STUDIA CELTICA
ET INDOGERMANICA

Festschrift für
WOLFGANG MEID
zum 70. Geburtstag

Herausgegeben von
PETER ANREITER und ERZSÉBET JEREM

BUDAPEST 1999

„(Zu-)eignung" in Anatolian and Indo-European

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

M. Poetto has recently argued (1997) that the Luvian verb /a:rlanuwa-/ (Cuneiform Luvian *ārlanuwa-* = Hieroglyphic Luvian 66*-*nu-wa/i-*) means 'donare' ('to bestow, make a gift'), deriving the word ultimately from the PIE root *$*(h_1)reh_1$- seen in Skt. *rā-* 'give, grant', *rāi-* 'property, wealth', etc. Both the interpretation and the root etymology are persuasive. Closer examination, however, shows that this Luvian verb is but one member of an extensive set of words in Anatolian whose range of meaning goes well beyond simply 'to give'. A full exploration of their formal relationship and semantics will in turn lead us to reexamine the meaning of the PIE root itself.

Like their counterparts in Hittite, Luvian verbs in *-nu-*[1] fall into two well-defined classes. First, there are deverbatives with transitivizing or „causative" sense (CLuvian *ḫuinuwa-* 'cause to run' < *ḫui(ya)-* 'run', both with direct Hittite cognates). Second, there are factitives formed to adjectives (CLuvian *urannu-* 'make great, exalt' to *ura-* 'great'). Poetto (1997: 241) assigns *ārlanuwa-* to the former class, taking it as the causative to a denominative verb *$*arlā(i)$-* to a base noun *$*arla$-* 'gift'. He is, however, unable to motivate any semantic difference between the purely hypothetical *$*arlā(i)$-* and the attested *ārlanuwa-*. Given the shape of *ārlanuwa-*, economy alone would argue for a factitive 'make *ārla-*', with *$*ārla$-* being an adjective.

Other evidence from Anatolian confirms this analysis. We may begin with Lydian *arlili-/arlylli-* '(one's) own'. The sense is assured by the parallelism of 23,13 *ni=k bis ni=k bilis arlyllis* and 24,15-16 *ni=k bis ni=k bil śfēnis* 'neither he nor (one of) his own': see Gusmani (1964: 61). The adjective *śfēni-* clearly is based on PIE *$*swo$-* '(one's) own', and the meaning of *arlili-/arlylli-* must be nearly synonymous: 'belonging to one, one's own'. While we do not have enough case forms to be certain, the chances are very good that the final *-i-* of the word is the „mutation-suffix" discovered by Starke (1990: 59ff.). The stem is thus probably in *-la-* < *$*-lo$-*. Since, as per Starke, the „mutation-*i*" is not part of the underlying stem and does not appear in derivatives, the first *-i-* of *arlila/i-* must be a true suffix.[2] I therefore propose that we have yet another example of the type of derivational chain discussed in Melchert (to appear): a thematic adjective *$*ārla$-* 'owned, one's own', whence a secondary noun *$*ārli$-* 'ownership, property' and in turn a secondary adjective *ārlila-** 'one's own' (perhaps with a special exclusive sense). One may compare the set of German *eigen* → *Eigentum* → *eigentümlich* (the latter in its archaic sense of *proprius*).[3]

The adjective *$*ārla$-* and noun *$*ārli$-* with the assigned meanings can account for the further derivatives listed by Poetto. First of all, *ārlanuwa-* itself is now 'make (something) owned (by someone), eignen',[4] more simply 'bestow, dedicate'.[5] HLuvian 66*-*nuwa-* is attested in absolute use, paired

---

[1] Also *-nuwa-*, with secondary „thematization" backformed from the third plural. One detail as yet unexplained is the consistent geminate *-nn-* of the suffix just when the form is *-nu-* vs. expected simple *-n-* when the form is *-nuwa-* (e. g. *arannuḫḫa* vs. *aranuwatta* cited below).

[2] The *-y-* of the variant *arlylla/i-* indicates that the second syllable is unaccented: see Melchert (1994: 342f.) with reference to Gusmani (1983: 57ff.). The status of the geminate *-ll-* is uncertain, as in several other cases of gemination in Lydian: see Melchert (1994: 354f.) for a brief discussion.

