

*With
best wishes,
JCM*

STUDIES IN HONOR OF JAAN PUHVEL

PART ONE

ANCIENT LANGUAGES AND PHILOLOGY

Edited By

Dorothy Disterheft, Martin Huld and John Greppin

**Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph
Number Twenty**

Institute for the Study of Man
Washington D.C. 20005

1997

Zuntz, Leonie

1936

Die hethitischen Ortsadverbien arha, parā, piran als selbständige Adverbien und in ihrer Verbindung mit Nomina und Verba (Inaugural-Dissertation ... München). Speyer a. Rh.: PilgerDruckerei.

Denominative Verbs in Anatolian

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

I am pleased to be able to offer the following lines as a small token of appreciation to Jaan Puhvel for his many contributions to Hittite and Indo-European studies: *nu=ita DINGIR. MEŠ-eš namma dalugauš MU.KAM.ĜI.A-uš ħatulātarr=a piškandu!*

Recent advances in our understanding of the Anatolian languages besides Hittite since Oettinger (1979) make it worthwhile to revisit the topic of denominative verbal formations in Anatolian. I will focus in what follows on one class in particular, but it seems useful to place the problem in its overall context.

1. STATIVES IN *-*eh*₁- AND FIENTIVES IN *-*eh*₁*s*-. These are represented in Hittite by examples such as *dammate*- 'be empty' and *dannate*šš- 'become empty' < *dannatta*- 'empty'. This class was established for Hittite by Watkins (1973:51ff). For supporting evidence see Melchert (1984a:32f, 42f) and note now the concession by Oettinger (1992:225f). No trace of these has yet been found elsewhere in Anatolian. The development of *-*eh*₁ to *a* in Luvian, Lycian and Lydian (Melchert 1989a:40f; 1994:368) and the change *-*s(s)* > *h* in Lycian would have made these classes hard to identify if they survived.

2. FACTITIVES IN *-*n(e)u*-. As described by Oettinger (1979:249ff), this type is quite productive in Hittite, which shows examples such as *ħarg(a)nu*- 'whiten' < *ħarki*- 'white', beside the archaic type of *tepnu*- 'belittle' < *tepu*- 'little' (cf Skt *dabhoiti** 'harms', with Oettinger 1979:164f). This class is also assured in CLuvian, where it is usually thematized by back-formation from the third plural: e g *ārlanuwa*- '?' (sense unclear, but necessarily denominative, based on the shape). One unexplained detail is the unexpected gemination of the suffixal -*n*- JUST WHEN THE SUFFIX IS NOT EXTENDED BY -*a*-. contrast iterative *ħalalanu*-šša- 'purify' < *ħalāl(i)*- 'pure'. Some Lydian stems in -*no*-/*-vo*- MAY(!) also continue factitives in *-*n(e)u*-.: see Oettinger (1978:77) and Melchert (1992:52).

3. FACTITIVES IN **-eh₂-*. These are preserved in the productive Hittite class in *-ahh-*, as in *nēwahh-* 'make new', compared correctly already by Kuryłowicz (1927:102) with Lat. *(re)nouāre*. The matching type in CLuvian is represented by examples like *tūrā-* 'pierce' (or sim.) < *tūrāli-* (a tool); NB Pret 3Sg *tūrāka*, Imv 3Sg *uraddu*. Likewise in Lycian we find *prīnawa-* 'build' (Pret 3Sg *prīnawate/ē*) < *prīnawa-* 'house'. It is crucial to distinguish this class from those discussed below. The key feature is the consistently unlenited state of the endings, with CLuvian *-tt-* and Lycian *-t-*, as given above. Contrary to some claims, this shows that the change of tautosyllabic **eh₂* to **ā* took place only AFTER the lenition (or voicing) of stops and **h₂* following accented long vowels in Proto-Anatolian (the first lenition rule of Eichner 1973:79ff). Note the corroborating evidence of the synchronically isolated CLuvian *tatta/dādda* 'has stepped/arrived' < **(s)léh₂to* (Morpurgo Davies 1987:218f). I have argued that Lydian verbs with present third singulars in *-at* such as *bita(a)t* continue the same type (Melchert 1992:44f).

