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H. Craig Melchert
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Current Status
All standard Hittite lexicographers agree in listing a single entry arkuwā(i)-, a verbal stem of the class labeled 12d by Oehring, Stemmbildung 30 and 309 (class L3 in Friedrich, HE 90-91), the type of hatatē “send a message.” There is also a consensus that arkuwā(i) is the verbal noun to this stem, by etymology from expected *arkuwār. There is no agreement, however, on the meaning of this verb. Friedrich Kammenhuber, HWS 1, 309, assumes a core meaning “pray,” manifested in Old Hittite as “pastwoidin,” but in Neo-Hittite mostly as “pray, pleading,” rarely as “excuse, justify oneself.” Palev, HED 1/2, 148, offers eight renderings ranged along a scale from “prayed, argued” to “respond, to make excuse.” The latter opinion reflects a distillation of several earlier proposals: Schulte, CC 3, 122; Larock, próbre hittite 14-19; von Schuler, JCS 22 (1970) 4-5.

The debate over the synchronic sense is at least in part bound up with two competing etymologies. Friedrich-Kammenhuber, HWS 1, 311, argues for PIE *erek- “pray, sing,” while Palev, HED 1/2, 150, opts for comparison with Latin argui “declare, prove,” following Duchesne-Guillaum, TPS (1946) 85, and Larock, próbre hittite 19. Oehring, Stemmbildung 309, also leaves the question open.

It is fair to say that the meaning and hence the historical derivation of this verb remain an unsolved problem. There is also a serious formal difficulty that stubbornly has been ignored. In KUB XXII 70 No. 90 and XVII 125 No. 5 we find a pretense third singular arkuwā. Aside from an exclamation point in Friedrich-Kammenhuber, HWS 1, 309, this form has elicited no comment. However, by the rules of Hittite phonology and morphology it cannot possibly belong to the paradigm of a stem arkuwā(i)-. The entire matter calls for a reexamination.

arkuwā(i)- (and haploglottized verbal noun arkuwā)

A review of all available evidence shows that the basic sense “(make a) plea” deduced by Larock, próbre hittite 14-19, is correct. Where he and subsequent scholars have erred is in factuating exclusively on those instances where the “prae” is made by a defendant or an accused—falsely concluding that the verb means inherently “respond to a charge, defend/excuse oneself.” The first crucial example cited by Larock shows that this inference is incorrect: n-at *IU32 takšan tšapartti n-at *IU32 ANA DLJIA pusašem nu-za kuit kuit arkuwār DŪ-zī n-at *IU52

45
"And they shall step before My Majesty together, and I My Majesty will interrogate them about the dispute(s), and I My Majesty will listen to the plea which each makes." Note that arkuwar refers equally to the presentations of both parties, at least one of which is a plaintiff. In fact, it is not clear that either party in the dispute may be properly characterized as a defendant. The only appropriate meaning is "make a plea" in the general sense of "present one's case."

Contra Laroche and Pauly, there is also no independent evidence at all that any of the examples in Neo-Hittite prayers involve some-one with a guilty conscience making an apology to the gods. The image in all cases is that of a slave appealing to a master (human or divine) for a solution to a problem. One example from Mur-šili’s second plague prayer may serve for all: nalmu nun ARAΔ10A kuAnuAsskiki nakk-nakhyi Inānu en-SU arkuwar iraziz (KUB XIV 9 Vo 23-24; CTH 378; NH/NS) "Or if something is weighing upon some servant, then he makes a plea to his master" ("And his master listens to him, ... and he puts right that which is weighing upon him.").

1. A variant of this formula occurs in Muwatallis’s Prayer (KUB VI 45 i 2-4; CTP:381; NH/NS), rendered correctly by Goetze, ANET 397, as "When things get too much for a man" and by the CHD L-N 372 as "If some matter becomes troublesome for a man."

