



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

**Indo-European origins of Anatolian morphology and semantics:
innovations and archaisms in Hittite, Luwian and Lycian**

Norbruis, S.

Citation

Norbruis, S. (2021, May 12). *Indo-European origins of Anatolian morphology and semantics: innovations and archaisms in Hittite, Luwian and Lycian*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Amsterdam. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3176460>

Version: Publisher's Version

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3176460>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3176460> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Norbruis, S.

Title: Indo-European origins of Anatolian morphology and semantics: innovations and archaisms in Hittite, Luwian and Lycian

Issue Date: 2021-05-12

Introduction

The Anatolian branch of the Indo-European language family is of central importance for the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European. It has long been suspected that Anatolian was the first branch to split off from the family. If this is the case – and current scholarship favors this option –, the stemmatic consequence is that for the reconstruction of any given feature of the proto-language, the evidence of the Anatolian branch is as important as that of all other Indo-European languages combined. If all other Indo-European languages unanimously point to one reconstruction, but the Anatolian evidence to another, there is *a priori* a serious possibility that Anatolian preserves the older situation, and that the innovation took place in the prehistory of the last common ancestor of the other Indo-European languages. The assumption of Anatolian's early departure rests exactly on cases in which this is the most probable scenario.

Although the body of scholars accepting the 'Indo-Anatolian hypothesis' seems to be ever growing,¹ all aspects of the hypothesis, both concerning the nature and the extent of the differences we have to reckon with, are still heavily debated. There is not a single element that is universally agreed upon, and theories run wild. This is not so much because of the non-Anatolian part of the comparison, of which we have gained quite a good grasp ever since Indo-European linguistics was founded on it in the 19th century. It is in part due to the fact that the interpretation of the Anatolian data is still in flux. There are only few dedicated specialists. This makes branch-internal progress slow, and can even catalyze the spread of incorrect ideas, which also emerge relatively easily due to the limitations of our corpora and the inherent complexity of linguistic reconstruction. The idea that Anatolian may be extremely archaic has inspired several backprojections without careful assessment of the possibility that the Anatolian situation is secondary. Very often, also, ideas are based mainly on Hittite, leaving valuable information provided by Luwian and Lycian

¹ Cf. Kloekhorst & Pronk (2019: 3 with refs.).

aside, or conversely, too much compellingness is attributed to Anatolian languages about which we know, and can only know, next to nothing.

For the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European, and for an informed opinion regarding the Indo-Anatolian hypothesis, it is absolutely critical to know and understand the Anatolian facts. This goes in particular for morphology and semantics, which harbor the bulk of potential divergences. Indeed most Indo-Anatolian arguments that have been proposed are of morphological or semantic nature.² The boldest of them concern morphology. At the same time, historical morphology is among the less well understood parts of the already generally understudied field of Anatolian linguistics.

Aims, basis and contents

The present work is meant to mend part of this unfortunate situation. It aims to contribute to our knowledge and understanding of Anatolian, and by extension Proto-Indo-European, by offering in-depth analyses of essential issues in Anatolian historical morphology and semantics.

The objects of the investigations are the three best-attested Anatolian languages that allow for solid analysis: Hittite, Luwian and Lycian. The latter two descend from a sub-node in the Anatolian family tree called Proto-Luwic, and are therefore ‘Luwic’ languages. I do not consider the other Anatolian languages (Palaic, Lydian, Carian, Pisidian, Sidetic) at present informative for the reconstruction of Proto-Anatolian. It is to be hoped that their corpora will grow in the future. As it is, our knowledge of these languages is informed by our reconstruction rather than the other way around.

The work as a whole is divided into two parts, of which one deals with nominal, the other with verbal matters. While the nominal morphology of Hittite is by now quite well understood (although here, too, there is still room for improvement), we are still in the process of establishing even

² For a collection of proposals see Kloekhorst & Pronk (2019: 3-5). The more improbable ones do not feature in this list, but we will encounter some of those in the course of this work.

synchronic Luwic morphology, and accordingly, of finding diachronic explanations for the patterns found. It will therefore not come as a surprise that all studies in the nominal part focus on Luwic.

By far the most important phenomenon in Luwic nominal morphology is that of the so-called ‘*i*-mutation’, a topic that has given rise to several wholly incompatible historical interpretations, with far-reaching consequences. The phenomenon of *i*-mutation is the topic of the first chapter, which leads to an assessment of the developments of the main nominal stem classes between Proto-Anatolian through Proto-Luwic to the individual Luwic languages.

The second chapter takes as its starting point the observation that Luwic proper names have their own inflection. The paradigms are established, and a historical explanation is offered for the endings that deviate from those of the appellatives. The search for the origin of the dative ending leads to a reappraisal of the Hittite use of the allative instead of the dative-locative in *i*-stems, and has important consequences for the debated reconstruction of the Proto-Anatolian allative, which is further relevant for the Indo-Anatolian hypothesis.

