

## INDO-EUROPEAN 'LARYNGEALS' AND HITTITE HINIK-, HEU-: SOME CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

Referring to 'lex Eichner'<sup>1</sup> certain scholars<sup>2</sup> teach that the *he-* of Hittite *heu-* 'rain' (*heu-/he-aw-*)<sup>3</sup> goes back ultimately to the lengthened  $\bar{e}$ -grade ( $*H_2\bar{e}y-$ ) of a root

- 1 For *Eichners Gesetz* see Mayrhofer, *Indogermanische Grammatik* Band I, 1986, pp. 132ff., 141f., and cf. the critical discussion by Lindeman, *Introduction to the 'Laryngeal Theory'*, 1988, p. 56ff., *HS*. 102, 1989, p. 274. For the stem *\*ink* in Old Irish *ro-iccu* 'I reach', *con-icimm*, *-cumcu* 'I can' and similar forms, mistakenly invoked as a piece of evidence for 'lex Eichner', see Thurneysen, *Grammar of Old Irish* p. 130, and cf. Lindeman, *Introduction*, p. 85. Theoretically, *cumacc*, verbal noun of *con-ic* 'can', may be the regular phonetic outcome in Old Irish of Celtic *\*kom-anko-* (with *\*ank-* representing IE. zero-grade *\*nk-*, cf. Mid. Welsh *anc* in *ranc bod* 'to satisfy' and in *cyfranc* 'encounter' = OIr. *comracc* 'id.'): a phonetic development of a preform *\*kom-anko-* into Old Irish *\*cumecc*, *cumacc* is quite straightforward, cf. Celtic *\*ko(m)-men-* > OIr. *cumen*, *cuman* 'remembered'. It should be stressed in this connection that the preverb *com-* occurs with a generalized *u* in *cúimne* 'remembrance', *cúimnech* 'mindful'. For the preverb *com-*, *cum-* see Lewis and Pedersen, *Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar* p. 104. I see little point in discussing recent *ad hoc* fabrications allegedly involving a preserved IE. lengthened  $\bar{e}$ -grade in the vicinity of  $*H_2$  or  $*H_3$ . It is perhaps worth noticing, however, that the  $\bar{a}$ s- attested by Skt.  $\bar{a}sa-$  'ash', OLat.  $\bar{a}sa$  'fire-altar', Oscan (loc. sing.) *aasai* 'in ara', if from a lengthened grade  $*[H_2\bar{a}s-]$  contrasting with normal grade  $*[H_2as-]$  seen in Toch. AB  $\bar{a}s-$  'dry up' (pres. iv *asatär*, B *osotär*), would be a particularly convincing piece of evidence against 'lex Eichner': if, prior to the rise of the lengthened grade in Indo-European, normal grade  $*H_2es-$  was realized phonetically as  $*[H_2as-]$ , it follows that the lengthened grade of  $*[H_2as-]$  must have been  $*[H_2\bar{a}s-]$ , whence non-Anatolian  $\bar{a}s-$ . See my remarks in *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, 1979, p. 153, note 6. For Hitt. *hassa-* 'fire-place', see Puhvel, *HED*. 3, p. 224.
- 2 See H. Eichner, *Gedenkschrift für H. Kronasser*, 1982, p. 18; Ch. Zinko, 'Hethitisch *heu-* "Regen"', *Akten der 13. Österreichischen Linguistentagung*, 1988, pp. 319–38, particularly p.329. Eichner, *ibid.* p. 18, note 12, positing IE.  $*(s)h_2i-né-k-$  as the source of Hitt. *hinik-* and Vedic *siñcāti*, writes: "Diese Analyse (nicht  $*sh_2i-n-ek-$ ) folgt aus dem Wurzelansatz  $*sH_2eik/*sh_2aik$  (ai. Perf. *sišéca*, nicht:  $*sisyáca$ ),..." Eichner's reasoning here is irrelevant, however: Saussure assumed that the original formation of the nasal infix presents involved a morpheme of regular ablauting type  $*-né-/n-$  and to this day, there is no linguistic evidence forcing us to consider his analysis unjustified. Cf. also e.g. Cowgill, *Language* 39, p. 252, Borgström, *NTS*. 15, p. 157, R. Antilla, *Proto-Indo-European Schwebelaut*, 1969, p. 39f. Cowgill, *Kratylos* 29, 1984[85], p. 8, taking *heu-* to come from pre-Hitt.  $*he-yu-$ ,  $*he-yaw-$ , or  $*hey-u-$ ,  $*hey-aw-$ , offers no comment on the origin of his pre-Hitt. root  $*he(-y)-$ . See also my *Introduction to the 'Laryngeal Theory'*, 1988, p. 110.
- 3 For the inflection of this word in Hittite see E. Neu, *Essays in historical linguistics in memory of J.A. Kerns*, 1981, pp. 203–12, *Kratylos* 25, 1980[81], p. 89. For the ablaut (*heu-/heaw-*) see now E. Neu, 'Zur Stammabstufung bei *i-* und *u-*stämmigen Substantiven des Hethitischen', *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen Festschrift für Johann Knobloch*, Innsbruck 1985, p. 260: "Es fällt schwer anzunehmen, dass die schon im Althethitischen für *heu-* bezeugte Stammabstufung bereits in so früher Zeit in Anlehnung an *u-*stämmige Adjektive erfolgt sein soll." For Puhvel's analysis (in *HED*, p. 303) see below. According to

