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Notes on Palæo

The existence of Palæo as an independent Indo-European language of ancient Anatolia beside Hittite and Luvian was first established by Forrer, *ZDMG* 76 (1922) 241 ff. The pitifully small corpus long delayed further analysis of the language, but the publication of a few more texts and the pioneering efforts of Otten, Laroche, Kamenhuber and others led up to the comprehensive summary of Carruba, *SiBoT* 10 (1970), who presents the known corpus in transcription along with a grammatical sketch and provisional lexicon (for specific references to prior works see Carruba’s summary, *SiBoT* 10.4–5).

Thanks to the above efforts, Oettinger, *Die Stammbildung des hehitischen Verboms* (1979) 612–613, is able to cite in his index nearly forty Palæo forms which he has exploited for comparative purposes. Watkins, *Lexion and Wortbildung* (1970) 358 ff., has argued that Palæo preserves reflexes of the PIE laryngeal *h* in positions where it is lost in Hittite and Luvian. Palæo seems about to assume its rightful place in comparative studies of Anatolian and Indo-European.

However, interpretation of much of the fragmentary Palæo material remains uncertain, and a close look at the use made of it for comparative purposes raises the fear that too much reliance has been placed on interpretations which Carruba himself warns are provisional. For example, Oettinger, *Stammbild*. 151, 281, etc., assumes the interpretation of Pal. *marg(n)u* as “out to pieces,” break up (= Hist. *marg(n)s*- or *marvi*). Since in the only clear occurrence (*KEM* XXX 166 Ra 23) the action is performed on the god Zəparwa, this meaning is virtually impossible. Similarly, Watkins’ assumption that *abkawawamu* (ibid. Ra 11) is merely the coll. nom.-acc. pl. of the stem *abkawamu* “sacrificed meat” may be shown from the context to be false (see 1.2 below).

The individual analyses which follow are intended as one contribution to the continuing effort to elucidate Palæo texts and grammar.


1. -kwaw

Carruba, *BitrPal* 5 ff. and *Fort 60* ff., argues that Pal. *-kwaw* is to be analyzed as conjunction *-ku* + *-war*, the particle of direct speech (= Hist. *-wers*-uu, Luv.-wu): cf. also Kamenhuber, *Pal* 49 ff. The distribution of *-kwaw* speaks against this analysis. Particularly instructive for the use of this particle is the following passage from the Palæo version of the myth of the gods in Perseus from Hittite parallel. The distribution of *-kwaw* speaks against this analysis. Particularly instructive for the use of this particle is the following passage from the Palæo version of the myth of the god in Perseus from Hittite parallel. The distribution of *-kwaw* speaks against this analysis. Particularly instructive for the use of this particle is the following passage from the Palæo version of the myth of the god in Perseus

Based on the corresponding Hittite myth, it is generally agreed that Pal. *wers* is a verb of saying, specifically that it is a root present ‘calls, cries out, related to Hist. *wes-su* ‘idet’: see Carruba, *SiBoT* 10.76; Kamenhuber, *Pal* 60, and likewise Oettinger, *Stammbild*, 344 ff. If *-kwaw* contains the particle of direct speech -war, it is hard to explain why it occurs in the first sentence above, which is to all appearances a narrative (*The Sun-god cries out*), but fails to show up in the following sentences, which clearly are direct speech. It then reoccurs in the next sentence about the sending forth of the eagle *kar-dawawar*- et al., again which we would expect to be narrative! Given this perverse distribution, the appearance of *-kwaw* in the remaining sentences which are direct speech is hardly probative. It is true that in Hittite the particle *-war* may be inadvertently omitted in one of a series of sentences, or a given text may not use the particle at all, but I know of no examples where *-war* appears and disappears willy-nilly as in the passage above.

It is also strange that the particle *-war* does not appear in any of the passages in Palæo which are unambiguously direct speech (marked by vocatives and/or verbs of saying): 2 A Vs 1 ff., 2 A Rs 11 ff., 10 ff., 21 ff., 3 B 31 ff., 4 ff.

*) Unless otherwise noted, the signs and readings of the Palæo texts are those of Carruba, *SiBoT* 10.

The interpretation of signs *wers* as ‘the sun torn’ by Morpigli, *Akademie* 57 (1979) 5 ff., wholly ignores the context of the phrase, which is known to us from the Hittite parallel. The received interpretation of *wers* as ‘call, cry out’ (= Hist. *wersu*-) seems assured.
Furthermore, the position of *kausar in several instances does not fit that of *suar, which should be enditic to the first word of the sentence. See e.g. 2 A Va 21-22 [ku-bi] parvadahal hys paksh tabarru LUGAL-1 p-paz-suar ti [dinma]-suar ti sika and 2 A Ba 23-24 dinma usal-ja tilarna ti-suar kina. Carubba's attempt to explain away these exceptions, Part 76-77, are forced, as is his splitting of 1 A I 16 into two clauses in order to save the proper position of *kausar: nu kwadad kwit-suar... . "Nun (ist) das s.: 'Was (ist) sagt er'."

