

京都大学大学院文学研究科 21 世紀 COE 研究拠点形成プログラム

「グローバル化時代の多元的人文学の拠点形成」31 研究会

## ユーラシア古語文献の文献学的研究

### NEWSLETTER

No. 15 2005/11/15

## 目次

活動報告	1
研究会報告の要旨	2
第 25 回研究会報告	2
次回研究会の開催予定	8
編集後記	8

## 活動報告

2005 年 10 月 1 日に第 26 回研究会が開催されました。

## 第 26 回研究会 (第 55 回羽田記念館定例講演会)

日時: 2005 年 11 月 12 日 (土) 14:00 ~

場所: 京都大学大学院文学研究科附属ユーラシア文化研究センター (羽田記念館)

『過ぎし年月の物語』 -テキストの構造と生成-

佐藤 昭裕 (京都大学大学院文学研究科教授)

司会: 岡本 崇男 (神戸市外国語大学教授)

「聖人伝に何を問うか - 『アルシディーン・ワリー伝』の世界 -」

濱田 正美 (京都大学大学院文学研究科教授)

司会: 井谷 鋼造 (追手門学院大学教授)

## 研究会報告の要旨

2005 年 10 月 1 日 (土) に京都大学大学院文学研究科ユーラシア文化研究センター (羽田記念館) で開催された第 25 回研究会の報告要旨を掲載します。

### 第 25 回研究会報告

#### PERFECT AND RELATED CATEGORIES IN PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN: SOME NEW THOUGHTS

**Norbert Oettinger**

(エアランゲン - ニュルンベルク大学教授)

1. As it is well known, the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) verb possessed, among others, a system of mood, consisting of active and middle, and a system of aspect, consisting of present, aorist and perfect, as the following table shows:

PIE \**kleu-* “to hear”

	present	aorist	perfect
active	* <i>kl-né-u-mi</i> “I hear” (Old Indic <i>śrnómi</i> )	* <i>(e-)kléu-m</i> “I heard”	* <i>ke-klóu-h<sub>2</sub>a</i> “I have heard”
middle	* <i>kl-n-u-h<sub>2</sub>á-r/i</i> “I hear for myself, I am heard”	* <i>(e-)klu-h<sub>2</sub>á</i> “I heard for myself, I was heard”	

The present as aspect indicates an action in progress, the aorist an action as a whole, and the perfect a stage one has arrived at. The middle (in opposition to the active) indicates that the subject is affected by the action, which means reflexivity, passive, etc.

The oldest ending of 3.person singular middle was *\*-o* <sup>\*1</sup>. In the present tense it was enlarged by *-r/i*. The ending of 1.sg. middle contains the same element *\*-h<sub>2</sub>a* as the ending of the perfect. Perfect and middle have similar endings. Within the traditional theory of the Indo-European verb scholars therefore assumed that the ending had always indicated the affection of the subject and so in a pre-stage the perfect had been a kind of middle.

And, indeed, there are many samples of perfect in Old Indic (OI) and Greek that are intransitive and functionally look more middle-like than active-like; so e.g. OI *bi-bhā-ya* “I have been frightened, I fear”, Greek *pé-poith-a* “I have put my trust, I trust”.

2. After the decipherment of Hittite a problem arose for the study of the I-E. verb. For Hittite has got the so-called *hi*-conjugation. Functionally it is a present and does not differ from the normal present of Hittite, the *mi*-conjugation.

<i>mi</i> -conjugation	<i>hi</i> -conjugation
<i>eš-mi</i> “I am”	<i>dā-ḥhi</i> “I take”

The *hi*-conjugation is functionally a present tense, but formally it is very similar to the Indo-European perfect. So the question is: does the Anatolian *hi*-conjugation derive from the Indo-European perfect, as one would expect given the formal similarity, or does it derive from some kind of present, as one would expect from the functional point of view, or what else does it come from?

