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Hittite Nominal Stems in -an-an-

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

Hittite has a small set of nouns that show a stem -an-an-.öl, *alloan- (kind
of tree), *upitiy-an- *(grape)*-vine* (? ) (thus PUHVEL, 1984:377f, for the
base *upitya-, but sense is uncertain), *lloan-an- *mind, soul, will*, *kaolan-
(a plant), *lahib-an- *shelduck*, *lamoan-an- *bulrush*, *taplan-an- (? ) (a
kind of metal). The inflection is peculiar: nominative singular in either
-an- or -an-an- and the rest of the paradigm built on a stem -an-

There has been a broad consensus for more than a quarter-century that
e, and only one, of these stems has a clear etymology. Since EICKNER
(1973-98) everyone has agreed that Hit. *fumancan*, taken to mean ‘cord,
binding’, is directly related to Grk. Ἰππή ‘membrane’ and reflects a PIE
animate n-stem with either ‘hystero-kinetic’ or ‘amphikinetic’ inflection:
nom. sg. *thiųm-νήντις or *thiųm-νήντας, weak stem *thiųm-. The
characteristics, Hittite addition of -i in the nominative singular and the
resulting complex paradigm led by some scenario to the attested forms: see
At least the origin of the class lies, then, in n-stems of the type cited,
though some scholars allow for the possibility that certain examples have been
adapted to this type secondarily. There was an earlier alternative account,
now apparently quite forgotten: MILEWSKI (1936:148&21) assumed addition
of a suffix *-yon- (cf. Lat. -i-tom-) to a neuter men-stem comparable to Skt.
yón-an- *bel, strap* (*fumancan- < virtual *yón-an-). This derivation
was approved by PEDERSEN (1938:431) and initially by KRONASSER
(1956:122), subsequently abandoned by the latter in favor of an implausible
alternative involving borrowing from Hittian (1966:201).

Unfortunately for the received view it is now clear that Hit.
*fumancan- means not ‘cord, binding’, but rather *(bul)rush*. BURDE
(1974:46) and ARCH (1988:36) already pointed out the existence of the
latter meaning, raising the possibility of two homophoneous words. A
reexamination of the total evidence now available shows that there is a
single word and that it means *(bul)rush*.1 The use of the word falls into
two broad categories.

1 I am deeply indebted to Harry A. Hoffner Jr. for pointing out this fact to me
and also for allowing me access to the draft article for *Hittinon- of the Chicago
Hittite Dictionary. I emphasize, however, that the presentation of the evidence have
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I believe the facts are quite unambiguous. The word refers to a plant, the bulrush. Braiding of this flexible material and its occasional ritual use for tying do not alter the fundamental sense. The only true Hittite word for "cord" is ḫuištani- šštun, which itself is an animate n-stem, transparently derived with a men-suffix from the verb ȗhšt- 'to bind' (see fn. 3). Hittite šumanszan- 'bulrush' has nothing to do with Gk. ὑφόρ, and the received etymology of the former and everything that goes with it falls.

Elimination of the false etymology of šumanszan- < ὑφόρ, mē-ôn> has a number of serious consequences. First, we now have no clear examples in Hittite (or in Anatolian) for hysterokinetic n-stems in *-mön/. Thus Hittite does not appear to tell us anything regarding the claim of HARDARSON (1987:119) and JANSO (1989:138) of a possible consistent PIE contrast of nom. sg. in *-môn vs. *-môn. 2 Second, there is no longer any basis whatsoever for the claim that the Hittite word for "woman" belongs to the class in *-môn (pace OETTINGER, 1980:60; STÄRKE, 1980:85; HARDARSON 1987: 121; JANSO 1989:139). That is, there is no longer any reason to think that the original paradigm of 'woman' and that of the stems in *-môn had any points of contact that would lead to the shift of 'woman' into the latter class. For a reason against assuming that *woman* is a stem in *-môn see below. Finally, there is no basis for taking animate n-stems with secondary nom. sg. in *-môn as a source of the *-môn-type nor for any of the complex scenarios by which these stems allegedly were altered to the attested inflection (OETTINGER, 1980:52; MELCHERT, 1983:9-10; PURHVL, 1984,700; JANSO, 1989:139, et al.).

