

A LINGUISTIC HAPPENING IN MEMORY OF BEN SCHWARTZ

STUDIES IN ANATOLIAN, ITALIC,
AND OTHER INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

Edited by

Yoël L. ARBEITMAN

EXTRAIT



PEETERS
LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE

1988

BCILL 42 : LINGUISTIC HAPPENING, 13-40

ARCHAISMS IN ANATOLIAN NOMINAL INFLEXION

F.R. ADRADOS

1

As against the theory that the anomalies of Anatolian nominal inflexion are due to alterations in the older model of eight cases, three genders and a three-term number system, pertaining to traditional reconstructions of IE, the opposite theory has little by little evolved: that Anatolian nominal inflexion, together with certain innovations, preserves a considerable number of archaisms. I shall refer to these ideas in further detail below and, specifically, to papers by Rosenkranz, Meid and Carruba above all. Within the sphere of Spanish scholarship, I shall refer to F. Villar and previous publications of my own.

I should point out that from my own point of view, the archaism of Anatolian in general and of Hittite in particular should be interpreted as a legacy of what I have termed IE II, an intermediate linguistic stage between IE I (or PIE) and IE III or classical IE (I once called it "Brugmannian"). It is therefore intermediate between pre-flexional IE and polythematic IE: a monothematic stage of which vestiges were left in the languages of Anatolia whilst elsewhere it was substituted by polythematic IE, from which two groups in turn derive: that of Indo-Greek and that of the languages of north and west Europe and Tocharian. As from 1962 I have expounded this thesis in a series of papers which I shall refer to briefly (1). As far as the verb is concerned, this thesis is in line with papers by Professor Schwartz - I should here like to pay due homage to his 1946 paper in collaboration with Professor Kerns (1946: 57-58) and to their book of 26 years later (1972).

My thesis, as is known, is that the diverse Indo-European waves which brought IE III or classical IE to Europe from the Ukraine and from even further beyond the Urals, were preceded by other waves which brought a more archaic form of IE that in general terms marked its grammatical oppositions by means of the opposition of endings and not yet through stem opposition. Thus, oppositions such as those of the aspects or the masc. and fem. or the degrees of comparison in the adjective are, in this sense, recent ones: they were as yet unknown to IE II which is represented by its survival in Anatolian and by archaisms in the other languages. Moreover, the old oppositions were extended: the indicative and imperative were opposed to a subjunctive and an optative, a future to the present and preterite, etc. In general terms, IE III made the older binary oppositions ternary ones and created other ternary ones, too; and they were chiefly based on stem oppositions, nevertheless respecting the older oppositions between endings.

However, in the above-mentioned papers I have expounded a general outline of the evolution of the Indo-European nominal system, to some extent also based on Prof. Villar's above-mentioned book (1974): I cannot help mentioning some facts briefly in order to justify the classification of archaisms as applied to other Anatolian data which I shall study below.

In the above-mentioned papers, number is considered as a recent category in nominal inflexion; according to my view the dual is not yet to be found within IE II and only partly in IE III, in which this category originates; and above all, the plural number was only gradually created, this being the cause (and not a recent syncretism as has been suggested) of the indifference of certain nominal forms to the sing./plur. opposition. Similarly, and in accordance with the majority of scholars, I have postulated that the masc./fem. opposition is also recent and later than Anatolian.

But above all the case oppositions have their own history: cf. a review of certain ideas on this point in an article by W.P. Lehmann (1958: 179-202) and another of mine (1984) among the bibliography on the subject. Moreover, in this history, the eight-case system of O.I., traditionally attributed to Indo-European, is the result of a

secondary evolution. It does not seem as if there is any dat./loc. opposition in IE, except in diverse languages which developed it and even then, not in all stems. The non-distinction of gen./abl. outside thematic inflexion, that of nom./gen. sing. in Hittite (the *antuḫšaš* type), certain "syncretisms" and the use of pure stems in diverse cases are all old.

Some of these ideas are quite wide-spread, others not so - this is not the place for a detailed discussion. I can, however, put forward those data in Anatolian which might help to support them.

Before doing this, I should nevertheless like to point out the peculiarities of IE nominal inflexion in relation to verb inflexion. For, on the one hand, as has often been rightly stressed (cf., for example, W. Meid, 1975: 212), the nominal and verbal inflexion had parallel development. On the other, however, one should note their differences, which are also important.

It is no longer a matter of the same formal elements being used at the service of different functions and categories and of the only common category, that of number, now being marked differently in both word classes. It is that IE III did not manage to create a number differentiation in the noun system based on stem oppositions as in the verb system. Yet, however, as early as IE II there is stem opposition in nominal inflexion, in the so-called heteroclitics (although each stem does not refer to a unitary category, as in the verb). Even more important than this is the fact that IE II does not, in general terms, offer anything more than binary oppositions which were only to become ternary or multiple ones in IE III. Nevertheless, Anatolian offers a seven-case system within which there is a complicated system of oppositions. Of course, this system displays undeniable traces of its relatively recent nature - I shall discuss this later on.

According to the thesis I have defended elsewhere, in the above-mentioned papers, this complex system is the result of the combination and inter-penetration of various simple systems which were binary. In the same way, whereas later in IE III other binary opposition systems were to combine and split secondarily to give other more complex ones. I believe that the first opposition is that

- which is given between any stem (later specialized for several case uses) and the same in an impressive-expressive function, that is, a vocative function. However, in the non-vocative sector, or that which responds to the representative function of language, there are from at least a very early date, three binary oppositions:

a) Nom./acc., as actants or verb determiners which are opposed to one another.

b) A nominal stem in any case/gen., this latter as a determiner of the former.

c) A nominal stem in any case/dat.-loc., as case determiner for the whole sentence.

These binary oppositions, not to mention others, which doubtless are more recent, for the abl. and instr. intervene in them, referred to different functions of language or to different contexts. With time, however, they combined in a unique opposition system. Yet, as is well-known, a case was not opposed to the others in any context, but rather there are oppositions between limited cases within limited contexts, too, this being the legacy of the older situation.

Without going into any depth on these ideas and by merely referring to other works in which they have been more fully expounded, it would seem quite clear that they are in close relationship to a series of defective uses in Anatolian nominal inflexion, which I mentioned briefly above. It may, of course, be argued to the contrary or one may dubitatively find a circular reasoning in these ideas - the defectiveness of Anatolian displays the recent nature of certain categories and this recent nature is why the defective uses of Anatolian are interpreted as archaisms. One may, nevertheless, break this vicious circle. For example, as the archaisms are not connected with any époque or dialect but reappear here and there, it is plausible to look for others comparable to those of Anatolian in the rest of IE: for example, the masc./fem. or dat./loc., or nom./voc. oppositions are missing sometimes (as likewise, the ind./subj. or pres./pret. opposition is also missing at times). One could also seek traces of an older lack of these oppositions in the fact that they are expressed through recent formal elements or used to this end only recently. I have discussed all this in my article on

the origin of the grammatical categories (1985), and elsewhere.

