



FLORILEGIUM MORPHOLOGICUM ANATOLICUM
or
HITTITE AND INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES II*

Calvert Watkins
Harvard University

*Presented First East Coast Indo-European Conference
June 1982*

I

I begin with two curiously spelled verb endings, which are to the best of my knowledge unique in the Hittite corpus: the 2. pl. presents har-te-ni-i 'you hold' and i-iš-te-ni-i 'you do', both in the Old Hittite/Old Script text KBo XXII 1 rev. 31', 33'.¹ The latter form is registered, without comment or reference, by N. Oettinger, Die Stamm-bildung des heth. Verbums 59,² beside the spelling i-iš-te-e-ni (ibid. 27') with the more usual scriptio plena for this ending. Oettinger for some reason gives no paradigm for har(k)-; had he done so, he could have compared the spelling har-te-e-ni KUB XIV 12 Rs. 11 (Mursili's third plague prayer).

Are these simply aberrant spellings, with the scriptio plena "in the wrong place", as does in fact occur? Or have we a genuine morphological or morphophonemic variant, like -tēni beside -tāni?

Examination of the text shows that neither of these is the explanation. The variant -tenī is phonetically real; yet it is not morphological or morphophonemic, but syntactic. The scriptio plena of the final syllable in this text serves to mark the sentences where it is found as questions; we have a sort of Hittite pluti, to use the Sanskrit term,

though the graphemic model in Hittite is doubtless Old Babylonian.³

As noted by W. von Soden, GaG §§39c, 153d, sentential questions have no interrogative; in the word questioned the accent is shifted from the penult to the ultima, from the antepenult to the ultima or the penult, e.g. šarranu...išlimū 'have the kings made peace?' The lengthened and stressed syllable is marked by plene-writing. In sentences with interrogative the negation is lā, e.g. mannu lā išīt 'who has not sinned', but in sentential questions (with accent-shift) the negation is ul: qaqqad-kā ul kabit 'is your head not honored?' Similarly Ebbe Egede Knudsen, 'Stress in Akkadian', JCS 32, 1980 [1981], 3-16, who states (p. 11), excessively narrowly, that the plene renders 'the characteristic intonation of a yes-no question.' Cf. also C. Wilke, ZA 67, 1977, 154³ (E. Neu). An exemplary discussion with exhaustive documentation in Boğazköy-Akkadian may be found in John Durham's 1977 Harvard dissertation (Near Eastern Languages and Literatures) Phonology and Morphology of Boğazköy Akkadian §31h and §65. Most noteworthy is the occurrence of the plene-writing in a question in The Siege of Ursu (KBo I 11), the oldest Akkadian text yet found in Bogazköy, paleographically and linguistically datable to the end of the Old Babylonian period, ca. 1600 B.C. The document was evidently translated from Hittite into Akkadian during dictation.⁴ The example, with Durham's translation, is ta-ḫa-za-a te-ep-pu-ša 'will you (really) fight a battle?'

The more or less contemporary scribe of our Old Hittite/
Old Script text KBo XXII 1 was familiar with this Akkadian
usage, for he writes in two successive sentences with
Akkadogram (edge and rev. 17-19)

na-at-ta LÚ^{MEŠ} NA-ŠI-ŠI-DI-TI₄-KU-NU-Ú

'Are they not your porters?'

ka-a-ša-at-ta-wa⁵ LÚ^{MEŠ} NA-ŠI-ŠI-DI-TI₄-KU-NU

da-me-eš-kat-te-ni

'"Lo, you are oppressing your porters," (he will say)'

The scriptio plena of the last syllable -KU-NU-Ú marks the
negative question, and clearly distinguishes it from the
following declarative sentence. The form is what we expect
for a Hittite negative question, nominal or verbal, as in
The Soldiers' Oath (KBo VI 34, Oettinger StBoT 22):

II 44 ki-i-wa ku-it Ú-UL-wa ŠA SAL TÚG^{MEŠ} NÍG.LAM

'What is this? Is it not women's clothing?'

III 14 [ka]-a-aš-wa ku-iš Ú-[UL-wa] li-in-kiš-ki-it

'Who is this? Did he not take an oath?'⁶

Our text KBo XXII 1 does show one verbal negative question,
marked as such not by plene-writing but by the position of
the negation (rev. 23)

na-at-ta-ša-ma-aš LÚ^{MEŠ} DUGUD-aš tup-pí (TUP-PÍ ?)

ḫa-az-zi-an ḫar-zi

'Does he not have you inscribed on a dignitary-
tablet?'⁷

The verb ḫarzi is not a simple auxiliary 'er hat eine Tafel
beschrieben', with Oettinger, Stammbildung 191, nor is it

declarative; if it were, the negation natta would precede the verb immediately, as in rev. 26

LÚ^{MEŠ} NAŠI-ŠIDITI, na-at-ta pu-nu-uš-te-ni

'You do not investigate his porters.'

Our text contains 33 lines of text, continuous but for the fragmentary first two and the last. We find no less than 10 occurrences of the 2 pl. active primary ending. In six examples it is spelled -teni, without scriptio plena:

<u>ta-me-eš-kat-te-ni</u>	obv. 3
<u>da-me-eš-kat-te-ni</u>	rev. 19
<u>pi-iš-kat-te-ni</u>	rev. 20
<u>pa-it-te-ni</u>	rev. 24
<u>ša-an-ḫi-iš-kat-te-ni</u>	rev. 25
<u>pu-nu-uš-te-ni</u>	rev. 26

In all but one of these cases there is reason to believe that the Hittite accent may have fallen on the (or a) syllable preceding the ending: -teni. Four of the verbs have the thematic suffix -ške/a-, which we must assume to be accented IE *-ské/ó- (Vedic -chá-), with the stress reflected by Hittite scriptio plena in ak-ku-uš-ke-e-ši (StBoT 25, no. 110 II 16, old ductus), ak-ki-iš-ke-e-et (KBo III 53+, 7, OH/NS), da-aš-ke-e-u-e-ni (KBo XXII 2 Ro. 19, OH/OS), zi-ke-e-ú-e-ni (KBo III 40, 5, OH/NS), and cf. monosyllabic zi-ke-e-et (KBo XXII 2, Ro. 3, OH/OS), zi-ki-i (KUB XXXIII 68 III 12, OH/NS), zi-ik-ki-i-it (KUB XXIV 4+ Vo. 6, MH/MS), cited by Otten in StBoT 17, 18-19. The verb punuš- 'ask' may be ultimately an etymological nasal infix verb, if it belongs with OCS pytati 'ask', ispytǎ 'investigation'; but

The contrast i-iš-te-ni-i and i-iš-te-e-ni is just as meaningful, and for the same reason, as that of -KU-NU-Ú and -KU-NU.

