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Introduction. It is a great honor to dedicate this article to Craig Melchert, whose achievements have shaped almost every aspect of comparative and reconstructive Anatolian studies. As a result, the honorand’s many insights are a happy playground for further thought, and form the backbone of the present study.

In several of the Indo-European languages we find a deictic-emphatic particle -i that regularly occurs with pronouns. This particle is still productive in Attic Greek as in for example ὁδ-ί, οὑτοσ-ί, ἐκεινοσ-ί and νυν-ί, but also in Old Latin in quo-i / gtr qu¯ı, etc. The -i of the Hittite demonstrative aši + (and its cognates Luv. *ašši + and Lyd. eš-) has long been equated with this particle (Pedersen 1938: 60). But, as I will show in §4, deictic-emphatic -i is also used with at least two other Anatolian demonstratives, *˘kó/í/é- and *obhó/é-. The starting point for the discussion of -i is the reconstruction of the Proto-Anatolian pronominal genitive, hitherto *-osyo. On the basis of the Hittite genitives aši, apaši (la), and the Luvian genitives zašši and apašši I will argue for PAnat. *,-(é)s with deictic -i (§§2 and 3).

The Hittite genitives aši, el̓ and uniyâš. As is well known and widely discussed, the Hittite pronominal genitive singular ending is -¯el. Among others, this ending is attested for the demonstratives kàr̥- ‘this’ (kèl) and apà- ‘that (near addressee); s/he, it’ (apèl). It is therefore not unreasonable to expect a genitive in -aš for the distal demonstrative aši + ‘yon’ as well. Instead, we have one secure and one restored attestation of a nominal genitive in -aš. This genitive, uniyâš, belongs to unî, a new distal demonstrative based on unî, acc.sg.comm. of aši +.

1. The discovery of the genitive el̓ is the serendipitous result of my research on aši + during a study visit to the Oriental Institute in October 2002. I am most grateful to the editors of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary for allowing me access to the files.

2. For a description of the function of aši + and its diachronic morphological development see Goedegebuure 2002. The radically different view expressed by Patri (2008) that aši + is a definite marker and not a pronoun is based on an unfortunate omission of data, namely the 40 or so independent occurrences of aši + that—using Patri’s own criteria (2008:152)—directly contradict his claims.

3. Peccioli Daddi (2004:460, 464 with nn. 62 and 63) reads another instance of the genitive uniyâš in KUB 13.3 ii 10’: u-ni-ali-ma-imá DINGIR.MEŠ-[u] kašu uhanzi ‘but the gods of that one have already seen you (pl.).’ The genitive uniyâš refers to the king, mentioned in the preceding narrative part (ii 7). Although the transliteration suggests differently, the first two signs are not fully visible. The difficulty with the restoration [u-] ni̒-ali is that the deprecative connotations of aši +, prevalent for anaphoric use, are not suitable for reference to the king. I therefore follow Friedrich (1928:46) in restoring [LUG]’AL-‘ali-ma-imá DINGIR.MEŠ/ŠU’ (Friedrich reads -[u]) ‘the gods of the king’.

*See Hoffner and Melchert 2008:146.
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These two genitives occur in the song of Ullikummi, a myth of Hurrian background that narrates the battle between different generations of gods. The Storm-god Teššub has just laid eyes on the frightful Basalt Stone, his opponent:

(1) KUB 33.113 + KUB 36.12 i 30’–34’ (NH/NS myth, Muršili II, CTH 345), ed. Güterbock 1952:12, tr. Hoffner 1998:60

(To ššub sat down on the ground, and his tears flowed like streams.)


The Storm-god, teary of eye, speaks: ‘Who can behold it again, that one’s violence? Who can fight again, who can behold them again, that one’s fearsome qualities?’

Since uniyaš is a new formation, there originally must have been another genitive. By analogy we would expect *eli, with deictic -i. This reconstruction is based on a comparison of several forms of the paradigm of aši+ and their respective counterparts in the paradigms of kă- ‘this’ and apă- ‘that’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>kă-</th>
<th>apă-</th>
<th>aši+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.sg.comm.</td>
<td>kăš</td>
<td>apăš</td>
<td>aši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.sg.comm.</td>
<td>kūm</td>
<td>apūn</td>
<td>uni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.-acc.sg.neut.</td>
<td>kû, kini, kēnî</td>
<td>apār, apēni?</td>
<td>inî, enî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.sg.</td>
<td>kēl</td>
<td>apē</td>
<td>*ēli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.-loc.sg.</td>
<td>kēti, kēdani</td>
<td>apēniš</td>
<td>apēdani edî, edani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.¹⁰</td>
<td>kēd</td>
<td>apid(-)</td>
<td>edî</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: comparison of kă-, apă- and aši+

¹According to Haas (2006:130) the Kumarbi cycle, to which the Song of Ullikummi belongs, is an original Hittite composition from the reign of Muršili II, and not a translation from Hurrian. The Hurrian background of the cycle remains of course undisputed.