Carubba rejects a unitary particle *kausar because he sees no function for it, but his usage in Palaic is actually quite consistent: it corresponds functionally to Hitt. *pats, indicating identity and less often emphasis. The various examples of *kausar may be directly compared to those of *pat analyzed by Hart, TPS (1971) 94ff. With nouns and pronouns the effect is that of English 'self' or 'the very...'. Hitt. *kausar 'the Sun-god himself', *karsi *kausar 'the eagle himself', *ti-suar 'you yourself' (cf. the frequent zil-pat of Hittite, TPS (1971) 128f.), Hitt. *kiusar-kuvar-an *kiti 'his, him right on his horn/him on/by his very horn' (on this and the immediately preceding sentences like it see I. 2 below), p-paz-suar ti sana-swar ti 'May the king have you as his very father, you as his very mother' (I. 4 below). With an interrogative the force is merely emphasizing: *swa *kausar 'why (for heaven's sake)!' (cf. Hitt. *kausat-pats, TPS (1971) 157). This is also plausible for the exhortation ti-swar(s)-a-ja is 'Come to him, come on!' (I 9 B), although one could also adduce the idea of persistence of action shown by *pat with verbs in Hittite: TPS (1971) 130ff.

Formally, Pal. *kausar may be analyzed as the enditic conjunction *-kausar 'and' seen in *kuwa plus an adversative *-ending which appears in Lat. car 'why', Lith. kve 'where', Germanic forms such as hcre and thcre and probably also Hitt. *suar (on the last see Joseph, KZ 96 (1981) 91ff., and Joseph-Schourup, KZ 96 (1983) 86ff.). The presence of the final -preserves the vowel, which is lost in absolute final -kausar *-kausar *x *kausar *x *kausar *x *kausar (note that *even) would fit several of the above examples just as well as *-self or *very). Pal. *kausar is thus a unitary particle equivalent to Hitt. *pat, as in the one alleged example of *suar alone in Palaic see the next section.

2. *tiltvar

Aside from *kausar, which has just been examined, the only evidence in Palaic for a particle *suar is found in I A I 10 cited above: *tiltvar-an *kita. The interpretation of this sentence and those following it centers on two issues: the meaning of the verb stem *-it and the syntactic analysis of *kita.

Kammenhuber, Pal. Stff., interprets *-it as 'seek', based on the parallel of KUB XVII 10 I 24ff. (see especially I 21, where Telipinu, not the places to be searched, is the object of *gan). However, Carubba also points out the parallel of Hitt. *kita (KUB XXXIII 5 II 6 and XXXIII 9 II 4), of which course also formally resembles Pal. *iti. Kammenhuber's rejection of this equation on the basis that Palaic should have preserved the 1-st-conjugation form *iti makes no sense. The form *iti in the meaning 'shoot' is already OH: see KBo XVII 44, 6. The replacement of *-i-forms by 'thematic' *-i- *-i- *-i- *-i- *-i- taken place in different lexemes at different times: cf. *tibh *tibh *tibh *tibh *tibh.

The issue can be settled by looking closely at the Palaic and Hittite contexts. KUB XXXIII 6 II 5-6 says: *Seek Telipinu; when you find him, then *kita his hands and feet *arkidita- them. Given that the adresses here is the bee, *kita has plausibly been taken to mean 'sting, prick' and *arkidita- 'set in motion' (upward). The bee is to sting Telipinu into moving from his hiding place. While I agree with this interpretation of the passage, I would emphasize that the translation of *kita as 'prick, sting' is entirely context-dependent. This single example does not justify attributing such a special meaning to the *iti verb.

Hitt. *iti-*kita has two distinct basic meanings: 'press' and 'throw', from which are derived respectively the special uses 'seal' and 'shoot') In the passages from the Hittite myth, the object of *kita is the god, specifically parts of his body (with a characteristic double accusative construction). The goal of the action is

*1) Haza, UP 13 (1981) 113, not only takes *kita as 'sting' but also *arkidita- as 'causes to swell up', claiming that the Hittites attributed special powers to the bee's poison. However, such a meaning for *arkidita- is even more ad hoc than *sting for *kita. The meaning 'set in motion upward' is also unusual, but I believe that it is paralleled in the homestaining texts, such as KUB 12341: *net 9 DAKUNA *arkidita- 'They cause them to move upward for two miles' (i.e., they drive them uphill for that distance).

