

glossa

Vol. 3:1 (1969)

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----|--|
| R. D. KING | 3 | Push Chains and Drag Chains |
| H. WITTMANN | 22 | The Development of <i>K</i> in Hittite |
| D. ABDO | 27 | A Note on the Doubled Nominals
and the Relative Clause in
Lebanese |
| P. A. LUELDORFF | 39 | On the Phonology of English In-
flection |
| G. H. FAIRBANKS | 49 | Language Split |
| C. R. LONGYEAR | 67 | Computer Simulation of Natural
Language Information Pro-
cess |
| D. L. F. NILSEN | 101 | The Expletive "There" from a
Transformational Point of
View |
| R. SAUNDERS | 108 | Review: Phonotactic Gramma-
ticality (Scholes) |
| | 123 | Notice |

HENRI WITTMANN, McGill University, Montreal

THE DEVELOPMENT OF *K* IN HITTITE.

Interests in hieroglyphic Hittite have worked for a long time around the interpretation of the rare but important sign , since it is contained in the words for 'horse', 'dog', and 'horn'. The reading of this sign in *a-x-wa-*, *x-wan-*, and *x-rna-* as *šu* phonologically reminiscent of IE *kw was first posed by Gelb (1942.19ff.). A few years later (1950.135 fn. 30), Gelb was fortunate to discover the name of a country written A-HORN-ra, which by the nature of things could only be Assur. Since Gelb's reading is today largely accepted,¹ the etymological connections of the three hHitt. items are as obvious as they are widely discussed;

- (1) *asuwa-* : Skt. *asva-* 'horse', IE *ekwo-.²
- (2) *suwan-* : Skt. *śvan-* 'dog', IE *kwan-.³
- (3) *surna-* : Skt. *śṛṅga-* 'horn', IE *ker-.⁴

In all instances, an Anatolian sibilant seems to correspond to Skt. *ś* < IE **k*.

The discovery of these correspondences has yielded diverse reactions among the scholars. Bonfante & Gelb (1944) asserted hieroglyphic Hittite to be a satem language. More recently, Siegel (1961) went considerably further: he wished to see in Hittite a 'decayed satem speech', whatever that meant.⁵ Others, especially

1-Laroche, 1960.231, still transcribes tentatively *sū?* on the ground that no proper noun containing *sū?* has as yet been identified.

2-Cf. here cHitt. *assu-śanni-* 'horseman, equerry', (Wittmann, 1964. 147f.), Lyc. abl.-inst. *esbe-di* 'cavalry'?

3-beside Lyd. **kan-* in *Kandaúles* 'dog slayer'. For the second element, cf. Skt. *sār-dūla-* 'tiger' and Gk. *kor-dúlos* 'lizard'.

4-beside cHitt. *karawar* 'horn', Lith. *kárvė* 'horned animal, cow', IE *ker-.

5-He bases his assumption largely on Garbrys' (1944) hypothesis of a close relationship between Lithuanian and Hittite. Siegel, besides having the customary distinction of satem and kentum, claims the priority of the 'satem speech' and posits 'kentum speech' as a later development.

Kronasser (1957), categorically declared such words to be borrowings from an Indic language. Most scholars, however, particularly Friedrich (1953.134), observed an attitude of reserve.

A more convincing argument to solve the problem was put forward by A. Goetze (1954). He demonstrated that the shift from the \hat{k} of the proto-language to an Anatolian sibilant only takes place if the \hat{k} is followed by the back-vowel u . Thus, the shift, he concluded (1954.405), has to be ascribed to the combinatory effect of this back vowel.⁶ Goetze's additional evidence is as follows:

- (4) cHitt. $\check{š}u\text{-}ppala-$ 'livestock' : Skt. $pa\check{š}u\text{-}$ 'livestock', $\check{š}u\text{-}$ in compounds, IE $*(pe)\hat{k}u\text{-}$.⁷
- (5) cHitt. $\check{š}uppi-$ 'pure, (ritually) clean, holy' : Skt. $súbha-$ 'beautiful, pleasant, bright; propitious', $súdh-$ 'to clean', $súddha-$ 'pure', Arm. $surb$ 'pure, clean, holy', IE $*k(e)u$ 'bright', $*\hat{k}u\text{-}bh-$, $*\hat{k}u\text{-}dh-$.
- (6) cHitt. $\check{š}wu-$ 'full', $\check{š}uwa-$ (medio-passive) 'to swell up', $\check{š}uwai-$ 'to fill', $\check{š}unna-$ 'to fill' : Skt. $\check{s}váyati$ 'swells up', $\check{s}ūna-$ 'swollen', IE $*\hat{k}(e)u\text{-}$ 'to swell'.⁸

In addition, he naturally reinterpreted Gelb's data.

