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A NEW ANATOLIAN "LAW OF FINALS"

H. Craig Melchert, U.S.A.


*šulešša/*šulešša; 'that with which one buts', an instrumental noun to the root of Hitt. šulešša: 'push, drive away' and Skt. swādi 'drives'. This derivation accounts directly for the Hittite stem šulešša and Pal. šulešša.\(^2\) However, Oettinger must attribute the remaining forms to analogy with watar/wider 'water' and abstracts in šar.\(^3\)

As stated, this analogy is quite implausible. There are simply no points of contact between the respective prehistoric paradigms. The word 'horn' would have been a trisyllabic a-stem *šulešša with fixed accent on the first syllable, consistent vocalism s./š, and a cluster š/š, while 'water' would have had sg. *watar, pl. *watar, i.e. a dissyllabic r-stem with alternating accent and vocalism and no consonant cluster. The abstracts had simply fixed *šar. Since 'water' and nouns in šar are r-stems, the remaining forms of the paradigm would have been even more divergent from 'horn'. There is certainly no semantic link between the concrete noun 'horn' and either 'water' or the abstracts. In the absence of some further factor, one cannot see any motivation for the alteration of the perfectly regular neuter a-stem šulešša.

I suggest that this missing factor is a special sound change of final *-Cron; namely, that such a final sequence underwent a metathesis to *-Cron. Since a final cluster of liquid plus nasal is apparently not permitted, *-Cron becomes *-Cor whence attested Car. Specifically, mt. nom.-acc. sg. *šuleššia >

---

\(^1\)For the philological facts see Oettinger (1979). One should ignore the erroneous presentation of Stark (1990: 400f).


\(^3\)As noted by Oettinger, it is uncertain whether the second -i- in the Palas word is a real anaptyctic vowel or merely graphic, but this does not affect the analysis.
CA *săwēడora* > *săwēডora* > *săwāda*, but not *nāmoc-*, pl. *săwēडora* > CA *săwēडora* > *săwätara*. For posttonic *t-* see Melchert (1984: 104f.), a change I now restrict to closed syllables. Following a suggestion of Warren Cowgill, I now assume rather *t* > *r* in posttonic open syllables. This accounts not only for the of *săwāder* vs. the *t* of *săwāna* but also for pros. 1/2pl. in *săwām-x* > *săwār-<x1> and a-stem collective *cēlīqū-* < *cērīqi-<x1>* with generalised accented full-grade root.

In the case of *bōr* this special change created an unusual allomorphy of nom.-acc. sg. *săwāda* vs. remaining *săwār-<x1>. Such a situation is ripe for a paradigmatic split, and I propose that this is exactly what happened. On the one hand, the nom.-acc. sg. *săwār-<x1>* was recreated, restoring a regular neuter *a*-stem seen in *bōr*, *bōrāra* and Hitt. *bōrāram-săwāra*. On the other, the new nom.-acc. sg. *săwā<sep>-<x1>* led to a neuter *a*-stem *săwār-* (gen. *săwār-<x1>*). This stem was now indeed open to the influence of *bōr-<x1>* and leading both to lengthening of the second vowel (*săwādar* and the false plural *săwār<sep>-<x1>*).

The rule given above accounts not only for *săwāda* beside *bōr-<x1>* but also for the other Clavian instrumental nouns cited by Starke (1990: 408f.): *sā<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'nail'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head'; *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'head' seen in the further suffixed Hitt. *sē<sep>-<x1>* 'spear (point)'); *sē<sep>-<x1>
see below). Again contra Starke (1990: 348) there is absolutely no basis for assuming substantivisation and then reanalysis as an adjective. Indeed, since the stems paubo- and suabo- cited above are attested only in adverbial use, it is quite possible to view these as adjectival stems (with Ilchiner, 1979: 53, notes 26 & 30).

The above rule would also have affected the accusative singular of animate nouns in *Cro, and I believe that there are traces of this development as well. Despite attempts to deny their existence, there are 1ittite animate *s stems which can hardly be explained as intransitities. Neu (1982/83: 125ff.) claims that the Old Hititte stems ipunasaaritasu- ‘liberation vessel’ and bipo- ‘food’ shows both neuter and animate forms, but he admits that he bases this solely on the fact that they have nominative and accusative singulars in -ar. It is time to abandon this prejudice that nominative and accusative forms ending in -e (or -d) are necessarily neuter in Old Hititite.9

There is no shred of evidence in the form of anaphora or agreement of adjectives to show that these forms are neuter in Old Hititite. Given that the rest of the paradigms of these stems show animate forms, the only proper conclusion is that they are indeed animate. Since animate *s stems are undesirably rare in Hititite, their subsequent replacement by a stems is to be expected (cf. likewise Inherited ketlar > ketlara ‘hand’).10

To kiv ‘visible’ shows that such a derivation is at least conceivable semantically, but it remains a mere possibility.

