(r (/ ((`| HS 103/2, '90

Adjectives in *-iyo- in Anatolian*) /

Kronasser, *EHS* (1966) 168 ff., correctly affirms that Anatolian inherited the PIE secondary suffix *-iyo-* which forms adjectives from nouns. Nevertheless, the role of this suffix has been much underappreciated, due no doubt to the fact that it had a limited productivity in Hittite.

As Kronasser points out, -iya- in Hittite does form adjectives to several place adverbs: *anturiya-* 'inner', *ištarniya-* 'medial, inner', and the hapax *araḫziya-* 'external, foreign' beside the more common *araḫzena-*.¹) Furthermore, there is a substantial if restricted number of other examples of *-iyo-* in Hittite. It is true that only a handful of these are directly attested as adjectives: EZEN *ḫarpiya-* 'festival of the *ḫarpa*', *nuttariya-* 'hastening'.²) There are also cases with secondary substantivization: *ḫappiriya-* 'city' < *'market' < 'that which pertains to sales', *ḫappariya-* 'things offered for sale',³) *pittuliya-* 'constraint' < *'pertaining to a snare, noose' (*pittula-*), *šiptamiya-* (a drink) < *'of seven' (for *tummantiya-* and *taparriya-* see the CLuvian section below).

We must add finally several instances whose existence is required by further derivatives: *anniyatar* 'motherhood' < *anniya-* 'maternal' (as per Kronasser, *EHS* 295, there is no basis for a Luvianism), *iyatniyant-* 'flourishing' < *iyatniya-* 'idem' (beside *iyatnuwant-*), probably ᴳᴵˢ*padiyalli-* 'foot of a bed' < *padiya-* 'of the foot' (cf. *EHS* 212), *šiuniyant-* 'priest' < *šiuniya-* 'of a god'.⁴) The above list is still very short. The suffix *-iyo-* does not appear to have been fully productive in Hittite.

The picture is different in the Luvian languages. In a most significant article in *Fs Neumann* (1982) 35 ff., Carruba has shown that alleged CLuvian *i*-stem anim. acc. singulars in -*iyan* and dat. singulars in -*iya* do not exist. Forms in -*iyan* and -*iya* are the nt. nom.-acc. singular and plural respectively of derived adjectives in *iya-*. Thus *anniyan* is not a variant of acc. sg. *annin* 'mother', but nt. nom.-acc. singular of *anniya-* 'maternal'.⁵) Remarkably, Carruba was able to achieve this analysis without benefit of the new edition of the CLuvian corpus by Starke, *StBoT* 30. Starke's reorganization of the texts makes the validity of Carruba's syntactic interpretation of the key passages all the more apparent.⁶)

Carruba's overall treatment of the CLuvian material requires only minor revision and amplification. The one revision concerns the nt. nom.-acc. plural: he interprets spellings such as *na-a-ni-e-ya* 'fraternal' as standing for *nan(i)-iya-ya*: base *nani-* plus suffix *-iya-* plus

---

*) Bibliographical abbreviations are those of *The Hittite Dictionary of the University of Chicago,* edd. Hans G. Güterbock and Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., Chicago: 1980 ff.

¹) The stems *andurziya-* and *araḫzeniya-* cited by Kronasser do not exist. See Friedrich-Kammenhuber, *HWb*² s.v.

²) The adjective *nuttariya-* is derived from the stem *nuntara-* *'present', attested only in the adverb *nuntaraš* 'soon, quickly'. See for the latter Melchert, *KZ* 93 (1979) 262 ff.

The oft-cited example *išpantiya-* 'nocturnal' (*KBo* IV 4 III 31) is quite uncertain. The context would permit either 'made the days nocturnal' or 'made the days (into) nights'. Since there are a number of other examples of acc. plurals in -*iuš* to nouns which are otherwise consonant-stems or *a*-stems, the one example is not solid evidence for a derived -*iyo-* adjective. It is true, of course, that the acc. plurals in -*iuš* themselves require an explanation. Given the ease with which -*iyo-* adjectives are substantivized and then compete with the base nouns, it is conceivable that the -*iuš* forms all indirectly reflect such adjectives. However, the marked preference for the acc. plural animate would remain unexplained by this account.

