The Hittite Inherited Lexicon

Kloekhorst, A.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

0.1 AIM OF THIS WORK

Since Hittite is the oldest attested Indo-European language, it is of prime interest for anyone involved in comparative Indo-European linguistics. A thorough description of the historical phonology of Hittite is therefore of paramount importance. In my view, one cannot describe the historical phonology of a certain language without having etymologically treated the entire inherited vocabulary of that language and without having a coherent view on the morphological changes that have occurred in it. Moreover, in the case of Hittite, it is essential to distinguish between the three chronological stages it displays (Old, Middle and Neo-Hittite, cf. § 0.3) and the changes that took place between these stages. In all recent handbooks dealing with the etymology of Hittite, this crucial combination is lacking: Melchert's *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (1994a) and Kimball's *Hittite Historical Phonology* (1999) both focused on the historical phonology only, not always taking into account all relevant material, whereas Puhvel's *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* (HED) and Tischler's *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (HEG) have no coherent view on the historical phonology in their treatment of the lexicon. Furthermore, most scholars do not seem to differentiate between orthography, phonetics and phonology, which in my view is a decisive part of the understanding of the Hittite language. I therefore felt it my task to write a historical phonology of Hittite on the basis of an extensive treatment of the Hittite inherited lexicon,[1] in which not only phonological change, but also morphological change and inner-Hittite chronology are taken into account.

Besides this introduction, in which I will give general information on the Hittites and their language, the Anatolian language branch and the place that this branch occupies within the Indo-European language family, this book consists of

[1] With 'inherited lexicon' I mean those words that are build up of morphemes that can be reconstructed for the PIE mother language (i.e. have cognates in the other IE languages). It should be noted that I therefore do not claim that each reconstructed form that in this book has been glossed as 'PIE' did exist as such in the Proto-Indo-European mother language. These reconstructions should rather be seen as explications of the morphology of the Hittite words in the light of their PIE origin.

two parts. The first part is called *Towards a Hittite Historical Grammar* and contains two chapters: chapter 1, *Historical Phonology*, contains a detailed discussion of the phonetic and phonological interpretation of Hittite orthography, as well as an overview of the sound laws that took place between the reconstructed PIE mother language and Hittite as it is attested; chapter 2, *Aspects of Historical Morphology*, contains a treatment of the prehistory of the Hittite personal pronouns as well as an elaborate morphological interpretation of the Hittite verbal system. The second part is called *An Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* and contains etymological treatments of all the relevant Hittite words.

These two parts cannot exist without each other. The sound laws and morphological interpretations described in Part One are illustrated by the material from Part Two, whereas the treatment of the words in Part Two rests heavily on the findings of Part One. The reader should be aware of this when consulting one of them.

0.2 THE STUDY OF HITTITE

The rediscovery of the Hittite language actually started in 1887 when in the Egyptian village Amarna 382 clay tablets inscribed in the cuneiform script were discovered containing letters from and to the Egyptian pharaoh Akhenaten (ca. 1352-1336 BC). Although most of these letters were written in Akkadian, a language that at that time was already well understood, two letters, addressed to the king of Arzawa, turned out to contain a hitherto unknown language. In 1902, the Dane J.A. Knudtzon elaborately treated these two letters and even claims that their language belongs to the Indo-European language family. In absence of any positive reactions to this claim, he retracted his views in 1915 (Knudtzon 1915: 1074).

When in 1905 the imposing ruins of an ancient city near the little Turkish village Boğazköy (presently called Boğazkale) started to be excavated, soon tens of thousands of (fragments of) clay tablets were unearthed. Many of these were written in Akkadian, which made clear that the tablets constituted the royal archive of the land Ḫatti[2] and that the site in fact was its capital Ḫattuša. The bulk

[2] The existence of the land Ḫatti had already been known from documents from Mesopotamia as well as from the Amarna-letters, some of which were written (in Akkadian) by Šuppiluliuma, king of the land Ḫatti.

of the tablets were written in a language identical to the language of the two Arzawa-letters, however, which now was coined 'Hittite'. Just ten years later, the Czech assyriologist Bedřich Hrozný published a preliminary "Lösung des hethitischen Problems" (Hrozný 1915), followed by a full description of "die Sprache der Hethither" (Hrozný 1917), probably the most complete decipherment of a language ever written. The results were baffling: Hrozný showed beyond any doubt that Hittite belongs to the Indo-European language family. Therewith Hittite immediately became the oldest attested language within that family. Not only did Hrozný's decipherment open up a new academic field, Hittitology, it also brought a fully new aspect to comparative Indo-European linguistics.

