p. 52. The argument for the equation Tocharian B kənmask- = A kəmnās (Vandendekens 1976, p. 242), but the structural similarity of these forms does not make it necessary to reconstruct for Proto-Tocharian an initial order of morphs similar to that in Tocharian A since the Tocharian B form is closer to the Indo-European rule than the Tocharian A one.


25 Ivanov 1981, pp. 98-99; objections raised by J. Puhl against the etymology that has been accepted by most scholars (Puhl 1984, p. 334-335 with references) were made before recent discoveries concerning the spelling of Hitite vowels.


27 Like maru-gu- ‘walking in the forest’ with the trace of a heteroclitic ţ- in the first part, Burrow 1959, chapter 4, §4.

28 To my knowledge a first brief cautious discussion of this possibility with its rejection was published by Carruba 1995, p. 22, n. 17.

29 On the meaning see: Starke 1990, p. 337, pp. 544-546; cf. 1995, pp. 18, 40-41, n. 95. Carruba, ib., mentions this etymology as implausible. If the Hitite title šal-ašt- ‘groom’ referred mainly to a court official who was in charge of a cart (Güterbock, van den Hout 1991, p. 48), it can be supposed that it was a Luvian borrowing in Hitite with a suffix -ašt- typical of Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luvian, Starke 1990, pp. 168, 227, 331 (Luvian words are pronounced in some rites where šal-ašt- men participate). In that case a connection to zal- ‘vehicle’ might have become possible as š and z may interchange in Hitite and Luvian cuneiform writing.


32 On a probable meaning ‘chassis’: Zimmer 1994, p. 32.

33 See on the data: Aabea 1958, pp. 287-288; Oranskij 1979, pp. 140-142, n. 16; Edelman 1986, pp. 157-158; Benveniste 1929, p. 91.
[Hes.]{34}, Tocharian A kukāl, B kokale ‘carriage’ and Germanic (Old Icelandic hvěl < *kwekól- *hwelhjväla > Old English hwæl/hweogol ‘wheel’){35}. A non-repduplicated derivative from the same root designates ‘wheel, wheeled vehicle’ in Western Prussian këlan ‘wheel’; kële-ranco ‘one of the four poles put into the frame of a vehicle’ (probably < *kela-rankâ); kelle-wesze ‘cart’-driver’ ( < *kela-wesi-s probably going back to a Proto-Balto-Slavic or late Indo-European compound *kwejol-o-velog’h- > Slavic kolo-vox-âci ‘a person living in a cart; a nomadic type’){36}. In Eastern Baltic the word has been preserved only in an archaic compound probably borrowed from Kuronian into Latvian: du-celis, du-cele, di-cele, di-celes, vi-cele < *dwe-*kowel- ‘two-wheeled vehicle’{37} (the same semantic pattern is seen in compounds with the other Indo-European name of a cart or chariot as ‘two-wheeled’ in Eastern Baltic as well as in Italo-Celtic dūr-rot-{38}). A similar non-repduplicated stem persists in Slavic (‘kola ‘wheel’, Plural ‘kola ‘wheeled cart’) and Celtic (Old Irish cul ‘carriage’). If the Luvian stem (contrary to what has been suggested above) does not represent a transformed reduplication it can be compared to this (North) Western Indo-European non-repduplicated type.

{34} Inspite of a sceptical remark of Chantaine (1984, p. 597) the interpretation of this gloss seems beyond doubt because of a number of exact semantic parallels to the Ursa maior (Big Dipper) being represented as a carriage: Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1995, pp. 592-622; the Old Russian name is derived from the same root as the Plurian one. At the same time the Old Slavic non-repduplicated term was a metaphor of the sun as the repnduplicated one in Indo-Iranian, Greek and Germanic: Ivanov 1980, 114.

{35} Among disputable possible ramifications cf. Old English gēola ‘month (December/January)’, Gothic freona julis ‘the month before the Yule month’; Old Icelandic jöl ‘heathen festival lasting 12 days’ with a generalization of the intervocalic voiced (glottalic according to the glottalic theory) consonant repeated also in the first syllable of reduplication (see on phonological obstacles Lehmann 1986, pp. 211, 38).