Therefore, the data on the archaism of the Anatolian noun given below should be interpreted as data to be added to those which from other branches of Indo-European support the theory of the gradual origin of inflexion as from a prior non-flexional stage. It should nevertheless be understood that if this hypothesis should be shown to be untrue, there would have to be reinterpretations carried out differently.

I trust, however, that it is valid and that the number of those who agree is really increasing. I should add that it is particularly well-founded as far as the verb system and the masc./fem. and positive/comparative/superlative one are concerned: wherever a new opposition system has been built up on the basis of those which are obviously independent older stems. In more hypothetical terms, when it is a case of the origin of oppositions expressed through endings, such as those of IE II, in general. Even here, however, the existence of \emptyset ending forms and the use of the same formal elements in diverse functions, sometimes recent ones and in any case with no original semantic relationship to the functions they express in the new system, are all strong arguments.

I have already said that in the particular case of noun inflexion, this stage in which there are oppositions expressed with the aid of endings alone (besides specific facts of vowel alternation and accent shifting) was not surpassed by IE III. Moreover, what can be compared - and not exactly so - to the stem oppositions I discussed above is heteroclisis, which doubtless comes from the opposition of two different stems to mark the gen. (and on top of this, other cases) or the fem. (cf., for example, E. Benveniste, 1935; Specht, 1944; Bader, 1975; Shields, 1979: 213-226). However, in spite of all, irregularities in the forms marked by endings show the recent nature of the opposition.

Yet, what has so far been said in this respect is not overmuch. I should here like to refer to papers by the three great scholars I mentioned above, who have contributed certain things on the subject of archaisms in Hittite nominal inflexion, although far fewer than on

verbal inflexion. I shall leave aside, withal, a point on which there is today a wide consensus, with a few exceptions: the non-existence in old Anatolian of the masc./fem. opposition. I shall return to this matter below.

I refer to four papers: two by B. Rosenkranz, one dated 1972 and another of 1979: (219-228); a third by O. Carruba dated 1976: (121-146); and to a fourth by W. Meid dated 1979: (159-176). I shall review the nominal archaisms noted by these authors.

In his 1972 paper, Rosenkranz mentions nom.-gen. homonymy in stems in *-aš*, neuters in *-a* (not *-am*), the use of *-aš* and *-an* in the gen. both sing. and plur. (although he does not appear to draw any conclusions on this), to the lack, still, of desinences in *-bh* and *-m* in the oblique cases of the plural and the use of pure stems in inflexion. In the 1979 paper, he states (quoting Kronasser) that the plur. inflexion is not totally complete; he stresses the lack of special forms for the oblique cases of the plur. and the identity of nom.-gen. in the sing., although he does not offer explanations of them that are very clear (cf. below). All this is useful, although too summary and not inserted into any consistent theory (cf., too, by the same author, his 1978 book: 126 ff.).

Carruba, in a very useful article on the archaisms of the Anatolian verb, has very little to say on the noun; the most important fact is the lack of a feminine and the fact that the differences between the Hittite oblique cases and those of other languages makes one think of the recent nature of all of them. Meid, in an equally useful article on the verbal field, has practically nothing to say about the nominal.

Naturally, this is not all; in diverse monographic articles one can find archaisms noted by their authors or material susceptible to interpretation as such, which are those I shall be concerned with. There are likewise interpretations. Yet, with regard to the interpretations, progress is probably less than might be expected; no satisfactory explanation is given even when data such as the nom.-gen. homonymy in thematic nouns is postulated. Moreover, acceptance of the recent nature of both the Indo-European oblique

cases and also in the plural is, I believe, likely to lead us farther along the path of reconstruction than hitherto. In any case, there is a lack of any detailed expounding of the archaisms in nominal inflexion and similarly of any attempt at interpretation of them from the point of view of evolution, from non-flexional PIE to the stages of IE later than Anatolian. This is what, only to a certain extent, I attempt to do here.

II

I shall begin with gender, the most well-known subject of all. It is well-known that as far as both the noun and the adjective are concerned, we find in Anatolian a common gender and a neuter or inanimate one, formally marked in general terms in the same way, as in the rest of IE.

Here too, of course, it might be thought that the non-existence of a masc./fem. opposition is due to secondary loss, which could be related to the non-existence in Hittite of an independent inflexion in $-\bar{a}$. I shall return later to this latter phenomenon, for supposed vestiges have been noted even, of the fem. in Hittite (*parkuiš* - "pure", *dankuiš* - "dark"). Linguists such as Pedersen, Sommer and Kronasser supported the thesis of a secondary loss of the feminine in Hittite, whilst Sturtevant and many other linguists have refuted this: I quote among them Laroche (1970: 50-57), Carruba (1976: 131), Brossmann (1979: 124-137), and K.H. Schmidt (1979: 793-810). Really, the forms in question are stems in $-i$ (Laroche) or in $-\bar{a}i$ (Brossmann); as we shall see, one and the other are really the same.

Brugmann and Meillet had already widely speculated on the secondary origin of the feminine in IE: Hittite furnishes evidence of a stage prior to the splitting of the common gender (animate) into masculine and feminine. K.H. Schmidt rightly points out, in the above-mentioned article, that this evidence need not necessarily lead to the conclusion of the later nature of the two animate genders. On their origin - through polarization of the old common gender as against the recently created feminine one - there is abundant bibliography which I shall not mention here, for the subject lies

outside the purpose of this paper. I shall merely refer to how the matter is treated in my 1975 book (: 479 ff.).

However, this is not the only archaism in Hittite (and in Anatolian in general) as far as gender is concerned. There are also archaisms for the common/neuter opposition which, although older (for it appears in IE II), represents an evolution from an earlier stage, that of non-flexional or ageneric PIE.

I cannot enter here into a lengthy discussion of the proposed origins for the common/neuter opposition (or animate/inanimate, as it is also called). I should nevertheless like to recall that the thesis I have supported (1975: 395 ff.) is that this generic opposition depends on an old opposition between sub-classes of the noun: the integrants of one of these (the future inanimates or neuters) had distributional constraints which consisted of their being unable to function either as the subjects of "active" verbs (like the future nom.) nor in impressive-expressive use (like the future voc.). Hence the lack in this class of the nom. with *-s* and the fact that in the acc., as against the nom., the acc. is marked with * *m*, whereas there is in the inanimates, according to the declensions, either **-m* or *-∅*, for there was no danger at first that they might be confused with a then non-existing nom. or voc. (later, when the concept of subject was extended, they were created as forms identical to the acc.) (2). Another thesis I have also supported is that the **-ā* or **-ə* which, according to general opinion, was only secondarily used to mark the plural of neuters, was not originally a sing. marker but an anumerical form (converted into a sing. only when it was given a new plur. in the animate inflexion).