Goetze's hypothesis aroused a minor discussion among Hit-tologists.⁹ It remained, however, largely without consequences for IE comparative research. Furthermore, scholars found it very difficult to extend the existing proof beyond its original dimension. Indeed, words with IE $*\hat{k}w$ are far and few in between. Such obvious candidates as Skt. $par\check{š}u\text{-}$ 'rib' do not yield a comparable equivalent in Anatolian. Nevertheless, three more instances can be offered where Goetze's combinatory effect seems to come into its own.

6-i.e. $\hat{k}u > \hat{k}iu > \check{š}u$.

7-On the alternation $p/\check{g}\text{-}$, see Goetze (1954.404 & fn. 17), Wittmann (1964.145 fn. 12); IH nominal prefix $*pe/\check{g}\text{-}$, Hitt. $pe/a\text{-}$ distinct from IH preverb $*b^{\text{c}}e\text{-}$, Hitt. $pe\text{-}$, Wittmann (forthcoming).

8-Cf. possibly cHitt. $\check{š}umrai-$ 'to become pregnant', Gk. $ku\acute{e}ō$ 'to be pregnant'.

9-Literature in Kronasser (1962.49). Kronasser himself dismisses Goetze's arguments in a few lines.

(7) cHitt. *išha-* 'lord, master'.

E.H. Sturtevant (1933.88, 1951.65) connected *išha-* with Lat. *herus* 'master', fem. *hera* on the assumption that the *h* in *herus* results from contamination with *hērēs*, because of older *esa* 'domina'. However, as Ernout & Meillet (1951.359) point out, this earlier *esa* is of doubtful existence, and *herus* itself is of extremely rare occurrence. Even if a *erus* existed such as, one would expect here a cHitt. *ešsus* or *ašsus* as cognate (following Sturtevant's own rules). In fact, a *ašsus* exists meaning 'good, kind; property', and an acceptable etymology has been posited for it by Sturtevant himself (1951.51). In this way, another etymology has to be found for *išha-*, as follows: Skt. *iśa-* 'lord, master', *iśvara-*, 'owner, ruler', *iś-* 'to own', Av. *iśvan-* 'rich, powerful', OHG *eigan* 'to possess, own', etc., IE *(e)īk(w)-.¹⁰

(8) cHitt. *šummittant-* 'axe, hatchet'.

Skt. *aśman-* 'stone, cliff, sky', *aśmara-* 'stony, Av. *asman-* 'stone, sky', Lith. *ašmuō* 'edge, sharpness', Gk. *ákmōn* 'anvil', Norw. *humul* 'stone', MHG *hamel* 'cliff', Gmc. originally 'stone hammer', as in ON *hamarr* 'hammer, cliff', OHG *hamar*, NE *hammer*, etc., IE *(a)īk(w)m- 'sharp edged'. Palatal *(a)īk(w)m- obviously fluctuated with a velar *(a)īk(w)m-: Lith. *akmuō* 'stone', OCS *kamy* 'stone'.¹¹

(9) cHitt. *šiu* 'god', *šiawatt-* 'day'.

H. Pedersen (1938.175) derived *šiu-* from IE *dyeu- 'heaven', *deiwo- 'god'. He ascribed the shift of a *dy-* to *si-* to the combinatory effect of the front vowel. Such a shift could be very plausible, were it not for the uniqueness of one single occurrence. Besides, a shift of this kind may be expected to crop up with all the dental

10-Cf. here possibly Arm. *isxan* 'lord, master'.

11-Also to be compared: Lat. *acus* 'needle', *acies* 'edge, sharpness', Gk. *akē* 'point, edge', *akīs* 'pointed instrument', Bret. *ek* 'point, edge', ON *ègg* 'edge', etc. Laroche (1957.25f.) links this group with cHitt. *aku-* 'stone, cliff'. Yet, cHitt. single *k* cannot reflect IE *k*; it would be preferable to connect *aku-* with IE *agw(e)sT 'axe, hatchet', as in OS *acus*, OE *acus*, OHG *achhus*, Goth. *agizi*, Gk. *axine*, Lat. *ascia* (cf. Ernout & Meillet, 1951.90). Indo-European must have had considerable fluctuations between *ak-*, *āk-*, and *ag-*, all meaning 'sharp edged'. Cf. also the fluctuations in: Lith. *ašmuō* 'edge'; *akmuō* 'stone', Lett. *suns* 'dog'; *kurfa* 'female dog', OPruss. *sirwis* 'roe, deer'; *kurwis* 'bull, ox', hHitt. *suwan-*: Lyd. **kan-* 'dog', hHitt. *surna-*: cHitt. *karawar* 'horn'.

stops. Still, the large number of words with initial *ti-* in Hittite reflecting an IE dental stop plus front vowel is surprising. A different etymology for *šiu-*, *šiwatt-* would therefore be more appealing: Skt. *hu-* 'to call (the gods)', part. *hūta-*, Goth. *gub*, gen.sg. *gudis* 'god', etc., Olr. *guth* 'voice', Gall. *gutuater*, a class of priests, IE **gh(a)u-*, **ghu-to-*.¹² Derivatives are Skt. *ahan-*, Av. *azan-* 'day'. This equation extends Goetze's shift to the voiced series and thus proves the generality of his hypothesis.

