

# The final cut: Hittite *iškallāri* ‘splits, slices’, PIE $*(s)k^{(u)}elH$ ‘cut in half, split’, and root statives in Proto-Indo-European

Laura Grestenberger  
University of Vienna

Laura.Grestenberger@univie.ac.at

## 1. Introduction

- A problematic category: Hittite 3sg.mid. “statives” in  $-a(ri)$ , e.g., *ēša(ri)* ‘sits’, *ḫannari* ‘decides a lawsuit’, *karšari* ‘cuts’, *paḫša(ri)* ‘protects’, *šaliga(ri)* ‘touches’, *tukkāri* ‘is visible’, etc.
  - a. Distribution of variants:  $-a(ri)$  vs.  $-ā(ri)$
  - b. Not really “stative”: transitive deponent subclass
  - c. Etymology of many verbs of the deponent subclass unclear
  - d. Function/origin of  $*-or$  vs.  $*-ór$
- Ad a.) PIE 3sg.mid. (“stative”) endings  $*-o(r)$  (“dentalless middle”):
  - Hitt. distribution of variants  $-a/-ari$  (&  $-ta/-tari$ ) depended originally on accent: unaccented  $*-or\# > -a\#$ , accented  $*-ór\# > -ār\#$  (Yoshida 1990:121, Yoshida 2011:105)
  - Confirms that PA patterned with Italo-Celtic and Tocharian with respect to its primary middle marker ( $*-r$  rather than  $*-i$ ), cf. Jasanoff 2003.
- Ad b.) Very few verbs with “stative” endings are actually stative verbs; the  $a(ri)$ -class includes a number of transitive, agentive verbs: *ḫannari* ‘decides a lawsuit, judges’, *ḫattari* ‘slits; sacrifices’, *ḫuettiya(ri)* ‘plucks, pulls’, *iškallāri* ‘tears, slits off’, (*karšari* ‘cuts’,) *paḫša(ri)* ‘protects’, *paršiya(ri)* ‘breaks’, *tuḫša(ri)* ‘cuts off’, *šaliga(ri)* ‘touches’, cf. Yoshida 1990, Oettinger 2007, Jasanoff 2012 → **deponents** (Grestenberger 2014, 2016, 2018)
  - tend to be replaced with *active* *ḫi*-verbs in later texts.
- Ad c.)  $a(ri)$ -deponents without a secure IE etymology: *ḫattari* ( $*h_2et$  only in Anat.), *ḫuettiya(ri)* ( $*h_2uēt/*h_2ued^h_2$ ), *paršiya(ri)*, *tuḫša(ri)*, *šaliga(ri)* ( $*sleig/g$ ), ***iškallāri*:  $*skelH$**
- Ad d.) Primary athematic middle presents in  $(*R(é))-or$  vs. (internally) derived “root stative-intransitive” presents to aoristic roots in  $(*R(ø))-ór$ , cf. Jasanoff 2003, 2013, 2017, Villanueva Svensson 2012, etc.

Today’s goals:

- discuss the averbo & etymology of the Hittite  $*ór$ -middle *iškallāri* ‘cuts off, slits’
- introduce new cognates (Tocharian)
- discuss implications for the prehistory of “stative-intransitive root presents” &  $a(ri)$ -deponents

## 2. Background: “stative presents”

Standard reconstruction of PIE verbal category “stative”:

- a descriptive label for athematic root presents with a “dentalless” 3sg. ending  $*-o(r/i)/-ó(r/i)$  (e.g. Jasanoff 2003, 2017) or  $*-e(r/i)/-é(r/i)$
- more often: a distinct verbal (voice) category besides active and middle in (pre-)Proto-Indo-European that was marked with a distinct set of endings (e.g., Oettinger 1976, 1992, Kümmel 1996, LIV<sup>2</sup>), originally probably identical to the perfect endings (i.e.,  $*-h_2e$ ,  $-th_2e$ ,  $-e$ , etc.).

Problems with “stative” as a distinct (voice) category: (cf. Jasanoff 2003:50-1, Grestenberger 2016):

- the attested dentalless forms are rarely semantically stative (cf. the  $a(ri)$ -deponent class)
- the attested distribution of dentalless and dental 3sg. endings depends on stem type, e.g.,  $*-s_1ke/o-$  and  $*-i_1e/o-$  verbs never select the dentalless set of endings in Hittite
- while there is evidence for a functional differentiation between  $*-o(r)$  and  $*-to(r)$  in some branches (Celtic, IIr.), this differentiation was clearly *einzel-sprachlich* (cf. passive  $*-or$  in Celtic vs. transitive  $*-or$ , passive  $*-tor$  in Anatolian, etc.)