[3] I cannot follow Bader (1986: 63, 73ff.), who relates *arlila/i-* 'one's own' to Lydian *aλa-* 'other'.

[4] For German *eignen* archaically as 'confer ownership of' see Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch. Neubearbeitung*, 7. Band (Stuttgart/Leipzig, Hirzel: 1993), p. 440. The sense of transferring ownership to someone else survives in modern German *zu-eignen* 'dedicate'.

[5] One would expect by either my or Poetto's account accusative of the thing granted and dative of the recipient. The HLuvian verb is attested only in absolute use, paired with /piya-/ 'give' (see further below). For the CLuvian verb (see Poetto, 1997: 237), we find dative of recipient and instrumental of the thing granted. On the origin of this construction and the general problem of the variable syntax of verbs of offering and worship see Melchert (1981:

asyndetically with *piya-*, the ordinary verb for 'give': *pi-i(a)-ha* 66*-*nu-wa/i-ha*. Poetto (1997: 235[4]) aptly compares Latin *dedi donaui*. I would argue that the second verb does not merely reinforce the first, but also adds the crucial additional meaning of 'permanently, irrevocably'. The speaker (King Tuthaliya) is emphasizing that his dedication to the gods is unconditional and forever.[6] This nuance is expressed in Hittite by *āppan tarna-*, literally 'leave behind' but collocated with *pāi-* 'give' to mean 'concede irrevocably' (see Melchert, 1989: 33f.). It is also unlikely to be accidental that the CLuvian verb *ārlanuwa-* is used of a deity bestowing upon a ritual client life, vigor, and divine favor, qualities envisaged to be inherent and life-long (see Poetto, 1997: 241, and further below).

The Carian personal names *a-r-l-i-š-* and *a-r-l-i-o-m-* (in Greek rendering Αρλισ(σ)ις and Αρλιωμος) are built on the noun **ārli-* with secondary suffixes of appurtenance (**-asso/-i-* and **-omo/-ī-* with the „mutation-*ī*").[7] These may be plausibly interpreted as 'of property, propertied', in effect 'rich, wealthy'. Compare the extensive set of West Germanic personal names built on *ōd-, ōt-, ēad-* 'property, wealth' (see Bach, 1943: 203) or Greek names such as Πολύκτητος or Πλούσιος. A direct substantivization of the adjective **ārlo-* alongside the suffixed **ārli-* with the same meaning 'property, wealth' would be trivial: cf. Hittite *šalpa-* and *šalpi-* 'dog dung', both from an adjective **sol-bho-* *'dirty gray' (see Schindler, 1978). This noun may or may not be attested as the first element of the personal names *Arla-na-* and *Arla-wizzi-* cited by Poetto (1997: 241).[8] If the HLuvian form *ara/i-la* (attested in a broken but clearly votive context) belongs here as /arla/ (Poetto, 1997: 241[51] with refs.), it could represent a parallel to the ritual usage of Latin *proprius*.[9]

Not all related derivatives are based on a stem **ārlo-*. There is also the CLuvian verb *arannu-/aranuwa-*. The preterite third singular *aranuwatta* is found in a hopelessly fragmentary passage (*KUB* 35.79 iv 5&6). The preterite first singular *arannuhha* in Hittite context is more informative (*KBo* 4.12 Ro 27-30): *nu=šmaš=kan* GAL.DUB.SAR*UTTA kuiēš dāmauš arnušker nu=šmaš=at ŪL arannuhha nu ANA* GAL.DUB.SAR*UTTI* ᵐUR.MAH.LÚ-*in* DUMU ᵐ*Middan*ᵃⁿ*namūwa titta[nunun]* „Those others who were trying to obtain the office of chief scribe for themselves – I did not *arannu-* it to/for them. 1 installed Walwaziti, son of Middannamuwa, as chief scribe." Laroche (1959:30) translates „Je n'ai pas prolongé leur secrétariat." However, thanks to Morpurgo Davies (1987: 218[31]) we now know that the Luvian adjective for 'long' is consistently *array(a)-* with a geminate -*rr*-. Laroche's analysis of *arannu-/aranuwa-* as the factitive of 'long' is quite impossible. The context calls for 'confer/bestow upon, grant'.