The very isolation of these spellings in Hittite, even in Old Hittite, inclines one to think they were an isolated scribal innovation, based on Akkadian, which never caught on. It is perhaps significant that in our texts the Akkadogram -KU-NU-Ú precedes the Hittite -te-ni-i endings. But the extreme rarity of OH/OS texts which show actual dialogue involving questions renders any conclusion in this matter uncertain.

While the evidence would indicate that the graphemic convention of marking question intonation by plene-writing is derived from Akkadian, the linguistic phenomenon in Hittite (in these few examples) does strikingly recall Vedic pluti. See on the latter Wackernagel, AiG 1.297-300 and Whitney, Skt. Gr. §78: the protraction of the vowel of a final syllable to three moras, with an accent in addition to any other accent word may have. In particular the Hittite plene, marking length or accent or both, is found only in the final syllable of word or clause, just as in Indic, but contrasting with Akkadian usage (cf. the examples above) where it can affect any questioned word in the sentence. Like Hittite (and Akkadian), Vedic pluti can be found in negative questions: RV I.146.1 ná tvā bhīr iva vindatī 'Does it not come over you like fear?' But unlike Akkadian plene, Vedic pluti is found in sentences with interrogative adverb, to judge from K. Hoffmann's emendation and interpretation (Aufs. 99) of JB III 64,3 kva nu sa

dadhyaññ abhavād iti 'What became of this Dadhyañc?'

Wackernagel viewed as an archaism the pluti of e o to ā3i ā3u (operating on older, 'underlying' āi āu) — '...alte Tradition, die sich ununterbrochen hielt' — and pluti was clearly obsolescent in the period after Pāṇini.¹¹ But the quasi-universal role of intonation features as a cue to signal questions not otherwise marked makes any genetic comparison of Hittite plene in questions with Vedic pluti in questions undemonstrable. Hittite further shows to my knowledge no evidence for pluti in vocatives.

II

A familiar passage in the Hittite Laws (§94=95) reads, in old ductus

ták-ku me-ek-ki ta-[(i-iz-zi me-ek)]-ki-še iš-ḫi-an-zi

ták-ku te-e-pu ta-i-iz-[(zi)] te-e-pu-še iš-ḫi-an-zi

'If he steals much, they bind much on him...

if he steals little, they bind little on him'

The figure of semantic antithesis and grammatical parallelism is clear: to the forms of 'much' correspond exactly those of 'little' in case, number, gender, and syntactic function.

Now a fragmentary passage in a small OH/OS ritual fragment, E. Neu, StBoT 25.23 = KBo XXV 23 rev. 6'-7' reads

ták-ku te-e-pu-uš

...t]i-e-pu ti-an-zi

'If (it is²) a little (nom. sg. anim.) [],

they place a little (acc. sg. neut.).'

The immediately preceding sentence in this text reads

ták-ku me-e-ek-e-eš

... m]e-e-ek ti-an-zi

Neu comments (60²²⁹) that the first form is probably an error for me-e-ek-<ke->e-eš or even me-e-ek-<qa->e-eš, though he does note me-ek-eš KUB XLII 29 II² 5' (v. infra). Yet it is clear that the passage shows the same semantic antithesis as §§94-5 of the Laws, and the same general syntactic structure: 'If much/many..., then much...; if little/few..., then little ...' Syntax and stylistics require full grammatical parallelism in such figures.

The forms te-ep-pu-uš, ti-e-pu are unambiguously nom. sg. anim. and acc. sg. neut. respectively.¹² Purely stylistically, therefore, we expect me-e-ek-e-eš and me-e-ek in this passage to be likewise nom. sg. anim. and acc. sg. neut. respectively. That the scribe would omit the ki sign twice in the same word is on the face of it unlikely. I suggest - somewhat tentatively - that these two forms may represent the Hittite reflexes of IE *meǵh₂s and *meǵh₂, Gk. μέγας and μέγα, Ved. nt. máhi, perhaps ON mjok. See however further below for an alternative hypothesis.

The consonant stem mekk- from *meǵh₂ is well attested in Old Hittite: acc. sg. anim. me-e-ek-kán KBo XXI 68 I 4 (MS), me-ek-kán KUB XXXVI 98b rev. 10, nom. pl. anim. me-ek-ke-eš KBo III 28 II 17, acc. pl. anim. me-ek-ku-uš KBo VI 2 II 8 (OS), etc. The i-stem is in older texts found only in the nom. sg. anim. me-ek-ki-iš (KUB XXI 47 I 15 MH/MS), nom.-acc. sg. neut. me-ek-ki (Laws, etc.), perhaps nom. pl. nt. me-ek-ki-i (Laws §47b, cf. my contri-

bution to the Gedenkschrift Kronasser). Only in Neo-Hittite does it spread to other cases and numbers. (Those in Old Hittite -aš are ambiguous, since they can reflect either consonant stem -aš or i-stem -ay+aš with yod-deletion and contraction.)

We can observe the same heteroclisy in the adjective u-ri-iš 'great' (3x), acc. sg. anim. u-ra-an (1x) in KUB XLIII 60 I 26-7, 29 (OH/NS). It is an innovation, parallel to that of Lat. iuuenis (g. pl. iuuenum) and arising from the same conditions, viz. the morphophonemic complexity of the earlier nominative. It is these earlier forms that I propose to see in the nom. sg. anim. me-e-ek-e-eš and neut. me-e-ek. The peculiar spelling of the former may be an attempt to render something like [mekxs] or [mek's] from *meḡh₂s. The latter could represent either [mekx] or [mek].

This animate form may be attested elsewhere. Neu cited me-ek-eš (reference supra) in a mandatu-tribute tablet; the context is fragmentary. Note KUB XLIII 22 obv. 7-9

ma-a-na-aš-ša-an A-NA ^{GIŠ} ḤASHUR.KUR.RA-ma na-aš-ma A[-NA
Ḫ A-NA ^{GIŠ} ḤASHUR.KUR.RA kat-ta-an EGIR-pa ḫu-u-i-y[a-
me-ek-ke-e-eš kat-ta-an QA-TAM-MA ḫu-u-wa-ya²-x[

'Apricots aplenty'? or singular? Finally, in the Appu folktale XXIV 8 I 11-12

GUD-uš-ši- iš
 UDU-uš me-ek-[] iš

'his cattle-and-sheep (are) many'

it is customary to restore me-ek-[ki-]iš (Friedrich,

Siegelová) but it is possible that nothing stood in the lacuna and that the sg. form was spelled me-ek-iš.

