

**B^hrġ^hntiáh₂ai*

ᲞᲠᲣᲔᲙᲚ, बृहत्यै, वृ॒ह॒त॒यै॑

Festskrift til

Birgit Anette Olsen

på 50-årsdagen den 2. april 2002



Editiones Olander

København 2003

**B^hrġ^hntiáh₂ai*

ᲞᲠᲣᲔᲙᲚ, बृहत्यै, वृ॒ह॒त॒यै॑

Festskrift til

Birgit Anette Olsen

på 50-årsdagen den 2. april 2002



Editiones Olander

København 2003

**Bʰr̥gʰntiáh₂ai. R̥w̥p̥d̥m̥, बृहत्पै, बॠडॢमॢ.* Festschrift til Birgit Anette Olsen på
50-årsdagen den 2. april 2002

© 2002 Editiones Olander

1. udg., 1. opl. (2002)

1. udg., 2. opl. (2003)

Printed in Denmark 2003

ISBN 87-91009-01-4

Redaktion

Adam Hyllested, Anders Richardt Jørgensen, Jenny Helena Larsson og
Thomas Olander



**Bʰr̥gʰntiáh₂ai*

R̥w̥p̥d̥m̥, बृहत्पै, बॠडॢमॢ

Festschrift til

Birgit Anette Olsen

på 50-årsdagen den 2. april 2002

redigeret af

Adam Hyllested, Anders Richardt Jørgensen,
Jenny Helena Larsson og Thomas Olander



Editiones Olander

København 2003

archaism, it must have been created within Anatolian, patterned on the enclitic forms of the personal pronouns.

⁵ This particle is possibly also found in the British pronominal type with final **-iθ* exemplified by OW. *hunnuiθ* ‘that’ < **hunnuiθ* < **sindo* + *xtV* < **sindos* + *ptV* (thus Klingenschmitt 1994: 248). Schrijver’s (1997: 68) objection, that we require *i*-umlaut and that this separates the British material from Latin *-pte* seems somewhat rash. We may well assume raising of the final *-o(h)* to *-u(h)*. Otherwise we would have to assume that the particle had somehow gotten its final *-i* lengthened.

⁶ Cf. Sommer 1948: 448-449.

⁷ Cf. Ambrazas et al. 1997: 206-207.

⁸ The noun **pot(i)*- ‘master’ may furthermore be found in the (within the Celtic languages) isolated Middle Breton *ozech*, Modern Breton *ozaec’h*, *ozae’h* (Léonais), *ôc’h* (Tréguier), *ohéh* (Vannetais) ‘man with wife and children, master of the house(!)’. On the loss of (originally) pretonic **-θ-* outside Léonais, see Jackson 1967: 529. Probably from **oθex* < **oθdex* + *o-*, thematicized from **oθdeh* < **ots-dess* < **pot-s dem-s*. The existence of a root noun **pot-* is, however, very uncertain. On the development of final **-h* to **-x*, cf. Middle Breton *dech* ‘yesterday’, Modern Breton *deac’h* from **deh* < PIE **ǵʰōes(i)*, in monosyllables, and possibly the comparative ending Middle Breton *-och*, Modern Breton *-oc’h*, if from < **-(ǵ)ox* + *o-*, the neuter sg. nom./acc. secondarily thematicized from **-iōh* < **-iōs*. This would mean that the vocalism of the Welsh comparative ending *-ach* would have to be secondary. Furthermore the effects of **-i-* (umlaut and *i*-epenthesis) would have to have been eliminated to avoid the allomorphy.

⁹ Thus Melchert 1994: 156.

¹⁰ One could choose to see a trace of the **-p-* in the fact that the 2.sg. acc./dat. enclitic pronoun *-tta-* uniquely takes on the shape *-tu-* before the reflexive particle *-za-*. This would suggest the development **pti* > **fti* > **ti-*, but **te-fti-* > **te-yti* > **tū-ti* (with regular monophthongization) > *-tu-za(a)* (with enclitic shortening).

References

- Ambrazas et al. 1997 Vytautas Ambrazas et al., *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius 1997.
- Boley 1993 Jacqueline Boley, *The Hittite Particle -za / -za*. Innsbruck 1993.
- Carruba 1969 Onofrio Carruba, *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens*. Roma 1969.
- Götze & Pedersen 1934 Albrecht Götze & Holger Pedersen, *Muršiliš Sprachlähmung*. København 1934.

The Origin of the Anatolian Reflexive Particle **ti*

Anders Richardt Jørgensen

The reflexive particle, indicating some specific sort of personal involvement on behalf of the subject, has the following forms in the oldest Anatolian languages: Hittite *-za(a)*, Luwian *-ti*, Palaic *-ti*. As the original Hittite form we probably have to posit *-za*, with the possibility of *-za* (= [*za*]?) reflecting **-tsi* < **-ti* before a vowel (Boley 1993: 10 with references). This leads to a Proto-Anatolian reconstruction **ti*.