As is now known, the oldest evidence for the Hittite language can be found in Old Assyrian texts (ca. 1920-1850 BC) that stem from the Assyrian trade colony or *kārum* established in the town Neša / Kaniš (= modern-day Kültepe). In these texts we find many Hittite names and some loanwords that clearly show that Neša / Kaniš was a Hittite town during that period. It may well have been the most important Hittite city at that time. Not only does the oldest Hittite text, the so-called Anitta-text (Neu 1974a = StBoT 18), which must be regarded as an account of the foundation of the Hittite royal dynasty, tell how Anitta, son of Pitḫana, the king of Kuššara, conquers Neša and from then onwards uses this city as its residence, the Hittites themselves also refer to their language as ^{URU}*ni-ši-li* (IBoT 1.36 iii 64), *na-a-ši-li* (KBo 5.11 i 3), *ne-eš*-[*u*]*m*$^{!}$-*ni*-[*li*] (VBoT 2, 24) and *ka-ni-šu-um-ni-l*[*i*] (KUB 41.14, 8), i.e. 'in Nešite, in the language of the people of Neša / Kaniš'. Nevertheless, two centuries later, around 1650 BC, the Nešites apparently chose the city Ḫattuša as their new capital (possibly because of its more strategic position) and the surrounding land Ḫatti (^{URU}*Ḫa-at-ti*, the region enclosed by the Kızıl Irmak) as their heartland. From that moment onwards their rulers call themselves LUGAL KUR ^{URU}*Ḫa-at-ti* 'king of the land Ḫatti', which is the source of our term 'Hittite'. The Hittite kingdom grew rapidly and in the 14th century it reached its peak, ruling over vast parts of Anatolia and northern Syria (then also called 'Hittite Empire'). From ca 1250 BC onwards rivalry between two branches of the royal family both claiming to be the legitimate heirs to the throne caused it to descend into civil war and around ca 1175 BC the Hittite kingdom ceased to exist.

Throughout its existence, the Hittite kingdom used Hittite as its administrative language (although Akkadian was used as well, especially for international affairs). The bulk of the Hittite texts (some 30.000 pieces) therefore were found in the royal archive at Ḫattuša, but important finds have been made in Ugarit / Ras Shamra (some 200 pieces), Maşat Höyük (116 pieces), Kuşaklı (48 pieces)

and Ortaköy (allegedly some 3500 pieces, of which only a handful have been published up to now) as well. Although most of the Hittite texts deal with religious affairs (ritual texts, hymns, prayers, festival descriptions, omens, oracles, mythological texts), we also find historical texts (annals), political texts (treaties with vassal kings, letters), administrative texts (instructions for functionaries) and legal texts.

0.3 DATING OF TEXTS

The Hittite texts span the whole period of the Hittite kingdom (ca. 1650-1175 BC). Already in the 1930's it had become clear that texts that had to be attributed to kings from the beginning of this period showed linguistic features that were different from texts that had to be attributed to kings from the end of this period: the language was changing throughout the Hittite period (like any living language is changing through time). It therefore nowadays has become generally accepted to divide the Hittite language into three successive linguistic stages: Old Hittite (OH, ca 1650-1450), Middle Hittite (MH, ca 1450-1380) and Neo-Hittite (NH, ca 1380-1175). From the 1960's onwards it has become clear that also the cuneiform script in which the Hittite tablets were written underwent changes: the shape of some signs has been altered drastically within the Hittite period. We therefore nowadays also distinguish between three palaeographic stages: Old Script (OS), Middle Script (MS) and Neo-Script (NS).[3] Since it is well known that within the Hittite archival system older texts were often copied in younger periods and that the scribes who carried out the copying did not always refrain from modernizing the language of the older original according to their own standards, any scholar who wants to be seriously involved in Hittite linguistics must date a given text according to these two criteria: composition and script. For the dating of compositions I have mainly used the lists of Melchert (1977: 45-131), Oettinger (1979a: 573-580) and Weitenberg (1984: 13-21) as well as the datings used in CHD. In this book I have adopted the practice of e.g. CHD to use the following abbreviations: OH/NS = a Neo-Hittite copy of an Old Hittite composition;

