

**ANATOLISCH  
UND INDOGERMANISCH  
ANATOLICO E INDOEUROPEO**

**Akten des Kolloquiums  
der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft  
Pavia, 22.-25. September 1998**

Herausgegeben von  
Onofrio Carruba und Wolfgang Meid

**SONDERDRUCK**

**INNSBRUCK 2001**

**INNSBRUCKER BEITRÄGE ZUR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT**

Herausgeber: Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Meid  
Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen Universität Innsbruck  
A-6020 Innsbruck, Innrain 52

Bestell- und Auslieferungsadresse:  
A-6020 Innsbruck, Elisabethstraße 11  
Telefon und Telefax: (+43-512) 561945

## Inhalt

Premessa (Onofrio Carruba).....	5
Vorwort (Wolfgang Meid).....	8
Adiego Lajara Ignacio-J.	
Lenición y acento en protoanatolico.....	11
Boley Jacqueline	
Suggestions for the original function of <i>-kan</i> .....	19
Carruba Onofrio	
Genere e classe in anatolico: La 'mozione in -i' e il 'caso in -sa/-za'.....	29
Cotticelli-Kurras Paola	
Textlinguistische Annäherungen in den hethitischen Erzähltexten.....	43
Euler Wolfram	
Hethitisch und Rumänisch – zwei Außenseiter in ihren Sprachfamilien.....	57
Fortes Fortes José	
Note sul lessico anatolico.....	69
Francia Rita	
La posizione degli aggettivi qualificativi nella frase ittita.....	81
Furlan Merka	
Hethitische Direktivendung <i>-ā</i> und indoeuropäische Quellen.....	93
Gamkrelidze Thomas V.	
Anatolian in light of the Glottalic Theory.....	119
García Ramón J.L.	
Hethitisch <i>hi(n)k-</i> 'darreichen, darbringen'.....	129
Giannakis Georgios K.	
On some expressions of „killing“ and „dying“ in Hittite and Indo-European.....	147
Hout Theo van den	
Neuter Plural Subjects and Nominal Predicates in Anatolian.....	167
Janda Michael	
Tracce indoeuropee nel mito di Ullikummi.....	193

Fortsetzung auf 3. Umschlagseite

## Hittite Nominal Stems in *-il*

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

Hittite nominal stems in *-il* have drawn considerable attention from Indo-Europeanists since their first discovery. Their interest lay in part in their putative status as archaisms. Hittite athematic stems in *-il* were seen as precursors of stems in *\*-lo-* or *\*-li-* elsewhere: see e.g. the treatment of Benveniste (1935: 40-49).

This view is undoubtedly correct for two classes of Hittite *il*-stems. We find a small set of deverbative neuter action/result nouns in *-al* < *\*-l*: e.g. <sup>URUDU</sup> *ardat-* 'saw' < *ard-* 'to saw', *išḫiyal-* 'belt, sash' < *išḫi-* 'bind'; likewise CLuvian <sup>GAŠ</sup> *ariyal-* 'basket' < *ariya-* 'lift'.<sup>1</sup> These surely reflect a PIE primary type, but the original inflection is impossible to determine, since all attested examples are transparently derived from the synchronic verbal stem. Either an „acrostatic“ or „proterokinetic“ type would account for the attested zero-grade of the suffix *\*-l*.<sup>2</sup> We might expect original heteroclitic inflection *\*-l/n-* parallel to *\*-r/n-*, but this cannot be proven. We likewise find a set of deverbative neuter action/result nouns in *-ul* < *\*-w/l*: e.g. *takšul-* 'peace' < *takš-* 'make even', *wašul-* 'sin' < *waš(a)-* 'sin', *išḫul-* 'obligation, treaty' < *išḫi-* 'bind' (see Oettinger 1986: 17). Once again, it is difficult to determine the original PIE inflectional type or the issue of original heteroclitic inflection, but a primary athematic class seems assured.<sup>3</sup>

I have argued elsewhere, however, that not all Hittite stems in *-il* are what they seem. In Melchert (1993) I presented evidence for a special conditioned

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Oettinger 1986: 16f. and Starke 1990: 300ff.. I cannot accept the claim that all Hittite examples are borrowings from Luvian. Contra Starke there is not a shred of evidence that the root *ard-* is Luvian, while the peculiar treatment in the first plural *ardumēni* < *\*ardunweni* < *\*ardweni* argues against a loanword. Likewise *išḫiyal-* reflects the Hittite stem *išḫi-*, not Luvian *hišḫi-*.

