Caucasian imposes many constraints on the form of a syllable; it is likely that the phonology of some other members of Caucasian Sprachbund were adapted to their model. A particular example of this adaptation is the elimination of the initial group */#CR/. At the same time the initial group */#sC-/* was touched much less by the interaction within this Sprachbund; the areal constraint on it was not very highly ranked. The last fact can be independently confirmed by the peculiar "native" development of Nakh languages (§ 7.2.1).

The influence of Hurrian (the language spoken on the Armenian plateau and in the adjacent areas in the second millennium BC) on Hittite and other Anatolian languages manifests itself on all levels of language organization. It would be nothing strange to suppose that during a certain period of time Hittite-Hurrian bilingualism was widespread in the eastern part of the Hittite kingdom. Under those conditions Hittite could have become a member of Caucasian Sprachbund and acquire constraints that were imposed on the syllabic and/or morphemic structure of Hurrian.

The different destinies of the initial cluster */#CR/* in Hittite, on the one hand, and in Armenian and Ossetic, on the other hand, are connected with the different trantait of internal clusters by those languages. Armenian and Ossetic choose the bizarre strategy of copying the syllable-driven (?) inlaut metathesis */#VCR(V)/ > */-VRC(V)-/*, adding to the result a prothetic vowel, thus */#CR/* > */#RC/> */#VRC-/*. Hittite eliminates this cluster through the natural anaptyxis */#CR/* > */#VRC-/*, which has typological parallels e.g. in Persian, Yakut, and Indonesian. Nobody doubts the reality of these sound changes in Armenian and Ossetic, so typologically there is less reason to doubt the much more normal kind of change that we propose for Hittite.

---

126 We are not aware of any standard reference work dedicated to the issues of linguistic interaction between Hurrian and Hittite. Many useful references can be found in Ivanov // UCLA IE Studies 1 (1999): 147—264.

---

INDO-EUROPEAN ACCENTOLOGY AND HITTITE DATA. NOMINA

This paper is dedicated to the analysis of plene-writing in the Hittite cuneiform texts. The most recent works, known to me, concerning this problem of Hittite graphics and phonetics are G. R. Hart's "Some Observation on Plene-Writing in Hittite" (BSOAS 43/1 (1980): 1—17) and O. Carrasso's "Plene-Schreibung und Betonung im Hethitischen" (KZ 95/2 (1981): 232—248)1. The general information about plene in Hittite, references to the previous literature and very useful discussions could be found there and I need not repeat these theses. Both scholars agree that the basic function of plene in Hittite seems be the marking of accented (or etymologically accented) vowel and I am inclined to choose this opinion too. Two recent monographs (S. E. Kimball's "Hittite Historical Phonology" and E. Rieken's "Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen" [StBoT 44]) also touch upon the plene question.

Below (§ 1) I list fourteen Hittite nominal lexemes, which:

a) are attested with plene in old script (OS) and/or middle script (MS) texts.
   Forms from new script (NS) texts (including OH/NS and MH/NS ones!) are out of play;
   b) have reliable cognates in other IE languages, relevant for accentological reconstruction (of course only direct stem corresponds are meant).

The next section (§ 2) is dedicated to the analysis of more problematic cases—six lexemes without direct IE parallels or with dubious etymology—


2 For datings of Hitt. texts see above, p. 11, fn. 3.
but I believe these Hittite words could be also interesting from the point of view of plene problem.

§ 1. HITTITE LEXEMES WITH DIRECT IE PARALLELS

1. ağıš, dat.-loc. ıśsi 'mouth' (OS+).
   \[ dat.-loc. sg. ı-šš-i giving, dir. sg. or dat.-loc. pl. ı-ša-a-Š-aš-ma-[-,]-. \]
   \[ HED, 1: 15; HW², 1: 48 ff. \]
   ☉ Tho phonetic and morphological details remain vague, direct comparison with Skr. ąś, Lat. ąś 'id.' hardly can be discarded. In Skr. only two forms of this lexeme are attested (BR, 1: 735); gen.-abl. ąśā (RV), instr. ąśā (RV). Hitt. dat.-loc. sg. ıśsi corresponds to the virtual Skr. loc. sg. ıśā.

2. ąra, adv. 'right, proper concern, due' (frozen nom.-acc. pl. n. from adj. *a-ra-) (MS+).
   \[ a-ara from MS on. Spelling a-ra is very infrequent, but also from MS on. \]
   \[ HED, 1: 118; HW², 1: 219 ff. \]
   ☉ Skr. adv. āram (RV, AV) 'zur Hand, zugegen; zurecht, recht, entsprechend; genug' (BR, 1: 407 f.).