3 Removal of the stems in *-môn from consideration renders the problem of the correct derivation of the type of Hitt. ḫuištani- šštun- 'cord, binding'. OETTINGER (1982:173ff) argues for an original hysterokinetic paradigm in *-môn. In MELCHERT (1983:60) I presented counter-arguments in favor of an amphikinet type in *-môn (nom. sg. *-môn). A crucial part of my argumentation, however, was the assumption that *-môn was reflected in nom. sg. šumanszan(a). The falsification of this assumption leaves us with the choice of beginning with an amphikinet paradigm and explaining away the forms with *-e (acc. sg. ḫuištana and ethnics with nom. pl. *-umanszan) as somehow secondary, or assuming an original hysterokinetic paradigm and explaining how *-môn can result in Hittite *-môn. Neither alternative is straightforward, and I must leave the question open here.

I stress the inherently implausible nature of all these scenarios (including my own). Most are very vague about just how the alteration took place, and in order to explain the attested ablative stem in *-môn all must appeal to some kind of ad hoc "contamination" or "blending". Note that in the real cases cited below where the
Liberated from the false equation *śamancan- = śapta, we can and should begin our analysis of the *śasan- class anew without preconceptions. Attestation of this type is unfortunately limited. The following summary includes all that is relevant to their inflection:

*ālana(n)-; Anīn NgS *ālana(n); Anīn Sgs *ālana(n) (incl. KUB 33.81 iv 11, MS) and *ālana(n) (Tunmawi); *ālana(n) (Tunmawi); Gīs *ālana(n); Gīs *ālana(n); *ālana(n) (both in Tunmawi).

*ippita(ā)n(-); Anīn NgS *ippita(ā)n; Gīs *ippita(ā)n (or *ippita(ā)n); NEUo *ippita(ā)n (see NEU, SbT 26:26).

*ītana(n)-; Anīn NgS *ītana(n)-kāśi (KUB 41.10 Vo 15, pre-NH/MS); *ītana(n)- kāśi (KUB 41.23 ii 19; OH/NS), also ambiguous Z-āśi; *ītana(n)-kāśi (ibid. ii 24), Z-āśi, Z-aśi (KUB 33.98 ii 17; OH/NS; KUB 43.60 ii 4f; OH/NS; and passim in NH); Gīs *ītana(n); Gīs *ītana(n); D-Lṣg Z-āśi; NH *ītana(n); Abl *ītana(n); Anīn NgS *ītana(n)-kāśi (KUB 17.27 ii 17).

*īdbhita(ā)n(-); Anīn NgS *īdbhita(ā)n; Gīs *īdbhita(ā)n; Gīs *īdbhita(ā)n; D-Lṣg *īdbhita(ā)n; NH *īdbhita(ā)n; Abl *īdbhita(ā)n; Gīs *īdbhita(ā)n; Gīs *īdbhita(ā)n (all OH/NS).

*ītana(n)-; Anīn NgS *ītana(n)-kāśi (KUB 12.58 ii 21; OH/NS; sic contra CHD; also surely KBo 14.45 rev 2), *ītana(n)-kāśi (KBo 10.45 ii 29; but Gīs possible); NH- ĀSg *ītana(n) and *ītana(n)-kāśi; CoIN-APī *ītana(n) (KBo 3.8 iii 6.24, KBo 11.11 i 9, KBo 59.43 i 9, KBo 21.20 i 7; thus with ARCH, loc. cit., for the first, contra *van den Hoit, KZ 97.79f, and CHD); Gīs *ītana(n)-kāśi (KBo 30.26 Vo 1; OH/NS = dupl. of KBo 20.26 Ro 11; OH/NS; cannot entirely assured); D-Lṣg *ītana(n) (KBo 20.8 Vo 14; OH/OS); Abl *ītana(n); D-LPī *ītana(n)-kāśi (thus in KBo 11.11 ii 2, with NH, 1993:144).

*ītana(n)-; Anīn NgS *ītana(n)-kāśi (KUB 12.24 i 11) (not assuredly here, but cf. Zārī *ītana(n)-kāśi).

