The Feminine Gender in Anatolian

In Leiden in 1987 I presented evidence to show that Lycian, unlike the other Anatolian languages, merged prehistoric $*\delta$ with e, not with a: see Melchert (1992a) and also Rasmussen (1992), who had independently arrived at essentially the same conclusion. One consequence of this demonstration is that Lycian animate nouns with a-vocalism (some of which have female referents) must continue PIE a n i m a t e nouns in $*-eh_2-$: e. g. *lada-* 'wife' (nom. sg. *lada*, acc. sg. *ladã*) < PIE $*leh_2$$_3$$deh_2$- 'spouse; dear one'.[1] Contrary to a widespread claim, then, Anatolian must have inherited the feminine gender, at least in the guise of one class of nouns.

At about the same time, Oettinger (1987) argued for another reflex of the feminine gender in Anatolian: the phenomenon of "*i*-motion" first discovered by Starke (1982: 408 f.). The Anatolian "motion"[2] suffix *-i-* is an obligatory marker added to the animate nominative and accusative singular and plural of most adjectives and many nouns in Luvian, Lycian and Lydian. For CLuvian we may take as an example the adjective *adduwal(i)-* 'evil': NSgC *adduwališ* ASgC *adduwalin*, NPIC *adduwalinzi*, APIC *adduwalinza*, but N-ASgNt[3] *adduwal=za*, N-APlNt *adduwala*, Abl/Inst *adduwalati*. For Lycian I cite *przze/i-* 'front-, foremost': APIC *przzis*, but N-ASgNt *przzē*, D-LPl *przze*. A clear example in Lydian is the adjective *sfardēt(i)-* 'Sardian': NSgC *sfardētis*, but D-GPl *sfardētav*.

I will not repeat Oettinger's analysis in full here. In brief, he assumes that Anatolian inherited both of the well-known PIE feminine motion suffixes: $*-eh_2-$ and ablauting $*-ih_2-/-yeh_2-$ (the Skt. *deví*-class). With the merger of $*\acute{a}$ and $*\delta$ (which he assumes to be Common Anatolian) and the consequent falling together of feminines in $*-eh_2-$ with masculines in $*-o-$, the feminine suffix $*-ih_2-/-yeh_2-$ was exploited to polarize the newly

---

[1] For this etymology see Winter (1965: 191), who compares Tocharian B *lāre* 'dear' < $*lh_2$$_3$*dro-* and Russian *ladyj* 'dear', *ladá* 'spouse' and other related Slavic forms. The comparison with Slavic had already been made by Hrozný (1917: 49). See Winter for the semantic relation to Russian *lad* 'concord', contra Vasmer (1955: 5).

[2] I use the term "motion" here in quotes, because as properly described by Starke (1990: 59 ff.), this suffix does not change the gender of the stem to which it is attached, but merely reinforces the animate gender already inherent in the stem.

[3] Pace Starke (1990: 45 ff.) it has been established beyond all doubt that the participle *-sa/-za* marks nominative-accusative s i n g u l a r in Luvian, not plural! I need not repeat here the cogent arguments of van den Hout (1984) and many others.

developing contrast of animate vs. inanimate, becoming the generalized marker of animacy for many stem classes. Unsurprisingly the ablauting suffix was leveled as *-ih₂-.

Oettinger offers no explanation, however, for one salient feature of the Anatolian "motion" suffix -i-: its unusual restriction to the animate nominative and accusative. If the "motion" suffix -i- represents the PIE suffix *-ih₂-/-yeh₂- in its classical form (as he presents it), one sees no convincing motivation for its subsequent restriction to the animate nominative and accusative.

Indeed, Starke (1990: 85 ff.), in his full presentation of the Anatolian "motion" suffix, argues a g a i n s t Oettinger's derivation, on two grounds. First, he notes the problem just cited of the suffix's restricted distribution. He accounts for this by assuming that Anatolian d i d n o t inherit the feminine gender. It reflects rather an earlier system with only a two-way contrast animate vs. inanimate. He then suggests that the "motion" -i- was added only to the nominative and accusative, because in the existing animate/inanimate system gender was distinguished only in those two cases. This is an important insight to which we will return below.

Starke's second objection is that in his view the original locus of the "motion" -i- in Anatolian was in thematic stems, while that of the ablauting feminine motion suffix *-ih₂-/-yeh₂- was in athematic stem classes. For this reason, he prefers to relate the Anatolian motion -i- to the derivational element seen in Latin dīuīnus < dīuus and/or the appurtenance suffix *-ih₂- of the Sanskrit vṛkí-class.

Starke's account must be rejected on two counts. First of all, his statement concerning the distribution of the "motion" -i- in Anatolian is simply false. As the table below shows, the suffix is at least as widespread in athematic stems as in thematic stems:

Distribution of "i-motion" in Anatolian

+ = present; – = absent; ? = indeterminate.

