

A PROPOSAL CONCERNING THE HITTITE NOM.-ACC. SG. NEUTER,
NOM.-ACC. PL. NEUTER, NOM. PL. COMMON ENCLITIC
THIRD PERSON PRONOUN *-at*

by KENNETH SHIELDS, JR.

One of the morpho-syntactic peculiarities of Neo-Hittite is the occurrence of the enclitic third person pronominal form *-at* in the nominative-accusative singular neuter, the nominative-accusative plural neuter, and the nominative plural animate (common). As Friedrich (1974: 63) observes, «Im Nom. Plur. comm. [and nom.-acc. pl. neut.] hat die alte Sprache die indogermanische Form des pronominalen Nom. Plur. mask. als *-e* < **-oi* bewahrt, während die Sprache des Neuen Reiches das zunächst singularische, dann auch pluralische Neutrum *-at* dafür mit eintreten lässt». Of course, the implication of Friedrich's remarks is that the plural enclitic pronoun *-at* shares a common origin with that of the neuter singular and that it simply represents an extension of the singular form. More recently, Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1995: 337-338) suggest that the enclitic plural *-at* of the common gender is a more ancient form which bears an etymological connection to the stem of plural «deictic pronominals» in the dialects of Indo-European Proper: «Hitt. *-at* 'they', Luw. *-atta* 'they' beside Skt. masc. pl. *té*, fem. *tās*; Gk. masc. pl. *toi*, fem. *taí*; Goth. masc. pl. *þai*, fem. *þōs*; Toch. A masc. pl. *cai*, B *cem*, fem. *tom*. As a common protoform for these dialects we can posit masc. pl. [**toi*] with a stem in [**t-*]¹. Ultimately, Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1995: 338) «reconstruct a Proto-Indo-European pronominal paradigm of the form [**oso*, cf. nom. sg. masc. Skt. *sá(s)*, Gk. *ho*, Toch. B *se*, Go. *sa*, etc.; **oto*], with the reduction of one or the other vowel in the individual dialects: in Hittite the final vowel is lost, while initial **o-* is lost in the other dialects». The implication of this proposal is that the Hittite enclitic plural *-at*, though not merely a generalization of the neuter singular form, does share a common origin with it². The distributional antiquity of Hittite enclitic plural *-at* within Anatolian is emphasized by Melchert (2000: 182), who, after a thorough analysis of Cuneiform Luvian data, asserts: «We must therefore conclude that the

¹ Of course, as a result of their acceptance of the Glottalic Theory, Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1995) reconstruct **tʰ* as the initial consonant in these items. They emphasize that their etymology for *-at* «rules out the possibility suggested by Sturtevant, of relating it directly to the syntactic linking particle attested in Hittite as ... *ta-*» (1995: 338 n. 10).

² Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1995: 338) argue that the pronominal forms **oso* and **oto* «can ... be reconstructed as active and inactive-class pronominals». However, the attested distribution of Hittite *-at* in the nominative plural of both common and neuter gender and *-aš* in the accusative plural of common gender, as well as the occurrence of the stem **to-* in the masculine and feminine nominative plural of Indo-European Proper, is problematic for this interpretation. They respond to these data by merely asserting that «the plural paradigm continues the same stem, which must have characterized the earliest inactive» (1995: 338).

nom.-acc. plural forms of the third person enclitic pronoun in C[uneiform]Luvian agree with those of Neo-Hittite ([neut. nom.-acc. pl.,] anim. nom. pl. *-ata* = Hitt. *-at*; anim. acc. pl. *-aš* = Hitt. *-aš*) rather than with those of H[ieroglyphic]Luvian, which has indeed generalized *-ata* for the entire nom.-acc. plural, animate and inanimate». In this brief paper, I wish to propose yet another theory of the origin of Hittite enclitic plural *-at* — a theory which acknowledges its antiquity and its etymological independence from the nominative-accusative neuter singular *-at*.

Of course, it is well known that, from an evolutionary point of view, phonological identity among linguistic forms does not presuppose common origin. As Samuels (1972: 51) emphasizes, «grammatical distinctions are often lost without any replacement of the particular function that they performed». To be sure, the syncretism of inflectional endings is widespread in the development of Indo-European languages — an obvious case in point being the falling together in Modern English of the genitive singular (from OE *-es*) and the plural (from OE *-as*) in almost all nouns. In my view such a development accounts for the attested Hittite distribution of enclitic pronouns in *-at*.