The facts just cited warrant a few useful generalizations. First, the stems are basically animate. The neuter singular of *śaman-, as back-formed from the collective plural *śaman- (a form that would surely have been fairly common for this word) by a well-known process (cf. the famous example of Grk. δήπον < ἄνδρος > ἄνδρος). Second, the nominative singular appears as both -aṇa and -aṇa, and both are attested from at least Middle Hitite (we unfortunately have no evidence for the nom. sg. in OS). Third, these stems are subject to the same analogical levings as the animate n-stems of the type of *ītana- 'eagle' (i.e. old amphikline animate nouns with nom. sg. *n- comparable to Lat. homó, hominis). We again find the leveling in two of these divisions: one forms a new a-stem based on the nom. sg. without the final -n (Gīs *ītana-, NH *ānātana after nom. sg. *ānātana(-), *ānātana(-)) or based on the oblique stem in -an- (new NgS *ītana(n)-kāśi after Gīs *ītana(n)-kāśi, D-Lṣg *ītana(n)-kāśi). Finally, there appears to be a noticeable semantic clustering; aside from the word for ‘mind, soul’ we have four names for plants, one for a bird, and one for the metal. This distribution suggests that our nouns may have originated as epiteths.

The most striking of the features just cited is the alternation between nom. sg. -aṇa and that in -aṇa, a peculiarity that is unique to this stem class. In trying to exploit this fact as a possible clue to the origin of the type, we must first confront the question of whether the spelling -aṇa rather represents [-ants] or [-anta]. This fundamental question has not been addressed since Kronasser, once again because we thought we already knew the answer: since nom. sg. -aṇa reflected *-aṇa, it obviously represented [-ants]. In fact, however, the very alternation -aṇa/-aṇa makes this highly unlikely. The ending [-ants] is quite frequent in Hitite as animate nominative singular. It is true that in the overwhelming number of instances it forms the nom. sg. of stems in -nt- thus [-ants]. However, the word for ‘woman’, descriptively an animate n-stem (however we ultimately derive this), also shows a nom. sg. MNUNAS-antsia-, surely to be read as [-ants]. It is striking that this quite common word never shows an alternative nom. sg. in -antsia (NB: MUNUS-aś stands for a secondary a-stem MUNCH-duration back-formed from the oblique stem).

Available evidence thus argues that animate nominative singulars in [-ants] were never enlarged in Hitite by adding -aṇa, and the reason for this seems self-evident. The ending [-ants] was itself already sigmatic and thus well formed as an animate nominative singular from the synchronic Hitite point of view. I assert therefore that the very coexistence of nom. sg. -aṇa

1 Personally favor the account of HARDMAN (1987:1220), following SCHLOSSER, which starts from a root noun with nom. sg. *γενη and weak stem *-γεν- (for one then Hit. nom. sg. *< *γενς>-b, but the Hitite inflection is also compatible with the derivation of JARANOFF (1989:137) by which a nom. sg. *γενη-ly yielded already PIE *γενη-, whence pre-Hittic *γενη-). In either case we are led to an animate n-stem with nom. sg. in *-ants- = [-ants].
and-cannot be properly understood in terms of 'sentences' as used in this context. The term 'sentence' as used in this context refers to a sequence of words that express a complete thought. In the context of the text, the use of 'sentences' is meant to convey the idea that the text is structured in a way that is meaningful and coherent.

In the case of the example provided, the use of 'sentences' is meant to convey the idea that the text is structured in a way that is meaningful and coherent. The text is organized in a way that is easy to follow and understand, and the use of 'sentences' is meant to convey the idea that the text is structured in a way that is meaningful and coherent.

In the case of the example provided, the use of 'sentences' is meant to convey the idea that the text is structured in a way that is meaningful and coherent. The text is organized in a way that is easy to follow and understand, and the use of 'sentences' is meant to convey the idea that the text is structured in a way that is meaningful and coherent.

In the case of the example provided, the use of 'sentences' is meant to convey the idea that the text is structured in a way that is meaningful and coherent. The text is organized in a way that is easy to follow and understand, and the use of 'sentences' is meant to convey the idea that the text is structured in a way that is meaningful and coherent.

In the case of the example provided, the use of 'sentences' is meant to convey the idea that the text is structured in a way that is meaningful and coherent. The text is organized in a way that is easy to follow and understand, and the use of 'sentences' is meant to convey the idea that the text is structured in a way that is meaningful and coherent.