<sup>2</sup> While Oettinger loc. cit. is correct in claiming that *išḫiyal-* could reflect *\*išḫiyel* with replacement of *-ye-* by *-ya-*, the consistent *-al-* in all examples points rather to *\*-l*.

<sup>3</sup> One would expect on the evidence of PIE 'sun' (*\*séh<sub>2</sub>-w/l*, *\*sh<sub>2</sub>-wén-s*) and the parallel of stems in *\*-wer/-wen-*, „proterokinetic“ inflection (see Schindler 1975: 10). For arguments against *l/n*-heteroclitics in PIE see Wachter 1997.

change in Anatolian comparable to the „ager“ rule of Latin by which a final sequence *\*-Cr/los/m#* became *\*-Car/ls/n#* whence with regular simplification of the final clusters *-Car/l#*.<sup>4</sup> Hittite *šyattal-* ‘missile, spear’ thus reflects a (virtual) *\*šh,y-o-ilo-* with the familiar „instrumental“ suffix (so after Forrer, contra Starke 1990: 200ff.). Hittite in this case then continues the same thematic inflection seen elsewhere, and the apparent archaism disappears.

My focus here is on Hittite stems in *-il*. These have generally been characterized as stems in *-ē*, and all previous analyses have been based on this premise. Benveniste (1935: 42f.) assumes primary *\*.ē*, comparing Hittite *š(u)w-ē* ‘thread’ with Latin *quer-ē-a* ‘complaint’ etc. and *šarnik-zē* (sic!) ‘restitution’ with Latin *tū-ē-a* ‘protection’ (followed by Sturtevant 1933: 77). Eichner (1973: 85) assumes rather *\*šuh,-ēl* with full, not lengthened grade (followed by Starke 1990: 301). Schindler (1975: 9) in turn posits again a „hysterokinetic“ collective *\*šuh,-ē* with lengthened grade. As I argued already in Melchert (1984: 119), this account of the class as a whole is incompatible with the true synchronic facts.

First of all, *alil* examples of these stems in Old and Middle Hittite manuscripts show consistently *i*-vocalism (this is significant, since there are distinct signs EL and IL).<sup>5</sup> In the absence of contrary evidence we should therefore speak only of stems in *-il*. Available evidence argues that Hittite *-il* with *i*-vocalism cannot be derived from either accented or unaccented *\*.ē* or from accented *\*.ēl* (see Melchert 1994: 133 and 142ff.). Unaccented *\*.ē* is possible phonologically (cf. Melchert 1994: 139f.), but one would need to justify an unaccented *e*-grade. It is also important to note that examples in *-wīl* are non-probativ for determining original *e*- or *i*-vocalism, given the sporadic raising of *\*ē > i* between *\*w* and following dental consonant in Hittite (Melchert 1994: 144f. with refs.).

A second fact which has been suppressed or overlooked is that some stems in *-il* are *animate* gender, not neuter. This is true for at least *alil-* ‘flower, blossom’ and *šarnikzil-* ‘restitution’ (in the absence of contrary evidence I assume the same for *tayazzil-* ‘theft’ based on its parallel structure to *šarnikzil-*). Evidence for *alil-*: *nu šankuš alil maḥtan parkiyat[ta]* ‘as the colorful’ flower rises’ (KUB 33.68 ii 1). As per Neu (1968: 138) there is no reasonable way to interpret this passage except with *šankuš* as an epithet of *alil*, which is nominative singular and subject of the verb. All tortured attempts to circumvent this are in vain, and there is no „lack of gender concord“. The text is telling us that *alil* is

<sup>4</sup> Since the 1993 article is not easily accessible, I refer readers also to the brief summary in Melchert 1994: 87f..

