

## INITIAL LARYNGEALS IN ANATOLIAN

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

Elsewhere I have argued that initial  $*H_2-$  and  $*H_3-$  yielded  $h-$  before  $*-e-$  and zero before  $*-o-$  in Armenian and Albanian and suggested that the same development may be established for Hittite, e.g. *harp-* ‘separate’ <  $*H_3erbh-$  versus *ark-* ‘mount’ <  $*H_3orgh-ey-$ , Gr. *orphanós*, *órkhis* (cf. Kortlandt 1984: 42). The new monographs by Kimball (1999) and Rieken (1999) have strengthened my view that this is indeed correct.

In his classic study of  $*H_3$  in Anatolian, Melchert lists seven examples of  $ha-$  <  $*H_3e-$  (1987: 21):

- (1) *haran-* ‘eagle’ <  $*H_3eron-$ , Gr. *órnis*;
- (2) *harp-* ‘change one’s group’ <  $*H_3erbh-$ , Latin *orbis*;
- (3) *happar* ‘transaction’, *happinant-* ‘rich’ <  $*H_3ep-$ , Latin *opus*;
- (4) *hastāi* ‘bone(s)’ <  $*H_3est(H_2)ōi$ , Gr. *ostéon*;
- (5) *hark-* ‘perish’ <  $*H_3erg-$ , Old Irish *orgaid* ‘slays’;
- (6) *hawi-* ‘sheep’ <  $*H_3ewi-$ , Latin *ovis*;
- (7) *haliya-* ‘bow’, *halhaltumar* ‘corner’ <  $*H_3el-$ , Gr. *ōlénē* ‘elbow’.

As Melchert points out, proponents of the view that  $*H_3-$  was lost in Anatolian assume  $ha-$  <  $*H_2o-$  in these words, which implies that the absence of non-Anatolian  $a-$  <  $*H_2e-$  in these roots must be ascribed to chance. This is clearly a circular argument. Moreover, initial  $*H_3-$  is reflected as  $h(a)-$  before a consonant in Hittite *harg(a)nāu* ‘palm, sole’ <  $*H_3rg-$ , Gr. *orégō* ‘stretch out’, and *hapus-* ‘shaft, penis’ <  $*H_3pus-$ , Gr. *opuíō* ‘marry’,<sup>1</sup> as Melchert points out, concluding that  $*H_3-$ , like  $*H_2-$ , is generally preserved as  $h-$ . In his more recent monograph, Melchert silently abandons  $*H_3-$  for  $*H_2-$  in ‘bone’ and ‘sheep’, to my mind for no good reason, and stealthily adds *hanna-* ‘litigate’ <  $*H_3enH_2o-$  (1994: 145, 235).

In his article, Melchert lists three examples where initial  $*H_3-$  may have been lost in Hittite (1987: 20):

- (1) *arta* ‘stands’ <  $*H_3erto$ , Gr. *ōrto*;
- (2) *arki-* ‘testicle’ <  $*H_3erghi-$ , Gr. *órkhis*;

<sup>1</sup> This etymology seems improbable to me.

- (3) *aniya-* ‘carry out, execute’ < *\*H<sub>3</sub>en-*, Latin *onus*.

As he points out, these instances might reflect *\*H<sub>1</sub>o-* if the necessary *o*-grade could be justified. In his book, Melchert posits *\*H<sub>1</sub>e-* with lowering of *\*e-* to *a-* before the following resonant in these forms (1994: 85, 137). This is clearly unsatisfactory in view of the non-Anatolian evidence. Moreover, he follows Kimball’s suggestion (1987) that initial *\*H<sub>3</sub>-*, unlike *\*H<sub>2</sub>-*, was lost in Lycian (on which see below).

In her recent monograph, Kimball adduces three alleged instances of Hittite *ha-* < *\*H<sub>2</sub>o-* (1999: 142):

- (1) *hawī-* ‘sheep’, Hom. *óis*, Latin *ovis*;
- (2) *hastāi* ‘bone(s)’, Gr. *ostéon*;
- (3) *hasduēr* ‘twigs, brush’, Gr. *ózos*.

