

A LINGUISTIC HAPPENING IN MEMORY OF BEN SCHWARTZ

STUDIES IN ANATOLIAN, ITALIC,
AND OTHER INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

Edited by

Yoël L. ARBEITMAN

EXTRAIT

WORD-FINAL -r IN HITTITE

H. Craig MELCHERT
University of North Carolina

It has long been recognized that several Hittite words ending in -r appear occasionally in texts without the final -r. There seems to have been more or less universal agreement that the omission of -r reflects a genuine difference in pronunciation. Since most of the forms without -r appear to alternate with others with -r, scholars have generally concluded that Hittite word-final -r was either weakly articulated or occasionally lost in speech: see e.g. Friedrich (1960: 33).

However, Eichner (1973: 75 with n. 78) has proposed a general loss of word-final -r after unaccented vowel in (pre-)Hittite. Word-final -r would be preserved regularly only in nominative-accusative plurals in -ār, such as *uđdār* 'words' and *widār* 'water' (collective), where graphic -a-ar represents a long vowel. The preservation of the long vowel in these forms would be due to a secondary shift of the accent to the final syllable: *widār* instead of **wédār* < **wédōr* (1). One may add here *ḫaršār* 'head' (pl. *ḫaršār*) and *ḫuitār* 'wild animal, beast' (pl. *ḫuitār*).

Eichner is obliged to explain all other cases of preserved final -r as analogical after the plural forms above: thus sing. *wātar* after *widār*, *paḫḫur* 'fire' after *wātar*, and after *paḫḫur* all other nouns in -ur except *pēru-* 'rock', where the failure to restore -r is attributed to 'prophylactic dissimilation'. In the abstracts in -ātar the analogical restoration is inconsistent.



There are some difficulties with Eichner's account, one of which has been pointed out by Neu (1982: 206) in a recent comprehensive treatment of word-final *-r* in Hittite: all cases of alternation between final *-r* and \emptyset are after *-a-*. There are no cases of loss of final *-r* after *-e-*, *-i-* or *-u-* (except *pēru-*, where it never appears, suggesting that its loss here is differently conditioned from that in *-ar/-a-*). By Eichner's explanation, it is hard to see why the analogical influence of *paḫḫur* on other nouns in *-ur* should be so much more consistent than that of *wātar* on nouns in *-ātar* (2).

There is also the more basic problem of the motivation for the massive analogy which Eichner must assume. Obviously, the proposed remodeling of the singulars *wātar* and *ūtтар* after their respective plurals is quite reasonable. Since influence of *paḫḫur* 'fire' on *wātar* 'water' seems assured (gen. sg. *witenaš* after *paḫḫuenaš*; see Schindler 1975: 7), influence in the opposite direction is also possible. That all nouns in *-ātar* are reshaped after *wātar* and all those in *-ur* after *paḫḫur* is much less compelling. Furthermore, Eichner does not even mention nouns in *-ešsar/-ešnaš*, *-āwar/-āunaš*, *-mar/-mnaš*, or verbal nouns in *-war/-waš*. Since there are no direct analogical models, the final *-r* of these classes is presumably after that in *-ātar/-annaš*, the only formal association being that of heteroclysis. We are now at the end of a long analogical chain indeed. A more direct alternative solution for *-ar/-a* seems desirable.

To my knowledge, all previous discussions of the *-ar/-a* alternation have assumed that the two forms are in fact mere alternates, entirely equivalent in sense and function. A reexamination of the attestations in my own files (now happily supplemented by Neu's complete survey) has led me to a quite different result.

I wish first to reiterate Neu's principal conclusion. Through a careful and painstaking review of all relevant examples, he has amply confirmed the earlier impressionistic conclusion that the forms of *r/n*-stems without final *-r* are archaisms. Most attestations are found in assured OH and MH texts (although most often the manuscripts are NH copies). Others appear in texts where influence of older models is indisputable (3), while a few examples are undatable. No such forms occur in assured NH compositions such as

historical texts.

There are three occurrences in OH manuscripts: 3 NINDA - *wagešša* 'three w. loaves' (KBo XVII 30 III 7), 2 *ḫanešša ma[(ruwan)]* 'two h. vessels of m.' (StBoT 25.80 IV 8) (4), and *takku šumeš natta šaktēni kāni LÜŠU.GI-ešša NU.GÁL* 'if you (pl.) do not know (it), (then) there is no old age here' (KBo XXII 1 Vs 5-6) (5). The first two examples are clearly plural in sense, as marked explicitly by the preceding numeral. Since Hittite may construe a plural number with a singular noun (6), the grammatical form of *wagešša* and *ḫanešša* actually is ambiguous, but the possible association of the *-ešša* forms with plural meaning seems worth pursuing. Note further that in the remaining OH example LÜŠU.GI-ešša 'old age' is to be understood as a possession of a plural subject. Thus a collective plural here is also quite in order.

A reexamination of other cases in final *-a* in heteroclytic stems with respect to number confirms the connection between lack of final *-r* and (collective) plural number.

In KUB XVII 10 I 38 we find [*parḫta*wa-ššet-wa *amiyanta* (likewise KUB XXXIII 5 II 13 [*parḫta*wa-ššet-wa *amiyanda*): 'its (the bee's) wings are weak'. In this case *parḫta*wa must be taken unambiguously as a collective plural, as shown by the adjective *amiyanta*. Similarly in KUB XXX 10 I 11 *ḫattata ḫūmanta* 'all your wisdom' can only be a collective plural, based on the form of *ḫūmanta*. Note further that in KUB I 16 II 56 (and III 58) we find collocated *uddār-mit ḫattāda-mitt-a* 'my words and wisdom'. The pairing with *uddār* certainly suggests that *ḫattāda* is likewise plural. In view of these examples, *ḫattata-šumet* [*ḫarakta*] 'Our wisdom has perished' in KUB XXIV 4 Vs 8 should also be taken as a collective plural. The fact that the verb is singular is, of course, no counterargument, since Hittite follows the *tā zoḫa trékhei* rule (see Friedrich 1960: 118). Nor does the spelling *ḫattatar-šumet* in the parallel KUB XXIV 3 II 18 weigh against interpreting *ḫattata* as a plural. As indicated above, the forms without final *-r* are archaisms, while in NH compositions the nom.-acc. plural form of *r/n*-stems is assuredly the same as the singular (7). We would thus not be surprised to find an archaic *ḫattāta* replaced in a NH copy by the

then current *ḡattātār*.