<sup>5</sup> *ḫapalzi* (Bo 1291 ii 16OS; see Neu 1980: 109); *ḫurkil* (KUB 29.35 iv 13OS); *šarnikzil* (KBo 6.2.147.ii 11.15.28.53OS; *šawil* (KBo 15.10 i 7MS); *tayazzil* (KBo 6.2 ii 55OS).

animate nominative singular. This is confirmed by the trivial thematization in *alilaš-za war-šawanzi UL memmai* ‘the flower refuses to be plucked’ (KUB 12.62 Ro 13, with Puhvel 1984: 32 contra all others). One also finds *alil/aiel* as an accusative singular (KUB 4.4 Ro 8 etc.).

Evidence for *šarnikzil-*: [*mān šarnikzel kuis*] ‘if there is some restitution’ (KUB 14.8 Vo 30) and accusative plural *šarnikiliuš* at KUB 46.42 iv 6 and 46.38 i 7&10. Scholars have resisted the evidence for animate gender out of a prejudice that a nominative or accusative form ending in *-l* must be neuter. This prejudice must be abandoned! I do not mean, however, to suggest that this prejudice is unfounded – there is evidence that the Hittites themselves shared it. Identical nominative and accusative singulars with zero ending are overwhelmingly neuter in Hittite, and endings animate forms in this function clearly were synchronically aberrant. One solution was to thematize such stems (hence *alila-š* for nominative singular *alil* above). Another was indeed to reanalyze such stems as neuters. Next to the indisputable animate forms of *šarnikzil-* just cited we also find equally certain neuters: *šarnikzell-a* ME-*anzi n-at* ANA GIDIM SUM-*anzi* ‘they take the restitutions and give them to the deceased’ (KBo 2.6 iii 45-46; likewise ibid. iii 61-62). Given the overall structure of Hittite nominal inflection, I must insist that a change from animate to neuter is natural for such stems, whereas if these stems were all neuter to begin with, I see no possible motivation for the cases where they are treated as animate.

It is an unfortunate fact that many of the stems in *-il* are poorly attested, and then often in contexts where gender cannot be determined. The evidence cited for reanalysis of animate *šarnikzil-* to a neuter means further that attested neuter gender for a stem found only in Neo-Hittite manuscripts does not assure that the word originally is neuter. We must in these circumstances be careful in going beyond the direct evidence available. As noted, *alil-* and *šarnikzil-* are originally animate. I assume the same for *tayazzil-*, but this cannot strictly be proven. The animate nominative singular *muwilaš* suggests that *as muwīl* (a tool) is animate. The stems *ḫapalzi-* ‘stew, soup’, *paššawil-* ‘?’, and *šawil-* ‘thread’ are attested as neuters, but the evidence is only from NS. All other stems in this class are quite indeterminate as to gender: *ḫārkil-* ‘perversion’, *ḫurutil-* (a cooked dish), *ḫāššil-* ‘clay-pit, refuse dump’, *ḫus gazzimuel-* (part of harness, hapax at KBo 6.10 ii 27 + 6.20.6), *as šušyazkil-* ‘?’ (part of a wagon).

A third and final point concerns *šarnikzil-* and *tayazzil-*. Contrary to the implication of previous analyses these can hardly be primary derivatives (Benveniste’s „connective“ *-t-* is a phantom). These are surely secondary in origin to action nouns in *-zzi < \*-ti-* (cf. *taiš-zi-* ‘load’ < *taiš-* ‘to load’ and *nuk-*

zi- 'Zucht', the latter per Melchert 1999).<sup>6</sup> This in turn raises the question of the status of the *-l-* of *-zi-l-*. A mere „Suffixkonglomerat“ with an apparently unmotivated *-(e)l-* (Eichner loc. cit., Melchert 1984: 120) seems dubious.

The above considerations make a unitary account of Hittite stems in *-il* unlikely and lead me to propose multiple origins for this type. First, it is likely that at least some examples are primary neuter nouns with hysterokinetic inflection, as suggested by previous scholars. Chief candidate for this type is the oft-cited *šwīl-* 'thread' (I interpret spellings in *š-u-ú-V-°* as indicating a hiatus-filling /w/, not a long /u:/, although the vowel of the first syllable could indeed be long). While none of the evidence is from OS, all that we have indicates neuter gender. The word is primary in appearance, and while a secondary derivative cannot in principle be excluded, such an assumption would be entirely gratuitous. The absence of any evidence for a living verb stem in Anatolian based on PIE *\*s(y)ewh<sub>2</sub>-* 'sew' increases the chances that *šwīl-* is a relatively old primary formation. Finally, there are the plene spellings *š-u-ú-i-il* (KUB 7.3, 7&13; KBo 10.37, 44&51) and *š-u-ú-e-el* (HT 1 iii 9), which point to accent on the suffix. It is true that none of these spellings (or others like them from other stems of this class) is from OS or from a contemporary manuscript of any period. Nevertheless, even errors or unreal scribal creations must have a motivation. If there were no original examples of this type with suffixal accent, it is very hard to see on what model they would have been created.