{38} Meid 1994.

1.3. The following correspondences may be added to the two discussed above as proving the conclusion about the palatalization of labiovelars before frontal vowels in Luvian. Luvian Cuneiform zîla, zîla-davo ‘from this time on; in the future’{39} can be traced back to the Indo-European *kwe-il-(-o-) > Old Indian Vedic ciradh- (adverb) ‘for long’; Nuristani Ashkun cirû ‘too late’; Gothic hvıel ‘while, time, hour’, Old English hwel ‘time, space of time’, Old Frisian hville, Old Saxon hvîlla, Old High German (hvîlta ‘time’){40}.

1.4. Luvian zan-tal-una ‘humiliation’ (semantically = Hittite tepnumar) can be supposed to come from the root *gw̥hen- (3 Person Singular/Plural Hittite kuen-zi /kun-anzi ‘to kill’; Old Indian han-ti /ghn-anti ‘to strike’, Lithuanian genû ‘to chase’){42}. The meaning similar to the Luvian one is attested in a combination of the root with the (initially mediopassive, then ‘determinative’ in Latin) suffix *-th- in Latin of-fendō ‘to strike against, to hit upon, to shock, to be offensive, offend’, ēf-fendo ‘to repel, to repulse, to ward off, to defend’, in-fensus ‘hostile, embittered’{43}. The suffix *-tel- which is probable also in this Luvian form may be alternating with its Indo-European doublet *-ter- in the Indo-Iranian continuation of an earlier *gw̥hen- *tel-/-ter-: Old Indian Vedic hantar- ‘victor, murderer’ = Avestan jantar ‘one who strikes’, Middle Persian zātar, *gw̥hm-tr-o- > Modern Persian zahr ‘poison’, Sogdian z’r ‘poison’{44}.

1.5. To the group of Luvian words showing palatalization of an ancient labiovelar possibly also Luvian zida- ‘man’ might belong{45} if

{39} Laroche 1959, p. 115; Starke 1990, p. 100.
{40} On the other more controversial comparisons including that to Lithuanian kelona ‘a short while, minute’ see Lehmann 1976, pp. 199-200.
{41} Starke 1990, p. 533.
{44} Bartholomae 1979, p. 604; Gauthiot 1914-1923, pp. 74, 168; benveniste 1929, p. 238; Pokorny 1959, p. 491.
{45} But see on another Indo-European etymology of the Luvian word suggested by Gusmani: Carruba 1991, p. 181; Melchert 1994, p. 241. For this Luvian word a borrowing from Northern Western Caucasian ‘cé’man’ (reduplicated in Ubykh ćora,
it is connected to *gʷeH-/*gʷi(y)-eH- 'living > Avestan jīta:" 'to live, alive'; jāmāo- 'life' (Bartholomae 1979, pp. 609, 611), Lithuanian gyti, Latvian dzīt, Slavic žiti 'to live'; Oscar bilīm 'vitam', Greek ἐπιτοσ.46.

1.6. It can be supposed that not only the ancient labiovelar but also a velar in the combination with the following frontial vowel might have palatalized in Luvian giving the same result as a palatalized labiovelar. Such a development *kwe > za- may be supposed for Luvian zappa- 'to boil (?), to evaporate, to disappear in vapor (about water)' if it can be derived from Indo-European *kwe- 'smoke, cook, boil' > Latvian kvēp-stu, kvēp-t- 'to smoke, to give off smoke', Lithuanian kvęp-ti 'to breathe', dialectal 'to smell', kvopas 'breath', Old Church Slavonic kypěti 'to boil', Greek κανάς 'smoke, vapor' (in μ, 202 'a cloud of spray from violently agitated water'), κανάς = Mycenaean κα-νι-να 'flue for smoke'.47 The role of the smoke and vapor in the Greek rituals connected to these terms might help in interpreting similar Hittite and Luvian rites. In the ritual of Puriyanni it is said that in the sacrifice to God of Thunder of the meadows 'the evil water is evaporated (so that it would not go back to the gods)' za-ap-pa-at-la at-tul-wa-lal-za ū-tar-ša (KUB XXXV 54 Vs, II 39 = Starke 1985, p. 67; 1990, p. 112). In the other part of the same ritual after a Hittite remark about a sacrifice being made 'with the water' (u-e-te-ni-it) to 'the god of the Sun' ('ULTU) the vocative Si-tu-la of the distorted Luvian name of the latter (with a Hittite form of the first phono) combines with the Luvian verb huwai- 'to run'49 in the context of evocatio in which both 'coming' and 'water' are used in the quasi-ergative case: ([Ši-wa-ta hu-wa-i-ū-ni-š a-aš-[da] za-ap-pa-at-la zu-am-ma-an-za ū-tar-ša, K Bo XXII 137 II 3-9 'Oh the God of the Sun! He should run'. The coming (see above on this word) water (or: the water of the coming [god?]) has been evaporated'. The boiling water and/or the smoke produced by it has been considered a condition for the coming of the god.

