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Suffixaufnahme and Genitival Adjectives as an Anatolian Areal Feature in Hurrian, Tyrrhenian, and Anatolian Languages

Mary R. Bachvarova
Willamette University

I argue that the Anatolian genitival adjectives, a response to the IE under-characterized thematic genitive singular in *-os, developed as the result of convergence with a Target Language closely resembling proto-Tyrrhenian, rather than Hurrian, with Suffixaufnahme and genitives in -s and -l.

The case for an Anatolian linguistic area has been most recently argued by Watkins (2001:52), who states that it “is clear, and striking,” and Ivanov (2001), who even suggests that the similarities between Luvian (his Southern Anatolian) and Hittite (his Northern Anatolian) are primarily the result of convergence and do not indicate that they belonged to a single sub-branch of PIE. The detailed studies that have been done on linguistic convergence in Anatolia have focused particularly on Hittite and possible influence from Hattic or from Hurrian (see Justus 1992; Ivanov 2001; Luraghi forthcoming). However, the Tyrrhenian languages share some obvious areal features with the Anatolian languages, including the following:

---

1 I thank Dr. Gregory D.S. Anderson for discussing with me the data presented in this article. Due to space constraints I keep bibliographic references to a minimum, focusing only on the most recent discussions, which will provide the interested reader with further references.

2 Most of these examples of areal features are drawn from Watkins (2001:52-54), who, like Beekes (1993:59), briefly suggests that Etruscan exhibits Anatolian features (Watkins 2001:50-51, 56).
phonology: stress accent, tense/lax opposition word-internal, and vowel inventory

morphology: limited tense inventory, agglutinative, suffixing, and genitalic adjectives/Suffixaufnahme

syntax: SOV

Needless to say, the linguistic data have some relevance to the issue of Etruscan origins, a matter of dispute since ancient times (Herodotus 1.57; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.25-30), and support Herodotus’ story of a migration from Anatolia (Beekes 1993:59-60). I take the matter as settled here, and I move on to an examination of the implications of participation in the Anatolian linguistic area by Tyrrhenian languages, focusing on one particularly interesting feature that extends from the Caucasus into Anatolia (Plank 1995a:13-23, 94, map on 96), Suffixaufnahme or double case-marking (e.g., “to the brother of John” = “brother”-dat. “John”-gen.-dat.), that can be found in the common era in such unrelated languages as classical Armenian, Old Georgian, and Tsez, and before the common era in Hurrian, its only attested relative Urartian, and the Tyrrhenian languages of Etruscan, Lemnian, and Raetic. Suffixaufnahme is also comparable to the genitalic adjective found especially in Southern and Western Anatolian languages. The coincidences in the forms of the morphemes used in Etruscan and the Anatolian languages have in fact been one of the reasons it has been argued that Etruscan is related to the Anatolian languages. While it has been proposed that influence from Hurrian encouraged the development of the Anatolian genitalic adjective (most recently Luraghi forthcoming), I argue here that the formal and functional similarities of Tyrrhenian

Suffixaufnahme and Anatolian genitalic adjectives are the result of areal convergence in a situation of long-term bilingualism at the early common Anatolian level with a Tyrrhenian language or languages, or with language(s) belonging to yet a third family, now completely lost, which influenced both. The convergence was facilitated in the Anatolian genitives in -s or -l and genitives in -s and -l of the Target Language, on which Suffixaufnahme occurred.

I will first briefly demonstrate Suffixaufnahme in Hurrian and discuss it in a little more detail in Tyrrhenian languages, then delve into the process of convergence with respect to the areal feature in Anatolian languages, finishing with an example of a stylistic figure pairing the genitalic adjective with a genitive that was shared by Etruscan and Hieroglyphic Luvian.

Hurrian is the paradigm example of Suffixaufnahme in the 2nd millennium. Carried out on genitive nouns by means of the “relator” or “article” -ne, pl. -na, it also occurred on certain types of derivational adjectives and could be used to create subordinate clauses out of conjugated verbs (see in detail Wegner 1995; Wilhelm 1995, who discusses Suffixaufnahme with and without the relator, and in Urartian, which I ignore here). I give examples below only of Suffixaufnahme built off the genitive. Example (3) shows headless Suffixaufnahme, a construction which also appears in Etruscan and is comparable to hypostasis in Hittite.