[3] Some scholars further divide the last period into two stages, namely Early Neo-Script (ENS) and Late Neo-Script (LNS = German spätjunghethitisch, sjh.). Since this is not yet common practice and since as a historical linguist I am mainly interested in the oldest stage of the language, I have decided to only use the term Neo-Script (NS) in this book (although I must admit that in hindsight the many morphological processes in the Hittite verbal system that take place in the NH period perhaps could for instance have been described more precisely if I had used this more precise system of dating).

OH/MS = a Middle Hittite copy of an Old Hittite composition; etc.[4] It has to be borne in mind that a given form from an OH/NS text cannot be immediately identified as a linguistically old form: it is quite possible that the text has been 'polluted' by the NH scribe and that the form in question in fact is a modernization.

0.4 METHODS OF TRANSCRIPTION

In this book, I use four different layers of representing Hittite words: (a) a one-to-one transliteration of the cuneiform signs,[5] e.g. *ne-e-pí-iš*; (b) a bound transcription,[6] e.g. *nēpiš*; (c) a phonological transcription, e.g. /nébis/; and (d) a phonetic transcription, e.g. [népis].

0.5 ANATOLIAN LANGUAGE FAMILY

Linguistically, Hittite belongs to the Anatolian language family, which further consists of the following languages:

Palaic was the language of the land Palā (^{URU}*Pa-la-a*),[7] probably situated in north-west Anatolia between the rivers Sakarya Nehri / Sangarios and the Kızıl Irmak / Halys (possibly identical to classical Paphlagonia or one of its regions, Blaene). Reference to this land is found in the OH version of the Hittite Laws only, which indicates that in MH times it had ceased to exist as such. The language, which the Hittites call ^{URU}*pa-la-um-ni-li*, i.e. "in the language of the

[4] Since any text in Old Script by definition must contain an Old Hittite composition, I only use the abbreviation OS in these cases (and not OH/OS). Similarly in the case of Neo-Hittite compositions which by definition can only be written in Neo-Script: I use the abbreviation NH (and not NH/NS).

[5] In this book I have transliterated the cuneiform signs according to Rüster & Neu's *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon* (= HZL). Note however that the signs GIR, GAD, NIR, UD and ŠIR, for which HZL cites the phonetic value *kir*, *kid*/t_9, *nir*, *pir* and *šir* respectively, sometimes have to be read *ker*, *ket*$_9$, *ner*, *per* and *šer* as well.

[6] Because of the ambiguity of this way of transcribing (e.g. the transcription *ualaḫzi* does not tell us whether the underlying form was *ua-al-aḫ-zi* or *ua-la-aḫ-zi*), I have used this transcription only when the transliteration of a certain form has been already given.

[7] Possibly pronounced /plaʔa/, which is visible in the difference between *palaumnili* 'in the language of the Palaic people' and *nešumnili* 'in the language of the Nešite people': just as *neš-umnili* is derived from *Neš-a*, with morphological replacement of the final *-a*, *pala-umnili* must be derived from a form *Pala-a* = /plaʔa/.

Palaic people", is known from a few Boğazköy-tablets only that deal with the cult of the god Zaparu̯a. These texts were composed in the OH period, and therefore it is generally thought that the Palaic language had died out by MH times. Its corpus is very small, and therefore many basic matters regarding grammar and lexicon are unclear. For texts, grammar, vocabulary and historical phonology, see e.g. Carruba 1970, Carruba 1972, Kammenhuber 1969, Melchert 1994a: 190-228.