*2) For a possible explanation of both 'press' and 'throw' from the same root *arkita- see Laroche, RPh 49 (1943) 73ff.
to rouse the god.1) The basic meaning of ṭā-tā ṣe 'press (on)', hence 'prod, urge', thus seems sufficient here as well. That 'press' here means 'sting' is merely due to the special circumstance that 'bee' is the subject. The same basic meaning 'press, urge' also fits the Palaeo passage with ἀγγίζω, where the eagle is addressed. This interpretation is confirmed by the fact we have one clear body part as the object of ἀ-1 I 13 ἀκτείνως-κοιτάζω-αν ἄλταν 'Press him right on his horn'.

As to the syntactic interpretation of ἄλταν, Carruba, Beir-Pal 7, has already solved the problem and the only solution: given one clear instance of the object anaphoric pronoun -an in ἄλταω-αν ἄλτας, ἀποθετικα-κοιτάζω-αν ἄλτας and ἀκτείνως-κοιτάζω-αν ἄλτας, one can hardly divide ἄλταν as ἄλτα-an. Such a repetition of the anaphoric pronoun would be unheard of in Anatolian. Interpretation of ἄλταν as a participle is excluded because it would have to be neuter, while -an is only anim. acc.: we cannot have a construction 'It (is) x-ed'. The only solution is to take ἄλταν as imbr. 2nd pl. Admittedly, the plural is unexpected when it is the eagle ὀιοσ is being sent forth. Carruba suggests that this command is directed at the gods them-

1) This is expressed in Histiaeus by κατα-κατα-α" [KUB XXXIII 10 II 5], which Larcoho, RHA 23 (1895) 108, translates as ἀρωτα-αλτα after II 18 and 20, which show forms of ἀρωτα-: 'remove, carry'. But κατα-κατα- is not a possible Histiaeus spelling for ἀρωτα- and we would expect the object to be -an 'him', not -αλτα- 'them'. More likely is κατα-κατα-Αρωτα and he (the god) appears with -αλτα- as anim. nom. sg. In the Palaeo myth I 1 A 15, where the eagle is unsuccessful in rousing the god, this failure is expressed by κοιτάζω-ατα-ατα- 'He did not p. at all'. I therefore believe that Pal. p.aret is parallel to ἀ-ατα- and thus an intranasal motion verb. This eliminates both of Carruba's suggestions for paret (κοιτάζω and 'charge'), but leaves many possibilities open: 'arose, moved, came forth', etc.

1) This interpretation requires, of course, that the god in question have one (or more) horns. I would point out that since the myth of ἄλτας exists in versions for several different gods, we have no way of knowing which god is being referred to in the Palaeo version. Furthermore, while the principal gods of the pantheon are represented by human figures at Yazilikaya, we know that storm-gods are often represented by bull figures: see Randzei-stein, Bildbaste. Taufs 1 (fol. p. 64) and also KUB XXXVIII 3 1-2, which refers specifically to the Storm-god of Libyans. Depiction of other gods as animals is likely. Since Pal. κατα-κατα- matches Hist. ἀκτείνω 'horn' and occurs in the double accusative construction (almost all cases of which in Histiaeus involve body parts), and since it matches 'hands and feet' in the corresponding Histiaeus myth, I find the interpretation as a body part unavoidable.
3. kāt and kuāt

These forms occur once together in 1 A I 8, the beginning of the Sun-god's speech cited in Section 1 above: kāt-kuāt kāt...

Carruba has already correctly identified each element of this phrase: kāt = nt. nom.-acc. sg. of ka- 'this', kuāt = a generalizing particle, kuāt = nt. nom.-acc. sg. of kuāt-'who, what' (see StBoT 10, Witterbach, with reference to Carruba, Pol). However, Carruba is rather tentative as to the syntactic interpretation of the entire phrase, leaving open several possibilities, including that of Kammenhuber, Pal 50: kāt... kuāt = 'Deshalb... weil'. The use of kāt as 'because' is well established in Hittite, but kāt as 'therefore' is without parallels in Anatolian. Such a meaning is made very unlikely by the word order: we would expect rather kuāt... kāt 'because... therefore'. The appearance of kuāt is also hard to motivate if kāt is an adverb.

We achieve much more natural syntax by assuming that kāt-kuāt kāt is a complete (nominal) sentence: 'What is this anyhow?'

Both kāt and kuāt (nt. nom.-acc. sg.) now have their expected value. Pal. kuāt formally matches Hitt. kuāt 'why?', but functionally equates rather to Hitt. kuāt 'somehow, anyhow'. This equation is confirmed by the negative ni-kuāt in 1 A I 16 = Hitt. ništa kuṣaqu 'not at all'. In the question kāt-kuāt kāt kuāt expresses impatience and dismay: the Sun-god is both vexed and perplexed by the gods' predicament. For a similar impatient question compare Kko III 40 vs 15 = Kk-ad puṣhun-ši k kši stūt saš-k+%H?k++u in 1 A I 16 = Hitt. ništa kuṣaqu 'not at all'.

