INDOGERMANISCHE FORSCHUNGEN

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR INDOGERMANISTIK UND ALLGEMEINE SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

Begründet von Karl Brugmann und Wilhelm Streitberg

Herausgegeben von WOLFGANG P. SCHMID

74. BAND 1969



WALTER DE GRUYTER & CO BERLIN

I. AUFSÄTZE

A Lexico-Statistical Inquiry into the Diachrony of Hittite¹

The degree of lexical relationship between Hittite and Indo-European may be determined by using the theory and techniques as set forth in the main by Morris Swadesh (1952) and Robert B. Lees (1953). No such lexico-statistic inquiry has been forth-coming, due to the lack of an adequate word-list.² In spite of Friedrich's Hittite-German dictionary (1952), the time has not yet arrived for a thorough-going lexicographical treatment of the language.³ Many common Hittite words are still only known by their Sumerian or Akkadian logogram. Of those written phonetically, some are of questionable interpretation. Large areas of the lexicon will remain obscure considering that scarcely half of the texts excavated have so far been published.

The starting point for assembling the Hittite material was Rea's (1958) list, said to be well-tested. The following items were found to be unsuitable for our purposes: 2. ashes, 4. belly, 6. bird, 13. claw, 18. dog, 20. dry, 24. egg, 26. fat-grease, 29. fish, 30. to fly, 35. green, 50. louse, 53. meat-flesh, 58. neck, 61. nose, 63. one, 64. person, 69. round, 70. sand, 73. seed, 75. skin, 81. stone, 83. to swim, 84. tail, 85. that, 89. tooth, 90. tree, 99. woman, 100. yellow. Alternants were chosen from Gudschinsky's list of 200 items wherever possible. The task of choosing alternants was entrusted to two non-Hittologists to

¹ This work was supported by a grant from McGill University 943.00.84.

² Wittmann (1964b) used the semantic field ANIMAL as a basis for a lexicostatistical comparison of Hittite with Gothic. For other statistical profiles of Hittite with different methods and goals, see Kroeber & Chrétien (1939), Cowgill (1963), Wittmann (1969).

³ Earlier word-lists were Sturtevant (1936) and (1939). Professor A. Goetze apparently is preparing a Hittite Dictionary. Word-lists of Luwian and other Anatolian languages are not considered here at all.

avoid the etymological biases of this author. The results are presented in Table I.

In setting up the list of Hittite equivalents, a minor problem was to eliminate all partial synonyms. These were found for the following items: 6. asariya- 'anbinden', hamenk- 'verbinden', kaleliya- 'fesseln'; 8. hanzana- 'black (?)' (rare); 9. mani- 'light colored blood'; 14. kammara- (Wittmann, 1964a., p. 146f.); 16. ar- 'hinkommen, gelangen'; 17. hark- 'umkommen (by accident)', mer- 'absterben'; 19. nink- 'sich betrinken', sarap-'nippen (?)'; 20. salpa- 'excrement (of dogs)'; kamarsuwant-'excrement', derivative of kamars- 'cacare'; 21. hazzizzi- 'Verstand'; 22. daganzipa-, derivative of tekan-; 23. ispai- 'sich satt essen', karap- 'fressen'; 25. titita- 'pupil'; 27. pittar 'wing'; 28. happina- 'flame'; 34. lazzai- 'in good condition'; 36. ishiyani-'body hair'; 38. halanta-, occurs only once in the texts; 41. sawatar 'horn (as a musical instrument)'; 43. hullai- 'to combat, fight (tr.)', hulhuliya- (intr.); 45. kaness- 'to recognize'; 47. ses- 'to sleep, lie down'; 51. antuhsa-, antuwahha- 'human being', danduki- 'ephemeral; human being'; 55. sarazziyatar 'mountain ridge'; 58. maninkuwan (adv.); 60. nekut- 'evening'; 66. esharwant- 'blood-red', derivative of eshar 'blood'; 67. urki- 'track'; palsa-, of doubtful conjecture; 69. ishimana- 'strap'; suil- 'cord'; 70. piddai 'to flee, fly'; 71. lalai 'to articulate', from lala(n)-'tongue'; mema- 'to speak'; 72. aus- 'sehen, erleben, träumen, lesen': 73. qalqalinai-, to sing in some way, possibly by using a galgalturi- 'tambourine'; 74. sesd- '(sitzend) ruhen, gedeihen'; 76. supp- (suppariya-), of rare occurrence; both have impeccable IE. etymologies; 77. ammiyant- 'tiny, weak'; tepu- 'little, few'; 78. kammara- (Wittmann, 1964a., p. 146f.); 79. arai- 'zum Stehen bringen'; 82. Istanu- 'sun-god'; 84. taggani- 'breast'; 90. nai- 'lenken', anda wart- 'eindrehen, flechten', weh- 'sich drehen'.

