JOURNAL

OF

ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS

Volume 8, 1993

Edited by

The Editorial Board of
The Institute for the History
of Ancient Civilizations

CONTENTS

Editor's Note

ARTICLES

REVIEWS

A NEW ANATOLIAN 'LAW OF FINALS'

H. Craig Melchert, U.S.A.

We have reflexes in Anatolian of a word for 'horn', in the sense of an animal's horn and a musical instrument: Hitt. *šawātar-/*SI*šawītra-*, Pal. *šawit(i)ra-/šawidār*, CLuv. SI*šawatar=ša*.[1]

Oettinger (1979: 200ff) derives the word from a preform *souhₑetro-* 'that with which one butts', an instrumental noun to the root of Hitt. *šuwela-* 'push, drive away' and Skt. *suvdti* 'drives'. This derivation accounts directly for the Hittite stem *šawītra-* and Pal. *šawit(i)ra-*.[2] However, Oettinger must attribute the remaining forms to analogy with *watar/widār* 'water' and abstracts in *-ātar*.

As stated, this analogy is quite implausible. There are simply no points of contact between the respective prehistoric paradigms. The word 'horn' would have been a trisyllabic *a*-stem *šāwidra-* with fixed accent on the first syllable, consistent vocalism *ā...i* and a cluster *-dr-*, while 'water' would have had sg. *wádar*, pl. *widār*, i.e. a disyllabic *r*-stem with alternating accent and vocalism and no consonant cluster. The abstracts had simply fixed *-ádar*. Since 'water' and nouns in *-ātar* are *r/n*-stems, the remaining forms of the paradigm would have been even more divergent from 'horn'. There is certainly no semantic link between the concrete noun 'horn' and either 'water' or the abstracts. In the absence of some further factor, one cannot see any motivation for the alternation of the perfectly regular neuter *a*-stem *šāwitra-*.

I suggest that this missing factor is a special sound change of final *-Crom*: namely, that such a final sequence underwent a metathesis to *-Corm*. Since a final cluster of liquid plus nasal is apparently not permitted, *-Corm* becomes *-Cor* whence attested *-Car*. Specifically, nt. nom.-acc. sg. *sóuhₑetrom >*

---

[1]For the philological facts see Oettinger (1979). One should ignore the erroneous presentation of Starke (1990: 400ff.)
Abbreviations used in the article: C—consonant, CA—Common Anatolian, CLuv.—Cuneiform Luvian, coll.—collective, Grk.—Greek, Hitt.—Hittite, HLuv.—~~Hittite-~~Luvian, OH—Old Hittite, OIr.—Old Irish, Pal.—Palaic, Skt.—Sanskrit. *Hieroglyphic*
[2]As noted by Oettinger, it is uncertain whether the second *-i-* in the Palaic word is a real anaptyctic vowel or merely graphic, but this does not affect the analysis.

CA *sówedrom[3] > *sówedorm > šāwadar, but nt. nom.-acc. pl. *sóuhₗetreh₂ > CA *sówedrā > šāwitra. For posttonic *ĕ > i see Melchert (1984: 104ff), a change I now restrict to closed syllables. Following a suggestion of Warren Cowgill, I now assume rather *ĕ > a in posttonic open syllables. This accounts not only for the a of šāwatar vs. the i of šāwitra-, but also for pres. 1/2 pl. in -wani/-tani < *-weni/teni and u-stem adjective oblique -aw- < *-ew- (e.g. tēpaw- 'few' < *dʰébʰew- with generalised accented full-grade root).

In the case of 'horn' this special change created an unusual allomorphy of nom.-acc. sg. šāwatar vs. remaining šāwitr(a)-. Such a situation is ripe for a paradigmatic split, and I propose that that is exactly what happened. On the one hand, the nom.-acc. sg. šāwitran was recreated, restoring a regular neuter a-stem seen in Pal. šāwit(i)ran and Hitt. šāwītran/šāwitra. On the other, the new nom.-acc. sg. šāwatar led to a neuter r-stem šāwatar- (gen. sg. šāwataraš). This stem was now indeed open to the influence of wātar, leading both to lengthening of the second vowel (šāwātar) and the Palaic plural šāwidār.

The rule given above accounts not only for šāwatar beside šāwitra-, but also for the other CLuvian instrumental nouns cited by Starke (1990: 408ff): šittar- 'spear-(point); spindle' < *shₗyélô-tro-[4] and *ištar- 'seat' < *hₗés-tro- seen in the further suffixed HLuv. i-sà-tara/i-ta- /i:starta-/ 'throne' and CLuv. adjective ištardalla/i-.

