Metka Furlan
Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian
Academy of Sciences and Arts*

THE ARCHAIC WORD-FORMATIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PROTO-SLAVIC NOUN *POL'E AND THE HITTITE ADJECTIVE PALHI-

1. In his 1982 article, Calvert Watkins demonstrated that the PIE acrostatic and proterokinetic declension patterns of *u*-stems originally expressed a functional relationship, in which nouns were declined following the acrostatic type and the word-formationally identical adjectives following the proterokinetic type,[1] and that the traces of such a relationship can still be recognized, for example, in Vedic Sanskrit, in which the noun *vásu-* (n.) 'good' is acrostatically inflected (cf. gen. sg. *vásvaḥ*), whereas the homophone adjective *vásu-* 'good' is proterokinetically inflected (cf. gen. sg. *vásoḥ*).[2] Based on the archaic Hit. nom-acc. pl. n. *a-aš-šu-u* 'good' $<$ *-u-H_2* (alongside standard *āššuu̯a* 'idem'), which inflectionally corresponds to Ved. *vásū* (nom.-acc. pl. n.) 'good' and Av. *vohū* 'idem', Watkins therefore postulated that the word-formational relationship between the Hit. adjective *āššu-/āššau̯-* 'good, dear, favored' and the noun *āššu-* (n.) 'good' is not as is generally explained, as though the noun is substantivized from the adjective, but that the noun *āššu-* (n.) 'good' was inflected in the protolanguage following the acrostatic accent pattern and has therefore also preserved the archaic case ending *-H_2* in the nom.-acc. pl. n. The proterokinetic quality of *-u/au̯-* in the adjective *āššu-/āššau̯-* and the acrostatic quality of the noun *āššu-* (n.) 'good' with the archaic form *a-aš-šu-u* (nom.-acc. pl. n.) thus presumably still expresses the protolanguage state of affairs.

2. Watkins' explanation of the original functional relationship between the acrostatic and proterokinetic accent-ablaut pattern can be typologically compared with the situation in more recent thematic relationships of the type φόρος (m.) : φορός (adj.) and may therefore merely be a transfer of the older protolanguage pattern:

acrostatic paradigm → nominal declension
proterokinetic paradigm → adjectival declension

Indirect indicators of this protolanguage pattern may include relationships of the type Skt. *ápas-* (n.) 'work' : *apás-* (adj.) 'active' and also the more recent type Skt. *uṣr-á-* (adj.) 'morning, reddish' : *uṣár-* (f.) 'sunrise, morning', *tamasá-* (adj.) 'dark' : *támas-*

---

* *Author's address*: Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša, Novi trg 4, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia. Email: metka.furlan@zrc-sazu.si

[1] A similar interpretation of the functional relationship between the acrostatic and proterokinetic declension of *i*-stems and *u*-stems is also found in Benveniste (1935: 52).

[2] Following Melchert (1994a: 301) and Pinault (2003).

(n.) 'darkness'. The last example of adjective formation includes not only thematization of a consonant noun but (also) shift of the accent onto it. Even substantivization with an accentual shift of the type Skt. *kr̥ṣṇá-* (adj.) 'black, dark' → *kŕ̥ṣṇa-* (n.) 'black antelope', Gr. λευκός (adj.) 'bright shining' → λεῦκος (m.) 'grey mullet' could be an expression of this protolanguage word-formational relationship.

