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I am pleased to be able to offer the following lines as a small token of appreciation to Jan Pihel for his many contributions to Hittite and Indo-European studies nus-naš-DINGIR, MEŠ-eš namma dalagaut MUKAM IHI A-at batlattar=a pltkandu. Recent advances in our understanding of the Anatolian languages besides Hittite since Oettinger (1979) make it worthwhile to revisit the topic of denominative verbal formations in Anatolian. I will focus in what follows on one class in particular, but it seems useful to place the problem in its overall context.

1. STATIVES IN *-eh- AND FIENTIVES IN *-eh-. These are represented in Hittite by examples such as dam matte, ‘be empty’ and dammati, ‘become empty’ < dammata ‘empty’. This class was established for Hittite by Watkins (1973:51ff). For supporting evidence see Melchert (1984a:321, 42f) and note now the concession by Oettinger (1992:225). No trace of these has yet been found elsewhere in Anatolian. The development of *eh₂ to a in Luvian, Lydian and Lydian (Melchert 1989a:40f; 1984:398) and the change *s(t) > h in Lycian would have made these classes hard to identify if they survived.

2. FACTITIVES IN *m(e)ja-. As described by Oettinger (1979:249ff), this type is quite productive in Hittite, which shows examples such as bargi:nu, ‘whiten’ < bargi- ‘white’, beside the archaic type of tepnu- ‘belittle’ < teput- ‘little’ (cf Skt dabhnare ‘harms’, with Oettinger 1979:164ff). This class is also attested in C-Luvian, where it is usually thematized by back-formation from the third plural: e.g. därana- ‘?’ (sense unclear, but necessarily denominative, based on the shape). One unexplained detail is the unexpected gemination of the suffixal -n: JUST WHEN THE SUFFIX IS NOT EXTENDED BY -a: contrast iterative balatmu: ‘purify’ < bâldū₃(i) ‘pure’. Some Lydian stems in -mo- also continue factitives in *m(e)ja-: see Oettinger (1978:77) and Melchert (1992:52).
3. FACTITIVS IN *eh₂.-. These are preserved in the productive Hittite class in aḫḫ₂-, as in nûwâh₂- ‘make new’, compared correctly already by Kuryszkowicz (1927:102) with Lat. (re)movere. The matching type in CLuvian is represented by examples like tārā- ‘pierce’ (or sim.) < tårāti (a tool): NB: Pret 3sg tårāta, Inv 3sg tårātadda. Likewise in Lycian we find pîrînawa ‘build’ (Pret 3sg pîrînawâzdâ) < pîrînawa- ‘house’. It is crucial to distinguish this class from those discussed below. The key feature is the consistently untenited state of the endings, with CLuvian -t- and Lycian -t̂, as given above. Contrary to some claims, this shows that the change of tautosyllabic *eh₂- to *ē < *ē, took place only AFTER the lenition (or voicing) of stops and *ē, following accented long vowels in Proto-Anatolian (the first lenition rule of Eichner 1973:79f). Note the corroboration evidence of the synchronically isolated CLuvian samâddadda ‘has stepped/arrived’ < *ṭe[i]h₂-tō (Morpurgo Davies 1987:218) I have argued that Hittite verbs with present third singulars in -at such as bīsaita just continue the same type (Melchert 1992:44f).

4. DENOMINATIVES IN *-ye₁₀.-. As per Oettinger (1979:343 ff), this type is rampant productive in Hittite, as elsewhere in Indo-European, and indeed to all varieties of nominal stems. As he also shows (1979:330f), many Hittite verbs in -w處/较为 likewise reflect *u-ye₁₀- with regular loss of intervocalic *e: e.g. ṣukrūwela ‘to water’.

Unsurprisingly, this is the one denominative formation which is secure for all other Anatolian languages as well: Palaiç ḫâ(i)ya- ‘apportion’ < luki- ‘portion’; CLuvian ḫt̂(p)jâ(k)ar(r)í- ‘distrain’ < *tt̂(p)jaltar *-[se]zing and šahâni- ‘impose s. upon’ < *ṭahânum (Rosenkranz 1952:71); Lycian ṣâbâni- < ṣâbē < *ṭâbāni, ṣâbâni- ‘harm(s)’. The ad hoc univocalization ‘protect’ < sature-tar ‘protector’ (Melchert 1992:47f; cf already Oettinger 1978:87).

One should note, however, that the Lydian present third person in -ad̂ points toward < *-yêti < *yêti, Hittite pattern must be analagous to the root-accented type of Hitt wemîyêzzi.
of the singular (e.g., *gatsthāti 'crushes'), versus the unlenited endings of *tāra- -ē <*eh₂- cited above. For this identification (without the phonological details) see already Oettinger 1979:563.