\* $H_2ey-$ , the zero-grade of which is attested by the Hittite nasal infix verb stem *hinik-* ‘to rain’ < \* $H_2inek-$  (cf. *heus hinikta*, Laroche, *RHA*. 23, 1965, p. 68f.); a variant form of the stem \* $H_2inek-$  is \* $H_2in(e)k-$  (with *s*-mobile) allegedly underlying Vedic *siñcāti* ‘pour, sprinkle’, Avest. *hinčaiti* ‘id.’. Hence, the basic verbal theme from which these nasal infix presents are all ultimately derived, must be reconstructed as IE. \*(*s*) $H_2eyk-$ .

However, the assumption that Hitt. *hinik-* and Vedic *siñcāti* reflect an orig. IE. nasal infix present of the shape \*(*s*) $H_2iné-k-$  can be shown to be unfounded.

As is well known<sup>4</sup>, Vedic *siñcāti* has a cognate in Proto-Germanic \**sejhw-a-* ‘filter’, seen in OE. *sēon*, pret. *sāh*, ptc. *siwen*, OHG. *sīhan*, pret. *sēh*, ptc. *siwan*, etc. Since Proto-Gmc. \**sejhw-* cannot be the regular phonetic reflex of a full-grade \**sayk<sup>w</sup>-* (< \* $sH_2eyk<sup>w</sup>-$  with an *a*-colouring ‘laryngeal’), the only course<sup>5</sup> open to those who want to uphold the assumption of an etymological connection of *hinik-* < \* $H_2iné-k-$  with Vedic *siñcāti* would be to resort to ‘lex Eichner’ and account for the shape of Gmc. \**sejhw-a-* by assuming an IE. lengthened grade \* $sH_2ēyk<sup>w</sup>-$ <sup>6</sup> (with \* $\bar{e}$  preserved in the vicinity of \* $H_2$ ) > non-Anatolian IE. \* $sēyk<sup>w</sup>-$ , whence (with regular shortening of preconsonantal \* $\bar{e}y$  to \**ej* according to Osthoff’s Law), Proto-Gmc. \**sejhw-a-*.

