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WORD-FINAL -r IN HITTITE

H. Craig MELCHERT
University of North Carolina

It has long been recognized that several Hittite words ending in
-r appear occasionally in texts without the final -r. There seems to
have been more or less universal agreement that the omission of -r
reflects a genuine difference in pronunciation. Since most of the
forms without -r appear to alternate with others with -r, scholars
have generally concluded that Hittite word-final -r was either weakly
articulated or occasionally lost in speech; see e.g. Friedrich (1960:
33).

However, Eichner (1973: 75 with n. 76) has proposed a general
loss of word-final -r after unaccented vowel in (pre-)Hittite. Word-
final -r would be preserved regularly only in nominative-
accusative plurals in -är, such as uûdûr "words" and wûzû "water"
(collective), where graphic -ûr represents a long vowel. The
preservation of the long vowel in these forms would be due to a
secondary shift of the accent to the final syllable wûzû instead of
ûwûzû (ûwûzûr). One may add here jûzû "head" (pl. jûzû) and
gûzûr "wild animal, beast" (pl. gûzûr).

Eichner is obliged to explain all other cases of preserved final -r
as analogical after the plural forms above: thus sing. wûzû after
ûwûzû, pejzû "fire" after wûzû, and after pejzû all other nouns in
-ûr except pejûr- "rock", where the failure to restore -r is attributed
to "prophylactic dissimilation". In the abstracts in -ûr the analogical
restoration is inconsistent.
There are some difficulties with Eichner’s account, one of which has been pointed out by Nau (1982: 205): in a recent comprehensive treatment of word-final -r in Hittite: all cases of alternation between final -r and -r are after -a. There are no cases of loss of final -r after -e, -e, or -a (except -pe, where it never appears), suggesting that its loss here is differently conditioned from that in -ar/-al. By Eichner’s account, it is hard to see why the analogical influence of pakhur on other nouns in -ur should be so much more consistent than that of watar on nouns in -star (21).

There is also the more basic problem for the motivation for the massive analogy which Eichner must assume. Obviously, the proposed remodeling of the singulars watar and utar after their respective plurals is quite reasonable. Since influence of pakhur ‘fire’ on watar ‘water’ seems assured (e.g. UtAkkur after pakhura; see Schindler 1975: 7), influence in the opposite direction is also possible. That all nouns in -star are renewed after watar and all those in -ur after pakhur is much less compelling. Furthermore, Eichner does not even mention nouns in -ew-tar/-ew-tarrad, -dew-/simed, -war/-miniad, or verbal nouns in -war/-wad. Since there are no direct analogical models, the final -r of these classes is presumably after that in -star/-starad, the only formal association being that of heteronymy. We are now at the end of a long analogical chain indeed. A more direct alternative solution for -ar/-a seems desirable.

To my knowledge, all previous discussions of the -ar/-a alternation have assumed that the two forms are in fact more alternates, entirely equivalent in sense and function. A reexamination of the attestations in my own files (now happily supplemented by Nau’s complete survey) has led me to a quite different result.

I wish first to reiterate Nau’s principal conclusion. Through a careful and painstaking review of all relevant examples, he has amply confirmed the earlier impressionistic conclusion that the forms of r/nt-stems without final -r are archaism. Most attestations are found in assured OH and MH texts (although most often the manuscripts are NH copies). Others appear in texts where influence of older models is indisputable (3), while a few examples are undatable. No such forms occur in assured NH compositions such as

There are three occurrences in OH manuscripts: 3 NINDA -wagedâ (three w. loaves) (KUB XVII 30 37 11), 2 pandedâ (a kind of bread) (KUB XXIII 1 15 11) and talku šumed matta šekkarâ (a kind of sweet) (KUB XVIII 1 4 18). This is a good age to check on the KUB XVI 25 117 2 (4), and talku šumed matta šekkarâ (a kind of sweet) (KUB XVIII 1 4 18). If you (pl.) do not know (3), then there is no old age here (KUB XVI 25 117 2). The final two examples are clearly plural in sense, as marked explicitly by the preceding numeral. Since Hittite may constitute a plural number with a singular noun (6), the grammatical form of wagedâ and pandedâ actually is ambiguous, but the possible association of the -edâ forms with plural meaning seems worth pursuing. Note further that in the remaining OH example LUGâGU-šedâ ‘old age’ is to be understood as a possession of a plural subject. Thus a collective plural here is also quite in order.

A reexamination of other cases in final -a in heterodite stems with respect to number confirms the connection between lack of final -r and collectival plural number.