It is assumed here that the relationship of Hittite to Indo-European is a parallel one instead of being successive. Sanskrit, Greek, Germanic, Latin, and Lithuanian were selected to reconstruct the lexical profile of Indo-European. Table II assembles

⁴ I am indebted here to two ladies, A. M. and C. P.

those items of Hittite and Indo-European with identical surface and deep structures.⁵ As can be seen, 45 Hittite words have perfect cognates in Indo-European. In setting up Table II, the following considerations were relevant: 6 2.02. sēi-3 in Pokorny (1959). 2.03. Cf. Ernout & Meillet (1951) p. 92. The grid made it necessary to choose lexical items from the most archaic texts available. Cf. also 2.05, 2.19. 2.05. Early Latin scerda only attested in the archaic compounds bucerda, müscerda, ovicerda, $s\bar{u}cerda$, the loss of s being due to the analysis of original $m\bar{u}s$ scerda as mūs-cerda. Later merda from mūscerda, the latter only attested in Festus. Stercus 'manure' is unrelated. 2.06. In support of metathesis, see also Sturtevant (1951) p. 59. 2.09. See 2. 29. 2. 10. Cf. Ernout & Meillet (1951) pp. 97, 862—864. Beside the lallword formations tata-, nana-, papa, and māmā, Indo-European had two words for 'father' and 'mother' respectively. IE. pater denoted father as the tribal and religious leader of the family-clan, in contrast to atta- as the father by birth; mater denoted the biological mother, in contrast to amma- as the wet-nurse or nanny, the latter function often taken by the grandmother. Of these, only atta- and amma- were reflected in Hittite. On lallword formations, cf. 2.33. 2.12. Wittmann, forthcoming a, § 19. 2.14. Wittmann, forthcoming b. 2.16. With dissimilation from k to gh in Sanskrit. Cf. 2.24. 2.19. Gk. phénō; cf. 2.03. 2.21. kei-1 in Pokorny (1959). 2.23. IE. õis- 'mouth' # ous- 'ear', with interferences. Cf. the IE. alternant for 'mouth' in Gk. stóma 'mouth', Av. staman- 'mouth (of dog)': Hitt. istamana- 'ear'. 2.24. With dissimilation from n to l in Hittite. Cf. 2.16. 2.29. Sturtevant (1933) pp. 120, 140f., 151.66, 133. 2.30. Benveniste (1962) pp. 10, 88; Wittmann, forthcoming a,

In reading the grid, the following symbols are relevant: (+) = coinciding in deep and surface structure with Hittite; (-) = coinciding in surface structure alone; (0) = not cognate to Hittite in any way. The contrast of IE. r, l, m, and n with their syllabic counterparts is not indicated. Similarly, IE. k^w , and Hitt. b, δ are noted kw, h, s respectively. The customary asterisk for Indo-European forms is consistently omitted.

⁶ References already noted in Friedrich (1952) and supplements or in Pokorny (1959) are not repeated here.

§ 15. 2.31. Some scholars derive from es- (because of interferences with es- 'to be') sed- 'to sit', Hitt. sesd- 'to rest (in a sitting position)', the latter with reduplication. 2.32. ster-2 in Pokorny (1959). 2.33. Pokorny (1959, p. 1056) claims here lall-word formation, linking TEAT to tata- 'father'. This all seems rather far fetched, considering that a concept like TEAT should turn up tabooed, if at all. Hitt. titan- is probably unconnected to Hitt. tittiya- 'to suckle', which should be compared to IE. dhēi- 'to suckle, suck'. The gemination in tittiya- is due to reduplication, from earlier Hitt. *tai-. 2.41. Vocalism i replaced in Skt., Gmc., and Lith. by e/o. 2.43. See 2.41.

