LINGUISTICA

IX./2

LJUBLJANA 1969

LINGUISTICA

IX./2

LJUBLJANA 1969

Uredniški odbor — Comité de rédaction: BOJAN ČOP, ANTON GRAD, MILAN GROŠELJ, MITJA SKUBIC, STANKO ŠKERLJ — Rokopisi naj se pošiljajo na naslov: prof. Stanko Škerlj, Filozofska fakulteta, oddelek za romanistiko, Aškerčeva 12, Ljubljana — Prière d'adresser les manuscrits à M. Stanko Škerlj, Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za romanistiko, Aškerčeva 12, Ljubljana — Natisnila Univerzitetna tiskarna v Ljubljani v 450 izvodih

L I N G U I S T I C A

LETO IX. 1969

Anton Grad

ŠE MALO O IMENIH *KOSEZE, KOSEZ*

Kazno je, da tolikokrat obravnavani[1] problem izvora imena in sloja *kosezov,* »pripadnikov slovenskega družbenega sloja med podaniki in plemstvom«[2], ter z njimi povezanega krajevnega imena *Koseze* tudi po najnovejših poskusih[3] še vedno ni našel zadovoljive rešitve[4] ter zato terja še nadaljnjih raziskav.

V svoji obširni in zanimivi razpravi *»Praslovensko *kasegъ »Edling«*[5] se ugledni slavist Fr. Ramovš ni mogel ogreti za Oštirjevo domnevo[6], po kateri naj bi ime *kosez* prihajalo iz starega traškega, še za Karpati izposojenega osebnega imena *Kosiggas* (> **kosegь*), ker se mu je to čisto upravičeno zdelo tako časovno kot prostorsko preveč oddaljeno; po Ramovševem mnenju, pa tudi po mnenju drugih raziskovalcev — in kot kažejo tudi zgodovinski podatki — bi bila beseda **kosegъ, *kasegь,* oziroma iz te osnove nastalo in še danes obstoječe krajevno ime *Koseze,* znana samo najzapadnejšim južnim Slovanom, Slovencem in Hrvatom, medtem ko prav na ozemlju starih Trakov, tj. v vzhodni polovici Balkana in v Dakiji, o njej ni sledov.

Ramovš je utemeljeno zavrnil tudi razlago L. Pintarja[7], ki je prvi na podlagi toponima *Koseze* rekonstruiral apelativ *kosez,* s tem da ga je izvajal iz besede *knez,* nastale iz germanskega *kuning-* »ex nobilitate ortus«, kot tudi Lessiakovo preumetno hipotezo[8] o nastanku oziroma razvoju *kosez* < < *kasegъ* < *praslovansko *kozakь,* avar. *quazaq* »svobodnik«, kar naj bi se bilo zgodilo že po naselitvi Slovanov v Alpah (7. stoletje).

No, tudi Ramovševa ingeniozna razlaga o nastanku naše besede iz langobardskega plemenskega imena **gauting,* ki bi po premiku *t* > *s* bilo prešlo v **gausing,* a to obliko bi bili zapadni južni Slovani sprejeli kot **kosegь,*

[1] Gl. B. Grafenauer, *Deset let proučevanja ustoličevanja koroških vojvod, kosezov in države karantanskih Slovencev,* Zgodovinski časopis XVI (1962), str. 176—209; Id., *Hrvati u Karantaniji,* Historijski zbornik XI—XII (1958—1959), str. 221 s.

[2] Gl. F. Bezlaj, *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika.* Poskusni zvezek, Ljubljana 1963, str. 17.

[3] Gl. J. Stanonik, *Še o kosezih,* Sodobnost XI (1963), str. 1038—1041.

[4] Gl. B. Grafenauer, *Cotsetlas = Kosezi?,* Sodobnost XI (1963), str. 1147—1150.

[5] Razprave Znanstvenega društva za humanistične vede v Ljubljani II (1925), str. 303—326.

[6] K. Oštir, *Illyro-Thrakisches,* Arhiv za arbanasku starinu I (1924), str. 109.

[7] L. Pintar, *O krajnih imenih,* Ljubljanski Zvon 1912, str. 600—605.

[8] P. Lessiak, *Edlinge — Kazaze,* Carinthia I, 103 (1913), str. 81—94.

**kasegъ*, ni mogla zadovoljiti vseh raziskovalcev, ki jih je ta problem zanimal. Ni se strinjal z njo germanist Kelemina[9], navajajoč zlasti dejstvo, da se je v langobardščini premik *-t-* > *ss* izvršil šele v Italiji[10] ter torej langobardski **gausing* ni mogel biti sprejet od Slovanov (kot **kosegъ*) že v severnem Podonavju pod Karpati, kot je to mislil Ramovš; edinole s takó zgodnjo izposoditvijo bi se dala namreč razložiti poznejša razširjenost besede *kosez* oziroma bolje rečeno njene izvedenke *Koseze* (*Kaseze, Kázaze*) po vsem ozemlju, naseljenem s Slovenci (in morda deloma Hrvati) po njihovem prihodu v novo domovino. Seveda pa se pri vsem tem tudi upravičeno sprašujemo, kako to, da se je to ime obdržalo dejansko le na Slovenskem.

Kelemina sam je nato prvi prišel na idejo o romanskem izvoru besede *kosez*: romansko-langobardski pravni izraz **casagium*, izvedenka iz besede *casa* (hiša), s pomenom *domnicatum, domus principalis*[11] naj bi bil prišel k Slovencem iz furlanskih, zlasti patriarhovih pisarn, pomenil pa je grad kot središče uprave; **casagium* bi torej po Keleminovem mnenju bil osnova za štiri slovenska krajevna imena *Koseze* na ozemlju bivše Kranjske, za krajevno ime *Kasaze* na Štajerskem pri Celju in za štiri toponime *Kázaze* na Koroškem[12]; toda zdi se nam, da bi za krajevna imena *Koseze* na bivšem Kranjskem eventualno še lahko računali s predlaganim Keleminovem romansko-langobardskim izvorom — seveda pa je beseda **casagium* sama na sebi več kot hipotetična —, pa je po našem mnenju to mnogo teže s primeri na Štajerskem in Koroškem, pri katerih je tak nastanek zaradi geografske oddaljenosti in zgodovinskih dejstev prav malo verjeten[13].

Tako se je germanist J. Stanonik, *o. c.*, pred kratkim vrnil zopet na germanska tla pri iskanju izvora naših kosezov: staroangleški izraz *cotsetla* »kmet svobodnik«, z mlajšimi variantami *coscets, coscez, cozets, cozez*, ga po svoji glasovni strukturi močno spominja na našega *koseza* ter se zato sprašuje, ali ne gre morda pri imenih *cotsetla* in *kosez* — tudi zaradi pomenske sorodnosti — za isti izvor; tudi ko zgodovinar B. Grafenauer — po temeljiti analizi vsebinskih razlik med *cotsetli* in *kosezi* — trdi, da gre tudi pri različnih variantah, še bolj podobnih našemu imenu *kosez*, le za »igro grafičnih substitucij, ki ne morejo prav nič pomagati pri reševanju niti nastanka koseškega družbenega sloja niti podlag njegovega imena«[14], se Stanonik ne umakne z germanskih tal in se — mislimo, da čisto upravičeno — čudi, da se pri iskanju nastanka imena *kosez* raziskovalci-lingvisti niso zatekli tudi h Grimmovemu slovarju, kjer bi bili lahko našli germansko sestavljenko *cotset* = *cot* (koča) + *saeta, set* (stanovalec, prebivalec); po Stanonikovem

---

9 J. Kelemina, *Kazaz, kosez*, Slavistična revija III (1950), str. 464—465.

10 Gl. E. Gamillscheg, *Romania Germanica*, II. Bd, Berlin-Leipzig (1935), str. 271.

11 Meyer-Lübke v svojem *Rom. etymol. Wörterbuch* besede *casagium* ne navaja.

12 *Koseze* pri Ljubljani, pri Vodicah za Šmarno goro, pri Moravčah in pri Ilirski Bistrici; *Kasaze* pri Petrovčah zapadno od Celja; *Kázaze* v podjunski dolini, pri Št. Petru vzhodno od Celovca, pri Bilčovsu in nad Blačami v ziljski dolini, gl. Ramovš, *o. c.*, str. 303.

13 O nekaterih drugih, še teže sprejemljivih etimologijah besede *kosez* gl. B. Grafenauer, *Hrvati u Karantaniji*, str. 221 s.

14 B. Grafenauer, *Cotsetlas = Kosezi?*, Sodobnost XI, str. 1150.

mnenju bi bili po asimilaciji soglasniške skupine *ts* v *ss* v besedi *kotset* prišli do oblike *Kossat*, izpričane v spodnji nemščini, a po konzonantskem premiku *t* > *s* do oblike *Kossass, Kossess* (ki pa jih Grimm nima oziroma ne navaja)[15]. Ne trdi pa Stanonik nikjer, da prihaja naše ime *kosez* neposredno iz geografsko zelo oddaljenega *kotsetla* oziroma iz njegovih zgoraj navedenih inačic, ki naj bi se bile iz stare angleščine oziroma z britanskega otočja vrnile na kontinent ter skupno z nemškim *Kotsasz* povzročile nastanek slovenske besede *kosez*, kot to nekako domneva J. Mal[16]. Takšni razlagi bi se — gledano le z jezikovnega vidika — upiralo tudi dejstvo, da so staroangleške oblike *cotsets, cascez, cozets, cozez* in tudi nemška *Kotsasz* poudarjene na prvem zlogu, kar bi pričakovali tudi za na njih temelječo izposojenko *kosez*, ki pa ima poudarek na drugem zlogu.

Pri iskanju izvora naše besede resnično preseneča predvsem dejstvo, da se ime *kosez* sploh ne pojavi v nobeni od starejših listin, da ga tudi Pleteršnik ne pozna, a da ga, kot se misli, srečamo prvikrat in edinokrat šele v turjaških urbarskih zapisih iz prve polovice 16. stoletja (1522—1547) za Žužemberk na Dolenjskem, v katerih je, kot pravi Ramovš, *o. c.*, str. 303, »ista oseba imenovana zdaj s slovenskim, zdaj z odgovarjajočim prevedenim nemškim imenom: *Gregor Edlinger — Gregor Kasses, Juri Edlinger — Juri Kasses, Janntsche Edlinger* in *Michel des Janntsche Kosses sun, Paull Edlinger — Paulle Khäses edlinger*«.

Pustimo za sedaj ob strani ta, za presojo naše besede važni zapis, h kateremu se bomo še povrnili, naj pa ugotovimo, da se krajevno ime *Koseze*, ki naj bi bilo nastalo iz apelativa *kosez* v njegovi množinski obliki[17], prvikrat omenja v listini iz leta 1424 — torej kakih 100 let prej kot domnevani apelativ *kosez* —, in sicer v zapisku *Edling, Kazezeh* za današnje *Kasaze* pri Petrovčah zapadno od Celja[18].

Toda čeprav se torej toponim *Kazeze* najde zabeležen mnogo prej kot (domnevani) apelativ *kosez* v že zgoraj omenjenih urbarskih zapisih za Žužemberk, so vendar dosedanji raziskovalci precej enotnega mnenja — z izjemo J. Kelemine z etimološko razlago **casagium* = grad —, da naj bi bili *kosezi* dali oziroma pustili nekaterim krajem, kjer so prebivali v večjem številu, svoje ime[19].

Vzrok za takšno razlago tiči v dejstvu, da za naše toponime *Koseze, Kasaze, Kázaze* najdemo v stari dobi tudi vzporedno nemško ime *Edling(en)*, ki naj bi bilo pomenilo »plemiško naselje« in ki naj bi bilo prevod slovenskega

---

[15] J. Stanonik, *Cotseti in kosezi*, Sodobnost XII (1964), str. 91—93.

[16] J. Mal, *Ist das Edlingerproblem wirklich unlösbar?*, Südost-Forschungen XXII (1963), str. 177.

[17] Pričakovali bi *Kosezi*, toda po akuzativni obliki *Koseze* je nastala nova nominativna oblika *Koseze* ter je ime postalo ženskega spola, gl. Ramovš, *o. c.*, str. 307.

[18] Ta kraj se leta 1248 omenja le z nemškim imenom *Edelingen*, »a to *prvotno* (podčrtal A. G.) nemško ime se je kasneje umaknilo slovenskemu (Kassasse)«, piše Ramovš, *o. c.*, str. 303.

[19] Tak nastanek krajevnega imena je seveda možen in celó pogosten, prim. npr. številne kraje, imenovane po Hrvatih na Koroškem v nekdanjem »pagus Crouuati«, v dolini gornje Mure, pa tudi toponim *Hrvača* pri Ribnici na Dolenjskem, gl. B. Grafenauer, *Hrvati u Karantaniji*, str. 207 ss.

imena *Koseze* (le-to bi torej bilo starejše kot nemško ime za te kraje, toda gl. opombo 18!); a po enačbi *Koseze* = *Edling(en)* se je napravilo razmerje *Koseze : Edling(en)* = *x : Edling* (= plemič) in izluščila neznanka *x* = *kosez*; nastal je torej sklep, da je »ob času nemške kolonizacije (tj. od 10. stoletja dalje) slovenščina imela substantiv s pomenom nemškega *Edelmann, Edling* (= plemič), kajti drugače ta prevod ne bi bil mogel nastati« (Ramovš, *o. c.*, str. 303). Do drugačnega sklepa seveda raziskovalci-lingvisti, ki so skušali najti izvor besede *kosez* v starih osebnih imenih *Kosingas, Kosentzes* (kot bomo takoj videli) oziroma v starem plemenskem langobardskem imenu **gausing* seveda tudi niso mogli priti.

Morda je naš jezik res že v dobi naselitve v novi domovini imel substantiv *kosez*, ali, kot že rečeno, nikjer ga v stari dobi ne srečamo — kot npr. srečamo slovensko ime *župan* prvič pri alpskih Slovencih že leta 777 v obliki *jopan* (F. Kos, Grad. I 290) in od 13. stoletja dalje v oblikah kot *supan, suppan* ter alpsko nemško *Sùppan* »sodnik, valpet, oskrbnik« (Bezlaj, *o. c.*, sub v. *župan*). Sklepanje o obstoju naše besede v tako zgodnji dobi temelji namreč predvsem na hipotezi o njenem izvoru iz eponima *Kosentzes*, ki ga zgodovinar Konstantin Porfirogenet (10. stoletje) omenja kot enega vodij plemena Hrvatov in čigar ime bi po Ramovšu moglo v svoji grški obliki podajati slovansko obliko **kasedz* (le-ta pa po Ramovševem mnenju temelji na njegovi domnevani langobardski osnovi **gauting* > **gausing*), tj. osnovo, ki jo imamo v slovenskih krajevnih imenih *Koseze*; potemtakem bi naj bili Hrvati prinesli Slovencem ime **kosez*[20], a čudno in presenetljivo je vsekakor dejstvo, da prav pri Hrvatih oziroma na njihovem ozemlju ne v stari in ne v novejši dobi nikjer ne najdemo apelativa *kosez*; pač pa srečamo — šele in edinole v 16. stoletju — samo krajevno ime, in sicer zapisano pluralno genetivno obliko *Kaseg* ter lokativno *Kasezih* v Liki, gl. *Akad. rječ.* IV 879; nastanek tega imena iz starega osebnega imena *Kosentzes* pa se nam zdi težko verjeten in bi se morda zanj našla boljša razlaga[21].

Sporno se nam tudi zdi navajati toponim *Kossessdorf* na Sedmograškem (Ramovš, *o. c.*, str. 315), ki naj bi tudi eventualno temeljil na domnevanem **kasedz*; tu gre po vsej verjetnosti za krajevno ime germanskega izvora, za zloženko iz *Kossess* + *Dorf* (vas); *Kossess* sam pa prihaja — kot je domneval že Stanonik — po asimilaciji *ts* > *ss* iz *Kotsasz, Kothsasz*, nastalo iz *Kot* (Kothe, Kathe, koča) + *saet, set* (stanovalec, naseljenec); obliko *Kosassen* najdemo zabeleženo v *Allgemeine deutsche Real-Encyklopädie*, Leipzig 1835, VI. zvezek, sub v. *Kothe* z razlago: »Kothe, eigentlich Kathe, hiess ursprüng-

[20] O težko vzdržljivi enačbi *Hrvati* = *kosezi*, oziroma narobe, zgodovinarja Ljud. Hauptmanna gl. M. Kos, *GV*, 1932, str. 114, in B. Grafenauer, *Hrvati u Karantaniji*, str. 219 ss.

[21] Morda bi tudi za ta toponim privzeli kot osnovo turško *»kaza* = upravno okrožje«, kot to domneva za *Kazagina* in *Kazagiće* v Bosni B. Grafenauer, *Hrvati u Karantaniji*, str. 224? Omenjam le kot zanimivost, brez kakega sklepanja za naš problem, da je prav v istem stoletju na beneškem teritoriju bila znana beseda *cas(s)asso* (= birič) = turško *'asas*, gl. *Dizionario etimologico italiano*, 1955, str. 789. Tudi ni nemogoče za ime *»terra Kaseg«* v Liki računati z vplivom s severa, kjer je imen z domnevano osnovo *kosez* mnogo več.

lich im Niedersächsischen ein Bauernhaus, welches weder Hof noch Laendereien hat, und dessen Besitzer deshalb bloss zu Hand- und Fussdiensten verbunden ist. Daher heissen Kothsassen, *Kosassen,* Kossaeten (Koether, auch Hintersassen), zum Unterschiede der eigentlichen Bauern, diejenigen Dorfbewohner, welche eine blosse Kothe, mithin weder Zugvieh noch Laenderei besitzen«. Grimm v svojem slovarju, V. zvezek, 1898, navaja oblike *Kot(h)sasz* = homo casatus, bewohner und inhaber einer Kote[22]. *Kossessdorf* bi torej nekako ustrezalo naši oznaki *Koče, Kočarji.* Ker vemo, da je bila germanizacija tudi na ozemlju Sedmograške močna, nas toponim germanskega izvora ne more presenečati[23]; res pa je, kot pravi Ramovš, da je glasovni sestav tega imena precéj podoben tistemu v naših *Kosezah,* zaradi česar Ramovš pripušča možnost, da je to ime v zvezi s *Kosezami;* tudi mi smo mnenja, da taka zveza obstaja, samo da bi zanjo imeli drugačno razlago[24].

Končno se R. Nahtigal[25] in Ramovš, *o. c.,* opirata pri izvajanju *kosez* < < *kosedz < *ka-, *kosegъ na krajevno ime v Reziji (Beneška Slovenija), ki naj bi vsebovalo žensko obliko starega **koseg,* namreč v posesivnem adjektivu, ki ga čitamo v zvezi *»tána Kasîginej hörýcoe«,* citiranem po Baudouinu de Courtenay[26].

Pri čitanju tekstov, ki jih je B. de Courtenay objavil v 5. poglavju omenjene knjige in ki na približno 20 straneh, v odstavkih 297—368, zajemajo

---

22 Seveda je *Kotsasz* iste družine kot flamski *Kossaat* ter severnonemški *Kotsâte, Kossäte* < *Kotsête,* iž česar po Grimmu srednjelatinski *cotsatus, cotsetus;* spada pa v to družino tudi že po Stanoniku navedeni anglosaški *cotsaeta, cotsetla* »rusticus, villicus«, kar vse izpričuje visoko starost besede v saških oziroma germanskih deželah. J. L. Frisch, *Teutsch-lateinisches Wörterbuch,* Berlin 1741, I str. 540, navaja: der Inwohner einer *Kote, Kate* heisst *Köter, Kotsasse, Kotsäte, Kossâte, Kotse* »casarius«, lat. barb. *cotarius, cotmannus, cotsetus, cotarellus; Kotsassen,* in der Magdeb. Verordn., p. 627 »die keine eigene Spann haben«. Tudi starofrancoski *cote* »cabane« ter izvedenke anglonormanski *cotin* »cabane« (14. stol.), anglonorm. *cottage* »tenure d'un jardin«, staro- in srednjefrancoski *cens cotage* »cens payé pour un tènement en roture«, *cotier* »tenant d'un héritage roturier«, pa tudi srednje- in moderno francoski *coterie* z zanimivim semantičnim razvojem spadajo semkaj, gl. W. v. Wartburg, *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch,* snopič št. 57 (1957), str. 345 sub v. *kot.* — Žal gesla *Kotsass* nismo mogli preveriti tudi v najnovejšem nemškem pravnem slovarju *Deutsches Rechtswörterbuch,* Weimar, 1939 —, ker ustrezni snopič (črke *Kot-*) še ni izšel.

23 Prim. R. Kötzscke, *Allgemeine Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Mittelalters,* Jena, 1924, str. 405: »In Siebenbürgen fanden unter König Geise II die Flandrer (aus dem Moselland) Aufnahme und erhielten später Zuzug von Norden her durch Sachsen . . .«.

24 O še nekaterih drugih krajevnih imenih, ki jih tudi — seveda s še večjo težavo in še manjšo verjetnostjo — spravljajo v zvezo s *kosezi,* gl. B. Grafenauer, *Deset let . . .,* str. 188, 199; glede furlanskega krajevnega imena *Cassacco,* ki ga Kranzmayer tudi povezuje s *kosezi,* je vsekakor verjetnejši romanski izvor, kar navaja tudi *Dizionario enciclopedico italiano,* Roma, 1955, II. zvezek, str. 855; pripominjam, da kaže še večjo glasovno podobnost s *kosezi* toponim *Casèz* v provinci Trento, ki ga pa seveda tudi ne bomo povezovali z besedo *kosez.*

25 R. Nahtigal, *O etimologiji izraza kosez,* Slavistična revija VIII (1965), str. 136 s; Ramovš, *o. c.,* str. 312.

26 Baudouin de Courtenay, *Materialien zur südslavischen Dialektologie und Ethnographie,* I., St. Petersburg, 1895; naš izraz »tàna Kasiginej hörycoe« avtor prevaja »Auf dem Kasiginen Platze« (= eine Örtlichkeit in Stolvizza).

področje Stôlbice (Stolvizza) v Reziji, pa nas preseneča dejstvo, da je beseda *Kasiginej* edina beseda v vseh teh tekstih z zapisanim *g*; vse druge imajo namreč namesto prvotnega *g* pisavo s *h*, to se pravi dosledno je tudi v pisavi podan znani prehod *g* > *γ* > *h* v rezijanskem dialektu[27], npr.: *te drühe* (druge), *móhal* (mogel), *hlédat* (gledat), *ha* (ga), *hré* (grè), *Buh* (bog), *hóra* (gora), *Hrat* (Grad), *míha brátra* (mojega brata), *bríh* (breg), *ohon* (ogenj) itd.; še celó večina romanskih izposojenk kaže pisavo s *h* namesto z *g*: *butœha* (bottega, prodajalna), *hràs* (grasso, tolst), *sohônt* (secondo, segondo, drugi), *hráčja* (grazia, milost), poleg *ligreč, legrêče* (allegrezza, slavje, slavnost); prav čudno je torej, da se edino v besedi *Kasiginej* pojavi pisava z *g*, ko bi prav pri njej, ki naj bi bila stara slovenska beseda, pričakovali, če že ne izvršeno palatalizacijo *g* v *z* pred vokalom *i* (prim. zgoraj navedeni hrvatski toponim v *Kasezih*, poleg genetiva *Kaseg*!), pa vsaj izvršeni in tudi zabeleženi prehod *g* v *h*. Bi torej beseda utegnila biti novejšega romanskega izvora z vrednostjo *g* = *z* (it. *dž*), kot to srečamo npr. v besedi *correginat* (= korezinat, it. correggere, popraviti, poboljšati) in za kar je izgovor z *z* dokazan z obliko *corrézina* (torej pisava z *z*!) v Mater., III, str. 51?[28] Omenjam še, da za intervokalični *g* (v tujih besedah)srečamo pisavo *gh* pred *e*, npr. v nemighen (it. inimico, sev. it. nemigo, sovražnik), ibid. 350, 412. Tudi poudarjeni *i* v naši neznanki bi lahko — kot pogosto v rezijanščini — bil prišel iz *é* prim. še *hríh* (greh), *sić* (séči, kosíti), tudi *míđeh* (it. medico, zdravnik), a protonični *a* bi lahko temeljil tudi na *e*, prim.: *nahá prásca* (enega prasca), *tacý!* (teci!), *wzamý!* (vzemi!), *žané* (žene), *talé* (têle), *taté* (tête), *jazík* (jezik), *raklà* (rekla), medtem ko je videti, da protonični *o* ostane: *kozá, kozé, wodó* (vôdo), *oćà* (oče), *poslàt, pomátat* (pometati) itd., poleg *patók* (potok).

Vsekakor se nam zdi, da je pri besedi *Kasiginej* težko in res nesporno misliti na izvor iz domnevane stare slovenske besede **koseg* in da ni izključeno, da gre za besedo romanskega izvora; tu bi eventualno mislili na sev. it. *casina*, it. *cascina*, pristava, planšarija, siranna[29] ali pa na furlanski deminutiv *ciasine*, hišica, koča (od *ciase*, hiša, it. *casa*); v zadnjem primeru bi šlo seveda za starejšo izposoditev, tj. pred znano furlansko palatalizacijo *ka* > > *ča, ća*; ostane pa še vedno problem intervokaličnega *g*, ki pa morda predstavlja fonem *j* ali *(d)z* v naši besedi? »*Tàna Kasiginej höricoe*« bi torej nekako pomenilo »*na kraju, prostoru, trgu pri pristavi* ali *kjer so hišice, koče, kajže*? Lahko pa *Kasiginej* predstavlja adjektivno izpeljanko iz nekega, žal neznanega osebnega imena? Vse to bi bilo treba še temeljiteje preučiti (zlasti na kraju samem, če se je ime še obdržalo) z dodatnimi raziskavami in tudi podatki, ki jih žal nismo imeli na voljo.

Zgoraj navedeni rezijanski tekst z besedo *Kasiginej* smatrajo dosedanji raziskovalci, lingvisti in zgodovinarji, za dokaz, da so tudi v tem delu sloven-

---

[27] F. Ramovš, *Kratka zgodovina slovenskega jezika*, Ljubljana, 1936, str. 124.

[28] Pisava *gi* podaja izgovor *dj*, prim. *pregián* (predjan),, Mat. III 66, *je nùtar gial* (djal, dejal, dal), ib. 8.

[29] M. Kos, *Urbarji Slovenskega Primorja*, II. zvezek str. 32, omenja planino *Kašina* pod Krnom (»cassina in monte Cren«).

skega ozemlja nekoč bivali *kosezi*, a drugi dokaz za to najdejo v današnjem krajevnem imenu *Koseze* pri Ilirski Bistrici na Notranjskem.

V zvezi z nastankom tega krajevnega imena pa smo mnenja, da bi se morda lahko zatekli k drugačni razlagi, kot jo nudi domnevana staroslovenska osnova **koseg, *kaseg*, in ki bi mogla veljati tudi za druge *Koseze* na Slovenskem.

V svoji razpravi «*Postanek in razvoj Kranjske*[30] piše M. Kos, da »so proti koncu 13. stoletja (leta 1292) v notranjskih Kosezah[31] imeli alodialno in, od goriških grofov, fevdno posest gospodje, ki se po Lipi pri Jelšanah imenujejo de Lipia, Lint ali de Tylia; od leta 1323 sledimo v Kosezah naslednike gospodov iz Lipe, rodbini s pridevkom Švabi (Swevi, Schwabn) (torej iz nemških krajev došlega rodu! op. A. G.), ki se po notranjskih Kosezah začno imenovati de Edlingen; goriški grofje jim dajejo v fevd »Vest Edlingen« (listini iz leta 1367 in leta 1398); okoli 1381—1383 se zaradi Švabov v Kosezah (i. e. Edlingen) prepirajo Goriški z Devinci«.

Po Kosovem mnenju v našem primeru ime *Edling* ne pomeni tujega kolonista — kot je to mislil zgodovinar Lj. Hauptmann[32] —, temveč le kraj, kjer so se ti Švabi naselili oziroma si pridobili posest in prevzeli — glede na enak pravni položaj, kot so ga imeli staroslovenski *kosezi* — tudi njihovo nemško označbo *Edling*, tj. nemški prevod slovenskega imena *Koseze*; torej bi slovensko ime takrat že bilo moralo obstajati kot krajevno ime, dobljeno po tamkaj živečih kosezih; žal pa je omenjeno le z nemškim imenom, medtem ko za Lipo čitamo poleg nemškega (*Lint*) in italijanskega (*Tylia*) tudi slovensko ime *Lipia*.

Toda dejstvo je, da se ime *Edling(en)* javlja v starih zapisih mnogo pred našimi *Kosezami* — ki se, kot že omenjeno, prvič srečamo z njimi v zapisu iz leta 1424 »*Edling, Kazezeh*« —, da naletimo na toponim *Edling(en)* tudi v primerih, kjer slovenskega odgovarjajočega imena *Koseze* ali podobno sploh ni in ni bilo — obratno pa za slovensko *Kazaze* pri Št. Petru vzhodno od Celovca čitamo, vsaj za novejšo dobo, vzporedno nemško ime *Harbach* (slov. *Horpoh*) —, skratka, treba je vendarle računati z možnostjo, da je ime *Edling(en)* starejše od naših *Kosez* in *kosezov*, kar pa seveda pomeni, da nastanek imena *Koseze, kosez* ne sega tako daleč v preteklost, kot se to splošno misli.

Za nemški izraz *Edling* čitamo v Grimmovem slovarju, III. zvezek (1862) na str. 28: *Edeling* m vir nobili genere natus, *ahd.* edilinc, mhd. edelinc, *ags.* ädeling; Grimm dostavlja: ein schönes, durch *edelmann* verdrängtes wort. — Po Grimmu je torej *Edling* neke vrste plemič[33].

---

[30] M. Kos, *Postanek in razvoj Kranjske*, Glasnik Muzejskega društva za Slovenijo, X, 1929, str. 39 ss.

[31] Zapis je seveda nemški: *Zadlinge, Zedlinge* = zu Edling(en).

[32] V *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 1928, str. 273.

[33] Iz burgundščine je *adhalings, adalings* prišel v provansalščino ter ga najdemo v epu *Girarz de Rossilho* (13. stoletje), toda vedno le v zvezi »*vassal i a(d)alenc*«: e lui ac bo vassal i adelenc, 4382 (= bil je dober vazal); ib. 2183, 2519; burgundski *adalings* je po Gamillschegu, *o. c.*, II 184, odgovarjal romanskemu *vassallus* = (adeliger) Lehensmann.

H. Fischer, *Schwäbisches Wörterbuch*, Tübingen, 1911, II. zvezek, str. 538, pa navaja: *Edeling* m; Edler, ter citira med drugim primera iz avgsburških kronik: *50 Pfärd eitel guet auserlesen, stark Volk, darunter etwa vil Edling*, 2,91 ter: *All Lantzhern und all Ritter und Edlinck*, 1, 61, 2, 23.

Najnovejši *Deutsches Rechtswörterbuch*, Weimar, 1939, II. zvezek, str. 1195: *Ed(e)ling, ahd.* adaling, ediling; glede pomena pa navaja za langobardsko, visokonemško, holandsko, spodnjenemško »freier Bauer« (kmet svobodnik), s primeri kot: *herimanni*[34] *aut nobiles* (?) *qui vocantur edelingenses*, 1232, Istrien, Böhmer-Ficker, Nr. 320; *ez sint dreier hande freien ... die dritten haizent edelinge und sint gepouweren* (= Bauern!), 1300, Schawsp. Var./WBS 80 (1875) 313; *der ... sol ... sweren, daz er seiner herschefte getriwe sei*, ib. 355, n. 5 (1305 Steier. L. Arch. hschr.); *berittene freie Grundbesitzer*, Werunsky, Oest. RG 499[n]; *die freysässen und edlinger, die jre aigne güeter und hueben haben, aber doch nit geadlt personen sein*, 1535 Krain, LGO 54.

Ker nisem zgodovinar, se lahko motim oziroma ne poznam še drugih virov z drugačno razlago za *Edlinge*, toda vse kaže, zlasti pa najnovejši zapisi v zgoraj omenjenem pravnem slovarju, da je to bil sloj svobodnikov, ki bi ga lahko uvrstili nekako med plemiče na eni ter nesvobodnike (podanike) na drugi strani. Grimmova razlaga — najstarejša — za *Edlinge*, ki jih šteje k plemičem, se torej ne sklada z razlagami novejšega datuma — v katerih velja *Edling* le za svobodnika —, kar je gotovo treba pripisovati dejstvu, da Grimm še ni poznal toliko zgodovinskih virov oziroma zapisov kot poznejši sestavljalci raznih slovarjev in je tako povezal besedo *Edling* z besedo *Adel* (plemstvo) ter izenačil besedo *Edling* z *Edelmann*. Tudi L. Pintar je istovetil *Edlinga* s plemičem in enačba *Edling(en)* = *Koseze* ga je privedla do tega, da je izraz **kosez* skušal izvajati iz plemiško zvenečega imena *knez*, a tudi poznejši raziskovalci so, kot smo videli, za *koseze* iskali »visok« izvor (*Kosingas* = glavar, *Kosentzes* = ime vodje Hrvatov).

Da pa *Edlingi* niso bili plemiči, dokazuje tudi dejstvo, da so opravljali dela, ki bi za plemiča bila nemogoča; tako so opravljali službo stražarjev na gradovih, bili sodni sluge, poštni seli, postavljali so vislice, vodili zločince na morišče ipd.[35]

---

[34] Za langobardski *harimann* pravi Gamillscheg, *o. c.*, II 68: *harimann* bezeichnet zunächst den Kriegsdienstleistenden, dann den Freien überhaupt, und dringt in das Mittellateinische.

