

## CONTENTS

<i>The editors</i>	
PREFACE	1
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS BY FREDERIK KORTLANDT	3
<i>Адриан Барентсен</i>	
О СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНОМ ИЗУЧЕНИИ ОГРАНИЧИТЕЛЬНЫХ ВРЕМЕННЫХ СОЮЗОВ СЛАВЯНСКИХ ЯЗЫКОВ	23
<i>Robert S.P. Beekes</i>	
PALATALIZED CONSONANTS IN PRE-GREEK	45
<i>Uwe Bläsing</i>	
TALYSCHI RĪZ 'SPUR' UND VERWANDTE: EIN BEITRAG ZUR IRANISCHEN WORTFORSCHUNG	57
<i>Václav Blažek</i>	
CELTIC 'SMITH' AND HIS COLLEAGUES	67
<i>Johnny Cheung</i>	
THE OSSETIC CASE SYSTEM REVISITED	87
<i>Bardhyl Demiraj</i>	
ALB. RRUSH, ON RAGUSA UND GR. ΡΩΞ	107
<i>Rick Derksen</i>	
QUANTITY PATTERNS IN THE UPPER SORBIAN NOUN	121
<i>George E. Dunkel</i>	
LUVIAN -TAR AND HOMERIC Τ' ἈΡ	137
<i>José L. García Ramón</i>	
EREBTES UND ERSATZKONTINUANTEN BEI DER REKON- STRUKTION VON INDOGERMANISCHEN KONSTRUKTIONS- MUSTERN: IDG. *ǵʰeǵ- UND HETH. LĀḤU-ḤḤI 'GIESSEN'	151
<i>Eric P. Hamp</i>	
INDO-EUROPEAN *Sǵʰédʰlā	171
<i>Andries van Helden</i>	
IS CASE A LINGUIST OR A FREDERIK?	173
<i>Tette Hofstra</i>	
AUS DEM BEREICH DER GERMANISCH-OSTSEEFINNISCHEN LEHNWORTFORSCHUNG: ÜBERLEGUNGEN ZUR ETYMOLOGIE VON FINNISCH RYTÄKKÄ 'KRACH'	195

## CONTENTS

<i>Georg Holzer</i> STRUKTURELLE BESONDERHEITEN DES URSLAVISCHEN	201
<i>Wim Honselaar</i> REFLECTIONS ON RECIPROCITY IN RUSSIAN AND DUTCH	213
<i>László Honti</i> ‘TIBI LIBER EST’ ~ ‘HABES LIBRUM’ (BEMERKUNGEN ZUR HER- KUNFT DER HABITIVEN KONSTRUKTIONEN IM URALISCHEN)	229
<i>Peter Houtzagers</i> ON THE ČAKAVIAN DIALECT OF KOLJNOF NEAR SOPRON	247
<i>Petri Kallio</i> ON THE “EARLY BALTIC” LOANWORDS IN COMMON FINNIC	265
<i>Janneke Kalsbeek</i> THE QUANTITY OF THE VOWEL <i>I</i> IN STIPAN KONZUL’S KATEKIZAM (1564)	279
<i>Jared S. Klein</i> INTERROGATIVE SEQUENCES IN THE RIGVEDA	297
<i>Jorma Koivulehto</i> FRÜHE SLAVISCH-FINNISCHE KONTAKTE	309
<i>Leonid Kulikov</i> THE VEDIC TYPE <i>PATÁYATI</i> REVISITED: SEMANTIC OPPOSITIONS, PARADIGMATIC RELATIONSHIPS AND HISTORICAL CONNECTIONS	323
<i>Winfred P. Lehmann</i> LINGUISTIC LAWS AND UNIVERSALS: THE TWAIN...	343
<i>Alexander Lubotsky</i> VEDIC ‘OX’ AND ‘SACRIFICIAL CAKE’	351
<i>Ranko Matasović</i> THE ORIGIN OF THE OLD IRISH <i>F</i> -FUTURE	361
<i>H. Craig Melchert</i> PROBLEMS IN HITTITE PRONOMINAL INFLECTION	367
<i>Cecilia Odé</i> COMMUNICATIVE FUNCTIONS AND PROSODIC LABELLING OF THREE RUSSIAN PITCH ACCENTS	377
<i>Norbert Oettinger</i> AN INDO-EUROPEAN CUSTOM OF SACRIFICE IN GREECE AND ELSEWHERE	403