In KUB XVII 10 1 38 we find (par)šum-tar-laš-šem aminjasta (likewise KUB XXIII 5 11 3) (par)šum-tar-laš-šem aminjasta: ‘its [the bee’s] wings are weak’. In this case paršum must be taken unambiguously as a collective plural, as shown by the adjective aminjasta. Similarly in KUB XXX 10 1 11 šattata šimanta ‘all your wisdom’ can only be a collective plural, based on the form of šimanta. Note further that in KUB I 15 11 56 (and III 58) we find collocated udiš-šim šattata-šim-ta ‘my words and wisdom’. The pairing with udiš-šim certainly suggests that šattata is likewise plural. In view of these examples, šattata-šim-ta (Gerazhd) ‘Our wisdom has perished’ in KUB XXIV 4 Vs 8 should also be taken as a collective plural. The fact that the verb is singular is, of course, no counterargument, since Hittite follows the aa-zeš trédeli rule (see Friedrich 1960: 218). Nor does the spelling šattata-šim-ta in the parallel KUB XXIV 3 II 18 weigh against interpreting šattata as a plural. As indicated above, the forms without final -r are archaism, while in NH compositions the non-acc. plural form of r/nt-stems is assuredly the same as the singular (7). We would thus not be surprised to find an archaic šattata replaced in a NH copy by the...
then current ātātār.

The form alwanzata 'sorcery, spell' is, with one fragmentary exception, found only in various manuscripts of the Ritual of Allā (CITH 402). While most examples are ambiguous, lituutamwanda alwanza (b) 'blood spells' (KUB XXIV 9 1) definitely plural, and there is no reason not to take the others as such. Note that at least one and perhaps two other examples of heteroclitic stems in -ata occur conflated with alwanzata and should thus also be interpreted as plurals: KUB XXIV 9 10 kṣayā alwanzata paprat 'also these spells and impurities' and ibid. 1.41 alwanzata Sīgīya.Sīgīya Spells and (cases of) jaundice' (8). The phrase kṣata-ā alwanzata durni tarmān harītan 'May you hold these evil spells fastened down' (KUB XXIV 11 13) is no evidence for a singular alwanzata because: (1) kṣata in a NH copy may be plural as well as singular; (2) Watkins (1982: 250 fn.) has shown that dura is the older form of the nom.-acc. pi. n. and in the construction with harīta- the past participle is fixed as nt. nom.-acc. sg. and does not agree in the direct object (Friedrich 1960: 111).

Several other examples of r/n-stems in final -a, while not assured as plurals by grammatical evidence, occur in contexts strongly favoring a plural interpretation. In KBo VII 26 Vs 48 kudawala 'insulting, insulting' follows an entire series of sentences of the form tātākātādā 'if so-and-so has slandered...'. The noun thus almost certainly refers to multiple cases of slander. Similarly, in KUB XI 7 18 papratā-ā tādān SAGDU-ša ddī dā 'He (Kumrai) put the impurities in his head' follows a series of acts of purification. Again we would expect papratā to refer to the collected impurities resulting from these ablations. In KBo XVI 78 IV 19, (13) UGU-papatā-ā GUĐ 'three limbs of a cow' obviously is plural in sense and may easily be plural in form as well (9). The word loweṭār occurs in stigmatized contexts, and its precise meaning has yet to be established. We do know that it refers to material obtained from trees or woody plants burned for incense (see CHT 3/1.73 fn.). Note, however, that besides several uncharacterized examples of loweṭār, we find GESA.NIḪA loweṭār (KBo XXIII 42 1 11), where the determinative ṣu.A suggests that again the heteroclitic form without -r is plural (10).

In the case of nouns in -iṣtar we are dealing with abstracts, for which in many contexts either a collective plural or generic singular would be suitable. Nevertheless, note that the contexts in the following examples favor a plural interpretation: UDUḪLA-ā mīṣaṭa abundance of sheep' (KUB XXIII 12 IV 19), ṣiṣkās GESA.NIḪA-ā Sar GUD DUDU.DU.DU.LU.LU.LU Sar mīṣaṭa 'abundance of grain, wine, cattle, sheep and men' (KUB XXXV 1 11 16). Once again the spelling mīṣaṭa in the parallel KUB XXXVII 2 R2 16 may easily be a substitution by a NH scribe of his own nom.-acc. pi. for the archaic mīṣaṭa (which, no longer being understood, might appear to him as a derivative spelling). The nouns ṣiṣṭar 'mobile wealth' and ṣamīṣestar 'immobile wealth' (see Watkins 1975: 280 fn.) by their very meaning lend themselves to a collective usage, and hence it is not surprising that these very nouns occur especially frequently without -r (11). In most contexts, of course, a generic singular would serve as well, but note KBo XII 42 R2 4, where they occur together in a 'taxonomy of wealth' (see Watkins, loc. cit.) preceding exclusively plurals, and also Bo 2727 I 4 (Neu 1982: 212, n.30) LIM UDUḪLA ṣereta 'a thousand sheep (as) mobile wealth' (12).

