

Stefan Zimmer, Bonn

Comments on a great book: The Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture, ed. by J.P. Mallory and D.Q. Adams. London & Chicago, Fitzroy Dearborn, n.d. [1997], 4°, xlvii, 829 p.

The publication of The Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture (henceforth abbreviated as EIEC) is a major event in Indo-European Cultural Studies. 70 years after Schrader-Nehring (1917-29), Indo-Europeanists of all kinds, as well as general readers interested in prehistory, diachronic linguistics, and the emergence of the world's biggest language family are provided with a large quantity of information about most possible questions, arranged according to catchwords, organized in a reasonable way, written in plain English, with many maps and drawings. Any work of such an encyclopedic nature is bound to remain imperfect for a number of editions. The following remarks, though critical, are thoroughly sympathetic. I intend to bring my share of addenda & corrigenda, the fruits of intensive reading, to the attention of fellow Indo-Europeanists. In order to avoid misunderstandings, I must say that these remarks are in no way systematic or exhaustive: they only reflect my personal foci of interest and attention. I am fully aware that much more scholarly literature could have been referred to, that many problems deserve fuller discussion, and, of course, that many of my views and opinions expressed here may be contradicted. The editors are asked not to receive my notes as negative criticism, but as matter put at their disposal in a constructive spirit, for the benefit of a future edition. I say elsewhere¹ how grateful we all are for what they have already achieved.²

¹ In a review for *Kratylos*, probably. vol. 44, 1999.

² Abbreviations used here: C / O / M / N / Mod before language names: Common / Old / Middle / New / Modern; language names: Alb Albanian, Av Avestan, Br Breton, Brit British (also called Brittonic), Co Cornish, CS Church Slavonic, E English, Fr French, G German, Gaul Gaulish, Germ Germanic, Goth Gothic, Gr Greek, HG High German, Hitt Hittite, IE Indo-European (often short for PIE), Ind Indo-Aryan, Ir Irish, Iran Iranian, L Latin, Latv Latvian, Lith Lithuanian, LG Low German, N Norse, Pers Persian, PIE Proto-Indo-European, Ru Russian, Sax Saxon, Sogd Sogdian, (with -B / M / C: Buddhist, Manichean, Christian texts), Span Spanish, Toch Tocharian, Umbr Umbrian, Ved Vedic Sanskrit, VL Vulgar Latin, W Welsh. With page numbers, a and b refer to the first and second column, respectively.

General criticisms: Avestan should be transcribed according to the universally accepted standard set by Karl Hoffmann, see CLI,³ or most recently Hoffmann-Forssman (1996 § 12). Indo-Iranian nouns are traditionally cited in stem form, not the nom.sg.; this is sensible and should be retained. With regard to the non-existence of a comprehensive Tocharian dictionary, all words not mentioned in Krause-Thomas (1960-64) should only be cited with full indication of their respective place of attestation; otherwise, checking is difficult or even impossible. There is no point in changing traditional Scandinavian orthography: vowel length should be marked by an acute accent, not a makron. All the 'X Goddess' articles (M.R.D.) are unnecessary, with the only exception of DAWN, because no other female deity can be reconstructed for PIE (p. 174 s.v. EARTH GODDESS, the only other possible, though doubtful, candidate, Gr Δημήτηρ, Messapic *damatura*, is not mentioned). The name of Heinrich Hettrich is always misspelt with an epenthetic vowel (e.g., p. 196). Against the presumed fourth laryngeal (h_4) consistently used in EIEC (supposedly introduced by D.Q.A.), see Eichner (1988). Indo-European poetical and legal traditions, as reflected in 'formulas', should be paid more attention to as sources for the cultural history of early IE or even PIE communities. The former subject has been treated on several occasions in recent years; for the latter, cf. Leist (1889 = 1978). Schlerath (1978) and Watkins (1994 and 1995), with further references. For theoretical and methodological questions, a broader range of anthropological scholarship from various adjacent fields might be profitably taken into account (for some details, cf. Zimmer 1990a).

Comments on individual articles, entries, etc.:

p. xv sqq.: Bibliographical references should not have been inserted under 'Abbreviations and technical terminology' with other kinds of scientific shorthand. The bibliography requires considerable expansion. All standard handbooks, even if written in languages other than English, must be indicated. Mayrhofer⁴ is not mentioned at all in the list, although his indispensable books have been used by some contributors (e.g. D.Q.A., cf. p. 413). It may seem trivial, but some American readers may need to be

³ Cf. the bibliography at the end of the article.

⁴ My references to 'Mayrh' in this article are to Mayrhofer 1986- (the first part was completed in 1996).

reminded that serious study of matters Indo-European demands passive knowledge of at least English, French, and German. According to the references given by J.P.M., archeologists have no problems in reading, for example, all the Slavonic languages. The reason for the choice of 'laws' (mostly sound-laws) given is unclear. Grimm's Law does not concern the whole family (but Germanic only), nor does Hirt's Law (Baltic and Slavonic); why then not mention Bartholomae's Law, Brugmann's Law, and the whole range of laws in Collinge (1985)?

p. xix: 'Ibero-Celtic' for what is called commonly 'Celtiberian' or recently 'Hispano-Celtic' seems to be a convenient term, and makes sense; it might be too late, however, to change the traditional misnomer which, in any case, needs to be mentioned in the definition (its absence p. 97, s.v. CELTIC, is regrettable.). The definition of 'injunctive' is wrong, and was dated already in pre-Hoffmann times.

p. xx: Under 'laryngeal', a reference to the standard theory (with three laryngeals) should be given. 'Maldivian' (also used p. 91, etc.) is unusual for current 'Divehi'.

p. xxi: The correct expansion of MSS is Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft.

p. xxii: Under OHG, the Second Sound Shift is wrongly labelled⁵ 'Germanic'. This adjective qualifies the First Sound Shift which distinguishes Germanic from the other IE languages; the Second is to be called 'High German' because it differentiates the High German dialects from the Low German ones and all other Germanic languages. The term 'Pahlavi' as name for a language is dated and should be avoided. Since the discoveries in the Turfan region at the beginning of the century, we know Middle Iranian much better. Today, Middle Persian and (Middle) Parthian are carefully distinguished (see Sundermann's articles in CLI, with full references). It would have been preferable, throughout EIEC, to stick to the standard notation of the aspirates with raised h's: *g^h*, *d^h*, *b^h*, etc., thereby clearly marking their monophonematic status (cf. the wrong line-break *d-h* p. 74).

p. xxv: The expansion "West Russian" for the abbreviation WRus must be an error for 'White Russian' = 'Belorussian'. Similarly, in place of "Žemaitis", read Žemaitic (vel sim.,⁶ Lith *žemaičių šakos*); *Žemaitis* is the Lithuanian word for a person from the region.

⁵ In my comments, British English orthography is preferred.

⁶ Alfred Senn used 'Zhemaitish'.

- p. 3 ABLE (M.N.): OInd *maga-* 'magician' is cited as a parallel to Av *moyu-*, OPers *magu-*. But the word is late and rare in Skt., and may be a loan from Iran. The meaning given is far from certain. OPers *magu-* is first 'Magian', hence the Magi of the Bible. Whether these Iranians were 'magicians' remains to be proven. Until this is the case, the proposed etymology remains doubtful. Add a reference to YOUNG.
- p. 3 ABUNDANT (D.Q.A.): OInd *maghá-* cannot belong to **meneg^h-*, see Mayrh.
- p. 4 ACCUSTOM (D.Q.A.): Add the lemma **demh₂-* or a reference to TAME
- p. 4 ADPREPS (D.Q.A.): Add references to several recent publications, e.g. of George Dunkel.
- p. 6 AGE SET (J.P.M.): The assumption of "regular military units of chariotry or cavalry" is highly unlikely for the PIE period. It would be fair to note that McCone's theory has met with severe criticism, e.g. by Untermann (1989: 51). Add a reference to Falk (1986) who gives important support from Vedic India.
- p. 11 ALBANIAN (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The works of St.E. Mann are unreliable and should not be cited in EIEC.
- p. 13 ANATOLIAN (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The position of Carian is in doubt. The writers of the Carian graffiti in Egypt were mercenaries, not "immigrants".
- p. 17 ANATOMY (D.Q.A.): To 'Internal Anatomical Parts', add the words for 'brain'.
- p. 19 ANCESTOR GOD (J.P.M.): The figures in the ON *Rígsþula* cannot represent 'Germanic' social classes, as the text is a learned didactic product of 13th c. Scandinavia, cf. Simek-Pálsson (1987: 295).
- p. 22-4 ANIMAL (D.Q.A.): The statement s.v. **meh₁l-* p. 23 that "the Celtic examples mean only a small animal" is wrong: both OIr *míl* and W *mil* refer to any wild animal (vs. domesticated), see the dictionaries.
- p. 25 APART (A.D.V., D.Q.A.): A connection of **yi-* to **yiso-* "all" is quite improbable for semantic and other reasons.
- p. 25 APPEAR (D.Q.A.): The meaning of W *rhith* is 'shape, form', not "species".
- p. 25 APPLE (P.F.): There is no "OWels *Aballo* (town name)": this must be due to a misunderstanding. *Aballo* on the Tabula Peutingeriana is in Gaul, obviously the earlier form of one of the numerous Fr places named *Avallon*

(the name also occurs in Arthurian lore).⁷ S.v. **meh₂lom* one might mention the L place-name *Beneventum*, a deliberate change by the Roman conquerors from original *Maluentum* (Livy), *Malies* (coins), misunderstood by speakers of Latin. Krahe's Illyrian etymology "Bergstadt" is unconvincing. The name is Western Greek **Μαλο-φεντις* "rich in apples", I think.

p. 27 ARMENIAN (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): Armenian instances with *a* instead of expected *e* or *o* are usually diagnostic for a loan (or at least influence) from Iranian.

p. 30 ARMY (J.P.M., E.C.P.): Beside the (Latinized) Gaulish tribal name *Tri-corii*, the parallel case of *Petru-corii* deserves mention. OW *Mori-iud* is probably not to be connected with the root **iud^h*- 'to fight' (see the remarks to p. 201 below). Proper names with 'wolf / dog' are also found in Welsh. The famous *maryannu*-question is mentioned later, s.v. WAR GOD, so a cross-reference should be given here.

p. 33 ASPEN (P.F.): The oldest meaning of OInd *sphyá-* clearly is 'wooden sword used for ritual purposes in preparing the sacrifice'.

p. 35 ASSEMBLY (A.D.V.): Hypothetical **h₂goreh_a-* would never yield OInd **igāra-*, but simply **gāra-*. The oldest form is *āgará-* AV 4.36,3; on the etymological problems, see Mayrh, with references. The comments on the Greek *agora* need not be printed in EIEC: they can be found in any reference book on the Classical world.

p. 37 AX (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): *Beil* and its cognates are missing; there is no entry HATCHET. S.v. **tekso/eh_a*: The Celtic representative is lacking: add OIr *tál* 'adze'. Akkadian *pilaqu* does not mean 'axe', but 'spindle'. Gamkrelidze-Ivanov have used dated dictionaries. There is no need for Djakonov to "argue" about the meaning (cf. Salonen 1965: I 152-4), he simply refers to the standard Akkadian dictionaries (see von Soden 1972: 863a).

p. 43 BACK² (D.Q.A.) s.v. **posti*: TochB *päst*, *pest* may function as a "particle indicating completion", but is basically a preverb meaning 'away, off'.

p. 45 BADGER (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): Celtic **brokko-* (Gaul *Broco-*, OIr *brocc*, W *broch*, etc.) is lacking. OE *broc(c)* is a loan from Celtic, probably British. L *broccus* 'with protruding teeth' has been explained as a loan from Gaulish. Gaul *broci* (a type of pot) may not belong here and is suspected to be a loan from Gr βροχίς 'jug for pouring water'.

⁷ On *Aballava*, a Roman fort in Cumberland, see Rivet and Smith (1979: 238, with references to similar names on the Continent).

p. 45 BALD (D.Q.A., D.A.M.): To imagine that the MW epithets *taleithyauc* 'bearing a diademe' and *kayawc* 'with a broach [or a torques?]' suggests "the image of the champion fighting naked" as mentioned in Diodorus is too far-fetched to be convincing, and fails to consider OWelsh aristocratic manners. What is meant by "superlative Second Function"? On p. 46 (same mistake p. 253), Paul Thieme's famous article is to be correctly titled 'Jungfrauengatte' (repr. 1970 and 1984).

p. 53 BE (D.Q.A.): Few linguists will accept the suggestion that the meaning of IE **h₁es-* was "possibly originally 'sit'". The verb is pan-IE and shows no trace of any other meaning than 'be'. On the lack of indications concerning the distinction between copula and substantive verb, see the comments on SIT below.

p. 56: Add a cross-reference BEARD → CHIN.

p. 57-8 BEE (M.E.H.): S.v. **k₁mh₂p-h₂-*: The meaning of OHG *humbal* is not 'drone', but 'bumble-bee'.

p. 58-60 BEECH (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The linking of Kurdish *būz* 'elm' has not "been universally rejected". The sentence p. 59-60 may mislead readers to assume that the Gauls and Germans had planted those forests of beech and oak. The reference to Lane (1967 [recte 1968]) is worthless, cf. Mayrhofer (1969); rather indicate Eilers-Mayrhofer (1962).

p. 60 BEER (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The word-families of G *Bier*, E *beer*, and Celtic *κοῦρμῖ*, Spanish *cervicia* are missing. Why not add a comment on the difference between *beer* and *ale* (cf. RGA s.v.).

p. 61 BELIEF (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The meaning of OIr *ires(s)* is not neutral 'belief', but rather 'religion, faith'. Add MPers *parist-* 'to serve, worship', NPers *-parast* '-worshipper'.

p. 61-3 BEND (M.N.): S.v. **nem-*, *nimidas* is neither a Fris[ian] word, nor an OSax[on] one as indicated p. 248 s.v. GROVE (P.F.), but a Galatian one (perhaps in Greek disguise); add Gaul *nemeton*, etc.

p. 63 BERRY (P.F., D.Q.A.): The Celtic and Slavonic words cannot belong together with the Baltic and Slavonic ones: the *-r-* is part of the root.

p. 66 BIRD (J.A.C.G.): Umbr *avif* is, more precisely, acc. pl. 'birds'.

p. 68 BISHKENT CULTURE (J.P.M.): The meaning of Vedic *gārhapatya-* 'domestic rule, household'; as a derivative of *gṛhā-pati-* 'lord of the house', it is not "female-associated". According to the prescriptions of the Gṛhyasūtras, even the domestic hearth-fire is kindled etc. by men.

p. 69 BITTER (J.C.S.): The *t-* of Alb *tëmbël* 'gall' should be commented upon. Demiraj (1997) rejects the etymological link between it and *ëmbël* 'sweet'

p. 69 BLACK (M.E.H.): With regard to the multiple colours honey can take, the semantic distance between **mel-n-* 'dull or brownish black' (if this is the correctly specified meaning) and **melit-* 'honey' is not at all "very great". Gr κίραφος 'fox' is not the common word, but from Hesychius, and therefore possibly from an unknown source. L *niger*, OInd *nila-* are not even mentioned.

p. 70 BLIND (D.Q.A., J.P.M., D.M. [sic, = D.A.M.?): To **káikos*: The meaning of W *coeg* is 'empty, vain, blind'; 'empty' (i.e. 'containing nothing') is *gwag*.

p. 74 BOAT (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The hypothesis of "hardened laryngeals" is a hoary one and should be avoided in such a general reference book. The line-break in **h_xold|huh₁en-* is unacceptable: *dh* denotes one phoneme. Could the word *(s)*kolmo-* point to boats made from rushes or reeds (cf. L *calamus*)?

p. 76 BOIL (M.N.): A root **bher-* 'seethe' does not exist; **b^her-* 'carry' and **b^hrey-* 'boil' must be kept separate. For details see the standard dictionaries, and now also LIV.

p. 77 BOOTY (E.C.P., D.Q.A.): L *servus* is less likely *'he of the booty', as the root **ser-* is firmly established in the PIE formula Av *pasuš.hauruua-* = L *servare pecus* with the meaning 'protect'. For *servus* and other Italic terms, see Rix (1994). The Anatolian and Celtic words are from a different etymon, to which might belong OHG (Hl.) *saru* 'armour', cf. Lühr (1982).

p. 77 BORDER (A.D.V.): S.v. **termn-*, add the lacking laryngeal to **terh₂-* 'cross over'. Boundary marks were (and largely still are) sacrosanct not only in Rome, Greece and India. The proposed connotation of "sacred, and thus living" vs. "profane and thus uninhabitable space" is certainly wrong, cf. the semantics of L *sacer*, *sanctus*, *profanus*, and the vast body of literature about the subject in Religious and Classical Studies.

p. 80 BRANCH (P.F., D.Q.A.): What is wrong with the old etymology of **o-zdo-* and **ni-zdo-*? And various kinds of branches may have been differentiated by different words.

p. 81 BREAK (M.N.): A root **bher-* 'cut' does not exist; it is (fittingly) not mentioned s.v. CUT. The semantics of Gaul *luxtos* (which has to be added here), OIr *lucht*, W *llwyth* do not support a connection with a root meaning 'break off'.

p. 83 BRIDE-PRICE (M.E.H.): Is "male" the modern (p.c.?) American expression for "bridegroom"?

p. 83 BROAD (D.Q.A.): OIr *leth*, W *lled* do in fact mean 'side' and 'half' (originally two different formations, see Thurneysen [1946: 216, 250]; the meaning 'broad' is carried by derivatives) so that a connection with the IE

adjective for "broad" is rather unlikely.

p. 84 BROTH (D.Q.A.): Perhaps add G *Jauche*, a loan from Sorabian.

p. 87 BUILD (A.D.V., D.Q.A.): L *ingere* should not be mentioned in the context of construction without Toch A *tsik-* 'to form', *tseke* 'statute (vel sim.)', see the classic study of Schulze (1921).

p. 90-1 CARRY (D.Q.A.): S.v. **uegh-*, add a reference to the formula OInd *vah-* + *go-*, Av *vaz-* + *gao-* which clearly points to Aryan ox-carts (cf. Zimmer 1997: 448).

p. 96-102 CELTIC (J.P.M., D.Q.A.): No Celticist believes in c. 180.000 Irish and c. 80.000 Scots Gaelic speakers (cf. Hindley 1990, MacAulay 1992). The real order of native speakers may be somewhere in the region of 20.000 for Irish, and of 10.000 for Scots Gaelic. Strangely enough, no numbers are given for Welsh, the most living of all Modern Celtic languages, whose speakers — at present, more than half a million — are recorded every 10 years by the National Census (see the last figures in Löffler 1997). On p. 101-102: To the short list of Further Readings, add Russell (1995). S.v. *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru*, read: Cardiff (with double ff), University of Wales Press, or else Caerdydd, *Gwasg Prigysgol Cymru*; and note that *LEIA* is published jointly by the CNRS in Paris and The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

p. 104 CHARCOAL (P.F.): The meaning of ModIr *aingeal* is not 'light, fire' but 'fire, lighted coal' (Ó Dónaill 1977). The word is rare in the older language; it is an earlier adjective meaning 'very bright' (DIL s.v. *'aingel*).

p. 108: Why give a cross-reference CLADISTICS → SUBGROUPING if the first term is not used in the latter article. The rare neologism (coined 1950 by the German entomologist Willi Hennig) may have its place in biology; for linguistics, 'taxonomy' is sufficient.

p. 108 CLEAN (M.N., R.S.P.B., D.Q.A.): If the ritual use of cow's urine in India is mentioned, the importance of bull's urine in Zoroastrian lustration rituals should also be mentioned. The Roman use of urine in cloth cleansing is well-known, but the indication of a source for "as a mouthwash" would be helpful.

p. 112 CLUB (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): After speaking of "a good many other derivatives with precisely the meaning 'club'", only words meaning 'axe', 'weapon', 'whip' are cited. For Vedic *vájra-*, the study of Schlerath (1975/77, not referred to) still offers the most convincing explanation; Schlerath now also offers a possibility of combining Falk's and his own interpretation (1997: 821-3).

