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M. Poetto has recently argued (1997) that the Luvian verb κατατωρεύω (Cuneiform Luvian ăr'rumaw-a = Hieroglyphic Luvian 66*-u-u-wa/-) means 'donate' ('to bestow, make a gift'), deriving the word ultimately from the PIE root *h₁(weh₁) seen in Skt. rd-, 'give, grant', rd₁- 'property, wealth', etc. Both the interpretation and the root etymology are persuasive. Closer examination, however, shows that this Luvian verb is but one member of an extensive set of words in Anatolian whose range of meaning goes well beyond simply 'to give'. A full exploration of their formal relationship and semantics will in turn lead us to reexamine the meaning of the PIE root itself.

Like their counterparts in Hittite, Luvian verbs in -ru- fall into two well-defined classes. First, there are deverbatives with transitivizing or "causative" sense (Cuneiform Luvian ḫuanna- = cause to run < luw(ua)- = 'run', both with direct Hittite cognates). Second, there are facilitives formed to adjectives (Cuneiform Luvian arwa- 'make great, exalt' to ar+w- 'great'). Poetto (1997: 241) assigns ăr'rumaw-a to the former class, taking it as the causative to a denominative verb ăr'zal(-) to a base noun ăr'zla- 'gift'. He is, however, unable to motivate any semantic difference between the purely hypothetical ăr'zal(-) and the attested ăr'rumaw-a. Given the shape of ăr'rumaw-a, economy alone would argue for a facilitative 'make ăr'zla-', with ăr'zla- being an adjective.

Other evidence from Anatolian confirms this analysis. We may begin with Lydian ar'illus- (ar'yllili- 'one's own'). The sense is assured by the parallelism of 23,13 ni=k bis ni=k bils aryllia and 24,15-16 ni=k bis ni=k bil' ūeni 'neither he nor (one of) his own': see Gusmani (1964: 41). The adjective ūeni- clearly is based on PIE *s-wo- 'one's own', and the meaning of ar'illis- (ar'yllili- must be nearly synonymous: 'belonging to one, one's own'. While we do not have enough case forms to be certain, the chances are very good that the final -i- of the word is the "mutation-suffix" discovered by Starke (1990: 59f). The stem is thus probably in -is- < *-lo-. Since, as per Stark, the "mutation-i-" is not part of the underlying stem and does not appear in derivatives, the first -i- of ar'illis- must be a true suffix. I therefore propose that we have yet another example of the type of derivational chain discussed in Melchert (to appear): a thematic adjective *ăr'illa- 'owned, one's own', whence a secondary noun *ăr'il- 'ownership, property' and in turn a secondary adjective ar'ilia- 'one's own' (perhaps with a special exclusive sense). One may compare the set of German eigen → Eigentum → eigentümlich (the latter in its archaic sense of proprius).1

The adjective *ăr'il- and noun *ăr'il- with the assigned meanings fit for the further derivatives listed by Poetto. First of all, ăr'rumaw-a itself is now 'redek (something) owned by (someone) eigene', more simply 'bestow, dedicate'.2 H.Luvian 66*-waćwa- is attested in absolute use, paired

---

1 Also -waćwa-, with secondary 'theamatization' backformed from the third plural. One detail as yet unexplained is the consistent gimestate -we- of the suffix just when the form u-we- vs. expected simple -we- when the form is -waćwa- (e.g. ăr numuwa vs. ăr numuwa cited below).

2 The -i- of the variant ăr'ilia- indicates that the second syllable is unaccented: see Melchert (1994: 342f) with reference to Gusmani (1983: 57ff). The status of the gimate -i- is uncertain, as is several other cases of gimation in Lydian: see Melchert (1994: 354f) for a brief discussion.

3 I cannot follow Bader (1986: 63, 73ff), who relates ar'ilia- 'one's own' to Lydian ali- 'other'.

4 For German eigene archaically as 'confer ownership of' see Grimme, Deutsches Wörterbuch. Neubearbeitung. 7. Band (Stuttgart/Leipzig/Hirzel: 1993), p. 444). The sense of transferring ownership to someone else survives in modern German zu-eigene 'dedicate'.