[35] O vsem tem in tudi o teritorialni razširjenosti naselbin *Edlingov* na slovenskem ozemlju gl. B. Grafenauer, *Zgodovina slovenskega naroda*, II 106 ss, ter J. Mal, *o. c.*, str. 151, v obširnem poglavju »Das Wesen der Edlinger und deren Dienste«. Mal navaja tudi zanimivost, da še danes prebivalce vasi Orehovica na Dolenjskem sosedje imenujejo »biričevnike« (= pomočnike biričev), ker so nekoč, tj. pred kakimi 500 leti, *Edlingi* te naselbine morali loviti hudodelce in postavljati vislice. Seveda pa so v tej dobi in gotovo tudi že prej med *Edlinge* nemškega roda bili pomešani in so opravljali iste posle tudi svobodniki slovenskega rodu, kot to dokazuje že navedeni žužemberški zapis iz začetka 16. stoletja, a na Koroškem J. Unrest, ki konec 15. stoletja v svoji kroniki (kot prvi) imenuje ustoličujočega slovenskega kmeta z imenom *Edlinger* (»ein Pawer Geschlacht, genant Edlinger«).

Bili bi torej glede notranjskih *Edlingov* rajši mnenja, da bi morda le kazalo dati prav Lj. Hauptmannu; goriški grofje oziroma plemiči-gospodarji gradu na Premu — ki so bili gotovo tujega, nemškega rodu — so na svojo posest naseljevali tuje nemške koloniste, tudi svobodnike, med njimi tudi Švabe, ki jih (oziroma njihove potomce!) M. Kos omenja kot jabolko spora med goriškimi grofi in Devinci konec 14. stoletja; ti tuji naseljenci pa so tudi po našem mnenju ime *Edling* prinesli že s seboj, ne pa si ga šele pridobili na kraju svojih posestev na Notranjskem kot prevod oznake pravno enakih že tamkaj naseljenih »*kosezov*«.

Ime *Edling* oziroma njihova naselišča *Edling(en)* srečamo že od 12. stoletja dalje na celotnem ozemlju, nekoč in sedaj naseljenem s Slovenci. Naj za Štajersko po J. Zahn, *Urkundenbuch des Herzogthums Steiermark*, Graz, 1872, II. zvezek, str. 259, navedem zapis iz c. 1150: recipiens tale predium quale nos (sc. samostan Admont) apud *Edelingin* habuimus (gre za Edling pri Trofaiach; isti *Edling* se omenja v listini iz leta 1164); v neki listini iz c. 1170 nastopa kot priča tudi Engilbertus filius Ratoldi de *Edelingen* (= Edling pri Gröbmingu); na str. 248 v listini iz c. 1145 čitamo med pričami imena Fridericus de *Ettelingin*, Liutwin de *Etelingen*, Heinrich de *Ettelingin* (ne ve se točno, za kateri Edlingen gre); str. 116 v listini iz leta 1205 najdemo med pričami nekega Rodegerus de *Edelingen*; str. 495 čitamo v listini iz leta 1240: item in der Dobre quicquid colunt *Edlinge*. Za *Edling, Kazezeh* iz leta 1424 gl. zgoraj.

Za Koroško navajamo po H. Jaksch, *Die Kärntner Geschichtsquellen*, Klagenfurt, 1904, III. zvezek, Nr. 1082, za leto 1164: die Güter im Lavanttal in *Edling*; Nr. 1163 iz leta 1173—1180 čitamo: ein Gut in ... *Edling* (pri St. Andrä); Nr. 777 v listini iz leta 1144 se omenja *Edlingen* (pri Hartmannsdorf pri Friesach); Nr. 887 za leto 1216 čitamo ime *Edelinge* de Amelricus (gre za Edling jvzh. Spittala); VI. zvezek, str. 192, za leto 1294 čitamo: eine Hube in *Edlingen* (gre za dar samostanu Vetrinje); str. 76 beremo v listini iz leta 1288 ime *Edilhingen* (gre za Edling am Zammelsberg, južno od Strassburga na Koroškem).

Na ozemlju bivše Kranjske pravi Krajevni leksikon Dravske banovine (1937), da se kraj *Koseze* pri Moravčah prvič omenja leta 1238; sicer ne pove s kakšnim imenom, toda gotovo kot *Edling(en)*; za *Koseze* pri Vodicah nad Ljubljano imamo zapis »aput *Edelingen* et in Woditz« iz leta 1265, gl. Ramovš, *o. c.*, str. 303 in Pintar, *o. c.*, str. 600; za *Koseze* pri Ljubljani najdemo zapis *Edling bey sannd Margareten* iz leta 1453, gl. Kelemina, *o. c.*, str. 464; za *Koseze* na Notranjskem gl. zgoraj.

Tako ne more preveč presenečati, če si upamo domnevati, da je tudi na Notranjskem leta 1292 zabeleženo nemško krajevno ime *Edelingen* prvotno krajevno ime, imenovano tako po Edlingih, tj. tujih, nemških kolonistih, med katerimi so — kot smo videli — izrecno omenjeni Švabi. Slovenska oznaka kraja, tj. *Koseze*, bi torej bila poznejša, a zelo verjetno se nam zdi, da je nastanek imena *Koseze* bil prav pogojen s prihodom nemških kolonistov, oziroma drugače povedano, zdi se nam možno, da je ime *Koseze* germanskega, nemškega izvora.

Za katero nemško besedo bi lahko domnevali, da je bila osnova za naše *Koseze*?

V že omenjenih Kosovih urbarjih večkrat srečamo besedo *gesäss, gesaezze, gesesse, gesezz, gesezze,* kar Kos sloveni s »selišče«; tako na str. 111: (c. 1370) Item 1 *gesazze,* das Mathyas Glopit inn hat; Item 1 *gesezz,* das der meins herren von Görz schultazz inne hat; na str. 113: Item Hainczl Fricleins sun von Zelkan hat ze lehen von dem haus ze Reyffenberg ein *gesezze,* das er selber pawet; na str. 115: Item Friczel von Zelkon 1 *gesezz* dasselbs, da er selber auf siczet mit ellen den Rechten dy darzue gehören; na str. 117: Item Pluemel ze Görz hat von dem haus Reiffenberg ze lehen ein *gesesse* in dem dorff ze Görcz. V urbarju za Vipavo iz leta 1499 čitamo, naj Primus Szerottnikh daje od svojega selišča (tj. *gesäss*) 80 šilingov.

Besedo *gesaez* srečamo tudi na Koroškem, kot kaže npr. zapis iz leta 1317: Graf Heinrich von Görz beurkundet, dass Otte von Reuntal sein hous und gesaz da ze Wynchlern (= Winkleren im Mölltal) ... aufgegeben hat, gl. H. Jaksch, *Die Kärntner Geschichtsquellen,* Klagenfurt, 1904, VIII. zvezek, str. 112, Nr. 368.

Grimmov slovar, IV. zvezek (1897), kol. 3806, navaja za besedo *Gesäsz* n za starejšo dobo oblike in pomene: stvn. *gisâzi, gesâze* »sedes, domicilium, tabernaculum, territorium«, srvn. *gesaeze,* starejše nvn. *gesäsze, gesasz*; za pomen »wohnsitz, wohnung, gebäude, niederlassung, lagerung« navaja primere kot: stvn. ih zimberôn dîn *gesâzze* »aedificabo sedem tuam«, St. Galler handschr. 88,5; die fruoasten arbeite sluog er in Chamis *kesâzzen* »primitias laboris eorum percussit in tabernaculis, Cham. 77, 51; srvn. ein *gesass* oder vesten newlich geseczet, Fontes rer. austr., II 20 (iz leta 1459); za pomen »landgut, bauerngut«: All Kössin git (giebt) ain pfund haller uszer irem hof und *gesaesz* ze Wessingen, monum. zollerana 1, Nr. 426 (za leto 1393); v listini iz leta 1421 hus, hofraiti und *gesaesz.*

Fischerjev švabski slovar daje za našo besedo pomen »wohnsitz«: Uz dem Huse bi unserem *Gesaezze,* Ulm 1308/Ub. 1, 296; An b-s Hus und Schur, daz man nempt der Nünnelin *Gesaehsse.*

Najnovejši Deutches Rechtswörterbuch, IV. zvezek, str. 415, navaja: *Gesässe* n *gesaezze, gesaizze, gesass, gesesse, geseste, geseze, ghesette* s pomenom »Besitztum, Wohnsitz«: possessiones *kasiezzi* Ahd. Gl., II 345; vicos ciuitatis kesazze, ib., I 728; unum *gesete* aduersus E., a. 1190, Erhard II 218; sine *gesesse* gelegen by dem wasser, a. 1279, Basel UB II. Nr. 287; daz *gesaizze* ze P., a. 1322, Lexer I 895; die da haben ir frey *gesez* oder höff, die schollen 1 M von ainem lehen geben, a. 1471, Fr. Austr. II 20, 83, itd.

Na podlagi gornjih primerov se nam ne zdi nemogoče, da bi apelativ *Gesäss,* ki je imel tudi pomen selišče, bivališče, stanovanjska in verjetno tudi gospodarska zgradba (koča), za notranjske *Koseze,* za katere vemo, da so v njih živeli (tudi) Švabi (gl. zgoraj švabske primere!) prav lahko prišel v poštev kot osnova za naše *Koseze*: Slovenci, naseljeni na tamkajšnjem področju, so začeli iz več poslopij sestoječo naselbino tujih kolonistov imenovati prav po imenu *Gesäss,* ki so jo v pluralni obliki gotovo pogosto slišali od nemških priseljencev. Edninska oblika *Gesäss* pa verjetno tiči v krajevnem

imenu *Kases*, ki ga je ugotovil Mal, *o. c.*, str. 155, v okolici kraja Rottenmann na Štajerskem, ob vznožju mogočnega gradu Strechau.

Slovenci so na pol zvenečo nemško medijo *g* točneje substituirali s svojim *k*, kot bi to bili mogli storiti s svojim zvenečim *g*, prim. isti pojav v stvn. krajevnem imenu *Sant Gangolf* ter slovenski *Šent Kandolf* na Koroškem, pa tudi apelative kot *kâvtre* (vrnila ‚lesena vrata) iz srn. *gater*, *kávklar* iz *Gaukler*, krompir iz bav.-avstr. *gruntpirn*, itd.; obratno pa za slov. *g* nemški *k* v *Krka*, nemško *Gurk*, itd. Prednaglasni *e* bi bil po disimilaciji prešel v *o* (ali ponekod tudi *a*), izvršila pa se je tudi konzonantska zamenjava *z* — *s* v *s* — *z*, verjetno pod vplivom slovenskega začetnega nezvenečega *k*: *Kezese* > *Keseze* > *Koseze*. Beseda je bila verjetno privzeta razmeroma zgodaj, tj. še preden se je v (pogovorni) švabščini oziroma nemščini izvršila redukcija in onemitev začetnega, nenaglašenega e v predponi *ge-*, pojav, ki ga stavljajo nekako v 14. stoletje.

Ali moremo tudi za ostale slovenske *Koseze* oziroma *Kasaze*, *Kázaze* domnevati isti nastanek? Že Ramovš, *o. c.*, je lepo dokazal, da so vse razlike v našem imenu produkt slovenskega dialektičnega razvoja in ne različnega substituiranja; torej bi mogli tudi pri naši domnevni nemški osnovi suponirati najprej začetno substitucijo v obliki Keseze, Kezese, v kateri bi v nadaljnjem razvoju na Koroškem in Štajerskem začetni nenaglašeni *e* prešel v *a* — prim. *teta* > *tatà*, *tele* > *talè*, Ramovš, *o. c.*, — ter še kasneje prenos poudarka na prvi zlog, o čemer tudi govori Ramovš, navajajoč za kranjsko govorico primere *motíka*, *navâda*, *porôka* proti štajerskemu in koroškemu *mótika*, *nâvada*, rož. *pôroka*.

Predvsem za notranjske *Koseze*, za katere zgodovinski viri govore o švabskih priseljencih, bi poleg švabske in splošno nemške besede *Gesäss* kot osnovo za *Koseze* lahko pritegnili tudi sestavljenko *Kottengesässe* (*Kotte* = = koča; torej selišče koč), ki smo jo našli v že omenjenem švabskem slovarju z razlago: »in Lagerbüchern ist mehrmals von »Kottengesässen«, d. h. Wohnungen der Hintersassen[36] ... die Rede«; beseda bi bila seveda tudi doživela močnejšo redukcijo nenaglašenih zlogov in konzonantsko asimilacijo: *Kottengesässe* > Kotg(e)sässe > Kotsässe > Kosese, Koseze; zlasti s svojim prvim sestavnim delom *Kotte(n)* bi morda predstavljala še bolj verjetno osnovo za naše *Koseze*[37]. Besedo *Kottengesässe* smo našli le v švabskem slovarju, a je gotovo bila znana tudi drugim nemškim dialektom, npr. bavarščini, in bi v tem primeru naši predniki nekatere *Koseze* bili lahko privzeli tudi od bavarskih kolonistov, dasi je iz starih listin razvidno, da je moralo

[36] *Hintersasse*, po *Grimmu*, IV/2, kol. 1514, »einer der hinter einem herrn in dessen schutze angesessen ist; po *Deutsch. Rechtsw.*, V 1053, »jeder der in best. Raum im Schutz jemandes sitzt« in »der zwar Schutz geniesst, aber nicht Untertan o. Bürger ist«.

[37] Z osnovo *(Kotten)gesässe* »selišče (koč)« bi bil, se nam zdi, najlaže razložljiv tudi toponim *Kajžice* za Kazaze, nemško Edling, pri Bilčovsu na Koroškem; morda ne gre le za posmehljivo ime, kot mislita Lessiak in Ramovš, temveč za dejansko zdrobljene posesti in majhna selišča (koče, kajže) obubožanih Edlingov; že Klebel pa je tudi domneval, da je v goriškem urbarju (c. 1300) omenjeni kraj *Edling* identičen s *Chotschaw* iz leta 1380, današnji *Kötschach* v zgornji dolini reke Zile.

biti tudi švabskih priseljencev precéj na Koroškem in Štajerskem, prim. zapise kot v listini iz let 1074—1087, kjer čitamo med pričami ime Merquart Sueuus (gre za darila salzburške nadškofije samostanu Admont), gl. Zahn, *o. c.*, II. zvezek; c. 1185 nastopa med pričami v neki listini Rudolf *Sueuus*; istega leta figurira kot priča Gotfridus *Sueuus* v neki zadevi samostana Admont; istega leta srečamo med pričami osebo Chonradus *Sueuus* v zemljiški zadevi za Ribnico pri Beljaku; leta 1205 se kot priča čita ime Fridericus de *Suabesdorf* v zemljiški zadevi za Leibnitz na Štajerskem.

Koseze bi se torej po svojem nastanku pridružile skupini iz nemščine sprejetih krajevnih imen tipa *Meierhof* > *Marof* (krajev z imenom *Marof* je v Sloveniji precéj: pri Cerknici, Trebelnem, Vidmu, Vojniku, Sevnici, Šmarjeti, Vuzenici, Jurkloštru, Pilštajnu), *Frîthof* (*Friedhof*) > *Britof* (npr. pri Kranju, Senožečah, itd.), *Reute* > Rovte, Rute, itd., da ne govorimo o gradovih nemških gospodarjev, ki so ohranili svoja nemška imena, seveda več ali manj spremenjena, vse do danes v slovenščini: Žužemberk, Čušperk, Jetrbenk, Bogenšperk, Dornberk, Rihemberk (danes Branik), Pilštajn, itd.

Naj še omenimo, da imamo na področju bivšega premskega gospodstva na Notranjskem še danes naselje *Britof*, torej še en dokaz, da tuji, nemški kolonisti niso bili tako redki v teh krajih in da se je pri Slovencih ohranilo nemško ime kraja oziroma naselbine. V bližini štajerskih *Kases*, pri Preboldu, pa se srečamo s toponimom *Žvajga*, ki more temeljiti le na srvn. *sweige* »Alpenhütte, Viehhof, Sennerei«[38]. Glede *Kosez* pri Moravčah, za katere nismo gotovi, ali se tudi zanje v starih zapisih bere vzporedno nemško ime *Edling(en)*, pa poroča Mal, *o. c.*, str. 156, o številnih *edlingih*, bivajočih v neposredni bližini tega kraja pred stoletji.

Za oblike *Kossas, Kos(s)es* in *Khäses* iz prve polovice 16. stoletja, ki jih srečamo edinole v že omenjenih žužemberških zapisih, pa bi podobno naši razlagi nastanka toponima *Koseze* domnevali, da je treba izvor teh besed iskati v že zgoraj navedeni nemški besedi *Kossass, Kotsass;* v nemščini, ki so jo govorili nemški priseljenci na ozemlju, nekoč in sedaj poseljenem s Slovenci, se je beseda *Kossass* gotovo uporabljala ter se zrcali tudi v žužemberških zapisih, v katerih je — tu soglašamo s Kelemino in Bezlajem — rabljena kot priimek (v tej dobi se je raba priimkov že uveljavila), za kar govori tudi zapis »Paulle Khäses edlinger«[39]. Če pa je ta naša razlaga pravilna, imajo žužemberške oblike poudarek na prvem zlogu — kot nemška osnova *Kossas* — ter bi zato težko predstavljale, kot je mislil Ramovš, prve (in edine) zabeležene primere besede *kosez* (ki ima poudarek na drugem zlogu)[40].

---

[38] Prim. zapis iz leta 1267: *unam svega sitam in ...*, Jaksch, *o. c.*, IV. zvezek, št. 2927; gre za *Schwaige* pri kraju Feldkirchen na Koroškem.

[39] Tudi prvotni apelativ *Edling* se je začel uporabljati kot priimek (*Edlinger*), kot dokazuje — poleg žužemberških zapisov — ime znane goriške plemiške družine v 14./15. stoletju, potomcev Švabov iz *Edlinga* (*Koseze*) na Notranjskem, gl. M. Kos, *Postanek in razvoj Kranjske*, str. 39 ss, ter meščanski priimek *Edlinger* v Celovcu.

[40] Za žužemberške oblike bi kot nemško osnovo morda lahko privzeli tudi besedo *Gesässe* s pomenom »Eingesessener, Bürger, Inhaber von Grundeigentum (Haus und Hof), auf fremdem Grund als Hintersasse sesshaft«, ki jo navaja *Deutsches Rechtswörterbuch*, IV. zvezek, 417, s primerom iz leta 1313; v tem primeru bi seveda

Glede apelativa *kosez* smo že omenili, da ga Pleteršnik ne pozna — če bi bil obstajal, bodisi na Kranjskem ali na Koroškem, kjer je največ *Kosez* oziroma *Kazaz*, bi ga bil prav gotovo zabeležil! — torej je moral nastati šele po Pleteršniku; dejansko ga je, kot smo že videli, ustvaril šele L. Pintar leta 1912, ko je rekonstruiral obliko *kosez* iz besede *knez*, oprijeli pa so se je za njim (dasi so zanjo iskali drugačen nastanek kot Pintar) tudi drugi raziskovalci, tako lingvisti kot zgodovinarji; navaja jo Glonar v svojem *Slovarju slovenskega jezika*, 1936, str. 173: »*kosez*: plemič, svobodnjak; rabljeno tudi kot osebno ime; po tem krajevno ime *Koseze, Kasaze, Kazaze*«. Slovenski pravopis iz leta 1950 besede *kosez* še ne omenja, a leta 1962 jo navaja kot pravno zgodovinski izraz. Bezlaj, *o. c.*, str. 17, pa točno beleži *kosez, kasez* z zvezdico (**kosez, *kasez*), s pripombo, da je oboje rekonstruirano.

Ob koncu te razprave bi želeli pripomniti, da predstavlja gornja razlaga nastanka imen *Koseze, kosez* seveda samo še en poskus osvetlitve — z malo drugačnega vidika kot dosedanji — tega važnega jezikovnega problema v slovenščini, ki upravičeno terja svojo, čim najbolj zadovoljivo rešitev.

Résumé

L'auteur passe en revue les tentatives des linguistes nombreux qui ont tâché de trouver l'origine si contestée du vocable slovène *kosez*, »home libre appartenant à une classe sociale slovène entre les nobles et les serfs à l'époque féodale«, ainsi que du nom de lieu *Koseze* qui en aurait été dérivé: Pintar croit trouver l'origine de *kosez* dans le mot slovène *knez* »prince«, tirant son origine du mot germanique *kuning* »ex nobilitate ortus«; Lessiak en cherche l'étymologie dans le vieux slave **kozak, qazaq* »homme libre, indépendant«; Ramovš pense au langobard **gauting*, Kelemina au roman **casagium* et Stanonik suppose comme origine l'ancien allemand *Kotsasz*.

L'auteur cherche, d'abord, à expliquer l'origine du toponyme *Koseze*, assez fréquent sur le territoire slovène; il croit la trouver dans le mot allemand *Gesässe*, pluriel de *Gesäss* »habitation«, ou *Kottengesässe* »habitations de cases, de huttes«, apportés, après le 10e siècle, par les colons allemands et acceptés sous la forme de *Koseze* par les Slovènes; par conséquent, *Koseze* appartiendrait au groupe de toponymes slovènes d'origine allemande du type *Meierhof* > *Marof, Frithof (Friedhof)* > > *Britof*, fréquents, eux aussi, sur le territoire slovène. Le premier exemple du toponyme *Koseze* remonte à l'an 1424.

Quant à *kosez*, il n'apparaît jamais dans les anciens documents, car il n'est pas du tout sûr que les noms de personnes *Kasses, Kosses, Khäses*, constatés dans un document de la première moitié du 16e siècle, représentent le mot *kosez*, l'auteur préfère y voir les reflets du terme allemand *Kotsasz, Kossass, Kosass* »habitant d'une case, d'une hutte« ou de *Gesässe* »propriétaire foncier«. *Kosez* serait un mot

oblike *Kossas, Kos(s)es* in *Khäses* bile poudarjene na drugem zlogu, a nemška osnova *Gesässe* bi bila pri Slovencih doživela iste spremembe kot *Gesäss* (selišče) — saj gre v bistvu za isto besedo. Ker pa se beseda *Kossas* itd. v zapisih pojavi razmeroma pozno, precéj kasneje kot toponim *Koseze*, je po našem mnenju težko misliti na možnost, da bi se pluralna oblika besede *Kossas, Kos(s)ses, Khäses* < < *Gesässe* (= lastnik selišča) začela rabiti tudi za oznako njihovih selišč, kar bi sicer bilo prav mogoče.

Verjetno bi tudi za priimek *Kaseznik* v Logarski dolini, ki ga omenja Ramovš, *Kratka zgodovina* ..., str. 10, vzeli kot izhodišče nemško osnovo *Kassess* (ali *Gesässe*), če ni izveden iz že sloveniziranega štajerskega toponima *Kasaze* ali kranjskega *Koseze*.

reconstruit: comme le toponyme slovène *Koseze* avait, autrefois, aussi le nom parallèle allemand *Edling(en)*, interprété comme »habitation des gens nobles« (*Edling* étant compris, erronnément, au sens de *Edelmann* »home d'origine noble«), Pintar a abouti, grâce à l'équation *Edling(en)* = *Koseze* à celle de *Edling* = *kosez*, créant ainsi le mot en question.

B. Vodušek

THE REPETITION OF PHONEMIC CHARACTERISTICS IN RADICAL MORPHEMES IN SETS OF SYNONYMS FROM INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES*

8.23 SPADE

1	Grk.	ámē	**yăm-** P 502
2	Grk.	skapheîon (?)	(s)kĕp-2 **(s)kăp-** etc. P 930-2 (Bois. 871 f.)
3	NG (Grk.	patóphtuaro patéō)	**pent-** B, P 808-9
4	(Grk.	ptuárion, ptúon)	**peu-1** B (8.24), P 827, Bois. 824
5	Lat. W.	pāla pal (fr. Lat.)	**păg'-** păk'- P 787-8, B, WH 2.236 :kʷel- P 545 for W.
6	It. (Late Gmc., cf. ON vangsni, OHG	vanga Lat. vanga fr. waganso)	wogʷh-nis- **wogʷh-nes-** etc. REW 9137, WH 2.730, P 1179-80
7	Fr. (VLat. Lat.	bêche *bissus fr. bis)	dwō(u)- **dwei-** FEW 1.381, 382 f., Gam. 93, REW 1132, P 228-30
8	Sp. (Basque:	laya laya)	**laya** Cor. 3.57, REW 4957
9	Rum.	lopata	**lēp-** B, P 679, Vas. 2.58
10	Ir.	rāme	**erə-1** P 338, B
11	Ir.	laige	**lăgh-** P 652, Bois. 561, WH 1.757 f. (: Frisk 2.92)
12	ON	reka	**reg'-1** P 854-6, B (8.24, 8,27), John. 717-8, FaT 870
13	Dan.	spade	**sp(h)ē[i]-2** sp(h)ĕi- P (982)980, FaT 1110, John. 887, KM 721
14	OHG	scūvala (?)	**skĕu-5** P (954)955, B, KM 639, 646, FaT 1020 f., 1045
15	MHG	grabeschīt	**ghrebh-2** P 455-6, B, KM 641
16			**sĕk-2** P (895)919-21
17	Lith.	kasiklis	**kes-** P 585, Fr. 226 f.
18	ChSl.	rylo	**ereu-2** P (338)868, Vas. 2.555, 558, 449, Brück. 471, 470, Mch. 431, 429
19	SCr. (Hung.	ašov aso, as)	**as-** B

* See First Part, Linguistica VI, 1964; Second and Third Part, Linguistica VII, 1 and 2, 1965; Fourth and Fifth Part, Linguistica VIII, 1 and 2, 1966—1968; Sixth Part, Linguistica IX, 1, 1969.

20	Russ.	zastup	steb(h)- stēb(h)- etc. **ste-m-p-** P 1011-3, B, Vas. 3.35
21	Skt.	khanitra-	cons. k^x vowel e^x Mh. 1.301, P 634

8.24 SHOVEL

1	Grk.	ptúon	**peu-1** P 827, Bois. 824
2	Lat. Br.	pāla pal (fr. Lat.)	**păg'-** păk'- P 787-8, B (8.23), WH 2.236 :kwel- P 545 for Br.
3	Rum.	lopata	**lēp-** B, P 679, Vas. 2. 58
4	Ir.	slūasat	cons. **s** vowel $\bar{u}^x$ B
5	W.	rhaw	**erə-1** P 338, B (8.23)
6	W. (NE	siefl shovel)	**skĕu-5** B, P (954)955
7	Goth.	-skaurō	**sĕk-2** P (895)954, F 566 f.
8	ON	reka	**reg'-1** P 854-6, B (8.24, 8.27), Joh. 717-8, FaT 870
9	Skt.	khanitra-	cons. k^x vowel e^x Mh. 1.301, P 634

8.25 HOE

1	Grk.	skapánē	(s)kĕp-2 **(s)kăp-** etc. P 930-2, Bois. 870 f.
	Lith.	kaplys	[s]kĕp-2 P 930-2, Fr. 217 f.
2	Grk.	skalís	**(s)kel-1** P 923, Bois. 868 f.
3	Grk.	sminūe	**(s)mēi-2** P 968, Bois. 886
4	Grk.	mákella	cons. k^x vowel e^x B, Bois. 602, Frisk 2.163 f.
5	Grk.	díkella	dwō(u)- **dwei-** P 228-9
6			**kel-3** P 545 :(s)kel-1 Bois. 189 (Frisk 1.392)
7	NG (It. zappa fr. Illyr. zapp- fr. a calling cry)	tsápa	**zapp-** B, REW 9599
8	Lat.	ligō	[s]leig- P 961, WH 1.800
9	Lat.	sarculum	**ser-5** P 911, WH 2.470 f.
10	Lat.	bidēns	**ed-** P 287-9
11	Fr. (Frank. *hauwa)	houe	**kāu-** REW 4084, Gam. 519, P 535, KM 293
12	Sp. (VLat. *asciāta, Lat. ascia)	azada	**ag-wesī** ak-sī Cor. 1.345, REW 697, P 9, WH 1.71 f.
13	NIr. (Gmc., cf. ON grafa, OE grafan)	grafan	**ghrebh-2** (B), P 455-6
14	Br. (Fr. pic)	pigell	**pikk-** B, Gam. 692, REW 6495 (cf. sub 8.26-3 OE pīc)
15	Dan. (MLG hacke, hacken vb.)	hakke	**keg-** kek- etc. FaT 372, 390, B, P 537-8, KM 279

16 OE	mattuc (VLat. *matteūca, *mattea, Lat. mateola)	**mat-2** B, REW 5426, 5425, P 700, WH 2.49	

8.26 FORK

(s. Linguistica VII, 2, 1965, p. 158)

8.27 RAKE

(s. Linguistica VII, 2, 1965, p. 155)

8.28 HARROW

(s. Linguistica VII, 2, 1965, p. 152)

8.32 MOW, REAP

1 Grk.	therídzō	**gʷher-** P 493-4, Bois. 341, Frisk 1.665 f.	
2 Grk.	amáō	**mē-2** m-e-t P 703, Bois. 53, Frisk 1.88	
3 It.	segare (Lat. secāre)	**sĕk-2** REW 7764, P 895 :sē[i]k- sə̄k- sek WH 2.504 f.	
4 It.	falciare (Lat. falx, -cem)	**dhelg-** REW 3175, BA 2.1586, P 247, (WH 1.449 f.)	
5 Sp.	guadañar (Goth. *waithō or Frank., Langob. *waidanjan)	**wei-3** Cor. 2.804, REW 9483, P 1123-4, FaT 1361 f., Joh. 111 f., KM 848	
6 Rum.	secera (VLat. *sicilis, Lat. sīcilis)	**cons. s** vowel **iˣ** P 896, REW 7900, WH 2.533, 504	
7 Rum.	cosi (Slav., cf. SCr. kositi, Russ. kosit')	**kʾes-** B, Bern. 1.581, Vas. 1.639 f., P 586	
8 Ir.	bongaim	**bheg-** bhe-n-g- P 114, LP 347, 340	
9 NIr.	spealaim	**sons. s, p** vowel **eˣ** B	
10 W. (Lat.	pladuro pāla)	**păg'-** păk'- B (8.23), P 787-8, WH 2.236 **:kʷel-** P 545	
11 Goth.	sneithan	**sneit-** P 974, F 440, Joh. 913 f., KM 670 (:FaT 1096 f.)	
12 ON	slā	**slak-** P 959, Joh. 920 ff., F 436, KM 652 FaT 1048 f.	
13 OE	rīpan	**rei-1** P 857-8, KM 592, FăT 902, 906	
14 Lith.	piauti	**pēu-** P 827, Fr. 584	
15 ChSl.	žęti	**gʷhen-2** F 491-3, Vas. 1.411,428, Brück. 662 f., Mch. 595	
16 Skt.	lu-	**leu-2** P 681, B	
17 Skt.	dā-	**dā- dāi- dāu-** P 175, Mh. 2.31	

8.33[1] SICKLE

(s. Linguistica VII, 2, 1965, p. 158)

8.33[2] SCYTHE*

1 Grk.	drépanon	**der-4** P 206-11	
2 Grk.	hárpē	**ser-5** P 911-2	

* This set of synonyms was erroneously omitted in the list of sets composing the present concept-group (Linguistica IX/1, 1969, p. 37). Consequently, the number of the included sets amounts to 55.

3	NG	kosa (Slav., cf. SCr. kosa, Russ. kosa)	**k'es-** B, Bern. 1.581, Vas. 1.639 f., P 586
4	Lat.	falx	**dhelg-** P 247, WH 1.449 f.
5	Sp.	guadaña (Goth. *waithō or Frank., Langob. *waidanjan)	**wei-3** Cor. 2.804, REW 9483, P 1123-4, FaT 1361 f., Joh. 111 f., KM 848
6	Sp.	dalle (Late Lat. daculum)	cons. **d**^{x} vowel **e**^{x} Cor. 2.105 f., REW 2458, P 247
7	Ir.	spel	cons. **s, p** vowel **e**^{x} B
8	W.	pladur	**păg'- păk'-** B (8.23), P 787-8, WH 2.236 **:kwel-** P 545
9	ON	lē	**leu-2** P 681, Joh. 739 ff., FaT 650
10	OE OHG	side segansa	**sĕk-2** P 895, FaT 963, KM 704 f., Joh. 777 f.
11	Lett.	izkapts	**[s]kĕp-** (s)kăp- etc. P 930-2, B
12	Skt.	dātra-	**dā- dāi- dāu-** P 175, Mh. 2.31

9.22 CUT (vb.)

1	Grk.	témnō	**tem-1** P 1062, Bois. 954, Vas. 3.111, Brück. 60
2	Grk.	kóptō	**[s]kĕp-** (s)kăp- etc. P 930-1, Bois. 492 f., Frisk 1.915 f.
3	Lat.	secāre	**sĕk-2** P 895, **:sē[i]k- sə̄k- sek** WH 2.504 f.
4	Lat.	caedere	**[s]k[h]ai-** P 917, WH 1.129
5	It.	tagliare (Lat. tāliāre, tālea)	**tāl-** REW 8542, EA 5.3698 f. P 1055, WH 2.643
6	Fr.	couper (Vlat. colpus fr. Grk. kólaphos)	**kel-3** REW 2034, WH 1.304, P 545
7	Fr.	trancher (Lat. truncāre, truncus)	**trenk-1** REW 8953, Gam. 857, P 1093, WH 2.710 f.
8	Sp.	cortar (Lat. curtāre, curtus)	**[s]ker-4** Cor. 1.919 f., REW 2418, P 938-9
	ON	skera	(s)ker-4 P 938-9, Joh. 835 ff., FaT 1010 f.
9	Ir.	snaidim	**(s)nadh-** P 972-3
10	Ir.	scothaim	cons. **s**, k^{x} vowel **X** B (8.57)
11	NIr.	gearraim	**g'her-6** P 443, B (12.59)
12	W.	torri	**ter-3** P 1071-3, B (9.26) **:P (1071)1077**
13	Goth.	maitan	**[s]mēi-** P (968)697, F 341 f., FaT 709
14	Goth.	sneithan	**sneit-** P 974, F 440, Joh. 913 f., KM 670 (:FaT 1096 f.)