In the question kāt-kuāt kāt kuāt express impatience and dismay: the Sun-god is both vexed and perplexed by the god's predicament. For a similar impatient question compare Kko III 40 vs 15 = stūt puṣhun-ši k kši stūt saš-k+%H?k++u in 1 A I 16 = Hitt. ništa kuṣaqu 'not at all'.

The form kuāt appears elsewhere in Palaima, notably in the final section of the Zapara Ritual (2 A Rs 11-12): nu ersetippu tiansa in-ka meda ni-ka Zaparesh aškunušu-wa saškas/kwaškas-[aškas]-ken KMIN šoštumaniši-ken KMIN gaššut-ken KMIN bāšt-la-ken kuškuna. Likewise ibid. Rs 19-20: EGIS-SU ma ESTA-MMIG TANIS QATAMMA mete ni-ka Zaparesh aškas/kwaškas kanšu-ken KMIN.

For a lengthy discussion of the problematic word-final formant -kuat see Carruba, StBoP 25-27, and Kammenhuber, Pal 29-31. Carruba attempts to explain the form as related to the 'appurte-

...
orthonymous form with deitic function: cf. Hitt. *eši and atesi. Thus -esi could mean 'that just as well as -esi.' Such suppletion according to preceding consonant/sound is attested elsewhere in early Anatolian: cf. Hittite -ai/*asand/ and -ai-*ma sutu.'

Pal. as 'this' is thus well attested in the nt. nom.-acc. sg. *ka and also once in the coll. nom.-acc. pl. *gas.18) Pal. hessu certainly equates functionally to Hitt. *kasa, 'anyhow, somehow.' Syr. generalizing *ka could be an exact cognate.

4. iškā

This word occurs in the sentence cited above in Section 1 (2 A VII 21–23): [ne-kwu] pùukakkalattu šigjas tabaran LUGAL-1 ppmax-kwar fi [demesa]-kwar ti iška. The form of the other words in this sentence is clear: a vocative figure (with preceding modifier), a dative tabaran 'the king'; an intransitive pāsāp and désa and a nominative 2nd sg. pronoun ti. This leaves iška, which must be sentence-final, since there immediately follows nu-ši-an-pi-. . . (contra Kannenheimer, Pal. 22–23). According to the etymology, the word iška is complete, because there is no room for another sign. Sentence-final position and the vocative plus 2nd sg. pronoun ti argue that the form is inv. 2nd sg. of a verb (thus Kannenheimer and Carruba). Since ti is the subject, the nominatives pāsā and désa can only be predicative, which means that the verb must be a form of 'be' or similar linking verb. I therefore suggest that iška is the inv. 2nd sg. of the 'iterative' of *ēšē, *ēšē. For the vocalism of the first syllable (Pal. *ēši < PIE *ēs-ê) compare u-ešā 'crise out' < wērēšē and u-ešā 'we do' or 'we go' < *ešē-šē. The final -a of idā 'be,' versus asūzā 'eat' reflects the same fluidizing e iška vocalism seen elsewhere in Palaioc. cf. anšaša and kusbiša beside anšaša and maršaša. Similar inconsistency in the distribution of *ešē vocalism in the suffixes *ēšēs- and *ēšē- also occurs in Hittite, of course.19)

18) For genitive -ai/*asand/ see Houbrechts ten Gaa, Pf. Osten 119ff. The fact that the suffix -ai/*asand/ has not been published, but an inspection of OH manuscripts shows that they are also originally in complimentary distribution (asides from a very few conditioned exceptions). 19) The nt. nom.-acc. sg. *ka vs. Hitt. *ka is patently analogical after atesi. The latter does not happen to be attested in Palaioc, but amin. nom.-acc. sg. *as suggest that both demonstrate influence from the stem nouns (ešē = *asē) hence coll. nom.-acc. pl. *ges.
ending *-u₂. The scene is plausible, but the phonology is dubious. First of all, we have seen that Watkins' other evidence for preservation of *-u₂ in Palaeo does not exist: *-u₂ in akkūmaduwa₃a is not a writing for [u₂] or the like, reflecting *-a₂ (ja = 'those', as shown in Section 3 above). Second, why would the Hittite(!) scribe not write simply *wa₂₃du₂₃ for [wa₃u₂₃], as in Hittite ḫu₂₃u₂₃p₂₃a₂₃? "Purify!" Compare in fact Palaeo ɪ-ma₂₃. Third, as Watkins himself suggests, the scriptio plena in a-un-ni₂₃ 'those' probably reflects the old collective ending *-u₂ with loss of final *-n₁₂ and compensatory lengthening. Note that wa₂₃du₂₃ also shows scriptio plena. I would compare rather Pal. su₂₃ alone to Hitt. ḫu₂₃, both reflecting *-u₂₃ as established by Watkins (see reference cited). The final -ja makes sense 'also' and equates to Lev.-ja and Hitt. geminating -a₂ and -a₂. The sentence thus reads: 'May you yourself, oh tabarn, fill also those good things and give (them) to him.'