3. Most scholars derive the *hi*-conjugation from the perfect. But the problem with this is that the *hi*-conjugation functions as a present. Most of *hi*-verbs are even transitive. So there is a functional difference from presents of other I-E. languages that without any doubt stem from perfect stems. Cf. the so-called Preterite-presents of Germanic, continued in English *I can, I must, I may*; e.g. *I can* from IE perfect *\*ǵe-ǵónh<sub>3</sub>-h<sub>2</sub>a* “(I have recognized and now) I know”.
4. For this reason, a few scholars have looked for different solutions. Among them is Jay Jasanoff 2003, who derives the Anatolian *hi*-conjugation from a category he calls “Proto-Indo-European *h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation”. According to him the Anatolian *hi*-verbs stem partially from PIE *h<sub>2</sub>e*-present stems, from *h<sub>2</sub>e*-aorist stems and from perfect stems. This last part consists of Hittite reduplicated stems like *wewakk-* that he translates with “to demand”.

---

<sup>\*1</sup> At the 6<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Hittitology, Roma, 5–9 September 2005, Kazuhiko Yoshida has presented interesting arguments to show that Proto-Indo-European originally had no middle ending 3.sg. *\*-to*, but only *\*-o*.

According to Jasanoff, the “*h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation” was simply a second present conjugation of Proto-Indo-European that existed beside the present proper, preserved as the *mi*-conjugation in Hittite. The special functions of the two categories with identical or similar endings, the middle and the perfect, came into being but later.

5. On the one hand the theory of Jasanoff has solved problems, whereas on the other hand it has created new ones. In consequence of his theory no less than four categories that all used “perfect ablaut” (singular: *o*-grade, plural: zero-grade) would have existed during one period of Proto-Indo-European. They are: 5.1) perfect, 5.2) “*h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation”, 5.3) “Intensive”, 5.4) PIE present-type \**d<sup>h</sup>é-d<sup>h</sup>oh<sub>1</sub>-ti* “determines, puts <sup>\*2</sup>”.

Some examples:

- 5.1. Perfect: reduplicated: \**k<sup>w</sup>e-k<sup>w</sup>ór-h<sub>2</sub>a* (older: \**k<sup>w</sup>é-k<sup>w</sup>or-h<sub>2</sub>a*, pl. \**k<sup>w</sup>é-k<sup>w</sup>r-me*) “I have cut”, \**me-món-h<sub>2</sub>a* “I have thought of, I remember”, without reduplication: \**woid-h<sub>2</sub>a* “I know”.
- 5.2. “*h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation”: According to Jasanoff this conjugation had originally *o*-grade of the root in the singular and *e*-grade in the plural. It is possible that a part of this conjugation had this ablaut, but it is not sure. But it is sure that most of the *hi*-verbs had “perfect ablaut” (singular: *o*-grade, plural: zero-grade), e.g. Hitt. *au-tti* “you see”: *u-meni* “we see”; *nai-tti* “you lead”: *ni-anzi* “they lead”. There are reduplicated verbs, too:  
Hitt. *me-mai* “speakes”: pl. *me-mi-anzi* < sg. \**mé-mh<sub>1</sub>oi-e* + *i*, pl. \**mé-mh<sub>1</sub>i-r(s)* “to measure, consider”; ablaut sg. *é-o-zero*, pl. *é-zero-zero*. (The fully reduplicated Hittite verb *lah-lahhi(ye)*- “to be restless” synchronically belongs to the *mi*-conjugation.)
- 5.3. PIE “intensive”: It shows full reduplication: 3.sg. \**h<sub>2</sub>wér-h<sub>2</sub>worg-ti*. 3.pl. \**h<sub>2</sub>wér-h<sub>2</sub>wrg-nti* “to turn to and fro”, ptc. OI *varīvrj-at-* (Schaefer 1994: 68, 191 f.), cf. Hitt. *wa-wark-i-ma* “door-hinge” with simple reduplication. Greek *dei-dékh-atai* “they greet” from \**déi-dik̂-ntoi* “they show again and again”; OI ptc.pl.fem. *dé-dis-at-īh* “praising” < \**déi-dik̂-nt-*. The function of the PIE “intensive” is iterative.
- 5.4. PIE present type \**d<sup>h</sup>é-d<sup>h</sup>oh<sub>1</sub>-mi* > OI *dá-dhā-mi* “I determine, put”, *dé-doh<sub>3</sub>-mi* “I give, take” > OI *dá-dā-mi*. Reduplicated present stems with *Cé-* are older than with *Cí-*, cf. Greek *bí-bē-si*, ai. *jí-gā-ti* from (apparent) PIE \**g<sup>w</sup>í-g<sup>w</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-ti* “goes”, but cf. OI *já-g-at* n. “world” < PIE \**g<sup>w</sup>é-g<sup>w</sup>h<sub>2</sub>-nt* “the going one” with *Cé-*. Cf. also Greek *dí-dōsi*, but OI *dá-dā-ti* “gives” < \**dé-doh<sub>3</sub>-ti*.
6. Jasanoff has made a good point deriving a big part of *hi*-conjugation from a former present, because this proposal pays regard to the function of the verbs of the *hi*-conjugation. On the other hand, his theory as a whole supposes that at one and the same time four different verbal types with identical ablaut existed. This is not likely.