15	ON	telgja	**del-3** P 194-6, Joh. 492 f., FaT 1252
16	ON	ho*ggva	**kāu-** P 535, Joh. 177, FaT 426
17	OE	ceorfan	**gerebh-** P 392
18	ME	cutte	cons. g^x vowel **X** FaT 598, Hh. 43, B
19	Lith.	piauti	**pēu-** P 827, Fr. 584
20	Lith.	re*žti	**wrēg-** P 1181-2, Fr. 725 f., Vas. 2.484, 485, 505, Brück. 476 f., Mch. 434
21	Lett.	griezt	cons. g^x, **r** vowel i^x B, Fr. 169
22	Pol.	rąbać	**remb-** P 864-5, Brück. 455, Vas. 2.541 f.
23	Skt.	lu-	**leu-2** P 681, B
24	Skt.	śas-	**k'es-** P 586, WH 1.179
25	Av.	thwarəs-	**twerk'-** P 1102, Mh. 1.539
26	Av.	brī-	**bher-3** P (133)166

9.23 KNIFE

1	Grk.	máchaira	**mag'h-** P 697, Bois. 616, Frisk 2.186, WH 2.3,4
2	Lat.	culter	**[s]kel-1** P 923-4, WH 1.304
3	Rum.	cut*it (VLat. *cōtītus, Lat. cōs, cōtis)	**ak'-2** B, P (18)541-2
4	Ir.	scian	**sĕk-2** P (895)919-20, LP 15
5	ON	knifr	**gen-** P 370, Joh. 332-4, FaT 550, 548
6	OHG	mezzisahs	**mad-** P 694-5, KM 475, FaT 944
7	Lith.	peilis	cons. **p** vowel i^x Fr. 563 f., Vas. 2.356, B
8	Lett. (Russ.	nazis nož)	**neg'h-** B, P 760, Vas. 2.225, Brück. 367, 364, Mch. 329, 326 f.
9	Skt.	kr*ti-	**[s]ker-4** P 938-41, Mh. 1.258, 260 257
10	Skt.	śastra-	**k'es-** P 586
11	Skt.	churikā	**kes-** P 585-6, Mh. 1.408 f., 292

9.24 SCISSORS, SHEARS

1	Grk.	psalís	**(s)p[h]el-1** P 985, Bois. 1073, 890
2	Lat.	forficēs (pl.)	**gʷher-** P 493-4, B, WH 1.526 f., 532 f.
3			**kap-** P 527, WH 1.159 f.
4	It.	cesoie (VLat. *caesorium, Lat. caedere)	**[s]k[h]ai-** REW 1475, P 917, WH 1.129
5	Sp.	tijeras (pl.) (Lat. [forfices] tōnsōrias, tondēre)	**tem-1** Cor. 4.631 f., REW 8784, P 1062-3, WH 2.689 f.
6	Ir.	demess	dwō(u)- **dwei-** P 228-9, B, LP 188

7			**mē-2** m-e-t- P 703
8	W.	gwellaif	**wel-4** P 1139
9			cons **b**^{x} vowel **X** B
10	ON	skaeri (pl.)	(s)ker-4 P 938-40, Joh. 835-7
	Skt.	kr*pān*ī-	**[s]ker-4** P 938-44, Mh. 1.261
11	ON	so*x (pl.)	**sĕk-2** P 895, Joh. 777-8, FaT 944, KM 575
12	Lith.	žirkle*s	**g'her-2** P 441, WH 1.569 f., A. Leskien, Die Bildung d. Nom. 348 (s. Ling. VII, 2, p. 158) :g'hel-2 P 434, B
13	SCr.	nožice (pl.)	**neg'h-** P 760, Vas. 2.225, Brück. 367, 364, Mch. 329, 326 f. Vuk 437
14	SCr.	makaze (Tk. makas fr. Arab.)	**makas** Bern. 2.9

9.25 AX

1	Grk.	pélekus (Akkad. pilakku)	**pilakku** Bois. 761, B
2	Grk.	aksīnē	**ag-wesī** ak-sī P 9, Bois. 65, Frisk 1.115 f., WH 1.71 f., F 54
3	NG	tsekoúri (Byz. sikoúrion, tzikoúrion fr. Lat. secūris)	**sĕk-2** B, P 895 sē[i]-k- sə̄k- sek WH 2.506, 504 f.
4	Lat.	(bipennis)	dwō(u)- **dwei-** P 228-9
5			**pet-2** P 825-6, WH 2.282 f.
6	Fr.	hache (Frank. *hapja, cf. OHG happa, heppa)	**[s]kĕp-2** (s)kăp- etc. REW 4035, Gam. 502, P 930-2
7	Rum.	topor (Slav., cf. Bulg., Russ. topor)	cons. **t** vowel **e**^{x} B, Vas. 3.121 f., 3.95, Lok. 1964
8	Ir.	biail	**bhei(ə)-** P 117-8, LP 14, 172
9	Ir.	tūag	**[s]teu-1** P 1032
10	ON	barda	**bhar-** P (108)110 :bher- Joh. 616 f. (FaT 52, 94, 129)
11	Lith.	kirvis	**[s]ker-4** P 938-40, Fr. 259
12	Skt.	kut*hāra-	cons. **K** vowel **X** Mh. 1.223 f.
13	Av.	taša-	**tekth-** P 1058, Mh. 1.468, 491

9.27 SPLIT (vb. trans.)

(s. Linguistica VII, 2, 1965, p. 143)

9.45 HEW

(s. Linguistica VIII, 1, 1966—1968, p. 31)

9.46 BORE

(s. Linguistica VII, 2, 1965, p. 154)

9.47 AUGER

(s. Linguistica VII, 2, 1965, p. 154)

9.48 SAW (sb.)

1	Grk.	prīōn	**prīs-** P 846, Bois. 813 f.
2	Lat.	serra	cons. **s** vowel **e**^{x} WH 2.524

3	It. sega (Lat. secāre)	**sĕk-2** REW 7764, P 895 :sē[i]k- sə̄k-sek- WH 2.504 f.	
4	Rum. ferestrau (Hung. füresz)	**füresz** B	
5	W. llif (Lat. līma)	lei-3 **slei-** B, P 662-3, WH 1.801 f.	
6	OE snid	**sneit-** P 974, F 440, Joh. 913 f., KM 670 (:FaT 1096 f.)	
7	Lith. piuklas	**pēu-** P 827, Fr. 599 f.	
8	ChSl. pila (Gmc., cf. OHG fīhala, fīla)	peig-1 **peik'-** B, Vas. 2.356, Brück. 414, P 794 f., KM 190, Joh. 535, FaT 216	
9	SCr. testera (Tk. testere)	**testere** B	
10	Skt. krakaca-	**ker-1 k'er-sker-** P 567-8, B (:Mh. 1.275)	
11	Skt. karapatra-	**kʷer-1** P 641, B (:Mh. 1.275)	
12		**pet-2** P 825-6	

9.50 NAIL TACK

(s. Linguistica VII, 2, 1965, p. 155 f.)

9.81 CARVE

1	Grk. glúphō	**gleubh-** P 401, Bois. 152, Frisk 1.315, WH 1.610 f.	
2	Lat. scalpere	**(s)kel-1** P 923-6, WH 2.486 f.	
3	Fr. tailler (Lat. tāliāre, tālea)	**tāl-** REW 8542, Gam. 829, P 1055, WH 2.643	
4	Ir. snaidim	**(s)nadh-** P 972-3	
5	W. cerfio (ME cerve)	**gerebh-** B (9.22), P 392	
6	Br. kizella (OFr. cisel fr. VLat. *ciselum, *caesellum, Lat. caedere)	**[s]k[h]ai-** B, REW 1474, FEW 2.40, Gam. 225, P 917, WH 1.129	
7	Br. bena	**bhei(ə̄)-** P 117, B (9.45)	
8	ON skera	**(s)ker-4** P 938-9, Joh. 835 ff., FaT 1010 f.	
9	ON grafa	**ghrebh-2** P 455-6, Joh. 396 f., FaT 343	
10	Dan. udhugge	**kāu-** P 535, B, FaT 426, Joh. 177	
11	NHG ausmeisseln	**[s]mēi-2** P (968)697, KM 472, FaT 709	
12	Lith. iškalti	**kel-3** P 545-6, Fr. 211	
13	Lett. tēluot (ORuss. tělo)	cons. **t** vowel **X** B (9.83), ME 4.171, Vas. 3.91	
14	ChSl. vajati	cons. **w** vowel **X** Vas. 1.175	
15	Boh. vytesati	**tekth-** P 1058-9, Mch. 527, Brück. 63, Vas. 3.99	

9.84 CHISEL (sb.)

1	Grk.	smīlē	**(s)mēi-2** P 968, Bois. 885 f.
2	Lat.	scalprum	**(s)kel-l** P 923-6, WH 2.486 f.
3	It. (VLat. *caeselum, Lat. caedere)	cesello	**[s]k[h]ai-** REW 1474, BA 2.877, P 917, WH 1.129
4	Rum. (Slav., cf. Bulg. dlato, Russ.-ChSl. dlato, Russ. doloto)	dalta	**delbh-** B, P 246, Vas. 1.360, 359
5	W. (Lat. cuneus)	cyn	**ak'-2** B, LP 57, P (18)626-7
6	W.	gaing	cons. **g^x, n** vowel **e^x** B
7	Dan. (MLG bêtel, beitel)	bejtel	**bheid-** FaT 69, P 116-7
8	OE	graefsex	**ghrebh-2** P 455-6, B
9			**sĕk-2** P 895
10	Lith.	kaltas	**kel-3** P 545-6, Fr. 211

12.352 POINT

1	Grk.	akís	**ak'-2** P 18-9
2	NG (Grk. mútis)	mútē	**mŭ-l** B (4.23), P 751
3	Lat.	cuspis	cons. **k^x** vowel **X** B, WH 1.318
4	Lat.	mucrō	**meuk'-** P 745, WH 2.117 f.
5	It. (Lat. punctum, pungere)	punta	peuk'- **peug'-** BA 4.3149, B, REW 6847, P 828, WH 2.389, 383 f.
6	Rum. (Slav., cf. ChSl. vьrchъ, SCr. vrh)	vîrf	**wer-2** B, P 1151-2, Vas. 1.190
7	Ir.	rind	**er-3** P 326-9 :**per-2** P 808-16, B
8	Ir.	benn	**bend-** P 96, LP 38
9	Ir.	corr	**[s]ker-4** P 938-44, B
10	W.	blaen	**mel-l** smel- P 716-9, LP 43
11	Br. (Fr. bec fr. VLat. beccus fr. Gall. *bekkos)	beg	**bheg-** B, REW 1013, Gam. 93, P 114, WH 1.99 :**bak-** P 93, B (12.75)
12	ON	oddr	**dhē-2** P 235-7, Joh. 166, FaT 787 :**wes-4** P 1172, FaT 1524
13	Dan. (MHG, NHG spitze)	spids	**(s)p(h)ēi-l** FaT 118, P 981, KM 728, 726 f., Joh. 887-9
14	Lith.	galas	**g^{w}el-l** P 470-1, Fr. 130
15	Lith.	smailusis galas	**(s)mēi-2** P 968
16	SCr.	šiljak	**sē(i)-3 sei-** P (891)915-6, B, Vas. 3.398
17	Boh.	hrot	**gher-3** P 440, Mch. 145, Brück. 159, Vas. 1.311
18	Pol. ChSl.	koniec koncъ	**ken-3** P 563-4, Brück. 252,74, Vas. 1.613 f.
19	Skt.	agra-	**ag-ro- eg-ro-?** P 8, Mh. 1.18

12.353[1] EDGE (of a knife, sword, etc.)

1	Grk.	akmē	**ak'-2** P 18-19

2 NG	athéras (Grk. athēr)	**andh-** B, P 40-1, Bois. 18 (:Frisk 1.28)
3 NG	kópsē (Grk. kóptō)	**[s]kĕp-** (s)kăp- etc. B, P 930-1
4 Grk.	stóma	**stom-en-** P 1035, B, Bois. 914 f.
5 It. (Lat. fīlum)	filo	**gʷheiə-** REW 3306, BA 3.1643, P 489, WH 1.497 f.
6 It. (Lat. tāliāre, tālea)	taglio	**tāl-** REW 8542, BA 5.3699, P 1055, WH 2.643
7 Fr. (Lat. truncāre, truncus)	tranchant	**trenk-1** REW 8953, Gam. 857, P 1093, (WH 2.710 f.)
8 Ir. (Brit., cf. W. gwaew)	faebar	**g'hais-o-** B, P 410, LP 10,18, 28, 67 :g'hei-1 P 424 f., B (20.26)
9 NIr.	bēal	**gwet-** P 481, B (4.25) :bheg- P 114, WH 1.99
10 W.	min	**mak-** P 698, B, LP 43
11 Br.	dremm	**derk'-** P 213, B, LP 4
12 Br.	lemm	**lei-3 slei-** P 662-3, B (15.78)
13 Br.	neudenn	**(s)nē- (s)nēi-** P 973, B (6.38), LP 24
14 Br. (Lat. barba)	barvenn	**bhar-** B (4.142), LP 61, P (108)110
15 Du.	scherp	**(s)ker-4** P 938-43, B (15.78)
16 MHG	snīde	**sneit-** P 974
17 Skt.	dharā-	**dhō-** P 272 (Mh. 2.101) :dheu-3 P 261, B

12.353[2] EDGE (of a table, forest, etc.)

1 Grk.	kráspedon	**k'er-1** P 574-5, Bois. 509, Frisk. 2.7 f.
2		**pĕd-2** P 790-1
3 Grk.	cheîlos	**ghelu-[nā] etc.** P 436, B (4.25), Bois. 1053, FaT 319
4 Lat.	ōra	**ōus-1** P 784, WH 2.218 f., 224 f.
5 Lat.	margō	**mereg'-** P 738, WH 2.39 f.
6 Fr. (Gmc. *bord, cf. ON borð)	bord	**bher-3** REW 1215, FEW 1.436 ff., Gam. 122, P (133)138
7 Sp. (Lat. cantus fr. Gall. *cantos)	canto	kam-p- **kam-tho-** Cor. 1.643 f., REW 1616, FEW 2.232, Gam. 205, P (525)526
8 Ir.	brū	**bher-** P 170, B
9 Ir.	cimas	**kem-1** P 555, B
10 Ir.	ochar	**ak'-2** P 18-21
11 Ir.	bil	cons. **x** vowel **X** B
12 Br. (Lat. rīpula)	ribl	**rei-1** B (1.27), P 857-8, WH 2.436

13	Goth.	skaut	**(s)kĕu-5** P (954)955-6, F 431, Joh. 819, FaT 1011 f., 1044 f., KM 677
14	ON	ro*nd	**rem-** P 8644, Joh. 723 f., FaT 876, KM 580
15	OE	snaed	**sneit-** P 974, B
16	OHG	trādo	**der-4** P 206-7, B
17	Lith.	kraštas	**[s]ker-4** P 938-42, Fr. 289
18	Lett.	mala	**mel-8** P 721-2
19	ChSl.	vъskrilьje	**[s]ker-3** P 935-6, Bern. 1.615
20	SCr.	ivica	cons. **x** vowel **X** Bern. 1.439
21	Boh.	hrana	**gher-3** P 440, Mch. 143, Brück. 155, Vas. 1.304
22	Pol.	brzeg	**bhereg'h-** P 140-1, Brück. 44, Vas. 1.76, Mch. 47, B (1.27)
23	Skt.	anta-	**ant-** P 48, B (12.35)
24	Av.	karana-	cons. **k^x, l^r** vowel **e^x** B (12.35)

12.75 HOOK
(s. Linguistica VII, 2, 1965, p. 156)

18.51 WRITE
(s. Linguistica VII, 2, 1965, p. 154)

20.25 ARROW

1	Grk.	tókseuma (Iran., cf. NPers. taxš)	**tekʷ-** P 1059, Bois. 975, Mh. 1.467 f.
2	Grk.	bélos	**gʷel-2** P 471-2, Bois. 118, Frisk 1.231 f.
3	Grk.	īos	**eis-1** P 299-301, Bois. 378, Frisk 1.730
4	Lat.	sagitta (Etruscan?)	cons. **s, g^x** vowel **e^x** B, WH 2.464
5	It. (Fr. flèche fr. Frank. *fleu[k]a, cf. MDu. vlieke, vleke)	freccia	**pel-1** REW 9424a, Gam. 423, Cor. 2.535 f., BA 3.1712, FaT 238, P (798)835-7
6	Br.	bir	cons. **r** vowel **X** B
7	Goth.	arhwazna	**arku-** P 67, F 56, Joh. 35, WH 1.64
8	ON OE	fleinn flān	cons. **p, l** vowel **X** P 1000, B, Joh. 905, FaT 235
9	Dan. (Lat. pīlum)	pil	**(peis-1)** pis- FaT 825, Joh. 1115, KM 542, P 796, WH 2.304, 302, 307 f.
10	OE	strael	**ster-4** P 1028, KM 755
11	Lith.	vilyčia	**wei-1** ME 4.639, P 1120 ff., Vas. 1.200
12	Lett. (MLG bolte)	bulta	**bheld-** B, P 124

13	Lett.	šautra	**sk'eu-** P 954-5, B, ME 4.10 (Fr. 969)	7	Lat.	hasta	**g'hast-o-1** g'hazd-o- P 412, WH 1.636
14	Boh.	šíp	cons. x vowel **X** Vas. 3.400, Mch. 499, 368	8	Lat.	pīlum	**(peis-1) pis-** P 796, B, WH 2.304, 302, 307 f.
15	Skt.	śaru-	**k'el-3** P 552	9	Fr.	épieu (Frank. *speut, cf. OSax. spiot, OHG spioz)	**(s)p(h)eud-** REW 8163, Gam. 372, P 998-9, KM 726, (FaT 1138)
16	Skt.	bān*a-	cons. x vowel e^x Mh. 425, B				
17	Av.	tig*ri	**[s]teig-** P 1016, Mh. 1.507, 525 f.	10	Rum.	sulit*a (Slav., cf. ChSl., SCr. sulica)	**sk'eu-** B, P 954-5, Vas. 2.44, Brück. 525, Mch. 484
18	Av.	ašti	cons. x vowel e^x B	11	Ir.	gae	**g'hais-o-** P 410, LP 18, 28, 67 :**g'hei-1** P 424-5, B , WH 1.575

20.26 SPEAR

1	Grk.	dóru	**deru-** P 214	12	Ir.	sleg	**selg'-** P 900, B
2	Grk. Lat.	lógchē lancea	cons. l vowel e^x B, Bois. 586, WH 1.757 f., Frisk 2.133 f., P 832	13	Ir.	croisech**	cons. k^x, r vowel **X** B
				14	Ir.	lāigen	**lăgh-** P 652, LP 29, Bois. 561, WH 1.757 (:Frisk 2.92)
3	Grk.	aichmē	**ăik'-** P 15, Bois. 31, Frisk 1.48, WH 1.670 f.	15	Ir.	mānais**	cons. m vowel a B
4	Grk.	égchos**	cons. K vowel e^x Bois. 214, Frisk 1.440 f., WH 1.608, 2.327	16	ON	spjo*r	**(s)per-1** P 990, Joh. 893 f., KM 722 :(s)p(h)er-4 P 992, FaT 1140, 1113, 1125
5	Grk.	ákōn	**ak'-2** P 18-20, Bois. 40, 32 f., Frisk 1.62				
6	NG (Late Grk. kontárion, Grk. kontós)	kontári	**k'ent-** B, P 567, Bois. 491, 434, Frisk 1.913, 820 f.	17	Lith.	ietis	**ei-1** P 293, B
				18	Lith.	ragotine*	cons. r, g^x vowel e^x Fr. 684, 736 f., Vas. 2.526 f.

g* in Av. tig*ri = the voiced guttural constrictive.
** Not in the list, but mentioned in Buck's discussion.

19 Lett.	šk'eps	(s)kĕp-2 (s)kăp- etc. P 930-2, ME 4.33	
ChSl.	kopьje	[s]kĕp-2 P 930-2, Vas. 1.621	
20 Pol.	wlocznia	**welk-1** P 1145, Brück. 627	
21 Av.	aršti	**eres-1** P 335, Mh. 1.125	

20.27 SWORD

1 Grk.	ksíphos	cons. k^x, s vowel X B, Bois. 678 f.	
2 Grk.	máchaira	**mag'h-** P 697, Bois. 616, Frisk 2.186, WH 2.3,4	
3 Grk.	áor	**wer-1** P 1150, B, Bois. 66, 15 f., Frisk 1.117, 23 f.	
4 NG (Grk. spathíon, spáthē)	spathí	**sp(h)ē[i]-2** sp(h)ĕi- B, P (982)980, Bois. 888 f., 896	
5 Lat. (Celt., cf. W. cleddyf, Br. kleze)	gladius	**kel-3** WH 1.603 f., P 545-6	
6 Lat.	ēnsis	**n*si-s** P 771, WH 1.406	
7 Rum. (Bulg. sab(i)ja, SCr. sablja fr. Hung. szablya, szab)	sabie	**szab** B, KM 617 f.	
8 Ir.	colg	**kel-2** P 545	
9 Goth.	hairus	[s]**ker-4** P 938-40, F 235, Joh. 835-7	
10 Goth.	mēki	cons. **m, K** vowel e^x F 352 f., Joh. 1096, Vas. 2.128, Brück. 331, Mch. 290	
11 ON	sverđ	**swer-4** P 1050, B, KM 693 :wer-1 P 1150, FaT 1214, 1560, Joh. 137 f.	
12 ON	brandr	**bher-2** P (132)143-5, Joh. 619-20	
13 Lett.	zuobens	**g'embh-** P 369, ME 4.756	

15.45 LOUD

1 Grk.	mégas	**meg'[h]-** P 708, B	
2 NG (Grk. dunatós, dúnamai)	dunatós	**(deu-2)** du- P 218 :deu-3 P 219, Frisk 1.423 f., (Bois. 204)	
3 Lat.	clārus	**kel-6** P 548-9, WH 1.228	
4 It. (Lat. fortis)	forte	**bhereg'h-** REW 3457, P 140, WH 1.535 ff. :dher-2 P 252 ff., B	
5 It. (Lat. altus)	alto	**al-2** REW 387, P 26, WH 1.4,31 f.	
6 Rum. (Lat. tālis)	tare	**to-1** REW 8543, P 1086-7	
7 Ir.	ard	**er-3** P (326)339	
8 W.	uchel	up-(o)- etc. **(e)up-s-** P 1106-7, LP 19	

IE **n*si-s** = with syllabic n.

9 ON	hār	**keu-2** P 588-9, Joh. 202 ff., FaT 451 f.
10 OE	hlūd	**k'leu-1** P 605-6, KM 427, FaT 668
11 Lith.	balsus	**bhel-6** P 123-4, Fr. 32
12 Lith.	garsus	**g^{w}er(∂)-4** P 478, Fr. 152, 154 :g'ār- P 352, B (15.44)
13 Lith.	didis	**dei-1** P 183, Fr. 93
14 Lett.	skan'š	cons. **s, k** vowel **e^{x}** B, Fr. 794
15 Lett.	skal'š	**(s)kel-** (s)kwel- P 550, Fr. 544
16 ChSl.	velij$_{Ъ}$	**wel-3** P 1138, B, Vas. 1.180, 181
17 SCr.	glasan	**gal-2** P 350, Vas. 1.287, Bern. 1.323, Brück. 144 :ghel- P 428, Mch. 129
18 Russ.	gromkij	**ghrem-2** P 458-9, Vas. 1.311, 310
19 Skt.	ucca-	**ŭd-** P 1103-4, Mh. 1.99, 101
20 Skt.	tāra	**ter-4** P (1074)1088-9 Mh. 1.497

18.12 SING

1 Grk.	aeídō	**au-6** P 76-7, Bois. 15, Frisk 1.22 f.
2 NG (Grk. tragō*déō)	tragoudô	**ter-3** B, P 1071-3, Bois. 978
3 Lat.	canere	**kan-** P 525, WH 1.154 f.
4 Ir.	gaibim	**ghabh-** P 407-8, B, LP 365
5 Goth.	siggwan	**seng^{wh}-** P 906-7, F 419, Joh. 786, KM 709 f. FaT 1227
6 ON	gala	**ghel-** P 428, Joh. 382 ff., KM 230, 244, 499, FaT 269
7 Lith.	dainuoti	cons. **d^{x}** vowel **i^{x}** B, Fr. 80
8 Lith.	giedoti	**gē(i)-** P 355, Fr. 150, Vas. 1.251 :gā(i)- B
9 ChSl.	pěti	cons. **p** vowel **i^{x}** Vas. 2.422, Brück. 404, Mch. 305

18.13 SHOUT, CRY OUT

(s. Linguistica VII, 2, 1965, p. 149)

18.41 CALL (vb. = SUMMON)

(s. Linguistica VII, 1, 1965, p. 42)

18.42 CALL

(vb. = NAME; BE CALLED, NAMED)

1 Grk.	kaléō	**kel-6** P 548, WH 1.141 f. :kal- Bois. 397 f., Frisk 1.762 f.

ō* in Grk. tragō*déō = ō with iota subscriptum.

2	Grk.	onomádzō	**en(o)-mn*-** etc. P 321, B (18.28), Bois. 704, WH 2.173	9	Lith.	vadinti	**au-6** P 76, Fr. 1177 f., Vas. 1.163 f.
3	NG (Grk. | légō légō)	**leg'-** B, P 658, Bois. 563 f., Frisk 2.94 ff., WH 1.780	10	Lett.	saukt	**kău- kĕu- k'ău- k'ĕu-** P 535-6, Fr. 968
4	Lat.	vocāre	**wek^{w}-** P 1135-6, WH 2.823 ff.	11	ChSl.	narešti	**rĕk-2** P 863, B (18.22), Vas. 2.525, 508 f., Fr. 716 f.
5	Fr. (Lat. | appeler appelāre)	**pel-2a** REW 542, P 801, WH 1.59				**:rei-3 rēi-** P 859-60 **:wer-6** P 1162
6	Ir.	gairim (?)	**g'ăr-** P 352, B, (cf. LP 368, § 555, 6)	12	SCr.	nazvati	**g'hau-** P 413, Vas. 1.447, Brück. 658, Mch. 589, Vuk 402
7	W.	galw	**gal-2** P 350, B				
8	Goth.	haitan	**kēi- kē[i]-** P 538, F 236, Joh. 198, KM 300 f., FaT 388	13	Skt.	abhi-dhā-	**dhē-2** P 235, B

* IE **en(o)-mn*-** = with syllabic n.

The chosen 55 synonymic sets are composed of 680 elements. There are 587 established Indo-European roots, 8 imitative radical morphemes belonging to individual Indo-European languages or languages groups, 13 foreign radical morphemes, and 72 unknown roots.

The tables N$^{os.}$ 38 to 42 give the consonantal distributions of the roots contained in the concept-group. As in establishing the etymologies of the single synonymic sets a somewhat unusual distribution of the root vowels came to light, this vowel distribution is separately listed in the table VI. Each of the vowel classes A and E is divided into two classes: the short A and the long A on the one hand, and the short E and the long E on the other. In all instances where by the traditional methods the original length or brevity of the root vowel cannot be determined with certainty, the vowels A and E are taken as short. Due to the interdependence of the concept groups SHARP and ROUGH the corresponding vowel distribution for the concept group ROUGH is set up in the table VII. The table VIII gives the same vowel distribution of the Representative Sample, and the resulting comparative data are tabulated in the tables N$^{os.}$ 43 and 44.

LIST OF ESTABLISHED INDO-EUROPEAN ROOTS OF THE GROUP »SHARP«

I. **(Type V).** I: **ei-1** (= root in Pokorny), 20.26 (= Buck's concept-number); **ei-4,** 8.21 sb.; **roots 2, different roots 2.** — U: **au-6,** 18.12, 18.42; **u-1,** 18.13; **roots 3, different roots 2.**

Sum I: 5 4

II a. **(Type CV).** L: **leu-2,** 8.32, 8.33[1], 8.33[2], 9.22, 9.27 **lēu-2,** 1.44[1]; **roots 6, different roots 2 = LU 6, 2.**

T: **dā-,** 8.32, 8.33[1], 8.33[2]; **dei-1,** 15.45; **deu-2,** 15.45; **dhau-, [s]teu-1,** 4.53, 9.25, 9.46; **dhē-2,** 9.46, 9.47, 12.352, 18.42; **dhō-,** 12.353[1]; **to-1,** 15.45; **roots 15, different roots 8 = TA 3, 1, TI 1, 1, TU 5, 3, TE 6, 3.**

K: **gē(i)-,** 18.12; **g^{w}heiə-,** 12.353[1]; **kē(i)-,** 18.41, 18.42; **[s]k[h]ai-,** 9.22, 9.24, 9.81, 9.84; **gōu-,** 18.41; **g'hau-,** 18.41, 18.42; **kāu-,** 8.25, 9.22, 9.45, 9.81; **kău-, k'ău-,** 18.13, 18.41, 18.42; **kau-l-,** 4.16; **keu-2,** 12.75, 15.45; **k'eu-1,** 8.22, 9.46; **roots 23; different roots 11 = KI 8, 4, KU 15, 7.**

P: **bhā-2,** 18.13, 18.41; **bhei(ə)-,** 9.25, 9.45, 9.81; **b(h)eu-2,** 6.63, 9.46, 18.13; **peu-1,** 8.23, 8.24; **pēu-,** 8.32, 8.33[1], 9.22, 9.48; **roots 14, different roots 5 = PA 2, 1, PI 3, 1, PU 9, 3.**

S: **sē(i)-2,** 8.21 sb.; **sē(i)-3,** 6.35, 6.37, 9.50, 12.352; **seu-1,** 9.47; **roots 6, different roots 3 = SI 5, 2, SU 1, 1.**

N: + **[s]mēi-2,** 9.22, 9.45, 9.81 [s. III b]; **meu-1,** 4.58; **mŭ-1,** 15.78, 12.352; **mē-2,** 8.32, 9.24; + **[s]nē-,** 6.35, 6.63 [s. III b]; **roots 5+5, different roots 3+ +2 = NI +3, +1, NU 3, 2, NE 2+2, 1+1.**

R: **rei-1,** 8.32, 12.353[2], 18.51; **rei-3,** 18.13; **reu-g-,** 4.57; **roots 5, different roots 3 = RI 4, 2, RU 1, 1.**

Sum 88 a: 74 + 5 35 + 2

II b. **(Type VC).** L: **al-2,** 15.45, **ēl-ā,** 6.37; **roots 2, different roots 2 = AL 1, 1. EL 1, 1.** — T: **ŭd-,** 15.45; **ed-,** 4.27, 4.58, 8.25; **edh-,** 6.36; **roots 5, different roots 3 = UT 1, 1, ET 4, 2.** — K: **ăik'-, ăig'-,** 6.36, 20.26; **ag-ro-,** 12.352; **ag-wesī,** 8.25, 9.25; **ak'-2,** 4.57, 15.78, 1.44[1], 1.44[2], 6.36, 6.63, 8.28, 9.23, 9.47, 9.50, 9.84, 12.352, 12.353[1], 12.353[2], 20.26; **ok^{w}-,** 6.37; **roots 21 different roots 5 = AK 18, 3, IK 2, 1, EK 1, 1.** — P: **up-o-, (e)up-s-,** 15.45; **root 1, different root 1 = UP 1, 1.** — S: **eis-1,** 20.25; **ōus-1,** 12.353[2]; **roots 2, different roots 2 = IS 1, 1, US 1, 1.** — N: **en(o)-mn*-,** 18.42; **root 1, different root 1 = EN 1, 1.** — R: **ar(ə)-,** 8.21 vb., 8.21 sb.; **er-3,** 4.66[1], 12.352, 15.45; **erə-1,** 8.23, 8.24; **ere-s-2,** 4.57; **ereu-2,** 8.22, 8.23; **roots 10, different roots 5 = AR 2, 1, ER 8, 4.**

Sum II b: 42 19

II c. **(Type VVC).** K: **aueg-,** 6.35; **root 1, different root 1 = UEK 1, 1.**

Sum II c: 1 1

Sum II: 117 + 5 55 + 2

III a. **(Type CVC).** LP: [lĕb-] **lăb-**, 8.21 vb.*; **lep-3 = 2**, 1.44[1]; **lēp-**, 8.23, 8.24; **roots 4, different roots 3 = LAP 1, 1, LEP 3, 2.** — LK: **lăgh-**, 8.22, 8.23, 8.24; [s]**leig-**, 8.25; **leg'-**, 18.42; **roots 5, different roots 3 = LAK 3, 1, LIK 1, 1, LEK 1, 1.**

Sum L-III a: 9 6

TL: **tāl-**, 15.78, 9.22, 9.45, 9.81, 12.353[1]; **del-3**, 9.22, 9.27, 9.45; **roots 8, different roots 2 = TAL 5, 1, TEL 3, 1.** — TR: **der-4**, 4.66[1], 8.28, 8.33[1], 8.33[2], 9.27, 12.353[2]; **deru-**, 20.26; **dher-5**, 4.66[1]; **ter-3**, 9.22, 9.45, 9.46, 9.47, 9.50, 18.12; **ter-4**, 9.47, 15.45; **roots 16, different roots 5 = TER 16, 5.** — TN: **dem-**, 9.45; **tem-1**, 9.22, 9.24; **roots 3, different roots 2 = TEN 3, 2.** — TK: **dhēig^{w}-**, 6.63, 8.22; + [s]**teig-**, 15.78, 20.25 [s. IV]; **dek'-2**, 8.26, 9.50; **tek^{w}-**, 20.25; **roots 5+2, different roots 3+1 = TIK 2+2, 1+1, TEK 3, 2.**