The rule also explains the shape of substantivised neuter nouns from *ro-stem adjectives, as cited by Starke (1990: 348ff): Hitt. pangar- 'mass; crowd' < *bʰ(o)ngʰro- (Eichner, 1979: 53³⁰); Hitt. naḫšar- 'fear' < *neh₂sro- (= Olr. nár 'modest; shameful', as per Pedersen (1938: 187); Hitt. *wakkar- 'lack' < *wakro- in wakkariye- 'fail'; CLuv. waššar- = HLuv. /wassar-/ 'favour' <

---

[3]For the voicing of *t to d between unaccented vowels in CA see Eichner (1973: 100⁸⁶ & 1980: 146⁶⁹), Morpurgo Davies (1982/83) and Melchert (1992a). One could obviously just as easily derive this example from the PIE variant *-dʰro-, but other cases cited below require *-tro-.

[4]The derivation of šittar- from *séhₗtro- by Starke (1990: 416) is phonologically impossible on two counts. First, the *t would have been voiced after the preceding accented long vowel resulting from *éhₗ (Eichner, 1973: 79ff). Second, contrary to widespread claims, *ehₗ gives ā in Luvian. Compare *yéhₗti > CLuv. ati 'does' and see Melchert (1984: 159ff. & 1989: 40f. with note 28). The attested šittar- may be regular from *shₗyétro- or syncopated from *šiyattar- < *shₗyótro-.

---

*(hₗ)wélósro-; CLuv. *ḫūtar- *'swiftness' < *h₂uhₗdro- in ḫūtarlā- 'servant' (the last three as per Starke). Starke's attempt to motivate the r-stems by the mere function as neuter nouns is unpersuasive, especially since his claim is false that such stems do not occur in the case of ro-adjectives or animate ro-stem nouns: cf. tabar-na- 'ruler', CLuv. tapar- 'to rule', Luvo-Hitt. tapariya(i)- 'determine' to *dʰabʰro- 'capable' (Eichner, 1975: 81⁵) or DImmar-niya- < im(ma)ra/i- 'open country' < *gʰĕmro- (= Hitt. animate gemra-).[5] The special rule of finals proposed above would have created competing allomorphs in -Car- and -Cra- in all such paradigms. In attested synchronic paradigms the alternates have naturally been levelled one way or the other, but there are still traces of the variation: cf. beside the appellative ḫūtarlā- 'servant' the personal name Ḫutrali/a- with the original shape of the suffix (Starke, 1990: 360) and see also note 13.[6]

Naturally, the neuter nom.-acc. singular would also have appeared as -ar by this rule in the ro-adjectives themselves. This is attested in nom.-acc. sg. (and secondarily plural) kallar to kallar(a)- 'baleful, unfavourable' < *gʰalHro- (= Olr. galar 'sickness', a substantivised neuter noun, as per Pedersen, 1938: 46f.). Contra Starke (1990: 356), there is no need nor justification to assume that the adjectival use of kallar(a)- is secondary due to predicatival use of a noun. Since many neuter nouns in Hittite end in -ar in the nominative-accusative singular, the ending is tolerated here despite the fact that the rest of the paradigm is a regular a-stem. Likewise, nt. nom.-acc. sg. šakuwaššar to šakuwaššar(a)- 'whole, integral' (sic!) < *sókʷo-sro-[7] (for the suffix

---

[5]Eichner himself attributes the shape of tabarna- to syncope *dʰabʰrono- > *taprno- > tabarna-), in and of itself a not implausible explanation. However, alternates like ḫūtarlā-/ḫutrala/i- suggest that we are dealing with competing allomorphs, and I would view the nominative and accusative singular as the source of the -Car- form. Phonetically, Eichner's account could still be correct, although not in the form he states: i.e., instead of metathesis, we could suppose syncope of final *-Cros/m to *-Crs/m and then development to *-Cars/m and -Car. This would recall the Latin development *agros > *agrs > *agers > ager.

[6]Substantivised ro-adjectives from bases in *-(e)nt- with the same phonological treatment are also the likely source of the class of Luvian nouns in -ntar- established by Starke (1990: 370ff.) (not all examples are assured, but the existence of the type seems undeniable).

