

## Another proterodynamic verb in Hittite

In KZ 87 (1973) 86–98 I proposed a new explanation of the ablaut type Hitt. *sakki sekkanzi*. Starting from Joh. Narten's theory (*Pratidānam*, Fs. Kuiper, 9–19) of a proterodynamic verb with lengthened grade in the singular active and normal grade in the other forms, I postulated the same type for the 'perfect', which probably was a special type of present in PIE. I demonstrated such perfect forms in Greek μέμηλε and, with *o*-grade, in εἴωθα, ἄωστο, probably in γέγωνε and perhaps in ἄνωγα. Comparing the *ō/e* ablaut in the nominal forms (Lat. *maior maiēs-tas*, Lith. *piemuõ piemeni* etc.<sup>1</sup>) I proposed that the ablaut of the type *sakki sekkanzi*, for which the explanations given are improbable<sup>2</sup>), might directly continue such a proterodynamic ablaut with *-ō-* in the singular and *-e-* in the plural<sup>3</sup>).

To this type I think must be added *hamank-/hamenk-* 'bind'. The forms found are the following:

	pres.	pret.	imp.	verb. subst.
sg. 1	<i>hamangami</i> <i>hamangahhi</i> (Heth. Wb. Erg. 3)			<i>hamenkuyar</i> <sup>4</sup> )
sg. 3	<i>hamanki</i>	<i>hamankta</i> <i>hamakta</i> <i>hamikta</i>		pte. <i>hamenkant-</i> <i>hamankant-</i>
pl. 3	<i>haminkanzi</i> <i>hamankanzi</i>	<i>haminkir</i>	<i>hamankandu</i>	

<sup>1</sup>) For Hittite one might consider whether *yāt-ar* / *yēt-enas* represents \**yōd-/yed-*.

<sup>2</sup>) Cf. also Puhvel, Actes X<sup>e</sup> Congr. Int. Lingu. 633: it is "dubious in the extreme" that the plural "simply followed the main type of conjugation with radical *e*-vocalism" while the singular retained *a*-vocalism (against Kuryłowicz, *Infl. Cat.* 56–89, who holds that the singular had zero grade; for this last assumption there is no evidence at all, cf. the text below). Watkins' view (*Idg. Gr.* 3, 117) is not clear to me.

<sup>3</sup>) The connection with Lat. *sāgīre*, Goth. *sokjan* (Benveniste, *BSL* 33, 140f.) must therefore be given up. From PIE \**sāg-* = \**seh<sub>2</sub>g-* we would expect \**sahk-* in Hittite, but *-h-* is hardly ever found before stop. The only other suggestion is to connect it with Lat. *sciō*.

<sup>4</sup>) Note that we have here an infinitive in *-uyar* of an ablauting verb, an exception to the rule of Miss Kammenhuber (e.g. *Hb. d. Or.* 137, 216).

The middle forms all have *-men-* (written *mi-ik*, *mi-en*, *me-in em-en*); Neu, *Interpretation* 38.

Though a process of levelling is evidently going on, it seems that *-a-* originally belonged to the singular, *-e-* to the plural. This seems the more sure as in verbs with *e/a* ablaut the *-a-* never penetrates into the singular (while the *-e-* does appear in the plural).

Though the word has no IE etymon, it might well be of IE origin. It could represent *\*h<sub>2</sub>menK-* (*K* indicating any guttural)<sup>5</sup>). Of such a form Hitt. */hmank-/* might represent *\*h<sub>2</sub>mṛK-*, but as an ablaut zero (in sg. act.)/full grade contradicts anything we know of PIE verbal ablaut, this is improbable. Hitt. *hamank-* must then represent *\*h<sub>2</sub>monK-* or *\*h<sub>2</sub>mōnK-*. Of these the first gives an ablaut *o/e* as yet unknown, whereas the last gives the proterodynamic type lengthened grade (*ō*)/full grade (*e*).

Pedersen, *Hittitisch* 111f., already put *hamank-* in the *sakhi* group (and also referred, mentioning the plene writing of *-a-* in these verbs, to γέγωνε, Lat. *fōdi* and the Celtic forms, though he assumed *o/ē* ablaut for *sakhi*). Friedrich (*Elementarbuch*<sup>2</sup> 85f.), however, classified it as a *mi-*verb, but the 3 sg. in *-i* and the 1 sg. in *-hi*, which has now been found, rather point to the *hi-*class. There would be no difficulty in assuming the same type of ablaut (*ō/e*) for a *mi-*verb (the group with which Joh. Narten started), but it now seems that the verb is simply a member of the *sakhi* group. (Perhaps one hesitated to 'acknowledge' the *a/e* (not *e/a*) ablaut for a supposedly *mi-*verb, because *a/e* was considered as a form of the perfect ablaut, which was expected only with the *hi-*verbs.)

<sup>5</sup> I do not agree with Nadia van Brock (*RHA* 70, 1962, 31–36), who considers the word as a normal nasal present. For the *n* lacking after *m* she adduces a form *ha-ma-na-ak-ta* [*hamnakta*]. But not only is the sign *na* not certain, also the *a* in *-nak-* for expected *-ne/ik-* is ununderstandable. She assumes influence of the preceding labial nasal, but this is an *ad hoc* assumption, which is improbable because of the consequent writing *t/damenk-*. She then says that it is understandable that after a nasal the infix *-nin-* was avoided. But as the original form was *Cṛn-n-eC* (a type attested by δάμνημι, κάμνω, τάμνω), it is hardly possible that this *n* was lost, unless through assimilation (*mn* > *nm*, Friedrich, *Elementarbuch*<sup>2</sup> § 32b), which was rare. Also the second *a* of *hama(n)k-* could not be explained in this way (see above). Lastly it is now certain that our verb is a *hi-*verb, so that this interpretation is for three reasons improbable. The connection with ἄγγω therefore remains very dubious. The connection of *tamenk-* with Skt. *tanakti* as *\*tṛn-n-ek-* seems also not possible, as this form would have given *\*tamnakti*, cf. *samnīte* < *\*kṛn-n-h<sub>2</sub>-toi*.

