

Old Hittite 1 sg. *-he* : 3 sg. *-i*

A New Synchronic Datum

As is pointed out notably by Otten-Souček, *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*, p. 56 and 76f., the 1 sg. present ending of the *hi*-verbs had the form *-he* in Old Hittite. It appeared from their material that it was well distinguished from the 3 sg. ending, which was written *-i*, also when it appeared after the *h* of the verbs in *-ahh*-.

It is now generally assumed that these two endings belonged to a separate set of — at least — singular endings of PIE. The basic elements for the first three persons were \tilde{h}_2 , $t\tilde{h}_2$, and \emptyset (zero) respectively. These endings could or could not have an *-i*. The central problem is which vocalism these endings could have. To my mind the appearance of OHitt. 1 sg. *-he* beside 3 sg. *-i* puts this question in a new light. We may therefore briefly discuss it.

3 sg. *-i*

For 3 sg. *-i* we can be sure that this ending contained an *-i*. We must see whether *-i*, or *-ei*, or *-oi* was the basis of Hitt. *-i*.

We know that PIE. *oi* is represented in Old Hittite by *e*. This appears from the enclitic pronoun for the third person, of which the nominative plural is *-e*. This form, of which the nominative and accusative singular are *-as*, *-an*, can hardly have been anything else than **oi*. Another form to confirm this is the dative of the enclitic pronoun for the third person singular, which in Old Hittite is *-se*, consistently distinguished from forms with *-si* (Otten-Souček, l. c., p. 56, 69). This form continues PIE. **soi*.

As, then, *oi* appears as *e* in Old Hittite texts, the 3 sg. ending *-i* cannot represent *-oi*.

The current interpretation of *-i* is that it goes back to **-a-i* (Rosenkranz, *Jahrb. kleinasi. Forsch.* 2 (1953) 344ff.; Kammen-

huber in *Altkleinas. Sprachen in Hb. Orient.* p. 331f.; Neu, *Das heth. Mediopassiv u. seine idg. Grundlagen*, p. 125—28 and *IF.* 72, 1967/68, 223—38; Watkins in *Kuryłowicz's Idg. Gramm.* III/1, p. 82). This *ai* is by some supposed to represent PIE. *-oi*, for which see above. Mrs. Kammenhuber considers the *a* in the supposed *-a-i* as due to a „ur-heth.-luw. Umgestaltung der Perfektendungen“, i. e. of **ha *tha *e* into **ha *tha *a*. The development of PIE. *ai*, or Hitt.-Luw. *ai* as we would have here, is not known. However, I think we can be sure that it was identical to that of PIE. *oi*, for in Hittite *o* and *a* merged into *a*. It is therefore probable that *oi* and *ai* first merged into *ai*, or, if this did not happen, that nevertheless the outcomes of *oi* and *ai* were identical in this language. This means that both *oi* and *ai* would appear as *e* in Old Hittite. As we find *-i* in the 3 sg., this cannot represent **-a-i* as was supposed.

Watkins (l. c.) points to a 3 sg. ending *-e*. This form, however, has as little value as the occasional writings *-me* for *-mi*, *-se* for *-si*, *-te* for *-ti*. See Neu, *Mediopassiv* p. 125 n. 15.

Taken by itself *-i* might be PIE. *-i*. Neu's argument that this is impossible because the *-t* of dental stems is not assibilated, is not decisive. It can be easily assumed that the *-t* was analogically restored (as it perhaps was in the dative of *t*-stems, if the dative had originally *-i*, not *-ei*).

It is not sure that *-i* could represent original *-ei*. Phonetically it is very well possible that, while *oi* (and *ai*) had become *e*, *ei* appeared as *i*. We shall see in the next paragraph that the assumption is probable. If it is right, 3 sg. *-i* could represent *-i* or *-ei*.

PIE. *i*-diphthongs in Hittite

It is difficult to show the development of PIE. *ei* in Hittite. Partly this is due to the fact that one can hardly ever be sure that the basic form had *ei* and not *i*. And in the later texts *e* and *i* seem to have been used without distinction.

In Old Hittite the dative-locative is consistently written with *-i* (Otten-Souček p. 56). If this ending continues (a dative) *-ei*, it would confirm our hypothesis. However, it might as well be an old locative in *-i*.

An important case to my mind is *ki-i-ta* 'he lies', which occurs in the same texts as those that distinguished *-he* : *-i* (Ottensouček p. 116; ten occurrences, attested in several texts). From the root **kei-* there occur, as far as I know, no verb forms with zero grade **ki-*. Compare the important article of Johanna Narten in *Pratidānam*, p. 9—19. She points to the curious fact that this root, though it has a Middle declension, has full grade in Indo-Iranian and in Greek. It is one of the forms on which she bases her 'proterodynamic' inflection. This form, then, would confirm *ei* > *i* in Old Hittite.

In later Hittite we find *-hi*. This form might be analogic, but, if the 2 sg. ending was **-h₂ei*, we would expect OHitt. **-te* (the form is not attested), and in *-he* **-te -i* generalization of *-i* is not evident. Of course, the *mi*-endings could have influenced the system.

