



MUNUS/ *duttarijata/i-* and some other Indo-European maidens¹

Veronika Milanova

Draft. Not for quotations!

Abstract:

The word ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-* discovered in three Hittite texts (KUB 22.40 iii 18, Bo 4120 r.col. 4, and KBo 24.126 obv. 28) is a valuable and fascinating attestation because it may be a reflex of **d^hugh₂tér*, one of the few PIE kinship terms preserved in Anatolian. However, the exact meaning, function and origin of this word in Hittite are questions of debate. The determinative MUNUS indicates that the word cannot be interpreted simply as an appellative ‘daughter’ but must be either a profession or a personal name of a woman. Admitting that *duttarijata/i-* could be a PN, I argue that this word could also be a sacred title designating a maiden/virgin priestess, a post for well-born girls, which existed in some IE cultures.

Key words: Hittite, Luwian, Greek, female priesthood, kinship terms, age grades, semantic change

1. Morphology

According to Starke (1987: 253–254), the base of the borrowed Hittite form *duttarijata/i-* must be Luwian *(*)duttar(i)*² (<< **d^hugh₂ter-*),³ which is probably attested in Bo 4120 r. coll. 4 (ibid.: 251–252). It can be a formation similar to Luwian stems with *i*-mutation (*ašri-* ‘woman’, *ānni-* ‘mother’, etc.) modified by a genitival suffix *-i(ja)-* as in *tadiya-* ‘paternal’ (cf. Yakubovich 2015: §6.2). Therefore, the meaning of **duttari(ja)* might have been something like ‘belonging to the daughter’ (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 904). The idea of appurtenance can also be understood as belonging to a certain group or type of people or possessing certain character traits.⁴

As for the final element, it seems most likely that it can be associated with the Luwian suffix *-tt(i)- / -d(i)-*, which extended nouns, especially nouns denoting people. An application of this

¹ The work on this paper has been possible thanks to a DOC-Stipendium from the Austrian Academy of Sciences. I would also like to express my special gratitude to Marinka Zorman and Heiner Eichner for sharing their knowledge of Hittite, Ilya Yakubovich for valuable remarks about morphological structure and possible semantics of the word ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-*, Billie Jean Collins for consultation about the character DUMU.MUNUS *šuppeššara-*, Gernot Windfuhr for his valuable advice about semantic change in New Persian and my thesis supervisor Melanie Malzahn for supervising and directing me in the right way. The usual disclaimers apply.

² Not all scholars agree that the form *duttari* can be viewed as attested. Unlike Starke (1987), who interprets the fragment *-jan-zi* ^{MUNUS}*du-ut-tar-ja-ta-aš'-kan* (Bo 4120 r. coll. 4) as “...*duttarja* (dat. sg.)// *təaš'kan* ...” (ibid.: 251), HEG (T: 472) assumes that here we are dealing with the form *duttarijataš*.

³ E.g., Ved. *duhitár-*, Av. *dugədar-*, Arm. *dowstr*, Gr. *θυγάτηρ*, Osc. *futír*, Goth. *dauhtar*, Gaulish *duxtir*, OLith. (gen.sg.) *dukterės*, OCS *dūšti*, Toch. A *ckācar*, Toch. B *tkācer* (cf. IEW 277; EIEC 147–148; NIL 126–130).

⁴ For instance, Ilya Yakubovich (p.c.) suggests interpreting this form as ‘daughter-like’ or ‘girl-like’.

suffix obviously had no significant effect on the meaning, judging by, e.g., Luw. *ann(i)-* vs. HLuw. *MATER-nat(i)-* (= **annat(i)-*), in both cases ‘mother’ (cf. Starke 1980: 76–77, Plöchl 2003: 57, Zehnder 2010: 96).⁵

2. Was *duttarijata/i-* a personal name? A syntactic problem

The determinative MUNUS shows that the word cannot be a common noun, but is either a personal name (PN) or a designation of some female profession. The main argument of those who prefer to interpret ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-* as a PN is the position of *iṽar* in KBo 24.126 obv. 28:

- (27) *mān ani-UD.KAM-ti U[D.KAM-z]a SIG₅-ešzi nušmaš^m uraḥešmaš^f piḥa-IR-i[ššza]*
 (28) *arḥa aniḫanzi arḥašmašmaš iṽar^{MUNUS/f} dutarijataš*
 (29) *≈parattašattan aniḫanzi nammašzaš MUNUS.LUGAL piran GAM teḥḫi*
 (30) *nzaš ūatarnaḥmi nzaš a[rḥ]a ‘KASKAL-šiaḥmi’ mānšmašmaš ŪL kuitki ḪUL-uešzi*
 (31) *[nu KI]N SIG₅-ru* (KBo 24.126 obv. 27–31)

- (27) If today the day is propitious, Uraḥešma and Piḥa-IR-i
 (28) will ritually purify themselves. The way d/Duttariyati (?) (does it), from them (29) they will ritually remove the impurity (or: “They will ritually remove (it) from them like the curse of d/Duttariyati (?)”). After that I will lead them to the queen (or “...I, the queen, will order them to come to me”)
 (30) and I will instruct them and will set them on the way. If nothing bad is going to happen to them,
 (31) the KIN-oracle should be positive.
 (cf. HEG T: 471–474, P: 449; CHD Pa: 141; van den Hout 1995: 119–120)

The syntactic behaviour of *iṽar* was discussed by Hoffner (1993). According to him, the normal word order should be “genitive noun + *iṽar*” as in:

[nuštaš...] ŠEŠ.MEŠ-aš iṽar piran iyantaru “Let them go before [you] like brothers”
 (KBo 10.12 iii 10, quoted in Hoffner 1993: 41)

Nonetheless, in NH (not before Hattušili III) this indeclinable form occurs as a preposition and is always followed by a logogram or a PN (ibid.: 47–48):

nu iṽar UDU ḫalziškanzi “And they bleat like sheep” (KUB 59.60 iii 14)