These ideas are needed if one is to understand the archaisms of Anatolian I mention below properly. It should also be acknowledged that the same entity may be conceived of, according to the cases, as either animate or inanimate. At times, there is a lexical difference: of the type of Gr. γῆ/πέδον, Lat. *terra/tellus*, doubtless old (cf. Hitt. *paḫhur*, Gr. πῦρ/O.I. *agnis*, Lat. *ignis* and similar, well-known cases). However, it is quite clear in other instances that the same root could be used either as an animate or as an inanimate: this is the origin of *-os/-om* fluctuations in neuters in diverse languages, cf. also Gr.

χθών (fem.)/Hitt. *tekan* (n.) from the same root. Furthermore: if the -s or -os of the nom. sing. is a characteristic which marks the subject (active), it is clear that at an older pre-flexional stage, it could have still been lacking and that we should therefore expect traces of alternance in the nom. sing., between *R* (= root) and *R-s* or *R-os*, and in the acc. sing. between *R* (certainly in the neuters, but also in the animates) and *R-m* or *R-om*. Where I say *R*, *S* (= stem) may also be inserted. All this is confirmed by Anatolian. These are the essential data from Hittite:

a) -an / -a alternance in the neuters

Rosenkranz (1972: 5) and also, among others, Brosman (1979: 58 ff.) have indicated the existence of neuter adjectives and nouns in -a, not in -an. Palmitis has pointed out parallels to this fact in several languages (1981: 74). Thus it happens, for example, that we find *danatta* "empty" both in nom.-acc. sing. n. and in the same cases in plur., this homonymy for the rest being frequent.

The fact is quite clear. And I believe that the explanation is, too. Far from being analogical (Brosman), these forms in $-\bar{a}$ (or $-\bar{a}$) were at first anumerical, their use as plurals together with -an obviously being secondary. But they were also ageneric; they could at first be used as animate nouns (hence the so-called first declension), yet also as inanimates. That is, $-\bar{a}$ (> -a) was generically ambiguous, -am (> -an) was specifically neuter and hence ended by predominating. $-\bar{a}$ split: it remained either as common (with a sing. and a plur.), or as neuter (with the exceptions quoted, as plur.). One should note as a parallel the existence of nouns in -a (neuters, variables or of unknown gender) alternating with neuters in -s (Brosman, 1979: 60).

Neuter plurals with $*-\bar{a}$ (or $*-\bar{a}$) > -a in stems in -u, -s, etc. should, I believe, be considered as analogical to those mentioned (3). The same goes for the n. pl. in -a-a or -a-ga of Palaic (4); not so the n. p. like Hitt. *šalla*, *šallai* alongside *šalli*, which are explained by the laryngeal theory, cf. below.

b) Alternance of common and neuter nouns

There are well-known data which nevertheless have not, I believe, been given suitable interpretation. I refer to the lack in Hittite of the type of IE III with animate nom. sing. with $-\emptyset$ ending and lengthening as against an acc. sing. with $-m$ (Gr. ποιμήν / ποιμένα); and to the presence of a double inflexion in certain roots and stems, one animate and the other inanimate (or at least interpreted thus).

In fact, the existence in Hittite of stems which are doubly declined is relatively frequent; on the one hand with the pure stem in nom. acc. sing., on the other with $-aš/-an$. The first forms are interpreted as inanimates, the latter as animates: thus nom.-acc. *keššar* "hand" as against a nom. *keššaraš* / acc. *keššaram* (see Kronasser, 1966: 275 ff.). The same occurs in the case of *kurur*, *takšul*, *kallar*, *šittan*, etc. and, of course, similarly in the case of a number of words with (a) only the form of nom.-acc. without endings and others with (b) only $-aš/-an$ forms.

Let us now return to interpretation. It is said that *kurur* is "enmity" and that its use as "enemy" is secondary, being the result of an opposition: a "man of enmity" would, for example give "enemy". This is the same explanation as that used to justify that a gen. in $-aš$ should also be nom.: I believe this explanation to be erroneous, cf. below. To my mind, what is quite clear is that "enemy", an animate, may be used when it is the subject, either unmarked (*kurur*, archaic use) or marked (*kururaš*, recent use). In the acc. it is well-known that there was no original distinction between animate and inanimate, either *kurur* or *kururan* is postulated. Similarly, I do not believe that *keššar* "hand" need necessarily be inanimate: how is it to be distinguished from *keššaraš*? Thus, too, in the other cases.

That is, the form without $-aš$ is an archaic form and is unmarked, at first animate or inanimate or indifferent. It may also be used as a plur. without adding $-a$ (*kurur/kurur* but *šuppai/šuppala*). Other languages preserved it as an animate and marked it with the lengthening of the type of Gr. ποιμήν and eliminated the unmarked form of the acc. in the animates (they kept only the form with $-m$).

In fact, the alternance S- \emptyset or S-*aš* / S- \emptyset or S-*an* in Hittite (S- \emptyset or S-*os* / S- \emptyset or S-*om* of IE II) is in line with an archaic stage at which the \emptyset forms could be nom. or acc., animate or inanimate; those with *-aš* could be only nom. (animate) and those with *-an* only acc. (animate). IE III introduced regularizations. The animate nom. was distributed according to the declensions: some have \emptyset , others *-s* or *-os*. And the animate and inanimate acc. were re-distributed: the latter took *-om* or \emptyset (according to the declensions), the former only *-m* (5). Therefore, an important isogloss is later than IE II and in particular, later than Anatolian.

III

I shall at this point go on to discuss the number system. I do not want to insist on what is to my mind a clear conclusion that the non-existence of the dual in Anatolian is due to the fact that this number was created later in some of the languages of IE III (6).

As far as the plural is concerned, I have already stated that the lack of special forms in Hittite for certain cases has been discussed as well as the occasional use of a gen. form (*-aš*), reputed to be sing., as a plur. and conversely, of a plur. one in *-an*, as a sing. I should stress that the facts are far more important than might be thought on the basis of certain explanations, as likewise their interpretation.

Whilst certain stems (those in *-a*, *-i* and *-u* above all) regularly have nom. plurals in *-eš*, others (and even these), often have a common form of nom. sing. and plur.: *ḫalkiš*, *lingaiš*, *utne*, *kurur*, etc. The forms in *-a* of the nom.-acc.-voc. plur. of the neuters, which coincide with forms in *-a* of the sing. as I have just said, are one more proof of this. Then there is the case mentioned of the forms in *-aš* of the gen. sing.-plur. and the equivalent ones in *-an*, although they tend to be restricted to the plur. Note, however, that these forms in *-aš* are at the same time the forms of the dat.-loc. plur.: *antuhšaš* (stem in **-o*), *ḫumandaš* (stem in *-nt*), for example, and cover all these functions. One should add that *-an* also appears as a dat. sing. in Hieroglyphic Hittite, Luwian and Lydian (in this latter, αv

is gen.-dat.-loc. plur. according to O. Carruba [1969: 78]). The abl. sing. and the plur. also often coincide and the same goes for the instr.: the forms in *-az(a)* and those in *-it*. In the stems in *-i*, the dat.-loc. sing. in *-i(ja)* is at the same time often a plural.