- there is also evidence for a *chronological* replacement of dentalless by dental endings (e.g., productive *-tta(ri)* in Hittite tends to replace older *-a(ri)* in canonical mediopassive functions; Ved. *śáye* ‘lies’ vs. Gk. *κείται*, etc.)

→ “stative” is here used descriptively for verbs with a dentalless 3sg. ending

Two types of dentalless “statives”: type I, accented full grade of the root (“vollstufiger Wurzelstativ”, LIV<sup>2</sup>:15), type II, R( $\emptyset$ ) and accent on the endings (“schwundstufiger Wurzelstativ”, LIV<sup>2</sup>:15).

Table 1. PIE “statives”

Type I: R( <i>ó/é</i> )-o( <i>r/i</i> )		Type II: R( $\emptyset$ )-ó( <i>r/i</i> )	
Ved. <i>śáye</i> , 3pl. <i>śére</i> , YAv. <i>sōire</i> , < * <i>kéi</i> -o( <i>r</i> )	< * <i>kéi</i> -o( <i>r</i> )	Ved. <i>duhé</i> ‘gives milk’, 3pl. <i>duh-</i> < * <i>d<sup>h</sup>ug<sup>h</sup>-ó(i)</i>	< * <i>d<sup>h</sup>ug<sup>h</sup>-ó(i)</i>
CLuv. <i>zīyar(i)</i> (vs. “dental” Gk. <i>κείται</i> , Hitt. <i>kitta(ri)</i> )	‘lies’	<i>ré</i> , Goth. <i>daug</i> ‘is useful’, Gk. <i>ἔτυχον</i> ‘happened to be at’	‘is useful’
Hitt. <i>eša(ri)</i> , YAv. 3pl. <i>aṅhāire</i> (vs. “dental” 3sg. Ved. <i>āste</i> , Gk. <i>ἵτα</i> )	< * <i>h<sub>1</sub>ēs</i> -o( <i>r</i> )	Hitt. <i>urāni</i> (< * <i>urāri</i> ) ‘burns’, OCS <i>vbrěti</i> ‘to boil, seethe’	< * <i>u<sub>ṛ</sub>H-ó(r)</i> ‘is hot’

- **Type I:** primary athematic middle root presents (media tantum), originally R(*é*), cf. Villanueva Svensson 2012
- **Type II:** derived athematic middle presents to aoristic roots through internal derivation: R(*o*)-middle aorist → R( $\emptyset$ ) middle present, cf. Jasanoff 2003, 2017, Villanueva Svensson 2010/11, etc.
  - In several IE languages, certain preterits or preterit-like categories with historical R(*o*) or R(*o/∅*)-Ablaut correlate with R( $\emptyset$ )-presents (often with middle endings) → “**stative-intransitive systems**” (Jasanoff 2003)
  - Synchronic/attested remnants of “stative-intransitive systems”: class V subjunctives & class III/IV presents in Tocharian, some Hittite active *hi*-conjugation presents (from older aoristic roots) with historic R(*o*)-grade & R( $\emptyset$ )-middle presents.

Table 2. R(*o*)-“aorists” → R( $\emptyset$ ) middle presents

	R( <i>o</i> )-“aorist”		R( $\emptyset$ ) present	
Hitt.	<i>lāki</i> ‘bends’ (tr.)	< * <i>lóg<sup>h</sup>-(e)</i>	<i>lagāri</i> ‘bends’ (itr.)	< * <i>leg<sup>h</sup>-ór</i>
	<i>wāki</i> ‘bites’ (tr.)	< * <i>uóh<sub>2</sub>g-(e)</i>	[* <i>wakāri</i> /* <i>ukāri</i>	< * <i>uh<sub>2</sub>g-ór</i> ]
	[Ved. <i>ástāvi</i> ‘was praised’]	< * <i>stóu-(e)</i>	<i>ištuwāri</i> ‘is known’	< * <i>stuu-ór</i>
Toch.	B <i>wākaṃ</i> ‘will bloom’	< * <i>uóh<sub>2</sub>g-(e)</i>	B <i>wokotār</i> ‘blooms’	< * <i>uh<sub>2</sub>g-ór</i>
	A <i>letaṣ</i> ‘will depart’	< * <i>lōit-(e)</i>	A <i>litatār</i> ‘departs’	< * <i>lit-ór</i>
	B <i>mārsaṃ</i> ‘will forget’	< * <i>mōrs-(e)</i>	B <i>mārsetār</i> ‘forgets’	< * <i>m<sub>ṛ</sub>s-ór</i>

### 3. Hittite *iškallāri*

- **Original inflection:** The formally unambiguous attested forms suggest a mediopassive “stative” (in this case: deponent) paradigm, or an active *hi*-conjugation verb (cf. Neu 1968a:76, 1968b:55, HED II:413, HEG:397–98, Kloekhorst 2008:399, Grestenberger 2014:269–70)
  - → agentive, transitive syntax of *iškallāri* unexpected in a “stative” or middle present.
- The meaning must be “cut/rip/slice off” or “tear to pieces” (cf. Hoffner 1997:178), cf. (1).

