HITTITE NOM. SG. *UK*: SOME FURTHER COMMENTS

by KENNETH SHIELDS

In Shields (1986) I reconstruct for early Indo-European a personal pronoun system of the type which Forschheimer (1953: 53-54) calls IIIA, characterized by "a lexical plural in the first person and no plural in the other persons or nouns", that is, one in which "only the first person distinguishes a form for one and a form for a group of which that one is a part ... 'I' and 'we' ... are ... two independent lexical entities" (Forschheimer 1953: 65-66). More specifically, I argue that the following paradigm was manifested by the proto-language:

	Singular	Plural (Non-Singular)
1st person	*e–	*we–
2nd person	*te–	
3nd person	(Demonstratives functioned in this capacity, cf. Brugmann 1904: 408 and Beekes 1995: 207)	

and that each member of the paradigm originally had two inflectional forms – a nominative in *–Ø and an objective in *–N (= m or n). In Shields (1993a, 1998), I provide an etymology for the Hittite first person singular nominative personal pronoun *uk* within the context of this more general reconstruction. In short, I propose that a first person pronominal element in *u evolved in late Indo-European, after inflectional non-singular markers appeared in the language[1]. One such non-singular marker was *–e (cf. nom.–acc. du. Gk. *mētér-e* 'two mothers', Lith. [dial.] *žmūn-e* 'two men', OIr. *rig* [< *rēg–e] 'two kings'), originally a general non-singular suffix prior to the bifurcation of the non-singular into dual and plural during the period of dialectal differentiation (cf. Adrados 1987: 7, Shields 1992: 13-14). *u– "resulted from a classic case of back formation (cf. Engl. sg. *pease* > sg. *pea* + pl. *–s*)" involving *we–Ø, which was morphologically reanalyzed as

---

[1] On the lateness of the appearance of the non-singular inflectional category, see Lehmann (1974: 201-02), Adrados (1985: 31-32), and Shields (1992: 13-14).

*w–e (*u + non-singular *–e) (Shields 1998: 50). The element –k of the
Hittite form I ascribe to a contamination of *u and a deictic particle in *k–,
which, as Markey (1980: 280-81) points out, "figures in the formation of, for
example, Lat. ci–s; Gmc. hē–r, OE hē, Goth. hi–mma, OHG hi–tumum (cf.
Lat. ci–timus), Goth. hi–dre (cf. Lat. ci–tra); OIr. ce–n, Com. ke–n, Gaul. du–
ci; Hitt. kāš, ki–ššan, directly comparable to Lat. ci–s; Gk. *ky– in Ion. sētos
= Att. tḗtos; Lith. šis; OCS si; Armen. s– (radical of the 1st pers.
demonstrative, 'this' hic, near the speaker, opposed to d– = near the person
spoken to, 'that' iste, n– = near a third person, far from the speaker and
person spoken to, 'that' ille)". Markey (1980: 291) maintains that "deictic
k(–i–) may originally have designated 'ichdeixis', retained in Armenian, but
could also be transformed to anaphoric usage..., so in Lat. cis, Goth. hi–".
Friedrich (1974: 135) similarly notes that "the Hittite demonstrative
pronoun ka– can ... be used in reference to the speaker, reinforcing the
testimony of Armenian" (Shields 1993a: 22). In Shields (1993a: 23), I
suggest that the contamination of *u and *k "was perhaps motivated by an
attempt to reinforce the gradually weakening deixis of *u"; however, in
light of Shields (1994b), where I conclude that the widespread affixation of
deictic particles to personal pronouns within Indo-European and the
dialects served to derive emphatic pronominal forms, it may simply be the
case that *uk constituted an emphatic variant of *u.

Recently my analysis of the etymology of Hitt. uk has been questioned
by Melchert (1994: 84), largely because it "fails to explain the long ū of
ūg". Of course, Melchert (1994: 27) has now adopted the view "that the
'scriptio plena' in Hittite (V-VC and CV-V spellings) marks vowel length
and only vowel length in most cases"; and, indeed, such an assumption
would require one to posit a long vowel in uk. Moreover, he asserts that
the preform of the Hittite second person singular nominative personal
pronoun zi–g was *tū–, whose vowel became ī through "a special
development of */u:/" in this pronoun alone (cf. Melchert 1983), and that
the long vowel of this preform served as the natural analogical source of
the vowel in uk, its reconstruction implying, in sum, support for the long
vowel in the first person singular (Melchert 1994: 7, 84). His ascription of
a voiced stop to uk stems from his position that "only voiced stops occur
word finally" in Hittite (1994: 111) since in Common Anatolian "voiced
stops are generalized in word-final position (cf. Old Latin): nt. nom.-acc.
sg. *–od > Hitt.-Pal. –at, Lyd. –ad, Luv. –ata and Lyc. –ede 'it' (the last two
with a secondary prop-vowel); pret. 3rd sg. *–t > –d in Hitt. pait=aš 'went
he'" (1993: 239-40). In his view, this final –g is a reflex of *–gh from
original *egh (cf. Lat. eg-o), extant prior to the analogical generalization of
*–u– from the second person singular (1994: 95).

