

ARAMAZD

ARMENIAN JOURNAL
OF NEAR EASTERN STUDIES



VOLUME VI, ISSUE 2 – 2011

ASSOCIATION FOR NEAR EASTERN AND CAUCASIAN STUDIES
YEREVAN 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES

ANDREW W. KANDEL, BORIS GASPARYAN, ANGELA A. BRUCH, LIOR WEISSBROD, DIANA ZARDARYAN. <i>Introducing Aghitu-3, the First Upper Paleolithic Cave Site in Armenia</i>	7–23
INESSA HOVSEPYAN, ALLA MNATSAKANYAN. <i>The Technological Specifics of Early Bronze Age Ceramics in Armenia: Tsaghkasar-1 and Talin Cemetery</i>	24–54
MANUEL CASTELLUCCIA. <i>A Transcaucasian Bronze Belt in a Japanese Collection</i>	55–67
JAAN PUHVEL. <i>Elliptic Genitives and Hypostatic Nouns in Hittite</i>	68–72
CRAIG H. MELCHERT. <i>Enclitic Subject Pronouns in Hieroglyphic Luvian</i>	73–86
ARAM KOSYAN. <i>Towards the Hittite Eastern Periphery (KUB XLIX 11)</i>	87–94
MARGARIT KHACHIKYAN. <i>Split Ergativity in Urartian</i>	95–100
NICOLAY HARUTYUNYAN, SONA GRIGORYAN. <i>Urartian zieldi and zieldubi</i>	101–103
RAFFAELE BISCIONE, ROBERTO DAN. <i>Dimensional and Geographical Distribution of the Urartian Fortifications in the Republic of Armenia</i>	104–120
STÉPHANE DESCHAMPS, FRANÇOIS FICHET DE CLAIRFONTAINE, DAVID STRONACH. <i>Erebuni: The Environs of the Temple of Haldi during the 7th and 6th Centuries BC</i>	121–140
VITALY SHEVOROSHKIN. <i>Why are the Nymphs Grieving in Xanthos?</i>	141–156
ARMEN PETROSYAN, NVARD TIRATSYAN. <i>First Armenian Capital Armawir as a Cult Center</i>	157–169
GRIGOR GRIGORYAN. <i>John of Jerusalem and His Exposition of Faith</i>	170–202
PAVEL CHOBANYAN. <i>The Struggle of Armenians for the Preservation of the Monasteries in Jerusalem between XII and XV Centuries</i>	203–215

IN MEMORIAM

GEVORG TIRATSYAN (<i>Garegin Tumanyan, Ruben Vardanyan</i>)	216–219
---	---------

SUMMARIES	220–232
-----------------	---------

ABBREVIATIONS	233
---------------------	-----

TABLES	234–258
--------------	---------

ENCLITIC SUBJECT PRONOUNS IN HIEROGLYPHIC LUVIAN*

H. Craig Melchert

I. Introduction

As first noted by Watkins (1968–69: 93) and fully demonstrated by Garrett (1990), in Hittite enclitic subject pronouns (all third person singular or plural) never occur with transitive verbs. As elaborated by Garrett (1996: 90–102), the enclitic subject pronouns appear regularly with the class of intransitive verbs generally defined as “unaccusative”, but not with those classified as “unergative.” Garrett (1996: 102–15) discusses the Hittite aspects of the well-known problem of drawing the line between unaccusative and unergative verbs, but the core classes of unaccusatives in Hittite are the typical ones of verbs expressing state, change of state, motion, and psychological states (see the summary in Garrett 1996: 101–2).

As far as we can judge from the limited evidence, this distribution of enclitic subject pronouns also applies in Palaic and Kizzuwatna (“Cuneiform”) Luvian.¹ I know of no instances of such pronouns occurring with transitive verbs in either language. As expected, of the two clear examples of an enclitic subject pronoun in Palaic (see Carruba 1970: 48 for the textual references), one appears in a nominal sentence with implied stative ‘be’ (*mān=aš marḫanza* ‘when he (is) invited/come as a guest’)² and the other with a change-of-state verb (*aḫuwanti ni=ppa=aš ḫašanti* ‘They drink, but they do not become satiated’).³

AE =h

Appearance of enclitic subject pronouns in Kizzuwatna Luvian also matches that

* I am indebted to Ilya Yakubovich for suggesting the following discussion of this topic and for invaluable suggestions and criticism. The usual disclaimer applies, and he is not responsible for any views expressed other than those explicitly attributed.

¹ For the language of the incantations of the Luvian-based ritual texts preserved at Hattusha as belonging to a Kizzuwatna dialect distinct from that reflected in scattered “Luvianisms” in Hittite context, see Yakubovich 2010: Chapter One, esp. 68–73.

² For this translation of *marḫanza* see Yakubovich 2006: 118–9, note 40.

³ Note also the expected absence of an enclitic subject with the “detransitive” verb ‘they drink’ (see Garrett 1996: 98–9). It is true that there appears to be no enclitic subject with the other verb ‘to become satiated’ in the preceding formula *atānti ni-ip-pa-ši mušānti* ‘they eat, but they do not become satiated’. The exception could be only apparent, since there may be either graphic or genuine linguistic simplification of the geminate /ss/ in the sequence of enclitic subject plus reflexive (expected /ni=ppa=as=si/). Compare, however, the genuine variability in the appearance of an enclitic subject with a reflexive in the Hittite verbs ‘to bathe’ and ‘to boast’ cited below.

in Hittite (for the texts cited see Starke 1990): with ‘be’ (overt in KUB 35.102+103 iii 6–7, in nominal sentences in KUB 35.45 ii 25–26 and elsewhere), with motion verb *awi-* ‘come’ (KBo 29.6 Ro 23), with change-of-state medio-passive *aiyaru* ‘let become’ (KUB 9.6+ ii 12ff.), and with two intransitive medio-passives of uncertain meaning (*paptittar* ‘blazes’(?) at KBo 29.25 ii 5ff. and *kuwalaru* ‘?’ at KBo 13.260 ii 34).

