

dieses Nicht-Präsens stofflich auf dem alten 'Injunktiv' des Perfektum beruht. Der Umstand, daß der heth. Präteritalendung *-ar* höheres Alter zukommt, ermutigt mich, in dieser bisher nur vereinzelt nachweisbaren Verbalendung *-ar* die Kontinuante von grundsprachlichem **-or* zu sehen, das zunächst im Bereich des Perfektum (Zustandsform) heimisch war, von dort in die hethitische *hi*-Konjugation geriet und von der *mi*-Konjugation als Präteritalendung übernommen wurde¹⁷⁾. Wegen der noch überaus spärlichen Beleglage von Präteritalformen auf *-ar* läßt sich schwerlich eine Vermutung wagen, in welcher Sprachschicht eine so alte Endung *-ar* (< idg. **-or*) überdauert hat, um dann doch noch an die Oberfläche der schriftlichen Überlieferung zu gelangen. Die Zukunft wird erweisen, ob sich noch weitere Belege für Präteritalformen auf *-ar* anfinden und, wenn ja, ob diese sich ebenfalls auf die ältere Sprache konzentrieren werden.

Sprachwissenschaftliches Institut
der Ruhr-Universität
Postfach 102148
D-4630 Bochum 1

Erich Neu

¹⁷⁾ Heth. *hemija-* (vgl. *hemijar*) ist ein *mi*-Verbum, *han-* (vgl. *hānijar*) ein *hi*-Verbum, doch flektiert stammerweitertes *hanija-* nach der *mi*-Konjugation (vgl. *hanijami*). Heth. *šaušija-* (*šapašija-*; vgl. *šausijar*) dürfte ein *mi*-Verbum sein. – Auslautendes *-r*, das sonst in der älteren Sprache nach *-a* gefährdet war, blieb, wie die wenigen Präteritalformen auf *-ar* zeigen, erhalten; zu *-r* im hethitischen Wortauslaut s. E. Neu, FsNeumann 1982, 205 ff., 222 ff., aber auch H. C. Melchert (in: Y. L. Arbeitman, Ed., A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwartz, Louvain-La-Neuve 1988, 215 ff.). – Zur Etymologie von heth. *han-* „schöpfen“ s. jetzt W. P. Schmid, FsOtten 1988, 310 ff.

MS 102/1, 189

Hittite *alpu* and *dampu*

I think that H. G. Güterbock has now amply defended ("Bilingual Moon Omens from Boğazköy", *Abraham Sachs Memorial*) his reading and interpretation of the adjectives *alpu-* 'pointed' and *dampu-* 'blunt'.

Regarding his discussion, we have lost nothing by surrendering German *Dampf* as a cognate, since IE **b* (> Gmc. **p*) is too rare to be of much assistance anyway. Cutting bluntness into a horn is nonsense in any language; I note also that Puhvel *HED* s. v. has "onto". One normally never cuts the absence that is left; when we read in *HED* ŠA GÍR *alpuē* ['blunting of a dagger' (cf. Laroche and Otten) we are led to wonder if it is natural to be always talking about *blunting* daggers and horns.

Consider now the entry *alpu-* *HED* 40-1, where *alpu-* is equated with Lith. *alpius* 'weak' (while *alpant-*, I think, is indeed well compared with Lith. *alpti*, etc.). *HED* adduces a further supposed relation to Greek *ἀμβλύς* : *ἀμαλός* (on which see *Živa Antika* 20, 1970, 5, and *Celtica* 10, 1973, 151 ff.), but this last is very differently based on the notion 'soft'. Puhvel's equation is not persuasive, and one may plausibly ask why 'blunt' implies 'weak'; I must also reject his account *Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser* 1982, 184-5.

