Sonderdruck aus

Historische Sprachforschung
(Historical Linguistics)

bisher
Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung
Begründet von Adalbert Kuhn

In Verbindung mit Claus Haebler
herausgegeben von
Alfred Bammerberger und Günter Neumann

103. Band (1990)
2. Heft

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen und Zürich
ISSN 0935-3518
Adjectives in *-yos in Anatolian*)

Kronasser, EHS (1966) 168 ff, correctly affirms that Anatolian inherited the PIE secondary suffix *-yos which forms adjectives from nouns. Nevertheless, the role of this suffix has been much underappreciated, due to no doubt to the fact that it had a limited productivity in Hitite.

As Kronasser points out, *-yos in Hitite does form adjectives to several place adverbs *antronys- 'inner', *sileremys- 'medial', *inner' and the hapax *andegys- 'external, foreign' beside the more common *andegys-.*) Furthermore, there is a substantial if restricted number of other examples of *-yos in Hitite. It is true that only a handful of these are directly attested as adjectives: EZEZ *harpys- 'festival of the *harpa', *matyarys- 'fastening.'* There are also cases with secondary substantivization: *happarys- 'city' = *mærkats 'that which pertains to sales', *happarys- 'things offered for sale';) *posculys- 'constraint' = *pertaining to a snare, noose (*pitulaus, *pitulamiys- (a drink) = *'of seven' (for *lumunamyys- and *sapparys- see the CLuvian section below).)

*) Bibliographical abbreviations are those of The Hitite Dictionary of the University of Chicago, ed H. G. Gitterbock and Harry A. Hoftscher, Jr, Chicago: 1980 ff.

*) The stems *andegys- and *antronys- cited by Kronasser do not exist. See Friedrich, Kurzhandbuch, HTHS II s.v.

*) The adjective *matyarys- is derived from the stem *matarys- 'present', attested only in the adv *maarten 'soon, quickly.' See for the latter Melchert, KZ 93 (1979) 262 ff.

The oft-cited example *andegys- 'nocturnal' (KBo IV 33 31) is quite uncertain. The context would permit either 'inside the days nocturnal' or the days (into 'night). Since there are a number of other examples of acc. plurals in *-ius to nouns which are otherwise consonant stems or *-a-stems, the cuneiform example is not solid evidence for a derived *-yos adjective. It is true, of course, that the acc. plurals in *-ius themselves require an explanation. Given the ease with which *-yos- adjectives are substantivized and complete with the base nouns, it is conceivable that the *-ius forms all indirectly reflect such adjectives. However, the marked preference for the acc. plural animate would remain unexplained by this account.

*) The attempt by Neu, StBo 17 (1974) 107, to explain away this example is unnecessary and ad hoc.

We must add finally several instances whose existence is required by further derivatives: *anmirys- 'motherhood' = *anmirys- 'maternal' (as per Kronasser, EHS 295, there is no basis for a Luwianism), *iṣatnys- 'nourishing' = *iṣatmyys- 'ident (beside *iṣatnams-), probably *paṣadaps- 'fool of a bed' = *paṣyys- 'of the foot' (cf. EHS 212), *samyarys- 'priest' = *samyys- 'of a god.' The above list is still very short. The suffix *-yos does not appear to have been fully productive in Hitite.

The picture is different in the Luwian languages. In a most significant article in Fs Neumann (1982) 35 ff, Carruba has shown that alluded Clavian i-stem anim. acc. singulars in *-yas and dat. singulars in *-iya do not exist. Forms in *-yam and *-iya are the nt. nom.-acc. singular and plural respectively of derived adjectives in *-yas. Thus *anmirys is not a variant of s. t. smirys 'mother, but nt. nom.-acc. singular of *anmirys- 'maternal.' Remarkably, Carruba was able to achieve this analysis without benefit of the new edition of the CLUvion corpus by Stacke, StBo 30. Stacke's reorganization of the texts makes the validity of Carruba's syntactic interpretation of the key passages all the more apparent.