9For example, all textual evidence suggests that nouns in -tsa1 are animate (Namu 437, etc.; furnumait, etc.), likewise hetar ‘resentment’ and hundat ‘heat’, which function as subjectives, must be grammatically animate, not neuter (see Garrett, 1990). These facts are to be explained, not explained away. The explanations are likely to be the same. None of the attempts to explain the animate *s stems jekar ‘crag’ (see Meich, 1984: 14211) as an inheritance is credible, including my own, and the word is likely a borrowing, as per Polheae (1991: 289).

10Certainly do not wish to claim that our prejudice about forms in -e being neuter is totally groundless. It is clear that Neo-Hittite speakers shared a similar view, whence ketlara ‘be] in the HIT copy of the Laws with neither form of the possessive pronoun or the eventual creation of an oblique ipunasaarita to ipunasaaritasu-. But the latter notion is more evidence for an original neuter ipunasaarita than the former is for a neuter ketlara-. Likewise neuter huppasar in Hittite manuscripts (1 huppasar /sunan at KUB 135 15 123) besides neuter huppasar (2 huppasar /sunu at KUB IV 9 116). In general, it is easy to motivate NH treatment of old animate forms in final -ar as neuter, but not vice versa.

A NEW ANATOLIAN ‘LAW OF FINALS’

The attempt of Neu (1982/83: 128ff.) to explain ipunasaaritasu- as an original neuter in *-lar is wanting in several respects. First of all, there is no OH suffix *-atal- forming verbal abstracts. All examples of *-tal are clearly secondary, analogical to a coexisting synchronic verbal stem: hantatal for hantatat after hant-; hantatalat beside hantatart to hantata- etc. Furthermore, the only instances of *-tal as a desubstantial suffix are clearly collective: e.g. hantatalat ‘waves’, flood’ < hahtabana ‘wave’. Thus Neu’s derivation cannot explain the Old animate *s stem, the first -a of *-tal-, nor the sense of ipunasaaritasu-. His attempt to motivate the shift from neuter to animate inflection by some kind of vague ‘personification’ is also manifestly forced, and we now know that his underlying premise that Hititite did not inherit the feminine gender can be argued. See Oegtetter (1987) and Melchert (1992b).

There is a suitable suffix available: -cmatar-. which forms animate denominative nouns in both Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian, as established by Neumann (1965: 231ff.; e.g. kantuarmari: - ku-tti-nu-i-tar- ‘orthostat’ < *-hur- ‘wall’ < Hitl. hur-); hanatarmari: - ha-ta-ak-tar- ‘vulcan’ < hahta ‘blow’. The original form of the suffix is surely *-ara-, with the preceding connective vowel spread from derivatives to thematic stems like hanata. Likewise then Hitl. ipunasiatal-‘liberation vessel’ from ipunasiar- ‘liberation’. It is likely that the original function of *-ara- is to form adjectives of appurtenance of or pertaining to X, which are then substantivised (Hitl. tukawatari- ‘whole, integral’ would show the original adjectival value).11 The formal coincidence between this *-ara- which forms adjectives of appurtenance and that which forms feminines in Anatolian (Hit. bat"la-ktar ‘queen’ < batla ‘king’),

11These nouns show animate stems in -stari (with *-motion), for which see Starke (1990: 50ff.). The -a- in some examples is euphemistic, as seen by Neumann. The original cluster *-ar- is also shown by the regular geminisation of the *-s- next to sonorants: e.g. *-*s- ‘hand’ > Hitl. kettara- and Clw. s(t)liffera-. The attempt by Starke (1990: 49ff.) to deny Neumann’s analysis in favor of neuter stems in -stari (star) is patently false, as is obvious already from the incredible distortion of the phonological evidence which he must make in order to justify his auctorship in turn. See my review to appear in Hittitische Zeitschrift. Neumann’s explanation of the suffix as a secondary reanalysis of *-tal, quite thinkable for the Luwian, is problematic for the Hititite, for the reasons cited above.
is strikingly reminiscent of the two values of the "-oa" suffix "-oro", but I would not care to affirm that the two forms of "-oro"
are necessarily the same.