⁵ Although the effect is usually not dramatic, it can still be perceived in some cases: Luw. *huha-* ‘grandfather’ vs. HLuw. *huhad(i)-* ‘great-grandfather’ (cf. Plöchl 2003: 57), *wan(i)-* ‘woman’ vs. *wanatti-* ‘woman, wife’ (Ilya Yakubovich, p.c.).

iuar^m *Manini* “like Manini” (KUB 5.1 i 43)

This is the reason why ^{MUNUS}*duttariyatijaš* in KBo 24.126 obv. 28 is believed to be a PN (^f*duttarijata/i-*). Moreover, similar names (or sobriquets) are attested in Hittite and Luwian: ^f*Anni* (*anna-* ‘mother’) and ^m*Ziti* (Luw. *zidi-* ‘man’) (quoted in *HEG* T: 471). Still, I would avoid drawing hasty conclusions, because Hoffner’s observation (p. 47) includes another important point: the noun following the prepositional *iuar* must occur in a stem form. The word *duttariyatijaš* is however not a stem form, but contains a case ending (genitive). Unfortunately, Hoffner did not include this example in his analysis. It is accordingly not quite clear how one should interpret *iuar* here and whether the question concerning the syntactic behaviour of prepositional *iuar* can be considered completely solved.

3. *duttarijata/i-* as title of a priestess

Even if we admit that ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-* might have been a PN, we should also take into consideration other possible interpretations. The unpublished text (Bo 4120 r. col. 4) does not give much information about the context, apart from being obviously a description of a ritual. However, the text quoted above (KBo 24.126 obv. 27–31) and especially KUB 22.40 iii 16–20, in which the 36th day of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival is described (Haas 1994: 820), clearly show that this character must be associated with a purification ritual and is probably a priestess or a temple attendant of some sort:

(16) [GIM-a]n^zma^zkan kī karaptari nu^dUTU^{URU}PÚ-na

(17) [KASKAL-a^z] SUD-anzi PANI^dUTU^{URU}PÚ-na ≈ *ḫuyalliš kištanuanzi*

(18) [na]mma DINGIR^{LUM} ^{MUNUS}*duttariyatijaš* ≈ *naniti kangatiti*

(19) [na]mma ANA^dUTU SISKUR *pianzi* GIM-an^zma MUNUS.LUGAL

(20) [IN]A^{URU} *ankuwa ari nu^zkan* ANA^dUTU^{URU}PÚ-na *mukiššar tianzi*

(KUB 22.40 iii 16–20)

(16) As soon as it is finished, (they) take the Sun Goddess of Arinna

(17) from the way (road?). Before the Sun Goddess of Arinna (they) extinguish cones (?).

(18) After that a girl⁶ (?) appeases (?) the divinity and treats (it) with the *gangati*-plant.

(19) Then (they) offer the Sun Goddess a sacrifice. And as soon as the Queen

(20) arrives in Ankuwa, (they) put the invocation to the Sun Goddess of Arinna.

(cf. Starke 1987: 252; *CHD* L/N: 325a; *HEG* I: 484–485; Christiansen 2006: 99)

Female priesthood is known to have been a well-established institution in the Hittite kingdom. Women not only took part in rituals, but often were also their authors. The names of some

⁶ It seems rather unlikely that a personal name of some low-ranked practitioner would appear in a prescriptive ritual text meant for many generations to come.

prominent practitioners were preserved in ritual texts written syllabically, usually accompanied by a logographic designation of their function, for instance ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI (‘old/wise woman’) ^f*Tunnawi* or ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁ (hierodule/ temple attendant) ^f*Kuwattalla* (cf. Hawkins 2003: 138 and Hutter 2003: 225, 245, 247–250, 253–256). These examples allow us to assume that if the word ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-* denoted a practitioner, it was hidden behind a logogram in most texts.⁷

The most obvious logographic counterpart of ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-* suggested by Starke (1987: 252) could be a designation of a functionary DUMU.MUNUS (*šuppeššara-*) ‘purified/ consecrated girl/daughter’ who took part in Paskuwatti’s and Anniwiyani’s Rituals,⁸ and in the Festival of the Hattic goddess Titiwatti.⁹ Although this assumption is not in accord with the evidence from KBo 20.101 Rs.² 3 DUMU.MUNUS-*la-an* (acc. sg.), which shows that the Hittite word for ‘daughter’ ends in *-la*, it cannot be abandoned altogether, since as Weeden (2011: 204) suggests, this logogram could have more than one Hittite reading.

The text KBo 20.101 Rs.² 3 (...^d*ḫalkin* DUMU.MUNUS-*lan* ^d*ḫalkin*...) is an extract from a ritual of the corn mother (grain goddess) Ḫalki and her daughter (young seed) of the same name, who represented a similar mother-daughter concept to the Greek dyad Demeter and Kore (Haas 1994: 306, 447). Therefore, the word X-*la-an*¹⁰ apparently expresses a general notion and should be either a kinship term (“daughter”) or simply a designation of a female child (thus “(mother) Ḫalki (and) baby girl Ḫalki”). The Luwian form (**duttar(i)-* may have started out with a fairly similar basic meaning “a young female”, but its derivative *duttarijata/i-* then came to refer to very special girls, namely to those who were involved in rituals. The logogram DUMU.MUNUS could still stand for both of these words and notions. However, in the latter case it would need an explanatory epithet such as *šuppeššara-*, i.e., the girl who is sacred (consecrated), not profane, not just any girl or young woman.¹¹

Like a number of religious, political, and ideological terms (e.g. the royal titles *labarna* < **tabarna* < **d^hab^hro-no-* (lit. ‘the powerful one’) and *tauananna* < *(*s*)*théh₂- uen(o)-* (lit. ‘the righteous one’), cf. Melchert 2003: 18–20; Yakubovich 2010: 227–239; Rieken 2015), ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-* was most probably a Luwian borrowing (Melchert 1993: 238), more

⁷ This might be the reason why *iuar* was used as a preposition in KBo 24.126 obv. 28: while rewriting an older text, the scribe probably copied its syntax but for some reason decided to write the functionary designation syllabically. It is also possible that the scribe perceived ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-* as a foreign element; that is why he treated it as a logogram or a PN.