Laroche is quite correct, however, in insisting on the quasi-legal overtones of this phraseology. The master (human or divine) is not a kindly uncle or "sugar-daddy" to be flattered into dispensing favors. He is seen in his role as dispenser of justice. The slave must present arguments, as if he were making a case in a court of law; that he deserves assistance or redress. By the Hittite moral code reflected in these passages, a just master is obliged to reward a successful presentation by acceding to the plea.

In insisting that arkuwar(?) - arkuwar has only an alliterative meaning "make a plea," some present arguments," I do not wish to deny that contextually it may come to mean "defend, explain, excuse oneself." Pragmatically, it is often a person who has been accused of improper conduct who must make an explicit accounting. In current English usage we generally use "plea" only of the defendant or defense attorney, while prosecutors typically make "motions." More fundamentally, in any unequal power relationship it is inevitably the subordinate who must account for his actions to his superior (whether preemptively or in response to charges). The latter does not usually have to explain himself.

Given the hierarchical and autocratic nature of the Hittite state, it is unsurprising that most instances of arkuwar in letters and treaties do involve self-justification, as in the Tawagalawa Letter: nams-udu en nu-en sa-nu sa-zu arkuwar iraziz (KUB XIV 9 Vo 64-65; CTH 181; NH/NS) "Come make an explanation/justification to me! And I will set you on your way." Similarly in the Maaš Letter: SESograms-1A ma kusi šallam šallael-udde-2A kwe ishaškenni nams-udu en nu-en sa-zu arkuwarUL kušiki iadai (HMK 68 No. 7-11; MH/MS) "(As to the fact) that you, dear brother, wrote me as follows: ‘No one brings me back an explanation of the matters which I keep writing about.’" Note that the sense of "re-spond, answer" is explicitly carried in the second example by appa ‘back,’ as usual in Hittite (cf. appa te-menur ‘reply, answer, respond’). It cannot be accidental that appa is also present in most other examples from the Maaš Letters as well as the "Indictment" of Marduwatta.3

1. Likewise CHD L-N 372: "Or if anything is a concern to some servant, (so that) he makes an appeal to his lord."

2. This sense of "pete (for assistance)" is also proper and sufficient for further instances in Neo-Hittite prayers: KUB VI 45 i 25; XIV 14* No. 6-7; XIV 1 iv 19-21. Nothing in the context supports the idea that the speaker is "answering for" some wrong previously committed. This includes the second instance, where the cause of the plea is the plague itself, not the old crime of Muršili’s father, to which he confesses only much later and very grudgingly.

3. See HMK 21 Vo. 38 (contra Alp, HMK 154, S2 Kd. 9, 64 Vo. 22-23, and KUB XIV Vo. 36). Other examples from Maaš are in incomplete contexts but the likely reconstruction in HMK 57 Vo. 36 arkuwar iraziz (without appa) clearly involves a legal dispute, and indeed one in which the person making the
A plea can also in context mean "request," a sense recognized only by Friedrich-Klauser, HW2 1, 523, but assured for at least the following example: rāsal AI-Na NAMBRU (sich) arkuwaš šišan Dū-zi "and he (the king) makes a plea/request to the transgressor as follows." (KBo XV 7:14; CTH 420; ṢNu; see also Kimmel, SSt 2, 36-37, 41). It is not remotely credible that the king would be making an excuse or apology to the transgressor, nor is he responding to the latter, since the king initiates the speech.

In sum, Larroche's original definition of arkuwaš (sich) "make a plea, present one's case" is correct. More specific meanings such as "excuse/defend oneself" or "request" are context-dependent only and should not be attributed to the lexeme itself. There is no evidence for a meaning "protest, repudiate" except in those cases where this force is carried by the verb āppa "back, re." Nowhere in its use in prayers, letters, or instructions does arkuwaš (sich) "make a plea" ever occur with the preverb kattan (sich) "with." These last two points are crucial for comparison with the examples to be discussed below.

arkuš (sich) "chant, intone"

