

Georges-Jean Pinault	447
Sur les traces du lièvre tokharien	
Elisabeth Rieken	457
Luwisch <i>tarza/i</i>	
Don Ringe	469
Some Problematic Consonant Clusters in Tocharian	
Jørgen Rischel	475
Some Thoughts on Sound Change	
Ralf-Peter Ritter	487
Zur Etymologie von lat. <i>lignum</i>	
Helmuth Rix	491
Ein neuer oskisch-griechischer Göttername in Pompei	
Peter Schrijver	507
Apes, Dwarfs, Rivers and Indo-European Internal Derivation	
Vitaly Shevoroshkin	513
Topics in Milyan	
Maren Sleth †	527
Hieroglyphic Luvian <i>zaxzami</i>	
Wojciech Smoczyński	529
Litauisch <i>vėžė</i> als Zeugnis einer athematischen Präsensform	
Marko Snoj	537
Zur Akzentuierung der urslawischen <i>ter</i> -Stämme	
Finn Thiesen	545
Telugu Loanwords and the Influence of Prehistoric Telugu on Indo-Aryan	
Gudrún Þórhallsdóttir	555
The Etymology of Old Norse <i>egfir</i> 'hawk'	
Eva Tichy	565
Vedisch <i>īraṁ</i>	
Xavier Tremblay	573
Die Ablautstufe des Lokativs der akrostatischen Nomina (AOPHONICA III)	
Michiel de Vaan	591
'Narten' Roots from the Avestan Point of View	
Theo Vennemann	601
Note on the Etymology of PGmc. <i>*smītan</i> and <i>*smipaz</i> (E. <i>smite</i> , <i>smith</i> , G. <i>schmeißen</i> , <i>Schmied</i> , etc.)	
Brent Vine	615
New Thoughts on an Old Curse (Tab. Ig. Vlb 60/VIIa 49)	
Jos J.S. Weitenberg	627
Armenian <i>barwōk</i> 'Good, Well'	
Stefan Zimmer, Harald Jankuhn and Rolf Ködderitzsch	633
Schleicher's Tale: Six Post-PIE Versions	

PER ASPERA AD ASTERISCOS

Studia Indogermanica in honorem
JENS ELMEGÅRD RASMUSSEN
sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV

Ediderunt

Adam Hyllested, Anders Richardt Jørgensen,
Jenny Helena Larsson et Thomas Olander

INNSBRUCKER BEITRÄGE ZUR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

Herausgeber: Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Meid

Bestell- und Auslieferungsadresse:
A-6020 Innsbruck, Elisabethstraße 11
Telefon und Telefax: (+43-512) 56 19 45

INNSBRUCK 2004

Table of Contents

Preface.....	11
Bibliography of Publications by Jens Elmegård Rasmussen.....	13
Henrik Vagn Aagesen	
Greenlandic Word Splitting.....	21
Douglas Q. Adams	
The Lessons of Two Words for Materials, 'Clay' and 'Iron,' in Tocharian.....	27
Peter Anreiter	
Schnittpunkt dreier Kulturen: Das <i>Kaiser Tal</i> in Osttirol.....	33
Irene Balles	
Zur Rekonstruktion des früh-urindogermanischen Nominalklassen systems	43
R.S.P. Beekes	
Armenian <i>gêter</i> and the Indo-European Word for 'Evening'.....	59
Václav Blažek	
A Little Light upon 'Night'.....	63
Allan R. Bomhard	
The Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals.....	69
Lars Brink	
PIE Feature Synchronism and Word Division in Verner's Law.....	81
Gerdt Carling	
Tocharian B <i>erkaite</i> [A * <i>arkāis</i>] and Related Phenomena	95
Fabrice Cavoto	
Lorsque reconstruction interne et comparaison externe se rencontrent: Le cas du marqueur personnel * <i>ʃ</i>	103
James Clackson	
Minge – a Loanword Study.....	109
George E. Dunkel	
The Indo-European Resultative Particle * <i>es</i>	117
Bernhard Forssman	
Lateinisch <i>proprius</i> , <i>propriare</i>	131
Michael Fortescue	
Lexical Sources of Eskimo-Aleut Affixes.....	139
José Luis García Ramón	
Homerisch <i>οὔποι</i> ‚Kieflurchen, Landgräben‘ (* <i>uorh-ó</i> , ‚der Ziehende‘) und <i>ἐρώω</i> ‚ziehen‘, gr. <i>ὄλκος</i> und <i>ἐλακω</i> , <i>κέλετρον</i> und hom. <i>κέλαα</i>	145
Jost Gippert	
Ein Problem der indogermanischen Pronominalflexion.....	155
Olav Hackstein	
Rhetorical Questions and the Grammaticalization of Interrogative Pronouns as Conjunctions in Indo-European.....	167
Ivo Hajnal	
Die lydischen <i>a</i> -Stämme.....	187
Eric P. Hamp	
Indo-European * <i>ʃ</i> - in Albanian.....	207
George Hinge	
<i>Ἀλέθωρ</i> : Lexikalische Diffusion im 2. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend	211