My derivation of the final consonant of *uk* from IE deictic **k* is consistent with Melchert's conclusions about Hittite phonology, for final **k* would have become /g/ in pre-Hittite. Indeed, my own opinions about the emphatic function of deictic particles in the Indo-European personal pronoun system and the ambiguity of the phonological realization of final stops in Hittite allow me to acknowledge that the emphatic particle **g(h)* (cf., e.g., Gk. 1st pers. acc. sg. *emé–ge*) may underlie the final consonant of *uk*. As I admit in Shields (1982: 2), "there are very few solutions to the problems posed by historical and comparative linguistics". Nevertheless, I do wish to defend here my argument that Hittite *uk* provides evidence for a late Indo-European first person singular personal pronominal stem in **u–*, even if one assumes that Melchert is correct in ascribing to this pronoun a long vowel.

As I have already indicated, in what follows I shall assume, for the sake of argument, the presence of a long vowel in Hittite *uk*. However, I must point out that Melchert's view that Hittite orthography indicates vocalic lenght is by no means uncontroversial. Thus, Luraghi (1998: 174) recently observes that in Hittite "the status of the opposition between long and short vowel is unclear, but it does not continue the IE contrast". She explains: "The spelling of the vowels in Hittite varies in such a way that it is difficult to establish which vowels were long and which short. Although we note greater consistency in the oldest texts, there are nevertheless still variations in vowel length in different forms of the same word. On exactly this basis, Carruba (1981) maintains that the so-called *scriptio plena* represents not long vowels but rather stressed vowels. However, his theory is not universally accepted: see recently Melchert (1993, 1994)" (1998: 192 n.2). Although "according to Melchert, the only function of the *scriptio plena* in Hittite is to indicate vowel quantity" (Luraghi 1998: 192 n.2), scholarly opinion regarding the interpretation of *scriptio plena* clearly remains divided.

Most certainly, Melchert's ascription of a long vowel, **/u:/*, to the second person singular personal pronoun *zīg* (< **tū–g*) cannot be adduced in support of a **/u:/* in *uk*, even if Hittite marked a contrast in vocalic length. In the first place, Melchert himself (1994: 84) admits that his posited sound change of **/u:/* to /i:/ is "a special development of **/u:/* (perhaps ultimately **/uh$_2$/*) to **/i:/* in the nominative form of 'you' singular. This may be viewed as either 'breaking' of the long **/u:/* after a dental (**tű >*tyű >*tyí > *tí*) or as palatalization of a dental before a close long **/u:/* (**tű >*t'ű >*t'ü > *t'í > *tí*): cf. Hrozny (1917: 107). The lack of any other comparable isolated sequences admittedly makes the rule unverifiable...". In Shields (1987), I derive *zi–g* from a stem in **tey–*,

a phonologically and morphologically reasonable proposal which Melchert disputes only because "the preform *tū is independently required in P[roto-]A[natolian] as the source of the long ū of the first singular nominative *ūg seen in Hitt. ūg" (1994: 84). Of course, in addition to the questionable status of a phonological change with such limited scope, the positing of a long vowel in *ū in the preform of zig to support the positing of a long vowel in uk, whose purported long vowel supports the positing of a long vowel in the preform of zig, is a classic circular argument.