(1) Hurrian absolutive case (i.e., unmarked stem):

[a-u]⁴⁵ prést-i ṭa-tu ṭi-ti e-ra-e-er-ne⁴⁵ TURU /listsul-tul-e-ne-er-

KUB 27.38 iv 13-14)

[au ḫimmu−n(e) ṭi-e-ti e-er-ne enumsul-er-ne-er-

’see’ ḫimmu = rel.sg. ‘lord’ king = rel.sg. Lullu = rel.sg. = gen.

See ḫimmu, lord, king of Lullu.

(2) Hurrian ergative with genitive:

... ḫa-ta-ta-er-tu-re-er-ši ṭA-er-ne-er-ši ... (KUB 27.38 i 16)

lallar-ne-ši ṭA-er-ne-er-ši

lamentation priest’ = rel.sg. = erg. ‘Ea’ = gen. = rel.sg. = erg.

‘The lamentation priest of Ea (does something to a direct object.)’

Examples (1) and (2) come from a Boğazköy Hurrian text edited by Haas and Wegner (1988:384-90) and analyzed by de Martino (1993). Example (3) comes from the Mitanni Letter; analysis follows, for the most part, Wegner (1995:144).

3 While most archaeologists tend to follow Pallottino’s view (1975:64-81) that Etruscan culture should only be discussed as an Etruscan phenomenon, we cannot simply ignore the issue of the linguistic affiliations of Etruscan. Beekes (2003) has recently presented a thorough, if somewhat tendentious, review of the data that supports an Anatolian origin for the Etruscans. Furthermore, three new genetic studies provide results consistent with an Anatolian origin for Tuscan cattle and humans (Achilli et al. 2007; Pellecchia et al. 2007; and see now the abstract Piazza et al. 2007).
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(3) Hurrian headless Suffixaufnahme with absolutive:
a-i-i-ni-in $\overline{3}$-mi-i-gi-ni-we,-ni-e-im-ma-na-an-am-mu-u-uša
(Mitanni Letter i.94)
\begin{align*}
adi=nin & \text{Šime} \text{g}=\text{ne}=\text{we}=\text{ne}=\text{mmam}\text{an} \\
am\text{m}=\text{oš}=\text{a}
\end{align*}
\text{‘thus’=?’}{\text{Šime} \text{g}=\text{rel.sg.}=\text{gen.}=\text{rel.s.}=\text{particle ‘reach’}=\text{trans.pret.}}
\text{=}3\text{s.trans.}
\text{‘He thus reached the (city) of Šime} \text{g} \text{.‘}

Double case-marking is built off of the genitive in Etruscan, Lemnian, and Raetic, playing multiple roles. The cases of Etruscan, the best known of the Tyrrhenian languages, are illustrated in Table 1.\textsuperscript{6} It appears to be an agglutinative language shifting to fusional morphology, partly as a result of phonological changes caused by strong word-initial stress (Rix 2004:951). For example, as is typical of agglutinative languages, plural is marked separately from case. It has two separate genitives, in -\text{la} (> -\text{l}), with loss of -\text{l} on a-stems in archaic Etruscan and then renewal (Rix 2004:952; Steinbauer 1999:55, 71), and in -\text{s}, with various vowels intervening between stem and ending. The reasons for the selection of the genitive I or II are primarily morphophonemic.\textsuperscript{7} Besides possession, the genitive is used in dedications to indicate the person the object is intended for, and thus has a “dative” function (Steinbauer 1999:170-71).

(4) Etruscan genitive I:
\textit{milar}θ\textit{la} (Cr. 2.13, 2.14)
\textit{mi lar}θ\textit{la-i}.
\text{‘I’ Larthia’-gen.}
\text{‘I am Larthia’s’}.

(5) Etruscan genitive II:
\textit{minimalvanicemamarce : velx}\textit{ana}s (Cr. 3.11)
\textit{mi-ni} \textit{mulvanicemamarce velx}\textit{ana}s.

