

Sonderdruck aus

Indogermanisches Nomen

Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut

Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft
Society for Indo-European Studies
Société des Études Indo-Européennes

Freiburg, 19. bis 22. September 2001

herausgegeben von

Eva Tichy, Dagmar S. Wodtko, Britta Irslinger

HEMPEN VERLAG
BREMEN 2003

Inhalt

BALLES, Irene:	8
Die lateinischen Adjektive auf <i>-idus</i> und das Calandsystem	9
DE BERNARDO STEMPEL, Patrizia:	
Der Beitrag des Keltischen zur Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Nomens	31
HACKSTEIN, Olav:	
Zur Entwicklung von Modalität in Verbaladjektiven	51
HÄUSLER, Sabine:	
Zu Form und Funktion der balto-slavischen <i>-ti</i> -Abstrakta	67
KRASUCHIN, Konstantin G.:	
Quantitativer und qualitativer Ablaut in der Nominalderivation	83
LINDNER, Thomas:	
Zur Schnittstelle von Komposition und Derivation	105
LÜHR, Rosemarie:	
Wortartwechsel in altdogermanischen Sprachen	115
MELCHERT, H. Craig:	
Hittite Nominal Stems in <i>-anzan-</i>	129
OETTINGER, Norbert:	
Zum Ablaut von <i>n</i> -Stämmen im Anatolischen und der Brechung $\bar{e} > ya$..	141
PINAULT, Georges-Jean:	
Sur les thèmes indo-européens en <i>*-u-</i> : dérivation et étymologie	153
SADOVSKI, Velizar:	
Bahuvrīhi-	189
SCHAFFNER, Stefan:	
Der Beitrag des Germanischen zur Rekonstruktion der urindogermanischen Akzent- und Ablautklassen	203
SCHUHLMANN, Roland:	
Zur deminutiven Funktion des <i>*-lo-</i> -Suffixes in Substantiva	219
TREMBLAY, Xavier:	
Interne Derivation: „Illusion de la reconstruction“ oder verbreitetes morphologisches Mittel? Am Beispiel des Awestischen	231
ZEILFELDER, Susanne:	
Graduierung beim Substantiv	261

Hittite Nominal Stems in *-anzan-*

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

Hittite has a small set of nouns that show a stem *-anzan-*: ^{GIS} *alanzan-* (kind of tree), *ippi(y)anzan-* '(grape)-vine' (?) (thus PUHVEL, 1984:377f, for the base *ippiya-*, but sense is uncertain), *ištanzan-* 'mind, soul, will', *kallanzan-* (a plant), *laḫ(t)anzan-* 'shelduck', *šumanzan-* 'bulrush', **tiyanzan-* (?) (a kind of metal). The inflection is peculiar: nominative singular in *either -anza or -anzaš* and the rest of the paradigm built on a stem *-anzan-*.

There has been a broad consensus for more than a quarter-century that one, and only one, of these stems has a clear etymology. Since EICHNER (1973:98⁷⁸) everyone has agreed that Hitt. *šumanzan-*, taken to mean 'cord, binding', is directly related to Grk. ἵμῆν 'membrane' and reflects a PIE animate *n*-stem with either "hysterokinetic" or "amphikinetic" inflection: nom. sg. **suh_h-mén+s* or **sēuh_h-mōn+s*, weak stem **suh_h-mn-*. The characteristic Hittite addition of *-s* in the nominative singular and the resulting complex paradigm led by some scenario to the attested forms: see variously OETTINGER, 1980:47ff; MELCHERT, 1983:9; PUHVEL, 1984:470; HARĐARSON, 1987:120; CARRUBA, 1992a:78; WEITENBERG, 1995:336. At least the origin of the class lies, then, in *n*-stems of the type cited, though some scholars allow for the possibility that certain examples have been adapted to this type secondarily. There was an earlier alternative account, now apparently quite forgotten: MILEWSKI (1936:14&21) assumed addition of a suffix **-iyon-* (cf. Lat. *-tiōn-*) to a neuter *men*-stem comparable to Skt. *syūman-* 'belt, strap' (*šumanzan-* < virtual **syūmon-iyon-*). This derivation was approved by PEDERSEN (1938:43f) and initially by KRONASSER (1956:122), subsequently abandoned by the latter in favor of an implausible alternative involving borrowing from Hurrian (1966:201).