Elsewhere (cf., e.g., Shields 1992: 27) I have endorsed Sturtevant's proposal (1933: 198-199) that the enclitic third person personal pronouns of Hittite are demonstratives in origin and that the Hittite pronoun *-a-*, as in nom. sg. common *-aš*, «contains the pronominal stem that appears in Skt. *asya*, Av. *ahe* 'eius', Osc. *es-identum* 'idem', etc. but as is natural in an enclitic, ... shows the vowel *o* instead of *e*». Sturtevant's derivation of Hittite *-a-* from the Indo-European demonstrative stem **e-* is similarly endorsed by Kronasser (1956: 144) and Friedrich (1974: 63). Interestingly, «the two variants [**e* and **o* of the original demonstrative] appear to be contaminated in the demonstrative stem **eo-* (e.g., Lat. *eum*, Osc. *ion-c*)» (Shields 1992: 27). In light of these comments, the Hittite nominative-accusative neuter singular enclitic *-at* most certainly shows the stem *-a-* with the ending **-t/d*, which is widely attested dialectally in the nominative-accusative singular neuter of demonstrative pronouns (cf., e.g., Skt. *tá-t*, Gk. *tó* < **to-d*, Lat. *is-tud*, Go. *pat-a* [Burrow 1973: 270]). In the neuter plural, the Hittite enclitic *-at* may constitute a generalization of the neuter singular since, within nominal paradigms at least, «the neuter plural appears ... in some cases undifferentiated from the singular», cf. Ved. *údhār* 'udder(s)', *yójanā* 'league(s)', Hitt. *kurur* 'hostility/-ties' (Burrow 1973: 237). I believe, however, that this interpretation of the origin of neuter plural *-at* is unlikely. First of all, with the exception of this enclitic, the suffix **-t/d* does not appear as a nominative-accusative case marker outside the neuter singular in the pronouns of the Indo-European dialects. Moreover, Indo-European pronominal declension generally does differentiate singular and plural, even within the neuter. The Hittite demonstrative *apā-* 'that', for example, shows *apāt* in the nominative-accusative neuter singular and *apē* in the nominative-accusative neuter plural³. What I now wish to argue is that the Hittite neuter plural enclitic in *-at* shares its origin with the common plural form in *-at*.

My theory of the origin of enclitic plural *-at* is based, in large part, on previous

³ It must be acknowledged, however, that the Hittite demonstrative *kā-* 'this' manifests a nominative-accusative neuter singular and plural in *kē*. Moreover, although in Indo-European generally the nominative plural masculine of demonstrative pronouns is formed with an element in **-e/o-i*, «we find such a form of the stem used in the singular» (e.g., Lat. *quōi*) (Burrow 1973: 271).

research of mine regarding the evolution of the inflectional categories of Indo-European, especially the category of number (e.g., Shields 1982: 63-94, 1985, 1991/2, 1992: 65-83, 1996, 1997, 2001). I have committed myself to the view that within the history of Indo-European «there was an earlier period in which there was no ... inflection for number» and that regular number congruence emerged only in late Indo-European (Lehmann 1974: 201-202, cf. Adrados 1985: 31-32). The appearance of a dual number in opposition to a plural was especially recent — as evidenced by the lack of the former category in Hittite (cf. Adrados 1987: 7, Bomhard 1988: 475). The dual itself was manifested by way of the specialization of original plural (non-singular) suffixes; and because of the late emergence of the dual, such specialization was generally a dialectal phenomenon. Thus, «the *ā*-stem ending **-ai* functions as a plural marker in Greek and Latin (cf. Gk. *khōr-ai* 'lands', Lat. *port-ae* 'doors'), whereas in Sanskrit and Balto-Slavic the same ending marks the dual (cf. Skt. *bāl-e* '(two) maidens', OCS *roq-ě*, Lith. *rank-i* [< **-ai*] '(two) hands')» (Schmalstieg 1974: 192). As the plural, i.e., non-singular, category developed, a variety of inflectional markers (whose origin may be traced to deictic/demonstrative elements [Shields 1991/2]) became its exponents, including **-e/os* (e.g., Gk. nom. pl. *pód-es* 'feet'), **-i* (e.g., Lat. nom. pl. *porta-e* 'doors'), **-e* (e.g., Gk. nom.-acc. du. *mētér-e* 'two mothers'), **-u* (e.g., Skt. nom.-acc. du. *pitár-a-u* 'two fathers'), **-n* (e.g., Toch. AB *riñ* < **-n* + the non-singular desinence **-i* 'cities' [see Shields 1982: 64-70]), and **-T* (= **-t* or **-d*). It is this latter ending which has relevance to the Hittite enclitic plural suffix under consideration here. The suffix **-T* is found in contamination with **-u* (i.e., **-Tu*) in Lithuanian personal pronouns like *vėdu* 'we two' and *jūdu* 'you two', while it most likely is attested in contamination with **-e* (i.e., **-Te*) in such Germanic personal pronouns as OE *wit* 'we two', *git* 'you two' (Shields 2001, cf. Sihler 1995: 382). Moreover, the affix **-T* appears in contamination with the non-singular marker **-n* in the plural suffix **-nt* (cf. Schmalstieg 1977: 131), «found in both Tocharian (A *-nt*, B *-nta*) and Luwian (*-nzi* [nom.], *-nza* [acc.-dat.])» (Shields 1982: 65). In the opinion of Schmalstieg (1977: 131), a non-singular marker in **-nt* had even greater dialectal currency in light of the fact that the collective is a secondary function of the plural (Kurylowicz 1964: 204): «In Hittite, Indo-Iranian, Slavic and perhaps in Greek we find **-nt-* more or less clearly as a collective suffix according to Erhart [1970: 69], cf., e.g., OCS *-et-* (gen. *tel-et-e* 'veal')⁴. The Hittite enclitic plural *-at* may thus etymologically constitute an occurrence of the pronominal stem *-a-* (< **-o-*) plus the non-singular suffix **-te*, attested in Germanic. In Hittite, final unaccented **-e* is subject to loss (Melchert 1994: 183), whereas in Luvian «final unaccented (short) vowels are all retained, with **-e/* and **-o/* becoming */a/*» (Melchert 1994: 279). Therefore, it would seem that the Cuneiform Luvian cognate *-ata* confirms a desinential etymon in **-te*, i.e., *-a-ta* < **-o-te*. Since, according to Melchert (1994: 279), final **-u* would be preserved as such in Luvian, **-tu* (cf. Baltic *-du*) is not a possible etymon for *-ta*⁵. The use of the suffix **-te* as a general (common and neuter