Cuneiform Luwian is only known from passages of incantation and cult songs cited in Hittite texts dealing with rituals and festivals with a Luwian background. In these texts, which date from the 16th-15th century BC, the language is referred to as *lu-ú-i-li*, i.e. "in Luwian". The language is closely connected with Hieroglyphic Luwian (see below). In Hittite texts from the NH period we find many words, often preceded by the gloss wedges 𒨗 and 𒨘, which have to be regarded as Luwian borrowings (although it is not always clear whether these words derive from CLuwian or HLuwian). Although in the OH versions of the Hittite Laws the land Luu̯iia or Lūia is attested (^{URU}*Lu-ú-i-ia*), which has to be equated with the land Arzau̯a as attested in younger texts and therefore must have been situated in west Anatolia between the rivers Gediz Nehri / Hermus and Büyük Menderes Nehri / Maeander, it is not necessarily the case that the CLuwian texts derive from that area. According to Melchert (2003: 174) "[i]n the few cases where a determination can be made, the Luwian rituals found in Hattusa are imported from the southern region of Kizzuwatna". For texts, grammar, vocabulary and historical phonology, see e.g. Starke 1985, Starke 1990, Melchert 2003c, Laroche 1959, Melchert 1993a, Melchert 1994a: 229-281.

Hieroglyphic Luwian is a language closely related to (but nevertheless clearly distinct from) Cuneiform Luwian (see above). It is written in an indigenous hieroglyphic script that seems to have been especially designed for this language. Although seals containing names written in these hieroglyphs can be dated back to the OH period (ca. 1600 BC), the oldest real HLuwian text (the Ankara Silver Bowl, cf. Hawkins 1997) may be dated around 1400 BC. By far most of the ca 260 known HLuwian texts are rock inscriptions. Some thirty of these were set up during the Hittite Empire period (13th century BC), but the bulk (some 230) date from the post-Empire period (1100-700 BC). The Empire-period inscriptions are found all over the area of the Hittite Empire, whereas the post-Empire-period inscriptions are found in south-east Anatolia only, the region of the so-called Neo-Hittite city states. For texts, grammar, vocabulary, script and historical phonology, see e.g. Hawkins 2000, Melchert 2003c, Plöchl 2003, Payne 2004, Meriggi 1962, Marazzi (ed.) 1998, Melchert 1994a: 229-281.

Lycian is the language of the Lycian region, situated on the south-west Anatolian coast between the modern-day cities Fethiye and Antalya. The Lycians called themselves *Trm̃mili*, which must be identical to the name *Termilai* used by Herodote. The Lycian language is known from some 150 coin legends and 170 inscriptions on stone, dating from the 5th and 4th century BC, using a native alphabet related to Greek. Most inscriptions are funereal and show little variation, but a few are edicts, the most important one of which is the trilingual of Letoon (with Greek and Aramaic translations). On two inscriptions, including another important edict, the stele from Xanthos, (part of) the text is written in a dialect distinct from 'normal' Lycian and that is either called Lycian B (with "Lycian A" referring to normal Lycian) or Milyan. Linguistically, Lycian is closely related to CLuwian and HLuwian, and it is in my view probable that they formed a sub-group within the Anatolian family. Nevertheless, the old view that Lycian is a younger variant of Luwian cannot be upheld: for instance, the Lycian vowel system (*a*, *e*, *i*, *u*) cannot be derived from the simpler vowel system of Luwian (*a*, *i*, *u*). For texts, grammar, vocabulary and historical phonology, see e.g. Kalinka 1901, Neumann 1979a, Houwink ten Cate 1961, Neumann 1969, Hajnal 1995, Melchert 2004a, Melchert 1994a: 282-328.

Lydian is the language of classical Lydia, situated in central western Anatolia, in the modern-day provinces of İzmir and Manisa. It is attested on some one hundred stone inscriptions in a native alphabet related to Greek, dating from the 8th-3rd century BC, with a peak around the 5th and 4th century. Most inscriptions stem from Sardis, the capital of Lydia. Although some inscriptions are fairly lengthy, the absence of a large bilingual text (the four bilingual texts, two Lydian-Greek and two Lydian-Aramaic are too short to be of much help) makes Lydian difficult to understand. The little knowledge we do have shows that it stands quite apart from the other Anatolian languages. For texts, grammar, vocabulary and historical phonology, see e.g. Gusmani 1964, Gérard 2005, Melchert 1994a: 329-383.

