

# The PIE Verb for ‘to pour’ and Medial $*h_3$ in Anatolian

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

*University of California, Los Angeles*

## 1. ‘to pour (a liquid)’ in Hittite and Luvian

The verb ‘to pour (a liquid)’ in Hittite is originally a *hi*-verb *lāh(h)u-* (OH/OS P3Sg *lāhui*, P3Pl *lahuanzi*, Ptc. *la-ḫu-a-an*).<sup>1</sup> Clearly secondary are the *hi*-verb stem *lāh(h)uwa-* back-formed from the third plural and the *mi*-verb stems *lahu-* (P3Sg *lahuzzi*) and *lāhuwā(i)-* (P3Sg *lāhūwāizzi*). Important is the fact that according to the figures of the *CHD*, *lāḫu(wa)-* with single *-ḫ-* is attested ninety-nine times beside *lahḫutti* (1×), *lahḫūwai* (2×), *lāḫḫuš* (1×), *lahḫuten* and *lāḫḫuwaten* (1× each in a single manuscript).<sup>2</sup> The alleged stem *lāh-* is assured only in the Imv2Sg *lāḫ* (2×). The Pret1Sg *lāḫun* can belong to the *mi*-verb stem *lahu-* and is not probative for a stem *lāh-*. There is also in Hittite a reduplicated stem *lilḫu(wa)-* ‘pour (repeatedly)’.

In CLuvian we find a stem *lu-u-wa-* ‘to pour’ (Pret3Pl *lu-u-wa-an-da* and syncopated *lu-ú-un-ta*). From an unattested infinitive *\*lā(h)una* there is also a denominative stem *lā(h)uni-/lā(h)unāi-* ‘to wash (away)’ (sense thus contra Puhvel 2001:23 et al., since the verb is used of both the thing cleansed [‘pediment’] and the thing removed [‘evil word’]). CLuvian also shows a reduplicated stem *lilūwa-* corresponding to Hittite *lilḫu(wa)-*. Finally, often overlooked is *ilḫā(i)-\** (P1Sg *elhawi*, P3Sg *ilḫati*, Pret1Sg *ēlḫāḫa*, Imv3Sg *ēlḫādu*) and the reduplicated *hi*-verb *ililḫā-*. Both of these also mean ‘to wash’ and cannot be separated from the other CLuvian forms.

The combined Hittite and Luvian evidence clearly points to an original ablauting *hi*-verb parallel to those in *-i-*, thus reconstructable as *\*léh<sub>2</sub>w-ei*, *\*lh<sub>2</sub>w-énti* (Jasanoff 2003:143) or *\*lól<sub>2</sub>u-ei*, *\*lh<sub>2</sub>u-énti* (Kloekhorst 2008:512; similarly Kimball 1999:398). Note that contra Kloekhorst CLuvian *ilḫā(i)-* confirms that *\*leh<sub>2</sub>w-* contains a suffix or enlargement. Since Luvian *ī* in this environment cannot reflect historical short *\*e*, *ilḫā(i)-* is apparently a lengthened-grade

---

1 I follow the conventions of the *CHD* in using the sigla OH, MH, and NH and OS, MS, and NS to indicate respectively Old, Middle, and New Hittite compositions and manuscripts.

2 The alleged example †[*lahḫuēšnit*] cited by Kloekhorst (2008:512), which can only be that of KUB 41.40 i 20 also read and restored thus by Puhvel (2001:22), does not exist. Read rather [*luḫḫuēšnit*] with Zeilfelder 2000:498, followed by Kloekhorst himself (2008:892).

iterative of the type of Latin *cēlāre* ‘to hide’ (CLuvian *kišā(i)-* ‘to comb’ and *widā(i)-* ‘to strike’ are further likely examples, although their root vocalism is strictly speaking ambiguous). I find it more likely that *īlhā(i)-* is back-formed from zero-grade *\*lh<sub>2</sub>-* rather than a reflex of a true “state I” *\*el-h<sub>2</sub>-* beside *\*l-eh<sub>2</sub>-*, but the latter is in principle possible.

The analyses just cited of the Hittite verb reflect an assumed root etymology *\*leh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘to pour’, allegedly attested in Lat. *lāma* ‘puddle, swamp, morass’ (Schmitt-Brandt 1967:65). One should note that if Balto-Slavic forms like Lithuanian *lomà* ‘depression, hollow’ and Bulgarian *lam* ‘pit’ are cognate, their sense is fatal to derivation of the Latin from ‘to pour’, since the former have no necessary reference to water. However, the Balto-Slavic words are likely not related to the Latin: see Fraenkel 1962:385 and Derksen 2008:268.