Our still limited understanding of Lydian precludes any definitive statement, but the sequence in Text 54 (Gusmani 1964: 268) certainly suggests the same pattern: [e] s *anlola atraštal šakardal ak=ad qis fisqānt buk=aš fēdavołt f=ak=τ=ad kabrdokid* ‘These *a.* (are) of Atrastas, (son) of Sakardas. Whoever *harms* them (–*ad*), or he (–*aš*) ___s and *steals* them (–*ad*) for himself (–*τ*)...’.¹ Contra Gusmani (1964: 124), given the presence of nominative singular –*aš* ‘he’, it is highly unlikely that the verb *fēdavołt* is transitive with an omitted direct object –*ad*. The complementary distribution of object pronouns with the two surrounding transitive verbs (but no subject pronoun!) versus the presence of a subject pronoun in the middle clause (but no object pronoun) strongly points to the verb of that clause being intransitive.

The loss of final *–s and the radical reshaping of basic clause structure vis-à-vis the other Indo-European Anatolian languages leave the entire status of enclitic subject pronouns in Lycian indeterminate.

II. Hieroglyphic Luvian: Basic Pattern

We would expect the distribution of enclitic subject pronouns in Hieroglyphic Luvian (Empire Luvian of the second millennium and Iron Age Luvian of the first) to match that of Hittite, Kizzuwatna Luvian, Palaic, and Lydian. Evidence from Empire Luvian is extremely limited, but what we have from the EMİRGAZİ altars (for which see Hawkins 1995: 86ff.) is consistent with this expectation. Enclitic subject pronouns are lacking in third-person clauses with transitive verbs (§§16, 22, 23, 25, 28) and present in the two nominal sentences with implied ‘be’ (§§31–32 *ma/i-wa-sa* = /ma:n=wa=as/ ‘whether he (is)...or he (is)...’).

Even a cursory examination of a few larger texts of Iron Age Luvian confirms that the distribution of enclitic subject pronouns there matches that of Hittite. In KARATEPE 1 (Hawkins 2000: 48–58) they are consistently absent in clauses with transitive verbs and third-person pronominal subject: §XLIX /usanu(wa)-/ ‘bless’, §LII /piya-/ ‘give’, §LVI /hass-/ ‘beget’, §LVII /uranu(wa)-/ ‘make great’, §§LXVI, LXXI, LXXII /anda damma-/ ‘build in’ = ‘fill in’. Likewise in KARKAMIŞ A11b+c (Hawkins 2000: 103–4): §§26–27 with /partuni-/ ‘sever’ and §§28–29 /la-/ (spelled *tâ-*) ‘accept’. The pattern with intransitive verbs also agrees with Hittite for all those whose sense and therefore semantic class can be determined. There is no enclitic subject pronoun with /assatsa-/ ‘say’ (e.g. KARATEPE 1 §LXVIII), just as with Hittite *memi/a-* ‘speak’ and *te-* ‘say’. On the other hand, enclitic subjects are without exception present with stative verbs: e.g., implied /as-/ ‘be’ in a nominal sentence in KARATEPE 1 §LX, (COR)

¹ For –*τ*– as a reflexive in Lydian see Yakubovich 2010: 178–81.

/alunaza-/ ‘be malicious, envious’ *ibid.* §LXV (compare Hitt. *aršane-* ‘idem’), and /as-/ ‘sit’ in KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §10. Motion verbs likewise always require enclitic subject pronouns: e.g., /hwiya-/ ‘run’ in KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §11 and /awi-/ ‘come’ *ibid.* §20. So do change-of-state verbs: e.g., medio-passive /itsiya-/ ‘become’ in KARATEPE 1 §L and §LV (compare Hitt. *kiš-* ‘idem’) and /arha wala-/ ‘die’ in TELL AHMAR 1 §10 and 18 (compare Hitt. *akk-* ‘idem’). Examples for both transitive and intransitive verbs could easily be multiplied.

III. Hieroglyphic Luvian: Apparent Exceptions

In his magisterial edition of the Iron Age Luvian texts David Hawkins, apparently unaware of the “Watkins–Garrett rule” for Hittite, does assume for a handful of examples the co-occurrence of enclitic subject pronouns with transitive verbs, including in combination with enclitic direct object pronouns. As I will show below, most of these can be equally well or better interpreted without enclitic subjects, while an obscure immediate context leaves one example uninterpretable. There is, however, one recurring expression whose analysis remains difficult under any interpretation.

Our first example is TELL AHMAR 6 §18, for which I also give the preceding and following clauses as context (see for the text Hawkins 2006: 12–17):

§17 | *za-a-sa-pa-wa/i-mu* | EXERCITUS-*la/i/u-na-si-i-sa* (DEUS)
TONITRUS-*sa* | (LITUUS)*á-za-ta*

§18 *wa/i-ma-sa-’/* | LITTUS²-*na²-hi-i-tà* | VIA(-)*hu-sa-la-hi-tà-ha wa/*
i+ra/i-li-ta

§19 *wa/i-ma-sa-’/* | PRAE-*na* | *hu-ha-sà-ta-si*

‘This Storm-god of the army loved me...and he ran before me.’

The preceding and following clauses are standard expressions of divine favor. Hawkins (2006: 15) reasonably translates the intervening clause as ‘and he made me (his) own in vision and in ... -ing’, comparing the expression *warali- iziya-* ‘make one’s own’ of KARATEPE 1 §LXIX. However, just as /itsiya-/ in the medio-passive also means ‘become, be made’, the denominative verb /waralli(ya)-/ may likewise here be medio-passive and mean ‘and he became/was made my own for X-ing and Y-ing’. This sense fits the context as well as the transitive version. The presence of the subject pronoun /-as/ would thus be perfectly in order with a change-of-state verb, just as it is with the motion verb in the following clause.