Unfortunately for the received view it is now clear that Hitt. ^(U) *šumanzan-* means not 'cord, binding', but rather '(bul)rush'. BURDE (1974:46) and ARCHI (1988:36⁴⁵) already pointed out the existence of the latter meaning, raising the possibility of two homophonous words. A reexamination of the total evidence now available shows that there is a single word and that it means '(bul)rush'.¹ The use of the word falls into two broad categories.

¹ I am deeply indebted to Harry A. Hoffner Jr. for first pointing out this fact to me and also for allowing me access to the draft article for *šumanzan-* of the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*. I emphasize, however, that the presentation of the evidence here

Some passages refer to the plant growing in the wild: (KBo 3.8 iii 5-6; ?/NS)² *ISKUR-aš wellu ḫamikta n=ašta anda [šuppi] šumanza ḫamikta ...* *ISKUR-aš wellu lāntat [n=ašt]a anda šuppi šumanza lāntat* 'He bound the meadow(s) of the Storm-god, and therein he bound the sacred rushes ... The meadow(s) of the Storm-god has/have been released, and therein the sacred rushes have been released.'; (KBo 24.3 i 4-5; ?/NS) *aruni=ma=kan anda šumanzan daškupāit arunaz=kan šumanz[(an)] ḫuitiyami* 'But in the sea the rush sighed/moaned. I will pull the rush from the sea.'; (KUB 39.8 iv 6-7; pre-NH/NS) *mān=wa=kan Ū.SAL-un* (var. *Ū.SAL-wa*) *pāiši n=ašta šumma[rzanan] lē ḫuitiyaši* 'When you go to the meadow, do not pull (up) the rush.' (for restored form cf. *ibid* iv 1 [*šum*]manzanan).

Others describe various ritual uses: (1) burned with other products to produce fragrance (HKM 116 ii⁷ 23; MH/MS // KUB 7.23.9; see GÜTERBOCK, *JKF* 10.207f); (2) waved over the head (KBo 24.3 i 1; cf. above); (3) wrapped in wool (KUB 59.43 i 9-10; ?/NS) 1 *šinaš 3 QATU 3* EME *išnaš 4 šumanza n=at SĪG antarit anda ḫūlaliyan* '1 figurine, 3 hands, 3 tongues of dough, 4 rushes; they are wrapped with blue wool'; (4) in a medical ritual (KBo 21.20 i 17; ?/NS) *ŠA ŠAḤ.BABBAR ūšummanza* 'the rushes of a/the white pig' (kenning for wild plant or meaning 'bristles'; cf. BURDE, 1974:46); (5) braided into a cord (KBo 10.45 ii 28-29; MH/NS) *INA SAG.DU=ŠU=ma šummanzāš purušiya[laš ki]ttat* 'but on her head was placed a bulrush as a fill[et]' (or gen. sg. 'a fillet of rush'; cf. *CHD P* 394); (KBo 11.11 i 1-10; ?/NH; dupl. 1134/u 2-6; see NEU, 1993:144f) *mān lalaš aniyami ta* ^{UZU}SA *šumanzanaš=(š)ta* (var. *šumanzanašš=a!*) *anda tarupiyami ... šumanza GIM-an tarupišta* 'When I treat for slander, I braid a sinew into rushes ... as the rushes have been braided ...' (first instance dat.-loc. pl. with NEU, loc. cit.); (KUB 12.58 i 21; ?/NS) *nu šummanza SĪG mītišš=a [anda tarupp]anza* 'A rush and red wool are braided together'; (KBo 24.3+ i 15) *n=an=kan GĪR.MEŠ=ŠU šumanzanaz aršāmi* 'I immobilize(?) his feet with a (cord of) rush' (for meaning of verb see BECKMAN, *OrNS* 59:49&55, and cf. KBo 17.60 Vo 3 *n=at=kan išḫimanit ārašmi* 'I immobilize them/it with a cord'); (KBo 1.45 rev. 1-2 (Akk.) *eblum* = (Hitt.) *išḫimanaš* 'cord', (Akk.) *ašlum* = (Hitt.) *šumanza* 'rush (used as) cord' (NB Akkadian *ašlu(m)* means both 'cord' and 'rush').

is my own, and Professor Hoffner is not responsible for the textual interpretations or morphological analyses, some of which he may not endorse.