Obviously, this reasoning being entirely circular can have no probative force whatever: a strictly *ad hoc* postulated lengthened grade \* $H_2ēy-$  in the preform of Hitt. *heu-* ‘rain’ (< IE. \* $H_2ēyu-$ ) forms the basis for the reconstruction of an IE. stem form \* $sH_2ēy-k<sup>w</sup>-$  (> Proto-Gmc. \**sejhw-*), the \* $\bar{e}$  of which has no other linguistic justifications than precisely the strictly *ad hoc* postulated lengthened grade in the preform of Hitt. *heu-*. *Non liquet*.

Puhvel, *HED*. vol. 3, 1991, p. 315f., explicitly rejecting the proposed etymological connection of *heu-* with *hinik-*, takes the latter verb form and vedic *siñcāti* to reflect an orig. nasal infix present \*(*s*) $H_1in(e)k-$  (with *s*-mobile) to a base \*(*s*) $H_1eyk<sup>(w)</sup>-$ , seen in Proto-Gmc. \**sejhw-a-* ‘filter’. However, the proposed reconstruction of a basic stem of the shape \*(*s*) $H_1eyk<sup>(w)</sup>-$  as the source of Hitt. *hinik-*, Vedic *siñcāti* and Proto-Gmc. \**sejhw-a-*, although phonologically possible, remains questionable as it rests on two unverifiable *ad hoc* assumptions, i.e. 1) that the *s-* of Vedic *siñcāti* is in fact an *s*-mobile, and 2) that the *h-* of *hinik-* does reflect a voiced *e*-colouring ‘laryngeal’<sup>7</sup> rather than \* $H_2$  or \* $H_3$ : we do not dispose of any linguistic material that could

J. Catsanicos, *BSL*. LXXIX, 1984, 2, p. 147, *heu-*, *heaw-* is characterized by a mobile accent.

4 Cf. Seebold, *Vergl. und etym. Wb. der germ. starken Verben*, 1970, p. 390.

5 Hoenigswald’s assumptions (‘Laryngeals and *s* movable’, *Language* 28, p. 172f.), that prevocalic ‘laryngeals’ were lost in the Indo-Hittite period before the difference of *e* and *a* had become distinctive, being unfounded, gives no support to the idea that a non-Anatolian IE. stem form \**seyk<sup>w</sup>-* (> Proto-Gmc. \**sejhw-*) may reflect orig. \* $s[H_2]eyk<sup>w</sup>$ . For Hoenigswald’s hypothesis see *Introduction to the ‘Laryngeal Theory’*, p. 49.

6 Or, more precisely, \* $sēyk<sup>(w)</sup>-$  in order to account for the ‘pure’ velar of Hitt. *hinik-*, cf. Puhvel, *HED*. 3, p. 315.

prove that Proto-Gmc. *\*sejhw-a-* and Vedic *siñcāti* do not simply go back to an IE. verbal stem of the shape *\*sey-k<sup>w</sup>-* (without any internal ‘laryngeal’) - a *\*-k<sup>w</sup>-* extension of an original root *\*sey-* (the *s-* of which is not an *s*-mobile). From a structural point of view, it should be stressed that judging by the etymologically clear cases, the present stem of Germanic strong verbs of the 1. ablautseries presupposes without exception the Indo-European normal grade, cf. e.g. Gmc. *\*lejhwa/e-* (in Goth. *leihwan*) < IE. *\*leyk<sup>w</sup>o/e-* = Gk. *leípō*.

