

Anatolian and the Indo-European Feminine

Andrew Campman

University of Georgia – Ac30734@uga.edu

Abstract

Luraghi (2009) presents a good argument that the Proto-Indo-European $^{*}(e)h_2$ suffix, which came to be an inflection marker of the feminine grammatical gender in the nuclear Indo-European subgroups, originally had a derivational function, forming abstract nouns from corresponding adjectives and other nouns, e.g. *néwo-teh₂-t-s* ‘newness, novelty’ < **néwos* ‘new’. However, Anatolian does not show feminine gender as an inflectional category in the same way that the other IE languages do. Some Anatolian languages, however, do make use of $^{*}(e)h_2$ as a derivational suffix, especially Luwian and Lycian. Hittite has a feminizing suffix that can be traced to a different PIE origin. Therefore, I intend to demonstrate the relative chronologies of these developments, namely that only after Anatolian broke off into its own subgroup did the suffix $^{*}eh_2$ transition from its derivational to inflectional function within nuclear Indo-European.

Several of the oldest Nuclear, i.e. non-Anatolian, Indo-European language families—Indo-Iranian, Greek, and Italic—have a tripartite grammatical gender system, consisting of masculine, feminine, and neuter.¹ The Anatolian subgroup—consisting most prominently of Hittite, Lycian, and Luwian—has

Acknowledgements: Many thanks to Dr. Jared Klein of the University of Georgia for his feedback on early drafts of this paper ahead of its presentation at LCUGA 2024. Thanks also to the anonymous reviewers who pointed out several corrections and clarifications which were needed ahead of publication. Any remaining errors are solely the author’s responsibility.

¹ In this paper I differentiate between “Nuclear IE” (described here) and what Kim (2014: 121fn) refers to as “Inner IE”.

only a bipartite grammatical gender system consisting of the masculine/common and neuter genders. Furthermore, as Oettinger (2017: 256) points out, “words designating living creatures are never found in the latter [grammatical gender].”² The fact that Anatolian was the earliest subgroup to break off from Proto-Indo-European (PIE) has led to two distinct theories about the history and development of grammatical gender in Indo-European. First, that Anatolian broke off before the feminine developed in Indo-European, or, conversely, that the feminine grammatical gender developed in early PIE and then was subsequently lost in Anatolian. Luraghi (2009) argues convincingly that the feminine gender developed in nuclear Indo-European after the departure of Anatolian, whose bipartite system reflects the same bipartite, animacy-based gender system which is posited for PIE. A brief discussion of the evidence for this is presented in the first portion of this paper. The remaining pages are dedicated to an establishment of the relative chronology of the departure of Anatolian from PIE, the development of the feminine grammatical gender, and the evolution of its inflectional suffix $^{*}(e)h_2$, using as evidence the outcomes in Italic, Greek, and Indo-Iranian, and comparing them to the previously mentioned Anatolian languages: Hittite, Luwian, and Lycian.

While some still argue that the feminine gender was lost in Anatolian—see e.g. Adiego (2016)—the current *communis opinio* is that it was a later development of nuclear Indo-European after the departure of Anatolian. This is supported by evidence in the adjectives and pronouns of the oldest Indo-European languages. Although most adjectives in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit have separate forms for their respective masculine (m.), feminine (f.), and neuter (n.) genders, certain adjectives in each language show the same form in

² Oettinger seems to be referring specifically to words which have individual beings as referents: Hitt./CLuw. *ḫuitar/n* ‘wildlife’ is, in fact, neuter, but this is also a collective, which belonged to a different grammatical category in PIE.

the masculine and feminine genders but a separate one for the neuter, e.g. Lat. *fortis* (m./f.), *forte* (n.) ‘brave’, Gk. ἄδικος (m./f.), ἄδικον (n.) ‘unjust’, Skt. *sumānās* (m./f.), *sumānas* (n.) ‘well-disposed’. Although “most such adjectives are compounds” in Greek (Smyth 1956: 74), a few are not, such as φορός (m./f.), φερόν ‘bearing’ (Lundquist and Yates 2018: 2096). In Latin, the adjectives which follow this pattern are primarily athematic adjectives of the third declension, with the adjectives of the first and second declensions necessarily showing the thematic agreement which is the hallmark of those classes of nouns.