Hieroglyphic Luvian Verbs in *-min(a)*

H. Craig Melchert
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Morpurgo Davies (1980: 93-97) analyzed Hieroglyphic Luvian verbal forms ending in *-min(a)* as present first person plurals. The evidence presented, however, is entirely circumstantial (no first person plural pronoun is attested in any of the relevant contexts). Her argumentation is largely a process of elimination. Taking for granted that the forms in *-mina* are finite verbs, she shows that, if we eliminate all person-number combinations whose endings we already know, of those remaining only present first plural fits the contexts. She notes in particular that some examples seem to refer to the future.

Hawkins (2000: 148 and passim) has accepted this interpretation, making the important observation that "this ending can now be seen to be frequent in practical documents, and seems to represent a verbal declaration which underlay contractual agreements." I believe Hawkins' characterization of the usage is essentially correct, but the additional evidence for *-min(a)* he has made available since Morpurgo Davies' discussion shows that the identification as finite first person plural verbs cannot be upheld.

In addition to being concentrated in texts involving some kind of contractual agreement, the forms in *-min(a)*¹ show another noteworthy restriction. All examples known to me are made to *transitive* verb stems: *hašmina* 'engrave' (CEKKE, §15), *his(a)himina* 'bind, impose' (CEKKE, §§13,16), *išyamina* 'make' (CEKKE, §10; KARKAMIŠ 4a, §4; SULTANHAN, §41), ("CAPUT+SCALPRUM")*kešamina* 'remove' (or sim.) (TUNP 1, §2), DARE-*mina* = **pšyamina* 'give' (CEKKE, §§8,9,11,12; KARKAMIŠ 4a, §11; KULULU lead strip 1, §§6.35,36; 7.40; 9.60,61; strip 2, §§1.3,6), CRUS-*nuvamina* = **tanuvamina* 'set up' (SULTANHAN, §3), PONERE-*mina* = **tu(pu)mina* 'place' (CEKKE, §19 and ALEPPO 3, §3)², and probably *311(-)la/i/umina (CEKKE, §18)³.

¹ The Hieroglyphic writing system makes it impossible to determine whether the final *-a* is linguistically real or not. I will henceforth for simplicity's sake write mostly *-mina*, but this is *not* intended as a claim that the vowel is genuine.

² Hawkins (2000: 563) attempts to remove this example by reading PONERE-*MI-na*, based on the hapax writing (PONERE+MD)tu-*wa/i-y[a]* in MARAŞ 7, side A, but in

In view of this distribution it is problematic for Morpurgo Davies' analysis that nowhere with any of the attested examples do we find a single unambiguous direct object.⁴ This fact, however, is by itself hardly a fatal objection. Since the neuter nominative and accusative naturally are identical in both the singular and plural, all examples of neuters are ambiguous as to whether they are direct objects or subjects in their respective clauses. Hieroglyphic Luvian has also merged the animate accusative plural with the nominative plural. Thus only animate singular nouns (or pronouns) can provide incontrovertible evidence regarding their role as subject or direct object. We now have three clear examples of these, and they all appear as *nominatives*, showing that the verb forms in *-mina* cannot be finite transitive verbs taking direct objects, as previously assumed.

