

**Proceedings of the 18th
Annual UCLA Indo-European
Conference**

**Los Angeles
November 3-4, 2006**

(selected papers)

Edited by:

**Karlene Jones-Bley
Martin E. Huld
Angela Della Volpe
Miriam Robbins Dexter**

**Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series, No. 53
Institute for the Study of Man
Washington, DC
2007**

Proceedings of the 18th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference

Los Angeles, 2006
(selected papers)

Table of Contents

Edited by:
Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin E. Huld, and
Angela Della Volpe

List of Illustrations v
Abbreviations vii
Introduction ix

Comparison and Reconstruction 1
Charles de Lamberterie

Accent in Athematic Nouns in Vedic Sanskrit and
Its Development from PIE 29
Melissa Frazier

Proto-Indo-European *-(*ʔ*)*y*^s/_s- Presents in Tocharian 47
Ronald I. Kim

Morphology and *i*-apocope in Slavic and Baltic 65
Hans Henrich Hock

The Old Italic *o*-Perfect and the Tortora Inscription 77
Miles Beckwith

The Third Person Endings of the Old Latin Perfect and
the Fate of Final *-d* in Latin 89
Martin J. Kümmel

Three Latin Phonological Details 101
Birgit Anette Olsen

New Light on Hittite Verse and Meter? 117
H. Craig Melchert

Library of Congress Control Number: 2007936288
ISBN hardback 0-941694-99-2
ISBN paper 0-941694-98-4

Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series No. 53

Cover: Johanna Nichols, A Typological Geography for Proto-Indo-European, Map 1: Language Sample: North vs. South, p. 193

Copyright © 2007, Institute for the Study of Man Inc.
1133 13th St. N.W. #C-2
Washington, D.C. 20005

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.¹ 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:²

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).