Historische Sprachforschung
(Historical Linguistics)

bisher
Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung

Begründet von Adalbert Kuhn

In Verbindung mit Claus Haebler
herausgegeben von
Alfred Bammesberger und Günter Neumann

2. Heft

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen und Zürich

ISSN 0935-3518
Luvian Lexical Notes*)

The revised readings of several key HLuvian signs presented by Hawkins, Morpurgo-Davies, and Neumann, *HHL* (1974), have revolutionized our understanding of the language, and now a complete up-to-date edition of the first-millennium HLuvian texts by Hawkins is about to appear.¹) F. Starke has recently given us a splendid new edition of the CLuvian corpus.²) Despite the limitations imposed by the relatively small corpora, these languages can now contribute significantly to our understanding of the development of the Indo-European languages in Anatolia. The following remarks are meant as one contribution to the on-going process of elucidating the rich material these languages offer us.

1. CLuv. *am(ma)ša/-*

The only occurrence of this stem in a CLuv. context, pret. 3rd sg. *am-ma-ša-[t]-a* in *KBo* XXIX 34, 3 (*StBoT* 30.377), is too fragmentary to be of any use. Likewise the pres. 3rd sg. *am-ma-ši-ti* in a Hittite context in *KBo* IV 6 Rs 2. Fortunately, the remaining example tells us all we need to know:

(1) *KUB* XII 26 II 5 ff.:

*nu-wa-kan* šappin ʾĀŠ.SAL.得天独 *kiššir nu-wa-an piššir nu-war-an-kan* arrir *nu-war-an *am-ma-ša-an-da*

‘They combed the sacralized ewe; they rubbed her; they washed her, and they _ed her.’


In view of the canonical sequence arra- ‘wash’, anūš- ‘wipe (dry)’ of Hittite rituals, the sense of CLuv. am(ma)şiš(ali)- can hardly be anything but ‘wipe’, and the equation Hitt. anūš- = CLuv. ammūš- imposes itself.

We can now finally solve the mystery of why only anūš- in all of Hittite shows -niš-, while elsewhere *ns- assimilates to -iš-: while Luvian preserves the relatively rare sequence *-ms- as such, in Hittite it is assimilated to -niš-, but only after the change of original *ns- to -iš-. Hitt. aniš-/anašš- (for /anass-/) shows the usual gamination of *s next to a sonant (cf. gull-/gulašši-, karš-/karašš- etc.). CLuv. am(ma)aštšal- (for /amasssal-) shows the same gamination of *s next to a sonant as well as the gamination of *m before another consonant: cf. for the latter CLuv. im(ma)nasiš- cognate with Hitt. gim-(ma)ra- ‘open field’.

Actually, anūš- ‘wipe’ probably is not the only example of Hittite -niš- from *-ms-. The sure example given above strongly supports Puvel’s derivation, Hittite Etymological Dictionary (1984) 63, of Hitt. anašša- (part of the back) from PIE *omso- ‘shoulder’. Puvel assumes an anaptyctic vowel, but the evidence of aniš-/anašš- suggests rather a reading /anassala/-, with the phonological developments sketched above. Since the word appears but once, the lack of an alternate spelling an-iša- is insignificant.

The realization that PIE *ms is preserved in Luvian but becomes nš(i) in Hittite has important consequences for our understanding of the source of Hitt. hašš- ‘beget; give birth’ and its large set of derivatives. Although no one has refuted my arguments, RHA 31 (1973) 57 ff., for Hitt. hašša- as ‘child, son, offspring’, the meaning

---

3) The most plausible comparanda for an Anat. *am-s- ‘wipe’ appear to be the group of Grk. ὕμεν ‘reap’ and the Germanic words for ‘mow’ (OHG mēn etc.), but the connection faces both semantic and formualtional uncertainties. One would have to assume that the original meaning was ‘wipe, pass the hand over’ whence ‘pluck, harvest’: cf. Hitt. warš- ‘pluck, harvest’ beside Lat. venerō ‘drag (across a surface), sweep’ < *werner-. The fact that ‘mow, reap’ comes to mean ‘cut’ would have to be a secondary result of changes in the mode of harvesting. The Germanic forms point to *meh₃, and the equation with Grk. ὕμεν requires that the second a of the latter be secondary: for a possible explanation see Peters, Unters. z. Vertretung d. idg. Laryngele im Gr. (1980) 90-91. The loss of *h₂ between consonants in an enlarged stem *am₃-s- would be expected, but it is questionable whether this would have happened soon enough to prevent gamination of the *m to the following velar or glottal sound represented by *h₃. The assumption of an alternation *am₃-s-: *m-eh₃- in a root with inherent *a also does not seem to me trivial. The assumption of PIE *a- instead of *h₂e- is of course required by Anatolian initial a- instead of ha-.