⁴ More recent scholarship (e.g. Neu 1989, Oettinger 2001) has demonstrated that the Hittite suffix *-ant-* identified by Schmalstieg and Erhart as a collective marker is best analyzed as an affix with «individualizierend» or «personifizierend» not collective, value.

⁵ Luvian also shows *-ata* in the nominative-accusative neuter singular. Because of the paucity of attested data, it is difficult to explain why the paradigm of the third person enclitic was regularized

gender) non-singular marker in Hittite is in keeping with the tendency of the language to utilize the same form for the common and neuter nominative plural in demonstrative paradigms (cf., e.g., nom. pl. common *kē*, nom.-acc. pl. neut. *kē*; nom. pl. common *apē*, nom.-acc. pl. neut. *apē*). This situation may reflect an early stage of development of the non-singular category whereby non-singular markers were indifferent to gender and case (see Shields 1982: 64-69 for details).

Although the focus of this paper is the enclitic pronominal form *-at*, I wish to conclude by making a few observations about the accusative plural common member of its paradigm, *-aš*. This accusative plural pronoun is found, along with plural *-at*, in Neo-Hittite, while *-uš* is characteristic of the earlier language. Because of the generalization of an accusative plural suffix *-uš* throughout nominal declension in the common gender and throughout parts of pronominal declension (e.g., acc. pl. comm. demonstrative *kūš*, *apūš*), it might be expected that *-uš* would be exclusively attested in the third person enclitic paradigm, especially if one subscribes to Melchert's argument (1994: 185) that *-uš* is «a special [phonological] development of final **-ons* to *-uš* in the anim. acc. pl. of *o*-stems». However, in Shields (1994), I propose that the accusative plural desinence *-uš* derives from an ancient deictic particle in **u* «incorporated into nominal declension» as an oblique case marker and the non-singular suffix **(e/o)s*. Boley's recent study (2002) of the accusative function in Hittite lends credibility to this theory, for she emphasizes a disparate functional role of the Old Hittite accusative which is in keeping with an original broad-based oblique case. If my proposal is valid, then it is possible to reconstruct **o-ns* as the etymon of the accusative plural enclitic pronoun *-aš* since */-as/* would be its expected phonological outcome in Hittite (cf. Georgiev 1975: 105 and Neu 1979: 192). The existence of competing functional variants (e.g., *-aš* and *-uš*) within the same paradigm is a widespread feature of Indo-European morphology — a phenomenon which Wandruszka (1969: 226) calls «paradigmatic polymorphy» (see Shields 1982: 33-62).

Anatolian languages present numerous problems for comparative linguists. However, despite the interpretative challenges which they offer, these languages «have had serious repercussions in Indo-European studies» (Boley 2002: 124), shaping the fundamental views of many Indo-Europeanists about the essence of the proto-language itself. Although my explanation of the etymology of the Hittite third person enclitic pronoun(s) in *-at* cannot be proven absolutely correct, I believe it, at least, demonstrates once again that the data are consistent with the interpretation of Hittite as an archaic Indo-European language⁶.

Kenneth Shields, Jr.
Department of English
Millersville University
Millersville, Pennsylvania 17601
USA

in this language through the generalization of the non-singular form. Most certainly, a nominative-accusative singular neuter pronominal ending in **-Te/o* is quite unexpected from a comparative Indo-European perspective.