	Hitt.	Pal.	Luv.	Lyc.	Lyd.
*-e/ont-	–1	–2	+	+3	+4
*-uent-	–1	?	+	+	?
*u-adjectives	–	–5	–6	?	+7
*-uer-	–	?	+	+	?
*-ot-	–	?	+8	–	?

	Hitt.	Pal.	Luv.	Lyc.	Lyd.
*-iyo-	–	–	?	+9	–10
*-tyo-	–	–	?	+	–11
*-(e)h₃so-	–	–	+	?	+
*-i(s)ko-	?	?	–13	–14	+/–12
*-ero-	–	–	+	?	+15
*-wo-	+	–	+	?	–16
'papa' etc.	–	–	–	+17	–
other *-o-	–	–	?	+	–

I cannot discuss the justification for every claim in the above table, but the following brief notes will alert readers to points of controversy or doubt:

(1) The absence of the suffix here in Hittite could be due to phonological loss. Just as r/n-stem abl. sg. *-anti > *-anzi > -anz(a) (/-ants/), so also perhaps nom. sg. *-ṇtih₂ > *-anti > *-anti > -anz(a).⁴

(2) Contra Starke (1990: 75) animate nominative singular in -anza/i = /-ants/ is assured.

(3) But note the relic substantivized form without "motion": lāta- 'dead person'.

(4) But note the relic substantivized form without "motion": dēt- 'mobile property' < *(h₁)yónt- = Hitt. (i)yant- 'walking' (Melchert 1992b).

(5) Contra Starke (1990: 75[179]). Note anim. nom. sg. aruš (stet) and anim. acc. sg. arun 'high'.

(6) Contra Starke (1990: 62 et aliter). Note CLuvian anim. acc. sg. wāšūn 'good'.

(7) Seen in anim. nom. sg. wišuis/wiššis vs. nt. nom.-acc. pl. wiswa 'good'.

---

⁴ As one possible example I cite labḫ(ḫ)anza(n)-, a migratory bird, probably a duck (see Güterbock and Hoffner 1980: 6 f.). I suggest that this word may be a transferred epithet *'the traveling one', specifically a f e m i n i n e participle (virtual) *leh₂ṇtiḫ- (this would not exclude the comparison with Grk. λάρος 'gull' made by Oettinger 1986: 29⁴²). The original nom. sg. *leh₂ṇtiḫ₂, acc. sg. *leh₂ṇtim (Stang's Law), weak *leh₂ṇt- (see below for absence of *-iḫ₂) would have led to a very irregular paradigm labḫanzi(ḫ), *labḫanzin, *labḫant-. I would assume that this was reshaped after the type of šumanz(a), šumanzan- 'cord' (for which see Melchert 1983: 9 f. following Oettinger 1980: 52 ff.). One could also interpret ištanza(n)- 'soul' in similar fashion as *sth₂ṇtiḫ₂- *'the lasting/abiding one'. I cannot pursue the details here, but possible support for the prehistoric paradigm cited above may be found in the alternate solution, a new paradigm built on the accusative singular: cf. ḫulpanzina-/ḫulpanzena-/ḫulpanzana- 'embossment, hump' (Puhvel 1991: 425) perhaps < *ḫₐw(e)lb(ʰ)ṇtiḫ₂- *'the protruding one'. Similarly perhaps the problematic stems *alwanz- and alwanzena- 'bewitching'.

(8) Note *ḫandatt(i)*- 'care, provision' or **ariyatt(i)*- 'elevation, mountain' (the latter with Starke 1990: 303[1031]),

(9) Likewise in the secondary type in *-ay(a)*- without deletion of the thematic vowel of the base (Carruba 1982: 49 f. and Melchert 1990: 201 f.) and in former ablauting stems with oblique *-ay(a)*- (Starke 1990: 62).

(10) In the suffix *-da*- (Melchert 1992b).

(11) In the suffix *-ta*- (Shevoroshkin 1967: 24 & 43).

(12) Note absence of "motion" in the relic form *-abe*- restricted to proper names versus productive *-abeli*-.

(13) Contra Starke (1990: 74 ff.) Palaic *-ikeš* is animate nominative p l u r a l.

(14) CLuvian *-izza*- = Lycian *-is(e)*- as per Melchert (1989: 29 ff.). Compare analysis by Starke (1990: 179) whereby CLuvian *-izza*- reflects **-iyazza*- < **-tyo*- likewise without "motion" versus above.

(15) This claim for Lydian is uncertain, being true o n l y i f *afariš* means 'descendant' and equals Luvian **appara/i*- 'later; younger' and Lycian *epre/i*- 'rear-; later' (Melchert forthcoming).

