

## Hittite *hi*-Verbs from Adverbs

Jasanoff (2003: 91ff.) derives Hittite *hi*-verbs with stems in *-i-* from a PIE class of *i*-presents with either *\*é/zero* or *\*ē/é* ablaut, formed exclusively to roots of the shape *\*C(C)eH-*. For alternate accounts see among others Oettinger (2001: 80-83) and Hajnal (to appear). Whether or not Jasanoff's analysis is correct for PIE, his claim (2003: 116<sup>60</sup>) that Hittite *āppai-* 'be finished' is of unknown etymology and doubtfully a member of the *hi*-verbs in *-i-* is not remotely credible. The inflection of the verb (understandably limited to the third person) is indisputably the same as that of *dāi/tianzi* 'put' and other *hi*-verbs in *-i-*. There is also no doubt that it is derived from the adverb *āppa* in the sense 'after, (temporally) behind' (thus 'over and done with'), as seen by Sturtevant (1932: 2-3 et aliter), Kronasser (1966: 574), Tischler (1983: 43) and Puhvel (1984: 95). For an explicit account of the semantics see most recently Hoffner (2002: 169).

Nevertheless, Jasanoff's skepticism regarding *āppai-* < *āppa* is justified in that none of the previous accounts of their formal relationship are persuasive. Sturtevant (1932: 2-3) suggests a univerbation of *āppa* and the perfect of *\*h<sub>1</sub>ei-* 'go', but all attested such univerbations in Anatolian are *mi*-verbs or medio-passives. One may compare Hittite *paizzi/uezzi* 'goes/comes', Luvian *awīti* 'comes' and Palaic *āntienta* 'they go in' (for the last see Melchert 1994: 198). Kronasser (1966: 574) and Puhvel (1984: 95) suggest a derivation comparable to

that of Greek *ἀρτίζω* ‘to make ready’ < *ἄρτι* ‘just now’ or Hittite *handāi-* ‘to arrange’ < *hanta* ‘according to’, but both comparanda employ a productive derivational suffix, and that of *handāi-* predicts present 3rd singular *\*āppāizzi*, again a *mi*-verb.<sup>1</sup>

Crucial previously overlooked evidence that illuminates the derivation of *āppai-* is available in the form of the Hittite *hi*-verb *p(a)rā-* ‘to appear, come/go forth’ < *p(a)rā* ‘forth, out’. The previously assumed stem *p(a)rai-* is based on a false analogy with *āppai-* (thus Oettinger 1979: 472, Melchert 1994: 222, Güterbock & Hoffner 1995: 134, et al.). The stem *p(a)rā-* is proven by the verbal noun *parannaš* (see Güterbock & Hoffner, loc. cit.).<sup>2</sup> The contrast with *šiyannaš* to *šai-* ‘to seal’, *pi(y)anna* to *pai-* ‘to give’, and so forth is diagnostic: to a stem *parai-* the verbal noun could only be *\*pari(y)annaš*.

Both the inflection of *parā-* as a *hi*-verb and the stem in *-a-* are confirmed by a likely cognate in HLuvian: *ARHA para-* ‘go missing, be missing, lack’ < ‘disappear’ (Melchert 1989: 36<sup>20</sup>; cf. Hawkins 2000: 542).<sup>3</sup> The consistent spelling of the stem as *pa+ra/i-ra+a-* (e.g. pres. 1st sg. *pa+ra/i-ra+a-wa/i*) strongly supports reading the stem as /pra(:)-/, not /pr(a)i-/: see Melchert 1988: 29-31.<sup>4</sup>

The parallel of *p(a)rā-* ‘appear, come/go forth’ < *p(a)rā* supports the formation of *āppai-* as a *hi*-verb from the adverb *āppa*, but it leaves the stem in *-i-* unexplained. The answer is that *āppai-* is not formed from the attested *āppa*, but from an *\*āppi* < *\*ópi*, preserved in HLuvian *a-pi* ‘afterward, further, again’ (for

which see Oshiro 1988). For Hittite *appa* as cognate with Greek *όπι* see already the arguments of Cowgill (1970: 116), Morpurgo Davies (1983) and others against Hamp (1981: 42&46—but cf. 43&47!) and Dunkel (1982/83). Attested Hittite and CLuvian *appa* has been trivially remade after its functional opposite *p(a)rā* < *\*pró*, which *is* old. If *appa* reflected inherited *\*ópo* (Dunkel 1982/83: 84), the Hittite verb stem could only be *\*appa-*, like *parā-*.