Although Latin and Greek have a tripartite grammatical gender system, they nevertheless show remnants of the original bipartite system in certain pronominal inflections, such as the interrogative pronoun. Lat. *quis* and Gk. τίς ‘who?’, which are both masculine and feminine, with Latin showing *quid* and Gk. τί for the neuter ‘what?’. Sanskrit does not have this distinction and instead shows a tripartite distinction between *kás* (m.) ‘who?’, *kā* (f.) ‘id.’, and *kát/kím* (n.) ‘what?’. Latin and Sanskrit do not show articles as such, using only demonstratives, and only where it is semantically and/or poetically necessary, but Greek reflects this same distinction in its definite article. Although Greek has a different article for each of the three genders—ὁ ‘the’ nom.sg.masc., ἡ ‘id.’ nom.sg.fem., and τό ‘id.’ nom.sg.neut.—, the feminine ἡ was certainly developed analogically on the basis of the masculine article ὁ. The masculine ὁ can be traced back to the PIE masculine demonstrative **só* via debuccalization of **s-* to Gk. *h-* in initial position. Subsequently, the feminine **seh₂* was formed via the addition of the **(e)h₂* suffix which was the inflectional marker of the feminine by the time of even Proto-Greek. The Greek neuter τό comes straightforwardly from PIE neuter demonstrative **tó*.

Before I proceed with my discussion of the PIE suffix and its outcomes in Anatolian, I feel it is important to clarify the scope of this paper. Several

scholars have looked at the nuances of difference between the suffixes $*-eh_2$, $*yeh_2/*ih_2$, and $*-h_2$, a few of which have been used as references. This paper will look at them at the time when they were allomorphs of the same original suffix, which I have given in this paper as $*-(e)h_2$, except where a more precise reconstruction can be established for specific forms. Kim (2014: 121) discusses competing theories about the origin and changes which underlie the eventual distribution of the $*-eh_2$ - and $*-ih_2$ - variants. However, he frames this discussion as pertaining specifically to the “Inner IE languages”, i.e. “the IE branches except Anatolian and Tocharian.” Fellner (2014: 9) disputes Kim’s (2014) claims about the status of $*-eh_2$ and $*ih_2$ at the time when Tocharian broke off from Nuclear IE. The present paper, however, attempts to bring some clarity to the period before even Anatolian broke off from PIE, and so will look at $*-(e)h_2$ at a stage when there was only one suffix with possible allomorphs.³ Furthermore, although I will be examining the reflexes of the suffixes in the Anatolian languages, I am equally if not more interested in their semantic values, i.e. the sense and kinds of words they were able to derive. From this perspective and given the early stage of PIE at which I will be looking, I have chosen in most cases to give the suffix as $*-(e)h_2$, which should be understood as the single suffix which later split into $*-yeh_2/*ih_2$, $*-eh_2$, and $*-h_2$.

Although the PIE $*-(e)h_2$ suffix was eventually generalized as an inflectional marker in the Nuclear IE daughter languages, it originally had derivational function, forming abstract nouns from adjectives—e.g. $*néwo-teh_2-t-s$ ‘newness, novelty’ < $*néwos$ ‘new’—and from other nouns—e.g. $*g^wén-h_2-$ ‘womanhood’ < $*g^wón-/*g^wén-$ ‘woman’ (for $*g^wen-h_2-$, see Harðarson 2014: 23). Luraghi (2009) demonstrates that this is the result of the desire of the speakers

³ In this, I follow Luraghi (2009), who suggests that the collective and feminine $*-(e)h_2$ suffixes were one and the same, and so no differentiation needs to be made.