\textsuperscript{6} I use the analyses of Rix (2004:950-53) and Steinbauer (1999:167-80). More details on the use and formation of cases may be found in these works. My terms for the cases are from Rix.

\textsuperscript{7} Steinbauer (1999:69-70, 172-73) argues against an agglutinative analysis, and for two declensions with genitives in -\text{s} and -\text{l}, while Rix instead argues that the -\text{s} originally was a separate (“ablative”) case.

Etruscan inscriptions are cited from Rix (1991).
Raetic inscriptions are cited from Schumacher (1992).

\textbf{Table 1: Etruscan Cases}
(For simplicity’s sake, I ignore here the distinction between sigma and san.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>case</th>
<th>affix</th>
<th>use</th>
<th>post-positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>-Ø in nouns</td>
<td>possession, apportion, ordinals, dedicate (&quot;dative&quot;)</td>
<td>pr, w, p, or,方位</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>-Ø in nouns</td>
<td>possession, ordinals, dedicate (&quot;dative&quot;)</td>
<td>pr, w, p, or,方位</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitive I</td>
<td>-(\text{V})\text{-s} (&lt; *-\text{ri})</td>
<td>location in place/time motion towards instrumental</td>
<td>*ri (benefactive), -\text{ti} (location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitive II</td>
<td>*-\text{la} &gt; -\text{l}</td>
<td>location</td>
<td>-\text{ti} (location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td>-\text{i, stems in -e} \text{ and -a + -i &gt; e}</td>
<td>location in place/time motion towards instrumental</td>
<td>-\text{ti} (location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ablative I</td>
<td>-\text{ø/\text{ti} with umlauting of preceding V.} &lt; *-\text{ri-si?}</td>
<td>agent origin</td>
<td>-\text{ø/\text{ti} (location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.-gen.</td>
<td>-\text{ø/\text{ti} with umlauting of preceding V.} &lt; *-\text{ri-si?}</td>
<td>agent origin</td>
<td>-\text{ø/\text{ti} (location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ablative II</td>
<td>-\text{la-s} &gt; -\text{l-s}</td>
<td>location</td>
<td>-\text{ø/\text{ti} (location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pertinative I</td>
<td>-\text{ø/\text{ti} with umlauting of preceding V.} &lt; *-\text{ri-si?}</td>
<td>loc. of gen., author/agent, &quot;dative”?</td>
<td>-\text{ø/\text{ti} (location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pertinative II</td>
<td>*-(\text{a})-\text{la-i} &gt; -(\text{a})\text{le}</td>
<td>loc. of gen., author/agent, &quot;dative”?</td>
<td>-\text{ø/\text{ti} (location)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only other case formed directly on the noun stem is the locative in -\text{i}, which also serves an instrumental function. To this can be added a specifying affix -\text{ri} (benefactive). The addition of -\text{ri/\text{ti}} made the locational meaning more clear, which was particularly useful for \text{i}-stems, where the locative in -\text{i} was not distinguishable from the endless nom./acc. (Steinbauer 1999:71), and the postposition could also simply substitute for the locative. Other cases are formed off of the genitive, which therefore serves as an extended oblique base. Compare formal Tamil, in which many nouns use the genitive as the oblique base: \textit{kangavu ‘dream’ (nom.), kangav\text{in} (gen.) ‘of a dream’, kangav\text{in}āl ‘by means of a dream’ (see Krishnamurti 2003:217-18, 222).
In Etruscan, the same set of affixes used for the genitive and locative are used to form the other two cases. The ablative, which is used for agent and origin, is formed by adding -s to either genitive. A further postposition -cexa ‘because of’ can be added to the ablative. The pertinative is formed by adding the locative -i to either genitive affix, and the postposition -thi as in the locative proper, can substitute for -i. Both Lemnian and Raetic have this pertinative case. Examples (6a) and (6b) illustrate the identical use of the genitive case in age formulas in Lemnian and Etruscan while (7a) and (7b) show the identical use of the cognate pertinatives built off the genitives I and II. Examples (8a) and (8b) show that Raetic also has both cognate pertinatives. In some cases, the form is transparently the locative of a genitive, for example (9), with a headless genitive using the affix -thi in place of the loc. -i, (7a), where the locative agrees with zilc-i, the head of vel-us-i hulqyie-s-i, and (7b). The pertinative is often called the dative, for with humans, it seems to serve as the equivalent of the Latin indirect object, yet it also indicates author or agent, as seen in both Etruscan (8a) and in Raetic (8b) (Rix 1998:29-31). Steinbauer (1999:174-6) argues cogently that the two uses with humans are based on a combination of the meanings of the two affixes, the genitive marking owner or interest, the locative marking producer or author.

