



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Hittite nasal presents

Shatskov, A.

Citation

Shatskov, A. (2017, October 25). *Hittite nasal presents*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/58877>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/58877>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/58877>

Author: Shatskov, A

Title: Hittite nasal presents

Issue Date: 2017-10-25

7.1 There is a very clear functional similarity between the infix *-nin-* and the suffix *-nu-*, which can be demonstrated by the following example: *harnink-* and *harganu-* both mean ‘to destroy’ and are both derived from *hark-* ‘to perish’ with the help of the infix and the suffix *-nu-*, respectively. The difference between them is chronological rather than functional, i.e. *harganu-* started to replace *harnink-* in the New Hittite period (s. Ünal 1984).

7.2.1 Just as there is no uniform shape of the infix (6.3.1-2), there is also no common function or semantics. *Harnink-* ‘to destroy’, *istarnink-* ‘to make ill’ are causatives, and many *nu-*verbs are causatives and factitives as well (see 4.14). *Sarnink-* ‘to compensate’, *ninink-* ‘to set in motion’, *sunna-* ‘to fill’ and *zinni-* ‘to finish’ are also likely to have been causatives originally, even though their parent verbs are either unknown or were no longer perceived as related; note, however, that *sarnink-* and *zinni-* can be used absolutely, so they are labile, or I/T verbs in Jamison’s terminology (for this type of verbs cf. a.o. Haspelmath 1993, Letuchiy 2009). Some other infixed verbs like *hulle-* ‘to smash’ or *munnaī-* are just transitive. Surprisingly, there are a few intransitive verbs – *tamink-* ‘to attach’, *nuntarnu-* ‘to hurry’, *huntarnu-* ‘to bark’, *wastanu-* ‘to sin’, *lalukkesnu-* ‘bring light to’ and perhaps *hatnu-* ‘to dry up’ and *tamenganu-* ‘to attach’. The contexts for the latter two verbs are damaged, so there may be also some transitive instances, see their respective entries. The verb *zaluganu-* ‘to delay’ may also be used intransitively if *nuntarnu-* is used in the same phrase.

On the functional semantics of the *nu-*verbs, see 4.15.

7.2.2 Among infixed verbs *tamink-* ‘to stick to, attach’ seems to be intransitive even in the active voice. This infixed stem is of PIE age, but its Skt. counterpart *tanákti* ‘to pull together’ is transitive. The intransitivity of *tamink-* is difficult to explain; one may argue that active forms were originally transitive, but eventually the

intransitive meaning of the middle forms was generalized. As for intransitive *nu*-verbs, I can only assume that the force of the suffix was intensive (in case of *nuntarnu*- ‘to hasten’ and *huntarnu*- ‘to grunt’) or terminative/telic (*wastanu*- ‘to sin’).

7.2.3 Hittite *nu*-verbs are often called causatives. The term was introduced by Sturtevant (e.g., 1933: 9) and has been widely applied in Hittitological studies since then, see, e.g., Kronasser 1966: 435ff., Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 178f. Sometimes, this term is applied to infixed verbs as well.

The application of the term “causative” may be correct for those *nu*-verbs (and infixed verbs) that were derived from intransitive verbs, but most Hittite *nu*-verbs derived from transitive verbs are not causatives in the strict sense, or morphological causatives, as there is no valency increase (for this condition of causativity see Kulikov 2001: 888f.).²¹² Kronasser (1960: 14) justified the application of the term ‘causative’ to Hittite verbs on the grounds that any transitive verb can be analyzed as a causative one. In our case, it is true that both the verb *huek*- ‘to slaughter’ and *hunink*- ‘to break, crack’ may be thought as denoting causative situations (cf. Nedjalkov and Silnickij 1973: 1). However, it is quite clear that *hunink*- ‘to scar, crack’ can hardly be viewed as a causative to *huek*- ‘to slaughter’. The same applies to many *nu*-verbs that either have a meaning similar to that of the basic verb (cf., e.g., *pahsnu*- ‘to protect’ or *asesanu*- ‘to install’) or change it only slightly (*isparnu*- ‘to sprinkle?’ or *kanganu*- ‘to weigh?’), not to mention the intransitive verbs like *nuntarnu*- ‘to hurry’. Therefore, at least synchronically, Hittite infixed verbs and *nu*-verbs are not exclusively morphological causatives. In fact, the suffix *-nu*- and the infix both had several functions and could be used to derive not only causatives but also intensive and terminative formations.