We have thus far examined forms in -a from fifteen heteroclitic stems. Three of these (paratā, ātātār, alwanzata) must be taken in at least some occurrences as nom.-acc. collective plurals. The remaining dozen occur in contexts in which varying degrees suggest, if not demand, a plural interpretation. Three of these involve numerals higher than one (wageda, pappada, ṣamada).

As one would expect, some examples occur in broken or otherwise totally ambiguous contexts: for ātātār 'pts.', dudumadā 'a mercy' and patrītara 'I refer the reader to Neu's discussion. The alleged examples pappā 'bowl' and ṣamadā 'exaltation' (?) do not belong here, for reasons cited by Neu (1982: 219 & 210 respectively). The cases of ṣiṣkās GESA.NIḪA 'girdle, waistband' (13) and ṣamīṭara 'form, facial features' (?) (14) are both quite dubious. If these two really represent r/n-stems without final -r, then they support the plural interpretation.

The noun ṣamīṭara has been analyzed as ṣamīṭarēstara and interpreted as 'lordship' by Güterbock (1958: 239), but as 'binding:
obligation' by Neu (1982: 208), following Friederich and others. The latter sense is easier to explain formally. While there are


denominative nouns in -edār, they seem to be collective in meaning (e.g. lāulīkhwedār 'ant-nil, colony' beside lāulīkhwa: 'ant'). An abstract iltjēdār 'lordship' < il 'lord' is thus problematic. On the other hand, iltjī:edār 'binding' < il 'bind' is straightforward. The verb ilja: and its other derivative iljī:ja, also 'binding', are used in Hítítittl to express the imposition by the king of laws and obligations, both for xiyul lāys 'treaties' for us and on internal officials ('protocols' or 'instructions'). The verb is also used for the imposing of restitution: see KBo VI 2 IV 42 II. (Galen) and KUB XIV 8 P 25. (Plague Prayer). The meaning 'obligation, duty' does not initially seem particularly fitting for iltjēdāsā in its three occurrences, because the reference is either to a god or to a king. However, we know that the Hittites viewed the authority of the king as deriving from a direct commission by the gods (see especially Ebt 1 30, CTH 621). It is likely that the view of divine government was analogous. That the king or even a god would have 'duties' is thus reasonable. If one renders iltjēdāsā as 'mandate' (whose original sense, of course, is 'order, assignment, commission'), the passages sound more natural to modern ears: KUB XXXI 127 11 dasāsā ilqōsāsā tāt-pat pīlun 'A mighty mandate has been given you' (the Sun-god); KUB XXX 10 Vs 7 nu-mur-du:āsā(k lām̥mara:āsā) iltjēdāsā-sā za kāt-pat DINGIR-YA 'atumelāsā anda nītta' (15)

'It was you, my god, who guided my name and mandate among men'; KBo XXII 22 Pt 45 δασοίναιπασίλιν AAMA-SU Beas.lamas:ma-ad iltjēdāsā-sā &̄-̄-̄-̄. For the Storm-god she is his mother, but for the labarna she is (the source of) his mandate'. For our present problem, iltjēdāsā is ambiguous. Either a singular or collective plural would be suitable (dasā above is not evidence for a singular, as per 21 above regarding awalacata; nor is pīlun, since the participle as predicate with ḫā is often singular with a neuter plural subject: see Friederich 1960: 118).

The example ḫūn-āsā to ḫatālā 'split (or similar) is also

indeterminate as to number: KUB IX 28 IV 15 ḫūnāsā KUBAIBBAR TUR ḫūnār: 'He holds (a) small silver split/strip stretched out'.

It is clear from the parallel passage KUB XXXI 127: II 21 (spelling ḫwara) that the form ḫusāsā of KUB XXXI 10 Vs 3 and 8 is the verbal noun of ḫwā: 'go, proceed'. The precise import of 'going, proceeding' in this context is not yet evident: see CHD 3/2, 165 (with references to other translations). I also see no good argument for or against ḫusāsā as a collective plural.

In KUB VII 1 I 25-26 (NH ms. of MH or OH text) we find in adjacent lines hənnumar and hənnuma: 'leaning (agents), yeast'. The passage is discussed at some length by Neu (1982: 217 f.), who concludes that it is impossible to find a rationale for the occurrence of the form with and without -r in such close proximity. However, for the reasons which he cites, I follow him in believing that the alternation is due to the MH copyst, and that the archaism probably had hənnuma in both instances. Once again we would be facing the (now abandoned) replacement of an older form in -a which no longer understood by one in -ar. The context gives no basis for deciding whether the example is singular or plural.

