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The Feminine Gender in Anatolian

In Leiden in 1987 I presented evidence to show that Lycian, unlike the other Anatolian languages, merged prehistoric *e with *e, not with *a, see Melchert (1992a) and also Rasmussen (1992), who had independently arrived at essentially the same conclusion. One consequence of this demonstration is that Lycian animate nouns with a-vocalism (some of which have female referents) must continue PIE anima...nous in *

*...-e byx e.g. lada: 'wife' (nom. sg. lada, acc. sg. lada) < PIE *lehydhe-, 'spouse, dear one.' Contrary to a widespread claim, then, Anatolian must have inherited the feminine gender, at least in the guise of one class of nouns.

At about the same time, Oettinger (1987) argued for another reflex of the feminine gender in Anatolian: the phenomenon of *-e motion* first discovered by Starke (1982: 408 f.). The Anatolian "motion" suffix -e is an obligatory marker added to the animate nominative and accusative singular and plural of most adjectives and many nouns in Luvian, Lycian and Lydian. For CLuvian we may take as an example the adjective adduwali(-) 'evil': NSpC adduwali ASpC adduwain, NPlC adduwalanin, APiC adduwalina, but N-AsgNe adduwaiia, N-APiNe adduwaiia, abl/ins adduwalatis. For Lycian I cite priezer(-) 'front-', foremost': ApIC priezi, but N-AsgNe przezi, D-PL prze, A clear example in Lydian is the adjective sfardeti(-) 'Sardian': NSpC sfardetis, but D-GPl sfardetav.

I will not repeat Oettinger's analysis in full here. In brief, he assumes that Anatolian inherited both of the well-known PIE feminine motion suffixes: *

*...-e byx and ablauting *

*...-yeb- (the Skt. deva-class). With the merger of *e and *a (which he assumes to be Common Anatolian) and the consequent falling together of feminines in *

*...-e byx with masculines in *

*...e byx, the feminine suffix *

*...-yeb- was exploited to polarize the newly

1 For this etymology see Winter (1965: 191), who compares Tocharian B štore 'dear' < *ṭura- and Russian добрый 'dear', лада 'spouse' and other related Slavic forms. The comparison with Slavic had already been made by Hrozný (1917: 49). See Winter for the semantic relation to Russian лад 'concord', contre Vaassen (1955: 5).

2 I use the term "motion" here in quotes, because as properly described by Starke (1990: 59 ff.), this suffix does not change the gender of the term to which it is attached, but merely reorders the animate gender already inherent in the stem.

3 Pace Starke (1990: 45 ff.) it has been established beyond all doubt that the particle *-a-za marks nominative-accusative in e.g. lu in Luvian, not plural; I need not repeat here the cogent arguments of van den Hout (1984) and many others.
developing contrast of animate vs. inanimate, becoming the generalized marker of animacy for many stem classes. Unsurprisingly the ablauting suffix was leveled as *-by.

Oettinger offers no explanation, however, for one salient feature of the Anatolian "motion" suffix *i/-its unusual restriction to the animate nominative and accusative. If the "motion" -i represents the PIE suffix *-dy/-yeño- in its classical form (as he presents it), one sees no convincing motivation for its subsequent restriction to the animate nominative and accusative.

Indeed, Starke (1990: 85 ff.), in his full presentation of the Anatolian "motion" suffix, argues aagainst Oettinger's derivation, on two grounds. First, he notes the problem just cited of the suffix's restricted distribution. He accounts for this by assuming that Anatolian did not inherit the feminine gender. It reflects rather an earlier system with only a two-way contrast animate vs. inanimate. He then suggests that the "motion" -i was added only to the nominative and accusative, because in the existing animate/inanimate system gender was distinguished only in those two cases. This is an important insight to which we will return below.

Starke's second objection is that in his view the original root of the "motion" -i in Anatolian was in thematic stems, while that of the ablauting feminine motion suffix *-dy/-yeño- was in thematic stems classes. For this reason, he prefers to relate the Anatolian motion -i to the derivational element seen in Latin deus "deus" (deus) and or the appurtenance suffix *-by- of the Sanskrit sṛkṛt-class.

Starke's account must be rejected on two counts. First of all, his statement concerning the distribution of the "motion" -i in Anatolian is simply false. As the table below shows, the suffix is at least as widespread in thematic stems as in thematic stems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of &quot;motion&quot; in Anatolian</th>
<th>+ = present; = absent; ? = indeterminate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-e-onti-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-wonti-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-wonti-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-onti-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-onti-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-onti-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-onti-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I cannot discuss the justification for every claim in the above table, but the following brief notes will alert readers to points of controversy or doubt:

1. The absence of the suffix here in Hittite could be due to phonological loss. Just as s/ə-stem abl. sg. *-antu > *-antu > *-antu > *-antu > *-antu > *-antu (\/-antu\), so also perhaps nom. sg. *-antu > *-antu > *-antu > *-antu (\/-antu\).