In the case of the example provided, the use of 'sentences' is meant to convey the idea that the text is structured in a way that is meaningful and coherent. The text is organized in a way that is easy to follow and understand, and the use of 'sentences' is meant to convey the idea that the text is structured in a way that is meaningful and coherent.
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Zidanca-, which may be analyzed as "*manly", the end of a derivational chain zida- > *zidant- > *zidant-* > *zidant-an > *zidant-o- (> zidanca), 'manly'. As noted long ago by Laroche (1952:122f & 1966:328f) and Kronasser (1966:199), a close connection between stems in -anca- and those in -an- is supported by the existence of doublets such as *Ninanta-(*Ninanta-) and *Zidanca-(*Zidanca-).

One must consider the alternate possibility that the personal names reflect directly n-stems. That is, from an original paradigm of nom. sg. *zidant-s, acc. sg. *zidant-an etc. one first spread the nom. sg. as the stem, producing acc. sg. *zidant-an. The latter was then reanalyzed as an a-stem zidanca-n, leading to a new nom. sg. zidanca-*. Compare the Livian noun of the Storm-god, with secondary nom. and acc. sg. Tarhunsaci, Tarhunzani beside Tarbut-. However, Laroche (1966:329) also cites a variant *Anwanzan- beside *Anwanzana-. The former is incompatible with the derivation just cited, but could easily represent an alternate outcome of final *nyos-n resulting from syncope: cf. regular *Vynos > *vynos but also adverb lazyn * = SIKUY-in 'well' < nom-acc. neuter *Naziyan to lazyn(t)-.

I therefore consider the most likely derivation for stems in -anca- to lie in an original pattern of verbal adjective (*lahant- 'traveling, migrating') > action noun ('lahannti-i- 'traveling, migration') > new thematic adjective (*lahanty-o- 'traveling, migrating') > *individualizing noun ('lahanty-an-an' + "the migrating one") > *shelduck'.

The above account includes enough unverifiable hypotheses that one should also consider the alternative of the "Hoffmann"-suffix *-yun- with "possessive" value. My reservations about this explanation concern mostly the dubious status of this suffix in Anatolian. Suggested direct examples have a certain plausibility, but are very far from assured: see Eichen (1974:64) for CLuvian maššan- 'god' (etc.) < *moyos-hun- *freien Willen habend' and Eichen (1983:62f) for Lycian Elijana- 'naïad' < *ali-hun- *Water (als Wohnstätte) habenb'.

Assumption of the

Hoffmann-suffix would allow direct derivation of the possessive adjective from the action noun: *lahant- 'traveling, migrating' > *lahanty-an- 'traveling, migration' > *lahanty-an-an 'the migrating person' > *lahanty-an-an- (NH 29:548), but this etymology is no more than a possibility. Some attested examples seem of -anca- certainly reflect secondary use of a new unitary suffix. These examples are not deduced in such cases. First, Hitt. *lanam- means 'bulrush' and has no connection with Grk. μύριος and with hysteroaxenic n-stems in -men-. Second, the synchronic alternation of nom. sg. -anca- > -anai- argues that nouns in -anca- continue amphikinetin n-stems in -men- (NH 1979:548). Third, the base -anai- (NH 29:548) is barely derived by some means from stems in -men-.

I find the likeliest origin in a chain of derivation that leads from verbal adjectives in *-ni- via action nouns in *-ni- and thematic adjectives in *-niyoo- to "individualizing" nouns in *-nyoo-on-. Other scenarios remain possible.

9 The derivation would be the same if one prefers with Katz (2001:210f) to begin with *[ضَيَّةَ] - [ضَيَّةَ] 'swimming' and take the shelduck as "the swimmer'.

10 One may also mention Hit. müriyinj- 'grease-cluster to mürij- 'grease', but the putative difference in meaning is far from assured. Also possible is thematicized *pee-n to some Livian stems in -anca-: e.g. *kansisati- (a topographic feature) probably 'wheatfield' < *having wheat'; perhaps husirmisati- *slave-holder' in the personal name Husirlani (revising Curruba, 1992b:252f, which see for other possible examples).

11 As a third alternative, one could even assume a process similar to the second derivation cited above for personal names in -anca-; i.e. direct derivation from stems in -ni- via analysis of the nom. sg. and then acc. sg.: *lahant-s, *lahant-an- > *lahannti, *lahannti-an- > *lahanty-o- > *lahanty-an-an that addition of "individualizing" *-an-.

12 I withdraw my derivation of *lanam- (NH 1979:548), which is more likely to be reflected in Hitt. *bababil- 'bush' < *babilit-.