The original functional relationship between the acrostatic and proterokinetic declension patterns must have started to break down very early in the protolanguage, before the Anatolian branch separated from the protolanguage system. In Hittite, *i*-stem and *u*-stem nouns are *predominantly* inflected following a declension pattern without ablaut; that is, acrostatically (e.g., *ḫalki-š, ḫalki-n, ḫalkii̯-aš* etc.; **ḫaššu-š, *ḫaššu-n, *ḫaššuu̯-aš* etc.), and *i*-stem and *u*-stem adjectives are *predominantly* inflected following a declension pattern with ablaut; that is, proterokinetically (e.g., *šalli-š, šalli-n, šallaš* (< **šallai̯-aš*) etc.; *āššu-š, āššu-n, āššau̯-aš* etc.). Hittite preserved this protolanguage feature as a tendency with a number of exceptions among both nouns and adjectives; for example, *u̯eši-* (c.) 'pasture': *u̯ešaeš* (nom. pl.), *u̯ešauš* (acc. pl.); ^NINDA*ḫarši-* (c.) 'type of bread': ^NINDA*ḫar-ša-i* (dat.-loc. sg.), ^NINDA*ḫar-ša-eš* (nom. pl.), ^NINDA*ḫar-ša-uš* (acc. pl.); ^DUG*palḫi-* (n.) 'type of (broad) vessel': ^DUG*pal-ḫa-aš* (dat.-loc. pl.), ^DUG*pal-ḫa-e-a*^HI.A (nom.-acc. pl.); *šēli-* (c.) 'pile of grain, granary (?)': *še-e-la-aš* (gen. sg.) etc.; *nakki-* (adj.) 'important; difficult': *nakkii̯-az* (abl.), *nakki-uš* (acc. pl. c.) etc.

There still exists an inherited functional distinction in Hittite between the homophone noun *āššu-* (n.) and the adjective *āššu-/āššau̯-*, but not between the homophone pair ^DUG*palḫi-* (n.) : *palḫi-* (adj.), from which it can be concluded that the second pair is of more recent origin because the noun could have arisen via the "zero substantivization" type Skt. *pr̥thivī́-* (f.) 'earth' ← *pr̥thivī́-* (adj. f.). It was probably the zero substantivization pattern that triggered the breakdown of the original relationship between the protolanguage acrostatic and proterokinetic declension types, with the result that the originally acrostatically declined nouns began switch over to the proterokinetic type, such as **deru-* (n.) 'wood, tree', in which the original acrostatic pattern, alongside Skt. and Gr. material, is also confirmed by PSl. **derv̂o* (n.), which arose with the thematization of the oblique case stem **deru-*:[3]

nom.-acc. sg.   **dóru* = Skt. dā́ru, Gr. δόρυ, Hit. tāru-
gen. sg.   **déru-s* (→ **déru̯-o-m* > PSl. **derv̂o*) → **dréu̯-s* = Skt. dróḥ (→ **dréu̯-o-m* = Goth. triu)

[3] With the same thematization from PIE **seru-/soru-* (n.) 'quarry' (cf. Hit. *šāru-* (n.) 'quarry', OIr. *serb* (f.) 'theft' < **seru̯eH₂*), it would be possible to explain membership in this word family of Lat. *seruus* (m.) 'slave' (EIEC: 77), in which the change of grammatical gender was probably influenced by the narrowing of the meaning to pertain only to human quarry: 'quarry' → *'quarry = people' → 'slave'.

The transition of the nominal acrostatic pattern into the proterokinetic one in *g'enu- (n.) 'knee' alongside Goth. *kniu* (n.) < *g'n-éu̯-o-m, as is known, with the archaic instrumental *ga-nu-ut* < *g'n-éu̯-d is also confirmed by Hittite:

nom.-acc. sg.   *g'ónu = Skt. jǎnu, Av. zānu, Gr. γόνυ

gen. sg.   *g'énu-s (→ Hit. gēnu-, Lat. genū) → *g'néu̯-s = Skt. jñóḥ (Hit. ganut) (→ *g'néu̯-o-m = Goth. kniu)

This phenomenon almost completely obscured the original functionality of the acrostatic and proterokinetic declension pattern. It appears to still be preserved in the Slavic-Anatolian relationship *pȍl'e (n.) : palḫi- (adj.).