The first and clearest example comes from the second KULULU lead strip, §1,6: 30 OVIS-*sa* ¹*ku-ki-ya* ¹*ku-mi-si-ya-ha* ¹*ku-tu-ya-ha* | DARE-*mi-na* | *zi-na-wa/i+ra/i-za*. Hawkins (2000: 510) translates: "30 sheep to Kulis and Tumisis and Turus we give, (men of?) (the town) Sunawara." This interpretation is quite impossible. We know that 'sheep' is an animate noun in Hieroglyphic Luvian (/ha-wi-/) and OVIS-*sa* can *only* be animate *nominative* singular. It is true that in most clauses of the KULULU-lead strips OVIS is written without any phonetic complement, but the use of *-sa* in this case is not fortuitous, as confirmed by the striking contrast with the almost immediately preceding clauses in KULULU lead strip 2, §1,1&2: 32 (OVIS) *ha-wa/i-na* ¹*mu-wa/i-hi-sa* ¹*ni-ya* | *pi-ya-i* "Muwahis gives 32 sheep to Nis" and 68 OVIS-*na* ¹*la-ki-sa* ¹*ma-x+ra/i-sa-ta-ya* | *pi-ya-i* "Lalis gives 68 sheep to Mars(a)tas." In these last two clauses we have an unambiguous finite third singular verb /*piyai*/, and as expected the noun 'sheep' appears as the accusative /*ha-win*/. It cannot therefore be accidental that in the clause with DARE-*mina* the word for 'sheep' appears rather as the *nominative* singular /*ha-wis*/.

The syntax of the clause with DARE-*mina* cannot be the same as that with /*piyai*/. If it were, we would necessarily likewise find OVIS-*na* marking the direct object. We must take the evidence of OVIS-*sa* at full value: 'sheep' is the grammatical *subject* of the clause with DARE-*mina*. This analysis is confirmed

view of attested PONERE-*mi-na* in CEKKE §19 this is unjustified. See further below on the syntactic analysis of the passage.

3 The meaning of the verb is unknown, but a transitive verb is likely. Cf. Hawkins (2000: 150).

4 The reading of the ending in the putative example ... IUDEX-*ni-i-na* PRAE LITUUS+*na-¹mi-¹na* in IZGIN 1, §14 is quite uncertain. See Hawkins (2000: 317). If the reading is correct, the incomplete context does not exclude taking LITUUS-*namina* as a participle modifying the preceding noun. The overall text shows consistently preterite verbs (1st and 3rd singular) and thus is unfavorable for the presence of a first plural present.

by two further examples. In TUNP 1, §2 (in the context of a land sale) we find the clause: *a-wa/i* ("SCALPRUM") *á-wa-sa* ARHA ("CAPUT+SCALPRUM") *ku-sá-mi-na*. Hawkins (2000: 155) cites new evidence that the verb means something like 'to remove'. The noun /*assu-*/ (cognate with Cuneiform Luvian ^{NA4}*a-á5-šá-*) refers to some kind of stone object, probably 'pillar, column' or the like. As suggested by Meriggi and Kalaş (cited by Hawkins), in the context this plausibly refers to a boundary stone or other property marker, which is to be removed in connection with the land transfer. The word /*assu-*/ is an animate *n-*stem in both forms of Luvian, and it is clear that *á-wa-sa* in our text stands for nominative singular /*assus*/, corresponding to accusative singular /*assun*/ attested in KARKAMIŞ A6, §27 as "SCALPRUM"-*wa-na*: Once again we have an animate noun functioning as the *subject* of the clause with the verb in *-mina*. The attempt of Hawkins (2000: 155f) to save the reading of *ku-sá-mi-na* as finite first plural by reading *á-wa-sa* as nom.-acc. plural neuter of a derived adjective /*assusa/i-*/ "(those) of the stone" is patently ad hoc and must be rejected in view of the parallel example with OVIS-*sa* DARE-*mina*.