- p. 112 COCK (J.A.C.G.): The adversative conjunction in "Goth *hana* (but ON *hæna* 'hen'...)" seems to indicate rejection (ignorance may be safely ruled out) of Darms's (1978) excellent formal and semantic analysis; a simple misprint?
- p. 113-5 COLOR (M.E.H., J.P.M.): Berlin and Kay's theory may be useful, but remains to be checked against individual languages with long-period documentation. 'Grey' comes too late in their stages, as shown by many IE languages. The article neglects the remarkable fact that Celtic had only one term for 'blue' + 'green', but two words for 'red' (OIr *derg* and *rúad*, etc.).
- p. 115 COME (D.Q.A.): For the non-specialist reader, it would be more informative to give the CToch present stem **kām-nāsk-* in place of the different looking A *kumnās-* B *kānmāsk-*.
- p. 116-23 COMPARATIVE MYTHOLOGY (D.A.M., J.P.M.) is a most interesting article on a host of disputed questions. Much more scholarly literature should be taken into account, first of all recent criticisms of Dumézil (Belier 1989/1991, Schlerath 1995-96). Only a few minor details: 'Ἡρα-κλήης may also mean 'acquiring fame (vel sim.) in spite of Hera'. Indo-European Tatpuruṣa compounds are extremely ambiguous: the first member may stand in any logical relation to the second. The transcription of Avestan, p. 119, is inconsistent ($\theta = th$), that of MPers is wrong; best follow MacKenzie (1971) and Gignoux (1972), and use standard name forms. The three fires called are *Ādur Farrōbāg*, *Ādur Gušnasp*, *Ādur Burzēnnihr*. Add a cross-reference to SMITH.
- p. 123 COMPENSATION (E.C.P., D.Q.A.): S.v. **serk-* add a cross-reference to CIRCLE. Toch A *sark* (unmentioned), B *serke* especially means the 'circle of rebirth'.
- p. 123 COMPLAIN (D.Q.A.): The meaning of the W verbal noun *edliw* (also *edliw-io*, *-ed*) is not 'blame', but 'upbraid, reproach'.
- p. 123 CONQUER (E.C.P.): The meaning of W *hŷ* (now usually written with circumflex) is 'bold, brave', today with a clear negative connotation.
- p. 125-126 COPPER HOARD CULTURE: no author indicated; probably J.P.M.
- p. 129 COSMOGONY (J.P.M.): Dating the Puruṣasūkta "c. 900 BC" is rather bold. The absolute chronology of Old India is notoriously doubtful. The reign of Aśoka (from 264 or 261 to 227 or 226 BC) is the first precisely datable period in India.
- p. 133 COUNTRY (A.D.V.): The meaning 'country, land (< the broad one)' is found several times, and may therefore be due to independent semantic processes, the adjective **p₁lth₂u₁h₂-* being a standard feminine formation.

Breton *manvro* is almost certainly a calque (though not necessarily from G *Mutterland*); it is first attested in Le Gonidec (1847).

p. 134 COVER (M.N.): S.v. *(s)teg-, add the Celtic representatives OIr *tech*, W *tŷ* 'house' (mentioned s.v. ROOF).

p. 134-9 COW (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): Add **n-g^{uh}n-o-* 'not to be killed (= milkcow)', attested by OInd *aghnya-* (with various accentuation), Av *agəntiia-*, Gr ἄφενος (cf. Balles 1998). The Celtic words for 'calf', OIr *lóeg* 'calf' < Goidelic **loigo-*, and W *llo*, OCorn *loch* (not referred to by EIEC) < Brit **logio-* (Zimmer 1999a), do not, in fact, belong to Alb *lopë*, etc., as already noted. To p. 137: There are two typos in "Welsh Fuwch Gyfeilioru"; read *buwch gyfeiliorn* 'wandering cow'. But such a mythical beast is unknown to both the Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru and Bromwich (1978). Where does it come from?

p. 139-40 CRAFT GOD (J.P.M.): Instead of Iranian "*aθarman*" read **aθar-yan-*; the meaning 'fire priest' is disputed, see the references in Mayrh s.v. *ātharvan-*. Add a cross-reference to DEFECT: the smith usually limps.

p. 140 CRANE (J.A.C.G.): The etymology of OInd *garuḍa-* is in doubt, see Mayrh.

p. 141 CRAWL (D.Q.A.): For the problem hidden in the suggestion that *t-* may be the remnant of a prefix, add a reference to Kölver (1976).

p. 141 CRIME (D.Q.A.): The monographic treatment by Jacoby (1974) should be indicated.

p. 142 CRUSH (D.Q.A.): An anit root **mer-* 'to crush, pulverize' is unlikely. See the details in LIV s.v. **merh₂-* (and cf. **melh₂-¹* 'zerreiben, mahlen').

p. 142-3 CUCKOO (J.A.C.G.): Add a cross reference to WOODPECKER.

p. 143 CURVE (A.D.V.): W *cant* is not only 'tyre', but 'outer circle, enclosure'.

p. 144 CUT (M.N., D.Q.A., C.F.J.): The root **put-* 'cut', invented by Van Windekens, does not exist. L *pūtare* is a back formation to *pūtus* 'pure' (cf. Zimmer 1994b: 199).

p. 146 DACIAN (J.P.M.): 1st column, line 2, read (probably): between the Dacians and the Romans.

p. 147 DARK (M.E.H., D.Q.A.): "British *Tamesas*" is not found in Caesar (B.G. V 11,8 has *Tamesis*; 18,1 *Tamesim*), and does not exist. The derivation of **Tamēssā* < **Tamēstā* (?) from **temH-* (on the possible identity of **temH-¹* 'ermatten, ohnmächtig werden' and **temH-²* 'be dark', see Mayrh and LIV) has been seriously disputed, see the references in Rivet & Smith (1979: 466). Why is the OInd river name *Tamasā* (→ *Gāṅgā*) not

mentioned? On the semantic and formal problems with the words under *merk-, see Feist (1939) and Lehmann (1986).

p. 147-8 DAUGHTER (M.E.H.): Celtiberian *tuater* (Botorríta III) may be part of the record (Untermann 1997). Why is it remarkable that "Indo-European daughters were significant to their families"?

p. 148 DAUGHTER-IN-LAW (M.E.H.): The meaning 'brother's wife' given for *snusos is nowhere attested (with a possible exception in Ossetic). It cannot be ascribed to the PIE word. Who is or was a "Teutonic" etymologist?

p. 148 DAWN (P.B.): OE *Ēastre* 'goddess of springtime' may be an invention by Bede. Its existence is denied almost universally today (see Knobloch 1986: 49-60). The meaning of OHG *ōstan* is not 'eastern': it's a noun meaning 'Osten, the East', the adjective and adverb is *ōstar*. Add a comment on the interrelation of 'east' and 'Easter'. Children of *Ušas* are unknown in Vedic literature. The idea of her 'reluctance' is given undue prominence.

p. 149 DAY (P.B.): The paragraph **d̥ieu-* gives a strange impression. The suggestion "that **d̥jē-* may be dialectally independent and not of PIE date" is certainly wrong. To treat as separate "lexical derivatives" 'sky', 'heaven' and 'god' is to ignore a basic fact of IE religion. Rejection of standard opinions requires the presentation of powerful arguments.

p. 149-50 DEAF (D.Q.A., D.A.M.): The preponderance of the spoken word over the written is known not only from Celtic, but is most probably a pan-Indo-European cultural (but not necessarily specific Indo-European) trait. It has nothing to do whatsoever with hearing or speaking defects.

p. 150 DEATH (D.Q.A.): **nek̑-* and **nek̑u-* belong together. Note the possible relation of the ON mythical ship *Nagl-far*. The nature and (Latinized) name of *Nehalennia* are far from being understood; to introduce the goddess here without commenting on the word-formation of the name is pointless. The explanation given for *véκταρ* 'nectar' as from 'death-conquering' is probably due to a misunderstanding of R. Schmitt's "überwindend": the meaning of the root **terh₂-* is 'durchkommen, überqueren, get through, cross, pass'.

p. 151-4 DEATH BELIEFS (L.J.H., J.P.M.): Beside cremation and inhumation, a third form, viz. exposition (to birds of prey), as best known from Zoroastrianism, should be mentioned. Furthermore, the custom of simply leaving alone, somewhere on the trek, old decrepit members of the community, as sporadically reflected in Vedic literature, might be noteworthy here. (This remarkable behaviour is recorded nowhere in EIEC.) In the

passage on Afterworld, the etymology linking OIr *at-bail* 'dies' to a verb for 'go' is wrong, cf. MW *nid adweil*; it may be correct for a different *baid* 'dies', preterite *-bath* 'is dead' (see the details in LEIA and LIV, with references). The bridge called *cinuuatō pārətu-* in Avestan should be cited correctly. Celtic *Barro-ūindos* is attested (BARRIVENDI FILIVS VENDVBARI, CIIC 368); its meaning is not simply 'head-white', but clearly 'white-haired', (probably = 'old'). On the composition type, see Zimmer (1992a). Etruscan is rather an adstrate to Latin than a substrate. Among the funeral gifts, servants must be recorded. The note on NE *paradise* is too short: it is not directly borrowed from Iranian, but from the Latin Bible < Greek < Hebrew < Old Persian. The sporadic appearance of the idea of rebirth (Pythagoras, India, Celtic lore) should be mentioned. Among the images of afterworld life, Vedic *pitṛ-loka-* 'world of the fathers' deserves mention; this also is a kind of 'meadow'.

p. 154 DEER (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): How is it possible that ToChA *yäl B yal* 'gazelle' designates precisely *Gazella subguturosa*? Witczak's metathesis in Germ **raiha-* < **roiko-* < **jorko-* is too far-fetched to be convincing.

p. 155-6 DEFECT (D.Q.A., D.A.M.): S.v. **skauros*, add cross-references to CRAFT GOD, SMITH GOD.

p. 156 DEGREES OF DESCENT (M.E.H.): **pro-* is simply the well-known preverb / preposition; similarly **epi-* and **eti-*. To call them 'generation markers' without pointing to this identity seems strange.

p. 157 DESCENDANT (M.E.H.): The Germanic and Celtic representatives are lacking here. They are given s.v. NEPHEW, NIECE to which cross-references should be added.

p. 158 DESIRE (D.Q.A.): OInd *lasati, laṣati* are late, their etymology is doubtful. S.v. **h₁ih₁iǵh-*, add Goth *aihtron* 'to beg'. The meaning of Av *xrap-* is not 'desire', but 'passend sein, to fit' (Hoffmann-Forsman 1996: 294), so that the entry falls.

p. 158: I miss an entry DISTRIBUTE (with e.g. the *bhaga*-words); cf. DIVIDE and PORTION.

p. 158 DESTROY (M.N.): The last paragraph should be rewritten with the help of LIV, and the literature referred to there.

p. 159 DIG (M.N.): Note that OIr *rucht* 'pig' is attested only in Ó Cléirigh's glossary; it is probably a vox nihili (cf. LEIA).

p. 160 DIRECTION: Add a cross-reference to WIND.

p. 160 DIRT (D.Q.A., M.N., R.S.P.B.): The meaning of W *lluddedig* is not 'muddy', but 'very tired, weary'. What might belong here is W *llaid* 'mud, mire, dirt', adj. *lleidiog* (but differently GPC).

p. 161 DIVIDE (D.Q.A.): Ved. *bhága-* is not an agent noun, but an abstract 'distribution', later 'prosperity', etc. The *Āditya* of the same name is, as are all the others, a personification of an abstract notion. The Slavonic words, OCS *bogatъ* 'rich', *u-bogъ* 'poor', etc., deserve mention. For the problems with the Iranian terms, cf. Zimmer (1984), for the Slavonic words, Zimmer (1986).

p. 161-5 DIVINE TWINS (S.T.O.B.): Line 3, read: lesser gods. — On the 'Celtic' paragraph: *Atepormaros* does not exist, read *Atepo-maros*. A name *Stirona* is not attested, only *Dirona*, *Āirona*, *Sirona*; it is clearly a derivation from the IE word for star, **h₂ster-*. For Tau gallicum and its graphic representations, see Evans (1967: 410-420). The notion of 'transfunctional goddess' is rather useless, or should be qualified. "*Mabon* ... gives his name to the *Mabinogi*" needs expansion, as this is not the standard explanation (cf. Maier 1999: 139-40, with references). The confession that the author found the Second Branch of the *Mabinogi* "confusing" tells the reader nothing about the tale. The final sentence (in reality a presupposition) that "these Irish gods are better understood in light of their Indo-European origins" might be dangerously misleading. The subject has been hotly discussed in Irish and Celtic Studies (e.g. by McCone 1991). — On the 'Germanic' paragraph: The Bronze Age rock carvings in Southern Scandinavia can in no reasonable way be labelled as 'Germanic'. How do we know that the *Naharnavali* (or better: *Naharvali*) were "dwelling near present day Wrocław in Poland"? Why not tell the reader the name of the Divine Twins given by Tacitus, viz. *Alci(s)* 'Elks (?)'. *Sleipnir*'s eight legs do not "represent an original pair of horses": they symbolize the mount's indefatigability and gliding swiftness. Unfortunately, not all possible cases for Divine Twins in Germanic lore are given, see Kuhn (RGA I: 133-4). — On the 'Greek' paragraph: *ἔυππτοι* is an error for *εὐππτοι*. The name of Helena is not "etymologically related to" Helios. If Boiotos is italicized, why not also Aiolos (or vice versa)? — On 'Indo-Iranian': The Mitanni form of the *Nāsatya-* name is incorrectly cited, read ^{DINGIR.MES} *na-ša-at-ti-ja-an-na*, which has a Hurrian plural affix.

p. 168 DOG (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The genitive of OInd *śvā́* is *śúnas* (place of accent problematic, but secured). Iran *spaka-* is given also by Herodotus, probably from Median.

p. 160: An entry DOZEN would be nice, with comments on traces of dodecadic systems, found in a variety of IE languages.

p. 171 DWELL (A.D.V.): The Av root is not *šēn* (which does not exist), but *šī-*. Add L *situs*; therefore hardly a "late IE isogloss of the south and east".