³) The attempt by Neu, *StBoT* 18 (1974) 107, to explain away this example is unnecessary and ad hoc.

⁴) The abstract *šiuniyatar* 'godhood, divinity' is not probative, since it could be derived directly from the *i*-stem *šiuni-* 'god'. However, the semantics of 'priest' make it unlikely that it reflects *šiuni-ant-* with -*ant-* added directly to *šiuni-*.

⁵) Elimination of the alleged *i*-stem anim. acc. singulars in -*iyan* removes any support for the proposal of Hawkins, Morpurgo Davies and Neumann, *HHL* 39–40, to explain HLuvian stems in -*nza-* via hypothetical acc. singulars in *-ntiyan. For the probable source of stems in -*nza-* see my discussion in *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill* (ed. C. Watkins) (1987) 193 f.

⁶) Surprisingly, Starke himself does not seem to recognize the adjectival function of the forms in -*iya-*. In *StBoT* 30.147, note 28, regarding *KUB* XXXV 43 III 28 ff., he says of [*kuwarš*]*ašša*[[*šša*]] and *tuliyašša* in line III 32: „Das Bezugswort zu den beiden Adj. gen. fehlt." He goes on to say that the modified noun is missing in all other parallel passages. However, as shown by the parallels *KUB* XXXII 14 + III 13 and XXXV 45 II 4 (see Carruba's table, p. 36), these two adjectives should be emended to *kuwaršaššan* and *tuliyaššan*. They are nt. nom.-acc. singular, modifying the nouns of lines III 28–29, just like all the pairs of adjectives preceding them. Note that [*pariy*]*analla* of line III 31 must also be emended to *pariyanallan* after the correct parallel texts. For the correct restoration and interpretation of [ ]*tariyal* of *KUB* IX 6 + I 13 see Carruba, p. 37 (= *nanuntariyal*).

an ending -ya. This is implausible and unnecessary. It is implausible because the neuter nom.-acc. plural of an o-stem *-iyo- would be *-iyeh₂, whence Luvian -iya. The "ending" -ya would be found only with i-stems, which is not what we are dealing with here, as Carruba has emphatically shown.[7]) His interpretation is unnecessary because spellings like na-a-ni-e-ya may easily represent the expected /na-niya/, with -iya < *-iyeh₂. Since Luvian does not distinguish /e/ and /i/, the Hittite scribes could use both e and i spellings for Luvian /i/.[8]) I therefore interpret nom.-acc. neuter plurals of -iya- as simply /-iya/.

We may add to Carruba's list of case forms (p. 49) the anim. acc. plural. His analysis neatly solves the previously problematic ᵈLula-hinzaš=tar huppara(n)za of KUB IX 31 II 24. Now that we have an adjectival stem /lulahiya-/, /lulahints/ may be identified as its regular anim. acc. plural, modifying hupparanza: 'Lulahiyan girdles' (vs. gen. plural Lulahiyaš hupruš 'girdles of Lulahiyans' in the Hittite). For the spelling as lūlahinzaš before the particle -tar, compare parnanzaš=ta (HT 1 II 7) = parnanza=ta (KUB IX 31 II 31) and see my article to appear in the memorial volume for Charles Carter.

The proper recognition of the CLuvian adjectives in -iya- had been prevented by the fact that in many case forms the adjectives in -iya- are indistinguishable from i-stem nouns. This partial overlap is due to the fact that Luvian extends most adjectives by a suffix -i- in the animate nominative and accusative, as discovered by Frank Starke: see his remarks in Fs Neumann (1982) 408 f., with note 3, and the discussion by Oettinger, KZ 100 (1987) 35–43, with references. In the case of a-stems (i. e., old o-stems) the "motion-i" replaces the thematic vowel. Thus an anim. nom. singular *-iyos became *-iy-i-s whence attested -iš.[9]) While the result of the contraction is often

---

[7]) The appearance of an ending -ya in the plural of the demonstrative adjectives (HLuv zaya, apaya; Lyc. ebeija) is not a counterargument, since forms like Hitt. nt. nom.-acc. sg. kī show that these words had i-stems in their declension.