[7]This adjective is most easily analyzed formally as *'pertaining to the eye/sight' to *sókʷo- > Hitt. šākuwa-. Olr. coldo léir 'whole/wholly'

see below). Again contra Starke (1990: 348) there is absolutely no basis for assuming substantivisation and then reanalysis as an adjective. Indeed, since the stems *pangar-* and *naḫšar-* cited above are attested only in adverbial use, it is quite possible to view these as adjectival stems (with Eichner, 1979: 53, notes 26 & 30).

The above rule would also have affected the accusative singular of animate nouns in *-Cro-*, and I believe that there are traces of this development as well. Despite attempts to deny their existence, there are Hittite animate *r*-stem nouns which can hardly be explained as inheritances. Neu (1982/83: 125ff.) claims that the Old Hittite stems *išpantuzziaššar-* 'libation vessel' and *ḫuppar-* 'bowl' show both neuter and animate forms, but he admits that he bases this solely on the fact that they have nominative and accusative singulars in *-ar*. It is time to abandon this prejudice that nominative and accusative forms ending in *-r* (or *-l* or *-š!*) are necessarily neuter in Old Hittite.[8] There is not a shred of evidence in the form of anaphora or agreement of adjectives to show that these forms are neuter in Old Hittite. Given that the rest of the paradigms of these nouns show animate forms, the only proper conclusion is that they are indeed animate. Since animate *r*-stems are undeniably rare in Hittite, their subsequent replacement by *a*-stems is to be expected (cf. likewise inherited *keššar-* > *keššara-* 'hand').[9]

---

to *léir* 'visible' shows that such a derivation is at least conceivable semantically, but it remains a mere possibility.

[8]For example, all textual evidence suggests that nouns in *-(zz)il* are animate (*šankuš alil*, acc. pl. *šarnikziluš*, etc.). Likewise *šāwar-* 'resentment' and *ḫandaiš-* 'heat', which function as agentive subjects, must be grammatically animate, not neuter (see Garrett, 1990). These are facts to be explained, not explained away. The explanations are likely to be varied. None of the attempts to explain the animate *r*-stem *ḫekur-* 'crag' (see Melchert, 1984: 142[113]) as an inheritance is credible, including my own, and the word is likely a borrowing, as per Puhvel (1991: 289).

[9]I certainly do not wish to claim that our prejudice about forms in *-r* being neuter is totally unfounded. It is clear that Neo-Hittite speakers shared a similar view, whence *keššar=šit* in the NH copy of the Laws with neuter form of the possessive pronoun or the eventual creation of an oblique *išpantuzziašn-* to *išpantuzziaššar-*. But the latter neologism is ∧ more evidence for an original neuter *išpanduzziaššar-* than the former is for a neuter *keššar-*. Likewise neuter *ḫuppar-* in NH manuscripts (1 *ḫuppar...šuwan* at KUB XXX 15 + Ro 3) beside animate *ḫuppar* (2 *ḫuppar...šuwanteš* at KBo IV 9 i 16). In general, it is easy to motivate NH treatment of old animate forms in final *-ar* as neuter, but not vice versa.

no ∧

The attempt of Neu (1982/83: 128ff.) to explain *išpantuzziaššar-* as an original neuter in *-aššar* is wanting in several respects. First of all, there is no OH suffix *-aššar/-ašn-* forming verbal abstracts. All examples of *-aššar* are clearly secondary, analogical to a coexisting synchronic verbal stem: *ḫannaššar* for *ḫanneššar* after *ḫanna-*, *ḫuittiyaššar* beside *ḫuiteššar* to *ḫuittiya-*, etc. Furthermore, the only instances of *-eššar* as a desubstantival suffix are clearly collectives: e.g. *ḫunḫuneššar* 'waves, flood' < *ḫunḫuwana-* 'wave'. Thus Neu's derivation cannot explain the OH animate *r*-stem, the first *-a-* of *-aššar-*, nor the sense of *išpantuzziaššar-*. His attempt to motivate the shift from neuter to animate inflection by some kind of vague "personification" is also manifestly forced, and we now know that his underlying premise that Hittite did not inherit the feminine gender ~~can be argued:~~ see Oettinger (1987) and   *is false;* Melchert (1992b).

