# Hittite Pronominal Suffixes in -*l*

Hittite pronominal morphology attests two suffixes which have been a puzzlement to Indo-Europeanists since the discovery of the language—namely, the genitive ending -*el* (e. g. *ammel* 'my', *tuel* 'your (sg.)', *anzel* 'our', *šumel* 'your (pl.)', *šel* 'his, her, its') and "the indeclinable particle -*el* 'ipse' . . ., [which—K.S.] may be appended to the nom. of the independent personal pronouns or of *apas* 'is'" (Sturtevant 1933, p. 203). An etymological connection between these two forms has been suspected, but no satisfactory hypothesis explaining the relationship has been proposed. Thus, Sturtevant (1933, p. 203) says: ". . . the particle [-*el*—K.S.] may very well be connected with the genitival -*el* of the pronominal declension," while Kronasser (1956, p. 150) observes: "Für 'selbst' tritt ein Suffix -*el* an die Pronomina: *a-pa-si-el* oder *a-pa-(a-)si-la* = *apas* + *el* 'er selbst', *ú-ki-el* oder *u-ki-la* = *uk* + *el* 'ich s.', *zi-ki-la* = *tsik* + *el* 'du s.' u. a. Herkunft des -*el* unklar (Beziehung zum g. sg. der Pron. -*el* . . . ??)." These two suffixes have similarly been connected with the *l*-demonstratives of Indo-European proper, e. g., "lat. *ollus ille* und ir. *tall, anall*. Sie gehören vermutlich ebenso mit lat. *alius alter* griech. *állos* usw. etymologisch zusammen . . . Lat. *ollus* wohl aus *\*olno-s:* slav. *\*olnī* 'im vorigen Sommer (Jahr)' aksl. serb. *lani*, poln. *łoni*; dazu *ul-s ul-tra ul-timus*, osk. *últiumam* 'ultimam', ir. *ind-oll* 'ultra', *ol* 'ultra' . . ." (Brugmann 1911, p. 340). In this regard, Sturtevant (1933, p. 203) says of the Hittite suffixes in -*el*: "As to etymology, one naturally thinks of the IE *l*-demonstratives;" and Misra (1968, p. 82) remarks that the Indo-European demonstrative stem "\**el-/elo-/eli-* . . . probably came to be used as Gen sg/pl Pronominal ending in Ht. . . ." But, again, no definitive explanation of this relationship has been posited. It is the purpose of this brief paper to show how all of these forms in \*-*l* emerged from a com-

mon Indo-European source. Simply, all can be traced to an original deictic particle in *e/ol.[1]

As I have already noted, Indo-European possessed a demonstrative pronoun in *e/ol-. I believe that this demonstrative form derives from an original deictic element since "vielleicht sind alle Demonstrativa einmal deiktische Partikeln, also indeklinabele Wörter gewesen" (Brugmann 1911, p. 311). Brugmann (1911, p. 340) maintains that the "l-Demonstrativa" indicated "Jener-Deixis," "bei der der Hinweis entweder auf etwas im Raum oder in der Zeit entfernter, weiter zurück Liegendes geschieht—wobei teils die Ich-Deixis in Gegensatz tritt (*hier und dort*), teils die Dér-Deixis (*da und dort*)—oder auf etwas auf einer andern Seite sich Befindendes, z.B. *jener, ille*" (1911, p. 312). Of course, in Indo-European deictic particles could be used enclitically, as the