3. After Julius Pokorny first demonstrated in his *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörtebuch* that only the Slavic neuter noun *pȍl'e 'field' and the Hittite adjective *palḫi-* 'wide' – as part of a word family that he combined under the root *pelə-/plā- 'wide and flat; to spread out; to make flat by pressing and beating, to beat out, to pat out' (IEW: 805 ff.)[4] – contain an *i*-stem morpheme, Schmitt-Brandt (1967: 71) derived the Hit. adjective from the reduced grade *p_elHi-, and the Slavic noun, understandably, from the *o*-stem *polHi̯on or, better, *pólH$_2$i̯-o-m.[5] I myself (Furlan 1986: 96; 1994: 11) have also written about this shared Slavic-Anatolian morphological feature and have demonstrated that the PSl. noun *pȍl'e (n.) was thematized following the same pattern as PSl. *mȍr'e (n.) 'sea' from a PIE neuter *i*-stem noun; specifically, *pȍl'e (n.) from PIE *pólH$_2$-i- (n.), and PSl. *mȍr'e from PIE *mór-i- (n.), cf. OIr. *muir*, Lat. *mare*.[6] The PSl. nouns *pȍl'e (n.) and *mȍr'e (n.) are therefore, like PSl. *deȓvo (n.), thematized nouns of the acrostatic type, only that *deȓvo preserves the oblique case stem, but *pȍl'e (n.) and *mȍr'e a direct case stem.

In the same papers, I also surmised that the PIE noun *pólH$_2$-i- (n.) arose through substantivization from a PIE adjective, which is preserved in Hit. *palḫi-* 'wide', and that this adjective therefore derived from the same *o*-grade form *polH$_2$-i-.[7] The explanation is based on the presumption that the Slavic-Anatolian relationship *pȍl'e (n.) : palḫi- (adj.) derives from the original PIE adjective *pólH$_2$i- 'wide', which was nominalized in PIE and then thematized in the PIE → PSl. transition, whereas in Hittite it was preserved in its original adjectival form as a reflex of PIE *pólH$_2$-i-.

By naming parts of the earth's surface *pȍl'e, the Slavs therefore marked it with the seme *width/extension*. This Slavic lexeme is etymologically (in its semantic moti-

---

[4] Prior to this, Benveniste (1935: 151) connected this word family or Lat. *plānus* only with Hit. *palḫi-* and demonstrated that it represents the full grade *pél-ə$_2$-.

[5] This explicit connection was not observed in the literature on Hittite, nor was it observed in Derksen (2008), where only root-related Germ. *Feld* is cited alongside PSl. *pȍl'e. This has been known in Slovenian etymology since the eighteenth century in the work of Marko Pohlin.

[6] On the secondary character of vowel coloring in Lat., see Schrijver (1991).

[7] This explanation of mine was later used in *ESSJ* (III, 82) and adopted in *ESJS* (678).

vation) determined exactly the same as, for example, Skt. *pṛthivī́-* (f.) 'earth', which is originally the nominalized feminine adjective *pṛthivī́-* (adj.) 'wide, extended' from *pṛthú-* (adj.) 'wide, extended'.

Although such an etymological explanation of PSl. *pȍľe* is also likely because the same PIE word family also includes the semantically comparable but word-formationally different Germ. *Feld* (n.) 'field, area', OHG *feld* 'field, plain' < WGerm. *felþa-* (n.) < PIE *pélH₂-to-m* or Arm. *hoł* 'earth, land, ground' < PIE *polH₂o-s* (IEW: 805 ff.; Olsen 1999: 53, 781),[8] today it is not possible to agree with the morphological part of the explanation, that PIE *pólH₂-i-* (n.) → PSl. *pȍľe* was substantivized from the PIE adjective *pólH₂-i-* 'wide', because the assumptions about PIE substantivization cannot be satisfactorily argued. Namely, neither of the other two thematized nouns *môr'e* and *dêřvo* have such an adjectival member in their word family. Internal Hittite evidence also leads to the more economical interpretation of the pair *pȍľe* (n.) : *palḫi-* (adj.) with the application of Watkins' model, which does not permit derivation of Hit. *palḫi-* (adj.) from *o*-grade *pólH₂-i-*.

Because of the Hit. proterokinetic declension type of the adjective *palḫi-* (cf. *pal-ḫi-iš* (nom. sg. c.), *pal-ḫa-a-e-eš* (nom. pl. c.)), and especially because of the possibility that assimilation was at work in PIE *-VlH₂V-* > Hit. *-VllV-*,[9] if the adjective is derived from *pólH₂-i-*[10] > **palli-*[11] then it is more likely that *palḫi-* 'wide' preserves a base from the PIE zero-grade root *plH₂-i-*,[12] which became independent from *plH₂-éi̯-*[13] and therefore derives from the adjectival proterokinetic declension pattern. However, in the direct cases, this contained the stem *pólH₂-i-*, taking into account that the

---

[8] At least three root-connected examples (i.e., PSl. *pȍľe*, Germ. *felþa-*, and Arm. *hoł*) show that Pokorny's reconstruction of the root *pelə-/*plā-* = *pelH₂-/*pleH₂-* was justified.