There are three examples of -r-stems in final -a which appear to argue for a plural interpretation. In KUB I 10 I 35 In a broken context we find nishma kudukwata: kultikī nishma hāranama: (?) kultikī' or some slander or some [question?]. The restoration of hāranama is uncertain, but there seems no doubt that kudukwata is modified by kultikī, which is formally nom.-acc. sg. neuter (165). KBo III 21 II 8 shows 3A-āsā-ān nāwanyūlīn kūl pāsāsāsā anda kūsā 'the message which lies in the waves/fox of Ea'. Here pāsāsāsā (i.e. pāsā-ν-ε-ς:ας) is modified by kūl, again nom.-acc. sg. neuter. Finally, in the hymn to the Sun-god KUB XXXI 135 Vs 11-13 (MH ms.) we have špāpalanna nāsāsā dā:šā kūl(655) L memitkār(631) aṣtāp-ā hānnattā šāwšūlā-ā nāwanyūlīn pāsāsāsā šāl kāt-pat KUBU-ad: hānnatta Also the case of the animals who do not speak — also that you judge. It is you, the Sun-god, who judge also the case of the evil and wicked man/man. Note that hānnattā is resumed by aṣtāp, nom.-acc. sg. neuter. The same manuscript has špāpalanna in Vs 10, but this in itself is hardly significant in a copy of an older archaism, as we have seen (note the similar cooccurrence of older hānnatta and hānnattā in successive sentences).
All three instances of forms in -a with singular modifiers are found in later copies of OH texts. Since the spellings in -a are an archaic feature, it is quite possible that they would be used incorrectly in later copies (17). Compare the misuse of the possessive pronouns in -ei/it with cases other than the n. nom.-acc. sg/pl.: see Otten (1973: 59) and Meineker (1977: 259 fl.). Direct evidence that the scribe of KBo III 21 had problems in following the OH archetype is furnished by the aberrant spelling þa-at-ti-ri-e-o-e-i. Since the noun was certainly /hatressar/ from /hattrfri/ "write" with no medial yod, the spelling with -i in KBo III 21 must be erroneous.

I am fully conscious that this argument may be applied in reverse. The three sure examples of r/r/-stems in -a with plural modifiers cited above also all occur in later copies of OH texts. The evidence for the association of heteroclite forms in -a with plural number is, like that for their being archaisms, largely circumstantial, but I believe that it is strong. Note first of all that the examples in OH manuscripts assure us that the -a forms themselves are real, not a creation of NH copyists.

Furthermore, one distributional fact is very hard to explain if -e is merely a free variant of -ar: there are no examples of -e spellings precisely for that set of stems which have plurals in accented -ar (butar, wáitar, buttar, þáitar). Since the first two of these are very frequently attested, this absence is particularly suspicious. Neubauer (1982: 221) in fact attributes the absence of any -e spellings in these two words to their very frequency, which he supposes would cause a stronger normalization of the spellings. This argument runs entirely counter to what we know about the relationship of archaism and frequency of use in language. It is well known that irregular forms survive particularly well precisely in words of very frequent use (the verb 'be' is a prime example) (18). This applies to archaic spellings as well, as spelling reformers have discovered ('medieval' has generally been adopted for "medieval", but "they're, 'through or 'tuff' for 'tough' have met with much less success.

The fact remains that the appearance of -a beside -ar is limited to stems with complex suffixes in -ar: -ë-far, -i-fr, -jær, -jáwar, -jær and verbal nouns in -jær. Note that all of these suffixes are at least moderately productive in Hittite, versus simple -ar in utter, wáitar, buttar and þáitar (19). A fixed accent on a non-final syllable is likely for all the complex-suffix nouns (20). We may account straightforwardly for both the highly restricted distribution of the forms without final -r and their association with the plural in one of two ways.

First, we could add a further restriction to Eltahir's original formulation (cf. above): word-final -r is lost only after unaccented long vowel. Thus while singular -ar remains, unaccented collective plural -ar (-r) -z, which then becomes -a by the same rule as -s (-f, -g, etc. or independently. We need no magical analogy to explain the final -r of singulars in -ar or -ur: the preservation of -r here is regular. The loss only after long vowel would not be unnatural. Essentially, at some point Hittite no longer tolerated in an unaccented final syllable the extra mora created by a sequence -PCll. In this case of -r, this was solved by deletion of the consonant; with other consonants, by shortening the vowel (see note 1).

There is an alternative analysis. We could retain Eltahir's original formulation of loss of final -r after any unaccented vowel and order this loss before the change of final -ë-z to -ar and final -ë-w to -ör. By this account singulars in -ar and -ur are regular because at the time of the conditioned loss of final consonantal -r they still ended in syllable -r: In this case, the loss of final -r in the collective plurals would be due not to the preceding long vowel but merely to the position of -r in an unaccented syllable. At present I see no way to choose between these two alternatives, there being no sure examples of Hittite reflexes of an original sequence -ë-far (but see below). Note that by either explanation one must assume that -r is more susceptible of loss than other consonants in the same environment. In view of its Instability in medial position (see Neubauer (1982: 221, n.78), this is not surprising.