So much for Hittite. The situation is also seen in the other Anatolian languages. Apart from what will be said later on the forms in *-ahi*, *ehi* of Lycian, see other forms such as *tideimi* nom. sing.-plur., *lada* nom. sing.-dat. plur. (cf. Meriggi, 1928: 425 ff.). Similar data may be found in other Anatolian languages.

This sing.-plur. identity occurs at times, as may be seen, in the pure stems; at others in stems with endings. It is also to be seen that there is a tendency to eliminate it by, for example, opposing *-an* and *-a* or *-iš* and *-e-eš* or *-eš* or gen. in *-aš* / id. in *-an*. Note that this defectiveness is at times allied to a defectiveness in the case system, although it has occasionally reached a clear sing./plur. opposition (*antuḫšaš* / *antuḫšeš*) and other parallels in the case system.

As has sometimes been said - as against the immediate temptation to see secondary loss of the plur. here - what occurs is that certain forms only secondarily became specialized for the plur.: almost invariably by means of secondary distributions, on the strength of the same endings of the sing. (and with no intervention of others which were specialized to the plur. and belong to various later languages). Above all, the system of alternances was used: *ḫalkiš/ḫalkeš* (written *ḫal-ki-e-eš*), probably from a plur. in **-ejes*, like in IE III (thus Georgiev, 1975: 104). In any case, it is clear that an *-eš* form became specialized to mark the plur.: it may derive either from here or from the plur. of the *antuḫšaš* type (as against sing. *antuḫšaš*), which in turn may represent an apophonic variation such as that of the voc. sing. or rather be one more analogical form on the basis of the stems in *-i*.

It is quite clear that IE III remodelled the plur. independently. I believe that within this remodelling, the nom. plur. in *-ōs* of the 2nd declension does not come from a contraction **-o-es* but from the use of a new morphological resource of this new phase of IE: vowel

lengthening. It definitely separated the gen. sing. from the plur. (but a gen. sing. in *-on* was left in Cyprian and perhaps in Mycenaean (cf. Pisani, 1959: 81-86). It created the lengthened nom. sing., stabilized diverse types of vowel alternances at the service of inflexion and specialized the endings (introducing certain special ones of the plur.). For the rest, there is a series of data of merely a dialectal nature, for example the development of an independent dat., and of a loc.

IV

Far more complex is the study of those archaisms which refer to the diverse cases. This is a subject which must be divided into several items.

a) The Genitives in -aš and -an in Hittite

The gen. sing. and plur. in *-aš* is not surprising, for it was normal in IE III in diverse stems such as those in *-i* (*halkijaš*), *-nt* (*humandaš*), *-r* (*kururas*) and others. Only the fact that it does not always adjust to the habitual system of later alternances is strange: there are forms of the type of *šallajaš*, *ašša_uaš*, etc., and forms of the **-ei-s* type are missing. Of course, the syncretism was with the plur. and within this, with the dat.-loc., too.

The most surprising thing, however is the homonymy of the nom. and gen. sing. in thematic nouns (the *antuḫšaš* type), a fact to which attention has been drawn many times and which is generally considered to be an archaism: in one way or another, it is thought that the gen.'s of IE III **-osjo* or **-oso* are derived from **-os* with differentiating purposes. I also believe this, but the details must be investigated.

For I do not agree with the commonest theory that said nom. is a sort of "Nominativus pro Genitivo" (cf., for example, Villar, 1974: 109 ff.; Rosenkranz, 1979: 231): *yaštullaš* would mean "he of sin, the sinner". This is not correct: there are animate nominatives with either a pure stem or a lengthened stem with *-aš* (< **-os*), as I have said. This ending (and *-š*, at other times) simply marked the active subject

as has so often been acknowledged; certainly it could be missing (nom. with pure stem, which was given a lengthening later in IE III).

What happens is that there is an ending which is homophonous to this: the *-aš* genitive ending. In general, there is assymetry: *-aš* is only in gen. *uttar/uddanaš, pedan/pedaš, -uar/-uaš*) or it is in the gen. whilst there is *-š* in the nom. (stems in *-i, -u, -nt*, etc.). There is only coincidence in the thematic stems and one could even say that this is a result of a spreading of *-aš* of the nom. in diverse consonantal stems, a spreading which was not completed for there are still pure stems of the nom. left. Not even in other stems was it fully completed: irregular concords in which the stems in *-i* appear with the pure stem (7) show this.

That is, *-aš* and *-an* spread from an early date as noun determiners, which produced both genitives and adjectives (cf. my 1975: 409 ff.). These may also take simply *-š* (perhaps also at an early date the genitives, as was preserved in IE III). But *-aš* and *-š* also occasionally marked verb determiners: the nom., although its spreading in this function was more incomplete.

That a lengthening of the root was grammaticalized in two different functions has nothing strange about it, for these functions were in principle due to different contexts or distributions. Homonymy only arose in certain very special contexts: subject with determiner and verb. As we know, there was a tendency to avoid it by using the formation with ending only in the gen. or by using the latter in the nom. and gen. in different vowel degrees. Really, there is only homonymy in the stems in *-a*, which is a slender basis upon which to postulate that all the nominatives in *-š* come from the gen. No, this is a case of homonymy (later eliminated) which was solved by the context, as many others. At the most, it may be accepted that gen. and adjective were originally identical, forms with a relational device as has at times been suggested (cf. my 1975: 483 ff.).

b) Genitives and adjectives in -ahl, -ehl in Lycian and comparable forms

It is well-known that the range of the gen. in Anatolian

languages other than Hittite is quite different. Doubtless with the aim of avoiding homonymy, they favoured the development of more or less equivalent formations.

In Luwian there is a gen. in *-ašši*, *-ašša*; in Hieroglyphic Luwian, there are also some in *-asi*, *-asa* (cf. Laroche, 1959: 136 ff.). They are evidently related to Hittite adjectives in *-ašša*. On the other hand, in Lydian there are adjectives in *-alli*. These are formations of Indo-European origin (8).

The Genitives of Luwian originate in the form in *-aš*; they are really derivations of the gen. And they should not be confused, as is usual, with Lycian formations in *-ahi*, *-ehi* which are considered diversely as gen.'s or adjectives.