KARKAMIŠ A11b+c §§2–4 read as follows (Hawkins 2000: 103):

§2 *a-wa/i za-a-sa URBS+MI-ni-i-sa mi-sá-’ | tá-tà-li-sa AVUS-ha-tà-li-sa*
|| ¹*447-*nu-wa/i-ya-si sa-tá-’*

§ 3 *wa/i-sa-’ VACUUS-ti-i-sa |ARHA (“LONGUS”)ya+ra/i-ya-ta*

§ 4 *wa/i-na-’ ¹MAGNUS+ra/i-TONITRUS-tá-sa-za |INFANS.NEPOS-sa-za*
CUM-*ní* |(LOCUS)*pi-ta-ha-li-ya-ha*

The sense of the first clause is clear: ‘This city of my father and grandfather was/had been of Ninuwi(ya)s’. Hawkins (2000: 103) renders the second as ‘(but) he *extended* (the hand?) in vain (*lit.* “empty”)', insisting that the subject of the clause must be the usurper Ninuwi(ya)s, who would also be the object (*-an*) of the following clause, which he interprets to refer to ‘exile’ or some other punitive action against the usurpers. However, even if we accepted the ad hoc ellipsis of ‘hand’ and the unlikely interpretation that this clause refers to a vain attempt of Ninuwi(yas) (the aim of which would be left strangely unspecified), the case of VACUUS-*ti-i-sa* /dannattis/ is clearly wrong: the elided ‘vainly’ outstretched hand would have to be accusative. There can be no doubt that the subject of the second clause is the city—construed with an intransitive verb (‘It stretched out desolate/empty’)—which Katuwas upon regaining then rebuilt (§6 ‘I (re)built it for myself’). We are dealing with a well-established topos in which a ruler rebuilds ancestral lands that had fallen into ruin. Compare MARAŞ 1 §§2–4 (Hawkins 2000: 263): ‘My paternal gods loved me, and they seated me on my father’s throne, and I (re)settled the desolate places.’ See also MARAŞ 8 §3ff. (Hawkins 2000: 253), KARAHÖYÜK §§3–9 (Hawkins 2000: 289–90), and surely also KARABURUN §§1–4 (Hawkins 2000: 481).

We must therefore also take the object pronoun *-an/* of the following clause as referring to *the city*, not to Ninuwi(ya)s (given the clear description of the desolation of the city, the latter is surely long out of the picture). This unavoidable reading of *-an/* also calls for a complete reconsideration of the problematic verb (LOCUS)/*pitahaliya-* and the sense of the entire passage. First of all, we must abandon all attempts to find in the first part of the verb a form of the Luvian word for ‘place’ (see Hawkins 2000: 105 for references to such attempts by him, me, and Poetto). The second syllable of the word for ‘place’ in Hieroglyphic Luvian is spelled with absolute consistency nearly thirty times with the signs *tà*, *ta/i₄*, and *ta/i₅*, *never* with *ta* or *tá*.¹ This spelling reflects the fact that the word for ‘place’ reflects either **pédo-* or **pedó-* matching Hittite *pēda-* or Lycian *pdde-* respectively. Whatever its precise synchronic realization, intervocalic **d* fell together with **l* into a sound represented by the three signs *tà*, *ta/i₄*, and *ta/i₅* (for the first see Rieken 2008 and for the last two Rieken and Yakubovich 2010: 208–10, but with an ill-advised attempt to insist on a reading as a lateral).

The word spelled (LOCUS)*pi-ta-ha-li-ya-* thus cannot contain the word ‘place’, nor is a “rebus spelling” based on homophony with the word for ‘place’ likely. We must conclude that LOCUS is used here merely as a determinative, indicating that the word refers to some action taken in or on a topographical feature. As to what that action might be, our only other clue comes from its being contrasted later in the same text with ‘take by force’:

§ 30 |*za-pa-wa/i-tá* |URBS+MI-*ni-i-na mu-*’ |REL+*ra/i-i* ¹MAGNUS+*ra/i-*TONITRUS-*ta-sa-za* INFANS.NEPOS-*sa-za* | (“*314”) *ha-sá-ti-i ARHA* | CAPERE-*ha*

¹ The iterated LOCUS-*tá* LOCUS-*tá* in KARAHÖYÜK §12 should be interpreted as standing for REL-*i-ta* REL-*i-ta* ‘wherever, everywhere’ (cf. Hittite *kuwapitta* ‘everywhere’).

- § 31 |NEG₂-wa/i-na |REL+ra/i-i (LOCUS)pi-ta-ha-li-ya-ha
 § 32 a-wa/i |za-a-zi |DEUS-ni-i-zi |AUDIRE+MI-ta+ra/i-ru

Key to understanding these clauses is the sense of REL+ra/i-i. Hawkins (2000: 107) renders ‘since’, but this is based on the false premise that the action expressed by *pitahaliya-* in clause §4 referred to Ninuwi(ya)s, whereas it is clear that the referent is the city. As he concedes, elsewhere the meaning of REL+ra/i- is rather ‘if’ (KARKAMIŠ A13d §5 and MARAŞ 8 §13). I assert that this sense also fits the present context: ‘If I took this city away from the sons of Ura–Tarhuntas by force, if I did not *pitahaliya-* it, let these gods be heard!’. That is, Katuwas is saying that if what he said in the earlier clause §4, where he says that he *did pitahaliya-* the city from the grandsons of Ura–Tarhuntas, is not true, and if in fact he took the city away from them by force, then the gods should declare him a liar.

Rather than referring to a punitive action against usurpers, *pitahaliya-* thus expresses that Katuwas regained the city by legitimate, non-violent means. The verb thus surely refers to some kind of real estate transaction. As shown by Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies (1982), the preposition CUM-*ni* ‘with’ is regularly used in commercial contexts to mark the person from whom something is bought, including land (TÜNP 1, §1, CEKKE §6b, etc.). I assume the same usage in clause §4 here: *pitahaliyaha* means ‘I legally obtained (in some fashion) it (the city) from the grandsons of Ura–Tarhuntas’. It is highly unfortunate that the verb of the next clause, which refers to further cities belonging to Katuwas, is missing. I suspect, but obviously cannot prove, that the missing verb is ‘gave’, expressing that Katuwas obtained Carchemish by effectively trading other cities for it. However, I would not exclude that the missing verb was rather ‘bought’, which could also contrast with whatever the precise nuance of *pitahaliya-* is.

