

## Lat. *über* again

ERIC P. HAMP, University of Chicago

O. Szemerényi has given us (Glotta 34, 1955, 272—87) an excellent philological discussion of the usage of the adjective *über* and its relation to *ūbertās*, etc. I agree completely with him (p. 277) in his conclusion 1) that the noun *über* was used in the sense 'fatness' only in some consciously poetic contexts, and 2) that the adjective *über* must be old and inherited in the sense 'copious'. But I cannot agree with some of the comparative assertions then made by Szemerényi.

The claimed Illyrian *Audarus*, etc., like any Illyrian claim, must be viewed as very insecure. The Germanic *audo-* 'possession, wealth', even with Scherer's acute observation of *Audemundus* < *\*-mptos*, is admittedly ambiguous. Anyhow Szemerényi is certainly right in insisting (279 and 282) that *\*audas* 'wealth' and *\*audama-* 'destined' should be kept apart.

The alleged British Keltic connexions (279) must be rejected entirely. Mediaeval Welsh *ud* can certainly have no connexion. Apart from K. Jackson's discussion of *udd* in LHEB (referred to by Szemerényi), one should now consult also Jackson's note on the name IDNERT on the Llanddewbreffi stone, *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 19, 1961, 232—4. While I do not agree in all particulars with Jackson's interpretation of the diachronic phonetics of this element in Welsh - - - I deal with that matter elsewhere - - - there can be no doubt that 'lord' was *iud-* in its earlier shape. Therefore it cannot be derived from an older *\*oudo-*. Pedersen and Lewis, like Jackson, surely knew that the etymon has an initial British *i-*. Therefore, regardless of Loth's ridicule and no matter whether IE *\*yudh-* is in fact the correct etymon, we must certainly start, with Pedersen, Lewis and Jackson, from an initial *\*i-*.

It is true that Breton *ozac'h* rightly not discussed by Jackson in relation to Welsh *ud*, cannot be derived with Stokes from *\*potikkos*; though, as I shall show elsewhere, I believe that Stokes was on the right track, as I think others have not been. Nor, however, can *ozac'h* be derived from anything like *\*odakkos*. (What, by the way, is the supposed suffix?). Such guesses ignore the fact that the Vannetais form is *ohēh*. On the phonological possibilities for these forms, see my critique of Pisani's attempt, *Ogam* 14, 1962, 376; it is obvious that we must start from a British *\*odex*, which surely excludes *\*-d-*.

Gaulish OLL(O)VDIO and VELLOVDIUS may well contain *oudo-*, but we have no guarantee that this is the same etymon as the one in question. We see then that the claimed Keltic evidence falls away completely<sup>1</sup>).

Not only is “Illyrian” a slippery entity, on which now see Heinz Kronasser, ‘Zum Stand der Illyristik’ (*Linguistique balkanique* 4, 1962, 5—23<sup>2</sup>), but to assume an Illyrian vowel assimilation (281) is to build on quicksand. We see then that there is no foundation whatever for Szemerényi’s claim (281) that “it can therefore be regarded as established that Gmc. *\*audā-* and Celtic *\*oudo-* also continue IE *\*oudho-*, and not *\*audho-*”, nor that “*\*oudheros* must be a derivative of a noun *\*oudho-* ‘riches, wealth’.”

In attempting to account (283—4) for the vocalisms of Skt. *ūdhar*, OE *ūder*, OSl. *vyme*<sup>3</sup>), Gk. *οὔδαρ*, OFris. *jader*, etc., Szemerényi makes several statements that I cannot accept. These are largely regarding IE noun formation. But first, I am surprised by Szemerényi’s assertion that “many scholars are inclined to discard them [long diphthongs] altogether.” We know, of course, that the long diphthongs of Brugmann have two possible interpretations in modern IE theory: Dehnstufe of a simple IE syllabic (e.g. *\*d̥iēus* > Skt. *dydus*, *Ζεύς*) or normal grade of a laryngeal bearing sequence (e.g. *\*nēH<sub>a</sub>us*, *\*g<sup>w</sup>eH<sub>o</sub>(u)m* > Skt. *nāus*, *gām*, *ναῦς*, *βῶν*). But while most agree that Brugmann’s formulation is insufficiently precise today, I for one do not discard the long diphthongs; I claim we refine them. Indeed, otherwise I know of no way of accounting for all the observed phenomena. Suffice it to say that not all “diphthongal” stems can be disposed of as Mayrhofer, *Sanskrit = Grammatik*<sup>2</sup>, *Sammlung Göschen* 1965, § 56, p. 46, following Szemerényi himself *KZ* 73, 1956, 167 ff., has done. In short, put in old fashioned terms, I see no way around old-fashioned long diphthongs, even though I do not subscribe to all cases of them that have been aduced.