There may also be a possibility of linking Goetze's findings with another phenomenon in Hittite. Frequently, Hitt. *w/u* after *k* reflecting IE (velar) *k, g* seems to be the product of anaptyxis. A *w/u* apparently is interpolated between (velar) *k, g* and a following front vowel *i/e*. Instances are cHitt. *kar-š- : kwer-* 'to cut', *ka-* 'this'; *kwi-* 'who', *še/akk-* 'to know'; *šakwi-* 'eye' (with derivative *šakuwai-* 'to see, look'), all with established IE cognates. Significantly, there are no Hitt. *kw-* followed by back or center vowels corresponding unambiguously to an IE 'labio-velar' stop followed by a back or center vowel. If we now let *K* stand for any guttural in the proto-language,¹³ regardless of voice, then we may combine the patterns into the following table:

WITHOUT ANAPTYXIS

IH <i>ki/e</i>	Antl. <i>ki/e-</i>	Hitt. <i>ki-</i>
<i>Ku/o</i>	<i>ku/a-</i>	<i>ku/a-</i>
<i>Ko-</i>	<i>ka-</i>	<i>ka-</i>

WITH ANAPTYXIS

IH <i>ki/e-</i>	Antl. <i>kwi/e-</i>	Hitt. <i>ku(i)-</i>
<i>Ku-</i>	<i>kyu-</i>	<i>š(i)u-</i>

The obvious conclusion must be that the proto-language did not have any labio-velar stops but distinguished palatal stops phonemically from velar ones, contrary to what has been stated in the past.¹⁴ Indeed, the presence or absence of anaptyctic vowels with *K* when followed by a vowel of maximum differentiation cannot be a phenomenon of chance.

12-Cf. here perhaps IE **gheu-* 'to pour a libation'.

13-By proto-language, the ancestor of both the Anatolian and Indo-European languages, Indo-Hittite, is meant here.

14-Sturtevant assumed here that Indo-Hittite lacked the phonological oppositions palatal : velar, velar : labio-velar, and only possessed aspirated : non-aspirated, voiced : voiceless, of which only the latter left traces in Hittite. Kronasser supposed for his proto-language all the feature-oppositions, of which none leave a trace in Hittite. Thus, 15 (or 20?) proto-stops collapsed neatly into 3 Hitt. stops, *p*, *t*, and *k*.

REFERENCES

- Bonfante, J.H. & Gelb, I.J. 1944. The position of 'hieroglyphic Hittite' among the Indo-European languages. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 64. 169-90.
- Emout, A. & Meillet, A. 1951. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. 3rd. ed. Paris.
- Friedrich, J. 1952. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg. (Ergänzungshefte 1957, 1961, 1966)
- _____. 1953. Zur Lesung der hethitischen Bilderschrift. *Archiv Orientální* 21. 114-39.
- Gabrys, P.J. 1944. *Parenté des langues hittites et lithuanienne et la préhistoire*. Geneva.
- Gelb, I.J. 1942. *Hittite hieroglyphs III*. Chicago.
- _____. 1950. The contribution of the new Cilician bilinguals to the decipherment of hieroglyphic Hittite. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 7. 129-41.
- Goetze, A. 1954. Review of Friedrich (1952). *Lg.* 30. 401-5.
- Kronasser, H. 1957. Zum Bildhethitischen. *Archiv Orientální* 25. 513-24
- _____. 1962 ff. *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden.
- Laroche, E. 1957. Etudes de vocabulaire VI. *Revue hittite et asianique* 15:60. 9-29.
- _____. 1960. *Les hiéroglyphes hittites*. I. Paris.
- Pederson, H. 1938. *Hittisch und die anderen indo-europäischen Sprachen*. Copenhagen.
- Siegel, W. 1961. *Early Europeans*. New York.
- Sturtevant, E.H. 1933. *A comparative grammar of the Hittite language*. Philadelphia.
- _____. 1951. *A comparative grammar of the Hittite language*. 2nd. ed. New Haven.
- Wittmann, H. 1964. Some Hittite etymologies. *Die Sprache* 10. 144-8.
- _____. forthcoming. Some Hittite etymologies II. *Die Sprache*.