The spelling *a-ra-an-nu-*°/*a-ra-nu-wa-*° (not †(*a)-ar-nu-*°) forces a reading /aran(n)u(wa)-/. This precludes an analysis of the stem as reflecting a primary **(h₁)r̥-neu-*, as tempting as this would be in view of the other evidence for such a stem elsewhere (see below). We must begin with a base **ara-/āra-* (the spelling *a-ra-*° gives no clue regarding the length of the first vowel). Once again, a verb stem **arā(i)-* would be entirely gratuitous (what might it mean?). The stem **ara-* is surely nominal, reflecting **(h₁)r̥-ó-*, **(h₁)or-ó-*, or **(h₁)ór-o-*. While the first two types of derivatives are vanishingly

---

250ff.), with reference to the masterful study of Hittite *šipand-* 'libate; consecrate; sacrifice; worship' by Goetze (1971).

[6] As per Poetto (1997: 242), the form of sign 66* (two raised hands, sometimes joined) is iconic for the act of solemn offering with *both* hands.

[7] For the latter compare CLuvian *maššanāma/i-* 'of a god/the gods' (a kind of priest) < *maššan-* 'god'.

[8] Given the multitude of -*ant-* suffixes attested in Anatolian, I forgo any analysis of the mountain name *Ar-la-an-ta-*. In view of *ar-u-* 'high' in Palaic, Luvian and (indirectly) Lycian, one may wonder whether the *Ar-la-* of *Arlanta-* belongs with our set of words at all.

[9] See the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, Clarendon: 1968) sub *proprius* 1.b. According to Wissowa (1912: 413f. with note 2) and Pighi (1965: 306), the word in this context refers to ritual offerings, particularly sacrificial victims, that are 'appropriate'; i.e., that are properly matched with the receiving deity in terms of qualities such as sex, color, and breed. On the occurrence in Plautus see also Lindsay (1921: 109). This notion is also attested in Hittite context: see Hoffner (1967: 400) and Haas (1994: 647f.), who cite examples involving sex and color. I am indebted to colleagues Billie Jean Collins, Harry Hoffner, and Brent Vine for invaluable references on this topic.

rare in Anatolian, the third clearly enjoyed some productivity.[10] Hittite shows at least a dozen examples. For Luvian note HLuvian (LINGERE)*ha-sa-* 'satiety, abundance' to an unattested verb matching Palaic *ḫaš-* 'be satiated'. Factitives in *-nu-* built to substantives are not frequent, but they do occur: one may compare Hittite *duddu-nu-* 'show mercy' < *du(wa)ddu-* 'mercy'. I therefore assume an **āra-* (virtual **(h₁)ór-o-*) *'owning, ownership', from which *arannu-/aranuwa-* 'confer ownership, grant'.

Since *arannu-* requires a base stem **āra-*, it seems most economical also to analyze our adjective **ārla-* as a secondary derivative **āra-la-* 'pertaining to ownership, owned, one's own'. For the syncope to **ārla-* one may compare Hittite **marla-* 'foolish' (attested as *marlant-*), plausibly analyzed as **mŏro-lo-* by Eichner (1975: 81[5]). This derivation accounts directly for the long vowel of CLuvian *ārlanuwa-*, which reflects accent on the first syllable, confirmed by Lydian *arlyllλ*[11]. I cannot, of course, in principle exclude a primary derivative, but I see nothing to recommend a primary adjective **ór-lo-* or **ŕ-lo-*.

Returning to Lydian, we find the verb *arvo-*, attested in 2,9: *qis=k dctdid ist esλ vānaλ karolλ sabλalλ karola=ś śfēndav arvol.* The basic structure and content of this sentence are reasonably clear: 'And whoever *dares* (or sim.) to *arvo-* the property of **Karos** in/from this tomb of Karos, (son) of Sabλas...'. The form *arvol* is an infinitive depending on the main verb *dctdid* and taking *karola(v) śfē ndav* 'the property of Karos' (dative plural) as its object. On this exemplar of the „double dative" construction in Anatolian and the force of the particle *-ś* see Melchert (1991: 132f.). The basic sense called for by the context is 'take'.

