

unvollständig erhaltene Text ohne irgendwelche erläuternde Personen- oder geographische Namen bietet in seiner Kargheit an sich nichts Bemerkenswertes, doch lassen sich doch einige Beobachtungen abfragen.

Die fehlende Satzeinleitungspartikel *—wa* beim Demonstrativpronomen *i* (N./A. sg.n.) zeigt, dass das kongruierende Substantiv *wanaia* 'Denkmal, (Mal-)Stein, Stele'¹⁾ als Praedikat im Akk. sg. steht. Der Akkusativ lässt sich erhärten durch das nachfolgende Verbum *ša-na-tá* (3. p. sg. Prt. oder besser Part. 2. p. sg. Prt. vgl. dazu A. Kammenhuber, Hdb. II/2, 264) das gewöhnlich mit dem Ideogramm/Determinativ (L. 402. 3/GI² 186 u. S. 105) *SA* in den Vordersätzen der Fluchformeln vorkommt und mit 'entfernen, verheizen, umwerfen'²⁾ gedeutet wird. Die nachfolgenden Zeichen können nur mit grossen Bedenken als 'von diesem Platz' (??) übersetzt werden, wobei das Zeichen des Relativpronomens (mit Dorn?) zum bekannten Substantiv 'Erde, Platz' (L. 201.1) mit Abl. Endung (?) gehören oder als Ortsadv. 'hier' stehen mag. Die Satzeinleitung mit evtl. weiteren Vordersätzen der Fluchformel muss daher auf einem anderen Inschriftenträger gestanden haben, der bisher noch nicht gefunden oder verschollen ist.

Festzustellen ist, dass das Vogelzeichen (L. 128.3), phonetisch *in*, in nicht-theophorem Zusammenhang nach den bekannten Belegen nur in späten Texten ab 8. Jhd. v. Chr. vorkommt; das *wa*-Zeichen mit gekrümmter Mittellinie³⁾ bestätigt eine Datierung ins 8. Jhd. v. Chr.

Zur Ergänzung sei eine ähnliche Stelle der Stele von Babylon in Nachzeichnung angefügt. (Abl. Z. 3).

Franz STEINHERR.
München.

1. H. Th. Bossert, *Bulletin* XVI/64, 1971, 498ff.

2. E. Laroche, *RHA* 68, 1951, 33 No. 18 = L. 402.3.

P. Meriggi, *RHA* 72, 1963, 2f; id., *NOG* II/1, 1967, 61 fr. 21f.

3. F. Steinherr, *WÖ* VI, 1971, 169ff.

A NOTE ON HITTITE *-(Y)A*

The Hittite suffix *-(y)a* occurs in word final position and has a meaning of 'and'. Following a vowel or ideogram it appears as *-ya* while after a consonant it is generally reflected as *-a*. Examples are *KUR IDŠe-ya* 'and the Seha-river land'; *kuenir-a* 'and they killed'; and *ŠEŠ-I-A-ya* 'and my brother'¹. However, note Old Hitt. *memal-ya* (rather than **memal-a*) 'and groats'; and *watar-a-ya* 'and (also) water' where simple *-a* would be expected.

D. Gary Miller (*Studies in Some Forms of the Genitive Singular in Indo-European*, Harvard dissertation 1969, pp. 236-287) has suggested, most recently, that the suffix *-(y)a* can be derived directly from the Indo-European relative **yo-*. Miller comes to this conclusion through an analysis of the genitive singular **os(y)os*, where **yo-* functions as a coordinate (rather than as a subordinate) sentence connective. But, this proposal also presupposes a semantic range for **yo-* which parallels the function of derivatives of the Indo-European interrogatives **kwis*, IE **kwis*, in addition to its basic interrogative role, also functions as a conjunction, as in Lat. *-que* and Skt. *-ca*. Moreover, the same stem has the semantic value of a relative pronoun in such reflexes as Lat. *qui, quae, quod*. However, that IE **yo-* can have a similar wide semantic spectrum is only hinted at by Hitt. *-ya* 'and'. On the basis of Miller's statement, we do not actually have sufficient cause to be compelled to accept the etymology, lacking further cognates of diverse range.

However, Armenian does seem to offer some helpful parallels. V. Pisani, in "Studi sulla fonetica dell'armeno", *RicLing* I, 1950,

1. These examples are provided, for the most part, by J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, I. Teil, *Kurzgefasste Grammatik*, Heidelberg, 1960 pp. 144-155. H. Kronasser (*Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*, Wiesbaden, 1966, s. 77) gives a possible interpretation, where *ša-a* probably stands for *šarna* 'homeward' rather than *ša-a* 'and the house'.

pp. 165-193, esp. p. 183, suggests that IE **yo-*, rather than **kwis*, is the original stem for the interrogative *or* 'who'. Pisani's argument is strong, and it seems likely that IE **yo-*, as well as **kwis* can have an interrogative-relative value, thus enhancing the possibilities for a parallel with Skt. *-ca* and Lat. *-que*.