4. DENOMINATIVES IN **-ye/o-*. As per Oettinger (1979:343ff), this type is rampantly productive in Hittite, as elsewhere in Indo-European, and indeed to all varieties of nominal stems. As he also shows (1979:330ff), many Hittite verbs in *-uwe/a-* likewise reflect **-u-ye/ó-* with regular loss of intervocalic **y*: e.g. *šakruwe/a-* 'to water'.

Unsurprisingly, this is the one denominative formation which is secure for all other Anatolian languages as well: Palaic *luki(ya)-* 'apportion' < *luki-* 'portion'; CLuvian *īp(pa)tar(r)i-* 'distrain' < **īp(pa)ttar-* **seizing* and *šahhani-* 'impose s. upon' < **šahhan-* (Rosenkranz 1952:71); Lycian *qehūni-* < *qehū-* '?'; Lydian *sawtarid* 'protects' < *sawtaar-* 'protector' (Melchert 1992:47f; cf. already Oettinger 1978:87).

One should note, however, that the Lydian present third person in *-id* points to a Proto-Anatolian **-yedi* < **-yēti*, with lenition between unaccented vowels by Eichner's second lenition rule (Eichner 1973:10086; Morpurgo Davies 1982/83:262 ff). Since we would expect denominatives to have accented **-yēti*, the Lydian pattern must be analogical to the root-accented type of Hitt *wemiyēzzi*

'finds' or *aniyēzzi* 'carries out' (Melchert 1992:48, with discussion). Luvian preserves the contrast between the two types: CLuvian *ānīti* 'carries out' < **ēnh₂yēti* (via **ēn(y)idi*) vs. denominative *kalutīti* 'makes the rounds of' < **-yēti* (so also Morpurgo Davies 1982/83:266f).

5. FACTITIVES IN **-éh₂-ye/o-*. As per Melchert (1984a:39f), following the communis opinio (pace Oettinger 1979:357), many Hittite denominative verbs in *-ā(i)-/ā-* must reflect this well-attested Indo-European extension by **-ye/o-* of factitives in **-eh₂-* described above. Note doublets such as *armā(i)-* and *armahh-* 'impregnate; become pregnant'.

As already suggested by Watkins (1975:373), Palaic verbs in *-ā-/āga-* such as *takkuwāiti/takkuwagati* 'offers' or *hantanāti* 'meets with' represent this same type. The alternate derivation of Oettinger (1979:557) and Melchert (1984b:382⁴) from **-éh₂ti* cannot be correct. As we have just seen in section 3 above, the loss of the laryngeal here with compensatory lengthening follows Proto-Anatolian lenition, but the Palaic ending has consistently single, lenited *-t-*. Following Watkins, we must assume rather Pre-Anatolian **-éh₂yēti*, with retracted accent after the base type in **-éh₂-*, whence by lenition between unaccented vowels Proto-Anatolian **-éh₂yēdi*, leading regularly to Palaic *-a(g)ati*. For the phonetic realization see Melchert (1992:50f), who also cites the corroborating evidence of Lydian denominative verbs in *-ad* (*silawad*, *bita(a)d*, etc.), whose lenited ending likewise must continue **-éh₂yēdi* < **-éh₂yēti*.

CLuvian and Lycian show traces of the same type, but the sparse attestation obscures the picture. The clearest example is Lycian Pres3Sg *xttadi*, Pres3Pl *xttāiti* 'harm(s)'. The ad hoc univerbation account of Melchert (1989b:86) should be abandoned. One should assume rather with Oettinger (1976/77:135) an early umlaut of **yē* to **(y)i* in Luvian and Lycian (as well as Lydian): thus singular **-éh₂yēti* > **-āyēdi* > **-āyidi* > **-āyēdi* (with almost immediate contraction) > *-ādi* vs. plural **-éh₂yōniti* > **-āyōnti* > **-āyanti* (Luvian) **-āyenti* (Lycian) > *-ai(n)ti* (post-tonic syncope). In CLuvian the alternation of strong *-ā-* vs. weak *-āy-* (NB: exactly the OPPOSITE of Hittite!) has been disturbed by analogy (Imv3Pl *āruwandu/aruwāndu*), but the type is assured by the lenited endings

of the singular (e.g. *pašihāti* 'crushes'), versus the unlenited endings of *tūra-* < **éh₂*- cited above. For this identification (without the phonological details) see already Oettinger 1979:563f.

