

OSWALD SZEMERÉNYI

PALAIC AND THE INDO-EUROPEAN LARYNGEALS

1. As is known, the laryngeal theory, gradually built up by de Saussure, Möller, and Cuny¹, received unexpected confirmation when, in 1927, Kuryłowicz² discovered that Hittite *h* reflected the second, *a*-colouring, laryngeal, cf. Hitt. *hanlezzi*- 'first': Lat. *ante*, *anterior*³. It is less well known that the view that Hittite *h* also reflects the third, *o*-colouring, laryngeal is due to Cuny⁴.

These two propositions are part and parcel of the widely held three-laryngeal variety of the laryngeal theory, but must be accommodated in the other varieties also which operate with two or more original laryngeals. Less clear is whether the spelling variation between *h* and *hh* in Hittite orthography has, as some believe, phonological significance, or not, that is whether in the Hittite synchrony two laryngeals are distinguished or not. Even less clear is the situation in Luwian⁵.

2. In these circumstances, the participants of the Indo-Europeanist conference, held at Regensburg in the autumn of 1973, listened with considerable interest to the promise held out by Harvard's Calvert Watkins: "Heute, sechsundvierzig Jahre nach der Veröffentlichung des Aufsatzes von Kuryłowicz, will ich das zweite direkte Zeugnis eines Laryngals als selbständiges Phonem in einer indogermanischen Sprache vorlegen. Die Sprache ist Palaisch" (1975: 358). Watkins produced several pieces of evidence in support of his claim. In view of the significance of the claim, all deserve careful consideration.

(a) An important piece of evidence is supplied by the thematic adjective *askumauwa*- which occurs in two forms: *as-ku-ma-a-u-wa-as* (twice) and *as-ku-ma-a-u-wa-ga* (once). The latter form is the Palaic rendering of the Hittite *uzusuppa* 'ritually clean, holy (meat-pieces)', and is thus defined as the neuter plural of an adjective also meaning 'clean (= kosher), holy'⁶. Following Carruba's interpretation (1970: 53;

(1) For an evaluation of their contributions see Szemerényi 1973: 3-15.

(2) All friends and admirers of Jerzy Kuryłowicz will learn with a sense of irredeemable loss that the master departed this life on 28th January, 1978.

(3) See Szemerényi 1973: 17.

(4) See Szemerényi, *l.c.*

(5) Cf. Laroche 1959: 131.

(6) Although not germane to the question at issue, I should mention that the central part *-kuma-* is no doubt identical with Luw. *kumma*- 'sacré, pur, tabou' which Laroche

1972: 46), Watkins assumes that *askumauwaga* and *askumauwas* are both nom.-acc. pl. forms (1975: 360) but it is clearly unacceptable that both the inanimate and animate forms should be used with this function. There can be little doubt that Kammenhuber rightly interprets (1973: 56) the line KBo XIX 152 Vs. 14'

askumauwas hanla tilila hari

as one sentence, the first word being a dat.-loc. pl. construed with *hanla* 'opposite' (= Hitt. *menahhanda*) and *hari* a 3. sg. pres. *active* meaning 'places' or sim., so that the whole sentence means

"dem kultisch reinen (Fleisch)
gegenüber plazierte er die *tilila*".

This means that the two forms do not present the same case in different genders but rather, as could be expected in the light of Hitt. *uzvusuppa*, the acc. and dat. pl. forms of the neuter.

But the question is: how does Watkins explain the difference between *askumauwa-* and *askumauwaga*? He notes first of all (360) that the normal form of the nom.-acc. of the neuter plural ends in *-a*, and for this a sizeable group of examples can be quoted indeed⁷. But he also notes that in one solitary instance (*har-ki-i-na-sa-a*) Carruba finds scriptio plena of the ending, "obwohl die Worttrennung nicht letztlich sicher ist". From all this Watkins concludes that the morphological category of the neuter plural normally appears spelt *-a*, but (once each) *-a-a* and *-a-ga* as well.