²For the latest update on the paradigms of kă- and apă- see Hoffner and Melchert 2008:143 and n. 8 below. For aši+, see Hoffner and Melchert 2008:145.

³For kini/kēnî as alternative neuter sg. of kă- see most recently Goedegebure 2007:30ff. and KBo 50:viii (ad no. 101).

⁴As I mention elsewhere (2007:310 n. 19), most or all tokens of apēni represent apē(da)ni. Still, the structure of the adverb apēniššan (compare in-išlan and kini-išlan besides kiššan) could point at a neuter *apēni. KBo 60:iv (ad no. 4) offers a possible attestation of apēni in KūSa 1/1 30 rev. 2’ (’a’-pē-e-ni-mu), which either reads ‘… that (acc.sg.) to me (dat.sg.) …’, or ‘… me (acc.sg.) to him (dat.sg.)’ if apēni is again a mistake for apēdani. KBo 66:4 rev. 1’ does not contain apēni but a-pē-e-ni-hu-wa-an, nom.-acc.sg.neuter of the adjective apēniššuwant- ‘that kind of…’.

⁵Attested in KUB 9.19:7’ (MS?). For the reconstruction of a PAnat. pronominal ablative in *-a, see Melchert and Oettinger 2009:34, 59ff., 70.
And indeed, there is one instance of an almost identical e-el.\(^{11}\)

(2) KUB 49.70 rev. 20'-zi (NH/lateNS oracle, CTH 572)

\[20'] \text{[BE-an-kân] 'ke-e-da-ni' } \text{MU.}^{1} [r] \text{e-} \text{el} \text{ üç} \text{UL} \text{UrU} \text{Az-} \text{i}\text{GIDRU-TI} \text{UL} \text{Aš-zi} \text{UL} \text{UrU} \text{Az-} \text{i}\text{[zi] } \text{[21'] } \ldots \]

‘[When] in this year [the weapon] of that (él) man of Azzi [one] does [not come to the lands of Hatti,] (and) the gods [verb] that (ašš) man of Azzi, (…).’

Assuming that *ašš-, presumably found in ānki ‘once’,\(^{14}\) could be reconstructed for Hitt. ‘one’, Eichner (1992:38) suggests that *e-el could be the reading of the genitive sg. -el, based on the equation nom.sg. apēl ‘that one’: gen.sg. apēl = nom.sg. ḫaš ‘one’: gen.sg. *el. In the present context, however, the translation ‘of (the) one man of Azzi’ can be excluded. More importantly, I recently re-analyzed the pronoun ši-\(^{35}\) as the Hittite numeral 1, equating -el with ši-(i)-e-el. One should therefore discard Eichner’s otherwise plausible proposals.

Recently Rieken (2008) has convincingly shown that the pronominal genitive ending -el is derived from a denominative adjective -la- < PIE *lo-,\(^{16}\) attached to the oblique pronominal stem in -e-. In pre-Hittite, she argues, pronominal possession could be marked by means of this morpheme, in the same way as Luvian (pro)nominal possession is expressed by means of the genitival adjective -aši/-, and possession in Lycian by means of -ahe/i-,-ehe/i-. In Hittite, however, the pronominal adjective lost its theme vowel -a- and then its inflection when followed by -s or -n (*abê-la-s, *abê-la-n > *abêš, *abêšu > abêš (a-pé-e-el), Rieken 2008).

In view of Rieken’s proposal we should now consider the possibility that the paradigm of ašš + originally contained yet another genitive. What argues for analogical formation of el after kel and apēl is its form. Had el been part of the Proto-Anatolian paradigm of the pronoun *u/-e/ before the addition of deictic -i to the case endings, we would have encountered *ššelī.

Recently Hoffner and Melchert (2008:145 n. 5) have detected this older genitive in ašši, attested only in the OS ritual KBo 17.17 (+) KBo 30.30 obv. 6'. I here present

\(^{11}\)As collected by the Chicago Hittite Dictionary Project through November 2009.