Table 3. Attested forms of Hitt. *iškall-*

Active	3sg.pres. <i>iškallai</i> : KBo 6.4 i 39 (OH/NS), <iš-gal-la-i> KBo 6.4 i 37 (OH/NS), <iš-kal-la-a-i> KUB 58.81 ii? 6 (NS); 3sg.pres. <i>iškallaizzi</i> (NS); 3pl.pres. <i>iškallanzi</i> (OH/NS); 1sg.pret. <i>iškallahhun</i> (NS); 3sg.ipv.act. <i>iškallau</i> (MH/NS); 3pl.ipv.act. <i>iškallandu</i> (NS)
--------	--

Mediopassive	3sg.pres.mid. <i>iškallāri</i> : KBo 6.3 i 39 (OH/NS; <iš-kal-la-ri>), KBo 6.5 i 16, 18 (OH/NS), KBo 6.3 i 37 (OH/NS)); 3sg.pret.mid. <i>iškallatta</i> <sup>1</sup> : KBo 8.37 i 9 (MH/NS), KUB 23.7 ii 12 (MH/NS);
Underspecified/ ambiguous	pres.ptcp. <i>iškallant-</i> ‘cut off, split’ (NS); inf. <i>iškalliawanzi</i> (NS); 2sg.ipv. <i>iškalli</i> <sup>2</sup> : HKM 24, 51 (MH/MS), KBo 37.1 ii 16 (NS); original verbal abstract in <sup>TUG</sup> <i>iškalleššar</i> n. ‘type of dress’ (< *‘slitting, cutting’ or ‘what has been cut (off)’)

(1) KBo 6.3 i 37-38

takku	LÚ.U <sub>19</sub> -LU-aš	ELLAM<-aš>	ištamana[n]=ššan	kuiški
If	person-GEN	free-GEN	ear.ACC=3SG.POSS.ACC	anyone.NOM
<b>iškallāri</b>		12 GÍN	KÛ.BABBAR	pāi
tear.off.3SG.PRES.MID		12 shekel	Silver	give.3SG.PRES.ACT
parna=šše=a		šuwāyezzi		
house.ALL=him=and		look.3SG.PRES.ACT		
‘If anyone tears off the ear of a free person, he shall pay 12 shekels of silver, and he shall look to his house for it.’ (Hoffner 1997:27)				

= KBo 6.5 i 16; the later version KBo 6.4 i 37 has <išgallai>; the mediopassive forms in KBo 6.3 i 39 & KBo 6.5 i 18 are replaced with active forms in the later KBo 6.4 i 39 → suggests that *iškallāri* was the older, inherited present & the active *hi*-present was its later replacement.

- **Original ablaut:** “stative” *-āri* points to \**-ór*, prototypical for the ending-accented “*a*-mediopassive” class (cf. Yoshida 1990) → implies R(ø) and hence \**iškalhāri* < \**sKlh<sub>2</sub>/h<sub>3</sub>-ór* (cf. Melchert 1994:55)
- Kloekhorst (2008:399) reconstructs full grade active 3sg. \**skólh<sub>2</sub>/h<sub>3</sub>-e<sub>i</sub>*, 3pl. \**sklh<sub>2/3</sub>-énti*; argues that the original strong stem allomorph that also spread to the weak stem & middle forms (full grade \**sKelH* would also be possible) → but “stative” forms are textually older, and the unexpected agentive semantics make it more likely that the “irregular”, deponent form *iškallāri* preserves the original inflection and was later morphologically “activized” (cf. Oettinger 1976)

**Interim summary:** Oldest form = /*skall-ár(i)*/ with \**-ór*, replaced with active *hi*-conjugation verb in the attested time span (no synchronic motivation for replacement in the opposite direction, *pace* Kloekhorst 2008, Villanueva Svensson 2010/11). If so, root must have been \**sKelh<sub>1</sub>* (more to be said below).