An alternative hypothesis would be to see in me-e-ek-e-eš and me-e-ek reflexes of an unsuffixed stem *meĝ- rather than *meĝh₂-, thus *meĝ-s, *meĝ respectively. In this case we would not have any problem about the word-final laryngeal in the neuter singular (cf. -wašta beside $-\mu\epsilon(\sigma)\theta\alpha$, -mahi), and the peculiar spelling of the animate singular, presumably phonetic [meks] with voicing assimilation, could be paralleled by e.g. ták-ke-e-eš-zi, ták-ke-e-eš-ta to takš- (for which cf. Otten, OLZ 58/1963, 252f., Kronasser, Etymologie 397, and the discussion in the two following sections). The form me-e-ek-e-eš under this interpretation could also still be a mistake for me-e-ek-<ke->e-eš, and is perhaps in the last analysis most easily taken that way after all.

III

It is a dozen years since I wrote a paper on the denominative stative in -ē-, and established the existence of that class in Hittite. The idea first saw the light of day in a letter to Warren Cowgil in the spring of 1970; it is perhaps not inappropriate that I make a small correction to it here at Yale.

In an addendum (TPS 1971 [1973] 93) I included the form hu-iš-ú-e-te-en 'escape with your life' from the MH/MS Madduwattas text as a Hittite stative in -e-, deriving it from huišu- 'alive'. The existence of this class has been

denied by N. Oettinger, Stammbildung 338ff., though it is accepted by various others, notably the editors of the CHD. Oettinger takes huešue- (p. 331, 340) as a denominative in °u-je/o- like kappue- 'count', šarue- 'plunder',¹³ and he likewise derives it from huešu- 'raw; alive'. H. C. Melchert, in the section on 'The vowels e and i in Hittite' of his forthcoming monograph (KZ Beihefte) defends the stative -e- class in general and the assignment to it of huešue- in particular because of the 2 pl. cited above; the -e- before the 2 pl. desinence must be the denominative stative -e-, since -ya- verbs in the 2 pl. universally generalize the thematic vowel -a-, as Oettinger himself correctly states on p. 344.

So far so good; we have a denominative stative huišue- (so spelled, never huešue-) attested in Middle Hittite manuscripts and later copies of Old Hittite texts. But closer attention to the data can give a clearer and somewhat different picture of the derivational history and synchronic facts.

One form that must belong to this verb, though ignored both by Otten and Oettinger, is the 1 pl. h]u-šu-e-wa-ni in KBo III 46 + II 39 = 46 of the whole (OH/NS), the Extensive Annals of Hattusili I, as the text is called by A. Kempinski and S. Kořak in their forthcoming edition in Tel Aviv. The stem is clearly zero-grade, hušue-. A form with the same ablaut is found in the Menschenfressertext, KBo III 60 III 4 (OH/NS): (^mz[ūppaš...]) iš-pār-za-aš-ta

še hu-šu-e- [er] '(Zūppaš...) escaped and they remained alive'.
 The common convention of distracting the last sign to the end
 of the line recurs four lines later in e-ep-pí- ir. The
 phraseology has an echo in the Zalpa tale rev. 8'-9' (OH/OS)
^mHa-a-ap-pí-ša iš-pár-za-aš-ta ^mTa-am-na-aš-šu-na
hu-šu-wa-an-ta-an IŠ-BA-TU 'Ḫāppi however escaped, but they
 took Tamnaššu alive.'

There can be little doubt that hušue- is the real Old
 Hittite form of this denominative stative, and that huišue-
 in Middle Hittite reflects analogical leveling and the
 trend toward elimination of samprasāraṇa-ablaut.

To derive hušue- from huešu-, as I and Oettinger did,
 is both semantically and morphologically suspect. The
 unmarked meaning of that adjective is 'raw', 'living' (of
 meat in ritual) by a metaphoric extension. We would further-
 more expect "Caland" truncation of the u-stem before the
 stative suffix -e-, as before the 'fientive' suffix -eš-
 (miu- : mieš-, miliddu- : militeš-, daššu- : daššeš-), and no
 root ablaut. Were there a stative from huešu- it should
 appear as *hueše-, and should mean *'be raw'.

The obvious derivational source of Old Hittite hušue-
 'remain alive', 'escape with one's life' is Old Hittite
huš(u)want- 'alive', with regular Caland truncation of the
 suffix -ant- as in paprant- : papre-, happinant- : happineš-
 etc.

On this much-discussed adjective see the references
 collected in J. Tischler, Heth. etym. Gloss. 2.265 (s.v.
huiš-/hueš-). Previous discussion has focused on the contrast

in stem, OH ḫuš(u)want- ~ NH ḫuiš(u)want-, under the assumption of apophony (rejected by Kammenhuber), an 'alternation' -ui-/u- (Neu), a 'contraction' -ui-(-ue-) > u (Friedrich), a 'lengthening' -ui- > ū (Otten), or a real Old Hittite 'syncope' rule ui/ue > u which was then 'reversed' — 'rückgängig gemacht' — in Neo-Hittite (Kammenhuber, Oettinger). The motivation for the latter, theoretically dubious process is given as 'Systemzwang' (Kammenhuber), or not at all (Oettinger), and there are simply too many counter examples in OH/OS texts for the syncope rule to be correct.