Since these are classic examples of non-apophonic *o-* in Indo-European (e.g., Beekes 1969: 130f., 139f.), I reconstruct *\*H<sub>3</sub>e-* here. Kimball lists six possible examples of *ha-* < *\*H<sub>3</sub>e-* (1999: 393f.):

- (1) *hāppar* ‘price deal’, *hapzi* ‘is rich’, *hāpperiya-* ‘city, settled place’, Latin *opus*;
- (2) *hāras*, *hāran-* ‘eagle’, Gr. *órnīs*;
- (3) *hāriya-* ‘bury’, Gr. *orússō* ‘dig’;
- (4) *hāri-* ‘valley’, Hom. *oūros* ‘boundary’,<sup>2</sup>
- (5) *happēna-* ‘baking kiln’, Gr. *optós* ‘roasted’;
- (6) *hāliya-* ‘kneel’, Gr. *ōlénē* ‘elbow’.

Kimball rejects the etymological connection of *aniya-* ‘work’ with Latin *onus* ‘burden’ and assumes *ā-* < *\*H<sub>1</sub>o-* in *ārra-* ‘arse’ < *\*H<sub>1</sub>orso-*, Gr. *órrōs*, and in *ār-* ‘arrive’, Gr. *órōra*, versus *ar-* < *\*H<sub>1</sub>r-* in *arki-* ‘testicle’ and *ar-* ‘stand, place oneself’ (1999: 387, 389). I would rather assume *\*H<sub>3</sub>o-* in *arki-* ‘testicle’ and distinguish between *\*H<sub>1</sub>er-* ‘move’ and *\*H<sub>3</sub>er-* ‘rise’ (cf. Oettinger 1979: 403f., 523f.). While *ār-* ‘arrive’ < *\*H<sub>1</sub>ōr-* reflects the vowel of the perfect, *ar-* ‘stand’ < *\*H<sub>3</sub>or-* has the root vowel of the original causative and iterative presents which spread to the middle flexion (cf. Oettinger 1979: 526).

It is important to note that Hittite does not tolerate an alternation between initial *h-* and zero within the paradigm while the vowel alternation between *-e-* and *-a-* in the root is productive. Consequently, a methodology which does not reckon with the possibility that initial *h-* was restored or analogically eliminated leads to a proliferation of reconstructed phonemes, and this is precisely what we see in Anato-

<sup>2</sup> This etymology seems impossible to me.

lian studies. My reconstructions differ from the ones proposed by Melchert and Kimball in two respects. First, they are much more constrained because I do not find evidence for more than four distinct sequences (three laryngeals before *\*-e-* and neutralization before *\*-o-*) whereas they start from 24 possibilities (zero and three laryngeals before three vowels *\*e*, *\*a*, *\*o* which may be short or long, cf. Melchert 1994: 46f., Kimball 1999: 119f.). Second, my reconstructed laryngeals are based on independent evidence from the non-Anatolian languages, especially Greek, whereas theirs are based on the internal evidence of the Anatolian languages, especially Hittite. In her excellent new monograph, Rieken is quite candid about adopting the latter methodology when she concedes that her view that *\*H<sub>3</sub>* was always lost in Anatolian is “nicht viel mehr als eine Arbeitshypothese” (1999: 5).

Any proponent of a scientific theory should indicate the type of evidence required for its refutation. While it is difficult to see how a theory which posits *\*H<sub>2</sub>-* for Hittite *h-* and a dozen other possible reconstructions for Hittite *a-* can be refuted, it should be easy to produce counter-evidence for a theory which allows no more than four possibilities which are moreover based on independent, non-Anatolian evidence. The fact that no such counter-evidence has been forthcoming suggests that my theory is correct. In particular, the alleged instances of *ha-* < *\*H<sub>2</sub>o-* all show non-apophonic *o-* in the non-Anatolian languages and Melchert reconstructs *e*-grade in these words (cf. 1987: 21 and 1994: 106, 145, 235, 257). For Hittite *ais* ‘mouth’, Latin *ōs*, I reconstruct *\*H<sub>1</sub>eH<sub>3</sub>s* (cf. Melchert 1994: 115f., Rieken 1999: 186).

