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, and that the traces of such a relationship can still be recognized, for example, in Vedic Sanskrit, in which the noun *vāsu*- (n.) ‘good’ is acrostatically inflected (cf. gen. sg. *vāsvah*), whereas the homophone adjective *vāsu*- ‘good’ is proterokinetically inflected (cf. gen. sg. *vāsoh*). Based on the archaic Hit. nom-acc. pl. n. *a-aššu-u* ‘good’ < *a*-H₂ (alongside standard *aššu* ‘idem’), which inflectionally corresponds to Ved. *vāśu* (nom.-acc. pl. n.) ‘good’ and Av. *vohū* ‘idem’, Watkins therefore postulated that the word-formational relationship between the Hit. adjective *aššu*/*āššu* ‘good, dear, favored’ and the noun *aššu* (n.) ‘good’ is not as is generally explained, as though the noun is substantivized from the adjective, but that the noun *aššu* (n.) ‘good’ was inflected in the protolanguage following the acrostatic accent pattern and has therefore also preserved the archaic case ending *-H₂ in the nom.-acc. pl. n. The proterokinetic quality of *a*-u/aṷ- in the adjective *aššu*/*āššu*- and the acrostatic quality of the noun *aššu* (n.) ‘good’ with the archaic form *a-aššu-u* (nom.-acc. pl. n.) thus presumably still expresses the protolanguage state of affairs.

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. *āpas* (n.) ‘work’ : *apās* (adj.) ‘active’ and also the more recent type Skt. *uṣrā* (adj.) ‘morning, reddish’ : *uṣār* (f.) ‘sunrise, morning’, *tamāsā* (adj.) ‘dark’ : *tāmas-

---

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).
(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. kṣṇā- (adj.) ‘black, dark’ → kṣṇa- (n.) ‘black antelope’, Gr. λευκὸς (adj.) ‘bright shining’ → λευκὸς (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, ḫalki-āš etc.; *ḫaššu-š, *ḫaššu-āš etc.), and i-stem and u-stem adjectives are predominantly inflected following a declension pattern with ablaut; that is, proterokinetically (e.g., ṣalli-š, ṣalli-n, ṣallaš (< *sallaš-āš) etc.; āššu-ś, āššu-n, āššu-āš etc.). Hittite preserved this protolanguage feature as a tendency with a number of exceptions among both nouns and adjectives; for example, yeši- (c.) ‘pasture’: yešæš (nom. pl.), yešauš (acc. pl); NINDA ḫarši- (c.) ‘type of bread’: NINDA ḫar-ša-i (dat.-loc. sg.), NINDA ḫar-ša-eš (nom. pl.), NINDA ḫar-ša-ūš (acc. pl.); DUG palḥi- (n.) ‘type of (broad) vessel’; DUG pal-ḥa-āš (dat.-loc. pl.), DUG pal-ḥa-e-āHLA (nom.-acc. pl.); šēli- (c.) ‘pile of grain, granary (?)’; še-e-la-āš (gen. sg.) etc.; ṇakki- (adj.) ‘important; difficult’: ṇakki-āz (abl.), ṇakki-ūš (acc. pl. c.) etc.

There still exists an inherited functional distinction in Hittite between the homophone noun ḫaššu- (n.) and the adjective ḫaššu-/āššu-ṷ-, but not between the homophone pair DUG palḥi- (n.): palḥi- (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. prthivē (f.) ‘earth’ → prthivē (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 PSI. *deřvo (n.), which arose with the thematization of the oblique case stem *deru-:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.-acc. sg.</td>
<td>*dóru = Skt. dåruru, Gr. δόρυ, Hit. tåruru-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. sg.</td>
<td>*déru-s (*déry-o-m &gt; PSI. *deřvo) → *dréy-s = Skt. dróth (*dréy-o-m = Goth. triu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the same thematization from PIE *seru-/soru- (n.) ‘quarry’ (cf. Hit. šåruru- (n.) ‘quarry’, OIr. serb (f.) ‘theft’ < *senheH₂), it would be possible to explain membership in this word family of Lat. servus (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-é-o-m, as is known, with the archaic instrumental ga-nu-ut < *g'n-é-y-d is also confirmed by Hittite:

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

gen. sg.    *g'énu-s (→ Hit. gēnu-, Lat. genū) → *g'néyy-s = Skt. jñó (Hit. ganut) (→ *g'néyo-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 *pōl'e (n.): palhi- (adj.).

3. After Julius Pokorny first demonstrated in his Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörtebuch that only the Slavic neuter noun *pōl'e ‘field’ and the Hittite adjective palhi- ‘wide’ – as part of a word family that he combined under the root *pelo-/plā- ‘wide and flat; to spread out; to make flat by pressing and beating, to beat out, to pat out’ (IEW: 805 ff.) – contain an i-stem morpheme, Schmitt-Brandt (1967: 71) derived the Hit. adjective from the reduced grade *p̲l̲H̲i-, and the Slavic noun, understandably, from the o-stem *polfom or, better, *pōlH̲2-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 *pōl'e (n.) was thematized following the same pattern as PSl. *mōr'e (n.) ‘sea’ from a PIE neuter i-stem noun; specifically, *pōl'e (n.) from PIE *pōlH̲2-i- (n.), and PSl. *mōr'e from PIE *mōr-i- (n.), cf. OIr. muir, Lat. mare.6 The PSl. nouns *pōl'e (n.) and *mōr'e (n.) are therefore, like PSl. *deřvo (n.), thematized nouns of the acrostatic type, only that *deřvo preserves the oblique case stem, but *pōl'e (n.) and *mōr'e a direct case stem.