6. DENOMINATIVES FROM **o*- STEMS IN **e-ye/o-*. Oettinger (1979:357f) denies the existence of this type in Hittite, claiming that the latter replaced this class with **o-ye/o-* (see further below). In Melchert (1984a:36f) I argued that there are remnants of denominative **e-ye/o-* in Hittite, but the evidence remains very slim and controversial. Whatever the status of the Hittite examples, I now believe that such thematic denominatives are well-attested in Luvian and Lycian, in the type of Pres 3 Sg *-īti/-idi* beside Pres3Pl *-ainti/-eiti*.

The existence of this distinct class was demonstrated by Morpurgo Davies (1982/83:266ff), who stresses the fact that it is always the LENITED Pres3Sg *-īti/-idi* which occurs in the same paradigm as Pres3Pl *-ainti/-eiti*. This contrasts with UNLENITED *-īti* beside expected plural *-inti*. She correctly recognizes the latter type as simple stems in **ye/o-*, as per above. Pace Starke (1990:passim), there is NO suppletion between stems in *-ī-* and those in *-ā-*. We are dealing with two completely distinct classes.

Morpurgo Davies (1982/83:267f) reasonably tries to identify the peculiar *-īti*, *-ainti* type with Hitt *-ā(i)-* (the most productive class of denominatives in Hittite). As she points out, the lenition in the third singular ending could be due to either of the lenition rules of Eichner cited above, depending on the chronology. The problem, however, is to explain the vocalism *-i-* of the third singular, starting from a sequence **eh₂ye-*. By anyone's account, this should give in the first instance a long diphthong **āy*, which we would hardly expect to lead to simple long *-ī-* (Morpurgo Davies offers no supporting evidence).

I therefore propose that these verbs instead continue thematic denominatives in **e-ye/o-*. In the third singular the umlaut cited above leads to **eyi-*, whence contraction to **ey-* and then regularly Luvo-Lycian (long) *-ī-* (cf. **kei-* 'lie' > CLuv *zi-/Lyc.si-*). In the plu-

ral **eyonti* yields regularly Luvian **ayaniti* and Lycian **eyenti*, which eventually syncopates to attested *-ainti/-eiti*.¹

Readers will have noticed, however, that the expected inherited denominative accentuation **e-yéti* will not explain the lenited ending in *-īti/-idi* (cf. the consistently unlenited *-īti* < **yéti* in section 4 above). One must assume rather that the accent was retracted already in Proto-Anatolian after the iterative deverbal type in **ó-eye/o-* (cf. the same analogical development in Sanskrit, where denominatives in *-a-yáti* eventually become *-áyati* after the corresponding iteratives). A Proto-Anatolian **éyeti* was, of course, subject to the lenition rule between unaccented vowels cited earlier, whence **éyedi* and development to *-īti/-idi* as per above.

If my analysis of these denominatives is correct, we would expect to find at least some examples of the iteratives which I allege served as the model for the accent retraction. These verbs should be indistinguishable in their inflection from the denominatives. I believe there are two solid examples: (1) CLuvian *wiši-/wišai-* '(op)press, crush' (for the sense see Starke 1990:549) < **wóiseye/o-*; Milyan *wisi-/wisei-* is surely an exact cognate, although the meaning cannot be demonstrated; (2) CLuvian *tūpi-/tūpai-*, HLuvian *tu-pi-* (singular) and Lycian *tubi-/tubei-* 'strike' < *(s) *tóub^heye/o-* (cf. for the root shape Gk στυφελίζω). Assuming that either of these is denominative to a root noun would be entirely gratuitous.

I believe that the evidence of the matching iteratives corroborates my derivation of the denominatives in *-īti/-ainti* from thematic **e-ye/o-*, with analogical retraction of the accent. I have argued in Melchert (1992:46f) that Lydian verbs in *-ed* furnish correspondents for both types. Note that the lenited ending *-ed* also supports the accent retraction claimed for the Luvo-Lycian class. For the real Luvo-

¹One could entertain for the singular rather a loss of *y between two *e's and contraction to *ē, which would also certainly give Luvo-Lycian *-ī-*. However, I know of no other positive evidence for such a loss of *y. In any case, note that one CANNOT use a contracted preform **éti* to explain the lenition of the ending, because the contraction must be post-Common Anatolian, while Luvo-Lycian *-āiti/-aiti* < **eh₂ti* (section 3) shows that the lenition rule after accented long vowel had ceased to operate in Luvian and Lycian.