Carruba's overall treatment of the CLuvian material requires only minor revision and amplification. The one revision concerns the nt. nom.-acc. plural: he interprets spellings such as na-ani-e-ya 'frater nal' as standing for *nan(i)-iya-ya: base na- ani- plus suffix *-iya-plus.
an ending -ya. This is implausible and unnecessary. It is implausible because the neuter nom.-acc. plural of an i-stem *-iyo would be *-rye, whereas Luvian *-ya. The *ending* -ya would be found only with i-stems, which is what we are dealing with here, as Carruba has emphatically shown.) His interpretation is unnecessary because spellings like na-sa-za-ya may easily represent the expected *sa-niya*, with -ya < *-rye. Since Luvian does not distinguish *-e/ and *-i, the Hittite scribes could use both e and i spellings for Luvian /i/ (I therefore interpret nom.-acc. neuter plurals of *-ya as simply *-i-ya/.

We may add to Carruba's list of case forms (p. 49) the anim. acc. plural. His analysis neatly solves the previously problematic *Lalabziel-sar hirpar-a (z)ya of KUB IX 31 II 24. Now that we have an adjectival stem *hilabziel-, *hilabziit- may be identified as its regular anim. acc. plural, modifying *harrparasa: 'Lalabzielian girdles' (vs. gen. plural *Lalabzielian hirpari girdles of Lalabzielian' in the Hittite). For spelling as *lalabziel before the particle -lar, compare para-n住宅la (HIT 1 II 7) = para-n住宅la (KUB IX 31 I 33) and see my article to appear in the memorial volume for Charles Carter.

The proper recognition of the CLuvian adjectives in -ya/ had been prevented by the fact that in many cases the adjectives in -ya are indistinguishable from i-stem nouns. This partial overlap is due to the fact that Luvian extends most adjectives by a suffix -i/ in the animate nominative and accusative, as discovered by Frank Starke: see his remarks in P. Neumann (1942) 403, with note 3, and the discussion by Ottinger, KZ 100 (1987) 35-43, with references. In the case of u-stems (i.e., old o-stems) the *motion-? replaces the thematic vowel. Thus an anim. nom. singular *-iya became *-iya (whence attested -i-ya). While the result of the contraction is often

7) The appearance of an ending -ya in the plural of the demonstrative adjectives (Hitt. irra, enii: Lyc. cireia) is not a countermotion, since forms like Hitt. ni, imm.-acc. sp. a? show that these words had i-stems in their declension.

9) Carruba is correct in claiming that e is occasionally used in oneform for *ya, but such usage by Hittite scribes is extremely rare. The alternation *-i-ye with -ye in verb stems, however, is not an example of e for *ya, but represents a genuine linguistic change from *ya to *ya.

This account, which is independently motivated by other facts in Luvian, makes unnecessary Carruba's assumption (p. 49) of an analogical proportion a? i: ?i: -allu -iian: *-iya. In Hittite, on the other hand, the partial merger of *-iya and i-stems is probably due to syncopation. The safest example is the adverb nimek, in which represent the syncopated form of *zipiyan, nom.-acc. singular of szapiza-
We thus find that in Lycian as well as H Lazian the *-iyo- adjectives are fully productive as a marker of possession alongside the *-arii- adjectives and the genitive case.39

Carruba does not include Lycian in his discussion, but I believe that traces of the *-iyo- adjectives can also be found there. Meriggi, RHA 3 (1935) 89-90, had already isolated a suffix -da. We find taac-da beside taac, ʃənda- beside ʃən(ɨ)- and ɬakən-da beside ɬakən- in ɬakən-iš. As is typical for Lycian, in none of these cases is the meaning of both the base and the derived form clear; see the lemmata in Guismani, L.9.