\(^{12}\)In the files of the CHD Project this sequence of signs was read as either “E.EL or E.SIR”. Only the latter reading is an attempt to make sense of the sequence. Allowing for two scribal mistakes, (1) an aberrant form of the sign SIR and (2) the absence of the determinative for leather objects, KUS, this interpretation would imply that ‘this year’ the oracle inquirer is concerned with the ‘shoe of the man of Azzi’. That this is lost its theme vowel -a-.

\(^{13}\)The restoration is based on KUB 49.70:10'-zi': BE-an-kân[ break with room for ca.10 signs -zi] GIDRU-TI UL Aš-zi-an-zi.

\(^{14}\)The multiplicative adverb a-an-ki ‘once, one time’ in KUB 4.1 iv 36, 38 does not exist. Although the hand copy has a-an-ki, the photo in the Konkordanz (version 1.6) clearly shows 2-an-ki, proving Hoffner and Melchert 2008:168 n. 49 right in their rejection of a-an-ki.

\(^{15}\)See Goedegebuure 2006, followed by Hoffner and Melchert 2008:154 (with some modifications in the paradigm) and Kloekhorst 2008:750 (with modification of the stem šiš- to šiš-).

\(^{16}\)The same morpheme is also present in the Lycian demonstrative adverb abēši ‘here’, locative of *abēš-la-, and as an independent innovation in the Lydian possessive adjective bili- ‘his, her’ (Rieken 2008).
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a new transliteration and translation of obv. 6’–7’ (w. dupl. KUB 43.53 i 16’–18’), replacing the one in Goedegebuure 2002:64, 70:

\[(3) \quad (6’) \quad [\{\text{DINGIR.MEŠ-}na-an \quad \text{dUTU-i}\}]’ ka’a-aša DINGIR.MEŠ-aš a-ši p[\{é-
č-ki-mi \quad \text{dUTU-}šum-ma-an la-ba-a\}]’ [na-an] (7’) \quad [\{\text{DINGIR.MEŠ-aš}’\}]’ (pi-
iš-ki-mi) t’a\[20\] a-an-da-aš-ša-an [p(i)-iš-ki-mi a-(a-za-aš-ši-iš’T)]’ an’-za-aš-
iš-iš’i (8’ ka-aša)]

‘O Sungod of the gods, I hereby give to the gods (that) of his (lit. of that one). Our Sun Labarna I give to the gods. I give his equivalent. Here is his equivalent, his living (substitute)!’

Originally I could not account for the existence of an Old Hittite acc.sg.comm. aši. Only in New Hittite documents do we encounter aši both as nom. and acc.sg.comm. (besides uni(n)). Finding aši instead of uni in such an old text was difficult to explain, but I could offer no solution. Now that the non-pronominal origin of -el suggests the existence of yet another genitive form, I find Hoffner’s and Melchert’s solution highly convincing.

It is also easy to see why the late-NH duplicate had aši not only in i 16’, DINGIR.MEŠ-aš a-ši pěč-ki-mi (dupl. of DINGIR.MEŠ-aš a-ši p[ě- … ]), but also in i 1’7’, DINGIR.MEŠ-aš a-ši p-iš-ki-mi.20 Assuming that line 16’ was favorable to dittography in line 17’, a repetition of aši as object would certainly have made sense to the late NH scribe in whose times aši only functioned as either a nom.sg.comm. or acc.sg.comm.21 while the genitive sg. was el or uniyaš.

3. The Luvian genitive -ašši < PA *-ēsi. Hoffner and Melchert (2008:145 n. 3) note that the Luvian possessive adjective in -ašša/i- is very similar to their newly found genitive aši. In Iron Age Luvian -ašša/i- and the -iya- adjective coexisted with the (pro)nominal genitives <'a/i-sa> and <'a/i-si>.22 The form in -i is usually read as /ašša/, a perfect match with Hittite aši, but there is solid evidence that the reading /ašša/ is not correct. Recently Yakubovich (2008:208ff.) has convincingly argued for a Luvian genitive -ašši /-ašsi/ and its connection with the possessive adjective /ašša/i-.23 Unfortunately this throws all reconstructions for -ašša/i- and previously read /ašša/ in disarray, and also severs the ties between the Hittite and Luvian forms.

