

The Source(s) of Indo-European Participles in *-e/ont-

H. Craig Melchert

University of California, Los Angeles

One of the most glaring discrepancies between the grammar of Hittite (respectively Anatolian) and that of the languages of “Core Indo-European” lies in the function of their respective participles formed with an *nt*-suffix. The former express an *attained state*: e.g., Hittite *akkant-* ‘having died, dead’, *adant-* ‘eaten’ or ‘having eaten’. The same is true of relics in other Anatolian languages, e.g., CLuvian *walant(i)-/ulant(i)-* ‘dead’ and Lycian *lāta-* ‘dead’ (NB not ‘dying’!). The latter have exclusively active and *processual* meaning: Tocharian AB *eṣant/aiṣenca* ‘giving’, Sanskrit *bhindánt-/bhidánt-* ‘splitting’, Greek διδούς/δούς ‘giving’, Latin *ferēns* ‘carrying’, etc. I stress that the principal difficulty lies not in the diathesis, but in the contrast between process and state.

In Melchert forthcoming and in the oral presentation of Melchert 2014, I claimed that neither attested function can be derived from the other and hence that the attested participles reflect different specializations of a PIE verbal adjective that had not yet acquired the function of a true participle (similarly Kuryłowicz 1964: 167). The proposal met justified opposition, since it was entirely inadequate as stated. First of all, merely positing an original verbal adjective does not *per se* explain the path to the attested usages. Second, I distinctly implied that the

alleged verbal adjective had quite vague and undefined semantics. This lack of specificity was convenient in allowing considerable latitude in deriving the very different attested meanings, but again lacked any explanatory power.

Furthermore, such semantic vagueness is decidedly not true of either of the putative parallels that I cited. First, PIE verbal adjectives in **-to-/-no-*, source of eventual past participles in multiple languages originally had possessive semantics: **m_ḡ-tó-* ‘having death’, **k_wḡ-tó-* ‘having holiness’, **pek^w-to-* ‘having ripeness/doneness’. See the characterization by Wackernagel-Debrunner (1954: 576): “dem der Verbalbegriff als *Eigenschaft*, Merkmal anhaftet” (emphasis mine–HCM), who were surely following Brugmann (1895: 93): “...daß durch sie eine Handlung als anhaftende Eigenschaft und Merkmal prädiiziert sind”.

Likewise, as argued in Melchert 2014: 206-7, the Luvo-Lycian past participles in *-Vm_ma/i-~ -Vme/i-*, which again express an attained state, originated in possessive derivatives in **-o-* to neuter *men*-stem action/result nouns: *‘having the result of X’ = ‘having (been) X-ed’; e.g., HLuvian /*tatariyamma/i-*/ ‘(ac)cursed’ (attested in NSgC (LOQUI)*ta-tara/i-ia-mi-sa* at KARKAMIŠ A2+3 §24) could be built on the base noun seen in CLuv. *tatariyamman-* ‘curse’.¹

¹ I naturally cite this pair entirely for purposes of illustration. Once the use as a past participle became productive, speakers could and did form the participles freely directly from the verb, and no corresponding noun was necessary.

My own effort to derive both sets of *nt*-participles from a common ill-defined PIE verbal adjective must be regarded as a failure. There remains a consensus that the Core Indo-European and Anatolian *nt*-participles must somehow be reflexes of a single PIE suffix **-e/ont-*. I may cite as representative of the handbooks Tichy 2000: 95, section 13.3.0, Kloekhorst 2008: 184, and Fortson 2010: 181, section 9.35. Audience reaction to the oral presentation of this paper reflected the same strongly held conviction. I must insist, however, that I am unaware of any remotely convincing *step by step account* of just how the two very disparate functions can be reconciled; that is, exactly how one could have developed from the other, or how they can each be derived from a third *well-defined* starting point. Kloekhorst suggests that the **-e/ont-* suffix may have been indifferent to diathesis and then specialized differently in the two instances. That is quite possible, but as noted above, the far more important difference is that between process and state, and he does not even acknowledge this problem. Tichy merely asserts that as part of the restructuring of the verb in Anatolian the **-tó-* participle was replaced by that in **-e/ont-*. She offers no explanation of why or how a processual active participle was pressed into service to express an attained state.² In the absence of

² The development of the Greek perfect middle participle in *-μέvoς* into a past participle, eventually replacing *-τός* (see Chantraine 1926: 224-5), is emphatically not a valid parallel for such a process. The inherited PIE active perfect expressing

any plausible account deriving the Anatolian function from that of Core Indo-European or vice-versa, a new attempt is called for.

The Anatolian past participles in *-nt-* may be derived from an originally denominative possessive suffix **-e/ont-* (for the denominative status as older see already Brugmann 1906: 650). Attested Hittite denominative examples are clearly innovative and analogical to participles (*nadānt-* ‘having a drinking straw < *nada-* ‘reed; arrow’, *perunant-* ‘rocky’ < *perur/perun-* ‘rock’), but an original possessive adjective **bhérġh-ont-/bhġġnt-* ‘high, having height’ from the root noun **bhérġh-/bhġġh-* ‘height’ (seen in Avestan *bərəz-*) was reanalyzable as derived from the verb ‘be high’ (> Hitt. *park(iya)-*, both ‘rise’ and ‘raise’). The only attested Hittite participle is *parkiyant-*, but a *parkant-** is safely inferable. The category was then extended from “adjectival” roots indicating “property concepts”—which could refer to change of state and hence actions (note again the attested sense of Hitt. *park-*)—to other change-of-state unaccusative verbs (such as ‘die’), then to other unaccusative verbs (such as those of motion like ‘go’ and ‘come’), and finally to

an attained state survives in Greek only as an archaism. What is productive is a mediopassive perfect with passive and stative sense (Chantraine 1926: 70 and 87). It is because *γέγραπται* meant ‘is written’ (describing a state) that *γεγραμμένος* meant ‘written’ (likewise expressing an attained state). There is no change here from a *processual* participle to a resultative one.

transitive verbs. In the case of transitive verbs in contexts with a specific object or patient (explicit or not) the meaning is patient-oriented, hence “passive” (*adant-* ‘eaten’). In generic use with no specific object the meaning refers to the activity per se, hence subject-oriented and “active” (*adant-* ‘having eaten’).

