

## 1st singular iterated mediopassive endings in Anatolian

Kazuhiko Yoshida

Kyoto University

It is well known that Hittite has 1 sg. iterated mediopassive endings pres. *-(h)ḫaḫari*, pret. *-(h)ḫaḫat(i)*, and imper. *-(h)ḫaḫaru* in addition to simple pres. *-(h)ḫa(ri)*, pret. *-(h)ḫat(i)*, and imper. *-(h)ḫaru*. Careful examination of the attested data reveals the following three facts: 1) A majority of the examples with the iterated ending are preterites. 2) The relevant examples are either mediopassives of *ḫi*-verbs or media tanta; no examples of *mi*-verb mediopassives are recorded. 3) The iterated endings are never attested in Old Hittite or Middle Hittite original manuscripts, but only in Neo-Hittite original manuscripts and Neo-Hittite copies of earlier texts.

The first two facts naturally lead us to consider the Proto-Anatolian situation of the 1 sg. verbal endings. While the 1 sg. pres. *ḫi*-ending *\*-h<sub>2</sub>ei* was formally distinguished from the 1 sg. pres. mediopassive ending *\*-h<sub>2</sub>e(r)* and the 1 sg. pret. *mi*-ending *\*-m* from the 1 sg. pret. mediopassive ending *\*-h<sub>2</sub>e*, there was no distinction between the 1 sg. pret. *ḫi*-ending and the 1 sg. pret. mediopassive ending, both of which had *\*-h<sub>2</sub>e*. An obvious inference to be drawn from this situation is that the 1 sg. mediopassive ending later came to be iterated so as to be formally disambiguated from the corresponding *ḫi*-ending. This development is evidenced by the Hittite pairs *paḫḫašḫaḫḫat* ‘I protected’ vs. *paḫḫašḫun* and *ḡeḫḫaḫat* ‘I turned’ vs. *ḡeḫun*. Our claim that the iterated ending was first created in the preterite is supported by the following two facts. First, Hittite does not have the present iterated ending *-(h)ḫaḫa*, but *-(h)ḫaḫari* marked by *-ri*, which became virtually obligatory in the Neo-Hittite period. Second, Lycian has the 1 sg. iterated ending only in the preterite: *aḫagã* ‘I became’ (besides *aḫa*, *aḫã* and *agã*) in contrast to *siḫani* ‘I lie’.

As for the third fact shown in the first paragraph of this abstract, this imbalance in attested periods of the iterated endings inevitably suggests that they did not exist in Proto-Anatolian yet and that they first appeared at a relatively late stage in the history of the individual Anatolian languages. The lenited quality of the second consonants in Hittite *-ḫaḫa* and Lycian *-χagã* might seem to be an obstacle to this interpretation because the lenition rules are generally considered to have operated in Proto-Anatolian. But there is evidence which shows that the second lenition rule was still retained in the prehistory of the daughter languages. This fact provides us with a reasonable explanation for the lenited second consonant in the 1 sg. iterated mediopassive endings, which are probably due to independent and parallel developments in the prehistory of the daughter languages.