

INDICE

Linguistica indoeuropea:	
P. DI GIOVINE, <i>Gli studi sul sistema verbale indoeuropeo ricostruito: problemi di metodo e prospettive di ricerca</i>	11
G. E. DUNKEL, <i>Early, Middle, Late Indo-European: Doing it my Way</i>	29
J. L. GARCIA RAMÓN, <i>Infinitive im Indogermanischen? Zur Typologie der Infinitivbildungen und zu ihrer Entwicklung in den älteren indogermanischen Sprachen</i>	45
R. LAZZERONI, <i>La transitività come categoria linguistica. I nomi di azione indoeuropei</i>	71
H. C. MELCHERT, <i>Traces of a PIE. Aspectual Contrast in Anatolian?</i>	83
N. OETTINGER, <i>Grundsätzliche Überlegungen zum Nordwest-Indogermanischen</i>	93
D. POLI, <i>La rappresentazione del «conoscere veritiero» in irlandese</i>	113
R. SCHMITT, <i>Notgedrungene Beiträge zu Westiranisch <i>st</i> versus <i>st</i> oder: Epigraphik und historische Dialektologie</i>	121
Linguistica germanica:	
E. DETTORI, <i>Una metafora: *WER-S- in latino e antico nordico</i>	133
L. INNOCENTE, <i>Commento alla glossa gotica <i>fijaida</i>: andwaih</i>	139
Linguistica anatolica:	
R. GUSMANI, <i>Lykische Streifzüge</i>	147
Linguistica uralica:	
L. HONTI, <i>Blosse Übereinstimmung oder kausaler Zusammenhang? Bemerkungen zum angeblich fremdsprachlichen Ursprung der zusammengesetzten Vergangenheitstempora und des Auditivs in uralischen Sprachen</i>	159
Linguistica africana:	
F. CREVATIN, <i>Profili linguistici africani: 1. Il verbo nella lingua Kurlango (Gur; Costa d'Avorio)</i>	185
Plurilinguismo:	
R. BOMBI, <i>La considerazione delle lingue speciali nella linguistica storica</i>	195
F. FUSCO, <i>Un latinismo paneuropeo nel lessico universitario</i>	201
V. ORIOLES, <i>Calchi semantici greci in latino: a proposito di una recente pubblicazione</i>	211
Note e discussioni:	
L. BONGRANI FANFONI, <i>Quattro epigrafi cretesi (?) dalla Valle dei Re (Tomba di Amenofi II)</i>	221
F. CREVATIN, <i>Note di onomasiologia</i>	229
F. CREVATIN, <i>Nuovo testo venetico da Trieste</i>	231
Schede bibliografiche (a cura di R. Bombi, F. Fusco, G. Graffi, R. Gusmani, L. Innocente, A. Landi, R. Oniga, V. Orioles, G. Ziffer)	235
Recapito dei collaboratori	253
Indice per autori dei volumi 11-20	255
Indice dei principali argomenti e termini trattati	261

UNIVERSITÀ
DI TRIESTE

UNIVERSITÀ
DI UDINE

INCONTRI LINGUISTICI

20
(1997)

ESTRATTO



ISTITUTI EDITORIALI
E POLIGRAFICI
INTERNAZIONALI®

PISA · ROMA

TRACES OF A PIE. ASPECTUAL CONTRAST IN ANATOLIAN?*

1. It is a famous principle of historical linguistics that we can and should exploit the evidence of forms which are irregular within their synchronic context to recover regular systems of prior linguistic stages. The validity and explanatory power of such a line of reasoning are unquestionable. However, irregularities are by their very nature typically isolated and few in number. In a given instance it can be hard to determine with assurance whether an irregular pattern is really a «precious archaism» or merely the peculiar (even aberrant) development of a particular language, the details of which remain beyond our grasp.

The topic treated below is a case in point. I believe that the scattered examples I have collected constitute a genuine pattern and are not the coincidental result of different language-particular processes. If this is true, then they also are the remnants, direct and indirect, of an earlier regular system. The evidence, however, remains sparse and variable in quality. Some readers will legitimately doubt that the data can support the weight of the analysis I propose. I nevertheless present the evidence and hypothesis here, because if the latter is correct, it has profound implications for the much-vexed question of the relationship of the Anatolian subfamily to Proto-Indo-European.

