

# HITTITE *arku-* “CHANT, INTONE” VS. *arkuwā(i)-* “MAKE A PLEA”

H. Craig Melchert  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

## Current Status

All standard Hittite lexica agree in listing a single entry *arkuwā(i)-*, a verbal stem of the class labeled I.2.d by Oettinger, *Stammbildung* 30 and 369 (= class I.3 in Friedrich, *HE* 90–91), the type of *ḫatrā(i)-* “send a message.” There is also a consensus that *arkuwar* is the verbal noun to this stem, by haplogy from expected \**arkuwawar*. There is no agreement, however, on the meaning of this verb. Friedrich-Kammenhuber, *HW*<sup>2</sup> 1, 309, assumes a core meaning “pray,” manifested in Old Hittite as “psalmodize,” but in Neo-Hittite mostly as “pray, plead for,” rarely as “excuse, justify oneself.” Puhvel, *HED* 1/2, 148, offers eight renderings ranged along a scale from “plead, argue” to “respond” to “make excuses.” The latter opinion reflects a distillation of several earlier proposals: Sturtevant, *CG*<sup>r</sup> 1, 222, Laroche, *prière 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, *HW*<sup>2</sup> 1, 311, argues for PIE \**erk<sup>w</sup>*- “praise, sing,” while Puhvel,

*HED* 1/2, 150, opts for comparison with Latin *arguō* “declare, prove,” following Duchesne-Guillemin, *TPS* (1946) 85, and Laroche, *prière hittite* 19. Tischler, *HEG Lfg.* 1, 60–61, cites the diverse assigned meanings and both etymologies. Oettinger, *Stammbildung* 369, 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 Ro. 90 and *LVII* 125 Ro. 5 we find a preterite third singular *arkutta*. Aside from an exclamation point in Friedrich-Kammenhuber, *HW*<sup>2</sup> 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 haplogized verbal noun *arkuwar*)

A review of all available evidence shows that the basic sense “(make a) plea” deduced by Laroche, *prière hittite* 14–19, is correct. Where he and subsequent scholars have erred is in focusing exclusively on those instances where the “plea” 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 Laroche shows that this inference is incorrect: *n=at PANI* <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> *tak-šan tiyanzi n=aš* <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> ANA DI.ĜIA *punušmi nu=za kuiš kuit arkuwar DÜ-zi n=at* <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup>

---

This paper is a revised version of the one presented at the Fifteenth East Coast Indo-European Conference at Yale University, June 13, 1996. I am grateful to several participants for useful comments and references. I am also very indebted to Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. for crucial textual references and constructive criticism. However, I must state explicitly that Professor Hoffner is in no way responsible for the views expressed here, many of which he does not share. Bibliographical references to Hittitological works follow the system of Hans G. Güterbock & Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Volume L–N xv–xxviii and Volume P, Fascicle 1, ix–xi.

*ištamašmi* (KBo III 3 iv 8–11; CTH 63; NH/NS) “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 Puhvel, there is also no independent evidence at all that any of the examples in Neo-Hittite prayers involve someone with a guilty conscience making an apologia 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 Muršili’s second plague prayer may serve for all: *našma mān* ARAD<sup>DI</sup> *kuedanikki kuitki nakkiyahhan nu=za ANA EN=ŠU arkuwar iyazzi* (KUB XIV 8 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.”).<sup>1</sup> A variant of this formula occurs in Muwatalli’s Prayer (KUB VI 45 i 2–4; CTH 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.”<sup>2</sup>

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 *arkuwā(i)-/arkuwar* has only an inherent meaning “make a plea/case, 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: *nu=wa ehu nu=wa=mu=za ar[kuwar] iya nu=wa=ta=kkān KASKAL-ši tehhi* (KUB XIV 3 ii 64–65; CTH 181; NH/NS) “Come! Make an explanation/justification to me! And I will set you on your way.” Similarly in the Mašat Letters: ŠEŠ.DÜG.GA=YA=mu *kuit kiššan hatrāeš uddār=wa kue hatreškemi nu=wa=mu uddanaš EGIR-pa arkuwar ŪL kuiški udai* (HKM 63 Ro. 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-pond, answer” is explicitly carried in the second example by *appa* “back,” as usual in Hittite (cf. *appa tē-/mema-* “reply, answer, respond”). It cannot be accidental that *appa* is also present in most other examples from the Mašat Letters as well as the “Indictment” of Madduwatta.<sup>3</sup>