The form *alwanzata* 'sorcery, spell' is, with one fragmentary exception, found only in various manuscripts of the Ritual of Alii (CTH 402). While most examples are ambiguous, *lišḡaḡrnuwanda alwanzata* 'bloody spells' (KUB XXIV 9 I 39) definitely is plural, and there is no reason not to take the others as such. Note that at least one and perhaps two other examples of heteroclitte stems in *-ata* occur conjoined with *alwanzata* and should thus also be interpreted as plurals: KUB XXIV 9 II 10 *kī-ya alwanzata paprata* 'also these spells and 'impurities' and *ibid.* I 41 *alwanzata SIG7.SIG7-ta* 'spells and (cases of) jaundice' (8). The phrase *kī ḡUL-lu alwanzata šumeš tarman ḡarten* 'May you hold these evil spells fastened down' (KUB XXIV 11 II 13) is no evidence for a singular *alwanzata* because: (1) *kī* in a NH copy may be plural as well as singular; (2) Watkins (1982: 250 ff.) has shown that *idālu* is the older form of the nom.-acc. pl. nt.; (3) in the construction with *ḡar(k)-*, the past participle is fixed as nt. nom.-acc. sg. and does not agree with the direct object (Friedrich 1960: 111).

Several other examples of *r/n*-stems in final *-a*, while not assured as plurals by grammatical evidence, occur in contexts strongly favoring a plural interpretation. In KBo VII 28 Vs 48 *kušduwata* 'slandering, insults' follows an entire series of sentences of the form *takku...kušduwāit* 'if so-and-so has slandered...'. The noun thus almost certainly refers to multiple cases of slander. Similarly, in KUB XLI 7+ I 8 *paprešša-ššan SAG.DU-i-šši dāiš* 'He (Kumarbi) put the impurities in his head' follows a series of acts of purification. Again we would expect *paprešša* to refer to the collected impurities resulting from these ablutions. In KBo XVI 78 IV 19, [3] *UZUḡappešša GUD* 'three limbs of a cow' obviously is plural in sense and may easily be plural in form as well (9). The word *luwešsar* occurs in stereotyped contexts, and its precise meaning has yet to be established. We do know that it refers to material obtained from trees or woody plants and burned for incense (see CHD 3/1.73 f.). Note, however, that beside several uncharacterized examples of *luwešša*, we find *GIŠERIN.ḡI.A luwešša* (KBo XXIII 42 I 11), where the determinative *ḡI.A* suggests that again the heteroclitte form without *-r* is plural (10).

In the case of nouns in *-ātar* we are dealing with abstracts, for which in many contexts either a collective plural or generic singular would be suitable. Nevertheless, note that the contexts in the following examples favor a plural interpretation: *UDU.ḡI.A-aš miyāta* 'abundance of sheep' (KUB XXXIII 12 IV 19), *ḡalkiyas GIŠGEŠTIN-aš ŠA GUD UDU DUMU.LULU LU-ya miyāta* 'abundance of grain, wine, cattle, sheep and men' (KUB XXIV 1 III 11-12). Once again the spelling *miyātar* in the parallel KUB XXIV 2 Rs 16 may easily be a substitution by a NH scribe of his own nom.-acc. pl. for the archaic *miyāta* (which, no longer being understood, might appear to him as a defective spelling). The nouns *iyātar* 'mobile wealth' and **tamētar* 'immobile wealth' (see Watkins 1979: 280 ff.) by their very meaning lend themselves to a collective usage, and hence it is not surprising that these very nouns occur especially frequently without *-r* (11). In most contexts, of course, a generic singular would serve as well, but note KBo XII 42 Rs 4, where they occur together in a 'taxonomy of wealth' (see Watkins, loc. cit.) preceding exclusively plurals, and also Bo 2727 I 4 (Neu 1982: 212, n.30) *LIM UDU.ḡI.A iyata* 'a thousand sheep (as) mobile wealth' (12).

We have thus far examined forms in *-a* from fifteen heteroclitte stems. Three of these (*parḡāwa, ḡattata, alwanzata*) must be taken in at least some occurrences as nom.-acc. collective plurals. The remaining dozen occur in contexts which to varying degrees suggest, if not demand, a plural interpretation. Three of these involve numerals higher than one (*wagešša, ḡappešša, and ḡanešša*).

As one would expect, some examples occur in broken or otherwise totally ambiguous contexts: for *ḡattešša* 'pits', *duddurmešša* 'mercy' and *patiyata* '?' I refer the reader to Neu's discussion. The alleged examples *ḡuppa* 'bow' and *šarlamišša* 'exaltation' (?) do not belong here, for reasons cited by Neu (1982: 219 & 210 respectively). The cases of *išḡuzziyašša* 'girdle, waistband' (13) and *šimmanata* 'form, facial features' (?) (14) are both quite dubious. If these two really represent *r/n*-stems without final *-r*, then they support the plural interpretation.