2. Hittite (respectively Anatolian) is famous for the fact that its verbal system is monothematic: every verb derives all its finite and non-finite forms from a single synchronic stem¹. The individual stems are often formed with suffixes cognate with those which carry aspectual value in other older Indo-European languages. Indeed, virtually every well-established PIE suffix and derivational process used to form imperfectives («presents») is represented. We find stems corresponding to *nu*-presents (*tēpnu-* 'belittle'), *ye/o*-presents (*wer(i)ye-* 'call'), transitives in *-eye-* (*wašše/a-* 'clothe'), «acrostatic» («Narten») root presents (*ēd-* 'eat'), and so on. There are also cognates of

* I am grateful to Jay Jasanoff and Norbert Oettinger for helpful comments and criticisms. I remain, of course, solely responsible for the views expressed.

1. In MELCHERT, 1998 I have argued that virtually every Hittite verb may form a stem in *-ške/a-* (or one of its suppletive allomorphs *-šš(a)-* or *-anni/a-*) which explicitly marks the action as «imperfective» or having some value of «verbal plurality». Although there is evidence for this system in other Anatolian languages, it clearly is an innovation and has nothing to do with any possible traces of inherited PIE aspect in Anatolian.

ordinary root presents (*ēš-/aš-* 'be'), and of root aorists (*tē-* 'say' < *'put'). Crucially, whether there are traces of a characterized (sigmatic) aorist is a matter of dispute².

In some cases we find correspondents of different aspectual stems to the same root: *huk-/huk-* 'slaughter' and *huni(n)k-* 'wound, injure', both from **h₂weg-*, the former matching a root aorist, the latter a «nasal-infix» present (see Strunk, 1979, p. 254 ff.). In Anatolian, however, the different stems function as lexically distinct verbs. No one denies the obvious relationship of the suffixes to PIE aspectual markers, but there is a widespread view that these appear in Anatolian in a «pre-aspectual» guise. They serve as derivational suffixes which modify the «Aktionsart» of the verbal roots (for one well-argued presentation of this general viewpoint see Strunk, 1979, p. 248 ff. and in more detail 1994). Cases of this sort, where Anatolian has generalized for a given verb a particular stem which has an aspectual value elsewhere, are not the object of discussion here.

3. I will claim that both Hittite and Luvian have verbs which show *two distinct synchronic stems*, specifically one in *-ye/ya-* (Luvian *-i-/ya-*) and one without. Furthermore, the general distribution is that the former marks the present (indicative) and the latter all other categories.

3.1. Some of the evidence I will present has been noticed by others. JASANOFF (1978, p. 40) cites Hitt. pres. ind. mid. *parkiya-* 'rise' beside imv. mid. 3rd sg. *par(a)k-taru*. He compares Tocharian *pärk-* and Armenian *ebarj* and explicitly suggests that the first Hittite stem may reflect a **ye/o-* present, and the second a root aorist³. Compare also Oettinger, 1979, p. 356²⁰⁷. Oettinger (1979, p. 350 and already 1976, p. 140) points to a phenomenon he correctly describes in synchronic terms as «Ausstoßung des *je-* Formans bei *nu-* Bildungen». He cites as examples *tit(ta)nu-* < *titti-* 'install' and *kartimnu-* 'make angry' < *kartimmiye-* 'be angry'. The second example is especially striking, because in this case we are certainly dealing with a denominative formation (even if we do not fully understand the details of the base **kartimm(i)-*). Starke (1990, pp. 259 & 551) has found an analogue in CLuvian, where there is likewise «Ausstoßung» of *-je-* in the verbal noun: e.g. *walluna(šša/i)-* 'of lifting' vs. finite *walli(ya)-*.

We owe to Oettinger (1979, p. 345) the insight that in Old Hittite the principal stem of 'lift' is *karp(i)ye-*, replaced in Middle Hittite by *kar(a)p-*.