The formal details of Lydian verbs in *-o-* remain unclear,[12] but the shape of the stem *arvo-* demands a denominative in any case. Once again, a primary derivative for the base cannot be excluded, but the other evidence we have seen leads me to assume rather a secondary adjective **āra-wa-* parallel to **āra-la-* above and with roughly the same sense 'pertaining to ownership, owned, one's own'. The denominative verb would then be 'sich (an/zu)eignen, appropriate'.[13] As per Eichner (1986: 9), the accent in *arvol* must fall on the *-o-*. For the pretonic syncope in **ārawó- > arvo-* see Melchert (1994: 376).

Finally, I must mention Lydian *ararm-/alarm-*, tentatively 'oneself' (in emphatic use in apposition to a noun): see Gusmani (1964: 59f.). As Gusmani suggests, it is quite possible that this word too is related to *arlila/i-* and belongs to our set. Any formal analysis is necessarily speculative. It seems likely that the variant *alarm-* is dissimilated from *ararm-*, which shows reduplication. It is tolerably certain that nominative and accusative singular *alarmś/alarmn* reflect syncope of a stem in **-mos/n* (see Melchert, 1994: 373f. with ref.). It is possible but not assured that there was a prior syncope of a vowel before the *-m-* (cf. the examples cited in Melchert, 1994: 375). We thus *may* suppose an **árara-ma-* 'of a particular property > individual' (for the suffix see note 7), based on a reduplicated noun **ar-ara-* 'property' (in the sense of *Eigenschaft* – one could also compare *eigentümlich* in the sense 'individual'). A synchronic meaning '(as) an individual, personally' would seem to fit the not entirely clear contexts of *ararm-/alarm-*. I certainly do not insist on this particular analysis, but the connection between an emphatic 'oneself' and 'one's own' as suggested by Gusmani remains plausible.

Our investigation thus far has placed Luvian /a:rlanuwa-/ in the context of a set of words based on an Anatolian root **ar-* with a core meaning 'own'. This result is by no means incompatible with Poetto's original comparison with Skt. and Av. *rā-* 'give, grant'. Szemerényi (1956: 181f.) points out

---

[10] Compare the similar conclusions of Oettinger (1986: 18f.).

[11] As per note 2 above, the accent in the Lydian cannot be on the *-y-*, and by the well-motivated rules of Eichner (1986: 9) it cannot fall on the syllabic *-λ* either. That leaves as the only possibility *árlyllλ*, matching CLuvian *ārlanuwa-*. The accent of the base noun was carried over in this instance to the derivatives.

[12] For a mere possibility see Melchert (1997: 136f.).

[13] For *sich eignen* archaically without prefix as 'take possession of' see the reference in note 4 (p. 441).

that the *$reh_1(i)$- posited as the source of the Indo-Iranian verb and of Skt. $r\bar{a}i$-/$rayi$- 'wealth' and Old Latin $r\bar{e}s$ 'property, possession(s)' may be analyzed as *h_xr-$eh_1(i)$- to a root *h_xer- seen in Av. $ərənu$- 'grant, bestow' = Grk. ἄρνυμαι 'I receive' = Arm. $aṙnum$ 'I take'.[14] Szemerényi himself (1956: 184) assumes a basic root *h_2er-, because he wishes to relate further Hittite $ḫar(k)$- 'hold, possess, have'. This step must be rejected, since the initial a- of the Luvian reflexes $aranuwa$- and $\bar{a}rlanuwa$- cannot continue *h_2-.

Nevertheless, Szemerényi's adduction of a verb meaning 'hold, possess' is not irrelevant for our problem. As he indicates, a development from 'take' to 'hold, possess' is commonplace: cf. Hitt. $ēpp$- 'take, seize' but also 'hold', Latin $capiō$ 'take' but OHG $hab\bar{e}n$ etc. 'hold, have', OIr. $gaibid$ 'take' but Latin $habe\bar{o}$ 'hold, have'. I suggest a similar semantic development for *h_1er-/h_1r-$eh_1(i)$- with the added element of permanence/inalienability: this root meant 'take/give possession of *in perpetuity*' and secondarily 'have *inalienable* possession of' > 'own' (in the fullest sense).

