A. AUFSÄTZE

The PIE Words for 'Name' and 'Me'

Bon exemple des difficultés posées par des
mots évidemment apparentés, mais dont les
relations sont obscures.

Chantraine, *Dict. étym.* s. v. ὄνομα

I. PIE 'name'.

1. The word may be discussed again after the recent treatments of Bammesberger (*Stud. z. Lar.*, 1984, 140f.)[1] and Hilmarsson (*Sprache* 30, 1984, 20 n. 4). Two interpretations exist, one taking the word as $*(H)nom$- n, the other as $*Hneh_3$-mn. Bammesberger and Hilmarsson defend the first, I think that the latter is more probable.

2. As to the initial, the agreement of a Greek and an Armenian prothetic vowel points to an initial laryngeal. That Sanskrit compounds do not show lengthening before *nāman*- does not prove that there was no laryngeal (thus Cowgill, *Evid. f. Larr.*, 1965, 152). The *absence* of an archaism can never be used as an argument, just as the absence of a wau in Homer proves nothing. On the other hand the Greek and Armenian evidence is unmistakable. There is no other explanation for the initial vowel of these two languages. (That was not yet so clear in the time when Cowgill wrote, on whose authority the initial laryngeal is still often denied.)

The initial laryngeal was h_3. One has postulated h_1 because of OPr. *emnes* and Gr. Ἔνυμα-, and because ὄνομα could be explained easily through assimilation from *ἐνομα. But OPr. *emnes* will contain zero grade, which is also found in Slavic. As $(H)n$- gave *in*- in Balto-Slavic, OPr. *em*- will stand for *$*im$- (thus Szemerényi, *Syncope*, 1964, 244f.). For a full grade h_1en- Old Prussian would be the only evidence (except perhaps Albanian), and it would be the third ablaut form, whereas neuters have only two. h_3- is shown by the most direct and most reliable evidence, Gr. ὀ- and Arm. *a*- (as h_2- is improbable; see the Appendix), by νώνυμος (as was stressed by Rüdiger Schmitt, *Dichtung*, 1967, 91 n. 562, whose short note is the best

---

[1] Bammesberger correctly cites my interpretation as $*{}_e nh_3$-/enh_3-. But since then I gave up the phoneme $/{}_e/$, and I gave up roots beginning with a vowel (and I withdrew -h_3- in *Orbis* 20, 1971, 140f., but incorrectly).

treatment of the word), and by Phr. *onoman*. That Phrygian kept the three laryngeals distinct appears from *-menos* $<$ *-mh₁nos* (cf. Dressler, *Sprache* 14, 1968, 47). Eichner's suggestion (*MSS* 31, 1972, 86 n. 12) that νώνυμος replaced *νη- is less probable (because it assumes a replacement). The Greek form Ἐνυμα- is best explained with Kortlandt (*Ann. Arm. Lingu.* 5, 1984, 42) as due to a dissimilation of the first h_3 against the second, i. e. $h^w - h^w > h - h^w$. Below we shall find the same dissimilation in the opposite direction, giving $h^w - h$, which confirms that the first initial was h_3 (and that the other became h_1).

3. We shall now consider the evidence for long *ō*. Skt. *nā́man-* can have *ā* from short *o* according to Brugmann's law. Hitt. *ā* (*lāman*) can be due to Oettinger's law (*Stammbildung*, 1979, 447 f.): lengthening under the accent in a disyllabic word in open syllable[2]. Arm. *anun* can have had a short *o* as well as a long one. The long *ō* of Latin is often explained as due to contamination with *gnō-*. However, it is not very probable that *nomen*, with short *o*, was influenced by (*g*)*nō-*, as they had only *n* in common, and as the meanings do not make influence evident. It is much more easy to assume that an original *nōmen* was contaminated with (*g*)*nō-*. I think that Lat. *nŏta* is a strong argument: though connection with (*g*)*nōscō* is evident, it never got a long *o*. The Oscan and Umbrian forms do not give decisive evidence for *o* or *ō*, as far as I see. The Latin evidence, then, is in favor of *ō*.