2. Cf. OETTINGER, 1979, p. 199 and 1992, p. 242¹³ and HACKSTEIN, 1993, p. 153 ff. vs. JASANOFF, 1988 on the status of Hitt. *g(a)nešš-* 'recognize, know'.

3. *parkiyat[ta]* and *par(a)ktaru* cooccur in a single passage KUB XXXIII 68 i 1ff, confirming that they do belong to a single synchronic verb with no discernible semantic differentiation.

He cites this as a case where the *-ye/a-* stem is older than the athematic, against the usual pattern whereby *-ye/a-* is the expanding, innovative form. He does not answer the question of why an otherwise productive formation should be replaced in this verb by a recessive one.

If we look at all the evidence for the verb 'lift', we find that in fact *all* (seven) examples of *karp(i)ye-* in OH manuscripts are in the present indicative⁴. Of the instances in later manuscripts, 13 are in the present, 15 are non-present, but fully half of the latter are in a single manuscript (KBo XVII 88 + XX 67). Beginning with Middle Hittite, we find more than 80 examples of *kar(a)p-* outside the present indicative. It is true, of course, that we also find present forms of *kar(a)p-*, beginning already in OH manuscripts (e.g. KBo XVII 43 iv 7). As Oettinger concluded, the latter has become the only stem for this verb in Middle and Neo-Hittite. Unfortunately, to my knowledge we have no non-present finite examples from OH manuscripts (we do find the participle *karpant-*, KBo XXV 31 ii 4 et aliter).

The highly skewed attested distribution seems to me, however, suggestive enough: the stem *karp(i)ye-* is effectively restricted to the present indicative, and there is no evidence for its use outside the present in original compositions from any period. I therefore propose that the pre-Hittite distribution was: pres. ind. *karp(i)ye-*, elsewhere *kar(a)p-*. This would also make the later development much more comprehensible. The athematic stem *kar(a)p-* did not have to be created (on what model?) – the language merely leveled the synchronically unmotivated allomorphy in favor of the non-present stem, beginning already in Old Hittite. By the later language the verb conformed to the productive Hittite pattern of one stem per verb.

Lehrman (1985, p. 62 ff.) had also noticed the restriction of OH *karp(i)ye-* to the present indicative and seen its potential importance for the question of the value of **ye/o-* in Hittite. Following the line of reasoning cited earlier, however, he argues that the suffix has its «pre-aspectual» function of modifying the lexical content of the verb (see his general summary, 1985, p. 241 ff.). Specifically, he suggests that in the expression *luzzi karpiye-* 'carry out/perform *luzzi*' (KBo VI 2 ii 29ff [§46] and passim in the Hittite Laws), the force of the *ye-* suffix is to mark the atelic, processual meaning of this idiom, versus ordinary *kar(a)p-* 'lift'. His account is quite plausible for this particular usage, but we also now find pres. 3rd pl. *kar(ap)pianzi* in the OH manuscripts KBo XVII 30 ii 3 (= StBoT 25,72) and KBo XXV 128 LC 3 (= StBoT 25,128). Despite the badly broken contexts, it is clear that we are dealing with concrete ritual activities, and the meaning is surely 'lift'

4. The standard restoration *kar-[(pí-i-e)-er]* in KBo VI 2 iii 14 (Laws, §54) is, of course, non-probative, being based simply on the NH copy KBo VI 6 i 23, which may have falsely generalized the present-tense stem from the other examples in the Laws (see below).

(cf. *karpanzi* 'they lift' in *KBo* XVII 11+ i 46 [=StBoT 25,25] and *KBo* XVII 43 iv 7 [=StBoT 25,43]). In any case, Lehrman's account does not work for the other examples of stems with and without *-ye-*, where there is not an iota of evidence for any functional contrast.