of PIE to mark certain categories of nouns as halfway between the animacy associated with the masculine/common gender and the inanimacy of the neuter gender. We see this in the Latin third declension nouns in *-tās*, most if not all of which are feminine, e.g. *novitās* ‘novelty’, *auctoritās* ‘authority’, and *potestās* ‘power’. This class of nouns can, at times, “bring about events, even if they do not act [voluntarily]/rationally,” (Luraghi 2009: 9) and so can be considered as *somewhat* animate. Luraghi (ibid.) argues that this middle ground is what prompted the creation of a third grammatical gender which was *originally* primarily populated by abstract nouns which were in the middle of the individuation scale, and that the speakers used the **-(e)h₂* derivational suffix as the formant for this new derivational class. Finally, once its derivational function was expanded, the suffix transitioned from derivational to the marker of an inflectional class which became, among others, the first declension in both Latin and Greek.⁴

However, although we see the avatar of the PIE **-(e)h₂* suffix in the Anatolian languages, it does not have the same inflectional function there as it does in Nuclear IE. In Anatolian, it instead remains derivational, forming nouns primarily from adjectives showing up in Lycian as *-(a)za* (from PIE **-tyeh₂*), in Luwian as *-(a)za* and *-ah₂it*, and in Hittite as simple *-a*. Although these suffixes form nouns which take feminine grammatical gender in Inner IE, these new nouns nevertheless are still of the common gender in Anatolian and do not show any evidence of belonging to a new or separate inflectional class—either on their own or in their agreement with other sentence elements—which is the primary marker of a new grammatical gender. This is the primary piece of evidence I will use in support of my conclusion that the departure of Anatolian from Proto-Indo-European took place after the extension of the **-(e)h₂* suffix to

⁴ The reader will recall that not all first declension nouns in either Greek or Latin are of feminine gender.

the derivation of more than just abstract nouns but before it transitioned to its eventual inflectional function.

Hittite, Luwian, and Lycian all show reflexes of suffixes which can be traced back to original PIE $^{*}(e)h_2$. However, there is some semantic variation even within the Anatolian subgroup regarding what categories of nouns they derive. Hittite and Luwian both show the same semantic function as the original PIE, though the surface outcomes are different. Hittite *wārra-* and Cuneiform Luwian *warrahīt-* are both derived stems meaning ‘help’ (Melchert 2014: 259), an abstract noun. We see this formation become quite productive in both languages, though as we shall see, there is a slight semantic difference between the two. Luwian mostly retains the original function of deriving abstract nouns, showing words like *ānnarummāhīt-* ‘forcefulness, virility’ and *mašḥahīt-* ‘growth, prosperity’ (Melchert 1993: 15, 144). In Hittite, however, the suffix does not appear to mark a similar semantic category, instead being found in abstract and concrete nouns alike, e.g. *ḫāššā-* ‘fireplace’ and *ḫišša-* ‘hitching pole’, in contrast to the stems which mean ‘help’ above. It should be noted that Hittite and Luwian show similar words for ‘mother’—*anna-* and *ānna-* respectively—but this may simply be a linguistic universal, since ‘mother’ belongs to the core vocabulary of human language.

Luwian also shows the suffix *-(a)za* ($<^{*}tyeh_2$), which is shared with Lycian. While this suffix is also derivational, both Luwian and Lycian use it to derive endocentric animate nouns from adjectives (Melchert 2014: 261), rather than to derive abstract nouns as was the case in PIE. Thus, from *wašḥa-* ‘the sacred’, Lycian shows the noun *wasaza-* ‘priest’, i.e. ‘the sacred one’. We see the same formation in *kumaza* ‘priest’ from *kumma-* ‘sacred’. In this instance, this suffix appears to have become grammaticalized and to have played a role “in forming animate nouns referring to professions:” (Melchert 2014) *maraza-* ‘judge’, *zxxaza-* ‘fighter’, and *asaxlaza-* ‘governor’. It appears then that this

suffix in Lycian serves as an agentive or at the very least individualizing suffix, which, semantically, is similar to how it originally functioned in PIE. Melchert (2014: 262) notes that the *-(a)za* suffix “became fully productive” in Lycian and Luwian. From this then, I will suggest that Anatolian split off from PIE around the time that the **(e)h₂* expanded from its original role in forming only abstract nouns to producing a wider variety of nouns including certain concrete, inanimate objects, and *-(a)za* followed a similar trajectory in Anatolian.