## CONTENTS

<i>Harry Perridon</i> RECONSTRUCTING THE OBSTRUENTS OF PROTO-GERMANIC	415
<i>Georges-Jean Pinault</i> TOCHARIAN FRIENDSHIP	431
<i>Адриана Полс</i> РОЖДЕНИЕ СЛОВАРЯ	453
<i>Arend Quak</i> ARCHAISCHES WÖRTER IN DEN MALBERGISCHEN GLOSSEN DER 'LEX SALICA'	469
<i>Jos Schaeken</i> NOCHMAL ZUR AKZENTUIERUNG DER KIEVER BLÄTTER	489
<i>Rüdiger Schmitt</i> ZU DER FREMDBEZEICHNUNG ARMENIENS ALTPERS. <i>ARMINA-</i>	499
<i>Patrick Sims-Williams</i> THE PROBLEM OF SPIRANTIZATION AND NASALIZATION IN BRITTONIC CELTIC	509
<i>Han Steenwijk</i> THE MICROSTRUCTURE OF THE <i>RESIANICA</i> DICTIONARY	527
<i>Michiel de Vaan</i> SANSKRIT <i>TRÍDHĀ</i> AND <i>TREDHĀ́</i>	543
<i>William R. Veder</i> NON SECUNDUM SCIENTIAM: READING WHAT IS NOT THERE	553
<i>Theo Vennemann gen. Nierfeld</i> <i>MÜNZE, MINT, AND MONEY: AN ETYMOLOGY FOR LATIN MONETA. WITH APPENDICES ON CARTHAGINIAN TANIT AND THE INDO-EUROPEAN MONTH WORD</i>	569
<i>Willem Vermeer</i> THE PREHISTORY OF THE ALBANIAN VOWEL SYSTEM: A PRELIMINARY EXPLORATION	591
<i>Jos J.S. Weitenberg</i> DIPHTHONGIZATION OF INITIAL <i>E-</i> AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF INITIAL <i>Y-</i> IN ARMENIAN	609

## PROBLEMS IN HITTITE PRONOMINAL INFLECTION

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

### 1. Introduction

Both the inflection and stem formation of Hittite pronouns continue to present serious problems for historical analysis. One factor contributing to our difficulties is the relatively poor attestation of pronouns in the other Indo-European languages of Anatolia, especially outside the nominative-accusative. We often cannot tell whether certain features already belong to Proto-Anatolian or are Hittite innovations. This limitation and others preclude any systematic account, but recent studies of pronouns from the viewpoint of both Hittite and Proto-Indo-European do open up new possibilities for explaining some of the peculiar details of Hittite pronominal inflection.

### 2. Hittite *ini*

Goedegebuure (2002/03) has confirmed earlier claims that the Hittite pronominal forms *aši*, *uni*, *i/eni*, *ed(an)i*, *etez* and *edaš* belong to a single paradigm, some form of which was already established in Old Hittite. Contrary to the previous standard view, however, she has shown that *aši* etc. is a third-person demonstrative pronoun with distal deixis 'yon', contrasting with first-person demonstrative *kā-* 'this, near me' and second-person demonstrative *apā-* 'that, near you'. An account of how *aši* acquired its attested value in Hittite must include the history of the two contrasting stems in Anatolian and cannot be undertaken here. I limit myself merely to the formal problem of the source of neuter nominative-accusative singular (and plural) *ini/eni*.