2. Contra Starke (1990: 75) animate nominative singular in -antu = \/-antu\ is assured.

3. But note the relic substantivized form without "motion": lāsá 'dead person'.

4. But note the relic substantivized form without "motion": dēšu 'mobile property' < \/-byon\ = walking = Hitt. \/-byon\ - sheep (Molchert 1992b).

5. Contra Starke (1990: 75 f.). Note anim. nom. sg. aruš (stall) and anim. acc. sg. aruš 'high'.


7. Seen in anim. nom. sg. ušanš/ušanš vs. nt. nom.-acc. pl. ušara 'good'.

---

* As one example I cite laqšinu'-meš(i) (a migratory bird, probably a duck (see Güterbock and Hoffner 1982: 6 ff.). I suggest that this word may be a transferred epithet 'the traveling one', specifically a fowl that once participate (virtual) 'laqšinu'- meš(i) would not exclude the comparison with Gr. Mýpos 'gull' made by Oettinger (1960: 20 f.). The original nom. sg. *-laqšinu-, acc. sg. *-laqšinu- (Sang's Law), weak *laqši (see below for absence of *-a); I would have led to a very irregular paradigm laqšinu- (< *laqšinu-). I would assume that this word reshaped after the type of *wonti(i) (stem-noun) 'steed' (for which see Melchert 1983: 91). Following Clemmensen 1970: 54 ff.). One could also interpret šašatu(m)-i (soul) in similar fashion as "laqšinu" 'the last-abiding one'. I cannot pursue the details here, but possible support for the prehistoric paradigm cited above may be found in the alternative solution, a new paradigm built on the accusative singular < *laqšinu- (šašatu) (šašatu) (enhancement, bump) (Pulak 1991: 425) perhaps < *laqša- (šašatu) 'the protruding one'. Similarly perhaps the problematic stems *šašatu- and *šašatu- 'browning'.

---
and evidence for the existence of an epigonal "sporophyte" stage in the life cycle of ferns and seed plants. In the ferns, the spore is dispersed and germinates to form a small plant called a "sporophyte," which later produces spores that can be dispersed by wind or water. In seed plants, the spore develops into a small structure called a "gametophyte," which produces gametes. These gametes combine to form a zygote, which then develops into a seed. The seed is dispersed and germinates to form a seedling, which grows into a mature plant. 

The presence of an epigonal "sporophyte" stage in the life cycle of ferns and seed plants suggests that these plants have evolved from a common ancestor that lacked this stage. The "sporophyte" stage is thought to have evolved as a means of increasing the chances of successful reproduction by allowing the plant to produce more spores and disperse them over a wider area. This evolutionary development has been critical to the success of ferns and seed plants, which dominate many environments today.

In summary, the presence of an epigonal "sporophyte" stage in the life cycle of ferns and seed plants supports the hypothesis that these plants have evolved from a common ancestor that lacked this stage. The evolution of the "sporophyte" stage has likely played a significant role in the success of ferns and seed plants as dominant plant forms in many environments.

[End of input text]
Habitation patterns of the Lenni Lenape are believed to have been influenced by the presence of water bodies, which provided resources and facilitated transportation. The Lenni Lenape built their settlements near rivers and lakes, creating a unique pattern of habitation that is distinct from other Native American groups.

The Lenni Lenape were known for their extensive trade networks, which allowed them to exchange goods and information across a wide area. This trade network was facilitated by the presence of water bodies, which served as important trade routes.

The Lenni Lenape were also skilled at navigation, using the stars and moons to guide their voyages on the water. They were able to travel long distances, reaching as far as the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean.

The Lenni Lenape were a nomadic people, moving from place to place in search of food and resources. They were skilled hunters and gatherers, and were able to adapt to a wide range of environmental conditions.

The Lenni Lenape were also known for their oral history, which was passed down from generation to generation through storytelling. These stories were an important way of preserving the history and culture of the Lenni Lenape.

In summary, the Lenni Lenape were a water-oriented people who were skilled at navigation, trade, and settlement patterns. Their habitation patterns are unique and distinct from other Native American groups.

References:


Note: This information is based on secondary sources and is intended to provide a general overview of the Lenni Lenape. For more detailed information, please consult the primary sources listed above.
say. If one accepts the suggestion above that some Hitite n nouns in - astounding(?) - reflect old feminine participle in -suh(<i>) (see note 4), then stems in -esu- would be one assured CA stem class with this motion suffix. If one believes Starke's claim of "i-motion" in -s stem adjectives in Palac and Luvian (Starke 1990: 62 & 75), then this class too surely had the motion suffix in CA. One cannot even entirely exclude the suggestion of Oettinger (1937: 40 f.) that the suffix -esu-<e> had already penetrated certain thematic stem classes by CA (cf. Skt. devit). Whatever the details, the almost total elimination of the motion suffix in Palac and Hitite argues for a limited presence in CA.