In this language, *a* and *e* alternate freely and *-ehi* should be derived from an original *-ahi*; then it tends to assign the former type to the stems in *-i*, *-ahi* to those in *-a*, but with numerous vacillations (9).

The exclusively adjectival nature of these formations, as Mittelburger suggests, doubtless on their analogy to the afore-mentioned ones, is highly doubtful (10). Meriggi considers them to be forms of nom., dat. and acc. sing. which at times, however, concord with a noun, in which construction they are adjectival. This is reasonable; but in other instances there is no concord, they are case forms of the noun. On the other hand, these forms can add case endings or diverse enlargements (abl. sing. *-ahedi*, dat. plur. *-ahe*, *-ehe*, nom. plur. n. *-aha*). Sometimes they are added to derived forms (nom. *-i* / gen. *-ijehi*, etc.). They occasionally lack *-h-*: dat. sing.-plur. and nom. plur. n. in *-a* in Lycian itself, *-a*, *-ai* in Hittite, cf. below.

As I already stated elsewhere (1981: 241 ff.) I believe that these are simply pure stems which should be compared to Luwian abstracts in *-aji(t)* (Lycian belongs to this same language group) which correspond to other Hittite ones in *-(a)-a-i*.

This is really an Anatolian isogloss (11). In Hittite the stems in

-i still take *-hi* at times (12). On the other hand, there are equivalences in Palaic in *-a*, *-a-a*, *-a-ga* to the n. plurals already mentioned (13).

It is worth noting that the pure stems in question have, as is logical, indifference to number: *-ahi* may act as gen. plur. I believe that this is the case of *ēni mahanahi* "μήτηρ θεῶν" in Lycian (14).

The foregoing is not enough to finish what should be said regarding these pure stems which I interpret as derivatives of $-eH_2^i$, the alternant form to \emptyset degree H^i : the former, according to the phonetic theory I have expounded elsewhere (15), would give either *-ahi* or *-ah* (later reduced to *-ai* and *-a*); the latter type would give *-hi* (later reduced to *-i*). For example, one should stress the fact that their adjectival use is quite secondary, and that an example such as the one Mittelburger offers of it, *xñnahi ehdiehi*, "of his grandmother" exactly displays the use of the gen. Cf. also *pñnutahi uhahi* - "of the fifth year" (Shevoroshkin, 1979).

This study clears the way for the one we shall now carry out on the pure stems. Several of them in *-ahi* (whence *-ehi*) were used, as may be observed, to give diverse cases, alternating with forms which lost the *h* (above all *-a* in nom. sing., in dat. sing.-plur., in nom.-acc. n. plur., also *-i* forms of the \emptyset degree). We have already seen that at times one and another type of forms mix, above all in the n. plur. Lycian clung particularly to the laryngeal and used it (as Hittite in other instances, cf. *dahhi/dai*) to differentiate originally identical forms. Although it tended in general terms to reduce *-ahi*, *-ehi* to the gen. sing., in which uneasy homonymous forms are ousted. Note that in Hittite the form in *-aš* sometimes covers more cases than just the gen., as I have already pointed out.

Lycian, then, did no more than to keep numerous pure laryngeal stems, as did Anatolian in general (and not only Anatolian), cf. the nominatives in $*-\bar{a}$, the datives in $*-\bar{a}i$, the vocatives in $*-\bar{a}$, in sing., and the nom.-ac.-voc. in $*-\bar{a}$, $*-\bar{a}$, in the plur. in IE III; besides the variants in *-i*, thus *-ei* in the dat. of the type of Gr. πόλει, OCS *kostí*, etc. (16). The newest thing about this language is the extending of these formations to the gen. sing. to avoid homonymous forms,

and using the alternance of forms with *h* and others which lost it for case distinctions and number distinctions which it introduces. I have already said that there was a model for extension to the gen., the occasional syncretism of this case with others. As far as the lengthening of these pure stems is concerned, it is a partly new, partly Indo-European procedure: I have already discussed the final *-a* of the n. plur. Pal. *-aga*, Lyc. *-aha* and the abl. and instr. It should be considered that final elements of pure stems in a laryngeal were secondarily interpreted as endings and additions even, to these stems: Hitt. dat. sing. *šuppaja*; Pal. nom. plur. n. *-a-ga*, O.I. *agnáye* (< **-ejei*), dat. plur. in *-ija* in Luwian (17), etc.

On the other hand, the foregoing shows in what a fluid state inflexion was in Anatolian, whilst a recent language like Lycian could spread pure stems in its own way: they doubtless continued to be used as synonyms, approximately, of all the cases, with dialectal variations.

c) Other forms and uses of the pure stems in -i, -a, -ai in Anatolian

I shall continue studying this remarkable archaism by stressing the facts about stems in *-a*, *-ai* and *-i*. Pure stems are not rare in IE III, in which pure stems continued to be used, being only secondarily classified as belonging to this or that case: the animate nom. sing., the nom.-acc.-voc. n. of sing. and plur., the voc. and the dat.-loc. sing. Certainly, they appear no longer in the animate acc. sing. (as they still appeared in Lycian, for example; in this and other matters it is more archaic than Hittite, that is if it did not lose an *-m*). But let us examine the use of the above-mentioned pure stems as a whole in the Anatolian languages, disregarding for the moment the particular instance of Lycian. As I cannot study the whole of the pure stems, or in general the archaisms of Anatolian, I shall keep to these which are particularly significant.

The whole of this study is based on the relevant part played by the pure stems in the nominal inflexion of Hittite, which has recently been the object of important monographs by E. Neu (1980) and F. Villar (1981). In this context, what is believed is the following: diverse

cases in *-a*, *-i* and *-ai* (with extensions, at times) are pure stems of the Hittite stems in *-i*, *-a* and *-ai*, stems which "classified" alternating Indo-European stems in $*-i / *āi / *-ā$ into three inflexions (the second of these fused with the thematic one in $*-o$). These dative-locatives in *-i*, *-a(i)* appear in all of them. The endings *-i*, *-ai*, *-a*, when they appear in other stems (*nepiša*, *nepiši* in dat. or dat.-loc., *idella_{ya}* in nom. plur. n., etc.) are overlappings or analogical extensions of the ending of said pure stems. On the other hand, these endings are to my mind, as I have already said, the same as those which appear in other instances as *-hi*, *-ahi*, *-ah* (lengthened *-aha*). I believe that in my above-mentioned works on the phonetic problem, I left it sufficiently clear that the laryngeals were being lost in Anatolian at the stage we know of and that occasionally, the forms with *h* and those without *h* had become specialized in different functions. I am not alone in saying this. Regarding some of the forms I mention, those of Palaic nom.-acc. plur. n. *-a*, *-a-a*, *-a-ga*, Watkins (1975: 367) explains that the apparent irregularity is due to a "sound change in progress".