² Textual citations follow the conventions of the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary (CHD)*: OH/MH/NH refer respectively to the date of composition as Old, Middle, or Neo-Hittite, while OS/MS/NS indicate the date of the manuscript.

I believe the facts are quite unambiguous. The word refers to a plant, the bulrush. Braiding of this flexible material and its occasional ritual use for tying do not alter the fundamental sense. The only true Hittite word for 'cord, binding' is *išḫima(n)-*, which itself is an animate *n*-stem, transparently derived with a *men*-suffix from the verb *išḫi-* 'to bind' (see fn. 3). Hittite *šumanzan-* '(bul)rush' has nothing whatsoever to do with Grk. ὄφυον, and the received etymology of the former and everything that goes with it falls.

Elimination of the false etymology of *šumanzan-* < **suh₁-mē/ōn-* has a number of serious consequences. First, we now have no clear examples in Hittite (or in Anatolian) for hysterokinetic *n*-stems in **-ē(n)-*. Thus Hittite does not appear to tell us anything regarding the claim of HARDARSON (1987:119) and JASANOFF (1989:138) of a possible consistent PIE contrast of nom. sg. in **-ēn* vs. **-ō*.³ Second, there is no longer any basis whatsoever for the claim that the Hittite word for 'woman' belongs to the class in *-anzan-* (pace OETTINGER, 1980:60; STARKE, 1980:85; HARDARSON 1987: 121; JASANOFF 1989:139). That is, there is no longer any reason to think that the original paradigm of 'woman' and that of the stems in *-anzan-* had any points of contact that would lead to the shift of 'woman' into the latter class. For a reason *against* assuming that 'woman' is a stem in *-anzan-* see below. Finally, there is no basis for taking animate *n*-stems with secondary nom. sg. in **-ŷn+s* as a source of the *-anzan-* type nor for any of the complex scenarios by which these stems allegedly were altered to the attested inflection (OETTINGER, 1980:52; MELCHERT, 1983:9-10; PUHVEL, 1984:470f; JASANOFF, 1989:139, et al.).⁴

³ Removal of the stems in *-anzan-* from consideration renews the problem of the correct derivation of the type of Hitt. *išḫima(n)-* 'cord, binding'. OETTINGER (1982:173ff) argues for an original hysterokinetic paradigm in **-mēn-*. In MELCHERT (1983:6ff) I presented counter-arguments in favor of an amphikinetic type in **-mon-* (nom. sg. **-mō+s*). A crucial part of my argumentation, however, was the assumption that **-mēn+s* was reflected in nom. sg. *šumanz(a)*. The falsification of this assumption leaves us with the choice of beginning with an amphikinetic paradigm and explaining away the forms with *-e-* (acc. sg. *išḫimanan* and ethnica with nom. pl. *-umeneš*) as somehow secondary, or assuming an original hysterokinetic paradigm and explaining how **-ēn+s* can result in Hittite *-aš*. Neither alternative is straightforward, and I must leave the question open here.

⁴ I stress the inherently implausible nature of all these scenarios (including my own). Most are very vague about just how the alteration took place, and in order to explain the attested oblique stem in *-anzan-* all must appeal to some kind of ad hoc "contamination" or "blending". Note that in the real cases cited below where the

Liberated from the false equation *šumanzan-* = ὕμνν, we can and should begin our analysis of the *-arzan-* class anew without preconceptions. Attestation of this type is unfortunately limited. The following summary includes all that is relevant to their inflection:

^{G1S} *alanza(n)-*: AnimNSg ^{G1S} *alanzaš* (incl. KUB 33.81 iv' 11, MS) and ^{G1S} *alanza* (Tunnawi); ASg ^{G1S} *alanzanaš*/^{G1S} *alanzaš* (both in Tunnawi).

ippi(y)a(n)-: AnimNSg *ippianzaš* and *ippiyanza*; GSG *ippiyanzanaš* (or 2ary NSG?); NB OH/OS *ippianza* [] (see NEU, *StBoT* 26.76).