5 One would expect by either my or Poetto's account accusative of the thing granted and dative of the recipient. The H.Luvian verb is attested only in absolute use, paired with gipes- 'give' (see further below). For the Cuneiform verb (see Poetto, 1997: 237), we find dative of recipient and instrumental of the thing granted. On the origin of this construction and the general problem of the variable syntax of verbs of offering and worship see Melchert (1981:
asymptetically with pyon, the ordinary verb for 'give': *pi-ta-*$ha 66-*$nu-wal-*$ha. Poetto (1997: 235) aptly compares Latin dedi *donau*. I would argue that the second verb does not merely reinforce the first, but also adds the crucial additional meaning of ‘permanently, irreversibly’. The speaker (King Tubalilaya) is emphasizing that his dedication to the gods is unconditional and forever. This nuance is expressed in Hittite by *upp* anu, literally ‘leave behind’ but collocated with *pi-ta* ‘give’ to mean ‘concede irreversibly’ (see Melchert, 1989: 33f.). It is also unlikely to be accidental that the Cilician verb *ar'ana-wa* is used of a deity bestowing upon a ritual client life, vigor, and divine favor. Qualities envisaged to be inherent and life-long (see Poetto, 1997: 241, and further below).

The Carian personal names ar-ti-*t* and ar-i-*t*-om in (Greek rendering Aπρολοκιος and Αριψμοιος) are built on the noun *tirli* with secondary suffixes of appurtenance (*-assol-i- and *-somol-i- with the *mutation*-i-). These may be plausibly interpreted as ‘of property, propertyed’, in effect ‘rich, wealthy’. Compare the extensive use of West Germanic personal names built on *ad-*, *dr-* (‘property, wealth’ (see Bach, 1943: 203) or Greek names such as Ιωάννιος or Ιωάννιοκ. A direct substantivization of the adjective *tirlo* alongside the suffixed *tirli* with the same meaning ‘property, wealth’ would be trivial: cf. Hittite *salpa* and *salpi* ‘dog dung’, both from an adjective *sol-b-wo* ‘dirty gray’ (see Schindler, 1978). This noun may or may not be attested as the first element of the personal names *Aria-ru* and *Aria-wiye*- cited by Poetto (1997: 241). If the Hittivan form *arali* (attested in a broken but clearly votive context) belongs here as *arali* (Poetto, 1997: 241) with ref., it could represent a parallel to the ritual usage of Latin *proprius*.6

Not all refined derivatives are based on a stem *tirlo*. There is also the Cilician verb *arumu*- / *aromnu*. The pretérite third singular *aromnu*$há in Hittite context is more informative (KBO 4.12 Ro 2-2:30; nu=ma$=kun GALDUB.SAR1721 kusst $damaus arunuker nu=ma$=at 01, aramnu$há na ANI GALDUB.SAR1722) *URMAJ-LU*-in DUMU "Middan*nomunna iti$tunanum". "Those others who were trying to obtain the office of chief scribe for themselves – I did not arumnu- it for them. I installed Walawazi, son of Middannamunu, as chief scribe." Laroche (1959:30 translates) Je n'ai pas prolongé leur secrétariat." However, thanks to Morpurgo Davies (1987: 218) we now know that the Cilician adjective for ‘long’ is consistently *arumu*- with a geminative -rr-. Laroche’s analysis of *arumu*- / *aromnu*- as the faculative of ‘long’ is quite impossible. The context calls for 'contrast/bestow upon, grant'.

The spelling *a-ra-am-nu* / *a-ra-nu-* (not t(4)-ar-nu-) forces a reading /arum$/a(n)/ aw/ya/. This precludes an analysis of the stem as reflecting a primary *(h)*$r*$me*- ar at this tempting as being it would in view of the other evidence for such a stem elsewhere (see below). We must begin with a base *a-ra/- ar*- (the spelling *a-ra*- gives no clue regarding the length of the (first) vowel). Once again, a verb stem *ar(*)-i- would be entirely gratuitous (what might it mean?) The stem *a-ra* - is surely nominal, reflecting *(h)*$r*$-o-*, *(h)*ar-*o-*, or *(h)*$r*$-o-*. While the first two types of derivatives are vanishingly

250ff, with reference to the masterful study of Hittite *tupu* = ‘libate; consecrate; sacrifice; worship’ by Goetz (1971).