If the -a forms represent the OH collective plural of complex stems in r/r, as I claim, then we should not find any nom.-acc. pl. in -ar in OH manuscripts. So far as I have been able to determine, there are in fact no examples of -ar in OH which must be interpreted as plurals. Naturally, the nature of the corpus is such
that there are several ambiguous cases. I must note explicitly that this does include three instances of -ar after a numeral: 2 NIND\waged 3zar - 10-8 (K'o 11 2 131), 50 NIND\waged 2zar - 21-25 (K'o XIII 175 Rs 2) and 1 ME 5\waged A.S.A (K'o VI 2 1 8). As per note 6, these examples may be grammatically singulars.

We may thus explain the distribution of -a vs. -ar in nouns by either of two reasonable conditioned sound changes. This explanation at the same time accounts for the consistent final -ar of nouns in -ar (21). There is no need to appeal to massive analogy. The exceptional treatment in pí\phur - rock (lower -ur) calls for a different explanation. Given the attractive equation with Gk, pel\nu\phur and Skt. pūr, "rock" (see Eichner 1973: 75 with refs.), I see no objection to assuming with him a dissimilation (22).

This exhausts the problem of final -ar in nouns. For pret. act. 3rd pl. in -ar see note 2 above. However, Neu (1982: 222 f/f) alleges two other cases of loss of final -ar after -a. One of these is the "quotative" particle -wa\wared - war, which appears as -war before vowels, as -wa\wared - war before consonants and in final position. Note first of all that again the distribution of final -ar differs in this case from that in nouns: in the speech particle we never find final -ar. This may be explained in one of two ways. First, in assuming that final -war reflects -war, Neu accepts the traditional derivation of -war from a verb war\wared to -wa\wared. This is a popular etymology (e.g. Oettinger 1979: 344, who takes -war as "he said" for -ar, -war\wared-). No one, however, has given even a clue as to how a finite accented verb war\wared can develop into an unaccented quotative particle -war (23). If one nevertheless accepts this development (and assumes a prior loss of -war and -ar), the consistent lack of absolute final -ar may be attributed to the fact that the quotative particle is always unaccented. Note that this account of -war does assume the second explanation for loss of -ar given above: final -ar is lost after short as well as long unaccented vowel before -ar - war.

There is an alternative explanation for Htt. -wa\wared - war. Joseph (1981) and Joseph-Schourup (1982) have presented several typological parallels supporting the earlier suggestion of Przybyski that Htt. -wa\wared - war is related to the postposition -war as, like and ultimately

Skt, Av. "ident." Functionally, the two opposing etymologies seem equally plausible - typological parallels being available for each. Formally, however, that relating -war - war to and has the advantage of accounting directly for the enditic position of the particle. It also permits two different explanations for the lack of final -ar - war and final -ar - war. First, the vowel of war was almost certainly short (cf. Av.). As already noted, the quotative particle is always unaccented. Thus unaccented -war would have regularly become -war in the same way as described above for -war - war.

However, one may also compare with Joseph the alternation -war - wa\wared - war to that in Av. vs. Iwar. As he admits, the latter alternation is itself ill-understood, but we may now at least point to another similar alternation within Anatolian: cf. Pal. (and Htt.) -kiw - ein and -i\kmed\wared with Pal. -i\kmed\wared - even and -ki\kmed\wared; see Melchert 1984b: 23 f.). There is thus evidence in Anatolian for the same form with and without "inverted" -ar. Therefore there is a good possibility that the alternation -war - war has nothing to do with phonological loss of final -ar; the first variant has no -ar because it never had one (like Skt. war (24)).

Neu also claims that Htittile medio-passive forms in -a reflect -ar with loss of final -ar after -a. Note once again that the distribution here differs from that in the nouns. One never finds final -a -ar in the verb. Neu (1968: 140 f/f) may well be right in relating the medio-passive endings in -a to the old perfect third plural ending, but his arguments specifically for 3rd pl. med. -anta - a - antar depend largely on the alleged parallel of alternating -ar -a in heteroclitic nouns. Likewise, his arguments (1968: 31 f/f) against the proposals of Wagner and Meid for a particle -\kmed\wared involve only their attempt to account for the distribution of medio-passive forms with and without -\kmed\wared in Htittile. He is in no way proves that Htittile medio-passive endings in -a must continue -ar. Since Neu himself has shown that within the history of Htittile endings in -a\wared replace those in -a in -a, nothing stands in the way of the assumption of Watkins (1969: 79) and others that the Htittile endings in -a reflect directly PIE *-a. Again, these endings do not show final -ar because they never had one.