6. DENOMINATIVES FROM *-STEMS IN *-e-yel-o. Oettinger (1979:237f) denies the existence of this type in Hittite, claiming that the latter replaced this class with *-o-yel-o (see further below). In Melchert (1984a:36) I argued that there are remnants of denominative *-e-yel-o in Hittite, but the evidence remains very slim and controversial. Whatever the status of the Hittite examples, I now believe that such thematic denominatives are well-attested in Luvian and Lycian, in the type of Pres Sg -illi-illi beside PresPI *aitn-i-iti.

The existence of this distinct class was demonstrated by Morpurgo Davies (1982:83:266ff), who stresses the fact that it is always the LENTED PresSg -illi-iti which occurs in the same paradigm as PresPI *aitn-i-iti. This contrasts with UNLENTED -itti beside expected plural -itti. She correctly recognizes the latter type as simple stems in *-yel-o, as per above. Pace Starke (1900:passim), there is no suppletion between stems in -i- and those in -é.

We are dealing with two completely distinct classes. Morpurgo Davies (1982:83:267f) reasonably tries to identify the peculiar -illi-, -aitn type with Hitt. -ullogi (the most productive class of denominatives in Hittite). As she points out, the lenition in the third singular ending could be due to either of the lenition rules of Eichner cited above, depending on the chronology. The problem, however, is to explain the vocalism -i- of the third singular, starting from a sequence *-eh₂-yel-o. By anyone's account, this should give in the first instance a long diphthong *-ay, which we would hardly expect to lead to simple long i- (Morpurgo Davies offers no supporting evidence).

I therefore propose that these verbs instead continue thematic denominatives in *-e-yel-o. In the third singular the unlaute cited above leads to *-eyī, whence contraction to *-e- and then regularly Luv.-Lycian (long) -āt (<i *kei; 'lie' > CLuv *zī-Lyc si-). In the plu-

1Readers will have noticed, however, that the expected inherited denominative accentuation *-e-yēti will not explain the lenited ending in -illi-iti (cf. the consistently unlenited -itti- *-yēti in section 3 above). One must assume rather that the accent was retracted already in Proto-Anatolian after the iterative deverbal type in *-ē eyel-o (cf. the same analogical development in Sanskrit, where denominatives in -āyati eventually become -dāyati after the corresponding it-eratives). A Proto-Anatolian *-eyetī was, of course, subject to the lenition rule between unaccented vowels cited earlier, whence *-eyetī and development to -illi-iti as per above.

If my analysis of these denominatives is correct, we would expect to find at least some examples of the iteratives which I allege served as the model for the accent retraction. These verbs should be indistinguishable in their inlection from the denominatives. I believe there are two solid examples: (1) CLuvian wēti-wēt-ai- 'oppress, crush' (for the sense see Starke 1990:549) in *wōsēye-lo; Miyian wēl- /wēel- is surely an exact cognate, although the meaning cannot be demonstrated; (2) CLuvian tēti-tēt-ai-, HLVian tu-pi- (singular) and Lycian tēb-i-tēb- "strike" < *sēti-dῆye-lo (cf. for the root shape Gk ἐρῆμελ[ά]ζω). Assuming that either of these is denominative to a root noun would be entirely gratuitous.

I believe that the evidence of the matching iteratives corroborates my derivation of the denominatives in -illi-aitn from thematic *-e-yel-o, with analogical retraction of the accent. I have argued in Melchert (1992:46f) that Lydian verbs in -ēd furnish correspondents for both types. Note that the lenited ending -ēd also supports the accent retraction claimed for the Luv.-Lycian class. For the real Luvov
Lyric cognizes of Hittite denominatives in \( \text{a}^{\circ}\cdot b \rightarrow \text{a}^{\circ}\cdot \text{b} \).
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Zu einigen Pronominalformen des Hethitischen

ERICH NEU
Ruhr-Universität Bochum

EINLEITUNG

0.1 Nicht alle in hethitischen Texten bezeugten Pronominalformen sind hinsichtlich ihrer grammatischen Bestimmung unumstritten. Mitunter stellt sich auch noch die Frage nach der richtigen Lesung.

0.2 Unter Heranziehung zunächst recht disparat anmutender Pronominalformen gelang Laroche (1979:147ff.; 151) die Restituitierung eines archaischen Pronominalparadigmas, dessen Deixisfeld auf der Vokaltria in idg.*-
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