I therefore would derive *šwīl-* from a hysterokinetic neuter with strong stem *\*suh<sub>2</sub>-él* or *\*suh<sub>2</sub>-ēl*. Since accented short *\*é* would be lengthened in this environment in Hittite, it is impossible to determine from Hittite evidence whether we should choose a full grade singular as per Eichner or a lengthened grade collective plural as per Schindler (and by implication Benveniste). As noted above, the attested Hittite change of *\*é > í* between *\*w* and following dental consonant means that this derivation is compatible with the fact that the earliest attested spelling is *š-u-ú-il* (KBo 15.10 i 7/MS). Whether any of the attested spellings with *e* reflect real cases of *e*-vocalism we cannot determine. It is also unclear whether any other examples of *-il* should be analyzed like *šwīl-*.

A second small group of Hittite stems in *-il* are either loanwords from Luvian or reshaping due to Luvian influence. We find in Luvian examples like *ḫantil-* 'first, foremost', whose neuter nominative-accusative singular *ḫantil-za* shows that the *-i-* of *ḫantili-* is the „mutation-*i*“ established by Starke (1990: 59ff.). Given the plentiful evidence from Hittite for secondary derivatives in *\*(V)lo-* (see below), we should not assume an otherwise quite unmotivated PIE athematic suffix *\*-il-* (note that Luvian requires a prehistoric *\*i*, not *\*e*). We should rather

<sup>6</sup> For primary *\*-ri-* in Anatolian see Oettinger 1986: 9-11 with references.

derive this inflectional type from thematic stems in *\*-ilo-* (matching those in Hittite) by a process of „reverse *i*-mutation“, a concept I owe to Elizabeth Rieken (1994: 47). That is, once such stems acquired the *i*-mutation in the animate nominative and accusative, they were descriptively thematic only in the nominative-accusative neuter. They were then open to dethematization based on the established pattern of original consonant stems: thus *-antis/-antin* : *-an-za* :: *-ilis/-ilin* : *x* (→ *-il-za* for *\*-ilan=za*).

Hence we also find in Hittite context neuter nom.-acc. singular *dammil/dammel* to *dammili-* 'virgin, uncultivated' (see Hoffner 1997: 172f. with citations). As per Hoffner, this word may be a borrowing from Luvian (cf. \*502-*mi-li* LOCUS-*ti* 'in a virgin place'(?)) in EMIRGAZI §33b), but a Hittite cognate of the Luvian with mere reshaping of the neuter nom.-acc. singular is also possible. Given the shape of the base, *e/išḫarwīl(i)-* 'blood-red' must be native Hittite, with Luvianized neuter nom.-acc. sg. *ešḫarwīl* at KUB 7.13 Ro 14&25, 9.4 ii 5, *išḫarwīl* at KBo 24.42 Vo 11, Bo 5969 i 3 (adjective in all cases as per Oettinger 1976:48 and Puhvel 1984: 311!). The relevance of all this for our present topic is that this same process may account for the attested nominative singular (*paṅgauwas*) *ḫuššil* 'communal dump' (KUB 35.146 ii 3) of what is otherwise attested as an *i*-stem *ḫuššili-* (see the examples collected in Puhvel 1991: 409). As established at length by Starke (1990: passim), Hittite speakers, not understanding the system of Luvian *i*-mutation, tended to treat Luvian loanwords as *i*-stems, but not with absolute consistency. If the word was neuter, a pattern like *dammili-š/dammilin/dammil(-za)* could have lead at least some speakers to produce a nominative-accusative *ḫuššil*.<sup>7</sup> Other examples like the semantically difficult *paššwīl-* (attested as a neuter) may belong here as well, as substantivizations of adjectives like *ešḫarwīl-*.