Let us turn to the formal aspects of these words. Antonyms with stems in *-ú-* were properly in zero-grade; see the relevant section of Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* (1953) and E. P. Hamp, *Lingua* 61, 1983, 1-8. Lithuanian, as with *alpius*, is a poor guide in this respect, since it has merged this class in vocalism with that of the oxytone *o*-grade deverbal thematics; see E. P. Hamp, *Baltistica* 20, 1984, 141-2.

I therefore reconstruct *dampu-* as **tup-ú-*, and place it in relation to Slavic *tъръ* (OCS *tъръ*, Cz. *tupý*, Pol. *tepy*) < **tomp-ó-s*, an *o*-grade deverbal thematic.

On similar lines we must explain *alpu-* as **lp-ú-* or **lbh-ú-*. Semantically the comparison then suggests itself to Welsh *llym*, Breton *lemm* < **limmo-* 'sharp'. Such a form cannot derive in Celtic from **lpmo-*, since in this position the **p* disappears and leaves the **m* to lenite; thus Welsh *cryf* 'strong' < **krimo-* < **krm-pmo-* : Lat. *corpus* (E. P. Hamp, *Études celtiques* 9, 1960, 139).

I therefore reconstruct **limmo-* < **li(k)smo-* < **lp-s-mo-*. For the formulation of such a formation see my analysis of OIr. *soimm* 'rich' < **s(u)ommi-* ← *su+ommo-* < **op-s-mo-*, of the type Gk. *πλοχμός*; cf. KZ 96, 1982-3, 173. However, in the participial **-mo-* adjective we have zero-grade of the base.

Univ. of Chicago
Dept. of Linguistic
1010 East 59th. Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
USA

Eric P. Hamp

06/11/11

New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses*)

Since the publication of a series of articles by E. Laroche a quarter of a century ago,¹⁾ there has been general agreement that Luvian and Lycian show a particularly close affinity within the Anatolian family of Indo-European: see e.g. Neumann, *Lyk* (1969) 365 ff., Oettinger, KZ 92 (1978) 74-92, and Starke, *Fs Neumann* (1982) 407 ff. Several scholars, however, have emphasized that important differences also exist between Luvian and Lycian: see Gusmani, *RIL* 94 (1960) 497-512, and Starke, op.cit., especially 424 ff. It is not my purpose here to argue about the relative weight to be attached to the various similarities and differences. Nor will I attempt to decide whether we should ascribe the shared features to a period of common development or to contact phenomena. I merely wish to add to the list of features shared by Luvian and Lycian.²⁾ These belong to both the phonological and lexical components of the languages.

1. PIE Tectals in Luvian and Lycian

In *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill* (1987) 182-204, I have argued that Luvian shows three distinct reflexes of PIE voiceless tectal stops:³⁾ PIE **k̑* > Luv. *z*, PIE **k* > Luv. *k*, and PIE **k** > Luv.

*) Bibliographical abbreviations are those of *The Hittite Dictionary of the University of Chicago (CHD)*, Chicago: 1980 ff. In citing HLuvian texts I use the system of Hawkins, *AnSt* 25 (1975) 153 ff. I cite Lycian texts after E. Kalinka, *Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti (TL)*, Vienna: 1901. These texts are also available in revised form in J. Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*, Berlin: 1932. Newer Lycian texts are indicated with the prefix N and numbered after G. Neumann, *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*, Vienna: 1979.

¹⁾ 'Comparaison du luvite et du lycien' *BSL* 53 (1958) 157-195, 55 (1960) 155-185, and 62 (1967) 46-66. One should also note the prior article by Tritsch, *ArOr* 18/1 (1950) 494-518.

²⁾ Unless otherwise specified, 'Lycian' refers in what follows to 'Lycian' proper or 'Lycian A'. Data from 'Lycian B' or 'Milyan' will be cited when available.

³⁾ Following a suggestion of H. Eichner, I have now adopted 'tectal' instead of 'velar' as a cover term for what were previously termed 'gutturals'. See Mayrhofer, *Idg. Gram.* 1.2 (1986) 102.