The original function of this particle is much disputed. Boley 1993: 11-14 lists the most important contributions in clarifying the origin and function made so far.

That the reflexive function should be entirely secondary¹ is hard to believe. The lack of the particle in the earliest Hittite documents seems more to indicate that it might have belonged to a layer of speech not represented in writing in this period.

The particle has now received an extensive treatment by Boley (1993). She points out that the earliest examples are of the type b) below, i.e. the ethical dative use.

Boley gives the basic functions as:

- a) *-za* represents a concrete personal involvement on the part of the subject: the equivalent of a simple dative. (Boley 1993: 204)
- b) *-za* represents a general, unspecific reference to the subject’s active involvement, interest, intent, or mental effort, as the case may be, in the verbal content. Sometimes the particle emerges simply because the subject is dealing with a relative, or with his own possessions or body. *-za* in these cases has no strict grammatical function in the clause. [...] This category in its purest state is the normal use of the particle in O[ld] H[ittite] (Boley 1993: 205)
- c) Verbs with which we perceive an accusative use of the particle. The principal group of verbs in this class are those relating to care of the body or one’s person in general[.] (Boley 1993: 207)

d) Transitive verbs which become intransitive with the inclusion of *-za*. (Boley 1993: 208)²

e) Verbs which have both stative and transformative use, and employ *-za* to mark the latter of the pair. [...] This category might seem exactly the opposite of c) above. The common thread linking them is that the use with *-za* indicates some direct bearing exclusively on the subject, with an active sense of transformation. (Boley 1993: 208)

f) Verbs relating to processes of mind, which take the particle apparently to emphasize their essentially middle character, whether they are actually middles or active. (Boley 1993: 208)

Numerous attempts have been made at clarifying the etymology of the “reflexive” particle, although no common consensus seems to have been reached. A reconstruction involving PIE **s(u)e-*³ is unacceptable due to the evidence from the other Anatolian languages, where we find, for example, Luwian *-ti-*.

Carruba (1969: 45-46) argues that we must be dealing with an original dative form of the pronominal stem **so/to-*. Setting aside the formal problems of the assumed form **ti/toi*,⁴ the precise functional development to a reflexive indeed require assumptions for which we do not have any evidence. The fact that the particle occupies the indirect object slot in Luwian and Hier. Luwian as opposed to the final slot in the “enclitic chain” in Hittite, is used by Carruba as a further argument in favour of the “demonstrative pronoun” hypothesis. Carruba would have the Hittite final position as a later development, following naturally the increasing reflexive function (Carruba, 1969: 45-46). In this case there seems to be no reason not to turn the argument around and take the final position of Hittite as original and the position as indirect object as secondary, a movement which, contrary to Carruba’s, makes sense, since the particle became associated with - and later used instead of - the very pronouns whose place it came to occupy in Luwian.

Lindeman (1978: 495) suggests connecting Anatolian **ti* with a putative Celtic **ti*, which he uses to explain a number of peculiarities of the Insular Celtic verb. This explanation is in itself based on some highly controversial “evidence” from Insular Celtic. As such, it is just a possibility among many others, trying to explain the intricacies of Old Irish. A notable weakness is furthermore the fact that the hypothetical Celtic **ti* has no independent meaning.

What I now suggest is deriving Anatolian **-ti* from PIE **-pti*,⁵ thus connecting it with Lat. *-pte*, used to add emphasis to personal pronouns⁶. The transition from reflexive particle to a mere emphasizing particle is naturally no obstacle. Hittite would then have retained the reflexive nuance of **-pti* also seen in the Lith. pronoun *pat-*⁷ ‘oneself’ from **pot-*, while **-pti* was reduced to a mere emphasizing particle in Italo-Celtic(?).

We already find the originally reflexive particle *-pat* in Hittite. Here we observe a development to an emphasizing particle parallel to the one found in Latin *-pte* (the only difference being a case of ablaut). Hitt. *-pat* is naturally connected with Lith. *pat-* ‘oneself’ and is somehow further connected with **pot-i*⁸ ‘master < “one own person, ie. a free man” (skt. *pāti-*, goth. *bruh-faþs)*.

If Hitt. *siptamiia-* ‘some liquid substance’ is to be derived from < **septm+*,⁹ **ti* from **pti* seems to be faced with serious counterevidence. In this instance, I would have to invoke the familiar fact that inherently unstressed words may follow different rules than the stressed ones. Furthermore, the cluster **-pt-* is *initial* in **pti*, although it will of course always have been preceded by at least a sentence connective or some other stressed part of the sentence.