Neither of the accounts just given is suitable, however, for the animate examples *alil-* and *šarnikzil-*. As already indicated above, the latter is to all appearances secondary, not primary. In view of the productivity of a secondary suffix *\*(V)lo-* in Hittite, I suggest that a third source of noun stems in *-il* consists of substantivizations of secondary adjectives in *\*-ilo-*. Gender assignment in such a process typically is variable, based on semantic

<sup>7</sup> There is evidence of another kind of adaptation in this case. We also find dat.-loc. sg. *ḫuššalli* (KBo 24.57 i 8) and *ḫuššalliyas* (BoT 1.12.15; ABOT 6.23), after the productive Hittite type in *-ullil-*. The formal evidence for various kinds of *i*-stems argues for a loanword and against the otherwise quite attractive derivation by Eichner (1980: 127) < PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eus-* (but in view of his own derivation elsewhere of Palaic *ḫušš-* 'pour' from the same root, the semantics could as well be *\*'the place where one pours out (refuse)'* as *\*'the place from which one draws (clay)'*). As in the case of *ḫurutil-* (see note 9 below), a loanword from Luvian would not, of course, necessarily exclude Eichner's Indo-European derivation.

associations not usually recoverable. The two likeliest examples, *alil-* and *šarnikzil-* happen to be animate, but I would not exclude that others formed in the same way are neuter. I tentatively attribute the unexpected endingless nominative and accusative singular to an apocope in a final sequence *\*-Cilos/m* when the accent was prepenultimate: *\*-Cilos/m* > *\*-Cils/m* > *-Cil* (the last step by the same simplification of final clusters I claimed for *\*-itolm* > *\*-italm* > *-ital* in *šyattal-* cited earlier); thus a *\*šarnikzilos/m* *\*off* pertaining to restitution' > *šarnikzil-* 'restitution' (the substantivization of the adjective ousting the original noun base, as often).<sup>8</sup>

Since it is probable that such a process, if real, would apply to more than just *\*o* (or its Hittite outcome *a*), it could also account for the appearance of loanwords in *-il-*, for which we would expect stems in *-ili-* (most loanwords in Hittite appearing as *i*-stems – see further below). While I believe we should be cautious in assuming loanwords based merely on „unusual“ shape, nevertheless both the phonotactics and semantic area of <sup>TUG</sup> *hapalzil-* (a stew or soup), <sup>TUG</sup> *hurutil-* (another cooked dish), <sup>KUŠ</sup> *gazzimuel-* (kind of harness) and <sup>caš</sup> *šušyazkil-* (part of a wagon) raise the possibility that these are loanwords.<sup>9</sup>

Attempting to corroborate or falsify the possibility that these are loanwords is a difficult task. How do we establish independently the place of the accent in relevant forms (those with a final sequence *-Vr/VVC#*)? There is now widespread agreement that scriptio plena in Hittite typically indicates an accented vowel.<sup>10</sup> We may thus use its distribution as a *rough* guide to accent placement. As is well-known, however, there are serious limitations on this usage. First of all, use of scriptio plena is not consistent, and its absence, particularly in poorly attested words, does not mean that a particular vowel is *not* accented. Second, I contend that there are at least some unaccented long vowels in Hittite (often spelled plene).<sup>11</sup> Finally, we must

<sup>8</sup> I should explicitly acknowledge that the apocope should have been applied to all case forms in final *\*-os/-om*. I find it unsurprising, however, that it was blocked/undone in cases like the genitive singular or plural or dative-locative plural. Indeed, I would assume it was permitted in the nominative-accusative singular precisely because zero endings already existed there in the language, albeit almost entirely in neuters.

<sup>9</sup> It is possible that *hurutil-* has an Indo-European origin. For evidence for a root *hur-* 'moisten, wet' see Puhvel 1991: 394. An action noun *\*hur-u-tti-* (with the productive connective *-u-* favored in Hittite and Luvian) for a soup or stew is thinkable. The unassibilated *-ti-*, however, means that the word would have to be in the first instance Luvian, so the word would still be a loanword from the Hittite point of view.