3. ęšhar, gen. išhanāš n. 'blood' (OS+)
   \[ From OS on the "mobile" paradigm is attested: nom.-acc. e-š-ḥar, gen. iš-ḥa-na-aš, dat.-loc. iš-ḥa-ni-i (the late forms of the obl. cases like e-š-ḥa-na-aš, dat.-loc. e-š-ḥa-ni-i are analogical). \]
   \[ HED, 2: 305 ff.; HW², 2: 115 ff. \]
   ☉ Skr. aś-ṛ (V), gen.-abl. asmās, instr. asmā (AV) 'blood' (BR, 1: 546, 559).

4. haštā, gen. haštijāš n. 'bone' (OS+).
   \[ In OS without plene. In MS: nom.-acc. sg. ha-ašt-ta-a-e, cf. also instr. sg. ha-ašt-ti-i-i. \]
   \[ HED, 3: 233 ff. \]

5. gēnu, gen. ginuwaš n. 'knee' (OS+).
   \[ In OS & MS nom.-acc. sg./pl. gēnu vs. obl. cases without plene: nom.-acc. sg./pl. gi-e-nu, gen. sg./pl. gi-nu-wa-aš, instr. sg. gi-nu-ta-at-kān (+ pron. -at + partic. -kan) dat.-loc. pl. gi-nu-wa-aš, gi-nu-wa. \]
   \[ In NS plene-writing is attested in the obl. cases (as well as in the secondary acc. sg. or pl. of common gender), in principle these forms could be explained as analogical: acc. sg. c. () gi-e-nu-wa-an, gen. sg./pl. gi-nu-wa-aš, abl. sg./pl. gi-e-nu-wa-za, acc. pl. c. () gi-e-nu-us, dat.-loc. pl. gi-e-nu-wa-za. \]
   \[ HED, 4: 146 ff. \]
   ☉ Grk. ἱόνω (H.); gen. γούνας (H.), nom.-acc. pl. γούνα (H.), gen. pl. γούναν (H.); γούνα (Alc.), γούναν (Hsch.) 'id.' (LS: 357); Skr. jāna (RV+ 'id.' (accented forms of the obl. cases are not attested in the archaic language)). Accentologically Hitt. nom.-acc. sg. gēnu directly corresponds to ἱόνω and jāna. Note especially the irregularity of Grk. accent: gen. sg. γούνας vs. gen. pl. γούναν, (the same as δούρας vs. δούρων, cf. below, § 1.12).
   ☉ For possibility of reconstruction of old heteroclisis as a parallel formation see Mayrhofer, KEWA, 1: 429 (Grk.—Arm.—Skr.).

6. kešār, dat.-loc. kišš(a)ri c. 'hand, paw' (OS+).
   \[ Plene is attested only in dat.-loc. sg. and dir. sg.: ki-iš-sa-ri-i, ki-iš-si-i, ki-iš-ša-ri-i, ki-iš-si-ša-ri. \]

3 OS: KBo 30.30 + StBoT 25, No 9 Vs.-I 4', MS, e.g.: KBo 16.97+ Rs. 5, 9; KBo 39.8 II 29, 39.
4 OS: StBoT 25, No 2 17 6', 8'.
5 MS, e.g.: KBo 16.25 III 20; KBo 17.65 + Vs. 14, 17.
6 MS: KUB 30.10 Vs. 13'.
7 For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 41, also KBo 22.1 Rs. 25'; MS, e.g.: KUB 33.66 + II 12'; KBo 15.10+ III 64', 66', 69'.
8 OS: StBoT 25 No 3± IV 8; MS, e.g.: KBo 15.10+ I 1, 20, 32, 39.
9 MS, e.g.: KBo 15.33+ III 31.
10 KBo 15.25 Rs. 18, 19.
11 KUB 13.27 + 23.77 + 26.40 Rs. 128'—130'.
12 MS, e.g.: KBo 15.10+ I 25.
13 For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 97.
14 OS: StBoT 25 No 9+ IV 17'.
15 MS, e.g.: KBo 17.61 Vs. 22, Rs. 16'.
16 MS, e.g.: KBo 17.54± II 1'.
17 For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 97; MS, e.g.: HBM No 38 Vs. 6.
18 MS, e.g.: HBM No 44 Rs. 10'.
19 OS: KBo 8.42 Rs. 4.
7. lāman, dat.-loc. lammi n. 'name' (MS+).