Probably, one characteristic feature of Proto-Luwic onomastic inflection was the use of the genitive, whereas appellatives used an inflected counterpart, the genitival adjective. In the third chapter, the Lycian allomorphy of the genitival adjective suffix (*-ahe/i-* ~ *-ehe/i-*) is scrutinized to determine the distribution and nature of the allomorphs. This has been the subject of debate, with different synchronic interpretations leading to different historical interpretations. The genitive and genitival adjective suffix are here ultimately traced back to **-osio(-)*, which problematizes the notion that the *o*-stem genitive **-osio* was an innovation of non-Anatolian IE.

The second part of the work deals with verbal issues, and this is also where semantics play a pivotal role. There is no doubt that the main issue in Anatolian historical verbal morphology is the origin of the *hi*-conjugation, which has inspired various scenarios with far-reaching consequences for the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European and the Indo-Anatolian hypothesis. The *hi*-conjugation is the subject of the fourth and largest chapter, and naturally leads to a shift of focus to Hittite. The chapter

offers a detailed reconstruction of the prehistory of the *hi*-conjugation, and contains a systematic analysis of the principles behind the distribution of lexemes among the *mi*- and *hi*-conjugations. Naturally, it also discusses the semantics of the PIE perfect.

One element that has been used for subgrouping in Indo-European linguistics is the past tense marker known as the augment. The value of this feature for determining subgroups has to be reconsidered in view of the fifth chapter, in which evidence is provided suggesting that the augment is of Proto-Indo-European date and left traces in Hittite.

The sixth and seven chapters focus on the semantics of two of the most prominent verbs in almost all Indo-European branches, **h₁es-* ‘to be’ and **deh₃-* ‘to give’, respectively. It is argued that the Anatolian meanings ‘to sit’ and ‘to take’ preserve the original, Proto-Indo-European meanings, which were lost in the prehistory of the ancestor of the other Indo-European languages. Thus, these verbs constitute evidence in favor of the Indo-Anatolian hypothesis.

Finally, the conclusion gives an overview of the most important findings.

Practical indications

Each chapter is conceived as a separate and self-contained study, featuring its own bibliography. Indeed, all chapters will also be published as separate articles in peer-reviewed journals.³

³ Currently, it is only known that the article counterpart of Chapter 1 will be published in *Historische Sprachforschung*, and that of Chapter 3 in *Hungarian Assyriological Review* (as part of the proceedings of the conference ‘Current Research on Lycian’ held in Munich, 2017). The exact fate of the article versions of the chapters will be reported on stefannorbruis.nl. The articles may turn out to deviate in some places from the chapters in this book due to the review process. One recurring discrepancy between the two versions of each text is that references to other chapters appear in this dissertation as crossreferences (e.g. ‘Chapter X’ rather than ‘Norbruis fthc.’). As in the article versions, however, references to sections and notes are always chapter-internal, and are therefore not preceded by the number of the chapter. The introduction, summary and conclusions, and the index will remain unique features of this book.

The work often relies on established dictionaries and databases for the identification of places of attestation and of the sources of received opinions. For Hittite, the main dictionaries are HW², CHD, HED, HEG, and EDHIL. Currently, the main online database for Luwian is ACLT, which includes vocabulary lists for both Cuneiform and (Iron Age) Hieroglyphic Luwian with links to their digitized corpora (Starke 1985 and Hawkins 2000, respectively). For Cuneiform Luwian there is also the CLL dictionary. The main Lycian dictionaries are those of Melchert and Neumann. In addition, exhaustive lexical treatments for all non-Hittite Anatolian languages are gradually becoming available through eDiAna.

The present work is not an exhaustive treatment of Anatolian historical morphology and semantics. An attempt to write an exhaustive historical morphology of Anatolian would have faced serious difficulties without extensive analyses of some of the topics discussed here. In its detailed treatment of these topics, however, the present study touches on many aspects of inflectional morphology, and it is hoped that the table of contents and the index will lead readers looking for a specific topic to a useful passage.

References

- ACLT = Ilya Yakubovich, *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts*, <http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/>.
- CHD = Hans G. Güterbock, Harry A. Hoffner & Theo P. J. van den Hout (eds.), 1980-, *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago: the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- CLL = H. Craig Melchert, 1993, *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon*, Chapel Hill, N.C.
- EDHIL = Alwin Kloekhorst, 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- eDiAna = *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*, <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de>.

HED = Jaan Puhvel, 1984-, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Berlin – New York – Amsterdam: Mouton.

HEG = Johann Tischler, 1977-2016, *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

HW² = Johannes Friedrich, Annelies Kammenhuber & I. Hoffmann, 1975-², *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

HAWKINS, J. David, 2000, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, Berlin – New York: W. de Gruyter.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin & Tijmen PRONK, 2019, ‘Introduction: Reconstructing Proto-Indo-Anatolian and Proto-Indo-Uralic’, in Alwin KLOEKHORST & Tijmen PRONK (eds.), *The Precursors of Proto-Indo-European: The Indo-Anatolian and Indo-Uralic Hypotheses*, Leiden – Boston: Brill – Rodopi, 1-14.

MELCHERT, H. Craig, 2004³, *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Ann Arbor – New York: Beech Stave;

NEUMANN, Günter, 2007, *Glossar des Lykischen*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

STARKE, Frank, 1985, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.