<sup>10</sup> See Melchert (1994: 27) for a summary and references. I personally favor the view of Eichner, Kimball and others that scriptio plena is marking synchronic vowel length, but for present purposes it does not matter if one follows rather Hart, Carruba et al. in supposing that the scriptio plena directly indicates accent on the vowel.

<sup>11</sup> Notable examples include animate nominative plural ending *-eš* < *\*-eyes* (so already Hrozný and Pedersen) and collective plural *āššū* 'goods' < *\*-sub₂* (with Watkins).

reckon with analogical influence of base forms on transparently related derivatives. Whatever one's views of the function and significance of scriptio plena, when we find examples with scriptio plena in more than one syllable, it can hardly be marking accent in all cases.

Despite these problems we must make use of what evidence we have, and I have tried to survey all the relevant data available to me (i.e. all cases of stems which would be expected to have forms in final *-Vr/VVC*). Predictably, many potentially useful examples are infrequently attested and unhelpful because they are never attested with plene spellings.<sup>12</sup> A fair number of cases are compatible with my claimed apocope in that they show plene in the penultimate or final syllable, where I would predict preservation of the final stem vowel. Penultimate cases: nouns in *-āa-* (e.g. *aggāa-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *arzanāa-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *asūšāa-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *karinnāa-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *lappāa-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *zuppāa-*; but see also below!); nouns in *-ūra-* (*aršaršūra-* [3x vs. 1x *āršāšūri*], *išūra-*, *purpūra-* [often, but also *pūrpūr-*° and 1x *pūrpūr-*°], also Palaic *tasūra-*); nouns/adjectives in *-ūri-* (<sup>TUG</sup> *mezziūri-*, *telipūri-*, *ukūri-*); nouns in *-ūa-* (<sup>sg</sup> *piddūa-*, *šarhūa-*, *waršūa-* [but only 1x!]; names in *-īli-* (*Ḫattušīli-*, *Mursīli-*); other stems in *-īli-* (*dammāli-* [but only 1x!], *haršamīli-*; various others (*idālu-*, *iwāru-*, *mišarāli-*, *piitiyāli-*, <sup>caš</sup> *tarwāli-*, <sup>caš</sup> *widāli-*, *zuppāri/u-*). Cases with likely final accent: <sup>DUG</sup> *harharā-*, *kakkarī-*, *kattapalā-*.

There are also examples that are problematic for my rule, in that they show plene spellings on a prepenultimate syllable, hence putatively prepenultimate accent, but still have a preserved final stem vowel: *ātara-* 'blue'; agent nouns <sup>LÜ</sup> *šarhala-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *šēšālā-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *dāwalala-*; *pāššila-* 'pebble' (1x); *šūpmili-* 'firm' (1x); *wālu-* 'bladder' (1x beside *wālu-* 1x). Perhaps more damagingly, there are also examples of stems in *-il-* with plene spelling of the final syllable: *ḫūšīl-*, *muwīl-*, *paššūl-*, *šarnikzil-*, *šawīl-* (vs. predicted *hūrkiil-*, *ḫūššīl*°). None of the examples cited are OS, so there is no basis for judging any of these as probative or non-probative on chronological grounds. Some of these may be explained away more easily than others. By the convincing etymology of Machek (1949: 131) *ātara-* reflects *\*ḫā(h)ro-*, so it is possible that this word did not yet have the relevant shape when my proposed apocope rule applied. The long vowel (or accent) on the first syllable of the three agent nouns may be analogical to their respective bases *šerha-* (a tool), *šēšā(n)-* 'fruit', and *tāwal-* (a drink). The plene

<sup>12</sup> The following are to my knowledge never attested with plene spelling in any syllable (I omit glosses for the sake of brevity): <sup>LÜ</sup> *arkanniyala-*, *arnuwala-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *auriyala-*, *ayawala-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *paršiyala-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *patowala-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *španuuzziyala-*, *gangala-*, *karubala-*, *labhaya-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *maitešwala-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *pulala-*, *tarwešwala-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *walḫaya-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *zupparyala-*; *aila-*, *arčila-*, <sup>NINDA</sup> *muḫḫila-*, <sup>caš</sup> *mutaḫila-*, *pašišīla-*, <sup>caš</sup> *šerappila-*, *šū(i)nila-*; *ašundula-*, *ḫinkula-*, *wardula-*; <sup>caš</sup> *marawirali-*; *karuwili-*, *šannapili-*, *tarḫūli-*; *ḫatūri-*; *akūtari-*; <sup>caš</sup> *ḫaḫpara-*, <sup>LÜ</sup> *ḫippara-*, *kurkura-*, *narmara-*; <sup>TUG</sup> *gapari-*, <sup>caš</sup> *manzari-*, *paššari-*; <sup>NINDA</sup> *allapuri-*, <sup>NINDA</sup> *iduri-*, *pidduri-*.