4) Also impossible is my account of hašš-, hašša- and haššu- ‘king’ Sprache 29 (1983) 7. These forms can only continue *h₂elons-, not *h₂elons-. If my suggested derivation of hašš-, etc. in footnote 5 below is correct, then Hitt. haššu- ‘king’, Av. āha ‘lord’ and Gmc. *ansu- < *h₂onsu- are probably unrelated to the group of *hašš-. For a possible alternate source of *h₂onsu- see Polomé, Études Germ. 8 (1953) 36 ff.

5) The isolated gen. sg. ha-am-ma-la- of KBo X 10 IV 9 is merely a Hittitized form of the Luvian word: cf. Hittite gen.sg. ikkunattas and šarrattas in KUB XXXV 18 I 10-11 from clearly Luvian stems.

I can suggest no PIE etymon for Anatolian *hamsu- ‘grandchild’, but this is hardly surprising for this kind of vocabulary item. A possible explanation for hašš- ‘beget; give birth’ is provided by the relationship between Lith. sėnti ‘draw liquid’ and OIr. do-essin ‘pour out’ and do-Ìisim ‘beget; give birth’. I suggest that hašš- may represent *h₂elons-∗, an extension of *h₂ensible ‘draw water’ seen in Hitt. han- ‘idem’ and perhaps in Grk. ἀνέρ ‘bilge-water’ (Benveniste, BSL 50 (1954) 39).

6) My derivation of hanzaša-, RHA 31.64, faces both semantic and phonological difficulties, while that of Laroche, ibid. 65 note, and that of Oettinger, KZ 94 (1980) 45, are phonologically impossible.
for -nz- instead of expected *-nā-, I have argued, *Sprache* 29/1.7f. (following a suggestion of J. Schindler), that Hitt. -nz- continues secondary clusters of -ns-, notably from *-ns- (e.g. anizāš 'us' < *-ns-). I already suggested there that Hitt. ąnžana- 'black' may reflect *h₂ns-(o)nō-: cf. Germ. Amsel 'blackbird', Skt. ásita- 'black' and Grk. ἄσις 'mud' (the root etymology is due to Čop, *Linguistica* 10 (1970) 95 f.). Since Hittite eventually assimilates *-Vms- to -Vns-, it does not seem unreasonable that *-ms- might lead to -anz- like *-ns-. On the other hand, in Luwian, which preserves *-Vms- as such (with gemination), we might expect that *-ms- also produce -ams-. I therefore tentatively propose that Luw. hamsa- and Hitt. ąnžana(ša)- continue *h₂ms-o-.

The preservation of -ms- in Luwian is apparently attested in one other place: KBo XIII 260 II 1 ff. and III 12 (StBoT' 30.260 ff.). Here we find ḫattaram-šan etc. and pariyaš-ša (vs. pariyan two lines later). It is clear from the following context that ḫattaram- etc. are acc. sg. animate, which leaves little alternative but to consider -šan an enclitic possessive adjective 'his' matching Hitt. -śin. The -ša of pariyaš-ša must be the -šal-za particle appended regularly to nom.-acc. sg. neutrals in Luwian. In both Luwian and Hittite -m in absolute final position appears as -n, and the rule is presumably Common Anatolian. The nt. nom.-acc. singular of a-stems thus ends in -an, and by regular rule the postposed particle -ša in Luwian becomes -za after -n (also usually after -l and -r: parišul-za 'crumb', zăr-za 'heart'). However, in KBo XIII 260 we have the original final -m preserved by the presence of the following enclitics beginning with š, both in pariyaš-ša and in the archaic construction with the possessive adjective in *-an-šan. The contrast between archaic pariyaš-ša and usual *-an-za is comparable to the difference in Hittite between archaic nāš-šan for nu-šan-šan with assimilation and later n-an-šan where -an is maintained before š on the basis of n-an# and other combinations.

7) When I propose a change *ms* to Luw. ąms, I mean in the first instance in root syllables. I do not exclude a different development of syllabic *p* in final syllables or absolute final position.