#### 4. Cognates in other IE languages

##### 4.1. Greek

- **Gk. σκόλλω** ‘flay, tear’ (cf. Σκόλλη) < \**skol(H)-ie/o-*, Vine 1999:566: \**-ol<sub>i</sub>-* > -υλλ-, no need for a Cowgill’s Law context (\**sk<sup>(u)</sup>ol(H)-ie/o-* > PGk. \**skol-ie/o-* > \**skul-ie/o-* > *skulle/o-*)
- **Gk. σκάλλω** ‘hoe, harrow’ (Hdt.+) < \**skl<sub>i</sub>-ie/o-* or \**skl<sub>i</sub>-n-* (Vine (1999: 586–87, fn. 51); cf. the root allomorph of Att. σκαλῖς, -ῖδος ‘hoe, shovel’; σκαλμός ‘thole pin, oarlock’, σκάλη ‘knife’)

Problem: Hittite form requires a laryngeal, Greek reflects an *aniṭ* root (cf. LIV<sup>2</sup>: \*?2. (*s*)*kel-* ‘spalten’).

- *aniṭ*-variant generalized from Saussure’s Law (“In PIE, a laryngeal was lost adjacent to a tautosyllabic resonant plus \*/o/”, Byrd 2015:26) or Pinault’s Law context (“A laryngeal is deleted in an onset before a tautosyllabic yod”, Byrd 2015:225)? → the \**ie/o*-present
- Suggests that \*/*skol*/ is the older root allomorph and \*/*skal*/ was backformed from it

<sup>1</sup> Both attestations on broken tablets without syntactic context.

<sup>2</sup> The formally problematic “*i*-imperatives” often correlate with “statives” in *-a(ri)*, cf. Oettinger (2007), who analyzes the *i*-imperatives as synchronically middle; Kloekhorst 2008, Jasanoff 2012: (originally) formally active.

## 4.2. Lithuanian

- Lith. *skeliù, skilti* & *e*-grade variant *skeliù, skélti* ‘split’ < \**skl̥H-je/o-*, \**skelH-je/o-* (Vine 1999: 566, Jasanoff 2003:78, Villanueva Svensson 2010/11: 17) also point to a *set*-root.

## 4.3. Old Norse

- ON *skilja* ‘divide, separate’ < \**skel(H)-je/o-* (Villanueva Svensson 2010/11:17)

Vine, Jasanoff, Villanueva Svensson (loc.cit): Lith. *skeliù, skélti*, ON *skilja* and Gk.  $\Sigma\kappa\acute{\omicron}\lambda\lambda\omega$  together present evidence for an old “*molō*-present” (= a \**h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation present with R(*o/e*)-ablaut). Some problems:

- A “stative” in \**-ór* usually implies a \**h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation *aorist* rather than a present (and cf. LIV<sup>2</sup>, where the root is reconstructed with a primary root aorist, though for different reasons)
- The *e*-grade \**je/o*-present Lith. *skeliù* is treated as a *Neubildung* in LIV<sup>2</sup>
- ON *skilja* is analyzed as denominal to ON *skil* ‘divide, division’ in LIV<sup>2</sup> (?2. \*(*s*)*kel-* ‘spalten’)

→ This leaves the unexpected *o*-grade of Gk.  $\Sigma\kappa\acute{\omicron}\lambda\lambda\omega$  — sufficient evidence for a “*molō*-present”?

## 4.4. Armenian

- Arm. *čelaw* ‘split, tore’ (itr.), 3sg.mid. aorist < (“semi-thematic”) aorist stem \**skel(H)-(e)-?* → main reason why LIV<sup>2</sup> reconstructs an aoristic root \**skel(H)-*
- However, no such aorist is found in any other daughter language (LIV<sup>2</sup> adds Hitt. *iškall(a)-*, but we’ve seen that that’s better analyzed as old “stative” present)
- The Armenian form has the phonological and morphological peculiarities (unexpected reflex of the initial \**sk*-cluster, whose lack of palatalization clashes with the supposedly generalized \**e*-grade of the form; age of the *e*-grade of the root and the middle inflection is unclear<sup>3</sup>)

**Summary:** comparative evidence points to a root \**sKelH* and possibly an R( $\emptyset$ )-\**je/o*-present, evidence for R(*o*) outside of Anatolian is limited to Gk.  $\Sigma\kappa\acute{\omicron}\lambda\lambda\omega$ .

## 4.5. Tocharian

Tocharian A and B both have an intransitive class III present from the root *kul<sup>a</sup>* (glossed as ‘nachlassen’, ‘recede’ in Malzahn 2010:602), TA 3sg. *kulatär*, TB *k<sub>w</sub>letär/kuletär*.

- Class III presents go back to stems of the structure 3sg. \*R( $\emptyset$ )-*ó-tor* (Jasanoff 2003, etc.).
- The corresponding (middle) subj. V paradigm (likewise with R( $\emptyset$ )) may have been modeled on the class III present and does not necessarily imply an inherited active subjunctive with R(*o*).