vowel in the *last* syllable of <sup>10</sup> *ššū-lā* remains puzzling and shows how uncertain this entire line of argument is! I can offer no explanation for *pāššū-lā*-, *šūhūmili*-, or *wāū-lā*-. The fact that all three examples are hapax is no comfort – as noted above, the same is true for many of the supportive examples as well. As to the examples of plene spellings of *-il* itself: I have argued above that for *šūwil*- this may be original. Given the cited evidence for accented *-ili*-, there is nothing surprising about borrowings from Luvian showing accented *-il* (thus perhaps *hūššūl* and *pāššūl* as already argued above). For *šūruikzil* in a post-Old Hitite manuscript I can only argue for analogy to the other types (real or merely graphic).

I believe it is fair to characterize the evidence of scriptio plena for accent placement in the relevant stems as mixed. My proposed apocope rule is possible, but hardly supported. I would therefore like to offer at least one positive example for its existence outside the stems in *-il*. Puhvel (1991: 288) has offered compelling arguments that <sup>NA</sup>*ḫekur*- 'rock sanctuary' is a loanword from Sumerian *é.kur*, Akkadian *ekurru* (possibly via Hurrian). No proposed derivation from PIE (including my own) can account for the attested inflection of this word as an animate *r*-stem.<sup>13</sup> Puhvel attributes the partial „lack of inflection“ to the word's status as a loanword. This *might* be applicable to the many cases where <sup>NA</sup>*ḫekur* designates the name of a particular place, but lack of inflection is decidedly *not* the usual treatment of loanwords in Hittite, which consistently appear as vocalic stems, usually *i*-stems, more rarely *a*- or *u*-stems. For stems with *-r* compare *zuppār/ur*- 'torch' < Akk. *tupparru* or *kakkarrī* < Akk. *gakkarru* cited above. We would therefore expect <sup>NA</sup>*ḫekur(r)i*-. I would attribute the very unusual Hittite animate *r*-stem to the same apocope rule and final cluster simplification seen in *-il*: nom. and acc. sg. *ḫekur* < <sup>NA</sup>*ḫekurs/m* < <sup>NA</sup>*ḫekur(r)is/m*.<sup>14</sup>

In closing, I insist only on two facts. First, the spellings of Old and Middle Hittite manuscripts show that we must account in the first instance for Hittite stems in *-il* – not stems in *†-ēl*, as previously assumed. Second, at least two

<sup>13</sup> For the relevant evidence see Melchert 1984: 142, note 113; acc. sg. *allantian* <sup>NA</sup>*ḫekur*, nom. sg. *awattantis* <sup>NA</sup>*ḫekur*, acc. pl. *ḫekurus*.

<sup>14</sup> I am not aware of any plene spellings for this word that would argue for or against this hypothesis. I now withdraw the second putative example I cited in the original oral presentation of this paper: *aššūl*- 'favor, well-being'. First of all, as pointed out by E. Rieken, plene spellings such as *aš-šū-ú-ú-i* (*KBo* 18.95 Ro 5, *VBoT* 2, 18.20.21) argue against prepenultimate accent (while examples with *a-aš-šū-l* may easily be analogical after *aššū*-). As already suggested by Puhvel 1984: 205, *aššūl*- may be deverbalive from the medial verb *ašš*-. Second, even if *aššūl*- is secondary from *aššū*-, my claim that there are no other secondary derivatives in *-ul*- is now falsified by the attractive derivation of <sup>GAD</sup>*kazzarnul*- from *karzan*- by Röble 1998 (NB the spelling *ka-az-ar-nu-ú-ul* with plene in the final syllable!).

