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'GOD-DRINKING': A SYNTACTIC TRANSFORMATION IN HITTITE

E. CRAIG MELCHERT
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

New evidence confirms that the Hittite ritual expression 'drink the god X' means 'drink to (the honor of) the god X'. The underlying indirect object (dative form) is made the surface direct object by an -optimal syntactic transformation of Hittite which also applies to other structures in ritual contexts. Comparative evidence suggests, though it cannot prove, that a form of this rule existed in PIE.

Hittite ritual language shows many sentences of the following type (KUB X 69 iv 2-3) (1):

1) [LUGAL SÂ] LUGAL TUŞ af dŠémën akuaņaz

'The king (and) queen, seated, drink Simen.'

The meaning of the expression 'drink a god' has been the subject of debate throughout the history of Hittite studies. Early researchers, faced with sentences like 1), concluded that the verb ēku- could mean 'give to drink' as well as 'drink' (see e.g. Hrozny 1917:85 note 2). Friedrich (1940:210 note 2) denied this and later compared the expression 'drink a god' to the Christian eucharist (1952:40).

Pulver (1957:31-33) argued against any eucharistic connotation. He equated the above sentence-type where the god is the direct object to other examples where the god's name stands in the dative. In both cases, the meaning would be 'drink to (the honor of) the god X'. For a transitive verb in this usage he compared English 'toast'.

Otten (1958:132) reasserted the meaning 'give to drink' for ēku-, based on passages in the royal funeral rites which will be examined below. Kammühuber (1961:308-309) concluded that the house-training texts contribute nothing to the solution of the problem, since in those texts ēku- means consistently 'drink', not 'give to drink' (the two exceptions being clearly aberrant). Friedrich (1961:9), citing Kammühuber (1) as well as Otten, readmitted the meaning 'give to drink' for ēku-.

(1) For the abbreviations used in citing Hittite texts see Friedrich 1952.
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rituals and was subject to interpretations and interpretations of the Hittite texts. The argument of the receiving god's speech led to the formation of the Hittite kingdom. Kammerer's treatment brought forth a short critique of Kammerer's treatment of the text, and the result was a more informed understanding of the text. The purpose of the following section is to examine the evidence of the text and to discuss Kammerer's interpretation of the text. The demonstration will include the presentation of new evidence for the reconstruction of the Hittite kingdom.

The physician who takes the king, the king with the b. h.,
and the settlement is made clear by examples.

(1) Kammerer's views on god-drinking in the king (Kamm-17) (Kamm-17). He presented the same "supernumerary" for the Kamm-17 kingdom, and this led Kammerer to question the interpretation of the text. The demonstration will include the presentation of new evidence for the reconstruction of the Hittite kingdom.

The purpose of the following section is to examine the evidence of the text and to discuss Kammerer's interpretation of the text. The demonstration will include the presentation of new evidence for the reconstruction of the Hittite kingdom.

(2) Kammerer's views on god-drinking in the king (Kamm-17). He presented the same "supernumerary" for the Kamm-17 kingdom, and this led Kammerer to question the interpretation of the text. The demonstration will include the presentation of new evidence for the reconstruction of the Hittite kingdom.

The purpose of the following section is to examine the evidence of the text and to discuss Kammerer's interpretation of the text. The demonstration will include the presentation of new evidence for the reconstruction of the Hittite kingdom.

(3) Kammerer's views on god-drinking in the king (Kamm-17). He presented the same "supernumerary" for the Kamm-17 kingdom, and this led Kammerer to question the interpretation of the text. The demonstration will include the presentation of new evidence for the reconstruction of the Hittite kingdom.

The purpose of the following section is to examine the evidence of the text and to discuss Kammerer's interpretation of the text. The demonstration will include the presentation of new evidence for the reconstruction of the Hittite kingdom.

(4) Kammerer's views on god-drinking in the king (Kamm-17). He presented the same "supernumerary" for the Kamm-17 kingdom, and this led Kammerer to question the interpretation of the text. The demonstration will include the presentation of new evidence for the reconstruction of the Hittite kingdom.

The purpose of the following section is to examine the evidence of the text and to discuss Kammerer's interpretation of the text. The demonstration will include the presentation of new evidence for the reconstruction of the Hittite kingdom.

The purpose of the following section is to examine the evidence of the text and to discuss Kammerer's interpretation of the text. The demonstration will include the presentation of new evidence for the reconstruction of the Hittite kingdom.