As Germanic evidence for *ō* are cited OFr. *nomia* and MHG *benuomen*. Both Bammesberger and Hilmarsson think that *nomia* does not prove a long vowel. Bammesberger considers *benuomen* as too late to be of PIE origin, but he admits that he cannot explain it as an innovation. Hilmarsson thinks that the MHG forms may have *u* $<$ *o* $<$ *a* before nasal, with lengthening in open syllable. For Middle Low German he considers a change *e* $>$ *ö* before labials, and suggests that *nam(n)j-* became *nem-*. Only about the Dutch forms Hilmarsson is in doubt. I asked the opinion of my colleague C. van Bree on these forms. Here is his view.

In Groningen *nuimm̥* points to old *ō* with umlaut (cf. *zuiken*, Goth. *sokjan*). Rounding of *e* would have given *eu*. In Twente we have *neumm*, which represents *ō* with umlaut. An older *e* would have given a short vowel, *nŏmm* (cf. H. L. Bezoen, *Klank- en vormleer van het dialect der gemeente*

---

[2] If HLuw. *áta₅man*, Lyc. *ad̃ãma* mean 'name' and are cognate with Hitt. *lāman* (cf. Neumann, *Sprache* 30, 1984, 91 n. 8), one might assume that here h_3- was vocalized before a stop, whereas it was not vocalized in Hittite before *l* (or *n*). However, this would imply that the laryngeal was preserved until after Hittite and Luwian were separated. (The *-t-* might have arisen out of *-l-* or directly from the original *-n-*.) The alternative is that in a Hitt. *an/lāman* the *a-* was lost (through analogy?). Or the *a-* must have another origin.

Enschede, Leiden 1938, § 8ff. and 23). In Kempenland *nü.üˑmə(n)* derives from **nōmian*; rounding would have given *ö* (A. P. de Bont, *Dialect van Kempenland*, I, Assen 1962, § 118 and 274). In Antwerpen we find *numen*, with umlaut from *ō*; rounding would have given *eu* (H. Stout, *Het Antwerpsch dialect*, Antwerpen 1980 repr.). Dutch *noemen* will represent **nōm-jan* without umlaut, a Western characteristic. The *ō* was long preserved here (MDutch *ghenomen*). Van Bree's conclusion is that all Dutch forms point to **ō* and cannot be explained otherwise. Therefore he doubts Hilmarsson's explanation of the MLG forms.

Thus I think that the Germanic evidence cannot be denied[3].

The Tocharian forms are usually explained as deriving from **nēm-* (Krause–Thomas, *Elementarbuch*, 1960, 57). If this is correct, they point in any case to a long vowel. (We will return to Tocharian below.)

4. The problem of the long vowel would be decided if clear evidence for or against a laryngeal (which would point to **$h_3n(e)h_3m$-* or *$h_3n(o)m$-*) could be found. Slavic *ȋmę* has a falling accent, as is shown by Slov. *imȇ* (Kortlandt, *Slav. Accent.*, 1975, 10). But this accentuation does not teach us anything, for the word 'name' had a mobile accentuation in Slavic (PS **jь̏mę*, pl. **jьmenà*; e. g. Stang, *Slav. Accent.*, 1957, 91), and in a mobile paradigm an acute root vowel became circumflexed (Meillet's law; cf. Kortlandt, ibid.).

Old Irish *ainm* has been considered as a decisive argument against a second laryngeal (Cowgill, *Evid. f. Larr.*, 156). As pointed out by R. Schmitt, again, the second laryngeal may have disappeared through dissimilation in **h_3nh_3mn > *h_3nmn > *anman > *anmen >* OIr. *ainm*, OW *anu*. L. S. Joseph thinks that HRHC- always became HRC- in Celtic; see *Ériu* 33 (1982) 42 and 51, with possible other instances. It must be admitted, however, that the form is easier explained without a laryngeal. (It is mostly stated that **HnHm-* would have given **nām-*. I would rather expect **nam-*, which would have given OIr. **naim*. Cf. below on Germanic.)