The appearance of endings in -ar and -\kmed\wared in Palai and Lovian
can be accounted for in more than one way. First, given our very rudimentary knowledge of the 'laws of finals' in these languages, a conditioned loss of final *-r in *-r could not be expected. Our inability to state the actual conditioning, however, makes the account unattractive. An alternative is implied by Watkins (1969: 78): the actual supplementary marker of the middle is simply *-r (its original function may be left open here). Therefore, the final *-r of *-r is merely the familiar *-ri et nunc participle distinguishing the primary from secondary endings (within Hittite compare present active *-veri, *-tami vs. preterite *-veni, *-tem). Therefore the remodelling of the middle endings in Anatolian may have taken place in two steps: first, *-r - *-r, then *-r */-ar. In Hittite, we find only the starting and end points of the process: original *a - *er and *ar with both the new middle marker and the particle -i. In Luwian we find the middle stage *-ar and the final result *-ari. Palallic appears to show all three stages (g̃uña, kilár, s̃t̄guwa, ś̃r̃i 125).

For Luwian there is a third possibility. At present we do not control the relative chronology of Luwian manuscripts. It is therefore possible that C. Watkins has pointed out to me, that *-ir in Luwian results from a general apoche of *-ari within the historical period. The apparent random distribution in the texts of the alternatives *-ar and *-ari would be illusory. Advances in dating Luwan manuscripts may be able to settle this question. Whatever the correct explanation for *-ar vs. *-ari in Luwian and Palallic, there is no positive evidence that Hittite middle endings in *-ar ever had a final *-r.

To summarize then: a reexamination of spellings in *-a of Hittite nouns in *-ar has shown that they are not only archaisms, but also show a marked association with (collective) plural number. Furthermore, all examples are limited to heterotonic nouns formed by productive complex suffixes where the accent is almost certainly on a non-final syllable. We may account for this distribution by assuming that forms in *-a reflect old plurals in *-ar versus those in *-ar (or -ar) in the small unproductive set of utter, water, /butar/ and /parar/ (and perhaps the plural tantum /taghmar/). With our present knowledge, the conditioned loss of final *-r in plurals in *-ar may be attributed to its position in an unaccented syllable or specifically to its position after a long vowel in an unaccented syllable. The exceptional

**NOTES**

(1) Support for Eltigher's interpretation of *-ar as accented */-ar/ is provided by the fact that Hittite appears to have shortened original long vowels in unaccented closed final syllables: tšixan /'eart/ = /degan/ < *deghin, probably also gen. pl. *-an = *-am. The spelling pa-da-a-an 'of the feet' in an OH ms. KBo XX 8 Vs 19 may continue directly the gen. pl. of the root noun with accented *-am of *sakal, *pallam. In the case of the gen. pl., of course, it has been argued that the ending was *-am, in which case *-an would be regular, while the plain spelling in *pallan would mark the accent.

As C. Watkins has reminded me, the contrast between tšikam / *deghin and wayšar / *wešar supports the shift of accent in the latter, but raises the question of the conditioning for the shift. The preserved long diphthong in the corresponding collective types *šašša 'beneath' < *s̄ašša, štišar 'window' < *štišar, šišar 'open space', and šeššiša 'palm' < *šeššiša, šisa 'surface' (see Welbom 1984: 223) suggests that they also may reflect a secondarily accented *-ar/-ar in Hittite. So also the animate stems in *-iš and *-išš (Gertz 1982: 234 f.) tries to solve the problem for wayšar by assuming an original *-išš. However, she then has no explanation for the i of wayšar, which may easily reflect *-ς, despite her claim to the contrary (see Meirch 1984a: 107 & 112). The root engrav in the 'amphictyonic' type seems assured. A shift of the accent to the final syllable in the nom.-acc. after the oblique cases seems possible (*/-ar/-ar after gen. *-am/-am), but this falls to explain why tšišan does not appear as *tišan (*/-tina/) after *tanša (*/-tana/). Compare perhaps in Greek peitho (*/-o/ vs. hērōs).
(2) Neu implies that the consistent "r" in forms in "-r" and "-r" also poses problems for Eichner's analysis. However, the noun K' "heart" and pī "house" (probably to be read as /kər/ and /pər/) are monosyllables where the preceding vowel is accented. The noun bədəwə "twigs, branches" appears to be a hyyeronotic noun in *-wr, again with an accented vowel before the "-r." Furthermore, in all these cases the "-r" runs throughout the paradigm, so that restoration of final "-r" in the nom.-acc. after the oblique cases would be expected. For the 3rd pl. active ending in "-r," I follow Dettinger (1979: 114) and others in comparing "-r" to Latin "-er/-ere," see my discussion in Mcleriot (1984a: 17 f.). In this case, then, we are not dealing with original "-r" at all.

(3) E.g., the prayer of Mursili II to Tepipiu KUB 30A 1 and parallels and the various omen texts (see Neu 1992: 213-215).

(4) As per Neu, the r/n-stem is assured by the NH parallel KBo XI 41 10-11, which shows /t̂ henədərə/ marnawen and /t̂ henədərə/ marnawen.