The noun *išḡiešša* has been analyzed as **išḡ(i)lešsar* and interpreted as 'lordship' by Güterbock (1958: 239), but as 'binding;

obligation' by Neu (1982: 208), following Friedrich and others. The latter sense is easier to explain formally. While there are denominative nouns in *-eššar*, they seem to be collective in meaning (e.g. *lala(k)weššar* 'ant-hill, colony' beside *lala(k)weša-ant*). An abstract *išheššar* 'lordship' < *išja-* 'lord' is thus problematic. On the other hand, *išji-eššar* 'binding' < *išji-* 'bind' is straightforward. The verb *išji-* and its other derivative *išjiul-*, also 'binding', are used in Hittite to express the imposition by the king of duties or obligations, both on foreign vassals ('treaties' for us) and on internal officials ('protocols' or 'instructions'). The verb is also used for the imposing of restitution: see KBo VI 2 IV 42 ff. (Laws) and KUB XIV 8 Rs 35 (Plague Prayer). The meaning 'obligation, duty' does not initially seem particularly fitting for *išhešša* in its three occurrences, because the reference is either to a god or to a king. However, we know that the Hittites viewed the authority of the king as deriving from a direct commission by the gods (see especially IBoT I 30, CTH 821). It is likely that their view of divine government was analogous. That the king or even a god would have 'duties' is thus reasonable. If one renders *išhešša* as 'mandate' (whose original sense, of course, is 'order, assignment, commission'), the passages sound more natural to modern ears: KUB XXXI 127 I 19 *daššu iš[h]išša tuk-pat piyan* 'A mighty mandate has been given to you' (the Sun-god); KUB XXX 10 Vs 7 *nu-mu-šša[ln laman-mit]* *išhešša-mitt-a zik-pat DINGIR-YA* < *antuwahjaš anda netta* > (15) 'It was you, my god, who guided my name and mandate among men'; KBo XXI 22 Rs 45 *d[ŠKUR-ni-aš AMA-ŠU [laba]rni-ma-aš išhešša-a-ššit* 'For the Storm-god she is his mother, but for the labarna she is (the source of) his mandate'. For our present problem, *išhešša* is ambiguous. Either a singular or collective plural would be suitable (*daššu* above is not evidence for a singular, as per (2) above regarding *alwanzata*; nor is *piyan*, since the participle as predicate with *eš-* is often singular with a neuter plural subject; see Friedrich 1960: 118).

The example *išpāta* to *išpātar* 'split' (or similar) is also indeterminate as to number: KUB IX 28 I 15 *išpāta* KUBABBAR TUR *išparran harzi* 'He holds (a) small silver spit/spits stretched out'.

It is clear from the parallel passage KUB XXXI 127+ II 21

(spelling *iyawar*) that the form *iyawwa* of KUB XXX 10 Vs 3 and 8 is the verbal noun of *ya-* 'go, proceed'. The precise import of 'going, proceeding' in this context is not yet evident: see CHD 3/2.165 (with references to other translations). I also see no good argument for or against *iyawwa* as a collective plural.

In KUB VII 1 I 25-26 (NH ms. of MH or OH text) we find in adjacent lines *ḫarnamma* and *ḫarnamma* 'leavening (agent), yeast'. The passage is discussed at some length by Neu (1982: 217 f.), who concludes that it is impossible to find a rationale for the occurrence of the form with and without *-r* in such close proximity. However, for the reasons which he cites, I follow him in believing that the alternation is due to the NH copyist, and that the archetype probably had *ḫarnamma* in both instances. Once again we would be facing the (inconsistent) replacement of an older form in *-a* which was no longer understood by one in *-ar*. The context gives no basis for deciding whether the example is singular or plural.

There are three examples of *r/n*-stems in final *-a* which appear to argue against a plural interpretation. In KUB I 16 I 35 in a broken context we find *našma kušdulwatja kuitki našma ḫarnamma* (?) *kuitki* 'or some slander or some [revolt]'. The restoration of *ḫarnamma* is uncertain, but there seems no doubt that *kušduwata* is modified by *kuitki*, which is formally nom.-acc. sg. neuter (16). KBo III 21 II 8 shows *d[É.A-aš-kan ḫawanḫuišni kuit ḫatrēšša anda kitta* 'the message which lies in the wave/flood of Ea'. Here *ḫatrēšša* (i.e. *ḫa-at-ri-i-e-eš-ša*) is modified by *kuit*, again nom.-acc. sg. neuter. Finally, in the hymn to the Sun-god KUB XXXI 135 Vs 11-13 (MH ms.) we have *šuppalam-a ḫannešša iššit kuit(eš)] Ūl memiškan[zi]] apatt-a ḫannattari idālawāšš-a ḫuwappas antuḫša[š ḫa]ḫnešša zik-pat d[UTU-uš ḫannatta* 'Also the case of the animals who do not speak - also that you judge. It is you, the Sun-god, who judge also the case of the evil and wicked man/men'. Note that *ḫannešša* is resumed by *apatt*, nom.-acc. sg. neuter. The same manuscript has *ḫanneššar* in Vs 10, but this in itself is hardly significant in a copy of an older archetype, as we have seen (note the similar cooccurrence of older *ḫannatta* and *ḫannattari* in successive sentences).

All three instances of forms in *-a* with singular modifiers are found in later copies of OH texts. Since the spellings in *-a* are an archaic feature, it is quite possible that they would be used incorrectly in later copies (17). Compare the misuse of the possessive pronouns in *-e/it* with cases other than the nt. nom.-acc. sg./pl.: see Otten (1973: 55) and Melchert (1977: 259 ff.). Direct evidence that the scribe of *KBo III 21* had problems in following the OH archetype is furnished by the aberrant spelling *ja-at-ri/-e-eš-ša*. Since the noun was certainly /hatressar/ from *ḫatrā(i)-* 'write' with no medial yod, the spelling with *-i-* in *KBo III 21* must be erroneous.