(6a) Etruscan age formula:

avils : maxs : selaqlxs (Ta 1.169)

avils maxs selaqlxs-c (*selaqlxs > selaqlxs as per Rix 1989:184)

‘year’-gen.
‘five’-gen.
‘sixty’-gen.
‘and’

‘sixty-five years old’

(6b) Lemnian age formula (Stele of Lemnos A).:

mav sialqxei:s avi:$

‘five’-gen.
‘sixty’-gen.
‘year’-gen.

‘sixty-five years old’

(7a) Etruscan date formula (Ta 5.5):

zilc : vel[s]i[s] : hul || giesti ...

zilc-i vel-us-i hulqyie-s-i

‘zilc’-loc. ‘Vel’-gen.-loc. ‘Hulkhnie’-gen.-loc.

‘when Vel Hulkhnie was zilc’

(7b) Lemnian date formula (Stele of Lemnos B).

holiae:i : qokiasiale : seronai$

holiae-s-i qokia-s-i-al-e

‘Holiae’-gen.-loc. ‘Phokia’-gen.-loc.-gen.-loc. ‘seronai’-loc.

‘when Holiae, the one of Phokia, was seronai’

lit.: ‘in the seronai, the one of Holiae, he of Phokia’

(8a) Etruscan pertinative:

mizinakultrazalekullenie:i (Fs 6.1)

mi zinak-a larduza-la-i kullenie-s-i

‘I’-make’-pret.-stative ‘Larthuza’-gen.-loc. ‘Kullenie’-gen.-loc.

‘I am made by Larthuza Kullenie’.

(8b) Raetic pertinative:

qelipuriesieltukuslepile (SZ-14)

qelipuriesi eluku slepile

qelipuriesi : qelvinuauleqiku (NO-3)

qelipuriesi qelvinuale upiku

(9) Etruscan headless pertinative:

unitali (TC 13)

Unita-$thi

‘Juno’-gen.-loc.

‘in the (temple) of Juno’

---

8 However, the formation of the ablative I is not transparent. According to the analysis of Rix (2004), and Beekes and van der Meer (1991:101-02), it is formed with $ and the ablauting of the preceding vowel, caused by a lost high vowel (*-ri-i > o-s > $), but Steinbauer (1999:172-73, 178-80), subsuming the ablative under the locative, argues that Rix’s ablative I is the locative combined with a locative post-position $.

9 On the Lemnian dating formula see Rix (1968); on the shared morphology of Etruscan and Raetic see Rix (1998), who goes into more detail on the uses of the pertinative in Raetic.

10 The function of: in (6b), apparently marking syllabic length, is disputed.

---

11 This interpretation follows Rix (1968:220-21), pace van der Meer (2004:52).
Etruscan also achieves Suffixaufnahme with the aid of cliticized demonstrative elements post-posed to a nominal form that sometimes seems to be un declined but, at other times, is clearly in the genitive. The pronoun (i)ita-(l)i ca-, which can also stand alone, is used in this way in (10), (16), as is the so-called “article” in -s-, which so far has not appeared as a separate word, see (11), (16). Example (10) is undeniably a headless attribute built off a genitive noun, since we can identify in the stem one of the most famous men in Roman history, Hannibal, in whose army the man memorialized was proud to serve. Example (11) shows how the deictic element could be used to distinguish the true double genitive from the ablative II -als.

(10) Pertinative built on a genitive with -ca-:
hanipaluscle (Ta 1.107, Steinbauer 1999:136-37; Beekes and van der Meer 1991:10-11)
hanipal-us-c-la-i
‘Hannibal’-gen.-pron.-gen.-loc.
‘in (the army) of those Hannibal’

(11) Double genitive with “article”:
mi : capra : calisna-š : larθalšepuš : arnθalidja : cursniax (Vt 1.77,
Steinbauer 1999:247)
mi capra calisna-š larθal šepu-š arnθ-al-ic-la
art.-gen.
cursni-al-x
‘Curshni’-gen.- ‘and’
‘I am the coffin of Calishna Larth Sepu, the (son) of Arnth and Curshni’.

