



Friends and Alumni of

INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES BULLETIN

University of California at Los Angeles

Volume 12, Number 1, November 2007

Luvian Evidence for PIE **H₃eit-* ‘take along; fetch’

Tichy (2004) has established a PIE verbal root **H₃eit-* ‘take along’ on the basis of Gk. οἴσομαι ‘fetch, take long’ and Lat. *ūtor* ‘use’. I may summarize the crucial points of her demonstration as follows. Most Homeric examples of οἴσομαι mean not merely ‘carry, bring’, but specifically ‘fetch’. That is, they include motion to a place to obtain something as well as bringing it back and handing it over (2004:179-84). Other uses refer to carrying something in conjunction with a movement that is an independent act: ‘take along’ (2004:185-87). Tichy takes this meaning as original and argues that the shift in sense to ‘fetch’ likely arose in collocation with motion verbs “...**‘geh und denk daran, mitzunehmen* → *‘geh und hol/bring’ oder *‘er ging und wollte sich mitnehmen’* → *‘er ging, um sich zu holen’*...”

In formal terms οἴσομαι reflects an old desiderative stem in **-se/o-* to a root **H₃eis/t-* (**[hois/t-]*). Assumption of a root shape **H₃eit-* also permits derivation of Lat. *ūte-* from an *e*-grade category: thematic present or root present **H₃éit-/H₃it-*. Tichy chooses the latter, with the Latin deponent reflecting an innovative Italic oppositional middle (2004:192-96). The sense of the middle shifts from **‘take along for oneself’* to *‘make use of’*. She seeks direct evidence for the active root present in the Duenos inscription: *oisi* is an infinitive (for **oissi*) and *oit* is an

imperative second singular (for **oid*) with a meaning ‘take along’ (2004:196-99). For a different view of the Duenos forms see Dupraz in Blanc et al. (2004:337-39). Crucial for present purposes is a root of the form **H₃eit-* that shows a sense ‘fetch’ arising from use with motion verbs.

We find attested twice in a single passage the Cuneiform Luvian verb *hizza(i)-*. The context of the following passage KUB 35.102+ ii 11-iii 7 is that of the end of a birth ritual. Compare the colophon (line iii 10): 2 *hukmaiš armauwaš QAT[I]* ‘Two birth rituals. (The text) is complete’. For the text see Starke (1985:222).

[iū]nni=wa^dEN.ZU-anzanza kummaya[nza]
[hat]ayannanza āpan hizzaūn[ni]
iyandu=ku=wa zaššin DUMU-annašši[n]
ānnin warallin uwata[ndu]
[a]nniš=ku=wa=ti parnan=za maddū[wati]
[p]apparkuwatti tātiš=pa=wa=ti=[?]a[ta]
x-tiyati pušuriya[tī]
[p]appašatti [-]
[p]a=wa iyandu^dEN.ZU-inzi x[...]
kummayanza hatayannanza
apan hizzaindu
zam=pa=ku=wa DUMU-nin wallindu
šannaindu pa=wa=an=tar ānni
ūtani dūwandu pa=aš pūwa
[kuw]ati āšta nanun=ha=aš apati āšdu

'Let us go and **fetch** him from the holy *h.*- of the moons/months.'

'Let them also go and bring this child's own mother.'

'The mother shall also purify the house with wine, while the father shall sprinkle it

with *pusuriya-*.'

'Let the [] moons/months go and **fetch** him from the holy *hatayanna-*.'

'Let them also lift and turn upside down this child. Let them place him on the mother's breast. As she was before, so let her also be now.'