[8]) Carruba is correct in claiming that e is occasionally used in cuneiform for /ya/, but such usage by Hittite scribes is extremely rare. The alternation -i-e- with -ya- in verb stems, however, is not an example of e for /ya/, but represents a genuine linguistic change from /ye/ to /ya/.

[9]) This account, which is independently motivated by other facts in Luvian, makes unnecessary Carruba's assumption (p. 40) of an analogical proportion -aš-šan: -aššiš= -ijan: *-ijiš.

In Hittite, on the other hand, the partial merger of -iya- and -i-stems is probably due to syncope. The surest example is the adverb SIG₅-in 'well', which represents the syncopated form of *lazziyan, nt. nom.-acc. singular of lazziyant-

---

spelled as simple -i-, it is represented by a plene vowel often enough to suppose that the regular outcome was a long vowel: cf. [lulah]īš in KUB XXXV 49 IV 15 vs. lulahiš in KUB XXXV 46 IV 7. Since the latter cooccurs with AMA -īš and tati[š] (ibid. IV 6), I assume a long vowel in all such cases, sometimes spelled plene (plene spelling of long vowels is not always consistent).

The fact that an anim. nom. singular in -iš (for -īš) can belong either to an i-stem or an iya-stem raises some thorny problems for the formal and functional analysis of such forms. For example, in KUB XXXV 43 III 30 we find huītwaliyan (nt. nom.-acc. sg.) modifying tapāru tatariyamman hirun. In KUB XXXV 49 IV 13 [hu]ītwa-līš (NB -ī-!) is likewise surely modifying taparuwaššiš tatariyamnaššiš hirutaššiš. We also find mān=aš huitwališ in KUB XXXV 45 II 25. The last clearly means 'If he (the enemy) is alive.' However, it is unlikely that tatariyamman 'curse' and hiru(n)t- 'oath' are 'alive, living'. Rather we have in huitwališ and huitwaliyan forms of an adjective huitwaliya- 'of a living person' < huitwali- 'living (person)'.

Likewise we must also assume both u(wa)lanti- 'dead' (KUB XXXV 45 II 26) and u(wa)lantiya- 'of the dead' (KUB XXXV 43 III 30, 39 I 27). In these cases, then, we can see a difference between the i-stem adjective (secondarily substantivized) and the -iya- derivative. Other examples are more problematic, but I wish to stress the point that virtually all CLuvian forms in -iš and -in (with long or short vowel) need to be reexamined with both possibilities in mind.

CLuvian also shows secondarily substantivized *iyo-stems like Hittite: tummantiya- 'obedience' < tummant- 'ear; hearing' and ta-parriya- 'rule, control' < *tapar(a/i)-, an unattested noun beside the verb tapar- 'to rule'.

The CLuvian adjectives in -i(ya)- reflect the "correct" inherited PIE procedure by which the final *-o- of the base noun is deleted before the *-iyo- suffix. Since most nouns in Luvian are i-stems, this step is generally not obvious, but acc. singular hūtarlān (KUB XXXV 136 IV 16) probably represents the base noun 'slave' (a-stem) to hutarliya- 'of a slave' (the latter is an adjective in all occurrences). See further examples below in HLuvian.

At some point, however, Luvian abandoned the deletion of the stem-vowel, which was unmotivated synchronically. This led to a second class of adjectives in Luvian in -ai(a)-. Carruba, p. 44, cites

---

'good'. I personally believe that such a syncope played a role in, if it did not in fact trigger, the shift of adjectives in -zziya- to i-stem inflection.