Sum T-III a: 32 + 2 12 + 1

KP: **ghabh-**, 18.12; **ghabh-(o)-lo-**, 8.26; **kap-**, 9.24; + [s]**kăp-**, [s]**kăb-**, 12.75 [s. IV]; + [s]**kēp-**, 15.78, 8.23, 8.33[2], 9.22, 9.25, 9.45, 12.353[1] 20.26 [s. IV]; **roots 3+9, different roots 3+2 = KAP 3+1, 3+1, KEP +8,+1.** — KT: **g'hed-**, 4.66[1]; **k^{w}ĕd-**, 15.78; **roots 2, different roots 2 = KET 2, 2.** — KL: **gal-2**, 15.45, 18.13, 18.41, 18.42; **gel-1**, 1.44[2]; **g^{w}el-1**, 6.36, 12.352; **g^{w}el-2**, 20.25; **ghel-**, 18.12; **ghelu-[nā]**, 12.353[2] **g'hel-2**, 8.21 sb., 8.33[1]; **kel-1**, 1.44[2]; **kel-2**, 20.27; **kel-3**, 8.22, 8.25, 9.22, 9.27, 9.81, 9.84, 20.27; **kel-6**, 15.45, 18.13, 18.41, 18.42; **k'el-2**, 8.28; **k'el-3**, 20.25; **k^{w}el-1**, 4.66[1], 8.21 vb.; + [s]**kel-1**, 9.23 [s. IV]; **roots 29+1, different roots 14+1 = KAL 4, 1, KEL 25+1, 13+1.** — KR: **g'ăr-**, 18.13, 18.41, 18.42; **kar-2**, 18.13, 18.41; **kar-3**, 1.44[1], 1.44[2]; **ger-2**, 4.57; **ger-3**, 8.28, 9.46, 12.75; **g^{w}er(∂)-4**, 15.45; **g^{w}eru-**, 6.63, 9.46, 9.47; **gher-3**, 12.352, 12.353[2]; **g'her-2**, 8.26, 9.24; **g'her-6**, 9.22; **g'her-s-**, **g'her-**, 1.44[1], 8.28; **g^{w}her-**, 8.32, 9.24; **ker-1** [sker-, k'er-], 8.27, 9.48, 18.13, 18.41; **ker-5**, 12.75; **k'er-1**, 4.39, 4.17, 8.26, 12.353[2], 12.75; **k^{w}er-1**, 9.48; [s]**ker-3**, 6.63, 8.27, 8.28, 8.33[1], 9.50, 12.353[2], 12.75; + [s]**ker-4**, 15.78, 6.91, 8.27, 8.28, 8.33[1], 9.22, 9.23, 9.24, 9.25, 12.352, 12.353[2], 20.27 [s. IV]; **roots 42+12, different roots 17+1 = KAR 7, 3, KER 35+12, 14+1,** — KN: [**kam-p-**] **kan-th-**, 12.353[2]; **kan-**, 18.12; **gem-**, 6.63; **gen-**, 4.16, 6.63, 6.93, 9.23; **g'en-1**, 6.35; **g^{w}hen-2**, 8.32; **kem-1**, 12.353[2]; **kem(∂)-4**, 8.21 vb.; **ken-2**, 4.58; **ken-3**, 12.352; **kon∂-mo-**, 4.16; **roots 14, different roots 11 = KAN 2, 2, KEN 12, 9.** — KK: **kakka-**, 4.66[1]; **k'ăk-2**, 8.21 sb., 8.26, 9.50; **geig'-**, 15.78; **g'egh-**, 8.21 sb.; **keg-**, 8.25, 12.75; **k'ek^{w}-**, 4.66[1]; **koko**, **kokk-**, 4.16; **roots 10, different roots ? = KAK 4, 2, KIK 1, 1, KEK, KOK 5, 4.** — KS: **k^{w}ās-**, 4.53; **g'hais-o-**, 9.47, 12.353[1], 20.26; **kes-**, 6.63, 6.91, 6.93, 8.22, 8.23, 9.23; **k'es-**, 8.32, 8.33[1], 9.22, 9.23; **roots 14, different roots 4 = KAS 1, 1 KIS 3, 1, KES 10, 2.**

Sum K-III a: 114 + 22 58 + 4

PT: **bheid-**, 4.58, 9.27, 9.84; **bhedh-1**, 8.22; **pĕd-2**, 12.353[2]; **pet-2**, 9.25, 9.48; **roots 7, different roots 4 = PIT 3, 1, PET 4, 3.** — PL: **bhel-3**, 4.57, 18.13; **bhel-6**, 15.45; **pel-1**, 20.25; **pel-2a**, 18.41, 18.42; **pel-3a**, 6.93; **pel-(i)-s-**, 1.44[1], 1.44[2];

* The radical morpheme is **lab-** according to WH 1.739 f. Therefore, the form **lāb-** given sub **laborāre** 8.11-8, 8.21-5 (Linguistica VI, 24, VII/2, 131, 152, 158), and sub **lābi** 10.42-3 (Linguistica VII/2, 139, 146), should be corrected into **lăb-**.

bol-, 8.28; **roots 10, different roots 7 = PEL 10, 7.** — PR: **bhar-**, 6.93, 9.25, 9.50, 12.353[1]; **bher-2**, 20.27; **bher-3**, 6.93, 8.28, 9.22, 9.46, 9.47, 12.353[2]; **bher-**, 12.353[2]; **per-2**, 6.63; **roots 13, different roots 5 = PAR 4, 1, PER 9, 4.** — PK: **bak-**, 12.75; **pāk'**, **pāg'**, 4.39, 8.22, 8.23, 8.24, 8.32, 8.33[1]; **peig-1**, **peik'-**, 9.48, 18.51; **peuk'**, **peug'**, 12.352; **bheg-**, **bhe-n-g-**, 8.32, 12.352; **pek'-2**, 6.91; **pek^{w}-**, 1.44[2]; **roots 14, different roots 7 = PAK 7, 2, PIK 2, 1, PUK 1, 1, PEK 4, 3.** — PS: **peis-1**, 20.25, 20.26; **pēs-1**, 8.21[1]; **roots 3, different roots 2 = PIS 2, 1, PES 1, 1.**

Sum P-III a: 47 25

ST: **sē[i]dh-**, 6.91; **root 1, different root 1 = SET 1, 1.** — SR: **ser-5**, 15.78, 8.25, 8.27, 8.33[1], 8.33[2]; **roots 5, different root 1 = SER 5, 1.** — SK: **seg'h-**, 9.50; **sēk-2**, 4.57, 4.66[1], 1.44[1], 1.44[2], 6.93, 8.23, 8.24, 8.32, 8.33[1], 8.33[2], 9.22, 9.23, 9.24, 9.25, 9.27, 9.48, 9.84; **roots 18, different roots 2 = SEK 18, 2.**

Sum S-III a: 24 4

NT: **mad-**, 6.93, 9.23; **mat-2**, 8.25, 8.28; **roots 4, different roots 2 = NAT 4, 2.** — NL: **mel-1**, 12.352; **mel-6**, 18.51; **mel-8**, 12.353[2]; **roots 3, different roots 3 = NEL 3, 3.** — NR: **mer-5**, 4.58; **root 1, different root 1 = NER 1, 1.** — NK: **mag'h-**, 9.23, 20.27; **mak-**, 12.353[1]; **meuk'-**, 12.352; **meg'h-**, 1.44[1], 15.45; **neg'h-** 6.93, 9.23, 9.24; **roots 9, different roots 5 = NAK 3, 2, NUK 1, 1, NEK 5, 2.**

Sum N-III a: 17 11

RT: **rēd-2**, 6.93, 8.27; **roots 2, different root 1 = RET 2, 1.** — RN: **rem-**, 12.353[2]; **root 1, different root 1 = REN 1, 1.** — RK: **reg'-1**, 6.93, 8.23, 8.24, 8.27; **rēk-2**, 18.42; **roots 5, different roots 2 = REK 5, 2.**

Sum R-III a: 8 4
Sum III a: 251 + 24 120 + 5

III b. **(Type CCV).** KL: **klēu-**, **klāu-**, 9.50; **k'leu-1**, 15.45; **roots 2, different roots 2 = KLU 2, 2.** — KS: **kskēu-** [**skēu-3**], 4.54; **root 1, different root 1 = = KSU 1, 1.** — PN: **pneu-**, 4.54; **root 1, different root 1 = PNU 1, 1.** — SP: **(s)p(h)ēi-1**, 6.63, 9.27, 9.50, 12.352; **(s)p(h)yēu-**, 4.57; **(s)p(h)ē[i]-2**, 8.23, 9.27, 20.27; **roots 8, different roots 3 = SPI 5, 2, SPE 3, 1.** — ST: **stā-**, 1.44[2]; **stāi-**, 1.44[1], 1.44[2]; **roots 3, different roots 2 = STA 1, 1, STI 2, 1.** — SL: [**lei-3**] **slei-**, 15.78, 9.48, 12.353[1]; **roots 3, different root 1 = SLI 3, 1.** — SN: **(s)mēi-2**, 8.25, 9.84, 12.352; **(s)nē-**, 6.36, 12.353[1] [s. II a]; **roots 5, different roots 2 = SNI 3, 1, SNE 2, 1.** — SK: **(s)kēu-5**, 8.23, 8.24, 12.353; **sk'eu-**, 20.25, 20.26; **roots 5, different roots 2 = SKU 5, 2.**

Sum III b: 28 14

III c. **(Type VCC, VCVC).** ST: **ost(h)-**, 4.16, 9.27; **roots 2, different root 1 = EST 2, 1.** — NP: **enebh-1**, 9.47; **root 1, different root 1 = ENP 1, 1.** — NT: **andh-**, 12.353[1]; **ant-**, 12.353[2]; **roots 2, different roots 2 = ANT 2, 2.** — NK: **ank-2**, 12.75; **onogh-**, 4.39, 9.50; **roots 3, different roots 2 = ANK 1, 1, ENK 2, 1.** — NS: **n*si-**, 20.27; **root 1, different root 1 = NS 1, 1.** — RP: **ereb-**, 9.46; **root 1, different root 1 = ERP 1, 1.** — RK: **arku-**, 20.25; **er(e)k-2,**

8.22, 18.51; **roots 3, different roots 2 = ARK 1, 1, ERK 2, 1.** — RS: **eres-1,** 20.26; **root 1, different root 1 = ERS 1, 1.**

Sum III c: *14* *11*
Sum III: *293 + 24* *145 + 5*

IV. **(Type CVCC, CVCVC, CCVC, CCCV).** TL-: **dhelg-,** 6.63, 8.32, 8.33[1], 8.33[2]; **dhelbh-,** 8.22, 9.84; **roots 6, different roots 2 = TEL- 6, 2.** — TR-: **derk'-,** 12.353[1]; **trēb-,** 8.21 vb.; **roots 2, different roots 2 = TER-, TRE- 2, 2.** — TN-: **denk'-,** 4.58; **root 1, different root 1 = TEN- 1, 1.** — TK-: **tekth-,** 9.25, 9.45, 9.81; **roots 3, different root 1 = TEK- 3, 1.**

Sum T-IV: *12* *6*

KL-: **gleubh-,** 9.27, 9.81; **roots 2, different root 1 = KLU- 2, 1.** — KR-: **ghreib-,** 8.26; + [**gerebh-**] **gribh-,** 8.28. [s. below]; **g^{w}rēug'h-,** 4.58; **grebh-1,** 8.27; **ghrebh-2,** 6.91, 8.22, 8.23, 8.25, 9.50, 9.81, 9.84; **gerebh-,** 9.22, 9.81, 18.51 [s. above]; **ghrem-2,** 15.45; **k'ers-2,** 8.21 sb.; **roots 15+1, different roots 7+1 = KRI- 1+1, 1+1, KRU- 1, 1, KER-, KRE- 13, 5.** — KN-: **g'embh-,** 4.27, 6.91, 20.26; **k'ent-,** 20.26; **roots 4, different roots 2 = KEN- 4, 2.** — KS-: **g'hast-o-,** 4.17, 20.26; **kost-,** 4.16; **roots 3, different roots 2 = KAS- 2, 1, KES- 1, 1.**

Sum K-IV: *24 + 1* *12 + 1*

PL-: **bheld-,** 20.25; **pelk', pelg'-,** 8.28; **roots 2, different roots 2 = PEL- 2, 2.** — PR-: **prīs-,** 9.48; **bhreg'-1,** 4.57, 8.28; **bhereg'h-,** 12.353[2], 15.45; **roots 5, different roots 3 = PRI- 1, 1, PER-, PRE- 4, 2.** — PN-: **bend-,** 4.17, 6.63, 12.352; **pent-,** 8.23; **roots 4, different roots 2 = PEN- 4, 2.**

Sum P-IV: *11* *7*

SP-: **(s)p(h)eud-,** 20.26; **(s)p(h)el-1,** 6.63, 9.24, 9.27; **(s)per-1,** 20.26; **(s)pen-(d)-,** 6.63; **roots 6, different roots 4 = SPU- 1, 1, SPE- 5, 3.** — ST-: **(s)teig-,** 6.63 [s. III a]; **(s)trei-g-3,** 18.13; **steb(h)-,** 8.23; **ster-4,** 20.25; **stom-en-,** 12.353[1]; **roots 5, different roots 5 = ST-I- 2, 2, STE- 3, 3.** — SL-: **slak-,** 8.32; **(s)leug-, (s)leuk-,** 4.57; **selg'-,** 20.26; **selk-,** 8.21 vb., 8.21 sb.; **roots 5, different roots 4 = SLA- 1, 1, SLU- 1, 1, SEL- 3, 2.** — SN-: **(s)nadh-,** 9.22, 9.45, 9.81; **sneit-,** 8.32, 9.22, 9.48, 12.353[1], 12.353[2]; **seng^{w}h-,** 18.12; **roots 9, different roots 3 = SNA- 3, 1, SNI- 5, 1, SEN- 1, 1.** — SK-: **(s)kăp-,** 8.22, 8.23, 8.25 [s. III a and the next]; + **(s)kĕp-,** 9.27 [s. III a and the former]; **(s)keu∂d-,** 18.13; **(s)kel-1,** 1.44[2], 8.25, 9.27, 9.81, 9.84 [s. III a]; **(s)kel-, (s)k^{w}el-,** 15.45; **(s)ker-4,** 6.93, 9.81, 12.353[1], 18.51 [s. III a]; **roots 14+1, different roots 5+1 = = SKA- 3, 1, SKU- 1, 1, SKE- 10+1, 3+1.**

Sum S-IV: *39 + 1* *21 + 1*

NR-: **mereg'-,** 12.353[2]; **root 1, different root 1 = NER- 1, 1.**

Sum N-IV: *1* *1*

RN-: **remb-,** 9.22; **root 1, different root 1 = REN- 1, 1.**

Sum R-IV: *1* *1*
Sum IV: *88 + 2* *48 + 2*

V. **(Type CCVCC, CCCVC).** TR-: **trenk-1**, 15.78, 9.22, 12.353[1]; **roots 3, different root 1 = TRE- 3, 1.** — PS-: **pster-**, 4.54; **root 1, different root 1 = PS-E- 1, 1.** — SK-: **s'kerd-**, 4.57, 4.66[1]; **roots 2, different root 1 = SKE- 2, 1.**

Sum V: *6* *3*
Sum I-IV: *509 + 31* *255 + 9*

VI. Y: **yeu-2**, 8.21 vb.; **yē-**, 4.57, 6.63; **roots 3, different roots 2 = YU 1, 1, YE 2, 1.**

YN: **yăm-**, 8.23; **root 1, different root 1 = YAN 1, 1.**

Sum Y: *4* *3*

W: **wei-1**, 8.26, 20.25; **wei-3**, 8.32, 8.33[2]; **wĭ-1**, 9.46, 9.47; **roots 6, different roots 3 = WI 6, 3.**

WL: **wel-3**, 15.45; **wel-4**, 9.24; **wel-7**, 1.44[2], 9.50; **roots 4, different roots 3 = WEL 4, 3.** — WK: **wek^{w}**, 18.41, 18.42; **wog^{w}h-nes-**, 8.22, 8.23; **roots 4, different roots 2 = WEK 4, 2.** — WP: **wāb-**, 18.13; **wap-2**, 18.13; **roots 2, different roots 2 = WAP 2, 2.** — WN: **wem-**, 4.57; **root 1, different root 1 = WEN 1, 1.** — WR: **wer-1**, 20.27; **wer-2**, 12.352; **wer-3**, 4.57, 6.35, 6.36, 9.46, 9.47; **wer-7**, 18.51; **roots 8, different roots 4 = WER 8, 4.**

WL-: **welk-1**, 8.28, 20.26; **roots 2, different roots 1 = WEL- 2, 1.** — WR-: **werg'-2**, 8.21 vb.; **wrēg'-**, 9.22; **roots 2, different roots 2 = WER-, WRE- 2, 2.**

-W-: [**dwō(u)-**] **dwei-**, 8.23, 8.25, 8.26, 9.24, 9.25; **twerk'-**, 9.22; **roots 6, different roots 2 = TWI 5, 1, TWE 1, 1.** — **koi-, kwĭ-**, 18.13, **gwes-**, 9.50; **gwet-**, 12.353[1]; **k'wek-**, 6.91; **roots 4, different roots 4 = KWI- 1, 1, KWE- 3, 3.** — **swer-4**, 20.27; **swerbh-, swer-**, 9.46, 9.47; **roots 3, different roots 2 = SWE 3, 2.** — **skwerb(h)-**, 9.46; **root 1, different root 1 = SKWE- 1, 1.**

Sum W: *43* *26*
Sum I-VI: *556 + 31* *284 + 9*

TABLE VI

SHARP		Short A		Long A		I		U		Short E		Long E		TOTAL	
I		—	—	—	—	2	2	3	2	—	—	—	—	5	4
II a	L	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	2	—	—	—	—	6	2
	T	—	—	3	1	1	1	5	3	1	1	5	2	15	8
	K	—	—	—	—	8	4	15	7	—	—	—	—	23	11
	P	—	—	2	1	3	1	9	3	—	—	—	—	14	5
	S	—	—	—	—	5	2	1	1	—	—	—	—	6	3
	N	—	—	—	—	3	1	3	2	—	—	4	2	10	5
	R	—	—	—	—	4	2	1	1	—	—	—	—	5	3
		—	—	5	2	24	11	40	19	1	1	9	4	79	37
II bc	L	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	2
	T	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	4	2	—	—	5	3
	K	18	3	—	—	2	1	1	1	1	1	—	—	22	6
	P	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1
	S	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	2	2
	N	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1
	R	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	4	—	—	10	5
		21	5	—	—	3	2	4	4	14	8	1	1	43	20
III a	L	4	2	—	—	1	1	—	—	2	2	2	1	9	6
	T	—	—	5	1	4	2	—	—	25	10	—	—	34	13
	K	21	12	1	1	4	2	—	—	110	47	—	—	136	62
	P	11	3	—	—	7	3	1	1	28	18	—	—	47	25
	S	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	23	3	1	1	24	4
	N	7	4	—	—	—	—	4	1	9	6	—	—	17	11
	R	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	3	2	1	8	4
		43	21	6	2	16	8	2	2	203	89	5	3	275	125
III bc	L	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	T	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	K	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	3	—	—	—	—	3	3
	P	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1
	S	—	—	1	1	13	5	5	2	2	1	5	2	26	11
	N	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	—	—	6	5
	R	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	3	—	—	5	4
		4	4	1	1	13	5	9	6	9	6	5	2	41	24
IV—V	L	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	T	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	7	—	—	15	7
	K	2	1	—	—	2	2	3	2	18	8	—	—	25	13
	P	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	11	7	—	—	12	8
	S	7	3	—	—	7	3	3	3	25	14	—	—	42	23
	N	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1
	R	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1
		9	4	—	—	10	6	6	5	71	38	—	—	96	53
I—V		77	34	12	5	68	34	64	38	298	142	20	10	539	263

V. **(Type CCVCC, CCCVC).** TR-: **trenk-1**, 15.78, 9.22, 12.353[1]; **roots 3, different root 1 = TRE- 3, 1.** — PS-: **pster-**, 4.54; **root 1, different root 1 = PS-E- 1, 1.** — SK-: **s'kerd-**, 4.57, 4.66[1]; **roots 2, different root 1 = SKE- 2, 1.**

Sum V: *6* *3*
Sum I-IV: *509 + 31* *255 + 9*

VI. Y: **yeu-2**, 8.21 vb.; **yē-**, 4.57, 6.63; **roots 3, different roots 2 = YU 1, 1, YE 2, 1.**

YN: **yăm-**, 8.23; **root 1, different root 1 = YAN 1, 1.**

Sum Y: *4* *3*

W: **wei-1**, 8.26, 20.25; **wei-3**, 8.32, 8.33[2]; **wĭ-1**, 9.46, 9.47; **roots 6, different roots 3 = WI 6, 3.**

WL: **wel-3**, 15.45; **wel-4**, 9.24; **wel-7**, 1.44[2], 9.50; **roots 4, different roots 3 = WEL 4, 3.** — WK: **wek^{w}**, 18.41, 18.42; **wog^{w}h-nes-**, 8.22, 8.23; **roots 4, different roots 2 = WEK 4, 2.** — WP: **wāb-**, 18.13; **wap-2**, 18.13; **roots 2, different roots 2 = WAP 2, 2.** — WN: **wem-**, 4.57; **root 1, different root 1 = WEN 1, 1.** — WR: **wer-1**, 20.27; **wer-2**, 12.352; **wer-3**, 4.57, 6.35, 6.36, 9.46, 9.47; **wer-7**, 18.51; **roots 8, different roots 4 = WER 8, 4.**

WL-: **welk-1**, 8.28, 20.26; **roots 2, different roots 1 = WEL- 2, 1.** — WR-: **werg'-2**, 8.21 vb.; **wrēg'-**, 9.22; **roots 2, different roots 2 = WER-, WRE- 2, 2.**

-W-: **[dwō(u)-] dwei-**, 8.23, 8.25, 8.26, 9.24, 9.25; **twerk'-**, 9.22; **roots 6, different roots 2 = TWI 5, 1, TWE 1, 1.** — **koi-, kwĭ-**, 18.13, **gwes-**, 9.50; **gwet-**, 12.353[1]; **k'wek-**, 6.91; **roots 4, different roots 4 = KWI- 1, 1, KWE- 3, 3.** — **swer-4**, 20.27; **swerbh-, swer-**, 9.46, 9.47; **roots 3, different roots 2 = SWE 3, 2.** — **skwerb(h)-**, 9.46; **root 1, different root 1 = SKWE- 1, 1.**

Sum W: *43* *26*
Sum I-VI: *556 + 31* *284 + 9*

TABLE VI

SHARP		Short A		Long A		I		U		Short E		Long E		TOTAL	
I		—	—	—	—	2	2	3	2	—	—	—	—	5	4
II a	L	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	2	—	—	—	—	6	2
	T	—	—	3	1	1	1	5	3	1	1	5	2	15	8
	K	—	—	—	—	8	4	15	7	—	—	—	—	23	11
	P	—	—	2	1	3	1	9	3	—	—	—	—	14	5
	S	—	—	—	—	5	2	1	1	—	—	—	—	6	3
	N	—	—	—	—	3	1	3	2	—	—	4	2	10	5
	R	—	—	—	—	4	2	1	1	—	—	—	—	5	3
		—	—	5	2	24	11	40	19	1	1	9	4	79	37
II bc	L	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	2
	T	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	4	2	—	—	5	3
	K	18	3	—	—	2	1	1	1	1	1	—	—	22	6
	P	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1
	S	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	2	2
	N	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1
	R	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	4	—	—	10	5
		21	5	—	—	3	2	4	4	14	8	1	1	43	20
III a	L	4	2	—	—	1	1	—	—	2	2	2	1	9	6
	T	—	—	5	1	4	2	—	—	25	10	—	—	34	13
	K	21	12	1	1	4	2	—	—	110	47	—	—	136	62
	P	11	3	—	—	7	3	1	1	28	18	—	—	47	25
	S	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	23	3	1	1	24	4
	N	7	4	—	—	—	—	4	1	9	6	—	—	17	11
	R	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	3	2	1	8	4
		43	21	6	2	16	8	2	2	203	89	5	3	275	125
III bc	L	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	T	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	K	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	3	—	—	—	—	3	3
	P	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1
	S	—	—	1	1	13	5	5	2	2	1	5	2	26	11
	N	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	—	—	6	5
	R	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	3	—	—	5	4
		4	4	1	1	13	5	9	6	9	6	5	2	41	24
IV—V	L	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	T	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	7	—	—	15	7
	K	2	1	—	—	2	2	3	2	18	8	—	—	25	13
	P	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	11	7	—	—	12	8
	S	7	3	—	—	7	3	3	3	25	14	—	—	42	23
	N	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1
	R	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1
		9	4	—	—	10	6	6	5	71	38	—	—	96	53
I—V		77	34	12	5	68	34	64	38	298	142	20	10	539	263

TABLE VII

ROUGH		Short A		Long A		I		U		Short E		Long E		TOTAL	
I		—	—	—	—	1	1	3	3	—	—	—	—	4	4
II a	L	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1
	T	—	—	2	1	—	—	2	2	—	—	2	1	6	4
	K	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	4	—	—	—	—	4	4
	P	—	—	1	1	—	—	3	2	—	—	—	—	4	3
	S	—	—	—	—	4	2	1	1	—	—	—	—	5	3
	N	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	2	2
	R	—	—	—	—	3	2	1	1	—	—	1	1	5	4
		—	—	3	3	8	5	13	12	—	—	3	2	27	21
II b	L	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	2	1
	T	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	K	6	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	7	2
	P	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	S	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	N	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1
	R	3	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	3	—	—	9	5
		9	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	6	—	—	19	9
III a	L	3	3	—	—	2	1	1	1	3	3	—	—	9	8
	T	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	19	6	1	1	21	8
	K	13	9	—	—	1	1	—	—	63	30	—	—	77	40
	P	8	3	1	1	1	1	—	—	19	12	—	—	29	17
	S	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	14	6	—	—	15	7
	N	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	3	—	—	5	5
	R	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	3	1	5	2
		26	17	2	2	5	4	1	1	123	61	4	2	161	87
III bc	L	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	T	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	2	1
	K	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1
	P	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1	3	3
	S	—	—	1	1	4	4	—	—	—	—	2	1	7	6
	N	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	—	—	6	3
	R	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	2	2
		3	1	2	2	4	4	4	3	5	4	3	2	21	6
IV—V	L	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1
	T	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	3	—	—	4	4
	K	3	3	—	—	3	2	1	1	10	8	—	—	17	4
	P	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	4	—	—	7	4
	S	—	—	—	—	1	1	3	3	15	8	—	—	19	12
	N	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1
	R	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	2	2
		4	4	—	—	4	3	4	4	39	27	—	—	51	38
I—V		42	25	7	6	22	17	25	23	177	98	10	6	283	175

TABLE VIII

REPRES. SAMPLE		Short A		Long A		I		U		Short E		Long E		TOTAL	
I		—	—	—	—	13	5	18	6	5	2	—	—	36	16
II a	L	—	—	1	1	5	2	12	2	—	—	1	1	19	7
	T	—	—	6	2	9	3	27	8	—	—	25	4	67	17
	K	—	—	11	2	31	14	33	16	6	2	4	2	85	36
	P	—	—	15	4	10	6	24	9	—	—	—	—	49	19
	S	—	—	—	—	6	1	12	6	1	1	—	—	19	8
	N	—	—	6	3	12	7	10	5	—	—	14	4	42	19
	R	—	—	—	—	2	1	4	3	—	—	—	—	6	4
		—	—	39	12	75	34	122	50	7	3	44	11	287	110
II bc	L	10	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	6	—	—	16	11
	T	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	5	2	1	1	8	5
	K	10	3	—	—	4	3	8	4	14	5	—	—	36	15
	P	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	—	—	3	2
	S	3	1	—	—	1	1	3	3	6	3	—	—	13	8
	N	10	4	2	1	—	—	—	—	7	3	—	—	19	8
	R	15	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	18	8	—	—	33	10
		49	16	3	2	5	4	11	7	59	29	1	1	128	59
III a	L	6	5	1	1	10	4	19	7	15	5	3	3	54	25
	T	2	1	—	—	11	3	4	2	86	32	2	1	105	39
	K	33	18	3	3	4	3	8	4	181	65	1	1	230	95
	P	19	8	1	1	8	5	8	5	110	38	1	1	147	58
	S	1	1	7	1	2	2	—	—	41	15	1	1	52	20
	N	9	5	—	—	1	1	4	2	53	23	5	2	72	33
	R	2	2	—	—	2	1	2	2	17	7	—	—	23	12
		72	40	12	6	38	20	45	22	503	185	13	9	683	282
III bc	L	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	3	3
	T	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1
	K	—	—	—	—	4	4	4	3	—	—	3	2	11	9
	P	—	—	—	—	3	3	1	1	—	—	—	—	4	4
	S	—	—	26	2	13	10	15	7	2	1	2	1	58	21
	N	6	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	3	—	—	11	8
	R	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	—	—	4	3
		9	8	26	2	22	18	20	11	11	7	5	3	93	49
IV—V	L	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	3	—	—	5	3
	T	1	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	19	14	—	—	21	16
	K	5	3	—	—	3	3	1	1	40	24	—	—	49	31
	P	5	4	—	—	—	—	3	2	15	7	—	—	23	13
	S	4	4	—	—	9	5	8	5	59	28	—	—	80	42
	N	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	6	1	1	11	9
	R	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	9
		17	14	—	—	13	9	12	8	147	83	1	1	190	115
I—V		147	78	80	22	166	90	228	107	732	309	64	25	1417	631

TABLE 1
REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE, ROOTS CVC etc., GROUP III—V

	P	T	L	R	N	K	K	S	
L	9	6	—	1	4	19	19	4	62
T	6	—	14	51	20	19	19	1	130
K	9	14	34	56	24	2	1	5	145
K	10	14	34	56	23	1	2	5	145
P	2	23	43	58	16	13	12	7	174
S	23	63	15	7	28	27	27	—	190
N	1	12	13	12	29	13	12	2	94
R	5	9	—	—	2	5	6	1	28
	65	141	153	241	146	99	98	25	968

TABLE 38
SHARP, POINTED, LOUD, ROOTS CVC etc., GROUP III—V
Normalized

	P	T	L	R	N	K	K	S	
L	9	—	—	—	—	5	7	—	21
T	—	—	33	49	9	12	12	—	115
K	14	3	39	82	21	7	5	21	192
K	14	2	40	82	21	7	5	21	192
P	—	16	28	42	12	16	17	9	140
S	33	26	19	12	33	47	46	—	216
N	3	14	7	5	—	14	14	2	59
R	2	5	—	—	5	9	9	3	33
	75	66	166	272	101	117	115	56	968

TABLE 39
SHARP, POINTED, LOUD, ROOTS CVC etc., GROUP III—V
Actual

	P	T	L	R	N	K	K	S	
L	4	—	—	—	—	2	3	—	9
T	—	—	14	21	4	5	5	—	49
K	6	1	17	35	9	3	2	9	82
K	6	1	17	35	9	3	2	9	82
P	—	7	12	18	5	7	7	4	60
S	14	11	8	5	14	20	20	—	92
N	1	6	3	2	—	6	6	1	25
R	1	2	—	—	2	4	4	1	14
	32	28	71	116	43	50	49	24	413

TABLE 4
REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE, DIFFERENT ROOTS CVC etc., GROUP III—V

	P	T	L	R	N	K	K	S	
L	7	5	—	1	2	7	7	2	31
T	3	—	8	24	6	7	8	1	57
K	4	8	13	26	10	2	1	3	67
K	5	8	13	26	10	1	1	4	68
P	1	13	19	18	7	6	6	5	75
S	12	18	11	6	14	11	11	—	83
N	1	7	8	6	10	8	8	2	50
R	3	5	—	—	2	2	3	1	16
	36	64	72	107	61	44	45	18	447

TABLE 40
SHARP, POINTED, LOUD, DIFFERENT ROOTS CVC etc., GROUP III—V
Normalized

	P	T	L	R	N	K	K	S	
L	7	—	—	—	—	2	5	—	14
T	—	—	9	17	7	4	7	—	44
K	7	2	19	29	14	5	4	6	86
K	4	2	20	29	15	5	2	9	86
S	15	20	11	2	11	13	11	—	83
N	2	9	7	4	—	6	9	2	39
R	2	2	—	—	4	5	4	3	20
	37	44	86	99	58	49	48	26	447

TABLE 41
SHARP, POINTED, LOUD, DIFFERENT ROOTS CVC etc., GROUP III—V
Actual

	P	T	L	R	N	K	K	S	
L	3	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	6
T	—	—	4	8	3	2	3	—	20
K	3	1	9	13	6	2	2	3	39
K	2	1	9	13	7	2	1	4	39
P	—	4	9	8	3	4	3	3	34
S	7	9	5	1	5	6	5	—	38
N	1	4	3	2	—	3	4	1	18
R	1	1	—	—	2	2	2	1	9
	17	20	39	45	26	22	22	12	203

TABLE 42
ROOTS CV, VC, GROUP II

	RS Roots	SHARP Norm.	SHARP Act.	RS Diff. roots	SHARP Norm.	SHARP Act.
L	35	27	8	18	12	4
T	75	68	20	22	33	11
K	60	**76**	22	25	25	8
K	61	**77**	23	26	26	9
P	52	51	15	21	17	6
S	32	27	8	16	15	5
N	61	38	11	27	17	6
R	39	51	15	14	24	8
	415	415	122	169	169	57

TABLE 43
ROOTS, GROUP I—V VOWELS

	RS Roots	SHARP Norm.	ROUGH Norm.	SHARP Act.	ROUGH Act.
Short A	147	**202**	**210**	77	42
Long A	80	31	35	12	7
I	166	179	110	68	22
U	228	168	125	64	25
Short E	732	**784**	**887**	298	177
Long E	64	53	50	20	10
	1417	1417	1417	539	283

TABLE 44
DIFFERENT ROOTS, GROUP I—V VOWELS

	RS Diff. roots	SHARP Norm.	ROUGH Norm.	SHARP Act.	ROUGH Act.
Short A	78	**82**	90	34	25
Long A	22	12	22	5	6
I	90	82	61	34	17
U	107	91	83	38	23
Short E	309	**340**	**353**	142	98
Long E	25	24	22	10	6
	631	631	631	263	175

CONCLUSION

I

1. In our examination of C. D. Buck's dictionary of synonyms we started from the fact that individual synonymic sets show frequent repetitions of identical or similar phonemes in independent radical morphemes. In the work of the Indo-European scholars this fact which clearly goes beyond the frame of generally recognized onomatopoetic terms has either been overlooked or — because of the theoretical suppositions to the contrary — has received no particular attention, even when observed. Despite the tiresome labour required by such an undertaking, it seemed worth while to proceed to a systematic investigation which might establish whether all this can be due to a broader regularity in the parallel naming of the same reality. By means of a comparative analysis of synonyms and by the application of the statistical method we approached, on a limited corpus of material, the old and yet again and again tackled problem of the intrinsic connection between sound and meaning.

