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PIE 'dog' in Hittite?

In her invaluable monograph on Hittite functionaries, F. PECCHIOLI, DADDI, Mestieri 41-42, lists a LÜkwana- 'lavoratore del rame ???'. The word occurs but three times in two manuscripts which are patently parallel texts: KBO VII 48, 10:12 [...1 LÜku-wa-aḥ-sa a-ap-pa aḥ-ṣi-y(a-ṣ...a-al-tt-e-ṣ GÎya-at-ta{-tu-ut LÜy-a-an-ta-wa-d a-ḥ LÜUR.GÎ-7 a-LÜK-7 }u-ṣa-aḥ-sa GÎRMES-ŠU-NU u{a-ar-ah-ḥa-an-ṣÍ} // KUB X 66 VI 1-4 [...]-a-l-tt-e-ṣ ((GÎ8)ya-at-ta-tu-ut LÜy-a-an-ta-wa-d -ya-an LÜUR.GÎ7 LÜku-wa-an-na-ṣa GÎRMES-ŠU-NU a-ar-ah-ḥa-an-ṣÍ.

The reading [k]u-ṣa-aḥ-sa 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 σχόμα ἀθάνατον 'his feet' μορφος '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 LÜkwana- is marked as the third member of the set by enclitic geminating-ṣ 'and': LÜkwana-ṣṣṣṣ-a... LÜkwnan-sṣṣ-a... LÜkwnan-ṣṣ-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 ḫatuwyā, the "dog- man", and the "kwana-man" with the door-bolt'. Noteworthy is the archaic instrumental GÎṣṣat-tagwewi (overlooked in MELCHERT, Diss.), which may be added to the example genw '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
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 *kwan-. 'dog'. Since UR.GI7 presumably represents the synchronic generic term, Hitt. kwan(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 functionaly, not as the designation for an animal.

Hitt. kwan, kwawan may be equated directly with Skt. ḍvâ and ᵇvânam. Hittite has secondarily added -s to the asigmatic animate nominative singular, as elsewhere (cf. āsra above)5. It is also probable that Hitt. gen.sg. kâna matches directly Skt. śanás (with a similar secondary retraction of the accent)6. However, since examples of contraction of īwa to s are attested in Hittite (MELCHERT, Phon. 52f), it is also possible that kân- represents a purely Hittite contraction of kwan- (previously generalized as in ārān-). In any case, we appear to have Hittite evidence for the ancient Indo-European term for 'dog', previously attested in Anatolian only in Hluv. ḍuwan- 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:

1) OETTINGER, Stammbildung 219, n70, assumes that *warθ- is a variant of *warθ- 'wipe; graze; pluck'. Despite the difficult morphology, this is probably correct, since we find a similar odd sentence with *warθ- in IBOt I 36 I 68-69: *B(i)n-i-ma Gilgaštama ʰi(ara)le našta rā-uθ arba warθi 'While the "barber" holds the g. (part of the door) and wipes off the gate.' HAAS-THIEL, ADAT 31 (1978) 125, are certainly correct in rejecting the meaning 'brush' given for *galšama by ROST, M10 11 (1966) 210, but their own translation of *warθ- is impossibly ad hoc.

2) H.G. GÖTTERBOCK (pers.com.) informs me that he now seriously doubts the meaning 'copper' for NĀKDÂN/orΩn-an-.

3) See OETTINGER, Go Kronasser (1982) 162ff, for several previously overlooked examples. However, the new word equation offered here, in addition to that of Hitt. ʰaṛa(n)- = OHG arc etc. 'eagle', argues against his derivation of this class from a PIE 'hysterokinetic' inflectional type. See my additional arguments in Sprache 29 (1989) 3ff. 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 e-stem is created either after the nominative singular (acc.sg. ʰaṛen after ʰaṛaθ, thus new stem ʰaṛna-) or after the rest of the paradigm (nom. sg. akšēθanāθ after akšēθanāθ, akšēθanēθ, etc., thus new stem akšēθana-).

5) Since old *-wov- dissimilates in Hittite to -wov- (MELCHERT, Phon. 22ff with prior refs.), the nom.sg. kwos probably represents /k痣s/ from a non-Lindemann variant *k痣s, not *k痣s (although paradigmatic remodeling of a *kwos to *kwos/=k痣os/ cannot be entirely excluded). In any case, the lack of scriptio plena in the single occurrence of kwos(θ) and kwosθ(na) is not an argument against an interpretation /k痣s/ and /k痣sθ(na)/, particularly since scriptio plena is often omitted when dialecticities are added.

6) Or is the accent here old? See HAMP, IP 85 (1980) 36.

7) After completing this article, I belatedly discovered that A.H. SAYCE, AFO 3, (1926) 64, had already noticed the collocation LINU.GI7, ÚKwosθanna in KUB X 66 and correctly added Grk. θομ. However, SAYCE in 1926 did not understand the syntax or morphology of kwosθanna, and his suggestion that kwosθ in KUB VII 19 Vs 17-18 means 'in the manner of a dog' is certainly false: the adverb could only be *kwosθ(θ)ntiθ. In the absence of the crucial morphological evidence provided by kwosθ and kannaθ, it is hardly surprising that SAYCE's suggestion was ignored and then apparently forgotten.