Although Hittite shows a suffix attached to several nouns which can be traced back to PIE **(e)h₂*, that suffix does not mark only grammatically or biologically feminine entities. However, Hittite does show another suffix with which it derives words for biologically feminine entities from their masculine counterparts. This phenomenon shows up even in modern languages which otherwise do not mark gender, such as modern English *-ess* in words like *waitress* and *baroness*.⁵ The suffix *-(š)šar(a)*, which comes from PIE **sor-* ‘woman’ (cf. PIE **swesor-* ‘sister’ < ‘female self’, Harðarson 2014), is used in Hittite as well as both Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian to mark terms with biologically feminine referents which were derived from their masculine equivalents (Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 59). Thus, in Hittite, we see *ḫaššu-šara-* ‘queen’ from *ḫaššu-* ‘king’ and *išhā-šš(a)raš* ‘mistress’ from *išhaš-* ‘master’. Likewise, Hieroglyphic Luwian shows *hasusara/i-* for ‘queen’, and Cuneiform Luwian shows *nāna-šra/i-* ‘sister’ from *nāna/i-* ‘brother’ (Harðarson 2014: 24-5). This *-(š)š(a)ra* suffix appears to be more widely productive in Luwian than in Hittite. While this suffix produces nouns which refer only to feminine animate entities in Hittite, we find in Luwian at least one concrete noun, *kuttaš(ša)ra/i-* ‘orthostat’ (Melchert 1993: 113), which may point to an extended derivational

⁵ A lot of these terms are falling out of favor from a sociolinguistic perspective; I mention them here purely to illustrate the function they served and the reason they developed in the first place, which can also be equated with the secondary development of the PIE **(e)h₂* suffix.

function similar to what happened with PIE $^{*}(e)h_2$ around the time that Anatolian broke off. If it is indeed a compound, as proposed by Melchert (2002: 300) (for more recent work against this analysis, see Hackstein et al. 2014), this would show a similar penchant for creating abstract nouns from the same formant used to denote feminine entities which Luraghi (2009) proposes for PIE $^{*}eh_2$.

PIE $^{*}sor-$ is also used in other IE languages in nouns and compounds that refer to individuals of feminine gender, but these formations are not nearly as productive in the other IE subgroups as they are in Anatolian. Many IE languages have similar forms of the word meaning ‘sister’—e.g. Gothic *swister*, Lat. *soror*, Vedic *svásar*, and Old Irish *siur*—but as these share an etymon, they are not derived. Latin, however, also shows a reflex of PIE $^{*}sor-$ in the word *uxor* ‘wife’, which is specifically feminine, as compared to the almost-synonymous but gender non-specific *conjunx*—whence PDE *conjugal*—which can mean either ‘husband’ or ‘wife’ depending on context. Harðarson (2014: 32-5) details various theories about the etymology of *uxor*, noting also its Faliscan cognate *uxo(r)*, and suggests that it may utilize PIE $^{*}sor-$ as one element of its compound, though this etymology is not presented by Michiel de Vaan (2008).

Young Avestan also shows PIE $^{*}sor-$ as the primary element of its lexeme *hāiriši-* ‘woman’. Harðarson (2014: 36) makes the case that *hāiriši-* is an *i*-stem from original $^{*}ser-i$, which shows *e*-grade of the original root $^{*}sor-$ ‘woman’, and which shows debuccalization of $^{*}s- > h-$ in a manner similar to that of Greek (on the development of $^{*}s-$ in Iranian, see Cantera 2017: 493-4). This form appears to have developed from an *i*-stem with subsequent extension to an *s*-stem, from $^{*}sēr-i$ ‘womanly’ $> ^{*}sēr-i-s$ ‘womanhood’ in the same way that we saw the development of $^{*}g^wen-h_2-$ ‘womanhood’ $< ^{*}g^wón-/^{*}g^wén-$ ‘woman’ (on the extensions of $^{*}ser- > hāiriš-$, see Harðarson 2014: 36-7). Harðarson (2014:

50) concludes that “The development of **sor-* as a word-forming suffix began in its use as a compositional suffix”, and that “the Anatolian languages preserve the older state.” In subgroups other than Anatolian, however, this suffix is found only in what can be considered either archaic or relic forms. Harðarson (2014: 50) does make the point that “This development is similar to that of the suffixes **-ih₂/-yeh₂-* and **-eh₂-*.”