The thesis which had to be tested on our statistical material was the assertion put as an anti-motto at the outset of our study [1], 21. There is little need to point out that in emphasizing only the difference of the sound-form of synonymic morphemes this assertion coincides with the well known principle of the arbitrariness of the linguistic sign [2], 67. Interpreted in statistical terms it amounts to saying that the phonemic distribution of language at all levels and in all component parts of the linguistic forms is in principle independent of the conceptual content. Hence — if the arbitrariness of the linguistic sign were generally valid — in our case the phonemic distribution of radical morphemes in the synonymic sets selected by specific conceptual criteria should not significantly differ from the normal distribution of radical morphemes appearing in synonymic sets taken at random in the dictionary.

But it turned out that the seven broad concept groups of synonymic sets chosen and analyzed show great deviations from the normal phonemic distribution.

2. In the course of our investigation we have limited ourselves to a detailed presentation of the data acquired through the analysis and to their illustration in the tables, leaving the facts to speak for themselves. For a definitive, statistically valid conclusion on the overall result of the inquiries as well as on the strength of the individual data this, however, is not sufficient. This is the reason why, in accordance with the requirements of the statistical theory, we have concluded our investigation with four probability calculations, namely:

a) the calculation of Chi-square for the tested seven concept groups, in every field — i. e. in the field of discrete consonants, of consonant pairs, and of vowels — in order to find out whether the phonemic distributions of these concept groups, taken as a whole, significantly differ from the respective normal phonemic distribution.

b) the calculation of Chi-square for thirty groups of synonymic sets set up at random from our population, in all the fields, for the purpose of establishing whether the normal phonemic distribution, taken as a whole, is stable.

c) the calculation of the standard deviations for the individual frequencies of the same at random set up groups of synonymic sets, in order to determine to what degree the individual frequencies in these conceptually unrelated groups are stable.

d) the probability calculation using the standard deviations obtained under c), to establish to what degree the individual frequencies of the tested seven concept groups significantly differ from the coresponding frequencies of the respective normal distribution.*

3. The probability inferences are as follows:

ad a) The differences between the consonant distributions of the seven concept groups and the normal consonant distribution are in all instances statistically significant. The same is true also of the distribution of consonant pairs, with the only exception of the concept group TOUCH. The differences between the vowel distributions of the concept groups and the normal vowel distribution are statistically significant with the concept groups BLOW, SMELL, SHARP and ROUGH. The probability that these differences might be differences of pure chance nowhere exceeds $P = 0.001$, this being a appropriately fixed limit for the evaluation of the essential differences of the total distributions [3], 2, 47.

ad b) The differences between the phonemic distributions of the thirty at random selected groups and the normal phonemic distribution are in no instance, in no field, statistically significant. The probability of chance is in every case far beyond the fixed limit of 0.001.

ad c) The deviations of the frequencies for the individual phonemic elements of the thirty at random formed groups from the frequencies to be expected from the normal distribution all the time move — with a single relevant exception for the consonant pair KR, and four negligible exceptions for LT, PP, NP, RS — within the interval of three standard deviations. The probability of chance is — besides the one case with KR — everywhere far greater than $P = 0.0027$ which corresponds with phonemic elements with greater relative frequency in the population to three standard deviations, and which is for the evaluation of the individual deviations an appropriately fixed limit [4], 95, 314.

ad d) The deviations of the frequencies for the individual phonemic elements of the seven concept groups from the frequencies to be expected from the normal distribution exceed three standard deviations in a number of instances. When taking into account also the relative frequency for the individual phonemic elements in the population, we find with the same

* My sincere thanks for the kind help in the computing operations are due to Mr. E. Zakrajšek, Head, and to Mr. J. Kozak, programmer, The Computing Centre at the Institute of Mathematics, Physics and Mechanics, University of Ljubljana.

phonemic elements as under c) 19 instances of doubtlessly significant deviations in the positive direction and to these correspond 18 instances of doubtlessly significant deviations in the negative direction.

Above all in the field of consonants we find positive significant deviations with all the seven consonant classes of high relative frequency: K, R, N, S, L, T, and P. Further ten positive significant deviations are found with the consonant pairs, each of which represents more than 3 per cent of the population [5], 292, specifically with KR, KN, SN (twice), PL (twice), PR, SK, TR, and ST. In the field of vowels we find with the same phonemic elements as under c) two occurrencies of positive significant deviations, both times with the class U.

The eighteen negative significant deviations are distributed as follows: in the field of consonants they occur with K (three times), R, N (twice), and T (twice) — altogether eight times; in the field of consonant pairs they occur with NN, LK (twice), SK (twice), ST, and TR — altogether seven times; in the field of vowels they occur with I, U, and long A altogether three times.

Here it should be added that owing to a later combining or splitting up of the individual phonemic elements another 12 significances have been established; six in the field of consonant pairs with the joined pairs SL + NL + TL (twice), TP + PT, PS + SP, KT + TK, and TR + PR, and six in the field of vowels and consonant-vowel combinations, with short A + short E (twice), with long A + long E (negative significance), with K — short A (twice), and with P-U.

The probability that all these might be deviations of pure chance nowhere exceeds the fixed limit od 0.0027.*

4. On the basis of the obtained results it is possible to maintain that the tested thesis about the expression of the same concepts with consistently various phonemes does not apply to the statistical material of our seven concept groups. Obviously there exists a connection between the significant deviations from the normal phonemic distribution, taken as a whole, and in particulars, and the fact that the synonymic sets of our concept groups have been selected according to specific conceptual criteria.

5. The existence of this connection is clearly demonstrated by our additional tests, in so far the normal phonemic distribution in the thirty

* The great difference concerning the distributions under c) and under d) is evident also from the following data: In the 30 groups set up at random we have with the phonemic characteristics representing 3 per cent and more of the population altogether 24 instances of deviations which exceed two standard deviations; once with K, R, L, P, and twice with S and T; once with KN, PL, TR, and twice with KL, SK, ST, LK, TK; once with short A, U, and E. In the seven concept groups, in spite of the four times smaller number of instances, 31 similar deviations are found; R, S, short A, and -U in the concept group SHARP; -L, PR, TR, -ST, -long A, -I, and E in the concept group ROUGH; -KL, NN, and -long A in the concept group NARROW; N, -SK, -long A, and -I in the concept group SMELL; -KR, -KN, -NN, -TK, -long A, and E in the concept group SMOOTH; -N, -L, -KL, -NN, and -U in the concept group TOUCH; -KL, -NN in the concept group BLOW.

b) the calculation of Chi-square for thirty groups of synonymic sets set up at random from our population, in all the fields, for the purpose of establishing whether the normal phonemic distribution, taken as a whole, is stable.

c) the calculation of the standard deviations for the individual frequencies of the same at random set up groups of synonymic sets, in order to determine to what degree the individual frequencies in these conceptually unrelated groups are stable.

d) the probability calculation using the standard deviations obtained under c), to establish to what degree the individual frequencies of the tested seven concept groups significantly differ from the coresponding frequencies of the respective normal distribution.*

3. The probability inferences are as follows:

ad a) The differences between the consonant distributions of the seven concept groups and the normal consonant distribution are in all instances statistically significant. The same is true also of the distribution of consonant pairs, with the only exception of the concept group TOUCH. The differences between the vowel distributions of the concept groups and the normal vowel distribution are statistically significant with the concept groups BLOW, SMELL, SHARP and ROUGH. The probability that these differences might be differences of pure chance nowhere exceeds $P = 0.001$, this being a appropriately fixed limit for the evaluation of the essential differences of the total distributions [3], 2, 47.

ad b) The differences between the phonemic distributions of the thirty at random selected groups and the normal phonemic distribution are in no instance, in no field, statistically significant. The probability of chance is in every case far beyond the fixed limit of 0.001.

ad c) The deviations of the frequencies for the individual phonemic elements of the thirty at random formed groups from the frequencies to be expected from the normal distribution all the time move — with a single relevant exception for the consonant pair KR, and four negligible exceptions for LT, PP, NP, RS — within the interval of three standard deviations. The probability of chance is — besides the one case with KR — everywhere far greater than $P = 0.0027$ which corresponds with phonemic elements with greater relative frequency in the population to three standard deviations, and which is for the evaluation of the individual deviations an appropriately fixed limit [4], 95, 314.

ad d) The deviations of the frequencies for the individual phonemic elements of the seven concept groups from the frequencies to be expected from the normal distribution exceed three standard deviations in a number of instances. When taking into account also the relative frequency for the individual phonemic elements in the population, we find with the same

* My sincere thanks for the kind help in the computing operations are due to Mr. E. Zakrajšek, Head, and to Mr. J. Kozak, programmer, The Computing Centre at the Institute of Mathematics, Physics and Mechanics, University of Ljubljana.

phonemic elements as under c) 19 instances of doubtlessly significant deviations in the positive direction and to these correspond 18 instances of doubtlessly significant deviations in the negative direction.

Above all in the field of consonants we find positive significant deviations with all the seven consonant classes of high relative frequency: K, R, N, S, L, T, and P. Further ten positive significant deviations are found with the consonant pairs, each of which represents more than 3 per cent of the population [5], 292, specifically with KR, KN, SN (twice), PL (twice), PR, SK, TR, and ST. In the field of vowels we find with the same phonemic elements as under c) two occurrencies of positive significant deviations, both times with the class U.

The eighteen negative significant deviations are distributed as follows: in the field of consonants they occur with K (three times), R, N (twice), and T (twice) — altogether eight times; in the field of consonant pairs they occur with NN, LK (twice), SK (twice), ST, and TR — altogether seven times; in the field of vowels they occur with I, U, and long A altogether three times.

Here it should be added that owing to a later combining or splitting up of the individual phonemic elements another 12 significances have been established; six in the field of consonant pairs with the joined pairs SL + NL + TL (twice), TP + PT, PS + SP, KT + TK, and TR + PR, and six in the field of vowels and consonant-vowel combinations, with short A + short E (twice), with long A + long E (negative significance), with K – short A (twice), and with P-U.

The probability that all these might be deviations of pure chance nowhere exceeds the fixed limit od 0.0027.*

4. On the basis of the obtained results it is possible to maintain that the tested thesis about the expression of the same concepts with consistently various phonemes does not apply to the statistical material of our seven concept groups. Obviously there exists a connection between the significant deviations from the normal phonemic distribution, taken as a whole, and in particulars, and the fact that the synonymic sets of our concept groups have been selected according to specific conceptual criteria.

5. The existence of this connection is clearly demonstrated by our additional tests, in so far the normal phonemic distribution in the thirty

* The great difference concerning the distributions under c) and under d) is evident also from the following data: In the 30 groups set up at random we have with the phonemic characteristics representing 3 per cent and more of the population altogether 24 instances of deviations which exceed two standard deviations; once with K, R, L, P, and twice with S and T; once with KN, PL, TR, and twice with KL, SK, ST, LK, TK; once with short A, U, and E. In the seven concept groups, in spite of the four times smaller number of instances, 31 similar deviations are found; R, S, short A, and -U in the concept group SHARP; -L, PR, TR, -ST, -long A, -I, and E in the concept group ROUGH; -KL, NN, and -long A in the concept group NARROW; N, -SK, -long A, and -I in the concept group SMELL; -KR, -KN, -NN, -TK, -long A, and E in the concept group SMOOTH; -N, -L, -KL, -NN, and -U in the concept group TOUCH; -KL, -NN in the concept group BLOW.

at random formed groups of synonymic sets nowhere essentially varies taken as a whole and shows almost no essential deviations in particulars. The statistical experiments under b) and c) confirm that our population of independent roots from Buck's synonymic sets behaves in this respect in the same way as the population of an alphabetically arranged dictionary. In fact, if we take sufficiently large parts from any alphabetically arranged dictionary, chosen at random, we shall see that the phonemic distribution will not essentially vary from one part to another or from the average phonemic distribution of the dictionary [4], 67. On the other hand, essential differences will immediately come up, when we compare the phonemic distributions of consecutively running word groups, chosen exclusively from one initial letter, with those chosen exclusively from another letter: the frequencies of the initial phonemes are in such a case throughout preferred.

In our case we are dealing not with an alphabetical but with an onomatological dictionary. Admittedly the dictionary is limited to the etymological projections of the root part of the various terms and is also reduced by the exclusion of the recurrent etymologically identical roots with each individual concept, but nevertheless it preserves the typical statistical characteristics of a dictionary with its stable phonemic distribution. A distribution, esentially different from the normal, were to be expected only on condition that the parts taken from the dictionary are chosen at one time exclusively under one concept group and at another time exclusively under another, and further, that there are specific phonemic characteristics preferred in different concept groups. The results of our investigation prove that such preferences in fact exist. Instances of preference may be seen already in the fact that in small synonymic sets certain phonemic characteristics prevail to the exclusion of others. Frequent instances of preference are found in the recurrence of certain phonemic characteristics where with regard to the normal phonemic distribution these recurrences should not turn up. And finally we get preference through excessive recurrences of certain phonemic characteristics with big synonymic sets, where with regard to the normal phonemic distribution only a smaller number of such recurrences would be justified. The sum of the preferences, of which each for itself is too small for reliable evaluation, gives significant differences, on the whole and with individual phonemic elements, in our seven concept groups. Conversely, in groups of synonymic sets formed at random the single preferences are mutually eliminating, and the phonemic distributions remain essentially identical with the normal phonemic distribution.

6. The fact that it was possible to detect so numerous phonemic characteristics preferred in definite concept groups, i. e. that it was possible to establish systematic morpho-semantic correlations, is based of course on the application of some fundamental methods.

First of all the Indo-European phonemic system had to be simplified. The simplification, as it was explained at an earlier stage, was necessitated by larger phonemic classes so that the statistical material should not get too

scattered. Here we must emphasize that the linguistic phenomenon subjected to our inquiry consists not only of the recurrences of the same phonemes and phonemic combinations under definite circumstances but to an even larger degree of the recurrences of similar phonemes and phonemic combinations. If the problem was to be approached in total, a classification into types was indispensable. The inductive classification of phonemes as resulting directly from our statistical material happens in respect of the principal consonantal characteristics to be in an almost consistent agreement with the traditional classification of consonants, i. e. the classification into plosives, fricatives, liquids and nasals according to the manner of articulation, and into labials, dentals, and gutturals according to the zone of articulation. The only difference from the traditional classification is in the separation of the two liquids considered as being two independent phonemic characteristics. This procedure, at variance with the hypothesis that the Indo-European parent tongue had originally only one liquid [6], was fully required by our statistical material. Not only that it was not possible to establish any broader concept group in which both liquids would appear in a joint morpho-semantic correlation but the initial perusal of Buck's dictionary already disclosed that each of the two phonemes was in an independent correlation with a highly different concept group. The statistical tests carried out confirmed our inductive conclusions and even revealed an unusual coherence of the simplified consonant system.

From the analysis of the recurrent R in the concept group ROUGH, for instance, we can see that the significance of R is primarily related to the occurrences of the radical morphemes in which R appears with any of the guttural plosives; and from the analysis of the recurrent L in the concept group SMOOTH we can see that the significance of L is at least in part dependent on the supernumerary occurrences of the radical morphemes with an additional labial plosive. If we take the guttural and labial plosives as phonemic types, we get in fact another two significant phonemic characteristics: KR, and PL. Similarly, the recurrent significant S in the concept group SMELL is related to the supernumerary occurrences of radical morphemes containing either an additional M or an additional N, and the two nasals treated as one single phonemic type give a further significant phonemic characteristic: SN. Three of the four consonant types: K, P, T, and N, which appear as independent phonemic characteristics in the concept groups SHARP, BLOW, TOUCH, and NARROW, appear thus in significant combinations with individual consonants in the first mentioned concept groups ROUGH, SMOOTH, and SMELL. The whole of the statistical results permits the conclusion that the morpho-semantic correlations of the consonant types are to be attributed to the generic, and hence the more important, auditory-articulatory features of these consonantal categories. Where, on the other hand, the morpho-semantic correlations are related to individual consonants, the individual auditory-articulatory features of these consonants are to be considered equally important as the generic features of the consonant types.

7. The establishment of types in the Indo-European vowel system was as well done inductively, but within the frame of the concept groups for which consonantal morpho-semantic correlation had been found. From the overall impression of the recurrences of similar vowel elements in these concept groups it seemed that the most appropriate thing to do was to make a statistical verification of the heuristic value of the traditionally assumed five-member vowel system **a-e-i-o-u**, modified, by joining **e** and **o**, into a four-member system. This modification was suggested by the absence of any sign that would point towards a morphosemantic correlation in connection with **o**, an absence that was probably correctly explained by the fact that owing to the qualitative vowel alternation or some other reason [**7**], 38, 106, 392, at least the large majority of roots with **o** sounds, either short or long ones, contained originally an **e** sound. In the simplified system of the four basic, qualitatively different vowel elements no distinction was made between short and long elements, regarding shortness or length as genetically secondary distinctive features.

8. A special procedure was used in the determination of the vowel classes U and I. These classes came to include not only the independent unreduced **u** and **i** root sounds [**8**] but also the falling **u** and **i** diphthongs in radical morphemes, irrespective of the quality of the various initial vowels. Already from the methodological point of view such a joining could hardly be avoided: the root diphthongs had to be taken as a uniform phonemic characteristic because of the statistical comparison with simple root vowels which are counted only once. Also it was not possible to count and discuss separately the **u** and **i** vowel sounds on the one hand and the **u** and **i** semi-vowel sounds on the other, since in both cases we are concerned with phonologically the same phoneme [**7**], 393. The decisive factor in the establishment of types was again our statistical material. After a statistical verification in two concept groups, BLOW and SMELL, the vowel class U, established in this way, turned out to be doubtlessly significant. The parallel class I gave indeed in our statistical material no positive significant result, but the negative significance of that class in the concept group BLOW indirectly proved its real existence. It follows that with the falling diphthongs the initial vowel subject to quantitative vowel alternation is — at least in the mentioned concept groups — semantically subordinated to the vowel element **u** and **i**. The decisive semantic significance of the second vowel elements in these diphthongs agrees with the fact that these elements are not affected by reduction, or rather are even strengthened by it. In their stability they are like the consonantal phonemic characteristics that represent the chief semantic value of the Indo-European radical morphemes [**9**], 152, [**7**], 392. Accordingly, we may, irrespective of the hypothesis about the monophthongal origin of the falling diphthongs in imitative words [**10**], 288, attribute the statistical significance of the U and I classes to the prominent auditory-articulatory features of the **u** and **i** sounds which prevail over the respective features of the accompanying initial vowels.*

9. Important as are the obtained results concerning the vowel classes U and I, within the frame of the four-vowel system they remained solitary. Only the vowel distribution of the concept group ROUGH seemed to indicate, if taken as a whole, another essential deviation from the normal vowel distribution — but this owing to the extremely low frequency of the class U and to a slightly less low frequency of the class I and not to any positive significance. One of the reasons for the small number of the established morpho-sematic correlations of vowels was obviously the fact that these correlations were being established in addition to those of the consonants — but the small number could have been caused also by inadequate establishing of the vowel types. To get this clear at the end of our investigation we split up the vowel class A into the class of short A sounds and the class of long A sounds. This was done with particular respect to the vowel distribution of the concept group SHARP in which short A sounds were markedly recurrent. Besides, we limited ourselves in distinguishing between short and long vowels to the class A, because particularly here it might be possible to find an original difference in the quality between the two categories [7.187]. With such a classification of vowels into five basic elements there appeared an essentially different vowel distribution, in contrast to the normal, not only with the concept group ROUGH but also in the concept group SHARP. Nevertheless neither of A classes reached the limit of significance. Only in distinguishing between short and long vowels also with the class E, a close parallelism showed up between the split up classes of A and E. Taking long A sounds and long E sounds together on the one hand, and short A sounds and short E sounds on the other, there came to light a clear significance of the joined short vowels in both concept groups SHARP and ROUGH. Conversely, with an opposite methodical approach, separating the various consonantal combinations with a short A sound, we succeeded in discovering the significance of the consonant-vowel combination K — short A.

10. In this way the finally established classification of the Indo-European vowel system consisting of six basic elements, short A — long A — I — U — short E — long E, capable of being joined together or further divided, now according to one of their features now according to another, came to be the most appropriate one for the determining of vowel morpho-semantic correlations in our statistical material. In the case of the significance of the joined short vowels we are concerned apparently with a morpho-semantically relevant opposition to long vowels, which in the concept group SHARP happen even to be negatively significant: this is to say that we are concerned with the positive significance of the closed syllable in opposition to the negative significance or rather non-significance of the open syllable, the shortness or

* Since in the rising root diphthongs with the initial semi-vowels **u** and **i** there is no reduction in favour of these initial vowel elements, the rising diphthongs were not included into the classes U and I, and the question of their classification remained open. In view of the comparatively small number of such instances this could be done without affecting the validity of the statistical results.

length of vowels in the Indo-European monosyllabic roots relying in principle on the central, or rather the final, place in the syllable [11]. The auditory-articulatory features which are the sole decisive factor for the morpho-semantic correlations are in this case related only to the syntagmatic structure, i. e. the closedness and openness, of the radical morphemes.*

The significance in our statistical material of the consonant-vowel combination K — short A with regard to the specific quality of the short A sound is another somewhat surprising finding since the existence of an original Indo-European A is also for the short A stil controversial. But even if in the statistical calculation we include only the roots containing in Pokorny's dictionary a consistently marked short A, and exclude all cases where A migt possibly be long, the significance of the K — short A combination with the concept group SHARP is beyond doubt. At this point it must be added that in the normal phonemic distribution almost half of the doubtlessly short A sounds appear in combination with K, while in the same distribution only a quarter of long A sounds appears in such a combination. Finally, in the combination K — short A the guttural is nowhere labialized, this occurs only in the combination K — long A. The sole exception to the rule is found in the radical morpheme (s)lăg^{w}-. All this points to the articulatory uniformity od the non-labialized K — short A, similar to the articulatory uniformity of P-U in the concept group BLOW, and to the real existence of the short A sound in the Indo-European mother tongue. The significance of the combination K — short A is in all probability to be attributed to the common guttural auditory-articulatory features of K and short A. But our results give no explanation to the problem whether the class of long A in fact represents an independent vowel quality that would be distinct not only from the vowel quality of short A but also from that of E. It is only the establishment of a particular morpho-sematic correlation appearing in some positive significance of the class of long A that could conduce to the elucidation of this question; until such a correlation has been established, a distinct treatment of the class of long A is methodologically required.

11. Along with the establishing of the phonemic types as common denominators in the recurrences of similar phonemic characteristics in the synonymic sets we proceeded with the conceptual categorization of these sets. The categorization was called for by the statistical method, but in order to carry it out successfully suitable theoretical criteria were required. The working hypothesis, which included these criteria, was in the course of this study already briefly explained; but since it represents the main methodological approach in our investigation, we shall try now to explain it in some detail and show how ts empirical and theoretical foundations agree.

* If the classes U and I are divided into occurences in closed and in open syllables, and the occurrences in closed syllables are added to short A and E, and occurrences in open syllables to long A and E, we get both with ROUGH and with SHARP positive significances in the first case and negative significances in the second.

The fundamental assumption in the working hypothesis was that the recurrences of phonemic characteristics under consideration have their origin in the imitative representation of reality. One indeed cannot imagine any other acceptable reason for these systematic recurrences. Theoretically speaking, only two modes of representation of the reality are possible: the imitative and the symbolic [4], 168, or rather, since the second term is not strictly unambiguous, the imitative and the non-imitative, or the iconical and the non-iconical [12]. The thesis about the arbitrary nature of the linguistic sign resides in the proclamation of the absolute validity of the second mode in language; the concretely established not-accidental recurrences of phonemic characteristics in our synonymic sets point, on the contrary, to the first alternative.

12. But what in fact is imitated in the radical morphemes, and what is the mechanism of imitation like? From our statistical material it seems to be evident that the established significances cannot be accounted for by onomatopoeias in the traditional sense of the word, i. e. by reproductions of acoustical phenomena. Unusual recurrences of phonemic characteristics occur frequently with synonymic sets where the denominated phenomena are not acoustically manifesting themselves or their acoustical manifestation is clearly subordinated, e. g. it is only facultative, less intense or less important with regard to other forms of manifestation. This applies to the majority of the synonymic sets in the concept groups SMOOTH, ROUGH, NARROW, TOUCH, and SHARP, as well as for numerous sets in the groups BLOW and SMELL. It is therefore a necessary conclusion that the significance in all these cases in caused by a specific imitation of non-acoustic phenomena. The idea that such imitations in fact exist, is — as has been seen from Plato's quotation — a very old one; it has been alive through the entire history of the European culture and was again emphasized by the romantic school of the 18th and 19th centuries. At the beginning of this century it was the well known psychologist Wundt [13], 323, who tried to formulate it in scientific terms. But the repeated studies of imitation in language to be seen in the copious bibliography [10], [12] have not led to a uniform view of sholars and to a clear demarcation between the not acoustically conditioned imitation and the onomatopoeia as it is traditionally understood. The uniform and overlapping use of terms like sound gestures, kinetic onomatopoeia, sound pictures, sound-symbolic expressions, expressive words, clearly reflects this state. And although the recent experimental and statistical studies on artificial and natural linguistic material [14], prior to the present investigation, more than once succeeded in proving the objective existence of systematic non-acoustic correspondence between sound and meaning, the basic physiological and psychological mechanism, the development, and the historical origin of this correspondence have remained unclear.

13. The first reason for this is to be sought in the insufficient knowledge about the physiological and psychological conditions of man's speech in

length of vowels in the Indo-European monosyllabic roots relying in principle on the central, or rather the final, place in the syllable [11]. The auditory-articulatory features which are the sole decisive factor for the morpho-semantic correlations are in this case related only to the syntagmatic structure, i. e. the closedness and openness, of the radical morphemes.*

The significance in our statistical material of the consonant-vowel combination K — short A with regard to the specific quality of the short A sound is another somewhat surprising finding since the existence of an original Indo-European A is also for the short A stil controversial. But even if in the statistical calculation we include only the roots containing in Pokorny's dictionary a consistently marked short A, and exclude all cases where A migt possibly be long, the significance of the K — short A combination with the concept group SHARP is beyond doubt. At this point it must be added that in the normal phonemic distribution almost half of the doubtlessly short A sounds appear in combination with K, while in the same distribution only a quarter of long A sounds appears in such a combination. Finally, in the combination K — short A the guttural is nowhere labialized, this occurs only in the combination K — long A. The sole exception to the rule is found in the radical morpheme (s)lăg^{w}-. All this points to the articulatory uniformity od the non-labialized K — short A, similar to the articulatory uniformity of P-U in the concept group BLOW, and to the real existence of the short A sound in the Indo-European mother tongue. The significance of the combination K — short A is in all probability to be attributed to the common guttural auditory-articulatory features of K and short A. But our results give no explanation to the problem whether the class of long A in fact represents an independent vowel quality that would be distinct not only from the vowel quality of short A but also from that of E. It is only the establishment of a particular morpho-sematic correlation appearing in some positive significance of the class of long A that could conduce to the elucidation of this question; until such a correlation has been established, a distinct treatment of the class of long A is methodologically required.

11. Along with the establishing of the phonemic types as common denominators in the recurrences of similar phonemic characteristics in the synonymic sets we proceeded with the conceptual categorization of these sets. The categorization was called for by the statistical method, but in order to carry it out successfully suitable theoretical criteria were required. The working hypothesis, which included these criteria, was in the course of this study already briefly explained; but since it represents the main methodological approach in our investigation, we shall try now to explain it in some detail and show how ts empirical and theoretical foundations agree.

* If the classes U and I are divided into occurences in closed and in open syllables, and the occurrences in closed syllables are added to short A and E, and occurrences in open syllables to long A and E, we get both with ROUGH and with SHARP positive significances in the first case and negative significances in the second.

The fundamental assumption in the working hypothesis was that the recurrences of phonemic characteristics under consideration have their origin in the imitative representation of reality. One indeed cannot imagine any other acceptable reason for these systematic recurrences. Theoretically speaking, only two modes of representation of the reality are possible: the imitative and the symbolic [4], 168, or rather, since the second term is not strictly unambiguous, the imitative and the non-imitative, or the iconical and the non-iconical [12]. The thesis about the arbitrary nature of the linguistic sign resides in the proclamation of the absolute validity of the second mode in language; the concretely established not-accidental recurrences of phonemic characteristics in our synonymic sets point, on the contrary, to the first alternative.

12. But what in fact is imitated in the radical morphemes, and what is the mechanism of imitation like? From our statistical material it seems to be evident that the established significances cannot be accounted for by onomatopoeias in the traditional sense of the word, i. e. by reproductions of acoustical phenomena. Unusual recurrences of phonemic characteristics occur frequently with synonymic sets where the denominated phenomena are not acoustically manifesting themselves or their acoustical manifestation is clearly subordinated, e. g. it is only facultative, less intense or less important with regard to other forms of manifestation. This applies to the majority of the synonymic sets in the concept groups SMOOTH, ROUGH, NARROW, TOUCH, and SHARP, as well as for numerous sets in the groups BLOW and SMELL. It is therefore a necessary conclusion that the significance in all these cases in caused by a specific imitation of non-acoustic phenomena. The idea that such imitations in fact exist, is — as has been seen from Plato's quotation — a very old one; it has been alive through the entire history of the European culture and was again emphasized by the romantic school of the 18th and 19th centuries. At the beginning of this century it was the well known psychologist Wundt [13], 323, who tried to formulate it in scientific terms. But the repeated studies of imitation in language to be seen in the copious bibliography [10], [12] have not led to a uniform view of sholars and to a clear demarcation between the not acoustically conditioned imitation and the onomatopoeia as it is traditionally understood. The uniform and overlapping use of terms like sound gestures, kinetic onomatopoeia, sound pictures, sound-symbolic expressions, expressive words, clearly reflects this state. And although the recent experimental and statistical studies on artificial and natural linguistic material [14], prior to the present investigation, more than once succeeded in proving the objective existence of systematic non-acoustic correspondence between sound and meaning, the basic physiological and psychological mechanism, the development, and the historical origin of this correspondence have remained unclear.

13. The first reason for this is to be sought in the insufficient knowledge about the physiological and psychological conditions of man's speech in

general; the beginnings of a universally conceived examination of these conditions come only from the second half of this century [15], [16]. In the elucidation of the problem outlined one must needs start from the physiological and psychological data concerning man's speech; until these have been adequately clarified, no definite explanation of any linguistic imitation can be expected. It should be pointed out that the question of the so-called acoustic imitation can no more be regarded as settled; this is demonstrated by the widely known fact that the imitations of this kind vary from one language to another — a fact which the protagonists of the consistently arbitrary nature of the linguistic sign have frequently used to negate any systematic imitation in speech [17].

14. As now it is certainly true that the examination of the relation between the linguistic sign and the phenomenon to which the sign refers is normally not the linguist's concern [12], this assertion does not apply to the real or presumable imitative terms. A consistent scientific study of the imitative terms would in addition to a necessary analysis inside the particular linguistic system require a special inter-disciplinary method for the comparison of these terms and the corresponding phenomena, the acoustical-auditory comparison on the auditory level and the physically-physiological one on the other sensory levels which are involved in the motor-sensory mechanism of man's speech. In this way only — with positive and negative findings — it would be possible to establish definitively the structure of the respective concepts with all the elements of sensory perceptions contained in them and to determine the intermediate link between the phenomena and the corresponding imitative terms. The fact that such investigations — with the exception of some experiments carried out by H. Wissemann [18] concerning the onomatopoeias — have not yet been undertaken is the second and the main reason for the ignorance of the physiological and psychological mechanism of the linguistic imitations. A direct consequence of the lack of such knowledge is the disagreement in view of the role of the imitative terms in the origin of language. If e. g. a renowned linguist regards the problem of the origin of language as insoluble and for that reason as something outside the scope of the linguistic science, his view is conditioned by a somewhat hasty judgment that the subjective work of a single, be it acute, observer in comparing imitative terms and the acoustic and other elements of the imitated phenomena [19] already suffices for a definitive explanation of the imitative mode in language [20], 19, 270.

15. In these circumstances a working hypothesis was necessary to explain the concept groups suggested by the unusual repetitions of phonemic characteristics in definite synonymic sets.

The basis of this hypothesis are two obvious facts: 1) The linguistic imitation consists in the reproduction of extra-linguistic perceptions by means of the organs of speech on the part of the speaker. 2) Speaking is performed through a motor process in the organs of speech, controlled on

the one hand by an auditory feedback from the ear, and on the other by a tactile and proprioceptive feedback from the organs of speech themselves.

It follows that trying to reproduce the extra-linguistic perception the speaker controls this reproduction by the multi-sensory feedback, necessarily acompanying every speech activity. And there exists the possibility that in the process of reproduction and feedback the speaker reproduces and controls anyone of the extra-linguistic perceptions which are of the same nature as those generally taking part in speaking, i. e. not only auditory but also tactile and proprioceptive perceptions.

In agreement with this possibility we assume that linguistic imitations of tactile and proprioceptive perceptions occurring wherever in the body really exist. We assume further that the understanding and the acceptation of these imitations on the part of the listener takes place after an active repeating of the particular imitation on his part and experiencing the same process of reproduction and control as experienced by the speaker. Finally, we assume that the identification of tactile and proprioceptive perceptions coming from any part of the body and those arising through speaking in the speech organs in many cases is facilitated by synergism and by sensations involving the entire human organism, taking place in various physiological processes and voluntary motor activities.