(16) Note Lydian *wesfa*- 'living' < **h₂wes-wo*- (Gusmani 1985).

(17) Contra Starke (1990: 620) the terms of relationship in Luvian are not *i*-stems, but have "*i*-motion", as shown by HLuvian dat.-loc. pl. *ta-ra+a-za* /tarants/ 'fathers' (for the spelling see Melchert 1988: 31) and by the absence of the *-i*- in the CLuvian derivatives *tāta-wanna/i*- 'step-father' and *ānna-wanna/i*- 'step-mother'.

I wish to stress that even if one adopts Starke's analysis in every case of disagreement cited above, the distribution of the "motion" *-i*- is not materially changed in terms of thematic vs. athematic stems (it is merely more widespread). Note in particular under points (2) and (6) that if one accepts his claim that *-nt*-stems in Palaic and *u*-stems in Palaic and Luvian take the "motion" *-i*-, then this would argue in favor of the **-ih₂-/-yeh₂*- suffix and against his own derivation from the *vṛkí*-suffix whose original locus is thematic stems.

It simply is not possible to determine the original locus of the "motion" *-i*- from its pattern of appearance in the attested Anatolian languages. The reason for this is not obscure. It is clear that the suffix enjoys considerable productivity in Luvian, Lycian and Lydian (in approximately that order) — note the relic forms cited in (3), (4) and (12) above. Starke arrives at the same conclusion (1990: 86). This productivity badly obscures the distribution of the suffix in Common Anatolian.

There is also a fatal logical inconsistency in Starke's derivation. The **-ih₂*- suffix of the *vṛkí*-type is to my knowledge attested in only two functions: (1) a motion suffix forming feminines from masculines (Skt.

vṛkí < *vṛka*- 'wolf'); (2) a derivational suffix of 'appurtenance' (Skt. *rathí*- 'charioteer' < *rátha*- 'chariot'). According to Starke, Anatolian did not inherit the feminine gender, so the first function is eliminated. However, as he correctly emphasizes, the Anatolian "motion" *-i*- also has no derivational value: the adjective stem for 'in front, foremost' in Lycian is *przze*-, and addition of the *-i*- in animate accusative plural *przzis* does not change the function of the stem at all.

The usage of the Anatolian "motion" *-i*- thus cannot be explained starting from the *vṛkí*-suffix in its derivational function. Furthermore, according to Starke's own description (1990: 88), the original role of the **-í*-suffix was to serve as an o b l i q u e stem beside the **-o*-stem. This is obviously precisely the opposite of the attested distribution of the Anatolian "motion" *-i*-. The restriction to the animate nominative and accusative would make sense only if the suffix were marking gender, but in the case of the *vṛkí*-suffix this could only be feminine gender, which Starke denies for Anatolian.

We must therefore return to Oettinger's derivation, but with one crucial modification. Since the restriction to the animate nominative and accusative cannot be motivated as an innovation, we must regard it as an archaism. The evidence presented for inheritance of the feminine gender in Anatolian in no way alters the well-known facts which suggest that the differentiation of the feminine from the masculine is a relatively recent development in PIE. I need not repeat these facts here. For a convenient recent summary see Meid (1979: 165 f.[11]).

In the prexisting animate/inanimate system, gender was distinguished only in the nominative and accusative. When the animate gender was then subdivided into masculine and feminine, principally by addition of the two motion suffixes **-eh₂*- and **-ih₂-/-yeh₂*-, I find it plausible that these suffixes were initially added o n l y i n t h e c a s e s w h e r e g e n d e r w a s a l r e a d y m a r k e d : nominative and accusative (cf. already the similar suggestion of Starke (1990: 87) cited above). The Anatolian "motion" *-i*- would indirectly reflect this original distribution. The generalization of the suffixes throughout the paradigm elsewhere would be an unsurprising further innovation.

If this hypothesis is correct, we would expect it to be true for the motion suffix **-eh₂*- as well as **-ih₂-/-yeh₂*-, and I believe that there is evidence for this, in the form of Hittite *ḫaššā*- 'hearth, altar'. This word has long been equated with Lat. *āra* 'hearth' etc. and taken as reflecting a PIE noun **h₂eh₁/₃seh₂*-.[5] However, the distribution of long vowels in the

---

5   Though it has never been properly appreciated, the fact that Hittite adds the animate marker *-s* to the nominative singular *ḫaššaš* confirms in my view that the noun

Hittite paradigm points to a mobile accent: nom. sg. *ḫaššaš*, acc. sg. *ḫaššan* but dat.-loc. sg. *ḫašši*, gen. sg. *ḫaššaš*, abl. *ḫaššaz*. For this reason, Kimball (1983: 158) goes so far as to deny the equation with Lat. *āra*, claiming that the Hittite word represents a root noun with secondary "thematization" in the nominative singular.