wasḫai(a)-. While I cannot agree with his semantic interpretation,[10] the formal derivation from the base *wasḫa*- seems solid. Another good example is *kummai(a)*- 'pure, sacralized' < *kumma*-, a base seen also in Lyc. *kuma-za*- 'priest' and other derivatives and in Pal. *aš-kumma-wa*- 'sacralized, taboo' (of food): see on the latter Watkins, *Fs Hoenigswald* (1987) 399 ff., following Szemerényi. Based on the few attestations available, we may also assume CLuv. *arrai(a)*- 'long' and *parrai(a)*- 'high'.[11]) However, it is not clear whether these adjectives are formed in the same manner as *wasḫai(a)*- and *kummai(a)*-.[12]) At least in the case of the latter two, the addition of the "motion-i" produced the attested paradigm parallel to that in *-i(ya)*-: anim. nom. sg. **-aiy-i-š* > attested *-Ca-iš* and anim. nom. pl. **-aiy-i-nzi* > *-Ca-i-in-zi*, beside nt. nom.-acc. sg. *-aiyan=za*, nt. nom.-acc. pl. *-aiya*, dat.-loc. plural *-ayanza*. Compare also the HLuvian examples below. The only uncertainty is whether we should read the animate nominative forms as contracted /-ays/ and /-ayntsi/ or uncontracted /-ayis/ and /-ayintsi/.

As Carruba has already indicated, HLuvian also shares in the formation of *-i(ya)*- adjectives: e. g. *tati(ya)*- 'paternal' (with the same partial merger with the *i*-stem inflection). What he does not make clear is the productivity of the formation in HLuvian and its function in marking possession, in competition with the suffix /-assi-/ and the inherited genitive case.

We find among others the following remarkable construction

---

[10]) Carruba takes *wasḫai(a)*- as 'fit for a master' from an alleged *wasḫa*- 'lord, master', but the latter word in its only occurrences (*KUB* XXXV 54 II 32 and *KBo* VII 68 II 2.4) is nt. nom.-acc. plural. Otherwise, we find only *wasḫazza*-, an epithet of ᵈLAMA, and *wasḫai(a)*-. The usage of the latter in *KBo* VII 68 II 5 ff. (as cited by Carruba) points rather to 'pure, sacralized'. Obviously, a similar sense would be appropriate for the epithet of the deity. The parallel formations in *-zza*- and *-iya*- beside *kumaza*- and *kummai(a)*- are not likely to be accidental. We probably have a matching adjective in HLuvian (*419/420) *washayan=za* (referring to an offering), but the precise meaning of the latter is not yet clear.

[11]) Morpurgo Davies, *Studies ... Cowgill* 218–219, has demonstrated that we must separate CLuv. *ari*- 'time' (noun) from *arrai(a)*- 'long' (adjective). This means that there is no direct evidence in Luvian for ablauting *i*-stem adjectives of the type of Hittite *šuppi*-, *šuppay*- (contra Melchert, *Studies ... Cowgill* 191, note 23).

[12]) There is no obvious source for *arrai(a)*- at all. Since *parrai(a)*- is an epithet of 'mountains', there is no reason to doubt that its ultimate source is *bʰergʰ- 'high' (cf. Hitt. *parku*-), but it is morphologically unclear. Despite the lack of direct evidence for ablaut (cf. note 11), it remains possible that *arrai(a)*- and *parrai(a)*- are *i*-stem adjectives with generalization of the stem in *-ay*-.

(CARCHEMISH A 5a,1): *za-wa/i* STELE-*za Za-ha-na-sa* VIR-*ti-sá* INFANS-*mu-wa/i-ya*(!)-*ya-za* "This stele (is) of = belongs to Zahana, son of Ziti.' This sentence shows the ability of HLuvian to combine freely formal genitive singulars of nouns and case forms of the relational adjective which agree with the modified (possessed) noun. Thus /Zahanas/ is genitive singular, marking the owner of the stele, while */nimuwiyaya(n)=za/ is nom.-acc. sg. neuter of the adjective *nimuwiyaya*- 'of the son' modifying /za *wanin=za/ 'this stele'. The adjective is replacing a genitive singular /nimuwiyas/ 'of the son', which would stand in apposition to /Zahanas/ and on which /Zitis/ would normally depend. Notice that even the underlying word order is retained in which /Zitis/ precedes the noun its modifies, although on the surface the latter is replaced by the relational adjective.