Besides dat, su₂₃ (and akkūmaduwa₂₃) Palaeo appears to have one more example of a collective in *-u₂ < *-a₂. I refer to bakt uru₂₃ = *luk̚t₂₃h₂₃b₂₃p₂₃a₂₃ (3.3, 3 = Q Vos 8).

On the resemblance to Hitt. ḫu₂₃. One does not burn offerings in Hittite rituals, at least not bread and liquid offerings. A meaning for bakt₂₃ such as 'divide, distribute' is tolerable certain, whatever its etymology.¹⁴

¹⁴) Carruba, STB 10.49, defines Pal. -a as 'and', alternating with -a₂, and equates it to Hitt. -a₂, Lev. -a₂. However, Pal. -a does not precede a geminating consonant like Hitt. -a₂ 'and'. Furthermore, in its generalized use with a relative (ba₂₃-a₂₃ who/whichever), it equates functionally to Hitt. non-geminating -a₂. The light adverbial sense of the latter is also visible in Palaeo; see Stark 1999, 127. But the relationship between these two uses is (as Carruba, STB 10.49) 2 A Ra 23 ḫu₂₃p₂₃u₂₃ about 'One has filled the A': A meaning 'And one has filled the A' is possible from the context, but the use of enclitic -a₂'and' in utterance-initial position is surprising, and one may legitimately suspect ditrigraphy: *mann₂₃u₂₃. I therefore find it plausible to suppose that Palaeo has an enclitic -a₂ (non-geminating) equating to Hitt. -a₂, Lev. -a₂ 'and' and an enclitic -a₂ 'and' equating to Hitt. geminating -a₂ and Lev. -a₂. The rarity of -a₂ and Palaeo would be due to the fact that we cannot use and be normally linked medially.
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³) Carruba adopts the reading of 2 A V 2 and 2 C V 8 bakt₂₃ uru₂₃ uru₂₃ and uru₂₃b₂₃p₂₃a₂₃, taking the form as pret. 3rd pl. of a reduplicated stem luk̚t₂₃h₂₃b₂₃p₂₃a₂₃. Such reduplication is possible, but the scriptio plena of the reduplicating syllable is surprising. Furthermore, his explanation of the A form by anticipatory nasallation is unsupported.¹⁴ Thus A's luk̚t₂₃h₂₃b₂₃p₂₃a₂₃ (NB: with space!) is certainly faulty. This is not the only place where ma. A is defective (see Kammenhuber's remarks, Pal. II E).¹⁵

Copy B has rather (paragraph initially) bakt₂₃ luk̚t₂₃h₂₃b₂₃p₂₃a₂₃, which has the appearance not of reduplication, but of a figura ezymologica. This also works nicely syntactically: 'They have distributed (luk̚t₂₃h₂₃b₂₃p₂₃a₂₃) the distributions (luk̚t₂₃h₂₃b₂₃p₂₃a₂₃). We have a collective plural luk̚t₂₃h₂₃b₂₃p₂₃a₂₃ to a noun luk₂₃h₂₃b₂₃p₂₃a₂₃ (which also fits well as the base for the derived verb luk̚k̚š₂₃). Copy A has apparently substituted an acc. sg. luk₂₃h₂₃b₂₃p₂₃a₂₃ for coll. acc. pl. luk₂₃h₂₃b₂₃p₂₃a₂₃, but the sense remains the same: 'They have distributed the distribution'.

Palaeo thus agrees with Hittite in showing a collective plural ending -a₂ reflecting PIE *-a₂₁⁵.
6. H. Craig Melchert

Pal. niqat (2 A 5 7:33.56 and duplicates) has been interpreted as 'here' and compared to Hitt. kē. This equation is not possible. Hitt. kē does not mean 'here', but 'on this side' (explicitly or implicitly opposed to dēl or kē 'on that side'). Hitt. kē can only represent *ēkk or *ēkə, neither of which could lead to Palaeo kē-ē. The latter may rather be analyzed as kē 'here' < *ēkə* (cf. Grk. εκέφ 'here')47 plus neuter enclitic pronoun -at, referring to the preceding offerings: 'Here they (are)'). This fits all occurrences.

For -at in Palaeo with a plural reference compare 2 A 5 6-6: [pê-pê b̄a še-kur [esp. še-kur gu-šu] še-ša-at]-ūt-um. And the tabarna and tawanna and the p-bār-cu-um (and) the liquid offerings. They have kē-ed them: The second clause consists of an initial pret. 3rd sg. verb with the royal couple as subject (just like the preceding sentence!) plus the enclitic neuter pronoun -at referring back to the two collective plurals palēnu and šunmuš. Old Hittite manuscripts also show -at referring to a series of neuter nouns: see Otten-Soubek, SB 8 1969 60. It is not clear whether we are dealing with the first stage of the replacement of nt. nom.-acc. pl. -kē by -at or merely with a different form of number agreement from our own (i.e., -at referring distributively to each of the preceding items).