This derivation can now be excluded, since we have attested the real root noun to this root, as convincingly demonstrated by Puhvel (1991: 210 ff.) *ḫašš-* 'ashes; lye, soap' with nom. sg. *ḫāš*, acc. sg. *ḫaššan* < *$h_2$ól/é$h_{1/3}$s-*.[6] I suggest that the word for 'hearth' is a secondary "proterokinetic" derivative from the root noun, with addition of the *-eh_2-motion suffix only in the nominative and accusative: *h_2é$h_{1/3}$s-eh_2-* but weak *h_2h_3s-*.[7] Hence by regular developments the attested Hittite paradigm above.

My essential claim is thus the following: the development of the feminine gender took place in not one but two steps. In the first, the motion suffixes were added only in the nominative and accusative where gender was already marked. In the second, the suffixes were generalized throughout the paradigm. Anatolian reflects only the first stage. This hypothesis obviously has implications for PIE relative chronology and the position of Anatolian. Before pursuing this point, however, I must make more explicit the developments which I assume for Anatolian.

We may begin with the stems in *-eh_2-*, which represent the simpler case. The few examples I presented in Melchert (1992a: 48[16]) for feminine -a- in adjectives in Lycian must be regarded as uncertain. Even if they

---

[6] Puhvel himself does not accept the root final laryngeal, but it is required not only by the geminate -šš- in Hittite, but also by the long vowel of Lat. *āra*. The root *ḫā-* 'be warm' seen in Palaic *ḫā-*: see Melchert (1984: 41 f.). The intervocalic loss in Palaic requires that the second laryngeal be either *h_1 or *h_3. The *a* of Latin demands that the first laryngeal be *h_2. As pointed out by Eichner (1988: 131), we are not well-informed about the coloring effects when two laryngeals are in competition. If one accepts Eichner's tentative but plausible hierachy, the second laryngeal here would be *h_1, but this is not assured.

[7] Puhvel (1991: 224) raises doubts about the animate gender of 'hearth', noting that the nom. sg. *ḫaššaš* is attested only in vocatival function and pointing to the existence of an ergative singular GUNNI-*anza*. However, although Garrett (1990) has convincingly demonstrated that the suffix -*anz(a)* is a true ergative, whose distribution is largely grammatically determined, some cases of real personification are undeniable (e. g. *attaš nepišanza* 'father heaven'). GUNNI-*anza* does not therefore prove that *ḫašša-* is neuter. Puhvel (1991: 397) has provided the crucial evidence: in *KUB* XXIX 1 iii 39–40 GUNNI is resumed by the animate accusative singular pronoun -*an*, thus proving that 'hearth' is animate gender.

prove to be genuine, they may well represent the beginnings of an independent innovation in Lycian parallel to that in Latin *nouus, noua, nouum* etc. It is quite unlikely that they reflect an archaic formation. Note in particular the complete absence of a separate feminine in the demonstrative pronoun *ebe-*. We may therefore assume that Anatolian inherited only feminine n o u n s in *-eh_2-*. Just how many such nouns is impossible to determine, but the productive status of this formation elsewhere suggests that the number inherited by Anatolian need not have been large.

If we assume "Stang's Law" for PIE and the regular loss of word-final *-h_2 in Anatolian, the nominative and accusative of feminines in *-eh_2- would have appeared as follows in Common Anatolian:

NSg	*-ā	NPl	*-aHes
ASg	*-am	APl	*-ans

The isolated allomorph *-aH- of the nominative plural would have been subject to leveling, perhaps already in CA. I assume with Eichner (1988: 138 et aliter) shortening of unaccented inherited *-ā*. Just when the final *-ā* resulting from *-eh_2 is shortened is problematic (cf. Watkins 1982: 256[14] & Eichner 1988: 141[60]). In any case, the change *o > a led to merger with the o-stems everywhere except in Lycian, where the stem in -a- is predictably generalized throughout the paradigm. The mobile accent in Hitt. *ḫaššā-* 'hearth' is a relic in an "Allerweltswort".