---

<sup>\*2</sup> Jasanoff himself (2003: 66 ff.) disputes the existence of this present-type, but see Nr. 5.4.

Therefore let us look for a different and more economical solution. The only reason for Jasanoff to reconstruct a category perfect for the prehistory of Anatolian is the Hittite verb *wewakk-*. He does it because of its reduplication. But does this verb really stem from a PIE perfect stem and does it really mean “to demand”?

The text KUB 14.4 III 19 ff. has:

*nu DAM-YA DINGIR.<sup>MES</sup>-aš piran ḫurzakizzi nan=kan....ḫinkan uwakkizzi*  
 “she keeps cursing my wife before the gods and wishing her a bad death”.

Here *uwakkizzi* is parallel to the *ške*-iterative *ḫurzaki-* (*\*ḫurt-ške-*) “to keep cursing”, which shows that the meaning of *wewakk-* is iterative, too. In the text “Annals of Mursili II.” *we-wakk-* and the *ške*-iterative *wek-i-ške-*, both derived from the basic verb *wek-* “to wish”, alternate even in the duplicates. In KUB 15.34 III 40 (Haas and Wilhelm, *Hurr. und luw. Riten*) *wewakk-* appears in a construction parallel to *peškatten* (18’), a further *ške*-iterative. In the ritual text of Tunnawi (Hutter, *Behexung* p. 33) *wewak(k)anzi* is clearly distributive, subjects being the 12 parts of the body. So *wewakk-* means not “demands”, but “keeps wishing”.

7. Hitt. *wek-zi* (*mi*-conjugation) “wishes”: *we-wakk-i* (*ḫi*-conjug.) “keeps wishing” is a pair like Luvian *ilha-ti* (*mi*-conjug.) “washes”: *il-ilhai* (*ḫi*-conjug.) “keeps washing”, but there are also pairs where both verbs belong to the *ḫi*-conjugation, e.g. Hitt. *parai* /*prai*/ (*ḫi*-conjug.) “blows”: *pari-pparai* /*pri-prai*/ “keeps blowing”, Luvian *lai* “takes”: *la-lai* “keeps taking”.

Our result is: Hitt. *wewakk-* belongs to a well established Anatolian morphological pattern to form stems of iterative function. It is iterative and therefore cannot stem from a perfect.