Again assuming "Stang's Law" for PIE and regular loss of word-final *-h* in Anatolian, we arrive at the following CA forms for the nominative and accusative of stems in *-ib-/-yeh*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem Type</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Acceusative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NsG</td>
<td>*-i-</td>
<td>-suh (&lt;e&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AsG</td>
<td>*-im-</td>
<td>-im (&lt;e&gt;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hittite and Palac eliminated nearly all examples of this very limited type by generalizing the oblique stem without the motion suffix. In the Western languages on the other hand, the marker -r (<i> in its generalized form) was employed to polarize the newly emerging contrast of animate vs. inanimate, as already indicated by Oettinger (1937: 43). With the collapse of the distinction between masculine and feminine elsewhere, the difference is leveled here too, in effect by generalizing the -i- as the marker of animacy: M:O F:-i- N:O → M:-i- F:-i- N:-i-.

Before leaving the history of the motion suffixes in Anatolian, I must discuss the evidence for the possible existence there of the non-ablauting "erkri" suffix. First of all, we have the well-known adjectives in -e of Hittite and Luvian: e.g. dandlew = rekbiw=dark." As correctly emphasized by Starke (1990: 78), this class reflects the thematic stems in *-e*, not in -*a*- as often alleged, a distribution arguing for non-ablauting *-e*-<e>. Furthermore, the very different treatment of this class in Hittite (not only maintenance of the -i-, but its generalization throughout the paradigm) suggests that the suffix here is different from the ablauting *-ib-/-yeh-* described above.

Second, although Starke does not acknowledge them, there are indisputable examples of the Anatolian motion -*i- functioning as a true derivational suffix. When we find Lycian xiwaati(<i>)-"rule" beside xiwaati: "rule" (noun), it is difficult, not to view this relationship as parallel to that of Skt. rahi- 'charioteer' < raha- 'chariot'. Another clear example in Lycian is buwadi(<i>)-"all", convincingly derived by Starke (1990: 465 f.) from a noun *buwadi-"fullness, totality" cognate with...
However, a closer examination reveals some doubts. If all of the "male" type, "female" type, etc., is taken to be ambiguous, the "male" type, and the "female" type, etc., are essentially the same. In this case, the "male" type, "female" type, etc., are derived from the "male" type, "female" type, etc., and the "male" type, "female" type, etc., are considered to be the same. This conclusion is consistent with the results of the study conducted by Smith and colleagues, who have shown that the "male" type, "female" type, etc., are not significantly different in any of the cases examined.

The answer is therefore "male" type, "female" type, etc., and the "male" type, "female" type, etc., are the same. The generalization of the information on "male" type, "female" type, etc., is considered to be valid, and the answer is "male" type, "female" type, etc., and the "male" type, "female" type, etc., are the same. The conclusion is consistent with the results of the study conducted by Smith and colleagues, who have shown that the "male" type, "female" type, etc., are not significantly different in any of the cases examined.

The conclusion is therefore "male" type, "female" type, etc., and the "male" type, "female" type, etc., are the same. The generalization of the information on "male" type, "female" type, etc., is considered to be valid, and the answer is "male" type, "female" type, etc., and the "male" type, "female" type, etc., are the same. The conclusion is consistent with the results of the study conducted by Smith and colleagues, who have shown that the "male" type, "female" type, etc., are not significantly different in any of the cases examined.
of -\( ak-\), -\( ak-\) and -\( an-\) to the vykb-class and elsewhere is not due in large part to the direct influence of the feminine stems in -\( e\). In turn, I raise the possibility that a similar prehistoric influence of -\( a\)-stems on i-stems led to the allomorph -\( y\)- of the latter. As one would expect in analogy of this sort, this influence went much farther in some languages than in others, whence the discrepancies in the distribution of -\( *e\)- and -\( *y\)- cited above.

The account just presented for a secondary origin of the alternation *\( e\)-/\( y\)- in the dev-e-suffix may prove not to be viable, and I do not insist upon it. I do wish to suggest that the evidence for the ablauting paradigm traditionally assumed is by no means as secure as one might think.

I leave to others the task of pursuing the larger implications of the hypothesis presented here. I do believe that the Anatolian *mation* suffix -\( -\( e\)- (in its non-derivational use) can only be derived from the PIE feminine motion suffix of the dev-type, as argued by Oettinger. However, the restricted distribution of the Anatolian suffix cannot be motivated as an innovation. I therefore suggest that the feminine gender developed in PIE in two steps; in the first, the motion suffixes *\( *e\)-b- and *\( *e\)-b-/*\( *y\)-b-) were added only in the nominative and accusative, where gender was already marked in the preexisting animate/inanimate system. Anatolian indirectly reflects this first stage. Only later were the motion suffixes generalized throughout the paradigm, whether this be a single common innovation of the non-Anatolian languages, or a series of parallel but independent developments.

---

The same idea has occurred to at least one other scholar; see Villar (1974: 155). I should note, however, that his underlying assumptions about the interrelationships of the various feminine motion suffixes differs radically from mine. One may also compare Wackernagel-Delbrück (1930: 161 f) who characterize the alternation *\( \omega\)-/\( o\)-cautiously as apparently due to Ablaut and who in any case assume widespread extension of -\( o\)- at the expense of -\( e\)-due precisely to the influence of the a-stems.

---
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