Note that the assumption that the oblique cases n e v e r had the suffix *-eh_2- makes the merger with the o-stems considerably easier in Hittite, Palaic and Luvian. By the traditional analysis, we have had to assume that the allomorph *-aḫḫ- existed not only in the nominative plural, but also in various oblique cases (loc. sg. *ḫaššaḫḫi*, dat.-loc. pl. *ḫaššaḫḫaš* etc.), and that this variant was eliminated after the nominative and accusative singular. This step is, of course, by no means impossible, but the complete lack of relic forms or examples of leveling in the opposite direction seems suspect.[8]

As pointed out above, the "motion" -*i*- is clearly productive in Luvian, Lycian and Lydian. This fact and its near-total absence in Hittite and Palaic suggest that the *-ih_2-/-yeh_2-* suffix had a very restricted distribution in Common Anatolian. Just how restricted is once again hard to

---

[8] Compare the fate of ablauting animate *n*-stems in Hittite. Here there is indeed leveling within the historical period, but the leveling predictably proceeds in both directions: *alkištaš, alkištanan* 'branch' with both new acc. sg. *alkištan* and new nom. sg. *alkištanaš*.

say. If one accepts the suggestion above that some Hittite nouns in -anza(n)- reflect old feminine participles in *-ntih_2- (see note 4), then stems in *-ent- would be one assured CA stem class with this motion suffix. If one believes Starke's claim of "i-motion" in u-stem adjectives in Palaic and Luvian (Starke 1990: 62 & 75), then this class too surely had the motion suffix in CA. One cannot even entirely exclude the suggestion of Oettinger (1987: 40 f.) that the suffix *-ih_2-/-yeh_2- had already penetrated certain thematic stem classes by CA (cf. Skt. devī-). Whatever the details, the almost total elimination of the motion suffix in Palaic and Hittite argues for a limited presence in CA.

Again assuming "Stang's Law" for PIE and regular loss of word-final *-h_2 in Anatolian, we arrive at the following CA forms for the nominative and accusative of stems in *-ih_2-/-yeh_2-:

NSg	*-i	NPl	*-yaHes
ASg	*-im	APl	*-ins

Hittite and Palaic eliminated nearly all examples of this very limited type by generalizing the oblique stem without the motion suffix. In the Western languages on the other hand, the marker -i- (thus in its generalized form) was employed to polarize the newly emerging contrast of animate vs. inanimate, as already indicated by Oettinger (1987: 43). With the collapse of the distinction between masculine and feminine elsewhere, the difference is leveled here too, in effect by generalizing the -i- as the marker of animacy: M∅ F -i- N∅ → M -i- F -i- N∅.

Before leaving the history of the motion suffixes in Anatolian, I must discuss the evidence for the possible existence there of the non-ablauting "urki-" suffix. First of all, we have the well-known adjectives in -wi- of Hittite and Luvian: e.g. dankewi= takkuwa/i- 'dark'. As correctly emphasized by Starke (1990: 78), this class reflects t h e m a t i c stems in *-wo-, n o t u-stems as often alleged, a distribution arguing for non-ablauting *-ih_2-/-yeh_2- described above.

Second, although Starke does not acknowledge them, there are indisputable examples of the Anatolian "motion" -i- functioning as a true derivational suffix. When we find Lycian xñtawat(i)- 'ruler' beside xñtawata- 'rule' (noun), it is difficult not to view this relationship as parallel to that of Skt. rathī- 'charioteer' < rátha- 'chariot'. Another clear example in Lycian is huwedr(i)- 'all', convincingly derived by Starke (1990: 465 ff.) from a noun *huwadar- 'fullness, totality' cognate with

CLuv. šīwatar. Starke analyzes the Lycian adjective as an *-iyo- stem huwedrije-, but this cannot account for the Milyan borrowing nom.-acc. pl. neuter uwadra. If the stem were in -ije-, the neuter plural could only be *huwedrija (Mil. *uwedrija): cf. arawazija, ebeija, etc. The relationship of anim. nom. pl. huwedri but nt. nom.-acc. pl. *huwadra (> Mil. uwadra) can only be explained in terms of the "motion" -i- suffix.

In my view Luvian (and Lydian) adjectives in -al(i)- also demand a derivational function for the "motion" -i-. It is true, as claimed by Starke (1990: 445[602]), that the attested use of CLuvian ādduwal as a noun 'evil' could reflect simply a substantivization of the nt. nom.-acc. singular of the adjective ādduwal(i)-. However, his explanation of the athematic l-stem adjective by "dethematization" of a *-lo-stem is quite unpersuasive, since he can give no adequate motivation for such a process (cf. Starke 1981: 156 f. & 1990: 342 f. on ši(b)ṷal-). Furthermore, he does not explain the d i r e c t derivation of an adjective ādduwal(i)- from another adjective ādduwa- (Starke 1990: 562[2094]).[9] We must rather assume with Watkins (1982: 261) an intermediate l-stem noun ādduwal(i)- is d e r i v e d with the "motion" -i- suffix.[10]

The derivational function of the "motion" -i- in the Luvian and Lycian examples points to the non-ablauting 'appurtenance' suffix *-ih_2-. I see no way to motivate directly the restriction of the suffix in this function to the animate nominative and accusative. However, this restriction may easily be secondary, analogical to the much more productive "motion" -i- < *-ih_2-/-yeh_2- described above. Note that the restriction is indeed limited to the Western languages where the "motion" -i- is productive.