These identifications are not conceived as conscious: in man's consciousness the phenomenon producing the extra-linguistic perceptions is identified with the sound carrying their linguistic reproductions.

16. Taking into account that the reproduced extra-linguistic sensory perceptions may occur either separately or in combination, we obtain seven possible types of imitated phenomena listed in the table below. Disregarding the difference between the tactile and proprioceptive perceptions and taking them together as non-auditory perceptions, the number of the possible types is reduced to three. In the table, AUD stands for auditory perceptions, NON-AUD for non-auditory perceptions, TACT for tactile perceptions, and PROP for proprioceptive perceptions.

TABLE IX: The basic possible types of imitated phenomena producing:

AUD	AUD	AUD				AUD
TACT	TACT		TACT	TACT		
PROP		PROP	PROP		PROP	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
AUD — NON-AUD				NON-AUD		AUD
I				II		III

The table shows what type of imitation may explain the unclear significances of the phonemic characteristics in our concept groups. Where the synonymic sets refer to real phenomena that are not acoustically manifesting themselves, it seems plausible to explain the unusual repetition of the phone-

mic characteristics as an imitation of sensory perceptions listed in the table under II 4, 5, or 6. Wherever the real phenomena expressed in the synonymic sets get at least in part acoustically manifested, the unusual repetition of the phonemic characteristics may be accounted for by the imitations under I 1, 2, or 3 in our table. In the forming of the synonymic sets, however, the imitative type 7 or rather III has been excluded for methodological reasons. Our guiding criterion in the forming of the concept groups was to collect in the concept groups only those synonymic sets which express phenonema producing normally tactile or proprioceptive perceptions or both, and to exclude the synonymic sets which refer to other phenomena. In other words: we have limited ourselves to the linguistic expression of that part of reality only which man directly experiences either through his body or on it.

17. Such a decision seemed inductively appropriate from the point of view of our statistical material; otherwise we just would not have known how to form both sufficiently large and sufficiently homogeneous concept groups covering sets with unusual repetitions of phonemic characteristics; and theoretically we relied here on the great significance of the simultaneous experience of one's own body and of the external reality [21], [22]. In this connection it might not be superfluous to note that even the study of modern poetic synaesthetic metaphors reveals that the most frequent source of these metaphors is to be found in tactile sensory perceptions, irrespective of the single authors [23], 282. And the decisive role of the sense of touch and of the proprioceptive sense in the human organism, which two senses condition all of man's physical operations, has been recently emphasized by the cybernetic science [24].

Just as we excluded from our concept groups all the sets with terms for phenomena which are accessible to man only by the auditive way we excluded also the sets with terms for phenomena accessible to man only optically. Since the visual perceptions in the auto-perception of the speech under normal conditions do not occur, there is a lack of parallelism. This lack does not permit the identification of extra-linguistic and linguistic sensory perceptions, and this applies also to all other sensory perceptions which are not considered in our model. All these perceptions may have an indirect share in the linguistic imitation, to the extent to which they are in a local, synergetic or synaesthetic connection with auditory, tactile, or proprioceptive perceptions.

18. Before trying to explain the individual established morpho-semantic correlations, we must tackle the question with what sound material the linguistic imitations under consideration have been performed: with linguistic sounds as they are known or reconstructed, or with pre-linguistic sound elements which were only at a later stage changed into linguistic sounds? Are these imitations primary or secondary, and to what period of the language do they belong?

Once more it was pointed out under 5. that the statistical population from which our results are derived represents an onomatological dictionary,

reduced to genealogically independent Indo-European radical morphemes in each synonymic set. This is of course not a dictionary referring to some pre-Indo-European state where the language morphemes would appear in their pure radical shape. This is a specially worked out onomatological dictionary of the main Indo-European languages; their independent linguistic systems are here taken in consideration with regard to the main periods of their development. Only because all these linguistic systems go back to the same original mother tongue it was possible to reduce the semantically decisive parts of the synonyms, i. e. the roots, to their their supposed shape in the mother tongue, and in this way we obtained the statistical population of the radical morphemes expressed in the same phonemic system and amenable to a statistical investigation. But although the roots of the synonyms go back to the period of the Indo-European community, the synonyms themselves belong to different historical periods. And although the root, abstracted from a particular synonym had most times in the Indo-European period the same semantic content, this is not the rule; often the semantic content of the Indo-European root is new in the synonym. From the fact that nevertheless we have found with the individual concept groups numerous morpho-semantic correlations, two conclusions can be made. First, that behind the established correlations there are certain identical, permanent imitative tendencies that have been working in the historical development with unchanged or not too changed phonemes; second, that among the radical morphemes in the concept groups there must be a considerable amount of old imitative linguistic material, which preserved in the later stages of the Indo-European languages its semantic concept, if not its sound form.

19. On a detailed inspection of the analyzed synonymic sets permanent imitative tendencies are confirmed. This is seen first in the cases of unusual change of meaning where terms whose roots have an outer significant phonemic characteristic acquire in spite of their originally different meaning the meaning corresponding to the particular significant phonemic characteristic. Another confirmation in seen in the cases where terms with the same phonemic characteristic are substituted, both containing the same or a similar root. Imitative tendencies appear also in a third phenomenon where terms possessing no significant phonemic characteristic are substituted by terms marked by a such. All these phenomena can be most clearly observed in cases of well recorded historical succession of terms, e. g. in Romance languages if compared with Latin. Finally we know cases of borrowings from foreign languages when terms with preferred root forms for a given concept are borrowed in agreement with synonyms possesing the same preferred phonemic characteristic.

In our statistical material borrowings from cognate Indo-European languages only come into consideration for the calculation of significance; analyzing entire synonymic sets, we can observe, moreover, analoguous cases of borrowings from non-cognate languages. Outside the calculation of the significance remain also the so-called »Urschöpfungen« (original creations)

[25] in the domain of the individual Indo-European languages which contain the very phonemic characteristics found in our statistical material to be significant. Because of the strict restriction of our inquiry to the original radical part of the synonyms root forms significantly changed through mutual contamination or irregular sound transformation, the so-called »Typusaufpropfungen (the graftings of type) are likewise excluded. Further instances of such a reconstructed agreement between sound and meaning appear in the combination of unsuitable radical parts with suitable affixes or by other morphological means, e. g. by reduplication [26], [19], 402. In our synonymic sets certain cases of secondary — not calculated — significance of root extensions belong there. Beyond doubt we have here to do with surprising parallel phenomena of imitative tendencies evident already from the comparatively narrow framework of our statistical material, limited to the common forms of the Indo-European radical morphemes.

20. Considering only the root material taken into account in the statistical calculations of significance, the later imitations, however, provoked by the continued imitative tendencies, represent an obvious minority in comparisons with the old imitations. Since we have no knowledge of the historical origin of the old imitations we cannot a priori distinguish the possible secondary transformations from a previous non-imitative linguistic material on the one hand, and the Indo-European »Urschöpfungen« or the inherited »Urschöpfungen« from the pre-Indo-European period on the other hand. But as the old imitations come up in great, semantically closely connected groups, and this in the earliest, still accesible stage of Indo-European languages, their primary origin is, on the whole, much more probable. In favour of this speaks also the circumstance that in single concept groups the positive and negative significant phonemic characteristics are clearly opposed with regard to opposed articulatory areas in the organs of speech, and that a similar opposition is found between the particular concept groups (table XII). And the most decisive in this respect is the fact that it is just the simplification of the Indo-European phonemes into the non-differentiated phonemic classes in connection with the auditory-tactile-proprioceptive categorization which permitted the discovery of numerous and systematic morpho-semantic correlations. If the non-differentiation of phonemic classes and the multi-sensory imitation, as they indeed seem to be, are the two characteristic features of an archaic linguistic stage, then our statistical investigation has brought us to the frontiers of that period when the forming of the original imitative morphemes was accompanied by the forming of linguistic phonemes. Be it as it may, one thing is clear: the imitative tendencies which reach till into our days represent at a time of increasing arbitrariness of the linguistic sign a regression taking place mostly in the peripheric areas of the linguistic and conceptual world. But the old imitations bear — irrespective of the uncertainties of detail — testimony to a quite different, opposite state where central elements of human language and thought are in a well recognizable way build up by the imitative representation of reality.

The five tables in the appendix contain:

Table X — a symmetric arrangement of the general and combined consonant characteristics according to their principal articulatory areas in the organs of speech;

Table XI — the total calculation of Chi-square, in all the fields, for the seven concept groups from SHARP to BLOW;

Table XII — the significant deviations concerning the individual phonemic characteristics, in all the fields, for the seven concept groups from SHARP to BLOW;

Table XIII — the supplementary data about the six-member vowel distribution set subsequently up, and the respective data about the consonant-vowel combinations K — short A, and P-U.

Table XIV — the Chi-square results, in all the fields, for the thirty at random set up groups of synonymic sets, and the greatest deviations concerning the individual phonemic characteristics in these groups;

Explanation:

In the tables the positive significant characteristics are printed with capital letters and the figures for all the significant results are in heavy print.

The statistical data for vowels, consonant pairs, consonants, and consonant-vowel combinations refer everywhere to the morphemic groups I to V. The number of vowels is in principle identical with the number of roots; one root with SHARP, three roots with SMELL, two roots with SMOOTH, and one root with TOUCH, contain, however, no vowel. The number of consonants is reduced by subtracting the repetitions of the same consonant class in the two-consonant roots. The fundamental figures for the REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE are: vowels 1417, consonant pairs 968, consonants 1936 (morphemic groups III to V) and 415 (morphemic group II), 37 repetitions having been subtracted — altogether 2314.

The initial figures 533.67 for consonants, 225.63 for consonant pairs, and 325.93 for vowels in the table XIV represent the arithmetic means of the respective numbers occurring in 30 groups of synonymic series set up at random. Each single group was formed by adding at random synonymic series from the REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE till the limit of 220 consonant pairs was attained, the number of consonants and vowels being thus mechanically determined. If a synonymic series had to appear more than two times in a group, this second repetition was not taken into account.

A great deal of the ordered consonant pairs having a small relative frequency, the sums of each two pairs were taken for the Chi-square calculations given in the tables XI and XIV. For the same reason in some cases even the sums of more consonant pairs had to be joined: kk etc. denotes kk, rr, ss, ll, tt, pp, nr, rn, sr, rs, lr, rl; sl etc. denotes sl, ls, nl, ln, tl, lt; tn etc. denotes tn, nt, pn, np.

At the probability level $P = 0.001$ the non-significant Chi-square for the distributions of consonants — taking six degrees of freedom — is 22.457. At

the same level the non-significant Chi-square for the distributions of consonant pairs — taking fortythree degrees of freedom — is 77.419. The corresponding non-significant Chi-square for the five-vowel distributions with four degrees of freedom is 18.467, and for the six-vowel distribution with five degrees of freedom it amounts to 20.515.

In the tables XII, XIII, XIV, in each case, the right lower figure is the determined standard deviation, and the left upper figure is the number of standard deviations. For the groups SHARP and TOUCH the figures are adequately reduced.

TABLE X

MOUTH	SHARP	ROUGH	NARROW	SMELL	SMOOTH	TOUCH	BLOW	LIPS
BLOW	pk	PR	pn	ps	PL	pt	P	BLOW
TOUCH	tk	TR	tn	ts	tl	T	tp	TOUCH
SMOOTH	lk	lr	ln	ls	L	lt	lp	SMOOTH
SMELL	SK	sr	SN	S	sl	ST	sp	SMELL
NARROW	nk	nr	N(n)	ns	nl	nt	np	NARROW
ROUGH	rk	R	rn	rs	rl	rt	rp	ROUGH
SHARP	K	KR	KN	ks	kl	kt	kp	SHARP
THROAT	SHARP	ROUGH	NARROW	SMELL	SMOOTH	TOUCH	BLOW	MOUTH

the same level the non-significant Chi-square for the distributions of consonant pairs — taking fortythree degrees of freedom — is 77.419. The corresponding non-significant Chi-square for the five-vowel distributions with four degrees of freedom is 18.467, and for the six-vowel distribution with five degrees of freedom it amounts to 20.515.

In the tables XII, XIII, XIV, in each case, the right lower figure is the determined standard deviation, and the left upper figure is the number of standard deviations. For the groups SHARP and TOUCH the figures are adequately reduced.

TABLE X

MOUTH	SHARP	ROUGH	NARROW	SMELL	SMOOTH	TOUCH	BLOW	LIPS
BLOW	pk	PR	pn	ps	PL	pt	P	BLOW
TOUCH	tk	TR	tn	ts	tl	T	tp	TOUCH
SMOOTH	lk	lr	ln	ls	L	lt	lp	SMOOTH
SMELL	SK	sr	SN	S	sl	ST	sp	SMELL
NARROW	nk	nr	N(n)	ns	nl	nt	np	NARROW
ROUGH	rk	R	rn	rs	rl	rt	rp	ROUGH
SHARP	K	KR	KN	ks	kl	kt	kp	SHARP
THROAT	SHARP	ROUGH	NARROW	SMELL	SMOOTH	TOUCH	BLOW	MOUTH

TABLE XI

Chi-square

	SHARP	ROUGH	NARROW	SMELL	SMOOTH	TOUCH	BLOW
			CONSONANTS				
K	+11.93	+ 2.93	− 1.33	−15.15	−11.61	− 3.31	−16.99
R	+ 3.25	+49.67	− 1.38	− 1.50	− 5.66	− 0.05	0.00
N	− 8.86	−14.52	+45.97	+ 6.46	− 0.36	− 6.01	− 0.08
S	+ 5.69	− 0.06	− 0.22	+12.64	+ 0.13	+ 1.05	− 0.08
L	− 1.75	− 3.36	− 0.67	+ 0.01	+68.14	− 3.98	− 0.26
T	−13.33	−11.53	− 1.23	+ 0.13	− 1.43	+26.88	− 1.56
P	− 0.87	− 0.14	− 1.62	+ 0.39	− 1.57	+ 0.23	+70.30
	45.71	**82.84**	**52.46**	**36.31**	**88.93**	**41.55**	**89.31**
			CONSONANT PAIRS				
kk etc.	+ 3.46	+ 5.72	− 1.72	+ 0.82	+ 0.18	− 1.13	0.00
KR + rk	+12.41	+29.18	− 0.05	− 4.11	− 9.74	− 1.33	− 0.01
KN + nk	− 0.01	− 0.31	+42.09	− 4.63	− 3.05	− 1.60	− 2.75
nn	−12.37	− 6.98	+ 4.83	− 1.67	− 4.59	− 6.17	− 6.77
SN + ns	+ 0.37	− 5.35	+ 7.88	+59.31	+ 0.81	− 0.12	+17.26
sl etc.	+ 0.05	− 0.45	+ 0.36	+ 8.25	+48.50	− 1.82	− 6.29
kl + lk	+ 0.85	− 1.66	− 6.54	− 4.19	+ 4.64	− 2.63	− 5.57
PL + lp	− 1.72	− 1.62	0.00	+ 0.06	+23.43	− 0.70	+23.41
pt + tp	− 2.33	− 5.12	− 5.27	+ 5.34	+ 1.01	+ 3.97	+ 7.71
sp + ps	+ 2.11	+ 1.06	+ 0.35	+ 0.32	− 0.41	− 0.12	+14.26
pk + kp	+ 2.78	+ 0.18	0.00	− 0.22	− 3.40	+ 1.18	+ 5.81
PR + rp	− 2.30	+ 4.04	− 3.62	+ 0.01	− 2.56	− 0.83	+12.01
SK + ks	+34.50	+ 2.03	− 7.32	− 0.55	− 1.24	− 0.96	−11.20
ST + ts	− 9.73	− 5.74	− 1.42	− 1.02	− 0.72	+15.78	− 1.63
tk + kt	− 9.27	− 4.97	− 1.68	+ 1.02	− 5.11	+ 9.81	− 1.89
TR + rt	− 0.26	+ 3.95	+ 0.10	− 1.85	+ 0.03	+ 5.76	− 5.79
tn etc.	− 1.15	− 5.15	+ 2.94	+ 1.14	0.00	+ 0.01	+ 0.21
	95.74	**83.59**	**86.22**	**94.58**	**109.51**	53.99	**122.66**
			VOWELS				
Short A	+ 7.95	+ 5.44	+ 0.49	− 0.04	− 1.26	+ 1.50	− 0.58
Long A	−11.16	− 5.04	− 3.02	− 4.51	− 4.91	0.00	− 2.41
I	+ 0.54	− 3.75	+ 0.57	− 6.32	0.00	− 0.25	−10.02
U	− 5.96	− 9.26	− 1.76	+32.23	− 0.81	− 5.34	+31.36
E	+ 0.67	+ 4.94	+ 0.37	− 1.28	+ 2.73	+ 0.87	− 0.53
	26.28	**28.44**	6.21	**44.38**	9.71	7.97	**44.90**

TABLE XII

Significant deviations for the particular phonemic characteristics

	SHARP	ROUGH	NARROW	SMELL	SMOOTH	TOUCH	BLOW
Cons.	938	505	549	520	490	739	565
C. Pairs	413	233	238	208	215	326	226
Vowels	539	283	327	319	280	423	353
KR		**4.65** 6.25					
K	**3.44** 15.69			**−3.83** 11.83	**−3.25** 11.83		**−4.22** 11.83
R		**9.24** 6.25			**−3.07** 6.25		
K — Short A	**6.08** 5.13	**3.88** 3.72					
Short (A + E)	**3.61** 11.27	**5.32** 8.16					
long (a + e)	**−3.25** 7.02						
long a	**−3.91** 4.71						
KN			**4.04** 3.08				
N	**−3.22** 9.70	**−4.01** 7.32	**7.44** 7.32				
nn	**−3.55** 3.48						
SN				**5.98** 3.01			**3.81** 3.01
SL + NL + TL				**3.66** 3.00	**6.88** 3.00		
S				**3.65** 7.25			

L														**9.99**						
														6.01						
lk			**−3.15**								**−3.11**									
			3.56								2.63									
PL														**4.56**					**4.72**	
														3.17					3.17	
TP + PT																			**3.26**	
																			2.22	
PS + SP																			**3.19**	
																			3.13	
P																			**8.63**	
																			8.16	
PR																			**4.28**	
																			3.38	
P – U																			**6.92**	
																			3.29	
U					**−3.18**						**6.31**								**6.55**	
					6.45						6.45								6.45	
i																			**−3.43**	
																			5.94	
SK			**3.81**				**−3.13**												**−3.23**	
			4.45				3.29												3.29	
ST			**−3.62**													**4.82**				
			4.38													3.90				
KT + TK																**3.02**				
																4.89				
T			**−3.39**		**−3.06**											**4.71**				
			12.77		9.63											11.57				
TR																**3.84**		**−3.79**		
																2.82		2.35		
TR + PR					**3.59**															
					4.12															

TABLE XIII

	Chi-square		
	RS	ROUGH	SHARP
Vowels	1417	539	283
Short A		+ 7.95	+ 6.08
Long A		−11.16	− 5.05
I		+ 0.37	− 3.75
U		− 5.96	− 9.26
Short E		+ 1.37	+ 6.49
Long E		− 0.78	− 0.60
		27.59	31.23

Significant deviations

SHARP		ROUGH	
	539		283
Short (A + E)	375	Short (A + E)	219
Expected	334.35	Expected	175.56
	40.65		43.44
Calculated stand. dev.	11.27	Calculated stand. dev.	8.16
40.65 =	3.61	43.44 =	5.32
	11.27		8.16

Long (A + E)	32
Expected	54.78
	22.78
Calculated stand. dev.	7.02
−22.78 =	−3.25
	7.02

Statistical data for K — short A

	RS	SHARP	ROUGH
IIbc	10	18	6
IIIa	51	34	17
IIIbc	5	2	3
IV—V	7	5	3
	73	59	29

	SHARP		ROUGH	
K — short A	59		K — short A	29
Expected	27.77		Expected	14.58
	31.23			14.42
Calculated stand. dev.	5.13		Calculated stand. dev.	3.72
	31.23 =	6.08 / 5.13		14.42 = 3.88 / 3.72

Statistical data for P-U

	RS	BLOW
Vowels	1417	353
IIa	24	18
IIbc	—	1
IIIa	15	10
IIIbc	1	3
IV—V	5	2
	45	34

	BLOW
	353
P-U	34
Expected	11.21
	22.79
Calculated stand. dev.	3.29
	22.79 = 6.92 / 3.29

TABLE XIV

The Chi-square results for 30 groups

Cons.	533.67	1. 3.51	2. 5.17	3. 5.96	4. 5.86	5. 3.73
C. Pairs	225.63	19.59	9.84	15.01	22.81	7.91
Vowels	325.93	3.82	9.63	4.79	3.11	0.59
6. 6.92	7. 7.00	8. 3.52	9. 5.05	10. 3.31	11. 3.58	12. 4.98
19.13	18.94	15.05	25.82	9.21	13.19	31.07
5.13	1.40	10.84	2.86	7.48	1.71	0.37
13. 8.48	14. 3.95	15. 7.32	16. 5.92	17. 5.37	18. 8.16	19. 3.52
17.87	12.89	19.41	13.84	21.97	19.13	11.34
4.66	11.15	7.01	1.91	4.48	10.56	1.39
20. 8.70	21. 4.17	22. 9.48	23. 8.09	24. 3.99	25. 3.57	26. 3.11
14.23	22.18	13.75	17.66	7.06	8.12	9.91
9.22	1.17	1.00	10.26	0.87	0.42	10.96
	27. 14.96	28. 4.17	29. 5.48	30. 15.58		
	26.66	16.74	20.92	31.12		
	5.20	2.72	3.29	1.90		

The greatest deviations for the particular phonemic characteristics in 30 groups

CONSONANTS

K	R	N	S	L	T	P
2.49	2.06	1.98	2.46	2.41	2.88	2.17
11.83	6.25	7.32	7.25	6.01	9.63	8.16

CONSONANT PAIRS

kk	KR	KN	ks	kl	kt	kp
2.48	3.40	2.14	2.70	2.08	2.17	1.95
1.52	6.25	3.08	1.37	3.62	2.44	1.88
rk	rr	rn	rs	rl	rt	rp
2.35	0.00	1.74	3.00	0.00	2.36	2.48
1.67	0.00	0.73	0.30	0.00	1.54	1.17
nk	nr	nn	ns	nl	nt	np
2.19	1.74	1.96	2.62	2.25	2.62	4.38
2.28	1.58	2.58	0.61	1.46	1.22	0.43
SK	sr	SN	ss	sl	ST	sp
2.18	1.44	1.86	0.00	2.31	2.34	2.49
3.29	1.08	3.01	0.00	1.50	3.24	2.92
lk	lr	ln	ls	ll	lt	lp
2.13	2.27	1.77	1.88	0.00	3.30	2.28
2.63	0.37	1.06	1.05	0.00	1.21	1.32
tk	tr	tn	ts	tl	tt	tp
2.04	2.39	2.05	2.56	2.21	0.00	1.81
3.26	2.35	2.03	0.34	2.14	0.00	0.96
pk	PR	pn	ps	PL	pt	pp
2.30	1.96	1.96	2.48	2.06	2.08	3.12
2.63	3.38	1.58	0.94	3.17	2.00	0.74

VOWELS

Short A	Long A	I	U	E
2.76	1.80	1.98	2.20	2.01
7.14	3.67	5.94	6.45	9.75

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] A. Meillet, Linguistique historique et linguistique générale, Paris, 1921.
[2] F. de Saussure, Course in General Linguistics, New York, 1959.
[3] R. A. Fisher and F. Yates, Statistical Tables for Biological, Agricultural and Medical Research, 6th ed., London, 1963.
[4] G. Herdan, Language as Choice and Chance, Groningen, 1956.
[5] S. J. Armore, Introduction to Statistical Analysis and Inference for Psychology and Education, New York, 1966.
[6] E. Benveniste, Répartition des consonnes et phonologie du mot, Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague. 8. Prague, 1939, 27—36.
[7] J. Kurylowicz, L'apophonie en indo-européen, Wroclaw, 1956.
[8] J. Kurylowicz, Probleme der indogermanischen Lautlehre, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 15, Innsbruck, 1962, 107—115.
[9] A. Meillet et J. Vendryes, Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques, Paris, 1924.
[10] J. M. Korinek, Studie z oblasti onomatopoje (Remarques sur les onomatopées), Prague, 1934.
[11] A. Meillet, Introduction a l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes, 8th ed., Paris 1937.
[12] S. Ullmann, Semantics, An Introduction to the Science of Meaning, Oxford, 1962.
[13] W. Wundt, Völkerpsychologie, I. Band, Die Sprache, 1. Teil, Leipzig, 1900.
[14] M. Chastaing, Nouvelles recherches sur le symbolisme des voyelles, Journal de psychologie normale et pathologique, 61, (1964), 75—88.
[15] R. Husson, Recherches récentes sur les mécanismes de la parole, La Nature, No. 3355, (1963), 415—421.
[16] F. Winckel, Kybernetische Funktionen bei der Stimmgebung und beim Sprechen, Phonetica, 9 (1963), 108—126.
[17] G. Kahlo, Der Irrtum der Onomatopoetiker, Phonetica, 5, (1960), 35—42.
[18] H. Wissemann, Untersuchungen zur Onomatopoiie, Heidelberg, 1954.
[19] M. Grammont, Traité de phonétique, 3rd ed., Paris, 1946.
[20] J. Vendryes, Le langage, Paris, 1921.
[21] H. Berr, Le langage et l'outillage mental, preface to J. Vendryés, Le langage, Paris, 1921, VII—XXVIII.
[22] F. Mayer, Schöpferische Sprache und Rhytmus, Berlin, 1959.
[23] S. Ullmann, The Principles of Semantics, 2nd ed., New York, 1957.
[24] N. Wiener, The Human Use of Human Beings, New York, 1954.
[25] L. Paul, Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte, 5th ed., Halle a. S., 1920.
[26] W. Oehl, Elementare Wortschöpfung, Anthropos 12—13, (1917—1918), 575 f., 1047 f.; 14—15, (1919—1920), 405 f.; 16—17, (1921—1922), 780 f.; 18—19, (1923—1924), 858 f.

(To be continued.)

POVZETEK

Preiskava Buckovega onomaziološkega besednjaka glede notranje zveze med glasom in pomenom se sklepa s pojmovno skupino »oster, špičast, glasen«, obstoječo iz 55 sinonimičnih serij, in vsebujočo nadštevilno fonemsko karakteristiko **K**.

Na podlagi končnega statističnega preračuna celotnih rezultatov sledi prvi del razlage, v katerem je obravnavana nenaključnost teh rezultatov in je teoretično utemeljen uporabljeni metodološki postopek.

Bojan Čop

BEITRÄGE ZUR INDOGERMANISCHEN WORTFORSCHUNG VII*

27. Het. *hariuzzi*

Ntr. »Tisch aus Rohrgeflecht (?)« = Dupl. ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR.AD.KID (s. Friedrich, *Heth. Wb.* 57) ist ein Wort mit Suffix *-uzzi-*, über dessen Funktion s. Friedrich, *Heth. El.* I^2 39 und Kronasser, *Etym. d. heth. Spr.: II. Wortbildung des Heth.* 240 f. Es bildet Nomina instrumenti, z. Teil aus Nominalstämmen; so sicher in *lahhurnuzzi-* »Opfertisch (??)« von *lahhura-* »Opfertisch« (hier erweitert um ein *-n-*); sonst deverbal: *kuruzzi-* »Schneidewerkzeug« von *kuer-* »schneiden«, *warp-uzi-* »Bronzegerät b. Baden« von *warp-* »baden« usw.; doch ist bei *kattal-uzzi-* »Schwelle (Unter- u. Oberschwelle)« auch an denominativen Ursprung zu denken (**kattala-* »unterer«?).

Da unser Gegenstand aus Rohrgeflecht gebildet ist, wird man beim Grundwort **hari-* oder **harija-* wohl an dies »Rohrgeflecht« bzw. »Rohr« selbst denken dürfen.

Nun ist die Anknüpfung an anderweitiges idg. Material gegeben: es werden wir idg. **aro-m* »Schilfrohr« (Pokorny, *Idg. EW.* 68) in gr. *áron* Ntr. »Natterwurz; Art Schilfrohr«, *ari-saron* »eine kleine Art davon«, lat. *harundō* »Rohr« heranziehen müssen.

Der heth. *-i-* bzw. *-ja-*Stamm stimmt gut zu gr. *ari-* in *ari-saron,* beides aus einem uralten **Hari-* »Rohr, Schilfrohr«.

Die indogermanische Wurzel hatte im Anlaut einen »Laryngal«, also **Har-*, wie das Hethitische erweist; vielleicht ist lat. *h-* auch ein Rest davon.[1]

Da heth. *h-* = Null in anderen idg. Sprachen wohl nur bei Urverwandtschaft vorkommt, da weiter lat. *-nd-* kaum erst nach etwaiger Entlehnung aus einer Mittelmeersprache antreten konnte, da nicht produktiv, wird man wohl mit Recht an eine ererbte, zufällig nur im Mittelmeergebiet belegte indogermanische Worteinheit denken müssen; Entlehnung aus einer Mittelmeersprache kommt also kaum in Frage![2]

---

* Unter demselben Titel erschienen: I (Nr. 1—3) in KZ. 74, 1956, 225—232; II (Nr. 4—10) in Die Sprache III, 1956, 135—149; III (Nr. 11) in Die Sprache VI, 1960, 1—8; IV (Nr. 12—14) in Slav. Rev. XI, Anhang Lingu., 1958, 49—68; V (Nr. 15—22) in Lingu. VIII, 1966—1968, 165—175; VI (Nr. 23—26) erscheint demnächst in KZ.

1 Trotzdem dass im Europeisch-Indogermanischen das **H-* im Anlaut gewöhnlich spurlos geschwunden ist, kann hie und da doch ein Rest davon geblieben sein; so vor allem im Lateinischen, wo unorganische *h*-Anlaute oft vorkommen. Mehr anderswo.

2 Gegen Pokorny a. O. u. a.

28. Idg. **qē-*.

Das Indogermanische besass eine Wortsippe, die »Zeit« bedeutete und in folgenden Wörtern belegt ist: alb. *kohë* »Zeit, Wetter«, aksl. *časъ* »Zeit, Stunde« und apreuss. *kīsman* »Zeit, Weile«.[3] Das apreuss. Wort ist Mask., mit *-ma-* (idg. **-mo-*) aus einem **kēs-* abgeleitet; die übrigen zwei sind vokalische Stämme, das alb. auf **-ā-*, das sl. auf **-o-* auslautend.

Bisher pflegte man allgemein als Wurzel ein idg. **qēs-* anzusetzen, wobei man fürs Albanische an den Wandel idg. **-s-* intervokalisch > *-h-* dachte. Dies ist aber nicht richtig; denn die Flexion von idg. **es-* »sein« zeigt im Alb. 2. Sg. *je*, das ja auf **esi* zuruückgeht. Und die Endung der 1. Pl. *-mi* (*jemi* »wir sind«, *kemi* »wir haben«) ist ebenfalls auf eine Urform mit intervokalischem **-s-* zurückzuführen: **-mesi*. Ein weiterer Fall von intervokalischem **-s-* = alb. Null wird später zur Sprache kommen. Alb. *kohë* müsste also in solchem Fall **ko* lauten, ohne *-h-*.[4]

Eine Urform, die dem albanischen Widerspruch folge leistet und zugleich auch alle drei Wörter unter einen Hut zu bringen imstande ist, wird wohl **qēsk'-* sein: apreuss. *-s-* kann ja auch ein urbaltisches *-š-* darstellen und dies ist aus einem **-sk'-* gut herleitbar; alb. *-h-* aus **-sk'-* ist eine bekannte Tatsache;[5] und schliesslich ist slavisches *-s-* aus urbaltoslav. **-ś-* und dies aus einer Lautgruppe wie **-sk'-* ebenfalls gut bezeugt.[6]

Das indogermanische **qēsk'-* kann natürlich keine echte Wurzel sein; diese Struktur muss weiter in eine kurze Wurzel **qē-* und das bekannte »inkohative« Suffix **-sk'-* zerlegt werden. Dass das inkohative Suffix **-sk'-* auch in nominale Gebilde verschleppt werden kann, zeigen mehrere Beispiele.[7]

---

[3] Vgl. u. a. Trautmann, *Apreuss. Sprachdenkm.* 359 m. Lit.; Trautmann, *Bsl. Wb.*; Sadnik-Aitzetmüller, *Aksl. Hdwb.* 221 mit neuen Deutungen, die aber nicht überzeugen.

[4] Alb. *vjehërr* »Schwiegervater«, *vjehërrë* »Schwiegermutter« wird wohl ein **wésk'uro-* < **swék'uro-* vertreten, also nicht **swésuro-*, das voralb. aus **sweśuro-* (< **swek'uro-*) entstanden wäre; überdies müsste ein **swe-* im Albanischen zu *dje-* werden, ein Überspringen des **s-* in den Inlaut ist also auch von dieser Seite her notwendig.

[5] Vgl. z. B. die »Inkohativa« auf **-sk'ō*, im Albanischen *-h*, z. B. *njoh* »ich kenne« < **g'nēsk'ō* ~ lat. *nōscō* usw.