The attestation of a stem arkuš in Old Hittite is highly restricted and stereotyped: it occurs only in the present third plural arkuš(ana). In all examples in a complete context it is accompanied by the preverb kattan (sich), and the latter can and should be restored in all others. Larroche, prière hittite 19, prudently leaves the kattan(ana) examples aside in his analysis of arkuš(ana) as "make a plea." In the typical instances, the former refers to the action of a "chorus," which is reacting to the action of a previously named "soloist," all performing in Hattic. The following passage may represent several dozen others: NEKANAM Epstein ASAR SUŅU apennu [ṣe-pensiš ti šišan SIRTU]1 "as his [the] hallelujah unto thee unāni apēr mašuš šišan QATAMMA [past kattan] arkuš(ana) (KBo XX 20) + XXV 54 (Ru. 13-15; CTH 649; OS) "The x-women take their planets. They stand up and sing as follows. [One] calls out "unāni apēr. Those (the others) arkuš (sich) just the same (along with her)." Note crucially that although the action of the x-women as a whole is termed "singing" (Akk zamūtu = Hitt. t ūmānu) the verb kattan arkuš (sich) actuallyResume Hittite hāltasī, which means merely "shout, cry out," with no necessary implication of "singing." Atypical, but important for the proper understanding of the Old Hittite usage is the following from the royal funeral rites: (ṣi)kandan ŠUM-an hāltasī (lepē) miāš šiš kattan arkuš(ana) (KUB XXXXII 11:13-14; CTH 459; OHA) "He calls the dead by name; they arkuš along with him." This example shows that the usage is not restricted to passages in Hattic. Note once again that our verb remains hāltasī, and in this context there is no evidence at all for singing of any kind. The usage in rituals with Hattic components is usually termed "Wechselgesänge" or "respon- sions." Puhvel and others have used this conception to try to account for all the uses of arkuš starting from a basic meaning "respond." We have seen that this sense does not work for the MI and NH forms arkuš (sich). The present is also false for the Old Hittite examples of arkuš (sich). The preverb kattan means only "(along) with." The "chorus" thus is clearly not responding to or answering the "soloist": they are accompanying her in repeating all or part of her solo passage. She is performing the act of arkuš as much as they are.

Such an alternation of solo passages and passages of soloist accompanied by chorus is well-known from Western classical music, including grand opera. More relevant to the present discussion is the fact that this practice is also common in religious music. In both cases, but particularly

4. For the restoration and general context of KBo XXIII 103 1-13 and the references in FrÖ 1, 311.

5. There is, of course, a homophone arkuš (sich) "below," but no one has seriously proposed that it is present here, for obvious reasons.
in the latter the function of the chordal accompani-
ment is also clear: by repeating the soloist’s
words along with the soloist, the chorus is re-
enforcing, in fact affirming them.9 The function
of this repetition is thus equal to that of “Amen!”
Such an affirmative use of repetition may also be
observed in many current churches in the
southern United States, where members of a
congregation will support a preacher’s sermon by
repeating portions of his sentences, instead of (or along with) saying “Amen.”

The function of accompanying and reinforcing is also clear in the two examples of kattan arku- in mythological passages. In the Myth of Uškumun, when Ishtar sings for the sea-monster, she receives help from heaven and earth as a “back-up chorus”: nu-ussa-kan [il]jamain dàni nus [ili] niy[i] daganzpapili sa kattan arku-
[ka]ni (KUB XXXVI 12 + KB XXVI 64 ii 1-2, CTH 349; MHNS) “She took up a song, and
heaven and earth accompanied/echoed her” (cf. Hoffner, Hittite Myths 56). In the tale of Cur-
paranzaš we find: nu-za “Curparanzašul ala-
lamkizezi sarapetí: bi kattan ar[k]uškanzi
(slcl. arkuškanzi9 [KUB XVII 9 i 17-19; CTH
362; MHNS] “G, wailed a lament. The exalted
ones arku-ed along with him.” In the latter
instance the notion of affirmation seems quite
clear: the others show sympathy and solidarity
with G by accompanying his lament.
It is the notion of affirmation that survives in
the only assured Neo-Hittite example of kattan(i)