The reason that the suffix which formed from PIE **sor-* developed in this way only in the Anatolian languages appears to be two-fold. First, the speakers of Hittite and Luwian appeared to have an interest in marking the feminine and masculine version of the same entity as distinct. This prompted the adoption of a suffix to mark the difference, in this case one whose source was, itself, one of the PIE words for ‘woman’. It is noteworthy that not all of the Anatolian languages adopted a suffix to mark specifically feminine entities, but that is something which may be attributed to natural cultural and/or linguistic variation. Second, it seems that Anatolian did not adopt its reflex of the **-(e)h₂* suffix in this function because it did not yet have that function at the time when Anatolian broke off from PIE. We see it as derivational in Hitt. *-a-*, Luw. *-āhīt-* and *-aza-*, and Lycian *-aza-*, but in none of these languages, or any other Anatolian language, for that matter, does any reflex of PIE **-(e)h₂* serve to mark feminine entities. This is supported by Kim (2014: 130), who states that the “specialization” of **-(e)h₂* “as a female-marking suffix must have been complete by the last common ancestor of Tocharian and Inner IE”, i.e. the developmental period of Indo-European after the departure of Anatolian and Tocharian, which are generally agreed to be the first two subgroups to break off from PIE (on “Inner IE” as the collection of IE subgroups excluding Anatolian and Tocharian, see Jasanoff 2003: 183, as cited by Fellner 2014: 7). While Lycian shows nouns with stems in *-a-* (< **-(e)h₂*) which refer to biologically feminine individuals, e.g. *lada-* ‘wife’ and *χñina-* ‘grandmother’, the majority of nouns in this class do

not refer to animate, feminine entities, so this must be taken as happenstance rather than a semantic marker of this category of nouns.

Luraghi (2009) shows that the IE inflectional category marked by $^{*-(e)h_2}$ was likely utilized to mark feminine entities only as a secondary development by speakers of the language who wanted a way to distinguish them semantically from masculine ones. Once the third grammatical gender was established, it provided them with that opportunity, and those speakers migrated those feminine entities over to that category as a way to keep them distinct. From this, then, the third inflectional gender developed, which also happened to offer a category not just for abstract nouns, but for those biologically feminine, animate nouns which the speakers wanted to distinguish from the masculine ones. It follows then that a similar development could have occurred, albeit to a lesser extent, in the Anatolian languages, some of whose speakers wanted to distinguish male and female entities—we have seen how Hittite and Luwian developed the $^{*}-ššara-$ suffix ($<$ PIE $^{*}sor-$ ‘woman’) in this function, and that Lycian does not show a similar reflex either from $^{*}sor-$ or from any other source. The notable difference with these suffixes in Anatolian as compared to the rest of the IE subgroups is that they remained derivational rather than regrammaticalizing and forming a new inflectional class.

Where the Hittite and Luwian suffix $^{*}-ššara-$ shows a different form serving a similar function, the $^{*}-aza-$ suffix in Luwian and Lycian, on the other hand, shows the opposite pattern: a different function despite having a form which comes directly from PIE $^{*}-tyeh_2-$. The oldest nouns which originate from the PIE suffix $^{*-(e)h_2-}$, those which refer to abstract concepts, are primarily exocentric in nature. That is, they refer overall to ‘the X quality’, or the ‘quality of being X’, the latter in instances where the root is that of a noun, e.g. $^{*}g^wénh_2-$, which is reconstructed as ‘woman’, but which Harðarson (2014: 23) states originally may have been interpreted as ‘womanhood’, i.e. ‘the quality of being

a woman'. Conversely the productivity of the *-aza* suffix in Lycian and Luwian lies in its creation of endocentric nouns, i.e. 'the X one', e.g. *wasaza-* 'priest', i.e. 'the holy/sacred one' < *wašḥa-* 'the sacred' as an abstract noun. That is, although the *-(a)za* suffix came straightforwardly in form from PIE **-(e)h₂*, its function changed once it was established as a productive suffix to that of deriving concrete and animate nouns in Anatolian. It seems that this development could not have taken place if that **-(e)h₂* suffix had undergone the shift from derivational to inflectional before Anatolian split off from PIE.