The real difficulty with the derivation from an alleged root *\*leh<sub>2</sub>-* is that it cannot explain the overwhelming Hittite spelling with single *-h-* (see the acknowledgement of the problem by Jasanoff [2003:143] with reference to the very complex account by Melchert 1994:72–3). A general “lenition” of voiceless obstruents after accented *\*ó* as per Kloekhorst (2006 [2008]:132 and 2008:65, 98) is falsified by examples like Hitt. *āppa* ‘back’ ← *\*ópi* (cf. HLuvian *á-pi*) and *dākki* ‘matches’ < *\*dókei*, while special Hittite lenition of just *\*h<sub>2</sub>* after *\*ó* (Kimball 1999:397) is entirely ad hoc (it is also contradicted by *lāhha-* ‘campaign’ with the plene spelling *la-a-ah-<sup>o</sup>* requiring *\*lóh<sub>2</sub>o-*).<sup>3</sup> An explanation of the Hittite pattern of present third singular with single obstruent versus third plural with geminate in certain *hi*-verbs like *aki*, *akkanzi* ‘die’ remains to be found.

The sense of Hittite *lāh(h)u-* and its general shape argue strongly for cognation with Latin *lauō*, Greek *λοέω*, etc. ‘to wash’, as already suggested by Sturtevant (1927:122 et alibi). See the characteristically pointed discussion by Puhvel (2001:23–4). This derivation has been blocked for most scholars by the prevailing assumption that *\*h<sub>3</sub>* was lost or assimilated in all word-medial positions: see, e.g., Eichner 1980:129n41, Melchert 1994:72–4, and Kimball 1999:385.

## 2. Medial *\*h<sub>3</sub>* in Hittite and Luvian reconsidered

Kloekhorst (2006:98–101 and 2008:836–9) has now demonstrated that no Luvo-Hittite verb stem *†/tarH-/* exists, only */tarH<sup>w</sup>-/* ‘be able; conquer’, spelled *tar-hu-*, *ta(r)-ru-uh-*, *tar-uh-* (sic!), entirely parallel to *e-ku-*, *e-uk-* ‘drink’ */eg<sup>w</sup>-/*. As he

3 That *lāhha-* is a remade root noun and retains unlenited *-h-* from instances of preconsontal *\*-h<sub>2</sub>-* is highly unlikely.

cogently argues, evidence against the previous reading of the ambiguous *tar-Vh-* as *tar-ah-* with an “empty vowel” for /tarH-/ is the complete absence of spellings †*tar-ḫa-<sup>o</sup>*, †*tar-ḫe/i-<sup>o</sup>*. One may compare the case of genuine /parH-/ ‘to chase’ which beside P3Sg *pár-ah-zi* attests both P3Pl *pár-ḫa-an-zi* and *pár-ah-ḫa-an-zi*.<sup>4</sup> We must therefore conclude with Kloekhorst that a sequence  $*h_2w$  developed to Proto-Anatolian  $*h^w/x^w$ , a unitary labialized fricative, spelled in Hittite *C-ḫu-* but also *-uh-(ḫV-)*.

This analysis has a number of important further implications. For those involving Lycian *q* I refer the reader to the treatment by Kloekhorst himself (2006: 98–101). What is crucial for our purposes is that CLuvian *tatarḫ-* cannot be derived from  $*terh_2-$ . As correctly noted by Kloekhorst (2008:838), the attested sense ‘to break’ already made the derivation dubious: *a=an DINGIR.MEŠ-inzi āḫḫa nātatta tatarḫandu* “Let the gods break him like reeds” (KUB 9.6+ iii 26–27; compare Hittite *duwarnanzi* *ibid.* iii 23). To overpower or conquer is not the same as to break. Kloekhorst persuasively derives the CLuvian verb rather from the root  $*terh_3-$  of Grk. τρώω ‘to wound’. The realization that some medial instances of  $*h_3$  are preserved as Hittite *-ḫ-* also allows derivation of *walḫ-* ‘to strike’ from the root  $*welh_3-$  seen in Grk. ἐάλων (Kloekhorst 2008:946). For the latter suggestion see already *LIV*<sup>2</sup> 679. The precise conditions for preservation of medial  $*h_3$  in Hittite remain to be worked out, but that it was in some cases maintained as *-ḫ-* can no longer be doubted.