The two incontrovertible examples with animate nouns just cited also shed a new light on the example from SULTANHAN, §3: | *a-wa/i-za* | *á-pi-i* | CRUS ^{ni-wa/i-mi-i-na} | BOS(ANIMAL)-*ra-i-i* 9 OVIS *a-ra/i-ma-sa-ri+i-i*. By the received interpretation this means: "We will set him (i.e. Tathunzas of the Vineyard) up *again/afterwards* with an ox and nine *monthing* sheep." However, Morpurgo Davies (1980: 95¹⁷) in her original treatment of the passage and Hawkins (2000: 467) both acknowledge the problem posed by the opening *a-wa/i-za*, which per Hawkins "still resists explanation." One would by their analysis expect *a-wa/i-za*, i.e. /*a-wa=an*/ with conjunction, quotative particle and animate accusative singular of the enclitic pronoun "him". The attested *a-wa/i-sa* appears instead to be /*a-wa=as*/, with animate *nominative* singular of the enclitic pronoun "he". When this example stood alone, one could reasonably ignore the problem or assume a scribal error (Oshiro, 1988: 250, explicitly emends to *a-wa/i-na*). We have now seen, however, that there are two additional examples with animate nouns that appear as the *subject* of a verb form in *-mina*. Under these circumstances we must also take the SULTANHAN example at face value and likewise interpret *a-wa/i-sa* indeed as /*a-wa=as*/ with perfectly regular *subject* pronoun.

Given the three unambiguous examples just cited for animate nominal forms as *subjects* of verbs in *-mina*, I believe we have no choice but to assume the same syntax for all the ambiguous cases with neuters and animate plural nouns. How are we to account for this syntax? A guide to the solution is the fact noted by Hawkins, cited above: the verb forms in *-mina* express some kind of obligation or commitment, hence their clustering in the context of contractual agreements. We are thus led to the analysis that they are syntactically a kind

of gerundive, functioning as the predicates of subject nouns in nominal sentences where the verb 'to be' is left unexpressed (quite permissible in Hittite and Luvian). Such an interpretation fits the context of all occurrences.⁵ The force of "thirty sheep (are) to be given", "the stone pillar (is) to be removed", and "he (is) to be set up again..." obviously is equivalent to "we will give thirty sheep", "we will remove the stone pillar", and "we will set (him) up again..." respectively. Both versions express a promise, commitment, or obligation, as demanded by the context.

An advantage of the new interpretation is that we need not arbitrarily supply a first person referent "we" for which there is no evidence in *any* of the attested examples. There is nothing in the context of the passages in the KULULU lead strips to suggest that the agent of the action is a first person "we". There is in fact nothing to indicate the identity of the agent at all. One may note, however, that when an agent is expressed in the lead strips, it is by personal name and in the third person. Likewise, in the transactions described in CEKKE, KARKAMIŠ 4a, and TÜNP 1, the acts of the named purchasers are described in the *third person* preterite. In order to justify the first person plural reading of the *-mina* forms, Hawkins must supply an "understood" phrase of speaking such as "(who said)" or "(saying)". Such a covert transition is not impossible, but it must be regarded as extremely dubious in the absence of a single example of a *-mina* form in the immediate context of an overt first person referent. Finally, in the SULTANHAN passage the principal actor is Sarwatwaras, who in all other clauses referring to his own actions uses preterite first *singular* verbs. Under these circumstances assumption of a "royal we" just in the single clause with /*tanuwamina*/ is egregiously ad hoc.

I submit rather that the lack of any expressed agent with the *-mina* forms is intentional. In the context of the contractual agreements it would have been clear that responsibility for the obligations expressed by the *-mina* gerundives would fall on the parties to the contract, or *their representatives or successors*. Not naming any particular person as the agent of the *-mina* clause allowed the stipulations to continue in force indefinitely, precluding someone trying to escape the provisions by claiming that the individual obligated was dead or missing. I likewise take the sense of the SULTANHAN passage to be that Sarwatwaras

5 I restrict myself here to the predicative use of the *-mina* forms with deontic meaning. I leave open the question of whether any other examples of *-mi-na* now interpreted as animate accusative singular of the past participle (/ *-min*/) might represent instances of our formant in some other syntactic construction. I have in mind here an example such as KARKAMIŠ 15b, §12: *wa/i-mu-tā* (DEUS) *ku-AVIS-pa-pa-sa* | ("PES") *pa-tas-* 'PONERE-*mi-i-na* | *tā-i*. The interpretation of Hawkins (2000: 131) may well be correct, but is by no means assured: "and for me Kubaba will take (it) placed at (her) foot." I also would entertain as an alternative "and Kubaba will take/accept me to be placed at (her) foot."

was stipulating that the Tarhunzas of the Vineyard whom he had established was to be regularly *re-established* (/ *appi*/ = 'again') by offerings in perpetuity – even after his death, by his successors (note the lengthy provisions for the future in §16ff).