Of course there is the problem as to what extent the stems in *-i*, those in *-ai* and those in *-a* are originally the same. This has been often put forward with respect to the two former types, for example by Kurylowicz (1968: 51). In Hittite specifically, various cases of *ḫalkiš*, *tuzziš*, etc., are identical to those corresponding of *zahḫaiš*, etc. On the other hand, the multiple forms in $*-āi$ (beginning with the dat. sing., but not only this), of the stems in $*-ā$ of several Indo-European languages, are well-known. The Hittite stems in *-aiš* mix one and another type (cf. Weitenberg, 1979: 289 ff.). In Hittite, old stems in $*-ā$ fused with those in $*-o$ have brought to these latter not only a voc. in *-a*, but also a dat.-loc. in *-i*. I can only refer in this matter to my 1975: 372 ff.

Of course, I am not unaware of the old hypothesis that the dat.-loc. in *-i* took an old deictic particle and that the one in *-a* came from an adverbial or instrumental $*-ō$. F. Villar is now more supporting it. But *-i* and *-a*, *-ai* alternate in the same stems and even words and appear in those in *-i*, *-ai*, *-a* mentioned above (where they are considered as radical) and in the others. How can we seek an independent origin in these others, and precisely a different one

for *-i* and for *-a*? How shall we interpret *-ai*? The whole theory is, to my mind, erroneous. Even more if, as the two above-mentioned authors have clearly seen, the syntactical differences sometimes to be found between *-i* and *-a* (they would be a locative and a directive or

terminative respectively) are a result of an internal evolution of Hittite that was never completed and even regressed in time. We are faced with the remarkable spectacle of how forms which only differ through vowel gradation tended to be grammatically specialized by opposing each other in a certain language.

And of course, there is the old hypothesis of the two original endings *-i* and *-ei* and their supposed fusion with the thematic vowel and \bar{a} : Georgiev has come out in its defence once more lately (1971: 59-65 and 1975: 104-119). This hypothesis is just as unnecessary in Hittite as in other languages: that there may at times be secondary additions such as those mentioned above does not mean that they are always there and that one should thus postulate, for example, that Gr. $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\iota$ comes from $*polej-ei$. If $*-i$ and $*-\bar{a}(i)$ function as alternating elements in the stems we refer to, and not only in Hittite but also outside it (cf. O.I. *Agnis* / *Agnā* / *Agnāyī*), and likewise also $*-ei$, what need is there to cause problems by splitting hairs and reconstructing unnecessary forms?

Naturally, there are many things that we do not know on the vowel alternances of Anatolian and cannot fix the primitive distribution of the diverse endings. However two things are quite clear: that they are all radical, with no specific meaning of their own; and that they spread to different stems from the ones they originally belonged to.

Curiously enough in Hittite, on account of the fusion of the stems in $*-\bar{a}$ and those in $*-o$, the form of a pure stem in *-a* does not appear in the nom. (except to the extent that it passed on to the nom.-acc. plur. n. and, exceptionally, is a nom.-acc. sing. n.; see above). Neither are there any pure stems in *-i* and *-a* left in the nom. except in the n.'s and in certain irregular concords mentioned above. On the other hand, as certain oblique cases (the abl. and instr. sing.) added lengthenings or endings to the pure stem (18), this latter tended to be reduced to the dat.-loc. sing.

What is worth noting is the fact that the use of the pure stem, and particularly that of the types studied here, is greater in other Anatolian languages than in Hittite. We have seen this with regard to the pure stem in *-ahi*, *-ehi* of Lycian. It is this language that has preserved this archaism to the greatest extent.

Some of these pure stems in quite different uses have been mentioned above. In Lycian we have stems in $*-\bar{a}$ with nom. *-a*, gen. *-ahi*, *-ehi*, dat. *-a*, all in the sing., but we also find *-ahi* in gen. plur., *-a* in dat. plur.: *lada* "woman" in nom. sing., dat. plur. *ladi*, in dat. sing., a specialization that recalls that of the dat. sing. *anni* alongside the nom. sing. *annaš* (older *anna*) in Hittite. At times, the form of the acc. sing. is identical to that of the nom. (at others the *-a* displays nasalization). However, if we go on to the stems in *-i*, we find more pure stems with varied uses: as may be seen, there is a similar classification here to that of IE III, stems in $*-\bar{a}$ on the one hand, in $*-i$ on the other. I believe that Hittite is the more archaic in this respect (although not in the fusion with thematic nouns), although the forms in *-ahi*, *-ehi* form exceptions to this. Moreover, in Lycian we find forms in *-i* such as *tideimi* - "boy", which are simultaneously nom. sing. and plur., dat. and acc. sing. (19). In other cases, there are specialized forms which are doubtless recent ones.

Some doubts must be expressed, however, on the nom.-acc. sing. *-a*, *-i*: some of them may be forms of the neutrum (*cumehi*, pl. *cumeha*), some others have perhaps lost *-s* or *-m*. But *tideimi*, nom. sing., is no neuter and it has not lost, it seems, an *-s* (cf. nom. pl. *tideimis*). In any case, many forms of gen. and dat. sing. (or sing.-plur.) are secure enough examples of pure stems.

V

It was not and could not be my intention in this paper to collect all the possible archaisms of nominal inflexion in the Anatolian languages; I have only done this to a certain extent by following the footsteps of other former linguists. I believe I have broadened the research begun by them and I have given it a sound basis through using certain phonetic theories and others related to the origin of

case inflexion. Neither could I, of course, trace a history of the evolution of nominal inflexion within the sphere of the Anatolian languages. Even so, I believe that the results thus obtained may help those who might undertake this task.

There is not, in fact — and this may be one of the conclusions — a model of nominal inflexion characteristic of all these languages. There are only certain common foundations on the strength of which the different languages operated in directions which at times coincided and at others not. Some of these common principles could be:

1) There is no feminine gender, but there is opposition of common/neuter, albeit with remains of indifferent forms; there are also some in the sing./plur. opposition. The diverse languages take these differentiations to a greater or lesser extent, using resources which are mainly new.

2) Certain cases may be marked either by means of endings or by the pure stem; the diverse languages select one or the other procedure or else alternate both according to the stems. Other cases are only marked by the pure stem (the end of which may have spread secondarily, now converted into an ending, as in the case of *-i* and *-a, -ai*): thus, the dat.-loc. sing.-plur. (reduced in Hittite to the sing.). Finally, others are originally pure stems, but add enlargements of IE or Anatolian origin. According to the greater or lesser use of endings and enlargements, the predominance of the pure stems is reduced to a greater or lesser extent. These take diverse degrees of alternance and give certain phonetic results. All of this is used to differentiate the cases.