ištanza(n)-: AnimNSg *ištanzaš* = *miš* (KUB 30.10 Vo 15, pre-NH/MS), *ištanzaš* = (*š*)*miš* (KUB 41.23 ii 19; OH/NS), also ambiguous ZI-*aš*; *ištanza* = *šmeš* (ibid. ii 24), ZI-*anza* (KUB 33.98 i 17; OH/NS; KUB 43.60 i 4ff; OH/NS; and passim in NH); ASg *ištanzanan*; GSG *ištanzanaš*; D-LSg ZI-*ni*; Inst *ištanzanit*; Abl *ištanzanaš*.

kallanza(n)-: ASg *kallanzanan* (KUB 17.27 ii 17).

lah(h)anza(n)-: AnimNSg *lah(h)anza*^{MUSEN}, *lahhanzaš*^{MUSEN}; GSG/PI *lahhanzanaš*^{MUSEN}, D-LSg *lahanzani*; API *lah(h)anzanus*^{MUSEN}, *lahhanzanus*^{MUSEN}, *lahhanzius* (all OH/NS).

šumanza(n)-: AnimNSg *šumanza* (KUB 12.58 i 21; ?/NS; sic contra *CHD*; also surely KBo 1.45 rev. 2), *šumanzās* (KBo 10.45 ii 29; but GSG possible!); NtN-ASg *šumanzan* and *šumanzanan*; CollN-API *šumanza* (KBo 3.8 iii 6.24, KBo 11.11 i 9, KUB 59.43 i 9, KBo 21.20 i 7; thus with ARCHI, loc. cit., for the first, contra VAN DEN HOUT, *KZ* 97.79f, and *CHD*); GSG *šumānzanaš* (KBo 30.26 Vo 1; OH/NS; = dupl. of KBo 20.26+ Ro 11; OH/OS; case not entirely assured); D-LSg *šumanzani* (KBo 20.8 Vo 14; OH/OS!); Abl *šumanzanaš*; D-LPI *šumanzanaš* (thus in KBo 11.11 i 2, with NEU, 1993:144).

tīyanza(n)-: AnimNSg *tīanzanaš* (KUB 12.24 i 11) (not assuredly here, but cf. 2ary *ištanzanaš*).

The facts just cited permit a few useful generalizations. First, the stems are basically animate. The neuter singular of *šumanzan-* is back-formed from the collective plural *šumanza* (a form that would surely have been fairly common for this word) by a well-known process (cf. the famous example of Grk. ἄστρον < ἄστροα to ἄστρη). Second, the nominative singular appears as both *-anza* and *-anzaš*, and both are attested from at

animate nominative singular becomes the stem and spreads to other cases, no such contamination occurs! I submit that we accepted the unsatisfactory nature of the standard account of stems in *-arzan-* only because we thought we “knew” that it somehow had to be so (because of *šumanzan-* = ὕμνν).

least Middle Hittite (we unfortunately have no evidence for the nom. sg. in OS). Third, these stems are subject to the same analogical levelings as the animate *n*-stems of the type of *hāran-* ‘eagle’ (i.e. old amphikinetic animate nouns with nom. sg. *-ō comparable to Lat. *homō, hominis*). We again find the leveling in either of two directions: one forms a new *a*-stem based on the nom. sg. without the final *-n*- (GSG *alanzaš*, API *lahhanzuš* after nom. sg. *alanzaš*), *lahhanzaš*) or based on the oblique stem in *-arzan-* (new NSg *ištanzanaš* after GSG *ištanzanaš*, D-LSg *ištanzani* etc.). Finally, there appears to be a noticeable semantic clustering: aside from the word for ‘mind, soul’ we have four names for plants, one for a bird, and one for a metal. This distribution suggests that our nouns may have originated as epithets.