The pronoun *-se* was replaced by *-si*. Here influence of the general dative ending *-i* is possible. As, however, we must assume two different types of analogy, it would be simpler to assume a phonetic development. However, this problem should be studied together with the development of OHitt. *e, i* representing PIE. *e* and *ē*. We have so far the following situation:

PIE.	OHitt.	later Hitt.
<i>ei</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>oi</i>	} <i>e</i>	} <i>?i</i>
<i>h₂ei, [h₂ai]</i>		
<i>ē</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>?</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>?</i>

1 sg. *-he*

The 1 sg. ending *-he* cannot represent *-h₂i*. We can be sure that originally there was a vowel between *h₂* and *i*. There are only two possibilities: *e* and *o*. If it was *e*, this vowel was 'coloured' to *a* by *h₂*. If the vowel was *o*, this *o* was not changed into *a* (cf. Beekes, *The Development of the PIE. Laryngeals in Greek*, pp. 128, 166—68, 290). Moreover, even if *h₂o* was

realized as [\hbar_2a], as some scholars believe, this would not be important here, because both *oi* and *ai* probably developed into OHitt. *e*, as we saw above. OHitt. *-he*, then, may represent $-\hbar_2ei$ or $-\hbar_2oi$.

1 sg. *-he* : 3 sg. *-i*

We have seen that for *-he* both $-\hbar_2ei$ and $-\hbar_2oi$ are possible, for *-i* both *-i* and *-ei*. At present we are not able to decide which of the two possibilities in each case is the right one, unless both endings had the same vowel before *i*. In that case, of course, the endings must derive from $-\hbar_2ei$ and *-ei* respectively. However, it is not sure that the three endings had an exactly parallel structure. Just as Greek $-(\mu)\alpha\iota -\sigma\alpha\iota -\tau\alpha\iota$ does not go back to a system with one and the same vowel (either *e* or *o*), this might be true of Hittite *-he -i*. However, the system of 'hi-endings', the set $-\hbar_2-$, $-t\hbar_2-$, $-\sigma-$, is apparently the system that died out in most languages. It is a relict, and it is therefore probable that it is an original unity, while $-(\mu)\alpha\iota -\sigma\alpha\iota -\tau\alpha\iota$ probably is not, *-s-* and *-t-* belonging together with *-m-*. The possibility, therefore, that the elements of this unity had a parallel structure seems to me rather great.

Also it should be pointed out that there is no sure evidence for *o*-vocalism in the *i*-holding series of *hi*-endings, while there is for *e* (in the form of *a* in the first person singular). We have:

OHitt.	Greek	Latin	Slavic	Indian (Middle perf.)
<i>he</i>	$(\mu)\alpha\iota$	\bar{i}	\check{e}	<i>e</i>
<i>*te?</i>		$t\bar{i}$		
<i>i</i>		\bar{i}		

Of these Greek and Latin point to *e*-vocalism. Of course the existence of $-\hbar_2oi$ etc. should not be a priori denied, but it should not be a priori posited either when there is no evidence for it. In the last case we would start from preconceived ideas about the original structure of the PIE. verb instead of deducing it from the facts.

PIE. Origin

The problem of the exact origin of these endings is, of course, linked up with the question whether they are of PIE. date, or rather a Hittite innovation. In this matter there have been from the beginning two views. We have seen that the current interpretation, which holds that the *i*-holding endings are a Hittite innovation based on forms without *i*, is impossible (as *-i* would represent *-a-i*). Safarewicz on the other hand already compared (Bull. internat. de l'Acad. d. Sciences et d. Lettres, Krakau 1938, pp. 149—56) the Latin perfect-endings, posited *e*-vocalism and considered PIE. origin. I have not seen any decisive argument that the Hittite *hi*-endings must be recent. That of Annelies Kammenhuber (l. c. p. 331) certainly is not one: „daß für heth. *-hi* . . . der sekundäre Antritt des *-i* im Präsens (. . .) durch die im Luwischen bewahrte ältere Form *-ha* erwiesen ist und daß ausgerechnet im hethitischen Medium . . . nicht die „medialen“ **ai*-Formen . . . vorliegen, sondern die (. . .) *i*-losen Formen“. Firstly, the Luwian form cited is a praeterite, which does therefore not prove that there could not have been a PIE. ending with *i* which Hittite used as present ending. The second argument, too, is premature, as it presupposes an exact knowledge of the history of the Middle category, which in fact we do not have. In any case it cannot be maintained that *i*-less forms are less 'Middle', as this notion was probably indicated by the elements \tilde{h}_2 , $t\tilde{h}_2$, σ .

At present, then, I see no reason why the Hittite *hi*-endings could not be old. Parallel forms are found in Latin, Greek, Slavic and Indian. It seems most probable, then, that these endings are of PIE. date, and had *-ei*, not *-oi*.

(Corrector's note: At present I hold that PIE. \tilde{e} had become *i* in Old Hittite; see my article on the proterodynamic perfect, which will appear in KZ. On h_2o an article will be published in: Die Sprache.)