Carian, Sidetic and Pisidian are so poorly attested or badly understood that I will disregard them in this work. Carian is the language from classical Caria (south-western Anatolia, between Lydia and Lycia), but most Carian texts (some 150) have been found in Egypt where Carian mercenaries were working. They date from the 6th-5th century BC. The twenty texts from Caria itself seem to date from the 4th century BC. Although the language is written in a script seemingly related to Greek, it still has not been fully deciphered yet. Only recently (in the 1990's) reliable sound values have been established for some signs on the basis of (short) Carian-Egyptian bilinguals. In 1996 a rather large Carian-Greek bilingual

inscription was found in Kaunos, which hopefully will elucidate our knowledge of the Carian language in the future. Sidetic is known from 8 inscriptions from the city Side in the region Pamphylia, written in a native alfabet related to Greek. They date from the 3rd century BC. Three of them have a Greek version, which enables us to identify a few words that show that the language must be Anatolian. Nevertheless, with such a small corpus not much is known about Sidetic. Pisidian is the language known from some thirty tomb inscriptions from Pisidia, located between the lakes Eğridir Gölü and Beyşehir Gölü. They are written in the regular Greek alfabet and can be dated to the 1st-2nd century AD. Until now only names have been attested, but the fact that a genitive-ending *-s* is used (= Luw. *-ašša/i-*) in combination with the establishment that some names clearly are Anatolian (e.g. Μουσητα = Luw. *Muu̯aziti*), points to an Anatolian language. For an introduction to these languages, see e.g. Van den Hout 1998.

Within the Anatolian branch, Hittite is by far the best attested and best-known language. Therefore, Indo-Europeanists understandably often only use data from this language when working on the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European. Nevertheless, I agree with Melchert (1994a: foreword) who states that "only [an Anatolian] perspective can fully illuminate the history of Hittite". Although within the research project that enabled me to write this work there was no time to fully describe the prehistory of the other Anatolian languages, I have taken them into account whenever necessary and sometimes digressed on certain aspects of their historical phonology.

0.6 THE PLACE OF THE ANATOLIAN BRANCH WITHIN PIE

A mere six years after the decipherment of Hittite, Forrer (1921: 26) writes: "Man wird [...] nicht umhin können, das Kanisische [= Hittite, AK] als Schwestersprache des aus den indogermanischen Sprachen erschlossenen Urindogermanischen zu bezeichnen". This idea was soon taken over by Sturtevant (e.g. 1926, 1929) who even introduces the name 'Indo-Hittite' for the proto-language that would underly Anatolian on the one hand and Indo-European on the other. The 'Indo-Hittite hypothesis' has been much discussed over the years, even resulting in a monograph (Zeilfelder 2001). Although at first scholars were sceptical, in the last decade it seems as if a concensus is being reached that the Anatolian branch indeed was the first one to split off of the Proto-Indo-

European language community. Nevertheless, these opinions are often based on the archaicity of some phenomena in Hittite (compare e.g. Zeilfelder's book that is entirely devoted to the archaic features of Hittite), whereas already Pedersen (1938: 12) rightly remarks that "[d]as unmittelbar abweichende Aussehen des Hittitischen hat natürlich keine Bedeutung; Neuerungen des Hittitischen oder Verlust des Alten entweder im Hittitischen oder in den zehn Sprachzweigen haben keine Beweiskraft". He states "dass nur gemeinsame Neuerungen der zehn lebendigen Sprachzweige sie dem Hittitischen gegenüber als eine Einheit charakterisieren können".[8] So, no matter how archaic some features of Hittite or the other Anatolian languages are and no matter how many of them have been preserved, the only evidence for a special position of Anatolian within the IE family would be if we could show that the other IE languages share a common innovation that is not present in Anatolian. It is my intention to present a few of these cases here (for full etymological treatment cf. their respective lemmas).

(1) The Hitt. verb *mer-^{zi} / mar-* 'to disappear' is generally considered cognate with the PIE root **mer-* that denotes 'to die' in the other IE languages (Skt. *mar-* 'to die', Av. *mar-* 'to die', Gr. ἄμβροτος 'immortal', (Hes.) ἔμορτεν 'has died', Lat. *morior* 'to die', OCS *mrěti* 'to die', Lith. *miřti* 'to die', Goth. *maurþr* 'murder', Arm. *meřanim* 'to die'). Because typologically it is improbable that an original meaning 'to die' would develop into 'to disappear', whereas a development of 'to disappear' to 'to die' is very common,[9] we must assume that the original meaning of the root **mer-* is 'to disappear', as is still attested in Anatolian, and that the semantic development to 'to die' as visible in the other IE languages must be regarded as a common innovation of them.