There is a suitable suffix available: *-(a)s(t)rali-* which forms animate denominative nouns in both Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luvian, as established by Neumann (1965: 82ff.): e.g. *kuttaššarali-* = *ku-ta-sa+rali-* 'orthostat' < **kutt-* 'wall' (= Hitt. *kutt-*); *ḫattašt(ar)rali-* = *ha-tax-sá-tarali-* 'violence' < *ḫatta-* 'blow; cut'.[10] The original form of the suffix is surely **-sro-*, with the preceding connective vowel spread from derivatives to thematic stems like *ḫatta-*. Likewise then Hitt. *išpanduzzi-aššar-* 'libation-vessel' from *išpantuzzi-* 'libation'. It is likely that the original function of **-sro-* is to form adjectives of appurtenance 'of/pertaining to x', which are then substantivised (Hitt. *šakuwaššar(a)-* 'whole, integral' would show the original adjectival value).[11] The formal coincidence between this **-sro-* which forms adjectives of appurtenance and that which forms feminines in Anatolian (Hitt. *ḫaššu-šš(a)ra-* 'queen' < *ḫaššu-* 'king')

---

[10]These nouns show animate stems in *-s(t)r(a)-* with "*i*-motion", for which see Starke (1990: 59ff.). The *-t-* in some examples is epenthetic, as seen by Neumann. The original cluster **-sr-* is also shown by the regular gemination of the **-s-* next to sonorant: cf. **gʰĕsr-* 'hand' > Hitt. *keliš(ša)r-* and CLuv. *iš(ša)r(i)-*. The attempt by Starke (1990: 384ff.) to deny Neumann's analysis in favor of neuter stems in *-štar* (sic!) is patently false, as is obvious already from the incredible distortion of the philological evidence which he must make in order to justify the fictitious neuters in *-štar*. See my review to appear in *Historische Sprachforschung*.

[11]Neumann's explanation of the suffix as a secondary thematisation of *-eššar*, quite thinkable for the Luvian, is problematic for the Hittite, for the reasons cited above.

is strikingly reminiscent of the two values of the "ǧŕā-" -suffix *-ih₂-, but I would not care to affirm that the two forms of *-sro- are necessarily the same.

By the rule as formulated above the accusative singular in *-srom would have resulted in -ššar. I propose to explain the nominative singular in -ar in similar fashion by generalising the rule: final *-Cros/m > *-Cars/m > -Car. I know of no evidence against the assumption that in CA a final sequence of *-Vrs was simplified to -r. Hitt. haštērz(a) 'star' < *h₂stēr shows -rz (/- rts/) from a secondary final *-r+s, but the final -s may easily have been added at any stage of pre-Hittite after the simplification I assume here.[12]

The animate r-stem ḫūppar- 'bowl' may similarly be derived from a substantivised ro-stem *ḫélóupro-. Puhvel (1991: 391), following Čop, compares Grk. ἵπνος and the Germanic words for 'oven'. The root comparison is surely correct, but an original neuter r/n-stem is unlikely for the Hittite. The lack of any trace of the oblique stem in *-n- is not a compelling argument, but the animate forms of the stem in OH are. It is instructive to compare the case of the real r/n-stem *h₃épr/h₃pén-. As per Oettinger (1981: 148f., contra Puhvel, 1991: 125), the oblique stem survives only in the synchronically isolated adjective ḫappenant- 'rich'. The noun ḫappar- 'transaction' is now an r-stem, but it notably remains neuter![13]

I began this discussion with a PIE instrumental noun in *-tro-. Its partial appearance in Anatolian as a stem in -(t)tar raises the question of the fate of the parallel suffix *-tlo-. I believe there is evidence to suggest that it was subject to the same rule: *-Clos/m >*-Cols/m > -Cal. The best example is the Hittite noun šiyat(t)al- 'missile, spear' < (virtual) *shₗyo-tlo- *'that with which one throws, the thing thrown'. The attempt of Starke (1990: 220ff.) to explain away this word as attested in the manuscripts in favour of a non-existent **siyatrit- is totally unconvincing and unnecessary. Contra Starke, the

[12]In an imperative second singular such as kar(a)š 'cut!' the final /-rs/ obviously is maintained by analogy to the rest of the verbal paradigm.
[13]The ro-stem *h₂éupro- is also shown by the characteristic variation seen in the certain derivative ᴸᵁḫuprala- (KBo III 34 ii 15 etc.) beside [ᴸᵁ ḫ]upparla-/ḫupparala- (KUB XL 88 iv 3 & 9) 'bowl-attendant' (or sim.) and in the likely derivative ḫupparattiyat(i)- beside ᵁᶻᵁḫuppart(i)- 'pelvis' (cf. Starke, 1990: 323¹¹³⁶, and Puhvel, 1991: 392).

derivation above (first proposed by E. Forrer) is morphologically impeccable, and now with our special rule of finals also phonologically straightforward.