8. So we have to look for a different solution. As we have just seen, the Hittite type *wewakk-* is iterative, and the PIE “intensive” of the type *\*h<sub>2</sub>wér-h<sub>2</sub>worĝ-* “to turn to and fro” (see 5.3 above) is iterative, too. The related Hittite noun *wa-wark-i-ma* “door-hinge” shows the possibility that the full reduplication of the PIE intensive had not been obligatory in former times. Therefore my proposal is to derive the Hittite type *wewakk-* and the PIE “intensive” from one and the same category.
9. It is likely that the monosyllabic verbs of the *ḫi*-conjugation without reduplication once also had been reduplicated, because many of their meanings look like former iteratives. Cf. Hitt. *eku-zi* (*mi*-conjug.): *sarāpi* /*srāb-i*/ “sips” (*ḫi*-conjug.). In extra-Anatolian Proto-Indo-European we find *\*srob<sup>h</sup>-éye-ti* “sips” containing the iterative formans -*éye-* (Greek *rhophéō*, Latin *sorbeō*), whereas in Pre-Proto-Anatolian we find the reduplicated iterative *\*sé-srob<sup>h</sup>-e + i* “sips” > /*srāb-i*/. For loss of reduplication cf. Gothic *faran* “to wander, travel, go by sea” from (3.sg.) *\*pé-por-ti* (former *\*pé-por-e + i*); cf. OI *pí-par-ti* <sup>\*3</sup>.

---

<sup>\*3</sup> See also Kim 2005: 194 for loss of reduplication in Tocharian.

10. According to traditional theory all Indo-European languages left the PIE mother-language about the same time, whereas according to the Indo-Hittite hypothesis the Anatolian branch left earlier. If the latter hypothesis is correct, two different stages of the IE mother-language become obvious for us: one stage at the time when Anatolian wandered away, called Pre-Proto-Indo-European, and a second stage just when the rest of the IE languages departed, called Proto-Indo-European. Using the Indo-Hittite hypothesis to solve our problem, we now assume that Jasanoff's " $h_2e$ -conjugation" existed not in Proto-Indo-European, but in Pre-Proto-Indo-European, which was spoken possibly between 500 and thousand years earlier than PIE. Let us call this Pre-PIE category (excluding the middle) "proto-intensive". There were three subsequent categories of it in Proto-Indo-European:

a. The perfect. Here stem and ending have been preserved whereas function has changed, e.g.:

The Pre-PIE proto-intensive  $*b^h\acute{e}-b^hoih_2-e$  "is trembling" with Pl.  $*b^h\acute{e}-b^hih_2-r(s)$  has  $h_2e$ -ending; the root is  $*b^heih_2-$  "to tremble". From this stems on the one hand (with replacement of  $\acute{e}$  by  $i$ ) Proto-Germanic  $*bibai-/bib\bar{i}- > *bibai-/bibja-$ , belonging to the 3. weak class. Cf. OHG *bibēn* <sup>\*4</sup> "to tremble". On the other hand it is continued by the PIE perfect <sup>\*5</sup>  $*b^h\acute{e}-b^hoih_2-e$  (later:  $*b^he-b^hoih_2-e$ ) "fears" > ai. *bibhāya* "fears". Another possible example is the Pre-PIE proto-intensive  $*sh_2\acute{e}-sh_2oi-e$  "keeps binding, binds tightly". It develops, on the one hand, to the Anatolian  $\check{h}i$ -verb  $*sh_2\acute{e}-sh_2oi-e + i$  (same meaning), continued in Luv. 3.pl. *ḫi-šḫi-anti* and (without redupl.) in Hitt. sg. *išḫai*, pl. *išḫi-anzi*, and on the other hand to the PIE perfect  $*sh_2\acute{e}-sh_2oi-e$  (later:  $*sh_2e-sh_2oi-e$ ) "has bound, holds bound" > Avestan *hišāyā* "holds bound".

b. PIE present-type  $*d^h\acute{e}-d^hoh_1-ti$  "determines, puts" stems from former proto-intensive  $*d^h\acute{e}-d^hoh_1-e$  "keeps putting, keeps taking", and  $*dé-doh_3-ti$  "gives, takes" from former  $*dé-doh_3-e$  "keeps giving, taking". Here ending and function have changed; these verbs are remains in PIE, where they constitute an unproductive mi-present-class. From the same  $*dé-doh_3-e + i$  "keeps giving, taking" stems Hitt. *dāi* "takes" with loss of reduplication, but cf. Luvian *lālai* "keeps taking".

c. The PIE "intensive", e.g. 3.sg. aho  $*h_2wér-h_2wor\hat{g}-ti$ , 3.pl.  $*h_2wér-h_2wr\hat{g}-nti$  "to turn to and fro" from older 3.sg.  $*h_2wér-h_2wor\hat{g}-e$ . Here ending has changed and full reduplication has got obligatory, whereas the function has been preserved. So all types with "perfect-ablaut" can be derived from one. There has never been a perfect in the prehistory of Anatolian from the beginning.