I am fully conscious that this argument may be applied in reverse. The three sure examples of *r/n*-stems in *-a* with plural modifiers cited above also all occur in later copies of OH texts. The evidence for the association of heterodite forms in *-a* with plural number is, like that for their being archaisms, largely circumstantial, but I believe that it is strong. Note first of all that the examples in OH manuscripts assure us that the *-a* forms themselves are real, not a creation of NH copyists.

Furthermore, one distributional fact is very hard to explain if *-a* is merely a free variant of *-ar*: there are no examples of *-a* spellings precisely for that set of stems which have plurals in accented *-ār* (*uttar*, *wātar*, *ḫutar*, *ḫaršar*). Since the first two of these are very frequently attested, this absence is particularly suspicious. Neu (1982: 222) in fact attributes the absence of any *-a* spellings in these two words to their very frequency, which he supposes would cause a stronger normalization of the spellings. This argument runs entirely counter to what we know about the relationship of archaism and frequency of use in language. It is well known that irregular forms survive particularly well precisely in words of very frequent use (the verb 'be' is a prime example) (18). This applies to archaic spellings as well, as spelling reformers have discovered ('medieval' has generally been adopted for 'mediaeval', but 'thru' for 'through' or 'tuff' for 'tough' has met with much less success).

The fact remains that the appearance of *-a* beside *-ar* is limited to stems with complex suffixes in *-ar*: *-eššar*, *-ātar*, *-āwar*, *-mar* and verbal nouns in *-war*. Note that all of these suffixes are at least

moderately productive in Hittite, versus simple *-ar* in *uttar*, *wātar*, *ḫutar* and *ḫaršar* (19). A fixed accent on a non-final syllable is likely for all the complex-suffix nouns (20). We may account straightforwardly for both the highly restricted distribution of the forms without final *-r* and their association with the plural in one of two ways.

First, we could add a further restriction to Eichner's original formulation (cf. above): word-final *-r* is lost only after unaccented long vowel. Thus while singular *-ar* remains, unaccented collective plural **-ār* > **-ā*, which then becomes *-a* by the same rule as *-a* < **-ā* < **-eh2* or independently. We need no massive analogy to explain the final *-r* of singulars in *-ar* or *-ur*: the preservation of *-r* here is regular. The loss only after long vowel would not be unnatural. Essentially, at some point Hittite no longer tolerated in an unaccented final syllable the extra mora created by a sequence *-VC#*. In the case of *-r*, this was solved by deletion of the consonant; with other consonants, by shortening the vowel (see note 1).

There is an alternative analysis. We could retain Eichner's original formulation of loss of final *-r* after any unaccented vowel and order this loss before the change of final **-r* to *-ar* and final **-Cwŕ* to *-Cur*. By this account singulars in *-ar* and *-ur* are regular because at the time of the conditioned loss of final consonantal *-r* they still ended in syllabic *-r*. In this case, the loss of final *-r* in the collective plurals would be due not to the preceding long vowel but merely to the position of *-r* in an unaccented syllable. At present I see no way to choose between these two alternatives, there being no sure examples of Hittite reflexes of an original sequence **-ŕr#* (but see below). Note that by either explanation one must assume that *-r* is more susceptible of loss than other consonants in the same environment. In view of its instability in medial position (see Neu 1982: 221, n.78), this is not surprising.

If the *-a* forms represent the OH collective plural of complex stems in *r/n*, as I claim, then we should not find any nom.-acc. pl. in *-ar* in OH manuscripts. So far as I have been able to determine, there are in fact no examples of *-ar* in OH which must be interpreted as plurals. Naturally, the nature of the corpus is such

that there are several ambiguous cases. I must note explicitly that this does include three instances of *-ar* after a numeral: 2 NINDA₁wageššar 10-*i* (KBo XX 3 II 13), 50 NINDA₁wageššar ZIZ-aš (KBo XIII 175 Rs 2) and 1 ME Gišgipeššar A.ŠA (KBo VI 2 I 8). As per note 6, these examples may be grammatical singulars.

We may thus explain the distribution of *-a* vs. *-ar* in nouns by either of two reasonable conditioned sound changes. This explanation at the same time accounts for the consistent final *-r* of nouns in *-ur* (21). There is no need to appeal to massive analogy. The exceptional treatment in *pāru-* 'rock' (never *-ur-l*) calls for a different explanation. Given the attractive equation with Grk. *peírar* and Skt. *párus-* (see Eichner 1973: 75 with refs.), I see no objection to assuming with him a dissimilation (22).

This exhausts the problem of final *-r* in nouns. For pret. act. 3rd pl. in *-ēr* see note 2 above. However, Neu (1982: 222 ff.) alleges two other cases of loss of final *-r* after *-a-*. One of these is the 'quotative' particle *-wa/-war*, which appears as *-war-* before vowels, as *-wā-* before consonants and in final position. Note first of all that again the distribution of final *-r* differs in this case from that in nouns: in the speech particle we never find final *-ar*. This may be explained in one of two ways. First, in assuming that final *-wa* reflects **-war*, Neu accepts the traditional derivation of *-wa/-war* from a form of the verb *wer(iya)-* 'speak, call out' (see e.g. Oettinger 1979: 344, who takes *-war* as 'he said' < aor. **werh-t*). No one, however, has given even a clue as to how a finite accented verb developed in Hittite into an uninflected enclitic particle *-war* (23). If one nevertheless accepts this development (and assumes a prior loss of **h₁* and **t*), the consistent lack of absolute final *-r* may be attributed to the fact that the quotative particle is always unaccented. Note that this account of *-wa#* < **werh t* does assume the second explanation for loss of *-r* given above: final *-r* is lost after short as well as long unaccented vowel before **-f* > *-ar*.