The most striking of the features just cited is the alternation between nom. sg. in *-anza* and that in *-anzaš*, a peculiarity that is *unique* to this stem class. In trying to exploit this fact as a possible clue to the origin of the type, we must first confront the question of whether the spelling *-an-za* represents [-ants] or [-antsa]. This fundamental question has not been addressed since Kronasser, once again because we thought we already knew the answer: since nom. sg. *-anza* reflected *-ēn+s, it obviously represented [-ants]. In fact, however, the very alternation *-anza/-anzaš* makes this highly unlikely. The ending [-ants] is quite frequent in Hittite as animate nominative singular. It is true that in the overwhelming number of instances it forms the nom. sg. of stems in *-nt-*: thus [-ant-s]. However, the word for ‘woman’, descriptively an animate *n*-stem (however we ultimately derive this),⁵ also shows a nom. sg. MUNUS-(an)z(a), surely to be read as [-ants]. It is striking that this quite common word never shows an alternative nom. sg. in -(an)zaš (NB: MUNUS-aš stands for a secondary *a*-stem MUNUS-naš back-formed from the oblique stem).

Available evidence thus argues that animate nominative singulars in [-ants] were never enlarged in Hittite by adding -aš, and the reason for this seems self-evident. The ending [-ants] was itself already sigmatic and thus well formed as an animate nominative singular from the synchronic Hittite point of view. I assert therefore that the very coexistence of nom. sg. *-anza*

⁵ I personally favor the account of HARDARSON (1987:122f), following Schindler, which starts from a root noun with nom. sg. *g^wōn and weak stem g^wēn- (for me then Hitt. nom. sg. < *g^wōn+s), but the Hittite inflection is also compatible with the derivation of JASANOFF (1989:137) by which a nom. sg. *g^wēn-h₂ yielded already PIE *[g^wēn], whence pre-Hittite *g^wēn+s. In either case we are led to an animate *n*-stem with nom. sg. in *-anz(a)* = [-ants].

and *-anzaš* in our stems in *-anzan-* suggests strongly that the former at least originally represents [-antsa] with a real final *-a* (thus with MILEWSKI, 1936:21). This asigmatic animate nominative singular *was* aberrant in Hittite terms and was consequently renewed by adding *-s*, just like nom. sg. **hāra* → *hāraš* (thus already KRONASSER, 1956:122!). The parallelism between the stems in *-anza(n)-* and those like *hāra(n)-*, previously noticed but downplayed due to the presence of the alleged *šumanzan-* = *ḫurḫ* (see e.g. PUHVĚL, 1984: 30), must be given its full due.⁶ I differ from Milewski and Kronasser on only one point: given the very aberrant status of an asigmatic animate nominative singular ending *-a* in Hittite, I do not believe that *attested* nom. sg. *-anza* directly represents a contemporary [-antsa]. I assume rather that just in this case the preceding sequence *-anz-* of the stem permitted an alternative “repair”: namely, instead of adding *-s* one could rather delete the *-a*, producing [-ants], also an acceptable sigmatic ending that was common in the language.

Nevertheless, I contend with Milewski and Kronasser (1956) that the alternation *-anza/-anzaš* in the nominative singular can only be motivated if we begin with stems in *-anza(n)-* with an *originally* asigmatic nominative singular. This inflection suggests that we should start from a base in *-anz(a)-* extended by a suffix **(H)on-* (NSg **(H)ō*). Before deciding the question of which of several well-known suffixes is present, we must first consider the source of the base in *-anz(a)-*. Deriving *-anz-* from a sequence **-n̥s-* leads nowhere in this instance (I reject the ad hoc account of *atanzan-* by PUHVĚL, 1984:30). More promising is *-nz-* < **-n̥ty-*, as per Milewski. An apparent obstacle to this derivation is the required loss of the yod, versus its retention in the case of the famous adjectives derived from adverbs with the suffix **-tyo-*: e.g. Hitt. *hantezziya-* ‘front-, foremost’ < **h₂n̥tei-tyo-* (see the remark of CARRUBA, 1992a:79).

I do not, however, believe that this objection is fatal. There may even be independent evidence to support the idea that yod is lost in **-Yntyō-* >

⁶ OETTINGER (1980:57) explains the unique addition of *-aš* to the nom. sg. in [-ants] in just our stem class by analogy to the *hāran-* type: *hāranāš* etc. : *hāraš* :: *ištananaš* etc. : *x* (→ *ištanzaš*). Such an analogy cannot be entirely excluded, but the coexistence of the two endings *-anza* and *-anzaš* suggests that the renewal was quite recent, and in attested Hittite the alternating type of *hāraš/hāran-* was itself highly recessive and undergoing leveling as described above. I find it unlikely that such a recessive type would serve as the model for another class. In any case, such an assumption still leaves unexplained the origin of the alternation of nom. sg. *-anz(a)/oblique -anzan-*.

