PIE analogies that just don't work (Abstract)
Jan-Niklas Linnemeier, University of Würzburg

As a precise description of how morphological analogy works is still lacking, analogy is often tackled with an "anything goes" attitude. At closer inspection, many proposed analogies that are widely passed around and accepted reveal themselves to be simply impossible.
This paper will discuss two prominent examples from recent discourse of PIE morphological reconstruction and expose their proposed analogies as methodologically unsound – albeit for different reasons.

1. Origins of the *-h_2e endings
Ever since the decipherment of Anatolian, the formal similarity between the Hittite ḫi-conjugation and the reconstructed PIE perfect has been observed. One school of thought (Eichner 1975, Kloekhorst 2018) strives to explain the ḫi-conjugation as deriving from the perfect. The second school goes the opposite way by proposing a primary *h_2e-conjugation, of which the PIE perfect represents a reduplicated present (Jasanoff 2003) or aorist (Jasanoff 2018).
It will be shown that both accounts in their current forms are doomed to fail, mostly since they require several steps of inflectional change where analogy is conducted on a morpheme-by-morpheme basis. A type for which (as per Hill 2020) we have no positive evidence.

2. s-aorist subjunctives
The long-standing standard explanation for both the Ancient Greek future and the Insular Celtic subjunctive is that they were simply subjunctives formed to s-aorists. (Most recently Willi 2018 for Greek, Darling 2019 for Celtic and Søborg 2021 for a common predecessor.)
Still, none of the accounts published to date satisfyingly explain the emergence of the *-s-/*-h_1s- allomorphy that either would have been acquired in the subjunctive or lost in the indicative. Furthermore, the Old Irish data reveals that the models on which the proposed analogies are based are in fact missing for most roots, as the two categories barely even touched.

References
Darling, Mark. 2019. *The Subjunctive in Celtic: Studies in Historical Phonology and Morphology*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge.
Eichner, Heiner. 1975 "Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystems." In: Helmut Rix (ed.). *Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. September 1973*. Wiesbaden: Reichert. 71–103.
Hill, Eugen. 2020. "Analogy in inflectional change: Modification or whole-word replacement?" Language 96.1. e38–e58.
Jasanoff, Jay H. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford University Press.
—. 2018. "What happened to the perfect in Hittite? A contribution to the theory of the *h_2e*-conjugation." In: Elisabeth Rieken et al. (eds.). *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen. Morphosyntaktische Kategorien in Sprachgeschichte und Forschung. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 23. September 2015 in Marburg*. Wiesbaden: Reichert. 137–56.
Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2018. "The Origin of the Hittite *ḫi*-Conjugation" In: Lucien van Beek et al. (eds.) *Farnah. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Sasha Lubotsky*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press. 89–106.
Søborg, Tobias Mosbæk. 2021. *Sigmatic Verbal Formations in Anatolian and Indo-European: A Cladistic Study*. Ph.D. thesis, Det Humanistiske Fakultet, Københavns Universitet.
Willi, Andreas. 2018. *Origins of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge University Press.