The stem form of the genitival adjective is usually considered to be -ašši-, with the forms in -i the result of i-mutation. Taking the Lycian form -ašša/i- into account, Melchert (1994:77) reconstructs PA *-ēšša24. Now that Yakubovich has shown that

---

20KUB 43.54 i 17 adds a-ši.
21KUB 43.53 i 18’ a-a-an-da-aš-ša-an is preceded by nu.
22KUB 43.53 i 18’: Ti-wa-an-Za-aš-iš-i.
23KUB 43.54 i 16’–17’ therefore translates as: “O Sungod of the gods, I hereby give that one to the gods, that is, Our Sun Labarna. I give that one to the gods, I give his equivalent.”
26Georgiev (1967:164) already connected the Iron Age Luvian genitive /-ašsi/ (his -aš) with the possessive adjective /ašša/i/ (his -asw), and derived the former from PIE *-a-año (1967:161, 164).
27Also see Bader 1991:137 for Luvian -ašša/ from *-ašša2/3/.
the genitival adjective is based on the genitive -ašši we still might take *-eh₂si instead of *-eh₃so- as the preform of Luvian -ašši (and Lycian -abhi-), although this would never lead to Hittite ašši. The Hittite form should reflect *-ési, itself considered an irregular apocope of *-osyo. A genitive *-ési in turn does not lead, for example, to the Luvian demonstrative genitives /abassi/ and /tassisi/. Given that *-eh₂si cannot possibly be a Luvic innovation but has to be Proto-Anatolian, *-ési must be a pre-Hittite innovation. Still, PAnat. *-eh₂si remains problematic. Both Kloekhorst (2008:216) and Yakubovich (2008:194–5) adduce important evidence against the Proto-Anatolian assimilation rule *-hs-s > -ss-, and both favor derivation from the well-known Proto-Indo-European thematic genitive *-osyo. Kloekhorst (2008:216) derives Hittite -ašša- (and therefore, I suppose, also Luvian -ašša-) from *-osyo through a different assimilation rule *-sy > -ss-, but since we now need to explain Luvian -ašši instead of -ašša-, the disappearance of -y- is not very helpful. Yakubovich (2008:211) extends to Luvian the Hittite rule that PAnat. */s/ geminates as the first member of a heterosyllabic consonant cluster (Melchert 1994:150–2). Thus, PAnat. */-osyo/ became Luvian */-aśs.sya/, and after apocope */-aśsi/ (Yakubovich 2008:211). The same process must then also have been at work in pre-Hittite, resulting in **/aśsi/ (later replaced by /ašsi/).

My objection against this development is that we now not only need the gemination of PAnat. */s/ in both Hittite and Luvian, but also an otherwise unattested apocope in both languages. Given its non-trivial nature this apocope should not have occurred independently in each language, so the only explanation is change through prehistoric contact, with the direction of interference unknown. An alternative is to place the whole development of gemination and apocope in Proto-Anatolian. Given these new complications caused by the new Hittite genitive ašši, I now prefer another, much simpler reconstruction.

According to me /tassisi/ and /abassi/ are the regular reflexes of PAnat. *-ési and *obhési (by “ˇCop’s Law”). As is clear from Hittite -el < *-é-lo-, -edi < *-é-dhi and -ed < *-é-d, the oblique pronominal stem is -é- (short accented e), and this is what I expect for the oldest reconstructable pronominal genitive in Hittite as well: instead of *-ési I assume *-ési. Of course this does not explain the earliest attested Hittite demonstrative genitive ašši, but neither does any of the other reconstructions. This form must be a Proto-Hittite innovation, whether it replaces *-ašši < *-osyo (Yakubovich) / *eh₂si (Bader, Melchert), or *esíi < *-ési (Goedegebuure).

4. Proto-Anatolian demonstratives with deictic -i. PAnat. *-ési could be the reflex of PIE *é-syo, with *é- as the oblique stem vowel and *-syo as the pronominal genitive ending, but there is an alternative for the final -i. We do not need to arrive at our form through the apocope which, as everyone acknowledges, is otherwise not attested.

41PA *-eh₂si > Hitt. -ahli, or -ašsi if one follows Melchert 1994:77, but not -ali.
42Melchert forthcoming; Szemerenyi 1999:184.
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in Anatolian. It is equally possible to treat PIE *-yeh as an innovation in Proto-Indo-European Proper after the Anatolian group branched off, and reconstruct PAnat. *-s.