This explanation is in my opinion the only one that makes sense so far, in that the previous attempts all fail in explaining the reflexive function of the particle. The transition from a 3.sg. demonstrative pronoun **t(o)i* (in a hitherto unknown form of the dative case) to a reflexive dative particle referring to the subject of the sentence is possible, but necessarily very uncertain. On the other hand, positing **pti* as the preform explains both the reflexive nature, as well as the fact that the particle does not possess any case function in Old Hittite. The difficulty lies in the suggested development of the cluster **-pt-* where I have to invoke a special development for this word, arguably due to its inherently unstressed nature.¹⁰

Notes

¹ Thus Carruba 1969: 46-47, basing himself on the analysis put forward by Götze, which Götze himself later retracted (Götze & Pedersen 1934: 80-81).

² The example is *armahh-* ‘get someone pregnant’, with *-za* ‘become pregnant’ (Boley 1993: 164). Obviously originally ‘get oneself pregnant’.

³ Thus Pedersen (Götze & Pedersen 1934: 80-83) and Kronasser (1956: 145).

⁴ This reconstruction, **ti/toi*, would certainly not agree with anything we otherwise assume for the inflection of the **so/to-* pronoun. Unless we take it to represent an

de preussiska gudarna (Perkūnas, Patulas och Patrimpas, se nedan) och de litauiska gudarna som han ser i Malalas *Chronographia* och i *Volynija krönikan*. I dessa verk vill han se en litauisk tredelad gudamakt mellan Perkūnas, Teljavel⁵ och Andaj.

Detta försök att placera in dessa gudar i en tre-delad panteon vilar på en mycket osäker grund, särskilt eftersom våra källor inte avslöjar mycket om dessa gudars funktioner. En intressant vinkel på problemet ger Jan Długoszs krönika från 1400-talet. Här omtalas de litauiska, samogitiska och jatvingiska gudarnas motsvarigheter till de romerska gudarna:

Eisidem sacris, Diisque, caerimoniis, quibus et Romani in errore gentili usi, Vulcanum in igne, Iovem in fulmine, Dianam in silvis, Aesculapium in viperis et serpentibus colunt, [...]. Iovem autem in fulmine venerando, vulgari suo illum Perkunum, quasi percussorem, appellabant.⁶

Det framgår tydligt att dessa gudar har olika funktioner och attribut, och vi kan känna igen vissa drag från andra mytologiska beskrivningar. Först nämns den gud som motsvarar Vulcanus, alltså en gud starkt associerad med eld. Som vi kommer att få se är det möjligt att denna sparsamma karaktäristik tillåter en jämförelse med underjordens gud Patollus (Velinas).

Därpå nämns Iovis, alltså Jupiter, som associeras med blixten, åskviggen och som explicit sägs motsvara Perkūnas. Sedan nämns Diana, tydligtvis en skogsgudinna som troligen motsvarar den förr nämnda gudinnan Mėjdėjn / Modeina.

Tillsist nämns en motsvarighet till Aesculapius som är en romersk gud associerad med örtbaserad medicinalkonst.⁷ Han beskrivs hos Długosz som nära associerad med ormen och några rader längre fram i Długoszs text står att läsa om bruket att ha ormar i hemmet och mata dem med mjölk.

Viperas insuper et serpentes fere singulorum hominum continebant domus, quibus et nutrimenta praebebant in lacte, et gallos illis velut hostias placationis immolabant.

Uppgifter från olika källor, tyder på att ormen, *žaltys*, ansågs lyckobringande, och även idag återfinns just denna orm som lyckobringande symbol i många litauiska hem. I ormen ligger kanske den medicinala motsättningen mellan sjukdom och helande och det är intressant att notera att även guden Patrimpo avbildas tillsammans med ormar som matas med mjölk och han beskrivs som en lyckobringande fruktbarhetsgud (se nedan). Det tycks alltså finnas en direkt linje mellan de funktioner som beskrivs av Długosz, omän

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Jackson 1967 | Kenneth Hurlstone Jackson, <i>A Historical Phonology of Breton</i> . Dublin 1967. |
| Klingenschmitt 1994 | Gert Klingenschmitt, Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen. – Jens Elmegård Rasmussen and Benedicte Nielsen (eds.), <i>In honorem Holger Pedersen</i> . København 1994: 235-251. |
| Kronasser 1956 | Heinz Kronasser, <i>Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen</i> . Heidelberg 1956. |
| Lindeman 1978 | Frederik Lindeman, Une correspondance syntactique entre les langues anatoliennes et le celtique. – <i>Études Celtiques</i> 15/2 (1978): 495-500. |
| Melchert 1994 | Craig Melchert, <i>Anatolian Historical Phonology</i> . Amsterdam/Atlanta 1994. |
| Schrijver 1997 | Peter Schrijver, <i>Studies in the History of Celtic Pronouns and Particles</i> . Maynooth 1997. |
| Sommer 1948 | Ferdinand Sommer, <i>Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre</i> . Heidelberg 1948. |