Szemerényi adduces other IE words (‘son’, ‘otter’) that are supposed to present the same structure; I differ. IE *\*sūnús* seems to me

<sup>1</sup>) The *h-* of OIr. (*h*)*uile* (p. 280, fn. 2) is surely not from *s-* in “proclitic position;” such purely graphic non-phonetic *h*’s in Old Irish are commonplace.

<sup>2</sup>) And also R. Katičić, *Liburner, Pannonier und Illyrier, Festschrift Brandenstein* (Innsbrucker Beiträge 14, 1968) 363—8, and earlier works there mentioned.

<sup>3</sup>) To which Szemerényi remarks “with suffix-substitution”, but with no indication why.

to be simply *\*suH-nu-*. I have always regarded Germanic *\*sunus* as a simple innovation whereby a new shape *\*su-* was extracted in this productive IE verbal base from instances where *\*suH-* appeared prevocally. Hence there is no need for Pedersen's complicated paradigm *\*séunnus*, gen. *sunéus*. The long vowel in Lith. *údra*, OSl. *vydra* 'otter' is surely a case of the familiar Balto-Slavic neo-Dehnstufe which was so productive. On the other hand, Szemerényi is surely right in rejecting Mahlow's and Pisani's impossible try at explaining the Greek *οῦ-* in *οὔρα* as an incredible [*u*] < IE *\*ū-*.

Thus by these examples Szemerényi has not marshalled any evidence in favour of reconstructing *\*oudh-/ūdh-* as *\*oudh-/udh-*. Why then were not hordes of IE forms in *\*u* 'levelled' to *\*ū*?

I further cannot agree in detail with Szemerényi's views on IE forms in *\*e* which occur beside forms in *\*o*. I quite agree that in some cases (but only some) forms in *\*o* are to be credited to compounds which later yielded freshly extracted simplexes. But I think that in general such cases are in a distinct minority - - - just as we might envisage on the basis of experience with living languages, where simplexes are in general not overhauled en masse on the model of compounded instances. In fact, the reverse tends to occur; compounds get refashioned on simplexes (*shepherd* for *shepard*, etc.). To take the examples mentioned by Szemerényi: For me Lat. *pedem* and Gk. *πόδα* represent two levellings from a single paradigm. A noun *\*pod-* would regularly have had a locative *\*ped(-i)*, and weak cases *\*pd-* which became phonetically *\*ped-* by synchronic rule in IE. Thus the noun was *\*pod-* (levelled by Greek), which yielded in Latin to a levelling of the weak and locative cases. As for *κῆρ* (OPruss. *seyr*), there is plenty of support elsewhere in IE (Balto-Slavic, Celtic, Indo-Iranian) for the attribution of Lat. *cord-* to the Schwundstufe. Thus we have simply Dehnstufe, *\*e*, and Schwundstufe for 'heart'. I have explained *genu/γόνυ* elsewhere as a similar levelling of *\*gonu*, with the Latin levelled from Schwundstufe *\*gny-*.

I cannot explain *\*swepnos* (> OE *swefn*) : *\*swopnos*<sup>4</sup>) and *\*weǵh-no-* (> OIr. *fén*) : *\*woǵh-no-* (> OHG *wagan*) immediately and incisively. But we know that these roots were active in most IE dialects, and such suffixed formations were open to refashioning. My guess is that a conflict arose between the participial and nominal formation in *-no-*. Hitt. *nekuz* is not clear beside the pan-IE (non-

<sup>4</sup>) But note, as Szemerényi certainly knows, that *\*supno-* (*ὑπνος*, Alb. *gjumë*) also occurs.

Anatolian) *\*nok<sup>w</sup>t-*; however, I have noted in Hittite a strong productivity in nominal formations for *e*-grade, e.g. *genu* beside *γόνυ*. Similarly I see a fresh formation in the Hittite word for 'water', as I show elsewhere; for me the IE noun 'water' was *\*uódr/udnós*, and *\*uedōr/udnes* (284) is impossible on several counts.

On grounds of the attested forms and of considerations of the general formation of the heteroclites, just as 'water' was *\*uódr/udnós* it seems to me that 'udder' was *\*ōudhr/ūdhnós*, or *\*(H)óHudhr/(H)uHdhnós*. If we are to take the Germanic *\*ēu*-forms at face value, they must represent refashioning; whether the verb *\*eudh*- 'swell' attested by Slavic was originally related to 'udder' I cannot at present see a way of deciding. The river name *Ūfens* adduced by Szemerényi (285) is tempting but inconclusive. For a Messapic-Illyrian "superstratum" in *Aufidus*, however, I can express nothing but wonder.