Additionally, where the PIE **-(e)h₂* suffix originally served to derive abstract nouns that fall somewhere in the middle of the individuation scale (Luraghi 2009: 8-10), the *-(a)za* suffix in Anatolian serves to derive only animate nouns. This seems to constitute a shift in function from derivation of abstract nouns to that of purely animate nouns, which does not align with its progression in the other IE subgroups. This, then, seems like a secondary development that could have taken place in Anatolian only after it broke off from PIE, but at a point after **-(e)h₂-* became more generalized in PIE than as a way to derive *only* abstract nouns. Furthermore, the fact that the widespread use and productivity of this suffix which we see in the other ancient IE languages did not also occur in Anatolian is further evidence that the **-(e)h₂* suffix had not yet come to mark an inflectional category but remained derivational.

This is supported also by the function of the *-ahi(t)-* suffix in Luwian, namely that of forming "neuter abstract nouns from adjectives and nouns, expressing status" (Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 54). Although there are a multitude of abstract nouns formed in Luwian with this suffix, it is not used to derive exclusively abstract nouns. "It also appears on a few terms for concrete objects: *ḥaršandanahit-* (part of a wagon or chariot wheel)" (Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 54). This seems to illustrate a distinction in Luwian between two different

formations, since it alone shows both *-ahīt-* and *-(a)za-*, each in a different function. It is plausible that the speakers of Luwian adopted two different formations of the **-(e)h₂-* suffix. One, **-tyeh₂-*, had the extension in **-t*—cf. Lat. *-tās*, Gk. *-της/-τας*, and Skt. *-tāti*—which became *-(a)za*,⁶ and another with **-(e)h₂*, which became Luwian *-ahīt-* and retained the original function of deriving primarily abstract nouns from adjectives. This branching off reflects the instability of the various forms of the suffix at the point when they became established specifically in Luwian, as well as more broadly in Anatolian; we have seen a variety of outcomes already which do not indicate one specific, unifying function.

To this point, I have focused primarily on what Kim (2014: 130) and Fellner (2014: 7) refer to as “Inner IE”, that is IE minus the Anatolian and Tocharian subgroups. It is well-established that Anatolian demonstrably does not have a feminine grammatical gender (see e.g. Oettinger 2017: 256, Hoffner & Melchert 2008: 66). The grammatical gender situation in Tocharian is a bit more complex, though it does offer additional hints about the development of grammatical gender in nuclear IE. Pinault (2017: 1336) discusses primarily that Tocharian does not have any nouns of neuter gender, showing remnants of neuter only in pronominal inflection. This in and of itself, however, highlights the fact that by the time of Tocharian, the feminine had in fact become its own inflectional category: the only way for the neuter endings to be able to merge “with those of the feminine in the plural in the prehistory of Tocharian” is if the feminine were already a separate grammatical gender rather than a later offshoot. Adams (1988: 108) additionally asserts that the neuter was lost in most instances due to the fact that Tocharian neuter nouns “became

⁶ It should be noted that any masculine or neuter nouns belonging to these classes in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit are secondary developments as a result of extension/expansion once the inflectional category had already been established.

phonologically indistinguishable from the masculine in the singular and the feminine in the plural” (Pinault 2017: 1336) and thus underwent analogic changes as a secondary development. That is, it appears that the feminine grammatical gender became fully realized at a time between the departure of Hittite and that of Tocharian.

More specifically, Fellner (2014) addresses the status of the $^{*}(e)h_2$ suffix as a marker of feminine grammatical gender in Tocharian. He notes (2014: 8) that Tocharian does not show the same outcomes which we see in the nominative and accusative singular of what became the Greek and Latin first declension, and that instead, “the attested feminine in this class deviates significantly from the expected continuants of the (late-)PIE feminine adjectival suffix $^{*}(e)h_2$.” This leads to Fellner’s (2014:9) suggestion that $^{*}(e)h_2$ was “not yet a feminine marker for adjectives when Tocharian left the Indo-European proto-language”, and thus had not been fully established and entrenched as a marker of a specific inflectional class. This additionally supports the outcome discussed above that Anatolian broke off from PIE before the feminine gender was established. It is even more certain, then, that $^{*}(e)h_2$ did not become the inflectional marker of that category before the departure of Anatolian.