7. maš

The only occurrence of Pal. maš in a complete context is in 2 A Ra 9-10: ilanà-à kēl šarrīt maš-pan-àt šarrī tē-ša-à kēl šarrī tē-ša énqar anu-ša ku-an-à tabarna-ì(1) 84tawanna. Both this and the lines 2 A 5 35-36 were interpreted by Kammenhuber, Pal. 235, Bein, BeinPal 21, to try to keep this interpretation, although his grammatical analysis is quite different (forms in -du = 'to him', not inv. 3rd sg.). The presence of the verb šē, however, is more than mildly awkward, since its positive value 'assist/enable you' cannot be reconciled with a curse. The insertion of 'curse formulae' in the middle of a set of offerings is not Hittite practice, and there is no good evidence for such a thing here either. What we have is another example of the reciprocity between gods and men—the sometimes almost brazen

47 The form 'ēkk 'here' may also be attested in Hittite šē-nuš 'now', but the latter could also reflect -ē-kē, with the same elements as Lu. nūs in reverse order.

48 For the renewal of a relative by a full noun see Held, Relösten, examples 156, 157, 158 and 159.


8. Animate Nomina tive Plurals in -ad, -af, and -d

Carruba, *SilBoT* 10.42, has already pointed out the existence of the animate nom. pl. endings -ad, -af and -d in Palao. What he does not indicate is the apparent complementary distribution of these endings. The examples *marhab 'goda*, *adramvadu 'sacralized masta* (and *iabu 'passions*, see II.3 below) are all surely to α-stems: animate stems in -ad, -af and -d are likely uniquely. On the other hand, stems in -ad show consistently -ad: *sākkuwadet (3.x)* and *vāli yandet (2.x)*. At least one example of a nom. pl. in -d is probably to -estim: *vālāqāti (on Palao nouns in -d)* see Watkins.

9. Verbs in -nd

Palao has a number of derived verbs in -nd: *kastino, marano, marīna, parino, and pātina*. Carruba, *SilBoT* 10.46, appears to equate this -nd- to Hittite durative -ana/-i, but no durative sense is discernible, and the infection differs: Palao verbs in -nd show mi-forms: *kastināti, parisi, and et al.* Furthermore, the Palao verbs have consistent single -s- versus Hittite durative -ana/-i.

Hittite has a much better counterpart: verbs in -nd(i)- with single -s- and -nd-infection: *pisiqandī* 'bestow gifts on', *impisiqandī* 'worry' < *burden oneself*. The meaning and infection in -nd(i)- argue that these are in origin denominatives to s- or m-stems, although to my knowledge the base nouns are not yet attested. Likewise, then, Palao verbs in -nd may reflect original denominatives.

Plethon und Wörterbildung 365. The example *kuwandt* is indeterminate as to stem-formation, but an i-stem is quite possible.

This leaves the plurals of the derived adjectives *Gudamsaikad, *adramvadet and *vāli yandet*. Carruba assumes a suffix -t (cf. Grk. -tis etc.), but -t is equally possible: cf. Lat. nouns in -a, -ētus. The small number of examples bids caution, but there is a good chance that Palao -ad directly continues PIE *-d of the o-stems, while Palao -af reflects the consonant-stem ending *-a*. In this regard Palao would thus be more conservative than Hittite. The nom. pl. ending -adi of the Palao i-stems could reflect a syncope structured form of *-du (cf. 2nd sg. *kāpi* -di probably to *kāpapis*). Obviously, however, with so few examples a phonemic contrast between ε and i in Palao is far from assured.

Note: Palao

9. Verbs in -nd

Palao has a number of derived verbs in -nd: *kastino, marano, marīna, parina, and pātina*. Carruba, *SilBoT* 10.46, appears to equate this -nd- to Hittite durative -ana/-i, but no durative sense is discernible, and the infection differs: Palao verbs in -nd show mi-forms: *kastināti, parisi, and et al.* Furthermore, the Palao verbs have consistent single -s- versus Hittite durative -ana/-i.

Hittite has a much better counterpart: verbs in -nd(i)- with single -s- and -nd-infection: *pisiqandī* 'bestow gifts on', *impisiqandī* 'worry' < *burden oneself*. The meaning and infection in -nd(i)- argue that these are in origin denominatives to s- or m-stems, although to my knowledge the base nouns are not yet attested. Likewise, then, Palao verbs in -nd may reflect original denominatives.