⁶ On additional shared archaic features of Hittite and Germanic languages, see Shields (1984, 1995a, 1995b, 1996, 2000).

REFERENCES

- Adrados, Francisco, 1985, «Der Ursprung der grammatischen Kategorien des Indoeuropäischen». In *Grammatische Kategorien: Funktion und Geschichte*, eds. B. Schlerath & V. Rittner, Wiesbaden, 1-52.
- , 1987, «Binary and Multiple Oppositions in the History of Indo-European». In *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald*, eds. G. Cardona & N. Zide, Tübingen, 1-10.
- Boley, Jacqueline, 2002, «The Function of the Accusative in Hittite and Its Implications for PIE». *Indogermanische Forschungen* 107, 124-151.
- Bomhard, Alan, 1988, «The Prehistoric Development of the Athematic Verbal Endings in Proto-Indo-European». In *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwartz*, ed. Y. Arbeitman, Louvain-la-Neuve, 475-488.
- Burrow, T., 1973, *The Sanskrit Language*. Rev. ed. London.
- Erhart, Adolf, 1970, *Studien zur indoeuropäischen Morphologie*. Brno.
- Friedrich, Johannes, 1974, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch I*. 2nd ed. Heidelberg.
- Gamkrelidze, Thomas & Vjačeslav Ivanov, 1995, *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*, trans. J. Nichols. Berlin.
- Georgiev, V. I., 1975, «Die Eigentümlichkeiten der hethitischen Nominalflexion». In *Flexion und Wortbildung*, ed. H. Rix, Wiesbaden, 104-119.
- Kronasser, Heinz, 1956, *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*. Heidelberg.
- Kurylowicz, Jerzy, 1964, *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg.
- Lehmann, Winfred, 1974, *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin.
- Melchert, H. Craig, 1994, *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam.
- , 2000, «Aspects of Cuneiform Luvian Nominal Inflection». In *The Asia Minor Connexion: Studies on the Pre-Greek Languages in Memory of Charles Carter*, ed. Y. Arbeitman, Leuven, 173-183.
- Neu, Erich, 1979, «Einige Überlegungen zu den hethitischen Kasusendungen». In *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, eds. E. Neu & W. Meid, Innsbruck, 177-196.
- , 1989, «Zum Alter der personifizierenden *-ant*-Bildung des Hethitischen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der indogermanischen Genuskategorie». *Historische Sprachforschung* 102, 1-15.
- Oettinger, N., 2001, «Neue Gedanken über das *-nt*-Suffix». In *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch. Anatolico e indoeuropeo (Atten des Kolloquiums der indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Pavia, 22.-25. September 1998)*, eds. O. Carruba & W. Meid, Innsbruck, 311-315.
- Samuels, M. L., 1972, *Linguistic Evolution: With Special Reference to English*. Cambridge.
- Schmalstieg, William, 1974, «Some Morphological Implications of the Indo-European Passage of **-oN* to **-ō*». *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 88, 187-198.
- , 1977, «Speculations on the Development of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection». *Folia Linguistica* 10, 109-149.
- Shields, Kenneth, 1982, *Indo-European Noun Inflection: A Developmental History*. University Park.
- , 1984, «The West Germanic Second Person Singular Verb Ending *-st*». *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 95, 405-410.
- , 1985, «Speculations about the Indo-European Cardinals, 5-10». *Diachronica* 2, 189-200.
- , 1991/2, «The Emergence of the Non-Singular Category in Indo-European». *Lingua Posnaniensis* 34, 75-82.
- , 1992, *A History of Indo-European Verb Morphology*. Amsterdam.
- , 1994, «On the Origin of the Hittite Accusative Plural Suffix *-uš*». *Hethitica* 12, 79-85.
- , 1995a, «Germanic Locative Adverbs in **-ōn-*». *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures* 7, 51-58.
- , 1995b, «The Indo-European Sources of the West Germanic Second Person Singular Preterite». *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 96, 1-7.

-
- , 1996, «Old High German 1st Pl. *-mēs*». *International Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis* 1, 283-292.
- , 1997, «Old English 'Einheitsplural': An Archaism?». *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 53, 11-19.
- , 2000, «Germanic Dative Personal Pronouns in **-s*». *Folia Linguistica Historica* 21, 25-35.
- , 2001, «On the Origin of Old English *uncet* and *incet*». *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 102, 211-216.
- Sihler, Andrew, 1995, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York.
- Sturtevant, Edgar, 1933, *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Philadelphia.
- , 1951, *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Rev. ed. New Haven.
- Wandruszka, Mario, 1969, «Polymorphie und Polysemie». In *Festschrift für Hugo Moser*, eds. U. Engel, P. Grebe & H. Rupp, Düsseldorf, 218-232.