A much simpler and theoretically more satisfactory explanation is that we have an apophonic paradigm in Old Hittite, which subsequently undergoes paradigm leveling. In OH/OS texts the nom. sg. anim. appears as

<u>ḫu-iš-wa-an-za</u>	Laws q IV 9 (§195)
<u>ḫu-iš-w[a-an-za</u>	KBo XVII 22 = StBoT 25 no. 124 II 8 (benediction for the king and queen)
<u>ḫu-iš-š[u-wa-an-za</u>	ibid. 13
<u>ḫu-]i-šu-wa-an-za</u>	ibid. 16

and similarly ḫu-iš-wa-an-za in the OH/MS Kantuzzili prayer KUB XXX 10 obv. 21, 22, in the MH/MS ritual of Šamuḫa KUB XXIX 7 obv. 31, and in Laws o (copied from q) at §190. Only one example of ḫu-šu-wa-an-za is found, KBo XXV 112 = StBoT 25 112 II 4 (OH/OS), in the same formula in another benediction for the king and queen. The nom. plur. anim. in OH/OS texts appears as

<u>ḫ]u-i-šu-wa-an-t[e-eš</u>	KBo XXV 117 = StBoT 25 no. 117 Rs.? 7
------------------------------	--

]x^{TIM} hu-iš-šu-wa-a[n-te-eš KBo XVII 22 = StBoT 25

no. 124 II 8

The conjecture of the latter, from the plural]x^{TIM}, is due to E. Neu (StBoT 26, to appear). But equally OH/OS texts show the acc. sg. anim.

hu-šu-wa-an-ta-an StBoT 17 (Zalpa) A rev. 9'

hu-šu-wa-an-da-an KBo XVII 4+ = StBoT 25 4 II 14', dupl.

hu-š[u-wa-an-d/ta-an KBo XVII 1+ = StBoT 25 3 II 5'

hu-š[u-wa-an-d/ta-an StBoT 18 (Anitta) obv. 43

The OH/NS text CTH 12 shows further, in two fragments of the same tablet,

hu-uš-wa-an-da-an KUB XXXI 64 III 14

hu-u-uš-wa-an-du-uš KBo III 55 II 8

No other zero-grade forms are attested. By Middle Hittite times, Laws B (OH/MS) §73 already shows hu-iš-wa-an-da-an, KUB XXIX 7 obv. 20 and 27 (MH/MS) hu-iš-wa-an-du-uš, and KUB XI 14 I 12 (MH or older/NS) hu-iš-wa-an-ti, IV 7 = KUB XLIII 57 IV 5 hu-iš-wa-an-ta-aš. Thereafter the word is nearly always spelled with the Sumerogram TI, except in NS copies of OH or MH compositions. Note also hu-u-iš-wa-an-da-an in the Neo-Hittite copy of the Zalpa text (StBoT 17) B rev. 25', replacing the older hu-šu-wa-an-ta-an cited above.

This distribution clearly points to an Old Hittite apophonic paradigm — however we chose to explain it —

nom. sg. huišwanza

pl. huišwanteš

obl.

hušwant°

analogically leveled to either

huišwanza

hušwanza (ḫwaš)

or

huišwant°

hušwant°

It was the former which won out, and was generalized by Middle Hittite times. The new stem huišwant- in turn provoked the replacement of the derivative verb stem hušue- by huišue-, a classic instance of Kurylowicz's first law.

The original and etymological root vowel e (cf. Gk. ἄεσα) is seen in the ipv. 2 sg. hu-e-eš KUB XXXI 127 I 56 (OH/NS, Sun Hymn) 'live!'; the zero-grade appears in the causative hušnu- (CTH 12 [v. supra] and 8, OH/NS), analogically replaced by huišnu- in MH times (Kantuzzili). Whether the i of the latter and of huišwanza are phonetic, or merely graphic for [hweš°], is uncertain, but does not concern the morphological problem here addressed.

IV

The only Hittite primary verb I have found to be missing from N. Oettinger's Stammbildung is nana(n)kuš- 's'obscure' (E. Laroche per litt. 20/10/73), get dark'. The principal attestations are the following:

KBo IX 68 + III 10-11 (restored after dupl. KUB XXXIV 15 and XLIII 2)

na-aš-ta K[(UR-an-ti ku-e-da-ni an-da)]

na-na-ku-uš-[(zi nu-za lu-ú-lu a-uš-zi)]

'Whatever land it gets dark in will see prosperity'

For the date of the original translation of these astral omen texts (CTH 535) from Akkadian, note that the protasis is always introduced by takku.

KUB XII 60 I 5-6, dupl. XXXIII 81 I 3 (=RHA 77, 1964, 19)
19. Myth, CTH 322)

nu-kán KUR-e an-da (dupl. an-da-an) i-da-a-la-u[-e-eš-zi(?)]
[n]a-ⁿra-an-ku-uš-zi nu a-ru[-na-
[(Ū-UL)] ku-iš-ki ma-az-za-az-[zi
'In the land it gets bad [] it grows dark and
the Se[a] no one can resist.'

In broken context we have

na-na-ku-uš-ši-an-ta KUB XXXVI 37 rev.[?] III 4' (=RHA 82,
1968, 28)

na-na-an-ku-u[š- ibid. 18'

na-na-ku-uš-ši-an-[KBo XV 5, 3 (=StBoT 3, 1967, 64)

A number of attestations of the participial form

nanakušši(y)ant- are cited by H. M. Kummel in StBoT 3.99, and
others were provided to me by the kindness of E. Neu. In
some of these a meaning 'dark(ness)' is probable or plausible
in context:

KBo XIII 101 rev. 16'-17'

n]a-na-ku-uš-ši-ya-an e-eš-du [
pí-ra-an la-lu-ki-u-wa-an e-e[š-du
'...]let it be dark; [but] before []let it
be light!'¹⁵

KUB XXXVI 89 obv. 12-13

^D_U ^{URU} Ne-ri-ik-wa-za-kán ša-a-it nu-w[a-ra-aš-kán¹⁶]
ha-at-te-eš-ni GAM-an-da pa-a-it
nu-wa-ra-aš-za na-na-ku-uš-ši-an-t[i¹⁷

'The Storm God of Nerik flew into a rage, and he went
down into a[]cave, and he [] in the dark[ness].'

ibid. obv. 27-8

na-na-ku-uš-ši-ya-[an-ta-]za¹⁸ IV ḫal-ḫal-tu-ma-ra-za
ḫ[al-l]u-u-wa-za ḫ[u-u-u]n-ḫu-e-eš-na-za UGU e-ḫu

'come up from the darkness, from the four corners,
from the deep wave'

482/e III 11-14

[pár-ga]-wa-az HUR.SAG^{MEŠ} ḫal-lu-u-wa-az [ḫa-ri-ya-az
[ḫal]-lu-u-wa-az ḫu-un-ḫu-eš-na-az ḫal-lu-u-[wa-az
[ḫal]-lu-u-wa-az al-ta-an-na-az ḫa-lu-u-wa-az [
[na]-na-an-ku-uš-ši-ya-az el-lu-eš-na-az [¹⁹

'from the [hi]gh mountains, from the deep [valleys,...
from the deep waves, from the deep [rivers,...
from the deep fountains, from the deep [wells,...
from the dark ellueššar,²⁰ [...