(5) For the interpretation as LUBULUL-ESARD see Otten (1973: 27) and Archi (1979: 45), who takes the toposis as a threat: "There will be no old sage here (for you)."

(6) See e.g.: 9: NINDA QEN 30v-31r, KBo XX 7-8: 7s 7 (OH ms.). Naturally one finds grammatical plurals: 3 NINDA QEN 31r (KBo XVII 1 1 23; OH ms.).

(7) See e.g.: Tātt. IV S2 1, uppəd ar=tul A-ma ms kue appellatek the possessive which they used to send me (NH nom.-acc. pl. kue and the iterative) or KBo XII 38 II 13-14 (Tutulya IV nr-kan QATAMMA adanta LÜ-NEŠAR.TA aždinu gudan 1: accordingly inscribed true many deeds.

(8) Neu (1982: 217) follows Friedrich (1957: 28) in interpreting SIGY.SIGY一起来 as an abstract "jaundice" in asyndeton with alwanzata. It seems to me also possible to take SIGYSIGY一起来 as the adjective jaundiced-. In that case, ṣejaundice=spells would parallel ṣalwanzatas rather than alwanzata=spells. Adjectives in "-want" may follow their noun: see HCH 3:1.62 on šalwant-.

(9) For reading the incomplete initial sign as the numeral "three" see the immediate context, which is a list of items, many of which are specified in quantity.

(10) One of the meanings suggested in the CHD article is "shavings" (of wood, preeminently cedar), which would be suitable for use as an incense. This points to a possible etymology of loguwaš, which would be the abstract cutting to the verbal root loguwaš cut (off) (Isk. lustušu cuts etc). While this proposal is too uncertain to count as an argument for a collective interpretation of loguwaš, it is consonant with it.

(11) In fact, thus far one finds only tamela without "-r." The final "-r" is assured by the derivatives tamimlentarwaš and dammitentarwaš.

(12) The occurrence in the lexical text KBo I 45 R1 15, where damdada imperfectly translates the Akkadkan adjective dulšuš ‘abundant’ tells us nothing about the number of tamela.

(13) The form alḫuzziyadša occurs in the Laws, KBo II 25 1 19 f.: alḫuzziyadša DI kultši šep. This is translated by Friedrich (1959: 79) as ‘such wēd an den Gürtel niemand greifen’, interpreting alḫuzziyadša as alḫuzziyadša (gen. sing. ) + aši also, even. Neu (1992: 201 f.) rejects this on the grounds that alḫ- uzuša can only mean an accusative object. However, the entire point of the prohibition here is that no one even takes it to touch the belt of the children of a woman who has become a slave by marrying a heathen. The sense ‘touch’ is precisely where one would expect a partitive genitive, cf. homeric lambdiš plus genitive and see Delbrück (1932: 340 a. 528). There is at least one other previously unrecognized example of a partitive genitive with a verb in Hittite, KUB XVII 5 1 12 šas-a (DULŠUŠ-added) gudan adun akₜuri: ‘They (Babylons and his sons) drank (some) of/from all the basins.” The form alḫuzz is here not an aberrant a-stem anim. acc. sing. but the regular OH gen. pl. of the 1st stem pašti. Note further the unique use of atas with okš- drink, reinforcing the partitive meaning. I therefore find the interpretation of alḫuzziyadša as a partitive genitive quite plausible. In any case, I take alḫuzziyadša ‘belts, waistbands’ as referring to the children (DULŠUŠ) is the last noun preceding alḫuzziyadša, so that a plural is indicated by either formal interpretation. The other example of alḫuzziyadša is in a list of objects in a broken context, where again either a collective plural of a noun in -šša or a genitive plus -a- and is possible (the genitive could modify a missing following noun).
(14) Neu (1962: 216) interprets ḍīmmamaṭa (= Akk. bāmānā) in the lexical text KBo I 44 + XIII 1 IV 32 as a form of ḍamantar ‘foundation’. While I do not doubt an etymological connection, both the difference in vocalism and the apparent difference in meaning make it quite uncertain that we are dealing with two forms of the same word (Akk. bāmānā) is a plural tantum meaning ‘form, facial features’: see von Soden (1965: 138). Hittite does have nouns in -nata: kudala- ‘bride-price’ (gen., sg./pl., kudalat₂ and NINDA-wagata- ‘piece of bread’ (both a-stems), pace Eichner (1973: 98) and Neu (1970: 56) respectively. Thus ḍīmmamaṭa could be an a-stem, separate from but related to ḍamantar, meaning ‘form, shape’, as the Akkadian suggests. Note that in either case the Akkadian equivalent (plural tantum) supports a collective plural in Hittite.