⁸ CTH 406 and CTH 393, quoted and discussed in Collins (forthcoming) and in her paper in this volume.

⁹ CTH 639, quoted and discussed in Taggar-Cohen 2006: 317–320.

¹⁰ The corresponding Hittite word was presumably *pulla-*. It might have an etymological connection to Osc. *puklo-* ‘child’ and Lat. *pullus* ‘nestling’ and might refer to both sons and daughters, as well as to both boys and girls depending on context like Gr. *παῖς* (cf. Starke 1987: 243–244 n. 3; Hoffmann 1992: 292–293).

¹¹ In my article I adopt Collins’ interpretation of DUMU.MUNUS *šuppeššara* “consecrated girl/daughter”, not specifically “virgin” in a medical sense.

precisely a title of a priestess, and its usage in Hittite was restricted to ritual contexts. It is also conspicuous that in the same passages we find other uncommon words, which are even marked with a Glossenkeil (^h*pa-ra-at-ta-ša-at-ta-an* in KBo 24.126 obv. 29; ^h*hu-wa-al-liš* and ^h*na-ni-ti* in KUB 22.40 iii 17/18, see above).

4. Consecrated girls in Ancient Greece

In order to imagine a maiden priestess more vividly, we should take a look at another IE religious tradition. In Ancient Greece, women were barred from political activity, but their part in religion and ritual was substantial. A key role in it belonged to young girls from noble families. This tradition is even reflected in Greek drama, as in the following extract from a comedy of Aristophanes, where Athenian women describe the ritual experiences they went through as young girls.

(641–642) ἑπτὰ μὲν ἔτη γεγῶσ' εὐθὺς ἠρρηφόρους (643–644) εἶτ' ἀλετρις ἢ δεκέτις οὔσα
 Βραυρωνίοις (645) καταχέουσα (or: καὶ χέουσα) τὸν κροκωτὸν ἄρκτος ἢ τὰρχηγέτι (646)
 κάκανηφόρουν ποτ' οὔσα παῖς καλὴ 'χουστ' (647) ἰσχάδων ὀρμαθόν

“As soon as I was seven years old, I was an Arrephoros;
 then I was a Grinder; when I was ten, at the Brauronia,
 I shed my saffron gown as one of the Foundress’s Bears;
 and I was once a basket-bearer, a beautiful girl, wearing a string of dried figs.”

(Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 641–647, ed. and tr. by Sommerstein 1990: 82–83)

The first consecration mentioned is ἀρρηφορία. The ἀρρηφόροι were two selected girls between the ages of 7 and 11, who were to spend one year on the Acropolis under the supervision of the priestess of Athena Polias and to perform ritual duties. One of their duties was the weaving of the Panathenaic robe for Athena (cf. Burkert 1977: 155–156). The second rite was ‘the sacred grinding’, although scholars are not sure to which goddess it was devoted (see the discussion in Sommerstein 1990: 188–189).

Ἀρκτεία was a consecration held once every four years and devoted to Artemis (cf. Burkert 1977: 394–395, Dowden 1989: 24–32; Sommerstein 1990: 189; Poulkou 2006: 155–158 with references). It was a mass event and was associated with the onset of female puberty. Some scholars (Dowden 1989) believe that this rite was very similar to primordial female puberty rites (cf. van Gennep 1909). Girls who took part in it were usually between 5 and 10 years old. However, the “ideal” age was obviously 10, because after this consecration a girl was deemed eligible to be proposed to.

The last sacred post for girls mentioned in the text is *κανηφόρος* ('basket-bearer'). This was a girl selected to lead the procession to sacrifice at major festivals (such as the *Παναθήναια*) and bear the ritual basket (*κανοῦν*) containing a knife and other ritual requisites for a sacrifice. Such a girl was usually between 12 and 15 years old, thus approaching the age of marriage (Sorvinou-Inwood 1988: 54–56, Sommerstein 1990: 190).

I assume that Hittite consecrations for girls were typologically and functionally similar to these Greek rites and were aimed at socialisation of adolescent girls and renewal of the entire community. Dowden (1989: 129–133, esp. 132) believes that although this practice is only attested in some IE cultures and has usually lost either its original sense (Vestal Virgin in Rome) or its communal significance (in Indian culture; see, e.g., Lynn 1978), it cannot be excluded that it ultimately has PIE roots.

5. **d^hugh₂ter-* in Anatolian: 'daughter', 'girl' or both?

Because we cannot interpret *duttarijata/i-* as specifically 'daughter', another important question arises. What original meaning did the Luwian (or, in general, Anatolian) reflex of the PIE word **d^hugh₂ter-* have? Was it an age grade ('girl'), a kinship term ('daughter'), or perhaps both? And if both, why could it be so? This question can have three possible answers. First of all, ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-* might have really been a priest's or a priestess's daughter (in which case this word underwent the same semantic change as Engl. *queen*) or symbolically represented some god's daughter. Moreover, similar titles are attested in Hittite texts: e.g., ^{MUNUS}*šiyanzanna-* (= ^{MUNUS}AMA.DINGIR) 'divine mother' or 'mother of a god'.¹²

Secondly, one can imagine that the meaning 'daughter' was extended to 'girl'. On the one hand, occasional usage of kinship terms for addressing strangers (mostly in non-neutral-style utterances) is a widespread phenomenon attested in many languages (cf. Hentschel 2012). Thus in the ancient Near East (including the Hittite kingdom), usage of kinship terms in a non-kinship context often reflected the power structure: the one who was referred to as 'son/daughter' was an inferior, as 'father/mother' a superior, and as 'brother/sister' an equal (cf. Hoffman 2010: 148–164). On the other hand, the semantic shift (extension) "kinship term proper > kinship term improper"¹³ is fairly rare¹⁴ and usually takes place in languages whose

¹² Taggar-Cohen (2006: 364) suggests interpreting the element AMA (= *anna*) in this compound not as 'mother' but as 'mature/fertile female'.