Other Hittite active verbs showing coexisting stems with and without *-ye-* have too few attestations to be useful. As per Lehrman (1985, p. 65 f.), we find in the Laws OH *kar(aš)šsiyezzi* (*KBo* VI 2 i 8 [§8]) vs. *kar(a)šzi* (ibid. iv 22 [§90]), but there is not enough evidence to show either a functional contrast or the original present vs. non-present distribution claimed here. That the case is parallel to that of *karp(i)ye-* vs. *kar(a)p-* remains likely, but unprovable. Similarly, the hapax inv. 2nd pl. *karušten* to regular *karuššiyē-* 'be silent' fits my prediction, but obviously little can be made of a solitary example. I would point out, however, that the stem *karuššiyē-* is almost certainly denominative. Hence, *karušten* does show descriptively «deletion» of the *ye-* suffix for which there is no apparent motivation.

The other significant Hittite evidence in my view consists of cases where we find a medial stem in *-ye-* for verbs which otherwise have an athematic (root) inflection (see Neu, 1968, p. 42). For 'perish' the active stem is *ḫar(a)k-* from Old Hittite onward, but in the middle we find only *ḫar(a)kkiye-* (2x)⁵. The verb 'make smooth' has an active (transitive) stem *ištalk-* (also secondary *ištalgā(i)-*), but medial *ištalk(i)ye-* (with passive value). Beside active transitive *mar(a)k-* 'divide' there is one attestation of medial *markiyan-dat* 'were divided'. The root *walk-* of uncertain meaning shows active transitive *wal(a)k-* (and also *walg(a)nu-*) vs. medial intransitive (or passive) present *walkiyanda* – but medial preterite *wal(a)ktat*. Here belongs also, of course, our first citation above: medial present *parkiyat[ta]* vs. imperative *par(a)ktaru*.

The examples just cited are selective, and I will not conceal the fact that the distributional pattern of the few other medial stems in *-ye-* cited by Neu seems more or less random. Since the total number of «tokens» for all such stems is very small, their evidentiary value must be regarded as suggestive, not compelling. Nevertheless, there is in my view a genuine and unmistakable contrast: some Hittite verbs which in the active have athematic root inflection form distinct intransitive/passive middles in *-ye-*. In some cases (*walk-/walkiye-* and *park-/parkiye-*) there is evidence to suggest that the *ye-* stem was confined to the present indicative middle.

Such a distribution inevitably recalls the use of **-ye/o-* elsewhere in Indo-European to form intransitive or passive present stems. I cite here merely

5. There is a single active form *ḫarkiyanzi* in *KUB* XVII 10 i 18, a MH copy of an OH composition. Given the general tendency to replace intransitive middles with actives in the history of Hittite, I believe this example is a remodeled **ḫarkiyanta*.

Sanskrit intransitive presents in unaccented *-ya-* (e.g. *búdhya-te/i* 'awaken', *yúdhya-te/i* 'fight', *mśyate/i* 'forgets', etc.) and accented *-yá-* which comes to be the productive Sanskrit marker of the present passive (Whitney, 1879, p. 248 ff.).

3.2. The admittedly very sparse Hittite evidence presented above can be augmented by similar material from CLuvian. The latter is predictably also fragmentary, but its very existence offers support for the reality of the patterns described for Hittite. The CLuvian verb 'wipe' shows precisely a contrast between present *am(ma)šši(ya)-* (*am(ma)ššitti*, *am(ma)ššiyan-ti*) vs. preterite *am(ma)ššata/am(ma)ššanda*. The Hittite cognate *ān(aš)š-*, an athematic *ḫi-*verb⁶, shows that the *ye-* stem in the CLuvian verb is secondary, but this does not detract from its value in establishing the contrast of present stem in *-ye-* vs. non-present athematic stem. When this verb took on *ye-* inflection, it did so *only* in the present indicative. This formal contrast, otherwise totally unmotivated – there is *no* evidence for any semantic distinction – can only have been modeled on such a contrast in *pre-existing* verbs in *-ye-*.

The CLuvian verb *kup-* 'plot, scheme' is attested only in the preterite third singular *kupta*. Indirect evidence for a present stem **kupi(ya)-* is furnished by the derived action noun *kupiyat(i)-* 'idem'. The latter is a deverbative action noun in **-ti-*: the lenited stop of the suffix would be phonologically regular from a root-accented **kúpye/o-* (see Morpurgo Davies, 1982/83). Derivation of the action noun from the marked present stem is not unexpected: cf. Hitt. *aniyatt-* < *aniye/a-* 'carry out, accomplish' from a similar present **énh₂-ye/o-* (vs. the usual «deletion» in the surely related *nu-*verb *annanu-* 'train'). The interest of this example is that CLuvian **kupi(ya)-* is likely to form a direct word equation with Skt. *kúpyati* 'be angry' and Lat. *cupiō* 'desire'⁷.