1. Likewise CHD L-N 369 “Or if anything is a concern to some servant, (so that) he makes an appeal to his lord.”

2. This sense of “plea (for assistance)” is also proper and sufficient for further instances in Neo-Hittite prayers: KUB VI 45 i 25; XIV 14+ Ro. 6–7; XXIV 1 iv 19–21. Nothing in the contexts 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 HKM 21 Vo. 26 (contra Alp, HBM 154), 52 Ro. 9, 64 Vo. 22–23, and KUB XIV 1 Vo. 36. Other examples from Mašat are in incomplete contexts, but the likely restoration in HKM 57 Vo. 26 *ark[uwar iyazi]* (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-Kammenhuber, *HW*<sup>2</sup> 1, 312, but assured for at least the following example: *n=aš A-NA NAM.RU* (sic!) *arkuwar kišan DÛ-zi* “And he (the king) makes a plea/request to the transplantee as follows” (*KBo* XV 7:14; *CTH* 420; ?/NS; see also Kümmel, *StBoT* 3, 36–37, 41). It is not remotely credible that the king would be making an excuse or apology to the transplantee, nor is he responding to the latter, since the king initiates the speech.

In sum, Laroche’s original definition of *arkuwā(i)-/arkuwar* as “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 “respond, rejoin” except in those cases where this force is carried by the preverb *appa* “back, re-.” Nowhere in its use in prayers, letters, or instructions does *arkuwā(i)-/arkuwar* cooccur with the preverb *katta(n)* “with.” These last two points are crucial for comparison with the examples to be discussed below.

### *arku-* (sic!) “chant, intone”

The attestation of a stem *arku+* in Old Hittite is highly restricted and stereotyped: it occurs only in the present third plural *arku(w)anzi*. In all examples in a complete context it is accompanied by the preverb *kattan* “with,” and the latter can and should be restored in all others. Laroche, *prière hittite* 19, prudently leaves the *kattan arku(w)anzi* examples aside in his analysis of *arkuwā(i)-* “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: <sup>MUNUS.MEŠ</sup> *zintuḫeš AŠAR-ŠUNU appanzi*

[*t*] = *e tienzi ta kišš[an S]İR<sup>RU</sup> [1-aš ḫ]alzāi uliwā ulin apē=ma=šše QATAMMA=[pat kattan] arkuwanzi* (*KBo* XX 26 + XXV 34 Ro. 13–15; *CTH* 649; OS) “The z-women take their places. They stand up and sing as follows. [One] calls out “*uliwa ulin*.” Those (the others) *arku-* [just] the same [along with] her.”<sup>4</sup> Note crucially that although the action of the women as a whole is termed “singing” (Akk. *zamāru* = Hitt. *išḫamāi-*), the verb *kattan arku-* actually resumes Hittite *ḫalzāi-*, 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: [*ak*] *kandan ŠUM-an ḫalzai [apē=m]a=šši kattan arkuwanzi* (*KUB* XXXIX 31:13–14; *CTH* 450; OH/NS) “He calls the dead by name; they *arku-* along with him.” This example shows that the usage is not restricted to passages in Hattic. Note once again that our verb resumes *ḫalzāi-*, 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 “responsions.” Puhvel and others have used this conception to try to account for all the uses of *arku+* starting from a basic meaning “respond.” We have seen that this sense does not work for the MH and NH forms *arkuwā(i)-/arkuwar*. The premise is also false for the Old Hittite examples of *arku(w)anzi*. The preverb *kattan* means only “(along) with.”<sup>5</sup> 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 *arku+* 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

*arkuwar* is the plaintiff. For another example of *arkuwar iya-* without *appa* meaning “make an explanation/ excuse” see the Duppi-Tešub Treaty, *KBo* V 9 iii 3–5. This is, of course, a vassal treaty where the addressee is explicitly in a subordinate position to the Hittite king.

4. For the restorations and general context of cf. *KBo* XXIII 103 iv 1–13 and the references in *HW*<sup>2</sup> 1, 311.