¹³ This term can refer to such words as 'boy', 'girl', 'man', 'woman', 'bride', 'bridegroom' i.e., words that can potentially become kinship terms or can be used as such in some contexts (Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 3–4).

¹⁴ Semantic change in kinship terms and their interaction with words from neighbouring semantic fields is still a research gap in linguistics. That is why I have almost nothing to quote here apart from Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2001), Zalizniak (2008), Hentschel (2012) and my own forthcoming article "Semantic change in terms of

natural, i.e. internal development has been heavily disturbed by some external influence. NPers. (*doxt*)*ar* ‘girl/daughter’ and *pesar* ‘boy/son’ (Junker – Alavi 1967: 301–302) is one example of this semantic extension,¹⁵ which most likely took place due to hybridisation of New Persian, its massive extensive and profound contact with neighbouring languages (Gernot Windfuhr, p.c.) such as Arabic (*bint* and *ibna* ‘girl/daughter’, Cameron 1979: 28), Turkic (Azari *qiz* ‘girl/daughter’, *oğlan* ‘boy/son’, Rahmati 1999: 444 and 501) and Mongol (*oxin* ‘girl/daughter’, Vietze 1981: 234 and 352). It is noteworthy that such a linguistic situation is typologically similar to the one in the Hittite kingdom.

For languages which have not undergone such extensive contact, a semantic shift / meaning extension “kinship term improper > kinship term proper” is more common. The most well-known and almost universal example is the shift “(adult) woman > wife” (Zalizniak 2008: 228). The development “girl > daughter” seems less obvious from the viewpoint of most modern cultures. However, in the context of a traditional (androcentric) society, in which a woman was associated either with her husband or with her father, it is not surprising that a woman’s age grade could also be used as a kinship term and a designation of her marital status.¹⁶

Therefore, the third possible answer to the question formulated above could be that the Anatolian continuant of **d^hugh₂ter-* was primarily used as an age-grade term (or had a hybrid meaning ‘girl/daughter’ just like NPers. *doxtar*). HLuw. *tuwatri-* (TELL AHMAR §§24, 29) and Lyc. *kbatra* (Hawkins 1978) cannot be viewed as counterexamples here. In the texts in which they occur they without doubt mean ‘daughter’, but there are so few attestations that one can only guess what meaning these words could have had in lost texts and in the everyday speech of the Luwians and the Lycians. This third assumption, which would imply that Anatolian inherited the form **d^hugh₂ter-* in a slightly different meaning from the other IE branches, would be especially fascinating for those scholars who believe in the early split-off of Anatolian and instrumental for determining the internal etymology of this PIE word.

6. PIE kinship terms in **-ter-* (morphology)

There are many and various hypotheses about the morphological structure of the kinship terms in **-ter-*. In my work, I follow the scenario originally suggested by Lohmann (1965:

social relation” (working title), in which I analyse this phenomenon from the point of view of both linguistics and social anthropology, including empirical data. The assumptions about the direction of semantic change (in the main body of the text above) reflect the preliminary results of my research.

¹⁵ In Pahlavi we find *kanik/g* ‘girl’ and *rēdak* ‘boy’ (Rastorguyeva 1966: 30, 46, 54, 69; MacKenzie 1986 [1971]: 71).

¹⁶ As was also correctly and eloquently expressed in B. J. Collins’ talk “Virginity in Hittite ritual”, “She was someone’s daughter because she was not yet someone’s wife.”

217) and Szemerényi (1977: 10) that has recently been developed in detail by Pinault (2005, 2007, 2012).

Pinault views the suffix **-ter-* as an instance of delocative derivation (see Nussbaum 1986: 235–247). Formally, this is the same derivational pattern as we see in the agentive nouns (Tichy 1995: 61), but semantically it is closer to the contrastive suffix, which is used to form the comparative grade of some adjectives (Ved. *tavástara-* ‘stronger’, NPers. *behtar* ‘better’, Gr. *παυρότερος* ‘smaller’) and adverbs from prepositions (**en* → **en-ter* → Lat. *inter*, OIr. *eter*, etc.). The element **(e)h₂-* reconstructed for all kinship terms in **-ter-* is analysed by Pinault as a collective or abstract suffix. The general meaning of the complex reconstruction **(e)h₂- + *-ter-* should be ‘belonging by contrast to the group of...’ (Pinault 2007: 276–277; 2012: 2–3), or ‘someone within a group of similar people’, or simply ‘one of...’.¹⁷

Pinault (ibid.) puts forth his own etymological suggestions for each of the kinship terms involved. In this article I will only mention his etymologies for female kinship terms in **-ter-* because the male ones—**ph₂tér-* ‘father’¹⁸ and **b^hréh₂ter-* ‘brother’¹⁹—represent a separate and complex topic.

For **méh₂ter-* ‘mother’,²⁰ Pinault offers a simple and elegant solution. He derives it from the nursery term **ma-* (*mama*), and **ma-h₂-ter* is, according to him, “one of the mothers.” **H₁énh₂ter-* ‘husband’s brother’s wife’²¹ (containing ***h₁i-én* ‘acquisition, gift’ from the root **h₁ai-* ‘give, take (exchange)’ per LIV² 229) is a person ‘within the group of acquired/given women’ (who takes part in an alliance relationship between two families), hence “one of the brides.” Finally, **d^hugh₂tér-* is “one of the (female) children” (the core of the word ***d^hug-* ‘(female) child’ will be touched upon in section 8 below).