9) I cannot agree with the suggestion of H. Eichner (personal communication) that Luwian and Palaic have dissimilated *-ns- to -ms- (see also Oettinger, *Stammbildungen* 439). We know that the nominal endings originally ended in *-m*. We know further that Luwian preserves original *ms*, as shown by amsšš- 'wipe'. We must assume original *m* in this word because original *ms* would have led to Hittite *śš* as elsewhere. Nor can one escape this conclusion by appealing to a laryngeal between the *m* and the *s*: if the loss were early, *ms* should still become śš, if it were late, a secondary sequence *ns* created by laryngeal loss should lead to Hittite nz. Since Hittite nīš in anīš cannot continue *ns*, it seems only reasonable to suppose that it reflects the *ms* shown by Cluv. amsššš, with a trivial assimilation. Under these circumstances it is entirely gratuitous to assume that final nominal -n was first generalized in Luwian to all positions, and then dissimilated back to -m before s. I see no reason not to take the -m forms of KBo XIII 260 as archaism preserved before s. The very presence of the enclitic possessive adjective in -ša- (only here in all of Luwian!) argues that the text (though not the manuscript) is old.

10) This parallel, overlooked by Starke, suggests that we should read ...šš- niż-ša- ki-išš-ša- ru-šš-šš: [a]rha d]wārzi[išš]-šš-[a] šš-šš 'begins to break the hands of dough' in KUB XXXV 45 III 13-14 (cf. Starke, StBoT' 30.154).

2. CLuv. malhu/-malwa- and mammalhu/-mammalwa-

The identification of these two verb stems has only become possible with the new evidence presented by Starke, StBoT' 30. It is the forms of the reduplicated stem which permit us to determine the meaning:

(2) KBo XXII 254 Vs 4 ff. (StBoT' 30.195):

[nam]ma šamšu.GI iš[n]aš šú-an EME-ya arha [duw]arnizzi uddār-ma-kan anda ki[ššan mema]-i mammalwvai [a]ddωwalin Š(U-in addωw) alin EME-e[n] ...

The "old Woman" breaks the hand and tongue of dough and inserts the words as follows: "He shall break the evil hand, the evil tongue ...".

The subject of the Luwian sentence is the "lord of ritual", as confirmed by the parallel:

(3) KUB XXXV 45 III 17 (StBoT' 30.154):

[mam]malwai-an EN SISKUR.SISKUR-iš addωwalin EME-in ...

The "lord of the sacrifice" shall break it, the evil tongue ...:

The meaning 'break' suggested by the parallel with Hitt. arha duwar-nižzi is confirmed by another example of the reduplicated stem:

(4) KBo XXIX 16 II 3 ff. (StBoT' 30.196):

... [wa]natiyatiya šarrī mammalḫunni (repeated) ... [nam]ma NINDA.KURš, RA pariya šš "We shall break [ ...] for the wanatiyati..." one breaks a loaf of leavened bread."
Here CLuv. mammalhunni equates to Hitt. pari(inya)- ‘break’ (used primarily of bread). The examples of the simple verb give no further evidence for the meaning, but they surely belong to the same base: ptc. malwannissi (KUB XXXV 70 II 21 = KBo XXIX 63 II 4) and pret. 3rd sg. ma-a-la-ḫu-u-ta, i.e. mālahuña (KUB XXXV 107 III 2).

The basic stem is malhu-, reduplicated mammalhu-. Before endings beginning with an unlike vowel, the -u- regularly becomes -w-: malhu-i, malhu-amnissi → *malhuwa, *malhwamnissi. By a rule observed elsewhere in CLuvian, the -h- tends to be deleted between a sonant and following w: cf. mammalhuwa/-mammawanni, erawwa/-erwa, šeḫwa/-šewwa, šeḫuwaš/-šewaš, etc. Thus we find attested mammalwa, malwanni beside mālahuña and mammalhunni.