5. There is, of course, a homophonous adverb *kattan* “below,” but no one has seriously proposed that it is present here, for obvious reasons.

in the latter the function of the choral accompaniment is also clear: by repeating the soloist's words along with the soloist, the chorus is reinforcing, in fact *affirming* them.<sup>6</sup> The function of this repetition is thus equal to that of "Amen!" Such an affirmatory 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!"<sup>7</sup>

The function of accompanying and reenforcing is also clear in the two examples of *kattan arku+* in mythological passages. In the Myth of Ullikummi, when Ishtar sings for the sea-monster, she receives help from heaven and earth as a "back-up chorus": *nu=za=kan [iṣḥ]amain dāš nu=šši nepi[š] daganzipašš=a kattan arkuš-k[an]zi* (KUB XXXVI 12 + KBo XXVI 64 ii 2–4; CTH 345; MH/NS) "She took (up) a song, and heaven and earth accompanied/echoed her" (cf. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths* 56). In the tale of Gurparanzaḥ we find: *nu=za mGurparanzaḥuš alalamniškezzi šargauēš=ši kattan ar[k]uiškanzi* (scil. *arkuškanzi!*)<sup>8</sup> (KUB XVII 9 i 17–19; CTH 362; MH/NS) "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 *katta(n)*

*arku+*: EME MUNUS.LUGAL <sup>f</sup>*tawana[na]* INA É.GAL<sup>LIM</sup> INIM <sup>f</sup>*Pattiya IŠPUR* <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup>=*ma=šši katta ŪL arkutta* (KUB XXII 70 Ro. 89–90; CTH 566; NH/NS) "Complaint (lit. "tongue") of the queen: she wrote of the affair of Pattiya to the palace, but His Majesty did not concur with her." Ūnal, *THeth* 6, 79, interprets *katta ŪL arkutta* as "hat sich nicht entschuldigt," followed by Puhvel, *HED* 1/2, 149. The context also permits a more neutral "did not respond." We have seen, however, that *arkuwā(i)-* 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 *arkutta* cannot possibly belong to the paradigm of the stem *arkuwā(i)-*.

The presence of the preverb *katta* (NH for *kattan*) seals the issue: *katta arkutta* clearly belongs to the same verb as OH *kattan arku(w)anzi/arkuškanzi*, and the form *arkutta* shows that the stem is *arku-*. This formal difference vs. *arkuwā(i)-* "make a plea" supports the evidence already seen for a contrast in meaning. In view of the affirmatory function of OH *kattan arku-* "accompany, 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 *bestimmen*, 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 *kattan arku-* resumes the action of several verbs, including *alalamniya-* "wail, keen" and at least one instance of *ḥalzāi-* "call out" in the royal funeral rites where there is no reason to suppose that there was any singing involved (in the sense of a tune and musical accompaniment). It is by no means clear, then, that *arku-* implies "singing" in the strict sense. A broader meaning for *arku-* is also suggested by the following example: *nu [k]uitman akkuškanzi kuitman a[kuan]na irḥanzi iṣḥamiškan=ma apa[t] SİR n=at iṣḥamiyawanzi EGIR-pa a[rku]škanzi* (KUB XXV 37 + XXXV 131 + LI 9 i 39–40; CTH 771.1; ?/NS)

6. In some instances, in both the Hittite and modern usage, the words of the soloist and chorus are new and do not repeat those of the solo passage. The fact of accompaniment (*not* response) and reenforcement remains.

7. My colleague George Cardona kindly informs me that it is not uncommon in early Sanskrit to find repetition of the final words of a verse, chapter, or other unit. He cites among others Aitareyabrāhmaṇa 1.3.14: *parokṣpriyā iva hi devāḥ parokṣpriyā hi devāḥ*. The use to mark cloture seems clear enough. Whether there is also an affirmatory effect is unclear.

8. For erroneous *arkuiškanzi* cf. *akkuiškanzi* for *akkuškanzi* "they drink" (addition of a single stroke turns the sign *uš* into *iš*). The presence of *kattan* assures that the verb is not *arkuwā(i)-*, which as we have seen, never co-occurs with this preverb. This fact obviously is due to the latter verb's meaning: one does not, except in extremely unusual circumstances, make a plea jointly with someone else.

“While they are drinking, until they finish drinking, that song is being sung. They *arku-* it back in a ‘sung’ manner.” For the use of an infinitive as a manner adverb cf. *lilahḫuwanzi* “hurriedly” in HKM 4 Ro. 8 and passim in the Mašat Letters. In this case the use of *appa* “back” suggests that we are dealing with a genuine *responson*. The need to specify the action of *arku-* with *išhamāi-* “sing” argues 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 *išhamāi-*. 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: <sup>GIS</sup>dINANNA.GAL/TUR “small/large lyre” (KUB XXV 2 vi 8–9; XXV 6 iv 7–8; and often); *ḫuḫupal-* “clapper” (KUB XXV 37 ii 13–21); *ḫuḫupal-* and *šawatar=ša* “horn” (KUB XXV 37 iii 24–32); “lyres,” <sup>GIS</sup>arkammi- and *galgalturi-* (probably percussive instruments) (KUB XXVII 49 iii 25–26).