¹⁷ If Pinault’s analysis is correct, we could compare the semantics of “**(e)h₂ + *-ter*” with that of the Slavic possessive suffix *-ov-*, which is still actively used in some West and South Slavic languages. If, for example, we have to use Marina Zorman’s surname in an oblique case, e.g. in the dative (‘to go to Zorman’), we cannot say *iti k Zormanu* (because the ending *-u* is masculine, and it would mean that Zorman is a man), nor can we say **iti k Zorman* (because grammatically *Zorman* is a masculine noun and the usage of the feminine ending would be incorrect). Slovenian has one way out of this dilemma by using the suffix **-ov-*: *iti k Zorman-ov-i*, lit. ‘to go to a woman who belongs to the family Zorman’. In this case, *Zorman* plays the role of a collective noun, not grammatically but semantically, because a surname refers to a group of people, and the suffix *-ov-* has a contrastive / distributive role: ‘one of the Zormans’.

¹⁸ E.g., Ved. *pitár-*, Av. *pitar-*, Arm. *hayr*, Gr. *πατήρ*, Lat. *pater*, OIr. *athair*, Goth. *fadar*, Toch. A *pācar*, Toch. B *pācer* (cf. IEW 829; EIEC 194–195; NIL 554–562).

¹⁹ E.g., Ved. *bhrátar-*, Av., OPers. *brātar-*, Arm. *elbayr*, Gr. *φράτηρ* ‘member of a phratry’, Lat. *frāter*, Goth. *broþar*, OIr. *bráth(a)ir*, OCS *brat(r)ŭ*, OPrus. *brāti*, Toch. A *pracar*, Toch. B *procer* (cf. IEW 163–164; EIEC 84; NIL 38–41).

²⁰ E.g., Ved. *mātár-*, Av. *mātar-*, Arm. *mayr*, Phrygian *matar*, Gr. (Attic) *μήτηρ*, Lat. *māter*, ON *móþer*, OIr. *máthair*, OLith. *mótė*, (gen.sg.) *móters*, ORus. *mati*, (gen.sg.) *matere*, Toch. A *mācar*, Toch. B *mācer*, Alb. *motër* ‘sister’ (!) (IEW 700–701; EIEC 385–386; NIL 457–461).

²¹ E.g., Ved. *yātar-*, Pashto *yōr*, NPers. (Isfahan) *yād*, Arm. *nēr*, (gen.sg.) *niri*, Gr. (Homeric, pl.) *εἰνότερες*, Lat. (pl.) *ianitrīcēs*, OLith. *jéntė*, (gen.sg.) *jenteřs*, Latv. (Courlandish) *jentere*, OCS *jetry*, (gen.sg.) *jetryve* (cf. IEW 505–506; EIEC 522; NIL 204–207).

The question that arises at this point is: what is the contrast between a female child, a bride and a mother? Pinault (2012: 2) suggests that we should apply here a “privative opposition with marking of one term only by the contrastive suffix”, e.g. Greek δεξιός vs. ἀριστερός, σκαίος vs. δεξιτερός, ὕμός vs. ἡμέτερος. Accordingly:

d^hugh₂tér-* vs. **suH-nu-*/suH-ju-*²²/**putló-*²³

**H₁énh₂ter-* vs. **suésor-*²⁴ (a woman taken from another family vs. one’s own woman)

**ph₂tér-* vs. **máh₂ter-* (exception: remade after **ph₂tér-*).

However, I believe that it would be more natural to assume that all terms in *-ter- were built from a single system of their own like other words containing this suffix: δεξιτερός vs. ἀριστερός (‘right’ vs. ‘left’), ἡμέτερος vs. ὑμέτερος (‘ours’ vs. ‘yours (pl.)’), Latin *superus* vs. *inferus* (‘upper’ vs. ‘lower’), etc. This would mean that **d^hugh₂tér-* is to be contrasted with **H₁énh₂ter-* and with **méh₂ter-*. The most obvious criteria here would be, of course, age and/or marital status (cf. also Kullanda 2001).

7. PIE kinship terms in *-ter- as stages of life

The assumption that the terms in *-ter might have been improper kinship terms does not mean by itself that PIE lacked words for ‘father’, ‘mother’, ‘brother’, ‘daughter’, and ‘sister-in-law’ before the terms in *-ter- were reanalysed as kinship terms proper. It would rather mean that other words had been used instead: e.g., **atta-* ‘father’ and **anna-* ‘mother’, both preserved in Anatolian in exactly this meaning. **suésor-* could originally have meant ‘(young) female relative’, i.e., it could also refer to daughters like the Greek ἑορ (Benveniste 1969: 214; Janda 1999: 320–324, esp. 322). Such words as **suH-nu-/suH-ju-* and **putló-* (because their basic meaning is ‘a born one’²⁵ and ‘a little one’²⁶ respectively) could originally have referred to both boys/sons and girls/daughters like Gr. παῖς (see also n. 10 above concerning Hitt. *pulla-*). Finally, **snusó-*²⁷ could have been applied as a generic term for all kinds of daughters- and

²² With the suffix *-nu- (e.g., Ved. *sūnús*, Av. *hunuš*, Goth. *sunus*, OCS *synŭ*, OPrus. *souns*) or the suffix *-ju- (e.g., Gr. *νίος*, Toch. A *se*, gen.sg. *seyo*, Toch. B *soy*) (NIL 686–690).

²³ E.g., Ved. *putrá-*, OPers. *puša*, Av. *puθra-*; Lat. (Plautus) *putillus* ‘young boy’; Osc. *puklum* (EIEC 533; Szemerényi 1977:18).

²⁴ E.g., Ved. *svásar-*, Av. *x^vañhar-*, Arm. *k’oyr*, Lat. *soror*, OIr. *siur*, Goth. *swistar*, OPrus. *swestro*, Toch. A *šar*, Toch. B *šer* (< acc.sg. **suésrṃ* per EIEC 521) (IEW 1051; EIEC 521; NIL 680–683), Gr. ἑορεῖς ‘female relatives, daughters, nieces’, and probably also ἑορα ‘wife’ (Janda 1999).

²⁵ < **seuH-* ‘to give birth’ (LIV² 538).

²⁶ < **paṃ-* ‘small’ with the addition of the diminutive suffix *-tlo- (cf. EIEC 533).