[9] The assimilation *-VRHV-* > Hit. *-VRRV-* took place before the transition of PAnat. syllabic sonants into the Hittite reflexes *vowel + sonant* (Melchert 1994b: 55).

[10] At one time Couvreur (1937: 216) excluded the possibility of *o*-grade ablaut in *palḫi-* because he determined that in such a case it would be written as *pa-al-ḫi-* and not *pal-ḫ°*, and so he derived the adjective from a zero-grade form; that is, *plH₂i-*.

[11] Also taking into consideration the possibility that the assimilation *-VlH₂V-* > Hit. *-VllV-* was not at work, the reflex of the base *pólH₂-i-* would be written *pa-a-al-ḫ°* with the full vowel *a* (the *išpāndi* type).

[12] According to Sturtevant (1933: 106) and Couvreur (1937: 216), an adjective was also derived from the same zero-grade base *plH₂-i-* by Oettinger (1979: 550), Melchert (1984: 45; 1994: 55, 125), Kimball (1999: 123, 242), and Wodtko et al. (2008: 562).

[13] The origin of *a*-vocalism in the Hit. alternations *-i-/-ai̯-* and *-u-/-au̯-* alongside the IE base *-i-/-éi̯-* and *-u-/-éu̯-* is not entirely clear. Melchert (1994: 138) has rejected his earlier attempt to derive this from the *o*-stem variant *-i-/-ói̯-* and *-u-/-óu̯-* (Melchert 1984: 45; derived the same way by Kimball 1999: 242, adjective *palḫi-* *plH₂-i-*, *plH₂-óy-*) and has decided in favor of an internal Hittite phonetic base for the vowel *a* from PIE *e* in post-tonic position and an open syllable. The application of such a phonetic development also makes it possible to explain the present-tense person marker with *a*-vocalism *-u̯ani* (alongside *-u̯eni*) and *-tani* (alongside *-teni*), where the preterit person markers do not have such vocalism. The transition into an *a*-vowel could have occurred after apocope into *-u̯en* < *-u̯e-ne* and *-ten* < *-te-ne*. Otherwise, the phenomenon would have also created *a*-vocalism in the preterit person markers.

CLuv. adjective $\underset{.}{u}\bar{a}\check{s}u$- 'good', related to Skt. *vasu*- (adj.) and Av. *vohu*- (adj.), as well as the OIr. noun *fó* 'goodness, obligingness', points to an *o*-grade < *$\underset{.}{u}osu$-.[14]

The adjectival paradigm from which Hit. *palḫi*- is derived is therefore probably:

nom. sg.	*pólH$_2$i-s
acc. sg.	*pólH$_2$i-m
nom.-acc. sg.	*pólH$_2$i-ø
gen. sg.	*pl̥H$_2$-éi̯-s → Hit. *palḫi-/palḫai̯*- (adj.)

and the nominal paradigm, from which PSl. *$p\ddot{o}l'e$* is derived, is:

nom.-acc. sg. n.	*pólH$_2$i-ø → *pólH$_2$i̯-o-m > PSl. *$p\ddot{o}l'e$* (n.)
gen. sg.	*pélH$_2$i-s

4. In the Hittite proterokinetically declined adjective *palḫi*- and the Proto-Slavic noun *$p\ddot{o}l'e$* (n.) it is therefore possible to recognize the old interparadigmatic connection from the earlier protolanguage period, when the *i*-stem and *u*-stem neuter nouns were declined acrostatically, but their homophone adjectives proterokinetically. This relationship is all the more valuable because until now such examples in IE languages have been recognized only among *u*-stem formations.

---

[14] Alongside OIr. *fó* < *$\underset{.}{u}osu$ there is also OIr. *feb* 'goodness, obligingness' < *$\underset{.}{u}es\underset{.}{u}eH_2$. Alongside this I should draw attention to the same formal relationship between OIr. *serb* 'theft, robbery' < *$ser\underset{.}{u}eH_2$ and Hit. *šāru*- (n.) 'quarry' < *$sóru$.