6 As per Poetto (1997: 242), the form of sign 66* (two raised hands, sometimes joined) is iconic for the act of solemn offering with both hands.

7 For the latter compare Cilician *moolmameln= ‘god's beloved gods' (a kind of priest) = moolm- ‘god’.

8 Given the multitude of *-ant-* suffixes attested in Anatolian, I forgo any analysis of the Hittite mountain name *Ar-la-an-ta*. In view of ar-*a*- ‘high’ in Palae, Cilician *nad* (indirectly) Lycian, one may wonder whether the ‘Ar-la- of Ar'ana-wa’ begins with cuent of words at all.

9 See the Oxford Latin Dictionary (Oxford, Clarendon: 1968) sub *proprius* 1.b. According to Wissowa (1912: 42f. note 2) and Pighi (1965: 306), the word in this context refers to ritual offerings, particularly sacrificial victims, that are *proprius*, i.e. that are properly matched with the receiving deity in terms of qualities such as sex, color, and breed. On the occurrence in Pausanias see also Lindsay (1921: 109). This notion is also attested in Heineke context: see Hoffner (1967: 401) and Haas (1994: 647f), who cite examples involving sex and color. I am indebted to colleagues Bizse Collins, Harry Neffor, and Brent Vito for invaluable references on this topic.
rare in Anatolian, the third clearly enjoyed some productivity. 18 Hittite shows at least a dozen examples. For Luvian note HLuvian (LINGERDE)Jo-so- ‘satiety, abundance’ to an unattested verb matching Palaeo-Eus. be satiated. Facultives in -wu- built to substantives are not frequent, but they do occur: one may compare Hittite dudu-ru- ‘show mercy’ < dudu-ru-du- ‘mercy’. I therefore assume an *tro- (virtual *h(tr-o-)* owning, ownership’, from which anarwa/anarwa- ‘confer ownership, grant’.

Since anarwa- requires a base stem *tro-, it seems most economical also to analyze our adjective *trola- as a secondary derivative *tro-la- ‘pertaining to ownership, owned, one’s own’. For the syn- cope to *trola- one may compare Hittite marla- ‘foolish’ (attested as marlant-), plausibly analyzed as *marla-la- by Eichner (1975: 81). This derivation accounts directly for the long vowel of CLuvian arianwa-, which reflects accent on the first syllable, confirmed by Lydian arulda. 11 I cannot, of course, in principle exclude a primary derivative, but I see nothing to recommend a primary adjective *trola- or *la-.

Returning to Lydian, we find the verb arvo-, attested in 2,9: gis=ke dti diabetes e®v anas karola konok konok arval. The basic structure and content of this sentence is reasonably clear: ‘And whoever dares (or sim.) to arvo- the property of Karos in/from this tomb of Karos, (son) of Sabas...’. The form arval is an infinitive depending on the main verb dti diabetes and taking karola(s) f® ndas-‘the property of Karos’ (dative plural) as its object. On this exemplar of the ‘double dative’ con- struction in Anatolian and the force of the particle -s see Melchert (1991: 132f.). The basic sense called for by the context is ‘take’.

The formal details of Lydian verbs in -o- remain unclear, 12 but the shape of the stem arvo- demands a denominative in any case. Once again, a primary derivative for the base cannot be ex- cluded, but the other evidence we have seen leads me to assume rather a secondary adjective *tarmo- (parallel to *trola- above) and with roughly the same sense ‘pertaining to ownership, owned, one’s own’. The denominative verb would then be ‘sich (an)ez(eigen, appropriate)’. 13 As per Eichner (1986: 9), the accent in arval must fall on the -o-. For the pretonic syncope in *tarmo- > arvo- see Melchert (1994: 376).