²⁷ E.g., Ved. *snusā*, Arm. *now* (gen.sg. *nowoy*), Lat. *nurus*, OHG *snur*, *snora*, ORus., Serbian CS *snŭxa*, Alb. *nŭse* ‘bride, young woman, younger daughter-in-law’ (IEW 978–979; EIEC 148; NIL 625–626)

sisters-in-law, like Russian *nevestka*.²⁸ This assumption thus does not contradict the general hypothesis of IE linguistics about PIE as a language that was once actively spoken. Any living language is dynamic, and its vocabulary is constantly undergoing semantic changes and innovations.

A vivid typological example of similar semantic change in terms of social relations can be found in the Greek language. The Ancient Greeks viewed the active period of a woman's life as divided into three stages: adolescence, family life (including motherhood), with a short transitional period between them (cf. Versnel 1994: 276–283; Clark 1998: 13–22, esp. 14; Cole 1998: 32–35).²⁹

Girls between the ages of 7 and 15 (i.e., between the sacred posts ἀρρηφόρος and κανηφόρος) had the special designation παρθένος.³⁰ A synonym of this word, which is more important for the present work, was κόρη.³¹ The primary meaning of the latter in Ancient Greek was ‘young unmarried woman’. Secondly, this word could be used as a synonym of θυγάτηρ, but only in combination with the genitive (‘my girl’ = ‘my daughter’). Compare:

μὰ τὴν Καλυψῶ τὰς τε **Νηρέως** (gen.) **κόρας** “by Calypso and **Nereus’ daughters**” (Euripides, *Cyclops* 264);

ὁ δ’ οὐ θέλων τε καὶ θέλων οἴκτω **κόρης** τέμνει σιδήρῳ πνεύματος διαρροάς: “And he, for pity of the **girl** both willing and reluctant, cut the breath’s passageways with his sword” (Euripides, *Hecuba* 566–567).

In Modern Greek this word still has both meanings, but it has almost replaced θυγατέρα and has become the only stylistically unmarked term for ‘daughter’ (Gates 1971: 39).³²

At the age of 15 or even earlier, a Greek girl became engaged and subsequently married. A new transitional phase in her life began, and she became a νύμφη ‘young woman’,

²⁸ 1) ‘brother’s wife’; 2) ‘son’s wife in relation to the mother (more rarely: in respect to the father)’; 3) ‘husband’s brother’s wife’ (= *yatrov*’ (obs.) < **H₁énh₂ter-*). This word is an innovation (a derivative of *nevesta* ‘bride’) and is a rival of the inherited PIE word *snoxa* (< **snusó-*), which is now viewed as specifically ‘son’s wife in relation to the father’ (Fedosyuk 1998: 24). Modern speakers regularly confuse these two words or even replace them with descriptive terms.

²⁹ Of course, this set of life stages is not unique and is characteristic for most traditional societies. I use the Greek material as an illustration because the long-term literary tradition of this culture permits one to trace how the meanings have evolved over the millennia.

³⁰ < **pr-steno-* ‘having protruding breasts’, the meaning ‘virgin’ being attested only in the youngest texts (Klingenschmitt 1974: 273–278); alternatively: **pr-d^h₁-nó-* ‘ausgesetzter Siegerpreis’ (Janda 2014: 545–554).

³¹ The etymology of this word is unfortunately rather vague. Beekes (2010: 752–753, 764) suggests two variants: κόρη as a derivative of the root **kerh₃-* ‘grow’ or somehow associated with κοῦρος ‘loppings, twigs lopped from a tree’.

³² Georgios Kostopoulos, a doctoral candidate at the University of Vienna and native speaker of Modern Greek, informs me that today only elderly people and nationalists use the word θυγατέρα instead of κόρη in a stylistically unmarked context.

‘bride/young wife’,³³ ‘woman who is married but has not yet had her first child’ (Clark 1998: 14). Later, in Hellenistic times, this word replaced *νόος* (< **snusó-*) and attained a kinship meaning ‘daughter-in-law’ (Gates 1971: 39):

ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ **νόμφην** κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐτῆς “for I came to set a man at variance against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a **daughter-in-law** against her mother-in-law” (Matthew 10:35).

The semantic change / extension “bride > daughter/sister-in-law” (parallel to “bridegroom > son/brother-in-law”) is not sporadic either, but reoccurs in other languages, e.g. NPers. *parus* “bride, daughter-in-law” and *dāmād* “bridegroom, son-in-law” (Tawakkulī 2003: 85, 425), Alb. *núse* “bride”, “daughter-in-law”, “young woman” and *dhëndërr* “bridegroom, son-in-law” (Orel 1998:82, 302–303). The same is true for Rus. *nevesta* ‘fiancée, bride’ > *nevestka* ‘daughter/sister-in-law’ (see above).

Finally, after the first child was born, a woman gained the status of *γυνή* and *μήτηρ*. The word **g^hen(h₂)-* (> *γυνή*) was apparently used in both kinship and non-kinship meanings already in PIE.

I suggest that a similar set of life stages might have existed in PIE and might have undergone a similar semantic change.

PIE	Ancient Greek
* <i>mé/áh₂ter-</i>	~ <i>γυνή</i> / <i>μήτηρ</i>
* <i>H_iénh₂ter-</i>	~ <i>νόμφη</i>
* <i>d^hugh₂tér-</i>	~ <i>κόρη</i>

8. **d^hugh₂ter-*: etymology

The internal etymology of **d^hugh₂ter-* is still a major challenge and cannot be determined with complete certainty. If my hypothesis about stages of life is correct and the primary meaning of this word in PIE was ‘young unmarried woman, girl’, the core semantics must imply either her young age (as Gr. *κανηφόρος* is referred to *παῖς καλή* ‘beautiful child’) or her maturation (etymology for *παρθένος* according to Klingenschmitt 1974: 273–278). The first alternative would mean that the first stage of a PIE girl’s life began immediately after her