---

[1] Of course, some recent theories depart significantly from my own proposal and its assumption of an association between the *l*-demonstratives of Indo-European proper and the Hittite suffixes under consideration. For instance, Josephson (1967), relying heavily on the ideas of Benveniste (1962, p. 66–67), derives the Hittite genitive desinence *-el* from an original derivational adverbial suffix. In brief, "When in apposition to a noun the adverbs (like the adjectives) would have developed a 'definitive' or 'qualitative' and ultimately a possessive function ..." (1967, p. 152). He does, however, indirectly relate the *l*-demonstratives to the Hittite genitive suffix *-el* since he believes that "both personal and demonstrative pronouns were originally adverbs" (1967, p. 150). On the other hand, Puhvel (1967, p. 238), cf. Sommer 1947, p. 86–88, dismisses any connection between the Hittite genitive in *-el* and such adverbial formations, and traces *-el* to the "extended paradigmatic usage" of the borrowed Hattic ending *-il*—a conclusion also embraced by Kronasser (1956, p. 142). Schmidt (1978, p. 91–92) has "diesen *l*-Kasus bei *šel* (d.h. im idg. Reflexivum; vgl. germ. *sel-ba-* 'selbst') in genetivisch-ablativischer Funktion für ererbt gehalten," cf. also Schmidt 1968, p. 239, while Georgiev (1970) traces the *el*-formation to *ammel*, which derives from *amen(e) < PIE. *mene "avec dissimilation des deux nasales *m – n* en *m – l* et avec une apocope de la voyelle brève finale qui est survenue probablement après la dissimilation" (1970, p. 20). An excellent bibliography of earlier work on the problem of Hitt. *-el* appears in Georgiev 1970, p. 18. I must emphasize at this point that I find all of these hypotheses to be plausible and that I offer mine merely as *an* alternative, not as *the* alternative.

occurrence of *$*i$, the particle signifying 'here and now', in verbal suffixes like *$*-mi$, *$*-si$, *$*-ti$, etc. demonstrates (Watkins 1962, p. 102–103). Meillet (1964, p. 369) points out that enclitic forms are especially common in Hittite.

Such deictic particles were of great importance in early Indo-European because they were the primary means through which spatio-temporal relations were expressed. As Markey (1979, p. 65) says: "At an early stage of Indo-European deictic markers constituted the formal indication of the grammatical categories expressing time, place and person." In other words, the inflectional system of early Indo-European was quite uncomplicated in nature. Thus, Lehmann (1974, p. 201–202) writes: "The system of verb endings clearly points to an earlier period in which there was no verbal inflection for number . . . For the dual and plural endings are obviously defective . . . The number system is defective in substantival as well as in verbal inflection . . . Number accordingly was not consistently applied in late PIE and the early dialects in accordance with natural reference. Subsequently application became more regular, and number congruence was carried out for both substantives and verbs . . . The late development of the number system in the noun is also clear from the lack of parallelism between forms of the dual, for which only three forms developed, and the forms of the singular and plural." Similarly, Lehmann (1974, p. 139) says: "In PIE, tense and the time of the action were not indicated by means of verbal affixes. Indications of the time of the action were given by means of particles or adverbs or were implicit in the aspects of the verb forms . . . tense was not a grammatical category in PIE." In regard to the Indo-European case system, Specht (1947, p. 353) points out that "die Zahl der nachweisbaren 7 oder 8 idg. Kasus ist sicher nicht auf einmal entstanden, sondern sie ist allmählich ausgebaut worden," while Lehmann (1958, p. 182–183) argues that "the cases expressing adverbial relationships (instrumental, dative, ablative, locative, and the genitive in some uses) are late: their endings differ from dialect to dialect; the plural endings for these cases are not attested in Hittite. Sandhi phenomena of Sanskrit support the assumption that these endings are late; that of the locative plural of the *s*-stems, for example, indicates that

this construction belongs to the sphere of derivation rather than inflection. The development of the adverbial cases belongs then to the study of late Proto-Indo-European and the individual dialects."[2] Mažiulis (1970, especially p. 78–81) also maintains that the adverbial cases of Indo-European are of secondary origin in that they were originally non-paradigmatic ("unparadigmatische" [1970, p. 329] formations, together constituting what he calls the "non-paradigmatic locative" (1970, p. 330). Of course, the various inflectional markers of the so-called adverbial or "concrete" cases, "which may be defined as having a primary *adverbial* meaning" (Kuryłowicz 1964, p. 193), were probably once enclitic deictic particles themselves (Markey 1979, p. 66). Indeed, Schmid (1972), in his "deep structure" analysis of case systems, argues that all case categories have their origin in "verschiedenen Deixisarten" (1972, p. 15), although he does affirm the traditional distinction between grammatical and adverbial cases.

