

*Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia*  
vol. 12      Kraków 2007

Kenneth SHIELDS, Jr. (Millersville)

### HITTITE *aši*, *āšma* AND THE DEICTIC ORIGIN OF INDO-EUROPEAN SIGMATIC VERBAL FORMATIONS

For many years now, I have endorsed the idea that a number of Indo-European verbal inflectional and derivational suffixes found in a variety of dialects derive from original deictic particles affixed to verb structures as a means of specifying the time of verbal action or state (cf., e.g., Shields 1981a, 1981b, 1982, 1983, 1986a, 1986b, 1988a, 1988b, 1989a, 1989b, 1992a, 1992b, 1997a, 1997b, 1999). In short, I have argued that when deictic elements (*X*) were affixed to third person singular constructions in  $*-\emptyset$ ,<sup>1</sup> two reanalyses were possible:

- (1)  $*-\emptyset-X > *-X$
- (2)  $*-\emptyset-X > *-X-\emptyset$ .

The first reanalysis gave rise to inflectional suffixes, and the second to formative (derivational) elements. Because the third person singular tends to impose its form on other members of its paradigm (cf. Benveniste 1971), reanalyzed structures like these were subject to analogical extension. I have further proposed that the deictic system of Indo-European was originally binary, organized simply as *here-now* : *not-here-now* (cf. Shields 1992a: 18-21), although deictic particles could express varying degrees of remoteness from *here-now* (cf. Schmid 1972). Among the first Indo-European verbal structures which I explained in this way were the sigmatic ones (Shields 1981a, 1992a: 35-40), which include aorists, futures, subjunctives, desideratives, preterites, presents, and inflectional second-third person markers. I have demonstrated at length how the sigmatic element in all of these constructions could be derived from a deictic particle in  $*(e/o)s$  with *not-here-now* signification, especially since the past, future, and irrealis are all manifestations of the *not-here-now*. Although I believe that my evidence for the existence of such a deictic in  $*(e/o)s$  is sufficient to justify my hypothesis, I now wish to expand that evidence based on some very compelling research by Goedegeburre (2002/03) and Hoffner (2002/03).

<sup>1</sup> I follow Watkins (1962: 90-106, 1969: 49-50) in reconstructing  $*-\emptyset$  as the original exponent of the third person singular.

My argument for a deictic in *\*(e/o)s* with *not-here-now* signification includes such data as an attested locative suffix in *\*-s* (e.g., loc. pl. *\*-s-i* [*< \*-s + the deictic particle \*-i*]: Gk. *-si*; *\*-su* [*< \*-s + the deictic particle \*-u*]:<sup>2</sup> Gk. *-su*, Skt. *-su*, OCS *-xb*, Lith. *-su*), since locative markers frequently evolve from deictics (Markey 1979: 65); an attested genitive suffix in *\*(e/o)-s* (e.g., gen. sg. *\*-e/os*: Skt. *-as*, Gk. *-os*, Lat. *-is*, etc.), since genitive markers, too, tend to arise from deictics (Lyons 1968: 500); and an attested demonstrative in *\*s-* (e.g., *\*so-*: Skt. *sá[s]*, Gk. *hó*, Go. *sa*), since demonstratives likewise generally have their origin in deictic particles (Brugmann 1911: 311). This latter demonstrative form in *\*so-*, which, according to Brugmann (1904: 20, 1911: 312), possessed “Dér-Deixis” (a non-proximal deixis), I have derived from a contamination of the deictics *\*(e/o)s* (specifically, its zero grade) and *\*e/o* (cf. Hirt 1927: 10-11). However, Goedegeburre (2002/03) and Hoffner (2002/03) provide significantly more direct evidence for a *not-here-now* deictic in *\*(e/o)s*.

Goedegeburre (2002/03: 1) argues that Hittite attests “a pronoun/adjective *aši*,” which “is not an anaphoric pronoun,” as has been assumed (cf. Laroche 1979: 148 and Puhvel 1984),<sup>3</sup> “but the 3<sup>rd</sup> person demonstrative ‘yon’ instead, accompanying the 1<sup>st</sup> person demonstrative *kā-* ‘this, near me’ and the 2<sup>nd</sup> person demonstrative *apā-* ‘that, near you’.” According to Goedegeburre (2002/03: 3), “this three-term system did not only exist in later Hittite, we also have to assume that it already was fully functional in Old Hittite.”<sup>4</sup> She supports her point that *aši* was a genuine demonstrative by showing that it meets all the typological criteria which have been posited for demonstratives, and she carefully documents the “3<sup>rd</sup> person distal” deictic value of *aši*, “with a secondary use as a disassociative marker” – a function in keeping with its primary deixis.<sup>5</sup> Because of the close etymological connection between demonstratives and deictic particles, one can easily posit a deictic etymon for the Hittite form.

