

MÜNCHENER STUDIEN
ZUR
SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

Im Auftrage
des Münchener Sprachwissenschaftlichen
Studienkreises

herausgegeben von
Bernhard Forssman, Karl Hoffmann
und Johanna Narten

Heft 50

R. Kitzinger, München
1989

Heft 50

<u>R.S.P. Beekes</u>	Old Persian <i>p-θ-i-m</i> 7
<u>Marina Benedetti</u>	Über einige altindische Verbalabstrakta mit <i>su</i> -Präfix 15
<u>Almut Hintze</u>	F1, E1 und drei neue Yašt-Handschriften 31
<u>Jean Kellens</u>	Le sens de vieil-avestique <i>hātqm</i> 51
<u>Jean Kellens</u>	Hüttes cosmiques en Iran.. 65
<u>Frederik Kortlandt</u>	Eight Indo-Uralic verbs?.. 79
<u>Michael Meier-Brügger</u>	Attisch AXONΔEE (5.Jh.v.) und XONΔHN (4.Jh.v.)..... 87
<u>Michael Meier-Brügger</u>	Griechisch <i>δομή, ἐάφθη,</i> <i>ἄπτος</i> und <i>ἐψία</i> 91
<u>H. Craig Melchert</u>	PIE 'dog' in Hittite?*.... 97
<u>Robert Plath</u>	Mykenisch <i>ke-ke-tu-wo-e</i> :..103
<u>Donald A. Ringe, Jr.</u>	Doric <i>ῥαντι</i>123
<u>Claus Peter Zoller</u>	Bericht über grammatische Archaismen im Bangani.....159
	Anschriften der Mitarbeiter dieses Heftes.....219
	MSS-Beihefte.....221

Die Zeitschrift

Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft

(abgekürzt: MSS) erscheint in jährlich mindestens einem Heft mit einem Umfang von mindestens 100 Seiten. Die MSS werden im Auftrag des Münchener Sprachwissenschaftlichen Studienkreises herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Bernhard FORSSMAN, Prof. Dr. Karl HOFFMANN und Prof. Dr. Johanna NARTEN, Kochstraße 4, D-8520 Erlangen. Das Manuskript schreiben Frau Irmela MICHELER, Erlangen und Frau Dagmar PAYNE, M.A., Fürth. Die MSS sind zu beziehen durch R. KITZINGER, Schellingstr. 25, D-8000 München 40.

ISSN 0077—1910

© by Münchener Sprachwissenschaftlicher Studienkreis, Erlangen

Druck: Ulrich Novotny, Starnberg

PIE 'dog' in Hittite?*

In her invaluable monograph on Hittite functionaries, F. PECCHIOLI DADDI, *Mestieri* 41-42, lists a $LÚ_{kuwana}$ - 'lavatore del rame ???'. The word occurs but three times in two manuscripts which are patently parallel texts: KBo VII 48, 10-12 [...] $LÚ_{ku-wa-aš-ša}$ $a-ap-pa$ $aš-ši-y[a-?]$ [...] $x-a-l-li-e-eš$ $GIŠ_{ha-at-ta-[(lu-ut LÚ_{ha-at-wa_a-ya-aš LÚ_{UR.GI7-aš LÚ_k})]u-ú-na-aš-ša}$ $GĪR.MEŠ-ŠU-NU$ $w[(-a-ar-aš-ḫa-an-zi)]$ // KUB X 66 VI 1-4 [...] $-a-l-li-e-eš$ [$GIŠ$] $ḫa-at-ta-lu-ut$ $LÚ_{ha-at-wa_a-ya-an}$ $LÚ_{UR.GI7}$ $LÚ_{ku-wa-na-an-na}$ $GĪR.MEŠ-ŠU-NU$ $ú-ar-aš-ḫa-an-zi$.