There can be little doubt as to the source of a CLuvian stem malhu- meaning ‘break’. We are facing a u-extension of the root *melh₃- ‘crush; grind’. Traces of the verbal stem in -u- (all pointing to ‘crush, break’, not ‘grind’!) are found elsewhere, suggesting that it is probably old: Goth. gamalwjian ‘crush’ may be directly equated to Toch AB malyw-/mely- ‘crush’ (Class II present) as an iterative *melh₂-weyelo-. Compare also Av. mruța- ‘weak’ continuing an old verbal adjective ‘crushed, worn down’. The existence of a stem *melh₂-u- ‘crush, break’ beside *melh₃-, whose meaning was specialized to ‘grind’ (grain) at an early date (Hitt. mall-, Lat. molere, etc.) is of considerable interest for the problem of ‘u-presents’ in PIE. Unfortunately, since we do not have attested the pres. 3rd singular of the simple verb, we cannot determine whether *melh₃-u- should be compared with the type of Hitt. tarḫuzzi/taruḫzi ‘is able, strong’ or with that of Hitt. läḫwi ‘pours’ (see also the next section). ¹¹)

¹¹) The existence of CLuvian malhu- with preserved -h- virtually assures that the laryngeal in *melh₃- is *h₂. °h₁ is entirely ruled out, since this phoneme never appears in Anatolian as h: see Eichner, MSS 31 (1973) 54 f. The second e of Myc. me-re-ti-ri-ja /meletrija/ ‘corn-grinders’ and me-re-u-ro /meleurom/ ‘meal, flour’ (Ventris & Chadwick, Doc. 158.560) must be explained by some means other than °h₁. There are to my knowledge also no solid examples of -h- < °h₁ either between consonants or between consonant and vowel. The preserved sequence malhu- < *melhuwa would seem to present a problem for the Common Luvo-Hittite root *Vṛk₃, V > VRRV (see Oettinger, Stammbildung 548 f., revised by Melchert, Phon. 44). However, whether it was a mi- or hi-verb, *melh₃-u- would have had some forms with an allomorph [malhuw-V-], where the -h- would have been regularly preserved in Common Luvo-Hittite. This could have led to its maintenance in malhu-. The loss of -h- before w in malwanni- and mammalwa is of a much later specifically Luvian change. The preserving...
mine whether the pret. 3rd plural *lu-ú-un-ta of *KUB XXXV 124 II 2 & 5 is a contracted form of the same stem,¹³ but a stem *lūwa- 'pour' seems reasonably sure.

The CLuv. stem *lūwa- versus Hitt. *lāhu- can be accounted for as follows. The existence of spellings of the weak stem in Hittite with scriptio plena of the ending (*lahawānzi, lahwawāndu, ptc. lahwawān) suggests that this verb originally had quantitative ablaut like hi-verbs in final -i- (see Jasanoff, Heth. u. Idg. 88). By the strict rules of syllabification in PIE, we would expect the plural to be realized as *[hventi], but this would have led to Anat. lāhuvi, *alhwanti, a very strange allomorphy. It seems reasonable to me to suppose that the initial l of the weak stem remained non-syllabic under the pressure of the singular. This would have left a sequence *lhw-, which led with loss of h between sonant and w (see above) to attested CLuv. -(u)w-. Although only the plural is attested, it is likely that *lūwa- was generalized: cf. CLuv./HLuv. tuwa- 'place'. We may assume that in Hittite it was the singular stem which was generalized instead: hence constant lāhu-. The set of Hitt. lāhu-lilhu(wa)- and CLuv. *lūwa-*lilwuwa- thus points to a Common Anatolian *lēh₂w-, *lh₂w- 'pour' beside an iterative *lī-lh₂w.-¹⁴

4. CLuv. mimma-

In Phon. 169 I argued that the form mi-im-ma-me-iš-ša (KUB VI 45 III 74; dupl. me-em-ma-mi-šiš-la[ć]) must be read as /mimmamis/, anim. nom. sg. of a Luvian participle in -ammi-. I was unable to

¹³) The first plural *lu-ú-un-ni of VBoT 60 I 12 can hardly belong to this stem, since it takes an infinitive karīna 'to cut'. The assignment of *lu-ni, KUB XXXV 128 III 9, is impossible to determine.