(2) The words for 'you (sg.)' in the Anatolian languages (e.g. Hitt. *zīk / tu-*) must go back to the PAnat. pair **tiH*, obl. *tu-* (cf. § 2.1.3). All other IE langauges point to a pair nom. **tuH*, obl. **tu-*, however. If we assume that the pair **tuH*, **tu-* is original, it is in my view impossible to explain how the Anatolian pair **tiH*, *tu-* has come into being. If, however, we assume that the pair **tiH*, **tu-* is original, we only need to assume a trivial analogical altering of **tiH* to **tuH* on the basis

[8] Note that Pedersen concludes (1938: 190-1): "Wir haben weder in der Grammatik noch in der Lautlehre einen Anhalt dafür gefunden, dass das Hittitische in einem Gegensatze zu den anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen stünde. Es stellt sich als elfter Sprachzweig neben die zehn altbekannten Sprachzweige".

[9] Consider euphemisms like ModEng. *to pass away*, *to be gone* and, even more clearly, French *disparaître*.

of the oblique stem **tu-*,[10] in order to explain the pair **tuH*, *tu-*. I therefore conclude that the Anatolain pair **tiH*, **tu-* is original and that the pair **tuH*, **tu-* as reflected in the other IE languages is the result of a common innovation, namely introduction of the oblique stem **tu-* into the nominative.

(3) The Hittite verb *šāḫ-^{i}* means 'to fill up, to plug, to stuff' and in my view is cognate to the PIE root **seh$_2$-* that is usually translated 'to satiate' (Gr. ἄμεναι 'to satiate oneself', Skt. *ásinvant-* 'unsatiable', TochB *soy-* 'to be satisfied'). Because it is understandable how a meaning 'to fill up, to stuff' would develop into 'to satiate', but not how 'to satiate' would be able to turn into 'to fill up, to stuff', it is likely that the original meaning of the root **seh$_2$-* was 'to fill up, to stuff' as attested in Hittite, and that the meaning 'to satiate' as visible in the other IE languages is a common innovation.

(4) As I will argue under the lemma $^{\text{MUNUS}}$*duttariia̯ta/i-*, the HLuwian word *tuwatra/i-* 'daughter' and Lyc. *kbatra-* 'daughter' point to a PLuw. form **duegtr-*, whereas $^{\text{MUNUS}}$*duttariia̯ta/i-* can only be explained from PLuw. **dugtr-*. So the Anatolian material points to an original inflection **dʰuégh$_2$tr*, **dʰugh$_2$térm*, **dʰugh$_2$trós* 'daughter'. In all other IE languages, we find forms that point to an inflection **dʰugh$_2$tḗr*, **dʰugh$_2$térm*, **dʰugh$_2$trós*, however (e.g. Skt. *duhitā́*, *duhitáram*, *duhitúḥ*; Gr. θυγάτηρ, θυγατέρα, θυγατρός; Lith. *duktẽ*, *dùkterį*, *dukteřs*; OCS *dъšti*; Osc. *futír*; Arm. *dowstr*; ModHG *Tochter*; Gaul. *duχtir*). Because I do not see how an original inflection **dʰugh$_2$tḗr*, **dʰugh$_2$térm*, **dʰugh$_2$trós* could ever be replaced by **dʰuégh$_2$tr*, **dʰugh$_2$térm*, **dʰugh$_2$trós*, whereas the other way around it is a trivial development (introduction of the acc.-form in the nominative combined with analogy to **ph$_2$tḗr* 'father'), I assume that the situation as reflected in Anatolian, **dʰuégh$_2$tr*, **dʰugh$_2$térm*, **dʰugh$_2$trós*, represents the original state of affairs and that the morphological change to the system **dʰugh$_2$tḗr*, **dʰugh$_2$térm*, **dʰugh$_2$trós* as reflected in the other IE languages is a common innovation.