The verb’s formal analysis remains elusive. Since the context of its occurrence is that of a city as owned property and the spelling with the sign *ta* points to a shape /pita-/ with a voiceless dental stop, the word likely contains the Luvian cognate of Hittite *piētta-*, a plurale tantum meaning ‘allotment’, but in attested use referring almost always to an allotment of *land*, thus property or estate (see CHD P 263 with refs.). As the second member of a putative compound, I can suggest only a cognate of Hittite *Āāli-* ‘share, portion’. The denominative verb would then mean something like ‘obtain as an allotted portion’. This would imply that the grandsons of Ura–Tarhuntas, however they gained control of it, simply granted Carchemish to Katuwas as its legitimate heir. This may seem too generous to be credible, but one may compare the story of the author of TELL AHMAR 1, who claims that Hamiyatas, son of the relative who had usurped the power of the author’s father, had restored to the author his great-grandfather’s power (§§11–16; Hawkins 2000: 240). I insist only that the references in clauses §§3–4 in KARKAMIŠ A11b+c must be to the city and that Katuwas stresses that he regained control of it by peaceful means (I see no basis for the idea of a “revolt”, as claimed by Hawkins 2000: 102).

Two further putative examples of enclitic subject pronouns with transitive verbs occur in KARKAMIŠ A21 (Hawkins 2000: 160). I cite as much of the immediate context as there is, because it is crucial for understanding §8:

- § 5 ... || ...]AMPLECTI–*nú–ta*
 § 6 NEG+*a–pa–wa/i–mu* REL–*zi* BONUS[...]
 § 7 [...–*t[āʔ]*] || *tá–ti–zi mi–zi* SERVUS–*ta/i*₄
 § 8 *wa/i–tà–na zi/a–ti* LOCUS?–*ti* SOLIUM–*nú–tá*
 § 9a *ku–ma–wa/i*[...
 § 9b ...]–*li–tà*
 § 10 *wa/i–ma–sa tá–ti i–zi*
 § 11 *wa/i–mu* INFANS–[x] REL–*ti* || <(x)>*ti–i+a–ta*

I begin, however, with the more straightforward case of §10, the meaning of which is elucidated by the insight of Hawkins (2000: 161–2) that the verb of clause §11 is /*tiyari(ya)–*/ ‘to watch over, guard’ in an archaizing spelling that omits the stroke marking *–ra/i–* (see further Hawkins 2000: 487). This clause thus means ‘She (Kubaba) watched over me like a child’. Hawkins translates the preceding clause as ‘and (she) made me father’, but this produces a complete non–sequitur. In view of the manifestly tutelary sense of the following clause §11, we should rather suppose that *i–zi* is an abbreviated writing of the preterite third singular of medio–passive /*itsiya–*/ in the sense ‘became’, probably *i–zi–ya–si* with the innovative reflexive particle, as seen in ÇINEKÖY §§6–7 and elsewhere (on such forms see Rieken 2004), although *i–zi–(i)–ta* homophonous with the corresponding active cannot be excluded (see the remarks above on *wa/i+ra–li–ta* in TELL AHMAR 6). We thus have a coherent: ‘and she became (a) father to me and watched over me like a child’. That a goddess in such a tutelary role could be styled ‘father’ is not problematic. One may compare from Mesopotamia the statement of Ishtar in an oracle to Esarhaddon: *anāku AD–ka AMA–ka birti agappēja urtabi–ka* ‘I am your father and mother. I have reared you between my wings’ (see CAD R 47 sub *rubbū* and Langdon 1914: 140). In similar oracles Ishtar also calls herself Esarhaddon’s ‘great protector’, ‘good nurse’ and ‘good shield’ (Langdon 1914: 130–1). Our expression in KARKAMIŠ A21 is merely an abbreviation of the widespread ‘become/make father and mother to’ (KARATEPE 1 §III etc.) used to indicate a tutelary relationship with either a divine or human patron.

Clauses §§7–8 are a more complicated case. Hawkins is surely correct in taking

the preceding clauses §§5–6 as describing an action of Kubaba in which she caused some set of people who were not dear (or perhaps rather ‘good’) to the author nevertheless to embrace him. That is, the relative clause §6 refers backward. As Hawkins indicates, there is only space enough at the beginning of clause §7 for the sign *wa/i* of the quotative particle and one or at most two signs representing pronouns or particles. Since ‘my fathers’ is either the subject or direct object, the only possible enclitic pronouns would be dative /-tu/ ‘to her’ or reflexive /-ti/, depending on whether ‘my fathers’ or the goddess is the subject. A third person pronoun /-ada/ is excluded, and I therefore take the partial sign not as *t[á]* (thus tentatively Hawkins), but rather as *t[á]* representing the local particle /-ta/.

Hawkins (2000: 160–1) reads *wa/i-tà-na* and interprets this as ‘and her they’, taking clause §8 as ‘and her they seated in this precinct’. This produces not only an enclitic subject pronoun with a transitive verb, but also an unprecedented sequence of enclitic subject and direct object pronoun in the same clause, a complete *monstrum* in terms of Anatolian Indo-European grammar. As Hawkins acknowledges (2000: 161), this reading also leaves a difficult *SERVUS-ta/i₄* in the preceding clause §7. The photo and drawing (Hawkins 2000: plates 48 and 49) confirm that Hawkins’ reading of the sequence of signs is certainly the most natural, but they would also permit rather: [*wa/i-(ti)?*]-*t[á]* || *tá-ti-zi mi-zi SERVUS-ta/i₄-tá wa/i-na zi/a-ti LOCUS?-ti SOLIUM-nú-tá*. We thus achieve normal syntax in §8: ‘they seated her in this place’.