The sense 'give in perpetuity' appears as 'dedicate, consecrate' (said of humans making offerings to gods) and as 'bestow' (of gods' blessings on humans): see on the use of Skt. $r\bar{a}$- Günther (1951) and recall respectively HLuvian and CLuvian /a:rlanuwa-/. The nuance of permanence/inalienability is not directly visible in the reflexes of 'take' (Grk. ἄρνυμαι, Arm. $aṙnum$), but the secondary 'have inalienable possession of' shows up not only in the various Anatolian reflexes based on 'own', but also in Skt. $r\bar{a}i$-/$rayí$- 'wealth' and Old Latin $r\bar{e}s$ 'property, possession(s)', whose semantic connection to $r\bar{a}$- 'give, grant' – never actually explained to my knowledge – now comes into focus.[15]

References

Bach, Adolf. 1943. *Die deutschen Personennamen*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Bader, Françoise. 1986. De skr. *anyá*- à skr. *árya*-: noms i.e. de l'„autre". *BSL* 80.57-90.

Benveniste, Émile. 1966. Don et échange dans le vocabulaire indo-européen. In: *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, 315-326. Paris: Gallimard.

Eichner, Heiner. 1975. Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystems. In: H. Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, 71-103. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

–. 1986. Die Akzentuation des Lydischen. *Sprache* 32.7-21.

Goetze, Albrecht. 1971. Hittite *šipant-*. *JCS* 23.77-94.

Günther, Herbert. 1951. Gabe und Geber. *KZ* 69.225-244.

Gusmani, Roberto. 1964. *Lydisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

–. 1983. Ein Weihrauchbrenner mit lydischer Inschrift im Metropolitan Museum. *Kadmos* 22.56-60.

Haas, Volkert. 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Leiden: Brill.

Hoffner, Harry. 1967. Second Millennium Antecedents to the Hebrew *'ōḇ*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86.385-401.

Laroche, Emmanuel. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

Lindsay, H. M. 1921. *T. Macci Plauti. Captiui*. Second Edition. Oxford: Clarendon.

Melchert, Craig. 1981. 'God-Drinking': a Syntactic Transformation in Hittite. *JIES* 9.245-254.

–. 1989. New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. *HS* 102.23-45.

–. 1991. The Lydian Emphasizing and Reflexive Particle -*š*/-*is*. *Kadmos* 30.131-142.

---

[14] Szemerényi (1956: 182f.) assumes for this and the other well-known cases that the basic meaning is 'take', from which 'give' is secondarily derived. Benveniste (1966) argues that in PIE giving and taking were viewed merely as complementary aspects of a single act of 'exchange'. I prefer the latter viewpoint, but a choice between these alternatives is immaterial for present purposes. What is crucial is that our root meant *both* 'give' *and* 'take', and I see no reason to exclude the latter meaning from the „enlarged" variant.

[15] For the last step in the presumed derivation compare German *Habe* 'possession(s), property, fortune'.

–. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

–. 1997. Denominative Verbs in Anatolian. In: D. Disterheft et al. (eds.), *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel. Part One. Ancient Languages and Philology*, 131-138. Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

–. to appear. Two Problems of Anatolian Nominal Derivation. In: H. C. Luschützky and H. Eichner (eds.), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Prague: Enigma.

Morpurgo Davies, Anna. 1987. 'to put' and 'to stand' in the Luwian languages. In: C. Watkins (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill*, 205-228. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Oettinger, Norbert. 1986. *„Indo-Hittite"-Hypothese und Wortbildung*. Innsbruck: IBS.

Pighi, J. B. 1965. *De ludis saecularibus*. Amsterdam: Schippers.

Poetto, Massimo. 1997. Un 'dono' luvio. In: A. Lubotsky (ed.), *Sound Law and Analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, 235-248. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

Schindler, Jochem. 1978. Hittite *šalpa-*. *Sprache* 24.45.

Starke, Frank. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Szemerényi, Oswald. 1956. Latin *rēs* and the Indo-European long-diphthong stem nouns. *KZ* 73.167-202.

Wissowa, Georg. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. Zweite Auflage. München: Beck.