Bibliography

References

BENVENISTE, Emile (1935) *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris: Librarie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve.

COUVREUR, Walter (1937) *De hettitische h. Een bijdrage tot de studie van het indo-europeesche vocalisme*. Leuven: Le Museon.

FURLAN, Metka (1986) *Indoevropske dvozložne težke baze v hetitščini*. PhD thesis. Ljubljana: University of Ljubljana.

FURLAN, Metka (1994) "Etimološko raziskovanje slovenskega besedja (Od Jarnikovega do Miklošičevega etimološkega slovarja)." In: M. Orožen (ed) *XXX. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture*. Ljubljana: Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture.

KIMBALL, Sara E. (1999) *Hittite Historical Phonology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (1984) *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Göttingen.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (1994a) "'Čop's Law' in Common Anatolian." In: J. E. Rasmussen (ed.) *In honorem Holger Pedersen*.Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (1994b) *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam /Atlanta: Rodopi.

OETTINGER, Norbert (1979) *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.

OLSEN, Birgit Anette (1999) *The Noun in Biblical Armenian. Origin and Word-Formation – with special emphasis on the Indo-European heritage*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

PINAULT, Georges-Jean (2003) "Sur les thèmes indo-européen en *-u- : dérivation et étymologie." In: E. Tichy, D. S. Wodtko, B. Irslinger (eds) *Indogermanisches Nomen. Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut*. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Freiburg, 19. bis 22. September 2001. Bremen: Hempen.

SCHMITT-BRANDT, Robert (1967) *Die Entwicklung des indogermanischen Vokalsystems (Versuch einer inneren Rekonstruktion)*. Heidelberg: Groos.

SCHRIJVER, P., 1991: *The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

STURTEVANT, Edgar H. (1933) *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.

WATKINS, Calvert (1982) Notes on the Plural Formation of the Hittite Neuters. In: E. Neu (ed) *Investigationes Philologicae et Comparative, Gedenkschrift für H. Kronasser*. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.

WODTKO, Dagmar S./Britta IRSLINGER/Carolin SCHNEIDER (2008) *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Dictionaries

EDSIL: Derksen, Rick *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden – Boston, 2008.

EIEC: Mallory, James/Douglas Q. Adams (eds) *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London /Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1997.

ESSJ: Bezlaj, France *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika I–V.* (Authors of headwords: France Bezlaj, Marko Snoj, Metka Furlan). Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1976–2007.

ESJS: *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnskeho 11*. Praha: Academia, 2002.

IEW: Pokorny, Julius *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I*. Bern /München: Francke, 1959.

HEG: Tischler, Johann *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar I-*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität, 1977-.

Abstract

THE ARCHAIC WORD-FORMATIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
THE PROTO-SLAVIC NOUN *POL'E AND THE HITTITE ADJECTIVE *PALHI-*

In the Hittite proterokinetically declined adjective *palḫi-* and the Proto-Slavic noun *pol'e (n.) it is possible to recognize the old interparadigmatic connection from the earlier protolanguage period, when the *i*-stem and *u*-stem neuter nouns were declined acrostatically, but their homophone adjectives proterokinetically (Watkin's model). This relationship is all the more valuable because until now such examples in IE languages have been recognized only among *u*-stem formations.

Povzetek

ARHAIČNO BESEDOTVORNO RAZMERJE MED PRASLOVANSKIM
SAMOSTALNIKOM *POL'E IN HETITSKIM PRIDEVNIKOM *PALHI-*

V hetitskem proterokinetično deklIniranem pridevniku *palḫi-* in praslovanskem samostalniku *pol'e (n.) je mogoče prepoznati staro medparadigmatsko vez iz zgodnejšega prajezičnega obdobja, ko so se ijevski in ujevski samostalniki srednjega spola deklinirali akrostatično, njim homofoni pridevniki pa proterokinetično (Watkinsov model). Razmerje je toliko bolj dragoceno, ker so bili taki primeri do sedaj v ide. jezikih prepoznani le med ujevskimi tvorbami.