-Ynza- vs. **-Ytyō-* > *-Yzziya-*. The stem *hullanza-* ‘fight’ shows next to expected nom. sg. *hullanzaš* an acc. sg. *hullanzan*. This amphikinetic stem would have begun with nom. sg. **hullant-āi-s*, gen. sg. **hullant-y-as*. If we suppose that the regular outcome of the latter was not the expected **hullanziyaš* like *zahhiyaš* to *zahhaiš* ‘battle’, but rather **hullanzaš* with loss of the yod, we have a motivation for the *a*-stem acc. sg. *hullanzan*. I am aware that there are alternative explanations available for *hullanzan* (WEITENBERG, 1979:293f, and OETTINGER, 1980:57), and I do not insist on my account. In any case I see nothing implausible in assuming loss of yod in the more complex cluster **-n̥ty-* vs. its retention in the simpler **-Yty-*.

Milewski’s morphological analysis of **-n̥ty-* is less satisfactory. As noted by CARRUBA (1992a:79), one does not see any motivation for the restriction by which **-tyon-* was added only to *n*-stems. I would add the further objection of unmotivated derivation of a noun from a noun and also the unsuitable semantics: our nouns in *-anzan-* do not appear to be abstract/action nouns.

I therefore propose that **-n̥ty-* represents originally **-nt-i-*, i.e. nouns formed with a secondary suffix **-i-* from verbal adjectives in **-e/ont-*. I have recently presented evidence for such nouns in Anatolian (MELCHERT, 1999:23): Hitt. *tukkanzi-* ‘cultivation, breeding’ and CLuv. *šalh(i)anti-* ‘growth’ (or sim.). We should also add **alwanzi-* ‘sorcery’ as the base of *alwanzina-* ‘sorcerous’ from a base adjective **alwent-*⁷ and with amphikinetic inflection *hullanza-* ‘fight’ cited above < *hullant-* ‘fighting’. One may compare for the process (with Alan Nussbaum apud MELCHERT, loc. cit.) Latin *absēns* → *absentia* (via abstract noun in **-ent-i-* and adjective in **-enty-ō-*; for the latter step cf. Skt. *satyá-* ‘true’).

There are two likely candidates for the further suffix **(H)on-*. The first is the “individualizing” suffix **-e/on-*. This is directly attested in Anatolian in Lycian personal names such as *Xudaliḫē* ‘the nimble one’ < **xudali-* ‘nimble’ to Luvo-Hittite *hūda-* ‘alacrity’ or *Pigrēi* ‘the resplendent one’ < **bhēh₂-ro-* ‘shining’.⁸ However, this suffix is itself originally substantivizing and is typically added to adjectives. We would hardly expect it to be added to abstract/action nouns. A possible solution to this difficulty is to suppose intervening adjectives in **-n̥ty-o-* (cf. above). This step may not be as ad hoc as it first appears. We find Luvo-Hittite personal names such as

⁷ Further analysis into **al-went-* or **alw-ent-* depends on finding a suitable etymon, which is thus far lacking.

⁸ The second example has been further extended by the “mutation-*i*” of Western Anatolian.

Zidanza-, which may be analyzed as *‘manly’, the end of a derivational chain *zida-* ‘man’ → **zidant-* *‘manly’ → **zidant-i-* *‘manliness’ → **zidantya-a-* (> *zidanza-*) ‘manly’. As noted long ago by LAROCHE (1952:122f & 1966:328f) and KRONASSER (1966:199), a close connection between stems in *-anza-* and those in *-ant-* is supported by the existence of doublets such as ^m*Ninanta-/Ninanza-* and ^m*Zidanta-/Zidanza-*.