Applying a typology of grammaticalization would help us to better understand the development of the Tyrrhenian case system, double case-marking, and Suffixaufnahme as interconnected processes in Etruscan. Etruscan, in turn, has much to offer the typologist, but unfortunately such interesting research lies beyond the issue at hand, which is the development of genitive adjectives in Anatolian languages as a process of convergence with a language or languages with double-case marking built on genitives in -s and -l. Despite some over-simplifying of the data

and skipping over some interesting and important controversies concerning the use and forms of the cases, we can see that—unlike Hurrian—Etruscan, Raetic, and Lemnian, and therefore proto-Tyrrhenian, have the features of the putative Target Language.

The genitive adjectives of the Anatolian languages are a product of attempts to solve the problem of the under-characterized IE thematic genitive singular, a process already underway in PIE. While in the Indo-European consonant stems the genitive ending -os is clearly different from the nominative singular common gender -s, in the o-stems the forms are identical, and such under-characterization has led to the creation of a variety of more clearly marked forms in the various daughter languages (Vilar 1995:243-45). In Greek, for example, we have two different solutions operating at once; *-osyo is found in Mycenaean (cf. te-ojo), becoming Hom. -oio, while CIGk. -ou comes from *-osa, not attested in Mycenaean, but implied by masc. *-ao (< *-aso, pace Meier-Brügger 1996), created by affixing to the gen.sg. *-os either *-yo or *-o.12 There are, of course, other ways to analyze the extended genitive, but in any case my argument does not hinge on the PIE etymology of the genitive affixes inherited by common Anatolian, but on Anatolian-speakers’ synchronic perception of the relationship between the genitive singular and the genitival adjective as shaped by their awareness of the Anatolian areal feature of Suffixaufnahme, in which a genitive form carries another case, with or without the use of a pronominal element.

(12) Anatolian genitives and genitival adjectives:13

a) built on PIE -s genitive
* -os > Hitt., Pal. -aš
HLuv. -asa (-/as/)
Lyc. Ø
* -e/osa > Lyc. -Vhe, Milyan -Vse
Car. -s
* -osa > Pal. -aša/-

13 Based primarily on Melchert (forthcoming, 2002). I do not discuss the use of -yo-
adjectives, although they are relevant. Ignore Ptsidian and Sicetic because of the lack of data.
*-eH₂so- > CLuv., HLuv. -ašša-i-
  Lyc. -a-he-, Milyan/Lyc. B -aše-

b) built with -l
Hittite pron. -el
  New Hit. apēllaš ‘belonging to that one’, šiēlaš ‘belonging
to a single one’
Lyd. gen.adj. -la/i-, cf. gen.sg. *-l < *-el

All the Anatolian languages I discuss here, except Hittite, relied on
genitive adjectives to avoid the under-characterized thematic gen.sg.,
although Middle Hittite developed what Luraghi (forthcoming) calls
“case attraction,” essentially treating a noun which inalienably possesses
another noun as an adjective modifying it (UN-az KA × U-az ‘man’-abl. ‘man’-abl., ‘from the mouth of man’, KUB 6.45 i 30-1).14 Nor was
Hittite immune to treating headless genitives as declinable nominatives
(Yakubovich 2006:44-49). The use of the genitive in -aš to form new
common-gender thematic stems from synchronically attested consonant-stems, e.g., ḫatsawāš ‘midwife’ from ḫatsawar (ḫat, ‘open’), with re-
analys of the gen.sg. as nom.sg., has in fact been argued to be the origin
of Indo-European thematic stems (Villar 1995:245-50, with earlier references), and hypostasis in Hittite remained productive under the
influence of the areal feature of Suffixaufnahme.