The last is not a participle but a nominal derivative
nanankušši-, morphologically comparable to the *lalukki-
underlying lalukki-want-, on which see CHD s.v.

KBo XIII 39 obv. 19-21'

na-]na-ku-uš-ši-ya-an-ti pé-di da-a[(-)]
[na-aš-ma-at-kán MU-ti MU-ti [

'...put in a dark place (the Dark Place?).../'

or [] it/them every years...'

This passage is from a treaty text; see Otten, MDOG 94,
1963, 1-23, esp. 10-12. The wording appears at least in
part traditional, cf. Alakšanduš III 74 ne-et-ta-kán MU.KAM-ti
MU.KAM-ti pí-ra-an III-Š[U ḫal-zi-eš-ša-an-]du 'Let them read
(these tablets) before you three times every year', and the
Old Hittite HAB III 56-57 nu ki-i [tup-p]í ITU-mi ITU-mi

pé-ra-an-ti-it hal-zi-eš-ša-an-du 'Let them read this tablet before you every month.'

The third -n- of nanankuš- is an intrusive nasal, as in tanantezzi beside tanattezi 'will be deserted' (references in TPS 1971, 73); it is doubtless phonetically real, as in my pronunciation of the Uninted States (/yunayntɪd/).

This infrequent and archaic verb is both semantically and formally parallel to the likewise archaic lalu(k)kišzi 'gets light'. We appear to have a morphological mini-class consisting of a pair *no-nok^w-s- ~ *lo-louk-s-, etymologically to the familiar roots of English night, light respectively.

There is admittedly an -ēš- 'fientive' lu(k)keš- 'become bright, dawn (?)' CHD 79 [to which add lu-ke-e-eš-zi (OH/NS) StBoT 9 no. 2 IV 2 (TPS 1971, 87)], and an -e-stative lalukke- 'be or become luminous' CHD 28 [thus adjust TPS 1971, 76], whence lalukkima-, lalukkiwant- (both OH/OS). But contrary to Oettinger 251, 276, 341, HWb 126, and CHD 29, I do not take lalukki/eš- as a 'fientive'; the old causative lalukki/ešnu- 'illuminate' shows that we must have an underlying cluster [laluks-nu-], for -ēš-verbs do not form -nu- causatives.²¹

The same is suggested by the omen-text KUB VIII 24 + XLIII 2 II 10-13 (OH/NS), where the spellings t[a-lu-k]e-e-eš-zi 'gets long' and te-pa-u-e-eš-zi 'gets small' (from tepawant-, Oettinger 241) contrast with la-lu-ki-iš-zi in the same paragraph. But the same tablet offers the spelling ta-lu-ki-iš-zi above and la-lu-ke-eš-zi below, hence is scarcely probative.

For phonological and morphological parallels to nana(n)kuš-, nanakušš-ia- and lalu(k)ki/eš-, lalu(k)ki/eš-nu- compare tekkušš-ie- 'show (intr.), appear; give a sign (?)' (correctly on the meaning Oettinger StBoT 22.54) from IE *dek^ws- in Avestan daxš- 'teach', an etymology I owe to J. Schindler (wrong Oettinger, *ibid.* and *Stammbildung* 355). Note further the causative tekkuš-nu- 'show (tr.), manifest, distinguish', and for the phonology takš-, takki/eš- 'prepare' from *toks- beside *teks- in Gk. τέχνη, OPers. ham taxša- (K. Hoffman, *Aufsätze* 595⁶); Oettinger's rule 'ě > ä vor Konsonantengruppe' *Stammb.* 219 is obviously wrong (nekuz, tekkus-, ...). The cluster /ks/ is so spelled in a-ak-ki-iš 'died', la-ak-ki-iš 'inclined [his ear]', wa-ak-ki-iš 'bit', sa-ak-ki-iš 'knew', 3 sg. preterites of the *hi*-conjugation.²² Note also wa-ak-ki-š-i-e-ez-zi KUB VIII 28 I 5 beside wa-ak-š-i-ya-.

Morphological parallels to the quasi-intensive (?) *no-nok^w-s-, *lo-louk-s- are not known to be, but the formation does not appear very recent. Hittite shows a-vocalism of the reduplicating syllable in papparš- 'sprinkle' and wawarš-ant- 'wiped off' (the -š- is part of the root), as well as in nannai 'drives (cattle)', and mammalzikanta beside mald- 'recite, vow'. Note also the reduplicated Tocharian preterite participles without palatalization like B nen(e)ku '(having) destroyed', peparku '(having) asked', verbs which form an s-preterite (Krause-Thomas, *Toch. Elem.* I §442.6).

The semantics of nana(n)kuš- like other derivatives of this root in Hittite point clearly to 'dark' (vs. 'light')

rather than 'night' (vs. 'day'). There is furthermore no discernible semantic feature like 'evening', 'dusk' or 'semi-dark'; the 'dark' of the texts would appear to be absolute. This 'dark' clearly has mythological chthonic or underworld overtones; in some passages it appears to refer to an indefinite but psychologically real place. If we have something like 'Dark', 'the Darkness', 'the Dark Place' expressed by a derivative of the root of *nok^w-t-, then it is tempting to compare the epic formula $\nu\acute{\upsilon}\xi \ \acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\beta\epsilon\nu\nu\acute{\eta}$, $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\beta\epsilon\nu\nu\acute{\eta} \ \nu\acute{\upsilon}\xi$, and to speculate that nana(n)kuššiyant- continues, as a transferred epithet, the cosmological semantics of Gk. $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\beta\omicron\varsigma$ and Ved. rājas.

V

No discussion of Hittite morphology would be complete without some reference to the hi-conjugation. For to paraphrase Meillet on the participle and infinitive, if the mi-conjugation is the greatest success of Hittite comparative grammar, the hi-conjugation is its greatest failure.

It would take a far braver (or more foolhardy) scholar than I to try and argue a general theory of the hi-conjugation before Professors Cowgill and Jasanoff at the same time in the same place. Fortunately I have no such general theory to present. I do not wish to argue here for or against any of their proposals, nor do I intend to discuss any of the other contributions to the extensive secondary literature on this much vexed category. Rather I wish to focus on one aspect of the primary data, which until recently has received

relatively little notice, and to propose a modest comparandum by way of explanation.

