


# 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. LUELSDORFF	39	On the Phonology of English In- flexion
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- ticity (Scholes)
	123	Notice

## 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 *śu* 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,<sup>1</sup> the etymological connections of the three hHitt. items are as obvious as they are widely discussed;

(1) *asuwa-* : Skt. *aśva-* 'horse', IE *\*ekwo-*.<sup>2</sup>

(2) *suwan-* : Skt. *śvan-* 'dog', IE *\*kwon-*.<sup>3</sup>

(3) *surna-* : Skt. *śṛṅga-* 'horn', IE *\*ker-*.<sup>4</sup>

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

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.<sup>5</sup> 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. *aššu-ššanni-* 'horseman, equerry', (Wittmann, 1964.147f.), Lyc. abl.-inst. *esbe-di* 'cavalry'?

3-beside Lyd. *\*kan-* in *Kandaūlēs* 'dog slayer'. For the second element, cf. Skt. *śār-dūta-* 'tiger' and Gk. *kor-dūlos* 'lizard'.

4-beside cHitt. *karawar* 'horn', Lith. *kārvė* '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.<sup>6</sup> Goetze's additional evidence is as follows:

- (4) cHitt. *šu-ppala-* 'livestock' : Skt. *paśu-* 'livestock', *śu-* in compounds, IE  $*(pe)\hat{k}u-$ .<sup>7</sup>
- (5) cHitt. *šuppi-* 'pure, (ritually) clean, holy' : Skt. *śubha-* 'beautiful, pleasant, bright; propitious', *śudh-* 'to clean', *śuddha-* 'pure', Arm. *surb* 'pure, clean, holy', IE  $*\hat{k}(e)u$  'bright',  $*\hat{k}u-bh-$ ,  $*\hat{k}u-dh-$ .
- (6) cHitt. *šwu-* 'full', *šwua-* (medio-passive) 'to swell up', *šuwai-* 'to fill', *šunna-* 'to fill' : Skt. *śv-āyati* 'swells up', *śūna-* 'swollen', IE  $*\hat{k}(e)u-$  'to swell'.<sup>8</sup>

In addition, he naturally reinterpreted Gelb's data.

Goetze's hypothesis aroused a minor discussion among Hittologists.<sup>9</sup> 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. *parśu-* '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.  $\hat{k}u > \hat{k}iu > śu$ .

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

8-Cf. possibly cHitt. *šumrai-* 'to become pregnant', Gk. *kuēō* 'to be pregnant'.

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

(7) cHitt. *išḫa-* 'lord, master'.

E.H. Sturtevant (1933.88, 1951.65) connected *išḫa-* 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. *eššus* or *aššus* as cognate (following Sturtevant's own rules). In fact, a *aššus* 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 *išḫa-*, as follows: Skt. *īśa-* 'lord, master', *īśvara-*, 'owner, ruler', *īś-* 'to own', Av. *īšvan-* 'rich, powerful', OHG *eigan* 'to possess, own', etc., IE \*(e)ik̑(w)-. <sup>10</sup>

(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)k̑(w)m- 'sharp edged'. Palatal \*(a)k̑(w)m- obviously fluctuated with a velar \*(a)k(w)m-: Lith. *akmuō* 'stone', OCS *kamy* 'stone'. <sup>11</sup>

(9) cHitt. *šiu* 'god', *šiwatt-* '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

<sup>10</sup>-Cf. here possibly Arm. *isxan* 'lord, master'.

<sup>11</sup>-Also to be compared: Lat. *acus* 'needle', *acies* 'edge, sharpness', Gk. *akē* 'point, edge', *akīs* 'pointed instrument', Bret. *ek* 'point, edge', ON *egg* '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)s-* 'axe, hatchet', as in OS *acus*, OE *acus*, OHG *achhus*, Goth. *aqizi*, Gk. *axinē*, Lat. *ascia* (cf. Ernout & Meillet, 1951.90). Indo-European must have had considerable fluctuations between *ak-*, *ak̑-*, and *ag-*, all meaning 'sharp edged'. Cf. also the fluctuations in: Lith. *ašmuō* 'edge': *akmuō* 'stone', Lett. *suns* 'dog': *kuņa* '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. *hū-* 'to call (the gods)', part. *hūta-*, Goth. *gub*, gen.sg. *gudis* 'god', etc., OIr. *guth* 'voice', Gall. *gutwater*, a class of priests, IE *\*ǵh(a)u-*, *\*ǵhu-to-*.<sup>12</sup> 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,<sup>13</sup> regardless of voice, then we may combine the patterns into the following table:

WITHOUT ANAPTYXIS

IH <i>Ķi/e</i>	Antl. <i>ki/e-</i>	Hitt. <i>ki-</i>
<i>Ku/o</i>	<i>ku/a-</i>	<i>ku/a-</i>
<i>Ķo-</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>Ķu-</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.<sup>14</sup> 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 *\*ǵheu-* '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. *Hittitisch 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*.