The purpose of the following section is to examine the evidence of the text and to discuss Kammerer's interpretation of the text. The demonstration will include the presentation of new evidence for the reconstruction of the Hittite kingdom.
In the underlying structure of these sentences, the ritual object is the direct recipient, and the subject is the indirect recipient. The form of the verb (in Old Hittite optionally the subject) and the deities in Hittite are expressed in Hittite by the accusative of the subject object and the deities, respectively, because the underlying form of the verbal is the same as the underlying form of the deities. The accusative of the subject object and the deities may therefore not necessarily be optional in these sentences. In the fourth sentence, the accusative of the subject object is obligatory. In the fifth sentence, the prepositional phrase (in Old Hittite optionally the subject) and the deities are expressed in Hittite by the accusative of the subject object and the deities, respectively, because the underlying form of the verbal is the same as the underlying form of the deities. The accusative of the subject object and the deities may therefore not necessarily be optional in these sentences. In the first two verbs, the subject object and the deities are expressed in Hittite by the accusative of the subject object and the deities, respectively, because the underlying form of the verbal is the same as the underlying form of the deities. The accusative of the subject object and the deities may therefore not necessarily be optional in these sentences. In the second verb, the subject object and the deities are expressed in Hittite by the accusative of the subject object and the deities, respectively, because the underlying form of the verbal is the same as the underlying form of the deities. The accusative of the subject object and the deities may therefore not necessarily be optional in these sentences.
He must then regard the type of Zl-mi ekūzu as a ‘contamination’ of the two. Accordingly, he translates 14 as: ‘Hinterher aber tränkt er dreimal seine Seele... wenn sie aber ihm, <ahem...> seiner Seele, zum dritten Male zu trinken geben...’. Note that Östen must interpret the dative pronoun -bi of the second sentence as proleptic: ‘to him, i.e., to his soul’. Such a construction is not unknown in Hititite, but it is certainly the lection difficilior. As we have seen (ex. 3 above), all unambiguous cases show that it is the human celebrant who does the drinking. A more natural interpretation of 14 would therefore be: ‘Then he drinks (to) his soul three times... but when they give him (the celebrant) (something) to drink to his soul for the third time...’. The parallel EGIR-enda... mahûnam suggests that 15 is to be restored after 14), thus reaffirming the equivalence of the dative and accusative constructions with ekū:- ‘Then he drinks to the soul of the dead three times, [but] when he drinks (to) his soul [for the third time]...’

Our transformation 13 thus accounts for the synchronic facts about Hititite ekū- and shows that the surface structure ‘drink a god’ has no more special or mystical significance than ‘whirl the king/god’, both being mere syntactic variants of structures with ‘god’ and ‘king’ as indirect objects.

There remains the question of the historical source of this syntactic rule. There are no parallels outside Hititite for such usage with ‘drink’ or ‘whirl’, but the behavior of lipant- ‘libate’, more generally ‘sacrifice’, recalls that of similar verbs in other Indo-European languages. Before turning to the comparative evidence, we must first sort out the various usages of lipant- in Hititite itself. The following treatment is based on the invaluable survey of Goette (1971).

First of all, lipant- in its meaning ‘libate’ may enter into the structure (13a) given above, with the liquid as direct object, the receiving god as indirect object and the vessel used in the instrumental. As already pointed out, in most cases one or more of the nominal complements are deleted on the surface. lipant- ‘libate’ may take a further nominal complement in the locative expressing the goal of the action, i.e., where the liquid is poured. Note the frequent ritual phrase (to) ḫappar lipant- ‘He libates into a bowl’. Theoretically, the complement in the locative could cooccur with the other nominal complements of (13a), but I know of no actual occurrence.

In PIE many verbs, including those of the semantic sphere of ‘pour’, could appear in two constructions: (a) liquid (acc.) + goal (loc.) or (b) liquid (inst.) + goal (acc.). Our translation of the verb as ‘pour’ in the first instance and ‘fill’ in the second is a function of the modern languages. In PIE the verb is the same (see Haudry 1977:235ff). In contemporary terms, we may say that (b) is derived from the underlying structure of (a) by an optional transformation.

In the case of Hititite lipant-, this transformation applied (apparently obligatorily) when the goal of the action was a sacrificial animal. Thus we find not: liquid (acc.) + animal (loc.), but rather: animal (acc.) + liquid (inst.).

The ‘old woman’ libates [ ], t-birds and a sheep with wine for the ancient gods.

This is not the end of the development. As Goette’s examples make clear, lipant- in Hititite came to refer not just to the act of consecrating an animal (by libation), but also to the entire act of sacrificing.

Now virtually any PIE verb may take an ‘internal’ accusative, where the nominal object repeats the semantic content of the verb: cf. Gk. ἵππος ἵππον ἵππον ‘make a libation’. The nominal object may be an actual derivative of the verb (the figura etymologica) or merely a noun whose meaning is closely related to that of the verb (Eng. ‘run a race’). Thus, once lipant- in Hititite came to mean ‘sacrifice’, it could take as a direct object the noun ‘sacrifice’: anītar (≈ SISKUR-SISKUR). As the means by which the sacrifice is accomplished, either the liquid or animal offering may appear in the instrumental (KUB XXIX 4 iii 56):

17) nu SISKUR surkyaiv İSTÜ MÅŞ TUR lipantandī
t ‘They perform the sacrifice of z. with a kid.’