Watkins marshals a few more instances of a similar variation (to which we shall return further on) and arguing (362) that the scribes must have tried to express some phonetic reality suggests that "wir in dem palaischen *-g-* die direkte Fortsetzung eines Laryngals haben, und zwar des vertrauten *H₂*, das gerade in diesen drei⁸ morphologischen Kategorien seit indogermanischer Zeit zu Hause war".

As is known, in 1879, exactly a century ago, H. Möller interpreted the feminine stem-ending *-ā-* as representing an earlier *-aA-* [in modern symbols *-eH-*], and ten years later Johannes Schmidt showed that the neuter plural in *-ā* derived from an earlier abstract-collective (=feminine) formation. Watkins believes (364) that this suffix was inherited in Anatolian in the form *-ah-* which was first expanded to *-ah-i-* (seen, amongst others, in Palaic *warlahi-*, *purtahhi-*), and then to the Luwian abstract suffix *-ah-i-t-*⁹. But the original (neuter plural) *-ah* is now attested in Palaic *askumauwaga*: since the form is normally spelt *-a* or *-a-a*, "müssen wir annehmen, daß der relativ schwach artikulierte nachvokalische Laryngal im Auslaut noch immer im Verschwinden begriffen ist. Wir haben es also mit einem *sound change in progress* zu tun: *-ah* > *-a*, das heißt, idg. *H₂* verschwindet nachvokalisch im Auslaut. Der

connected (1974: 124) with the Lycian words *kumaza* 'priest (ἱερεὺς)', *kumezi* 'to sacrifice', *kumaha* 'objet sacré', *kumehi* 'victime (ἱερεῖον)', *kumeziye* 'autel/sanctuaire (βωμός)'. Palaic has in this case a connection with Luwian, and its descendant Lycian, but not with Hittite. The Palaic word seems to be a compound (as + kuma-) expanded with the suffix *-wa-*.

(7) See Kammenhuber 1959 a: 33.

(8) On the other two see the text further on.

(9) Watkins refers repeatedly (see 364 f.) to the Greek type *πρεσβ-ηιδ-α τιμήν, τιμῆς βασιλ-ηιδ-ος* as being at least typologically parallel to *-ahil-*. But if this type is, as is usually assumed (cf. Schwyzler, GG I 465), from *-ηF-ιδ-*, then the comparison with the Luwian type is impossible. And if it is from *-aH-id-*, then it ought to be represented in Greek as *-αιδ-*, not *-ηιδ-*.

Schwund ist im Palaischen aber noch nicht vollzogen, während er im Althethitischen und im Luwischen schon vollendet ist" (366 f.).

This interpretation bristles with unsolved, even unnoticed, difficulties. First of all, no word is said about the mysterious laryngeal which, in contrast to Hittite and Luwian where it can only appear as *h(h)*, in Palaic manifests itself not only as *-h(h)* but also as *-g-*. More important still, the neuter plural ending *-ah*, which on Watkins' assumptions *should* appear as *-ag*, in fact appears as *-aga*, and again no word is lost on this aberration. Finally, it must be mentioned also that the 'variant' *-a-a*, which plays such an important role in Watkins' construct, has not only the weakness of being only found in one solitary example but is also most unreliable. Kammenhuber originally (1959 b: 61, 74) read *harkīnasāpa* but expressly noted that the segmentation was uncertain. Carruba at first (1969: 33 f.) merely repeated the segmentation just quoted but added that *harkīnasa apa* 'those (*apa*!) *h.*' or *harkīnas āpa* were not impossible either. Somewhat later (1970: 55) he thought that a segmentation *harkīnasā- pa* (particle) and *iyali* (verb) was probable. I would merely note that *harkīna sāpaiyali* ('cleanses'?) is also possible, but to use such unreliable data for far-reaching inferences, seems the height of irresponsibility.

It is quite clear that the explanation proposed with so much ingenuity raises more problems than it solves. It cannot be right. Is there any alternative?

In answer we must first note that, since *askumauwaga* is a hapax, we cannot rule out the possibility that we have to do with a scribal error. But if the form should prove to be correct, an alternative interpretation, already envisaged by others¹⁰, would be to regard *-(a)ga* as containing the adjective suffix (of appurtenance) which occurs in quite a number of examples¹¹, and in all probability reflects IE *-ko-*, *-iko-*, and in our case *-oko-*¹².