As per Goedegebuure (2002/03: 4<sup>14</sup> and 26), it is clear that *ini* is the older form (against Melchert 1984: 92).<sup>1</sup> As the only member of the paradigm with initial *i-*, it was trivially reshaped to *eni* in Neo-Hittite after *edani*,

---

<sup>1</sup> My claim there that *eni* is the Old Hittite form was erroneously based on instances in Neo-Hittite copies. The word does not occur in Old Hittite manuscripts, and the form in Middle Hittite manuscripts is consistently *ini*. In text citations I follow here the conventions of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary, using OH, MH, and NH to indicate respectively Old, Middle and Neo-Hittite compositions and OS, MS, and NS to indicate the respective dates of text copies.

*edaš* and *etez*. The initial *i-* of *ini* eliminates all previous etymologies (for references see Tischler 1983: 106-107): (1) a reshaped form of the demonstrative stem *\*eno-*; (2) an enlarged form of the pronominal stem *\*e-* (with *-ni* modeled on *uni*); (3) a particle *\*ēni* seen in the Greek and Latin interjections ἦν/ἦνιδε and *ēn* 'behold!' secondarily incorporated into the paradigm of *aši/uni*.

The parallel of animate nominative singular *aši* < *\*ós+ĩ* and animate accusative singular *uni* < *\*óm+ĩ* suggests that *ini* likewise reflects *\*im+ĩ*.<sup>2</sup> I propose that the preform *\*im* is the same as that seen in Old Latin *im* 'him' and Sanskrit accusative singular masculine *imám* 'this one'.<sup>3</sup> The attested use of Hittite *ini* as *neuter* nominative-accusative singular is not an obstacle. Compare Sanskrit *kím* 'what?' as the neuter nominative-accusative of interrogative *ka-* and the gender indifference of Greek accusative singular  $\mu\nu$  (Doric  $\nu\iota\nu$ ) 'him, her, it'. With Schmidt (1978: 150) and Beekes (1982/83: 214) I find it unlikely that forms ending in *\*-im* functioned as neuters already in PIE and assume that the attested use of *ini* is an independent innovation.<sup>4</sup> The lack of evidence from the other Anatolian languages leaves the details of this innovation beyond our reach.<sup>5</sup>

### 3. Allatives in *-atta*

The demonstrative stem *apā-* shows a form *apadda* (*a-pád-da*), attested in Neo-Hittite in the sense 'on that account', most often in the phrase *apadda šer*, but also occasionally alone: *nu=mu eni AWATE<sup>MEŠ</sup> apadda hatre[šker]* 'They wrote these words to me on that account' KUB 19.29 iv 15 (NH/NS).<sup>6</sup> In Middle Hittite we find *apadda* used in a concrete allative sense: *mān huwāi*

<sup>2</sup> For the derivation of *aši* and *uni* see Pedersen (1938: 60). The vocalism of the latter may be regular (contra Tischler 1983: 81). See Melchert (1994: 187) with references.

<sup>3</sup> For the presence of *\*im* in Proto-Anatolian in some form note Hittite *imma* and HLUvian *i-ma* (/imma/) 'indeed, truly', matching Latin *immō*.

<sup>4</sup> Tedesco (1945: 132ff.) argues that Sanskrit *kím* is a Middle Indic form seen in Palī *kiñ* alongside neuter nom.-acc. singular *tañ* and *yañ*, although the much earlier appearance of *kím* complicates this account. Tedesco also cites Meillet's formal comparison of Armenian *inč* 'something' with Sanskrit *kiñ cit*, while viewing these as independent creations. I am indebted to S. Insler for the reference to Tedesco's article.

<sup>5</sup> More specifically, we do not yet know how full a paradigm Proto-Anatolian had for the pronominal stem *\*(e)i-* reflected in Latin *is, im, id* etc. Nor the extent of the Proto-Anatolian paradigm for the pronominal stem *\*o/e-* and the distribution of the stem vocalism within it (e.g. was the neuter nom.-acc. singular *\*ed* or *\*od?*).

<sup>6</sup> See also KBo 4.12 obv. 11-12 (NH/NS). One also finds the variant *apaddan* (*šer*), with a secondary *-n*, for which compare *arḥaya(n)* 'separately'. These are both probably modeled after *anda/andan* (with Kronasser 1966: 351).