Whereas the Indo-European material used here can be checked by most linguists, only a few are sufficiently familiar with Hittite to do so. For the sake of completeness, the fate of the 55 remaining Hittite items is therefore listed below. 19 are of presumably non-Indo-European origin: 1, 11, 13, 29, 36, 38, 46, 48, 50, 51, 54, 55, 65, 68, 77, 78, 82, 85, 88. The other 36 have formal cognates in Indo-European: 2 (Sturtevant, 1951, p. 50f.), 3 (Benveniste, 1962, p.125f.), 5 (Wittmann, forthcoming a, fn.17), 7 (Sturtevant, 1933, p. 62), 8, 12 (IE. wer-12), 14 (Sturtevant, 1951, p. 46), 15 (IE. yeg-), 16, 17, 18 (?), 19, 21 (Sturtevant, 1933, p. 93), 27 (Goetze, 1954, p. 403; cf. Pokorny, 1959, p. 850), 32 (Goetze, 1954, p. 404 & fn. 13), 33, 35 (Benveniste, 1962, pp. 96—98), 39 (derivative of 21), 45 (related to 25 [2.09], Sturtevant, 1933, p. 120, 1951, p. 133), 52 (Sturtevant, 1951, p. 30 fn. 4, Benveniste, 1962, pp. 111—112; Pokorny, 1959, p. 709, erroneously gives the meaning of mekki- as 'big'), 53 (see note on 2.10.), 58 (Ernout & Meillet, 1951, p. 720), 60 (IE. kwsep-'darkness (of night)'; the regular IE. word nekw(t)-, Skt. nom. sg. nak, adv. naktam changed in Hitt. nekut- its meaning to 'evening'), 63 (contains da-'two'), 64 (Wittmann, forthcoming b), 66, 69, 70 (Sturtevant, 1933, p. 94), 71 (Benveniste, 1962, pp. 119— 122, Sturtevant, 1951, pp. 120, 121; tar- is only suppletive to te-), 75, 76 (Hitt. ses-/sup-, both 'to sleep', reflects Skt. sásti/svápiti, both 'sleeps', etc. However, the frequency ranges unfortunately

⁷ Again, references already noted in Friedrich and Pokorny are not repeated.

do not coincide at all), 79, 81 (Wittmann, 1964, p. 147), 83 (Sturtevant, 1951, p. 51), 90 (Sturtevant, 1951, p. 50), 93 (etymology under handais- 'heat'; prefix ha-, Wittmann, forthcoming b).

On the basis of 45 perfect cognates for Hittite and Indo-European, the time depth was computed by using Lees' (1953) formula:

$$t = \frac{\log c}{2 \times \log r}$$

Assuming a rate of retention of 80.5% per thousand years, we arrive at a time depth of 1,841 years. Consequently, Hittite and Indo-European may have separated at about 3,600 B.C. Trager & Smith (1950) placed this event at about 3,500 B.C., and in Wittmann (1964b), this date was set at approximately 3,900 B.C. Although the three dates coincide very closely, some will prefer to calculate lexical relationships in terms of dips by using the formula:

$$d = .014 \frac{\log c}{2\log r}$$

The degree of lexical relationship of Hittite with Indo-European may thus be assumed to be 25.774.

The results achieved here will not be satisfactory to everyone. However, the lists established in Tables I and II are not bound to the preconceptions of this author and may be used in different contexts. Those who wish to compare Hittite directly with any of the Indo-European languages, may do so by simply developing a formula to compute the time differentials. Of course, not all will disagree on the use of the lists alone, and some even object to any numerical expression of genetic relationships.

The following observations are relevant to our theory. Lexicostatistics deals not with single morphemes but with morpheme masses. The reaction of one morpheme can be forecast by no known mathematics; the reaction of masses is something else

⁸ Readers need not feel bound by the obvious Indo-Hittite biases of this author.

⁹ Cf. Teeter (1963) for the former and Fedor (1965) for the latter,

again. Since the internal structure of the morpheme is unstable, there must be decomposition; and since masses of morphemes are constantly involved in decomposition, the rate of decomposition must be predictible. The same is incidentally true for the decomposition of radioactive (i.e. unstable) nuclides. However, the rate of change in carbon 14 dating is 'constant' only if the environment remains so. Carbon 14 dating is therefore relative. It can predict only probabilities, and no certainties. There is always a margin of error, and as time passes that margin increases in geometric progression. If outside variables which are not part of the theoretical framework of carbon 14 dating interfere, then this 'law' of change becomes relative in the context of those outside variables. In other words, the rate of decomposition of radioactive nuclides can be accelerated or slowed down by independent variables; the nuclide may even be 'destroyed' and cease to 'exist', a change too radical for us to describe in any other way. No one has as yet suggested to abolish numerical expression here to accomodate the whims of a few. Similarly, a theory of diachronic morpheme replacement cannot predict the effect of environmental factors which have undergone a mutation caused by variables the quantification of which was not included in the theory's underlying assumptions.