I believe that the deictic origin of the markers of the locative case reconstructed for Indo-European is clearly demonstrated by their homophony with various deictic particles. Thus, the locative singular suffix *-i (Skt. -i, Gk. -i, Lat. -e) is paralleled by a deictic particle *i, attested, for example, in "1. i-bi 'hier', 1. i-ta 'so', i-tidem, ai. i-há 'hier', ai. i-va 'wie', ai. i-ti 'so' . . ." (Hirt 1927, p. 11) and in the demonstrative stem *i- (Lat. is, Go. is, Lith. jis). The locative plural markers *-si (Gk. -si) and *-su (Skt. -su, OCS. -хъ, Lith. -su) represent contaminations of the deictic particles *-(e/o)s, attested in the Hittite enclitic personal pronoun -aš (which was probably at one time a demonstrative, cf. Sturtevant 1933, p. 198 and Friedrich 1974, p. 63) and the etymologically related, cf. Anttila 1972, p. 359, demonstrative pronoun *so- (Skt. sá(s), Gk. hó, Go. sa) (see also Shields 1981); *u, attested in "1. ubi 'wo', 1. u-ti 'so', aw. u'ti, gr. ē-úte 'gleich-

---

2 The possessive function of the genitive is precisely one of these late-developing uses. Originally the genitive was the case that "basically results from the process of converting a sentence into a nominal . . ., the genitive representing a kind of neutralization of the nominative/accusative distinction found in the underlying sentence" (Fillmore 1968, p. 8).

wie', ai. *u-tá* 'auch sogar'" (Hirt 1927, p. 11–12) (see also Shields Forthcoming a); and *\*i*. The locative dual ending *\*-ous* (Skt. *-os*, OCS. *-u*) is simply a contamination of the thematic vowel *\*-o* and the deictic particles *\*-u* and *\*-(e/o)s* (Shields 1981, p. 270).[3]

I have also argued elsewhere (Shields Forthcoming b) that Indo-European possessed a locative case in *\*-N* ( = *m* or *n*), which can be seen in locative forms like Skt. *aśvāyām* 'mare' and OP. *schisman* 'this', cf. Gray 1932, p. 192. "A similar element *-i(n)* is found in Skt. and Av. loc. types like *a-sm-ín, a-hm-i, a-hm-y-a*, and in Homeric ablatives, instrumentals, and locatives (both sing. and plur. without distinction of form) in *-phi(n)* < *\*-bh-i(n)*: abl. sing. *melathróphin*, plur. *osteóphin*; instr. sing. *biẽphin*, plur. *theóphin*; loc. sing. *eskharóphin*, plur. *ikrióphin*. Here, too, one must place Dor. *emín, tín*, Boeot. *hein* < *\*seFin*, Lesb. *ammi(n), ummi(n)*, Attic *hēmín, humín*" (Gray 1932, p. 192–193). These forms may perhaps also show *\*-N* in contamination with other elements, e.g., the suffix *\*-i*, with *\*-m* > *-n* in Sanskrit on analogy with the endingless locative of the *n*-stems. A related locative nasal suffix is probably seen in Hitt. *ketani* 'this' and Sanskrit adverbs like *idánīm* 'now' and *tedánīm* 'then', cf. Josephson 1967, p. 137–138. Likewise, a similar locative construction in Umbrian is described by Brugmann (1911, p. 181): "Neben *tote, Akeřunie* auch *-em: Acersoniem, totem-e* (mit *-e-(n)* 'in')." In Shields Forthcoming b, I propose that certain of the problematic Hittite adverbs in *-an* (e.g., *dagan* 'at the bottom') and the Tocharian locative endings (A *-aṃ*, B *-ne*) derive from this same locative-case construction in *\*-N*. The existence of a deictic element in *\*-N* is especially suggested by "die *n*-Demonstrativa *\*no-, \*eno-, \*ono-, \*oino, \*aino-*" (Skt. *aná-*, OCS. *onъ*, Lith. *anàs*) (Brugmann 1911, p. 335).