After all of this only the following is clear to me. There was an IE noun *\*ōudhr/ūdhnós* (to write it conservatively) meaning 'udder'; there is a poorly attested root *\*eudh*- 'swell' of uncertain relation and dialect distribution. This root *\*eudh*- might have been North European, and it might have provoked fresh Germanic formations of the shape *\*ēudher*-. It is not clear whether Lat. *uber* continues *\*ōudh*- or *\*ūd*h- or both. There are some "Illyrian" and Germanic forms which have been glossed 'wealth' which may perhaps be weakly related. Otherwise, I see no clear outside cognates, and if the comparative IE picture has been refined in this respect it has not been enlarged.

I do however think that the Latin adjective *uber* is old, but on very different comparative grounds from Szemerényi. Regardless of the question of the Latin syncope in the final syllable, the Sanskrit *-ar* of *ūdhar* (and perhaps also the columnar accent) needs explaining. In such nouns we expect a Schwundstufe final in the nom.-acc.; Greek in fact shows it. This would seem to indicate that a related formation had interfered with the Sanskrit noun. The simplest assumption is that it was susceptible of derivation with a full grade vowel in the second syllable. We might then envisage an adjectival formation along the lines of Skt. *patará*- 'flying' (: Welsh *adar* 'birds', O.Ir. *én* 'bird', Lat. *penna*), *vāsará*- 'matutinal' (: *vasar*- 'morning'), alongside *udrá*- 'otter' (: Umbr. *utur*), *usrá*- 'matutinal' (: *ušar*- 'dawn'), *vīpra*- 'inspired' (: *vīpanyā*); or *sthāvará*- 'stable' (: *sthāvand*-, *sasthāvan*-), *aśmará*- 'stony' (: *aśmán*-), *ἄργυρος* (: *árjuna*-). Then *ūdhar* would show the retracted accent of a nominalized ad

jective. Again, there is *urvárā* 'cultivated land', perhaps to the OIr. heteroclit *arbor*, gen. *arbe* < \**arxen-s* 'corn', and an *i*-stem *vádhri-* 'castrated animal' (: ἔθρις, *a-vádhri-* 'not injuring', *vádhri* 'weapon'<sup>5</sup>), *vadhánā* 'slaughter'), or a *u*-stem such as *patáru-* 'flying'. A formation such as *vádhri-* is particularly suggestive, standing opposite the old defective neuter *vádhri*, Avestan *vadar-*.

It seems possible then that beside the noun \**ōudhr/n-* 'udder' there could have been an adjective \**ūdhró-* or \**ōudheró-* or \**ōudhri-* or \**ūdhrú-* 'full, copious (as an udder)'. Additionally, we may note without being able to pursue the point further that another Sanskrit noun in *-ar*, *áhar* gen. *áhnas* (Av. *azan-*) 'day', has a duplicate match in Germanic, where we find beside the NGmc. *dógr*, *dógn* also the archaic OE *dōzor*; on this last set see my article in *Studies for George Lane*.

## Zur Etymologie des Wortes 'Slavus' (Sklave)

VON GEORG KORTH, Berlin

Die herkömmliche Ableitung der Bezeichnung *Sklave* für eine „als rechtlos und ohne Eigentum angesehene männliche Person“, wie es bei Fr. L. K. Weigand, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Gießen, 5. Aufl. 1909), Sp. 877 heißt, ist diese: Das Wort sei „hervorgegangen aus der byzantinischen Benennung der südslaw. Völker *Σκλαθηνοί*, *Σκλαβηνοί* (im 6. Jh. n. Chr.) . . .“. Man brauche „daher in Italien im 8./9. Jh. mlat. *Sclavi* als Bezeichnung der als Leibeigene verkauften slawischen Kriegsgefangenen . . .“.

Weigand verweist auf diese Ausführungen beim Stichwort 'Slave, Slawe' in Sp. 879, wo er von diesem „Völkernamen“ zunächst bemerkt: „Bei Jordanes im 6. Jh. nach byzant. Benennung *Sclaveni* . . ., aber in ihrer eigenen Sprache russ. *Slavjaninu*, abg. *Sloveninu*, Pl. *Slovene*.“ Dann wird in Übereinstimmung mit dem oben Zitierten betont, daß „mhd. *slave* . . . urspr. 'kriegsgefangener Slave'“ bedeute. — Als beachtenswert heben wir hervor, daß der später *Slovenen* genannte Volksstamm bei den Schriftstellern des 6. Jh. auf lateinisch „*Sclaveni*“ hieß und auf griechisch „*Σκλαβηνοί*“ u. ähnl.

<sup>5</sup>) *vadhasná-* 'deadly weapon' looks like a new formation to this.