Hilmarsson thinks that **(H)n̥Hm-* gave **unm-* in Germanic. The syllabicity sign under the *n*, however, is misleading. In an article on *RHC-* (to appear in *IF*) I have shown that such forms gave *RaC-* in Germanic. The *H-* did not influence this development. Thus the regular development of **HnHm-* was PGm. **nam-*[4].

---

[3] After I wrote this I saw that Matzel (*Sprachwiss.* 9, 1984, 353–355) also argues that *benuomen* etc. must be old and point to an original long *ō*, which he finds confirmed by OHG *chinōmidi* 'Bezeichnung': "Für die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Wortes für den 'Namen' ist weiterhin mit einem im Westgermanischen nachweisbaren Stamm **nōm(n)-* zu rechnen."

[4] As an alternative explanation, one might consider shortening of long vowels

Hilmarsson further holds that Tocharian definitely refutes a laryngeal, as preforms with both h_3 and eh_3 would not have resulted in the forms actually found. This is in principle correct. But the Tocharian forms require a more extensive discussion.

So far there is no conclusive evidence either in favour of or against a laryngeal.

5. The palatal consonant of Toch. *ñom*, *ñem* was explained by Winter (*Evid. f. Larr.*, 202f.) as due to a preceding h_1-. This is in itself improbable, and appears now impossible as the word had h_3-. Lindeman (*The triple representation*, 1982, 65) and Hilmarsson (independently) explain the palatal from the oblique stem **Hnmen-*. This implies two things: first, that, though *m* resisted or lost palatalization, the *n* was and remained palatalized; and, second, that the palatalization spread to the nominative though this had PIE *o* (in **Honm-n, Hnm-en-s*). The combination of the two makes the explanation less probable.

This explanation could be improved by assuming a static type, **Hnom-n, *Hnem-n-s*. Schindler (*BSL* 70, 1975, 4–7) argued that neuters (at least *r/n*-stems) with *o*-vocalism in the nominative had a static accentuation, e. g. **uod-r, *ued-n-s*, to which Hitt. *wātar, wetenas* would testify. However, the reconstruction of this type cannot yet be regarded as certain. Though it explains *o* beside *e* in the word for 'knee', the assumption that gen. **ǵen-u-s* was replaced by **ǵn-eu-s* involves difficulties: if it happened in PIE, there could not have been traces of **ǵen-u-*; if it happened in the separate languages, we would have to assume that in several languages this replacement occurred independently, which is improbable as we would expect **ǵen-u-os* or **ǵen-eu-s*, but hardly (always) **ǵn-eu-s*. As to **h_3nem-*, this form is improbable as there is no other evidence for *e*-vocalism, and as it supposes that it was changed into **h_3n-men-s* in several languages to explain **Hnm-* in Balto-Slavic, Celtic and Albanian. Therefore another explanation of the Tocharian forms would be preferable.

6. When we now turn to the paradigm

    nom. **h_3néh_3-mn*
    gen. **h_3nh_3-mén-s*

---

followed by resonant before the stress in Proto-Germanic (and Italo-Celtic) as proposed by Dybo, *Vopr. slav. jaz.* 5, 1961, 9–34 (see the discussion by Kortlandt, *Ériu* 32, 1981, 1–22, esp. 13f.). **h_3néh_3mn* had the stress on the root, but the stress of the suffix *-mén-* in the oblique cases might have been generalized. We cannot see what happened in Germanic as the neuters in *-mn* disappeared (Goth. *namo* is the only remnant). Neuters in *-mn* that became masculines, Goth. **stoma*, OHG *sāmo*, OIc. *ljómi*, retained the long vowel (cf. Meid, *Germ. Sprachwiss.* III, 1967, 127f.). As both Sanskrit and Greek have root stress, Germanic will have had the same.

we note first that this is a normal formation in -mn with e-grade in the nominative. It has the normal proterodynamic inflection of the neuters.