Meaning: “weaken”, “fail”, “be diminished”, subjects = abstract nouns (“power”, “will”, “virtue”):

Tocharian B (examples & translations from CEToM unless otherwise indicated):

(2) THT 278 b2

<i>[ne]mcek</i>	<i>nai</i>	<i>tremaššana</i>	<i>ařāklaṃts</i>	<i>kuletär</i>	<i>maiyyo</i>
certainly	indeed	angry.GEN.PL	snake.GEN.PL	recede.3SG.PRES.MID	strength.NOM

Peyrot 2013:355: ‘(Who has the thought), “certainly the power of the snakes of anger **fails**”.’

(3) THT 21 b5

...	<i>pakwäreṃmpa</i>	<i>nauš</i>	///	<i>(att)s(ai)k</i>	<i>maiyyo</i>	<i>kulātär</i>	<i>-me</i>
	bad.COM.PL	earlier		Completely	strength.NOM	recede.3SG.SUBJ.MID	-3PL.OBJ

‘With the bad ones first .... their power **will recede** completely.’

(4) THT 78 a1

<sup>3</sup> Daniel Kölligan (p.c.), cf. Klingenschmitt 1982:83, 278, Kölligan 2015:174–175.

*pāramitne* *āyorṣṣe* *mā* *no* *kulā* *-ñ* *palsko*  
 virtue.LOC munificent.OBL not PART recede.3SG.PRET.ACT -1SG.OBJ mind.NOM  
 ‘Also, my mind would not relent towards the virtue (*pāramitā*) of munificence.’

Tocharian A:

(5) A 17 b1

*pñiṣiṃ* *tampeyo* *mā* *tsraṣṣune* *kulatār*  
 virtuous.OBL power.INSTR not energy.NOM recede.3SG.PRES.MID  
 ‘Through the power of virtue, energy does not **weaken**.’

(6) A 230 b7

*tampe* *kālpītār* *kuli(ṣ)* *tampe* *omāskeṃ* *kleśās(ś)i*  
 power.NOM obtain.3SG.OPT.MID recede.3SG.OPT.ACT power.NOM evil.NOM kleśa.GEN.PL  
 ‘... power will be gained; the evil power of the Kleśas **will go down**.’

Etymology of *kulā* (cf. Malzahn 2010:603):

- (*\*g<sup>h</sup>el(h<sub>1</sub>)*), *\*guel(h<sub>1</sub>)*: Jasanoff 1978:39–40 (cf. *\*g<sup>h</sup>elh<sub>1</sub>* ‘treffen, werfen’, LIV<sup>2</sup>:208, ?2. *\*guel-* ‘sich legen’, LIV<sup>2</sup>:192), equates TA *kulatār*, TB *kuletār* with the Lith. “essive”/stative *guliù*, *gulėti* ‘lie’ and Lith. *gul̃ti* ‘lie down’, arguing that B.-Sl. “ē-statives” like *gulėti* < *\*gul-eh<sub>1</sub>-* often functionally replace older root statives or middles
  - so could imply an older stative *\*gul-ór* or *\*gul̥H-ór* underlying the Toch. and the Lith. forms – but only indirect evidence
  - The Toch. forms suggest a passive or anticausative (= dynamic rather than stative) middle, so semantically closer to (formally unrelated) Lith. *gul̃ti* ‘lie down’ than to stative *gulėti*
- *\*k<sup>h</sup>elh<sub>1</sub>* ‘turn’, Hilmarsson 1991:64ff.; but that root = Toch. *kālī* ‘lead, bring’, with alternating subj. V and pret. I paradigms in Toch. A and B, cf. Malzahn 2010:584–586; Adams 2013:256
- *\*(s)k<sup>(w)</sup>el*: Lubotsky 1988:92
  - argues that PIE labiovelars and palatals became velars after *\*s*, and that forms like Tocharian *kulā* with a labiovelar reflex are therefore in principle compatible with forms without labiovelar reflexes after *\*s* in *s-mobile* roots.

**5. Proposal:** connect TA *kulatār*, TB *kuletār* with Hittite *iškallāri* based on Lubotsky’s etymology of the former & argue that they all descend from a “stative-intransitive”, ending-accented present *\*(s)k<sup>(w)</sup>l̥(H)-ór* from an *s-mobile* root *\*(s)k<sup>(w)</sup>elh<sub>1</sub>* ‘cut off/into, slice’.