There is an alternative explanation for Hitt. *-wa/-war*. Joseph (1981) and Joseph-Schourop (1982) have presented several typological parallels supporting the earlier suggestion of Przyluski that Hitt. *-wā/-war* is related to the postposition *iwar* 'as, like' and ultimately

Skt. *iwa* 'idem'. Functionally, the two opposing etymologies seem equally plausible – typological parallels being available for each. Formally, however, that relating *-wā/-war* to *iwa* and *iwar* has the advantage of accounting directly for the enclitic position of the particle. It also permits two different explanations for the lack of final *-r* in *-wa#*. First, the vowel of *iwar* was almost certainly short (cf. *iwa*). As already noted, the quotative particle is always unaccented. Thus unaccented **-war#* could have regularly become *-wa#* in the same way as described above for *-wa#* < **werh t*.

However, one may also compare with Joseph the alternation *-wā/-war* to that in *iwa* vs. *iwar*. As he admits, the latter alternation is itself ill-understood, but we may now at least point to another similar alternation within Anatolian: cf. Pal. (and Hitt.) *-kku* 'and' < **k₁wē* with Pal. *-kuar* 'even' < **k₁wē* + *-r* (see Melchert 1984b: 23 f.). There is thus evidence in Anatolian for the same form with and without 'adverbial' *-r*. Therefore there is a good possibility that the alternation *-wā/-war* has nothing to do with phonological loss of final **-r*: the first variant has no *-r* because it never had one (like Skt. *iwa*) (24).

Neu also claims that Hittite medio-passive forms in *-a* reflect **-ar* with loss of final *-r* after *-a-*. Note once again that the distribution here differs from that in the nouns. One never finds final **-ar* in the verb. Neu (1968: 140 ff.) may well be right in relating the medio-passive endings in *-r* to the old perfect third plural ending, but his arguments specifically for 3rd pl. med. *-anta* < **-antar* depend largely on the alleged parallel of alternating *-ar/-a* in heteroclitite nouns. Likewise, his arguments (1968: 31 ff.) against the proposals of Wagner and Meid for a particle *-r(i)* involve only their attempt to account for the distribution of medio-passive forms with and without *-r* in Hittite. He in no way proves that Hittite medio-passive endings in *-a* must continue **-ar*. Since Neu himself has shown that within the history of Hittite endings in *-ari* replace those in *-a*, nothing stands in the way of the assumption of Watkins (1969: 79) and others that the Hittite endings in *-a* reflect directly PIE **-o*. Again, these endings do not show final *-r* because they never had one.

The appearance of endings in *-ar* and *-ari* in Palaic and Luwian

can be accounted for in more than one way. First, given our very rudimentary knowledge of the 'laws of finals' in these languages, a conditioned loss of final *-i* in *-ri* cannot be excluded. Our inability to state the actual conditioning, however, makes this account unattractive. An alternative is implied by Watkins (1969: 78): the actual supplementary marker of the middle is simply *-r* (its original function may be left open here). The final *-i* of *-ri* is merely the familiar 'hic et nunc' particle distinguishing the primary from secondary endings (within Hittite compare present active *-weni*, *-teni* vs. preterite *-wen*, *-ten*). Therefore the remodeling of the middle endings in Anatolian may have taken place in two steps: first, *-a* + *-r*, then *-ar* + *-i*. In Hittite, we find only the starting and end points of the process: original *-a* < **-o* and *-ari* with both the new middle marker and the particle *-i*. In Luwian we find the middle stage *-ar* and the final result *-ari*. Palaic appears to show all three stages (*ḫānta*, *kītar*, *šittumar*, *ḫārī*) (25).

For Luwian there is a third possibility. At present we do not control the relative chronology of CLuvian manuscripts. It is therefore possible, as C. Watkins has pointed out to me, that *-ar* in CLuvian results from a general apocope of *-ari* within the historical period. The apparent random distribution in the texts of the alternates *-ar* and *-ari* would be illusory. Advances in dating CLuvian manuscripts may be able to settle this question. Whatever the correct explanation for *-ar* vs. *-ari* in Luwian and Palaic, there is no positive evidence that Hittite middle endings in *-a* ever had a final *-r*.

To summarize then: a reexamination of spellings in *-a* of Hittite nouns in *-ar* has shown that they are not only archaisms, but also show a marked association with (collective) plural number. Furthermore, all examples are limited to heteroclit nouns formed by productive complex suffixes where the accent is almost certainly on a non-final syllable. We may account for this distribution by assuming that forms in *-a* reflect old plurals in **-ōr* versus those in **-ōr* (> *-ār*) in the small unproductive set of *uttar*, *wātar*, *ḫuitar* and *ḫaršar* (and perhaps the plurale tantum *taḫtumār*). With our present knowledge, the conditioned loss of final *-r* in plurals in **-ōr* may be attributed to its position in an unaccented syllable or specifically to its position after a long vowel in an unaccented syllable. The exceptional

pēru- < **pērwj-* may be taken with Eichner as the result of a dissimilation. The appearance of *wa#* beside *-war-* in the quotative particle could be due to loss of final *-r* after an unaccented short vowel. However, it is also possible that *-wa* continues an old form without *-r*. The loss of **-r* in medio-passive *-a* beside *-ari* is quite unproven. The much discussed alternation or free variation of final *-ar* and *-a* disappears.

NOTES

(1) Support for Eichner's interpretation of *-ār* as accented */-ār/* is provided by the fact that Hittite appears to have shortened original long vowels in unaccented closed final syllables: *tēkan* 'earth' = /degan/ < **dheḫhōm*, probably also gen. pl. *-an* < **-ōm*. The spelling *pa-da-a-an* 'of/for the feet' in an OH ms. KBo XX 8 Vs 19 may continue directly the gen. pl. of the root noun with accented **-ōm*: cf. Skt. *padām*. In the case of the gen. pl., of course, it has been argued that the ending was **-ōm*, in which case *-an* would be regular, while the plene spelling in *padār* would mark the accent.