(b) A second piece of evidence is found by Watkins in the variants *lāk-ku-wa-a-li* and *lāk-ku-wa-ga-li*; they occur twice each, and although the meaning is unknown, the participial nom. pl. gen. comm. *lakkuwantes* suggests that we have to do with 3. sg. present forms¹³.

Since there are a few more verbal forms with a 3. sg. ending *-a-a-li*, Watkins finds (359 f.) that here we have to do with derivative verbs formed with a suffix which is normally spelt *-a-a-* but twice also *-a-ga-*. Since the Hittite verbal type in 3. sg. *-aizzi*, which in the non-Anatolian IE languages is continued in the denominative type formed with *-āye-*, is not found in Palaic, Watkins suggests (372 f.) that the missing type be identified with the verbs in *-a-a-/a-ga-*: these spellings represent "die direkte Fortsetzung des gemeinanatolischen **-ahye-*", the laryngeal is "in der Schreibung *-g-* treu bewahrt".

We must of course at once add that the laryngeal is obviously "gar nicht bewahrt in der Schreibung *-a-a-*". What is more, the essential element of the verbal suffix, *-y-*, is not spelt either. To be sure, in this case Watkins himself admits that: "Weitere

(10) Cf. Kammenhuber 1959 a: 34; Kronasser 1966: 170 f.; Laroche 1966: 307 f.; Carruba 1970: 3, 4, 43, 72, 76; 1972: 26, 46 fn. 18; Neumann 1974: 281 f.

(11) E.g. *Gulzannikes* 'Göttinnen der Tafeln', *Uliliyantikes*, *dammariga*, etc.

(12) Tovar 1954; Leumann 1977: 336-341.

(13) For the forms and the meaning see Carruba 1972: 47 f., 54.

Auskünfte über die Entwicklung von Jod im Inlaut im Palaischen wären willkommen" (373), but surely the same applies to internal *h*. The assertion that *h* in the cluster *-hy-* was lost in Hittite and Luwian (371), is based on the preconceived idea that *-aizzi/-aili* must reflect *-āye-li*, whereas the existence of *-ah-* verbs (e.g. *newah-*) should warn us of the tenacity of the laryngeal. If Watkins' main thesis were correct, Palaic could be expected to be even more conservative in retaining laryngeals.

Carruba at first (1970: 39, 72) hesitated between a glide *-g-* (but surely the glide between *-a-a-* would be *y* or *h*!) and a misspelling of GA for TA, but later (1972: 47) dropped the first alternative. The possibility of misspelling must of course be borne in mind. But if *-ga-* is real, then it would be more satisfactory to regard the verb *takkuwaga-* as based on an adjective derived with *-(a)ga-* from *takkuwa-*.

(c) A third form is found by Watkins in *pa-na-a-ga-an-zi*. In this case no alternative spelling is attested but Watkins assumes all the same (361) that the "rather strange" stem *panag-* could be regarded as an alternant of *pa-na-a-* and belonging with the *-na/-na-a-* verbs.

There is of course not the slightest evidence for this assumption, at least not in the facts. *Prima facie* more likely is Carruba's assumption (1972: 7) that the verb *panaga-*—of which *panaganzi* is the participle **panaganis*—is a compound of *aga-* possibly attested in the middle participle **aga-ma-*; but the further assumption that *pan-* is the apocopated form of the preverb *appan-* is so unlikely that the assumed segmentation also becomes most improbable.

If Carruba's assumption that the meaning of the verb refers to the movement of the eagle—and then it is surely 'fly' rather than 'go, come' as suggested by him (1972: 7, 55)—is correct, a different interpretation offers itself. We have referred above (see fn. 11) to the divinities named *Gulzannikes*. It has long been held that they have their name from *gulzatar* 'tablet', that is from **gulzatn-ika*¹⁴. Assuming, then, that, unlike Luwian but like Hittite, Palaic assimilated *-ln-* to *-nn-*¹⁵, **pan-(n)aga-* could represent **pal-n-aga-*, that is IE **pel-n-oko-* 'flying' from **pet-* 'to fly', or, alternatively, an IE **pel-n-ogo-* from the original *r/n*-stem seen in Hitt. *pallar* 'wing', and comparable to Ind. *palaṅga-* 'flying'.