Three main problems to overcome:

- the proposed phonological equation *\*(#)sk : \*(#)k<sup>h</sup>*
- the semantic mismatch between the Toch. intransitive verb & the Hitt. transitive-agentive verb
- the morphological question of the original root ablaut in Hittite (& the Greek forms)

### 5.1. *\*(#)sk : \*(#)k<sup>h</sup>*?

An old idea (Meillet 1894): labiovelar coarticulation is lost after *\*s*, cf. more recently Steensland 1973 (shows that the sequence *\*/sk<sup>h</sup>/* is completely missing from the reconstructed forms in IEW).

**Hittite:** no instances of inherited */#sk<sup>w</sup>/*, potential medial *-sk<sup>w</sup>-*:

- is secondary, e.g., *maleškuēšzi* ‘become weak’ ← *mališku-* ‘weak’
- or lacks an etymology (*tašku(i)-* ‘thigh bone’, *wašku(i)-* ‘offense’)

**Tocharian**<sup>4</sup>: initial <kw>, <ku> and <ku> as reflexes of \*#k<sup>u</sup>, \*#g<sup>u</sup>, \*#g<sup>uh</sup> are well-represented,<sup>5</sup> and some medial reflexes are found as well (e.g., Toch. B *walkwe* ‘wolf’ < \*u<sub>l</sub>k<sup>u</sup>o-, Fellner & Malzahn Forthcoming), synchronic sequences of <(#)skw>, <(#)sku>, <(#)sk<sub>u</sub>> and <(#)suk> are only found

- in Skt., BHS, and Iranian loanwords (e.g., Tocharian B *sakw*, A *suk* ‘fortune, happiness’ < Skt./Pkt. *sukhá-* ‘fortune’, Toch. B *pässakw*, A *psuk* ‘garland’ < Iranian \**pusāka-*, etc.)
- in synchronically derived sequences of -sk + u/w- (e.g., verbal nouns in -o/-w to neo-roots in -sk, like Toch. B *māskw* ‘obstacle’, *palsko* ‘thought’, etc.).

Potentially inherited \*sk<sup>u(h)</sup> (< \*s + \*g<sup>u</sup>, \*g<sup>uh</sup>, \*k<sup>u</sup>) does not reflect the labial element:

- Toch. B *skeye*, A *ske* ‘zeal’ (→ skāy<sup>ā</sup> ‘strive’) < PIE \*sk<sup>u</sup>oyo-<sup>6</sup> (Adams 2013, cf. Malzahn 2010:956), possibly an s-mobile variant of the root of Gk. ποιέω ‘do’, Ved. *cinóti* ‘collects, arranges’, etc. (LIV<sup>2</sup>:378–9, 2. \*k<sup>u</sup>ej- ‘sammeln, schichten’).
- Toch. A adverb *skam* ‘always, continuously’ < \*sk<sup>w</sup>-o-mo-, \*sek<sup>w</sup>- ‘follow’ (a “quasi-participial” \*mo-adjective, Georges-Jean Pinault, p.c.).<sup>7</sup>

So even though more evidence is a desideratum, this suggests that Toch. A *kulatär*, Toch. B *kuletär* and Hitt. *iškallāri* could in principle go back to the same root.

## 5.2. Meaning

- Toch. ‘recede, weaken’ could come from a canonical “middle” meaning ‘be/get cut off (from)’
- But the Hittite verb is the real problem: transitive, agentive ‘cut/tear off’
- Grestenberger 2014, 2016: at least some members of the Hittite deponent *a(ri)*-class are “inherited deponents” that lost their canonical non-active semantics already before the Anatolian split-off and were therefore not renewed with the synchronically productive non-active (“mediopassive”) endings (that is, a 3sg. in -*tta(ri)*, etc.).
- The same would then be the case for *iškallāri*, which could go back to a canonical “proto-middle” meaning ‘cut off for oneself’ or ‘cut (away) at’.<sup>8</sup>
- Tocharian replaced *all* inherited dentalless endings with \*-tor, so \*k<sup>u</sup>l(H)-ór → \*k<sup>u</sup>l(H)-(ó)tor was used to “update” the semantics of the form as well
  - Parallels: “protomiddle” \*k<sup>u</sup>ónk-e ‘hangs’ (itr.), formally > synchronically active Hittite 3sg. *kānki* ‘hangs’ (tr.) & new oppositional middle 3sg. mid. *gangattari* ‘hangs’ (itr.), cf. Jasanoff 2003: 72–4.

→ synchronically productive, *canonical* non-active contexts tend to be associated with the appropriate productive non-active morphology or could be renewed as such - the Hittite-Tocharian pair *iškallāri*: TA *kulatär*, TB *kuletär* would then be a further example of this type of renewal.