As C. Watkins has reminded me, the contrast between *tēkan* < **dheḫhōm* and *widār* < **wedōr* supports the shift of accent in the latter, but raises the question of the conditioning for the shift. The preserved long diphthong in the corresponding collective types *ḫaštai* 'bone(s)' < **h₂ést(h₂)ōi*, *luttāi* 'window' < **léu(h₂)ūtōi* 'open space', and *ḫarganau* 'palm' < **h₃rēgnōu* 'surface' (see Weitenberg 1984: 223) suggests that they also may reflect a secondarily accented **-ōi/-ōu* in Hittite. So also the animate stems in *-āiš* and *-āuš*. Gertz (1982: 294 ff.) tries to solve the problem for *widār* by assuming an original **udōr*. However, she then has no explanation for the *i* of *widār*, which may easily reflect **é*, despite her claim to the contrary (see Melchert 1984a: 107 & 112). The root *e*-grade in the 'amphikinetic' type seems assured. A shift of the accent to the final syllable in the nom.-acc. after the oblique cases seems possible (**-ōr* after gen. **-n-és* etc.), but this fails to explain why *tēkan* does not appear as **tigān* (/digān/) after *taknās* (/dagnās/). Compare perhaps in Greek *peithō* (< **-ōi*) vs. *hērōs*

- (< *-ōus).
- (2) Neu implies that the consistent *-r* in forms in *-er* and *-ir* also poses problems for Eichner's analysis. However, the nouns *kīr* 'heart' and *pīr* 'house' (probably to be read as /kēr/ and /pēr/) are monosyllables where the preceding vowel is accented. The noun *ḥašdwār* 'twigs, branches' appears to be a hysterokinetic noun in **-wēr*, again with an accented vowel before the *-r*. Furthermore, in all these cases the *-r* runs throughout the paradigm, so that restoration of final *-r* in the nom.-acc. after the oblique cases would be expected. As for the pret. 3rd pl. active ending *-ēr*, I follow Oettinger (1979: 114) and others in comparing *-ēr* to Latin *-ēre*: see my discussion in Melchert (1984a: 117 f.). In this case, then, we are not dealing with original *-r* at all.
- (3) E.g., the prayer of Mursili II to Telipinu (KUB XXIV 1 and parallels) and the various omen texts (see Neu 1982: 213-215).
- (4) As per Neu, the *r/n*-stem is assured by the NH parallel KBo XI 41 I 10-11, which shows [2 *ḥanJeššar marruwan* and *ḥanJeššar*].
- (5) For the interpretation as LÜŠU.GI-eššar see Otten (1973: 27) and Archi (1979: 45), who takes the apodosis as a threat: 'There will be no old age here (for you)'.
- (6) See e.g. 9 NINDAḥaššar 30[-iš] (KBo XX 7+ Rs 7; OH ms.). Naturally one also finds grammatical plurals: 3 NINDAḥaršaršar (KBo XVII 1 IV 23; OH ms.).
- (7) See e.g. ḥatt. IV 52 f. *uppeššar*||A-*ma-mu kue uppiškanzi* 'the presents which they used to send me (NB nom.-acc. pl. *kue* and the iterative) or KBo XII 38 II 13-14 (Tuthaliya IV) *nu-kan QATAMMA ašanta LÜ-natar*||A *a[nda]n guššun* 'I accordingly inscribed true manly deeds'.
- (8) Neu (1982: 217) follows Friedrich (1957: 28) in interpreting SIG7.SIG7-ta as an abstract 'jaundice' in asyndeton with *alwanzata*. It seems to me also possible to take SIG7.SIG7-ta as the adjective *ḥaḥlawant-*. In that case, **ḥaḥlawanta* 'yellow spells, jaundice-spells' would parallel *išḥarnuwanda alwanzata* rather than *alwanzata paprata*. Adjectives in *-want-* may follow their noun: see CHD 3/1.62 on *lā/want-*.
- (9) For reading the incomplete initial sign as the numeral 'three' see the immediate context, which is a list of items, many of which

are specified in quantity.

- (10) One of the meanings suggested in the CHD article is 'shavings' (of wood, preeminently cedar), which would be suitable for use as incense. This points to a possible etymology of *luwessar*, which would be the abstract *'cutting' to the verbal root **leuḥ_x-* 'cut (off)' (Skt. *luṇāti* 'cuts off' etc.). While this proposal is too uncertain to count as an argument for a collective interpretation of *luwešša*, it is consonant with it.
- (11) In fact, thus far one finds only *tameta* without *-r*. The final *-r* is assured by the derivatives *tam(m)etarwant-* and *dammetarwatar*.
- (12) The occurrence in the lexical text KBo I 45 Rs! 15, where *damiēda* imprecisely translates the Akkadian adjective *duššū* 'abundant' tells us nothing about the number of *tameta*.
- (13) The form *išḥuzziyašša* occurs in the Laws, KBo VI 26+ II 19 f.: *išḥuzziyašša UL kulški ēpzi*. This is translated by Friedrich (1959: 79) as 'auch wird an den Gürtel niemand greifen', interpreting *išḥuzziyašša* as *išḥuzziyaš* (gen. sg.) + *-a* 'also, even'. Neu (1982: 208 f.) rejects this on the grounds that *ēp-* 'seize' can take only an accusative object. However, the entire point of the prohibition here is that no one is even (*-a*) to touch the belt of the children of a woman who has become a slave by marrying a herdsman. The sense 'touch' is precisely where one would expect a partitive genitive: cf. Homeric *lambánō* plus genitive and see Delbrück (1893: 320 & 328). There is at least one other previously unrecognized example of a partitive genitive with a verb in Hittite: KUB XVII 5 I 11 *n-ašta DUḡ-paḥḥan ḥūmandan ekLuerJ* 'They (Iluyanka and his sons) drank (some) of/from all the basins'. The form *paḥḥan* here is not an aberrant *a*-stem anim. acc. sg., but the regular OH gen. pl. of the *i*-stem *paḥḥi-*. Note further the unique use of *-ašta* with *eku-* 'drink', reinforcing the partitive meaning. I therefore find the interpretation of *išḥuzziyašša* as a partitive genitive quite plausible. In any case, I take *išḥuzziyašša* 'belts, waistbands' as referring to the children (DUMU.MEŠ is the last noun preceding *išḥuzziyašša*), so that a plural is indicated by either formal interpretation. The other example of *išḥuzziyašša* is in a list of objects in a broken context, where again either a collective plural of a noun in *-aššar* or a genitive plus *-a* 'and' is possible (the genitive could modify a missing following noun).