In the case of the Hittite and Luvian adjectives in -wi-, the -i- obviously has no derivational value. If it reflects non-ablauting *-ih_2- of the

---

9 Starke gives the shorter stem as *āddu(i)-, but a u-stem is excluded by the nt. nom.-acc. sg. adduwan=za, which pace Starke can only be from a stem ādduwa-. The problem of an unmotivated derivation of an adjective from another adjective is the same in either case.

10 Watkins, who did not yet know of the shorter stem ādduwa-, derives the noun ādduwal- directly from a collective *ḫed-wol- 'evil'. By this analysis the noun would not originally have been derived from the adjective *ḫḗdwo- > ādduwa-, but this is immaterial for the further derivation of ādduwal(i)- from ādduwa-. In any case, the noun ādduwal- could easily have been reinterpreted as a derivative of ādduwa- any time in the prehistory of Luvian. The same relationship surely exists for the stems ši(b)ṷa- and ši(b)ṷal- whatever their precise meaning. Starke's interpretation (1981: 152 ff.) of ši(b)ṷal as 'lamp', a "dethematized" ṷṛddhi-formation *sēḫ_2-wol-ó- 'of the sun' is improbable formally and semantically. That the feeble oil lamp of the Hittites would be derived from the word for 'sun' and used as a metaphorical agent of 'blinding' seems to me farfetched.

"vrkī-" type, it must do so in its other function: a feminine motion suffix. This raises the question of why the feminine stem would have been generalized in just these adjectives. At least in Hittite *dankui-* 'dark, black' the answer may lie in the usage of this particular adjective. Skt. *krsnī-* 'night' represents a transferred epithet 'the dark/black one'. It may not be accidental that by far the most common usage of Hitt. *dankui-* is as the epithet of *daganzipa-* 'earth' (for the origin of this expression see Oettinger 1989/90). The generalization of the feminine stem in $*-ih_2-$ in *dankui-* may thus reflect the prevalence of this set phrase.[11] I concede, however, that the texts do not offer any evidence for a similar explanation of *parkui-* 'clean, pure' or *warpui-* 'rough, shaggy'. Be that as it may, I believe we must consider the strong possibility that the non-ablauting $*-ih_2-$ of the *vrkī-*type has also left reflexes in Anatolian.

The potential relevance of the above hypothesis regarding the feminine gender to PIE relative chronology is evident. If the feminine gender developed in two stages, and only the first stage is reflected in Anatolian, then the latter may be regarded as an "early IE" feature preserved only there. Phrased in Stammbaum terms, the generalization of the feminine motion suffixes from the animate nominative/accusative to the rest of the paradigm could constitute a common innovation of the non-Anatolian languages. This would argue for an "early separation" of the Anatolian group.

The probative value of the $*-eh_2-$suffix for a common non-Anatolian innovation seems to me very limited. A paradigm with a contrast between a suffix in the nominative and accusative and zero in the remaining cases would have been highly unusual, and the generalization of an independent $*-\bar{a}-$ to the whole paradigm seems trivial enough to be an independent and parallel innovation in the non-Anatolian languages.

The case of $*-ih_2-/-yeh_2-$ seems at first sight much more promising. Here we have an ablauting paradigm, and indeed of a type generally considered to be archaic. It is unlikely that the individual non-Anatolian languages would independently create such a paradigm. A single common innovation thus appears to be indicated.

11 The earth is viewed as a goddess by the Hittites (see Catsanicos 1986: 127[24]), so a feminine adjective would be expected. Since Oettinger has shown that the phrase 'the dark earth' is a borrowing from Hurrian, this epithet of 'earth' cannot be projected far back into the prehistory of Hittite. However, Oettinger himself (1989/90: 87[13]) suggests that *dankui-* has replaced an inherited epithet *šuḫmili-* 'firmly fixed', for which see Catsanicos (1986: 123[4]) to find other secondary adjectives in Hittite in -*li-* is largely unproductive, and it is not unlikely that *šuḫmili-* itself reflects feminine $*-ih_2-$ in an epithet for 'earth'.

However, a closer examination raises some doubts. If ablaut of the type $*-ih_2-/-yeh_2-$ is in fact an archaic "early" IE feature (cf. optative $*-yeh_1-/-ih_1-$), is it likely that a "middle" or "late" innovation which excludes Anatolian would show this ablaut? Since "early", "middle", and "late" IE are relative terms, I do not place undue weight on this consideration.