Plene in nom.-acc. sg. la-a-ma-an²⁰. In the oblique cases without plene: dat.-loc. sg. lam-nis²¹, instr. sg. lam-ni-it²².


Grk. χαίρε, χαείρα, χαιρος, χαιρί (H.+) 'id.' (LS: 1583 f.). Accentually Hitt. dat.-loc. kisstanti directly corresponds to χαείρ.

8. nēbīs n. 'sky, heaven' (OS+).

Nom.-acc. sg. ne-e-pi-is²³, gen. sg. ne-e-pi-sa-as²⁴

⇒ CHD, I—N: 448 ff.; HEG, 2: 310 ff.; Rieken, StBoT 44: 278 ff.

Grk. νεβος, νεβος (H.+) 'cloud' (LS: 1171); Skr. nābhas, gen.-abl. nābhasas (RV+⁵) ‘vapour, cloud’ (BR, 4: 38); secondary i-stem in Lith. debesis 'cloud': accentual paradigm 2 debesis, gen. debesis (is preserved in texts from Prussian Lithuania and somewhere in dialects) → secondary accentual paradigm 4 debesis, gen. debesies (see ИЛЯЧ-СВИТЫЧ, IA: 61).

9. pad(a)-, acc. pl. pāduš, gen. pl. padān c. 'foot' (OS+).

⇒ acc. pl. pa-ta-atuš²⁷, gen. pl. pa-ta-na (-a 'but')²⁸, pa-ta-an-²⁷, dat.-loc. pl. pa-ta-as-ša-as (+ poss. 3 sg. -aš)²⁹.

⇒ CHD, P: 231 ff.

Grk. ποος, acc. ποο δα, gen. ποος, acc. pl. ποος, gen. pl. ποοδω, dat. pl. ποος(ς) (H.+) 'id.' (LS: 1546 f.); Skr. pād, acc. pādam, gen.-abl. pādās, acc. pl. pādas, gen. pl. pādam, dat. pl. pāsats (V+ 'id.' (BR, 4: 444 f.; Grassman: 770). Hitt. acc. pl. pāsus directly corresponds to ποοδω as well as gen. pl. padān directly corresponds to ποοδω and pādam.

Strictly speaking synchronically we should posit an a-stem in Hitt., not a C-stem, since the expected nom. sg. **pazz(a), abl. **pazza or instr. **pasta are not attested, while nom. sg. GIR-ā (covering Hitt. pādas) is attested, to my knowledge, thrice: in vocabulary KBo 1.52 g (NS) and, functioning as voc., in MH ritual of Kizzuwatanean origin (Maštikka; CTH 404)—KBo 39.8 III 11 (2 Mast.; MS) // IBoT 2.109++ II 25 (1 Mast.; NS). I believe that nom. GIR-ā is a result of secondary thematicisation (already in MH)³⁰, but forms of the oblique cases, quoted above, go back directly to the IE lexeme *pēd, pōdēs.

Cf. also nom. GIR-ī in the ritual of clear Kizzuwatanean background KUB 9.4++ I 34¹ (MH/NS), [GIR-ī ibid. 15¹; it seems natural to explain GIR-ī as a Luwoid, but note that in this text in the same line 34¹ the form of C(a)-stem pad(a)- is used: acc. GIR-an (besides the ambiguous dat.-loc. GIR-ē, ibid. 15¹), not to mention pad(a)-is clearly a C(a)-stem in CLuw. itself³⁰. Probably GIR-ī (covering Hitt. pānis) is not a Luwism, but just one more way to eliminate the primary athematic form³⁰.

10. péran adv., postpos. 'before, in front of' (OS+).

⇒ pi-ra-an passim in OS & MS texts³¹, very infrequent is spelling *pi-ra-an³².

⇒ CHD, P: 291 ff.