## 5.3. Original root ablaut grade

- R(∅) attested in Tocharian and required by the reconstruction as a “root stative-intransitive” → implies that the Hittite form cannot come from the zero grade of a root with \*h<sub>2</sub> or \*h<sub>3</sub>
- Suggests a preform with \*h<sub>1</sub>: \*sk<sup>l</sup>h<sub>1</sub>-ór > \*sk<sup>l</sup>-ór > \*sk<sup>l</sup>l-ór > /(*i*)skallá/ (cf. Melchert 1994:80 on \*R<sub>h1</sub>)
- So neither *iškallāri* nor its formally active replacement *iškallai* requires an o-grade.

<sup>4</sup> I am grateful to Bernhard Koller and Hannes Fellner for helpful discussion of the orthographic variants.

<sup>5</sup> Apart from contexts where labiovelar dissimilation took place by regular sound change, cf. Fellner 2005, 2006.

<sup>6</sup> Alternatively, B *skeye*, A *ske* could be verbal nouns formed to the inherited averbo of skāy<sup>ā</sup> ‘strive’, since the regular outcome of inherited \*-ojo- is controversial. Either way, the initial cluster lacks of a labial reflex.

<sup>7</sup> It could be argued that dissimilatory unrounding before [+round] vowels could have played a role in these cases, but there are several counterexamples to unrounding in that environment, e.g., Toch. A *saku*, B *sekwe* ‘pus’ < \*sok<sup>u</sup>-o- (Gk. ὀπός ‘vegetable juice’, OCS *sokъ* ‘juice, broth’, etc.); Toch. B *enikwe* (A *onik*) ‘human’ < \*n<sup>u</sup>k-*u*-o-; see Pinault 2008: 424-5 for discussion.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Jasanoff 2003:145+fn.2 for a discussion of the protomiddle use of verbs of violent action.

- *iškall(a)*- is consistently spelled with the signs <kal> or <gal> rather than <ka-a-al> or <ka-al><sup>9</sup>
- “stative” *iškallāri* is textually older than the formally active *iškallai*, where such an *o*-grade might be expected; no *o*-grade expected in an *\*ór*-stative in the first place.<sup>10</sup>

However, two independent reasons for the *internal* reconstruction of a preform with *o*-grade:

- R( $\emptyset$ ) “root stative-intransitives” are (originally) internally derived from *\*h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation aorists with R(*o*) (cf. Section 2.2). A root stative-intransitive 3sg. *\*(s)k<sup>(w)</sup>lh<sub>1</sub>-ór* could therefore imply an older 3sg. *\*h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation aorist *\*(s)k<sup>(w)</sup>ólh<sub>1</sub>-e* and justify reconstructing an aoristic root
- The *o*-grade of Greek σκόλλω ‘flay, tear’, which is unexpected in a *\*ie/o*-present (no obvious nominal basis for σκόλλω) → maybe deverbal *\*ie/o*-present from inherited *\*h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation aorist *\*(s)k<sup>(w)</sup>ólh<sub>1</sub>-e*, with root ablaut grade from its derivational basis.

## 6. Conclusion

- No need to assume that the PIE “dentalless middle” endings were associated with a separate, semantically distinct (voice) category “stative”
- Rather, they represent a particular stage in the development of the PIE non-active (“middle”) endings and its various functions, some of which were compatible with a later development into syntactically active, transitive functions, i.e., as formally active (thematic) verbs or as deponents.
- Assuming that labiovelars are reflected as velars after *\*s* in Anatolian and Tocharian makes it possible to identify Toch. B *kuletär*, A *kulatär* as cognates of Hitt. *iškallāri* and reconstruct a further dentalless, R( $\emptyset$ ) “stative” *\*(s)k<sup>(w)</sup>lh<sub>1</sub>-ór* for PIE.
  - And possibly a *\*h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation aorist indirectly reflected in the R(*o*)-grade of Gk. σκόλλω

## References

- Adams, D. Q. 2013. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B: Revised and Greatly Enlarged*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Byrd, A. M. 2015. *The Indo-European Syllable*. Leiden: Brill.
- CEToM = 2011–. *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts*. <https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian>.
- Fellner, H. A. 2005. “Die Vertretung der Labiovelare im Tocharischen.” M.A. thesis, University of Vienna.
- . 2006. “On the development of labiovelars in Tocharian.” In K. Jones-Bley et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 17<sup>th</sup> Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, October 27–28, 2005*, 51–65. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.
- . and M. Malzahn. Forthcoming. “The Tocharian version of Māra’s attack on the Bodhisattva.” *TIES*.
- Grestenberger, L. 2014. “Feature mismatch: deponency in Indo-European languages.” Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
- . 2016. “Reconstructing Proto-Indo-European deponents.” *Indo-European Linguistics* 4:98–149.
- . 2018. “Deponency in finite and nonfinite contexts.” *Language* 94/3: 487–526.
- HED = Puhvel, J. 1984–. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin/New York: Mouton.
- HEG = Tischler, J. 1977–. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar. Mit Beiträgen von Günter Neumann*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Hilmarsson, J. 1991. *The Nasal Prefixes in Tocharian: A Study in Word Formation*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- Hoffner, H. A. Jr. 1997. *The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Jasanoff, J. H. 1978. *Stative and Middle in Indo-European*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- . 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

<sup>9</sup> I am grateful to Jay Jasanoff for pointing this out to me.