Most discussions of the hi-conjugation note the consistent a-vocalism of the singular, "generally written plene in Old Hittite" as Cowgill quite rightly puts it (Proceedings XIth Int. Cong. Ling. Bologna 1972 II 596), and then place greater or lesser emphasis on "the e that sometimes shows up in the plural" (Cowgill, ibid.), which will not be further considered in this paper. This a-vocalism in the singular is equated by nearly everyone with the o-vocalism of the singular of the IE perfect, or an antecedent thereof.

The largest class of consonantal hi-verbs in Oettinger's Stammbildung is his II 1b or lāg- class; it is to his credit that he systematically noticed they are characterized by paradigmatic ablaut ā/ǎ, i.e. scriptio plena in the singular (and 2 pl.!), and no scriptio plena in 1 and 3 pl. and middle. (The ablaut forms are distributed elsewhere in the finite and non-finite verb, but I ignore that here.) The scriptio plena is typical of Old Hittite manuscripts, though not always found even there; later manuscripts are much more sporadic in their notation. Thus such forms as the following (references are given only to forms not cited by Oettinger):

'reach'	<u>a-ar-ti</u>	<u>a-ra-an-zi</u>	<u>a-ar-te-ni</u>	KUB XXIII 68 obv. 25 (MH/MS)
'die'	<u>a-ak-ti</u>	<u>ak-kán-zi</u>	(<u>a</u> -) <u>ak-ki-iš</u>	<u>a-ak-te-ni</u>
'stop up'	<u>ša-a-ḫi</u>	<u>ša-ḫa-a-ri</u>		
'lay back'	<u>la-a-ki</u>	<u>la-ga-a-ri</u>	<u>la-ak-ki-iš</u>	KBo XI 14 II 6 (OH/NS)

'wash'	<u>a</u> - <u>ar</u> - <u>ri</u>	<u>ar</u> - <u>ra</u> - <u>an</u> - <u>zi</u>	<u>a</u> - <u>ar</u> - <u>at</u> - <u>te</u> - <u>en</u>
'correspond to'	<u>da</u> - <u>a</u> - <u>ak</u> - <u>ki</u>	<u>ták</u> - <u>kán</u> - <u>zi</u>	<u>ták</u> - <u>kán</u> - <u>ta</u> - <u>ri</u>

Some eight verbs, like a-ki, show an alternation C/CC along with the vocalism ā/ă, which Oettinger after Eichner terms 'lenition' after long vowel. In three cases this does not take place: da-a-ak-ki, ša-a-ak-ki (with ā/e vocalism), a-ar-ri. No further notice of this problem will be taken here.

The scriptio plena is found both before consonant clusters arising from inflexion, as in a-ar-ti, a-ak-ti, iš-ta-a-ap-hé, ha-a-aš-hu-un, and in TERT-roots:

'libate'	<u>iš</u> - <u>pa</u> - <u>a</u> - <u>an</u> - <u>ti</u> StBoT 25.44	<u>iš</u> - <u>pa</u> - <u>an</u> - <u>ta</u> - <u>an</u> - <u>zi</u>
	<u>ši</u> - <u>pa</u> - <u>a</u> - <u>an</u> - <u>ti</u> StBoT 25.51,52	<u>ši</u> - <u>pa</u> - <u>an</u> - <u>ta</u> - <u>an</u> - <u>zi</u>
'hang (tr.)'	<u>ka</u> - <u>a</u> - <u>an</u> - <u>ki</u>	<u>ka</u> - <u>an</u> - <u>ka</u> - <u>an</u> - <u>zi</u>
	<u>ga</u> - <u>a</u> - <u>an</u> - <u>ga</u> - <u>aḥ</u> - <u>hé</u>	
'recite, vow'	<u>ma</u> - <u>a</u> - <u>al</u> - <u>di</u>	(<u>ma</u> - <u>al</u> - <u>te</u> - <u>eš</u> - <u>šar</u>)
	<u>ma</u> - <u>a</u> - <u>al</u> - <u>taḥ</u> - <u>hu</u> - <u>un</u>	
'divide'	<u>ma</u> - <u>a</u> - <u>ar</u> - <u>ki</u>	<u>ma</u> - <u>ar</u> - <u>kán</u> - <u>zi</u>
	<u>ma</u> - <u>a</u> - <u>ar</u> - <u>ka</u> - <u>aḥ</u> - <u>hi</u>	
'cut up'	<u>a</u> - <u>ar</u> - <u>ki</u>	<u>ar</u> - <u>kán</u> - <u>zi</u>

There can be no doubt that the descriptive facts of Old Hittite point unambiguously to an ablauting paradigm, as Oettinger rightly classifies it. How we should account for it is another matter; but any explanation or comparison must start from this fact about a high percentage — over half — of the primary consonantal hi-conjugation inventory.

Oettinger's explanation (447ff.) starts from the IE

perfect with accented o-grade root in the singular, accented ending in the plural. Though he does not mention it, he evidently assumes analogical generalization of the o-grade in the plural and middle as well. He then invokes a sound law 'o → o' lengthening short vowels in stressed open syllables of disyllabic words. The scriptio plena marks that length. Before consonant clusters he assumes analogical introduction where it is found. This explanation is clearly unsatisfactory.

My own modest proposal, along lines independently advanced by others, is simply that we have here the reflex of what can be called "Narten perfects", i.e. acrostatic perfects with ō-vocalism.²³

Just as we have beside present

CéC(C)-ti

CC(C)-énti

a residual type

CéC(C)-ti

CéC(C)-nti
o

and beside the causative-iterative

CoC(C)-éje-

a residual

CōC(C)-(é)jé-

typically associated with long vowel or 'Narten' presents (Lat. ēst : Arm. utem), just so we can without difficulty imagine beside an IE perfect - or its antecedent -

CóC(C)-e

CC(C)-ér(s)

a residual

CóC(C)-e

CóC(C)-r(s)
o

For the 3 pl. endings note Venetic teuters on the one hand,²⁴ and Gathic cikōitaraš on the other. The absence of palatalization in the root syllable in the latter points to o-vocalism.

More concretely, we may propose the sample derivations

<u>dākki</u>	<u>dōk-</u> / <u>dók-</u>
<u>ārti</u>	<u>h₁ōr-th₂a</u>
<u>kānki</u>	<u>kōnk-</u> / <u>kónk-</u>
<u>išpānti</u>	<u>spōnd-</u> / <u>spónd-</u>

which are structurally similar to the *ĝōnh₃- of Gk. γέγωνα 'is audible, can be heard' beside *ĝonh₃- of Germanic kann. For one of these a Narten present has been proposed by E. Tichy, Glotta 54, 1976, 71-84: *dēk-ti (Ved. dāsti 'venerates' and pf. pple. dāśvás- 'pious', Gk. δέκτο 'received').²⁵ The o-vocalism of Gmc. *hanhan and Lat. cunctor are not incompatible with such a preform for kānki, and for that matter the preform of ārti 'thou reachest' could perfectly well by Osthoff's law be that of English thou art.