Unproblematical are Skt. $n\acute{a}man$-, Hitt. $l\bar{a}man$, Lat. $n\bar{o}men$, Arm. $anun$ (which must have had full grade, as $*h_3nh_3m$- would in my opinion have given $*anam$-), all from $*h_3neh_3$-, and Slavic, Russ. $\acute{i}mja$, Baltic, OPr. $emnes$ if for $*im$-, which derive from $*h_3nh_3$-. Alb. $em\ddot{e}r$ too must have had a zero grade (Hamp, $AION$-L 2, 1960, 188; M. E. Huld, $Basic\ Alb.\ Etym.$, 1984, 62; Klingenschmitt, $Altarm.\ Vb.$, 1982, 68 n. 6, who posits $*h_1\mathring{n}h_3men$-). The Celtic ($*HnHm$- $>$ $*Hnm$- $>$ $*anm$- etc.) and Germanic forms ($*HnHm$- $>$ $*nam$-) have been discussed above. So there remains the Greek, Phrygian, and Tocharian evidence.

For Greek Rüdiger Schmitt posited $*h_3enh_3$-, but this is improbable as it would imply three ablaut grades in a neuter. The form must be explained directly from $*h_3nh_3m$-. Hitherto it was uncertain what the development of initial $HRHC$- in Greek was. ὄνομα now provides evidence for the development into $VRVC$-[5]. Phrygian $onoman$ will derive from the same form.

For the Tocharian forms a preform $*n\bar{e}m$- was posited which remained ununderstandable. The solution is now given by Kortlandt ($Ann.\ Arm.\ Lingu.$ 5, 1984, 42), viz. that $*h_3neh_3mn$ was dissimilated into $*h_3neh_1mn$ (i. e. $h^w - h^w > h^w - h$; see above on the initial laryngeal). The dissimilation is comparable to the one seen in Gr. ἔειπον from $*h_1\acute{e}ueuk^wom$. This explanation has the advantage that it explains the palatalization from the form that provided the vocalism of the existing forms, not from another form of the paradigm. Of course, the dissimilation is a new concept. The explanation of Gr. Ἐνυμα- supports the idea.

7. Let us now reconsider the three explanations:

1. $h_3n\acute{e}h_3$-mn	2. $h_3n\acute{o}m$-n	3. $h_3n\acute{o}m$-n
h_3nh_3-$m\acute{e}n$-s	h_3nm-$\acute{e}n$-s	$h_3n\acute{e}m$-n-s

I make the following remarks.

1. Neuter nouns with a nominative in -n, with the exception of -mn, have not been reconstructed for PIE so far. Sanskrit does not have such nouns, nor does Greek, though some of this kind are found in Hittite (type $henkan$). Lat. $unguen$, OIr. imb hardly suffice to establish the type. The

---

[5] I was inclined to assume $VR\bar{V}C$-, especially because of ἔρημος which is isolated in Greek and where one expects zero grade in the root; but the form may have to be explained otherwise. It must have full grade. The aorist ὄνητο will be analogical, after the predominating ὀνη-. – The result of this conclusion for the word νῆσσα 'duck' is that it cannot continue $*h_2nh_2t$-. The word must have had $*neh_2$- (and it was not cognate with the other 'duck'-words). M. Peters, $Unters.$, 1980, 16 (n. 18) and 81 n. 38 suggests other solutions, which are not wholly clear to me; the assumption that the accent was a factor I consider as improbable.

argument is not in itself decisive, for $*h_3nóm\text{-}n$ could be the only form of that type, but if a word ends in -*mn*, it is more probable that it contains the well-known suffix -*mn* than a suffix -*n* for which there is no evidence.

2. An *o* in the nominative is problematical. Neuters have mostly full grade with *e*, not with *o*. Exceptions are the *i*- and *u*-stems, but only these. We cannot check the neuters in -*n*, because there are none, but those in -*mn* had *e*-grade (Meillet, *Introduction*, 274f.). Other instances of *o*-grade like $*uod\text{-}r$ are supposed to have had a static inflection.

3. A static inflection is improbable because there is no direct evidence for $*h_3nem\text{-}$ anywhere, and $*h_3nm\text{-}$ (in Balto-Slavic, Albanian and Celtic) would require a reshaping of the paradigm, which involves chronological difficulties.