²⁰ MS: KBo 3.21 III 19; KUB 31.124(+) II 23¹.
²¹ MS: KUB 30.11++ Rs. 16¹.
²² MS: KUB 58 Vs. 10.
²³ As if we suppose that IE accented short vowels yielded Hitt. long vowels and IE unaccented long vowels yielded Hitt. short vowels (i.e. that the plene-writing shows the vowel quantity and the length of vowels is reflex of IE accent), one can speculate about the vowel shortening in position before the cluster "resonant+resonant" (partly it runs parallel to Latin and Ancient Greek).
²⁴ M < *m.
²⁵ For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 126; MS, e.g.: KBo 8.35 II 12¹.
²⁶ For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 126; MS, e.g.: KBo 20.34 Rs. 14¹.
²⁷ MS: KBo 25.46 3¹.
²⁸ OS: StBoT 25 No 26 I 4¹, 19¹.
²⁹ OS or MS: KBo 17.74++ 1 10.
³⁰ OS: StBoT 25 No 27 Rs. 1¹.
³¹ Skr. acc. pl. padās (RV I 146.2) is apparently an innovation, cf. Hitt. Der Akzent: 225.
³² As e.g. nom. nepēs & acc. nepētan vs. archaic nepēs, or nom. šašas 'bed' vs. šašas (a).
³³ See Laroche, DLL: 81; Melchert, CLL: 173.
³⁴ As e.g. adj. mekkī- 'much' vs. more archaic mekk-.
³⁵ Reading pi-ra-an in OS StBoT 25 No 23 Vs. 7, 8 is uncertain (pace CHD).
³⁶ According to CHD, only four times—HBM, No 24 Vs. 7 (MS; *pi-ra-an); KBo 2.8 II 10, IV 3 (NS); KUB 58.85 III 20 (NS).
Grk. adv. prepos. πέραν, πέρην (H. +) 'on the other side, across; over against, opposite' (LS: 1365)\(^{37}\).

11. ἡπέα n. 'place' (OS+).
   || nom.-acc. sg. πε-ε-δ/α-αμ \(^{38}\), dat.-loc. sg. πε-ε-δι \(^{39}\), etc.
   ⇒ CHD, P: 350 ff.

   In Grk. and Skr. the "second type" of accential correspondence is attested (see OCA Словарь, 1: 69 ff.): Grk. πέδων, πέδω (H.Cer. +) 'ground, earth' (LS: 1352) vs. Skr. padām, gen. padē (RV+ 'step; position' (BR, 4: 445 ff.). Hitt. plene corresponds to Grk. accent.

12. τάρ ν. 'tree; piece of wood' (OS+).
   || nom.-acc. sg. τα-α-ρυ \(^{40}\); obl. cases are not attested with plene in the archaic language.
   ⇒ HEG, 3: 230 ff.

   Grk. δάρυ (H. +), gen. δαρός, δαρός (Trag.), dat. δαρύ (H. +), δαρῆ (Trag.), nom.-acc. pl. δάρα (H. +), gen. pl. δαρόν (H. +), δαρῶν (Hsch.) 'tree' (LS: 445); Skr. dāru, gen. drās (RV) 'piece of wood' (BR, 3: 595, 809). Accentologically Hitt. nom.-acc. sg. τάρ ν. directly corresponds to δάρυ and dāru. Note especially the irregularity of Grk. accent: gen. sg. δαρός & dat. sg. δαρύ vs. gen. pl. δαρῶν (the same as γουνός vs. γουνόν, cf. above, § 1.5).

13. τέγαν, gen. τάγνας n. 'earth, ground' (OS+).
   || nom.-acc. sg. τε-ε-κάν \(^{41}\), gen. τάκα-α-ας \(^{42}\), loc. τακ-νι-ι \(^{43}\), dir. τακ-να-α-α, \(^{44}\), loc. adv. τα-γα-α-α \(^{45}\), etc.

   Goes back to IE *dhēḡām/*dhēḡom (the latter form < *dhēghom-s), gen. *dhēghom-s, for details see Kassian, loc. cit. (where the sign ι2 stands for schwa secundum).

\(^{37}\) - α- in πέραν can be a result of analogy with adv., prepos. πέρα 'beyond, further, more than' (frozen nom.-acc. pl. n.)?

\(^{38}\) OS: StBoT 25 No 25+ + I 4 (πε-ε-κα-α-ας) vs. pedan + - met; MS, e.g.: |BoT 136 I 9, III 14.

\(^{39}\) For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 148, also KBo 3.22 Rs. 48, KBo 22.61 + 6.2+ + I 24; MS, e.g.: KBo 32.16 II 9.

\(^{40}\) OS: StBoT 25 No 24 IV 12.

\(^{41}\) For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 194.

\(^{42}\) MS, e.g.: KBo 7.28 Vs. 5', 17; KBo 32.31 II 11, 14 (2x).

\(^{43}\) MS, e.g.: KUB 30.10 Vs. 4'.

\(^{44}\) For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 194; note also the single instance (probably a scribal mistake) OS ta-ak-α-na-a, (Gütterbuck, Laws III 15).

\(^{45}\) For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 194; MS, e.g.: KBo 15.10+ II 17.