The rule as formulated above the accusative singular in "-stom" would have resulted in "stom. I propose to explain the nominative singular in "ar" in similar fashion by generalizing the rule: final "-stom" + "ar" + "-Car" + "-ar". I know of no evidence against the assumption that in a final sequence of "-ar" was simplified to "-ar". Hitt. "hôstas" + "-tāš" + "-tāš" shows "-tāš"/"-tāš" from a secondary final "-tāš", but the final "-tāš" may easily have been added at any stage of prehistoric Illyricum. I assume here.12

The animate *-stem *japāma- "bowl" may similarly be derived from a substantivised *-stem *japāma-. Pulver (1991: 391), following Cop, compares Grk. *ytron and the Germanic words for "oven". The root comparison is surely correct, but an original neuter *-stem is unlikely for the Illyricum. The lack of any trace of the oblique stem in "-stom" is not a compelling argument, but the animate forms of the stem in Old are it is instructive to compare the case of the real *-stem *japāma-. As per Oettinger (1981: 148f., contra Pulver, 1991: 125), the oblique stem survives only in the synchronically isolated adjective *japāma- "rich". The noun *japāma- "transaction" is now an *-stem, but it notably remains neuter.13

I began this discussion with a PIE instrumental noun in *-oro*. Its partial appearance in Anatolian as a stem in "-or" raises the question of the fate of the parallel *-os-: I believe there is evidence to suggest that it was subject to the same rule: *-stom *-clōs > *-clōs > *-cal. The best example is the Illyricum noun *(ə)-stom "muscle, spear" (virtual) *-klo- "that with which one throws, the thing thrown". The attempt of Starke (1990: 220ff.) to explain away this word as attested in the manuscripts in favour of a non-existent *-siiaros- is totally unconvinced and unnecessary. Contra Starke, the

derivation above (first proposed by E. Borner) is morphologically impeccable, and now with our special rule of finals also phonologically straightforward.

Extending our rule to include final *-clōs also permits explanation of the base *tannalos- of *tannaloiros- "opponent at law", which has caused so much difficulty (see Oettinger, 1982: 174f.) Pulver, 1991: 88). The stem *tannalos- would represent the regular outcome of a noun in *-clōs "that by which one litigation > lawsuit" (for the original sense of the verb see Pulver, 1991: 77ff.). The voicing of the "-s-" and change of *-s- to *-t- would be the same as in tawros above (in this case the vocalism of the closed-syllable allomorph has been generalised). In this example the *-aro- suffix is as expected added directly to a verbal stem. I would also explain the unusual base *tannalos- of *tannalos- "capacity to be a mother" as a secondary denominal use of the same suffix *tannalos- "means of being a mother". It may not be accidental that *tannalos- rhymes with *tannalos-.

Finally, although there is insufficient evidence to be certain, it is possible that the varying forms of *Hoppala- "animal" (acc. sg. *Hoppala at KUR XXXVI 55 II 30, coll. pl. *Hoppala, but elsewhere animate *Hoppala-) reflect a similar treatment of a stem *Hoppala- "sapien" (see Watkins, 1973: 397).

Whatever the status of this last example, there seems more than ample evidence for a special rule by which final sequences *-Cronos and *-clōs appear in Illyricum. Lupanic and Pulver has the parallel in *-kronos. This rule accounts for a number of otherwise unexpected *-s- and *-t-stems in these languages and variations in their paradigms. In the absence of solid evidence for the particular "stom" and "siiaros-" stems, we cannot determine whether this rule is already Common Anatolian or an innovation of the three languages named above.

REFERENCES

Eichner, Hölder

Garrett, Andrew
1990 "The origin of NP split ergativity", Lg 66.201-296.

Melchert, H. Craig

Morpurgo Davies, Anna
1982/83 "Dentals, rhotacism and verbal endings in the Luwian languages", ZK 96.245-270.

Neu, Erich
1982/83 "Zum Genus hethitischer r-Stämme", Festschrift G. Jvnescu, 125-130, iasi.

Neumann, Gunter
1965 "Das hieroglyphen-luwische Nominalsuffix -ru.", Sprache 11.82-88.

Oestinger, Norbert
1987 "Bemerkungen zur Anatolischen i-motion und Geminifrage", ZK 100.55-43.

Pedersen, Holger
1938 Hittisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen, Copenhagen.

Puhvel, Jaan