Second, the action indicated by *išhamāi-* is typically reserved for a few particular functionaries: <sup>LÚ</sup>MEŠNAR “singers/musicians,” <sup>LÚ</sup>MEŠḫalliyareš, <sup>LÚ</sup>MEŠšahtarileš, <sup>MUNUS</sup>MEŠzintuḫieš, <sup>MUNUS</sup>MEŠKI. SIKIL “maidens,” and the “men” of various cult cities. In apparent contradiction to this stand passages such as KUB XII 8 iii 1–4: *nu=kan* <sup>LÚ</sup>MEŠ<sup>URU</sup>Tuḫumiyara anda uwanzi nu 3 <sup>LÚ</sup>MEŠdaškupānzi pankušš=a kiššan <sup>SÌR</sup>RU “The men of T. enter. Three men wail, and the *panku-* also sings as follows” (Hattic text follows). The CHD P 90 takes *panku-* here to mean the “(worshipping) assembly, congregation,” a sense clearly correct in many instances. However, *panku-* as a noun means simply “the totality,” and given the immediately preceding reference to the “men of Tuḫumiyara” and three 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.<sup>9</sup> 7–9 and parallels (see Starke, StBoT 30, 334–37): [*namm*]a 2 <sup>LÚ</sup>MEŠ GAL=ŠUNU kiššan <sup>SÌR</sup>[<sup>RU</sup>...]tadutar ḫāzza pankušš=a=šmaš

[*kat*]tan QATAMMA=pat <sup>SÌR</sup>RU “Then two of their leaders (or “their two leaders”) sing as follows: (Luvian). The *panku-* sings just the same with them.”<sup>9</sup> There is no firm evidence for “singing” (*išhamāi-*) by the “lay” assembly.

The notion that “singing” (*išhamāi-*) was a special professional skill is supported by the presence of a special term *išhamattalieš* “singers” (KUB XVII 21 ii 11, iii 5, 19).<sup>10</sup> Also of interest is the unfortunately fragmentary reference to instruction in the art: <sup>LÚ</sup>NAR=wa=mu *kuitki maniyahḫeškez[zi]* [ ]karū 3 *išhamāuš maniyahḫta* (KUB XL 92 Ro. 10–11) “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 *išhamāi-* “song” to refer to the epics of the Kumarbi cycle and to the Old Hittite “Song of Neša,” which we have strong reasons to suppose were in verse (see McNeil, AnSt 13 (1963), 237–42, and Durnford, AnSt 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 <sup>SÌR</sup>. This text may or may not be in verse, but several features qualify it as consciously literary art, meant for oral performance: see Neu, StBoT 32, 7–8.<sup>11</sup>

It thus seems fully justified to translate *išhamāi-* as “sing,” with the expected implications of a performance art at least typically including musical accompaniment. However, the very first passage cited above for *kattan arku-* (KBo XX 26

9. Likewise in KUB XXV 37 ii 17–21 (StBoT 30, 345) the reference for the entire performance is to the “men of Lallupiya.”

10. The rarity of this word is surely due to the fact that it is usually hidden by the logogram <sup>LÚ</sup>NAR (which may also, however, mean “musician” in general).

11. Note also the characterization of the Hittite epic as having “eine—mehr oder weniger—gebundene Sprache” by Güterbock, Hethitische Literatur, in K. von See, *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, Bd. 1: Altorientalische Literaturen*, ed. by W. Röllig (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1978), 240. This cautious formulation seems appropriate for our current state of knowledge. There is no basis for assuming that *išhamāi-* always and exclusively implies metrical verse, much less that this feature defines the difference between *išhamāi-* and *arku-*.

+ Ro. 13–17) shows that  $\text{S}\ddot{\text{I}}\text{R}^{\text{RU}} = \text{i}\check{\text{s}}\text{h}\text{a}\text{m}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{i}-$  is also used to refer to an overall performance that includes the action of  $\text{h}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{z}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{i}-$  “shouting, crying out.”<sup>12</sup> Note further in the first *panku-* passage cited, the co-occurrence of “singing” with  $\text{d}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{s}\text{-k}\ddot{\text{u}}\text{p}\ddot{\text{a}}(\text{i})-$  “wail.” Finally, both examples with *panku-* show that the choral accompaniment may indeed be “sung.”