Further support for the interpretation of *-mina* as forming gerundives comes from the second SULTANHAN passage, §§38-42: *ni-pa-wa/i-ta* | *URBS+MI-ni* | *HWT-sa-ha-* | *ka-ti-i* | *CRUS-i* | *ni-pa-wa/i-ta* | ("TERRA") *ta-ka-mi-i* | *HWT-sa-ha* | *ka-ti-i* | *ta-i* | *ni-pa-wa/i-ta* | *wa/i-na* | *REL-sa-ha* | *ka-ti-i* | *CRUS-i* | *á-pi-i-wa/i-ta-* | *REX-ti-ya-ti+i* | *LEPUS+ra/i-ya-ti-i* | *i-zi-ya-mi-na-* | *a-wa/i* | *ka-ti-i-sa* | *ni-i* | *á-sa-tu-u-* "or (if) anyone stands in/for KATI towards the city, or anyone stands KATI towards the land, or anyone stands KATI towards the *vine*, they (*-ta*) are to be required by royal authority.⁶ Let there be no KATI." For the general sense of the passage and the associated problems see Hawkins (2000: 467, 471), with references to Morpurgo Davies and Oshiro. Note that the clause with *-mina* represents a positive prescription for what is to happen to the evildoers parallel to the negative imperative in the next clause. And once again I suggest that the lack of a personal agent is intentional: punishment is left to whatever representative of royal authority may be available in the future.

Final confirmation for the above analysis of the verbs in *-mina* as gerundives in predicative use comes from ALEPPO 3, §3: [...]*wa/i tá-ti-i* | *mi-i REL-zi* "FINES"*-hi-zi* | *za-ta-na PONERE-mi-na s[á]-t[a ...]*. The precise sense of the passage remains elusive, due to the uncertain meaning of the combination /*zal*(*an tu-wa-* / 'to put *zalan*'. As per Hawkins (2000: 563), the phrase seems to have a negative connotation elsewhere. What seems reasonably certain, however, is that *tá-ta* = /*santa*/ 'were' is the main verb, making a first person plural reading impossible for *PONERE-mi-na*. For this reason Hawkins, loc. cit., reads *PONERE-MI-na* = infinitive /*tuna*/ 'to put', citing MARAŞ 7, side A (*PONERE+M*) *tu-wa/i-y[a]* 'puts' as possible support for taking the "MI" sign as a functionless element as seen in *SOLIUM+MI*. This analysis produces quite acceptable syntax, since there is other evidence for predicative use of the infinitive with 'be' to express obligation, as cited by Hawkins. However, given the evidence presented above for the forms in *-mina* as predicative gerundives in nominal sentences (with present-future force), it seems far more likely that we have here the predicted preterite equivalent, where the verb 'be' must of course be overtly expressed. What we unfortunately cannot determine is whether the dative of 'my father' expresses merely the person to be affected by the prescribed action or rather in this case the *agent*: "the frontiers that were to be put *zi* for my father" or "were for my father to put *zi*". The apparently nega-

6 For the combination / *appi iziya-* / as 'require' see Oshiro (1988: 249).

tive connotation of 'to put \tilde{z} ' seems problematic for either interpretation.⁷ Note that I have necessarily translated the agentless gerundives with English passive infinitives, but this is merely an artifact of English grammar. The forms in *-mina* were in all likelihood indifferent to diathesis, just like the infinitives.⁸

In summary, I submit that there are at least three incontrovertible examples where the noun functioning as the "patient" of a transitive verbal form in *-mina* appears in the nominative case. On the contrary there is not a single unambiguous example of a noun in the accusative in this role. I therefore conclude that the forms in *-mina* cannot be first person plural presents as previously claimed, nor indeed any other finite form. The contexts of the *-mina* verbs suggest that they have a deontic value: they express contractual obligations or other commitments. This sense, combined with the evidence for an associated noun in the nominative, argues that the *-mina* verbs are a kind of gerundive, used predicatively with the verb 'be', which predictably is left unexpressed in the present tense.