One must consider the alternate possibility that the personal names reflect directly *nt-* stems. That is, from an original paradigm of nom. sg. **zidant-s*, acc. sg. **zidant-an* etc. one first spread the nom. sg. as the stem, producing acc. sg. **zidants-an*. The latter was then reanalyzed as an *a-* stem *zidanza-n*, leading to a new nom. sg. *zidanza-š*. Compare the Luvian name of the Storm-god, with secondary nom. and acc. sg. *Tarḫunzaš*, *Tarḫurzan* beside *Tarḫunt-*. However, LAROCHE (1966:329) also cites a variant ^m*Anuwanzi-* beside ^m*Anuwanza-*. The former is incompatible with the derivation just cited, but could easily represent an alternate outcome of final **-ntyos/m* resulting from syncope: cf. regular **-Vyom* > *-zziyan* but also adverb *lazzin** = SIG₅-in ‘well’ < nom.-acc. sg. neuter **lazziyan* to *lazziyant-*.

I therefore consider the most likely derivation for stems in *-anza-* to lie in an original pattern of verbal adjective (**lahhant-* ‘traveling, migrating’) → action noun (**lahhanti-i-* ‘traveling, migration’) → new thematic adjective (**lahhantyo-o-* ‘traveling, migrating’) → “individualizing” noun (**lahhantyo-on-* *‘the migrating one’ > ‘shelduck’).⁹

The above account includes enough unverifiable hypotheses that one should also consider the alternative of the “Hoffmann”-suffix **-h₂on-* with “possessive” value. My reservations about this explanation concern mostly the dubious status of this suffix in Anatolian. Suggested direct examples have a certain plausibility, but are very far from assured: see EICHNER (1974:64) for CLuvian *maššan-* ‘god’ (etc.) < **moh₂os-h₂on-* *‘freien Willen habend’ and EICHNER (1983:62ff) for Lycian *Elijāna-* ‘naiad’ < **ali-h₂on-* *‘Wasser (als Wohnstätte) habend’.¹⁰ Assumption of the

⁹ The derivation would be the same if one prefers with KATZ (2001:210¹⁶) to begin with *(s)*neh₂-nt-* ‘swimming’ and take the shelduck as *‘the swimmer’.

¹⁰ One may also mention Hitt. *mūri(ya)n-* ‘grape-cluster’ to *mūri-* ‘grape’, but the putative difference in meaning is far from assured. Also possible is thematized **-h₂no-* in some Luvian stems in *-anna/i-*: e.g. *ḫantanna-* (a topographic feature) probably ‘wheatfield’ < *‘having wheat’; perhaps *ḫutarlanna/i-* *‘slave-holder’ in the personal name *Hudarlani* (revising CARRUBA, 1992b:252f, which see for other possible examples).

Hoffmann-suffix would allow direct derivation of the possessive adjective from the action noun: **lahhant-* ‘traveling, migrating’ → **lahhant-i-* ‘traveling, migration’ → **lahhanti-h₂on-* ‘traveling, migrating’ (then secondarily substantivized perhaps via a transferred epithet).¹¹

I am, of course, not proposing that either of these derivations explains more than the *origin* of the type in *-anza-*. A similar account is possible for *ištanzan-* ‘mind, soul’ < **sth₂-ént-* ‘abiding’ (thus with OETTINGER, 1979:548), but this etymology is no more than a possibility. Some attested examples of *-anza-* certainly reflect secondary use of a new unitary suffix. This seems assured for *ippiyanzan-* beside *ippiya-*. I also find attractive the suggestion of N. Oettinger (pers. comm.) that ^{GIS}*alanzan-* reflects a similar extension of an **al-o-* to the root of Latin *alnus* ‘alder’ and related forms.¹²

I may summarize our results as follows. First, Hitt. *šumanzan-* means ‘bulrush’ and has *no* connection with Grk. ὑμῖν or with hysterokinetic *n-* stems in **-men-*. Second, the synchronic alternation of nom. sg. *-anza* ~ *-arzaš* argues that nouns in *-anza-* continue amphikinetic *n-* stems in *(H)*on-* (NSG *(H)*ō*). Third, the base *-anz(a)-* is surely derived by some means from stems in **-nt-*. I find the likeliest origin in a chain of derivation that leads from verbal adjectives in **-nt-* via action nouns in **-nti-* and thematic adjectives in **-ntyo-* to “individualizing” nouns in **-ntyo-on-*. Other scenarios remain possible.