If we reconstruct a PAnat. pronominal genitive *-s, a different solution is readily available in the reconstruction of the PAnat. genitives *kés-i and *oβéš-i with the deictic -i that is also found in the paradigm of Hittite aši + (see figure 1) and Cuneiform Luvian ašši.²⁹ We only need to show that not only aši + /ašši + but also at least some of the other Proto-Anatolian demonstratives were once attested with deictic -i.

According to the dictionaries and grammars Hittite ka- and apa- are not attested with deictic -i, but in fact we do have one instance of a reinforced demonstrative:

(4) VBoT 58 obv. 34–5 (OH/NS myth, CTH 323)

(“[Go,] call Gulsu (and) Hannannah! If the other deities (lit. they) have died, [then these] too have certainly died! Did Frost even [come to] their gates?”

[hi]a-la-hi-ma-[š][a ’I]M-ni te-ez-zi ku-u-[i]³⁰-wa pé-ıš-ı-at-ı³¹ [ki-it (?)] nu-wa bu-u-ma-an-te-ı a-ki-ı-

[But Fr]ost says to the [S]torm-god: “[Why (?)] do you keep sending these (gods)? They all have died!”

Within this context it is worthwhile to reconsider the etymology of the adverbial intensifier apašila ‘himself, herself, on one’s own, personally’. Friedrich and Kammenhuber (1975:165, with references) and Hoffner and Melchert (2008:132, 143) analyze apašila as the nominative sg. apaš followed by the suffix -ila(a), only attested with the personal pronouns. But we might consider this form as a genitive apaš followed by -ila in adverbial use. This requires that apašila be a hypostasis of the adjective *apašila-, ²⁸

²⁸The PIE pronominal ending *yo is often assumed to be based on an earlier *s through addition of the relative pronoun *-s (see for example Szemerényi 1999:209), or *-i-e/o (Shields 1991:58, 2001:234).

²⁹Melchert (2009:112) has shown that Cuneiform Luvian had far-deictic *ašši, only attested in aššimuttar ‘poor’ and aššimuttattar ‘poverty’. Although Hitt. ašši points to pre-Hitt. *ašši, Luv. *ašši can only continue *ašši (“Cop’s Law”). The latter reconstruction is also necessary for the Lydian near-deictic demonstrative el ‘this’ < *ašši. According to Kloekhorst (2008:220–1), the o-vocalism of Hitt. ašši is a pre-Hittite innovation.

³⁰Pecchioli Daddi (1990:66), Hoffner (1998:28), and Mazoyer (2003:179) all take ku-u-ši as the 2nd pers.sg. prs. of kuen- ‘kill’. First, this requires the unwarranted emendation of ku-u-ši to ku-e-ši, and in addition, the order of events ‘you kill, you cast away’ is not supported by the context. All the Storm-god does is send out deities to find the vanished Sun-god, and as a result of their mission into the frozen lands they all are frozen themselves (caused by Frost). He never kills them personally.

³¹This verb form is usually taken as an (aberrant) 2nd pers.sg.prs. (<-mi) conjugation of the -mi verb peššiya- ‘reject, neglect, cast away’. But we can also analyze it as a combination of the preverb pe- ‘away, thither’ and išši, formally the 2nd pers.sg.prs. imperfect of yeš ‘do, make’. We see here proof of the etymological connection between yeš- ‘do, make’ and *pe- ‘send away’ and connected with Lat. iēt (Kloekhorst 2008:864). Kloekhorst’s main argument against connecting the two is that according to him the oldest forms for the first person singular of yeša- should have been yemi and *yennu (compare yeyemi and pyeyennu) instead of yami and yannu (2008:81–2), if the two were connected. But we do have OS yami (i-e-mi), and the earliest form for the past tense is MH/MS yannu, at a time therefore when the yeš- stem is firmly gaining ground on the ye-stem. It is very well possible then that MH/MS yannu replaces OH *yennu. To conclude, just as šila- and piša-/šila- coexist as imperfective forms of šiye-/-, I propose that also piša- and pēša-/piša-coexist as imperfective forms of peye-.
with grammaticalized ellipsis of its head noun. Following a suggestion of Kammenhuber (1965:206 n. 100) that apasi may be compared with Akk. ramānu = Hitt. tuekka- “body” (pl. ‘body parts, limbs’), one could imagine on original construction *apasi tuekka- (pl.) + poss.encl. ‘his/her body parts, limbs’. When the derivational morpheme -la- became productive as a possessive marker, *apasi tuekka- + poss.encl. became *apasiša-tuekka- + poss.encl. A sentence like “She raised them (using) her own limbs = personally” (in Dutch one can say eigenhandig ‘with one’s own hands’) would then have required the appositional phrase *apasiša tuekka-ššet in adverbial use. Because the phrase “using one’s own body parts, limbs” would have been a standard expression, it would have been prone to grammaticalized ellipsis of the head noun, exactly as happened with English “on one’s own” < Middle English on ouen bëd ( = head).