The North Anatolian conjunction *-(y)a* (Hittite, Palaic and Lydian) is semantically paralleled by South Anatolian *-ba* (Luwian, Hier. Hittite) and *-xe* (Lycian). Although their semantic relationship is exact, the question of their etymology is undecided³. Carruba (*Die Satzleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens*, Roma, 1969, p. 105) acknowledges that their etymological origin appears opaque. However, he cites the semantic pairs, Luwian *kuiš-ba* and Hitt. *kuiš-ki* 'anyone', and implies that both *-ba* and *-ki* may be of the same origin: IE **kui-* ("Lautlich ist eine Entwicklung aus **que* über *-ka* möglich"). This would seem remote on phonetic grounds since the Luwian interrogative pronoun is *kuiš*, not **kuiša*^{3a}.

The possibility that they are of two separate origins also seems remote. All other well attested Anatolian conjunctive particles (*a-*, *-ku*, *-ma*, *maš-*, *na-*, *nu-*, *pa-*, *-pa*) are present in both North and South Anatolian dialects. It would seem appropriate to view *-(y)a* and *-ba* (*-xe*) in the same light until we have adequate cause to do otherwise.

The phonetically simplest pattern would be IE **Hyo-*, which is thus reflected in North Anatolian as *-(y)a* and in South Anatolian as *-ba* (*-xe*)⁴. But, this opens up a much larger question: what happens to initial **Hy-* clusters in North Anatolian. IE **Hw-* frequently appears as *b(u)w-*: why then is there no parallelism of **b(i)y-*? Firstly, it should be pointed out that the Hittite lexeme for 'yoke', *Gišyuga-*, appears with no reflex of the laryngeal. However, one would be

2. The role of initial IE **y-* in Classical Armenian is dealt with at greater length in my article "The Armenian Reflexes of IE **w* and **y*", *REArm* IX, 1972.

3. Laroche ("Comparaison du luvite et du lycien", *BSL* 53, 1957, pp. 159-197, esp. 172) discusses the semantic rapport of *-ba* and *-(y)a* but acknowledges no etymological relationship.

3a. Unlike Hitt. *kuiš* and *-kuiš* do not seem to be in free variation in Luwian.

4. The relationship of Hittite *b* with Luwian *b* and Lycian *χ* (and thus with the IE laryngeal **h*) has been previously well established by Pedersen in *Lykisch und Hittitisch*, København, 1945, pp. 16-17, where Hitt. *bantezzi* 'first' is compared with Lycian *χatawta* 'leader, chieftain'; and "Hittitische Etymologien", *AO* 5, 1933, pp. 177-186, esp. 184-186.

expected on the basis of Gk. ζυγόν where initial ζ- has been derived from **Hy-*.

A clear cut alternation of North Anatolian *y-* and South Anatolian *b-* exists in the pair Luw. *bīšbiya-*, Hitt. *išbiya-* 'bind'. Hitt. *iš-* is regularly connected to Skt. *syāti* 'bind', and the initial *i-* is said to be the standard Anatolian prothesis before a sequence **sC-*. However, this etymology completely ignores the initial *b-* of the Luwian cognate, and Luwian does not elsewhere show a tendency for irregular epenthesis of *b-*. In face of the proposed etymological relationship of *ya-* and *ba-*, it would appear that there is now more cause to take seriously the etymology first proposed by Cuvreur (*De Hittitische b*, pp. 197-198) and reinforced by Sturtevant (*The Indo-Hittite Laryngeals*, p. 51), that Hitt. *išbiya-* and Luw. *bīšbiya-* are more likely related to Gk. ζώννυμι (**ζωσ-νυ-μι*) 'gird' than to Skt. *syāti* 'bind'. There are now three instances (*Gišyuga-*, *išbiya-* and *-ya*) where Hittite does not show a reflex of initial **H* before a following *y-* or *i-*.

That the original morpheme of *-ya* may have had a shape of **Hyo-* recalls a suggestion made by Sapir in *Lg* 14, 1938, pp. 248-274, esp. 269-274, "Glottalized Continuants in Navaho, Nootka, and Kwakiutl (with a note on Indo-European)". Here Sapir suggested, on the basis of phonemic patterns in Kwakiutl, that there was a relationship between Skt. *ya-* 'who (relative)', Gk. ὅς⁵, and Skt. *ayam* 'this', Lat. *is*, *ea*, *id* 'this': IE **Hyo-*. Though Lehmann repeated the observation in *Proto-Indo-European Phonology*, Austin, 1952, p. 108, it has received little support, nor has it been further buttressed with supporting evidence⁶. However, the likelihood that there is a proto-form **Hyo-*, and that Sapir and Lehmann were correct, is reinforced by the Anatolian evidence of *-ba* and *-ya* < **Hyo-*.

There is the distinct possibility that Armenian might well provide an additional reflex of **Hyo-* other than the interrogative *or* 'who'. There is a conjunction *u* 'and' which appears occasionally under certain conditions in Modern Armenian; it is more common in Cilician

5. The lack of initial ζ- from **Hy-* is still best explained on the basis of voiced **H* vs. voiceless **h*. Here one would expect voiceless **h* (= **E*).