The scenario just outlined is not viable for Core Indo-European processual participles with a sense ‘(in the act of) X-ing’. I believe the correct solution was already suggested by Oettinger (2001), which I adopt here with minor modifications. Their source is the PIE “individualizing” and substantivizing suffix **-e/ont-*, an extension of **-e/on-* with same function (the type of Latin *Catō* ‘the sharp one’ < *catus* ‘sharp’, Lycian *Xudalijē* ‘the nimble one’ < **xudali-* ‘nimble’, also attested as personal name). For both forms of the suffix see Solta 1958 (on the *nt*-stem especially 13-23) and for individualizing *nt*-stems in both Anatolian and Tocharian Melchert 2000: 59-61 and 68-70. Just as substantives in **-e/on-* ‘the X one’ easily became adjectives (e.g. in Germanic weak adjectives), likewise substantives in **-e/ont-* turn into adjectives (the type of Hittite *wargant-* ‘fat’, etc.). Thus as per Oettinger (2001: 311), a stem like **ḡérh₂ont-* ‘old’ (originally ‘the old one’ < **ḡérh₂-o-* ‘old’ seen in Armenian *cer* ‘old man’) was reassociated with the verb and became a participle. The same step-by-step extension took place from “property concept” roots to action roots as for possessive **-e/ont-*, but necessarily with different semantics: ‘the X-ing one’ would have led to a consistently active sense. However, Oettinger’s explanation (2001: 308-9) of

the *-t-* of *-e/ont-* as due to excrescence seems unlikely (the only word-final position in the paradigm would have been neuter nom.-acc. singular, hardly a suitable starting point for a reanalysis as an active participle). I assume rather extension of **-e/on-* by the likewise individualizing/substantivizing *-(e/o)t-* suffix of the type of Latin *dīuēs, dīuit-* ‘rich’ < *‘the rich one’ < *dīus* ‘brilliant, radiant’.³

I therefore assert that the apparent “disconnect” between the functions of the *nt-*participles in Anatolian and Core Indo-European is a mirage: the two formations have different functions because they have distinct origins. They share the commonality that their attested use as participles reflects a reanalysis of originally denominative adjectives as being deverbative, starting in “property concept” roots where the distinction between noun and verb was not always a sharp one. However, the attained state meaning of the Anatolian *nt-*participles reflects their origin in exocentric possessive adjectives ‘having (the state of) X’,

³ For an alternative denominative origin see Neri (2001: 132, note 211): “...**dérĕk-* /**dĵĕk-* ‘Blicken, Blick’ → *-en-* Lok. Sg. **dĵĕk-én* ‘beim Blicken’ → hysterokinetisch flektierende *t*-Hypostase **dĵĕk-én-t-* ‘beim Blicken befindlich, einmalig blickend’ (> gr. Pind. δρακείς) → amphikinetisch flektierendes internes Derivat **dérĕk-on-t-* / **dĵĕk-ŋ-t-* ‘prototypisch starrend, Starrer’ (→ δράκων ‘Schlange’).

whereas the active processual sense of the Core Indo-European *nt*-participles shows their origin in endocentric derivatives '(the) X-ing (one)'.

References

- Brugmann, Karl (1895): Die mit dem Suffix *-to-* gebildeten Partizipien im Verbalsystem des Lateinischen und es Umbrisch-Oskischen. Eine syntaktische Untersuchung. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 5, p. 89-152.
- Brugmann, Karl (1906): *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Band II.1. Second edition. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Chantraine, Pierre (1926): *Histoire du parfait grec*. Paris: Champion.
- Fortson, Benjamin W. IV (2010): *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. 2nd edition, Chichester UK / Malden MA: Wiley-Blackwell (= Blackwell textbooks in linguistics 19).
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden / Boston (= Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5).
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy (1964): *Inflectional Categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Melchert, H. Craig (2000): Tocharian *-nt-* Plurals and Related Phenomena. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 9, p. 53-75.
- Melchert, H. Craig (2014): Anatolian Nominal Stems in **(C)o-*. In: Norbert Oettinger and Thomas Steer (eds.), *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen. Morphologie, Substantiv versus Adjektiv, Kollektivum*. Akten der

Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen. Wiesbaden: Reichert, p. 205-214.

Melchert, H. Craig (forthcoming): The Position of Anatolian. In: Andrew Garrett and Michael Weiss (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Indo-European Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Neri, Sergio (2011): *Wetter. Etymologie und Lautgesetz*. Ph.D. dissertation, Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena.

Oettinger, Norbert (2001): Neue Gedanken über das *-nt*-Suffix. In: Onofrio Carruba and Wolfgang Meid (eds.), *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch / Anatolico e Indoeuropeo*. Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Pavia, 22.–25. September 1998. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen (= Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 100), p. 301-315.

Solta, Georg (1958): *Gedanken über das nt-Suffix*. Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 232/1. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Tichy, Eva (2004): *Indogermanisches Grundwissen*, Bremen: Hempen.

Wackernagel, Jacob and Albert Debrunner (1954): *Altindische Grammatik*. II.2. *Die Nominal-suffixe*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.