Now there exists an intimate relationship between locative constructions and genitive constructions in a large number of

---

[3] Since there exists a specifically plural morpheme *\*-s*, the *\*-s-* of the locative plural "can be identified as the plural *s* which appears in other cases, to which the further elements *i* and *u* are added in the two types (Burrow 1973, p. 240). However, I feel that the identification of this *\*-s-* of the locative plural as a locative ( < deictic) element has validity because *\*-s* does occur in the locative dual as well.

the world's languages. Lyons (1968, p. 496–500) thus argues that "in many languages . . . what we will translate into English as 'possessive' sentences are quite clearly locatives (using a locative case, preposition or postposition)" and that "in many, and perhaps in all, languages existential and possessive constructions derive (both synchronically and diachronically) from locatives." Clark's detailed study (1978) of such structures in a wide variety of languages reinforces these same conclusions: "The existential, locative, and possessive constructions examined in the present sample of languages are related to one another in word order, in the verbs used, and in their locative characteristics" (1978, p. 117–118). Moving beyond surface structure evidence, Schmid (1972, p. 15–17) emphasizes the close deep structural relationships between the locative and the genitive categories. I believe that it is because of this natural association of the locative and the genitive cases that they share a common form in the dual number of Indo-European. Indeed, this common form has led Kuryło-wicz (1964, p. 200) to propose that "the paradigm of the dual suggests an original identity of the gen. and the loc., i.e. a pre-historical stage attested neither in the sing. (-s, -i) nor in the plural (-ōm, -su/-si)." The original identity of the two cases in Indo-European is also perhaps implied by the fact that the genitive case has residually retained a secondary locative function which Brugmann (1904, p. 438) describes as "Der Gen. von räum-lichen und zeitlichen Begriffen."

Yet, the original unity of locative and genitive formations is demonstrated by even more striking formal parallels. In the first place, *-s is found as a desinence in the genitive case not only in the dual but also in the singular as well (*-(e/o)s: Gk. -os, Lat. -is, Skt. -as), while *-u is limited to the dual function. *-N is attested in the genitive plural suffix *-ŏN, a contamination of the thematic vowel and *-N (Schmalstieg 1974, p. 189): Gk. -ōn, Skt. -ām, Lat. -um, Hitt. -an.[4] In Shields 1979, I argue that Indo-

---

[4] The number specifications of the various suffixes under consideration here are relatively unimportant since, as noted earlier, number congru-ence emerged only in later stages of Indo-European and in the dialects. In other words, many suffixes only gradually became limited

European showed a genitive suffix in *-i*—a direct parallel to the locative suffix *-i*. This genitive desinence is attested in the *o*-stem genitive ending generally reconstructed as *-sịo* (Skt. *-sya*, Avest. *-he*, Hom. *-io* < *-o-sịo*), which represents a contamination of the genitive markers *-s* and *-i* with the thematic vowel. Tocharian also possesses a genitive ending in -*i*. Krause and Thomas (1960, p. 105) note that a genitive suffix "-*i* tritt in beiden Dialekten bei Verwandtschaftsnamen auf -*r* auf: A *pācri* = B *pātri* (N. A *pācar*, B *pācer*); entsprechend A *mācri* [B *mātri*], *pracri* [*protri*] ... Die Genitivendung -*i* findet sich in beiden Dialekten ferner in einer Reihe von fremden Personennamen, z. B. B *Mahākāśyapi* (N. -*e*) [A *Kāśyapi*, N *Kāśyap*] ..." Krause and Thomas (1960, p. 59) also point out that one etymological source of AB -*i* is *-oi*, and thus these Tocharian forms probably show an analogically extended *o*-stem genitive construction in *-i*. In Shields 1979, I further argue that the problematic Gothic genitive plural ending -*ē* and the Italo-Celtic genitive singular desinence -*ī* are also to be derived from an *o*-stem genitive formation in *-i*. (See Shields 1979 for details.) Thus, the same morphological markers are generally found in both the locative and the genitive of Indo-European.