examples of this class, *alil*- 'flower, blossom' and *šūruikzil*- 'restitution' are animate, not neuter, gender. I believe that these facts preclude a unitary explanation for this Hittite inflectional type. While some examples like *šūwil*- 'thread' probably do reflect PIE hysterokinetic neuters in *\*-él* or *\*-ē* as commonly assumed, some neuters are more likely to represent Luvian or Luvianized neuters of the type *ḫantil-za* (themselves dethematized from *\*-ilom*). Since neither of these sources can account for the animate examples, I have suggested as a third source substantivizations of secondary thematic stems in *\*-ilo-*, whose endingless nominative and accusative singulars would reflect an apocope rule in sequences *\*-Cilos/m#*. Evidence for this rule is less than compelling. If it cannot be upheld, we must seek some other source for this group.

## References

- Benveniste, E. 1935. *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Eichner, H. 1973. Die Etymologie von heth. *mēhur*. MSS 31.53-107.
- . 1980. Phonetik und Lautgesetze des Hethitischen – ein Weg zu ihrer Entschlüsselung. In *Laugeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der VI. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft* (ed. M. Mayrhofer et al.), 120-165. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Hoffner, H. 1997. *The Laws of the Hittites*. Leiden: Brill.
- Machek, V. 1949. Hittito-Slavica. In *Symbolae ad Studia Orientis Perinentes Frederico Hrozny Dedicatae* (ed. V. Čihár et al.), 2.131-141. Prague.
- Melchert, C. 1984. *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1993. A New Anatolian 'Law of Finals'. *JAC* 8.105-113.
- . 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- . 1999. Hittite *uk(kan)zi*- 'cultivation, breeding'. *Ktéma*, 24.17-23.
- Neu, E. 1968. *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1980. *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Oettinger, N. 1976. *Die mitridrischen Eide der Hethiter*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1986. 'Indo-Hittite'-Hypothese und Wortbildung. Innsbruck: IBS.
- Puhvel, J. 1984. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vols. 1-2. Words Beginning with A, E and I*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 1991. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vol. 3. Words Beginning with H*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Rieken, E. 1994. Der Wechsel *-a/-i-* in der Stammbildung des hethitischen Nomens. *HS* 107.42-53.
- Rößle, S. 1998. Heth. *karza* 'Gerät des Webens' und *kazzarnul* 'eine bestimmte Tuchart'. *MSS* 58.111-128.
- Schindler, J. 1975. L'apophonie des thèmes indo-européens en *-r/n*. *BSL* 70.1-10.
- Starke, F. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-lawischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sturtevant, E. 1933. *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Philadelphia: LSA.
- Wachter, R. Das indogermanische Wort für 'Sonne' und die angebliche Gruppe der *ln* Heteroklitika. *HS* 110.4-20.

*Fortsetzung Inhalt*

Katz Joshua T.	205
Hittite <i>ta-pa-ka-li-ya-&lt;aš&gt;</i> .....	205
Lühr Rosemarie	239
Zum Modalfeld im Hethitischen.....	239
Melchert H. Craig	263
Hittite Nominal Stems in <i>-il</i> .....	263
Milani Celestina	273
Onomastica micenea e onomastica anatolica.....	273
Negri Mario	291
Further Observations on Indo-European 'Long' Sonants.....	291
Oettinger Norbert	301
Neue Gedanken über das <i>nt</i> -Suffix.....	301
Ofitsch Michaela	317
„Ackern“ und „pflügen“ im Hethitischen – Bemerkungen zum semantischen Wandel.....	317
Palmucci Alberto	341
Tarconte, un ponte mitostorico fra Tarquinia e Troia.....	341
Rasmussen Jens E.	355
From the Realm of Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation. Problems of Reduplication.....	355
Rieken Elisabeth	369
Einige Beobachtungen zum Wechsel <i>u/(u) ̣a</i> in den hethitischen Texten.....	369
Schulze-Thulin Britta	381
Zur <i>hi</i> -Konjugation von Fortsetzern urindogermanischer <i>-o-éjje/o-</i> Kausativa/Iterativa im Hethitischen.....	381
Zeifelder Susanne	395
Zum Ausdruck der Finalität im Hethitischen.....	395
Zinko Christian	411
Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen <i>s</i> -Stämmen.....	411
Autorenverzeichnis.....	427