(d) One last piece of evidence is found in the name of the Palaic god *Zaparwa*¹⁶ (361 f.). Since, beside the normal *a*-stem inflection, represented by 13 forms, the texts present only once the dative *Za-pár-wa_a-a-la-i* (but twice *Za-pár-wa_a-a-i*) and again only once the adjectival derivative *Za-pár-wa_a-a-la-sa-as* (but also once *Za-pár-wa_a-a-sa-an*), Watkins concludes that the two aberrant forms cannot justify a stem-variant **Zaparwat-*; we must rather assume that their TA is an error for GA, and so we can restore the name of the god in two instances as *za-pár-wa_a-a-ga-*, perhaps phonetic *zparfa'a-*.

(14) See Carruba 1970: 61; 1972: 27; and for the basic *guls-* 'write, einritzen' Eichner 1975: 24 f., 64 f.

(15) On account of *i-it-na-*, Carruba now has misgivings (1972: 27) but this incomplete form, of unknown formal analysis, could have a secondary sequence *-ln-* (from syncope). Cf. the well-established Hittite rule, in spite of *ulne*!

(16) Note that according to Laroche (RHA 31, 1976, 85) the source is Hatti **labarwa* which was taken over into Palaic as *Zabarwa*, and into Hittite as *Zibarwa*. Cf. also Kammenhuber 1959 a: 26 f.

It is of course always unfortunate if a thesis has to be based on two emendations. But in this particular case the data leave no doubt that there are two stems, *Zaparwa-* and *Zaparwat-*, and Carruba is right in stating (1972: 48) the situation in these terms. This naturally means that there is no point in trying to squeeze the laryngeal *-g-* into some of the forms.

3. To sum up. Our examination of the (alleged) evidence has shown that—so far at any rate—there is no justification for the belief that Palaic of all Anatolian dialects should have preserved traces of an IE laryngeal, and of a second laryngeal at that. The Emperor's new clothes have proved not just see-through but simply non-existent. Until incontrovertible evidence will be discovered, the evidence for IE laryngeals will continue to be supplied by Hittite and Luwian; the other Anatolian dialects can lend their support to their vote but have no say in these matters independently.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Carruba, O. 1969. Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den idg. Sprachen Anatoliens, Rome.
 Carruba, O. 1970. Das Palaische — Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 10, Wiesbaden.
 Carruba, O. 1972. Beiträge zum Palaischen, Istanbul.
 Eichner, H. 1975. Untersuchungen zur hethitischen Deklination, Dissertation Erlangen.
 Kammenhuber, A. 1959a. Esquisse de grammaire palaïte. BSL 54, 18-45.
 Kammenhuber, A. 1959b. Das Palaische : Texte und Wortschatz. RHA 64, 1-92.
 Kammenhuber, A. 1973. Review of Carruba 1970. Kratylos 16, 54-60.
 Kronasser, H. 1966. Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache I, Wiesbaden.
 Laroche, E. 1959. Dictionnaire de la langue louvite, Paris.
 Laroche, E. 1966. Les noms des Hittites, Paris.
 Laroche, E. 1974. La stèle trilingue de Xanthos. CRAI 1974, 115-125.
 Leumann, M. 1977. Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, Munich.
 Neumann, G. 1974. Hethitisch *nega-* 'die Schwester', in : Gedenkschrift H. Güntert 279-283.
 Szemerényi, O. 1973. La théorie des laryngales de Saussure à Kuryłowicz et à Benveniste. BSL 68, 1-25.
 Tovar, A. 1954. El sufijo *-ko-* indo-europeo y circum-indo-europeo. AGI 39, 56-64.
 Watkins, C. 1975. Die Vertretung der Laryngale in gewissen morphologischen Kategorien in den idg. Sprachen Anatoliens. Akten der 5. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (hrsg. von H. Rix, Wiesbaden), 358-378.