⁷ The same ambiguity attaches to dat.-loc. sg. URBS+MI-*ni* in CEKKE §13: URBS+MI-*ni-pa-wa/i* 20 *tá-mi* 10 INFANS-*ni ki-tara/i-sa* || (PUGNUS+PUGNUS)*ni-sá-hi-mi-na*. Hawkins (2000: 145&149) takes URBS+MI-*ni* as acc. sg. /URBS-nin/, object of the alleged first plural /hishimina/, along with /kitara/i=sa/, putatively neuter nom.-acc. singular: "We bind the city (as) a donation for 20(+10) TAMI(s) and child(ren)." His tentative interpretation of *ki-tara/i-sa* as 'donation' (with comparison to "Akkadian" *kit(ert)na*) is attractive, but not the rest of the analysis. The verb *it̃i-* 'to bind' is used in Hittite exclusively of obligations, penalties, or payments imposed on someone (see Puhvel 1984: 398f). Likewise in Akkadian there is no confusion between *nadānu* or *rī(š)amū* 'to give' and *rakāšū* 'to bind; impose' or *emēdu* 'to lay on; impose'. The notion of 'binding' a gift on a recipient would be decidedly peculiar and to my knowledge without parallel in the Ancient Near East. The city referred to must be either the city Kamana just purchased or the city Kanapu, from whose citizens the former city has been bought. The pairs of fathers and sons named later are apparently to gain a share of the newly purchased city. Use of the verb 'to bind' argues that they are also to make a donation towards the purchase (and in §16 towards paying for the boundary stones necessary to demarcate everyone's share). Clause §13 means either (1) "A donation (/kitara/is/, anim. nom. sg.) (is) to be imposed on the 20(+10) TAMI(s) and child(ren) for the city (i.e. Kamana)" or (2) "A donation (is) for the city (i.e. Kanapu) to impose on the 20(+10) TAMI(s) and child(ren)." That Akkadian *kit(ert)na* refers to the viewpoint of the recipient ("inheritance share") in no way precludes that HLuvian /kitara/i-/ refer to the perspective of the contributor. The original (Hurrian?) word may have been neutral in this respect, like English "donation". Use of the infinitive in the same deontic sense in no way precludes this function for *-mina*. Hittite uses the genitive of the verbal noun as well as the infinitive for this purpose, and Tocharian uses the gerundive in *-(y)-* and the infinitive with no discernible difference in meaning (see Thomas, 1952: 15, with the example *te pákšáille iátype lipátisi* "This (is) to be cooked. The fat (is) to remain/be left over").

Elimination of the alleged Hieroglyphic Luvian present first person plural ending *-min(a)* removes the difficult problem of accounting for the historical source for an ending of this shape in this function. All current available evidence suggests that **-wen(i)* had been generalized as the first person plural ending in Proto-Anatolian: Hittite pres. *-we/ani*, pret. *-wen*; CLuvian pres. *-unni*, Palaic pres. *-we/ini*, and probably Lydian pret. *-uv*.

Unfortunately, derivation of an ending *-min(a)* with a deontic sense presents equally serious difficulties. On typological grounds one expects either a case form (such as dative or locative) of a verbal noun, or some kind of verbal adjective. An adjective seems unlikely in this case, because in all comparable syntactic constructions with adjectives known to me there is agreement with the subject noun.⁹ There obviously is no such agreement with the forms in *-mina*.

A verbal noun initially seems more promising. Such a use of the PIE suffix **-men* is well known, and Starke (1990: 243ff) has shown that *-mman* is very productive in Luvian in just this function. However, as per Starke, the attested inflection in Luvian shows only three allomorphs: *-mman*, *-m(m)n-* and *-mm-* (the last by assimilation from *-mmm-*). I see no non-ad hoc means of explaining the *-i-* of *-min(a)* starting from the paradigm of a *men*-stem. If one assumes that the final *-a* represents an old allative ending (cf. Luvian infinitives in *-un-a* to **-wer/-wen-* verbal nouns), we have no grounds for expecting anything but *†-mm-a*, which would surely be spelled in HLuvian as *-ma-na*.¹⁰ Even if we allow for an original *e*-grade in the stem that was leveled out in the productive paradigm (an ad hoc assumption), we have no basis for expecting a putative **-men-a/o* to appear as anything but *†-man-a*.¹¹ A preform **-mēn* would yield HLuvian /-min/, which would be spelled *-mi-n(a)*, but to assume a lengthened-grade endingless locative **-mēn* seems to me far-fetched. I believe the synchronic value of verbs in *-mina* as predicates with deontic force is secure, but I cannot offer any convincing historical account of their origin.