More serious is the matter of the evidence for the supposed ablaut $*-ih_2-/-yeh_2-$. I have imitated Oettinger above in giving the PIE nominative plural as $*-yeh_2es$, but in fact one could just as well suppose $*-ih_2es$. Vedic -*īs*, Avestan -*īš* and OIrish -*i* point to $*-\bar{\imath}s$ vs. Goth. -*jōs* and Lith. -*iōs* < $*-y\bar{a}s$ < $*-yeh_2es$. The ending $*-\bar{\imath}s$ is surely a replacement by analogy to nom. sg. $*-\bar{a}$: nom. pl. $*-\bar{a}s$, but it may just as well have replaced $*-ih_2es$ as $*-yeh_2es$, as already noted by Brugmann (1911: 2. 2. 214), who leaves the question open. He further points out that the various daughter languages also disagree in the ablaut of the rest of the plural and dual cases (1911: 2. 2. 205 & 226).

The ablauting paradigm $*-ih_2-/-yeh_2-$ thus rests principally on the contrast between $*-ih_2-$ in the nominative singular and $*-yeh_2-$ in the weak cases of the singular, where there does seem to be general agreement: gen. sg. Skt. -*yā́s*, Grk. -ης-/-ας, OIr. -*e*, Goth. -*jōs*, etc. In the accusative singular, however, there is again a discrepancy: Skt. -*ī́m* and Grk. -*ι̯αν* point to $*-ih_2m̥$, but Goth. -*ja* and Lith. -*ią* must reflect $*-y\bar{a}m$.

We would expect for a "proterokinetic" paradigm zero grade of the suffix (here $*-ih_2-$) in the nominative and accusative singular and full grade (here $*-yeh_2-$) in the weak cases. Available evidence certainly permits such a reconstruction; whether it requires this conclusion is another matter.

What if — as a hypothesis — the feminine motion suffix (that of the asigmatic *devī*-type) was a nonablauting $*-ih_2-$? If this suffix were then generalized throughout the paradigm in the manner of $*-eh_2-$, what would have been the result? In the dual and plural before case endings with initial consonant the outcome would have been $*-\bar{\imath}-$, as attested in Sanskrit and elsewhere (see again the references in Brugmann cited above).

In the weak cases of the singular before endings with initial vowel, $*-ih_2V-$ would have produced in the first instance $*-i̯\_V-$ with hiatus, i.e. the same result as in the *vrkī*-type. We know the fate of the latter type in Sanskrit: within the historical period the endings -*ias*, -*ie*, -*i* are replaced by -*yās*, -*yāi*, -*yām*. Here this can be viewed as due to direct analogy with the existing type of *devī, devīm, devyā́s, devyāi, devyām*. However, the singular endings -*ās*, -*āi* and -*ām* also spread in Sanskrit to feminines in -*ū*, -*i* and -*u*. I believe one may legitimately wonder whether the spread

of -*ās̄*, -*ā̃i* and -*ā̃m* to the *vṛkí-*class and elsewhere is not due in large part to the direct influence of the feminine stems in -*ā̄*. In turn, I raise the possibility that a similar prehistoric influence of *ā̄*-stems on *ī*-stems led to the allomorph -*yā̄-* of the latter. As one would expect in analogy of this sort, this influence went much farther in some languages than in others, whence the discrepancies in the distribution of *-ī̄-* and *-yā̄-* cited above.[12]

The account just presented for a secondary origin of the alternation *-ī̄-/-yā̄-* in the *devī́-*suffix may prove not to be viable, and I do not insist upon it. I do wish to suggest that the evidence for the ablauting paradigm traditionally assumed is by no means as secure as one might think.

I leave to others the task of pursuing the larger implications of the hypothesis presented here. I do believe that the Anatolian "motion" suffix -*ī-* (in its non-derivational use) can only be derived from the PIE feminine motion suffix of the *devī́-*type, as argued by Oettinger. However, the restricted distribution of the Anatolian suffix cannot be motivated as an innovation. I therefore suggest that the feminine gender developed in PIE in two steps: in the first, the motion suffixes *-*eh₂-* and *-*ih₂-*(/-*yeh₂-*) were added only in the nominative and accusative, where gender was already marked in the preexisting animate/inanimate system. Anatolian indirectly reflects this first stage. Only later were the motion suffixes generalized throughout the paradigm, whether this be a single common innovation of the non-Anatolian languages, or a series of parallel but independent developments.

---

12 The same idea has occurred to at least one other scholar; see Villar (1974:155). I should note, however, that his underlying assumptions about the interrelationships of the various feminine motion suffixes differs radically from mine. One may also compare Wackernagel-Debrunner (1930: 164 f.) who characterize the alternation -*ī-*/-*yā̄-* cautiously as 'apparently' due to Ablaut and who in any case assume widespread extension of -*yā̄-* at the expense of -*ī-* due precisely to the influence of the *ā̄*-stems.