Extending our rule to include final *-Clos/m also permits explanation of the base *ḫannital- of ḫannitalwa(n)- 'opponent at law', which has caused so much difficulty (see Oettinger, 1982: 174⁴⁷; Puhvel, 1991: 88). The stem *ḫannital- would represent the regular outcome of a noun in *-etlom *'that by which one litigates' > 'lawsuit' (for the original sense of the verb see Puhvel, 1991: 77ff.). The voicing of the *-t- and change of *ĕ to i would be the same as in šāwitra- above (in this case the vocalism of the closed-syllable allomorph has been generalised). In this example the *-tlo- suffix is as expected added directly to a verbal stem. I would also explain the unusual base *annital- of annitalwātar 'capacity to be a mother' as a secondary denominative use of the same suffix: *annital- *'means of being a mother'. It may not be accidental that *anitalwa(n)- rhymes with ḫannitalwa(n)-.

Finally, although there is insufficient evidence to be certain, it is possible that the varying forms of šuppal(a)- 'animal' (acc. sg. šuppal at KUB XXXVI 55 ii 30, coll. pl. šuppala, but elsewhere animate šuppal(a)-) reflect a similar treatment of a stem *suplo- *'supine' (see Watkins, 1973: 397).

Whatever the status of this last example, there seems more than ample evidence for a special rule by which final sequences *-Cros/m and *-Clos/m appear in Hittite, Luvian and Palaic as -Car and -Cal. This rule accounts for a number of otherwise unexpected r- and l-stems in these languages and variations in their paradigms. In the absence of solid evidence for such stem types in Lycian and Lydian, we cannot determine whether this rule is already Common Anatolian or an innovation of the three languages named above.

REFERENCES

Eichner, Heiner
    1973 "Die Etymologie von heth. mēḫur", MSS 31.53-107.
    1975 "Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbums", Flexion und Wortbildung, ed. H. Rix. 71-103, Wiesbaden.
    1979 "Hethitisch gĕnuššuš, ginuššil, ginuššin", Hethitisch und Indogermanisch, edd. Erich Neu and Wolfgang Meid, 41-62, Innsbruck.

1980 "Phonetik und Lautgesetze des Hethitischen—ein Weg zur ihrer Entschlüsselung", *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie,* ed. Manfred Mayhofer et al., 120-165, Wiesbaden.

Garrett, Andrew

1990 "The origin of NP split ergativity", *Lg* 66.261-296.

Melchert, H. Craig

1984 *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology,* Göttingen.

1989 "New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses", *HS* 102.23-45.

1992a "The Middle Voice in Lycian", *HS* (in press).

1992b "Relative Chronology and Anatolian: the Vowel System", *Rekonstruktion und Relative Chronologie (Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden),* edd. R. Beekes et al., 41-53, Innsbruck.

Morpurgo Davies, Anna

1982/83 "Dentals, rhotacism and verbal endings in the Luwian languages", *KZ* 96.245-270.

Neu, Erich

1982/83 "Zum Genus hethitischer *r*-Stämme", *Festschrift G. Ivănescu,* 125-130, Iasi.

Neumann, Gunter

1965 "Das hieroglyphen-luwische Nominalsuffix -*str*-", *Sprache* 11.82-88.

Oettinger, Norbert

1979 "*šayitra*- 'Horn', eine hethitische *-*tro*-Bildung", *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch,* edd. Erich Neu and Wolfgang Meid, 197-204, Innsbruck.

1981 "Hethitisch *ganenant*- 'gebeugt, durstig'. Ein Beitrag zur Heteroklisie", *MSS* 40.143-154.

1982 "Reste von *e*-Hochstufe im Formans hethitischer *n*-Stamme einschliesslich des '*umna*'-Suffixes", *Investigationes Philologicae et Comparativae. Gedenkschrift fur H. Kronasser,* ed. Erich Neu, 162-177, Wiesbaden.

1987 "Bemerkungen zur anatolischen *i*-motion und Genusfrage", *KZ* 100.35-43.

Pedersen, Holger

1938 *Hittitsch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen,* Copenhagen.

Puhvel, Jaan

1991 *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Words Beginning with H,* Berlin/New York.

Starke, Frank

1990 *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (*StBoT* 31). Wiesbaden.

Watkins, Calvert

1973 *Latin suppus. Papers on Italic topics presented to James Wilson Poultney* (*JIES* 1/3). 394-399.