Even though apasiša was already fully grammaticalized in OH, there is one instance in Hittite of an almost identical construction intensifying the actions of the subject, with apel instead of *apasiša:

(5) KBo 32.14 ii 1–2 (MH/MS, CTH 789), ed. Neu 1996:73ff

a-li-ya-š[a-an]-za a-pē-el tu-e-ag-ga-aš[=]-ššet H˘UR.SAG-ai a-wa-an ar-ḫa šu-ú-e-š

A mountain personally pushed off a deer from himself (-za).

The use of the “original” construction preceding H˘UR.SAG-ai instead of apasiša following it is probably triggered by the original Hurrian phrase. Since adverbial constructions and adverbs like apasiša only modify the actions of the subject, another solution is needed to express ‘-self, -selves, in person’ in the remaining syntactic roles. Not surprisingly, we find the same construction that once gave rise to apasiša, the genitive personal pronoun followed by tuekka- and possessive

---

For a discussion of hypostasis as a case of synchronic head-noun ellipsis in possessive noun phrases with case attraction, see Yakubovich 2006.

For this equation see the lexical list KBo 1:31 rev. II, Akk. [RA-MA-][NU = Hitt. r[u]-e-ššat.

Collective/neuter nom.pl. For tuekka- vacillating between common and neuter gender see Kloekhorst 2008:88f.

For appositions with adverbial function see Hoffner and Melchert 2008:216f.

Translating different: “Einen Rehbock vertrieb ein Berg von seinem Körper.”

This sign is usually interpreted as -a[=] (Neu 1996:75) and tuqqa[a-zA] [z ...] (therefore as an ablative, mainly because the morpheme -ne- in the Hurrian original i-še[=] = i-[ne]-EL is understood as an ablative (Neu 1996:100). There are however four arguments against the ablative tuqqa[a-zA] [z ...]: 1) the hand copy only shows one horizontal instead of the two that are expected for AZ, leaving no other option but to read AŠ; 2) pushing an object off from an object or a location in the ablative requires either -kan or -nā, so the absence of a sentence particle makes the presence of an ablative highly unlikely; 3) the particle -za is sufficient to express removal from oneself; and 4) originally the full grade (tuekka-) was only found in the direct cases, whereas the zero-grade occurred especially in the genitive and ablative (Kloekhorst 2008:88f). The “loss” of the ablative of course has consequences not only for the Hittite translation, but also for our understanding of the matching Hurrian phrase i-še[=] [z ...] [ne]-EL ( = apel tuqqa[a-zA]). Limitations of space prevent me from elaborating my views, but I reject i-še[=] [z ...] [ne]-EL = idši-[ne]-EL (body-ENL-ABL-ERG) ‘from his body’ (Neu 1996:100) in favor of i-še[=] [z ...] [ne]-EL = idši-[n]-ni-[ne]-EL (body-adj.-nL-ABL-ERG) ‘bodily > personally’.
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critic in the appropriate case: [(šume)nuzan [tuēği-gaš-maš]]\(^9\) ‘to your (pl.) own bodies > to you yourselves’ (MH/MS, KBo 32.24 ii 8′–9′, w. dupl. KBo 32.27 r.col. 2′–3′, cf. KBo 32.29 r.col. 3′ and par. KBo 32.19 ii 22–23, iii 48′ šumāš tuēği-gaš-maš).

With the partitive apposition, the post-Old Hittite replacement of the Old Hittite split genitive construction,\(^4\) we find nu-wa-ka-n DINGIR\(^{90}\), as kuvapi haaš šik’izzi [nu-wa apiya’ DINGIR\(^{90}\), uš tuékkuš anda arnud[d]u ‘Where he will pass judgment on the gods, [there] he must bring together the gods themselves/in person’ (MS, KUB 36.55 ii 21′–22′\(^{41}\)) and [nu-wa’i’ Madduwaṭa tuékkuš anda mekki āṛnu’n ‘I have often met with Madduwaṭa himself/in person’ (MH/MS, KUB 14.1 obv. 82).