These facts suggest that  $\text{i}\check{\text{s}}\text{h}\text{a}\text{m}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{i}-$  could be used to refer globally to a ritual solo/choral performance, some elements of which were not “singing” in the sense of requiring musical accompaniment. Such an extension of usage is hardly surprising: one may compare the similar extension of  $\text{s}\check{\text{i}}\text{p}\text{a}\text{n}\text{d}-$  “libate” to mean “sacrifice; worship.” This wider use of  $\text{i}\check{\text{s}}\text{h}\text{a}\text{m}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{i}-$  makes it unlikely that there was a hard and fast contrast with (*kattan*) *arku-*. There seems no reason to deny that some instances of choral accompaniment expressed by the latter refer to singing. Indeed, the absence of *kattan arku-* in texts with Luvian elements raises the strong possibility that *kattan* \* $\text{i}\check{\text{s}}\text{h}\text{a}\text{m}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{i}-$  ( $\text{S}\ddot{\text{I}}\text{R}^{\text{RU}}$ ) replaced *kattan arku-* in the sense “accompany” (as a chorus).

Nevertheless, all examples of  $\text{i}\check{\text{s}}\text{h}\text{a}\text{m}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{i}-$  known to me refer either to singing with musical accompaniment or to ritual performance including singing, whereas the examples of *arku-* from the royal funeral rites and the Gurparanzaḫ story argue that this verb originally had a broader range of meaning, of which “singing” is merely one realization. One may venture perhaps “chant” or “intone” as the closest English equivalent. The verb’s overall attestation, however, suggests that already in Old Hittite it was becoming largely restricted to the set phrase *kattan arku-* “intone along with” hence “verbally support/affirm.” My claimed interpretation of the NH passage as “did not concur” thus does not require loss of a sense “sing” (for which there is no basis in the first place), but merely secularization of a usage mostly restricted in Old Hittite to ritual performance.

12. Compare also *KBo* XXIII 103 iv 1–13, which confirms that here too the Hittite verb standing behind  $\text{S}\ddot{\text{I}}\text{R}^{\text{RU}}$  is  $\text{i}\check{\text{s}}\text{h}\text{a}\text{m}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{i}-$ .

## Conclusions

Confirmation of the meaning “make a plea, state one’s case” for the stem  $\text{a}\text{r}\text{k}\ddot{\text{u}}\text{w}\ddot{\text{a}}(\text{i})-$  and its verbal noun *arkuwar* strongly supports the comparison made by Duchesne-Guillemin and Laroche with Latin *arguō* “declare, prove.” In fact, there is probably a direct word-equation based on a preform \* $\text{a}\text{r}\text{g}\text{u}-\text{y}\acute{\text{e}}\text{l}\acute{\text{o}}$ , a denominative stem from an adjective or noun \* $\text{a}\text{r}\text{g}\ddot{\text{u}}$ .<sup>13</sup> The stem  $\text{a}\text{r}\text{k}\ddot{\text{u}}\text{w}\ddot{\text{a}}(\text{i})-$ , attested only in Neo-Hittite, may easily be a replacement for an earlier \* $\text{a}\text{r}\text{k}\ddot{\text{u}}\text{w}\text{e}/\text{a}-$  (cf. NH  $\text{k}\text{a}\text{p}\text{p}\text{u}\text{w}\ddot{\text{a}}(\text{i})-$  for  $\text{k}\text{a}\text{p}\text{p}\text{u}\text{w}\text{e}/\text{a}-$  “count” and see Oettinger, *Stamm-bildung* 336–37).<sup>14</sup> The absence of initial *h-* in Hittite means that the connection of *arguō* with the root of  $\text{h}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{r}\text{k}\text{i}-$  “bright, white” must be abandoned, but this is hardly a great loss, as already noted by Laroche, *prière hittite* 19, Puhvel, *HED* 1/2, 150, and Friedrich-Kammenhuber, *HW*<sup>2</sup> 1, 311. Nothing in the semantics of *arguō* or *argūtus* demands a derivation from \* $\text{h}_2\text{e}\text{r}\acute{\text{g}}$ .<sup>15</sup>

On the other hand, the stem *arku-* (sic!) 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 NH secular usage. The preterite third singular form *arkutta* shows not only that the stem is simply *arku-*, instead of  $\text{a}\text{r}\text{k}\ddot{\text{u}}\text{w}\ddot{\text{a}}(\text{i})-$ , but also that it is /ark<sup>w</sup>-/, with a unitary labiovelar, just like

13. For this analysis of the Latin stem see already O. Szemerényi, *Italic and Romance Linguistic Studies in Honor of Ernst Pulgram*, ed. H. Izzo. (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1980), 13–14.