¹⁴) The strong stem lāhu- may be preserved in Luvian in an extended form. Meriggi, WZKM 53.204, suggests a meaning 'pour' for lahuni-lamnai, attested at *KUB XXXV 54 III 32 & 34. While 'pour' is impossible, a sense 'wash' would be appropriate (applied to both the object washed clean and to the impurity removed, which is also possible in English). An original stem *lahwānā(i)- would have had a doublet *lahwānā(i)- by the -i- deletion rule cited above. Syncope of the following -a- (which has Hittite parallels; see Phon. 52.f.) would lead respectively to the attested lahum(a)- and laumai. The suffix -nā(i)- (with single -n- and mi-inflation!) has nothing to do with the "durative" suffix -anni/a- of Hittite and Luvian (with geminate -nn- and hi-inflation). It is surely in origin a denominative suffix to stems in -n(a)-, but in both Hittite and Palaeo-Luvian it appears to have become productive as a deverbal suffix: see my discussion, KZ 97.37f. It would not be surprising to find the type in Luvian as well.

give any other evidence for a Luvian stem mimma- or to establish the precise meaning. The existence of such a verb in CLuvian is now confirmed by mi-im-ma-an-du (HT 78,7; StBoT 30.338). Although the context is badly broken, the parallel with other texts of the same type assures the interpretation as a Luvian word, as given by Starke, loc. cit.

The form mimmandu gives us no clue as to the meaning of mimma-, but other evidence is available from related words in Luvian. Recall first of all that the context of mimmammiš-a is the following:

(7) KUB VI 45 III 74 = VI 46 IV 44
IŠTU dU pihassasi-wa-za kanišši-[anza šalla]nuwan[(za)] mimma-
miš-a
I am/have been recognized, raised and mimma-ed by the Storm-god pihassasši-.

The verb kanešš- is being used here in the special sense of 'give special recognition to, show favor to above others': cf. the Apology of Hattusili passim.

Hawkins, Kadmos 19 (1980) 123 ff., has shown that the HLV. verb LITUSU + na- means 'see, look upon', and Starke, ibid. 142 ff., has demonstrated that the equivalent verb in CLuv. is noša- 'embody'. There is also a reduplicated from mimmamna- (HLuv. LITUUS-LITUSU-na-). This stem also means basically 'look upon, experience, see', but in the Hittite incantation KUB XXIV 12 II 28 ff., the inv. 2nd plural *ma-ma-an-na-talen has the special sense of 'look with favor upon, have regard for, accept': see CHD 3/2.138. It is clear that 'favored, well-regarded' would also fit perfectly as the meaning of mimmammiš-a in the passage cited above. In effect, Luvian mimmammiš is the functional equivalent of Hitt. kaniššanza and reinforces the latter.

There is no difficulty in formally relating CLuv. mimma- 'regard, favor' and noša- 'see, look upon'. As Starke indicates, Kadmos 19.147, noša- surely continues *mnu-h₂-, an extension of the PIE root *men- 'think, consider' (cf. Doric métra- 'remembrance'). The stem mimma- may be taken as another example of a present with i-reduplication (see the references in Section 3 above): *mi-mm-. As I have argued, Sprache 29/1.3, in Hittite the immediate result of an old *(m)mn- cluster is *mmn-, with gemination of the *m before another consonant: cf. also Hitt. gim(ma)ra-, CLuv. im(ma)rašši- and aм-(ma)šali- cited in Section 1 above. There is a strong tendency to
simplify the cluster -mmn- to -mm-. In ablauting paradigms where forms with -mVm- coexist, the oblique stem shows both -mmn- and -mm-. However, where the cluster *-mn- is constant throughout the paradigm, one finds only the final result -m-. cf. Hitt. mimma- ‘refuse’ < *mi-mn- (= Grk. μημνά ‘stay, tarry’; see Phon. 100 with refs.). CLuv. mimma- ‘regard, favor’ would be identical, but to the root *men- ‘think, consider’. The fact that Luvian shares the same phonological developments regarding *-mn- as Hittite is confirmed by the forms of CLuv. tatariam(m)an- ‘curse’ for which see Larochel, DLL 95.

Beside manā- < *mn-eh₂- we thus have mimma- < *mi-mn-. Starke (following Oettinger, Stammbildung 486) interprets the third stem, mammanna-, as a direct continuation of an old reduplicated perfect *me-mon- (cf. Grk. μεμνων, Lat. memini). This derivation can account for the shape of the first syllable (Luv. mamma- < *mēno- by ‘Cop’s Law’), but it leaves unexplained the consistent double -nn- of mammanna-. It is also worth noting that no sure instances of old reduplicated perfects have been demonstrated for Anatolian. While the present type with i-reduplication is likely old (cf. Grk. τορμι, etc.), and those with e-reduplication (Hitt. we-wak- ‘demand’) may be as well, Hittite verbs with a-reduplication such as lalukk- ‘shine’ must be an innovation. We may assume that at least some of the Luvian stems with a-reduplication are of this type. The Luvian stem mamma- may thus reflect Anatolian *ma-mm- with the phonological developments sketched above. The attested mamma- is the “durative” of this stem. For “durative” -anna in Luvian compare CLuv. uppannandu ‘let them bring’ (KBo XIII 260 III 15.18) to uppa- ‘bring’. It may seem surprising to find both mimma- and mammanna- beside manā-, but note the Hittite hapax lalhwa- (CHD 3/1.27) next to līhwa(ıa) and lāhu-.

