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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: 414 and 26), it is clear that ini is the older form (against Melchert 1984: 92).1 As the only member of the paradigm with initial i-, it was trivially reshaped to eni in Neo-Hittite after edani,

---

1 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.
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 *eni seen in the Greek and Latin interjections ἢν/ἡνίδε and ἔν 'behold!' secondarily incorporated into the paradigm of aši/uni.

The parallel of animate nominative singular aši < *ôš+ī and animate accusative singular uni < *ôm+ī suggests that ini likewise reflects *im+ī. I propose that the preform *im is the same as that seen in Old Latin im 'him' and Sanskrit accusative singular masculine imām 'this one'. The attested use of Hittite ini as neuter nominative-accusative singular is not an obstacle. Compare Sanskrit kim 'what?' as the neuter nominative-accusative of interrogative ka- and the gender indifference of Greek accusative singular μίν (Doric νίν) '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. The lack of evidence from the other Anatolian languages leaves the details of this innovation beyond our reach.

3. Allatives in -atta

The demonstrative stem apā- shows a form apadda (a-pād-da), attested in Neo-Hittite in the sense 'on that account', most often in the phrase apadda šer, but also occasionally alone: nū=μu eni AWATEMES apadda ūatre[šker] ‘They wrote these words to me on that account’ KUB 19.29 iv 15 (NH/NS).

In Middle Hittite we find apadda used in a concrete allative sense: mān ḫuvwāi

---

2 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.

3 For the presence of *im in Proto-Anatolian in some form note Hittite imma and HLuvian i-ma (imma) 'indeed, truly', matching Latin immā.

4 Tedesco (1945: 132ff.) argues that Sanskrit kim is a Middle Indic form seen in Pali kīṁ alongside neuter nom.-acc. singular tanī and yānī, although the much earlier appearance of kim complicates this account. Tedesco also cites Meillet’s formal comparison of Armenian in ‘something’ with Sanskrit kim cīt, while viewing these as independent creations. I am indebted to S. Insler for the reference to Tedesco’s article.

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

6 See also KBo 4.12 obv. 11-12 (NH/NS). One also finds the variant apaddan (šer), with a secondary -n, for which compare arhagat(n) ‘separately’. These are both probably modeled after anda/andā (with Kronasser 1966: 351).
kuiški [t=as] EGIR-pa apadda uzzi ‘If someone flees, [and he] comes back there’ (KUB 23.77:57-58, MH/MS).7

The stem damā- ‘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 pittuliŋai peran išanazaš=miš tamatta pēdi zappiškezzi ‘Out of anxiety my soul drips from me to another place’ (KUB 30.10 rev. 14-15, MH/MS).8 In our one Old Hittite example t/damatta has a locational meaning: mān=as tamatta=mu KUR-e n=an tamētaz KUR-az suuteten ‘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 kuvatta(n). It is attested only in Neo-Hittite manuscripts, but these include assured Old Hittite compositions: e.g. [(k)u]vatta=as laḫḫa=ma paizz ‘wherever he goes on campaign’ (KBo 3.1+i 5, OH/NS).9 Neo-Hittite has kuvatta šer ‘for what reason’ (KUB 33.102 i 13) parallel to apadda šer.

For damā- 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).10 Likewise, we find once apēda for apadda: nu karāvar=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. damēdaž, damēdaš, apēdaš etc.) plus the allative ending -a.11 The functional alternates in -atta are aberrant in having a-vocalism and -t/-d/- instead of -t/-d-. These two features are likely to be related. We know that voiced stops followed by *h₂ appear as geminates in Hittite: mēkk(i)- ‘much’ < *méǵh₂- and padda- ‘dig’ < *bhó/édhh₂- (see Melchert 1994: 76-77 after Pedersen and Jasanoff respectively). I suggest that the pronouns in -atta reflect *-ēd-h₂-₀—the regular

---

7 See also KUB 26.17 i 11 and KBo 17.65 rev. 26, both MH/MS.
8 See also darna[i]ta naš ‘turned elsewhere’ KUB 30.10 obv. 3 (MH/MS). The parallel text FHG 1 ii 9-10 (NSI) has tamēda nātš.
9 For kuvatta in a similar usage see KUB 1.1+i 67 (NH/NS).
10 See also KBo 3.6 iii 66-67 (NH/NS).
11 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 -ēd- (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 *-h₂o 'to; up against'. The derivation -atta < *-ēd-h₂o implies that the *h₂ geminated the preceding voiced stop and that *ē became a before a cluster of dental stop+h₂. 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 *vē 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 kidani 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 *apid- or *kuid-) argues strongly that the forms with i-vocalism in the case of kā- reflect generalization from the neuter nom.-acc. singular kī. We may therefore derive pronominal -ēd- < *-ēd- with regular lengthening in accented open syllable.