14. As Jaan Puhvel has reminded me, from an original stem \* $\text{a}\text{r}\text{k}\ddot{\text{u}}\text{w}\text{e}/\text{a}-$  one could get an extended stem  $\text{a}\text{r}\text{k}\ddot{\text{u}}\text{s}\text{k}\text{e}/\text{a}-$  with syncope (cf.  $\text{k}\text{a}\text{p}\text{p}\text{u}\text{s}\text{k}\text{e}/\text{a}-$  to  $\text{k}\text{a}\text{p}\text{p}\text{u}\text{w}\text{e}/\text{a}-$ ). However, I know of no evidence for syncope of a pret. 3rd sg. in *-uwet* to *-ut*, and even an assumed \* $\text{a}\text{r}\text{k}\ddot{\text{u}}\text{t}$  would still not explain attested *arkutta*. In view of the observed replacement of OH *watkutta* by NH *watkut* (see Oettinger, *Stamm-bildung* 237), a change in the opposite direction is not credible.

15. Since the likely preform for the Hittite is also \* $\text{a}\text{r}\text{g}\text{u}\acute{\text{y}}\acute{\text{e}}/\acute{\text{o}}$ , there is no evidence for a labiovelar, with Szemerényi, contra Puhvel. However, an already PIE dissimilation of \* $\text{a}\text{r}\text{g}^{\text{w}}\text{-u-}$  to \* $\text{a}\text{r}\text{g}\text{-u-}$  cannot be excluded.

*ekutta* “drank” < *eku-* (/eg<sup>w</sup>-/). As cogently argued by Lindeman, *RHA* 23 (1965) 29–32, if the stem were [egu-], then the preterite third singular would have to be \*[egud], spelled \**e-ku-ut*. Likewise, then *ar-ku-ut-ta* must be [ark<sup>w</sup>ta], because the preterite third singular of an \*[argu-] could only be \**ar-ku-ut*.

Given this independent evidence for a root-final labiovelar along with a meaning in the sphere of “intone, chant,” there seems no reason not to derive *this* stem from PIE \**erk<sup>w</sup>-*, seen also in Sanskrit *ārcati* “praise,” Armenian *erg* “song,” and Tocharian AB *yärk/yarke* “reverence, honor.” The long-standing debate over the etymology of *arkuwā(i)-* thus turns out to have been ill-conceived: once we have correctly identified two distinct stems *arku-* and *arkuwā(i)-*, we see that both etymologies are correct, one for each verb.

The presence in Hittite of *arku-* “intone, chant” (or sim.) < \**erk<sup>w</sup>-* beside *išhamāi-* “sing” < \**s(e)h<sub>2</sub>-m-* (see Puhvel, *HED* 1/2, 395, with refs., to which add Bader, *BSL* 85 (1990) 36–48) is of in-

terest for the reconstruction of PIE ritual performance. This topic can only be alluded to here, but it is at least worth noting that in Sanskrit, *ṛc-* is the more general term for “verse, hymn,” but also specifically “recited, spoken verse” versus *sāman-* “song, verses which are sung; tune.”<sup>16</sup> Whatever the precise range of meaning of \**erk<sup>w</sup>-* and \**seh<sub>2</sub>-(m)-* in PIE, it is thus likely that the original difference between Hittite *arku-* and *išhamāi-* reflects an inherited contrast. However, this relationship was obscured by the virtual elimination of the simplex *arku-* in favor of the combinations *kattan arku-* “accompany” hence “repeat, affirm” and *āppa arku-* “recite back.” With changes in Hittite ritual practice even these expressions became obsolete, leaving only a residual secular “affirm, concur with,” of limited usage.

16. See the entries for *ṛc-* and *sāman-* in any of the standard Sanskrit lexica (Böhtlingk-Roth, Monier Williams, etc.) and the remarks of Arthur B. Keith, *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads* 1.16, Harvard Oriental Series 31 (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1925).