³³ << **sneub^h-* ‘to marry’, cf. Lat. *nūbere* ‘to marry (a man)’, Russian CS *snubiti* ‘to join, connect’ (see *IEW* 977–978; *LIV*² 574); Lat. *nupta* ‘bride’ (cf. Beekes 2010: 1026, de Vaan 2008: 417).

birth and lasted until her engagement (or wedding).³⁴ The second alternative would only include the period after the onset of puberty before her transition into her husband's family.³⁵

A similar problem emerges when one tries to determine the etymology of Proto-Slav. **děva* (< **doi-wā* < **d^hoh₁i-u-* per Snoj 1997: 88). It has the same meaning as the meaning of **d^hugh₂ter-* postulated above, 'young unmarried woman', and is most probably derived from $\sqrt{*d^heh_{1}(i)-}}$ 'suck, suckle' (*LIV*² 138). However, **děva* is usually viewed as an adolescent girl. Therefore, she is neither the one who sucks nor the one who suckles. It is debated what kind of shift took place here. Berneker (*apud IEW* 242) prefers the shift 'breastfeeding mother' > 'adolescent girl' ('potential breastfeeding mother'). Nevertheless, a shift 'suckling (little girl)' > 'adolescent girl' is also quite plausible.

Pinault (2007: 276) derives ***d^hug-*, the core of **d^hugh₂ter-*, from the same verbal root $\sqrt{*d^heh_{1}(i)-}}$ 'suck, suckle' and analyses it as **d^hh₁-u-g-*, a *u*-stem with a suffix/root extension **-g-*.³⁶ In spite of morphological difficulties, this suggestion looks attractive because it would connect this protoform with Slavic **děva* and with the Latin terms *filia* 'daughter' and *fēmina* 'woman'. However, the question of the etymology and semantic shift of **děva* would still remain open.

Conclusion

The word ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-* attested in Hittite ritual texts is obviously a Luwian borrowing. It is either a personal name or, more likely, a sacred title of well-born (adolescent) girls who performed various ritual duties. Similar posts for girls existed, e.g., in Ancient Greece and had an educational and socialising function. DUMU.MUNUS (*šuppeššara*) might have been the corresponding logogram for this word, although this cannot be proven until/unless a text is discovered in which they both occur.

The reconstruction of the semantic development of ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-* is especially complex. In the given context, the word cannot be translated as specifically 'daughter', but should be interpreted more broadly as 'girl/maiden'. This latter meaning may simply be an occasional usage. However, it is also possible that in Anatolian this word could have a hybrid meaning 'girl/daughter', which is a characteristic feature of many languages of the Near East. It might

³⁴ In social anthropology this type of age stratification is referred to as the New Guinea type, i.e. the first stage of life begins after the biological birth (Jeffreys 1950: 159).

³⁵ This is the Hamitic type of age stratification, in which the first stage of life begins with the onset of puberty/initiatory rite, etc. (social birth; *ibid.*).

³⁶ In his formulation, **-g-* is "an expressive suffix referring to females" as in Hitt. *ne-g-a-* 'sister', Lith. *mer-g-à* 'girl, maiden' (Pinault 2007: 276 n. 17; 2012: 2). It may probably be viewed as a sort of combinatory athematic variant of the individualising suffix **(i)k-* or **(a)k-* (Lat. *sene-k-s*, cf. Oettinger 2004: 169–170, Jamison 2009: 312–329).

show the semantic extension “daughter > girl” as in NPers. *doxtar*. However, the opposite shift, which is typologically more frequent and natural, would be more fascinating because it could offer a hint as to the original meaning of **d^hugh₂tér-* in PIE.

References

- Beekes, R. S. P. (2010) *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* [LIEEDS 10], Leiden: Brill.
- Benveniste, E. (1969) *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, I: *Économie, parenté, société*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Cameron, D. A. (1979) *An Arabic-English Dictionary*, Beirut: Librairie du Liban.
- Clark, I. (1998) The gamos of Hera, in: S. Blandell – M. Williamson (eds.), *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*, London, New York: Routledge, 13–26.
- Cole, S. G. (1998) Artemis at the borders of the polis, in: S. Blundell – M. Williamson (eds.), *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*, London, New York: Routledge, 27–43.
- Collins, B. J. (forthcoming) Paskuwatti’s ritual “When a man is not a man with respect to a woman” (CTH 406). Anniwiyani’s rituals “When I perform the ritual of the tutelary deity lulimi” and “When they invoke the protective deity *kurša*” (CTH 393), in: *Hittite Rituals from Arzawa and the Lower Land*, Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Christiansen, B. (2006). *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429 und CTH 463* [StBoT 48], Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Dahl, Ö. – Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. (2001) Kinship in grammar, in: I. Baroh – M. Helsund – F. Sørensen (eds.), *Dimensions of Possession*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–16.
- Dowden, K. (1989) *Death and the Maiden: Girls’ Initiation Rites in Greek Mythology*, London – New York: Routledge.
- Fedosyuk, Yu. (1998) *Čto neponjatno u klassikov ili énciklopedija russkogo byta XIX veka*, Moskva: Flinta (2nd ed.).
- van Gennepe, A. (1909) *Les rites de passage*, Paris: Nourry.
- Haas, V. (1994) *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, Leiden: Brill.
- Hawkins, J. D. (1978) The Luwian word for “daughter”, *ZVS* 92, 112–160.
- (2003) Scripts and texts, in: H. C. Melchert (ed.), 128–169.
- Hentschel, E. (2012) All men become brothers. The use of kinship terms for non-related persons as a sign of respect or disrespect, *Linguistics Online* 51/1, 29–42.
- Hoffman, J. M. (2010) *And God Said: How Translations Conceal the Bible’s Meaning*, New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Hoffmann, I. (1992) Das hethitische Wort für “Sohn”, in: H. Otten et al. (eds.), *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 289–293.
- Hoffner, H. (1993) Hittite *iṣar* and related modes of expressing comparison, *Istanbul Mitteilungen* 43, 39–51.
- van den Hout, Theo (1995) *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hutter, M. (2003) Aspects of Luwian religion, in: H. C. Melchert (ed.), 211–280.
- Jamison, S. W. (2009) Sociolinguistic remarks on the Indo-Iranian **-ka-*suffix: a marker of colloquial register, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52, 311–329.
- Janda, M. (1999) Zur Herkunft von homerisch *ῥάπ*, in: S. Deger-Jalkotzy, et al. (eds.). *Florentinae Studia Mycenaea: Akten des X. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Salzburg vom 1.–5. Mai 1995*, Vol. 2, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 315–324.
- (2014) *Purpurnes Meer: Sprache und Kultur der homerischen Welt* [IBK 7], Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Jeffreys, M. D. W. (1950) Age-groups among the Ika and kindred people, *African Studies* 9/4, 157–166.
- Junker, H. F. J. – Alavi, B. (1967) *Persisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Klingenschmitt, G. (1974) Griechisch *παρθένος*, in: M. Mayrhofer – W. Meid (eds.), *Antiquitates Indogermanicae: Studien zur indogermanischen Altertumskunde und zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der indogermanischen Völker. Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert zur 25. Wiederkehr seines Todestages* [IBS 12] Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 273–278.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008) *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* [LIEEDS 5], Leiden: Brill.
- Kullanda, S. (2001) Indo-European “kinship terms” revisited, *Current Anthropology* 43/1, 89–111.
- Lohmann, J. (1965) *Philosophie und Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Lynn, B. (1978) Sitting in a cave: An analysis of ritual seclusion at menarche among Brahmans and Chhetris in Nepal, *Contribution to Nepalese Studies* 6/1, 31–45.