Of eighteen attestations of the CLuvian verb *tapar-* 'rule', all but one are non-presents. Most of these are finite preterites (1st sg. *taparḫa*, 3rd sg. *taparta*). As per Starke (1990, p. 259), a present stem **tapari(ya)-* is attested in HLuvian *ta-pa+ra/i-ia-* and indirectly in the Hittite loanword

6. For the meaning of the CLuvian verb and its equation with the Hittite see MELCHERT, 1988, p. 211 ff. Cf. also probably Palaic *āmšai*, which would confirm original *ḫi-* inflection. The long *ā* of the Hittite verb definitively precludes the speculative PIE etymology I offered then. A PIE etymon for an Anatolian **óms-/aps-* (or **óms-/éms-*) remains to be found.

7. See for this comparison OETTINGER, 1979, p. 204, following Pedersen and many others. The likely word equation tips the balance in favor of this etymology against the otherwise attractive comparison by ČOP, 1956, p. 146 with Gmc. **hup-* seen in English 'hope' and so forth. For the unexpected single *-p-* < PIE **p* see section 4 below.

taparriya(i)- 'manage, direct'⁸. It is true that in this case the two attested stems are semantically differentiated, but internal reconstruction assures that we are dealing with a paradigm split of what was once a single verb.

As Starke correctly emphasizes, the verb *tapari(ya)-* is denominative from an adjective **dhab(h)-ro-* 'massive, strong' (cf. German *tapfer*). As already seen by Eichner (1975, p. 81⁵), the Hittite royal title *tabarna-* is derived from the same stem: **dhab(h)ro-no-*⁹. Derivation of the verb *tapari(ya)-* is straightforward from an *iyō*-stem *tapariya-*, attested in the noun *tapar(r)iya-* '(sphere of) command'. The verb *tapar-* 'rule' must also somehow be denominative from **dhab(h)ro-*, but there is no support in Anatolian for direct formation (with zero-suffix) of a verb stem from a thematic adjective. I propose that the mechanism for its creation was back-formation from *tapariya-*, based on the model of present stem **kupi(ya)-*: non-present *kup-* (cf. Hitt. *karuš-ten* to *karuššīye-* above)¹⁰.

CLuvian also shows at least two (or perhaps better one-and-a-half) examples of the pattern seen above in Hittite whereby a middle in **-ye/o-* stands beside a different active stem. We find active *ḫalta-* 'call' (pres. 2nd sg. *ḫaltatti*), but middle *ḫalti-* (pres. 3rd sg. *ḫaltittari* 'is called'). With only a single example, we cannot determine the inflectional class of the active stem, but it is manifestly not a **-ye/o-* stem¹¹. Beside pres. 3rd sg. middle *palpatittari* 'is blazing' (?)¹² stands a participle *palpataimma/i-*. The fact that the latter is a non-finite form weakens the force of this example, but once again we have the pattern of a present middle in *-y(a)-* versus a non-present form without the suffix. The verb 'call' at least shows that Luvian has traces of the same use of **-ye/o-* to form distinct present intransitive/passive middles that we saw in Hittite¹³.

8. For Hittite stems in *-iya(i)-* as remodeled Luvian stems in *-i(ya)-* see OETTINGER, 1979, p. 382 ff.

9. For the likely source of the attested shape *tapar-* < **dhab(h)ro-* see MELCHERT, 1993, p. 107. For an alternative account see EICHNER, loc. cit..

10. STARKE, loc. cit., already says explicitly that *tapar-* must be secondary to *tapari(ya)-*, but he gives no account of how this could have taken place. As per OETTINGER, 1979, p. 198, the descriptively athematic inflection of Hitt. *kammarš-* 'defecate' vs. CLuvian *katmaršī(ya)-* is surely to be explained in the same way, starting from a denominative in **-ye/o-*. The source of the *-s-* in the nominal base **ḡhod-m(V)r-s-* remains unclear.