With its syntactically motivated restriction to intensifying the subject only, apašila was open to reinterpretation after knowledge of the original formation as adjectivized genitive was lost. Similar to the reinterpretation of the genitive aši in KUB 43.54 i 16′, 17′ (see above) as accusative in agreement with the productive pattern of its era, apašila could only be understood as a singular nominative apaš with a new derivational morpheme -ila. Thus we start finding ukila ‘I myself’, ziklila ‘you yourself’ and šumešila ‘you yourselves’, starting with Middle Hittite compositions.\(^4\)

Deictic -i is also still visible in the Palaic independent demonstratives, with the exception of kät,\(^4\) neuter nom.-acc.sg. of kät- in the phrase kät-kuwat kuw ‘What is this anyhow?’ (KUB 32.18 i 8′).\(^4\) Otherwise we find the accusatives gân-i ‘this’, apaši ‘that/him’ in KUB 35.165 rev. 9′ and obv. 25, respectively. Not surprisingly, enclitic -ka-/a-\(^{45}\) and apa\(^{46}\) are always attested without deictic -i.

Formally Pal. gânı can be compared with Luv. gâni ‘this’ (Melchert 1984:35, 1993:277), but not with Hitt. kâni ‘here’. Assuming that gâni indeed represents *gâni+i, Hitt. kâni has to be excluded because it is not an extended version of adverbial kân ‘thiš’ (pace Puhvel 1997:47, Kloekhorst 2008:435). The latter is only attested as a by-form of the accusative singular kân.\(^4\) The place adverb kâni rather continues the combination *kî-i+nî > *kî+yî > *kî + kâni,\(^4\) with *î+i > a̯i as the dative-locative

\(^9\) Of course tuēği- in the split genitive construction could still be taken literally, as in [k]aša-va annuł tuēği-gaš-miš aššu [M]e here, my limbs are hot’ (VBoT 38 obv. 24). For kāša as ‘me here’, see Rieken 2009.

\(^4\) Garrett 1998.

\(^4\) See also Archi 2002:4, 7–8.

\(^4\) u-ki-la in KBO 16.07 obv. 2 (MH/MS oracle), zî-ki-la in KUB 17.10 i 11 (OH? MH/MS myth), în-mē-si-la in HKM 4.3 lower edge ś’ (MH/MS letter).

\(^4\) The neuter kāt is analogical after *apāt (Melchert 1984:30 n. 10), which itself must be a Proto-Anatolian innovation *obidd (after *ki’d?) replacing original *obîni. The latter is only attested in Hitt. apēnî(?) (see Table 1) and apēnin-īšan), but reflexes of *obidd are found in Hitt. apat and Luv. apa.


\(^4\) See Melchert 2009:152.

\(^4\) The sequence ka-a-nət in KUB 41.23 ii 20′ has to be emended to ka-a UD’-at (Goedegebuure 2003:207f. n. 230).

\(^4\) In KUB 33.93 + 91 + 36.7b iv 18′ with duplicate KUB 33.92 iii ʃ′, and KUB 46.37 obv. 4′. Two attestations of ka-a-an without context are KBO 18.127 rev. ʃ′ and KUB 16.11:7.

\(^4\) As a proclitic *ʃ is probably treated in the same way as nu, where the -u- is maintained before consonants but elided before vowels (*nu-6š > *nuš > naš, Kloekhorst 2008:608).
singular of the obsolete near-deictic demonstrative ana- ‘this’. It is thus similar in formation to kinun ‘now’ < *ki-num.9 Luv. zâni is attested in KUB 35.107 iii 8’–9’ (MH/MS myth, CTH 764):

(6) (The gods vomited three times.)

§ (8’) dUTU-wa-az dKam-ru-še-pa-i da-u-e-ya-an ma-am-ma-[an-na-at-ta] (9’)
za-na-ni-wa ku-wa-ti dKam-ru-še-pa a-wa ku-wa-ti na-a-[wa . . . . . .] §

§ Tiwat looked towards Kamrusepa. “Why (is) this (zâni), Kamrusepa? Why don’t . . . ?”

Although zâni is clearly a neuter, referring to an event in the speech setting, the formation is unclear. Is it a neuter singular zâ ‘this’ that is extended with an unclear deictic -ni, or does it consist of an original neuter *zân with deictic -i (< kóm-i?) similar to the Hittite neuters ktn, ini < PAnat. *kim-i, *im-i? I consider both options problematic, but tend towards the latter.

To return to the point of departure for the discussion of demonstratives with deictic -i, the Proto-Anatolian pronominal gen.sg. *-ési, we may indeed analyze it as *-é-s-i, that is, the oblique stem -e-, followed by the genitive -s and the deictic particle -i.