Fellner’s (2014: 19-20) conclusion that PIE $^{*}ih_2$ and $^{*}eh_2$ are both inherited into Tocharian with “no deviation from the inner-Indo-European branches”—the former used with athematic nouns and latter used with thematic ones—suggests that Anatolian was the only subgroup to depart from PIE before $^{*}eh_2$ became grammaticalized as a separate gender. However, this stance is not universally accepted (in opposition, see Kim 2009 and Hackstein 2011, as cited by Fellner 2014: 9). If Fellner’s (2014: 19-20) conclusion is correct, this outcome bespeaks a status of $^{*}(e)h_2$ in Tocharian which differs from that of either Anatolian or inner IE. That is, it highlights a degree of flexibility which is seen in neither Greek nor Latin—neither of the latter

languages shows any exception to the rule that third declension nouns of the respective types in -της/-τας and -tās are feminine (for Greek, see Smyth 1956: 60; for Latin, see Weiss 2020: 324). Furthermore, there is a marked paucity of masculine nouns of the first declension in both Greek and Latin, and these can be shown to be the result of secondary development after the establishment of the $^{*}(e)h_2$ suffix as the inflectional marker of the class of nouns which originally primarily included partially animate abstract and then subsequently entirely animate feminine nouns as the result of two separate developments.

The summation of the evidence given above provides the following picture of the history of the Anatolian subgroup as it connects to the rest of PIE and that of the development of the feminine grammatical gender and various suffixes used to mark both biologically and grammatically feminine entities. It is well-known that Anatolian had no feminine grammatical gender, which means it must have departed from PIE before the feminine became its own inflectional category or that Anatolian subsequently lost it. The *communis opinio* is that Anatolian broke off from PIE before the $^{*}(e)h_2$ suffix, the eventual marker of feminine grammatical gender in nuclear IE, developed as such. This is supported by the fact that the most prominent Anatolian languages—Hittite, Luwian, and Lycian—show reflexes of the $^{*}(e)h_2$ suffix in -a, -ahit-, and -(a)za respectively, the last of which is found in both Luwian and Lycian. In each case, it seems much more likely that these suffixes remained derivational rather than that they regrammaticalized back into inflectional suffixes after making the initial transition from derivational to inflectional (on the initial transition from derivational to inflectional, see Luraghi 2009).

Nevertheless, Anatolian shows two derivational suffixes which mark the feminine in IE. The -(š)š(a)ra suffix (< PIE **sor-* ‘woman’) was used to derive feminine nouns from their male counterparts in Hittite and Luwian, but not in Lycian. It’s possible that this was not characteristic of Anatolian as an entire

subgroup, simply of those languages whose speakers felt the need to distinguish between masculine and feminine entities. However, it is more likely that it is simply an issue that these happen to be attested in Hittite and Luwian but not in Lycian. And although this same formant **sor-* may be found in Lat. *uxor* and Faliscan *uxo(r)* ‘wife’ (see above) as well as in YAv. *hāiriši-* ‘woman’, nowhere is this derivational suffix as productive as it is in Anatolian. On the other hand, the reflexes of the PIE **(e)h₂* suffix, *-ah₂it-* and especially *-(a)za-*, also “became fully productive,” (Melchert 2014: 262) and show similarly versatile derivational function as PIE **(e)h₂* before it was regrammaticalized as the marker of an inflectional category. The *-ah₂it-* suffix in Luwian primarily derives exocentric abstract nouns from adjectives and concrete nouns, which is exactly the same function that **(e)h₂* served in PIE. The *-(a)za-* suffix in Luwian and Lycian is also derivational but has in the latter two undergone a secondary development by which it is used to mark only endocentric, animate nouns.