*kuiški* [*n=aš*] EGIR-*pa apadda uezzi* 'If someone flees, [and he] comes back there' (KUB 23.77:57-58, MH/MS).<sup>7</sup>

The stem *damāi-* 'other', which follows pronominal inflection in the non-direct cases, likewise shows a form *t/damatta* (*t/da-ma-at-ta*), attested in Middle Hittite in an allative sense: *nu=mu pittuliyai peran ištanzaš=miš tamatta pēdi zappiškezzi* 'Out of anxiety my soul drips from me to another place' (KUB 30.10 rev. 14-15, MH/MS).<sup>8</sup> In our one Old Hittite example *t/damatta* has a locative meaning: *mān=aš tamatta=ma KUR-e n=an tamētaš KUR-az uwatetten* 'But if he is in another country, bring him from another country!' (KUB 43.23 obv. 5, OH/OS).

The interrogative/relative stem *kui-/kuwa-* likewise has a matching form *kuwatta(n)*. It is attested only in Neo-Hittite manuscripts, but these include assured Old Hittite compositions: e.g. [*(ku)*]watta=*aš laḫḫa=ma paizzi* 'wherever he goes on campaign' (KBo 3.1+ i 5, OH/NS).<sup>9</sup> Neo-Hittite has *kuwatta šer* 'for what reason' (KUB 23.102 i 13) parallel to *apadda šer*.

For *damāi-* Neo-Hittite compositions show *t/damēda* instead of *t/damatta*: *tamē[(da)]=ma [(l)]ē kuiški aušzi* 'Let no one look elsewhere!' (KUB 21.42 i 12-13, restored after KUB 26.1a:9, NH/NS).<sup>10</sup> Likewise, we find once *apēda* for *apadda*: *nu karāwar=šet apēda lipšan* 'And his horn is \_\_ed for that reason' (KUB 31.4 obv. 19 + KBo 3.41 obv.! 18, OH/NS).

The forms *t/damēda* and *apēda* are regular from the synchronic point of view, consisting of an oblique stem *-ēd-* (cf. *damēdaz*, *damēdaš*, *apēdaš* etc.) plus the allative ending *-a*.<sup>11</sup> The functional alternates in *-atta* are aberrant in having *a*-vocalism and *-tt/-dd-* instead of *-t/-d-*. These two features are likely to be related. We know that voiced stops followed by *\*h<sub>2</sub>* appear as geminates in Hittite: *mēkk(i)-* 'much' < *\*mégh<sub>2</sub>-* and *pad-da-* 'dig' < *\*bhól/édhh<sub>2</sub>-* (see Melchert 1994: 76-77 after Pedersen and Jasanoff respectively). I suggest that the pronouns in *-atta* reflect *\*-ēd-h<sub>2</sub>o-*—the regular

<sup>7</sup> See also KUB 26.17 i 11 and KBo 17.65 rev. 26, both MH/MS.

<sup>8</sup> See also *dam[a]tta naiš* 'turned elsewhere' KUB 30.10 obv. 3 (MH/MS). The parallel text FHG 1 ii 9-10 (NS!) has *tamēda nāieš*.

<sup>9</sup> For *kuwattan* in a similar usage see KUB 1.1+ i 67 (NH/NS).

<sup>10</sup> See also KBo 3.6 iii 66-67 (NH/NS).

<sup>11</sup> Contra Neu (1974: 72) their prehistory may be quite different from their synchronic analysis. Once pre-Hittite had established a nominal inflectional system with allative in *-a* and dative-locative in *-i*, pronominal preforms with suffixes *\*-dhe* and *\*-dhi* (> *-da* and *-di*) could easily have been reanalyzed as having the endings *-a* and *-i*, leading to a new stem formant *-(e)d-* (for such a derivation of *-di* see Szemerényi 1956: 63 and Georgiev 1971: 65). On the other hand, the current pattern of attestation leaves open the possibility that the allatives in *-ēda* are merely analogical replacements of those in *-atta* after the general pattern of non-direct cases with stem *-ēd-*.