A third example of a Hittite *hi*-verb formed from an adverb is *šanna-* ‘to conceal’ (thus also independently Puhvel 2002: 675). Oettinger (1979: 159) posits a nasal-infix stem to a *verbal* root *\*senh<sub>2</sub>-*, but all other Indo-European evidence points to an *adverbial* base *\*s<sub>h</sub>(H)-* (thus with Dunkel forthcoming): Greek *όνευ* ‘without’, Lat. *sine* ‘without’, Skt. *sanutár* ‘far removed’, *sánutya-* ‘distant; hidden’, and so forth.<sup>5</sup> For the adverbial status of *\*šanna-* in Hittite note especially the adverb *šannapi* ‘in an isolated place’, attested in iterated form as *šannapi šannapi* ‘scattered here and there’, with the ending *\*-bhi* of *kuwapi* ‘where; when’ (see Güterbock, Hoffner and van den Hout 2002: 159, following Eichner 1992:45-46, and Puhvel 2002: 675).<sup>6</sup>

Pre-Hittite *\*s<sub>h</sub>(H)o* ‘isolated/separated off for oneself’ versus *\*s<sub>h</sub>(H)i* in Latin *sine* and OIr. *sain* may be old or an earlier reshaping like that of *appa* after *\*pró* and *\*éndo*. Hittite *šanna-* is phonologically compatible with either *\*s<sub>h</sub>h<sub>1</sub>-*

(Schrijver 1991: 218) or a Lindeman variant *\*sḡ(n)-* (Pinault 1989: 42-43), but not with *\*sḡh<sub>2</sub>-* (Oettinger 1979: 159 and Eichner 1992: 46).

As explicated in detail by Puhvel (2004), Hittite *šanna-* means ‘to conceal, secret’ primarily in the sense of ‘to keep to oneself, withhold (verbal) information about’, as opposed to *munṇā(i)-* ‘to (actively) put out of sight’. It is therefore based on the use of the base *\*šanna < \*sḡ(H)o* ‘isolated’ in the particular meaning ‘separated for/kept to oneself, secret’.<sup>7</sup>

We thus have at least three solid examples of Hittite *ḡi*-verbs formed from local adverbs. However, the formation of *āppai-*, *p(a)rā-* and *šanna-* is not derivation in the proper sense, but reflects the *secondary inflection* of adverbs. That is, the pre-Hittite forms of the *ḡi*-conjugation verbal endings have been directly added to the invariant adverbs: in the present third person *\*āppi+i/* *\*āppi+anti*, *\*p(a)rā+i/\*p(a)rā+anti*, *\*šanna+i/šanna+anti*. In the first, the attested present 3rd singular *āppāi* has been remodeled after the pattern of *piddāi/pittianzi* ‘flee’ and other disyllabic *ḡi*-verbs in *-i-*.

The choice of the largely recessive *ḡi*-conjugation for such secondarily created verbs may seem surprising. Note, however, that it is likely that in pre-Luvo-Hittite there were no *mi*-verbs with present third singulars in *\*-iti* or *\*-ati* (or *\*-oti*, depending on the precise date of the creation).<sup>8</sup> While there could have

been some *hi*-verbs with present third singulars already in *-i* < *\*-ei* (cf. attested Hittite *wāši* ‘buys’).

The precise mechanism of the formation of these verbs is probably unrecoverable. For *āppai*- direct secondary inflection of a predicative adverb is conceivable: *X \*āppi* ‘X (is/are) behind/over and done with’ → *X \*āppi/āppanti* ‘X is/are finished’. A similar scenario for the others seems unlikely, and I forgo any further speculation. For the unpredictability of the transitivity of such formations from adverbs one may compare English intransitive ‘to back’ (to move backward), attested from the 15th century, versus transitive ‘to back’ (to support from the back), attested from the 16th.<sup>9</sup> Whatever the individual details, the mutually supporting examples of *āppai*-, *p(a)rā*- and *šanna*- argue that all three reflect the secondary inflection of local adverbs as *hi*-verbs.

## References

- Cowgill, Warren. 1970. Italic and Celtic Superlatives. In: *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*, edd. George Cardona et al., 113-153. Philadelphia: UPennsylvania Press.
- Dunkel, George. 1982/83. πρόσσω καί ὀπίσσω. *KZ* 96.66-87.
- . forthcoming. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*.
- Eichner, Heiner. 1992. Anatolian. In: *Indo-European Numerals*, ed. Jadranka Gvozdanović, 29-96. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fritz, Matthias. 1995. Griechisch ὅθεν—ein adverbiales Privativkompositum. *HS* 108. 195-204.
- Güterbock, Hans G. and Harry A. Hoffner Jr. 1995. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume P. Fascicle 2*. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Güterbock, Hans G.†, Harry A. Hoffner Jr. and Theo van den Hout. 2002. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume Š. Fascicle 1*. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