- p. 173-4 EARLY (P.B.): *W cynnar* never means 'morning' or 'dawn': it's an adjective for 'early, prompt, quick'.
- p. 177 ELF (E.C.P.): OCS *rabъ*, etc., belongs more probably to the family of *L orbus*, cf. p. 411.
- p. 178 ELK (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): No mythological connections are cited; but cf. Germ *Alci(s)* mentioned above in the comments on DIVINE TWINS.
- p. 179 ENEMY (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The term *ba-ntu* "men (= Bantu people)" is not a good example because it was coined by a modern linguist (as noted, e.g., in Zimmer 1990a: 23 n.44).
- p. 182 ESCHATOLOGY (S.T.O.B.): The Danish king *Haraldr blátǫnn* is not nicknamed 'Wartooth' but 'Bluetooth' i.e. 'with a black tooth'.
- p. 184-6 EXCHANGE (E.C.P., J.P.M.): Beside the Aryan god *Mitrá-* (m), the 'Contract' in person, the neuter noun *mitrá-* 'contact' should be mentioned (cf. my remark on *Bhaga-* 'Share' above). *Mitrā-* (p. 185a, line 10) is a misprint. The basic meaning of *W prynu* is 'buy'; this is the current term used in any market. The given 'redeem' is only a very specialized usage in religious contexts. S.v. **per-*, add cross-references to GO and THROUGH. Could **per-* and **pel-* be just dialect variants of each other? Both roots are of doubtful existence, cf. LIV (422-427) for the missing laryngeal and for an alternative explanation of OIr *renaid*; and Mayrh s.v. *pañ-* for the Indo-Iranian words in question.
- p. 186 EXCREMENT (D.Q.A.): Does the reconstruction **kerd-* signal that the existence of a *s*-mobile is not accepted by the author in this root (contra Pokorny and Watkins), or not at all in PIE? Elsewhere in EIEC, *s*-mobiles do occur.
- p. 188 EXTINGUISH (M.N.): To translate TochA *käs-* B *kes-* (Krause-Thomas: AB *käs-*) as 'go out' is highly misleading, and far too broad. The verb means 'erlöschen'; its abstract A *ksalune* B *kselñe* is a synonym for AB *nervām* < skt. *nirvāna-*. So, better translate as 'fade away, become extinguished'.
- p. 194 FAST (J.C.S.): Av *ərəzifīia-* 'eagle' should be mentioned here (it is lacking s.v. EAGLE also). For "modern sources are sceptical". better read: "modern scholars".
- p. 194: There is no entry FASTING, though the ritual practice of fasting 'against' a superior is well-known from Indian and Celtic legal traditions, and certainly part of the IE heritage (cf. Kelly 1988: 182, with references).
- p. 194-5 FATHER (M.E.H.): In my attempts to collect all the relevant material, I have never come across "OWels *-atr*"; did the author think of Gaulish *gutuater*? *W athro*, earlier 'foster-father; confessor (?)', today

'teacher, professor' might be mentioned in passing, though derived from **al-* 'to nourish'. I don't think that the "term for 'having the same father' ... suggests that the Indo-Europeans employed parent and sibling terms for a wider variety of people..." — it is simply due to the custom of polygamy. Sometimes, it is important to distinguish between full brothers and those who only have one parent in common. Cf. medieval *W deu uroder un uam ac ef* "two brothers (sharing) the same mother with him" i.e. from a different father, and similar expressions elsewhere.

p. 197 FAVOR (D.Q.A.): Not all the words cited s.v. **h₂eu-* 'favor' do actually belong here, cf. LIV s.v. **h₁eyH-* 'helfen, fördern' and s.v. **h₂ey-* 'genießen'.

p. 198 FEAR (D.Q.A.): TochB *proskye* is a misprint for *proskiye*; beside, a simple *prosko* is also attested.

p. 198 FEED (D.Q.A.): *W pawr* 'meadow' (cf. further *pori*, *-af* 'graze') cannot belong to **peh₂-* since IE **p-* > Celtic zero is one of the basic sound laws.

p. 199 FENCE (A.D.V., D.Q.A.): S.v. **mand-*, perhaps add a cross-reference to HORSE (**mendjōs*). In the next paragraph, TochB *warto* 'forest' is a misprint for *wartto*.

p. 200 FIELD (D.Q.A.): The older cluster *-nd-* of the root **le/ondh-* is still visible in the British place-name element *-landa* (ending may be Latinized, cf. *Vindolanda*), and in Gaul as reflected by Fr *lande* 'heath, moor'. In the light of Puhvel's arguments (his article is cited), I cannot find the concept of a 'meadow of the otherworld' "most speculative" (see my remarks to p. 151-4 above).

p. 201 FIGHT (E.C.P.): To derive the OW name element *Iud-* from the root **iudh-* is an interesting proposal. Unfortunately, the alleged meaning 'fighter' cannot be proven. All Continental Celtic attestations, viz. Gaul *Iudos*, *Iuda*, *Iudatus*, are proper names. The Celtic etymology proposed anonymously⁸ (in Ogam 10.1958: 328 and 336) is not mentioned (i.e. not accepted) by Schmidt (1957) or Evans (1967). Koch (1997: xlvi + n.3) has recently published an interpretation as a loan from L *iudex* (via Romano-British use as a title)

⁸ The series of articles seem to be written by either P. Leroux or Ch. Guyonvarc'h.

which would exclude any link with the Gaul names.⁹ The root **ueik-* is well attested in Celtic names, from the name of the Isle of Wight **uextā* (Förstemann's etymology, cf. Rivet & Smith 1979: 488-9), to the personal names discussed by Evans (1967: 281-5).

p. 201 FILL (M.N.): The thème I of the root is restricted to nominal forms; all IE verbs show thème II, so that the entry should rather be put as **pleh₁-*. For details, see now LIV.

p. 202 FIND ONE'S WAY (D.Q.A.): The etymology of the IE word for 'path' is one of the most discussed questions, see the references in Mayrh. The proposal of linking it to the Lith. verb *pinti* 'to plait' could merit a mention if roads made from fascines (vel sim.) are known from archeological records beside the well-known block roads. The Germanic words have always been suspected to have been borrowed from Iranian but this has never been actually proven.

p. 203 FIRE CULT (J.P.M.): It is correct that Iranian has replaced the *ignis*-word by *ātar-*; but Iran. **aṃi-* must have existed, for it is found in proper names (Av *Dāštāṃi-*, etc.; cf. Mayrhofer 1977: 35). For the correct name forms of the Sasanian ritual fires, see above to p. 116. The name "archangels" for the beings called *aməša- spənta-* in Avestan is not completely wrong, but seems a bit rash. The Biblical concept of 'archangels' seems to have been developed under Iranian influence.

p. 206: There is no entry FLOUR.

p. 207 FLOW (D.Q.A.): S.v. **sreu-*, the river name Στρούμων, belonging to one of the minor Indo-European languages on the Balkan, might be mentioned. *W dadleithio* means 'to thaw, melt'. *W taen* 'sprinkler' seems to be an error: MW *taen* meant 'host, raid', as an adj. 'brave'; ModW *taen* is 'spreading'. An instrument called 'sprinkler' is *taen-ell*, cf. the nomina agentis *taenell-wr*, *taenell-ydd*. The word cannot be related etymologically to Br *staer*, etc., i.e. a root with **st-*, because such an initial cluster gives *s-* in W (cf. *ser-enn* 'star').

p. 208 FOLLOW (D.Q.A.): The root **sek^h-* has the meaning 'see' in Germanic, and 'speak' in Celtic. This second point is not mentioned here, nor are cross-references given to SEE and SPEAK.

p. 208 FOOT (D.Q.A.): If OIr *ís* (and W *is*) is mentioned under such a heading, it cannot be a substantive 'lower part'; the true meaning 'below,

⁹ The simplex OW *ud* is very rare: Gododdin B 28, Taliesin poems VII 31, X 8. We have many other proper names with the element *-iud-/ud-*, always written with *u*, never with *w* or *y*. The vowel is thus long.

under' is clear from the etymology **pēd-su* loc.pl. 'at the feet'.

p. 209 FORCE (E.C.P.): The Indo-Iranian record may be completed by GathicAv *aogō*, *aojañh-*; OInd *ug-rá-*. The Proto-Indo-Iranian form is **aujas-* (with a palatalized velar). The proposed connection with L *augur* has been disputed, and remains problematic. If (but this is far from clear) the primary function of an *augur* was to find out the magical message of the flight of birds, the word might rather belong to *avis*.

p. 210 FORT (A.D.V., J.P.M.): The modern meaning of W *dinas* is 'city' (cf. *prifddinas* 'capital city'). The Common Celtic term borrowed by Germanic is **dūno-* (the alleged **dh-* could never have given Germ. **t-* via Grimm's Law). The vowel length in OHG *zun* should be marked in the usual way: *zûn*.

p. 211 sq. FORTUNE (E.C.P., M.R.D.): I have argued elsewhere that a nomen agentis **bhago-* 'apportioner' does not exist (Zimmer 1984, 1986). Further in the text, the correct meaning 'portion' is given (obviously, a problem of fusion of two manuscripts). The comparison of L *Fortuna* with OInd *Pṛthu-* is not only "linguistically insupportable", but simply wrong and therefore unacceptable. The translation of *Ahurō Mazdā* as 'wise Lord', though still defended by some scholars, is certainly wrong, as shown by the flexion type: the name's meaning is 'Lord Wisdom'. The precise date given for "several Yasnas" invoking *Ārmaiti*, viz. "from c. 660 to 583 BC" is surprising. The translation of the name *Ārmaiti* as "devotion" seems a bit weak (better is Lommel's "Fügsamkeit" which may be rendered by 'docility, obedience'); for details, see Lommel (1930: 58-65), still the best handbook on Zarathustra's religion.

p. 212-3 FOX (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): Av *urupi-* is not simply 'dog', but, according to the Videvat, an animal to be classified with dogs; according to the Parsi tradition, it is a 'weasel'. For its use as a proper noun, and more details, see Mayrhofer (1979, 1.319).

p. 213 FREEMAN (D.Q.A.): The article seems particularly garbled. Thieme's¹⁰ theory about OInd *ári-*, *árya-* and the PIE background may perhaps not be acceptable to everybody, but is far better than anything else proposed before or afterwards. The author's wording neglects the chronology of the texts, and the stratification of the meanings recoverable by philological analysis. Basically, *ári-* is a word for 'foreigner', oscillating between 'enemy' and 'foreigner received in hospitality'. There can be no doubt that *árya-*, first of all, was a social term denoting the practice of a certain social behaviour,

¹⁰ In the reference to his book, read: Morgenländische.

not the adherence to a 'religion' (the PIE and the Vedic Indians would not have understood such a term), not to speak of an ethnonym. Interestingly, D.Q.A. accepts Thieme's doctrines in his article OTHER, p. 411.

p. 214 FRIEND (E.C.P.): The translation "friendly" given for **keh₂ros* (I'd prefer **kā-ro-*) is too weak: all attestations in the different languages point to 'loving, desiring'.

p. 214 FRIGHTEN (M.N., D.Q.A.): The meaning of *W turfu* is not 'hunt', but 'to scare'.

p. 215 FURROW (D.Q.A.): The alternative etymology for **porkō-* viz. as belonging to **perk-* 'speckled, spotted' should be mentioned. The localisation of 'furrow' (and generally, agriculture) only in western IE is doubtful, cf. the etymologies of OInd *sītā-* 'furrow' and *sīra-* 'plough' (< 'sowing plough'?), on which see Mayrh.

p. 218-23 GERMANIC (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The very first sentence, dating "their [= Germanic-speaking peoples] entrance into history in the last centuries before Christ" is contradicted by the fact, recorded p. 222, that "the earliest ... account of the ancient Germans" [i.e. Germanic-speaking peoples, not ancestors of modern Germany's citizens, St.Z.] is Caesar. I do not understand the sentence p. 221b, line 44-47: why must a substrate "have disappeared a thousand or perhaps two thousand years before" [presumably: the first sound shift]? The items ascribed by Hans Kuhn to his 'Nordwestblock', however they are to be interpreted, are proof enough that a substrate could have been living on well into the first millenium AD. The first sound shift (i.e. Grimm's Law) is said to be "often being set around 500 BC" (p. 223a, lines 1-2). But this is most probably too early: Germanic names from Caesar's time show the fluctuation between Pre-Germanic and Germanic phonology. On the whole range of methodological problems implied, see now Timpe et al. (RGA 12. 1998: 181-438).¹¹

p. 224 GIRD (D.Q.A., E.J.W.B.): The references s.v. **kerd-* may be misleading without further comment. Celtic **krd-su-* is Pedersen's reconstruction in light of the Slavic words. But *W gwregys* clearly is a compound with **upo-*, and the British correspondences of OIr *cris* (which are not mentioned), *W crys*, etc., mean 'shirt'. The Celtic suffix was rather the common IE **-tu-*; cf. LEIA C-238f.

¹¹ It is a pity that Kluge's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* is cited in its 21st ed. of 1975 (which is identical with the 20th of 1967). E. Seebold has published a "völlig neu bearbeitete" 22nd ed. in 1989, and a corrected 23rd one in 1995.

p. 225 GLAND (D.Q.A.): What is the function of parentheses in speaking of "certain 'central' dialects"? The term (with or without parentheses) is defined nowhere in EIEC, as far as I can see.

p. 227-9 GO (D.Q.A.): W *wyf* "I am" does not belong here; it is a formation from the root **h₁es-*. It cannot be separated from 3rd sg. forms such as OW *-oi*, *-wy* (e.g. *hitt-oi* 'is', *p-wy* 'who/whose is'), cf. Zimmer (1999b, with references). The meaning of Toch AB *lä-n-t-* (sic) is not 'to emerge', but 'to go, to leave' (mostly: the stage, but also a room, a town. etc.) The preterite A *luc* B *luc* is 2nd and 3rd sg. (not only 3rd sg. masc., as translated here) as shown independently by K.T. Schmidt and G.-J. Pinault. To the next lexeme: What is the **-d^h-* found in all languages except Hittite, if not part of the root? To **per-*, add cross-references to EXCHANGE and THROUGH. It is striking to see that s.v. **terh₂-* the famous *véκταρ* is not cited; cf. my remarks above on p. 150.

p. 230-1 GOD (E.C.P., D.Q.A., J.P.M.): More references should be given, at least to the classical studies by Schindler, Strunk and Dunkel.

p. 232 GODDESSES (M.R.D.): The Greek lunar deity Σεμέλη is said to be a form of an earth-goddess, borrowed from Thracian. So, Moon = Earth ?

p. 234 GOLD (M.E.H., J.P.M.): This is a case where correct transcription of Avestan is beneficial: read Av *zaraniia-*, OPers *daraniya-* (*daranyam* is a misprint). The preform given for these and OInd *híranya-* cannot have been **ǵhl-enjo-*. Such a form would have given automatically **ǵhl-enjo-* > OInd **hranya-*. The correct preform **ǵhlh₃-en-jo-* makes clear that 'gold' is the 'yellow' metal (cf. OInd *hári-*, etc.).

p. 235-6 GOOD (J.C.S., D.Q.A.): The translation of the Gaul name element (-) *uesu-* as "worthy" seems to be a misunderstanding. Gaul *vesu-* is 'good', perhaps also 'rich' (so Schmidt 1957: 294); 'worthy' is Gaul *vīsu-*, OIr *fiu*, W *gwīw*, a *vřddhi* derivative of the basic adjective. S.v. **meh₂(t)-*, a reference to Gaul MAT / ANM on the Calendar of Coligny might be added.

p. 237 GRAIN (D.Q.A.): Is there a reason for doubling data like "MDutch *tarwe* 'wheat', NDutch *tarwe* 'wheat'", or is it simply a formatting error? Similar waste of space occurs many times, esp. with Tocharian words.

p. 238 GRANDFATHER (M.E.H., D.Q.A.): The Proto-Germanic form of G *Oheim*, etc., is properly **awa-haima-* "whose second element is somewhat obscure" according to the authors. This is rather strange, since the compound has been convincingly explained long ago as a Bahuvrīhi 'living in the home of the grandfather' (vel sim.), cf. the etymological dictionaries.

p. 240 GRASS (D.Q.A.): Add OIr *gelt* 'pasture, grassland', a loan from Brit.

- p. 248 GROVE (P.F.): The classification of *nimidās* as OSax is wrong, see my remarks above on p. 63. To label the evident relation of **nemos* 'grove' to the root **nem-* 'to bow' as "inherently unlikely" is unfounded. It is the relation of OInd *namas-*, Av *nəmāh-* to **nem-* which is in doubt (see Mayrh) because of the known praying posture, which is upright.
- p. 248 GROW (D.Q.A.): OInd *oj-mān-* does not belong here, but to *ug-rá-*, etc., cf. the article FORCE. Add OInd *ukṣán-* (according to K. Hoffmann apud Oettinger 1979:170). The meaning of **ǵerh₂-* does not contain the connotation 'mature'. More Indo-Iranian words could be cited; the name of *Zarathuštra-* might be discussed. The meaning of **h₂el-* is not 'grow', but 'to nourish, raise'; Goth *alan* 'grow' does not exist (the participle *alandis*, the only form attested, translates Gr *ἐντροφόμενος* 'nourishing oneself'), and similarly, the meaning of OE *alan* is not 'grow', but 'to nourish'. The curious semantic evolution of W *athro* may be worth mentioning (cf. my remarks above to p. 194).
- p. 253 HAIR (D.Q.A., D.A.M.): The final sentence of the long article about CúChulainn's "hair tricolored in perfect consonance with the IE formula" is a void speculation in the style of Dumézil's epigones. There are so many 'tricolores' all over the world.
- p. 255 HANG (M.N.): S.v. **(s)leb-*, G *schlaff* might be worth mentioning.
- p. 255 HAPPY (D.Q.A.): The meaning of OInd *tusyati* is not 'is delighted with' but 'is content, satisfied'. The accent printed is unattested (in Vedic, only causatives are found). In the Indian word family, the connotation of 'joy' only emerges later, e.g. in Hindi *tūsnā* 'be glad', etc.
- p. 256 HARAPPA (J.P.M.): The comparison of Akkadian *Meluhha* (name of a region) with OInd *mlecchā-* is rather improbable, as demonstrated by Burrow (1977: 67). Greek *βάβραρος* shows a variant with (-r- for -l-) of the PIE root **mlajs-* 'to speak gibberish'.
- p. 261-2 HEAL (D.Q.A.): The first paragraph is at variance with the entry INSPIRATION.
- p. 262 HEALTHY (D.Q.A.): W *coel* is not '(good) omen', but rather a neutral 'omen, portent'; a positive connotation only emerges in the modern technical meaning 'credit (in business)'.
- p. 262 HEAP (D.Q.A.): To Slavic **kopa* 'batch of sixty', a note on possible traces of hexagesimal systems might be added.
- p. 263 HEARTH (A.D.V., D.Q.A.): Lines 3-4 are wrong: rhotacism is found in Latin and Umbrian, but not in Oscan (cf. Buck 1904 :74).
- p. 263 HEAT (J.C.S.): W *tân* is not 'hot'; it is a noun meaning 'fire'. 'Hot' is *poeth* or *brwd*.

p. 265 HELLEBORE (D.Q.A.): The alleged accent of OInd *kámala-* is unattested, the word being late. Borrowing from Dravidian is unlikely here (see Mayrh).

p. 265-6 HELL-HOUND (L.J.H., J.P.M.): OInd *śarvara-* is a doubtful word, see Mayrh, so that the reconstruction of the PIE name for the 'hell-hound' is far from being secured. In the Zoroastrian ritual, the dog is brought in not "to a dead body", but to a dying person. The name of the dog attributed to Gwynn ap Nudd is wrong: there is no "*Dormarth* 'Death's Door'". Gwynn's dog is named *Dormach* in the Black Book of Carmarthen, where a drawing of the strange beast (only two forelegs and a tail) may be found (cf. Bartrum 1993: 352). Its relation to the theme of hell-hound is rather weak. It is incorrect to state that in OInd dice playing, "the best throw is known as the 'dog-killer'": see the correct explanation of *śva-ghnín-* in Mayrh (with ref.).

p. 266 HELP (M.N.): Here, a whole range of IE expressions is missing: L *suc-surro*, OIr *fo-raith*; Gr *βοηθεῖν*. Add a cross-reference to FAVOUR.

p. 266-7 HEMP (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): Is "the spirit world" the worlds of 'spirits' i.e. ghosts, or a misprint for 'spiritual world'? It should be made clear that the traces of hemp at Hochdorf are remnants of hemp bast textiles, not of drugs.

p. 268 HERDSMAN (D.Q.A.): W *bugail* is not only 'shepherd', but generally 'herdsman'. It might be worth mentioning Br *bugel*, which is today the current word for 'boy'.