An even more complex example of this kind of syntax is attested in MALATYA 1,2 and MALATYA 3. These two passages are entirely parallel in structure and I cite here only the first:[13]) *za-ya-wa/i* (*262) *sa-sa-li-ya* TONITRUS.HALPA-*pa*-AVIS-*sa* ᴵCRUS + *RA/I-sa* HEROS Maₓ.Liₓ-*i*(!)(URBS) DOMINUS-*ya-ya* INFANS.NEPOS-*ya* MONS.CORNU.-CERVUS₂ INFANS-*mu-wa/i-ya-ya* REX(?) 'These ___ are of Halpasulupi, grandson of Tara(?), the hero, lord of Malatya, son of Wasuruntiya(?), the king.' Note that we have here besides */nimuwiyaya/ also the relational adjectives DOMINUS-*ya-ya* 'of the lord' and */hamsiya/ 'of the grandson'. All are nt. nom.-acc. plural modifying *zaya sasaliya*, replacing corresponding genitive singulars of the respective nouns. Notice that by attraction even the genitive singular 'of the lord', which depends on the underlying genitive singular 'of the grandson', not on *zaya sasaliya*, nevertheless has also been replaced by nt. nom.-acc. plural of the relational adjective.[14]) While we may find this structure hard to "process", it is perfectly grammatical in HLuvian.

The example of *nimuwiyaya*- 'of the son' is crucial in several respects. The attested adjective is formed by adding *-iya*- to a base *nimuwiya- 'son, child'. Note that it shows the "newer" process by

---

[13]) I am grateful to David Hawkins for his generous help with the reading and interpretation of this passage.

[14]) For the attraction compare HLuvian *tanimasin* REGIO-*nisin* INFANS-*nin* 'child of every country', where *tanimi*- 'every', which logically modifies 'country', has taken on the suffix and ending of the latter, which modifies 'child'. See the excellent discussion of Neumann, *Gs Kronasser* (1982) 149 ff. The same syntax which he has established for *-assi*- thus also applies to *-iya*-.

which the final vowel of the base is retained, whence a stem in -ai(a)- like CLuvian kummai(a)- above. The base *nimuwiya- in turn is itself a substantivized stem in -iya- formed in the "older" fashion from *nimuwa- *'lack of virility' (or the like) with deletion of the final vowel of the base.[15]) The original sense of the stem *ni-muwiya- would have been 'lacking in virility' hence 'immature', as a noun 'child, boy'. For the existence of nimuwiya- alongside the attested nimuwiza- 'child, son' D. Hawkins cites Karkamisi(ya)- beside Karkamisiza- 'of Carchemish'. We thus find in the single example nimuwiyaya - evidence for both the older type in -i(ya)- and the newer type in -ai(a)- as well as for the tendency of these stems to become substantivized.

The certain example of nimuwiyaya- permits us to clarify the status of DOMINUS-(na)ni- 'lord' and its derivatives. Beside the i-stem noun itself we find a relational adjective in -i(ya)-: DOMINUS-(na)niya- 'of the lord' (e.g. dat.-loc. plural DOMINUS-na-ni-ya-za in CARCHEMISH A 15b,3). There is also a word for 'lord' ending in -ya-: nom. sg. DOMINUS-ya-sa (ANDAVAL 1, CARCHEMISH A 3,1.3). From this stem the relational adjective is DOMINUS-yai(a)-: nt. nom.-acc. plural DOMINUS-ya-ya (see above in MALATYA 1,1) and anim. nom. singular DOMINUS-ya-i-sa in REGIO-ni-DOMINUS-ya-i-sa NEPOS-sa 'grandson of the lord of the country' (CARCHEMISH A 11b,1). In view of the frequent substantivization of *-iyo- adjectives, one may wonder whether the ya-stem noun for 'lord' is merely the substantivized -i(ya)-adjective 'of the lord', but this cannot be demonstrated.