Oscan urust 'shall have pled', 'shall have made the accusation' points to a suffixless long vowel perfectum *ōr- with the vocalism recurring in Lat. ōrāre 'pray; plead' and ōrāculum 'place where one makes a request (of a god)', whence 'oracle' (Benveniste, RPh. 22, 1948, 120). The Hittite cognate ariya- 'determine by oracle' 'be determined by oracle' never shows plene-writing, and must reflect *or-. Note especially participle arant-, occasionally arānt-, (Friedrich, HWb. 30, Friedrich⁺-Kammenhuber HWb.² 291) which occurs only as a stative predicate with eš- 'be', and lacks the

suffix -iya-. We could have in ariya- a causative

*h₁or-éie-

like *doĕ-éie- in docēre, beside the long vowel acrostatic

h₁ōr-/h₁ór-

of Oscan ur-ust (indirectly Lat. ōr-ā-) and the Hittite participle arānt-, like *dōĕ/doĕ- in Hittite dākki/takkanzi, as against the apparent normal o-grade of Lat. didicī. The vocalism of the participle arānt- from *h₁or- recalls that of Lat. cunctārī from *ĕonk-t(o)- beside *kōnk-/ĕonk- in Hitt. kānki/kankanzi. For scriptio plena in the suffix of the participle of these apophonic hi-verbs with root vocalism ā, cf. arānt- from ār- 'reach', lagān from lāg- 'lay back', išgarān from išqār- 'stick, fix'.

These Hittite hi-verbs have ā-vocalism and roots of the structure TER-, TET-, and TERT-. This cannot but recall the Germanic sixth class (faran, slahan) and part of the seventh (haldan). Even more striking is the Celtic ā-preterite, formed to TET- and TERT- roots: -táich 'ran', fáig 'wove', fo-caird 'put', ro-scaird 'scraped off' (Thurneysen, OIGr. 692, 694).²⁶ The latter two assume shortening of the long vowel by Osthoff's law, which would have to apply after IE ō > Celt. ā; I know of no other evidence for this. But if it were so, it would be also possible to include in this class -condairc 'has seen', -ommalg 'has milked', -comarcair 'has asked', as well as dessid 'has been settled', dellig 'has lain down'. With the latter we regain Hittite la-a-ki 'lays back'; note only that parallel to da-a-ak-ki :

δέκτο we can set la-a-ki : λέκτο.

But these are all only suggestions for discussion.

NOTES

*Cf. TPS 1971 [1973], 51-93.

¹The text has been transcribed and translated, neither wholly accurately, by A. Archi in Florilegium Anatolicum (Mélanges Laroche) 45-8. I am indebted to G. Beckman, A. Kempinski, N. Oettinger and above all to E. Neu for valuable comments and references.

²Oettinger does explain the form as I do "i-iš-te-e-ni 'ihr wirkt' (Frageintonation: i-iš-te-ni-i!)", but only on p. 566, fn. 12, where I overlooked it in preparing the original version of the paper. I am grateful both to Oettinger and to E. Neu for pointing out my error. Cf. note 3.

³It would now appear that the use of the scriptio plena in this text has been explained orally by other scholars as question markers some time ago: for the Akkadian by H. Otten and E. Neu (fide the latter), for the Hittite by N. Oettinger (n.2 above), and for both by H. A. Hoffner (fide G. Beckman). H. Eichner tells me he has also collected other forms outside this text which seem to exhibit pluti-like scriptio plena. I happily concede priority.

⁴See most recently A. Kempinski, Syrien und Palästina

(Kanaan) in der letzten Phase der Mittelbronze IIB-Zeit (1650-1750 v. Chr.) §1.4 (forthcoming) for discussion and translation, after H. G. Güterbock, ZA 44, 1938, 114-123.

⁵On this form see H. A. Hoffner, BiOr 33, 1976, 335.

⁶Cf. M. Kalaç, Anadolu Araştırmaları 2, 1965, 280, and N. Oettinger, StBoT 22.10, 12.

⁷Alternatively, with F. Starke, StBoT 23.38 ex.43, 'hat er euch nicht die Tafel für Würdenträger eingestochen (d.h. geschrieben)?'

⁸The ritual for the royal couple (StBoT 8, now StBoT 25 no. 2-8) shows 1 pl. paiwani (passim) and harwani, which might pattern with paitteni, hartenī of KBo XXII 1. But the status (and archetype) of the form in the Kuruštama treaty (CTH 134) (lē) pa-it-ta-a-ni KBo VIII 37 Vo. 6 = dupl. pa-it-te-e-ni KUB XXIII 7 Vo. 1, is far from certain.

⁹Translation after A. Archi (op. cit. 46) and E. Neu. Here and in Vo. 30-1 (below) A-WA-A-AT is the correct form of the plural construct, and stands for a Hittite plural, as G. Beckman points out to me.

¹⁰This minatory question recalls the spirit of the land-grant tablets, e.g. Inandık rev. 19-20 A-WA-AT Ta-ba-ar-na ŠA AN.BA[R] ŠA LA NA-DI-E ŠA LA ŠE-BI-R[I(-x)] 'The word of the Tabarna, the great king, is of iron, is not to be cast aside, is not to be broken.' Cf. K. Balkan, Inandık'ta... Bağis Belgesi 66-7 (Ankara, 1973); H. G. Güterbock, SBo I 49; K. K. Riemschneider, MIO 6, 1958, 334f.

I follow Neu (per litt.), Oettinger (per litt.), and apparently Archi (loc. cit.) in taking ar-ha-a-an as participle of the verb arḫāizzi (StBoT 12 II 2, pp. 20, 82). Oettinger takes the sense as extended from 'make the rounds' to 'umgehen', Archi further and more loosely as 'violer'. But Neu rightly prefers to follow Friedrich in interpreting the verb in this context as 'vollenden', 'accomplish', as in KBo VII 28+ Vo. 41' f. DINGIR^{MEŠ}-nan uddār irḫān eštu 'may the words of the gods be accomplished'. The similarity to AWĀT ABI-YA arhān hartenī is indeed striking, as Neu notes. See Friedrich's edition in Scritti Furlani 222 (RSO 32, 1957). The ^{et}tab~~lisch~~ is of Middle Hittite date, the composition itself perhaps older; cf. Neu, Serta Indogermanica (FS Neumann) 214 with references.