The reading $[k]u-ú-^o$ in line 12 of KBo VII 48 (thus already PECCHIOLI DADDI, *Mestieri* 234) and the other restorations are assured by the parallelism with KUB X 66. The only difference in the full sentence in the two texts is that the first employs the OH possessive genitive construction 'of the ___ their feet', while the second shows the 'accusative of respect' or $σχημα καθ' ὄλον καὶ μέρος$ 'the ___, their feet': cf. the alternate constructions in the OH and MH manuscripts of the Laws, § 11ff, and see the excellent discussion by YOSHIDA, *THeth* 13.34ff. Note that in all three occurrences $LÚ_{kuwa(n)}$ - is marked as the third member of the set by enclitic geminating $-a$ 'and': $LÚ_{kuwašš=a}$... $LÚ_{kūnašš=a}$... $LÚ_{kuwanann=a}$. Neither the subject to be restored nor the sense of the verb is certain, but the basic content of the sentence is clear: 'The ___ wipe(?) the feet of the *hatwaya*, the "dog-man", and the "kuwan-man" with the door-bolt¹⁾'. Noteworthy is the archaic instrumental $GIŠ_{ḫattalut}$ (overlooked in MELCHERT, *Diss.*), which may be added to the example *ganut* 'by the knee', on which see NEU, *KZ* 86 (1973) 288ff. This striking archaism gives independent confirmation that we are dealing with an OH text, although the manuscripts are both

Neo-Hittite.

PECCHIOLI DADDI's interpretation of $LÚkuwana-$ (sic!) as 'copper-worker' is clearly an act of desperation, as indicated by the triple question mark. Any connection with $NA_4ku(wa)nnan-$ 'bead; copper'²⁾ is phonologically and morphologically impossible. The latter word always has a geminate first $-nn-$ and is itself a neuter n -stem. Even an internal derivative of such a stem (e.g. a hypostasized genitive 'the one of ___') would have to be an a -stem $*LÚku(wa)nnana-$.

On the other hand, our functionary is attested as nom.sg. $LÚku-wa-aš$, acc.sg. $LÚku-wa-na-an$, gen.sg. $LÚku-ū-na-aš$. This paradigm is unmistakably that of an animate n -stem, of the type of Hitt. $ḫāraš$, $ḫāranan$, $ḫāranaš$ 'eagle'. The PIE origin of this type (cf. Lat. *homō*, *hominis*) is also well-known: see MELCHERT, *Sprache* 29 (1983) 6ff, with prior references. Although there are more than twenty examples of this type in Hittite³⁾, the inflection with a nominative singular in simple $-aš$ versus oblique stem $-an-$ is an archaism which is leveled out within the history of Hittite⁴⁾. The morphology of $LÚkuwa(n)-$ argues strongly that it is an inherited lexeme.

As to its meaning, we notice that it is collocated with $LÚUR.GI7$. The latter appears to mean 'dog-handler', thus 'hunter' in some instances, but in ritual contexts it refers rather to 'dog-men', those who act out the part of dogs: see KBo IV 13 VI 7 etc. $LÚ.MEŠUR.GI7 wappiyanzi$ 'The "dog-men" bark.' They are thus comparable to the $LÚ.MEŠUR.MAH$ 'lion-men', $LÚ.MEŠUR.BAR.RA$ 'wolf-men', and $LÚḫartagga-$ 'bear-man'. See PECCHIOLI DADDI, *Mestieri s.v.*, and JAKOB-ROST, *Or* 35 (1966) 419. The overall context of KUB X 66 (see PECCHIOLI DADDI, *Mestieri* 234) makes it certain that we are dealing with the ritual $LÚUR.GI7$ 'dog-man'.

When we combine the archaic animate n -stem inflection, the phonetic shape, and the collocation with $LÚUR.GI7$ 'dog-man', we cannot help but conclude that we have found the Hittite reflex of PIE $*ḡwon-$ 'dog'. Since $UR.GI7$ presumably represents the synchronic generic term, Hitt. $kuwa(n)-$ has apparently developed a more specialized meaning, but this is not a valid counterargument: compare the case of English 'hound'. Given only a single occurrence (contextually) of what is already a secondary usage (a man acting like the animal), we have no way of determining just what the specialized meaning in Hittite is. It is quite possible that the word survives only in the name of the functionary, not as the designation for an animal.