p. 268 HIDE¹ (D.Q.A.): "ON *eld-gýgr* 'abyss (crater of volcano)' (< *'something hidden') is wrong. ON *eldr* is a poetical word for 'fire', and *gýgr* is a word for a giantess, lit. 'concealer'. The compound is ModIcelandic only, as is its usage for 'volcano crater'.

p. 270 HOLD (M.N., D.Q.A.): The meaning of **Heik-* is more precisely 'to appropriate', see LIV, where also the relationship of the Germanic and OInd lexemes is explained.

p. 271 HONEY (M.E.H., D.Q.A.): There may be a W word reflecting the custom of preparing drinks of mead, viz. *meddyglyn* (cf. Zimmer 1992b: 316). TochB (add the dialect letter) *mot* 'brandy' is not an inherited word, but a loan either from OIran **madu-* (Isebaert 1980: 141), or from MIran, probably Sogd *mwd*, *mōw* 'wine' (see the discussion in Isebaert; for references to the Sogd forms, see Gharib 1995).

p. 272 HOOK (D.Q.A.): To the third lexeme, add TochA *ānkar* B *ānkār* 'tusk (of elephant)'.

p. 272 HORN (D.Q.A.): Rather than 'horn', **koru-* is 'hart, horned animal', see the Celtic and Italic words; other derivatives being are thematizations, or

are derived from such.

p. 273 HORNBEAM (P.F.): The final sentence of the last paragraph but one contains an interesting idea, viz. that phonological "variation might reflect its [the tree's] use in ritual" (with respect to initial **g/k/sk-* and final **p/b^h*), which, however, would need massive substantiation by other such (or at least similar) cases in order to be convincing.

p. 273-9 HORSE (D.Q.A., J.P.M., D.A.M.). Again, "the supposition that in animal names a derived feminine in **-eh_a-* denotes a domestic animal and a derived feminine in **-ih_a-* denotes a wild animal" (p. 274, s.v. **marko-*) is a brilliant idea but impossible to prove. Do we have enough cases of parallel formations of the type *X-ā* 'domestic female animal' vs. *X-ī* 'wild feminine animal'? Meid's theory (cited p. 277) that Greek ἵπότης also means 'rider' is contradicted by synonymous ἵπρεύς: both words are clearly 'master of horses, i.e. driver of a horse-drawn chariot' in Homer. Only later did the meaning of both words include 'rider' and 'knight'. The strange Irish royal inauguration ceremony recorded (or invented?) by Giraldus Cambrensis cannot be labelled an 'analogue' to the OInd *ašvamedha-*, for the discrepancies are far too strong; the authors speak, two lines down (p. 278), about "similarities" only. See Polomé's paper cited and my remarks elsewhere (Zimmer 1994a: 31): these similarities are rather weak and superficial.

p. 281-4 HOUSE (A.D.V., D.Q.A., J.P.M.): It is strange to note the omission of the standard book on the subject (Buti 1962). In connection with OIr *cuile*, its exact Germanic parallels Goth *halja*, OE *hel(l)*, ON *hel*, OHG *hella* (G *Hölle*) should be mentioned.

p. 284 HUNT (E.C.P., D.Q.A.): There are serious alternatives for the etymologies given for Gr λέων 'lion' and Toch A *lu* B *luwo* 'animal' which might be worth mentioning. The root **selg-* 'to set loose (dogs, etc.)', attested in Celtic and Aryan (cf. LIV 479), should be added.

p. 284-5 HURRY (D.Q.A.): A comment on the productive causative formation in Germanic, as seen with the root **sperg^h-*, may be useful. OInd *ucchalati* (in dictionaries only) is of doubtful value (cf. Mayrhofer 1956-1976: III 313), its meaning being far from certain. OInd *sísarti* has nothing to do with **sel-* (cf. LIV 477-8).

p. 287 ICE (R.S.P.B.): The author's well-known theory that "PIE had no **a*" plays an important role in his reconstructions. It is, however, not accepted by many Indo-Europeanists (cf. BLIND, HUMBLE, NOSE and many other words). For a reference tool such as EIEC, it might be more appropriate to stick to standard procedures, or at least to add a reference to standard

accounts (as e.g. Mayrhofer 1986: 169-70 for the question of PIE *a; cf. my remarks to p. xx above, laryngeal notation).

p. 288 ILLYRIAN (J.P.M.): W *tud* 'country' is only indirectly attested (in compounds, e.g. *all-tud* 'foreigner'); better cite Br *tud* 'people, relations'. Among the testimonies for **teytā*, the Anatolian and Iranian words should also be indicated, or "etc." with a cross-reference to PEOPLE added.

p. 290 IMPELLER (E.C.P., J.P.M.): The function of the phrase "cf. also the Old Irish festival of *samain* which marked the end of the Celtic year" is not clear to me. Etymologically, *samain* is 'coming together, meeting', so any linguistic relation to the OInd god *Savitār-* is excluded.

p. 299 I-E HOMELAND (J.P.M.): At the end of the excellent article, the reference to Gimbutas (1991) seems rather useless. It is striking that no publication of an Indo-Europeanist is indicated (the only linguist mentioned is Diakonoff). Even if it is not published in English, my paper (Zimmer 1990a) might be of interest to some readers.

p. 299-303 I-E LANGUAGES (M.E.H.): A number of good overviews of the family have been published in the last decades, some in English. Compared to those, the article is less reliable. The statement that "about half of the world's population presently speak an IE language" seems to be exaggerated and to underestimate the population numbers of Asia and Africa. To Celtic: "Less than one hundred inscriptions ... survive to record the Gaulish language" is wrong, see RIG with more than three hundred entries. "New" Irish and "New" Welsh are unusual for current Modern Irish / Modern Welsh. To Germanic: It is incorrect to indicate "Dutch, Flemish and Afrikaans" as survivals of OLFranconian on the same footing: Flemish is the cover term for a number of dialects of the Dutch (better: Netherlandic) language, whereas Afrikaans has grown out of a colonial version of the latter; for some aspects of its history, see Zimmer (1992c). To Slavonic: The Glagolica cannot be labelled "an earlier form of the Cyrillic alphabet"; it is quite a different alphabetic script. The imprecise wording of "Lower Sorbian (or Wendish or Lusatian)" is misleading. Correct terms in English are to be found in Stone (1972). To Indo-Iranian: The list of Prakrit languages is garbled: the first four terms are language names, but the following six are names of places where the main Aśokan inscriptions are to be found (the last name to be read correctly: *Shāhbāzgarhī*).¹² The sentence on the Avesta is again wrongly constructed; one cannot say "the greater part of the Avesta, usually termed Younger Avestan or simply Avestan". 'Avesta' is the name of

¹² The linguistically correct transcription of the name is *Shāhbāzgarhī*.

the holy book of the Zoroastrians; its contents are written in two dialects, called 'Old Avestan' or 'Gathic', and 'Younger Avestan'. 'Avestan' without qualifications refers to both. The taxonomy of the Middle Iranian languages is incorrectly represented: Khotanese Saka and Tumshuqese Saka are two forms (dialects) of one language. Among the names for New Persian, Dari should be indicated: it is the oldest name of the language, still current in Afghanistan. To Tocharian: Reference only to the expedition of Aurel Stein might be felt as an insult to the French, Prussian, and Japanese expeditions (cf. Dabbs 1963). The Further Readings are especially inappropriate: does the author really hold the books by Beekes, Cowgill, Ramat&Ramat, Szemerényi, etc., to be less recommendable?

p. 303-11 INDO-IRANIAN (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The use of CLI might have prevented many errors. On p. 304a, line 10 **yajátám* is wrong (a misprint?) for **yajátám*; the primary palatals and the secondary palatalized velars must be distinguished (cf. Hoffmann-Forsman 1996: 99-103). The beginning of column 2 is incorrect, Brugmann's Law being not yet PIE. The merger of *r* and *l* in Iranian *r* is not absolutely complete, cf. NPers *lab* 'lip', *lisidan* 'lick'. In the table p. 305, some diagnostic OPers forms should be included (e.g. OPers *dasta-*, Av *zasta-* 'hand'). To Indo-Aryan: The perfect is not an aspect (p. 306a, lines 18-9). For the technical terms of Kikkuli's horse training book, see Starke (1994). Prakrit spoken to "1100 AD" is certainly far too late; Apabhramśa should also be mentioned in its proper place (Masica 1991 is given, but obviously not followed). To Iranian: It might be worth mentioning that some texts of the Avesta are as recent as the 18th c. AD. Among the Middle Iranian languages, Parthian is lacking (on the misleading use of 'Pahlavi', see above on p. xxii). To call Middle Persian "a markedly simplified version of Persian" (probably for intended Old Persian) is an oversimplification, see CLI. To Nuristani: No reference is given to the ground-breaking publications of Buddruss (see CLI).¹³

p. 312-3 INSPIRATION (E.C.P.): The relation of the heading to the only entry given (with semantics of 'sacred power, strength') is shaky. One expects a discussion of L *vates*, OIr *fáith*, etc.; this is given s.v. POET, SACRED. S.v. HEAL, a different view is to be found.

¹³ In the literature list, s.v. Mayrhofer 1973 read: Oesterreichische; s.v. Mayrhofer 1986- read: Altindoarischen (similarly, p. 335 at the end of KINSHIP: s.v. Delbrück read: indogermanischen). The absence of CLI is revealing. Parpola 1994 has no bearing on the subject.

- p. 313 INTOXICATOR (J.P.M.): The OInd *Mādhavī* cannot be etymologically connected to the root *mad-* (with unaspirated *d*), whose meaning is not "boil, rejoice, get drunk", but 'to gladden'.
- p. 313: There is no entry INVITE; see instead CALL.
- p. 314-9 ITALIC (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): At the end, one of the two standard etymological dictionaries is lacking, viz. Walde-Hofmann. None of the important publications by Rix and Meiser is indicated, and the whole range of publications by Italian scholars is neglected, with the exception of Pallottino (1981).
- p. 322 JASTORF (J.P.M.): Lines 4 and 5, read: **īsarno-*, **īsar-na-*.
- p. 329-30 KING (D.Q.A.): Cf. my remarks to p. 273 HORSE above.
- p. 335 KINSMAN (M.E.H., D.Q.A.): Add W *edrydd* '(paternal) residence', and *modryb* 'aunt'.
- p. 343 LACK (D.Q.A.): S.v. **deu(s)-*, the possible connection to the prefix **dus-* 'bad(ly)' could be indicated (cf. Meier-Brügger 1989: 60); add a cross-reference to LEAVE.
- p. 344 LARGE (D.Q.A.): To first lexeme, add the zero-grade forms Av *aš-*, Gr *ἀγ-ᾶν*.
- p. 345-6 LAW (E.C.P., J.P.M.): To the first word, add ON *dómr* 'sentence, judgement' which, like OE *dóm*, has a strong connotation to the 'Last Day's Doom' of the Bible. *Saliū* is no longer accepted as a tribe's name (cf. Timpe, RGA 11. 1998: 240). Add a reference to the works of Leist (at least to Leist 1978) and to Schlerath (1978).
- p. 348 LEAF (D.Q.A.): S.v. **dhal-*, add Gr *θαλερός*.
- p. 348 LEARN (D.Q.A.): The heading seems inappropriate for the heterogeneous groups of verbs gathered here. The words meaning 'wish', etc., are not variants of the verbal compound **mens-d^heh₁-*. Add OInd *śikṣ-* 'to help, try' (act.), 'to study, learn' (med.), a desiderative to *śak-* 'to be able to', and similar formations elsewhere.
- p. 351-2 LICK (D.Q.A.): Add NPer *lisidan* with IE **l-* preserved.
- p. 353 LINDEN (P.F.): The formulation "Celtic place-names in *Līmo-*, etc. (< Celtic **leimo-*)" may be misleading; these names, if the *-i-* is short, continue the zero grade **limo-*.
- p. 356 LION (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The new (?) proposal of explaining OHG *lēwo* as a loan from OCS *lvъ* is certainly wrong. It is borrowed from L *leo*, cf. the earliest literary attestations.
- p. 356 LIP (D.Q.A.): IE **leb-* is not a "westernism", as shown by NPer *lab* which ought to be added to the article. Note the exceptional preservation of IE **l-* in Iranian.

p. 356 LITTER (A.D.V.): Many other derivatives from the root **bher-* could, and some of them at least should, be added. Not only formations in **-tlo-* denote instruments, cf. e.g. German *Bahre*, (LG) *Böre*.

p. 357 LONG (J.C.S., D.Q.A.): The root given in the form **meh_hk-*, i.e. with velar tectal (against Pokorny), is incompatible with Av *mas-*, *masah-* which have clearly an original primary palatal **k̄*.

p. 357-8 LOVE (D.Q.A.): It might be worth citing the other (equally old) meaning of W *câr*, viz. 'kinsman'; add OIr *carae* 'friend, kinsman'. To reconstruct an hypothetical "verbal noun **kéh_hr* (gen. **kh_hrós*)" is unconvincing and unnecessary. The separation of OInd *kāma-* from *kāmāyati* is a mistake; the second lemma **kem-* needs the additional comment that this is a secondary development out of the first, perhaps as old as PIE itself (cf. Mayrh I 305-6, 338-9). For another possible root **kem-* 'to press', see LIV. S.v. **leubh-* add the Germanic words meaning 'belief', Goth *galaubjan*, Germ *Glaube*, etc.; perhaps, even *Laub* 'leafage' (if < 'fodder, bait') belongs here. Add a reference to Ofitsch (1997).

p. 359 LUNG (D.Q.A.): Every butcher sees the lungs swim when the entrails are washed. A clear semantic parallel to L *pulmo*, etc., is E *lights* 'lungs' (mentioned s.v. LIGHT²), Port *leve*, Slav *lěgkije* which have to be added here. The second lemma given has nothing to do with lungs and should be placed elsewhere.

p. 359-60 LYNX (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): Add Gaul *lugu-* which, at least in some place-names, might refer to the animal (cf. Maier 1996: 128-9). The preservation of the word in Irish and English is a clear case of inheritance and may well be due to IE poetical traditions.

p. 361 MACEDONIAN (J.P.M.): Βερνίκη is probably a misprint for Βερενίκη.

p. 362 MAKE (D.Q.A.): W *digoni* has a strong connotation of 'perform in masterly fashion, be fully able to' (cf. Zimmer 1998a: 1035-6); after all, it is a denominative of *digon* 'enough, plenty'. The translations offered for Av *aša-* (correctly *ašā-*) and OInd *ṛtá-* are so imprecise as to be misleading; after all the long discussions among specialists, the basic meaning 'truth' is to be regarded as safely established.

p. 364 MAMMALS (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): How is it possible that "the mouse played no economic role" (cf. p. 387: "no evident economical role") if people at all periods had to invent ways of preserving their harvests against this animal's attacks?

p. 366-7 MAN (M.E.H.): To the word family of Gr ἀνήρ, add L *Nero*, Germanic (Tacitus) *Nerthus* (fem.), ON *Njǫrðr* (masc.); to that of L *homo*,

Gaul -XTONION (Vercelli). The semantics of German *Mann* and *Mensch* (if NHG are cited, to be written with capital initials) seem to be misunderstood: *Mensch* is no term of prestige in relation to *Mann*; it is a different word with a different meaning. I disagree with the author's explanation of **dhǵhmon-* 'earthling', allegedly denoting humans as "inhabitants of the earth". The PIE terms for 'human being' must be seen against those for 'gods': as **deǵyo-* is clearly 'the heavenly one' (which might include notions such as 'living in heaven' or 'possessing heaven' but there is no need to attempt any precision at all), so **dhǵhmon-* is 'the earthly one'; humans are **mórto-* 'mortal' in contrast to the gods who are **n-mrto-* 'immortal'.

p. 369 MARRIAGE (M.E.H., J.P.M.): W *dyweddio* (no need to spell it with *i*) is 'to betroth', not 'to marry'. As a denominal derivative of older *dyweddi* 'betrothal, espousal, marriage, matrimony', it cannot be cited on the same level as e.g. Lith *vedù*.

p. 371 MASTER, MISTRESS (M.E.H., D.Q.A.): The wording of "Goth *bruf-fups* 'bridegroom' (whence Alb *fat* 'husband')" seems misleading: is the Albanian word regarded as a loan from Gothic? The idea that **potnh₂-* "did not refer to the wife of the **potis* but to his mother" is to be rejected: Albanian alone cannot outweigh the evidence from all other Indo-European languages.

p. 375 MEDICAL GOD (J.P.M.): Why are *haurvatāt* and *amərətāt* "Iranian counterparts" of the Aśvins? The second term does not mean 'long life' but 'immortality'. Avestan *airiīaman-* has been shown to be a 'ghost god' by J. Kellens 20 years ago: it is a neuter meaning '(cult) community' (see the ref. in Mayrh).

p. 377 MEET (M.N.): Pedersen's etymology cited here is not generally accepted, see the etymological dictionaries of the various Germanic languages.

p. 379 METAL (M.E.H., J.P.M.): In column 1, line 4 from the bottom, read: Kapiṣṭhala-.

p. 380 MIDDLE (D.Q.A.): The etymon given as **(s)me-* is based on the unnecessary assumption that **med^hi* is to be analyzed as **me-d^hi*. The presumed *s-* mobile is nowhere attested. IE **me-th_a-* (sic) does not exist.

p. 384 MIX (M.N.): To the first lexeme, add the Slavonic words, e.g. Sorabian *jucha* 'soup, broth; liquid manure', borrowed by German as *Jauche*.

p. 384 MOAN (D.Q.A.): **sten-* 'moan' and **(s)tenh₂-* 'thunder' are to be kept separate according to J. Narten (cf. ref. in LIV).

p. 385 MOON (R.S.P.B.): All the names for the days of the week in Celtic are loan translations from Latin, but there is no need to doubt the inherited

status of OIr *lúan* (cf. the traditional *lúan láith*) and, with a different suffix, *W lleu-ad*.

p. 387 MOUTH (D.Q.A.): *W safn* is not 'jawbone', but 'mouth'.

p. 388 MULBERRY (P.F.): The wording may be misunderstood; it should be made clear that sericulture is fairly recent in "northern and Mediterranean Europe".

p. 389: Note the strange cross reference "NAKED see BALD".

p. 390 NAME (E.C.P., J.P.M.): The Gaul plural *anuana* may be worth citing. *Av X'aronbaxša* does not exist, cf. Mayrhofer (1979). OIr *Boand* 'Boyne' and OInd *Go-vinda-* are not 'White-cow'. If the first is not a purely Celtic formation 'white as a cow', it might be inherited as 'finding cows', or 'searching cows'. See the careful discussion of Uhlich (1993: 181-3, with full documentation and references); but a reversed *Bahuvrīhi* 'characterized by white cows' is still another serious possibility (Uhlich's definition of the type is different). For 'names of plants' as proper names, one should not cite the obvious nickname *Cicero* without further comment. To the short list of Further Readings, many other important studies might be added.

p. 391 NAVE (D.Q.A.) and NAVEL (D.Q.A.), both giving identical items, should be combined.

p. 391-2 Similar, NECK (D.Q.A.) and NECKLACE (D.Q.A., J.P.M.) could either be combined or organized in a way which would avoid duplication.

p. 393 NET (D.Q.A.): Assuming a Greek "(prefixed?) *d-" as in the word for 'tear' is strange. S.v. TEAR, possible other explanations for *d- are given. None of those would work for 'net'; so, better keep the lexemes separate.

p. 393 NETTLE (D.Q.A.): It might be practical to add that MW *dynat* is ModW *danadl*. If nettle fibres have really been spun into coarse sheets, the famous shirt impregnated with *Nessos'* blood which caused the death of Herakles might belong here.

p. 395 NOISE (D.Q.A.): S.v. *ger-, the Germanic words need checking. At least, OHG *karōn* 'to lament', OE *cearian* 'to care' (both usually spelled with one -r-) are weak verbs. S.v. *dhren-, add TochB *trānk-* 'to lament'; B *trenk-* (= A ²*trānk-*) is not 'speak', but 'to stick, cling' (as a Buddhist technical term).

p. 395 NOT (D.Q.A.): The last sentence is misleading. It should be stressed that the strict distinction between *mē (+ injunctive, etc.) and *ne (+ indicative) is old and fundamental in Indo-European syntax.

p. 397-405 NUMERALS (C.F.J.): This long article might ideally be divided up into the different units. The speculations about the protohistory of the PIE system should be kept apart from the question of the various etymologies.

