

H. Craig Melchert

Abstract: Hittite *āppai-* ‚to go back; be finished, belongs to the class of *hi*-verbs in stem-final *-i-* and is related to *āppa* ‚back; after‘. Derivation of *hi*-verbs from adverbs in Hittite is confirmed by *parā-* ‚to appear‘ < *parā* ‚forth, out‘ and *šanna-* ‚to conceal‘ < **sanna-* ‚isolated, secret‘. The contrasting *i*-stem inflection of *āppai-* shows that it is derived not from attested *āppa*, but from a pre-Hittite **opi* cognate with attested HLuvian /a:ppi/.

Jasanoff (2003: 91ff.) derives Hittite *hi*-verbs with stems in *-i-* from a PIE class of *i*-presents with either **é*/zero or **é*/*é* ablaut, formed exclusively to roots of the shape **C(C)eH-*. For alternate accounts see among others Oettinger (2001: 80-83) and Hajnal (to appear). Whether or not Jasanoff’s analysis is correct for PIE, his claim (2003: 116⁶⁰) that Hittite *āppai-* ‚be finished‘ is of unknown etymology and doubtfully a member of the *hi*-verbs in *-i-* is not remotely credible. The inflection of the verb (understandably limited to the third person) is indisputably the same as that of *dāi/tianzi* ‚put‘ and other *hi*-verbs in *-i-*. There is also no doubt that it is derived from the adverb *āppa* in the sense ‚after, (temporally) behind‘ (thus ‚over and done with‘), as seen by Sturtevant (1932: 2-3 *et alibi*), Kronasser (1966: 574), Tischler (1983: 43) and Puhvel (1984: 95). For an explicit account of the semantics see most recently Hoffner (2002: 169).

The verb is also probably attested as a motion verb meaning ‚to go back, back up‘ in KBo 25.31 ii 12’ and KBo 20.26+25.34 Ro 22’. The first passage reads: *mān=ašta NIN.DINGIR-aš LUGAL-i handāēitta x[...]āppianzi ta AŠAR=ŠUNU appanzi* ‚When the N.D-priestess draws even with the king, the [] go back and take their places.¹ While a sense ‚be finished with‘ is certainly possible with a person as subject, the immediate context here makes this meaning very unlikely. It would be very odd to say that someone is finished with an activity just when some other person draws even with someone else. The description is of the movements of various functionaries, not of ritual activities performed.

Nevertheless, Jasanoff’s skepticism regarding *āppai-* < *āppa* is justified in that none of the previous accounts of their formal relationship are persuasive. Sturtevant (1932: 2-3) suggests a univerbation of *āppa* and the perfect of **h₁ei-* ‚go‘, but all attested such univerbations in Anatolian are *mi*-verbs or medio-passives. One may compare Hittite *paizzi/uezzi* ‚goes/comes‘, Luvian *awīti* ‚comes‘ and Palaic *āntienta* ‚they go in‘ (for the last see Melchert 1994: 198). Kronasser (1966: 574) and Puhvel (1984: 95) suggest a derivation comparable to that of Greek *ἀπρίζω* ‚to make ready‘ < *ἄπρι* ‚just now‘ or Hittite *handāi-* ‚to arrange‘ < *hanta* ‚according to‘, but both comparanda employ a

¹ The missing subject is likely to be the *hapiya*-men mentioned in line ii 9. For the sense ‚be lined up, draw even (with)‘ for medio-passive *handā(i)-* see Güterbock and van den Hout 1991: 17. The context of the second passage is the same. When some person draws even with someone else, the staff-bearer goes back and takes his place.

productive derivational suffix, and the example of *ḥandāi-* predicts present 3rd singular **āppāizzi*, again a *mi*-verb.²

Crucial previously overlooked evidence that illuminates the derivation of *āppai-* is available in the form of the Hittite *ḥi*-verb *p(a)rā-* ‚to appear, come/go forth‘ < *p(a)rā* ‚forth, out‘. The previously assumed stem *p(a)rai-* is based on a false analogy with *āppai-* (thus Oettinger 1979: 472, Melchert 1994: 222, Güterbock & Hoffner 1995: 134, *et al.*). The stem *p(a)rā-* is proven by the verbal noun *parannaš* (see Güterbock & Hoffner, *loc. cit.*).³ The contrast with *šiyannaš* to *šai-* ‚to seal‘, *pi(y)anna* to *pai-* ‚to give‘, and so forth is diagnostic: to a stem *parai-* the verbal noun could only be **pari(y)annaš*.