11. Nor can it be equated directly with the Hittite *ḫi-* verb in *-i-*: *ḫalzā(i)-*. We do not have a certain Luvian example of such a stem, but HLuvian *pi-ya-i* 'gives' and Luvo-Hittite verbs in *-yai-* (cf. note 8) make it very unlikely that all traces of the *-i-/y-* would be lost in Luvian: expect **ḫalti(ya)-* or **ḫalzi(ya)-*. Likewise, CLuvian *qyari* 'is made, becomes' and *ziyar(i)* 'lies' argue against taking *ḫaltittari* as a mere renewal of the stem seen in Hittite *ḫalziyari*.

12. For the tentative semantic interpretation and derivation see STARKE, 1990, p. 290 f. with note 987.

13. An additional indirect Luvian example may be present in Hittite *uwai(ttari)* 'be seen, appear', reflecting a remade Luvian **u-ye-*, as per OETTINGER, 1979, pp. 380 and 408, whether or not attested CLuvian *wī(ttari)* (with resyllabified **u-(y)i-*) directly represents said stem.

4. I have made at least a *prima facie* case for the existence in Hittite and Luvian of a set of verbs with *two* synchronic stems, one with the suffix **-ye/o-* and one without (the latter is in fact usually athematic, in non-denominatives typically the bare root). In view of the general productive rule by which the Anatolian verb derives all of its forms from a single stem, I see no plausible way to motivate this class as a whole as an innovation. The suffixless stem of the denominative examples obviously is an innovation, but it is especially hard to see how the well-established denominative suffix **-ye/o-* would have come to be deleted *just in certain forms* of the verb, except upon the model of a *pre-existing* primary (or at least deverbative) class with a homophonous suffix.

The observed distributional pattern by which the original locus of the **-ye/o-* suffix appears to be the *present* tense, in some cases specifically the *present middle*, argues that this suffix should be identified with the PIE «present»-stem- forming (i.e. imperfective) suffix of the same form. The restriction of **-ye/o-* to the present and the *absence of any observable functional distinction* between the stems with and without it suggest that we are dealing not with the «pre-aspectual» form of the suffix, but rather with its «post-aspectual» incarnation¹⁴. That is, in Anatolian as elsewhere, with the breakdown of the inherited aspectual system of imperfective/perfective and stative («present/aorist» and «perfect»), the suffix **-ye/o-* lost its aspectual value and became simply a (redundant) formal marker of the present tense. As one would predict, this purely formal distinction was eventually eliminated – hence the heavily recessive status of the type in the attested languages.

Specifically, I claim that Anatolian inherited a contrast between an imperfective stem («present») **kérpyeti* (> Hitt. *karpiyuzzi* and Lyd. *fa-korfid*)¹⁵ and a perfective stem («root aorist») **kérpt* (> Hitt. *kar(a)pta*) for the verb 'lift'. Likewise, the verb **wish for* inherited an imperfective stem **kúpye-* (> CLuvian **kupi(ya)-* in the action noun *kupiyat(i)-* 'plot') beside a perfective stem **kéup-t* reflected in *kupta* 'plotted'. The latter stem with accented full-grade (hence diphthong) is the source of the «lenited» form with single *-p-* (for the rule see Eichner, 1973). As already suggested

14. The observed pattern fits the picture sketched by LEHRMAN himself (1985, p. 241) for a *post-aspectual* system: «The two stems would become synonymous, and one of them would disappear, giving way to the other; or, they would coexist, *in the same meaning*, perhaps as dialectal or register variants; or, the erstwhile imperfective stem would be associated with and generalized for the tense in which it was typically used, namely the present and the erstwhile perfective stem would be generalized as the preterite stem.»