The works of Eichner (1982, unpublished but circulating widely in xerox form), Blažek (1998a,b,c) and Starke (1994, for the Kikkuli terms) should be used for the second edition. Strangely enough, the apparent traces of nondecimal systems are neglected; there are no cross-references to dodecadic, vigesimal, hexagesimal, and perhaps even other systems (e.g. W *deunau* 'eighteen' which is clearly 'two [times] nine'). The following comments are confined to a selection of the most salient points. To p. 398a, lines 11-13: the numerals from 'six' to 'nine' do not "behave like nouns rather than adjectives": there is no trace of flexion (as with 'one' to 'four'). Incidentally, both adjectives and substantives are nouns; an encyclopedia written by linguists should avoid popular misconceptions. To column 2, lines 20-22: Is 'hundred' really "attested ... where one would expect" 'ten' or 'five'? Without further explanation, this phrase remains incomprehensible. To p. 399a, lines 4-5: Welsh has no indefinite article, so the indication "*un* 'one; a, an (indef.art.)" is an inexplicable mistake. To p. 399-400: To the words for 'second', add W *ail*, G *ander(-)*. To 'double', add W *dyblyg* < L *duplicem*. The word **bhōu* 'both' is not a numeral at all, but a pronominal adjective. What about its syntax? To p. 400b, 'three': What is "an old late PIE dialectal feminine"? The fem. numeral **tisrēs* is safely to be ascribed to PIE, due to its attestation in Indo-Iranian and Celtic. To p. 401 'four': The assumed development "**petuor-* < **k^uetuor-* under the influence of **penk^e*" is unnecessary, at least for British where every IE **k^u* > *p* is basic. To 'five' (and 'fifth'): The same holds true for the "assimilation of **-k^u-* to *-p-*" seen in W *pump*, etc. It is more economic to assume a Common Celtic assimilation **penk^e* > **k^uenk^e* which automatically yields Brit **pemp*. The same happened in Italic, with Latino-Faliscan retaining the labiovelar and Osco-Umbrian turning it into *p*.¹⁴ The idea that 'five' is secondary for older 'hand' is repeatedly mentioned, but unconvincing: cf. s.v. HAND. The word for 'fist' given there is much more likely 'five fingers combined'. Unfortunately, no source for the brilliant etymology of ToChB *epinkte* (add: A *opäntäs*) 'in between' (adverb and postposition) < *'in the middle between the four cardinal directions' is given.¹⁵ To p. 402, 'seven': To explain the

¹⁴ Note that in the prehistory of Germanic, a progressive assimilation **penk^e* > **penpe* has taken place. Goth *fimf* shows subsequent assimilation of the nasal.

¹⁵ Hilmarsson's (1991: 138) reference to Winter (1982: 401) is an error. In the place indicated, Winter connected A *opäntäs* and B *epinkte*, without further comment.

retained sibilant in W *saith* "with Latin influence" is easy, but unconvincing. The question must be seen in connection with the other cases of retained *s* < Brit *s*- and inversely, of *h*- < Latin *s*- (cf. Zimmer 1994c). To 'seven': The various "full-grade roots" from which 'eight' "may be derived" are void constructions violating the rules of syllable structure and word-formation. To p. 403, 'nine': If 'nine' were a derivative of 'new', what is the status of the final **-n*, which is undoubtedly old and quite unpredictable? To 'ten': There is no trace of the presumed proto-forms ***deku*, ***deken* (note the different tectals). To derive Cornish *degves* (not *-ē-*) from a form with suffix **-os* or **mos*, but MW *decuet*, ModW *degfed* from a derivative with **-mo-* is wrong. First, the suffix in higher Celtic ordinals is **-metos* (which has been generalized from forms like **sextam-etos*); then, every Brit final *-t* becomes *-d* in W, but is further turned (in most instances and the majority of dialects) into a sibilant in Corn and Bret; so, the Corn and W words are identical. Above 'ten', the Celtic formations are widely neglected though they are quite original¹⁶ (cf. 'eleven' to 'nineteen' in W: *un ar ddeg*, *deu-ddeg*, *tri ar ddeg*, *pedwar ar ddeg*, *pym-theg*, *un ar bymtheg*, *dau ar bymtheg*, *deu-naw*, *pedwar ar bymtheg*, and the scores '20' to '140': *ugain*, *deugain*, *trigain*, *pedwar ugain*, *cant*, *chweugain*, *saith ugain*). To p. 404, 'fifteen': *pymtheg* is not Old Welsh, but Middle and Modern (it would be written **pimtec* vel sim. in OW). The special OIr formations of 'Substantive numbers' for indicating units of things (type *úathad*, *déde*, *tréde*) and 'Personal numbers' for groups of persons (type *oínar*, *triar*) are not mentioned; they too belong to the various IE numerals. In the paragraph on 'Decade Formation', add the Danish vigesimal numbers. Together with the remarkable OE decadic formations, OSax *ant-sibunta-* 'seventy' may be worth citing, and the extraordinary Dutch *t-achtig* 'eighty'. To 'twenty': *figgit* is not "MWels", but evidently a Gaelic form as shown by the initial *f*.¹⁷ To 'thirty': OW

¹⁶ Some older formations are also preserved: MW *undec* '11', MW *pedwardeg*, *pedeirdeg* (fem.) '14', OW *naunec* '19'. The emergence of the new, irregular system awaits investigation.

¹⁷ It belongs to a special set of numerals attested in the 18th c. from the Lake District as used for counting sheep. It is a strange mixture of Gaelic (Irish or Scottish?) and British (Welsh or even Cumbric?) with unidentifiable items. For details, see Ellis (1877/9, with many variants) and Greene's chapter in Gvozdanović (see in 'Further Readings', where "Gvozdanivic" is to be corrected accordingly.). Yet another similar system from Middle Wales with traces of Irish influence is also given

trimuceint has a good chance of not meaning 'thirty' but 'sixty', see the arguments put forward by Lambert (1982). To p. 405, 'hundred': The analysis "**de-kmt* 'two units'" is unconvincing as PIE **de-* is not a possible form of the numeral 'two'. To 'thousand': There is no justification for the palatal tectal in the first reconstructed item.

p. 407-8 OAK (P.F.): "The various Baltic and Slavic forms" of the thundergod's name (viz. ORuss *Perunъ*, Lith *Perkūnas*) are given as "surely cognate with OInd (Vedic) *Parjanya-* 'god of storm'" which is rather bold. For many reserves, see the references in Mayrh. Apart from phonetical problems, *Parjanya-* is primarily the god of rain. That the oak "attracts lightning" is only a myth as every forester can tell. The use of the oak-word for naming mountains is uncharacteristic because this is simply a variation of the general 'wood' = 'hills'. Mistletoe rituals are hardly found "in half of the IE stocks"; practical usage of the plant (e.g. for hunting) is more widespread. Mistletoe is never cultivated, but only cut where it grows without being sown or planted by men.

p. 408 OAR (D.Q.A.): "Different in formation but identical in meaning..." should be specified.

p. 408-9 OATH (E.C.P., D.Q.A., J.P.M.): More information on the juridical value of oath and its function in ordeals might be given. Add a reference to Markey (1985) whose remarks on the totem & taboo against oath & ordeal question should not remain unnoticed.

p. 409-10 OLD MAN (M.E.H.): Why not indicate that the first two entries are simply the present participle and an adjective of the same root? This is not "used as a verb only in Indo-Iranian", but also in Slavonic and Greek, see LIV (p. 116f.).

p. 410 ORDER (E.C.P.): cf. my remarks on Av *aša-* and OInd *ṛtá-* above s.v. MAKE. 'To make ritually pure' is Indo-Iranian **yauždhā-*, Avestan *yaoždā-*. Similarly, the nomen agentis is Av *yaoždātar-*.

p. 411 OTHER (D.Q.A.): Add the meaning 'second' to both W *ail* and OHG *andar*. This is still current in NHG (in phrases of the type "von einem Ort zum andern").

p. 413 PAIN (D.Q.A.): To the first entry: W *hoed* is not 'pain', but 'longing, sorrow, grief, vexation'.

p. 414 PAINT (M.E.H.): The famous formula of L *pingo fingo*, ToChA *tsekeši pekeši* should be mentioned here (cf. Schulze 1921).

there.

p. 415 PASTORAL GOD (E.C.P.) OInd *Pūṣā-* is a printing error for either *Pūṣān-* (the stem form) or *Pūṣā* (nom.sg.). For the figure, see now also Oberlies (1999).

p. 416-7 PEOPLE (E.C.P., J.P.M.): OW *dauu* 'cliens' is a gloss; add that Middle & ModW *daw* only means 'son-in-law'. The lexeme of the second entry is attested in appellative use in Venetic also: *louderai* 'puellae' (dat.sg.fem., perhaps a theonym¹⁸), *louderobos* 'liberis' (dat.pl.masc.). To **teutā*: A nice and perfect parallel to ON *þýða* 'to translate' is Yiddish *deitschen*. In Iranian, the word is not only attested by NPers *tūdeh* (*toda* is a different transcription) 'heap, mass (esp. of people, cf. the Tudeh Party)', but also by SogdB *twōʾk* (SogdM *twōdyh*, SogdC *twdy*) which must be a loan¹⁹ from MPers or MParth **tōdag/tōdag* which goes back to Iran. **tautaka-* (cf. Zimmer 1987: 326). For the etymology of L *totus*, see Zimmer (1986b). It is therefore incorrect to repeat the (since 1942) dated opinion that **teutā* "is a word of the west and center of the IE world".

p. 418 PERCEIVE (D.Q.A.): The lemma **h₄eu-* needs to be checked. Ved *uvé* and Hith *ūhhi* 'I see' go back to **h₁ey-* and have nothing to do (cf. LIV 216) with the root of L *audio* 'hear', etc., which cannot belong to PIE 'ear' because the latter contains no **-i-* as correctly cited by the same author p. 173. "OInd *ud-/pra-avati* 'observes' does not exist (Gotō 1987:107).

p. 420-3 PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY (J.P.M.): The teaching of Cavalli-Sforza and others that "blood types and other factors ... have been found to correlate often with linguistic borders" is highly doubtful; see the recent powerful refutation by Sims-Williams (1998). J.P.M. is fully right in stressing that "the use of modern genetic patterns seems still a very uncertain tool for research into prehistoric times"; as far as historical linguistics are concerned, even the "still" is better avoided.

p. 425 PIG (D.Q.A., J.P.M., L.J.H.): For **porko-* 'piglet', the connection with **perk-* 'to dig up earth' is not the only possibility: the word could be a derivative of ²**perk-* 'to be speckled', found in Gr *περκνός* 'speckled', *πέρκη* 'river perch', Ir *erc* 'spotted; salmon'. S.v. **keul-*, W "Culhwych" and

¹⁸ The transliteration *Louzera* (with -z-) should be avoided even if the letter sign for [d] is (a variant of) the Etruscan letter /zl/. Thurneysen had already proven in 1892 that it denotes an occlusive, and Lejeune has repeatedly argued since 1950 for the transliteration /d/. For the history of the case, see Lejeune (1974: 23-24, with full references).

¹⁹ Werner Sundermann, personal communication.

"hwyeh" are wrong: there is no **hwyeh*. The hero's name is *Culhwch*, and *hwch* is 'sow' as well as 'boar'; the porcine semantics are not to be found in the first compositional element of the name. The Celtic material in the mythological section should be better organized; its relevance to PIE remains to be proven. The satirical elements in the Celtic texts seem neglected.²⁰

p. 435 PLOW (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): OInd *halá-* 'a plow' (sic) is cited with an accent but said to be "attested only rather late (in the epics)". The latter is wrong, as the word is first attested in the Gobhila-Gṛhyasūtra. Where does the accent come from?

p. 436 POET (D.Q.A.): S.v. **yōt-*, the names of *Wuotan* and *Óðinn* should at least be mentioned.

p. 436-9 POETRY (J.P.M.): Unfortunately, the W word for 'carpenter of the song' is not given; is it *saer cerdd* (GPC has not yet published the lemma *saer*)? Beside OIr *sochlu* 'famous', W *hyglod* deserves mention. To cite OInd *sumānas-* in stem form (as usual), but *durmanās* in nom.sg. might be misleading for readers who don't know Sanskrit. The IE formula attested by L *pictis fictis*, ToChA *tsekeṣi pekeṣi* is not only "describ[ing] practical pursuits": it aims at artistic activities (both in the sense of Medieval *ars* and Modern *art*), cf. Schulze (1921).

p. 439 POINT (D.Q.A.): Gr *ἄρδης* is not only 'arrowhead', but also 'stick, prick'. The connection with OInd *ali-* 'bee' (which is not from **ardī-* as presumed) is far from certain, cf. Mayrh (III: 16).

p. 439 POISON (D.Q.A.): Add a cross-reference to YEW (where the poisonous function has to be added). Mention could also be made of hemlock, another poisonous plant perhaps in use quite early.

p. 440 POPPY (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The reconstruction of OHG *māho* from **mḥ_ako-* is strange and impossible; the *-a-* is long. Why not accept the standard **méko-*?

p. 441 PORTION (D.Q.A.): The lexeme Indo-Iranian **bhaga-*, important for its religious history (also in Slavic) is not mentioned. Cf. my remarks to DIVIDE and FORTUNE above; cross-references to both entries should be given here.

p. 441-2 POST (A.D.V., D.Q.A., J.P.M.): W *crib* is not 'point', but 'crest, summit, ridge'. OIr *matan* is not 'club', but 'morning': obviously a misprint for *mátan* 'club'. In the first entry, add cross-references to GREEK (esp. p. 245) and WAGON.

²⁰ Cf. Conchobor who is deadly wounded in a battle, but restored to full vigour by eating a cooked pig.

p. 443-6 POT (M.E.H., J.P.M.): Here, a great variety of terms is assembled. OE *ofen*, etc., is explained by "older, marginal *k* < *p*", an interesting idea which needs careful formulation²¹ and further support by other etymologies. Obviously, this is not shared by R.S.P.B., as can be seen in his article WATER. OInd *ukhá-* and L *aula* cannot belong together without further qualification. To p. 444: The meaning of W *celwrn* is not specifically 'milk can', but a more general 'bucket, pail, barrel'. To p. 446: The terms referring both to vessels and skulls (L *cuppa* : G *Kopf*; ON *hverr* : Goth *hvaírmei*) should be seen, I think, as results of semantic shifts in casual speech, cf. Fr *tête* < L *testa* 'potsherd'. The famous Tocharian 'mechanical maiden' is called "an object carved from wood". This is both too precise ("carved") and too simplified ("wood"): the text speaks explicitly not only of *tām oršinām šominānam* 'this wooden girl', but also of *kratswañ šorkmi šutkmi* i.e. (approximately) 'rags, pegs, strings' which might point to a more elaborated type of doll.

p. 448 POUR (M.N., D.Q.A.): The velar tectal in **seik-* (against traditional **seik**-) needs justification. Hitt *šēhur/n-*, and some other pertinent lexemes are lacking, cf. the etymological dictionaries; the different ablaut grades should be separated. With L *siat*, cf. G *seichen*, a causative to *seihen*.

p. 449 PRAISE (D.Q.A.): The entry **kar-* 'praise loudly' needs to be rewritten. The presumed basic meaning is wrong (see LIV), and not all words given do belong here; the Baltic verbs e.g. are from **kerd-* 'hear'.

p. 449-50 PRAY (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): Beside OIr *guidid* and W *gweddi*, Gaul *uedíumí* (Chamalières) deserves to be mentioned.

p. 450-1 PRESS (M.N., D.Q.A.): Late OE *cnif* is taken over from ON *knifr*. The word is also found in G *Kneif* beside *Kneip* (cf. Seebold 1995: 455). The meaning of OIr *cnocc* is not 'lump, ball', but 'lump, protuberance, swelling, hill, mound'; beside, OBr *cnoch* gl. *tumulus*, ModBr *krec'h* 'hill' and W *cnwch* 'protuberance' should be given. For differing etymological connections, see LEIA (C-132).

p. 451 PRICK (M.N.): The first root should be cited (as in Pokorny) with *s*-mobile: *(*s*)*teig-* because of the Indo-Iranian words, and perhaps, of G *Distel* (on which see Seebold).

p. 451-3 PRIEST (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): Gr *κόης κοίης* (in Hesychius only) cannot be separated from *κοῖον, κοέω*, L *cavere*. Av nom.sg. *kavā* (better:

²¹ Note that **k** < **p* is not a Germanic sound law. I would prefer to say that in some words at least, the assumption of a very old PIE dialect shift between *k** and *p* is hard to avoid, e.g. in the etymon of L *aqua* vs. Germ **apa*, Ind and Iran *úp-*.

kauuā) beside OInd *kaví-* (stem) is inconsistent: why not cite the stem form *kauui-*? Hardly acceptable is the old equation of L *flamen* with Ved *brahmán-*, see the references in Mayrh. To L *pontifex*, OInd *pathi-kṛt-*, a nice parallel hitherto not adduced in this connection might be seen reflected in the MW proverb *a uo penn bit pont* 'the one who is leader shall be [also] a bridge/way' according to the traditional understanding as exemplified by the Second Branch of the Mabinogi. Bran's serving as a bridge for his army is indeed a very special kind of 'waymaking'. To p. 452b: *Ahura Mazdā* is not 'Lord Wise', but 'Lord Wisdom' as clearly shown by the special nom.sg.masc. ending of the otherwise fem. abstract *mazdā-* 'wisdom'. On Ved *ṛtá-*, supposedly 'divine order', see the remark above on p. 362. To p. 453b: The reconstructed **Wātónos* should be characterized as a PIE form. For the name of the Gaul god *Esus*, translations other than 'lord' exist. As the quality of *e-* is uncertain, so is the etymology (cf. Maier 1997: 110).

p. 454-8 PRONOUNS (D.Q.A.): This long article contains too many bold assumptions in need of further support to be commented upon in detail here. 1st sg: Add TochA *nāš* (masc). TochB "*ñas*" is a misprint for *ñāš* or its (otherwise unmentioned) variant *ñiš*. It should be stressed that East Tocharian is the only IE language which differentiates the genders in any personal pronoun. The Resian Slovene *ja* fem. beside *jaz* masc. 'I' is doubtful; cf. Zimmer (1985: 244), with references, and for Resian in general, see Steenwijk (1992). 1st & 2nd du: Note that in six Germanic languages or dialects, dual forms developed plural meanings, viz. in modern standard Icelandic, in Bavarian and Southern Westphalian, in Dalarna Swedish, in most Norwegian dialects and in Faroese; for the actual forms and references, see Guðmundsson (1972). 2nd sg. In TochB, beside *t_vwe* (sic), *twe* is also attested. On p. 456 'where': MW *cw* is not only 'where', but also 'wherefrom, whereto'. Toch A *kus* is not "'where' (interrogative and relative)", but only 'who, what' (interrog.); the rel. use of *kus* (instead of regular *kusne*) in *kus pat* 'or who/what' is a special case (perhaps comparable to L *quis* instead of *aliquis*, when used after *si, nisi, ne, num*). On p. 457: Toch A *ke* 'whose' should not be separated from B *kete* 'id.'. Add that the relative pronoun **jo-* is still inflected in Celtiberian. The "interrogative / relative pronoun" **me/o-* seems rather doubtful. Breton *ma, may* "'that' (conj.)" is unknown to me: OBret *ma, mar*, Corn *mar* is 'when, if' and belongs to OIr *ma* 'when, if' + copula (ModIr *ma, mar*) so that the underlying **me/o* might have been a particle meaning 'as, so'. Among the Toch words, insert the missing dialect mark B before *mükte* 'how', *mäksu* 'who'. S.v. **so-*: Why not also indicate OPers *hauv*, OInd *asui* etc. which

show the combination of *so- + deictic -u much clearer than Av *huuō*? On p. 458 s.v. **kis*: Gaul *kovt* is doubtful, being a conjecture of J. Loth's (cf. LEIA C-51).

p. 458 PROTECT (E.C.P.): The formula reflected in L *servare pecus* : Av *pasuš.hauruua-* (also found in Umbrian *pequo ... salua seritu*) is proof that *ser- is part of the inherited poetical vocabulary.

p. 458-470 PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN (D.Q.A.): The fourth laryngeal (p. 462a) is not generally accepted. Some formulations s.v. Accent (p. 462b) are misleading: why should PIE **ɸ* and **ʔ* not be "full vowels" such as **i* and **u*? The only reduced vowel in PIE is **ə* arising either beside a laryngeal (formely: shwa primum) or in difficult consonantal clusters (formerly: shwa secundum). "Syllables without vowels" simply do not exist because some part of vocalic element is required by any definition of syllable. 'Syllable' is not identical with 'morpheme', 'root' or the like. A PIE syllable as e.g. **km-* consists of consonant + vowel exactly like *so-. Ablaut grades have nothing to do with syllable structure. To Syntax: Verb-initial has been generalized not only in OIr but in all Insular Celtic languages (p. 463a/b). The text of the famous dipylon inscription should be given in original orthography (i.e. without η ω), ὄρκηστων for ὄρχηστων is a misprint; the reading of the last word given here as *καλπον* is far from secure.²² On p. 465b, it might be worth mentioning that OIr voc.pl. *firu* (beside nom.pl. *fir*) is the only support for the reconstruction of the PIE category of voc.pl. The opinion that the perfect is "probably a late, dialectal, creation" (p. 466a) may not be shared by many fellow scholars; that it clearly has a history within PIE or reconstructed intermediate languages is a question different from that of common PIE status. The suggestion that traces of the augment might possibly be found in Baltic, Slavic, and Tocharian (p. 467a) should be supported by examples or references; it is unknown in recent handbooks. For the insufficient list of 'Further Readings', see the general remarks above. The absence of Kuryłowicz-Mayrhofer's Indogermanische Grammatik (cf. Mayrhofer 1986) is unacceptable, especially as Mann's dictionary (on which see Mayrhofer 1989: 41-45) is included.

p. 471 PULL (D.Q.A.): To the attestations of **deuk-*, add TochA *tsuk-* 'to drink' (non-present only).

p. 472 PUT IN ORDER (D.Q.A.): The root **jet-* may well be attested in Latin, too, as I have suggested (Zimmer 1986b). Accordingly, it is no longer

²² For the literature on the inscription, see Meier-Brügger (1992: I 56) and Ruijgh (1997: 584).

"preserved only on the margins of the Indo-European world".

p. 478-80 RECONSTRUCTION (D.Q.A.): Is "in the middle nineteenth century" (p. 479a, line 19) a misprint for "in the middle of the 19th c."? The assumption (p. 479b, last line) that "we can reconstruct [language] in any detail (say about 10.000 years)" is extremely bold and should be better avoided in an encyclopedic publication. The general public is misled often enough by poorly qualified journalists. "Bynan, Historical Languages" is a double error for Theodora Bynon, Historical Linguistics.

p. 481 RED (M.E.H., D.Q.A.): OIr *derg* is not mentioned. The MPers name *Luhrāsp* could not be 'red horse' even if its first member were an adjective for 'red': it then would be a Bahuvrihi cpd. 'characterized by red horses' (vel sim.). But the proposed analysis is wrong. An initial *l-* in Iranian from IE **r-* or **Hr-* would be unique (on exceptionally preserved IE **l* in Iranian, see the remarks above on p. 303 INDO-IRANIAN and p. 356 LIP). The correct explanation (< **Druuāspa-* 'with solid horses', vel sim.) is long since known, see Nyberg (1974: 121).

p. 481 RELEASE (D.Q.A.): Ir *seilgim*, W *helaf* (vn *hela*) are still the common words for 'hunt'.

p. 483 REMEMBER (D.Q.A.): The Gaulish goddess *Ro-smerta* (and some of the proper names with the element *-smerto-*) might belong here.

p. 484 RETURN HOME (D.Q.A.): Av *asta-*, Ved *ásta-* are not 'house, dwelling', but precisely 'home', and the root **nes-* itself is not 'return home, to a favorable state or place' but 'return home safely, happily (through dangers)'. Ved *nimsate* is not 'touch with the body, kiss', but, as shown by Gotō (1987: 200-1), rather 'to go to'.

p. 484 REWARD (D.Q.A.): Goth *lausjan* 'to collect money' is a special meaning of the factive *lausjan*, basically 'to make loose', from *laus* 'loose', and does therefore not belong here. E *loot* is borrowed from Hindi *lūt*. OInd *árhant-* (clearly a present participle of *arh-* 'to merit, be worth') is not 'dignity', but 'dignitary', and in Buddhist Sanskrit an *arhat* is not 'the highest rank' but a person who has reached illumination.

p. 484 RICH (D.Q.A.): There are many more words in the various languages for the notion.

p. 485 RIDE (D.Q.A.): It should be stressed that 'ride' is not 'to ride a horse', but originally 'to use every means of transport, especially cart or wagon'.

p. 486 RIVER (R.S.P.B.): A reference to the main collections by Krahe, W.P. Schmid and J. Udolph should be added.

p. 487 RIVER GODDESS (M.R.D.): If *Sárasvatī* is cited by name, why not also her Iranian counterpart *Harax^haitī*? Translation of names of mythological figures is sometimes helpful, so why not indicate that this Indo-Iranian name is 'Rich in lakes', and *Anāhitā* the 'Virgin'?

p. 487-8 ROAD (A.D.V.): It might be worth mentioning that Av *Hu-pərəθβa-* 'Euphrates' is probably a kind of Iranian popular etymology (later partly translated into Greek) of an old, perhaps pre-Semitic name (Akkadian *Purattu*).

p. 490 RULE (E.C.P.): OIr *flaith*, W *gwlad* certainly continue Common Celtic **glati-* 'rulership', but the semantics have further developed rather early. OIr *flaith* became a word for 'ruler'. In W and the other Brit languages, *gwlad* etc. is only attested with a territorial sense as 'kingdom, country, land'; ModBreton shows a further development in the meaning 'possessions, riches, money' which can only be derived from the original abstract meaning.

p. 491 RUN (Q.D.A.): S.v. **tregh-*, add Gaul *vertragos* '(kind of) hound' > French *vautre*.

p. 494-6 SACRED DRINK (J.P.M.): *Vāsiuki* p. 494b is a misprint for *Vāsuki-*. The explanation of the second member of *aśva-medha-* by reference to **maddhos* 'drunk' or **meīdhos* 'strength' is highly doubtful, cf. Mayrh. On the disputed interpretation of Indian and Celtic rituals combining horses and kingship, see my remarks on HORSE above, with references.

p. 498 SALT (R.S.P.B., J.P.M.): On the question of PIE **a*, see Mayrhofer (1986: 169-70), Eichner (1988: 132-3), and Sihler (1995: 44-45). Beekes' position is of course highly respectable, but in an Encyclopedia, a less dogmatic description might make more sense. Most other authors of EIEC do use PIE **a* in their reconstructions.

p. 500 SATISFY (D.Q.A.): Not all the words collected s.v. **terp-* belong here as already suggested by the big semantic divergence. A much more convincing list is now to be found in LIV. Vedic *tr̥pnōti* is older than *tr̥pyati*.

p. 500 SCATTER (D.Q.A.): To **sper-*, OIr *sráb* 'torrent, host', W *ffraw*, *ffrawdd* 'vehemence, impetuosity' should be added.

p. 500-3 SCHLEICHER'S TALE (D.Q.A.): It was a good idea to include this synopsis, but unfortunately, one important version, viz. that by Martin Peters (in Birkhan 1985: 308), the first to make use of laryngeals, truly a milestone in the history of this pedagogical text, is lacking. In the Lehmann-Zgusta version of 1978 (oddly enough, still without laryngeals), a misprint in the seventh word is to be corrected (twice); read *ekwōns*.

p. 503 SCRAPE (D.Q.A.): What is the meaning of "connected in some fashion are possibly"? Why suddenly use the term "Italo-Celtic"? At other places in EIEC, the correct view is found that no such linguistic unit ever existed.

p. 504 SEA GOD (D.Q.A.): Add entries on Neptun/Nechtan and Poseidon, or at least cross-references to articles where these figures are discussed.

p. 505 SEE (Q.D.A.): Add, s.v. **leuk-*, OInd *loká-* 'world', etc. The relation to the same root s.v. SHINE should be explained. The root **sek#-* 'see' is indeed a special case of the basic **sek#-* 'to follow'; it should, however, be added that in Celtic, the word means 'to speak, say', or a cross-reference to SPEAK added.

p. 505 SEEK (D.Q.A.): Add that the verb became a productive composition member in Insular Celtic derivative verbs in Ir *-aigidir*, W *-háu* meaning 'to look for, to seek, to try to, to beg'.

p. 506 SERVANT (E.C.P.): To W *llu*, add the old compound *teulu* 'family' < **(s)tego-slougo-* 'host of the house', perhaps first in the sense of 'familia monastica'.

p. 506-7 SET IN MOTION (D.Q.A.): The meaning of **pelh₂-* is rather 'to approach (with friendly or unfriendly aims)', see LIV. It is also attested in W subjunctive stems of 'go' and 'come'. Av *yaozaiti* does not belong directly to **jeud^h-*, see Mayrh s.v. *yodh-*.

p. 510-2 SHEEP (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): The preform reconstructed for OInd *āreya-* is highly doubtful, the Sanskrit word being extremely late (10th c. AD).

p. 513-4 SHINE (D.Q.A.): The meaning of **leuk-* is rather 'to get bright'. On the various present formations and meanings, see now LIV. Add OInd *loká-* 'world' which is an exact formal parallel to OE *léah*. The article **dei-* needs expansion and clarification. The difference between (or the identity of?) an 'enlarged' root and a derivative might be explained. The meaning of PIE **d₁éu₂-* should not be given as 'Jupiter': this is one of the attested forms. The basic meaning 'bright day, sky god' is undisputable. On the formal relation to the root and many other words belonging to it, see Mayrh. The root **b^heh₂-* 'shine' is most probably identical with the homonymous 'speak', cf. p. 535, and see Mayrh.

p. 516 SHOW (D.Q.A.): The meaning of **b^heud^h-* is not 'to pay attention' but 'to awake, to become attentive'.

p. 518 SILVER (M.E.H., J.P.M.): The comments on TochA *ārki* B *ārkwī* 'white' are imprecise and possibly misleading: check with p. 641 WHITE by the same authors. There can be no doubt that silver was called the

'white/shining [metall]' (with a simple participle) in nearly all old Indo-European languages; it is more a historical question than a linguistic problem whether it is to be ascribed to PIE. Celtiberian (transliterated) *śilaPur* should no longer be transcribed as "/šilabur/": Villar (1995) has demonstrated that the sibilant written with the Iberian *ś*-sign stands for the ordinary phoneme /s/. Add a cross-reference to WHITE.

p. 522 SIT (D.Q.A.): Together with Span *ser* vs. *estar*, the Celtic distinction of copula vs. substantive verb should be mentioned (Ir *is* vs. *tá*, W *yw* etc. vs. *taw*). Add a cross-reference to BE.

p. 523-6 SLAVIC (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): To p. 524a: Effects similar to that of the ruki-rule are also to be seen in some German words, e.g. NHG *Barsch* vs. LG *bars*.

p. 527 SLIDE (D.Q.A.) and SLIMY (J.C.S.): These two articles should be taken together. There is no need for two lemmas **(s)meug-*, etc; the possible (partly rather doubtful) relations of **h₃sleǵdh-* (sic) to **(s)leǵ-* beside **sleǵb-* 'to slip' (to be added here), **(s)leǵm-*, **(s)leǵn-* and **leǵp-* 'to stick' remain to be clarified. Add further **sleǵǵ-* 'to smear' (Greek, Celtic, Germanic). Some of the adduced material might rather belong elsewhere.

p. 529 SMITH GOD (E.C.P.): Add a cross-reference to DEFECT.

p. 534 SOUND (D.Q.A.): Add a cross-reference to SWAN.

p. 534 SPACE (A.D.V., D.Q.A.): The reconstruction of OIr *-tella* < **-tǵp-nā-* is impossible because it belongs to *do-ella* (see LEIA D-119, Thurneysen 1946: 55).

p. 535-6 SPEAK (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): S.v. **b^heh₂-*, mention the homonym in the entry SHINE. With the Slavonic words s.v. **tolk^h-*, Dutch *tolk* 'interpreter' might be given, a loan from Russian.

p. 537 SPECKLED (M.E.H., D.Q.A., J.C.S.): Some animal names (possibly) derived from **perk-* might be added, e.g. PIE **porko-* 'young pig' (L *porcus*, etc.), OHG *forhanna* 'trout', etc. Why is an Av cpd. exceptionally translated into French (from Benveniste)? On the latter's proposal Av *pouru.paxšta-* (delete the asterisk) < **pouru.pi(x)šta-*, one should consult Oettinger's unfortunately still unpublished Habilitation thesis (Oettinger 1983).

p. 539 SPREAD (D.Q.A.): In the first entry, add a cross-reference to TEXTILE. The actual meaning of OIr *fo-sern* is 'arranges, spreads abroad' (< 'strews under'); beside it, W *gwa-strawd* 'groom' (< 'spreading [straw] under [the horses]'), with preservation of *-str-* in inlaut, should be mentioned.

p. 539 SPRING (R.S.P.B.): With the various 'water'-words, again a reference to Krahe would make sense (cf. on RIVER above).

p. 542 STAMMER (D.Q.A.): OInd *mlecchá-* 'ununderstandable speech', perhaps related to L *blaesus* 'lisping', should also be mentioned.

p. 543 STAR (R.S.P.B., D.Q.A., J.P.M.): OInd *táras* (nom.pl.) 'stars' may well be related (see Bartholomae's explanation in Mayrh s.v. *stár-*). Greek ἄστεροπή is not "of non-IE origin" as shown by Homeric στεροπή "id." < **h₂ster-h₃k^h-eh₂*;²³ ἄστεροπή is simply analogically adapted to ἄστηρ "star".²⁴ A few words on Indo-European names for the Milky Way would be welcome here, too: some of them are inherited.

p. 543 STEAL (D.Q.A.): S.v. *mus-*, it should be said clearly that this is the PIE name of the mouse, and a cross-reference added.

p. 544-6 STELAE (J.P.M.): p. 545, text to figure, line 3: phallas is a misprint for phallus.

p. 548 STRENGTH (D.Q.A.): In the first entry, add the names of the Germanic goddess *Nerthus* (attested in Tacitus), the corresponding ON god *Njǫrðr*, and Latin (from an Italic dialect) *Nero*.

p. 548-50 STRIKE (D.Q.A.): The Brit words cited s.v. **gen-* could equally belong to **g^hen-*, the labial and the aspirated labiovelar falling ultimately together in anlaut. S.v. **keh_au-*, Mlr *cuad* 'war' (once in O'Davoren) is a vox nihili. cf. the dictionaries (DIL C 569 and LEIA C-5). S.v. **g^hel-* 'strike, stab', add at least OIr *at-bail* 'dies'. Not all the words cited belong together, and not all branches are duly represented: more probably, three different roots are to be distinguished. For a better and fuller presentation, also of the remaining open questions, see now LIV, with references. S.v. **bheih_a-*, a number of precious old Celtic attestations should be added (to be found in LEIA B-34), and further OW *gomyn* 'to hew down' (Isaac 1996: 311). S.v. **tken-*, the possible Iranian cognates might be mentioned (cf. Mayrh): for the difficult phonetics, see LIV, where also Germanic cognates are given.

p. 550 STRONG (J.C.S.): TochAB *wāsir* 'vajra' is much more likely to have been borrowed through Iranian than directly from Indian (Prakrit or Buddhist Sanskrit).

p. 556 SUCK (D.Q.A.): W *dyfnu* 'suck' (there are also old forms of *dynfu*) cannot stand uncommented beside OIr *dinid*, *denid*, the immediate Brit parent of the Ir word being W *dynu*, *dynaf*.