4. The $\bar{o}$-vocalism found in Sanskrit, Hittite, Armenian (possibly), Latin and Germanic is probably old and can hardly be explained away in all cases.

This means that the first paradigm is most probably the correct solution.

II. The Armenian 'prothetic vowel'.

The Armenian prothetic vowels are discussed by Kortlandt, *Studia Caucasica* 7 (1986), who defends a threefold reflex of the laryngeals, as against Mrs. Olsen in *APILKU* (*Arbejdspapirer, Inst. Lingv., Københavns Univ.*) 4 (1984) 103–118.

Kortlandt presents the following evidence for h_1- and h_3- (h_2- being unproblematic), to which I add *aniw* 'wheel' $< *h_3n\bar{e}bh\text{-}o\text{-}$ (Ritter, *MSS* 42, 1983, 191–196):

h_1C-		h_3C-	
eluzanem	ἐλεύσομαι	*anicanem*	ὄνειδος
erek	ἔρεβος	*awelum*	ὀφέλλω
inn	ἐννέα	*y-awelum*	ὀφέλλω
im, im-	ἐμός, ἐμέ	*y-areay* (aor.)	ὀροῦσαι
orcam < *eruc-*	ἐρεύγομαι	*aniw*	ὀμφαλός
		anun	ὄνομα
		atamn	ὀδών
		ołb	ὀλοφύρομαι
		utʽ	(ὀκτώ)
		ʔorb	ὀρφανός
		ʔorjikʽ	ὄρχις
		ʔoskr	ὀστέον
		ʔełungn	ὄνυξ

o- from h_3- became *a*- in open syllable.

olb from *h_3lbh-, cf. Lith. *ulbúoti*. *ut'* from *$h_3\acute{k}t$-, perhaps from the ordinal. *elungn* perhaps from **enong-* < **onong-*, which could be a contamination of **onog-* and **ong-* from *h_3nog^{wh}-, *h_3ng^{wh}-.

For h_1- > *e*-, *inn* and *erek* are quite certain. So is *im*, I think, but this requires some discussion, which is given below.

It is essential that *anun* and *atamn* had h_3-. As to the latter word, to Kortlandt's arguments it could be added that, if Aeol. ἔδοντες would be old, the other dialects would have had the assimilation independently, which is rather improbable. The form cannot provide evidence for PIE against the agreement of ὀδοντ-, Arm. *atamn*. (Compare my remark on methodology at the end of the next section.)

III. PIE 'me'.

1. Kortlandt assumes that 'me' was *h_1me in PIE. He removed my doubts on this point (*Development*, 1969, 43). As this is contrary to the current view, and as it is not without consequence (also from a methodological point of view), the question may be discussed here. The latest full-scale discussion is Gernot Schmidt, *Personalpronomina*, 1978, 48ff.

Beside *h_1me there are two other explanations:[6] PIE had *(h_1)*eme*, or *(h_1)*e*- was taken from the nom. *(h_1)*eǵ(H)*, either in PIE or later.

Relevant is also the possessive pronoun. The material is as follows:

	acc.	encl.	poss.
Gaul.			*im-*?
Alb.	*mue/a*	*më*	*im*
Arm.	*is* (*im-*)	—	*im-*
Gr.	ἐμέ	με	ἐμός
Av.	*mąm*	*mā*	*ma-*
Hitt.	*ammug*	-*mu*	-*mi-*/-*ma-*
Luw.		-*mu*?	
HLuw.	*amu*	-*mu*	*ami-*
Lyc.	*amu*, *e-*, *ẽ-*		*ẽmi-*
Lyd.	*amu*		*ẽmi-*

2. PIE *h_1em-. The evidence presented (e. g. Schmidt, 48f.) for PIE *h_1em- is rather doubtful. It rests upon Gaulish, Albanian and Sanskrit.