²¹² Nedjalkov and Silnickij (1973: 32) note that in causatives made to some verbal classes (verbs of perception, of obtaining or taking) the original syntactic valency may be preserved, though it is more accurate to describe this process as a development of an optional argument into an obligatory one. They also point out that if a causative has more than two arguments, the causee may often be omitted.

7.3 If we take a look at another ‘causative’ morpheme reconstructed for PIE, the suffix **-éye-*, we actually see a similar picture. In Vedic, there are two types of forms with this suffix, an intransitive and a transitive (or causative) one. The intransitive forms, which are sometimes called intensive but are better described as atelic (see Kulikov 2008), have zero grade of the root or full grade in the roots of the type *CaC*, while the causatives have the original *o*-grade; for a detailed description see Jamison 1983, Lubotsky 1989. Note that in non-ablauting roots these two types are indiscernible (Kulikov 2013: 81f.).

In other Indo-European languages, **-éye-* formations may also be intransitive as well as transitive. Kölligan (2007) studied Latin verbs of the types *sorbēre* ‘to slurp’ and *monēre* ‘to remind, admonish’ that go back to PIE *o*-grade stems with the suffix **-éye-*. His conclusion is that, based on high or low agentivity²¹³ of the original verb, the derived verbs will turn out either iterative-intensive or causative. In another study, he applied this approach to Greek reduplicated aorists and to Gothic *jan*-verbs²¹⁴ (Kölligan 2004) and pointed out that there is crosslinguistic data for intensive and causative polysemy of certain morphemes, e.g., intensive usages of causatives in Swahili (see Comrie 1985: 330).

Summing up, the case for polysemy of the infix and the suffix *-nu-* in Hittite is supported by crosslinguistic data; causative and intensive meanings coexist particularly often.

7.4.1 What was the function of the infix in PIE? There is a long tradition of assuming a terminative meaning for the infix, see, e.g., Kuiper 1937: 202ff., cf. Oettinger 1979: 167 and note 80.

7.4.2 More recently, some scholars have suggested a causative/factitive function, see, e.g., Rasmussen 1997: 251. For instance, in Vedic, two different present stems can

²¹³ “Agentive actions may be defined as situations in which the subject has the following features (in a prototypical case): (1) it carries out the action. (2) The subject is the source of the action and it is not caused by something and somebody else. (3) The action comes about by the energy input of the subject which is not an experiencer” (Kölligan 2007: 58).

²¹⁴ On intensive/iterative *jan*-verbs in Gothic see also García García 2005: 40ff.

be built to one root, one of them being usually transitive and the other intransitive, cf., e.g., *éti* ‘goes’ and *inóti* ‘sends’ or *kṣīyate* ‘perishes’ and *kṣiṇāti* ‘destroys’; this situation has caused scholars to use terms like ‘factitive’ (Joachim 1978: 24f.) or ‘causative’ (Kulikov 2000: 194f.). The problem with this approach is that it is based mainly on Anatolian and Indo-Iranian data. In most other Indo-European languages, infixed stems were fully integrated into respective verbal paradigms, so there is no semantic difference between infixed and infixless stems, e.g., Lat. *vincō* ‘I win’ vs. *vīcī* ‘I won’.

7.4.3 Moreover, nasal verbs in Germanic, Baltic and Slavic languages are generally intransitive and inchoative. Even in Vedic, we find intransitive usages of infixed verbs, although this semantic function could have been related to thematization, see Kulikov 2000: 195f. The intransitive character of Germanic and Balto-Slavic nasal verbs is usually explained as secondary.

There are several intransitive infixed verbs in Lithuanian that correspond to Sanskrit or Latin transitive verbs, e.g., Skt. *limpāti* ‘to attach’ and Lith. *limpù* ‘to stick to’. Stang (1970: 78f.) believes that these Lithuanian verbs acquired the intransitive meaning from the perfect and the thematic aorist stems during the restructuring of the Lithuanian verbal system. For the overview of the theories for the development of the nasal presents in Baltic languages, see Schmalstieg 2000: 154ff., cf. also Rasmussen 1997: 251 and 6.3.5 above.