oblique pronominal stem in *-ed-* plus *\*-h<sub>2</sub>o* 'to; up against'.<sup>12</sup> An allative sense for *\*h<sub>2</sub>o* is seen in Greek ὀκέλλω 'drive to land' and in its variant *\*h<sub>2</sub>u* seen in Hittite *eḫu* 'come!' < *\*eīh<sub>2</sub>u* (Melchert 1994: 133, pace Dunkel 2002: 91).<sup>13</sup>

The derivation *-atta* < *\*-ēd-h<sub>2</sub>o* implies that the *\*h<sub>2</sub>* geminated the preceding voiced stop and that *\*ē* became *a* before a cluster of dental stop+*h<sub>2</sub>*. As per above, the gemination has good parallels. The putative conditioned change of *\*ē* to *a* requires justification.

The first issue is whether or not the *-ē-* of forms like *apēd-*, *kēd-* and *damēd-* even continues an accented short *\*ē*. In Melchert (1984: 67 & 142-143) I claimed that *-ēd-* continues *\*-oid-*, on the basis that prehistoric *\*Vi* led to a close long *\*ē* (distinct from inherited long *\*ē*) subject to raising to *ī* in late Neo-Hittite: e.g. late NH neuter nom.-acc. plural *kī* for *kē* and dat.-loc. singular *kīdani* for *kēdani*. None of the evidence I presented for the distinct vowel *\*ē* or a phonological raising rule is compelling (hence the caution in Melchert 1994: 145), and no new supporting data has appeared. The absence of any such change in the corresponding forms of the stems *apā-* and *kui-* (no NH *\*apīd-* or *\*kuid-*) argues strongly that the forms with *i*-vocalism in the case of *kā-* reflect generalization from the neuter nom.-acc. singular *kī*.<sup>14</sup> We may therefore derive pronominal *-ēd-* < *\*-ēd-* with regular lengthening in accented open syllable.<sup>15</sup>

The next question is whether *\*ē* could have become *a* before dental stop+*h<sub>2</sub>* in pre-Hittite. Such a change is comparable to that of *\*ē* to *a* before other sequences of coronal consonants plus *\*h<sub>2</sub>* in Hittite: *\*wēlh<sub>2</sub>-ti* > *walḫzi* 'strikes', *\*sēnh<sub>2</sub>-ti* > *šanḫzi* 'seeks', *\*térh<sub>2</sub>-o-* > *tarra-* 'be strong' (cf. Melchert 1994: 83).<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> The adverb *\*h<sub>2</sub>o* is most directly attested in Hittite *ḫašduēr* 'branch, twig, splinter' < *\*h<sub>2</sub>o-sd-wēr* (see Rieken 1999: 346-347). It is also the source of the Anatolian conjunction *\*-h<sub>2</sub>o* 'also, and' (Dunkel 1982/83: 198-199 and Melchert 1992: 46<sup>13</sup>). In deriving the pronominal allatives in *-atta* by means of *\*-h<sub>2</sub>o* I leave open the much vexed question of the source of the *nominal* allative ending. For varying opinions see among others Dunkel (1994: 19-22), Melchert (1994: 51 & 325 after Jasanoff), and Hajnal (1995: 98).

<sup>13</sup> The locative meaning in the Old Hittite example cited above is probably a trivial innovation (cf. the locative use of Latin *ad* or German *zu*), but I do not exclude the possibility that it is an archaism.

<sup>14</sup> As I conceded already (1984: 143), the change of *nē(y)a-* to *nīya-* 'turn' < *\*nēih<sub>2</sub>o-* may easily be due to analogy with the numerous verbal stems in *-iya-*.

<sup>15</sup> Some non-direct forms of the demonstrative stem with *-ē-*, however, do continue *\*-oi-*. The genitive plural ending *-enzan* reflects *\*-oi-n-sōm* (see Melchert 1994: 121 with references to Petersen, Milewski and others and for the source of the inserted nasal Oettinger 1994: 326).