²³ I prefer this reconstruction to M. Peters' (Peters 1980: 208 n. 160 **h₂str-h₃ok^h-eh₂*).

²⁴ Cf. further Hesychius' *στορπά . ἄστραπή* which conforms to Peters' reconstruction.

p. 560 SWEAR (D.Q.A.): The semantic development from 'to grasp, hold' to 'to swear' should be explained by the known details of oath/ordeal ritual (cf. Hoffmann 1969).

p. 560-1 SWELL (D.Q.A.): TochA *tmām*, B *tumane* (also *tmāne* which should be added) are not inherited from PIE but loans from Iranian, perhaps even Old Iranian (Isebaert 1980: 102-3 with ref.).

p. 561 SWIM (D.Q.A.): Goth *swumfsl* 'pool' is the form traditionally cited, but in fact, there is only one attestation each of this and *swumsl*, so the original form is unknown.

p. 563-4 TAKE (Q.D.A.): The etymology proposed for TochA *ype* B *yapoy* 'land' is far from convincing. S.v. **ghabh-*, W *caffael*, *cael* should also be cited. S.v. **ghe(n)dh-*, *gann-af* is only MW (though still used in the 1588 Bible). The meaning of **kagh-* is rather 'to enclose, include'.

p. 567 TEAR¹ (D.Q.A.): A.J. Van Windekens always insisted on the spelling of the preposition in his name with a capital letter.²⁵

p. 569 TEXTILE (D.Q.A., E.J.W.B.): S.v. 'thread', L *nēmen*, Gr *νήμα*, OIr *snáth* are not mentioned; perhaps add cross-references to the appropriate places in the following article. The notion of 'outstretched arms, fathom', at least in the Germanic languages, seems to have arisen not (only) from "arms spread apart as in preparation of yarn" but rather from of the outstretched arms as a natural measure of length (also for yarn, of course). The proposal of an IE "*pilo*-dialect" is unconvincing. It is strange to see that in this, and the following long article on TEXTILE PREPARATION p. 569-74 (by the same authors and, partly, J.C.S.), the root of L *texere*, (whence ultimately E *textile*) is not even mentioned. S.v. **uei(h_s-)*, p. 571a: OInd *váyati* does not necessarily belong to this root: it could be a perfectly formed iterative from the root **Heu-* (treated further down s.v. 'weave'). Not only textiles and wattle-and-daub but also wickerwork should be mentioned here. In the first entry to 'spin', p. 571b, Latv *snāju* might not belong here, cf. LIV. OInd *snāyu-* more probably does not, see Mayrh. The last six lines are better kept apart as belonging to a different root. The relation of the various similar roots of similar meanings is far from explored. In the second entry, add a cross-reference to SINEW. To p. 572 s.v. 'weave': For the doubtful case of OInd *váyati* as a "suppletive present" to *u-*, see above. In the second entry, the reconstruction of a laryngeal in anlaut is based only on Hitt *huppai-*, etc., but these Anatolian words probably do not belong here. At least, Gr *ὄφαινω* points strongly to a root **ueb^h-* without laryngeal. OW *guetic*, s.v. **ueg-*, is

²⁵ The same error again p. 594a.

a verbal adjective, therefore not 'weave', but 'woven', or if used as a verbal noun, 'weaving'. Note that W *gwau*, *gwe-af* is still the common verb. Among the weaving techniques, the archaic and wide-spread hole board weaving should be mentioned (cf. Schlabow RGA 3. 1978: 445-450). S.v. 'sew', p. 573b, TochA *su-* 'sew' is unknown to me; it is found neither in the Berlin texts nor the newly discovered Maitreyasamiti fragments (Ji-Winter-Pinault 1998).

p. 574 THICK (J.C.S.): In the first entry, OCS *dobrŭ*, etc., should be added. The immediate equation of L *densus*, gr *δασύς*, Hitt *dassus* is not only problematic, but utterly impossible, cf. de Lamberterie (1990: II 683-700, with ref.). Meillet had to assume a "gemination expressive", and this is not yet sufficient to explain everything.

p. 575 THINK (D.Q.A.): The remarks following Gr *φρήν* etc. are rather short. It might be more appropriate to include a separate article on ideas about 'physical location' of the various emotional and intellectual functions as attested by numerous languages.

p. 577-8 THREEFOLD DEATH (D.A.M.): When drowning in a vat or cauldron is mentioned, it may be worth referring to the main mythological cauldron types attested in Celtic literatures also, viz. the cauldron of plenty, and the cauldron of rebirth.

p. 578-81 THREE-HEADED MONSTER (D.A.M., J.P.M.): The Jómsvikingr becoming a sea monster is not called Pui Digre, but Pái Digri (or Digre) 'Peacock the Thick'.

p. 581 THROUGH (D.Q.A.): Add cross-references to EXCHANGE and GO; a comment on the relation of the lexeme to the verbal root **per-* "to cross" (cf. LIV) would be fitting.

p. 581-2 THROW (D.Q.A.): A root **smeit-* does not exist. There are two different roots, **smejd-* "to smear" and **meiθ₂-* "to change, exchange, remove", see LIV with full documentation.

p. 582 THUNDER (R.S.P.B.): The words assembled s.v. **(s)tenh_x-* belong to two different roots, viz. **sten-* "to groan" and **(s)tenh₂-* "to thunder", as shown by Narten (1993: 314-39). Add the Celtic words: Gaul *Taranos*, Ir *torann*, W *taran*.

p. 583 THUS (D.Q.A.): The existence of **ne* 'thus' is highly doubtful. We have a sentence particle **nu* 'now', but the **ne* used in questions or comparisons is nothing other than the negation **ne*, cf. expressions of the type ORuss Игор не орёл "Igor, like an eagle" < "Igor, not (as one might think) an eagle...".

- p. 587-8 TIN (M.E.H., J.P.M.): Suddenly, undefined symbols are used: PIE * α and * \bar{n} . On p. 588a, line 49 read: Erzgebirge.
- p. 588 TIRED (D.Q.A.): The collection s.v. **leh,d-* teems with problems, as a glance in current etymological dictionaries will show. For the semantics, note the curious developments of NHG *letzen* "to relish" and *verletzen* "to hurt".
- p. 590 TO (D.Q.A.): OIr *do-/du-* (and unmentioned W *dy-*) are usually understood as pretonic lenited forms of PIE **to-*, with a tenuis (cf. Zimmer 1986b).
- p. 590-4 TOCHARIAN (D.Q.A., J.P.M.): Many details of the article are wrong or doubtful. To begin with, the names of the decipherers are not given. The name 'Tocharian' was not at all given "more than a little arbitrarily" but erroneously. The manuscripts are not "typically single leaves ... brought as votive offerings to ... shrines" but simply remnants of monastic libraries, damaged and dispersed by nature and men. There is no language called Kharoṣṭhī Prakrit (pp. 591a, 593a): Kharoṣṭhī is the name of a script. Probably, Kroraina Prakrit (or Gandhara Prakrit, or Niya Prakrit) was intended. To repeat earlier suppositions that the latter language contained loanwords in a "third Tocharian language" is unfounded because nobody has ever proven Burrow's suggestion (cf. Zimmer 1998b: 172, with ref.). It is not true that "the only exception to this general merger" (of the three tectal series in plain velars) "is in final syllables": in TochB, Proto-Toch **kw-* is preserved in anlaut before vowel (cf. the examples given by Pinault 1989: 51). The Tocharian 'ablative' does not "preserve ... the ... PIE ... ablative" but is the product of a Tocharian development, being clearly a secondary case, derived with different affixes (< old postpositions?) in both languages. "Nominative" as one "of the PIE moods" is an error for "indicative"; but the subjunctive (conjunctive) is not even mentioned! The question of the relevance of Chinese documents for early Tocharian history is an extremely difficult one: argumenta e silentio are of doubtful value. To state that "Chinese historical sources ... report no ethnic or linguistic changes during the previous seven hundred years" which would "allow the linguistic situation of the 6th c. AD to be projected back to at least the end of the 2nd c. BC" is to strain such silence beyond any credibility. The identification of the 'Tocharians' with the 'Yue-zhi' in Chinese reports has often been made but could never be proven beyond doubt. With regard to the frescos depicting Tocharian aristocrats, one should mind the caveat repeatedly brought forward by art historians, viz. that the colours we see today ("red or blond hair, blue or green eyes"), at least in the case of some pigments, bear no longer the original hue, but have changed over the centuries. For a critical assessment

of the series of articles on the mummies edited by V. Mair given under 'Further Readings', see now Zimmer (1989b).

p. 594 TODAY (P.M.): There is no reference to Buck (14.47), and this work seems not to have been consulted in preparing the article. Therefore, unfortunately, most of the IE forms and even a number of attestations belonging to the proposed reconstruction are lacking (e.g. Umbrian *foied*, OHG *hiutu*, etc.). The standard OInd form is *adyá* (the variant with final long vowel is due to rhythmical lengthening), and this cannot go back to **a-dyavi*.

p. 595 TRACK (A.D.V.): It is strange to see that the most firmly established Celtic attestation for PIE **ped-/*pod-*, viz. Ir *W is* 'below, under' < **pēd-su* loc.pl., is not even mentioned. Beside Ir *inad*, *W ól* 'trace; after' may also belong here, if from **ped-lo-* (see Thurneysen 1946: 559); but note Jackson's (1953: 431) warning that no good examples for IE **-dl-* in Celtic are known.

p. 598-9 TREE (P.F.): The meaning of *W prys* is rather 'copse, grove' than simply 'woods'. The word, and its variant *prysg* (with unetymological *-g*), does not go back to **kw̥rsto/-i-* as suggested but to **k*restio-*.

p. 601-2 TRICKSTER (D.A.M.): The *W* trickster Efnysseyen and his brother Nissyen, attested in the Second Branch of the *Mabinogi*, are omitted.

p. 606 TRUE (E.C.P., D.Q.A.): The last four lines of the second entry, on a supposedly "expanded form **y(h₁)érh_x-*" (by the second author?), are highly doubtful. Homeric *ῥορνται* is from **ser-*, cf. Mycenaean *o-pi ... o-ro-me-no* (see LIV).

p. 606-8 TURN, TWIST (D.Q.A.): *W chwerfar, chwerfan* (p. 607 s.v. **slenk-*) is a double misprint for *chwerfan, chwarfan*. These are variants of one single word meaning 'wharve, whorl; pulley'. 'Whirling' and 'turning' is *W chwyrlio, troi, chwyrndroi*, etc.; to express 'spindlewhorl', the word for spindle is required in *W: chwerfan* (or: *sidell*, or *troellen*) *gwerthyd*.

p. 608 TWIN (M.E.H.): The reserves against connecting ON *Ymir* and Latv (Lith is a misprint) *jumis* with OInd *yamá-*, etc., are unnecessary, see Schmid (1979) and Mayrh (both with ref.).

p. 611-2 UNDERWORLD (L.J.H.): The first sentence of the article is wrong. There is no such person as a "Proto-Indo-European deity ... belonging to the underworld", only several ones in the various different traditions. There is no *L Orcus* "death itself ... personified": *orcus* is the name of the underworld. In poetical usage only, the word may be used for Pluto, or for death. In the second title indicated at the end, read: Frühgriechischer.

p. 612 UP (D.Q.A.): In the first entry, add Gaul *uo-*, *ue-*, OIr *fo-* (ModIr *faoi*), and the derivatives **upselo-*, **upemo-*, **upero-*, etc., which are not

discussed s.v. HIGH or OVER.

p. 613 URINATE (D.Q.A.): Add a cross-reference to the formula given p. 439 s.v. POETRY.

p. 614 USE (D.Q.A.): The old etymologies given for OIr *dúal* 'fitting' and OIr *dúan* 'poem' are contested: see Schmidt (apud de Bernardo Stempel 1999: 220-1, 251-5) and Watkins (for ref., see LEIA D-209).

p. 620-1 VENETIC (J.P.M.): On the dated transcription, see the introductory remarks. The OHG compound *selboselbo*, though often cited, is a vox nihili. In fact, only a syntactical unit *der selb selbo* 'he himself' is attested.

p. 629 WANT (D.Q.A.): Speaking about **h₂eis-*, Anatolian words are connected with the introduction "without the **-s-* we have ...". Is this to postulate a *s*-mobile in root final position? Or is the PIE root to be reconstructed without *-s-*, all non-Anatolian languages having added a 'root determinative' *-s-*?

p. 6301 WAR GOD (E.C.P.): Add a cross-reference to YOUNG.

p. 631-5 WARRIORS (D.A.M.): Discussing various warrior groups, the term OInd *sakhā-*, etc., is not mentioned (but see COMPANION, FOLLOW, FRIEND, to which cross-references could be added).

p. 636 WATCH (D.Q.A.): The meaning of **b^heyd^h-* is not "pay attention, be observant", but 'to awaken, to become attentive'. Details, and more material are to be found in LIV.

p. 637-8 WEALTH (E.C.P., D.Q.A.): On Gr ἄφρονος, see now Balles (1998) with a better explanation (related to OInd *aghnya-*, Av *agəniia-*).

p. 638 WEDGE (A.D.V.): Why not link **d^húb^ho-* to the root **d^heub^h-* 'deep, hollow'?

p. 638-9 WET (J.C.S.): In the second entry, beside E *meut* and Goth *mats*, OHG *mezzi-rah*s G *Messer* should be given to show that these words have no connotation whatever to 'wet'. In the third entry, the meaning of Mlr *laith* is only 'ale, liquor', not 'moisture'; that of *lathach* only 'mire, puddle', not 'mud'; *llat* is not "OWels" but OBret; it is a gloss for L *crapulam* 'intoxication caused by wine'. The meaning of MW *llad* is 'liquor, ale'. The relation of OInd *ukṣāti* 'splashes' to *ukṣán-* 'ox' is problematical, see the references in Mayrh s.v.V. *ukṣ-* and *vakṣ-*.

p. 641-2 WHITE (M.E.H., D.Q.A.): In the third entry, note that ON *blár* has a strong connotation of 'black', cf. Haraldr *blátǫnn*, *blámaðr* 'negro', etc. In the fourth entry, add OInd *śvitrá-*, *śvítina-*, *śvítī-* (in compounds), Av *spiti-* (in compounds), etc.

p. 642 WIDOW (M.E.H.): The expression "to commit suttee" is wrong and seems to misunderstand the Indian term. A *satī*, a 'true' wife, is one who,

following some doctrines, does not want to part from her deceased husband and therefore chooses to die on the pyre. This custom may be termed 'sutteeism' in English, according to my dictionaries. When *svayámvara-* is mentioned, the marriage according to the bride's 'self-choice' of her future husband, a note on the social and political reason of this extraordinary, but certainly old procedure should be added (it is also unmentioned s.v. MARRIAGE, by the same author, and D.Q.A.): if the girl herself decides whom she accepts, none of the unhappy pretenders can reproach her father for the choice (cf. the Eastocharian Śaḍḍanta-Jātaka. 66a1-4).

p. 642 WIFE (M.E.H.): Together with OInd *priyá-*, Av *friia-*, one might indicate a similar semantic development in W *priod*, a loan from L *privatus*, -a, -um, meaning, among others, 'married person'. As I have suggested (Zimmer 1990b: 281), this is a case of Roman army slang: VL *privata* '(my own) girlfriend' > 'spouse' > 'wife'. In discussing the formation and meaning of Gr *πότνια*, L *regina* should be adduced. "Other terms for wife" are said to be derived from "the root **h₂medh(h₁)-*", but no examples given: add at least Vedic *vadhū-*.

p. 646 WITH (D.Q.A., C.F.J.): S.v. **som-*, add a cross-reference to SAME.

p. 646 WITHOUT (D.Q.A.): OInd *bahí-* is a misprint for *bahís*; this word is an adverb.

p. 646-8 WOLF (D.Q.A., J.P.M., D.A.M.): The term **uailos*, from the onomatopoeticon **uai*, is simpler understood as 'howling (animal)'. The etymology proposed for ON *vitmir*, Hitt *huetar* is far from being secured. On p. 647b, line 35, read: Wütendes Heer. Under 'Further Readings', add Jacoby (1974); add that the book referred to under Weitenberg is a Festschrift for E.C. Polomé.

p. 648 WOMAN (M.E.H.): Strunk's and Schmidt's proposal (1989) to connect the Germanic words (OE *wif*, etc., neuters!) with TochA *kip* B *kwipe* 'shame, privy parts' deserves to be summarized; even if not accepted by the author, it should at least be mentioned as a serious and important attempt to solve the riddles inherent in the Germanic lexemes.

p. 654 YEAR (P.B.): Together with other animal terms derived from 'yearling', L *vitulus* (perhaps from a dialect) should be mentioned, and its possible relation to *Italia* indicated. S.v. **perut*, ON *ffjorð* is wrong for *i ffjorð*. Add OHG *vert*.

p. 654 YELLOW (M.E.H.): W *gell* is not only 'yellow', but also 'brown, auburn'.

p. 655 YOUNG (M.E.H., P.B.): OW *map*, W *mab*, is not from ***magynos*. The British words cannot be separated from Gaul *Maponos* which is clearly

derived from **mak^ho-*, and from OIr *macc* which, with an expressive geminate, is from **mak^hk^ho-* (not from **mak^ho-*!). See LEIA M-2. Add a cross-reference to ABLE. For the *maryannu* problem, add a cross-reference to WAR GOD.²⁶

I hope to have demonstrated that EIEC has excellent potential for improving a general audience's knowledge about matters Indo-European, and that it can be greatly improved by the publication of a revised and enlarged second edition. If fellow scholars published similar lists, comments and proposals, the future work of the editors would be greatly facilitated. Both Jim Mallory and Doug Adams, and their collaborators, have merited their readers' sincerest gratitude. They have also aroused great expectations!