14. ῥάδαρ, dat.-loc. ῥιδνί, nom.-acc. pl. ῥέδαρ n. 'water' (OS+).
   || nom.-acc. sg. ῥα-α-τάρ \(^{46}\), dat.-loc. sg. ύ-ι-τ-ε-η-νι \(^{47}\), nom.-acc. pl. ύ-ι-τ-ε-η-νι-α-α-α-ρ \(^{48}\).

   Grk. δορό n., gen. δοροτος <*υδό-η-τ-ος (H. +) 'id.' (LS: 1845 f.) — accent is levelled out after nom.-acc. sg.; Skr. gen.-abl. udānas, loc. udāni, udān, instr. pl. udābhās (V, TS) 'id.' (BR, 1: 911 ff.).

   Hitt. dat.-loc. ῥιδνί directly corresponds to udāni;

   Skr. ῥάदर may correspond to δορό. Segmentally Grk. nom.-acc. sg. δορό corresponds to Hitt. nom.-acc. pl. ῥέδαρ; on the grounds of Hitt. and Grk. forms one can reconstruct IE nom.-acc. sg. *uðono, nom.-acc. pl. (= collect.) *uðo, accordingly Grk. δορό should be recognized as a result of contamination between virtual nom.-acc. sg. *uðo and nom.-acc. pl. *uðo.

\(^{46}\) For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 212.

\(^{47}\) MS: KUB 31.79 Vs. 8 (dating after Rieken, StBoT 44: 292); cf. the same spelling in MH/NS KBo 5.2 (passim).

\(^{48}\) For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 194.

\(^{49}\) For IE zero grade *uC- vs. Hitt. wC- cf. witt- 'year' below, § 2.6.

\(^{50}\) For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 44.

\(^{51}\) Cf. also more archaic γλυνόν (Arist., etc.), γλυνάνω (Geoponica) 'glutinous'. The postclassical writing with η indicates the historical length of i.
2. **hāraš**, acc. **hāranan** c. 'eagle' (OS+).
   || nom. sg. ha-a-ra-aš52, acc. sg. ha-a-ra-na-an53, gen. sg. ha-a-ra-na-aš54. All very infrequent examples of plene on the suffixal syllable are probably NS55.
   ♦ Hitt. nom. sg. **hāraš** goes back to *ha-ran- + -s. The closest parallel is Germ. *ar(o)n* 'id.: Gothe, ara, Oic. are, OHG are, but this forms are irrelevant for accentology. Cf. extended stem in Grk. ὤρις, gen. ὤριν (H. +) 'bird' (LS: 1254).

3a. **hāšaša-** c. 'ash(es), soda ash, soap' (MS+)
   || The following MS forms are known to me: nom. sg. (secondary!) ha-aš-ša-aš56, acc. sg. ha-aš-ša-an57, acc. pl. ha-aš-šu-šu58. The 'correct' nom. sg. is attested only in pre-NH/NS texts: ha-aš59. Cf. also NS instr. sg. ha-aš-ši-it60.
   ⇒ HED, 3: 210 ff.; Rieken, StBoT 44: 19 ff.

3b. **hašša-** c. 'fireplace, hearth, brazier, fire-altar' (OS+).
   || nom. sg. (= voc.) ha-ašša-aš61, acc. sg. ha-ašša-an62, ha-ašša-an63, gen. sg. ha-ašša-aš64, dat.-loc. sg. ha-ašši-i65, ha-ašši-i66, dir. sg. ha-ašša-a67, abl. sg. ha-ašša-a-aa68, nom. pl. ha-ašša-leš-ta (+ 'a but')69, other pl. forms are not attested70.