3) With regard to the old endings, in the whole of Anatolian there are traces left of a nom./acc. opposition in which in the animates, the nom. takes a pure stem or one with **-s, *-os* and the acc. takes **-m, *-om* (but also a pure stem in Lycian). There are also traces of another opposition between determined noun/determiner in which this latter takes **-s* or **-os* (also *-om*); there is a general attempt to break with the homonymy of the nom. and the determiner (gen.), but Hittite does not always manage this. The other languages innovate by substituting the gen. for adjectives or for a pure stem in

-*ehi* which is also at times adjectivized. There is also the opposition between the other cases and the voc., either a pure stem or formally specialized (cf. R. Stefanini, 1974: 37-43).

4) If the fact that the pure stems may refer to diverse cases should not seem surprising, it is indeed worth noting that the endings we have classified as of the gen. are used at times in another function, above all in that of dat.-loc., sing. and plur. It has been said that this is an old phenomenon (cf. Ambrosini: 1960). This may be so and *-s and *-m may have been used for all types of determinations, although later they tended to be restricted to those of nom. and gen. But it may also be a case of a secondary spreading within Hittite.

From here onwards, one should go into depth in two contrary directions: the history of the Anatolian group and its prehistory in IE II and even further back than this.

As far as the Anatolian group is concerned, Hittite displays certain innovations: a) scant use of the *h*, b) reduction of the pure stems to the dat.-loc. sing., to the voc. sing. and to the nom.-acc. plur. n., c) wide spreading of the abl. and instr., d) fusion of stems in *-ā and *-o are the main ones. There are archaisms such as the preservation of the gen. (lost in other languages), the wide use of the nom. plur. in *-es, etc. As regards the other Anatolian languages, they should be studied one by one. We have already seen their archaisms and some of their innovations and there is more which I cannot deal with here. Moreover, it is sometimes doubtful as to which language innovates.

On the other hand, if we now refer to the declension of Anatolian within the history of IE, we should say that, to judge from the common elements which are to be found in the inflexions of the different Anatolian languages and which may be attributed to IE II, the inflexion of this latter was not very fully developed. To a great extent, the use of pure stems continued where, in other instances, special resources were used to mark the animate or inanimate or the plural or the nom. or acc. or gen. Pure stems which did not suffer the concurrence of marked forms or suffered it only restrictedly, were left. The problem cannot be solved here, but together with the three

cases mentioned (and the voc.), all the rest make up a block, from which it is not certain that the Instr. and abl. had already broken away in IE II. They are not known in several Anatolian languages, in fact, and seem recent in Hittite, although they use Indo-European adverbial characterizing elements.

The inflexion of IE II was only formally marked to a slight extent and even so, it used to mark the nom. and the acc., the same determiners, which it used as allomorphs in the gen. (for which the pure stem could also be used and similarly at times for the nom. and the acc., as also for the voc.). I have explained elsewhere (cf., for example, my 1975: 441 ff., 433 ff.), that the animates needed these two determinations for the verb has two actants, subject and object, and they had to be independently marked. The noun has only one actant or determiner: the gen. Therefore, it used *-s and *-m indiscriminately, although it tended to distribute them between the two numbers (in general terms, it anticipated IE III in this). In any case, the problem of homonymy which resulted from this had an important effect on the evolution of the Anatolian languages, which in general eliminated the gen., as also on that of IE III, which characterized it in several ways.

There is no doubt that other archaisms could be pointed out: for example, the conversion of pure genitive stems to adjectival ones, albeit not totally completed. I believe, however, that although the differences between Anatolian (and IE II) and IE III are less noticeable in the nominal system than in the verbal one, the foregoing will suffice to show that such differences do in fact exist and that they are important.

FOOTNOTES

- (1) Adrados, 1962: 145-161 (communiqué read in 1961); 1965 (2nd ed. 1974); 1975; 1979: 261-282; 1982: 1-35; 1985; 1987; (among other publications).
- (2) These ideas do not bear much relation to those which suggest an Indo-European ergative, into the criticism of which I cannot enter

- here (cf. my 1985). They nevertheless display certain coincidences, for example, with W.P. Lehmann, 1958: 179-212, who suggests that in PIE the *-m* indicated a "non-active object" and that the *-s* indicated "an individual involved in the action" (although not only this). The greatest difference lies in the fact that to my mind *-m* and *-s* are old enlargements with no specific meaning which were only later defined in an opposition system. And that, as I state, I do not support the ergative theory.
- (3) And not as a result of a *-H* of n. plur. as V. Georgiev believes, for example, 1973: 43-50; however I cannot go into the details here.
- (4) Cf. my remarks in 1981a: 242.
- (5) Another regularization is that of Hitt. O.N. *ḫumaz* (< **-nts*)/O.I. *ḫuman*, O.N. nom. *alkištaš* (< **-ns*)/ acc. *alkištanam*; cf. Georgiev, 1975:141. It is comparable to that of Greek *ἄλς/ἄλός*.
- (6) Cf. my 1975: 441 ff. Puhvel (1982: 192 ff.) wonders whether *elzi* 'scales' is a dual form from **elt-ī*. But an isolated conjecture is not enough for attributing this number to Anatolian.
- (7) Cf. Rosenkranz 1972: 2: *man antuwahḫaš šuppi*.
- (8) Cf. on these, H. Mittelberger, 1966: 99-106, plus articles by Meriggi and Laroche quoted elsewhere in this paper; and for the Indo-European connections, J. González-Fernández, 1978: 301-317.
- (9) On all this, see, apart from Mittelberger's article, P. Meriggi, in his 1928 and 1978 articles on the declension of Lycian.
- (10) Cf. in the same sense Ph.H. Houwinck ten Cate, 1961.
- (11) Cf. Watkins, 1975: 358 ff. and Adrados, 1981b: 197-219.
- (12) Cf. Kronasser, 1966: 209 and Adrados, 1981a: 242, as likewise diverse etymologies in my 1973: 341 ff.
- (13) I give the bibliography in my 1981a.
- (14) Laroche, 1969: 54. He translates as "mère divine", but he himself later understands *ēnilahi ebiyehi* as a genitive — "mère de l'enceinte que voici". For the nominative sing.-plur. in *-i* already without *h* (see below) of Lycian, cf. Meriggi in the first part (1928) of his article, *tideimi* also dative and accusative sing. (but also nominative sing. *cumehi*, nominative-accusative n. plur. *cumaha*).
- (15) Besides my 1973, *loc. cit.*, see now my 1981a and 1981b: 193-235.
- (16) And other forms of other timbres and this one itself; cf. my

1975: 462 ff.

- (17) Cf. O. Carruba, 1982: 47: the ablative is lengthened in *-ijati*.
 (18) On derivatives from pure stems, cf. J. Jasanoff, 1973: 125-128.
 (19) The loss of final consonants cannot be totally excluded (in Luwian there is nominative sing. *-iš* / accusative sing. *-in*).