Prof. Dr. Stefan Zimmer
Sprachwissenschaftliches Institut
An der Schloßkirche 2
D-53113 Bonn

²⁶ Some further entries I have missed: colluvies gentium, drugs, grey, hallucinogenes, Krahe's hydronymy, mead, Nordwestblock, polygamy, slavery, snowball effect, totem & taboo, ver sacrum, witch(craft), wizard.

LITERATURE

Balles, Irene

- 1998 "Griechisch ἄφ(ε)νοσ "Reichtum"."
In: *Kuhn's Zeitschrift für Historische Sprachforschung* vol. 110
(1997), pp. 215-32.

Bartrum, Peter C.,

- 1993 *A Welsh Classical Dictionary*.
Aberystwyth: National Library of Wales.

Belier, Wouter W.

- 1989/91 *Feiten, fouten en fabels. Ontstaan en ontwikkeling van Georges Dumézils 'idéologie tripartie'*, Ph.D. thesis Leiden 1989 = *Decayed Gods. Origin and Development of Georges Dumézil's 'idéologie tripartie'*.
Leiden 1991: Brill.

de Bernardo Stempel, Patrizia

- 1999 *Nominale Wortbildung des älteren Irischen: Stammbildung und Derivation*. Niemeyer: Tübingen.

Birkhan, Helmut

- 1985 *Etymologie des Deutschen*.
München: Beck.

Blažek, Václav

- 1998a "Indo-European "two"."
In: *Sborník Prací Filosofické Fakulty Brněské University, A*,
vol. 46, pp. 5-25.
- 1998b "Indo-European "four"."
In: *Indogermanische Forschungen*, vol. 103, pp. 112-23.
- 1998c "Indo-European "eight"."
In: (*Kuhn's Zeitschrift für*) *Historische Sprachforschung*, vol. 111,
pp. 209-24.

Bromwich, Rachel

- 1978 *Trioedd Ynys Prydein*, 2nd ed.
Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Burrow, Thomas

- 1977 Review of M. Mayrhofer 1956-76, Lieferung 28.
In: *Kratylos*, vol. 21 (1976), pp. 64-7.

Buti, Gianna Gabriella

- 1962 *La casa degli Indoeuropei: tradizione e archeologia*.
Firenze: Sansoni.

CLI

1989 *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, ed. Rüdiger Schmitt.
Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Dabbs, Jack A.

1963 *History of the Discovery and Exploration of Chinese Turkestan*.
The Hague: Mouton.

Darms, Georges

1978 *Schwäher und Schwager, Hahn und Huhn. Die Vṛddhi-Ableitung
im Germanischen*.
München: Kitzinger.

Demiraj, Bardhyl

1997 *Albanische Etymologien*.
Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

DIL

1913-76 (*Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language*.
Dublin: Royal Irish Academy

Eichner, Heiner

1982 *Studien zu den indogermanischen Numeralia, Rekonstruktion des
urindogermanischen Formensystems und Dokumentation seiner
einzelsprachlichen Vertretung bei den niederen Kardinalia 'zwei'
bis 'fünf'*. Regensburg (unpublished Habilitation thesis, 607 pp.)
1988 "Anatolisch und Trilaryngalismus."
In: Alfred Bammesberger (ed.), *Die Laryngalthorie und die
Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*.
Heidelberg: Winter, pp. 123-151.

Eilers, Wilhelm and Manfred Mayrhofer

1962 "Kurdisch *būz* und die indogermanische "Buchen"-Sippe."
Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien, vol. 92,
pp. 61-92.

Ellis, Alexander J.

1877-9 "The Anglo-Cymric Score."
Transactions of the Philological Society, pp. 316-373.

Evans, D. Ellis

1967 *Gaulish Personal Names*.
Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Falk, Harry

1986 *Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel*.
Freiburg: Hedwig Falk.

- Feist, Sigmund
1939 *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Gotischen Sprache*, 3. Auflage.
Leiden: Brill.
- GPC
1950- *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru*, gol. R.J. Thomas, G.A. Bevan.
Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Gharib, Badruzamān
1995 *Sogdian Dictionary*.
Tehran: Farhangian Publishers
- Gignoux, Philippe
1972 *Glossaire des Inscriptions Pehlevies et Parthes*.
London: Lund Humphries.
- Gotō, Toshifumi
1987 *Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen. Untersuchung der voll-
stufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia*.
Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Guðmundsson, Helgi
1972 *The Pronominal Dual in Icelandic*.
Reykjavík: Rannsóknastofnun í Norrænum Málvísindum.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur
1991 *The Nasal Prefixes in Tocharian, A Study in Word-formation*.
Reykjavík: Tocharian and Indo-European Studies.
- Hindley, Reginald
1990 *The Death of the Irish Language*.
London/New York: Routledge.
- Hoffmann, Karl
1969 "Materialien zum altindischen Verbum, 11. *am'*, 12. *jaks'*."
In: *Kuhns Zeitschrift (für Historische Sprachforschung)*, vol. 83,
193-215
(= *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, ed. J. Narten.
Wiesbaden: Reichert 1975, pp. 288-310).
- Hoffmann, Karl and Bernhard Forssman
1996 *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*.
Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Isaac, Graham R.
1996 *The Verb in the Book of Aneirin*.
Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- Isebaert, Lambert
 1980 *De Indo-Iraaaanse bestanddelen in the Tocharische woorden-
 schat.*
 Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit.
- Jackson, Kenneth H.
 1953 *Language and History in Early Britain.*
 Edinburgh: University Press.
- Jacoby, Michael
 1974 *Wargus, vargr, 'Verbrecher', 'Wolf', eine sprach- und rechts-
 geschichtliche Untersuchung.*
 Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Ji Xianlin, in collaboration with Werner Winter and Georges-Jean Pinault
 1998 *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the
 Xinjiang Museum, China.*
 Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Kelly, Fergus
 1988 *A Guide to Early Irish Law.*
 Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Knobloch, Johann
 1986 *Sprache und Religion*, vol. III.
 Heidelberg: Winter.
- Koch, John T.
 1997 *The Gododdin of Aneirin, Text and Context from Dark-Age North
 Britain.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Kölver, Bernhard
 1976 *Verschiffene Präfixe im Altindischen.*
 Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Krause, Wolfgang and Werner Thomas
 1960-64 *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*, 2 vols.
 Heidelberg: Winter.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves
 1984 "'Thirty' and 'Sixty' in Brittonic."
 In: *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies*, vol. 8, pp. 29-43.
- de Lamberterie, Charles
 1990 *Les adjectifs grecs en -υς. Sémantique et comparaison.* 2 vols.
 Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

- Lane, George S.
1968 "The Beach Argument."
In: *Kuhns Zeitschrift (für Historische Sprachforschung)*, vol. 81
(1967), pp. 197-212.
- Le Gonidec, Jean-François
1847 *Dictionnaire français-breton*.
St-Brieuc: Prud'homme.
- Lehmann, Winfried P.
1986 *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary* (Based on Feist 1938).
Leiden: Brill.
- LEIA
1959- Joseph Vendryes, Édouard Bachellery, Pierre-Yves Lambert,
Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien.
Dublin/Paris: Institute for Advanced Studies / Centre National de
Recherche Scientifique.
- Leist, Burkard W.
1978 *Alt-arisches jus gentium*. Reprint of the 1889 edition, with
preface by B. Schlerath and indexes by J. Gippert, ed. W. Meid.
Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Lejeune, Michel
1974 *Manuel de la langue vénète*.
Heidelberg: Winter.
- LIV
1998 Helmut Rix et alii, *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben*.
Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Löffler, Marion
1997 *Englisch und Kymrisch in Wales. Geschichte der Sprachsituation
und Sprachpolitik*.
Hamburg: Kovač.
- Lühr, Rosemarie
1982 *Studien zur Sprache des Hildebrandsliedes*, 2 vols.
Frankfurt a.M./Bern: Lang.
- MacAulay, Donald (ed.)
1992 *The Celtic languages*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacKenzie, David N.
1971 *A Concise Pehlevi Dictionary*.
London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press.

McCone, Kim

- 1991 *Pagan Past and Christian Present in Early Irish Literature.*
Maynooth: An Sagart.

Maier, Bernhard

- 1997 *Dictionary of Celtic Religion and Culture.*
Woodbridge: Boydell.
- 1999 *Keltische Geschichten aus Wales. Die Vier Zweige des Mabinogi nach dem Weißen Buch Rhydderchs, mit einer Einleitung versehen, übersetzt und kommentiert.*
München: Deutscher Taschenbuch-Verlag.

Markey, Thomas L.

- 1985 "The Totemic Typology."
In: *Quaderni di Semantica*, vol. 6/1, pp. 175-94.

Mayrhofer, Manfred

- 1956-76 *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, 4 vols.
Heidelberg: Winter.
- 1969 Short review of Lane 1968.
In: *Die Sprache*, vol. 15, p. 78 (= IC 15a, no. 51).
- 1977 *Zum Namengut des Avesta.*
Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 1979 *Iranisches Personennamenbuch*, vol. I: *Die altiranischen Namen.*
Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 1986 *Indogermanische Grammatik*, vol. I/2.
Heidelberg: Winter.
- 1986- *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoirischen, Erster Teil: Ältere Sprache*, 2 vols., *Zweiter Teil: Jüngere Sprache* (ongoing).
Heidelberg: Winter.
- 1989 Review of Stuart E. Mann, *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*, Hamburg 1984-87.
In: *Kratylos*, vol. 34, pp. 41-5.

Meier-Brügger, Michael

- 1989 "Verbaute schwundstufige -s-Neutra in der griechischen Wortbildung."
In: (*Kuhns Zeitschrift für Historische Sprachforschung*), vol. 102, pp. 58-61.
- 1992 *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*, 2 vols.
Berlin: de Gruyter.

- Narten, Johanna
1993 "Ved. *stanáyati*, gr. στένω etc.: idg. 'donnern' und 'stöhnen'"
In: G. Meiser (ed.), *Indogermanica et Italica*, Festschrift H. Rix.
Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, pp. 314-
39 (= *Kleine Schriften*, ed. M. Albino & M. Fritz, vol. I.
Wiesbaden: Reichert 1995, pp. 396-421).
- Nyberg, Henrik S.
1974 *A Manual of Pahlavi*, vol. II.
Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ó Dónaill, Niall
1977 *Foclóir Gaeilge-Béarla*.
Baile Átha Cliath: Oifig an tSoláthair.
- Oberlies, Thomas
1999 "Pūšans Zahnlücken und Hermes' Vorliebe für Backwerk: Ererbte
Strukturen des Pantheons der ṛgvedischen Religion."
In: B. Forssman & R. Plath (eds.), *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die
Indogermanistik*.
Wiesbaden: Reichert (in press).
- Oettinger, Norbert
1979 *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns*.
Nürnberg, Hans Carl.
1983 *Untersuchungen zur avestischen Sprache am Beispiel des
Ardvīsūr-Yušt*. München (unpublished Habilitation thesis).
- Ofitsch, Michaela, ed.
1997 *Eros, Liebe und Zuneigung in der Indogermania*.
Graz: Leykam.
- Peters, Martin
1980 *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale
im Griechischen*.
Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- RGA
1968- *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, 2. Auflage, ed. H.
Beck et alii.
Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Rivet, A.L.F. and Colin Smith
1979 *The Place-Names of Roman Britain*.
London: Batsford.

- Rix, Helmut
1994 *Die Terminologie der Unfreiheit in den Sprachen Alt-Italiens.*
Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Ruijgh, Cornelis J.
1997 "La date de la création de l'alphabet grec et celle de l'épopée homérique."
In: *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, vol. 54, pp. 533-603.
- Russell, Paul
1995 *An Introduction to the Celtic Languages.*
London/New York: Longman.
- Salonen, Armas
1965 *Die Hausgeräte der alten Mesopotamier nach sumerisch-akkadischen Quellen*, vol. I.
Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennicae.
- Schlerath, Bernfried
1975/77 "Vedisch *vajra*- "die Keule des Indra"."
In: *Orbis*, vol. 24 (1975), pp. 493-518; with a supplement in *Orbis*, vol. 26 (1977), pp. 133-4.
1978 "Indogermanisches Recht."
In: A. Erler & E. Kaufmann (eds.), *Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 2.
Berlin: Schmidt, pp. 343-6.
1995/96 "G. Dumézil und die Rekonstruktion indogermanischer Kultur."
In: *Kratylos*, vol. 40 (1995), pp. 1-48; vol. 41 (1996), pp. 1-67.
1997 "Metallgeräte in vedischer Zeit."
In: C. Becker et al. (eds.), *Χρόνος, Festschrift B. Hänsel.*
Espelkamp: Leidorf, pp. 819-27.
- Schmid, Wolfgang P.
1979 "Lettisch *jumis*, eine sprachwissenschaftliche Nachprüfung."
In: *Humanitas Religiosa, Festschrift H. Biezais.*
Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, pp. 261-7.
- Schmidt, Karl Horst
1957 "Die Komposition in gallischen Personennamen."
In: *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, vol. 26, 27-301.
- Schmidt, Klaus T. and Klaus Strunk
1989 "Toch. B *kwīpe* "Scham; Schande", A *kip* "Scham" und germ. **wība*- "Weib"."
In: K. Heller et al. (eds.), *Indogermanica Europaea, Festschrift W. Meid.* Graz: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, pp. 251-84.

- Schulze, Wilhelm
1921 "Tocharisch *tseke peke*."
In: *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, pp. 293-7.
- Seebold, Elmar
1995 (*Kluges*) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 23rd edition.
Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Sihler, Andrew L.
1995 *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*.
New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simek, Rudolf and Hermann Pálsson
1987 *Lexikon der altnordischen Literatur*.
Stuttgart: Kröner.
- Sims-Williams, Patrick
1998 "Genetics, linguistics, and prehistory: thinking big and thinking straight."
In: *Antiquity*, vol. 72, No. 277, pp. 505-27.
- von Soden, Wolfram
1972 *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*.
Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Starke, Fred
1994 *Ausbildung und Training von Streitwagenpferden. Eine hippologisch orientierte Interpretation des Kikkuli-Textes*.
Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Steenwijk, Johannes J.
1992 *The Slovene dialect of Resia, San Giorgio*.
Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Stone, Gerald
1972 *The Smallest Slavonic Nation. The Sorbs of Lusatia*.
London: Athlone.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf
1946 *A Grammar of Old Irish*.
Dublin, Institute of Advanced Studies.
- Uhlich, Jürgen
1993 *Die Morphologie der komponierten Personennamen des Altirischen*.
Witterschlick/Bonn: Wehle.

Untermann, Jürgen

- 1989 Review of Meid, Wolfgang, ed. *Studien zum indogermanischen Wortschatz*. Innsbruck 1987.
In: *Kratylos*, vol. 34, pp. 45-54.
- 1997 *Monumenta linguarum Hispanicarum*, vol. IV: *Die tartessischen, keltiberischen und lusitanischen Inschriften*.
Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Watkins, Calvert

- 1994 *Selected Writings*. 2 vols., ed. L. Oliver.
Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- 1995 *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*.
Oxford: University Press.

Zimmer, Stefan

- 1984 "Iran. *baga-* ein Gottesname?"
In: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. 43, pp. 187-215.
- 1985 "Ein neues Werk zur historischen Laut- und Formenlehre des Tocharischen." In: *Anthropos*, vol. 80, pp. 243-8.
- 1986a "Slavisch *ubogъ* und "Winter's Law"."
In: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. 47, pp. 223-7.
- 1986b "Zur Etymologie und zu den ältesten Belegen von lat. *totus*."
In: *Glotta*, vol. 63, pp. 221-5.
- 1987 "Indogermanische Sozialstruktur? Zu zwei Thesen É. Benvenistes."
In: W. Meid (ed.), *Studien zum indogermanischen Wortschatz*.
Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, pp. 315-29.
- 1990a *Ursprache, Urvolk und Indogermanisierung. Zur Methode der Indogermanischen Altertumskunde*.
Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- 1990b "Dating the loanwords: Latin suffixes in Welsh (and their Celtic congeners)." In: A. Bammesberger and A. Wollmann (eds.), *Britain 400-600: Language and History*.
Heidelberg: Winter, pp. 263-81.

- 1992a "Die umgekehrten Bahuvrīhi-Komposita im Kymrischen und Indogermanischen." In: R. Beekes et al. (eds.), *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, pp. 421-35.
- 1992b "Some Welsh etymologies." In: L. Isebaert (ed.), *Studia etymologica indoeuropaea memoriae A.J. Van Windekens dicata*. Leuven: Peeters 1991 [recte 1992], pp. 313-7.
- 1992c "On Language Genesis: the Case of Afrikaans." In: *Persepectives on Indo-European Language, Culture and Religion, Studies in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé*. vol. II. McLean, Va.: Institute for the Study of Man, pp. 347-59.
- 1994a "Die Indogermanen und das Pferd – Befunde und Probleme." In: B. Hänsel and St. Zimmer (eds.), *Die Indogermanen und das Pferd, Festschrift B. Schlerath*. Budapest: Archaeolingua, pp. 29-35.
- 1994b "Lateinisch *putare* > deutsch *putzen*." In: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. 53 (1992), pp. 197-9.
- 1994c "Zum britischen *s-*." In: *Journal of Celtic Linguistics*, vol. 3, pp. 149-64.
- 1997 "Aspects de la civilisation des Indo-Aryens." In: *Bulletin des Études Indiennes*, vol. 13/14 (1995/96), 431-59.
- 1998a "Sprachliche Archaismen in *Culhwch ac Olwen*." In: *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 49/50 (1997), pp. 1033-53.
- 1998b "Modern Necromancy, or How to Make Mummies Speak" In: *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, vol. 26, pp. 163-80.
- 1999a "Vieux-gallois *gener* et autres problèmes à propos de la minute «*Surexit*»." In: *Études Celtiques*, vol. 33 (1997): 143-58.
- 1999b "The verb "to be" in Old Welsh." In: *Festschrift N.N.*, ed. N.N. (in press).