6. In some instances, in both the Hittite and modern usage, the words of the soloist and chorus are new and do not repeat the
first part of the solo passage. The fact of accompaniment (not res-
sponset) and reinforcement remains.
7. My colleague George Carvounis kindly informs me that it is
not uncommon in early Sumerian is fixed repetition of the
final words of a verse, chapter, or other unit. He cites among
other Anuwazu, tablet 2, lines 20-24, pragipratu ki dier
pargapiot ki dier. The use to mark closure seems clear en-
ough. Whether there is also an affirmative effect is unclear.
8. For erroneous arkuškanzi of akkuškanzi for akku-
kanzi “they drink” (addition of a single stroke turns the sign
into it). The presence of kattan assures the verb is not
arkuš(ā), which we have seen, never co-occurs with this
verb. This fact obviously is due to the later verb’s mean-
ing: one does not, except in extremely unusual circumstances,
make a plea jointly with someone else.

arku-: EME MUNUSLUCAL; AVMiANAGAAL; INA
ARKU-1; INIM-; PESU-1; EME: MUNUSLU-
i-in the phrase “Complaint (lit. ‘tongue’) of the
queen: she wrote of the affair of Pattiya to the
palace, but His Majesty did not concur with her,” Ushat, Thoth 6, 79, interprets katta UL ar-
uš as “bat sich nicht entschuldigt,” followed by Pahvel, HED 1/2, 149. The context also per-
mits a more neutral “did not respond.” We have
seen, however, that arkuš(ā) does not mean
“respond,” and it is hardly consistent with the
known behavior of the Hittite king that he would be
making a public apology, even to the queen.
Furthermore, one should note that arkuš cannot
possibly belong to the paradigm of the stem
arkuš(ā).

The presence of the preverbal katta (NH for
kattan) seals the issue: katta arkuš clearly be-
longs to the same verb as OH kattan arkuš(ā)/
arkuškanzi, and the form arkuš shows that the
stem is arku-. This formal difference vs.
arkuš(ā)–“make a plea” supports the evidence
already seen for a contrast in meaning. In view of
the affirmative function of OH kattan arku- “ac-
company, repeat the words of,” I submit that the
meaning of the NH passage is that the king failed
to support the queen by affirming or repeating her
charges. For the passage from “accompany”
(with words) to “concur” compare German be-
stimmen, where bei-matches kattan “with.”

One potential objection to this analysis is that
there clearly is no trace of “singing” in the NH
passage. However, we have already seen that
cattan arku- resums the action of several verbs,
including alašammar “call, keen” and at least one
instance of halani “call out” in the royal fu-
neral rites where there is no reason to suppose that
there was any singing involved (in the sense of a
time and musical accompaniment). It is by
no means clear, then, that arku- implies “sing-
ing” in the strict sense. A broader meaning for
arku- is also suggested by the following example:
ns [il]summan akkuškanzi kitumma a[k]uan [na
irhan]ni[i]šamifikan e-na apal[ SIR n=at isša-
muyavnazi EGH-PA ar[k]uškanzi [KUB XXV
37 + XXXV 131 + LI 9 i 39-40; CTH 77.1; ?NS]
While they are drinking, until they finish drinking, that song is being sung. They arku- it back in a 'song' manner. For the use of an indicative as a manner adverb cf. liliba zokwani 'hurriedly' in HMK 4 Ro. 8 and passim in the Matat Letters. In this case the use of apba 'back' suggests that we are dealing with a genuine response. The need to specify the action of arku-with isikhamisi- "sings" suggests that the meaning of the former is more general than that of the latter.

Pinning down the precise range of usage of arku obviously depends in part on how we understand that of isikhamisi. A complete review of the evidence for the latter verb is not possible here, but some key characteristics of its usage seem assured. First, in many examples there is explicit mention of musical accompaniment: cildi zinannahagal/tub "small/harge song" (KUB XXV 2 vi 5-9; XXV 6 iv 7-8; and often); buh oupe "clapper" (KUB XXV 37 ii 13-21); buh oupe and karinsa "haut" (KUB XXV 37 iii 24-32); "Ayers, "Karkamisii and gqalqalwini (probably percussion instruments) (KUB XXVII 49 i 25-26).