52 For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 53; MS, e.g.: KBo 21.22 Vs. 9'.
53 For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 53 f.; MS, e.g.: KUB 17.10 I 24'.
54 MS, e.g.: KUB 15.34 I 12.
55 E.g. acc. sg. ha-na-na-an KBo 13.86 Vs. 16.
56 MS: KBo 21.41 + KUB 29.7 Rs. 35.
57 MS: KBo 21.41 + KUB 29.7 Rs. 32, 34. Cf. also MS ha-ša-ša-an in KBO 32.19 (passim) 'fireplace' or 'ash', see discussion in Neu, StBoT 32: 429 f.
58 MS: KBO 15.10+ III 42'.
59 KBo 4.2 I 45 (pre-NH/NS); KBO 11.10 II 12' (MH/NS); KBO 32.7 Vs. 17 (OH/NS).
60 KUB 43.74 Vs. 3'.
61 MS: KBO 17.105+ II 19'.
62 Passim in OS, see Neu, StBoT 26: 59; MS, e.g.: KBo 17.105+ II 17'.
63 Once in OS: StBoT 25 No 31 II 17; seldom in MS, e.g.: KBo 17.105+ II 23'.
64 Passim in OS, see Neu, StBoT 26: 59; MS, e.g.: KBo 17.105+ II 17'.
65 Passim in OS, see Neu, StBoT 26: 60; passim in MS, e.g.: KBo 15.10+ III 61'.
66 Once in OS: StBoT 25 No 25++ I 52'.
67 For OS attestations see Neu, StBoT 26: 61.
68 OS: StBoT 25 No 25++ + 138; OS or MS: KUB 34.123++ + 139.
69 MS: KBO 32.16 III 2' (cf. Neu, StBoT 32: 283 w. discussion).
70 Pace Neu, StBoT 26: 61, ha-ašša-an in StBoT 25, No 43 I 7' (= an haššaša pıra tana) is not gen. pl., but probably should

⇒ HED, 3: 221 ff.
♦ In my opinion from both morphological and semantic points of view there is no reason to separate 3a and 3b into two lexemes with different paradigms. We can posit athematic lexeme haš c. 'ashes (→ soap); fireplace' with "mobile" paradigm:

Sg. nom. [NS haš] (back-formation: MS haššaš, haššaš)
   acc. OS+ haššan (analagical: OS+ haššan)
   gen. OS+ haššaš
dat.-loc. OS+ haššu (analagical: OS hašši)
dir. OS haššu
   abl. OS+ haššaz
Pl. nom. MS haššaš
   acc. MS+ haššaš

♦ Beyond Neo Hitt. (nom. haššaš, athematic forms are not attested elsewhere in IE. Cf. a-stem in Skr. āsa- m. 'ashes, dust' (BR, 1: 735)71; āsa-s can be a result of secondary thematisation, as e.g. well attested dāma-s (RV+) 'home, family' vs. relict dam 'id'. Further cf. Lat. āra (Old āsa) 'altar', Umbr. āsa (with unexpected -s), Osc. asa 'id'.

Thus one can posit IE athematic noun *Hās, *Hās-ša, *Hās-šaš with primary meaning 'ashes'. Secondary thematic nom. sg. is attested already in Middle Hittite and Vedik Sanskrit. Meaning shift 'ashes'→'fireplace'→'fire-altar' is natural. Eventually Lat. āra is probably a collective noun in *-ā.

4. **gēma-**, dat.-loc. **gēmi** 'winter' (MS+).
   || dat.-loc. sg. gi-e-mi72; cf. without plene but with geminate: gi-im-mi73.
   ⇒ HED, 4: 143 ff.
♦ Phonetics and morphology of the Hitt. word are obscure, cf. HED with discussions.
♦ Cf. the following IE reconstructions (only forms relevant for accentology are quoted):
   1) IE *gēmād: Slav. accentual paradigm e *zımə, *zıməq 'winter', Lith. accentual paradigm 4 žėmą 'id.'.

be read ha-ašša-aš and interpreted as gen. sg., since the use of more than one hearth is untypical for Hitt. festivals and rituals. For the same reason ha-ašša-aš-an in StBoT 25, No 127+129+147++ II 20' (… haššan piran āda) should be treated as acc. sg. (cf. StBoT 26: 59 with doubts; quoted as No 147 Rs. 7'6'), not as gen. pl.; for similar ruital action cf. e.g. KUB 25.3 (CTH 634.2) II 8—9 haššan=kon piran dan 'they take the braziers from before'.

71 Infrequent word, only nom. sg. āsas (AV, ÇB), nom. pl. āsás (ÇB).
72 MS: KUB 13.1(+ IV 12'.
73 MS: KUB 13.2 + 31.84 IV 23' (dating after Neu, StBoT 32: 431); KBO 15.32++ + 1 I 4.
2) IE *gʰiːom: Grk. χιόν, χιόνος (H.) 'snow'.
3) IE *gʰeymín n., *gʰeimōn m.: Skr. loc. hēman (TS+) 'in the winter', Grk. χειμα, χειμάτος (H.) 'winter weather, frost' → 'winter', χειμών, χειμή-μόνος (H.) 'winter'.
4) IE *gʰimos m., *gʰimā f.: Skr. himā- (RV+) 'cold, frost', himā (RV+) 'winter'.