References

BRUGMANN, KARL (1911). *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen.* 2nd edn. Strassburg: Trübner.

CARRUBA, ONOFRIO (1982). Beiträge zum Luwischen. *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann,* ed. JOHANN TISCHLER, 35-51. Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachw. der Univ. Innsbruck.

CATSANICOS, JEAN (1986). A propos des adjectifs hitt. *šuḫmili-* et véd. *sū-máya-:* quelques remarques sur le traitement du groupe -*V-HC-* à la jointure des composés. *BSL* 81.121-180.

EICHNER, HEINER (1988). Anatolisch und Trilaryngalismus. *Die Laryngaltheorie,* ed. ALFRED BAMMESBERGER, 123-151. Heidelberg: Winter.

GARRETT, ANDREW (1990). The origin of NP split ergativity. *Lg* 66. 261-296.

GÜTERBOCK, HANS G. and HARRY A. HOFFNER (1980). *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.* Volume 3/1. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the Univ. of Chicago.

GUSMANI, ROBERTO (1985). Microasiatica. 3. Lidio *vešfa-* e *ittito buiswant-. IncLing* 10.110-112.

VAN DEN HOUT, THEO (1984). Einige luwischen Neutra auf -*ša/-za* in überwiegend junghethitischen Texten. *KZ* 97. 60-80.

HROZNÝ, BEDRICH (1917). *Die Sprache der Hethiter.* Leipzig: Hinrichs.

KIMBALL, SARA (1983). Hittite Plene Writing. Univ. of Pennsylvania Ph.D. Dissertation. Philadelphia.

MEID, WOLFGANG (1979). Der Archaismus des Hethitischen. *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch,* edd. ERICH NEU and WOLFGANG MEID, 159-176. Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachw. der Univ. Innsbruck..

MELCHERT, H. CRAIG (1983). A 'New' PIE *-*men* Suffix. *Sprache* 29. 1-26.

—, (1984). Notes on Palaic. *KZ* 97. 22-43.

—, (1988). 'Thorn' and 'Minus' in Hieroglyphic Luvian Orthography. *AnSt* 38. 29-42.

—, (1989). New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. *HS* 102. 23-45.

—, (1990). Adjectives in *-*iyo-* in Anatolian. *HS* 103. 198-207.

—, (1992a). Relative Chronology and Anatolian: the Vowel System. *Rekonstruktion und Relative Chronologie. Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Leiden, 31. August – 4. September 1987,* ed. ROBERT BEEKES et al., 41-53. Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachw. der Univ. Innsbruck.

—, (1992b). PIE *-*y* > Lydian *d. Gedenkschrift für Otokar Klima,* ed. PETR VAVROUŠEK (in press).

OETTINGER, NORBERT (1980). Die *n-*Stämme des Hethitischen und ihre indogermanischen Ausgangspunkte. *KZ* 94. 44-63.

—, (1986). "*Indo-Hittite" -Hypothese und Wortbildung.* Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachw. der Univ. Innsbruck.

—, (1987). Bemerkungen zur anatolischen *i-*Motion und Genusfrage. *KZ* 100. 35-43.

—, (1989/90) Die 'dunkle Erde' im Hethitischen und Griechischen. *WO* 20/21. 83-98.

PUHVEL, JAAN (1991). *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 3. Words Beginning with H.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

RASMUSSEN, JENS E. (1992). The Distribution of *e* and *a* in Lycian. *Rekonstruktion und Relative Chronologie*, ed. ROBERT BEEKES et al., 359-366. Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachw. der Univ. Innsbruck.

SHEVOROSHKIN, VITALY (1967). *Lidijskij Jazyk*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Nauk".

STARKE, FRANK (1981). Die keilschrift-luwischen Wörter für 'Insel' und 'Lampe'. *KZ* 95. 141-157.

—, (1982). Die Kasusendungen der luwischen Sprachen. *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann*, ed. JOHANN TISCHLER, 407-425. Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachw. der Univ. Innsbruck.

—, (1990). *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

VASMER, MAX (1955). *Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Zweiter Band. Heidelberg: Winter.

VILLAR, FRANCISCO (1974). *Origen de la flexión nominal indoeuropea*. Madrid: C.S.I.C.

WACKERNAGEL, JAKOB and ALBERT DEBRUNNER (1930). *Altindische Grammatik*. Vol. 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

WATKINS, CALVERT (1982). Notes on the Plural Formations of the Hittite Neuters. *Investigationes Philologicae et Comparativae. Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, ed. ERICH NEU, 250-262. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

WINTER, WERNER (1965). Tocharian Evidence. *Evidence for Laryngeals*, ed. WERNER WINTER, 190-211. The Hague: Mouton.