To posit (with Puhvel, *HED*. 3, p. 303) a stem *\*(s)H<sub>1</sub>ew-H<sub>2</sub>-* (with *s*-mobile) as the source of Hitt. *heu-*, *heaw-* and of Toch. AB *su-*, *swā-s-* ‘to rain’ (e.g. B present V *suwam*, subjunctive V *swāsam* < *\*suwāsam*), OPruss. *suge*, Alb. *shi* ‘rain’<sup>8</sup>, Gk. *hūei* ‘rains’ is equally *ad hoc*: to my knowledge there exists no linguistic material that could prove *a*) that the root underlying non-Anatolian IE. *\*sū-* < *\*su-H-* is not simply orig. *\*sew-* (with no *s*-mobile), and *b*) that the initial *h-* in Puhvel’s “basic stem” *\*hew(a)-*<sup>9</sup> is not a reflex of *\*H<sub>2</sub>* (or *\*H<sub>3</sub>*)<sup>10</sup> rather than of an *e-* colouring ‘laryngeal’. Further, the idea that the *-a-* in *heaw-* (< *\*he[w]aw* by dissimilation) reflects a ‘vocalized’ *\*H<sub>2</sub>* is disputable on phonological grounds: since, in the Indo-European sound system, *\*H* represents a consonantal element inherently less sonorous than the resonants *\*y*, *\*w*, *\*r*, *\*l*, *\*n*, *\*m*, it follows that what we write phonemically *\*/H<sub>1</sub>ewH<sub>2</sub>wo-/* must be interpreted phonetically as *\*[H<sub>1</sub>ewH<sub>2</sub>uo-]* (according to Sievers’ Law), see the discussion in my *Introduction* p. 104. An illustrative example is *\*/g’énH<sub>1</sub>yo-/* (i.e. stem *\*g’énH<sub>1</sub>-* ‘beget’ plus suffix *\*-yo-*) = phonetically *\*[g’énH<sub>1</sub>io-]*, a form that survives in Vedic *jāniya-* ‘belonging to the race’. Cf. Lindeman, *IF*. 91, p. 79ff. It should also be stressed that there does not seem to exist any non-ambiguous evidence for a ‘vocalization’ (> *a*) of the IE. ‘laryngeals’ in Anatolian, see *Introduction*, p. 106 (with further references), and cf. H. Craig Melchert, *Sprache* 33, 1987, p. 19f., note 3, who argues that internal cases like HLuw. *tuwatri-*, Lyc. *kbatra-* ‘daughter’ < *\*dhugH<sub>2</sub>tr-* “may show anaptyxis rather than vocalization.”

Not surprisingly, ‘laryngeal’ speculations, however imaginative, thus offer little help to the linguist who sets out to establish the original formation and prehistory of the noun *heu-*, *heaw-*. The obvious reason for this is to be found in our insufficient knowledge of Hittite ‘laryngeal’ reflexes and of Hittite phonology on the whole. Also, such ‘laryngeal’ speculations do not offer any clear answer to the question whether

7 In Puhvel’s system, the symbol *\*H<sub>1</sub>* denotes a voiced *e*-colouring ‘laryngeal’, see *HED*. vol. 1 and 2, p. x with further references.

8 Since initial IE. *\*s-* before a stressed syllable normally yields Alb. *gj-*, the proposed etymological connection of *shi* with non-Anatolian IE. *\*sū-* remains uncertain.

9 See *HED*. 3, p. 303. Puhvel posits an orig. nom. sg. *\*hewus* for Hittite, which, however, would probably have been written *\*hemus*, cf. acc. plur. *heamus* (with *-wu-* written *-mu-* as in *idalamus*, acc. pl. of *idalu-*), and see E. Neu’s discussion in *StBoT*. 18, p. 121f.

10 Theoretically, *\*hew-* in Puhvel’s stem *\*hew(a)-* might come from *\*H<sub>2</sub>seyw-*.

*heu-*, *heaw-* is to be etymologically connected with the Hittite verb *hinik-*, the preform of which likewise remains uncertain.

Povzetek

INDOEVROPSKI 'LARINGALI' IN HETITSKO HINIK-, HEU-: NEKAJ OPAZK

Ko natančno pretehta predpostavke nekaterih sodobnih fonoloških podmen, pride pisec do sklepa, da indoevropska etimologija hetitskega *heu-/heaw-* 'dež' nima opore v 'laringalni' teoriji ali v anatolskem in neanatskem jezikovnem gradivu. Povezava te besede z glagolom *hinik-* 'deževati' se s formalnimi sredstvi ne da dokazati.