5. tuēkka- c., n. 'body, body part, limbs' (OS?; MS+).
   ⇒ HEG: 3; 401 ff.
   ◊ Root comparison with Skr. tvāk f., acc. tvācam, gen.-abl. tvācās, loc. tvācī (RV+) 'skin, hide' (BR, 3; 463 f.) seems undoubted. Morphological analysis, however, is more problematic. One can consider that Hitt. tuēkkα- goes back to virtual IE o-stem *tuēkos (i.e. *tuēko-s?) as opposed to nom. *tuēk (⇒ Skr. tvāc), but in this case it is hard to explain Middle Hitt. forms with u-vocalism (tuggās, tuggaz).
   On the other hand, we can suppose that Hitt. lexeme is a result of secondary thematization; in this case plene root (and e-vocalism) in the obl. cases is levellled out after old athematic nom. sg., while attested nom. sg. c. tuēkkas (only NS?) and nom. sg. n. tuēkkān (only NS?) are in their turn back-formations of acc. tuēkkān, etc. Oxytonical tuggaż=sēt can go back directly to IE lexeme with mobile accentual paradigm. U-vocalism of gen. tuggās and abl. tuggaz can be explained as a zero grade and the IE paradigm should be reconstructed as nom. *tuēk, acc. *tuēk-ν, gen. *tuēk- ō (note that Skr. did not preserve this ablaut pattern); or, if we reconstruct IE nom. *tuēk, acc. *tuēk-νi, gen. *tuēk-ōs, Hitt. -u- is a result of contraction of -u- in the non-plene position, cf. the same in OS prs. 3 pl. huēttuanta82 'they draw' vs. OS prs. 3 sg. huṭṭuēnāi83.

74 KBo 17.65++ Vs. 44, 47.
75 KBo 32.14 II 1.
76 KBo 15.10+ 1 17.
77 KUB 14.1+ Vs. 82.'
78 KUB 13.34 II 28.
79 KBo 32.19 II 23, III 48'.
80 KUB 17.10 III 10.
81 KUB 30.10 Vs. 9.'
82 hu-e-it-ti-an-ta Güterbock, Laws III 6'.
83 hu-ud-ti-an-na-a-i StBoT 25, No 44 I 3', 11'.

6. witt-, dat.-loc. wittia c. 'year' (OS+).
   || dat.-loc. sg. ú-i-it-ti88, gen. pl. ú-[i]-[(i)-ta-an-na] (+ 'ja 't&c')89, ú-i-it-ta-as90.
   ⇒ Rieken, StBoT 44: 25 ff.
   ◊ The most reliable evidence of the athematic stem in Hitt. is compounded wiziz(za)apant- 'old' (for morphology cf. discussion in StBoT 44: 26; for list of attestations see ibid., fn. 105 91), where wiz(za) could be sigmatic nom. sg. (wiz + s) or rather old abl. (wit + z), i.e. 'old' as 'passing through years'. Note that common half-logographic spelling MU-za, MU-an, MUL- ti, etc. can cover either athematic stem witt- or ant-stem wittant- with the same meaning92.
   The traces of athematic stem in other IE languages are more scarce. In all likelihood one can reconstruct IE adv. *per-it(ī) 'last year' (< loc. sg. *utiš) of Late Skr. parat (late Class., gram., lex.) 'id.' (BR, 4; 564; Mayrhofer, KEWA, 2; 219)93, for Iran. parallels see KEWA; Grk. πανον(v) (Ion., Att.), ἄνωτ (Dor.) 'id.' (LS: 1595; Frisk, 2; 518); Germ. *furubi / *furubi > *furudi > Ofc. i fjord 'id.', MHG vert 'id.', Arm. heru 'id.'; Ofr. on hurid 'ab anno priore' (WP, 1: 251). How should we reconstruct IE accent: *uti or *utti—is uncertain.
   Opposition Hitt. wittia ~ IE ute is similar to Hitt. witen. ~ IE uteden (cf. above, § 1.14).
   ◊ Cf. widespread IE *yetos, gen. *yetos-os 'year; old'. Relationship of Hitt. šāwidišt-/šawidišt 'tuckling (of animal)' (for list of attestations see Rieken, StBoT 44: 149 84) to this IE stem is somewhat problematic due the unusual voicing IE *-t > Hitt. -d-. Cf. StBoT 44: 147 ff. with traditional