¹¹The Slavic parallels (from Byelorussian) alleged by Kretschmer ap. Wackernagel are late and clearly independent.

¹²The neut. tepu could be an archaic plural, though the form is not actually attested. But the singular reading makes more sense in the passage.

¹³As I derived the latter in IESt II 323-9 (1975) = Ériu 27, 1976, 116-9. The verb ḫaššue- probably belongs here as well (contra TPS 1971, 77-8).

¹⁴Oettinger 331¹⁵¹ seeks to modify Otten's original observation (StBoT 11.12) that the verb is confined to older texts, by adducing examples from Neo-Hittite texts. But the Huqqanaš-treaty like other texts of Šuppiluliumaš I is

linguistically Middle Hittite, and was so classed already by Otten, and hu¹-iš¹-wa-iz-zi from a birth-ritual text edited by Gary Beckman (forthcoming in StBoT 29) cannot be so read, according to collation by Klengel. This leaves two alleged NH attestations, both from unpublished texts, one of which Oettinger is uncertain about dating. In fact, as E. Neu kindly informs me and allows me to report, VAT 6700, now published as KUB XLVIII 106, is a Middle Hittite manuscript (based on inspection of a photograph), and the allegedly unpublished hu-iš-wa-it of Bo 2127 I 4' is the same example as the OH/NS hu-iš-wa-it of KBo III 64 I 4'. The claim that the verb hu(i)šuezzi is archaic, I think, can stand.

¹⁵ Thus complete the translation of the passage in CHD s.v. lalukkiwant-.

¹⁶ As restored by V. Haas, Der Kult von Nerik 144, but the space in the edition would indicate something else is still missing.

¹⁷ Restore an intransitive verb (due -aš) used with -za, e.g. e-ša-at 'sat down'. Haas' [IV hal-hal-tu-ma-ri-ya] makes no grammatical sense. *part?*

¹⁸ As restored by Haas, though the space in the edition seems a bit large. I have so punctuated and translated since I doubt that the adjective in this position would modify 'the four corners', as he takes it; cf. perhaps ABoT 44 I 58 IV hal-hal-tu-u-ma-ri uk-tu-ri and H. G. Güterbock, JAOS 78, 1958, 241.

¹⁹Cited in Haas 162 (as 428/e; the correct number in Kümmel, StBoT 2, loc. cit.). My restorations in the translation are only exempli gratia. Haas notes that these too are 'Aufenthaltssorte eines verschwundenen Gottes', as shown by the wemiyatten 'find' of line 18.

²⁰Haas 162 cites ^{NA₄}el-lu-e[š- from KBo XIV 20 II 18 (Annals of Mursili), where it doubtless serves as a geographical name: see Ph. Houwink ten Cate, JNES 25, 1966, 174, 182, 190. Segmentation ellu-eššar is indicated; the epithet nanankušši- and the determinative point to a dark, stony, "chthonic" place where a divinity can vanish. One might entertain a connection with MUS illuyankaš (MUS el-li-ya-an-ku-uš KUB XXIV 7 III 70, MUS e]l-li-ya-an-ku-un KBo XXVI 79 IV 17' = StBoT 14.68); the meaning of ellueššar might then be 'snakepit', 'snake hole' or the like.

²¹It is by no means clear that ḫatkišnu- 'harden' is *ḫatkeš-nu- from ḫatku- 'narrow', pace Oettinger, Stammbildung 244, 251.

²²E. Neu in StBoT 18.88 considers the vowel of these forms as real, on the evidence of the stems in final dental maltaš, ḫurtaš, šipandaš (not *malza, etc.) and assumes an ending '-Vš (V = a oder i)' beside the -š of vocalic stems. But the cluster t+s where a morpheme boundary intervened is spelled z in the nom. sg. of dental stem nouns, to be sure, but not so in e.g. na-at-ši 'et id ei', never *na(-az)-zi. A real anaptyctic prop-vowel is possible in these 3 sg. pret. forms and others (cf. the discussion in Melchert, forthcoming);

but that the phonetic cluster is earlier is to my mind proved by lakkiš 'laid back', where the root-final /g/ of lāki, lagāri (IE *logh-) can have been devoiced to /k/ -kk- only by assimilation to a contiguous -s.

²³Something like this morphological type was first posited by R. S. P. Beekes in 'The proterodynamic "Perfect"', KZ 87, 1973, 86-98. Beekes however assumed a basic ē-vocalism in the perfect ('CēC-h₂e CéC-r' p.89) though he also adduced forms with long ō-vocalism like εἴωθα, ἄωπο, γέγωνε and ultimately (p. 94) opted for an ablaut ō in the singular and e in the plural, which he would see in the Hittite type ša-a-ak-ki še-ek-kán-zi. The interplay of quantitative and qualitative apophony in this type, as well as accent (note 2 pl. ša-ak-te-e-ni), is far from clear; but I would separate it from what I term "Narten" or acrostatic ō-grade perfect.

An acrostatic perfect was even earlier suggested by J. Schindler (reported in H. Mittelberger's unpublished Habilitationsschrift [non vidi]) also for the vocalic type dā-; he himself, as he informs me, no longer believes this.

The two-page chapter on the perfect in P. Hollifield's unpublished doctoral dissertation (1977) envisages two accentual patterns in the perfect, mobile and fixed-root, the latter with original o-grade in the plural as evidenced by GAv. cikōitarāš.

²⁴On which see A. L. Prosdocimi, Venetico. L'altra faccia di Pa 14, il senso dell' iscrizione e un nuovo verbo

Firenze, 1979: Istituto di Studi per l'Alto Adige). Venetic -ers probably has a short e, by Osthoff's law. Long ē is found unambiguously in Lat. -ēr(e), and probably in OLat. (Satricum V B.C.) stet-erai. Original *-ēr is assumed for Hitt. -er by Hollifield, op. cit., and by H. C. Melchert (forthcoming, KZ Beihefte).

²⁵This conclusion is not affected by B. Forssman's far superior treatment of δειδέχεται in Die Sprache 24, 1978, 3-4.

²⁶Beekes in the article referred to in n. 11 made this comparison.