We also now have an analyzable verb with proper ending in §7. Rieken and Yakubovich (2010: 205–6) argue persuasively that the Hieroglyphic Luvian word for ‘servant, slave’ is /*hudarla/i-*/, matching Kizzuwatna Luvian *Āutarlā-* but with “*i*-mutation” in view of spellings like nominative singular *SERVUS-ta/i₄-i-sa* in ALEPPO 2 §1 etc. We would predict that from the underlying stem */*hudarla-*/ Luvian could create a denominative stem /*hudarli-~hudarlai-*/ ‘make a servant, slave’ with “lenited” ending in the third singular: cf. Kizzuwatna Luvian *tarmi-/tarmai-* ‘to nail down, fasten’ < *tarma/i-* ‘nail, peg’ (Pret3Sg *tar-mi-ta!*). We may thus read *SERVUS-ta/i₄-tá* as /*hudarlida*/ and the sentence as: ‘She (Kubaba) made my fathers servants [(for herself)].’¹

The following passage from KIRÇOĞLU (Hawkins 2000: 384) remains a crux, due to the unclear relevance of ‘thousand’ and the obscure sequence *ta-t̄*

§ 2 *wa/i-’ za-’ STATUA-ru-sà (DEUS) REGIO-ni-sa-na MAGNUS.*
FEMINA-sa₅+ra/i-i || ARHA (“PES”)u-pa-ha
 § 3 *wa/i-ma-sá | (“FRONS”)ha-ta MILLE DOMUS-sa-ha i-zi-i-tà(-)ta-’*

¹ Given the ambiguous vocalism of the sign *ta/i₄*, it is also possible that the denominative stem was rather /*hudarla:-*/, which would likewise have “lenition” in the third singular: see Melchert 1997: 133–5. The fact that Hittite uses a factitive in *-aĀĀ-* (ARAD-(n)*aĀĀ-*) for ‘make (someone) a slave/servant’ does not require that Luvian use the identical derivational suffix. I cannot accept the proposal of Rieken and Yakubovich (2010: 206–8) that the Hieroglyphic Luvian verb PUGNUS. PUGNUS represents a denominative to /*hudarla/i-*/ ‘servant’. I will return to the problem of this verb elsewhere.

The sense of clause §2 is tolerably clear: ‘I brought away this statue for the Divine Queen of the Land’. Since the object bearing the inscription is a small statue, it is reasonable that it might have been carried away as booty and placed in honor of the goddess (I see no justification for Hawkins’ ad hoc rendering of the verb as ‘produced’). Interpretation of the verb of clause §3 is made problematic by the final sequence *ta-^l* which seems to exclude interpreting the verb as belonging to */itsi(ya)-/* ‘make; become’ (the beginning of the next clause totally precludes construing the *ta-^l* sequence with it). Hawkins (2000: 384) tries to solve the problem by emending to *i-zi-i-<sa>-tā-ta-^l* and interpreting the clause as ‘for me she honored(?) the face...’. This proposal must be rejected, because the verb ‘to honor’ is spelled with absolute consistency with *ta* (eight times): *i-zi-i-sa-ta-*. Given the convincing arguments by Rieken (2007: esp. 265–6) that *izis(a)ta-* ‘to honor’ contains *izi(ya)-* ‘make’ in the sense ‘worship’ (cf. Hittite *-za iya-* ‘worship’), it is likely that we are dealing with another derivative */itsida-/* or */itsila-/*, an intransitive verb in the same semantic sphere: ‘She became the object of honor/worship before me and a thousand houses(?)’ (lit. ‘in the face of me and of a thousand houses’). This interpretation obviously must remain speculative, but nothing precludes an intransitive verb.

The sole remaining alleged example of an enclitic subject pronoun with a transitive verb involves a recurring expression whose syntax and meaning present grave difficulties by any account. These may be most easily illustrated by its most elaborated occurrence in KARKAMIŠ A2+3 (Hawkins 2000: 109):¹

- § 2 *wa/i-mu-’ |ku-ma-na (DEUS)TONITRUS-sa || |á-ma-za |tá-ti-ya<-za>*
 | (“LIGNUM”) *sà-la-ha-za |pi-ya-ta*
- § 3 *a-wa/i |za-a-sa |kar-ka-mi-si-za-sa(URBS) (DEUS)TONITRUS-*
sa NEG₂-ha mi-i-’ |tá-ti-i |“COR”-tara/i-na POST-ni a-tá
 | *BONUS-li-ya-ta*
- § 4 *NEG₂-ha-wa/i-sa mi-i-’ AVUS-ha POST-ni a-tá |BONUS-li-ya||-ta*
- § 5 *wa/i-sa-’ mu-’ ka-tu-wa/i-ya kar<-ka>-mi-si-za(URBS) REGIO*
DOMINUS-ya “COR”-tara/i-na POST-ni a-tá BONUS-li-ya-ta
- § 6 *wa/i-mu-ta |su-ha-na-ti-’ (“FRONS”)ha-ta-ti a-tá LITUUS+na-tà*

The basic thrust of the passage is not in doubt: we have the familiar topos of divine favor shown to the author in contrast with his predecessors: ‘Until the Storm-god gave me my paternal succession...he looked upon me with a *smiling* (or sim.) face’. In this context Hawkins (loc. cit.) reasonably translates the intervening clauses as: ‘... this Karkamišean Tarhunzas had exalted the person neither for my father, nor for my grandfather had exalted (the person), but for me Katuwas the Karkamišean Country-Lord he exalted the person...’.

¹ I accept the arguments of van den Hout (2002: 181–5) that sign *341 represents a heart, not a vase, and should be transliterated COR, not VAS.