Although the two dialects of Luvian are substantially the same, one
of the ways in which they differ is in their use of the genitival adjective.
Cuneiform Luvian uses only the genitival adjective, to the exclusion of
the IE genitive, while Hieroglyphic Luvian uses both (Melchert
2003a:171). The responses to the under-characterized genitive in Luvian
can be set in the context of modications of other under-characterized
case forms, and a shift in nominal typology from fusional to
agglutinative. As Table 2 shows, several of the Luvian case forms are
agglutinative. The ergative plural is built out of the ergative and the
plural marker; similarly in Cuneiform Luvian the plural of the dependent
noun is marked by suffixing on the gen.adj. formant -ašša- the plural
marker -nz- in the dat./loc. and abl./instr. (Melchert 2000:73-79). The
under-characterized genitive singular of -a- stems in -aš can be
distinguished by the addition of -l (whatever its origin, see discussion
below), and to the neuter absolutive singular is added an undeclined
eclitic deictic element -sa, allowing it to be differentiated from the
(rare) dative/locative in -a. This same deictic, from PIE *so, is found
criticized to its noun in Cuneiform Luvian (Melchert 2003a:186-87, KBo
29.6 obv. 25’), and could have been perceived by speakers of this earlier
form of Luvian, dating to the 16th-15th century BC (Melchert
2003a:174), to be affixed to the genitive -aš as an alternative way to
disambiguate the genitive singular, declined in agreement with its head
noun, although the Luvian and Lycian relational suffix is derived from
*eH₂so-. The germinate -ss- must derive from -H₂s- because of the a
vocalism in the Lycian -a-he- (PIE *eH₂so- > Panat. -assο-; Panat. *o/a
> Luv. a but Panat. *o > Lyc. e, Panat. *a > Lyc. a; Panat. *ss > s > h
in Lycian, Melchert 1994a:77). That is, the suffix is made up of the
“appurtenance” affix -eH₂- + -so (Bader 1991:137) or -eH₂- + gen. -s +
o. Either analysis allows for a post-clitic declined pronomininal element,
either well-attested PIE *so- or *e/o-, found in the Anatolian languages
in the enclitic pronouns of the opening particle chains (Melchert
1984:29-30; Watkins 1968-1969), but I opt for the latter, in which the
enclitic relation is marked both with the appurtenance affix and the
genitive. The formation, therefore, is analogous to *-os-yo and *-os-o.

Palai. -ašša/-i- is a declined form of a genitive from *-ošo (Melchert
position clitic chains allowed for a synchronic analysis of Pal. -ašša- as
genitive with declined pronomininal element.15 The *-ošo genitive may
have left traces in Hieroglyphic Luvian in undeclined -ašša, since the
spelling could reflect /-asša/, rather than /-aš/ (Melchert forthcoming),
but the anomaly presented below in (13) only works if the spelling reflects
/-aš/. It is more definite that Lyc. -a-he- derives from *-ošo with
inflection, likely secondary, in a few cases (Melchert forthcoming), as
does Car. -s (Melchert 2002:309).

In Pal. -ašša/-i- and Luv. (Lycian) -ašša/-i-, i-motion or i-mutation is
found in the common gender nominative and accusative, the -i- derived
from a version of the appurtenance suffix, non-abluting *-i-H₂-, being
attached to the stem before the case ending is added (Melchert