6. The etymology is ignored by Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, Heidelberg, 1956.

Armenian (J. Katst, *Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen*, Berlin, 1901, p. 256). The conjunction *u* also appears in Late Classical Armenian. Moreover, it is regularly attested in the earliest level of Classical Armenian in the numeral system where the numbers '17, 18, 19' are written as *ew't'u-n-tasn*, *ut'u-tasn* and *inn-u-tasn* (Bible, 1 Chronicles 24, 15-17). The other numerals do not have the connective *-u-*: *veš-tasan* '16' and *bnye-tasan* '15'. The *-u-* existed only in this medial position after the first integer⁷. It would be derived from a full grade IE **H₂yo-* > **oyo-* > **o-* > *-ō-* > *-u-*⁸. Thus Armenian would seem to provide further support for a proposed relationship of Hitt. *-(y)a* and IE **H₂yo-*.

The suggestion that Anatolian *-(y)a* and *ba-* are related, stemming from a proto-form of **H₂yo-*, seems not impossible. The proposed proto-form of **H₂yo-* is buttressed by the semantic values in both Anatolian and Armenian. The phonetic disposition also has parallels. The further relationship with Skt. *ayam* 'this', first proposed 35 years ago, seems still more possible in light of this new evidence.

John A.C. GREPPIN
New Orleans La., USA.

7. The numbers lacking a conjunctive *u* have the decadic suffix appear as *-tasn* (*veš-tasn* '16') rather than *-tasn* (*ut'u-tasn* '18'). Though the regular genitive singular of *tasn* 'ten' is *tasin*, there is a form *-(y)tasn* which appears in compounds; note *tasan* and 'tenth'. The expansion of *tasn* to *tasan* recalls the innovative Armenian genitive in such nouns as 'name': *anun* (nominative), *anun* (genitive), etc.

8. The forms '17, 18, 19' were sometimes written in later Classical Armenian as *ew't'u-ew-tasn*, etc., with the more common conjunction *ew* 'and'. It was probably from this source that Arm. *u* developed into an independent lexeme interchangeable with *ew* 'and'.

DER LUWISCHE GENITIV AUF *-assa*

Im Aufsatz "Die Genitivformen des Hieroglyphisch-Hethitischen"¹ glaube ich nachgewiesen zu haben, dass im Hieroglyphisch-Hethitischen eine Genitivform auf *-asa*, die lautgesetzlich aus ide. *-o-s(y)o* stammt, vorhanden ist, z.B. *hapatāsa* Gen. von *hapata-s* "Fluss, Tal", *105-vasa* Gen. von *hawa-s* "Schaf" u.a.

Dieselbe Genitivform auf *-assa* aus ide. *-o-s(y)o* ist auch im Luwischen vorhanden. KUB XXXV 54 II 35 liest man *imrassa* DIŠKUR-*unli*, was von Annelies Kammenhuber folgenderweise übersetzt und kommentiert wird²: "zum/dem Wettergott (Dat. auf *-i*) des Feldes ("Lok." auf *-a*). Die Übersetzung ist richtig: *imrassa* Gen. ist durch den Genitiv "des Feldes" gut übersetzt. Aber die Erklärung von *imrassa* als "Lok." auf *-a* ist falsch. Der luwische Text entspricht dem hethitischen LIL-as *du-an* (VII 14 I 2)³ "den Wettergott des Feldes", wo LIL-as = heth. *gim(ma)ras* Gen. von *gim(ma)ra* "Feld, Flu" ist.

Dann zitiert A. Kammenhuber *immarassan* DIŠKUR-*ti* (II 37) und *im(ma)rassa* DIŠKUR-*assanza* (II 14, III 7), wobei *immarassan* als Sg. N.A.n. oder Pl. Gen., DIŠKUR-*ti* als Dat., *im(ma)rassa* als Sg. "Lok." oder Pl. N.A.n. und DIŠKUR-*assanza* als Pl. Dat.-Lok. oder A. erklärt werden. Danach folgt die Behauptung:

"Diese Belege sprechen für die Annahme, dass im K.-Luw. im Gegensatz zu den Schwestersprachen sogar das Kasusbewusstsein defekt geworden zu sein scheint... Ausserdem fehlt bei dem zuletzt genannten *im(ma)rassa*, das in Kongruenz zu DIŠKUR-*assanza* stehen sollte ("die zum Felde gehörigen Wettergötter" = "die Wettergötter

1. *Revue hittite et asianique*, XXV, 81, 1967, S. 157 ff.

2. A. Kammenhuber, *Alt kleinasiatische Sprachen*, S. 302, (in Handbuch der Orientalistik, I. Abt., II. Bd., I. u. II. Abschn., Lfg. 2. Leiden/Köln, 1969).

3. Darüber s. E. Iaroche, *Dictionnaire de la langue hittite*, Paris, 1959, S. 51.