As we will see, Hieroglyphic Luvian elsewhere uses (BONUS)/walliyanu-/ for ‘exalt’, but this fact per se would not affect Hawkins’ interpretation of (BONUS)/walli(ya)-/. We know that Kizzuwatna Luvian attests a verb *walli(ya)-* in the concrete meaning ‘raise, lift’ (used of a newborn child): KUB 35.102+103 iii 4 and 35.88 iii 13 (see for the contexts Starke 1990: 222 and 227). In Hittite we find three(!) competing verbal stems, but all with the derived meaning ‘exalt, praise’ (or with humans perhaps rather ‘elevate, promote’): *walla-* (*Āi*-verb), *walliya-*, and *walluške-*.¹ Since the meanings ‘exalt/praise’ and ‘elevate/promote’ are easily derived from the physical one of ‘lift, raise’ (cf. Luvo–Hittite *šarlā(i)-* with the same range of meanings), the Hittite verbs are surely in origin from the same root as Kizzuwatna Luvian *walli(ya)-* ‘lift, raise’.² That the matching stem /walli(ya)-/ in Hieroglyphic Luvian would have evolved the sense ‘exalt, elevate, promote’ would be unsurprising, as would the creation of a competing stem /walliyanu-/ with the same meaning: for this compare cases like Hittite *laknu-* beside *lag-* ‘cause to incline/fall’ or *pašnu-* beside *paš-* ‘protect’. As correctly noted by Hawkins (2000: 263), the epithet (BONUS) *u-li-ya-mi-sà* of Halparuntiyas is surely the participle of /walli(ya)-/, for which ‘exalted’ or ‘elevated’ seems unavoidable.

Nevertheless, Hawkins’ interpretation of /walli(ya)-/ in the passage cited as merely equivalent to /walliyanu-/ faces serious difficulties beyond the presence of an enclitic subject pronoun with a transitive verb (in A2+3 clauses §§4–5). His analysis totally ignores the presence of the local adverbs POST-*ni* and *á-ta* (/a:pan/ or /a:pani/ ‘behind, after’ and /a:nda/ ‘into’ or ‘to’). This problem is not trivial, since they are present in every instance of the construction with /walli(ya)-/ and /atrin/ (and enclitic subject pronoun), but *never* appear with /walliyanu-/, which clearly does mean ‘exalt’ or ‘elevate, promote’, whether the latter co-occurs with /atrin/ ‘person’ or not. The use of /walliyanu-/ may be illustrated by two occurrences in MARAŞ 4 (Hawkins 2000: 256–7):

§ 11 |a-wa/i *187-TERRA-mi |tá-ti-na AVUS-ha-na AVUS-ha-ti-na AVUS-ha-tu-li-ha |(BONUS)wa/i-li-ya-nú-wa/i-ha

‘I exalted/elevated (my) father, grandfather, great-grandfather and *forefather* in/for....’

§ 15 |wa/i-mi-i |á-mi-na (“COR”)á-tara/i-i-na |á-pa-ara/i |BONUS-li-ya-nu-wa/i-ha

‘I thereby exalted/elevated my own person.’

¹ Pace Kloekhorst 2008: 952, there is no justification for doubting the meaning of *walluške-*, which in the active clearly means ‘exalt’ (of a god in KUB 29.1 i 26) or ‘elevate, promote’ (of Hattusha in KUB 23.77 Ro 79) and in the medio-passive with reflexive particle means ‘boast’, just like *walliya-*. For the correct meaning of the medio-passive of *wallu(ške)-* see already Oettinger 1979: 490, note 82, contra Neu 1968: 188 and Hoffner 1998: 27. See for a complete and correct translation of both KUB 48.99 (the anger of Pirwa) and of KUB 36.44 i 5–6 and 14 (disappearance of the Sun-god) Atterer 2011: 71 and 101–2. For New Hittite *walliya-* (which may be a Luvianism) plus reflexive as ‘boast’ see Friedrich 1952: 242 and Kloekhorst 2008: 944 (to which add the examples in the “Milawata Letter” KUB 19.55+48.90 LowerEdge 3; Hoffner 2009: 320).

² The concrete meaning ‘raise, lift’ makes problematic the derivation of this set of words from the PIE root **welH-* ‘be strong’ (Oettinger 1979: 491).

Likewise in TELL AHMAR 6 we find /walliyanu-/ with /atrin/ but without the local adverbs (see Hawkins 2005: 14–15):

§14 | CAPUT-ti-pa-wa/i | INFANS-ni-i | COR-tara/i-na | BONUS-li-ya-nu-wa/i-ha | (“CAPUT”)ha+ra/i-ma-hi-na

‘For man (and) child the person I exalted (as) head.’¹

The difference between the two constructions is particularly striking in TELL AHMAR 5 §§10–15 (Hawkins 2000: 232):

§ 10 |mu-pa-wa/i-’ |zi-la |za-a-sa DEUS-ni-sa || |POST-ni a-tá BONUS-li-ya-ta

§ 11 |wa/i-mu-’ pa-si-i-’ |CORNUS+CAPUT-mi-i-sa |á-sa₅-za-ta

§ 12 |SUPER+ra/i-a-wa/i-ta |SA₄(-)li-li-ya-wa/i-na-’ |COR-tara/i-i-na BONUS-li-ya-nu-wa/i... wa/i ... [...]

§ 15 ...]x x-na-’ |VAS-tara/i-na |BONUS-li-ya-nu-wa/i-ha

Hawkins for some reason just here renders /walliyanu-/ as ‘cause to exalt’, but there is no justification for this. Whether the verb in §12 is an imperative second singular or an indicative first person singular, there is no reason to take it as other than in MARAŞ 4: ‘Elevate!/I will elevate the __ person on high.’ On the other hand, just as in KARKAMIŞ A2+3, the verb /walliya-/ in §10 (here without /atrin/!) is accompanied by POST-ni a-tá. The same is true of KARKAMIŞ A14a §§6–7, where we find again /atrin/, POST-ni á-ta, (BONUS)/walliya-/ and in the second sentence an enclitic subject pronoun.

There are two more examples of /walliya-/ relevant to its interpretation, although their precise meaning is less than assured. The first is in IZGIN 1 (Hawkins 2000: 316):

§18 wa/i-tá-’ 9?-zi-’ DEUS[-ni]-zi POST-ni a-tá BONUS-li-ya-za-ta

Note that we have here the two local adverbs and the verb (in the “marked imperfective” form /walliyatsa-/ expressing an action taken by multiple subjects), but no /atrin/ and no dative referring to any person, but rather the local particle /-ta/.