¹¹ As a third alternative, one could even assume a process similar to the second derivation cited above for personal names in *-anza-*; i.e. direct derivation from stems in *-nt-* via reanalysis of the nom. sg. and then acc. sg.: **lahhant-s*, **lahhant-an* → **lahhantis*, **lahhantis-an* → **lahhantis-a-s*, **lahhantis-a-n*, then addition of “individualizing” **-on-*. My objections to this idea are twofold: (1) *nt-* stems are generally well-preserved in both Hittite and Luvian, including many examples where they form the base of further secondary derivatives; (2) in the genuine Luvian example of this process the leveling does not proceed beyond the accusative singular (dat. sg. still only *Tarḫunti* etc.).

¹² I withdraw my derivation of ^{GIS}*alanzan-* from the root of Latin *alō* ‘nourish’, which is more likely to be reflected in Hittite *ḫahhal-* ‘bush’ < **h₂el-*.

References

- ARCHI, Alfonso. 1988. Société des hommes et société des animaux. In *Studi di storia e di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli* (ed. Fiorella Imparati), 25-37. Firenze: Elite.
- BURDE, Cornelia. 1974. Hethitische medizinische Texte (= StBoT 19). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- CARRUBA, Onofrio. 1992a. Le notazioni dell'agente animato nelle lingue anatoliche (e l'ergativo). In *Per una grammatica ittita* (ed. Onofrio Carruba), 63-98. Pavia: Iuculano.
- CARRUBA, Onofrio. 1992b. Luwier in Kappodokien. In *La circulation des biens, des personnes et des idées dans le Proche-Orient ancien*, XXXVIII^e R.A.I., 251-257. Paris.
- EICHNER, Heiner. 1973. Die Etymologie von heth. *mehur*. MSS 31.53-107.
- EICHNER, Heiner. 1974. Untersuchungen zur hethitischen Deklination (Diss. Teil-druck). Erlangen.
- EICHNER, Heiner. 1983. Etymologische Beiträge zum Lykischen der Trilingue vom Letoon bei Xanthos. Or 52.48-66.
- HARDARSON, Jón A. 1987. Das uridg. Wort für 'Frau'. MSS 48.115-138.
- JASANOFF, JAY. 1989. Old Irish bé 'woman'. Ériu 40.135-141.
- KATZ, Joshua. 2001. Hittite *ta-pa-ka-li-ya-<as>*. In *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch/Anatolico e indoeuropeo* (ed. Wolfgang Meid & Onofrio Carruba), 205-237. Innsbruck: IBS.
- KRONASSER, Heinz. 1956. Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen. Heidelberg: Winter.
- KRONASSER, Heinz. 1966. Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- LAROCHE, Emmanuel. 1952. *Recueil d'onomastique hittite*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- LAROCHE, Emmanuel. 1966. *Les noms hittites*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- MELCHERT, Craig. 1983. A "New" PIE **men* Suffix. *Sprache* 29.1-26.
- MELCHERT, Craig. 1999. Hittite *tuk(kan)zi-* "cultivation, breeding". *Ktema* 24.17-23.
- MILEWSKI, Tadeusz. 1936. *L'indo-hittite et l'indo-européen*. Cracow.
- NEU, ERICH. 1993. Zu den hethitischen Ortspartikeln. In *Bojan Čop septuagenario in honorem oblata* (= *Linguistica* 33), 137-152.
- OETTINGER, Norbert. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
- OETTINGER, Norbert. 1980. Die *n*-Stämme des Hethitischen und ihre indogermanischen Ausgangspunkte. *KZ* 94.44-63.
- OETTINGER, Norbert. 1982. Reste von *e*-Hochstufe im Formans hethitischer *n*-Stämme einschließlich des "*umna*"-Suffixes. In *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae*. Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser (ed. Erich Neu), 162-177. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- PEDERSEN, Holger. 1938. *Hittisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

- PUHVEL, Jaan. 1984. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Volume 1/2. Berlin/New York: Mouton.
- STARKE, Frank. 1980. Das luwische Wort für 'Frau'. *KZ* 94.74-86.
- WEITENBERG, Jos. 1979. Einige Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Diphthong-Stämmen. In *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* (edd. Erich Neu & Wolfgang Meid), 289-303. Innsbruck: IBS.
- WEITENBERG, Jos. 1995. Sigmatization and Thematization in Hittite. In *Studio Historiae Ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (edd. Theo van den Hout and Johan de Roos), 333-344. Leiden: PIHANS.