TABLE I

1. ALL	dapiya-	12. TO BURN	war-
2. ANIMAL	hwitar	13. CHILD	hammasa-
3. TO BARK	wappiya-	14. CLOUD	alpa-
4. BEARD	zamangur-	15. COLD	ekuna-
5. BIG	uri-	16. TO COME	uwa-
6. TO BIND	ishiya-	17. TO DIE	akk-
7. TO BITE	wakk-	18. TO DIG	padda-
8. BLACK	dankwi	19. TO DRINK	eku-
9. BLOOD	eshar	20. EXCREMENT	sakkar
10. BONE	hastai-	21. EAR	istamana-
11. BREAST	taggani-	22. EARTH	tekan-

23.	TO EAT	ed-	62. NOT	natta
24.	EAGLE	hara(n)-	63. OTHER	damai-
25.	EYE	sakwi-	64. TO PULL	hwittiya-
26.	FATHER	atta-	65. RAIN	he(ya)u-
27.	FEATHER	partawar	66. RED	miti-
28.	FIRE	pahhuwar	67. ROAD	itar
29.	FLOWER	alil	68. ROOT	surki-
3 0.	FREE	arawa-	69. ROPE	summanza(n)-
31.	FOOT	pata-	70. TO RUN	huwai-
32.	FULL	swu-	71. TO SAY	tar-/te-
33.	TO GIVE	pai-	72. TO SEE	sakuwai-
34.	GOOD	assu-	73. TO SING	ishamai-
35.	TO GRAZE	wesiya-	74. TO SIT	es-
36.	HAIR	tetana-	75. SKY	nepis-
37.	HAND	kessar	76. TO SLEEP	8 0 5-
38.	HEAD	harsan-	77. SMALL	kappi-
39.	TO HEAR	istamass-	78. SMOKE	tuhhuwai-
40.	HEART	ker, kardiyas	79. TO STAND	ar-
41.	HORN	karawar	80. STAR	astira.
42 .	I	uga	81. TO STING	sai-
43.	TO KILL	kwen-	82. SUN-DISK	sittar
44.	KNEE	genu-	83. TO SWALLOW	pas-
45.	TO KNOW	sekk-	84. TEAT	titan-
46.	LEAF	hurpasta(n)-	85. THICK	harsi-
47 .	TO LIE	(kik)ki-	86. THIS	ka-
48.	LIVER	lissi-	87. THOU	ziga
49.	LONG	daluki-	88. TONGUE	lala(n)-
50.	LUNG	hahressar	89. THREE	teri-
51.	MAN-MALE	maya-	90. TO TURN (IT)	wahnu-
52 .	MANY	mekki-	91. TWO	da-
53.	MOTHER	anna-	92. TO WALK	iya-
54.	MOON	arma-	93. WARM	ant-
55.	MOUNTAIN	kalmara-	94. WATER	watar
	MOUTH	ais	95. WE	wes
	NAME	laman-	96. WHAT	kwit
		maninku- (adj.)	97. WHITE	harki-
	NEW	newa-	98. WHO	kwis
	NIGHT		99. WIND	huwant-
-		ispant-	100. WOOD	
υ1.	NUDE	nekumant-	TOO. MOOD	taru-