Lycian cognates of Hittite denominatives in $-\bar{a}(i)/-\bar{a}- < *-\acute{e}h_2ye/o-$ see section 5 above.

7. DENOMINATIVES FROM O-STEMS IN $*-o-ye/o-$ (?). We have not yet quite exhausted the available evidence for denominative verbs in Anatolian. Lycian shows a handful of poorly attested verbs which cannot be fit into any of the classes thus far described: Pre3Sg *tubedē*; Imv3Sg *dāzedu*. The first example cannot belong to the verb 'strike', for which the Pre3 Sg could be only $*tubide/\acute{e}$. The nominal base for *tubedē* is probably attested in TL 29, 10 (*tube*) and is in any case assured by the derived adjective *tubehe/i-*. The verb stem *dāze-* is surely based on a noun in *-aza-* or an adjective in *-ze/i-*, both very productive Lycian suffixes.

This additional class of denominatives is characterized in Lycian by predestinial *-e-* and lenition of the ending. Unless we wish to make simply a null hypothesis and attribute this type to some unknown Anatolian innovation, we have virtually only one Indo-European denominative type left to consider: the secondary thematic class in $*-o-ye/o-$. If we assume the same accent retraction as in the $*-e-ye/o-$ type established earlier, a Proto-Anatolian $*-\acute{o}-yeti$ would give $*-\acute{o}yedi$, whence with umlaut and contraction as per above SECONDARY pre-Lycian $*-\acute{o}ydi$. Whether this would lead to Lycian *-edi* is difficult to decide, but compare at least Pres3Sg *pije* 'gives', surely with a secondary diphthong as in HLuavian *pi-ya-i*.

As I noted in Melchert (1992:51), the origin of most Lycian verbs in *-od* remains obscure, but several must be denominative, based on their shape (*batarwod*, *ēntarḫod*). I now wonder if these likewise reflect the Lycian outcome of Proto-Anatolian $*-\acute{o}yedi$. We would expect umlaut and contraction to $*-\acute{o}ydi$, but whether the latter would produce simple *-od* in Lycian is at present quite unknown.

Recall that Oettinger (1979:358) derives the class of Hittite denominatives in $-\bar{a}(i)/-\bar{a}-$ precisely from a preform $*-o-ye/o-$. As I have argued in section 5 above, this cannot be correct for the class as a whole, some of which definitely reflect rather $*-\acute{e}h_2-ye/o-$, as commonly assumed. However, if we indeed suppose that Proto-Anatolian had a type in $*-\acute{o}-ye/o-$ with retracted accent, then this preform would ALSO lead regularly to Hittite $-\bar{a}i/-\bar{a}-$, as Oettinger sug-

gests (for lengthening of the accented $*\acute{o}$ in an open syllable see Eichner 1980:144⁶⁵ and Kimball 1983:136ff). Further, by regular prehistoric developments $*-\acute{o}ye/o-$ would also surely have merged with $*-\acute{e}h_2ye/o-$ in Luvian, whether one accepts my version of this merger in section 5 or not.

It is obvious that the Lycian and Lydian evidence for the very existence of a Proto-Anatolian type $*-\acute{o}-ye/o-$ is sparse and far from compelling. However, as noted, we do need SOME explanation for the Lycian leniting verbs in *-e-* and for most of the Lycian class in *-od*. I believe we need to seriously reconsider whether the massive Hittite class in $-\bar{a}i/-\bar{a}-$ (and likewise Luvian $-\bar{a}i/-\bar{a}i-$) represents a conflation of BOTH $*-\acute{e}h_2-ye/o-$ AND secondary thematic $*-\acute{o}-ye/o-$, types which remained distinct in Lycian and Lydian due to different phonological developments.

REFERENCES

- Eichner, Heiner
 1973 Die Etymologie von heth. *mēhur*. *MSS* 31:53-107.
 1980 Phonetik und Lautgesetze des Hethitischen – ein Weg zur ihrer Entschlüsselung. In *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie*, edited by Manfred Mayrhofer et al, 120-65. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kimball, Sara
 1983 *Hittite Plene Writing*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Ph.D. dissertation.
- Kurylowicz, Jerzy
 1927 *a* indoeuroéen et *h* hittite. *Symbolae ... Rozwadowski* 95-104. Krakow: Univ. Jagel.
- Melchert, H. Craig
 1984a *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
 1984b Notes on Palaic. *KZ* 97:22-43.
 1989a New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. *HS* 102:23-45.
 1989b *Lycian Lexicon* (self-published). Chapel Hill, NC.
 1992 The Third Person Present in Lydian. *IF* 97:31-54.