Both the inflection of *parā-* as a *ḥi*-verb and the stem in *-a-* are confirmed by a likely cognate in HLuvian: *ARHA para-* ‚go missing, be missing, lack‘ < ‚dis-appear‘ (Melchert 1989: 36²⁰; cf. Hawkins 2000: 542).⁴ The consistent spelling of the stem as *pa+ra/i-ra+a-* (e.g. pres. 1st sg. *pa+ra/i-ra+a-wa/i*) strongly supports reading the stem as /pra(:)-/, not /pr(a)i-/: see Melchert 1988: 29-31.⁵

The parallel of *p(a)rā-* ‚appear, come/go forth‘ < *p(a)rā* supports the formation of *āppai-* as a *ḥi*-verb from the adverb *āppa*, but it leaves the stem in *-i-* unexplained. The answer is that *āppai-* is not formed from the attested *āppa*, but from an **āppi* < **ópi*, preserved in HLuvian *a-pi* ‚afterward, further, again‘ (for which see Oshiro 1988). For Hittite *āppa* as cognate with Greek *όπι* see already the arguments of Cowgill (1970: 116), Morpurgo Davies (1983) and others against Hamp (1981: 42&46—but cf. 43&47!) and Dunkel (1982/83). Attested Hittite and CLuvian *āppa* has been trivially remade after its functional opposite *p(a)rā* < **pró*, which *is* old. If *āppa* reflected inherited **ópo* (Dunkel 1982/83: 84), the Hittite verb stem could only be **āppa-*, like *parā-*.

A third example of a Hittite *ḥi*-verb formed from an adverb is *šanna-* ‚to conceal‘ (thus also independently Puhvel 2002: 675). Oettinger (1979: 159) posits a nasal-infix stem to a verbal root **senh₂-*, but all other Indo-European evidence points to an *adverbial* base **sṇ(H)-* (thus with Dunkel forthcoming): Greek *άνευ* ‚without‘, Lat. *sine* ‚without‘, Skt. *sanutár* ‚far removed‘, *sánutya-* ‚distant; hidden‘, and so forth.⁶ For the adverbial status of **šanna-* in Hittite note especially the adverb *šannapi* ‚in an isolated place‘, attested in

² The derivation of *ḥandāi-* < *ḥanta* is in any case false. See the far superior account by Puhvel (1991: 106-107), who persuasively derives *ḥandāi-* from *ḥānt-*, the participle of *ḥāi-* ‚trust, believe‘.

³ The form *parannaš*, which is thus far hapax, appears in HKM 26:7-10: *nu* ^{LÚ}KUŠ₇ GUŠKIN *kuit parannaš waḥannaš* [LÚ-aš? *ēšta*] EGIR-an=ma=an=kan ^{LÚ}KÚR *ku[enta]* n=at *AŠME* ‚That the Gold Chariot Warrior [was a man]/one of going forth and turning (back), but that afterwards the enemy killed him, I have heard it.‘ Whether one restores [LÚ-aš] in the first break with the editors of the *CHD* makes no difference in the interpretation. I find ‚of going forth‘ an obvious pendant for ‚of turning (back)‘. Whether the reference is positive, referring to skill in making deceptive maneuvers, or negative, implying cowardice, is not clear to me.

⁴ For the force of the preverb as ‚dis-‘, reversing the sense of the verb, one may compare Hittite *arḥa tarranu-* ‚to weaken, unman‘ and *arḥa ḥapai-* ‚to dry‘ (lit. ‚un-moisten‘): see Oettinger 2003: 310-311.

⁵ Contra Oettinger (1986: 48) and Melchert (1994: 222) Palaic *p(a)rāi-* ‚to appear‘ with pret. 3rd sg. *p(a)rāit* may be a genuine univerbation of *parā* with **ḥ₁ei-* (and thus a *mi*-verb!).