Moreover, apart from Hittite, there exists substantial independent dialectal support for the reconstruction of a first person singular personal pronoun alternate in *u-. It is widely acknowledged that within Indo-European, as in many languages, there exists an etymological connection between verbal suffixes and pronouns. Szemerényi (1996: 319) thus asserts that "since Bopp's earliest writings, indeed since the eighteenth century, it has been usual to find in the personal endings the personal pronouns," while Bomhard (1998: 483) similarly maintains that "the ultimate origin of the athematic endings is immediately apparent: they can be nothing else but the agglutinated personal pronouns". For this reason, I believe it to be significant that a first person verbal suffix in *-u is widely attested within the dialects. In the first person singular, it is seen in Hitt. pret. –u–n (< *-u [without vocalic length] + *-m), Lyd. pres. –u, Luw. pres. –w(i), Hier. Luw. pres. –w–i, Toch. act. pret. A –w–ā, B –w–a, mid. pret. A –w–e, and Lat. perf. –u–ī (cf. Watkins 1969: 207). The presence of *-u in such dialectal first person (secondary) dual suffixes as Skt. –v–a, Go. –u, –w–a, OCS –v–ĕ, and Lith. –v–a is a result of "the general dialectal trend to specialize *-u in the non-singular function" because of the functional competition supplied by the first person marker *-m (cf. Watkins 1962: 105) and because of "the association of the *-u- element of the verbal suffix with an homophonous non-singular affix in *-u, attested in the nominative-accusative dual ending *-ōu (e.g. Skt. vŕkā–u 'two wolves,' OIr. dau 'two,' Go. ahtau 'eight')" (Shields 1994a: 151). In Shields (1994a) I propose that the Gotic first person plural preterite ending –um similarly derives from *-u (reanalyzed as a non-singular suffix) in contamination with the first person suffix *-m plus a hypercharacterizing non-singular morpheme in *-(e/o)n (cf. Toch. AB nom. pl. riñ 'cities,' nom.-acc. du. Skt. vŕkā, Gk. Iúkō [< *-oN] 'two wolves') or *-e (see Shields 1994a for details). Within pronominal declension, a first person singular element in *u- is manifested in Lydian acc. sg. amu and Lycian acc. sg. emu, "which show a contamination of the old first person singular objective *eN [cf. Gk. acc. em-é] and the first person singular pronominal form in *u" (Shields 1998:

51)[2]. The Balto-Slavic pronominal stem *mun–* (cf. Lith. [dial.] *munì*, Latv. [dial.] *mun*, OCS *mъně*) probably contains the same pronoun in *u*, according to Erhart (1970: 38)[3]. Also, "the attested oblique dual and plural of the first person pronouns of Germanic (cf., e.g., acc. du. Go. *ugkis*, OE *unc*, ON *okr*; acc. pl. Go. *uns*, OE *ūs*, ON *oss*) are traditionally derived from Indo-European etyma in *n̥–* (dual) and *n̥s–* (plural)" (< *n̥s–* [= zero grade of *mes–*, cf. Lith. nom. pl. *mēs*, via assimilation], cf. Schmidt 1978: 177-80)... However, it is possible that Germanic itself shows an original *u–*" in such forms since Germanic has the properties of "an archaic Indo-European language" (Polomé 1982: 52) and since "the *un* IE *n̥* which is at the basis of all the [Germanic dual] oblique cases is apparently an abstraction which never existed anywhere else in IE territory" (Petersen 1934: 64). It must be emphasized that the oft-cited Hittite evidence for a first person oblique plural in *n̥s–* is quite ambiguous: "as Szemerényi (1956: 78) proposes, Hittite *anz–aš* may easily derive from earlier *ens–*, a form which, I believe, shows the first person singular in *em* (Hitt. *amm–u–k*, cf. Kronasser 1956: 141) extended by the non-singular desinence *–(e/o)s* [cf., e.g., nom. pl. Skt. *pắd-as*, Gk. *pód-es* 'feet'], with *–m–* becoming *–n–* by way of assimilation to *–s–*" (Shields 1998: 52).

Now if Indo-European did indeed possess a first person singular pronominal stem in *u–*, how can this stem be related to a Hittite form in *ū–*? I believe that the answer to this question is provided by Melchert himself (1993: 242) when he ascribes to Common Anatolian the monophthongization of IE *eu* to *ū*. In short, I would propose that Hittite *ū-g* may represent the reflex of an ancient pronominal alternate in *eu–*, itself a contamination of the older first person singular stem in *e–* and the more recent stem in *u–*, with this contaminated form passing to *ū–* in Common Anatolian. Such a contamination was like the one which produced Lyd. *amu* and Lyc. *emu*; but instead of the old objective in *eN* underlying the first contaminated element, the nominative in *e–Ø* served as its basis.

Of course, there is no definitive solution to the problem of the etymology of Hittite *uk*. Nevertheless, I offer this proposal as a means of

---

[2] Although, according to Melchert (1994: 291, 343), neither Lycian nor Lydian orthography distinguishes /u/ and /u:/, he posits an original Proto-Anatolian short /u/ in both forms.