[6] So aksl. *tysęšta, tysõšta* »1000« < **tūs-k'mtī usw.*

[7] Vgl. z. B. **-sk'-* in der Gruppe von **ais-* »wünschen, begehren, aufsuchen« (Pokorny 16): ai. verbal *iccháti* (< **is-sk'ō*) »sucht, wünscht« = av. *isaiti* > ai. *icchā* »Wunsch«, arm. *aich* (< **ais-sk'ā*) Untersuchung«, av. verbal *išasā* »begehre« > nominal *aēšasa-* »suchend, ausgehend auf« = **aisosk'o-* in lat. *aeruscāre* »bitten«, ebenso denominal (von **ais-sk'o-* oder **ais-skā*) ahd. *eiscōn* »forschen, fragen, fordern« usw., vgl. ahd. *eisca* »Forderung«, auch lit. usw. so: *ieškau, ieškóti* »suchen«, sl. *iskati* (neben Präs. *iskō*, auch *ištō*) »suchen«, *iska* »Wunsch«; zu **prk'sk'ō-* »frage, begehre, bitte, verlange« (ai. *prcchāti* »fragt«, av. *pərəsaiti* »fragt, begehrt«, arm. *e-harch* »er hat gefragt«, lat. *poscō* »fordere, erbitte«, ir. *arco* »ich bitte« usw.) ai. *prcchā'* »Frage, Erkundigung« = arm. *harch* ds., ahd. *forsca* »Forschung, Frage« mit *forscōn* »fragen, forschen«; vgl. auch umbr. *persk-lu, pesk-lu* »supplicatione« u. a. (Pokorny 821 f.); ähnlich in **wen(ə)-* »streben«, wünschen, lieben, befriedigt sein« usw. (Pokorny 1146 f.): ein *sk'-* Präs. in ai. *vāñchati* »wünscht«, davon *vāñchā* »Wunsch«, anord. *ōsk* (< **wunskō*) »Wunsch«, ahd. *wunsc* »Wunsch« usw., wovon ahd. usw. *wunscen* »wünschen« usw. usw.

Somit bekommt man durch die obige, wohl einzig richtige Analyse eine neue indogermanische Wurzel **qē-*. Wenn man sie richtiger bedeutungsgeschichtlicher Analyse unterwirft, kann sie an folgendes iranisches Wort angeschlossen werden, das Benveniste, *Etudes sur la langue ossète* (Paris 1959), 25 ff. so evident ausgelegt hat:

Bisher wollte man osset. *än-cain*, Part. *än-cad* »aufhören, ruhen, Halt machen« mit av. *šyā-*, *šā-* »sich freuen«, av. *šāiti-*, apers. *šiyāti-* »Freude, Wohlbehagen, Glück« verbinden; mit osset. Wort gehört zusammen sogd. *'nč'y-* (*an-čāy-*), Part. *'nč't-* (*an-čāt-*) »aufhören, Halt machen«, das den ossetischen Formen genau entspricht. Wie sogd. *š't* (*šāt*) »reich« und *šw-* (*šaw-*) »gehen« (~ av. *šyav-*, apers. *šiyav-* ds. < **čyav-*, idg. **qjeu-*) gegen osset. *cäu-* »gehen« zeigen, entspricht in Wirklichkeit der uriranischen Lautgruppe *čy-* im Sogdischen *š-*; also muss *an-čāy-* anders interpretiert werden, nicht durch **čyā-!*

Man muss also osset. *än-cai-* und sogd. *an-čāy-* aus einem iran. **čāy-* herleiten (S. 28). Auch morphologisch und semasiologisch müssen beide Wörter von **čyā-* getrennt werden; vgl. zur Bedeutung noch osset. *cadäg* »langsam«, sogd. *'p-č't* »Halt, Intervall (Zwischenzeit), Augenblick«, das von einem **ap-čāy-* ausgeht.

Man muss also ein iran. **čāy-* mit **čāta-* als Partizip rekonstruieren, das »Halt machen, aufhören«, Ende einer Bewegung, bezeichnete; davor standen die Praverbien **ham-* und **apa-* (S. 28).

Da Benveniste wohl Recht hat, wird man aus diesem **čāy-* (Präs. wohl **čāyati*) und **čāta-* ein idg. **qē-jeti*, **qē-to-* folgern dürfen. Die Bedeutung wird wohl dieselbe sein wie im Sogdischen und Ossetischen: »Halt machen, aufhören«. Damit ist aber das preussisch-slavisch-albanische **qē-sḱ-* gut vereinbar.. Zuerst muss man an das schon erwähnte sogd. *'p-č't* (*apčāt*) »Halt, Zwischenzeit, Augenblick« erinnern, das sehr ähnliche Bedeutung aufweist wie unser Wort **qē-sḱ-* + Suffixe. Dem preussisch-slavisch-albanischen Wort liegt eine Auffassung des Begriffes »Zeit« zugrunde, die darin ein »Aufhören, Ruhen« sieht. Ähnliches in der germanischen Entwicklung der Gruppe **qᵘijē-* usw. »behaglich ruhen« (Pokorny 638): got. *hweilan* »weilen, zögern, aufhören« ~ got. *hweila*, ags. *hwīl*, ahd. *(h)wīla* »Weile, Zeit« (anord. noch *hvīla* »Ruhebett«).

Man wird wahrscheinlich von nun an eine neue Auffassung auch für die slavische Gruppe um aksl. *čajati*, *čajõ* »erwarten, warten, hoffen« aufbringen können, denn *čajõ* kann von nun an eher zu unserem **qē-* »aufhören, ruhen, Halt machen« (anstatt zu **qᵘei-* »worauf achten« (Bedeutung!) bei Pokorny 636 f.) gehören. Darüber an einer anderen Stelle.

Eine weitere Gruppe wird auch später zur Sprache kommen.

Vielleicht wird man unsere Wurzel **qē-* als eine isolierte und verselbständigte Bildung (mit Suffix *-ē-*, wie so oft)[8] aus **oq-* verstehen dürfen, das in

[8] Vgl. zum Suffix *-ē-* u. a.: **pel-* »giessen, fliessen, aufschütten, füllen, einfüllen« neben **pl-ē-* ds. (Pokorny 798 ff.) z. B. in lit. *pìlti* »giessen, schütten, aufschütten, füllen«, ai. *píparti*, Pl. *piprmás* »füllt, sättigt, nährt usw.« — aor. *áprāt*, gr. *plēto* »füllte sich«, lat. *pleō* usw. »fülle« u. a.

gr. *óknos* »Bedenklichkeit, Zaudern«, *oknéō* »zaudere«, *oknērós* »saumselig« stecken kann (die bei Pokorny 774 gegebene Verbindung mit got. *aha* »Sinn, Verstand« usw. müsste dann entfallen). Zur Bedeutung vgl. oben osset. *cadäg* »langsam«!

29. Osset. *xizyn,*

dig. *xezun* »klettern«, auch »weiden, hüten, warten« wird von Benveniste a. O. 55 ff. genauer besprochen. Nach ihm bedeutet es immer »se déplacer en grimpant, traverser un lieu accidenté«; urspr. »grimper à travers«, von der Herde oder dem Hirten »grimper« (trans. oder intrans.) > »paître« oder »faire paître«; dazu *xizän,* dig. *xezän* »Weideplatz; Stelle, wo man überklettert, übergeht« (urspr. »l'endroit qu'on parcourt en grimpant«); von der Bedeutung »se déplacer en montagne, traverser un pâturage« kommt *xizyn* zu »traverser«; trans. »faire paître (en montagne)« ist immer »faire parcourir les pâtures de montagne«; daraus »protéger«, »garder« (vgl. russ. *pasti* »paître (trans.)« und »garder«); schliesslich, wie in d. *warten* »garder« > »attendre«, im Digorischen *xezun* = »surveiller (l'arrivée de quelqu'un); attendre«.

Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung von osset. *xizyn* ist also »grimper; parcourir un trajet escarpé« (S. 57). Als Urform ist nach Benveniste ein **xaiz-* anzusetzen, dem nur im Sogdischen eine gute Entsprechung gegenübersteht: sogd. *z'y-γyz-, z'y-xyz-* »rampant sur le sol«, also ein **xaiz-* »ramper, se déplacer à quatre pattes«, woraus Benveniste eine gemeinsame Wurzel *xiz-* »se mouvoir à quatre pattes, ramper, grimper« erschliesst.

Bei Zupitza, *Germ. Gutt.* 116 finden wir eine germ. Sippe, die bedeutungsmässig und phonetisch gut entspricht: mhd. *hickelen* »springen«, engl. *hitch* »to move with a jerk usw.«; weiter vergleicht Zupitza noch lit. *keĩžiotis,* das ich aber in den mir zur Verfügung stehenden Wörterbüchern vergeblich gesucht habe; weder in Niedermann-Senn-Brender, *Wörterbuch der litauischen Schriftsprache* noch in Fraenkel, *Lit. EW.* steht ein solches Wort.

Die germ. Sippe ergibt zusammen mit der iranischen eine idg. Wurzel **q(h)eig'-,* die etwa »aufspringen« bedeutete. Zur osset. Bedeutung vgl. etwa ital. *salire* 'steigen', urspr. 'springen'.

30. Toch. B *sruk-*

»sterben« bildet das Präsens III: 3. Sg. Med. *sruketrə,* 3. Pl. *srukentrə,* Partizip *srukemane* usw.; dazu Konj. V 1. Sg. *sraukau* usw., Opt. *srūkoy* usw., schliesslich das Prät. I 1. Sg. *srukāwa,* 3. Sg. *sruka* usw.[9]

In A entspricht als Grundverbum bedeutungsmässig *wəl-* »sterben«, das bekannte Verwandte hat.[10] Als Kausativ begegnet aber unser *sruk-* in der Bedeutung »töten«: Prät. III Med. 3. Sg. *sruksāt,* Partizip Prät. *sasruku.*[11]

---

[9] Vgl. zum Formensystem Krause, *Westtoch.* Gr. I 304.

[10] Vgl. van Windekens, *Lex. étym. des dial. tokh.* 156. Bei Pokorny 1144 f. fehlt das tocharische Wort.

[11] S. Schulze-Sieg-Siegling, *Toch. Gr. 481;* Thomas-Krause, *Toch. El.* II 158.

Vgl. noch B *srukor* »Sterben, Tod«.[12]

Das Präsens III hat gewöhnlich reduzierte Wurzel,[13] so auch in unserem Fall; dies wird unser Ausgangspunkt für eine neue Etymologie sein, denn die alten sind nicht stichhaltig.[14]

Toch. *-ru-* wird einem idg. **-ru-* entsprechen; dies **-ru-* kann entweder Schwachstufe zu **-reu-* sein oder aber aus **-wr-* umgestellt sein, wie auch **-lu-* aus **-wl-*; vgl. **q"etru-*, **q"tru-* »4« (1. Kompositionsglied) in av. *čaθru-*, gr. *try-pháleia* »Helm«, gall. *petru-* usw., lat. *quadru-*, **q"etru-s* »viermal« in av. *čaθruš*, lat. *quater* (< **quatrus)* neben **q"etwr-* usw. »4« (Pokorny 642 f.); oder gr.-lat. päon. **lúq"os* »Wolf« in gr. *lýkos*, lat. *lupus*, päon. MN *Lýppeios*, *Lýkkeios* neben **wlq"os* ds. in ai. *vr'kas*, av. *vəhrka-*, got. *wulfs*, lit. *vilkas*, aksl. *vlьkъ* (Pokorny 1178). Der tocharische Stamm *sruk-* kann also als Entsprechung einen anderen mit *-wr-* finden: **swrK-*.

Dann kann unmittelbarer Anschluss an die idg. Wurzel **swergh-* »sorgen, sich worum kümmern; krank sein« (Pokorny 1051) eintreten, vgl. ai. *sūrk-š-ati* »kümmert sich um etwas«, got. *saúrga* »Sorge, Betrübnis«, as. ahd. *sorga*, afränk. *sworga* »Sorge«, got. *saúrgan* usw., ahd. *sorgēn*, *sworgēn* »sorgen«, alb. *dergjem* »bin bettlägrig« (< **swórghjō*); weitere Verwandte (ohne *-w-*): air. *serg* »Krankheit«, lit. *sergù*, *sirgti* »krank sein«, aksl. *sraga* »Krankheit«, *sragъ* »austerus, torvus«.

Toch. *sruke-* aus **srugho-* kann also unmittelbar zur Seite von lit. *sergù* < **swérghō* treten.

Es bleibt nur noch die Bedeutung übrig. Das tocharische »sterben« ist eigentlich nur das Ende einer Krankheit; schon dieser Überlegung zufolge wird unsere Etymologie richtig sein. Klare Parallele bildet z. B. die idg. Sippe **g"el-* »stechen« (Pokorny 470 f.), die auch folgende Wörter geliefert hat: lit. *gìlti* »zu schmerzen anfangen«, *gãlas* »Ende, Tod«, *gėlà* »Schmerz«, apreuss. *gallan* »Tod«, russ.-ksl. *želějo*, *želěti* »betrauern«, aksl. *želja* »Leid«, *žalь* »Schmerz«, air. *at-baill* »stirbt«, korn. *bal* »pestis«, kymr. *(a)ballu* »sterben«, ahd. *quelan* »Pein leiden«, ags. *cwelan* »sterben«, anord. *kvelia* »peinigen«, ahd. *quellen* ds., ags. *cwellan* »töten« usw. usw.

Eine noch bessere Parallele ist im Uralischen nachzuweisen: finn. *sure-* »trauern, sich grämen«, *suretta-* »bekümmern, betrüben« und »töten«, *surma* »Tod« (weitere Verwandte bei Collinder, *Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary*, Stockholm 1955, 116). Die bedeutungsmässige Ähnlichkeit dieser uralischen Sippe mit dem idg. **swergh-*, **srugh-* ist so gross, dass ich an Urverwandtschaft denke. Mehr darüber an einer anderen Stelle.

---

[12] Thomas-Krause a. O. 260.

[13] Vgl Krause, *Westtoch. Gr.* I 66: mit einer Ausnahme nur Verba mit dem Wurzelvokal *ə*, *i*, *u* (3 mit *e*), vgl. *triketər* »in die Irre gehen«, *mitentər* »sich aufmachen«, *wiketər* »sich entfernen«, *lyuketər* »leuchten« usw. usw.

[14] Vgl. van Windekens a. O. 116 mit Lit. Beide Etymologien sind wenigstens morphologisch schwierig, da ein Suffix *-k-* in der Präsensklasse III nicht vorkommt; hier sind reine Wurzelverba zusammengeflossen; *prutk-* »eingesperrt sein« hat ein Suffix *-tk-*, also eine ganz andere Bildung, ebenso *sətk-* »sich ausbreiten« und *plətk-* »hervortreten« (wenn hierher), *məsk-* »sein, sich befinden« wohl *-sk'-* der Inkohativa, ebenso *musk-* »schwinden« usw.

31. Aind. *śiš-*

»übrig bleiben« in Pass. *śišyátē* »bleibt übrig«, *śinásti* »lässt übrig«, *śēša-* »übrig«, »Rest« ist bisher ungedeutet, denn keine annehmbare ausserindische, auch nicht arische Anknüpfung ist gefunden worden.[15]

Die Wurzel *śiš-* ist jedoch uralt, denn sie kommt schon im Vedischen vor: Pass. *śišyátē* ist in Rigveda belegt, der *a*-Aorist *á-śiša-t* und der passive Aorist *śēši* in Atharvaveda. Auch der Präsenstypus *śinásti* muss ererbt sein, da nicht produktiv.

Die Laute dieser Wurzel sind so eindeutig, dass sie unmittelbar Rekonstruktion der idg. Urform gestatten: **k'eis-* »übrig bleiben«. Dies kann aber *in *k'ei-* + Wurzeldeterminativ *-s-* zerlegt werden. Somit bekommen wir eine kürzere Urwurzel **k'ei-*, die sofort Anschluss findet.

Denn m. E. gehört hierher die baltoslavische Sippe **šei-ra-* »verwaist, orbus«, die in aksl. *sirъ* »verwaist« und lit. *šeiry's* »Witwer«, *šeirė* »Witwe« steckt.[16] Diese Sippe wurde mit Recht mit av. *saē-* »verwaist, Waise« zusammengestellt, das aus **śaj-i-* als erstes Kompositionsglied entstanden ist und bekanntem Wechsel der Suffixe folgt (1. Kompositionsglied *-i-*, selbständiges Adjektiv *-ro-*),[17] entspricht also gänzlich der bsl. Bildung, uridg. also **k'ei-ro-*, **k'ej-i-*.[18]

Zur Bedeutung ist die Sippe von idg. **g'hē-*, **g'hēi-* »leer sein, fehlen«, »verlassen, fortgehen« (Pokorny 418 f.) zu vergleichen: ai. *jáhāti* »verlässt, gibt auf«, *hīyatē* »wird verlassen, bleibt zurück«, av. *zazāmi* »ich entlasse aus«, *ava-zā-* »entfernen, verscheuchen«, gr. *kházomai* »weiche, fliehe, lasse ab«, gr. *khētis* »Ermangelung«, *khatéō* »ermangle, bedarf usw.«, *khēros* »beraubt, leer«, *khē'rā* »Waise, Witwe« usw.

Man wird also ein **k'ei-* »verlassen, übriglassen, aufgeben« ansetzen dürfen, das alle Glieder schön zusammenhält; **k'ei-ro-* also ursprünglich »verlassen«.[18a]

32. Heth. *hā-*

»glauben, trauen, für wahr (zuverlässig) halten« bei Friedrich, *Heth. Wb.* 45 ist etymologisch noch nicht erklärt.

Es wird konjugiert nach der vokalischen Verbalklasse I 2 b: Präs. Sg. 1 *hāmi*, 2. *hāši*, Prät. Sg. 1 *hānun*, 2. *hāiš*; Part. *hānt-*.[19] Die Flexion ist also im

---

[15] Die Verbindung mit av. *syazd-* »zurücktreten vor, aufgeben« usw. ist formell und bedeutungsgeschichtlich falsch.

[16] Zur baltoslavischen Sippe vgl. Trautmann, *Bsl. Wb.* 301; Fraenkel, *Lit. EW.* 970 usw.

[17] Vgl. z. B. gr. *kyd-ró-s* »berühmt, ausgezeichnet« ~ *kyd-i-áneira* »mit sich auszeichnenden Männern«, av. *dəṛəz-ra-* »fest« ~ *dəṛəz-i-raθa-* »festen Wagen habend« usw., Brugmann, *Grdr.* II² 1, 78.

[18] Vgl. Bartholomae, *Altiran. Wb.* 1547.

[18a] Zusatz: Ich verweise noch auf die abwegige Analyse des altind. Verbums, die Kuiper, *Nasalpräs.* 40 und 168 gegeben hat. Auch seine weiteren Verknüpfungen sind wohl abzulehnen, nur über ai. *śīyatē* »weicht, schwindet« liesse sich diskutieren.

[19] Vgl. Friedrich, *Heth. Wb.* 45 und *Heth. El.* I² 88 f.

Vgl. noch B *srukor* »Sterben, Tod«.[12]

Das Präsens III hat gewöhnlich reduzierte Wurzel,[13] so auch in unserem Fall; dies wird unser Ausgangspunkt für eine neue Etymologie sein, denn die alten sind nicht stichhaltig.[14]

Toch. *-ru-* wird einem idg. **-ru-* entsprechen; dies **-ru-* kann entweder Schwachstufe zu **-reu-* sein oder aber aus **-wr-* umgestellt sein, wie auch **-lu-* aus **-wl-*; vgl. **q^{u}etru-*, **q^{u}tru-* »4« (1. Kompositionsglied) in av. *čaθru-*, gr. *try-pháleia* »Helm«, gall. *petru-* usw., lat. *quadru-*, **q^{u}etru-s* »viermal« in av. *čaθruš*, lat. *quater* (< **quatrus)* neben **q^{u}etwr-* usw. »4« (Pokorny 642 f.); oder gr.-lat. päon. **lúq^{u}os* »Wolf« in gr. *lýkos*, lat. *lupus*, päon. MN *Lýppeios, Lýkkeios* neben **wlq^{u}os* ds. in ai. *vr'kas*, av. *vəhrka-*, got. *wulfs*, lit. *vilkas*, aksl. *vlьkъ* (Pokorny 1178). Der tocharische Stamm *sruk-* kann also als Entsprechung einen anderen mit *-wr-* finden: **swrK-*.

Dann kann unmittelbarer Anschluss an die idg. Wurzel **swergh-* »sorgen, sich worum kümmern; krank sein« (Pokorny 1051) eintreten, vgl. ai. *sūrk-š-ati* »kümmert sich um etwas«, got. *saúrga* »Sorge, Betrübnis«, as. ahd. *sorga*, afränk. *sworga* »Sorge«, got. *saúrgan* usw., ahd. *sorgēn, sworgēn* »sorgen«, alb. *dergjem* »bin bettlägrig« (< **swórghjō*); weitere Verwandte (ohne *-w-*): air. *serg* »Krankheit«, lit. *sergù, sirgti »krank sein«*, aksl. *sraga* »Krankheit«, *sragъ* »austerus, torvus«.

Toch. *sruke-* aus **srugho-* kann also unmittelbar zur Seite von lit. *sergù* < **swérghō* treten.

Es bleibt nur noch die Bedeutung übrig. Das tocharische »sterben« ist eigentlich nur das Ende einer Krankheit; schon dieser Überlegung zufolge wird unsere Etymologie richtig sein. Klare Parallele bildet z. B. die idg. Sippe **g^{u}el-* »stechen« (Pokorny 470 f.), die auch folgende Wörter geliefert hat: lit. *gìlti* »zu schmerzen anfangen«, *gãlas* »Ende, Tod«, *gėlà* »Schmerz«, apreuss. *gallan* »Tod«, russ.-ksl. *želějo, želěti »betrauern«*, aksl. *želja* »Leid«, *žalь* »Schmerz«, air. *at-baill* »stirbt«, korn. *bal* »pestis«, kymr. *(a)ballu* »sterben«, ahd. *quelan* »Pein leiden«, ags. *cwelan* »sterben«, anord. *kvelia* »peinigen«, ahd. *quellen* ds., ags. *cwellan* »töten« usw. usw.

Eine noch bessere Parallele ist im Uralischen nachzuweisen: finn. *sure-* »trauern, sich grämen«, *suretta-* »bekümmern, betrüben« und »töten«, *surma* »Tod« (weitere Verwandte bei Collinder, *Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary*, Stockholm 1955, 116). Die bedeutungsmässige Ähnlichkeit dieser uralischen Sippe mit dem idg. **swergh-*, **srugh-* ist so gross, dass ich an Urverwandtschaft denke. Mehr darüber an einer anderen Stelle.

---

[12] Thomas-Krause a. O. 260.

[13] Vgl Krause, *Westtoch. Gr.* I 66: mit einer Ausnahme nur Verba mit dem Wurzelvokal *ə, i, u* (3 mit *e*), vgl. *triketər* »in die Irre gehen«, *mitentər* »sich aufmachen«, *wiketər* »sich entfernen«, *lyuketər* »leuchten« usw. usw.

[14] Vgl. van Windekens a. O. 116 mit Lit. Beide Etymologien sind wenigstens morphologisch schwierig, da ein Suffix *-k-* in der Präsensklasse III nicht vorkommt; hier sind reine Wurzelverba zusammengeflossen; *prutk-* »eingesperrt sein« hat ein Suffix *-tk-*, also eine ganz andere Bildung, ebenso *sətk-* »sich ausbreiten« und *plətk-* »hervortreten« (wenn hierher), *məsk-* »sein, sich befinden« wohl *-sk'-* der Inkohativa, ebenso *musk-* »schwinden« usw.

31. Aind. *śiš-*

»übrig bleiben« in Pass. *śišyátē* »bleibt übrig«, *śinásti* »lässt übrig«, *śēša-* »übrig«, »Rest« ist bisher ungedeutet, denn keine annehmbare ausserindische, auch nicht arische Anknüpfung ist gefunden worden.[15]

Die Wurzel *śiš-* ist jedoch uralt, denn sie kommt schon im Vedischen vor: Pass. *śišyátē* ist in Rigveda belegt, der *a*-Aorist *á-śiša-t* und der passive Aorist *śēši* in Atharvaveda. Auch der Präsenstypus *śinásti* muss ererbt sein, da nicht produktiv.

Die Laute dieser Wurzel sind so eindeutig, dass sie unmittelbar Rekonstruktion der idg. Urform gestatten: **k'eis-* »übrig bleiben«. Dies kann aber *in *k'ei-* + Wurzeldeterminativ *-s-* zerlegt werden. Somit bekommen wir eine kürzere Urwurzel **k'ei-*, die sofort Anschluss findet.

Denn m. E. gehört hierher die baltoslavische Sippe **šei-ra-* »verwaist, orbus«, die in aksl. *sirъ* »verwaist« und lit. *šeiry's* »Witwer«, *šeirė* »Witwe« steckt.[16] Diese Sippe wurde mit Recht mit av. *saē-* »verwaist, Waise« zusammengestellt, das aus **śaj-i-* als erstes Kompositionsglied entstanden ist und bekanntem Wechsel der Suffixe folgt (1. Kompositionsglied *-i-*, selbständiges Adjektiv *-ro-*),[17] entspricht also gänzlich der bsl. Bildung, uridg. also **k'ei-ro-*, **k'ej-i-*.[18]

Zur Bedeutung ist die Sippe von idg. **g'hē-*, **g'hēi-* »leer sein, fehlen«, »verlassen, fortgehen« (Pokorny 418 f.) zu vergleichen: ai. *jáhāti* »verlässt, gibt auf«, *hīyatē* »wird verlassen, bleibt zurück«, av. *zazāmi* »ich entlasse aus«, *ava-zā-* »entfernen, verscheuchen«, gr. *kházomai* »weiche, fliehe, lasse ab«, gr. *khētis* »Ermangelung«, *khatéō* »ermangle, bedarf usw.«, *khēros* »beraubt, leer«, *khē'rā* »Waise, Witwe« usw.

Man wird also ein **k'ei-* »verlassen, übriglassen, aufgeben« ansetzen dürfen, das alle Glieder schön zusammenhält; **k'ei-ro-* also ursprünglich »verlassen«.[18a]

32. Heth. *hā-*

»glauben, trauen, für wahr (zuverlässig) halten« bei Friedrich, *Heth. Wb.* 45 ist etymologisch noch nicht erklärt.

Es wird konjugiert nach der vokalischen Verbalklasse I 2 b: Präs. Sg. 1 *hāmi*, 2. *hāši*, Prät. Sg. 1 *hānun*, 2. *hāiš*; Part. *hānt-*.[19] Die Flexion ist also im

---

[15] Die Verbindung mit av. *syazd-* »zurücktreten vor, aufgeben« usw. ist formell und bedeutungsgeschichtlich falsch.

[16] Zur baltoslavischen Sippe vgl. Trautmann, *Bsl. Wb.* 301; Fraenkel, *Lit. EW.* 970 usw.

[17] Vgl. z. B. gr. *kyd-ró-s* »berühmt, ausgezeichnet« ~ *kyd-i-áneira* »mit sich auszeichnenden Männern«, av. *dərəz-ra-* »fest« ~ *dərəz-i-raθa-* »festen Wagen habend« usw., Brugmann, *Grdr.* II² 1, 78.

[18] Vgl. Bartholomae, *Altiran. Wb.* 1547.

[18a] Zusatz: Ich verweise noch auf die abwegige Analyse des altind. Verbums, die Kuiper, *Nasalpräs.* 40 und 168 gegeben hat. Auch seine weiteren Verknüpfungen sind wohl abzulehnen, nur über ai. *śīyatē* »weicht, schwindet« liesse sich diskutieren.

[19] Vgl. Friedrich, *Heth. Wb.* 45 und *Heth. El.* I² 88 f.

Grunde dieselbe wie in der Klasse I 3 (Stämme auf *-āi-*), z. B. (dieselben Formen): *hatrāmi* »schreiben«, *hatrāši, hatrānun, hatrāeš, hatrant-*. Da nun die Klasse I 3 auf idg. Denominativa auf **-ā-je-* zurückgeht, könnte man auch bei *hā(i)-* an eine Urform **hāje-* (idg. **Hāje-*) denken; doch diese Urform ergibt leider keinen Anschluss an anderweitiges Material.

Es gibt noch eine andere Möglichkeit: nimmt man an, dass in unserer »Wurzel« *hā-* einst ein intervokalisches *-w-* vorhanden gewesen ist, so kommt man auf ein **ho(w)o-*, idg. **Howo-* (genaueres unten) zurück, das wohl eine gute Verknüpfung findet: ein idg. **(H)ow-* mit ähnlicher Bedeutung gibt es ja in der folgenden griechisch-lateinischen Sippe: gr. *oï'ō*,[20] *oï'omai*[20] (Aor. *oï'ssato, ōï'sthēn)* »meine, glaube, verfalle worauf«, *an-ōïstos* »unerwartet«, später kontrahiert *oíomai* und *oîmai*, das evident an ein **owis-* denken lässt, und lat. *ōmen*, alat. *osmen* Ntr. »Vorzeichen«, das als deverbales **owis-men* zu deuten ist.[21] Die griechisch-lateinische Sippe lässt einen Stamm auf *-is-* **owis-* ansetzen, der wahrscheinlich überhaupt nicht verbal ist, sondern nominal, nämlich mit Suffix *-is-*[22] von einem kürzeren Verbalstamm **ow-* »glauben, erwarten« abgeleitet; gr. *oï'ō* usw. also denominal **owis-jō*.

Doch das wichtigste ist, dass man hier mit einem verbalen **ow-* bzw. **How-* zu tun hat, das nun auch im Hethitischen steckt: *hā-* aus **Howo-*; da die Bedeutungen aller verglichenen Wörter gut übereinstimmen, bleibt nur noch die lauthistorische Frage übrig, wie heth. **Howo-* zu *hā-* geworden ist.

Im allgemeinen scheint im Hethitischen das indogermanische intervokalische *-w-* erhalten zu sein, vgl. *newaš* »neu, frisch« (idg. **newos*) mit *newahh-* »erneuern«; *mišriwant-* »hell, glänzend«, *mišriwatar* »Glanz, Pracht, Herrlichkeit«, *mišriweš-* »hell sein, strahlen« mit denominalem Suffix **-w-*, **-went-*, und die Flexion der *u*-Stämme, wie z. B. *harnau-* »Gebärstuhl«, Gen. *harnawaš*, Dat.-Lok. *harnawi*, oder *aššu-* »gut«: Gen. *aššawaš*, Dat.-Lok. *aššawi*, Abl. *aššawaza*, Instr. *aššawet*, Pl. Nom. *aššawēš, aššawa* usw.

Doch neben Abl. *idālawaz* »von bösem« kommt auch *idālaz* vor und dies bildet den Schlüssel zu unserem Problem: im Abl. war die Urform **-owo-ti*,[23] das *-w-* stand zwischen zwei *-o-* und schwand; erst nachträglich wurde es nach anderen Kasus wiederhergestellt. Wenn wir also annehmen, dass *-w-* im Heth. zwischen zwei *-o-* schwinden musste, war es analogisch hergestellt im Gen. Sg. *-awaš* statt *-aš* aus **-owos*, im Abl. (s. oben), im Dat.-Lok. Pl. *-awaš* statt *-aš* aus **-owōs* (od. ähnl.)[24] usw., während es z. B. im Lok. Sg.

---

[20] Das *i* ist kurz oder lang, ursprünglich ist die Länge (**owisjō*).

[21] Vgl. Boisacq, *DEGr.* 692; Walde-Hofmann, *LEW.*[3] II 208 mit Lit., Frisk, *Gr. EW.* II 366.

[22] Dazu vgl. Brugmann, a. O. 533 f.

[23] Zur Entstehung des hethitischen Ablativs vgl. meine Bemerkung *Lingu.* IX/1 (Ljubljana 1969), S. 46.

[24] Der Dativ — Lokativ (und Genitiv) Pl. kann zwar aus einem Dualkasus (mit **-ōs* = av. *-å)* erklärt werden, wie Pedersen, *Hittitisch* 33 nach Benveniste wollte, doch bietet sich noch eine andere, viel bessere Möglichkeit, über die ich an anderer Stelle berichten werde.

bleiben musste: *-awi* < **-owi* oder **-owei*, ebenso im Nom.-Akk. Pl. Ntr. *-awa* < **-ow-ā*.

Genau so verhielt sich unser **How-*: in der Urform **Howomi* (1. Sg. Präs.) schwand *-w-* regelrecht, ebenso in der 3. Pl. Präs. **Howonti*, im Part. **Howont-* usw., auch in der 1. Sg. Prät. **How-u-m*, sogar in der 2. Sg. Präs. **Howosi*, sobald das thematische *-o-* (= heth. *-a-*) aus der 1. Sg. in die 2. Sg. übertragen wurde (vgl. *hatrāši* < **-ājasi* = **-ājosi*!). Vor dem Themavokal *-e-* müsste dagegen *-w-* bleiben; doch trachtet das Hethitische bekanntlich danach, dass das Paradigma möglichst einheitlich ist; so wurde die Stammform *hā-* < **Howo-* auch in 2. Sg. Prät. *hāiš* übertragen, wo sie ursprünglich **Howe-* lautete; Hilfe leistete dabei auch der Typus I 3 *(hatrā(i)-)*: *hāiš* ~ *hatrāeš* (bekanntlich kann *hāiš* auch */hāes/* gelesen werden).[25]

Zusatz: Endgültig wird unsere Vermutung, dass in *hā-* einst ein *-w-* stand, durch die Existenz eines weiteren hethitischen Verbs erwiesen, und zwar durch heth. *hušk-* »warten, abwarten« (Präs. 2. Sing. *huškiši*, 3. Plur. *huškanzi* usw., s. Friedrich, *Heth. Wb.* 77). Das Wort ist augenscheinlich ein Iterativum auf **-sk'e/o-* von einer *u*-Wurzel, die besten Anschluss gerade an *hā-* < **Howo-* findet; *huške-* kann direkt aus idg. **Hu-sk'e/o-* mit schwundstufiger Wurzel entstanden sein, wie die hethitischen Iterativa noch öfters schwundstufige Wurzelform aufweisen, so etwa *kuašk-* zu *kuen-* »schlagen; erschlagen, töten« (idg. **gʷhn-sk'e/o-*), *zikk-* »(wiederholt) legen« zu *dāi-* »setzen, legen, stellen« (idg. **dh-sk'e/o-* oder besser **dhə-sk'e/o-*, worüber an einer anderen Stelle), *uwanšik-* zu *wen-*, *went-* »futuere« (idg. **wn(t)-sk'e/o*), *ušk-* »sehen« zu *au(š)-* ds. (idg. **u-sk'e/o-*), *azzikk-* zu *ed-* »essen« (idg. **ed-sk'e/o-*), *akkušk-* zu *eku-* »trinken« (idg. **əqʷ-sk'e/o-*) u. a.