10) The comparative-relative stem *meq(s) (cf. Toch. A *madā 'here') is also the base of the Anatolian conjugation ms, which is attested in Old Hittite as *meq-, *meq- (comparative) and *māq- (temporal). In later Hittite and in Luvian the meaning is 'whenever, if'. The two Palao examples may be interpreted as 'when' or 'whenever'. For the first three uses one may compare Germ. woh. Comparable in both form and meaning is PIE *h₂wms-, which appears in Lat. quaeum (rsms) 'when' and 'whenever, Av. hāt 'lat', *hom 'when', OvP. hom and Lath. (dual.) kh 'whenever, it'. With a *d- extension one also finds Umb. pudā 'and' and OvP. pu 'when', Bock, Gram. Umb. und Lath, and Pokorny, IEH 645, label quaeum etc. as st. acc. sg. However, Lat. quae (as OvP. *quās) 'because' shows the pronominal st. acc. sg. ending and also functions as a conjunction: cf. also *hāt 'because'. Furthermore, Lat. quaeum (as OvP. *quās, Umb. *quās, etc.) than shows the fu. acc. sg. of the interrogative-relative in use as a conjunction. It therefore seems easier to suppose that φείν represents the m-sst, acc. sg. functioning as a conjunction. Likewise, Anat. Νατάν would reflect mesur, acc. sg. *mēs (or possibly fem. acc. sg. *mēsa) 'mesur' (cf. 1st sg. in a pronoun would be expected in Common Anatolian).

11) The comparison to Grk. -tis etc. is already made by Klassenhober, GLZ (1965) 369. The ultimate connection of these forms to Pal. -tis remains likely, since *-tis* is apparently built on *-tis- (cf. Lat. moror 'inser tool') besides mordere 'bury' and see Müllner Vindulga, Gram. comp. 396, 419–420.

12) For reasons which I will discuss elsewhere, the general Hittite animate nom. pl. ending -ad must represent *-ad* < *-at, generalized from the i-stems. cf. already Stirnemann, OvP. 90, and Pedersen, Htt. 22.

13) The contrast of *-m* and *-m* is phonemic in Palao as in Hittite. Palao *fil* continues the old strong stem *m-nd*, while *anomalous (a liquid offering) reflects the weak stem *m-nd-, like Hitt. *ioma* (cf. *iomas, *fil* both showing the change *FRIY* > *FRR*).
therefore suggest that Pal. údána is the regular locative in -a of a verbal abstract *údáro 'unraveling, entangling' > 'thickest'. Pal. údána thus equates functionally to Hitt. marnmari, but shows the same basic lexic as the Hitt. verb *ud. For *-a > *-aa in Palai see already *Alu[m]sanik̡ed < *Alu[m]sanik̡ed cited by Carruba, StStFI 10.61. Pal. marnmari (also with double -m- Likewise represents the gen. sg. of an abstract *marnādā 'homeliness, sweetness' -ness).[82] The form keklamad (3 B III 11) is also surely gen. sg. of a *keklādā, but the sense remains obscure.

2. ária

The sentence a-ra-a-ra-am-pi ti sūlak væliti occurs in 2 A II 23 = 2 B 9, shortly after the sentence discussed in Section I.4 above, where the Sun-god is to become father and mother to the king. Carruba suggests two possible analyses for both the opening sequence and the verb. One may read either ária-ampi or ária-nami-pi, and súlak/væliti may be either 'you build' or 'you carry'. Carruba finds ária 'sea' more likely, presumably because there is evidence elsewhere only for a particle -pi, not for -ampi. However, mention of the sea makes no sense in the context, which concerns the Sun-god's close relationship to the king. In particular, neither the Sun-god's 'building' nor 'bringing' the sea seems likely. Since we know oneself as the basic meaning and analyses the verb as semantically: preverb -a plus "lak, 'hide' (cf. Hitt. np-4-lak has hidden oneself). However, this meaning will not do at all for the Kumeri passage with its companion to (moleen) bronze, nor is it likely that the Hittite king has 'hidden himself' in the town. Oettinger's attempt to unite all attested forms into one paradigm is also forced and unnecessary. The intransitive forms súlak and súlak may reflect an inchoative in -a 'become united with', while ária and ária-ampi may belong to a transitive súlak- 'unite with' (in XXIX I 9 and the reflexive as súlak and turn this into 'unite oneself with'. For the consociates of ária in -a and -a from the same base, cf. álica 'grow large' and állica- 'make large' > 'spread out' to állica- 'large'. The sense of the verb suggests ultimate derivation from the PIE root *wel- 'press, crowd together' seen in Grk. álēn 'elbow', hálle 'elbowed together', etc. Greek evidence for an initial árika in this root is weak (see Beekes, Develop. PIE Laryng., in Grk. 66 and 65, and initial *-ah would in any case not show up in Hittite. Since in all other cases and -a is demonstrative, we should probably start with a root noun *-weld-'of; cf. tamados- 'arrange' > *tamos- 'Jord, beforehand. I know of no direct evidence for such a root noun, but the sense is true of *wal- 'become dry' to the root *wel- (Hitt. wel- 'be dry, dry up').