<sup>10</sup> Alternative: Craig Melchert (p.c.) suggests that an inherited *\*h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation aorist *\*(s)k<sup>(w)</sup>ólh<sub>1</sub>-e* could have transmitted its *o*-grade analogically to its internally derived stative present (the Anatolian reflexes of the *\*h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation have mostly generalized *o*-grade throughout the paradigm, cf. Melchert 2013), the aorist would then have been lost in Anatolian, or is simply not transmitted.

- . 2012. “Did Hittite have *si*-imperatives?” In R. Sukač and O. Šefčík (eds.), *The Sound of Indo-European II*, 116–32. München: Lincom.
- . 2013. “The Tocharian subjunctive and preterite in *\*-a-*.” In A. I. Cooper et al. (eds.), *Multi Nominis Grammaticus: Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, 105–20. Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave.
- . 2017. “PIE *\*ueid-* ‘notice’ and the origin of the thematic aorist.” In Hansen, B. S. S. et al. (eds.), *Etymology and the European Lexicon: Proceedings of the 14<sup>th</sup> Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17–22 Sept. 2012, Copenhagen*, 197–208. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kölligan, D. 2015. “Indogermanisch und Armenisch: Studien zur historischen Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen.” Habilitation thesis, University of Cologne.
- Kümmel, M. 1996. *Stativ und Passivaorist im Indoiranischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- LIV<sup>2</sup> = Kümmel, M., and H. Rix (eds.). 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert
- Lubotsky, A. 1988. “Tocharian A *šurm*, B *šarm* ‘cause’ and A *šul*, B *šale* ‘mountain’.” *TIES* 2:89–95.
- Malzahn, M. 2010. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden: Brill.
- Meillet, A. 1984. “De quelques difficultés de la théorie des gutturales indo-européennes.” *Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 8:277–304.
- Melchert, H. C. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- . 2013. “Ablaut patterns in the Hittite *hi*-conjugation.” In S. W. Jamison et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24<sup>th</sup> Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, October 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012*, 137–50. Bremen: Hempen.
- Neu, E. 1968a. *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1968b. *Das hethitische Mediopassiv und seine indogermanischen Grundlagen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1976. “Der indogermanische Stativ.” *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 34:109–49.
- . 1992. “Zur Funktion des indogermanischen Stativs.” In G. Meiser and J. Bendahman (eds.), *Indogermanica et Italica: Festschrift für Helmuth Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*, 347–61. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- . 2007. “Der hethitische Imperativ auf *-i* vom Typ *paḫši* ‘schütze!’.” In D. Grodek and M. Zorman (eds), *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, 561–68. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Peyrot, M. 2013. *The Tocharian Subjunctive: A Study in Syntax and Verbal Stem Formation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Pinault, G.-J. 1982. “A neglected phonetic law: the reduction of the Indo-European laryngeals in internal syllables before yod.” In A. Ahlqvist (ed.), *Papers from the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, 265–72. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2008. *Chrestomathie tokharienne: textes et grammaire*. Leuven/Paris. Peeters.
- IEW = Pokorny, J. 1959–69. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- Steensland, L. 1973. “Die Distribution der urindogermanischen sogenannten Gutturale.” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Uppsala.
- Vine, B. 1999. “On ‘Cowgill’s Law’ in Greek.” In H. C. Luschützky and H. Eichner (eds.), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in Memoriam Jochem Schindler*, 555–600. Prague: Enigma.
- Villanueva Svensson, M. 2007/2008[2010]. “Indo-European middle root aorists in Anatolian (part I).” *Die Sprache* 47/2:203–38.
- . 2010/2011[2012]. “Indo-European middle root aorists in Anatolian (part II).” *Die Sprache* 49/1:6–25.
- . 2012. “The ablaut of the middle root athematic presents in Indo-European.” In H. C. Melchert (ed.), *The Indo-European Verb: Proceedings of the Conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies, Los Angeles, 13–15 September 2010*, 333–42. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Yoshida, K. 1990. *The Hittite Mediopassive Endings in –ri*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- . 2011. “Proto-Anatolian as a mora-based language.” *Transactions of the Philological Society* 109/1:92–108.