- Hajnal, Ivo. to appear. Vergleichende Rekonstruktion im Wandel—vom Paradigma zur Funktion. In: *Akten des Gyarmathi-Symposiums, Göttingen, 19.-21. November 1999*.
- Hamp, Eric. 1981. Indo-European *\*(H<sub>e</sub>)op-*. *MSS* 40.39-60.
- Hawkins, J. David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 2002. Before and After: Space, Time, Rank and Causality. In: *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Piotr Taracha, 163-169. Warsaw: Agade.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kronasser, Heinz. 1966. *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache (Band 1)*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1988. “Thorn” and “Minus” in Hieroglyphic Luvian Orthography. *AnatolianStudies* 38.29-42.
- . 1989. New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. *HS* 102. 23-45.
- . 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Morpurgo Davies. 1983. Mycenaean and Greek Prepositions: *o-pi*, *e-pi* etc. In: *Res Mycenaee*, edd. Alfred Heubeck & Günter Neumann, 287-310. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Oettinger, Norbert. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
- . 1986. Anatolische “Kurzgeschichten”. *KZ* 99.43-53.
- . 2001. Varia Hethitica. *HS* 114.80-89.
- . 2003. Hethitisch *utēzzi* “Nässe” und indogermanisch *\*wed-*. In: *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edd. Gary Beckman, Richard Beal & Gregory McMahon, 307-314. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Oshiro, Terumasa. 1988. *api* in Hieroglyphic Luwian. *Archív Orientální* 56.246-252.
- Pinault, Georges. 1989. Reflets dialectaux en védique ancien. In: *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, ed. Colette Caillat, 35-96. Paris: Brocard.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1984. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vols. 1-2. Words beginning with A, E and I*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton.
- . 1991. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Vol. 3. Words beginning with H*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 2002. Nomen proprium in Hittite. In: *Anatolica Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, edd. Stefano di Martino & Franca Pecchioli Daddi, 2.671-675. Firenze: LoGisma.
- . 2004. Secrecy in Hittite: *munnai-* vs. *sanna-*. *IncLing* 27.101-104.



- Schrijver, Peter. 1991. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. 1932. The Development of the Stops in Hittite. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 52.1-12.
- Tischler, Johann. 1983. *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar. Teil I*. Innsbruck: IBS.

<sup>1</sup> The derivation of *ḫandāi-* < *ḫanta* is in any case false. See the far superior account by Puhvel (1991: 106-107), who persuasively derives *ḫandāi-* from *ḫānt-*, the participle of *ḫāi-* ‘trust, believe’.

<sup>2</sup> The form *parannaš*, which is thus far hapax, appears in HKM 26:7-10: *nu* <sup>LÚ</sup>KUŠ7 GUŠKIN *kuit parannaš waḫannaš* [<sup>LÚ</sup>-*aš*? *ēšta*] EGIR-*an=ma=an=kan* <sup>LÚ</sup>KÚR *ku[enta] n=a-at AŠ-ME* ‘That the Gold Chariot Warrior [was a man]/one of going forth and turning (back), but that the enemy killed him, I have heard it.’ Whether one restores [<sup>LÚ</sup>-*aš*] in the first break with the editors of the *CHD* makes no difference in the interpretation. I find ‘of going forth’ an obvious pendant for ‘of turning (back)’. Whether the reference is positive, referring to skill in making deceptive maneuvers, or negative, implying cowardice, is not clear to me.

<sup>3</sup> For the force of the preverb as ‘dis-’, reversing the sense of the verb, one may compare Hittite *arḫa tarranu-* ‘to weaken, unman’ and *arḫa ḫapai-* ‘to dry’ (lit. ‘un-moisten’): see Oettinger 2003: 310-311.

<sup>4</sup> Contra Oettinger (1986: 48) and Melchert (1994: 222) Palaic *p(a)rāi-* ‘to appear’ with pret. 3rd sg. *p(a)rāit* may be a genuine univerbation of *parā* with *\*h<sub>1</sub>ei-* (and thus a *mi*-verb!).

<sup>5</sup> But for an alternate account of ὄνειν see Fritz 1995.

<sup>6</sup> The sense ‘empty’ of the derived adjective *šannapili-* can be derived via an intervening ‘deprived of’. Compare the two senses of French *privé* ‘isolated/separated off for oneself’ and ‘deprived of’.

<sup>7</sup> This notion of ‘separated for oneself, secret’ is also attested in Hittite in the Prayer of Kantuzzili (KUB 30.10 obv. 16): NINDA-*an=za wemiyanun n=an=za AHĪTI=YA natta kuwapikki edun* ‘(If ever) I found bread, I never ate it secretly by myself’. We do not know what Hittite stood behind the Akkadian *AHĪTI=YA* ‘of my side’. The adverb *šannapi* or other derivative of *\*šanna* cannot be excluded.

<sup>8</sup> Attested *mi*-verbs with third singulars in *-izzi/-azzi* (in Luvian *-itti/-atti*) would have still had *\*-yeti* and *\*-eti* at the prehistoric stage.

<sup>9</sup> Indicative of the difficulty in recovering the precise avenue of such formations is the recent English neologism ‘to out’, a transitive verb meaning ‘to reveal that a person is gay’, explainable only via the previously existing expression ‘to come out’, itself in turn by ellipsis from ‘to come out of the “closet”,’ a recently formed idiom that requires further sociolinguistic information for its explication.