The remaining example appears in KARKAMIŞ A23 (Hawkins 2000: 119):

§ 10 wa/i-ta-’ (DEUS)ku+AVIS-pa-na |kar-ka||-mi-si-za-na(URBS) MAGNUS.DOMINA-sa₅+ra/i-na |POST-ni |SOLIUM-nu-wa/i-ha

§ 11 wa/i-ti-’ pa-sa-’ tá-ti-ya DOMUS-ni |BONUS-ya-ta

§ 12 mu-ha-wa/i ti-[...][...][...]

¹ Hawkins (loc. cit.) translates ‘for man (and) boy the person I exalted (and) the head’, but I do not see the sense of exalting the head. I take ‘head’ rather as predicatival, indicating that the elevation of the persons resulted in their being ‘heads’, that is, chiefs/leaders. For such a use of ‘head’ see the Annals of Mursili, KBo 3.4 i 32, where two cities are styled the SAG.DU.MEŞ KUR.KUR.MEŞ ‘head lands’ of the Kaskeans, or KBo 14.19 ii 21, referring to the ‘heads’ of a rebellion.

‘I afterwards established Kubaba, Queen of Karkamiš, and she __ed ... Also I/me...[.]’

Hawkins (2000: 120), against his earlier analysis, argues that BONUS-*ya-ta* means ‘was good’ and represents the verb /*sanawiya-*/ of SULTANHAN §7, which refers to a grapevine. This suggestion is extremely unlikely, since it leaves entirely unexplained the presence in A23 §11 of the reflexive particle /-*ti-*/, which could have no place in a clause with a stative verb ‘be good’.

Likewise against his previous analysis, Hawkins (loc. cit.) now construes *tá-ti-ya* DOMUS-*ni* as a locative singular. This is likewise highly improbable, since the attested (and expected) dative-locative singular of the adjective /*tadiya-*/ ‘paternal’ is *tá-ti-(i)*, which contra Hawkins represents /*tadiya-*/, with the regular deletion of the stem-final /-*a-*/ before a following /*i-*/, in this case the ending. While he is correct that /*parni-*/ makes little sense as the plural of /*parn(a)-*/ ‘house’, it may easily represent the syncopated (or apocopated) nom.-acc. plural neuter of a derived adjective /*parniya-*/ ‘of/belonging to a house’ (cf. nom.-acc. pl. *ha-li-(i)* ‘days’ in BOR §11 and ÇİFTLİK §17 beside (“DIES”) *há-li-ya* in KARATEPE 1 §LI). The reflexive particle /-*ti-*/ now also has its usual function of marking a locally bound possessor (Yakubovich 2010: 165): ‘and she exalted/elevated the things belonging to her paternal house’.

This passage is thus irrelevant to our main problem: the construction of /*walliya-*/ with the local adverbs /*a:ppan(i) a:nda-*/, sometimes but not always with accusative /*atrin-*/, and sometimes but not always with an enclitic subject pronoun. As to the sense of /*walliya-*/ in this construction, we may note that the subject is always a deity, never a person (as opposed to /*walliyanu-*/ ‘exalt, elevate’). The verb is *always* accompanied by the combination POST-*ni á-ta* /*a:ppan(i) a:nda-*/ ‘in behind’, and in all instances except one there is a person in the dative (noun or pronoun). In one case there is no overt mention of a person but only the local particle /-*ta-*/ (IZGIN 1 §18).

It is difficult not to construe the persons in the dative with the postposition /*a:ppan(i)*/ ‘behind’. As in Hittite, /*a:nda-*/ may also mean not so much ‘into’ as merely underscore close physical contact (see Salisbury 1999: 66). While I know of no comparable example in Hittite with both adverbs in a single clause, the following passage shows them clearly linked (KBo 5.4 Ro 8–9): *nu=šši=ššan anda imma kišta[ti n]u=šši* EGIR-*an tiyaši* ‘You even join in with him and step behind him.’ The expression ‘step/stand behind’ (*āppan tiya-/ar-*) is well attested in New Hittite in the sense ‘support, join the side of’ (Friedrich 1952: 27 and 223 with refs.), including of deities (KBo 6.29 ii 13–15): *nu=mu* ⁴*IŠTAR* URU*Šamuġa* [GAŠAN=YA] EGIR-*an tiyat nu ġatrānun kueda[š KUR]-eaš* EGIR-*an=wa=mu tiyatten n=at=mu* EGIR-*an ti[y]ēr* ‘Ishtar of Samuha, My Lady, stepped behind me, and the lands to whom I wrote “Step behind me!” stepped behind me’.

I therefore can only suggest that HLuvian /*walliya-*/, which in the medio-passive would mean basically ‘lift/raise oneself, rise’, is used with the appropriate preverbs in the sense of the Hittite expressions cited with *tiya-* ‘step’ and *ar-* ‘stand’ (it is worth noting that *tiya-* means essentially ‘put oneself in a standing position’). It thus means

that the deities stood up (bestirred themselves) in active support of the persons named (whence the determinative BONUS). In IZGIN 1 §18 the incomplete context does not allow us to say why the beneficiary (surely the author of the text) is not explicitly named.

As to the accusative /atrin/, my first inclination was to take it in its grammaticalized function as a reflexive pronoun serving as a locally bound direct object (for which see Yakubovich 2010: 164): ‘raise oneself’ > ‘rise’. However, as Ilya Yakubovich has reminded me, this account cannot explain why /atrin/ is absent in so many cases: TELL AHMAR 5 §10, IZGIN 1 §18, and KARKAMIŠ A2+3 §4 and A14a §7 (in the last two instances with a subject enclitic pronoun). He suggests as an alternative that /atrin/ is an “accusative of respect” referring to the deity, who intervenes ‘in person, personally’. For such a construction in Iron Age Luvian he compares the expression X(accusative) LOCUS-*ta/i_{4/5}-za san(n)-ai-* ‘to overturn X with respect to (its) place’ = ‘to overturn on the spot’, where ‘place’ is grammatically nom.-acc. singular /*padan-tsa/* (see Rieken and Yakubovich 2010: 208–9). One also finds this construction with body parts with a transitive verb: see MARAŞ 4 §13 |*wa/i-tá VIR-ti-i-zi-i* (“PES”) *pa-ti-zi* |*ARHA* (“MANUS+CULTER”) *REL+ra/i-ha-* ‘I cut off the men’s feet’ (lit. cut off the men, the feet).