(5) The PIE root **h$_2$erh$_3$-*, which denotes 'to plough' in all non-Anatolian IE languages (Gr. ἀρόω 'to plough', Lat. *arō* 'to plough', OIr. *-air* 'to plough', OHG *erien* 'to plough', Lith. *árti* 'to plough', OCS *orati* 'to plough'), is reflected in

[10] In personal pronouns it is a common phenomenon that nominatives are altered on the basis of oblique forms, cf. for instance the NH use of nom.sg. *ammuk* 'I' instead of original *ūk* on the basis of the oblique forms *ammuk* 'me'.

Hittite in the verbs *ḫarra-*^{i} / *ḫarr-* ‘to grind, to crush’ and *hārš-*^{i} ‘to harrow, to till the soil’ (with an *s*-extension). Although the latter term indeed has agricultural connotations (but note that its usage in the pair *ḫārš-*^{i} *... terepp-*^{zi} ‘to harrow and plough’ clearly shows that it itself did not mean ‘plough’, but rather originally ‘to crush (the ground)’), the basic meaning of *$*h_2erh_3$-* seems to have been ‘to crush’, which could be used having the ground as an object as well. The semantic development of ‘to crush; to harrow (the ground)’ to the specific technical term ‘to plough (with a plough)’ as visible in the non-Anatolian languages must be regarded as a common innovation of them and shows that the Anatolian branch split off before the introduction of the plough.

(6) The verbal root *$*meh_1$-* ‘to refuse, to reject’ is attested as a fully living verb in Hittite, *mimma-*^{i} / *mimm-* < *$*mi\text{-}moh_1$- / *$*mi\text{-}mh_1$-*, whereas in the other IE languages it only survives in the 2sg.imp.act.-form *$*meh_1$* ‘don’t!’ that has been grammaticalized as a prohibitive particle (Skt. *mā́*, Arm. *mi*, Gr. μή, TochAB *mā*). This grammaticalization must be a common innovation of these languages.

(7) As I will show under the lemma **ekku-*, the Anatolian words for ‘horse’ (Hitt. ANŠE.KUR.RA-*u*-, CLuw. ANŠE.KUR.RA-*u*-, HLuw. ^{EQUUS}*á-sù-*, Lyc. *esb-*) all reflect an *u*-stem noun and therefore point to a preform *$*h_1e\acute{k}\acute{u}$-*, whereas the words for ‘horse’ in the other IE languages (Skt. *áśva-*, Av. *aspa-*, Gr. ἵππος, Myc. *i-qo*, Lat. *equus*, Ven. *ekvo-*, OIr. *ech*, OE *eoh*, TochB *yakwe*, TochA *yuk* ‘horse’, Arm. *ēš* ‘donkey’, Lith. *ašvà* ‘mare’, OPr. *aswinan* ‘mare’s milk’) all point to an *o*-stem noun *$*h_1e\acute{k}uo$-*. There is no known phonological development through which PIE *$*h_1e\acute{k}uo$-* could yield PAnat. *$*h_1e\acute{k}u$-* and in view of the productivity of the *o*-stem inflection in Anatolian it is unlikely that PIE *$*h_1e\acute{k}uo$-* would have yielded PAnat. *$*h_1e\acute{k}u$-* through secondary developments. We therefore must conclude that the PAnat. *u*-stem *$*h_1e\acute{k}u$-* reflects the original state of affairs and that the thematicization as visible in the non-Anatolian IE languages (which is a trivial development) must be regarded as a common innovation of them.

Although I realize that not everyone may find every example that I have given here as convincing as another, we must realize that each example on its own already shows that the non-Anatolian IE languages have commonly undergone an innovation where Anatolian has preserved the original situation. This can only lead to one conclusion, namely that the non-Anatolian IE languages still formed

one language community (at least close enough for innovations to reach all speakers) at the moment that the Anatolian branch split off. In other words, each of these examples is conclusive evidence that the Anatolian branch was the first one to split off from the mother language. Whether one then calls this mother language Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Indo-Hittite or something else is only a matter of terminology. I think that the term Proto-Indo-European is still adequate as long as we keep in mind that the Anatolian branch may have preserved an original situation that has undergone innovations or losses in the other IE languages (but likewise the Anatolian branch may have innovated or lost an original situation that is still present in the other IE languages, of course). So, the times of a solely Graeco-Indic reconstruction of PIE are definitely over: we should always take the Anatolian material into account and keep in mind the possibility that the non-Anatolian IE languages have commonly undergone an innovation where Anatolian preserves the original, PIE situation.