Although Goedegeburre (2002/03) does not provide an etymology of *aši*, I would suggest that it derives from a late contamination of the deictic/demonstrative *\*(e/o)s* (specifically, its *o*-grade) and a comparable element *\*i* (cf. Hirt 1927: 11). Such contamination of deictics/demonstratives is a common develop-

<sup>2</sup> Hirt (1927: 11-12) provides ample evidence for the reconstruction of this particle.

<sup>3</sup> Prior to Laroche (1979), “the view ... was that *aši* and the other forms [of its paradigm] were demonstratives, albeit anaphoric ones” (cf. Friedrich 1960: 68) (Goedegeburre 2002/03: 3).

<sup>4</sup> For example, Friedrich & Kammenhuber (1975: 400) contest the antiquity of the form.

<sup>5</sup> That is, “the use of *aši* indicates a kind of cognitive distance, for which a better term might be *disassociation*” (Goedegeburre 2002/03: 22). “To summarize, even if an entity is in the presence of a Speaker and somehow associated with him, it is still possible to use *aši* in order to express the negative or disassociating emotional attitude of the Speaker towards the entity” (Goedegeburre 2002/03: 24).

ment because of the need to reinforce the deixis of these forms (cf. Lane 1961: 469). Although the original deictic force of *\*i* seems to have been *here-now* expression, as evidenced by its presence in primary verbal suffixes used to mark present tense, this original particle was subject to weakening of its deictic force in the dialects. In Latin, for example, the demonstrative *i-s* (nom. sg. masc.), *i-d* (nom.-acc. sg. neut.), derived from deictic *\*i*, has third-person value. Indeed, in regard to this Latin demonstrative, Schmid (1972: 10) identifies its deictic value as ‘yon,’ or, in his words, “nicht näher bestimmt.” If one assumes the same development of *\*i* in Hittite, then it is not surprising that non-proximal *\*(e/o)s* and *\*i* were contaminated there. It is interesting to note that other members of the suppletive paradigm of which *aši* is a part lend themselves to a similar etymology involving the contamination of deictics. For example, the Old Hittite nom.-acc. sg. neut. *eni* is probably a contamination of the non-proximal deictic *\*(e/o)n* (cf. Shields 1992a: 29) and *\*i*, while the Old Hittite acc. sg. common *uni* probably reflects a contamination of the deictics *\*u* (with “there and then” signification, cf. Hirt 1927: 11-12), *\*(e/o)n* in zero grade, and *\*i*.

Hoffner (2002/03: 81) proposes that the Hittite adverbial form *āšma* contains an original deictic element which “was not proximal (close to or on the ‘deictic center’), but distal.” That is, its function was to add temporal distance to the verbal action or state, marking it as “decidedly then,” or distant to the “deictic center.” Moreover, he asserts that *āšma* is to be etymologically connected to *aši* (2002/03: 81-83),<sup>6</sup> although he points out that “since *āšma* is an adverb (or interjection), not a pronoun, and is further relatively rare in preserved texts, we cannot expect to be able to identify examples of all [the typological demonstrative] uses for [*aši*].” Nevertheless, Hoffner’s argument for an etymological connection between *āšma* and *aši* “focus[es] ... on three aspects of distance or remoteness: (1) temporal, (2) spatial, and (3) dissociative” (2002/03: 83). He maintains that the final *-ma* of *āšma* results from the contamination of the deictic/demonstrative *āš* with another particle in *-a/-ma*, widely attested in Hittite. Of course, he notes the difference in vocalic length of the initial segments of *āšma* and *aši* and argues that, “since in Hittite texts from Boğazköy word-initial writings like *a-a-*, *e-e-*, *i-i-*, and *u-u-* are confined to Hurrian, Luvian and Hattian words,” *aši* may have had a long initial which was not represented in writing, or, less likely, that “an alternate account could suppose compensatory vowel lengthening accompanying contraction” for *āšma* (2002/03: 82). In my own view, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that the long-initial of *āš-ma* could have resulted from the contamination of the deictic particle *\*(e/o)s* with the non-proximal deictic *\*e/o* (cf. Hirt 1927: 10-11), i.e., *\*e/o + \*(e/o)s > āš*. Alternatively, if Voyles (2004: 152) is correct in his assertion that historical

<sup>6</sup> Hoffner thereby rejects *\*sem-* ‘one’ (cf. Eichner 1992: 43-44) and *kāšma* ‘see, behold’ (Puhvel 1983: 671) as possible underlying etyma for *āšma*.

vowel length was lost in early Hittite; that “in languages where phonemic vowel length has been lost, stressed vowels tend to be phonemically lengthened”; and that in Hittite “the first vowel in a word receives the main stress,” it is reasonable to suppose that *\*e/os* underlies both *aši* and *āšma* and that only the latter represents in explicit orthographic form the vocalic length which both came to exhibit as a result of the lengthening of initial stressed syllables in later Hittite.