However, in all cases the suffix is clearly denominative, and taac- 'votive offering' and ʃən(ɨ)- are definitely substantives. On general grounds we would expect a suffix added to substantives to be an adjective-forming suffix. The fact that some of the derivatives might be attested as substantives themselves would not be surprising. As to the shape of the suffix, examples such as prefix ʃr- from *endu 'lo' show that original sequences of nasal plus dental stop show up as -d. The attested -nd- of ʃən-da and ɬakən-da with preserved -n- therefore indicates that the suffix continues a syncopated *-Vd-. We thus have a denominative adjective-forming suffix of the shape *-Vd-; I shall soon present elsewhere the full evidence for intervocalic */y > Lyd. d. Here I cite merely the pret. 1st singular ending -yíd *-yom: e.g. bād 'i' gave' from a virtual *piyom. Given the other evidence for */y > Lyd. d, an interpretation of the suffix *-Vd- as *-iyo- imposes itself. Whether the adjective ʃənda- 'Sardian' contains this suffix is at this point impossible to determine.

We have now discovered reflexes of *-iyo- adjectives in every Anatolian language except Palaic. Their existence there is to be expected. I know of no certain examples, but the stem ɬawuni- is a

the names Tifas and Tifus (Zgusta, KP 513) have anything to do with Lycian *TIFAS. Structurally, however, they could both easily be the stem in -i- used as a patronymic.

39) As Starkie indicates in the reference above, the 'motion-' is nearly as widespread in Lycian as it is in Lazian. This is, of course, the real reason for the absence of -i- in oblique and neuter forms of what appear to be i-stem adjectives: e.g. dat. pl. prezzi and nom.-acc. sg. prezzi to prezzi(-i) 'from'. I now withdraw my attempted explanation in note 20 of the paper cited in note 18 above.

Given the partial merger of *-i- and *-i- stems due to the 'motion-', the number of -i- stems in Lycian is greater than previously recognized. Several adjectives listed in Melchert, Lycian Lexicon (1989), as i-stems should be analyzed rather as *-i- stems with the 'motion-' in the strong animate cases. I cite here as merely one example əhịi-iš 'local'.

likely candidate. In KUB XXXV 165 Vs 16 ɬawuni is nom. sg. animate, an epithet of ɬaṭaθpapirî, a goddess. In the same text Rs 6 ɬu- 

wasu- must be nom. pl. animate, referring to objects offered to the gods. It is hard to reconcile these two usages on the assumption of a single noun. However, if we suppose that one instance reflects an i-stem noun and the other a relational adjective in -iy- then we can account for the reference to an animate being in one case and to inanimate objects in the other. Naturally, one could also take both instances as belonging to the adjective. Given our current limited knowledge of Palaic phonology and morphology, the attested anim. nom. sg. and pl. endings in -iy to an i-stem could reflect syncope as in Hittite or the "motion-" of the other Anatolian languages.39

We can only make a guest at the actual meaning, but we know that the name of the goddess ɬaṭaθpapirî- contains the Hittic word for 'queen'. C. Watkins has ingeniously suggested (pers. comm.) that ɬawuni- as an epithet of the goddess may continue the PIE word for 'woman' *s-em-, whatever the precise synchronic sense. The other occurrence could then be a substantivization of the relational adjective: 'the things belonging/pertaining to the ɬawuni-'. Whether or not this Palaic example is correct, the wide attestation and vitality of the *-iyo- formation in Anatolian is beyond doubt.

Carruba does not include Lycian in his discussion, but I believe that traces of the *-iyo- adjectives can also be found there. Meriggi, RHA 3 (1935) 89-90, had already isolated a suffix -da. We find taac-da beside taac, ʃənda- beside ʃən(ɨ)- and ɬakən-da beside ɬakən- in ɬakən-iš. As is typical for Lycian, in none of these cases is the meaning of both the base and the derived form clear; see the lemmata in Guismani, L.9.

We have now discovered reflexes of *-iyo- adjectives in every Anatolian language except Palaic. Their existence there is to be expected. I know of no certain examples, but the stem ɬawuni- is a