There are two Gaulish forms with *im-*, which are supposed to mean 'my': *geneta imi* 'my daughter' and *gabi buððuton imon* 'give my kiss'; see Whatmough, *Lg.* 25 (1949) 391 and Hamp, *Evidence*, 135 n. 32 (who

---

[6] Cowgill's theory (*Evidence*, 170) is, of course, highly speculative and its consequences (*m-me* > *me* and *me-me* > *eme*) are unacceptable.

translates 'take my kiss'). Now Gaulish is a language of which we know very little, to state it mildly, so the form might well be misinterpreted, either as to its meaning, or as to its origin. Also, the Celtic languages we really know have no trace of *em-. Thus it is dangerous to base any conclusions on these two forms.

Albanian has *im* 'my'. "The forms of the Possessive Adjective are of extreme complexity" (S. E. Mann, *Alb. Hist. Gramm.*, 1977, 117). I may give the forms:

	'my'		'your'	
	masc.	fem.	masc.	fem.
sg. nom.	*i im*	*e ime*	*i yt*	*e jote*
obl.	*tim*	*time*	*tat*	*tate*
pl. nom.	*e mi(j)*	*e mi(ja)*	*e tu*	*e tua*
obl.	*të mi(j)*	*të mi(ja)*	*të tu*	*të tua*

The first element is the article. The first thing that one observes is that there are also forms without initial vowel, like the accusative of the personal pronoun (*mue/a*). This may be due to the loss of unstressed initial vowels. I do not know whether it is possible that the initial vowel of the nominative was stressed. The next thing is that the second person also has an initial vowel (which is not taken from 'my'), which cannot be of PIE origin. Mann (119) calls *y*- and *jo*- "purely demonstrative". This makes one doubt about the vowel of 'my'. Nevertheless Mann adopts the old comparison with Gr. ἐμός. So does M. E. Huld, *Basic Alb. Etym.*, 1984, 164. Hamp, *Evidence*, 135, assumes $*h_1em$-$/h_1m$- and concludes: "it is...hard to say which grade of vowel originally applies". Which surprises, as he demonstrated in *AION-L* 2, 1960, 185–190 that Albanian had no 'prothetic vowels' (cf. my *Development*, 20). Huld (ibid. 154) states that *e became *i except before nasals. Thus we have to assume, I think, *i im* remade from *im* contracted from *i em*, which is found in Geg. Kortlandt suggests to me that *em* might continue a vocalized *m*. – The origin of this form, then, is too uncertain to be used as evidence for PIE. In general it must be remembered that Albanian is the latest known IE language, and the language of which the (pre)history is least well studied. We have been misled more often by material from the less known languages. E. g. some time ago it was commonly accepted that OPr. *emmens proved* that 'name' had h_1-, and even full grade; the idea is now generally abandoned. The evidence, then, is not reliable enough to draw conclusions about PIE.

Schmidt, 49 rejects Skt. *amā́* 'at home' as evidence for *am*- 'my', but thinks that *áma*- 'this' contains $*h_1eme$. It is clear that this cannot be considered as certain (semantically one might rather accept the first: 'at mine').

The forms, then, that would prove PIE h_1e- are all unreliable.

3. We shall now consider the other forms with an initial vowel, for which an explanation from $*h_1m$- is possible.

The Anatolian forms go back to $*amu$, Kammenhuber, *HbO*, 1969, 250. Except Sturtevant, who assumed a reduced grade $əm$-, everybody assumes that the a- continues older e-. However, this is highly problematic. Though e. g. Schmidt states that a occurs more often for e, Melchert (*MSS* 42, 1983, 165 n. 11) admits that this is not regular. He thinks that there was a rule that a stressed e before a geminate became a, a rule which Čop (*IF* 75, 1970, 85ff.) proposed for Luwian. That a stressed e would become more open when it stands in a closed syllable seems highly improbable. Also, there is no evidence for a geminate m in our form in any of the other languages (cf. Pedersen, *Hittitisch*, 1938, 73). Therefore, it seems that Anatolian does not continue an e.