The next question is whether *ē could have become a before dental stop+h₂ in pre-Hittite. Such a change is comparable to that of *ē to a before other sequences of coronal consonants plus *h₂ in Hittite: *wēḷh₂-tī > wāl/hlunūlzi 'strikes', *sēnḥ₂-tī > šan/hlunūlzi 'seeks', *tērḥ₂-o- > tāra- 'be strong' (cf. Melchert 1994: 83). The adverb *h₂o is most directly attested in Hittite hašduēr 'branch, twig, splinter' < *h₂o-sd-wēr (see Rieken 1999: 346-347). It is also the source of the Anatolian conjunction *-h₂ 'also, and' (Dunkel 1982/83: 198-199 and Melchert 1992: 46). In deriving the pronominal allatives in -atta by means of *-h₂o 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: 81 & 325 after Jasanoff), and Hajnal (1995: 98).

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

As I conceded already (1984: 143), the change of nē(y)a- to nīya- ‘turn’ < *nēh₂o- may easily be due to analogy with the numerous verbal stems in -ēh₂. Some non-direct forms of the demonstrative stem with ē, however, do continue *-oi-. The genitive plural ending -enzau 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 pidda- ‘flee’ may reflect a PIE root *peth₁,₂* (Oettinger 1979: 473 with note 33 and Jasanoff 2003: 95 with note 9). Jasanoff derives the Hittite verb from a preform *peth₁,₂*, 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 *peth₁,₂* would likely lead to pidda- (cf. ir̂há(i)- ‘make the rounds of’ < *érh₂ēh₂ye/o- vs. aráhza ‘outside’ < *érh₂īlīt). In any case, pidda- ‘flee’ does not contradict a change *ê* > a before stop+h₂.

Direct positive evidence for the change is also lacking. The Hittite *hi-*verb padda- ‘dig’ reflects *bhōdhh₂/*bhēdhh₂- (cf. Jasanoff 2003: 77), but the consistent spelling of the verbal stem with the sign pā/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 *ê* > a before dental stop+h₂. The hypothesis of such a change would permit a new account of the Hittite factual negative nat- *ta ‘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 *nētV could yield only Hittite *nētV, with preservation of e-vocalism and lengthening under the accent before a voiceless stop. Compare *wēt- > wētt- ‘year’ and *tuēk- > tuēkkā- ‘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 *ê 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 *nō-te or *nō-te, with o-grade of the PIE negative particle. However, accented short *ō* appears as long ā in Hittite before voiceless stop: e.g. dākki ‘resembles’ < *dōkei and ēppar ‘transaction’ < *ēppar (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 [nattā]. We can only conclude that the negative was [nattā].
with short [a]. If we assume the change *ʔ > a before stop+h₂ proposed above for the allatives in -atta, we may derive Hittite natta from "nē-th₂ohl₁, with the same adverbial formant as in Sanskrit tālāḥā ‘thus’, kālāḥā ‘how’, etc.17

There remains one more pronominal allative in -tta to be accounted for. Goedegebuure (2005) has shown that the reading of Hittite 1-ētta is šīētta, to the stem šia-, 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=aštta UKÚ.MEŠ-tar 1-ētta neḫḫun ‘I turned the populace into one’ = ‘united’ (KUB 21.37 obv. 17 (NH/NS), nu=za 4UTU-SÍ kuin NAM.RA INA É.LUGAL awatenun n=aštta 1-ētta 6 SIG₂ 6 LIM NAM.RA ěšta ‘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.18

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. kušša ‘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’.19 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-edā.

18 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-ēl), but lost the meaning ‘also, even’.
19 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. The only discrepancy between the predicted form and attested 1-ētta is the vocalism. Goedegebuure’s demonstration that the full reading is šiētta ([syē:tta]) now furnishes an explanation: the presence of the preceding yod preserved the original short *ē in *syēdhw which then underwent regular lengthening under the accent. The attested meaning of 1-ētta /šiētta 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 *h₂o ‘to, up against’.
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