15. As per MELCHERT, 1992, p. 47 ff., the Lydian verb even preserves the regularly «lenited» ending **-yedi* expected in a root-accented present, while Hittite has as usual generalized the unlenited form.

by Jasanoff, Hittite *parkiyat[ta]* 'rises' continues an imperfective middle **bhṛghyeto-*, while inv. 3rd sg. *par(a)ktaru* reflects a perfective (root aorist) **bh(é)rgheto*¹⁶.

Based on these and other inherited examples, the contrast was spread to new secondary examples of **-ye/o-* inflection (such as CLuvian *am(ma)šši(ya)- : am(ma)šši(a)-*) and even to cases of denominative **-ye/o-* (e.g. *tapariya- : tapar-*, *kartimmiya- : kartimnu-*)¹⁷. In fact, it is surely not coincidental that **-ye/o-* is the only present-forming (imperfective) suffix for which we have any traces of this contrast. It is only the productivity of both deverbative and denominative **-ye/o-* in Anatolian that allowed remnants of this system to survive into the historical period. Note that in half the cases presented for Luvian the contrast must be secondary and analogical, not inherited.

If the system I have reconstructed from the attested *disiecta membra* is correct (and it is unmistakably a *reconstruction*, not a manifest fact), then Anatolian must have inherited at least the imperfective/perfective portion of the aspectual system traditionally reconstructed for PIE on the basis chiefly of Greek and Indo-Iranian, *at least in some of its manifestations*. This renews the question of the status of the other well-known formations attested in Anatolian which correspond to aspectual stems elsewhere, cited in section 2 above. I believe that a proper response must address each individual case on its own merits.

I certainly do not wish to propose that every suffix which forms verbal stems in Anatolian necessarily reflects a PIE formation with aspectual val-

16. The prehistoric source of the root vowel in *par(a)k-/parkiya-* cannot be directly determined. The ablaut grade of the former depends on one's views of the origins of the root aorist middle and the attendant relative chronologies. This point, which I cannot pursue here, is not crucial for my purposes. The stem *parkiya-* is ambiguous in terms of both accent and ablaut: it may reflect **bhṛghyē-*, **bhṛghyē-*, or **bhṛghyē-*. I assume zero grade based on the dominant pattern of the intransitive/mediopassive type. In Luvian *kupiya(t)-* the «lenition» of the suffix suggests a root accent **kúpye-*. One assumes for PIE on systemic grounds an original pattern with R(é)-ye/o- but R(Ø)-yé/ó-. In Sanskrit the latter type underwent a polarization whereby suffixal accent came to mark the passive, while intransitives retracted the accent onto the root after the original root-accented full-grade type (see e.g. THUMB-HAUSCHILD, 1959, p. 333 ff. with refs., and STRUNK, 1967, p. 78). We do not have enough evidence for passive use to know if there was a similar development in Anatolian, but generalization of root accent from the *aniye*-type (**h énh₂-ye-*) to intransitives like **kúpye-* seems unproblematic. As Jay Jasanoff reminds me, it cannot be excluded that the analogy extended to the ablaut grade as well, hence PA **képye-* > **kéuhye-* > *kupiya-*. The lack of plene spelling in the first syllable argues mildly against this assumption.

17. In the latter case, we are probably not facing a mere formal analogy. As elsewhere, there was a need to provide denominative stems, which had formed only imperfective («present») stems in PIE, with a full inflection. A contrast of present vs. non-present was achieved by creating forms without **-ye/o-* outside the present (on the model of the **kérp(ye)-* type). Compare the situation in Greek, as described by Rix (1976, p. 201).

ue. I personally doubt very seriously that the contrast between *hnek-* 'slaughter' and *hu-nin-k-* 'wound' or between *ištar(a)k-* 'sicken' (construed personally and impersonally) and *ištar-nin-k-* 'cause to be sick' reflects directly the use of the nasal infix **-n(e)-* to form a (present) imperfective stem contrasting with a root aorist. On the other hand, I am prepared to consider the possibility that Anatolian inherited a **ye/o-* present **sh₁-yéti* beside root aorist **séh₁-t* 'release from the hand', seen respectively in Hitt. *šięzzi* 'throw, shoot' and Lycian *hadi, hati* 'lay down, let go'¹⁸. Compare *mutatis mutandis* Skt. present *syāti* vs. aorist *ásāt* 'bind'. This is not the place to rehearse the history of all the relevant suffixes. If I am correct about the inheritance in Anatolian of the PIE suffix **-ye/o-* in its function as a marker of imperfective aspect, the entire topic does deserve to be reexamined.