⁶ But for an alternate account of *άνευ* see Fritz 1995.

iterated form as *šannapi šannapi* ‚scattered here and there‘, with the ending **-bhi* of *kuwapi* ‚where; when‘ (see Güterbock, Hoffner and van den Hout 2002: 159, following Eichner 1992: 45-46, and Puhvel 2002: 675).⁷

Pre-Hittite **sḡ(H)o* ‚isolated/separated off for oneself‘ versus **sḡ(H)i* in Latin *sine* and OIr. *sain* may be old or reflect a reshaping like that of *āppa* after **pró* and **éndo*. Hittite *šanna-* is phonologically compatible with either **sḡh₁-* (Schrijver 1991: 218) or a Lindeman variant **sḡ(n)-* (Pinault 1989: 42-43), but not with **sḡh₂-* (Oettinger 1979: 159 and Eichner 1992: 46).

As explicated in detail by Puhvel (2004), Hittite *šanna-* means ‚to conceal, secret‘ primarily in the sense of ‚to keep to oneself, withhold (verbal) information about‘, as opposed to *munnā(i)-* ‚to (actively) put out of sight‘. It is therefore based on the use of the base **šanna* < **sḡ(H)o* ‚isolated‘ in the particular meaning ‚separated for/kept to oneself, secret‘.⁸

We thus have at least three solid examples of Hittite *hi*-verbs formed from local adverbs. However, the formation of *āppai-*, *p(a)rā-* and *šanna-* is not derivation in the proper sense, but reflects the *secondary inflection* of adverbs. That is, the pre-Hittite forms of the *hi*-conjugation verbal endings have been directly added to the invariant adverbs: in the present third person **āppi+i/ *āppi+anti*, **p(a)rā+i/*p(a)rā+anti*, **šanna+i/šanna+anti*. In the first, the attested present 3rd singular *āppāi* has been remodeled after the pattern of *piddāi/pittianzi* ‚flee‘ and other disyllabic *hi*-verbs in *-i-*. The choice of the largely recessive *hi*-conjugation for such secondarily created verbs may seem surprising. Note, however, that it is likely that in pre-Luvo-Hittite there were no *mi*-verbs with present third singulars in **-iti* or **-ati* (or **-oti*, depending on the precise date of the creation).⁹ On the other hand there could have been some *hi*-verbs with present third singulars already in *-i* < **-ei* (cf. attested Hittite *wāši* ‚buys‘).

The precise mechanism of the formation of these verbs is probably unrecoverable. For *āppai-* one can imagine a ‚delocutory‘ formation. That is, the adverb **opi* was used alone as an imperative ‚Back!‘ in the sense ‚Get back!‘, and from this was backformed a fully inflected verb. But I cite this merely as one possibility. For the unpredictability of the transitivity of such formations from adverbs one may compare English intransitive ‚to back‘ (to move backward), attested from the 15th century, versus transitive ‚to back‘

⁷ The sense ‚empty‘ of the derived adjective *šannapili-* can be derived via an intervening ‚deprived of‘. Compare the two senses of French *privé* ‚isolated/separated off for oneself‘ and ‚deprived of‘.

⁸ This notion of ‚separated for oneself, secret‘ is also attested in Hittite in the Prayer of Kantuzzili (KUB 30.10 obv. 16): NINDA-an=za wemiyānūn n=an=za Aḫīti=YA natta kuwapikki edun ‚(If ever) I found bread, I never ate it secretly by myself‘. We do not know what Hittite stood behind the Akkadian Aḫīti=YA ‚of my side‘. The adverb *šannapi* or other derivative of **šanna* cannot be excluded.

⁹ Attested *mi*-verbs with third singulars in *-izzi/-azzi* (in Luvian *-itti/-atti*) would have still had *-yeti* and **-eti* at the prehistoric stage.

(to support from the back), attested from the 16th.¹⁰ Whatever the individual details, the mutually supporting examples of *āppai-*, *p(a)rā-* and *šanna-* argue that all three reflect the secondary inflection of local adverbs as *hi-*verbs.