On the other hand, Anat. a- from h_1- before consonant is a development often assumed, though perhaps not proven, for *asanzi, adanzi*. Catsanicos (*AEHE-HPh*, 1977–78[79], 1232) concluded that h_1R- did not give a 'prothetic vowel'. Of the material he gives, however, *arskezi* $<$ $*h_1r$-$sk̑$-e-ti and *arnuzzi* $<$ $*h_1r$-$n(e)u$-ti are not relevant, as they have $h_1r̥C$-, which could not give anything else but ar-. Then *warsa*-, Gr. ἐέρση and *wes-/was*- (*if* this goes back to $*h_1ues$-, but cf. Gr. ἕννυμι) have laryngeal before $u̯$. In that case h_2 was not vocalized either, but resulted in hw- (*hwiszi*). If *nakki*- 'heavy' continues $*h_1nok̑$-, it seems to prove his point. *lāman* did not have h_1-, but h_3-, but this may not be essential. It is probable that the following consonant was decisive. (Note that this is true also for Greek and Armenian, which do not have 'prothetic vowels' before $i̯$; Armenian does not have one before $u̯$ either.) Catsanicos believes that before non-resonants h_1- was vocalized[7]. I suppose, then, that Hm- developed differently from Hn-, Hr- Hl-. This is not surprising, as m often behaves differently from n, r, l; cf. e. g. the behaviour of m (like stops) with regard to lenition in Old Irish (Thurneysen § 121 c). The conclusion is that there is no good evidence for h_1- $>$ e- (note 2), but possible evidence for h_1- $>$ a- in *asanzi, adanzi*; that there is some evidence for h_1R- $>$ R- (only *nakki*-, indirectly *lāman*). We may assume that m behaved like the non-resonants in this respect, which makes h_1m- $>$ am- possible.

---

[7] Catsanicos suggests that h_1- became e- in this position. As far as I know this has not been proposed earlier. The evidence would be *edalu* (Luw. *adduwali*-) 'bad', and gen. *esnas* $<$ $*esanas$ $<$ $*h_1s$-h_2-n-os, to the nom. *eshar*. For the first form I see no reason to assume a zero grade, and the second form is too much in discussion to be used as evidence for a totally deviant development. C. assumes that *asanzi, adanzi* have a- through vowel harmony, which is quite improbable: vowel harmony is not an established phenomenon in Hittite, but at most a sporadic development; it is then improbable that it would have affected a paradigm which had e- throughout.

For the form *-mu* see on the Greek forms.

As h_1C- gave *eC*- in Armenian, *im*- may continue $*h_1m$-.

For Greek the problem with $*h_1me$ is, of course, that we have an *e*-less form in the enclitic. Note that those who reconstruct PIE *em*- with full grade, i.e. $*h_1em$- (unless they accept that PIE had words with initial vowel) face the same problem (as a zero grade $*h_1m$- would have given Gr. ἐμ- as well); so $*h_1eme$ is no better explanation for Greek. If one posits $*h_1me$, the *e*- must have been removed. This was why I hesitated, but Kortlandt convinced me that this is exactly the kind of thing that may happen with (enclitic) pronouns. To mention one example which I came across recently, Serbo-Croatian has *mu* beside *njĕmu* (OCS *jemu*), *ga* beside *njĕga* (OCS *jego*). A reason may have been to give it the same structure as had σέ. I think that it is significant that the possessive did not get a form *μός (cf. Av. *ma*-). A pronominal form with and without *e*- (probably) already existed in ἐκεῖνος, κεῖνος, where $*h_1e$- was an independent pronominal element. The interchange here could have served as a model. With respect to *e*-deletion in other forms, I may point to θέλω/ἐθέλω $< *h_1g^{wh}el$-, where we know that the *e*-less form is secondary. For Anatolian we have to assume the same phenomenon. Here we also have a possessive form without initial vowel, but only in Hittite, which shows that the *a*- was lost in an enclitic[8].

Thus, Greek, Armenian, and Anatolian can have their initial vowel from $*h_1C$-.