References

- Hawkins, John D., 2000: *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luvian Inscriptions. Volume I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin / New York.
 Morpurgo Davies, Anna, 1980: "The Personal Endings of the Hieroglyphic Luvian Verb". - *Historische Sprachforschung* 94: 86-108.

⁹ This applies to Latin *-ndus*, Sanskrit *-ya-* and *-tavya-*, Greek *-reos*, Lithuanian *-imas*, and also Tocharian *-(y)-* (Thomas, 1952: 16ff). In several cases the gerundive may also be used impersonally without agreement, but then the "patient" is construed as the direct object of the verb and stands in the accusative (or other appropriate case). I am indebted to Olav Hackstein for invaluable references on this topic.
¹⁰ Assuming an anaptyctic *-i-* to explain *-mi-na* < **-mēn-* would be entirely ad hoc.
¹¹ An accented **-mēn-a/o* is conceivable, but by "Cop's Law" this would lead to *†-manna*, also to be spelled in HLuvian as *-ma-na*.

- Oshiro, Terumasa, 1988: "epi in Hieroglyphic Luwian". – *Archiv Orientalní* 56: 248–252.
 Puhvel, Jaan, 1984: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 1/2*. Berlin / New York.
 Starke, Frank, 1990: *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens [= Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31]*. Wiesbaden.
 Thomas, Werner, 1952: *Die tocharischen Verbaladjektive auf -i. Eine syntaktische Untersuchung*. Berlin.

- Adam Hyllested
 L'esprit des eaux: grec *νύμφη*, sanskrit *Rám̐bhā*, lituanien *Laumė*
 et quelques autres formes semblant apparentées 219
 Michael Janda
 Vom blauen Himmel Griechenlands: *ὀυρανός* 235
 Jay H. Jasanoff
 Acute vs. Circumflex: Some Notes on PIE and Post-PIE Prosodic Phonology 247
 Folke Josephson
 Singulative and Agentive in Hittite and Germanic 257
 Anders Richardt Jørgensen
 Middle Breton *eugen* 'Ox', *euryen* 'Edge' and Plurals in *-yen* 263
 Jan Katlev
 The Odyssey through Space and Time of an Inherited and Borrowed
 Culture-Word: The Case of the Danish Numeral *þjú* 269
 Joshua T. Katz
 Sanskrit *sp̥hij-* / *sp̥hig-* and Greek *φίξ* 277
 Frederik Kortlandt
 Nivkh as a Uralo-Siberian Language 285
 Martin Joachim Kümmel
 Ungeklärtes **u* neben Liquida in germanischen Nomina 291
 Jenny Helena Larsson
 Metatony and Length in Baltic 305
 Alexander Lubotsky
 Avestan *sīaxd-*, Sanskrit *śadh-*, Latin *cēdere* 323
 Javier Martínez
 Gr. *ἰμάς*, *ἰμοιά* y otra forma emparentada: *αἰμασιά* 333
 Gerhard Meiser
 Die Periphrase im Urindogermanischen 343
 H. Craig Melchert
 Hieroglyphic Luwian Verbs in *-min(a)* 355
 Ole Nedergaard Thomsen
 Direction Diathesis and Obviation in Functional Grammar:
 The Case of the Inverse in Mapudungun, an Indigenous Language
 of South Central Chile 363
 Benedicte Nielsen
 An Introduction to Vedic Nominal Accentuation (An Attempt at a
 Simplified Analysis) 379
 Norbert Oettinger
 Die Entwicklung von *h*, im Anatolischen und hethitisch *arai*
 „erhebt sich“ 397
 Thomas Olander
 The Ending-Stressed Word-Forms of the Baltic and Slavic Mobile Paradigm 407
 Birgit Anette Olsen
 A Note on **s/t*-Stems and Secondary Derivation 419
 Martin Peters
 Mögliche Reflexe einer Interaktion hoher und niedriger Phonostile im Tocharischen 429