A relational adjective in -ai(a)- also helps to account for the syntax of another complex possessive construction (MALPINAR 2):[16])

...z[a-ti]   á-mi-i   ¹a-ta₅-ya-za-sa-na   ¹HÁ+LI-sa-na   mí-ta₄-ya   STATUA- ru-ti-i ... 'to this my statue, (that) of Atayaza, servant of Hattusili ...'. The adjective /Atayatsassan/ is dat. singular, modifying /taruti/ 'statue'. The phrase '(of the) servant of Hattusili' in apposition to 'Atayaza' must likewise then consist of possessive adjectives in the dative singular, as confirmed by the ending on */Hattusilassan/ (cf. note 14). This means that mí-ta₄-ya cannot simply be /miday(a)/, dative of the noun 'servant'. It is rather dative singular to

---

[15]) The precise meaning of muwa- remains uncertain, but it must lie in the area of 'potency, virility, (male) seed'.

[16]) I am indebted for this example to D. Hawkins, who is editing the text with M. Kalaç.

a relational adjective /midai(a)-/ 'of the servant'. The shape is due to the form of the dative singular ending -i: /miday-i/ contracts to /mi-day/, as in Hitt. dat. sg. *šallay-i > šallai 'great' (for the spelling in HLuvian cf. the pres. 3rd sg. verb ending /-ay/ spelled -a-ya).

Carruba also notes the existence of the *-iyo- suffix in Lycian, vindicating Pedersen's earlier claim, LH 34 (contra Neumann, Lyk 385). See also Carruba, SMEA 22.294 ff., and Gusmani, RIL 94.500 f. Once again, however, we find -ije- not merely as a derivational suffix, but competing with -a/ehi- and the genitive case as the marker of possession: TL 18 ebeñ[ne] xup[ã m=en]e [pr]ñn[a]watē Prisei epñnē[n]ē ehbi apñxahbija ehbi 'Prisei built this tomb. (It belongs) to his younger brothers (and) his descendants.'[17]) We have here as in HLuvian a mixed construction with a formal genitive and a relational adjective in -ije-: epñnēnē is gen. plural 'of (his) younger brothers', while apñxahbija is feminine(!) nom. singular (agreeing with the understood subject xupa) of an adjective apñxahbije- 'of the descendant' < apñxahba- 'descendant'.[18])

A second example of this type is found in TL 100: ebe xupa me Tibeija. This short and atypical tomb inscription has to my knowledge never been discussed, but there can be little doubt as to its structure. The noun xupa could be either nom. singular or loc. singular, but the locative of ebe- 'this' could only be ebehi, as elsewhere. The attested ebe can only be anim. nom. singular (= Luv. apas) modifying a likewise nom. singular xupa. Instead of the usual 'X built this tomb' we must have the direct 'This tomb belongs to X'. However, tibeija cannot be genitive singular or plural. Given apñxahbija in TL 18, the solution is obvious: Tibeija is likewise fem. nom. singular of a derived adjective in -ije-: 'This tomb is Tibeian', i.e. 'belongs to Tibe'.[19])

---

[17]) The reading epñnēnē is that of Aikwright. For the sense 'younger brother' see Laroche, FdX 5.126. While I accept his argument that epñ marks posteriority, not descendance, apñxahba- can hardly mean 'younger grandson'. I also find a collocation 'younger brothers and great-grandsons' unlikely. Since xahba- (cognate with HLuvian hasu-) is in origin merely 'offspring' and then secondarily 'grandson' (cf. Hitt. haśśa- 'offspring' and specifically 'son'), I assume that apñxahba- is 'after-offspring', i.e. 'descendant' (cf. Germ. Nachkomme).

[18]) For Lycian animate nouns in -a- (and hence modifying adjectives in -a-) as feminine, see my article to appear in The Proceedings of the VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft.

[19]) The name Tibe- is unattested elsewhere in Lycian, but the structure of the text leaves little choice. It is hardly credible that the name of the tomb owner/occupant would not appear. Given the distance involved, it is questionable whether

We thus find that in Lycian as well as HLuvian the *-iyo- adjectives are fully productive as a marker of possession alongside the *-assi- adjectives and the genitive case.[20])

Carruba does not include Lydian in his discussion, but I believe that traces of the *-iyo- adjectives can also be found there. Meriggi, RHA 3 (1935) 89–90, had already isolated a suffix -da-. We find taac-da beside taac, śfēnda- beside śfēn(i-)-λ, and mλvēnda- beside mλvēn- in mλvē-siλ. As is typical for Lydian, in none of these cases is the meaning of both the base and the derived form clear: see the lemmata in Gusmani, LW.