Since it is predictable from the verb, the internal accusative ‘sacrifice’ may be deleted, producing the type of KBo V 1 iii 54:

18) nu adadıl DINIR-MES:at ężyanit 1st lipantandī
‘They sacrifice to the father-gods (marus) with cooked fat.’

(8) It is immaterial for the present analysis if one prefers to derive (a) from (b) synchronically. Historically, it is likely that the use of the accusative to express the goal is older than its use to mark the direct object.
This type of construction is common with several Vedic verbs in the field of 'sacrifice': e.g. vihat, dāk (see Haufry 1977:526f). It is rare, but attested, in Old, e.g. m 563 alt.-husati spend 0 0 d  h n nder the 'but libating with water ... ', Herodotus I 216 tē hēlēs thiuosu hēpposai 'they sacrifice to the sun with horses' (vs. variant ἱππόπαι).

None of the above, of course, yet accounts for the type 13b) with the god as direct object. The explanation for 13b) lies in the fact that in PIE two classes of verbs occurred in similar ritual contexts, each with their own typical syntactic structure: 19a) god (acc.) * object (inst.) + 'venerate', 'reverence', 'honour' 19b) god (dat.) * object (acc.) + 'give', 'offer', 'present'. I have intentionally avoided 'worship' and 'sacrifice' in the list of verbs, because it is precisely this which we cannot reconstruct for PIE: a single common lexeme for the total act of 'worship' / 'sacrifice'. (9)

Nevertheless, the existence of both types (19a and 19b) in PIE is assured, and evidence from Vedic, Latin, Germanic and Slavic shows that the two constructions mutually influenced one another. More precisely, verbs of either class came to occur in either construction, or again in transformational-generative terms, the underlying structure of 19a) could optionally be transformed into that of 19b), and vice-versa. The relevant material has been collected by Haufry (1977:342-367).

Thus in Vedic with saparya- we find both tē aya nāmA sāNa saparyaṁ 'They honor his strength with obeisance' (RV 1.4.12) and dāma diNu nāMaM pṛthūpāti saparyaṁ 'I offer this obeisance to heaven (and) earth' (RV 3.5.43). Likewise dāk- takes both constructions: yā tābhyām ... nāma ... dāma tāwhe offer you obeisance ... . (RV 4.1.71, 6) and kathā dāmena nāmaM viśādmi ... mariste 'How shall we honor the bountiful Maruts with obeisance ... .' (RV 5.41, 16). The usual Vedic syntax with vihat- is that of (18) above, but there are also examples like RV 3.3.1: sūthiṣṭya ... rāmai viśādmi 'They offer V. pearls ... '. Once there is also attested: viśādo tā end hāvā viśāhema 'We wish to honor your clan with this

(9) Hamp (1973) makes a good case for a compound of *s-ta- 'giver' as the PIE expression for 'offer' a sacrificial animal or meat. As the animal offering was only part of the total act of 'sacrifice', which included libation, verbal praise and other components.

oblation' (RV 8, 96, 8).

Other Indo-European languages show the same phenomenon: cf. Latin mactāre dōnum 'magically worship a god with a sacrifice' and mactāre vicītām doē 'offer a sacrifice to a god'. Both constructions are also attested with reflexes of Germanic *blōtian: Gothic fāsdtukaum sah bōlām boltande fraujan 'honoring the Lord with fasting and prayer' (Luke 2, 37) versus Old English bēarn bōlān feondum 'sacrifice children to demons'. Finally, there is OCS žrati, which is attested in the meaning 'sacrifice' with the offering in the accusative. Other reflexes of PIE *gʰerh₂- such as Skt. gṛhā and Lith. gūri show that the original meaning was that of 'praise' or the like, with the god as the direct object.

The semantics of the roots *mēgh₂- 'great' > 'magnify' and *gʰerh₂- 'sing, praise' make it certain that these verbs were of the type (19a). Thieme's etymology of Vedic vihat- (< *vi- dēh₂), confirmed by Hoffman 1969, assures that it belonged originally to type (19b). Other cases are less clear. We may be sure, however, that verbs of either class came to occur in either surface structure (19a) or (19b).

We come finally to the age of this phenomenon. In the absence of any specific correspondences, i.e. examples of the same lexical item participating in both constructions in more than one Indo-European language, we cannot with assurance attribute the optional transformation of 19a) and (19b) to PIE. The facts cited may be due to independent but parallel developments in the individual languages. However, we can assert with confidence that the Hittite transformation of (15) originally applied to lipsānt- 'libate; sacrifice' and was then extended to the other ritual expressions with eku- 'drink' and fer arka uhdyanā- 'whirl (over)'. Furthermore, at least the origins of this development lay already in the ritual language of PIE.
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