Second, the action indicated by isikhamisi is typically reserved for a few particular functions: LEMOLEMIS NUR singers/musicians; LEMOLEMIS Zilisindelwile; LEMIS Valimise; interjuecus; Minumuseki; SKIL "maidens", and the "men" of various cult cities. In apparent contradiction to this stand passages such as KUB XI 9 iii 1-4; tus-kan LEMIS; Ledlumisikwana ndaba wanci nu 9 LEMIS dalaphuzi pankusikana kithwan SIR51 "the men of T. enter. Three men waken, and the panku also sings as follows" (Hittite text follows). The CHD p90 takes panku here to mean the "worshipising congregation," a sense clearly correct in many instances. However, panku as a noun means simply "the total," and given the immediately preceding reference to the "men of Dalumisikwana" and Ayers soloists, one may wonder if panku is not rather the rest of the "men of T." functioning as a chorus. The same remark applies to the repeated phrase of KUB XXV 38 Ro. 7-9 and parallels (see Stark, SBoT 30, 334-37); [name of] 2 LEMIS GAL sUNU KIT- kihwan SIR52 ... ledla tshaka pankusi as intai

[51] kithwan QATAMMA pat SIR53 "Then two of their leaders (or 'their two leaders') sing as follows. "[avian]. The panku sings just the same with them." 54 There is no firm evidence for 'singing' (isikhamisi) by the "lay" assembly. The notion of 'singing' (isikhamisi) was a special professional skill is supported by the presence of a special term isikhamisiteli "singer" (KUB XVII 2 i 11, iii 5, 19). Also of interest is the unfortunately fragmentary reference to instruction in the art: 55 NAR "natakunya kusinji manjukhelele [of] ... kari 3 isikhamisi mainyenda [KUB XI 92 Ro. 1611] "The singer keeps teaching me something." He has already taught me three songs" (following CHD L-n 165). Finally, we may note that the Hittites used isikhamisi- "sings" to refer to the epic of the Kumanchi cycle and to the Old Hittite "Song of Nels," which we have strong reasons to suppose were in verse (see McNel, AS 13 (1963), 237-42, and Durmford, AS 21 (1971), 69-75). While we cannot be assured of the Hittite equivalent, we also know that the Hurro-Hittite epic of "setting free" is designated as SIR. This text may or may not be in verse, as several features qualify it as classically literary in art, meant for oral performance: see Neu, STSB 32, 7-8.

It thus seems fully justified to translate isikhamisi as "sings," with the expected implications of a performance art at least typically involving musical accompaniment. However, the very first passage cited above for kattan arku (KBo XX 26

5 Lekwense in KUBXXVII 37 ii 17-21 (1969 T 30, 343) the reference for the entire performance is to the "men of Lalubwa.
6 The rarity of this word is merely due to the fact that it is usually hidden by the logogram L32NAB (which may also be, however, mean "musician," in general).
7 Note also the characterization of the Hittite epic as having "sine-muhe xwe without陨cowardly Speaks" by Götzeck, Hebräische Literatur, in V. von Scc, Nervas Handbook der Buch酄tevchtheit, Bd I. Altorientalische Litctur, ed. by W. Bölek (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1978), 80. This cautious formulation seems appropriate for our current state of knowledge. There is no basis for assuming that isikhamisi always and exclusively implies metrical verse, much less that this feature defines itself between isikhamisi and arku.
Conclusions

Confirmation of the meaning "make a plea, state one's case" for the stem arkusati(-) and its verbal noun arkuwar strongly supports the comparison made by Duchesne-Guillenin and Laroche with Latin arguō "declare, prove." In fact, there is probably a direct word-equation based on a preform argu- Gut−ae, a denominative stem from an adjective or noun argus.13 The stem arkusati(-), attested only in Neo-Hittite, may easily be a replacement for an earlier *arkusana− (cf. NEH kappuskati−) for kappuskate− "count" and see Oettinger, Stammbildung 336–37.14 The absence of initial /i/ in Hittite means that the connection of arguō with the root of harši− "brilliant, white" must be abundantly clear, but this is hardly a great loss, as already noted by Laroche, préface Hittite 19, Puh- vel, HED 1/2, 150, and Friedrich-Kammenhuber, HWI 1, 311. Nothing in the semantics of arguō or argutus demands a derivation from *arku−.15