---

14 Plank (1995a:76-83) on the cline of attributiveness from nouns to adjectives.

15 In Palai. whose texts date to the 16th century BC, the demonstratives apa- ‘that’ and
kí- ‘this’ can be criticized to the noun they modify (Melchert 2003a:190, 1984:29-30).
16 On the appurtenance affix, which lies behind the development of the a-declension, the
Latin 2nd decl. gen.sg. -i, and Old. vrkthi and rathi noun types, see Bader (1992:99-101).
be directly cognate with Faliscan/archaic Lat. *osyo, Myc. *o-jo, or Lat. *ārius as argued by Bader (1991:146-47; see Melchert forthcoming). On the other hand, it is not impossible that *osyo > HLuv. *asi, although the analysis requires otherwise unattested apocope (so Melchert forthcoming; Szemerényi 1996:184). Alternatively, *asi can be analyzed as a Hieroglyphic Luvian innovation with -i added to -as (so Hajnal 2000:177, n.46). Similarly, Carian palatalized -i-s(-) could have come either from *assa/i/- (Melchert 2002:311-12), with loss of inflection, then secondary inflection, or from *osyo(-) (Melchert forthcoming). Unfortunately, the evidence is too scanty to make a firm decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuneiform</td>
<td>Hieroglyphic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom. comm.</td>
<td>(-i)⁻š</td>
<td>/(-i)-s'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. comm.</td>
<td>(-i)-n</td>
<td>/(-i)-n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erg.</td>
<td>-antš</td>
<td>/-antis/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>gen. adj.</td>
<td>/-asa =/-as/,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-(a)šša/-</td>
<td>/-as/,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/-a/-</td>
<td>/-a/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abs. neut.</td>
<td>-O, /-n</td>
<td>/O, /-n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(⁺-šš)</td>
<td>(⁺-ša)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat./loc.</td>
<td>-i, /-a,</td>
<td>/-i, /-a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/-an for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ašša-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl./instr.</td>
<td>-ati</td>
<td>/-adi/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Luvian Cases (based on Melchert 2003a:186-88)

While at an earlier point a pronoun was considered to be suffixed to the Palaic and Luvian genitive, there is good evidence that by the New Hittite period (1375-1200 BC) the Luvian suffix -assa/i- was perceived by speakers as an inflected genitive singular. Hoffner (2006) has detected a small number of declined gen. adj. built on the pronominal genitive in Hittite; thus, apēl' of that one' can be inflected as apēllas. There are only four attestations, all New Hittite; thus, Hoffner (2006:195) suggests that the Hittite inflected pronominal genitive could be a neologism influenced by Luvian. While Hoffner argues for a re-analysis of the genitive in -ēl as an endingless neut.sg.adj., a better possibility is that Luv. -assa/i- was perceived as a declined genitive, allowing for the following analogy:

(13) Development of the Hittite declined pronominal genitive:
Luvian gen. apaš   gen.adj. adašša/a-
Hittite gen. apēl, šiēl gen.adj. apēlla-, šiēla-

The Lydian relational adjective suffix -lai/- has been connected to the Hittite pronominal genitive, but -l- is in fact an extremely common adjectival formant in Indo-European languages, including Luvian and Hittite, and it appears in a variety of morphemes in Lydian from the dat./loc.sg. to the infinitive. It is therefore not safe to argue that Lydian -l- along with -alla-, -alli-, -ala-, -ila-, and -illi- in Hittite is of pronominal origin (so Bader 1988:173-76). In Hittite, we can trace the origin of -lla-, -alli-, -ila- from Luvian (Melchert 2001:266-68, 2005:455-56), but there is also the possibility that the common Hattic suffix -il, used to mark male humans, as in Hattušili- 'man of Hattusa,' originally helped to drive the productivity of these suffixes in Hittite. The suffix certainly was not borrowed outright from Hattic to form the pronominal genitive case (Melchert 2003b:16), which is best derived from a PIE athematic suffix -l-, used with pronominal forms to mark belonging (Oettinger 1999:263-65, with corrections of Hoffner 2006:189, n.2) and raised to productive status under influence from an -l- genitive in the Target Language.

While ultimately unrelated, there is a good possibility that the Lydian gen.adj. in -lai/- was perceived by Lydian-speakers as related to the gen. sg., which, although unattested, we can reconstruct as cognate with Hitt. -ēl. The dat./loc.pl. -a(-)v (-av: esavv) comes from the gen.pl. (*-ōm), and the suffix does appear a couple of times as a gen.pl. (ibšimavv 2.10, šarda(v) 11.9, Melchert forthcoming). Given the merging of the dat./loc. with the genitive in the plural, a process matched in Carian with the use of the gen.sg. for dat./loc.sg. (Melchert 2002:308),

17 See Justus (1992:456 with earlier references), but thinking in terms of borrowing.
18 The gen.adj. is made up of -l- and the i-motion -i (Melchert 1994b:239; tentatively suggested by Starke 1990:85), but attestations show that it was in the process of being reanalyzed as an i-stem, with l-stem forms more frequent (Manelid) and i-motion forms rare archaisms (Arumud) (van den Hout 2001:5).
it is probable that the dat./loc.sg. -λ (palatalized -l) reflects a Proto-
Lydian gen.sg. *-əl with progressive palatalization from the high vowel
(on which see Melchert 1994a:342).