(15) See the parallel passage KUB XXXI 1274, II 17-19 for the restoration. The text in Karantzi looks like a complete nominal sentence, but this is already contradicted by the -d-āā, e.g., Oettinger (1979: 405) does not list nekta as pret. 2nd sg. of nāt ‘turn, guide’, but it is in fact the expected regular result of *nāt-tye (cf. 1st sg. neghun < *negh-un-tye). The šē vocalism of the later nātta is analogical after the pres. 3rd sg. nāt; see my discussion in Melchert (1984a: 65 ff.). The archaic nekte would be yet another sign of the OH origin of this composition (see also Neu 1962: 219).

(16) The other occurrences in this text, KUB I 16 I 51 and 55 kudawatā šē ḍardān-paš ḍādu, are not evidence for a singular, since, as noted above, the participle as a predicative with -dū - is usually singular, even with a neuter plural subject.

The reason for this is not entirely clear: perhaps it is merely attraction of the predicative adjective to the singular verb.

(17) This applies even to MH copies of OH texts. E.g., KBO VI 3, a MH ms., the Laws, Table 1, already shows certain unclear forms versus the OH manuscript KBo VI 2. See Melchert 1984a: 106, n. 63.

(18) This may be because irregular forms are learned individually by each generation by imitation, rather than by general rule. If this is true, then irregularities which are heard frequently would have a much better chance of survival than those of rarer use, which would tend to be eliminated by rule generalization.

(19) In suffix -tar as originating in derivatives of adjectives in *-ēs- see Melchert 1984a: 90; for -star as an extension of stems in *-ēg- (cf. Lw. *-ēg-) see among others Eichner 1973: 60; in verbal nouns in -war (with generalization of the postvocalic reflex of *w-; see Schindler 1975: 81) the accent surely follows that of the verb stem; as for nouns in -war, there are several reasons to suppose that the nom.-acc. inflection in *-ēs- in these nouns is non-original and modeled after that of the verbal nouns in -war (see my discussion Melchert 1983: 20 ff.). In Melchert 1984a: 63, following a suggestion of J. Schindler, I compared Hittite nouns in -war with Lat. carēsae ‘corpus’, assuming a preform *-ēs- war. In so doing, I overlooked the fact that tautosyllabic Lat. -war may reflect -war < *w-: cf. versus -versus < *w-vers-. Thus -war could also continue *-ēs- war. Since both *ēs- and -war are extensions of stems in *-ēg-, a fixed non-final accent is likely for both types.

(20) We would expect the original collective plural of nouns in -ur (cf. *-ur-) to have been *-wur- ē. A trace of this may be attested in the hapax paḫkuwar in KUB VII 60 II 11 (NH ms. of an undatable text). The form paḫkuwar could represent *paḫkuwar- with secondary accent on the final syllable after paḫkuwāt (cf. kēdir- above). The lack of scriptio plena in this one example is not an argument against a reading ≈-wur- ē, cf. nom.-acc. pl. ḫar-ēs-ar-ītal in KUB XVII 4 1 18 (OH ms.) vs. the duplicate ḫar-ēs-ar-ītal. On the other hand, nothing in the context argues decisively for a plural, and in view of the widespread
syncope of -ülue- to -u̯-, a false resolution of -u̯- to -wer- in a NH copy is hard to exclude. The authenticity of piṣṭuwīr is thus debatable.

(22) The noun kurūs' eminence' is not a counterargument. Whatever the prehistory of this noun, it is attested as a pure -nem- and the final -r- of the nom.-acc. may easily have been maintained/restored after the oblique cases. In the latter, the different syllabification would have led to much less pressure for disyllabification: /kur-i/ after /kur-u-ru/, /kur-u-r/ etc.

(23) An appeal to Lat. inquil or similar parallels does not go beyond the typological argument that such a development is possible. Independent evidence for occurrence of the verb in enclitic position in Hittite is still lacking.

(24) The existence of enclitic -kur in Palaeo and the coexistence in Cluvian of enclitic -tar (locational particle) with consistent -r- and quotative -wa always without -r- complicates but does not settle the issue of morphological alternation or phonological loss in Hitt. -wa/-war-. One could assume a Common Anatolian loss of *r- in final *karwa, with generalization of the variant -wa in Cluvian. The addition of 'adverbial' -r- in -kur and -tar would have been after this loss. However, one could also suppose the existence of forms with and without -r- in all three cases, with a different distribution of the variants.

(25) However, the striking parallelism between Pal. 3rd sg. piṣṭu and consistent Hitt. piṣṭu, piṣṭu suggests that the exclusive appearance of the full form in the 3rd sg. of this verb is motivated by the desire to avoid a monosyllabic *ṣṭu or *ṣṭu. Therefore Pal. piṣṭu may not be an accurate reflection of the overall distribution in Palaeo. That is, instead of the apparent free variation of -u- -ar- and -ar- Palaeo in general may have had only -u- and -ar- For Pal. 2nd pl. mid. 8 piṣṭuwar (cf. Cluv. diṭṭuwar) see Melchert 1984a: 25 ff.
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