In Melchert (1993:75) I tentatively translated *hizza(i)-* as 'hand over', based on the cooccurrence with both accusative and dative objects. However, the immediately following context clearly refers to the birth of the child, so it makes far better sense to suppose that the child is being fetched from the 'holy *hatayanna-*', with a "dative of disadvantage." The word *hatayanna-* (attested only here) may refer either to some kind of assistants of the months or to the supposed source (place) from which the months obtain children (a *plurale tantum* would not be surprising for such a concept). Due to the merger of the dative and locative cases in Hittite and Luvian, the dative-locative may express 'from' with inanimate objects as well as with persons. For such a use in Luvian compare KARKAMIŠ A6 §28: *ta-sà-pa-wa/i-' ta-si* | NEG₃ +i CUM-*ni ARHA* | *tà-ya* 'or takes away a stele from a stele' (parallel to ablative-instrumentals in preceding and following clauses).

It is also noteworthy that our verb occurs in both instances in the so-called "serial" construction with the verb 'go', which is frequent in Hittite (see most recently van den Hout 2003), but attested for certain only here in Luvian. Thus not only does the specific meaning 'fetch' established for **H₃eit-* by Tichy illuminate our Luvian passage, but the collocation with a motion verb that she predicted is also directly attested. While it is possible that the development of the sense 'fetch' is a parallel independent innovation in Greek and Luvian, I find it more likely that the PIE verb already had this connotation.

The attested imperative third plural *hizzaindu* and indicative present first plural

hizzaun[ni] argue for a synchronic Luvian stem *hizzā(i)-* of the class of denominatives in **-éH₂ye/o-* (see Melchert 1997:133-34): compare preterite third plural *\ti<š>šainta* 'made ready' to *tiššā(i)-* 'make ready, fashion' and infinitives *gulzāuna* 'to draw' and *\patalhauna* 'to fetter' versus from stems in *-a-* the infinitives *palhuna* < *palha-* 'spread' and first plurals *maršu<n>ni* < *marša-* '?', *piünni* < *piya-* 'give', and *hūiunni* < *huya-* 'run', which show in synchronic terms deletion of the stem-final *-a-*. As Michael Weiss reminds me, the stem *hizzā(i)-* could be derived directly from the root **H₃eit-* if we assumed a virtual stem **H₃eit-séH₂ye/o-* comparable to the type of Lat. *uexāre* 'afflict, harass'. However, the absence of any other evidence for this type in Anatolian makes me hesitate to reconstruct such a source for our verb.

The preform **H₃eit-se/o-* reconstructed for Gk. οἴσομαι would lead regularly to a CLuvian stem **hizza-* for which we would expect inflection as a *hi-*verb, as in marked imperfectives in *-ssa-* (for which see Jasanoff 2003:132, 136-39): **hizzai*, *hizzanti* like CLuv. *karmalaššai* 'becomes crippled'. The fact that in our verb the sequence **-t-s-* produced *-zz-* would make no difference, since by analogy to imperfectives in *-ssa-* Luvian imperfectives in *-zza-* < **-ške/o-* also inflect as *hi-*verbs: CLuv. *halwatnazzai* 'gets excited' (or sim.).

However, lexicalization of **hizza-* as a base verb 'fetch' (cf. lexicalized *-ške-* in Hitt. *iške-* 'anoint' or *duške-* 'rejoice') would have left the verb open to analogical influence of the Luvian verbs with a fixed stem in *-ā-*. One may compare the behavior of the cited lexicalized Hittite stems in *-ške-*, where we find innovative and analogical *iškiyazi*, *duškiyazi*, *dušgai*, *duškun* versus the very stable inflection of stems in *-ške-* when they function as marked imperfectives (see Oettinger 1979:326). It is therefore likely that lexicalized **hizza-* inflected as a *mi-*verb.