In the same papers, I also surmised that the PIE noun *pōlH̲2-i- (n.) arose through substantivization from a PIE adjective, which is preserved in Hit. palhi- ‘wide’, and that this adjective therefore derived from the same o-grade form *pōlH̲2-i-.7 The explanation is based on the presumption that the Slavic-Anatolian relationship *pōl'e (n.): palhi- (adj.) derives from the original PIE adjective *pōlH̲2-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 *pōlH̲2-i-.

By naming parts of the earth’s surface *pōl'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. palhi- and demonstrated that it represents the full grade *pēl-ô.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. *pōl'e. This has been known in Slovenian etymology since the eighteenth century in the work of Marko Pohlin.


7 This explanation of mine was later used in ESSJ (III, 82) and adopted in ESJS (678).
mationally different Germ. *polle 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. *felida- (n.) < PIE *polH₂-to-m or Arm. hol ‘earth, land, ground’ < PIE *polH₂-o-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 *polH₂-i- (n.) → PSl. *pölIe was substantivized from the PIE adjective *polH₂-i- ‘wide’, because the assumptions about PIE substantivization cannot be satisfactorily argued. Namely, neither of the other two thematized nouns *môre and *dervo have such an adjectival member in their word family. Internal Hittite evidence also leads to the more economical interpretation of the pair *pölIe (n.) : palhi- (adj.) with the application of Watkins’ model, which does not permit derivation of Hit. palhi- (adj.) from o-grade *polH₂-i-.

Because of the Hit. protokinetic declension type of the adjective palhi- (cf. palhi-iš (nom. sg. c.), pal-ja-a-eš (nom. pl. c.)), and especially because of the possibility that assimilation was at work in PIE *VlH₂V→ Hit. –VlV,9 if the adjective is derived from *polH₂-i-10 > **palli-11 then it is more likely that palhi- ‘wide’ preserves a base from the PIE zero-grade root *plH₂-i-,12 which became independent from *plH₂-éi13 and therefore derives from the adjectival protokinetic declension pattern. However, in the direct cases, this contained the stem *polH₂-i-, taking into account that the

8 At least three root-connected examples (i.e., PSl. *pölIe, Germ. *felida-, and Arm. hol) show that Pokorny’s reconstruction of the root *pela*/*plá = *polH₂/*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 palhi- because he determined that in such a case it would be written as *pa-al-hi- and not pal-hi, and so he derived the adjective from a zero-grade form; that is, *plH₂-i-.

11 Also taking into consideration the possibility that the assimilation *-VlH₂V→ Hit. –VlV was not at work, the reflex of the base *polH₂-i- would be written *pa-a-al-hi with the full vowel a (the ispänti 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 Wodtke et al. (2008: 562).

13 The origin of a-vocalism in the Hit. alternations -i/-aître and -u/-aître alongside the IE base *-i/-eître and *-u/-eître is not entirely clear. Melchert (1994: 138) has rejected his earlier attempt to derive this from the o-stem variant *-i/-oître and *-u/-oître (Melchert 1984: 45; derived the same way by Kimball 1999: 242, adjective palhi- *plH₂-i-, *plH₂-oître) 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 -yani (alongside -yeni) 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 -yen < *-ye-ne and -ten < *-te-ne. Otherwise, the phenomenon would have also created a-vocalism in the preterit person markers.
CLuv. adjective yāșu- ‘good’, related to Skt. vasu- (adj.) and Av. vohu- (adj.), as well as the OIr. noun fō ‘goodness, obligingness’, points to an o-grade < *yosu-.14

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

nom. sg. *pōl₂₁-s
acc. sg. *pōl₂₁-m
nom.-acc. sg. *pōl₂₁-o
gen. sg. *p₁₂₂₁-é-s → Hit. palḥi-/palḥaj- (adj.)

and the nominal paradigm, from which PSl. *pōl’e is derived, is:

nom.-acc. sg. n. *pōl₂₁-o → *pōl₂₁-o-m > PSl. *pōl’e (n.)
gen. sg. *p₁₂₂₁-s

4. In the Hittite proterokinetically declined adjective palḥi- and the Proto-Slavic noun *pōl’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. fō < *yosu there is also OIr. feb ‘goodness, obligingness’ < *yesyeH₂. Alongside this I should draw attention to the same formal relationship between OIr. serb ‘theft, robbery’ < *seryeH₂ and Hit. šāru- (n.) ‘quarry’ < *sóru.
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**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 akrostaticno, njim homofoni pridevni pa proterokinetično (Watkinsov model). Razmerje je toliko bolj dragoce- no, ker so bili taki primeri do sedaj v ide. jezikih prepoznani le med ujevskimi tvorbami.