[3] On possible etymological connections between such forms containing *u* and the Tocharian A 1st pers. sg. nom. personal pronoun *ñuk*, see Erhart (1970: 37-38) and Shields (1993b). Although Erhart also reconstructs a first person pronominal stem in *u–*, he fails to address the broader set of etymological relationships which it implies.

reconciling the apparent existence of an Indo-European first person singular personal pronoun alternate in *u– and the possibility that the Hittite form under consideration does indeed possess a long vowel.

Kenneth Shields, Jr.
Department of English
Millersville University
Millersville, PA 17551
USA

REFERENCES

Adrados, Francisco, 1985, "Der Ursprung der grammatischen Kategorien des Indoeuropäischen." In *Grammatische Kategorien: Funktion und Geschichte*, eds. B. Schlerath & V. Rittner, Wiesbaden, 1-52.

–, 1987, "Binary and Multiple Oppositions in the History of Indo-European." In *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald*, eds. G. Cardona & N. Zide, Tübingen, 1-10.

Beekes, Robert S. P., 1995, *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction.* Amsterdam.

Bomhard, Allan, 1988, "The Prehistoric Development of the Athematic Verbal Endings in Proto-Indo-European." In *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwartz*, ed. Y. Arbeitman, Louvain-la-Neuve, 475-88.

Brugmann, Karl, 1904, *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Strassburg.

Carruba, Onofrio, 1981, "Pleneschreibung und Betonung im Hethitischen." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 95, 232-48.

Erhart, Adolf, 1970, *Studien zur indoeuropäischen Morphologie.* Brno.

Forschheimer, Paul, 1953, *The Category of Person in Language.* Berlin.

Friedrich, Johannes, 1974, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch I.* 2nd ed. Heidelberg.

Hrozny, Fr. 1917, *Die Sprache der Hethiter.* Leipzig.

Kronasser, Heinz, 1956, *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen.* Heidelberg.

Lehmann, Winfred, 1974, *Proto-Indo-European Syntax.* Austin.

Luraghi, Silvia, 1998, "The Anatolian Languages." In *The Indo-European Languages*, eds. A. Giacalone Ramat & P. Ramat, London, 169-96.

Markey, T. L., 1980, "Deixis and Diathesis: The Case of the Greek k–Perfect." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 85, 279-97.

Melchert, H. Craig, 1983, "The Second Singular Personal Pronoun in Anatolian." *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 41, 151-65.

–, 1993, "Historical Phonology of Anatolian." *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 21, 237-58.

–, 1994, *Anatolian Historical Phonology.* Amsterdam.

Petersen, Walter, 1934, "The Dual Personal Pronouns in Germanic." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 33, 64-67.

Polomé, Edgar, 1982, "Germanic as an Archaic Indo-European Language." in *Festschrift für Karl Schneider*, eds. K. Jankowsky & E. Dick, Amsterdam, 51-59.

Schmidt, Gernot, 1978, *Stammbildung und Flexion der indogermanischen Personalpronomina*. Wiesbaden.

Shields, Kenneth, 1982, *Indo-European Noun Inflection: A Developmental History*. University Park.

–, 1986, "Some Remarks about the Personal Pronouns of Indo-European." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 99, 10-22.

–, 1987, "On the Origin of Hitt. 2nd Sg. Nom. *zig*." *Hethitica* 7, 161-71.

–, 1992, *A History of Indo-European Verb Morphology*. Amsterdam.

–, 1993a, "Hittite Nom. Sg. *uk*." *Historische Sprachforschung* 106, 20-25.

–, 1993b, "On the Origin of the Tocharian Personal Pronouns A *näs, ñuk,* B *ñäš*." *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 6. 189-96.

–, 1994a, "Gothic 1st Pl. Pret. *–um*." *Historische Sprachforschung* 107, 147-54.

–, 1994b, "The Role of Deictic Particles in the IE Personal Pronoun System." *Word* 45, 307-15.

–, 1998, "Comments on the Evolution of the Indo-European Personal Pronoun System." *Historische Sprachforschung* 111, 46-54.

Szemerényi, Oswald, 1956, "Hittite Pronominal Inflection and the Development of Syllabic Liquids and Nasals." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 73, 57-80.

–, 1980, *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt.

–, 1996, *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. 4th ed. Oxford.

Watkins, Calvert, 1962, *Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb*. Dublin.

–, 1969, *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Vol. 3.1. Heidelberg.