However, in all cases the suffix is clearly denominative, and taac- 'votive offering' and śfēn(i)- are definitely substantives. On general grounds we would expect a suffix added to substantives to be an adjective-forming suffix. The fact that some of the derivatives might be attested as substantives themselves would not be surprising.

As to the shape of the suffix, examples such as prefix ēt- from *endo 'in' show that original sequences of nasal plus dental stop show up as -V̆t. The attested -nd- of śfēn-da- and mλvēn-da- with preserved -n- therefore indicates that the suffix continues a syncopated *-V̆da-. We thus have a denominative adjective-forming suffix of the shape *-V̆da-. I shall soon present elsewhere the full evidence for intervocalic *y > Lyd. d. Here I cite merely the pret. 1st singular ending -idv < -*iyom: e. g. bidv 'I gave' from a virtual *piyom. Given the other evidence for *y > Lyd. d, an interpretation of the suffix *-V̆da- as *-iyo- imposes itself. Whether the adjective śfarda- 'Sardian' contains this suffix is at this point impossible to determine.

We have now discovered reflexes of *-iyo- adjectives in every Anatolian language except Palaic. Their existence there is to be expected. I know of no certain examples, but the stem kuwani- is a

---

the names Τίβιος and Τίβειος (Zgusta, KP 513) have anything to with Lycian Tibe-. Structurally, however, they could both easily be the stem in -ije- used as a patronymic.

[20]) As Starke indicates in the reference above, the "motion-i" is nearly as widespread in Lycian as it is in Luvian. This is, of course, the real reason for the absence of -i- in oblique and neuter forms of what appear to be i-stem adjectives: e.g. dat. pl. przze and nt. nom.-acc. sg. przzē to przz(i)- 'front-'. I now withdraw my attempted explanation in note 20 of the paper cited in note 18 above.
Given the partial merger of -i- and -ije- stems due to the "motion-i", the number of -ije- stems in Lycian is greater than previously recognized. Several adjectives listed in Melchert, Lycian Lexicon (1989), as i-stems should be analyzed rather as -ije- stems with the "motion-i" in the strong animate cases. I cite here as merely one example ebi(je)- 'local'.

---

likely candidate. In KUB XXXV 165 Vs 16 kuwaniš is nom. sg. animate, an epithet of Kataḫzipuriš, a goddess. In the same text Rs 6 kuwaniš must be nom. pl. animate, referring to objects offered to the gods. It is hard to reconcile these two usages on the assumption of a single noun. However, if we suppose that one instance reflects an -i-stem noun and the other a relational adjective in -iya-, then we can account for the reference to an animate being in one case and to inanimate objects in the other. Naturally, one could also take both instances as belonging to the adjective. Given our current limited knowledge of Palaic phonology and morphology, the attested anim. nom. sg. and pl. endings in -iš to an iya-stem could reflect syncope as in Hittite or the "motion-i" of the other Anatolian languages.[21])

We can only make a guess at the actual meaning, but we know that the name of the goddess Kataḫzipuri- contains the Hattic word for 'queen'. C. Watkins has ingeniously suggested (pers. comm.) that kuwani- as an epithet of the goddess may continue the PIE word for 'woman' *gʷen-, whatever the precise synchronic sense. The other occurence could then be a substantivization of the relational adjective: 'the things belonging/pertaining to the kuwani-'. Whether or not this Palaic example is correct, the wide attestation and vitality of the *-iyo- formation in Anatolian is beyond doubt.

Curriculum in Linguistics
CB 3155, Dey Hall
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3155
U.S.A.

H. Craig Melchert

---

[21]) For the supposed syncope of -iya- to -i- compare the preterite 3rd plural ḫuššinta 'they poured', which must reflect a third plural ending *-iy-anta.