REFERENCES

- Čop 1956 = B. ČOP, *Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortkunde*, in «Die Sprache» 3, pp. 135-149.
- Eichner 1973 = H. EICHNER, *Die Etymologie von heth. mēhur*, in «MSS» 31, pp. 53-107.
- Eichner 1975 = H. EICHNER, *Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystems*, in «Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft», ed. H. Rix (Wiesbaden), pp. 71-103.
- Hackstein 1993 = O. HACKSTEIN, *Osttocharische Reflexe grundsprachlicher Präsensbildungen von idg. *ǵneh₂- 'er)kennen'*, in «Indogermanica et Italica (Fs. H. Rix)», ed. J. Bendahman et al. (Innsbruck), pp. 148-158.
- Jasanoff 1978 = J. JASANOFF, *Stative and Middle in Indo-European* (Innsbruck).
- Jasanoff 1988 = J. JASANOFF, *PIE ǵnē- 'recognize, know'*, in «Die Laryngaltheorie», ed. A. Bammesberger (Heidelberg), pp. 227-239.
- Lehrman 1985 = A. LEHRMAN, *Simple Thematic Imperfectives in Anatolian and Indo-European*. Yale University Ph.D. dissertation (New Haven).
- Melchert 1988 = H. C. MELCHERT, *Luvian Lexical Notes*, in «HS» 101, pp. 211-243.
- Melchert 1989 = H. C. MELCHERT, *New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses*, in «HS» 102, pp. 23-45.
- Melchert 1992 = H. C. MELCHERT, *The third person present in Lydian*, in «IF» 97, pp. 31-54.
- Melchert 1993 = H. C. MELCHERT, *A New Anatolian 'Law of Finals'*, in «Journal of Ancient Civilizations» (Changchun) 8, pp. 105-113.
- Melchert 1998 = H. C. MELCHERT, *Aspects of Verbal Aspect in Hittite*, in «Acts of the Third International Congress of Hittitology (Çorum, September 1996)», ed. A. Süel (to appear).
- Morpurgo Davies 1982/83 = A. MORPURGO DAVIES, *Dentals, rhotacism and verbal endings in the Luwian languages*, in «KZ» 96, pp. 245-270.

18. See on these forms MELCHERT 1989, p. 37 ff.

- Neu 1968 = E. NEU, *Das hethitische Mediopassiv und seine indogermanischen Grundlagen* (Wiesbaden).
- Oettinger 1976 = N. OETTINGER, *Der indogermanische Stativ*, in «MSS» 34, pp. 109-149.
- Oettinger 1979 = N. OETTINGER, *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* (Nürnberg).
- Oettinger 1992 = N. OETTINGER, *Die hethitischen Verbalstämme*, in «Per una grammatica ittita», ed. O. Carruba (Pavia), pp. 213-244.
- Rix 1976 = H. RIX, *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen* (Darmstadt).
- Starke 1990 = F. STARKE, *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (Wiesbaden).
- Strunk 1967 = K. STRUNK, *Nasalpräsentien und Aoriste* (Heidelberg).
- Strunk 1979 = K. STRUNK, *Heth. ḫuekzi, heth. ḫūnikzi und die indogermanischen Nasalinfixpräsentien*, in «Hethitisch und Indogermanisch», edd. E. Neu and W. Meid (Innsbruck), pp. 237-256.
- Strunk 1994 = K. STRUNK, *Relative Chronology and Indo-European Verbal-System: The Case of Present- and Aorist-Stems*, in *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 22, pp. 417-434.
- Thumb-Hauschild 1959 = A. THUMB-R. HAUSCHILD, *Handbuch des Sanskrit, II. Teil: Formenlehre*,³ (Heidelberg).
- Whitney 1879 = W. D. WHITNEY, *Sanskrit Grammar* (Leipzig/Boston).