### 3. A new proposal for *lāḫu-*

If PIE  $*h_2w$  developed into a unitary fortis/voiceless labialized PA  $*h^w/*x^w$  and not all medial  $*h_3s$  were lost, then we may suppose that likewise  $*h_3w$  developed into a unitary lenis/voiced labialized PA  $*ɣ^w/ʕ^w$ , spelled as expected *-(V)-ḫu-*. One finds this idea *in nuce* already in Hovdhaugen 1971:122, but with a labialized PIE laryngeal, and in Kloekhorst 2006:100n60 and 2008:512–3, but wrongly with  $*h_2w$  (leaving the overwhelmingly single spelling unexplained) and no etymology. I suggest explicitly for ‘to pour’:

PIE strong stem  $*lé/óh_3-w-$  > PA  $*lóɣ^w-$  > Hittite *lāḫu-*, CLuvian *lā(h)u-* (source of generalized Hittite *lāḫu-*)

PIE weak stem  $*lh_3-u-C$  → PIE  $*luh_3-C-$  > Hittite, CLuvian *lu-u-* (source of generalized CLuv. *lu-u-wa-*)

4 I am indebted to colleagues at the University of Chicago, who in response to my query sent me the draft article for this verb by Oğuz Soysal. Soysal independently came to the same conclusion as Kloekhorst on the same grounds (without explicit discussion of the phonetics).

The outcome of the prevocalic weak stem PIE  $*lh_3w-V-$  is uncertain. If the  $*l-$  was kept non-syllabic due to the pressure of the other allomorphs, then there was likely regular loss of  $*h_3$  between consonants and thus  $*luw-V$ . A regular syllabification  $*lh_3w-V$  would have led to  $*alh_3w-V-$  (i.e.,  $/al\gamma^w-/$ ). In either case this allomorph was unsurprisingly leveled out in both languages. Existence of the strong stem  $lā(h)u-$  in Luvian is confirmed by the derived  $lā(h)uni-/lā(h)unāi-$  ‘to wash (away)’ reflecting an infinitive  $*lā(h)una$ .

The assumption of a unitary originally lenis/voiced labialized velar predicts most examples of Hittite  $lāhhu-$  with geminate: by devoicing before  $-s-$  (Pret3Sg  $lāhhuš$  and noun  $lahhuš$ ) and  $-t-$  (P2Sg  $lahhutti$  and P2Pl  $lahhuten$ , whence by mechanical renewal  $lāhhuwaten$ ). Only the two examples of P3Sg  $lahhūwai$  must be taken as analogical. As already seen by Kloekhorst (2008:512), delabialization of a labialized velar fricative is not implausible in Auslaut (compare Lat. *nec, ac* from apocopated  $*nek^w/*atk^w$  versus *neque, atque*). Hence the twice attested Imv2Sg  $lāh$  versus *eku* ‘drink!’ with analogical restoration. With only two examples of the imperative second singular attested for ‘to pour’ we cannot exclude that likewise a restored  $*lāhu$  may have existed.

Assumption of  $*h_3w$  (and of genuine lenited  $*h_2w$ ) developing to  $\gamma^w$  also simplifies the Luvian result. We need only assume the attested tendency for Luvian  $-Vh_3wV-$  (NB with single  $-h-$ !) to be reduced to  $-VwV-$ , for which see Melchert 1994:258. By the analysis suggested here this weakening actually consists of deocclusion of a unitary  $\gamma^w$  to  $w$ , which is reminiscent of the regular deocclusion of  $*g^w > w$  in Luvian. CLuvian *li-luwa-* is likely an independent creation from *lu-u-wa-*, based on a pattern productive in Luvian as well as Hittite, not an inherited cognate of Hittite *lilhu(w)-* (contra Melchert, loc. cit.).

The Core Indo-European root  $*leuh_3-$  may easily be back-formed from the metathesized pre-consonantal zero-grade  $*luh_3-$ . Compare  $*keh_2u-$  ‘strike, split’  $>$  Tocharian AB *ko-/kau-* ( $< *kh_2u-$ ) and via the metathesized zero-grade  $*kuh_2-$  the new full grade  $*keuh_2-$  in Lith. *kāju*, ON *hoggva*, etc. (see Jasanoff 1978:79–82, Hackstein 1995:54–6 and *LIV*<sup>2</sup> 345–6).