Finally, I must mention Lydian ararm- /alarm-, tentatively ‘oneself’ (in emphatic use in appos- ition to a noun) see Gusmani (1964: 59f). As Gusmani suggests, it is quite possible that this word too is related to artiali- and belongs to our set. Any formal analysis is necessarily speculative. It seems likely that the variant alarm- is dissimilated from ararm-, which shows reduplication. It is tolerably certain that nominative and accusative singular alarmi/alarm reflect syncope of a stem in *armlo (see Melchert, 1994: 373f, with ref). It is possible but not assured that there was a prior syncope of a vowel before the -m- (cf. the examples cited in Melchert, 1994: 375). We thus may suppose an *ararm-a- ‘of a particular property > individual’ (for the suffix see note 7), based on a reduplicated noun *ar-arvo- ‘property’ (in the sense of Eigenschaft – one could also compare eigentümlich in the sense ‘individual’). A synchronous meaning ‘(as) an individual, personally would seem to fit the not entirely clear contexts of ararm-/alarm-. I certainly do not insist on this particular analysis, but the connection between an emphatic ‘oneself’ and ‘one’s own’ as suggested by Gusmani remains plausible.

Our investigation thus far has placed Luvian /iarulwa/- in the context of a set of words based on an Anatolian root *ar- with a core meaning ‘own’. This result is by no means incompatible with Foetto’s original comparison with Skt. and Av. reh- ‘give, grant’. Szemerényi (1956: 181f.) points out

18 Compare the similar conclusions of Oettinger (1986: 18f).
11 As per note 2 above, the accent in the Lydian cannot be on the -o-, and by the well-motivated rules of Eichner (1986: 9) it cannot fall on the syllabic -e either. That leaves as the only possibility erekwa, matching CLuvian arulwa-. The accent of the base noun was carried over in this instance to the derivatives.
12 For a more possibility see Melchert (1997: 136f).
13 For sich eigeon archaically without prefix as ‘take possession of’ see the reference in note 4 (p. 441).
that the *re(h)i(-) posited as the source of the Indo-Iranian verb and of Skt. rājι-/rajι- ‘wealth’ and Old Latin rēs ‘property, possession(s)’ may be analyzed as *her-eh(i)- to a root *her- seen in Av. arnav- ‘grant, bestow’ = Grk. ὑποτασεῖν ‘I receive’ = Arm. arnum ‘I take’. Szemerényi himself (1956: 184) assumes a basic root *her- because he wishes to relate further Hittite bar(h)k- ‘hold, possess, have’. This step must be rejected, since the initial a- of the Livonian reflexes aranuva- and drušanuva- cannot continue *her-.

Nevertheless, Szemerényi’s addition of a verb meaning ‘hold, possess’ is not irrelevant for our problem. As he indicates, a development from ‘take’ to ‘hold, possess’ is commonplace: cf. Hitt. ἐπί- ‘take, seize’ but also ‘hold’, Latit capit ‘take’ but OHG habēt etc. ‘hold, have’, OIr. gocht ‘take’ but Latin habēbā ‘hold, have’. I suggest a similar semantic development for *her-/*hr-eh(i)- with the added element of permanence/inalienability: this root meant ‘take/give possession of in perpetuity’ and secondarily ‘have inalienable possession of’ > ‘own’ (in the fullest sense).

The sense ‘give in perpetuity’ appears as ‘dedicate, consecrate’ (said of humans making offerings to gods) and as ‘bestow’ (of gods’ blessings on humans): see on the use of Skt. rā- Güntner (1951) and recall respectively HLuvian and CLuvian *arauva-. The nuance of permanence/inalienability is not directly visible in the reflexes of ‘take’ (Grk. ὑποτασεῖν, Arm. arnum), but the secondary ‘have inalienable possession of’ shows up not only in the various Anatolian reflexes based on ‘own’, but also in Skt. rājι-/rajι- ‘wealth’ and Old Latin rēs ‘property, possession(s)’, whose semantic connection to rā- ‘give, grant’ — never actually explained to my knowledge — now comes into focus.15
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Szemerényi (1956: 182f.) assures for this and the other well-known cases that the basic meaning is ‘take’, from which ‘give’ is secondarily derived. Benveniste (1966) argues that in PIE giving and taking were viewed merely as complementary aspects of a single act of ‘exchange’. I prefer the latter viewpoint, but a choice between these alternatives is immaterial for present purposes. What is crucial is that our root meant both ‘give’ and ‘take’, and I see no reason to exclude the latter meaning from the ‘enlarged’ variant.

For the last step in the presumed derivation compare German Habe ‘possess(ion), property, fortune’.