11. Epilogue: Why did most of the Hittite  $\check{h}i$ -verbs lose reduplication, but some did not?

<sup>\*4</sup> Formally similar is LIV<sup>2</sup> 62 f. (with lit.)

<sup>\*5</sup> cf. Knobl 2004: 279.

In a first step beside the reduplicated “proto-intensives” variants without reduplication arose. This can always happen because reduplication can always be felt as motivated. We find e.g. in Faliscan (Italic) *pa-fo* “I shall drink” beside correct *pi-pa-fo* of the same meaning and in Latin *do* “I give” beside correct *di-do* in other Italic languages. In a next step the older, reduplicated variant was abandoned. This was possible, because the iterativity of the meaning had been weakened or lexicalized, like in Hitt. *š(a)rāpi* “sips”. If in cases like that need for a new iterative arose, it was created by means of an iterative suffix like Hitt. *-ške-*, *-anna/i-* or *-šš(a)-*.

12. Only in cases where out of semantic reasons there was a permanent need for iterative counterparts, the old reduplicated variant survived beside the old unreduplicated “basic verb”, like in Hitt. *wek-zi* (*mi*-conjugation) “wishes”: *we-wakk-i* (*hi*-conjug.) “keeps wishing”, Luvian *ilha-ti* (*mi*-conjug.) “washes”: *il-ilhai* (*hi*-conjug.) “keeps washing”. In similar cases the non-iterative meaning was taken over by secondary unreduplicated variants (*hi*-conjug.). So we find pairs like Hitt. *parai* /*prai*/ (*hi*-conjug.) “blows”: *pari-pparai* /*pri-prai*/ “keeps blowing”, Luvian *lai* “takes”: *la-lai* “keeps taking”. In Luvian there are several pairs like that.

To sum up: The Hittite verbal type *we-wakk-i* “keeps wishing” (*hi*-conjugation) continues an older stage of development than the Proto Indo-European perfect.

## Bibliography

Jasanoff, J. H. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford.

Kim, R. I. 2005. Review of J. Jasanoff, *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. In: *Diachronica* 22, 191–200.

Knobl, W. 2004. The Nonce Formation. A more-than-momentary look at the *Augenblicksbildung*. In: *The Vedas. Text, Language & Ritual*, ed. by A. Griffiths e.a., Groningen, p. 279.

Rix, H., ed. 2001. *Lexikon indogermanischer Verben*. 2. Auflage (LIV<sup>2</sup>).

Schaefer, Ch. 1994. *Das Intensivum im Vedischen*. Göttingen.

## 次回研究会の開催予定

第 27 回研究会 (京都大学言語学懇話会第 69 回例会)

日時: 2005 年 12 月 10 日 (土) 13:30 ~

場所: 京大会館 211 号室

「印欧語史的形態論研究 — 中・受動態動詞の先史 —」

吉田 和彦 (京都大学大学院文学研究科教授)

「現代日本語における 2 種のモーダル助動詞類について

— 推論の方向性とメノマエ性の観点から —」

田窪 行則 (京都大学大学院文学研究科教授)

---

## 編集後記

COE 31 研究会ニューズレター第 15 号をお届けいたします。研究会等、今後も活発に活動して参ります。皆様のあたたかいご支援、ご協力をお願い申し上げます。

## 連絡先

「ユーラシア古語文献の文献学的研究」(事務補佐員: 稲垣 和也)

〒606-8501 京都市左京区吉田本町 京都大学大学院文学研究科言語学研究室

Tel & Fax: 075-753-2862 E-mail: [eurasia-hmn@bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp](mailto:eurasia-hmn@bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp)

Web page: <http://www.hmn.bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp/eurasia>