- MacKenzie, D. N. (1986 [1971]). *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Melchert, H. C. (1980) The Hittite word for “son”, *IF* 85, 90–95.
- (1993) *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*, Chapel Hill, NC [self-published].
- (2003) Prehistory, in: H. C. Melchert (ed.), 8–26.
- (ed.) (2003) *The Luwians* [HdO I/68], Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Nussbaum, A. (1986) *Head and Horn in Indo-European* [UISK 2], Berlin – New York: de Gruyter.
- Oettinger, N. (2004) Griechisch γυνή „Frau“ und der Ursprung des „i-Kollektivums“, in: T. Kirsch – T. Lindner – U. Müller (eds.), *Analecta homini universali dicata* (Vol. 1), Stuttgart: Heinz.
- Pinault, G.-J. (2005) Analyse étymologique d’un nom de parenté indo-européen, in: G. Schweiger (ed.), *Indogermanica: Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien*, Tübingen: Schweiger, 465–485.
- (2007) A star is born: a “new” PIE *-ter-suffix, in: Alan J. Nussbaum (ed.), *Verba Docenti: Studies in Historical and Indo-European Linguistics Presented to Jay H. Jasanoff*, Ann Arbor – New York: Beech Stone, 271–279.
- (2012) Distance, proximity, exchange and kinship (semantics and etymology of Proto-Indo-European terms) (handout read at Lund University, 2012).
- Plöchl, R. (2003) *Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische* [DBH 8], Dresden: Verlag der TU Dresden.
- Poulikou, M. (2003) Arkteia. Überlegungen zu den nackten ‘Bärinnen’ in Brauron, in: G. Koiner et al. (eds.), *Akten des 10. Österreichischen Archäologentages*, Wien: Phoibos.
- Rahmati, N. (1999) *Aserbaidzschisch-deutsches Wörterbuch unter Berücksichtigung der Besonderheiten des Nord- und Südaserbaidzschischen*, Engelschoff: auf dem Ruffel.
- Rastorguyeva, G. S. (1966) *Sredne-persidskij jazyk*, Moscow: Nauka.
- Rieken, E. (2015) A Luwian crown-prince (handout from the 34th East Coast Indo-European Conference, Universität Wien, 04-07.06.2015).
- Snoj, M. (1997) *Slovenski etimološki slovar*, Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (ed., tr.) (1990) *Lysistrata. The Comedies of Aristophanes*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Ch. (1988) *Studies in Girls’ Transition: Aspects of the Arkteia and Age Representation in Attic Iconography*, Athens: Kardamitsa.
- Starke, F. (1980) Das luwische Wort für „Frau“, *ZVS* 94, 74–86.
- (1987) Die Vertretung von uridg. *dhugh₂tér- „Tochter“ in den luwischen Sprachen und ihre Stammbildung, *ZVS* 100, 243–269.
- Szemerényi, O. (1977) *Studies in the Kinship Terminology of the Indo-European Languages* [Acta Iranica 17], Leiden: Brill; Teheran – Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi.
- Taggar-Cohen A. (2006) *Hittite Priesthood* [THeth 26], Heidelberg: Winter.
- Tawakkulī, H. (2003) *Farhang-i ālmānī-fārsī, fārsī-ālmānī*, Aachen: Tavakkoly; Tihān: Intiṣārāt-i Tarma.
- Tichy, E. (1995) *Die Nomina agentis auf -tar- im Vedischen*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- de Vaan, M. (2008) *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages* [LIEEDS 7], Leiden: Brill.
- Versnel H. S. (1994) *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion, 2: Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual*, Leiden – New York: Brill.
- Vietze, H.-P. (1981) *Wörterbuch Deutsch-Mongolisch*, Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie
- Weeden, M. (2011) *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Yakubovich, I. S. (2010) *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- (2015) *The Luwian Language*, Oxford Handbooks Online, <http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935345-e-18>
- Zalizniak, A. A. (2008) A catalogue of semantic shifts: towards a typology of semantic derivation, in: M. Vanhove (ed.), *From Polysemy to Semantic Change: Towards a Typology of Lexical Semantic Associations* [Studies in Language Companion Series 106], Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Zehnder, T. (2010) *Die hethitischen Frauennamen. Katalog und Interpretation*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Veronika Milanova (veronika.milanova@univie.ac.at)

Ph.D. candidate at the Institute of Linguistics, University of Vienna
The Ph.D. project is financed by the Austrian Academy of Sciences (ÖAW).