I would now like to propose that the deictic particle *-e/ol* was integrated into the declensional system of Anatolian in the manner described above. Its occurrence as a desinence only in this subgroup is not surprising because the adverbial cases were late developments and therefore subject to a great deal of individual dialectal influence. Hittite paradigmatically attests the inflectional suffix -*el* only in the genitive case of pronouns, but Lydian shows a related oblique (i. e. dative-locative, cf. Josephson 1967, p. 146) case in -*l* in both nominal and pronominal declension. Of course, on the basis of formal and semantic correspondences, the original unity of the Indo-European dative and locative cases has been proposed by Kuryłowicz (1964, p. 199), who main-

---

to the expression of particular numbers. The original vacillation in number specification inherent in the Indo-European inflectional system can still be seen in the dialects, e. g., in the undifferentiated singular/plural role of the Hittite genitive suffix -*an*, cf. Kronasser 1956, p. 104.

tains that "the *dat.* and the *instr.* seem to have been originally secondary functions of the *loc.*;" so the two functions of the Lydian suffix are not unexpected. Indeed, Hittite likewise shows a formal identity of the dative and the locative singular cases, utilizing the suffix *-i*. Apparently Proto-Anatolian possessed an alternative genitive-locative suffix in *\*-el* which either developed there uniquely or developed in Indo-European and was eliminated in the other dialects (as well as in most of the Anatolian dialects themselves, cf. Kronasser 1956, p. 142) after the migration of the Anatolians.[5] This case-form came to be specialized in the genitive function of pronouns in Hittite and in the (dative-) locative function of nouns and pronouns in Lydian as the oblique-case systems of these and the other Indo-European languages were enriched. Such enrichment is merely a manifestation of the universal linguistic tendency for there to be "as much one-to-one symbolization between meaning and form as possible" (Anttila 1978, p. 55).

Finally, the origin of the Hittite indeclinable pronominal suffix *-el* 'ipse' and its apparent relationship to the genitive suffix *-el* is readily explained within the context of the proposal just presented.[6] The deictic origin of this emphatic particle is quite clear since it is used to reinforce the deixis of the personal pronouns to which it is attached. Evidence provided by the dialects of Indo-European proper suggests, as noted earlier, that the deictic particle *\*e/ol* originally possessed Jener-Deixis. Now Schmid (1972, p. 10–12) points out the intimate relationship which exists in languages between Jener-Deixis and "Selbst-Deixis." Thus,

---

[5] Although it could very well have been the case that a genitive-locative construction in *\*-l* developed only in Proto-Anatolian, the process by which it was formed (the addition of deitic elements to nominal and pronominal stems) was common in Indo-European. Perhaps if the genitive-locative in *\*-l* was of Indo-European origin, it disappeared in Indo-European proper before the disintegration of this speech community. This would explain why it has been systematically eliminated in all dialect groups except Anatolian.

[6] I leave open the question of etymological relationship between the Hittite suffixes in *-l* and adverbs and dimensional adjectives like Lycian *ebeli* 'here' and Lat. *tālis* 'such', cf. Josephson 1967, p. 146.

he emphasizes that the same pronominal form may indicate both concurrently: ". . . so etwa das altindische *svayam* oder das deutsche *selber*, *selbst*, . . . so etwa im Vulgärlatein und Romanischen . . ." (1972, p. 12). Therefore, the Hittite use of the original deictic element *\*e/ol* in this additional function is a natural evolutionary development.

The complexities involved in the analysis of Hittite data are tremendous and therefore alternative explanations are often possible. Thus, I offer my hypothesis about the Hittite suffixes in -*el* as a reasonable alternative to those which have heretofore been devised.