1.7. In all these cases palatalization in Proto-Luvian was caused by the front vowel *e or a diphthong *ei (that may be later represented by Luvian *i), but not by the old sonant *iy before which the labiovelar did not change as in Luvian relative pronoun ki- where also a possibility of the influence of an artificial Hittite-Luvian official koine should be taken into consideration.51 For Luvian wāna 'woman' either a reduced grade or an *-o- grade should be reconstructed.52

The development demonstrated in the Luvian forms analyzed above can be typologically similar to palatalization of labiovelars in some other satum dialects.53 Luvian shares with the other satum dialects the development of the Indo-European palatal phonemes into affricates (becoming spirants in Hieroglyphic Luvian and Lycian)54;
in that sense definition of Luvian being a satem language suggested more than half a century ago has been proved. But it was a language in which only the first two stages of the development of the velars stops took place: the palatal stops had already become affricates and fricatives (and some of them then disappeared) and the labiovelars had been already palatalized in the position before a front vowel, but they were not yet mixed up with plain velars (some of which meanwhile had also disappeared). The development in Luvian may be summarized as:

A. *k' > ts > s
B. *g'h/g' (before e only?) > C56 (or *y = j before i > Oi?)
C. *k'/g'/gh > k
D. *k'/w/*q'/w/*g'/w > (before *e > a) z = ts
E. *k'w- > (before sonants) ku
F. *g'w-/*kw- > ( before *o or *o) w

Since the number of forms in which the old labiovelar had been preserved as in kuš, ku'er- was restricted Luvian was gradually approaching the state of a true satem dialect.

At a later stage new combinations of the ku-/kw- type arose due to the processes like *du-/dw- > *ku-/kw-.

and may be interpreted as migrational terms (for city/fortress and wall), interdialectal borrowing (evident in the case of the two forms of the Luvian word for 'earth') and/or taboo deformations (kat-mars- ‘defecate’; Hititite kamars-, Meriggi 1980, p. 263; from Indoeuropean *g’dh-; Old Indian hād-, Greek κατα, Albanian dhjës, a possible taboo-form, Huld 1974, p. 144; Laroche 1959, pp. 55, 132, suggested a change *-m- > -mm- in Hititite with the preservation of the combination in Luvian, but later he supposed the same change for Luvian kūnum < kuitman, 1979, p. 70; thus the form katmars- with a Glossenkel may not be Luvian, but might have belonged to another archaic Anatolian dialect), but see also discussion in Melchert 1994, pp. 254-256 (with references).


56 Following a general assumption of Luvian being a satem language one may suppose that "g'h and g' first changed into voiced (or glottalized) palatal affricates (like "h") which later disappeared.

57 According to Melchert (1994, p. 61) in prehistoric Luvian "*k'w- > *g'w- in medial position. But practically what is described is disappearance of the velar constituent of this phoneme. Thus it may be stated that the velar element was lost in an old voiced (glottalized) and voiceless labiovelar.
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**Baltico-Anatolica I.**

Luw. zammantiš' 'neugeborenes Kind': altprz. gemmons 'geboren'

V.V. Ivanov (Los Angeles)

Der Artikel eröffnet eine Reihe von baltisch-anatolischen Beiträgen und ist einer Luwisch-altprussischen sprachlich-semantischen Parallele gewidmet.