4.   Let us now consider the three theories. The idea that *e*- was taken from the nominative in the separate languages is improbable, because it implies that this happened in several languages independently (although being not a very self-imposing development), and exactly in those languages that do have 'prothetic vowels' (if we consider the Gaulish and Albanian forms as too doubtful). While for Greek it is conceivable that *με was reshaped after ἐγώ, the case is different for Anatolian. Here in the nominative no particle (or whatever it was in Greek etc.) has been added. That $*(h_1)eǵ$, *me* was reshaped into *eme* is far from easy, I dare say quite improbable. Further we have seen that the *a*-vocalism of Anatolian probably cannot be explained in this way. − If the $(h_1)e$- was taken from the nominative already in PIE, the theory becomes identical with the one that assumes that PIE had $*h_1em$- (without giving a further historical interpretation).

This latter theory is improbable because in the great families like Indo-Iranian, Balto-Slavic, Germanic and Italo-Celtic there is no trace of *em*-. While one may assume that *e*- could have been easily introduced from

---

[8] One might think that h_1- was lost in the enclitic form. This could have happened in PIE.

the nominative, it is rather improbable that an original e- was lost on so large a scale. I do not see how the advocates of this theory can account for *me, except by accepting this form as the enclitic form of PIE, without further explanation. It should be noted that *eme/me is not a normal type of ablaut. Further, here too the Anatolian a- refutes PIE e-. The fact that the languages where initial vowel is surely established are the ones that have 'prothetic vowels' (if we put aside for a moment the doubtful Gaulish and Albanian forms) is decisive.

On the other hand, the theory that assumes *h_1me explains why the initial vowel occurs in Greek, Armenian, and Anatolian. But this theory also explains the vocalism without any problem: Greek and Armenian e-, now that h_1C- > eC- has been established for Armenian, and Anatolian a-. It must be assumed, in this case, that Greek and Anatolian removed the vowel in enclitic forms, a process which we can observe in Anatolian. But this is a phenomenon common and just to be expected with pronouns. Also, those who assume *h_1em- must do the same (unless they would admit vowels in absolute initial in PIE).

It should also be pointed out that *h_1me agrees in structure with *$t\d{u}e$, and with *$\d{n}sme$ and *$usme$ in that all these forms have only one full vowel. The presence of just one vowel points to a very archaic character. It is important that the Greek accentuation ἐμέ is in agreement with the reconstruction *$h_1mé$. This argument is not refuted by forms like the gen. *h_1mene[9], because these are clearly formations of a later date based on *h_1me.

When we now look back at the Gaulish and Albanian forms, it must be considered certain that they do not point to *h_1em-. Of course, *h_1m- may be the zero grade of *h_1em-, but there is no evidence for such a form.

Thus *$h_1mé$ must be considered the correct reconstruction.

5. It may be useful to make a methodological remark here, about details and general lines. It is a good tradition in Indo-European linguistics to concentrate on facts, i.e. on details. The details, of course, are the beginning and the end. However, if the details do not point all in the same direction or leave more possibilities, or (seem to) contradict each other, we have to go by broad lines to try to settle problems. In this case, the correspondence:

Gr. eC-, Arm. eC-, Hitt. aC-, other C-

points to h_1C-. It is in this light that we have to judge the (seemingly)

---

[9] I never understood the idea that *$mene$ originated from *me-me. That a reduplicated accusative (or, if one so wants, casus obliquus) would have given a genitive is extremely improbable. Now that the form *h_1me is established, it is also impossible for formal reasons.

deviant testimony of Albanian and Gaulish. I think that too often the details block / hamper our sight of the great lines.

Finally it may be remarked that this is, as far as I know, the first case where we can be certain that Hittite (Anatolian) had a 'prothetic vowel' (from an initial laryngeal). Note that Oettinger, *Stammbildung*, 546ff., does not give an instance of h_2- > a-. If *asanzi* results from *h_1s-, it is remarkable that *h_2s- would have given *hs*- in *haster*-; it must be due to the different nature of the two laryngeals (I would expect *h_3s- to give *hs*- too; cf. my paper on the nature of the laryngeals at the Pavia Congress in 1985)[10].

University of Leiden   Robert S. P. Beekes
Faculteit der Letteren
Vergelijkende taalwetenschappen
POBox 9515
NL-2300 RA Leiden

Rijnsburgerweg 88
NL-2333 AD Leiden

---

[10] For some references I am indebted to M. Peters.