The Hittite *hi*-verb *piddāi*- ‘flee’ may reflect a PIE root *\*peth<sub>1</sub>-* or *\*peth<sub>2</sub>-* (Oettinger 1979: 473 with note 33 and Jasanoff 2003: 95 with note 9). Jasanoff derives the Hittite verb from a preform *\*pteh<sub>1/2</sub>-*, which would make the form irrelevant for our purposes, but gives no account of the vowel of the first syllable. Anaptyxis in an initial cluster *\*pt-* is possible, but without parallels. If it could be motivated morphologically, an unaccented *\*peth<sub>1/2</sub>-* would likely lead to *pidd-* (cf. *irhā(i)-* ‘make the rounds of’ < *\*erh<sub>2</sub>éh<sub>2</sub>ye/o-* vs. *arāza* ‘outside’ < *\*érh<sub>2</sub>ti*). In any case, *piddāi*- ‘flee’ does not contradict a change *\*é > a* before stop+*h<sub>2</sub>*.

Direct positive evidence for the change is also lacking. The Hittite *hi*-verb *padda-* ‘dig’ reflects *\*bhódh<sub>2</sub>/**\*bhédh<sub>2</sub>-* (cf. Jasanoff 2003: 77), but the consistent spelling of the verbal stem with the sign *pá/íd-* makes it impossible to prove that the vocalism of the weak stem is /a/. Even if it is, it could result from generalization of the *o*-grade of the strong stem.

It thus seems fair to say that current evidence allows for but does not prove a change *\*é > a* before dental stop+*h<sub>2</sub>*. The hypothesis of such a change would permit a new account of the Hittite factual negative *natta* ‘not’, which has thus far defied etymological analysis (for a summary of proposals see Tischler 1991: 287-288). The crux of the problem is the *a*-vocalism of the first syllable: a preform *\*nétV* could yield only Hittite *\*nētV*, with preservation of *e*-vocalism and lengthening under the accent before a voiceless stop. Compare *\*wét-* > *wēt-* ‘year’ and *\*twék-* > *tuekka-* ‘body; limb’ (Melchert 1994: 133 and Kimball 1999: 132). As cogently argued by Dunkel (1982/83: 194), the attested syntactic behavior of *natta* makes highly implausible all attempts to circumvent the difficulty by attributing the change of *\*é* to *a* to a special development in unaccented position. There is not an iota of evidence that *natta* ever occurred unaccented.

Dunkel suggests rather a preform *\*nó-te* or *\*nó<sup>̄</sup>-te*, with *o*-grade of the PIE negative particle. However, accented short *\*ó* appears as long *ā* in Hittite before voiceless stop: e.g. *dākki* ‘resembles’ < *\*dókei* and *hāppar* ‘transaction’ < *\*h<sub>3</sub>óp<sub>ɸ</sub>* (Melchert 1994: 146 and Kimball 1999: 129-130). The negative is spelled phonetically more than fifty times in OS and more than a hundred times in total, always as *na-at-ta*. The complete absence of a “plene” spelling *\*na-a-at-ta* under these circumstances is not credible if the word were [na:tta]. We can only conclude that the negative was [natta]

<sup>16</sup> The example *mēkk(i)-* < *\*mēǵh<sub>2</sub>-* cited above suggests that there was no such change before dorsal stop+*h<sub>2</sub>*, but the complicated prehistory of this word (NB neuter nom.-acc. singular *mēk* < *\*mēǵh<sub>2</sub>* with regular loss of word-final laryngeal) makes its testimony about regular sound changes uncertain.



with short [a]. If we assume the change  $*\acute{e} > a$  before stop+ $h_2$  proposed above for the allatives in *-atta*, we may derive Hittite *natta* from  $*n\acute{e}-th_2oh_1$ , with the same adverbial formant as in Sanskrit *táthā* ‘thus’, *káthā* ‘how’, etc.<sup>17</sup>