The multitude of derivational suffixes in Anatolian which either mark feminine entities or eventually came to do so in other languages—but not both—makes a convincing case that we can place the departure of Anatolian from PIE at a point after **(e)h₂* became generalized as a derivational suffix for more than just abstract nouns, but before it transitioned over to its eventual inflectional function. The fact that the variety of derivational suffixes never elicited a new inflectional class either with or without **(e)h₂* also points to this chronological sequence of events.

References

- Adams, Douglas Q. (1988). *Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Adiego, Ignasi-Xavier. (2016). "Anatolian languages and Proto-Indo-European." *Veleia*, 33, pp. 49-64.
- Cantera, Alberto. (2017). "The Phonology of Iranian" in *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics* (ed. Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, & Matthias Fritz), pp. 481-503. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- de Vaan, Michiel. (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Fellner, Hannes A. (2014). "PIE Feminine **-eh₂* in Tocharian" in *Studies on the Collective and Feminine in Indo-European from a Diachronic and Typological Perspective* (ed. Sergio Neri & Roland Schuhmann), pp. 7-21. Leiden: Brill.
- Hackstein, Olav. (2011). "Collective and Feminine in Tocharian" in *Linguistic Developments Along the Silk Road: Archaism and innovation in Tocharian* (ed. Olav Hackstein and Ronald I. Kim), pp. 143-77. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hackstein, Olav, Jared Miller, Elisabeth Rieken, and Ilya Yakubovich (eds.). (2014-). *The Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Anatolian Corpus Languages*. <https://www.ediana.gwei.uni-muenchen.de/>.
- Harðarson, Jon Axel. (2014). "Das Andere Wort für 'Frau' im Urindogermanischen" in *Studies on the Collective and Feminine in Indo-European from a Diachronic and Typological Perspective* (ed. Sergio Neri & Roland Schuhmann), pp. 23-55. Leiden: Brill.
- Hoffner Jr., Harry A. and H. Craig Melchert. (2008). *A Grammar of the Hittite Language: Part 1: Reference Grammar*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

- Jasanoff, Jay H. (2003). *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kim, Ronald I. (2009). "The Feminine gender in Tocharian and Indo-European" in *East and West: Papers in Indo-European Studies* (ed. Kazuhiko Yoshida and Brent Vine), pp. 69-87. Bremen: Hempen.
- Kim, Ronald I. (2014). "A Tale of Two Suffixes: $*-h_2-$, $*-ih_2-$, and the Evolution of Feminine Gender in Indo-European" in *Studies on the Collective and Feminine in Indo-European from a Diachronic and Typological Perspective* (ed. Sergio Neri & Roland Schuhmann), pp. 115-136. Leiden: Brill.
- Lundquist, Jesse and Anthony D. Yates. (2017). "The Morphology of Anatolian" in *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics* (ed. Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, & Matthias Fritz), pp. 256-73. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Luraghi, Silvia. (2009). "The Origin of the Feminine Gender in PIE" in *Grammatical Change in Indo-European Languages. Papers Presented at the Workshop on Indo-European Linguistics at the XVIIIth International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Montreal, 2007* (ed. Vit Bubenik, John Hewson, & Sarah Rose), pp. 3-13. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Melchert, H. Craig. (1993). *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill.
- Melchert, H. Craig. (2002). "Covert Possessive Compounds in Hittite and Luvian." In *The Linguist's Linguist: A Collection of Papers in Honour of Alexis Manaster Ramer* (ed. Fabrice Cavoto), pp. 297-302. Munich: LINCOM.
- Melchert, H. Craig. (2014). "PIE $*-eh_2$ as an 'Individualizing' Suffix" in *Studies on the Collective and Feminine in Indo-European from a Diachronic and Typological Perspective* (ed. Sergio Neri & Roland Schuhmann), pp. 257-271. Leiden: Brill.

- Oettinger, Norbert. (2017). "The Morphology of Anatolian" in *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics* (ed. Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, & Matthias Fritz), pp. 256-73. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. (2017). "The Morphology of Tocharian" in *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics* (ed. Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, & Matthias Fritz), pp. 1335-1352. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. (1956). *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Weiss, Michael. (2020). *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*, 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.