To sum up, all branches of Anatolian discussed here show evidence
of convergence with the area feature of Suffixaufnahme, realized in
three ways:

(14) Convergence with Suffixaufnahme in Anatolian languages:

a) Hittite case attraction
b) declension of gen.sg.

1. treating the genitive as a thematic nominative
   Hitt. ḫasšuwaš ‘she of opening’

2. treating the “genitive” as a stem
   Luv. and Lyc. -assa/i-, -ahe-
   Pal. -aša-
   Lyd. -la/i-
   Hitt. štēla-

The Anatolian languages inherited several different solutions to the
under-characterized thematic gen.sg., such as -osyo and perhaps -osyo.
They also inherited the appurtenance suffix -eH₂- to mark genitival
relation in the double-marked affix *-eH₂so-, which has no direct
cognates in other IE languages. Furthermore, the Hittite process of
hypostasis, the formation of new thematic nouns off of genitives of
athematic stems, was a feature inherited from PIE. The inherited material
was the base from which the process of converting substantives to
appurtenative adjectives expanded and became much more productive.
At least one case involved re-interpretation of an adjectival affix as
related to the genitive: Lyd. -la/i-, with reinterpretation of the formant as
related to (untested) gen.sg. -l. The convergence was an ongoing
process lasting from the 2nd millennium BC into the 1st millennium BC.
Hypostasis is found already in Old Hittite, case attraction by Middle
Hittite, and degenitival pronominal adjectives only in New Hittite. In
Lycian, -ahe- (<assa/i-) was inherited, but -Vhe (< *e/oso) was
secondarily inflected, and Carian seems to show secondary inflection of
-s (either from -osyo, or from -assa/i-, after loss of inflection).

I close my comparative discussion with an example of a suggestively
similar stylistic figure in Hieroglyphic Luviun and Etruscan involving
the genitive and genitival adjective. Note the combination of ‘Muwatali’
gen.adj.-nom.sg.comm. and ‘king’-gen.sg. in the hieroglyphic Luvin example (15) (Neumann 1982:159-60).²⁹

(15) Hieroglyphic Lunian combining of gen.adj. and gen.:
EGO-wa/i-nti-i ḪALPAS-pa-CERVS₂-ti-i-ia-sa
[‘IUDEX]tar/i-wa/i-nti-ia [ku++ra/i-ku-ja-wa/i-nti-ia-sa (URBS)
REX-ti-sa mu-wa/i-ia-ia/i-ia-sa
[‘IUDEX]tar/i-wa/i-nti-ia-sa [INFANS]nt-mu-wa/i-ia-ia-sa
(Maraš 4 §1, transcription and translation Hawkins 2000:1.256)

amu=wa=mi Halparuniya-s
tarwani-s kurkum-awi-s
REX-ti-s Muwatali-ssi-s
tarwani-s nimuwiza-s
‘king’-gen.sg. ‘son’-nom. sg.comm.
‘quote: (am) Halparuniyas the Ruler, Gurgumian king, the ruler
Muwatalis’ son.’

We can see the same combination of both types of genitive in the
final three words of the Etruscan example (16): Larbi-al-is-v-la-i cestna-l
combining the genitival adjective built off of ‘Larbi’ with the noun
‘Cestna’ in the genitive.

(16) Etruscan combining of gen.adj. and gen.:
caresri : aušes : larbil : prevùthàsi : larbìalsvle : cestna :
elaràsi ... (Pe 5.2, Beekes and van der Meer 1991:48, 84)

²⁹ There are also equivalents in Latin and Slavic languages (Plank 1995a:77).
already had returned to close contact with other known Anatolian languages. The Lydian gen.adj. in -l as opposed to -s remains the key bit of evidence that Lydian did not evolve its genitival adjective under pressure from another Anatolian language, but from the Tyrsenoi with whom Lydian-speakers had such close contact that the tradition which informed Herodotus’ theory of a “Lydian migration” to Etruria considered them to be members of a single ethnic group.
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