In Slavic languages, there are traces of transitive infixed stems, for instance, in Old Russian *krъnju* ‘to buy’, see Vaillant 1966: 304ff., LIV: 395f. By contrast, intransitive verbs with the suffix **-nq-* became productive relatively late (see Stang 1966: 338, Vaillant 1966: 281), while intransitive infixed verbs *bqđq* ‘will be’ and *lēqo* ‘will lie’, have no infixed counterparts elsewhere and therefore must be late as well.

As to Gothic and Old Icelandic inchoative verbs in *-na-*, Lehmann (2004: 120) points out that Western Germanic languages do not have parallel formations, therefore the Gothic and Old Icelandic verbs in question are likely to be innovations. Jasanoff (1973: 865f.) argues that Gothic nasal presents of the 4th class go back to middle

forms. For an overview of Germanic nasal stems, see the recent work by Scheungraber (2014).

Thus, it is possible to view all intransitive nasal formations in Baltic, Slavic and Germanic as a relatively recent development, with anticausatives built to causative nasal stems²¹⁵, the causative meaning of which was lost at a later stage. However, it cannot be excluded that already in PIE nasal stems could be intransitive as well as transitive, and in the Balto-Slavic and Germanic it was the intransitive usage that became dominant.

7.5. According to Hopper and Thompson (1980), transitivity is to be interpreted as a scale rather than a binary opposition, and verbs can occupy various positions in the transitivity hierarchy. Hopper and Thompson proposed 10 criteria of transitivity degree (ibid. 252):

	High transitivity	Low transitivity
A. Participants	two part. or more	1 participant
B. Kinesis	action	non-action
C. Aspect	telic	atelic
D. Punctuality	punctual	non-punctual
E. Volitionality	volitional	non-volitional
F. Affirmation	affirmative	negative
G. Mode	realis	irrealis
H. Agency	A in high potency	A in low potency
I. Affectedness of O	totally affected	O not affected
J. Individuation of O	highly individuated	O not individuated

This approach has been applied to nasal stems in Indo-European. Meiser (1993) argues that the function of the infix in PIE was raising transitivity rather than causativization, i.e. the infixed stems had a higher position in the transitivity hierarchy than their infixless counterparts. He argues that the root **ueid-* ‘to see’ has the

²¹⁵ On this phenomenon, see Haspelmath 1993.

meaning ‘to find’ exactly in those languages where a nasal present to this root is attested (Skt. *vindāti*, Av. *vīnasti*, OIr. *ro-finnadar*, Arm. *gtanem*). The branches where the infixed stem is not attested (e.g., Lat. *videō*, Goth. *witan*, OCS. *videti*, Lith. *veizdėti*) retained the meaning ‘to see, observe’. ‘To find’ is higher in the hierarchy than ‘to see’ according to several criteria, such as volitionality or affectedness of object.

7.6 A similar approach, in my opinion, can be applied in determining the function of the nasal stems in Hittite. A causative/factitive function is the most obvious, but the suffix *-nu-* and the infix *-nin-* (in *hunink-* ‘to scar, crack’) may also have telic as well as intensive function (see 4.14-15). If one wants to find an explanation for the polysemy of the suffix *-nu-* and the infix, raising transitivity is perhaps the most likely underlying function of these morphemes²¹⁶.

²¹⁶ Crosslinguistically, Akkadian D-stems provide another example for such a polysemy. The D-stem is often described as factitive (bringing into a condition or state), but there are also resultative and even intransitive durative meanings (von Soden 1995: 143f.). Kouwenberg examined the relations between the basic stems, or G-stems, and derived D-stems and showed that D-stems to intransitive G-stems are transitive and therefore ‘factitive’, but the D-stems to already transitive G-stems preserve the valency of the G-stem (Kouwenberg 1997: 920). The meaning of individual D-stems made to transitive G-stems is largely unpredictable, and often there is no clear difference, but D-stems are generally used in sentences with high degree of transitivity (agentive subject, strongly affected object, reference to a salient action) and with a plural element (ibid. 196f.). The factitive meaning of D-stems resulted from their association with high transitivity, and seems to be one of possible semantic extensions of the high transitivity, others being duration and intensity (ibid. 436).