On the other hand, the stem arkus−(-i) has been shown to mean "solemnly intone," typically in the context of choral accompaniment of singing or recitation in ritual performance, but also occasionally in other contexts where a group affirms the utterance of a single person by repeating his or her words in unison. It is apparently the sense of "affirm, concur with" that survives in NEH secular usage. The preterite third singular form arkuati shows not only that the stem is simply arku− instead of arkusati−; but also that it is ārk−i−, with a unitary labiovelar, just like 15. For this analysis of the Latin stem see already O. Sommer, Inclusive and Romance Historical Studies in Honour of Ernst Pulgian, ed. H. Izzo. (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1980). 13–14.

14. As Jean Puehl has reminded me, from an original stem arku−[--] one could get an extended stem arkukhura− with syncope (cf. *appuska− to kappuskate−). However, I know of no evidence for syncope of a prot. 3 rd sg. in -erto to *arto, and even an assent *arkus−arkus would still explain attested arku-ta. In view of the observed replacement of OHH gut−ate by NEH gut−ate (see Oettinger, Stammbildung 337), a change in the opposite direction is not credible.

15. Since the likely perfom for the Hittite is also *argual− /i− (there is no evidence for a labiovelar, with Sommer, contra Puehl. However, an already PIE dissimilation of *arg−ui− to *argo− cannot be excluded.

12. Compare also KBo XXIII 103 iv 1–13, which confirms that here too the Hittite verb standing behind SIRR is ārḳamāt.
ekutta "drank" < ekr- (<erg-)/. As cogently argued by Landenman, RIA 23 (1965) 29-32, if the stem were *egwae, then the preterite third singular would have to be *egwe, spelled *e-ekw-at. Likewise, then ar-ku-ut-ti must be [ark*tu], because the preterite third singular of an *engwe could only be *ar-ku-at.

Given this independent evidence for a root-final labial-vowel along with a meaning in the sphere of "insane, chant," there seems no reason not to derive this stem from PIE *eek*. Seen also in Sanskrit dritti-"praise," Armenian erg-"song," and Tocharian Ab yeqyik/qeyke "reverence, honor."

The long-standing debate over the etymology of arku<sup>66</sup> thus turns out to have been ill-conceived: once we have correctly identified two distinct stems arku- and arku<sup>67</sup>-eth, we see that both etymologies are correct, one for each verb.

The presence in Hittite of arku- "innate, chant" (or sim.) < erkk- beside šiamat- "sing" < ši(e)k>met (<Arunbed>),RED 1/2, 335, with refs., to which add Beider, ESL 55 (1990) 36-49 is of interest for the reconstruction of PIE ritual performance. This topic can only be shied to here, but it is at least worth noting that in Sanskrit, rṣ is the more general term for "verse, hymn," but also specifically "recited, spoken verse" versus śadān- "song, verses which are sung; tune." Whatever the precise range of meaning of *eek*<sup>68</sup> and *eek*<sup>69</sup>- in PIE, it is thus likely that the original difference between Hittite arku- and šiamat- reflects an inherited contrast. However, this relationship was obscured by the virtual elimination of the simplex arku- in favor of the combinations kțumus arku- "accompany," hence "repeat, affirm," and etpu arku- "excite back." With changes in Hittite ritual practices even these expressions became obsolete, leaving only a residual secular "affirm, concord with," of limited usage.

<sup>66</sup> For the etymology for arku and arku<sup>67</sup> in any of the standard Sanskrit lexica (Skutsch-Wright, Muster Williams, etc.) and the papers of Arthur W. Kerth, The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads 1.18, Harvard Oriental Series 31 (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1925).