In this brief paper, I have attempted to demonstrate that the recent analyses formulated by Goedegeburre and Hoffner of Hittite *aši* and *āšam* as original, genuine demonstrative/deictic forms with non-proximal deictic force lends support to my own proposal that Indo-European verbal suffixes in general and sigmatic suffixes in particular derive from the reanalysis of deictic particles, a case in point being the non-proximal deictic particle *\*(e/o)s*. I have also attempted to provide some insight into the etymology of these Hittite forms and those paradigmatically associated with them.

Kenneth Shields, Jr.  
 Millersville University  
 English Department  
 P.O. Box 1002  
 Millersville, PA 17551-0302, USA

### References

- Benveniste, E.  
 1971. “Relationships of Person in the Verb”, [in:] *Problems in General Linguistics*, M. Meek (trans.), 195-204, Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press.
- Brugmann, K.  
 1904. *Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Strassburg: Trübner.  
 1911. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Vol. 2.2, Strassburg: Trübner.
- Eichner, H.  
 1992. “Anatolian”, [in:] J. Gvozdanović (ed.), *Indo-European Numerals*, 28-96, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Friedrich, J.  
 1960. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch I*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Friedrich, J. & A. Kammenhuber  
 1975. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Vol. 1, Heidelberg: Winter.

- Goedegebuure, P.  
2002/03. "The Hittite 3<sup>rd</sup> Person/Distal Demonstrative *aši* (*uni, eni*, etc.)", *Die Sprache* 43, 1-32.
- Hirt, H.  
1927. *Indogermanische Grammatik*, Vol. 3, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Hoffner, H.  
2002/03. "Hittite *a-aš-ma*", *Die Sprache* 43, 80-87.
- Lane, G.  
1961. "On the Formation of the Indo-European Demonstrative", *Language* 37, 469-475.
- Laroche, E.  
1979. "Anaphore et deixis en anatolien", [in:] E. Neu & W. Meid (eds.), *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, 147-152, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Lyons, J.  
1968. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Markey, T. L.  
1979. "Deixis and the *u*-Perfect", *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 7, 65-75.
- Puhvel, J.  
1983. "Review of J. Friedrich & A. Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Band I: A, Lieferung 6/7", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103, 670-672.  
1984. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Vols. 1-2, Berlin: Mouton.
- Schmid, W.  
1972. *Die pragmatische Komponente in der Grammatik*, Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.
- Shields, K.  
1981a. "On Indo-European Sigmatic Verbal Formations", [in:] Y. Arbeitman & A. Bomhard (eds.), *Bono Homini Donum: Essays in Historical Linguistics, in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns*, 263-279, Amsterdam: Benjamins.  
1981b. "The Indo-European Third Person Plural Verbal Suffix", *Linguistica* 21, 105-118.  
1982. "The Origin of the Germanic Dental Preterite: A New Proposal", *Leuvense Bijdragen* 71, 427-440.  
1983. "Hittite Imperative Endings in *-u* and Their Indo-European Origins", *Hethitica* 5, 119-129.  
1986a. "The Lithuanian Imperative Suffix *-k(i)*", *Baltistica* 22, 48-55.

- 
- 1986b. "The Origin of the Germanic *r*-Preterites", *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 24, 1-10.
- 1988a. "Tense, Linguistic Universals, and the Reconstruction of Indo-European", *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 16, 241-252.
- 1988b. "The Indo-European Origins of the Germanic Third Weak Class", *Leuvense Bijdragen* 77, 43-56.
- 1989a. "The Origin of the Thematic Vowel", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 94, 7-20.
- 1989b. "The Origin of the Umbrian Perfect Suffix *\*-nky-*", *Historische Sprachforschung* 102, 74-83.
- 1992a. *A History of Indo-European Verb Morphology*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- 1992b. "The Origin of the Oscan-Umbrian *f*-Perfect and the Latin *u*-Perfect", *Živa Antika* 41.2, 15-19.
- 1997a. "The Origin of the Vedic 2nd Sing. Imperative in *-si*", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 40, 149-155.
- 1997b. "Typological Plausibility and the Deictic Origin of the Germanic Dental Preterite", *Leuvense Bijdragen* 86, 125-129.
1999. "On the Origin of Tocharian B 3rd Sg. Act. Pres.-Subj. *-(ä)ṃ*", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 8, 241-246.
- Voyles, J.  
2004. "A Reassessment of Hittite Historical Phonology", *International Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis* 9, 145-163.
- Watkins, C.  
1962. *Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb*, Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.  
1969. *Indogermanische Grammatik*, Vol. 3, Heidelberg: Winter.