#### 4. The semantics of ‘to pour’ in PIE

Derivation of Anatolian ‘to pour (a liquid)’ from the same root as ‘to wash’ in the Core Indo-European languages has implications for the semantics of ‘to pour’ in PIE. The combined evidence suggests the following scenario, with three roots in this semantic field in PIE. First, there was  $*leh_3w-$  ‘to pour’ liquid (only) beside  $*h_1erH-$  ‘to wash’ (Hitt. *ārr-*, TochA *yār-*). In Core Indo-European the latter was

lost, and \*leh<sub>3</sub>w- (in the form \*leuh<sub>3</sub>-) was specialized to ‘to wash’ (contra Puhvel 2001:24–5).

Second, PIE had a root \*sh<sub>2</sub>eu- ‘to pour’ both liquid and dry materials (processual in meaning, as per García Ramón 2008:165). This root appears in Hittite as išhu(wa)- and (from the metathesized zero-grade \*suh<sub>2</sub>-C) also as šuhha-, both meaning ‘to pour, sprinkle’, restricted only to dry materials.<sup>5</sup> Elsewhere it became specialized rather to liquid, whence Tocharian AB suw-/swās- and Greek ὕει ‘to rain’ (thus with LIV<sup>2</sup> 545).

Finally, there was PIE \*ĝheu- ‘to pour’ liquid and dry materials (momentive, as per García Ramón 2008:157). The latter sense is reflected indirectly in Hittite kutt- ‘wall’ and CLuvian kuttasšara/i- ‘orthostat’, as per Puhvel 1997:299 and Kloekhorst 2008:499 (false García Ramón 2008:156). The original double sense is still preserved in Greek and Latin, with specialization to liquid only elsewhere in Core Indo-European (contra García Ramón 2008:160).

### References

- CHD = Güterbock, Hans Gustav, Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., and Theo Ph. J. van den Hout (eds.). 1980–. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Derksen, Rick. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Eichner, Heiner. 1980. Phonetik und Lautgesetze des Hethitischen—ein Weg zu ihrer Entschlüsselung. In Manfred Mayrhofer (ed.), *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie: Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. Wien, 24.–29. September 1978, 120–65. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Fraenkel, Ernst. 1962. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- García Ramón, José Luis. 2008. Ererbtes und Ersatzkontinuanten bei der Rekonstruktion von indogermanischen Konstruktionsmustern: Idg. \*ĜHEU- und Heth. LĀḪU-ḪḪI ‘Giessen’. In Alexander Lubotsky, Jos Schaeken, and Jeroen Wiedenhof (eds.), *Evidence and Counter-Evidence: Essays in Honour of Frederik Kortlandt I: Balto-Slavic and Indo-European Linguistics*, 151–69. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Hackstein, Olav. 1995. *Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsensstambildungen des Tocharischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

5 The attempt by Melchert (1984:99n49) to distinguish iterative išhu(wa)- ‘to sprinkle’ from šuhh(a)- ‘pour (out)’ is not supported by the overall usage! Thus there is no evidence for an alleged reduplicated \*h<sub>2</sub>i-sh<sub>2</sub>w-. Hittite išhu- is generalized from the prevocalic zero-grade: \*sh<sub>2</sub>w-énti, etc. We are dealing with a case of paradigm split, not two different prehistoric paradigms.

- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1971. Review of *Einführung in die Laryngaltheorie*, by Fredrik Lindeman. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 25.116–26.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 1978. Observations on the Germanic Verschärfung. *MSS* 37.77–90.
- . 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kimball, Sara. 1999. *Hittite Historical Phonology* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 95). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2006. Initial Laryngeals in Anatolian. *HS* 119.77–108.
- . 2006 [2008]. Čop's Law in Luwian Revisited. *Die Sprache* 46.131–6.
- . 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- LIV<sup>2</sup> = Helmut Rix et al. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*<sup>2</sup>. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1984. *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- . 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3). Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1997. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 4: Words Beginning with K*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 2001. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 5: Words Beginning with L*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schmitt-Brandt, Robert. 1967. *Die Entwicklung des indogermanischen Vokalsystems: Versuch einer inneren Rekonstruktion*. Heidelberg: Groos.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. 1927. Hittite *h* Initial = Indo-European *bh*. *Language* 3.109–22.
- Zeifelder, Susanne. 2000. Heth. *tuhhuessar* und der Thymian. In Michaela Ofitsch and Christian Zinko (eds.), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz*, 497–508. Graz: Leykam.