REFERENCES

- Adrados, F.R. 1962. "Hethitisch und Indogermanisch", in *II. Fachtagung für idg. Sprachwissenschaft*. Innsbruck.
 1965. *Evolución y Estructura del Verbo Indoeuropeo*. Madrid: C.S.I.C. (2nd ed. 1974).
 1973. *Estudios sobre las sonantes y laringales indoeuropeas*. C.S.I.C. (2nd ed.).
 1975. *Lingüística Indoeuropea*. Madrid: Gredos.
 1979. "Arqueología y diferenciación del Indoeuropeo", *Emerita* 47. (German translation as *Die räumliche und zeitliche Differenzierung des Indo-europäischen im Lichte der Vor- und Frühgeschichte*. Innsbruck: IBS 27).
 1981a. "Further considerations on the Phonetics and Morphologizations of H^i and H^u in Indoeuropean", *Emerita* 49.
 1981b. "More on the Laryngeals with Labial and Palatal Appendices", *Folia Linguistica Historica* 2.
 1982. "The Archaic Structure of Hittite: the Crux of the Problem", *JIES* 10.
 1985. "Der Ursprung der grammatischen Kategorien des Indoeuropäischen", in *The Acts of the VII. Fachtagung für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 1987a. "Binary and Multiple Oppositions in the History of Indo-European", in *FS for Henry M. Hoenigswald*. Ed. G. Cardona and N.H. Zide. Tübingen: Günter Narr.
 1987b [1988]. "Ideas on the Typology of Proto-Indo-European", *JIES*.
 Ambrosini, R. 1960. "Stabilizzazioni formali del rapporto locativo in alcune lingue indoeuropee", *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* II, 19, fasc. I-II.

- Bader, F. 1975. "Adjectifs verbaux hétéroclitiques (-i, -nt, -u) en composition nominale", *RPH* 49.
- Benveniste, E. 1935. *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris.
- Brosman, P.W. 1978. "Hittite Evidence and the $\bar{i}/y\bar{a}$ -stem Adjective", *IF* 83.
1979. "The Hittite Neuter -a Stems", *ZVS* 93.
- Carruba, O. 1969. "Zur Grammatik des Lydischen", *Athenaeum* 47.
1976. "Anatolico e Indoeuropeo", in *Scritti in onore di Giuliano Bonfante*. Brescia.
1982. "Beiträge zum Luwischen", in *Serta Indogermanica: FS für Günter Neumann*. IBS 40. Ed. Johann Tischler. Innsbruck.
- Georgiev, V. 1971. "Die Herkunft der hethitischen-luwischen Dativ-Lokativendungen des Singulars", *IF* 76.
1973. "Die Herkunft der indoeuropäischen Endungen für Nominativ-Akkusativ-Vokativ Plural Neutrum und Dual", *IF* 78.
1975. "Die Eigentümlichkeiten der hethitischen Nominalflexion", in *Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. Ed. H. Rix. Wiesbaden.
- González-Fernández, J. 1978. "Lat. *classis*, luv. -ašš-i- y el carácter ide. del sufijo -si", *Emerita* 46.
- Houwinck ten Cate. P.H. 1961. *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Jassanoff, J. 1973: "The Hittite Ablative in -anz(a)", *MSS* 31.
- Kerns, J.A. and B. Schwartz. 1946. "Multiple Stem Conjugation: an Indo-Hittite Isogloss?", *Language* 22.
1972. *A Sketch of the Indo-European Finite Verb*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Kronasser, H. 1966. *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*. Band I. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kurylowicz, J. 1968. "Les adjectifs thématiques à féminin en -ī", in *Pratidānam: Studies ... F.B. Kulper*. Ed. J.C. Heesterman et al. The Hague: Mouton.
- Laroche, E. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. Paris.
1969. "Comparaison du louvite et du lycien (1)", *BSL* 70.
1970. "Le problème du féminin", *RHA* 28.
- Lehmann, W.P. 1958. "On the Earlier Stages of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection", *Language* 34.
- Meid, W. 1975. "Probleme der räumlichen und zeitlichen Gliederung

- des Indogermanischen", in *Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. Ed. H. Rix. Wiesbaden.
1979. "Der Archaismus des Hethitischen", in *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*. Ed. E. Neu and W. Meid. Innsbruck: IBS 25.
- Meriggi, P. 1928. "La declinazione del licio" (I), *Rendiconti della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* VI, 4/7-10: 410-450.
1978. "La declinazione del Licio" (II), *Rendiconti della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, 33/5-6: 243-268.
- Mittelberger, H. 1966. "Genitiv und Adjektiv in den anatolischen Sprachen", *Kratylos* 11.
- Neu, E. 1980. *Studien zum endungslosen 'lokativ' des Hethitischen*. Innsbruck: IBS.
- Palmaris, M.L. 1981. "The New Look of Indo-European Declension", *IF* 86.
- Pisani, V. 1959. "Sul genitivo miceneo dei temi in -o", *PP* 65.
- Puhvel, J. 1982. "Scales in Hittite", in *Folklorica: FS for Felix J. Oinas*. Ed. E.V. Žygas et al. Bloomington: Research Institute for Asian Studies (IUPUAS 141).
- Rosenkranz, B. 1972. *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Idg. Nominalflexion*. Mimeographed publication. Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Köln.
1978. *Vergleichende Untersuchungen der altanatolischen Sprachen*. The Hague: Mouton.
1979. "Archaismen in Hethitischen", in *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*. Ed. E. Neu and W. Meid. Innsbruck: IBS 25.
- Schmidt, K.H. 1979. "Zur Vorgeschichte des Indogermanischen Genussystem", in *FS for Oswald Szemerényi (CILT 11)*. Ed. Bela Grogyanyi. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Shields, K. 1979. "More on Early Indo-European Nominal Inflection: The Origin of the -r-/-n- Stems", *JIES* 7/3-4.
- Shevoroshkin, V. 1979. Materials (Aug. 16, 1979). Mimeographed working papers, privately circulated.
- Stefanini, R. 1974. "Ancore sul vocativo hittito", *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 59.
- Specht, F. 1944. *Der Ursprung des Idg. Deklination*. Göttingen.
- Villar, F. 1974. *Origen de la flexión nominal indoeuropea*. Madrid: C.S.I.C.
1981. *Dativo y Locativo en el singular de la flexión nominal*

indoeuropea. Salamanca, Universidad.

- Watkins, C. 1975. "Die Vertretung der Laryngalen in gewissen morphologischen Kategorien in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens", in *Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. Ed. H. Rix. Wiesbaden.
- Weitenberg, J.J. 1979. "Einige Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Diphthongstämmen", in *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*. Ed. E. Neu and W. Meid. Innsbruck: IBS 25.

Adresse de l'auteur :

Instituto de Filología
Duque de Medinaceli 6
28014 Madrid
Espagne