My theory makes three more predictions which could but have not been refuted: the absence of an Indo-European alternation between *\*e-* and *\*a-* (not *\*o-*), the absence of Indo-European etymologies with *\*a-* not from *\*H<sub>2</sub>e-*, and the absence of an Indo-European origin of Hittite *he-* (unless *-e-* represents an *i*-diphthong). There was no phoneme *\*a* in Indo-European (cf. Lubotsky 1981 and 1989). The only example of Hittite *a-* < *\*a-* which looks ancient is *alpā-* ‘cloud’, Gr. *alphós*, Latin *albus* ‘white’, also Gr. *álphi* ‘barley’, Old High German *albiz* ‘swan’ (cf. Melchert 1994: 147, Rieken 1999: 98). I think that this root was borrowed from a European substratum language because it is not found in Indo-Iranian or Tocharian, has a variant *\*elbh-* in Slavic, has an alternating suffix *-it-*, *-ut-* in Germanic (cf. Boutkan 1998: 127) and the same suffix with an infix nasal in Slavic in the word for ‘swan’, plays a role in Germanic mythology (cf. English *elf*) and is frequent in European geographical names (e.g., *Alba*, *Albion*, *Elbe*, the *Alps*). It supports the view that the Anatolians preceded the Greeks and the Phrygians in their migration from the Ukraine into the Balkans and then into Anatolia.

The assumption that original long vowels were not colored by adjacent laryngeals is still maintained by Melchert (1994: 47, 68) and Kimball (1999: 120, 144f.). Since the color of the laryngeals is under discussion and original vowel length is notoriously difficult to establish, it adds another degree of freedom to

available loose reconstructions. Interestingly, the harvest of this free lunch is extremely small. Kimball still subscribes to Melchert's obsolete view that  $*H_2\bar{e}$ - and perhaps  $*H_3\bar{e}$ - yielded *hi-* in Hittite (1999: 144f.), a view which Melchert himself has fortunately withdrawn (1994: 143). Both Melchert (1994: 144) and Kimball (1999: 145) now recognize that *hekur* 'crag, rock' is a loanword from Hurrian. Incidentally, *sēhur* 'urine' must be a loanword from Semitic (cf. Orel & Stolbova 1995: 125, #533). The derivation of *henk-* 'offer, grant', middle voice 'bow' <  $*H_2\bar{e}$ - cannot be correct in view of the Old Hittite spellings 3sg. *ha-ik-ta*, 3pl. *ha-in-kán-ta* which "cannot be dismissed as hypercorrections" (Melchert 1994: 144, cf. Oettinger 1979: 172, 177, Rieken 1999: 336). It follows that there is simply no evidence for Hittite *he-* <  $*H_2\bar{e}$ - or  $*H_3\bar{e}$ -.

Kimball claims that initial  $*H_3$ -, unlike  $*H_2$ -, was lost in Lycian *epirije-* 'sell', Hittite *happariye-* <  $*H_3ep-$ -, Latin *opus* (1987: 187f. and 1999: 385), and Melchert follows her (1994: 72). Rieken has seen that this verb is actually derived from a thematic stem  $*Hopro-$ , not directly from *hāppar* 'transaction' (1999: 315). Thus, I think that the initial laryngeal was regularly lost in the verb and later restored in Hittite on the basis of the heteroclitic  $*H_3ep-r/n-$ . Note that Oettinger already proposed two different chronological layers for *hap(pa)rae-* and *hap(pa)rie-* and an anaptyctic *-i-* in Lycian *epirije-* (1979: 352f., cf. Rieken, l.c.). I conclude that the material adduced by Oettinger, Melchert, Kimball and Rieken is fully compatible with my view that initial  $*H_2$ - and  $*H_3$ - were preserved before  $*-e-$  and lost before  $*-o-$  in Anatolian.

#### REFERENCES

- Beekes, Robert S.P.  
1969 *The development of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Greek*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton.
- Boutkan, Dirk F.H.  
1998 "On the form of North European substratum words in Germanic". *Historische Sprachforschung* 111, 102-133.
- Kimball, Sara E.  
1987 " $*H_3$  in Anatolian". In: *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald*, 185-192. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.  
1999 *Hittite historical phonology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Kortlandt, Frederik  
1984 "PIE.  $*H$ - in Armenian". *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 5, 41-43.
- Lubotsky, Alexander  
1981 "Gr. *pégnumi* : Skt. *pajrá-* and loss of laryngeals before mediae in Indo-Iranian". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 40, 133-138.  
1989 "Against a Proto-Indo-European phoneme  $*a$ ". In: *The new sound of Indo-European*, 53-66. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Melchert, H. Craig  
1987 "Reflexes of  $*h_3$  in Anatolian". *Die Sprache* 33, 19-28.

- 1994 *Anatolian historical phonology*. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Oettinger, Norbert  
1979 *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
- Orel, Vladimir E. & Stolbova, Olga V.  
1995 *Hamito-Semitic etymological dictionary*. Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill.
- Rieken, Elisabeth  
1999 *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.