Stems in fixed *-ā-* crucially included those with and without lenited endings. Per Melchert (1994:69, 1997:132) Luvo-Lycian verbs in *-a-* with unlenited endings continue denominatives in **-eH₂-*, with loss of laryngeal before stop after the Proto-Anatolian lenition rule. But such stems were originally *hi-*verbs (Jasanoff 2003:139-41), so the attested inflection and lack of lenition is secondary (thus already Hajnal

1995:131). Loss of $*H_2$ before stops therefore precedes the lenition rule (with Hajnal 1995:162¹⁸²). This chronology also allows derivation of CLuv. *manāti* ‘sees’ < $*mnéH_2ti$, with a root shape attested elsewhere, instead of an invented $*mneH_1-$ (with Starke 1980:147 contra Melchert 1994:237 et alibi). CLuvian also surely had some simple thematic stems in $*-ati/-anti$ with lenited third singular ending: compare HLuv. AEDIFICARE+*MI-ri+i* ‘builds’, i.e. [tamari], rhotacized from $*tamadi$.

The presence in CLuvian of stems with lenited third singulars $-ati/-ata$ beside third plurals $-anti/-anta$ would have particularly favored interchange with stems in $-ati/-ainti$, and such interference is in fact well attested, in both directions. For stems in $-ā(i)-$ we also find forms with $-ā-$ inflection: *puwā(i)-* ‘crush’ (NB lenited 3sg. pres. *puwāti* and the Hittite stem *puwā(i)-*) shows 3pl. impv. *pūwandu* (expect $*puwaindu$), *pašihā(i)-* ‘pulverize’ (lenited 3sg. pres. $\backslash pašihāti$) shows 1sg. pret. *pāšihahha* (unlenited!). Conversely for stems in $-ā-$ we find forms with $-ā(i)-$ inflection: *lāla-* ‘take’ shows the infinitive *lalauna* (expect $*laluna$), *aruna-* ‘?’ (NB 2sg. impv. *arunā/arūna*) shows 3pl. impv. *arunaindu* beside expected *arunandu*. For 2sg. impv. as diagnostic for an *a*-stem (contra Melchert 1993:33) compare to stems in $-ā(i)-$ 2sg. impv. *tiššāi*, *ušantarāi*, *annarummāi*. We are thus allowed likewise to assume that the attested $-ā(i)-$ forms *hizzaūnni* and *hizzaindu* are secondary to an *a*-stem $*hizza-$.

It would obviously be desirable to have at least one attested example of our verb with the predicted *a*-stem inflection, in order to confirm the proposed derivation. However, the precise meaning ‘fetch’ in collocation with a motion verb and the formal match between *hizzV-* and $*H_3eitsV-$ are so striking to be mere coincidence. CLuv. *hizza(i)-* provides not only a third reflex of PIE $*H_3eit-$ ‘take along; fetch’ beside Gk. οἴσομαι and Lat. *ūtor*, but also further welcome evidence for the appearance of word-initial $*H_3$ in Hittite and Luvian as *h-*.

References

- Blanc, Alain, Jean-Paul Brachet, and Charles de Lamberterie
 2004 Chronique d'étymologie latine. N° 2.
Revue de philologie 78(2):317-39.
 Hajnal, Ivo
 1995 *Der lykische Vokalismus*. Graz: Leykam.

- van den Hout, Theo
 2003 *Studies in the Hittite Phraseological Construction. I. Its Syntactic and Semantic Properties*. In: *Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr.*, G.M. Beckman, R.H. Beal and J.G. McMahon (eds.), Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 177-204.
 Jasanoff, Jay
 2003 *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
 Melchert, H. Craig
 1993 *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill: self-published.
 1994 *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
 1997 Denominative Verbs in Anatolian. In: *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel. Part One. Ancient Languages and Philology*, Dorothy Disterheft et al. (eds.). Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 131-38.
 Oettinger, Norbert
 1979 *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
 Starke, Frank
 1980 Keilschriftluwisch *manā-^{III}* ‘sehen’, *mammanna-^I* ‘schauen’. *Kadmos* 19:142-48.
 1985 *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift* (Studien zu den Boğazköy Texten 30). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 Tichy, Eva
 2004 Gr. οἴσομαι, lat. *ūtor* und die Mittelzeile der Duenos-Inschrift. *Glotta* 78:179-202.

H. Craig Melchert
 Program in Indo-European Studies
 UCLA
 melchert@humnet.ucla.edu