- (14) Neu (1982: 216) interprets *šimmanata* (= Akk. *bunānū*) in the lexical text KBo I 44 + XIII 1 IV 32 as a form of *šamanatar* 'foundation'. While I do not doubt an etymological connection, both the difference in vocalism and the apparent difference in meaning make it quite uncertain that we are dealing with two forms of the same word (Akk. *bunānū* is a plurale tantum meaning 'form, facial features'; see von Soden (1965: 138). Hittite does have nouns in *-ata*: *kušata-* 'bride-price' (gen. sg./pl. *kušataš*) and NINDAWAGATA- 'piece of bread' (both *a*-stems, pace Eichner (1973: 98) and Neu (1970: 56) respectively). Thus *šimmanata* could be an *a*-stem, separate from but related to *šamanatar*, meaning 'form, shape', as the Akkadian suggests. Note that in either case the Akkadian equivalent (plurale tantum) supports a collective plural in Hittite.
- (15) See the parallel passage KUB XXXI 127+ ll 17-18 for the restoration. The text in Kantuzilli looks like a complete nominal sentence, but this is already contradicted by the *-ššan*. Oettinger (1979: 405) does not list *netta* as pret. 2nd sg. of *nāi-* 'turn, guide', but it is in fact the expected regular result of **nōiḥ-ḥze* (cf. 1st sg. *neḥḥun* < **nōiḥ-ḥze+*). The *āi* vocalism of the later *nāitta* is analogical after the pres. 3rd sg. *nāi*: see my discussion in Melchert (1984a: 65 ff.). The archaic *netta* would be yet another sign of the OH origin of this composition (see also Neu 1982: 219).
- (16) The other occurrences in this text, KUB I 16 l 51 and 55 *kušduwāta lē* (*lē*) *ḥandān-pat ešdu*, are not evidence for a singular, since, as noted above, the participle as a predicative with *eš-* is usually singular, even with a neuter plural subject. The reason for this is not entirely clear: perhaps it is merely attraction of the predicative adjective to the singular verb.
- (17) This applies even to MH copies of OH texts. E.g., KBo VI 3, a MH ms. of the Laws, Table I, already shows certain unreal forms versus the OH manuscript KBo VI 2. See Melchert 1984a: 106, n. 63.
- (18) This may be because irregular forms are learned individually by each new generation by imitation, rather than by general rule. If this is true, then irregularities which are heard frequently would have a much better chance of survival than those of rarer use, which would tend to be eliminated by rule generalization.

- (19) In *uttar* and *ḫuitar*, an analysis with suffix *-tar* is possible, but simple *-tar* is also unproductive in Hittite. There is one other apparent plural in *-ār*: *taḫ(at)umār* (a material used for incense). See on this word Neu (1970: 69-70) and Gertz (1982: 29 & 160). For the reasons given by Neu, the word is probably plurale tantum. Despite its superficial resemblance to *ḫalfaltumar* 'corner', *taḫ(at)umār* with its cluster *-ḫt-* has little chance of being an inherited abstract in *-mar*, and there is thus no reason to expect it to behave like that class. The plural in *-ār* may be modeled simply on the others in *-ār*. That such analogical spread of *-ār* took place is shown by the form DUG₂[U]ppāri ḫl.A 'dishes' (Gertz 1982: 157), although *ḫuppar-* is usually an animate *r*-stem!
- (20) For the suffix *-eššar* as originating in derivatives of adjectives in **-és-* see Melchert 1984a: 90; for *-ātar* as an extension of stems in **-eh₂* (cf. Luv. *-aḫ-it-*) see among others Eichner 1973: 80; in verbal nouns in *-war* (with generalization of the postvocalic reflex of **w₂*; see Schindler 1975: 8) the accent surely follows that of the verb stem: as for nouns in *-mar*, there are several reasons to suppose that the nom.-acc. inflection in *-r* in these nouns is non-original and modeled after that of the verbal nouns in *-war* (see my discussion Melchert 1983: 20 ff.). In Melchert 1984a: 63, following a suggestion of J. Schindler, I compared Hittite nouns in *-āwar* with Lat. *cadāver* 'corpse', assuming a preform **-ā-wer*. In so doing, I overlooked the fact that tautosyllabic Lat. *-wer* may reflect *-wor* < **w₂*: cf. *uersus* < *uorsus* < **w₂t-tos*. Thus *-āwar* could also continue **-ā-w₂*. Since both *-ātar* and *-āwar* are extensions of stems in **-eh₂*, a fixed non-final accent is likely for both types.
- (21) We would expect the original collective plural of nouns in *-ur* (< **-Cw₂*) to have been **-wār*. A trace of this may be attested in the hapax *paḫḫumar* in KUB VII 60 ll 11 (NH ms. of an undatable text). The form *paḫḫumar* could represent */pahhuwār/* with secondary accent on the final syllable after *paḫḫuenaš* (cf. *widār* above). The lack of scriptio plena in this one example is not an argument against a reading */-wār/*: cf. nom.-acc. pl. *ḫar-šar-ar(-ra)* in KBo XVII 4 l 18 (OH ms.) vs. the duplicate *ḫar-šar-ar(-ra)*. On the other hand, nothing in the context argues decisively for a plural, and in view of the widespread

syncope of *-(u)wa-* to *-u-*, a false resolution of *-u-* to *-uwa-* in a NH copy is hard to exclude. The authenticity of *paḫḫuwar* is thus debatable.