H. Craig Melchert
 University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
 CB#3155, Dey 320
 Chapel Hill NC 27599-3155
 U.S.A.
 melchert@email.unc.edu

References

- Cowgill, Warren (1970). Italic and Celtic Superlatives. In: George Cardona et al. (edd.). Indo-European and Indo-Europeans. Philadelphia: UPennsylvania Press. pp. 113-153.
- Dunkel, George (1982/83). πρόσσω και όπίσσω. In: Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung 96. pp. 66-87.
- Dunkel, George (forthcoming). Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme.
- Eichner, Heiner (1992). Anatolian. In: Jadranka Gvozdanović (ed.). Indo-European Numerals. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 29-96.
- Fritz, Matthias (1995). Griechisch ἄνευ—ein adverbiales Privativkompositum. In: Historische Sprachforschung 108. pp. 195-204.
- Güterbock, Hans G./Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. (1995). The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume P. Fascicle 2. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Güterbock, Hans G.†/Hoffner, Harry A. Jr./van den Hout, Theo (2002). The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume Š. Fascicle 1. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Güterbock, Hans G./van den Hout, Theo (1991). The Hittite Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Hajnal, Ivo (to appear). Vergleichende Rekonstruktion im Wandel—vom Paradigma zur Funktion. In: Akten des Gyarmathi-Symposiums, Göttingen, 19.-21. November 1999.
- Hamp, Eric (1981). Indo-European **(H₂)op-*. In: Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 40. pp. 39-60.
- Hawkins, J. David (2000). Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. (2002). Before and After: Space, Time, Rank and Causality. In: Piotr Taracha (ed.). Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. Warsaw: Agade. pp. 163-169.
- Jasanoff, Jay (2003). Hittite and the Indo-European Verb. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

¹⁰ Indicative of the difficulty in recovering the precise avenue of such formations is the recent English neologism ‚to out‘, a transitive verb meaning ‚to reveal that a person is gay‘, explainable only via the previously existing expression ‚to come out‘, itself in turn by ellipsis from ‚to come out of the „closet“‘, a recently formed idiom that requires further sociolinguistic information for its explication.

- Kronasser, Heinz (1966). *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache* (Band 1). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Melchert, H. Craig (1988). „Thorn“ and „Minus“ in Hieroglyphic Luvian Orthography. In: *Anatolian Studies* 38. pp. 29-42.
- (1989). New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses. In: *Historische Sprachforschung* 102. pp. 23-45.
- (1994). *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Morpurgo Davies, Anna (1983). Mycenaean and Greek Prepositions: *o-pi*, *e-pi* etc. In: Alfred Heubeck / Günter Neumann (edd.). *Res Mycenaeae*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. pp. 287-310.
- Oettinger, Norbert (1979). *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
- (1986). Anatolische „Kurzgeschichten“. In: *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 99. pp. 43-53.
- (2001). *Varia Hethitica*. In: *Historische Sprachforschung* 114. pp. 80-89.
- (2003). Hethitisch *utēzzi* „Nässe“ und indogermanisch **wed-*. In: Gary Beckman / Richard Beal / Gregory McMahon (edd.). *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. pp. 307-314.
- Oshiro, Terumasa (1988). *api* in Hieroglyphic Luwian. In: *Archív Orientální* 56. pp. 246-252.
- Pinault, Georges (1989). Reflets dialectaux en védique ancien. In: Colette Caillat (ed.). *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*. Paris: Brocard. pp. 35-96.
- Puhvel, Jaan (1984). *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Vols. 1-2. Words beginning with A, E and I. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton.
- (1991). *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. 3. Words beginning with H. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (2002). *Nomen proprium in Hittite*. In: di Stefano Martino / Franca Pecchioli Daddi (edd.). *Anatolica Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*. Firenze: LoGisma. pp. 671-675.
- (2004). Secrecy in Hittite: *munnai-* vs. *sanna-*. In: *Incontri Linguistici* 27. pp. 101-104.
- Schrijver, Peter (1991). *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. (1932). The Development of the Stops in Hittite. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 52. pp. 1-12.
- Tischler, Johann (1983). *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar*. Teil I. Innsbruck: IBS.