TABLE II

	Skt.	Gk.	Gmc.	Lat.	Lith.	Hitt.	reconstruction of IE.
1.	i +	0	0	0		4.	smekru-
2.	+		. —	0		6.	sēi-
3.	+	+	0	+	0.	9.	esr, esnés
4.	+	+	0	+	0	10.	osth-
5.	0	+	dddarrae	+	***************************************	20.	skerd-
6.	+	+	. —	+	+	22.	dh(e)ghom-/gh(e)dhom-
7.	+	+	+	+	+	23.	ed-
8.	0		+	0	+	24.	er(n)-
9.	+	+	+	+	+	25.	(s)okwi-
10.			+	+	0	26.	atta-
11.	0	+	+	0	0	28.	pewor, punés
12.		0	0	0	+	30.	arwo-/aryo-
13.	+	+	+	+		31.	ped-
14.	+	+		0	0	34.	(w)esu-
15.	+	+	0	********	***************************************	37.	ghesor-/ghesto-
16.	+	+	+	+	+	40.	ker, kerdyos
17.	+	+	+	+		41.	ker- ()
18.	+	+	+	+	+	42.	eg(h).
19.	+	+	*******	*********		43.	gwhen-
20.	+	+	+	+	0	44.	ĝenu-
21.	+	+			<u> </u>	47.	kei-
22.	+	+	+	+	+	49.	dl(on)gho-
23.	+	0		+	-	56.	ōis-
24.	+	+	+	+	0	57.	nomn-
25.	+	+	+	+	+	59.	newo-
26.	+	+	+	+	+	61.	nogw(no/dho)-
27.	+		+	+	+	62.	ne(-)
28.	*****	_		+		67.	iter, itenos
29.	+	+	+			72.	(s)e/okw-
30.	_	+	0	0	0	73.	sōm-
31.	+	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	0	0	0	74.	es-
32.	+	+	+	+	0	80.	ster-()
33.	0	0	+	0	0	84.	did(n)-
34.	0	1	+		+	86.	ko-
35.	+	+	+	+	+	87.	tu(-)
36.	+	+	+	+	+	89.	trei-
37.	+	+	+	+	+	91.	dwo(u)-
38.	+	+		+	+	92.	θi-
39.	+	+	+		+	94.	wedőr, udnés
40.	+	0	+	0	+	95.	we(i)-
41.] + ,	+	+	+	+	96.	kwid

	Skt.	Gk.	Gmc.	Lat.	Lith.	Hitt.	reconstruction of IE.
42. 43. 44. 45.	+ + + + +	+ + - +	- + + +	++	0 + -	97. 98. 99. 100.	arg- kwis wento- deru-
	36 4 5	32 8 5	28 10 7	27 8 10	20 13 12		Total of perfect cognates Total of formal cognates Total of zero cognates Generalized perf. cognates

REFERENCES

- Benveniste, E., 1962. Hittite et indo-européen, Etudes comparatives. Paris.
- Cowgill, W., 1963. A search for universals in Indo-European diachronic morphology. In: J. H. Greenberg, Universals of language. Cambridge, Mass.
- Ernout, A., and Meillet, A., 1951. Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. 3rd. ed. Paris.
- Fodor, I., 1965. The rate of linguistic change: Limits of the application of mathematical methods in linguistics. The Hague.
- Friedrich, J., 1952. Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg. (With supplements 1957, 1961, 1966.)
- Goetze, A., 1954. Review of Friedrich (1952). Lg. 30,401-405.
- Kroeber, A. L., and Chrétien, C. D., 1939. The statistical technique and Hittite. Lg. 15, 69-71.
- Lees, R. B., 1953. The basis of glottochronology. Lg. 29,113-127.
- Mayrhofer, M., 1953ff. Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. Heidelberg.
- Rea, J. A., 1958. Concerning the validity of lexicostatistics. IJAL. 24, 145-150.
- Sturtevant, E. H., 1933. A comparative grammar of the Hittite language. Philadelphia.
- ---, 1936. A Hittite glossary. 2nd ed. Philadelphia. (With supplement 1939.)
- —, 1951. A comparative grammar of the Hittite language. 2nd. ed. New Haven.
- Swadesh, M., 1952. Lexico-statistic dating of prehistoric ethnic contacts. PAPS. 96, 453-462.

- Teeter, K. V., 1963. Lexicostatistics and genetic relationship. Lg. 39, 638–648.
- Trager, G. L., and Smith, H.L., 1950. A chronology of Indo-Hittite. SIL. 8,61-70.
- Wittmann, H., 1964a. Some Hittite etymologies. Die Sprache 10,144-148. (Part II forthcoming a.)
- —, 1964b. A lexico-statistic experiment with Hittite and Gothic. Mimeo. University of Windsor.
- —, 1969. The Indo-European drift and the position of Hittite. IJAL. 35, 266—268.
- —, forthcoming b. Les préfixes h(a)-, pe/a-, et u- du Hittite.

Montréal, Canada, McGill University Henri Wittmann