(22) The noun *kurur* 'enmity' is not a counterargument. Whatever the prehistory of this noun, it is attested as a pure *r-*stem, and the final *-r* of the nom.-acc. may easily have been maintained/restored after the oblique cases. In the latter, the different syllabification would have led to much less pressure for dissimilation: /ku-rur/ after /ku-ru-ras/, /ku-ru-ri/ etc.

(23) An appeal to Lat. *inquit* or similar parallels does not go beyond the typological argument that such a development is possible. Independent evidence for occurrence of the verb in enclitic position in Hittite is still lacking.

(24) The existence of enclitic *-kuar* in Palaic and the coexistence in CLuvian of enclitic *-tar* (locative particle) with consistent *-r* and quotative *-wa* always without *-r* complicates but does not settle the issue of morphological alternation or phonological loss in Hitt. *-wa/-war-*. One could assume a Common Anatolian loss of **-r* in final **-war**, with generalization of the variant *-wa* in Luvian. The addition of 'adverbial' *-r* in *-kuar* and *-tar* would have been after this loss. However, one could also suppose the existence of forms with and without *-r* in all three cases, with a different distribution of the variants.

(25) However, the striking parallelism between Pal. 3rd sg. *ḫāri*, 3rd pl. *ḫanta* and consistent Hitt. *āri*, *ānta* suggests that the exclusive appearance of the full form in the 3rd sg. of this verb is motivated by the desire to avoid a monosyllabic **ḫā* or **ḫār*. Therefore Pal. *ḫāri* may not be an accurate reflection of the overall distribution in Palaic. That is, instead of the apparent free variation of *-a*, *-ar* and *-ari*, Palaic in general may have had only *-a* and *-ar*. For Pal. 2nd pl. mld. *šītūwar* (cf. CLuv. *dādūwar*) see Melchert 1984b: 25 ff.

REFERENCES

Archi, Alfonso. 1979. "L'humanité des hittites", in *Florilegium Anatolicum* (Mélanges E. Laroche), Paris. 37-48.

CHD = Güterbock, H. and H. Hoffner. 1980 ff. *The Chicago Hittite Dictionary*. Chicago.

CTH = Laroche, Emmanuel. 1971. *Catalogue des textes hittites*. Paris. Delbrück, Berthold. 1893. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg.

Eichner, Heiner. 1973. "Die Etymologie von *heth. meḫur*". *MSS* 31.53-107.

Friedrich, Johannes. 1957. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. 1. Ergänzungsheft*. Heidelberg.

1959. *Die hethitischen Gesetze*. Leiden.

1960. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* I. 2te Auflage. Heidelberg.

Gertz, Janet. 1982. *The Nominative-Accusative Neuter Plural in Anatolian*. Yale dissertation. Ann Arbor.

Güterbock, H.G. 1958. "The Composition of Hittite Prayers to the Sun". *JAOs* 78.237-245.

Joseph, Brian. 1981. "Hittite *īwar*, *wa(r)* and *Skt. iva*". *ZVS* 95.93-98.

Joseph, Brian and Lawrence Schourup. 1982. "More on *(i)-wa(r)*". *ZVS* 96.56-58.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1977. *Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite*. Harvard dissertation. Unpublished.

1983. "A 'New' PIE *men Suffix". *Sprache* 29.1-26.

1984a. *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Göttingen.

1984b. "Notes on Palaic". *ZVS* 97.22-43.

Neu, Erich. 1968. *Das hethitische Mediapassiv und seine indogermanische Grundlagen* (= *StBoT* 6). Wiesbaden.

1970. *Ein althethitisches Wetterritual* (= *StBoT* 12). Wiesbaden.

1982. "Hethitisch /r/ im Wortauslaut", in *Serta Indogermanica* (Festschrift G. Neumann). Innsbruck. 205-225.

Oettinger, Norbert. 1979. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg.

Otten, Heinrich. 1973. *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa* (= *StBoT* 17). Wiesbaden.

Schindler, Jochem. 1975. "L'apophonie des thèmes indo-européens en -R/N". *BSL* 70.3-10.

von Soden, Wolfram. 1965. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* I. Wiesbaden.

StBoT = *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten*. Wiesbaden.

Watkins, Calvert. 1969. *Geschichte der indogermanischen Verbalflexion* (*Indogermanische Grammatik*, III/1). Heidelberg.

1979. "NAM.RA GUD UDU in Hittite: Indo-European poetic language and the folk taxonomy of wealth", in *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* (edd. E. Neu & W. Meid). Innsbruck. 269-287.
1982. "Notes on the Plural Formations of the Hittite Neuters", in *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae (Gedenkschrift H. Kronasser)*. Wiesbaden. 250-262.
- Weitenberg, J.J.S. 1984. *Die hethitischen u-Stämme*. Amsterdam.

Adresse de l'auteur :

Curriculum in Linguistics
The University of North Carolina
318 Dey Hall 014A
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
U.S.A.