References

Anttila, Raimo, 1972, An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics, New York, The Macmillan Company.
— 1978, Analogy, The Hague, Mouton.
Benveniste, Emile, 1962, Hittite et indo-européen: Études comparatives, Paris, Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve.
Brugmann, Karl, 1904, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indo-germanischen Sprachen, Straßburg, Karl J. Trübner.
— 1911, Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indo-germanischen Sprachen, Vol. 2.2, Straßburg, Karl J. Trübner.
Burrow, T., 1973, The Sanskrit Language, Rev. ed. London, Faber and Faber.
Clark, Eve, 1978, Locational, Existential, Locative ,and Possessive Constructions, in: Universals of Human Language, Vol. 4, Ed. by J. Greenberg, Stanford, Stanford University Press, p. 85–126.
Fillmore, Charles, 1968, The Case for Case, in: Universals in Linguistic Theory, Ed. by E. Bach and R. Harms, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, p. 1–88.
Friedrich, Johannes, 1974, Hethitisches Elementarbuch I, 2nd ed., Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
Georgiev, Vl., 1970, L'origine du génitif pronominal hittite en -*el*, Revue Hittite et Asianique 28, p. 18–21.
Gray, Louis, 1932, On Indo-European Noun-Declension, Especially of -*o*- and -*ā*-Stems, Lg. 8, p. 183–199.
Hirt, Hermann, 1927, Indogermanische Grammatik, Vol. 3, Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
Josephson, F., 1967, Pronominal Adverbs of Anatolian: Formation and Function, Revue Hittite et Asianique 24, p. 133–154.

Krause, Wolfgang and Werner Thomas, 1960, Tocharisches Elementarbuch, Vol. 1, Heidelberg, Carl Winter.

Kronasser, Heinz, 1956, Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen, Heidelberg, Carl Winter.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy, 1964, The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European, Heidelberg, Carl Winter.

Lehmann, Winfred, 1958, On Earlier Stages of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection, Lg. 34, p. 179–202.

— 1974, Proto-Indo-European Syntax, Austin, University of Texas Press.

Lyons, John, 1968, Existence, Location, Possession and Transitivity, in: Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science, Vol. 3, Ed. by B. van Rootselaar and T. Staal, Amsterdam, North-Holland, p. 495–509.

Markey, T. L., 1979, Deixis and the u-Perfect, The Journal of Indo-European Studies 7, p. 65–75.

Mažiulis, V., 1970, Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai, Vilnius, Mintis.

Meillet, A., 1964, Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes, University, Alabama, University of Alabama Press.

Misra, Satya, 1968, A Comparative Grammar of Sanskrit, Greek and Hittite, Calcutta, The World Press Private.

Puhvel, Jaan, 1967, Dialectal Aspects of the Anatolian Branch of Indo-European, in: Ancient Indo-European Dialects, Ed. by. H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, Berkeley, University of California Press, p. 235–247.

Schmalstieg, William, 1974, Some Morphological Implications of the Indo-European Passage of *-oN to *-ō, KZ. 88, p. 187–198.

Schmid, Wolfgang, 1972, Die pragmatische Komponente in der Grammatik, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, No. 9, Mainz, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.

Schmidt, Gernot, 1968, Zu den singularischen Genetiven der idg. Personalpronomina, KZ. 82, p. 227–250.

— 1978, Stammbildung und Flexion der indogermanischen Personalpronomina, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.

Shields, Kenneth, 1979, The Gothic Genitive Plural Ending -ē, Leuvense Bijdragen 68, p. 257–268.

— 1981, On Indo-European Sigmatic Verbal Formations, in: Bono Homini Donum: Essays in Historical Linguistics, in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns, Ed. by Yoël Arbeitman and Allan Bomhard, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, p. 263–279.

— Forthcoming a. Hittite Imperative Endings in -u and Their Indo-European Origins. Hethitica.

— Forthcoming b. The Origin of the Tocharian Locative Suffixes, Journal of the American Oriental Society.

Sommer, Ferdinand, 1947, Hethiter und Hethitisch, Heidelberg, Carl Winter.

Specht, Franz, 1947, Der Ursprung der indogermanischen Deklination, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Sturtevant, Edgar, 1933, A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language, Philadelphia, Linguistic Society of America.

Watkins, Calvert, 1962, Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb, Dublin, Institute for Advanced Studies.

210 Gertrude Street,                    Kenneth Shields
Philipsburg/Pennsylvania 16866,
U.S.A.