However, to suppose that the deity ‘rises (up behind)’ personally is tautological. How else could a deity rise except with respect to his or her person? One may note again that /atrin/ occurs *only* in instances where a beneficiary is named (a noun or pronoun in the dative). In these cases it is very difficult not to construe /atrin/ with the beneficiary. I therefore accept Yakubovich’s suggestion that /atrin/ is an accusative of respect ‘personally’, but with reference to the person of the human beneficiary. The main point in all passages is precisely that the deity aided the author of the text and not others. It thus makes sense to stress that the support was directed at him *personally*. This specification could naturally be omitted.

IV. Conclusion

We have seen that, of the handful of alleged exceptions in Hieroglyphic Luvian to the rule that enclitic subject pronouns do not occur with transitive verbs, most can be better analyzed otherwise. The interpretation of KIRÇOĞLU §3 remains unclear due to the obscurity of the verb. The precise sense of the combination (/atrin/) /a:ppan(i) a:nda walliya-/ remains elusive, but it certainly does not mean merely ‘exalt the person (of)’, and its overall syntax is also compatible with an intransitive medio-passive verb.

H. Craig Melchert

Department of Linguistics

3125 Campbell Hall

P.O. Box 951543

University of California

Los Angeles, CA 90095–1543

USA

melchert@humnet.ucla.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Archi A., Francia R. 2008 (eds.), VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittologia Roma, 5–9 settembre 2005, SMEA 50, Roma.
- Atterer M. 2011, Typologische Analyse hethitischer Mythen. Schlange und Wettergott. Hamburg.
- Bunnens G. 2006, A New Luwian Stele and the Cult of the Storm-god at Til Barsib – Masuwari. Louvain – Paris – Dudley(MA).
- Carruba O. 1970, Das Palaische: Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon. Wiesbaden.
- CAD = Oppenheim A.L.† *et al.* 1956–. The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Chicago.
- CHD = Güterbock H.G.†, Hoffner H.A.Jr., van den Hout Th.P.J. 1980–. The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Chicago.
- Disterheft D., Huld M., Greppin J. 1997 (eds.), Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel. Part One. Ancient Languages and Philology., Washington DC.
- Friedrich J. 1952, Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg.
- Garrett A. 1990, Hittite Enclitic Subjects and Transitive Verbs, JCS 42, 227–242.
- Garrett A. 1996, Wackernagel's Law and Unaccusativity in Hittite, in: Halpern, Zwicky 1996, 85–133.
- Gusmani R. 1964, Lydisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg.
- Hawkins J.D 1995, The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG). Wiesbaden.
- Hawkins J.D 2000, Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I: Inscriptions of the Iron Age. Berlin – New York.
- Hawkins J.D 2006, Chapter 2. The Inscription, in: Bunnens 2006, 11–31.
- Hawkins J.D, Davies A.M. 1982, Buying and selling in Hieroglyphic Luwian, in: Tischler 1982, 91–105.
- Halpern A.L., Zwicky A.M. 1996 (eds.), Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena. Stanford.
- Hock W., Meier-Brügger M. 2007 (eds.), *Даръ Slovesъny*. Festschrift für Christoph Koch zum 65. Geburtstag, München.
- Hoffner H.A. Jr. 1998, Hittite Myths. Second Edition. Atlanta.
- Hoffner H.A. Jr. 2009, Letters from the Hittite Kingdom. Atlanta.
- Hout Th. van den 2002, Self, Soul and Portrait in Hieroglyphic Luwian, in: Taracha 2002, 171–186.
- Kloekhorst A. 2008, Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon. Leiden – Boston.
- Langdon S. 1914, Tammuz and Ishtar. Oxford.
- Melchert H.C. 1997, Denominative Verbs in Anatolian, in: Disterheft *et al.* 1997, 131–138.
- Neu E. 1968, Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen. Wiesbaden.
- Oettinger N. 1979, Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns. Nürnberg.
- Rieken E. 2004, Das Präteritum des Medio-Passivs im Hieroglyphen-Luwischen, HSp 117, 179–88.
- Rieken E. 2007, Hieroglyphen-luwisch i-zi-ia: ein Beitrag zur Rekonstruktion der urindogermanischen Kulturgeschichte, in: Hock, Meier-Brügger 2007, 263–275.
- Rieken E. 2008, Die Zeichen <ta>, <tá> und <tà> in den hieroglyphen-luwischen Inschriften der Nachgroßreichszeit, in: Archi, Francia 2008, 637–648.
- Rieken E, Yakubovich I. 2010, The New Values of Luwian Signs L 319 and L 172, in: Singer 2010, 199–219.
- Salisbury D. 1999, anda and andan in Neo-Hittite, JCS 51, 61–72.
- Singer I. 2010 (ed.), *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies presented to J. David Hawkins on the occasion of his 70th birthday*. Tel Aviv.
- Starke F. 1990, Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift. Wiesbaden.

- Taracha P. 2002 (ed.), *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Warsaw.
- Tischler J. 1982 (ed.), *Serta indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*, Innsbruck.
- Watkins C. 1968–1969, The Celtic masculine and neuter enclitic pronouns, “*Études Celtiques*” 12, 92–95.
- Yakubovich I. 2006, Were Hittite Kings Divinely Anointed? A Palaic Invocation to the Sun-God and its Significance for Hittite Religion. “*Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions*” 5, 107–137.
- Yakubovich I. 2010, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. Leiden – Boston.