84 AV (BR, 3: 464).
85 CB (BR, 7: 590).
86 AV, VS (BR, 7: 1174).
87 AV (BR, 7: 1625).
88 OS: Güterbock, Laws III 23; KUB 4.72 Rs. d 2.
89 OS: StBoT 25 No I I 2'.
90 MS: Bo 4365 III 10' (apud StBoT 44: 26).
92 For ant-stem cf. clear MU-an-ti KBo 22.2 Vs. 1 (OS or MS) and extended stem wittantadar in ú-e-it-[i]-[(i)-an-da-an-ni] KBo 9.22 Rs. 64 (OS) = ú-i-i-da-an-da-an-w KUB 26.71 I 10' (NS).
93 Cf. also secondary parumna, parumna (only gramm.) 'vorjährig' (BR, 4: 564).
§3. CONCLUSIONS

As we have seen in §1 in the nominative stems the place of plene in Hittite OS & MS texts always coincides with the place of IE accent (as far as we can reconstruct it on the grounds of Grk., Skr. and Balto-Slav. accentual systems as well as Verner’s law in Germ.)98. But since the Hittite data are so scant (only 14 lexemes are available to us), the hypothesis that in Hittite plene marks an accented vowel and that Hittite accentual system goes back to IE accentual system requires additional evidence.

98 The single exception could be Hitt. nom.-acc. pl. widēr vs. Grk. nom.-acc. sg. ὤδωρ, but Grk. form probably goes back to *ὕδωρ (see above, §1.14). Cf. also láman, §1.7.

INDO-HITTITE LARYNGEALS
IN ANATOLIAN AND INDO-EUROPEAN

In 1927 Jerzy Kuryłowicz // FsRozwadowski, 1 (1927): 95—104 dusted off de Saussure’s coefficients sonantiques and connected these precocious structuralist constructs, modified by Möller, VIVSb (1911), with the evidence of Hittite, matched against the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European as codified in the 2nd edition of Brugmann’s Grundriss. The view that the coefficients posited by de Saussure corresponded to the Hittite h-sounds started gaining an acceptance that was quite disproportionate to the facts. In some instances the coefficients relabeled by Kuryłowicz éléments consonantiques (de Saussure’s A and O rewritten as α and ρ and Möller’s E rewritten as η), did correspond to Hittite h/hh, but in many other instances they did not. Whereas it is true that Lat. pāsco ‘pasture’ (pl. pāvō), with the projected *ph₂s₂ in lieu of the Brugmannian *ṭā, corresponds to Hitt. pahhas- / pahš-, and Lat. ante, Gk. ἄντε from the projected *ph₂s₂e₄t- corresponds to Hitt. hanz(a) ‘front’ and hantezziš ‘first’, and Lat. ős, Gk. ὦσσον ‘bone’ from the projected *ph₂s₂s₂e₄t- corresponds to Hitt. ḥastai n. ‘bone’, it is also true that Gk. ὀδο-ς-ον, ὀδό-το-ς from the projected *de₂s₂- ‘give’ corresponds to Hitt. da₄₄i (ς sg. prs., hhi-conj.) ‘take’, da₄₄as (ς sg. prt.), with no trace of h or hh; Gk. πο-ς-ε ‘drink’, O.Ind. a-pa₄-i ‘drink’, projected from *pe₂s₂-, corresponds to Hitt. pa₄₂-i (ς sg. prs., hhi-conj.) ‘swallow’, with no trace of any h/hh. O.Ind. stāyati ‘furtively’, tāyāh ‘thief’, O.Ind. tāid, OCS. tata ‘thief’, projected from *(t)s₄e₂₂-, corresponds to Hitt. taiszi (ς sg. prs., mi-conj.) ‘steal’ and not to an expected *tahhi₄₂i. Gk. τι-ς-η-ς, Lat. či₂-c₂-i, projected from *dhe₂₂s₂, corresponds to Hitt. da₄₄i, prt. da₄₄as, without any trace of h/hh. Greek ἄστι ‘is’ / ἄσι ‘are’, Lat. est, sunt, etc. from the projected *e₂s₂₄ς / *e₂s₂₄ς, correspond to Hitt. ās-zi₄₄, as-anzi. Lat. ős ‘mouth’, etc., from the projected *e₂₂s₂₂₂- or *e₂₂s₂₂₂- or *e₂₂s₂₂₂- or *e₂₂s₂₂₂- depending on whom one believes, corresponds to Hitt. ai₄₂ ‘mouth’, Luw. a₄₂s₂₂ id., with no trace of either *e₂₂ or *e₂₂.

Moreover, none of the “disyllabic” verbs, which, according to W. Cowgill’s well-known assessment of the evidence for the laryngeals, as the éléments consonantiques are widely known, “furnish the most powerful evidence for the laryngeal theory,—evidence that (...) would be sufficient to establish the theory...