5. Conclusion. Hitt. apâsi(-la) ‘himself’, kûši ‘these (acc.pl.)’, the Palaic singular accusatives gân-i ‘this’ and apami ‘that’, and possibly Luvian zâni ‘this’ prove that not only aši + but probably most or all Proto-Anatolian demonstratives could take deictic -i. As in Greek, the core function of deictic -i in Proto-Anatolian is emphasis: the little evidence we have is enough to show a distribution between unemphatic demonstratives without -i and emphatic ones with -i.

Pal. gân-i and apan-i are not only independent pronouns but also occur in clause-initial position, whereas the forms without -i are cliticized to their head nouns or to the clause-initial clitic chain, i.e. they are phonologically dependent.

The PAnat. distribution of emphatic versus non-emphatic forms led to a different outcome in Hittite and Luvian. The one example of kûši in Hittite is indeed found in clause-initial position, but this is not the case for neuter ktni. Also, the demonstratives without -i never developed into clitics. Since fronting will typically do to mark a constituent as emphatic, the emphatic deixis of -i became redundant and disappeared almost completely in Old Hittite, with the exception of ktni, which is attested until Middle Hittite (Goedegebuure 2007:312). More evidence for the emphatic nature of -i is its survival in the highly emphatic adverb apâš-i-la, based on the genitive *apâš. In less emphatic contexts the genitive *apâš was replaced already in pre-Hittite by newly created apel.

For Luvian we possibly have zân-i in clause-initial position as an emphatic form, but the genitives zašši < *kés-i and apâšši < *obkes-i do not occur in particularly emphatic contexts. The survival of only these forms at the expense of *zaš and *apâš may have

9 For ana- see most recently Melchert 2009:151.

Hittite proclitic kr- continues the reinforcing PIE particle *kr that is also attested in Lat. nun-‘now’ (Kloekhorst 2008:491), br-‘this’ and Gk. swdo that < *kr-emos (Melchert 2009:151 n. 7).
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been prompted by the part they played in the formation of the possessive adjective (Yakubovich 2008:211).

I suggest that the development of the Proto-Anatolian neutral demonstrative *é- with and without -i is somewhat similar to what happened to Pal. ka- and apá-. Initially unemphatic deictic *é- could freely be turned into emphatic deictic *é- + -i, but then unemphatic deictic *é- lost its deictic feature. It developed into the independent third person pronoun *é-, with further grammaticalization into enclitic *é-a-, leaving the emphatic demonstrative *é- + -i as the only neutral deictic. This must have led to the loss of the emphatic feature of *é- + -i, at which point the -i, robbed of its function, merged with the endings to form PAnat. *éši+, witness Hitt. aši+, Luv. *āši+ and secondarily inflected Lyd. éš-.

Since PAnat. *éši+ now only contrasted with the demonstratives *ko/ji/é- and *obho/é-, and no longer with a non-deictic pronoun, it acquired its non-neutral semantics. It became distal in Hittite and Luvian where we find the reflexes of *ko/ji/é- and *obho/é-, but proximal in Lydian and Palaic. After the loss of *ko/ji/é- in Proto-Lydian but with retention of secondarily inflected non-proximal ob-, reflex of PLyd. *ówši- < PAnat. *ówš-i, *ėši+ entered the empty proximal slot. In Palaic, a- without -i is only attested as the post-consonantal part of the enclitic proximal demonstrative -a/-ka-. No such distribution would be possible between independent proximal aši+ and kaši+, and I therefore assume the loss of Pal. aši+.

I conclude with an updated paradigm of the only demonstrative that fully preserved deictic-emphatic -i:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hittite</th>
<th>Proto-Hittite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.sg.comm.</td>
<td>aši</td>
<td>*ôšš-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.sg.comm.</td>
<td>uni</td>
<td>*ôm-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.-acc.sg.neut.</td>
<td>ini</td>
<td>*im-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.sg.</td>
<td>aši</td>
<td>*ôšš-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.-loc.sg.</td>
<td>edí</td>
<td>*êšš-i-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>edí</td>
<td>*êšš-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: paradigm of singular forms of aši+

References


Unlike near-deictic PIE *kό/ó-, Proto-Anatolian *é- started out either as a third person anaphoric pronoun or as a non-contrastive or distance-neutral demonstrative (Melchert 2009:185, 156 n. 9).
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