In the case of *sak-*, *ak-* and *ar-* there could have been some doubt as to the zero grade expected in the plural when these verbs had the normal perfect ablaut: *sk-*, or *s<sub>2</sub>k-*? With this verb there can be no doubt. We expect *\*h<sub>2</sub>monK-*, *\*h<sub>2</sub>m<sub>2</sub>K-*, which would both have given *h(a)mank-* in Hittite. Of course there is no reason why here an *e*-form would have been introduced in the plural. This means that these verbs did not have the normal perfect ablaut *o/Ø*.

Perhaps belongs here also *hink-* 'sich verneigen', to which Prof. Houwink ten Cate draws my attention. Neu, *Interpretation* 54, gives the Old Hittite forms middle pres. 3 sg. *ha-ik-ta-ri*, 3 pl. *ha-in-kán-ta*. As PIE *-oi-* had become *-e-* in Old Hittite and *-ei-* had developed into *-i-* in the same time, Hitt. *-ai-* must represent PIE *-ōi-*. On the other hand the *hink-* forms might continue PIE *-ei-*. This would give a proterodynamic ablaut *ōi/ei*. However, this reconstruction is doubtful as *\*h<sub>2</sub>eink-*<sup>6)</sup> has an unusual root structure for PIE, with two resonants before a stop at the end.

#### *Verbal Ablaut in Hittite*

A few words may be added on verbal ablaut in Hittite in general. We may now expect a priori the following types:

sg. hysterodynamic	<i>e</i>	<i>o</i>	proterodynamic	$\bar{o}$	$\bar{e}$	$\bar{o}$
pl. (normal)	Ø	Ø		<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>o</i>
	I 1	I 2		II 1	II 2	II 3

All types may be expected for both *mi-* and *hi-*verbs.

As to the types II 2 and II 3, the second has not been demonstrated; the first is evidenced only by *μῆδομαι/μῆδομαι*<sup>7)</sup> and Lith. *ėmi*/Lat. *edo*. I think that this type originated from levelling of a system  $\bar{o}/e$  (as in the nouns  $\bar{e}r/er$  (*δοτήρ*) and  $\bar{o}r/or$  (*δότηρ*) from  $\bar{o}r/er$ ; see KZ 86 (1972) 30–63), so that  $\bar{o}/o$  may be expected as well. The forms Goth. *ga-motan* and Arm. *utem* seem evidence for this. There is of course no reason to deny the possibility that the three types existed already in PIE.

In Hittite II 3 cannot be distinguished from types with *-a-*generalized (unless plene writing could indeed have been used —

<sup>6)</sup> As Hitt. *h-* probably continues PIE *h<sub>2</sub>*, Hitt. *ai* might as well represent *\*h<sub>2</sub>ēink*, [*h<sub>2</sub>āink-*]. Then *\*h<sub>2</sub>eink-*, [*h<sub>2</sub>aink-*], would have given *henk-* in Hittite, with *-e-* from *-ai-*.

<sup>7)</sup> Note *μῆστο· βουλεύσατο* Hsch., which will represent *\*μῆδ-το* (Schwyzer 751 with Nachtr.; there is no reason to assume an *s*-form) and shows athematic inflection for the verb.

inconsequently —to indicate a long vowel)<sup>8)</sup>. Nor could II 2, unless I am right in supposing that PIE  $\bar{e}$ - had become  $-i$ - in Old Hittite<sup>9)</sup>. In that case we expect some old texts to present verbs with  $-i$ - in the singular and  $-e$ - in the plural. I have not found one so far.

The types given above would have developed in Hittite into  $e(i)/\emptyset$  (with a subtype  $e/a$  from phonetic developments in Hittite),  $a/\emptyset$ ,  $a(\bar{a})/e(i)$ ,  $i(e)/e$ ,  $a(\bar{a})/a$ . It is evident that levelling will have produced either  $e$ ,  $i$  or  $a$  in the whole paradigm. Perhaps will further old texts allow us to recognize one or more of these types.

Prinsenlaan 23  
Oegstgeest, The Netherlands

R. S. P. Beekes

---

<sup>8)</sup> From StBoT 8 I noted *is-ta-a-ap-he* and *ma-a-ar-ka-ah-hi*, but the plurals are not found in these texts. Beside *ga-a-an-ga-ah-he(hi)*, *ka-a-an-ki* there is *k[a]-a[n-ka]-an-z[i]* („Ergänzung unsicher“ but probable) and the ptc. *ga-an-ga-an-te-es* and *ka-an-kán-* [ (the participle generally has the ablaut grade of the plural). Of course this material is too limited for any conclusions.

<sup>9)</sup> To the five arguments given in KZ 87, 89–90. I would like to add the following consideration. It is remarkable that *nepis* is always, also in old texts, written thus, with the  $-e-$  of the first syllable carefully expressed (*ne-* or *ne-e-*) and never  $-es-$  used to indicate  $/nepes-/$ . From the other languages we know only  $-os-$  and  $-es-$  in neuter  $s$ -stems, but Hittite might have retained another type. Neuters with long vowel in the suffix (in the nominative) are well known, e.g.  $\text{ḫδωϑ}$ . Does *nepis* represent  $*nebhēs$ ?