There remains one more pronominal allative in *-tta* to be accounted for. Goedegebuure (2005) has shown that the reading of Hittite 1-*ētta* is *šīetta*, to the stem *šīa-*, whose meaning she has established as ‘one’ on other evidence (against the standard interpretation as a demonstrative). 1-*ētta* means ‘(in)to one, together’, as per Güterbock and Hoffner (1989: 361): *n=ašta UKÛ.MEŠ-tar 1-ētta nehhun* ‘I turned the populace into one’ = ‘united’ (KUB 21.37 obv. 17 (NH/NS), *nu=za dUTU-ŠI kuin NAM.RA INA É.LUGAL uwatenun n=aš anda 1-ētta 6 SIG<sub>7</sub> 6 LIM NAM.RA ēšta* ‘The civilian captives whom I brought into the palace were altogether 66,000’ (KBo 3.4 iii 32-33, NH/NS). Goedegebuure follows Melchert (1977: 376-377) in analyzing 1-*ētta* as an instrumental 1-*ēt* in the sense of ‘on/to one side’ (cf. OH *kēt* ‘on/to this side’) plus the conjunction *-a* ‘also, even’ (which geminates a preceding consonant). However, nothing in any of the contexts supports a meaning ‘even, also’. The sense of 1-*ētta* is that of an allative ‘(in)to one, together’, as per Güterbock and Hoffner.<sup>18</sup>

Eichner (1992: 39-40) has a similar formal analysis, but assigns 1-*ētta* to a unitary 1-*ašša* ‘(only) one single one, one and the same’ (cf. *kuišša* ‘each, every’). However, all of the examples he presents of the alleged unitary stem can be analyzed as merely ‘even/also one’. Furthermore, he does not account for how the sense ‘one and the same’ is derived from ‘also/even one’.<sup>19</sup> His analysis also does not explain why in Neo-Hittite the expression is not  $*1-edazziya$  or  $*1-ēzza$ .

Several forms of ‘one’ in Hittite follow pronominal inflection: e.g. genitive singular 1-*ēl*, dat.-loc. singular 1-*edani*, and also a regular allative 1-*eda*.

<sup>17</sup> I follow Dunkel (1988: 59 with note 27) in the analysis of the adverbial formant. Crucial is the evidence of Sanskrit aspirated *th* for a sequence  $*th_2$ .

<sup>18</sup> As acknowledged by Goedegebuure, there is also a serious formal problem in analyzing 1-*ētta* as containing *-a* with a sense ‘also, even’. The instrumental is moribund in Neo-Hittite. The only synchronic form for ‘on/to one side’ is 1-*ēz* (e.g. KUB 46.48 Vo 18) or 1-*edaz*, to which the form with *-a* ‘even’ would be 1-*ēzzi=ya*/1-*edazzi=ya*. One could assume that 1-*ētta* is a frozen form preserved from Old Hittite, but then there is no possibility that Neo-Hittite speakers could analyze it as containing *-a* ‘also, even’. If one attempts to derive the attested meaning of NH 1-*ētta* from OH 1-*ētt=a*, then one must explain how/why a form with the original sense ‘also on/to one side’ was preserved (but not 1-*ēt!*), but lost the meaning ‘also, even’.

<sup>19</sup> The real expression for ‘one and the same’ in Hittite is 1-*aš=pat*. See Güterbock and Hoffner (1995: 215-216 sub *-pat* 1.d).

We would therefore not be surprised to find an allative \*1-*atta* matching *apatta*, *kuwatta* and *t/damatta*.<sup>20</sup> The only discrepancy between the predicted form and attested 1-*ētta* is the vocalism. Goedegebuure's demonstration that the full reading is *šīētta* ([syé:tta]) now furnishes an explanation: the presence of the preceding yod preserved the original short \**ē* in \**syédh<sub>2</sub>o* which then underwent regular lengthening under the accent.<sup>21</sup> The attested meaning of 1-*ētta* /*šīētta* and the geminate -*tt*- do argue that it has the same derivational history as *apatta*, *kuwatta* and *t/damatta*. I hope to have made a persuasive case that these reflect a combination of the Hittite non-direct pronominal stem -*ed*- < \**ēd*- plus the adverb \**h<sub>2</sub>o* 'to, up against'.