Zur Bedeutung vgl. z. B. gr. *oknéō* »zaudere« — got. *ahjan* »glauben, meinen« (Pokorny 774); vor allem aber **men-* »denken usw.« — **men-* »warten«. In allen diesen Fällen kann »glauben, denken, meinen« das Ursprüngliche sein.

---

[25] Die Idee, dass in *hā-* ein *-w-* ausgefallen wäre, stammt eigentlich von Prof. Oštir; doch verglich er das idg. **aw-* »gern haben« (Pokorny 77 f.), das aber bedeutungsmässig stark abweicht und auch keine guten Voraussetzungen für den Ausfall von *-w-* bietet. Oštirs Idee vom Ausfall des *-w-* war leider noch nicht genau umschrieben, was ich hier nachholen muss. Oštir verglich auch heth. *lā-* »lösen« mit idg. **lew-* »abschneiden, trennen, loslösen« (Pokorny 681 f.) in ai. *lunā'ti* usw. »schneidet, schneidet ab«, gr. *lýō* »löse, befreie«, lat *luō* »büssen, zahlen«, *solvō* »lösen«, got. *fraliusan* »verlieren« usw. usw. Auch hier muss man mit unserer Regel vom Ausfall des *-w-* zwischen zwei *-o-* auskommen: Präs. 1. Sg. *lāmi* < **lowo-mi*, 2. Sg. *lāši* (mit analog. Themavokal *-o-* wie in *hāši*!) < **lowo-si*, 3. Pl. *lānzi* < **lowo-nti*, Prät. 1. Sg. *lāun* < **low-u-m*, 1. Pl. *lāwen* < **lowo-wen*, Imper. 2. Pl. *latten* < **lowo-ten* (vgl. *hatratten* »schreibet!« aus < **-āja-tten* < **-ā-jo-ten* mit analogischer Durchführung des Stammauslautes *-o-*), Part. *lant-* < **lowont-*; analogische Entfernung des *-w-* in Prät. 2. Sg. *lāiš* (statt **lawes*), 3. Sg. *lāit* (statt **lawet*), Imper. 2. Sg. *lāi* < **lowei* (statt **lawi*); vielleicht so auch 3. Sg. Präs. *lāi* < **lowei*, doch kann hier auch an ein **lowo-i* gedacht werden (mehr anderswo). In anderer Umgebung blieb das *-w-* der letzten Wurzel erhalten: *lawarija-* (*lawarr-*) zerbrechen« hatte urspr. **low-*, aber das Suffix war wohl **-erje/o-*, also mit *-a-* im Anfang im Uranatolischen.

Grunde dieselbe wie in der Klasse I 3 (Stämme auf *-āi-*), z. B. (dieselben Formen): *hatrāmi* »schreiben«, *hatrāši, halrānun, hatrāeš, hatrant-*. Da nun die Klasse I 3 auf idg. Denominativa auf **-ā-je-* zurückgeht, könnte man auch bei *hā(i)-* an eine Urform **hāje-* (idg. **Hāje-*) denken; doch diese Urform ergibt leider keinen Anschluss an anderweitiges Material.

Es gibt noch eine andere Möglichkeit: nimmt man an, dass in unserer »Wurzel« *hā-* einst ein intervokalisches *-w-* vorhanden gewesen ist, so kommt man auf ein **ho(w)o-*, idg. **Howo-* (genaueres unten) zurück, das wohl eine gute Verknüpfung findet: ein idg. **(H)ow-* mit ähnlicher Bedeutung gibt es ja in der folgenden griechisch-lateinischen Sippe: gr. *oï'ō*,[20] *oï'omai*[20] (Aor. *oï'ssato, ōï'sthēn)* »meine, glaube, verfalle worauf«, *an-ōïstos* »unerwartet«, später kontrahiert *oíomai* und *oîmai,* das evident an ein **owis-* denken lässt, und lat. *ōmen,* alat. *osmen* Ntr. »Vorzeichen«, das als deverbales **owis-men* zu deuten ist.[21] Die griechisch-lateinische Sippe lässt einen Stamm auf *-is-* **owis-* ansetzen, der wahrscheinlich überhaupt nicht verbal ist, sondern nominal, nämlich mit Suffix *-is-*[22] von einem kürzeren Verbalstamm **ow-* »glauben, erwarten« abgeleitet; gr. *oï'ō* usw. also denominal **owis-jō.*

Doch das wichtigste ist, dass man hier mit einem verbalen **ow-* bzw. **How-* zu tun hat, das nun auch im Hethitischen steckt: *hā-* aus **Howo-*; da die Bedeutungen aller verglichenen Wörter gut übereinstimmen, bleibt nur noch die lauthistorische Frage übrig, wie heth. **Howo-* zu *hā-* geworden ist.

Im allgemeinen scheint im Hethitischen das indogermanische intervokalische *-w-* erhalten zu sein, vgl. *newaš* »neu, frisch« (idg. **newos*) mit *newahh-* »erneuern«; *mišriwant-* »hell, glänzend«, *mišriwatar* »Glanz, Pracht, Herrlichkeit«, *mišriweš-* »hell sein, strahlen« mit denominalem Suffix **-w-*, **-went-*, und die Flexion der *u*-Stämme, wie z. B. *harnau-* »Gebärstuhl«, Gen. *harnawaš,* Dat.-Lok. *harnawi,* oder *aššu-* »gut«: Gen. *aššawaš,* Dat.-Lok. *aššawi,* Abl. *aššawaza,* Instr. *aššawet,* Pl. Nom. *aššawēš, aššawa* usw.

Doch neben Abl. *idālawaz* »von bösem« kommt auch *idālaz* vor und dies bildet den Schlüssel zu unserem Problem: im Abl. war die Urform **-owo-ti*,[23] das *-w-* stand zwischen zwei *-o-* und schwand; erst nachträglich wurde es nach anderen Kasus wiederhergestellt. Wenn wir also annehmen, dass *-w-* im Heth. zwischen zwei *-o-* schwinden musste, war es analogisch hergestellt im Gen. Sg. *-awaš* statt *-aš* aus **-owos,* im Abl. (s. oben), im Dat.-Lok. Pl. *-awaš* statt *-aš* aus **-owōs* (od. ähnl.)[24] usw., während es z. B. im Lok. Sg.

---

[20] Das *i* ist kurz oder lang, ursprünglich ist die Länge (**owisjō*).

[21] Vgl. Boisacq, *DEGr.* 692; Walde-Hofmann, *LEW.*[3] II 208 mit Lit., Frisk, *Gr. EW.* II 366.

[22] Dazu vgl. Brugmann, a. O. 533 f.

[23] Zur Entstehung des hethitischen Ablativs vgl. meine Bemerkung *Lingua* IX/1 (Ljubljana 1969), S. 46.

[24] Der Dativ — Lokativ (und Genitiv) Pl. kann zwar aus einem Dualkasus (mit **-ōs* = av. *-ā)* erklärt werden, wie Pedersen, *Hittitisch* 33 nach Benveniste wollte, doch bietet sich noch eine andere, viel bessere Möglichkeit, über die ich an anderer Stelle berichten werde.

bleiben musste: *-awi* < **-owi* oder **-owei*, ebenso im Nom.-Akk. Pl. Ntr. *-awa* < **-ow-ā*.

Genau so verhielt sich unser **How-*: in der Urform **Howomi* (1. Sg. Präs.) schwand *-w-* regelrecht, ebenso in der 3. Pl. Präs. **Howonti*, im Part. **Howont-* usw., auch in der 1. Sg. Prät. **How-u-m*, sogar in der 2. Sg. Präs. **Howosi*, sobald das thematische *-o-* (= heth. *-a-*) aus der 1. Sg. in die 2. Sg. übertragen wurde (vgl. *hatrāši* < **-ājasi* = **-ājosi*!). Vor dem Themavokal *-e-* müsste dagegen *-w-* bleiben; doch trachtet das Hethitische bekanntlich danach, dass das Paradigma möglichst einheitlich ist; so wurde die Stammform *hā-* < **Howo-* auch in 2. Sg. Prät. *hāiš* übertragen, wo sie ursprünglich **Howe-* lautete; Hilfe leistete dabei auch der Typus I 3 *(hatrā(i)-)*: *hāiš* ~ *hatrāeš* (bekanntlich kann *hāiš* auch */hāes/* gelesen werden).[25]

Zusatz: Endgültig wird unsere Vermutung, dass in *hā-* einst ein *-w-* stand, durch die Existenz eines weiteren hethitischen Verbs erwiesen, und zwar durch heth. *hušk-* »warten, abwarten« (Präs. 2. Sing. *huškiši*, 3. Plur. *huškanzi* usw., s. Friedrich, *Heth. Wb.* 77). Das Wort ist augenscheinlich ein Iterativum auf **-sk'e/o-* von einer *u*-Wurzel, die besten Anschluss gerade an *hā-* < **Howo-* findet; *huške-* kann direkt aus idg. **Hu-sk'e/o-* mit schwundstufiger Wurzel entstanden sein, wie die hethitischen Iterativa noch öfters schwundstufige Wurzelform aufweisen, so etwa *kuašk-* zu *kuen-* »schlagen; erschlagen, töten« (idg. **g^{w}hn-sk'e/o-*), *zikk-* »(wiederholt) legen« zu *dāi-* »setzen, legen, stellen« (idg. **dh-sk'e/o-* oder besser **dhə-sk'e/o-*, worüber an einer anderen Stelle), *uwanšik-* zu *wen-*, *went-* »futuere« (idg. **wn(t)-sk'e/o*), *ušk-* »sehen« zu *au(š)-* ds. (idg. **u-sk'e/o-*), *azzikk-* zu *ed-* »essen« (idg. **^{e}d-sk'e/o-*), *akkušk-* zu *eku-* »trinken« (idg. **əq^{w}-sk'e/o-*) u. a.

Zur Bedeutung vgl. z. B. gr. *oknéō* »zaudere« — got. *ahjan* »glauben, meinen« (Pokorny 774); vor allem aber **men-* »denken usw.« — **men-* »warten«. In allen diesen Fällen kann »glauben, denken, meinen« das Ursprüngliche sein.

---

[25] Die Idee, dass in *hā-* ein *-w-* ausgefallen wäre, stammt eigentlich von Prof. Oštir; doch verglich er das idg. **aw-* »gern haben« (Pokorny 77 f.), das aber bedeutungsmässig stark abweicht und auch keine guten Voraussetzungen für den Ausfall von *-w-* bietet. Oštirs Idee vom Ausfall des *-w-* war leider noch nicht genau umschrieben, was ich hier nachholen muss. Oštir verglich auch heth. *lā-* »lösen« mit idg. **lew-* »abschneiden, trennen, loslösen« (Pokorny 681 f.) in ai. *lunā'ti* usw. »schneidet, schneidet ab«, gr. *lýō* »löse, befreie«, lat *luō* »büssen, zahlen«, *solvō* »lösen«, got. *fraliusan* »verlieren« usw. usw. Auch hier muss man mit unserer Regel vom Ausfall des *-w-* zwischen zwei *-o-* auskommen: Präs. 1. Sg. *lāmi* < **lowo-mi*, 2. Sg. *lāši* (mit analog. Themavokal *-o-* wie in *hāši*!) < **lowo-si*, 3. Pl. *lānzi* < **lowo-nti*, Prät. 1. Sg. *lāun* < **low-u-m*, 1. Pl. *lāwen* < **lowo-wen*, Imper. 2. Pl. *latten* < **lowo-ten* (vgl. *hatratten* »schreibet!« aus < **-āja-tten* < **-ā-jo-ten* mit analogischer Durchführung des Stammauslautes *-o-*), Part. *lant-* < **lowont-*; analogische Entfernung des *-w-* in Prät. 2. Sg. *lāiš* (statt **lawes*), 3. Sg. *lāit* (statt **lawet*), Imper. 2. Sg. *lāi* < **lowei* (statt **lawi*); vielleicht so auch 3. Sg. Präs. *lāi* < **lowei*, doch kann hier auch an ein **lowo-i* gedacht werden (mehr anderswo). In anderer Umgebung blieb das *-w-* der letzten Wurzel erhalten: *lawarija-* (*lawarr-*) zerbrechen« hatte urspr. **low-*, aber das Suffix war wohl **-erje/o-*, also mit *-a-* im Anfang im Uranatolischen.

Vgl. noch gr. *an-ō'istos* »unerwartet« und weiter gr. *peithomai* »lasse mich überreden«, *peithō* »überrede, überzeuge«, lat. *fīdō* »traue, vertraue« ~ got. *beidan* »warten« usw. bei Pokorny, *Idg. EW.* 117.

So bekommt man eine neue idg. Wurzel **How-* »glauben«. Ein weiterer Spross derselben kommt später zur Sprache.

33. Heth. *haššikk-*

»sich sättigen« ist ein Verbum seltsamer Form: Präs. 3. Sg. *haššik-zi*, Prät. 3. Pl. *haššikkir*, Imper. 1. Sg. *haššigalu*, 2. Sg. *haššik*, 3. Sg. *haššikdu*, 2. Pl. *haššikten*. Ich wüsste keine genaue Parallele für einen solchen Stamm. Der Gedanke an das dur.-distr. Suffix *-šk-* (Kammenhuber, *RHA.* XVII, Fasz. 64, 1959, 47 und 74) ist hinfällig, da das Verbum athematisch flektiert. Davon ist der Kausativstamm *haššikkanu-*, *haššiknu-* »satt machen, sättigen« abgeleitet; zu beiden s. Friedrich, *Heth. Wb.* 63. Zum Kausativ noch Sturtevant, *A Hittite Glossary*, 2nd Ed., 46: »cause to sate oneself, soak (the earth with the rain)«. Zur Bedeutung gleich unten.

Abwegig scheint mir die Erklärung, die Goetze bei Friedrich a. a. O. gegeben hat: urspr. »sich öffnen für« = »etwas in sich ziehen«, d. h. zu *haš(š)-*, *heš(š)-* »öffnen«.

Im Palaischen entspricht ein kürzerer Stamm *haš-* »sich satt trinken«, nur in der 3. Pl. Präs. *hašānti* belegt, s. Kammenhuber, RHA. a. O. 47, 49, 74 f.

Das Palaische hat wohl den Wurzelstamm erhalten, während im Hethitischen derselbe von der Ableitung *haš-ikk-* verdrängt wurde.

Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung ist »sich satt trinken«; sie ist im Palaischen erhalten: *ḫuwānti nippaš hašānti* = »sie trinken, werden aber nicht satt« Kammenhuber a. O. 46 f. Ebenso klar im Hethitischen z. B. in Telipinu-Mythus KUB XVII 10 I 20 ... *ekuer-ma n-e-za UL haššikkir* »sie aber tranken, wurden jedoch nicht satt (getrunken)«. Ebenso das Kausativum *haššigganu-*, *haššiknu-*, nach Kammenhuber, Hippol. Heth. (Wiesbaden 1961) 309 das erste »(mit Trank) sättigen«, das zweite »man sättigt sie im Tränken, man lässt sie sich satt saufen« mit Inf. *šakruwawanzi*. Die Konkurrenz von *nink-* »sich satt trinken; sich betrinken« muss noch untersucht werden.

Ein uranatol. **has(s)-* »sich satt trinken« findet sofort Anschluss an eine lat. Sippe, wenn man vom *h-* absieht, das ja aus einem Laryngal enstand und in ausseranatolischen Sprachen spurlos schwindet.

Es handelt sich um das bekannte lat. Wortpaar *ēbrius* »trunken« und *sōbrius* »nüchtern (nicht betrunken), enthaltsam, besonnen«; das letztere wohl aus privativem **se-* »ohne« + abgetöntem **ōbrios*,[26] was auf ein recht grosses Alter der Gruppe hinweist. Vgl. dazu und zu etymologischen Versuchen Walde-Hofmann, *LEW.*[3] I 387 f. und 861 f.

Da das lat. *-b-* vor *-r-* auch aus idg. *-s-* entstanden sein kann,[27] wird man also unser *ēbrius*, **-ōbrios* aus vorurlat. **ēsrios*, **ōsrios* herleiten dürfen.

---

[26] Zum Typus der Komposita mit *o*-Abtönung im 2. Glied im Lateinischen vgl. lat. *terra* ~ *extorris* »landflüchtig, verbannt«, *tellūs* ~ *meditullium* »Binnenland usw.« < **-toll- und* Walde-Hofmann, *LEW.*[3] I 434; II 57.

[27] Vgl. Sommer, *Lat. Laut- und Formenlehre* 2–3 226.

In **ēs-* steckt also die Wurzel, die bedeutungsgeschichtlich so schön zu uranat. **has(s)-* passt, dass kein Zweifel an der Zusammengehörigkeit möglich ist.

Es bleiben übrig nur noch einige Nebenfragen:

a) morphologisch ist lat. **ēsrios* mehrdeutig. Es kann — und dies wird die beste Deutung sein — mittels des Suffix *-io-* aus einem Substantivum **ēsro-* »Trunkenheit« abgeleitet sein.

b) die genaue Festsetzung der indogermanischen Wurzel für »sich satt trinken« ist auch nicht möglich. Es kann eine leichte Basis sein, etwa **Hes-*, wobei im Anatolischen entweder mit **-o-* (weniger wahrscheinlich) oder mit schwachstufigem Vokal (»Schwa secundum«) gerechnet werden muss, im Lateinischen aber mit Vrddhi; oder es ist eine schwere Basis, etwa **Hēs-/ *Həs-*, woraus sich das lateinische *ē-* und das anatolische *-a-* unmittelbar erklären lassen. Die zweite Möglichkeit scheint mir geratener.

34. Heth. *āšš-*

»bleiben, übrig bleiben« ist ein athematisches Verbum und somit altes Erbgut: Präs. 3. Sg. *āš-zi*, 3. Pl. *āššanzi*, Prät. 3. Sg. *aš-ta*, Imper. 3. Sg. *āšdu*. Inf. I *āššuwanzi*, Part. *āššant-*. Vgl. Friedrich, *Heth. Wb.* 34 und *Heth. El.* I² 79-81. Keine Etymologie ist mir bekannt geworden.

Es wird sich hier um ein ursprachliches **ās-* handeln, wobei die Doppelschreibung des intervokalischen *-s-* im Hethitischen wohl mit Erscheinungen, die ich *Lingu.* VI (Ljubljana 1964), S. 49 f. behandelte, zusammenhängt, vgl. auch *hašša-* »Herd« zu lat. *āra*, osk. *aasai* »in ara«!

Ich vergleiche lat. *inānis* »leer, hohl, unbeladen; unnütz, vergeblich, eitel«, wozu Walde-Hofmann, *LEW*³. I 688 f. Nach den letztgenannten ist *inānis* in ein privatives *in-* + **ānis* zu zerlegen; wir haben also vor uns wohl ein Bahuvrīhi des Typus *in-ermis* »waffenlos«; das zweite Glied war ursprünglich also ein Substantiv **āno-* schwer zu bestimmender Bedeutung. Lautlich geht nun dies **āno-* ohne Schwierigkeit auf ein älteres **āsno-* zurück, das etwa als »Rest, das Übriggebliebene« zu unserem **ās-* »bleiben, übrigbleiben« zu stellen ist. *inānis* also ursprünglich »*restlos, wo nichts übriggeblieben ist«.

Zu bedauern ist, dass *-s-* nur im Hethitischen bezeugt ist. Aber eine Wurzelform, die nur im langen Vokal **ā-* bestünde, ist kaum vorstellbar, ein *ā-* + etwa das Aoristsuffix *-s-* ebenso kaum wahrscheinlich.

Somit können wir ein neues, athematisches Verbum fürs Urindogermanische ansetzen: **ās-ti* »bleibt übrig«.

Iorgu Iordan, LINGÜÍSTICA ROMÁNICA. EVOLUCIÓN — CORRIENTES — MÉTODOS. Reelaboración parcial y notas de Manuel Alvar. Ediciones Alcalá, Madrid, 1967; pag. XXII + 755.

Como se señala en la introducción, la presente obra de Iorgu Iordan es una reelaboración de la obra anterior del lingüista rumano, aparecida en su propia lengua en 1932. El mismo hecho nos convence de que las orientaciones del *Introducere în studiul limbilor romanice* son sólidas, como lo mostró claramente el éxito que tuvo la versión inglesa, hecha por John Orr antes de la segunda guerra mundial, a través de la cual la mayoría de los romanistas llegaron a conocer las ideas de Iordan. Reapareció la obra original, reelaborada, en 1957 y, nuovamente, en 1962. Esta última edición sirvió de base para la traducción alemana de W. Bahner.

La traducción del libro en español, traducción basada en la última edición rumana, también es fruto de una estrecha colaboración entre el autor y uno de los más importantes romanistas españoles, Manuel Alvar. No es una simple traducción la suya; su mérito radica también en la reelaboración de algunos capítulos, sobre todo de aquellos que se refieren a la materia española; con lo que se salva la laguna que la crítica encontró en Iordan reseñando muy favorablemente la traducción inglesa y lamentando que el desarrollo de la romanística en la Peninsula Ibérica no hubiera sido tratado proporcionalmente a su importancia.

La contribución de Alvar resultá tan importante que Iordan mismo no vacila en llamarle »... el coautor, en buena parte, de esta versión española«. Su contribución aparece ante el lector claramente reseñada entre paréntesis.

Se observa una tendencia a la claridad en el rígido método de Iordan. En la mayoría de los casos supera la máxima dificultad: la de presentar las ideas de un autor con un gran rigor, no confundiéndolas con las suyas y reservando sus opiniones críticas para el final. Su deseo de exponer con el máximo rigor las ideas de los lingüistas le obliga a que las citas en traducción española estén siempre acompañadas, excepto las en italiano, por la cita en original al final de la página.

Debemos estar agradecidos a Iordan también por su disposición metodológica que dá preferencia a las ideas. A pesar de que por este procedimiento encontramos a un autor en dos lugares, este método tiene la ventaja de hallar en un párrafo la presentación (y la crítica) de todos los estudios sobre un problema dado.

En la edición española, la materia está distribuida en cuatro grandes capítulos. En el primero, empezando con las reflexiones desarrolladas por Dante en el *De vulgari eloquencia,* Iordan analiza la lingüística románica (y,

según la necesidad, la indoeuropea) hasta inclusa la segunda mitad del siglo pasado. Resulta muy clara su exposición de la importancia del estudio de las ciencias naturales en lo que se refiere a la llamada escuela neogramática; Iordan muestra las contradicciones de su doctrina, pero reconoce aportaciones positivas, es decir la investigación de las hablas vivas, la observación directa de los hechos lingüísticos y la convicción acerca del importante papel del elemento psíquico en las innovaciones lingüísticas. Iordan subraya que el neogramaticismo no es una filosofía del lenguaje muerta, sino que había y hay todavía lingüistas que no rompen por completo con la doctrina neogramática.

En el capítulo segundo, Iordan analiza detalladamente las ideas de la escuela idealista y las de Karl Vossler en particular, dedicando al filólogo alemán unas setenta páginas. Iordan subraya la diferencia fundamental entre Croce, filósofo y no lingüista, quién se abstrae de la realidad de los hechos de la lengua, y Vossler, lingüista en primer lugar, aunque influenciado por la doctrina estética de Croce. A pesar de sus posiciones idealistas, Vossler se sitúa por completo en la realidad lingüística y valora un hecho lingüístico con critérios lingüísticos y no con los de un sistema apriorístico. La objeción principal que Iordan hace a la escuela idealista es que ésta desprecia el papel de la colectividad, disminuyendo su importancia y exagerando la del individuo. Según Iordan también está exagerada la importancia del elemento estético en la lengua y, con consecuencia, el carácter alógico de la lengua, pues Vossler no hace distinción entre *lengua* y *habla* en el sentido saussureano. Vossler y la escula idealista ofrecen, según la severa crítica de Iordan, »pocos aspectos positivos«: prestan especial atención al factor psíquico y, con esto, el interés por la sintaxis y la estilística (aunque ésta sea casi siempre idéntica a la crítica literaria).

El capítulo más amplio es el de la geografía lingüística. Iordan la define muy acertadamente como »el estudio cartográfico de las hablas populares«, considerándola justamente como un método, una disciplina lingüística, importante sin duda, pero no como una filosofía del lenguaje semejante a la positivista o a la idealista. Iordan muestra el valor de los mapas lingüísticos en los territorios de las lenguas románicas y discute sobre la importancia que tuvieron los datos recogidos para la lingüística general. Manuel Alvar enriquece esta parte con preciosos informes sobre los numerosos atlas regionales de España. Concluyendo el capítulo con una reseña de la doctrina neolingüística de Bartoli, Iordan considera que ésta representa una continuación de la escuela neogramática con modificaciones que provocaron las ideas de la geografía lingüística.

En el último capítulo están expuestas las ideas de la escuela lingüística francesa, empezando con las del *Curso de lingüística general* de Saussure. La crítica de los paralelismos saussureanos es profunda y exhaustiva. Iordan no reconoce la posibilidad de una rígida separación entre *lengua* y *habla*, no considera posible imaginarse la una sin la otra, puesto que las dos forman una unidad dialéctica, inseparable. El error más grave sería, dice Iordan, la idea de considerar *lengua* como una abstracción; se deduciría de una tal

idea que en la lengua no hay más que puras relaciones (la idea desarrollada por los glossemáticos). También opina Iordan que la conclusión final del *Curso* no es muy acertada (debemos añadir que actualmente hay duda sobre el verdadero contenido y hasta la paternidad de ésta; cfr. edición en italiano, *Corso di linguistica generale*, Bari, Laterza, 1968, pág. 465/6) puesto que hace creer que la lengua se debe estudiar en si misma y por consecuencia no tienen ningún interés otros factores, los llamados extralingüísticos (tiempo y espacio; situación del hablante); lo que, en realidad, es la manera de estudiar los hechos lingüísticos de algunas corrientes estructuralistas. Aún habiendo expresado opinión negativa sobre algunas ideas fundamentales de la doctrina saussureana, Iordan reconoce »que estas ideas se han convertido hoy en un bien común para la mayoría de los romanistas, indiferentemente de la escuela a la que pertenecen«.

Expresando la admiración por la imponente obra de Iordan, es preciso al mismo tiempo lamentar que el autor no ha ofrecido un análisis completo de las corrientes contemporáneas en la lingüística románica. La falta de un tal análisis la lamentó el mismo autor con ocasión del XI.o Congreso de estudios románicos en Madrid. Sus palabras en aquella ocasión no han sonado y no suenan en este libro demasiado optimistas: Iordan cree que la romanística se encuentra en una crisis; lamenta que la lingüística soviética sea poco o nada conocida y estudiada en Occidente (el hecho de aprovechar los estudios de las investigaciones lingüísticas en la Unión Soviética y de ofrecer una rica bibliografía de ellos es otro importante mérito de la *Lingüística Románica*), puesto que, según el autor, las ideas de los lingüistas rusos podrían contribuir a las nuevas posiciones teóricas, dando preferencia a la lengua sobretodo como al »producto de la vida humana colectiva«. Esta definición podría resultar unilateral: en teoría, por lo menos, tal orientación no favorecería más que investigación de los aspectos sociales en el lenguaje, apartando el elemento individual.

Mitja Skubic

Roland Barthes, IL GRADO ZERO DELLA SCRITTURA. Lerici editori, Milano, 1960, pag. 110.

La traduzione italiana segue di qualche anno l'originale francese. Per l'edizione in italiano Barthes stesso ha scritto una premessa in cui riassume il suo pensiero così: il linguaggio letterario mi è intollerabile, e tuttavia non posso uscirne.

La breve opera del Barthes merita una profonda riflessione non fosse altro che per l'introduzione di un terzo elemento nella dicotomia saussuriana. Barthes vede nel linguaggio umano tre aspetti: *lingua, stile* e *scrittura*. Un elemento saussuriano, *parola*, è scisso in due: *lo stile* (immagini, lessico, il periodare) è per Barthes l'elemento materiale che nasce dal passato dello scrittore, qualcosa che isola lo scrivente; *la scrittura*, invece, lo lega alla società e, se la scelta della scrittura è libera, è anche condizionata dalla storia e dalla tradizione: scegliendo una scrittura, chi scrive ha già premesso al testo il segno del suo impegno ideologico.

Da un tale punto di vista Barthes giudica le varie *scritture* nella storia della lingua francese. Due lo attirano più particolarmente, una è quella della politica, soprattutto quella marxista, l'altra quella del romanzo. Sono acute le sue osservazioni sulla sparizione della »neutralità« o addirittura »innocenza« delle parole in una scrittura politica, come ad es. *cosmopolitismo/ internazionalismo, frazionismo, deviazionismo,* oppure sulla voluta ambiguità dei termini come *democrazia, libertà.*

Un capitolo importante e impegnato (non per niente Barthes stesso parla di »... un'ossessione, movimento che intralcia sempre molto la comunicazione« e B. Terracini in *Analisi stilistica,* p. 84, invece, di »certi conflitti /tra la tradizione della lingua e la tradizione segnata dalle sue correnti letterarie/ ... esasperati addirittura, e messi crudamente in luce da un libretto cosí appassionato come *Le degré zéro de l'écriture* di R. Barthes) è dedicato alla *scrittura* del romanzo. Il Romanzo, dice l'autore, è un prodotto caratteristico della società borghese, e menziona, poi due elementi (»gesti inevitabili«) tipici del Romanzo: il passato remoto e la terza persona nel verbo. Ci lascia perplessi la spiegazione sull'uso di quest'ultima che sarebbe giustificato in Cesare, giustificato nel Balzac, ma una pura convenzione nel Flaubert. E si rimane scettici soprattutto sulla spiegazione riguardo all'uso del passato remoto. Secondo Barthes »Scaduto nel linguaggio parlato, il passato remoto, pietra angolare del Racconto, è sempre il segnale di un'intenzione artistica; fa parte di un rituale delle Belle Lettere. Non ha piú il compito di esprimere un tempo. Il suo ruolo è di riportare la realtà a un punto e di astrarre, dalla molteplicità dei tempi vissuti e sovrapposti, un puro atto verbale ... Il passato remoto *significa* una creazione ... Anche se usato nel piú grigio realismo ... il verbo esprime un atto chiuso, definito, sostantivato ...« (pag. 44—46).

Questa analisi del valore del passato remoto è criticabile per molti aspetti. Oltrepassa decisamente i limiti della realtà linguistica e chiama in causa molti elementi extralinguistici. Leggendo tali pagine non possiamo non richiamare in mente la visione idealistica sulle sorti del *passé simple* e *passé composé* di un Vossler il quale legava la fortuna delle due forme preteritali a due diverse concezioni dell'uomo medievale e dell'uomo moderno; visione seducente, fin che si vuole, ma non corrispondente alla realtà linguistica. E se Barthes obiettasse che i fatti di lingua non sempre sono spiegabili con ragioni linguistiche, si potrebbe dire che, infatti, una spiegazione extralinguistica può chiarire un problema linguistico, ma non può in nessun caso prescindere dal fatto linguistico. Barthes non si domanda per qual ragione la forma composta del preterito si sia sostituita a quella semplice, ed è nel suo giusto: un'analisi sincronica non è interessata a indagare perché una forma verbale esista e un'altra no, le preme solo di constatarne i valori. Ma l'esplicita constatazione del Barthes è che il passato remoto sarebbe scaduto nel linguaggio parlato; e, parlando della versione italiana, una tale asserzione deve necessariamente lasciarci sorpresi; ammettiamo pure che *le passé simple* sia forma morta per il francese parlato, tuttavia, anche per i passi laddove lo troviamo, e fosse anche solo nella letteratura, è difficile accettare l'opinio-

ne che »non avesse piú il compito di esprimere un tempo« e che sia eventualmento una scelta stilistica, scelta che, poi, caratterizza uno stile ormai superato. Nella versione italiana, invece, tale idea stona, perché Barthes, pur citando sempre esempi francesi, parla del fenomeno come se fosse una specie di *universale* o almeno per niente limitato al francese. Nell'italiano, infatti, il passato remoto è una forma in vigore cosí nel linguaggio medio come in parecchi dialetti. Avendo preso in considerazione altre lingue romanze, Barthes avrebbe potuto evitare questa conclusione frettolosa, limitando il fenomeno alla storia della lingua francese, e anche per la situazione nel francese avrebbe forse attenuato il giudizio su una forma verbale che per complesse ragioni è stata scavalcata da un'altra; la qual forma può aver in uno scrittore o in una intera generazione solamente il valore impressivo (essere elemento della *scrittura,* appunto), ma sarebbe un errore sforzarsi di voler trovare tale valore in qualsiasi impiego del passato remoto.

Mitja Skubic

Nous avons le plaisir de reproduir ici une circulaire que nous avons reçu de l'OFINES, Madrid:

Esta en preparación por la Officina Internacional de Información y Observación del Español (OFINES), »El Anuario del Español«, una de cuyas secciones estará destinada a información biobibliografica de las personas dedicadas al estudio y enseñanza del idioma español en el mundo.

Agradeceriamos a dichas personas su colaboración, enviando a OFINES (Instituto de Cultura Hispánica), Avda de los Reyes Católicos s/n, Madrid (3), España, una ficha completada con los datos que se solicitan en el siguiente modelo:

Apellidos .....
Nombre .....
País .....
.....
Fecha de nacimiento .....
Lugar de nacimiento .....
Nacionalidad .....
LIBROS PUBLICADOS (Fichas bibliográficas completas).

Tambien agradeceriamos a nuestros lectores, sobre todo aquellos que trabajan en paises todavía no publicados en la sección »Anuario del Español« de la revista Español Actual, que nos proporcionaran nueva información, o bien adiciones o correcciones a lo ya publicado en dicha sección en relación con los siguientes puntos:

I) Instituciones de Interés Lingüístico Hispánico
II) Bibliotecas de Interés Lingüístico Hispánico
III) Universidades y Colegios Universitarios

VSEBINA

SOMMAIRE