- 1994 Morpurgo Davies, Anna *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
1982/83 Dentals, Rhotacism and Verbal Endings in the Luwian Languages. *KZ* 96:245-70.
- 1987 'To Put' and 'to Stand' in the Luwian Languages. In *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill*, edited by Calvert Watkins, 205-28. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Oettinger, Norbert
1976/77 Nochmals zum lykischen Plural. *IncLing* 3: 131-5.
- 1978 Die Gliederung des anatolischen Sprachgebietes. *KZ* 92:74-92.
- 1979 *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nuremberg: Hans Carl.
- 1992 Die hethitischen Verbalstämme. In *Per una grammatica ittita*, edited by Onofrio Carruba, 213-52. Pavia: Luciano.
- Rosenkranz, Bernhard
1952 *Beiträge zur Erforschung des Luvischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Starke, Frank
1990 *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschriftluvischen Nomens* (StBoT 31). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Watkins, Calvert
1973 Hitrite and Indo-European Studies: The Denominative Statives in *-ē-*. *TPS* 1971:51-93.
- 1975 Die Vertretung der Laryngale in gewissen morphologischen Kategorien in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens. In *Flexion und Wortbildung*, edited by Helmut Rix, 358-78. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Zu einigen Pronominalformen des Hethitischen

ERICH NEU

Ruhr-Universität Bochum

EINLEITUNG

0.1 Nicht alle in hethitischen Texten bezugten Pronominalformen sind hinsichtlich ihrer grammatischen Bestimmung unumstritten. Mitunter stellt sich auch noch die Frage nach der richtigen Lesung.

0.2 Unter Heranziehung zunächst recht disparat anmutender Pronominalformen gelang Laroche (1979:147ff.; 151) die Restituierung eines sehr archaischen Pronominalparadigmas, dessen Deixisfeld auf der Vokaltrias idg.**o-* (heth. *a-*), **u-* und **e-* beruht, wobei offensichtlich die geschlossene Aussprache des *e-* im Hethitischen zu graphischen Schwankungen zwischen *e-* und *i-* führte. Während **o-* (heth. *a-*) und *u-* in der Klasse [+ BELEBT] angesiedelt sind, hat man **e-* doch wohl der Klasse [- BELEBT] zurechnen: heth. *a=š=i* (**o=s=i*) Nom. Sing. c., *u=n=i* Akk. Sing. c., *e=ni* Nom.-Akk. Sing. n. Diese Kasusformen zeigen im Auslaut einheitlich noch die deiktische Partikel *-i*, die in den anderen bezugten Kasus (Dativ, Lokativ, Ablativ) fehlt.¹ Bemerkenswert ist, daß die außerhalb von Nominativ und Akkusativ bezugten Pronominalformen (*edani* Dativ, *edi* Lokativ, *edez* Ablativ) klassenunabhängig deiktisches *e-* als Grundlage haben, was für die genannten drei Kasus auf eine Art Neutralisierung oder Indifferenz gegenüber einer bestimmten Klassendeixis zu weisen scheint.²

¹Die Dativ- und Lokativformen *edani* bzw. *edi* enthalten in ihrem auslautenden *-i* eine Kasusendung (**-ej* bzw. **-i*). Abweichend von Lebrun 1976:123 hat man in mittelheth. KUB XXIX 7+ Rs. 39 nicht [PA-JNI], das schon syntaktisch fehl am Platz ist, sondern *i-ni* zu lesen. Auch liegt in Vs. 29 (Lebrun, 119) nicht [*e-]ni-i*, sondern am ehesten [*e-da-]ni-i* vor; vgl. Rs. 25 *e-da-ni*.

²Es vollzieht sich im Hethitischen zwischen Genus commune und Genus neutrum ein ähnlicher Ausgleich, wie er in den obliquen Kasusformen des indogermanischen Demonstrativpronomens **so*, **sā*, **tod* anzutreffen ist, wo im Nominativ die Pronominalformen der Klasse [+BELEBT] mit *s-*, nicht-belebtes **tod* im Nom.-Akk. aber mit *t-* anlautet. Wie z.B. das Altindische mit