Hitt. $kuwaš$, $kuwanan$ may be equated directly with Skt. $śvā$ and $śvānam$. Hittite has secondarily added $-s$ to the asigmatic animate nominative singular, as elsewhere (cf. $ḫāraš$ above)⁵⁾. It is also probable that Hitt. gen.sg. $kūnaš$ matches directly Skt. $śūnas$ (with a similar secondary retraction of the accent)⁶⁾. However, since examples of contraction of $(u)wa$ to $ū$ are attested in Hittite (MELCHERT, *Phon.* 52f), it is also possible that $kūn-$ represents a purely Hittite contraction of $kuwan-$ (previously generalized as in $ḫāran-$). In any case, we appear to have Hittite evidence for the ancient Indo-European term for 'dog', previously attested in Anatolian only in HLuv. $zuwani-$, which is now assured as an inheritance, not a borrowing (for the phonology see MELCHERT, *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill* (1987) 182-204)⁷⁾.

Notes:

- * For bibliographical abbreviations see *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, edd. H.G. GÜTERBOCK and H.A. HOFFNER, Jr., Chicago: 1980ff.

- 1) OETTINGER, Stammbildung 429, n70, assumes that *warš̥h-* is a variant of *warš-* 'wipe; graze; pluck'. Despite the difficult morphology, this is probably correct, since we find a similar odd sentence with *warš-* in IBoT I 36 I 68-69: LUŠU.I=ma GISgalāma ḥ[(arš)]i n=ašta KÁ-uš arḥa warš̥i 'While the "barber" holds the g. (part of the door) and wipes off the gate.' HAAS-THIEL, AOAT 31 (1978) 125, are certainly correct in rejecting the meaning 'brush' given for *galāma* by ROST, MIO 11 (1966) 210, but their own translation of *warš-* is impossibly ad hoc.
- 2) H.G. GÜTERBOCK (pers.comm.) informs me that he now seriously doubts the meaning 'copper' for NA⁴*ku(wa)nnan-*.
- 3) See OETTINGER, Gs Kronasser (1982) 162ff, for several previously overlooked examples. However, the new word equation offered here, in addition to that of Hitt. *ḥāra(n)-* = OHG *aro* etc. 'eagle', argues against his derivation of this class from a PIE 'hysterokinetic' inflectional type. See my additional arguments in Sprache 29 (1983) 6ff. Nevertheless, OETTINGER's evidence for *e*-grade of the suffix in the animate nominative plural is incontrovertible. Since the *e*-grade here is difficult to motivate secondarily (see my attempts, loc. cit.), we must consider the possibility that it is old. That is, we must assume more allomorphy for the various PIE nominal types (acrostatic, proterokinetic, amphikinetic, etc.) than previously recognized.
- 4) A regular *a*-stem is created either after the nominative singular (acc.sg. *ḥāran* after *ḥāraš̥*, thus new stem *ḥāra-*) or after the rest of the paradigm (nom. sg. *alkištanaš̥* after *alkištanan*, *alkištaneš̥*, etc., thus new stem *alkištana-*).
- 5) Since old **-uwV-* dissimilates in Hittite to *-umV-* (MELCHERT, Phon. 22ff with prior refs.), the nom.sg. *kuwaš̥* probably represents /k^was/ from a non-Lindeman variant **k^wōš̥*, not **k^wūwōš̥* (although paradigmatic remodeling of a **k^wūwōš̥* to **kuwaš̥* = /kuwas/ cannot be entirely excluded). In any case, the lack of scriptio plena in the single occurrence of *kuwaš̥(ša)* and *kuwanan(na)* is not an argument against an interpretation /k^was/ and /k^wānan/, particularly since scriptio plena is often omitted when enclitics are added.
- 6) Or is the accent here old? See HAMP, IF 85 (1980) 36.
- 7) After completing this article, I belatedly discovered that A.H. SAYCE, AfO 3, (1926) 64, had already noticed the collocation LUUR.GI7.LU*kuwananna* in KUB X 66 and correctly adduced Grk. κων. However, SAYCE in 1926 did not understand the syntax or morphology of *kuwananna*, and his

suggestion that *kunnali* in KUB VII 19 Vs 17-18 means 'in the manner of a dog' is certainly false: the adverb could only be **ku(wa)nili*. In the absence of the crucial morphological evidence provided by *kuwaš̥* and *kūnaš̥*, it is hardly surprising that SAYCE's suggestion was ignored and then apparently forgotten.