*University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

#### REFERENCES

- Beekes, Robert S.P.  
 1982/83 "On Laryngeals and Pronouns". *KZ* 96, 200-232.
- Dunkel, George  
 1982/83 "IE Conjunctions: pleonasm, ablaut, suppletion". *KZ* 96, 178-199.  
 1988 "Indogermanisch \**āt*, Vedisch *átha*". *HS* 101, 53-78.  
 1994 "The IE Directive". In: G. Dunkel et al. (eds.), *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch. Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich*, 17-36. Wiesbaden: Reichert.  
 2002 "\*\**ēgō* and \**ágō*, \**ēgH-óh<sub>1</sub>* and \**h<sub>2</sub>ēg-oh<sub>1</sub>*: Perseveration and the primary thematic ending \**-ō*". In: H. Hettrich (ed.), *Indogermanische Syntax: Fragen und Perspektiven*, 89-103. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Eichner, Heiner  
 1992 "Anatolian". In: J. Gvozdanović (ed.), *Indo-European Numerals*, 29-96. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Georgiev, Vladimir  
 1971 "Die Herkunft der hethitisch-luwischen Dativ-Lokativendungen des Singulars". *IF* 76, 59-65.
- Goedegebuure, Petra  
 2002/03 "The Hittite 3<sup>rd</sup> person/distal demonstrative *aši* (*uni*, *eni* etc.)". *Die Sprache* 43/1, 1-32.

<sup>20</sup> Contra Eichner (1992: 40) the form 1-*at-ta* at KBo 17.104 ii 7 does not mean 'one and the same' and match KI.MIN in the same text. It is clear that the latter stands for the verb *dā* 'take!', while 1-*at-ta* is clause-initial, following *dā*. We probably have merely 1-*att=a*, neuter nom.-acc. singular plus -*a*: 'even/also one'. An allative is contextually unlikely.

<sup>21</sup> This factor overcomes the objection of Eichner (1992: 40) to construing 1-*ētta* as an allative.

- 2005 "A New Proposal for the Reading of the Hittite Numeral '1'": *šia*-. In: T. van den Hout (ed.), *Festschrift DeRoos*. Leiden: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.
- Güterbock, Hans and Harry Hoffner  
1989 *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Volume L-N. Fascicle 4. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- 1995 *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Volume P. Fascicle 2. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Hajnal, Ivo  
1995 *Der lykische Vokalismus*. Graz: Leykam.
- Jasanoff, Jay  
2003 *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kimball, Sara  
1999 *Hittite Historical Phonology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Kronasser, Heinz  
1966 *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Melchert, H. Craig  
1977 *Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite*. Harvard University PhD Dissertation.
- 1984 *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- 1992 "Relative Chronology and Anatolian: the Vowel System". In: R. Beekes et al. (eds.), *Rekonstruktion und Relative Chronologie. Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Leiden, 31. August – 4. September 1987*, 41-53. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- 1994 *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Neu, Erich  
1974 *Der Anitta-Text*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Oettinger, Norbert  
1979 *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
- 1994 "Etymologisch unerwarteter Nasal im Hethitischen". In: J. Rasmussen (ed.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, 307-330. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Pedersen, Holger  
1938 *Hittitisch und die anderen indo-europäischen Sprachen*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Rieken, Elisabeth  
1999 *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schmidt, Gernot  
1978 *Stammbildung und Flexion der indogermanischen Personalpronomina*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Singer, Itamar  
2002 *Hittite Prayers* (Writings from the Ancient World 11). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Szemerényi, Oswald  
1956 "Hittite pronominal inflection and the development of syllabic liquids and nasals". *KZ* 73, 57-80.
- Tedesco, Paul  
1945 "Persian *čiz* and Sanskrit *kīm*". *Language* 21, 128-141.
- Tischler, Johann  
1983 *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar. Teil I. a-k*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.  
1991 *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar. Teil II. Lieferung 7. N*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.