For the deletion of the -a of *málkładā 'sweet' in the abstract *málkładāt of Hitt. pürpürtu 'bright' to pürpu 'bright'.

Notes on Palai
4. H. Craig Moteber

That was right, in the context of the text. It simply was a matter of choice. They do not have to be.

To this end, the meaning of "He said, 'I was dead'" in the context of the text is as follows:

1. "I was dead" in the text means that he was not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

2. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

3. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

4. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

5. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

6. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

7. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

8. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

9. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

10. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

11. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

12. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

13. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

14. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

15. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

16. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

17. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

18. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

19. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

20. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

21. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

22. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

23. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

24. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

25. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

26. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

27. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

28. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

29. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

30. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

31. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

32. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

33. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

34. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

35. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

36. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

37. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

38. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

39. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.

40. "I was dead" in the text means that he was dead and the.ws were not dead anymore, as he had already said that he was alive. This is a common use of the word "dead" in the context of the text.
The equation of Hittite initial ˘a- with ˘a- elsewhere points to PIE *a-. This cannot be reconciled with Palaeo initial b, nor need it be by an ad hoc assumption of an *h or other device. There is another PIE and Anatolian stem with initial ˘a- pointing to 'heat, set fire to', that of *bad₂a- 'hearth'. The equation of Hitt. *ba₃a₂ and Lat. ara demands a preform *kʰe₂a₂-aro. The second laryngeal, which is already required by Lat. long ˘a, is confirmed by Hitt. double ˘a: cf. inchoative ˘a˘f < *kʰa˘f and pādi- 'swallow' < *pʰa˘d. Compare also Hitt. dan- 'ashes, dust'. By definition a PIE 'root' of a shape *kʰe₂a₂ is complex, being analyzable into a root *kʰe₂a₂ plus enlargement -a-. Palaeo ˘a- is the missing *kʰe₂a₂. The loss of the second laryngeal (whether it is *h or *k is indeterminate) in *kʰe₂a₂-(e) would have produced a hiatus (or long vowel), which is reflected in ˘a-e-ro, ˘a-s-an-ta. It is the same root *kʰe₂a₂ which is the base of Hitt. *ba₃a₂- 'heat, warm season', but the formation of the latter is obscure.

5. ˘a₃u₃a₃

It is clear from the context of 2 A Ra 19-20 that Pal. ˘a₃u₃a₃(-at) is equivalent to *a₃NIG.GIG 'liver'. Poetto, KZ 95 (1981) 274, note 3, has attempted to equate ˘a₃u₃a₃(-at) to Hitt. *a₃panda₂a₂ṣ- 'stomach' (or similar). However, we have seen above (Section I.3) that -at is not part of the noun stem, but an enclitic form of hit 'this', referring to the liver which has just been served. As Poetto himself admits, the equation of Pal. -at to Hitt. -at is also problematic.

The Palaeo word for 'liver' is simply ˘a₃u₃a₃. This may be derived from a PIE adjective *pen₃- 'fattened': cf. Lith. pens 'fatten'. As elsewhere in IE languages, the epithet of the fattened liver has replaced the original name for the organ itself. Compare English 'liver' and relatives, which are cognate with Grk. ἰπέρις 'fat' and It. fegato, Fr. foie 'liver' < Lat. ın curs fidēsum 'liver of a goose fattened with figs'.

Pal. ˘a₃u₃a₃- < *pen₃- is phonologically regular, showing the usual change of *e to ˘a before a tense syllable medial: cf. schematic pres. 3rd pl. -e₃u₃ < *e₃u₃ and inv. 2nd pl. -e₃u₃ < *e₃u₃. It is true that most adjectives in -ne- attested elsewhere are active in sense: see Wallenagel-Debrunner, Altind. Gram. II 2.741, with cf. German. However, *e₃u₃-ne- 'son' appears to be 'the (one) born'. I have also suggested recently (JCS to appear) that Hitt. šek₃a₃- 'robe' represents a substantivized *piece of cloth' < *se₃-ne- 'that which is out' to PIE *sek₃- 'cut'. As is well-known, other verbal adjective suffixes such as *-de₃-, *-ne₃- and *-est₃- produce adjectives with either active or passive meaning from transitive roots. There thus seems no difficulty in assuming a meaning 'fattened' for *pen₃-, whence Pal. ˘a₃u₃a₃- 'liver'.

Some of the individual morphological and lexical analyses presented above have significant consequences for Palaeo phonology and its dialectal position within Anatolian. I hope to treat these issues soon in a separate discussion.
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