5. HLuvian (VINUM)hari- and (*69)har(at)i-za-

In KARATEPE XLVIII, 271 Hu has (“VINUM”)ha + ra/i-ha and Ho (“VINUM”)ha + ra/i-wa/i. The appearance of -wa in Ho in place of -ha “and, also” in Hu is merely another example of the occasional use of the quotative particle in conjointing parts of a sentence: compare ibid. LI, 295 for another example. The noun stem is thus simply hara/i-. The Phoenician equivalent tells us that the word means ‘harvest’, and the syntax of the rest of the sentence shows that the form is dative-locative singular: hara/hari.

HLuvian orthography and phonology permit several interpretations of a stem hara/hari- ‘harvest’, but the most immediate plausible comparandum is Hitt. ḥalki- ‘grain’, especially ‘barley’, along with halkueštar ‘first fruits’.15) The noun ḥalki- is also used to mean ‘crop’; in the plural this is the standard meaning. See Hoffner, Alim. heth. 60ff., for a thorough discussion of ḥalki-. Hitt. ḥalki- and HLuvian hari- may be equated by assuming a common preform *h₂r₃(e)l₃(h)i- which meant ‘harvest’ and the result of harvesting, namely ‘crop’. The use in Hittite as both ‘harvest, crop’ and ‘grain’ is not unusual: cf. Lat. mesi- ‘harvest, crop’ but also ‘grain’ (standing or reaped) or Skt. sasya- ‘grain’ but also ‘crop, harvest’. The use of the generic term ḥalki- ‘grain’ as a specific term ‘barley’ also reflects a common practice: cf. American English ‘corn’ for ‘maize’ and see Buck, Selected Indo-European Synonyms 513.

In HLuvian the *l has undergone rhotacism, for which compare wala/-wara- ‘die’ or (MALUS)₃₄-tu-wa/i-r₁-i-z₁ ‘evil for’ *addu-walinzi (KARATEPE XX, 102). The loss of a voiced velar stop would also be regular: cf. CLuv. pari- ‘high’ < *bh(e)rg₂i-. The putative *h₂r₃(e)l₃(h)i- ‘harvest’ has the appearance of a primary action/result noun, for which compare Hitt. urki- ‘trail’ < *wrg₂i- to the root of Skt. vraj- ‘walk’ (Eichner, MSS 31 (1973) 73, following Duchêne-Guillemin).

The sense ‘harvest’ (crops) may easily be specialized from the more general meaning ‘gather, collect’: cf. for example Lat. colligere ‘gather’ and specifically ‘harvest’ (whence ultimately Sp. cosecha ‘harvest, crop’). This suggests a possible explanation for the verb (*69)hara/iza (inv. 2nd sg.) which occurs three times in the Assur letters. Two of the instances refer to supplies to which the addressee is to procure:

(8) ASSUR g, 4 (properly g, 2)
   i) | wai/ti-ri + a₁ | (*69)ha + ra/i-za
   ii) | wai/ti-ma-ra + a₁ | ARHA- | VIA-wa/i-ni
   ‘Find/collection them and send them off to me.’

See ASSUR b,2 for a virtually identical passage. Morpurgo-Davies, KZ 94 (1980) 98, translates hara/iza here according to context as ‘get’.

15) Hoffner, Alim. heth. 25f., is undoubtedly correct in rejecting the equation of halkueštar with BUR₂₄-₃(nt) ‘harvest (time)’. However, halkueštar does seem to refer to the ‘first fruits’ of the harvest reserved for ritual use, so a basic meaning ‘that which is of the harvest’ etymological connection with ḥalki- remains very likely.
The remaining instance of ("*69") hara/iza as has its object a missing tunikara-official, whom the addressee is likewise asked to find and return:

(9) ASSUR g.1-2 (properly g. 3-4)
   i) | á-pi-ka-wa/i + rai-ta | ha + rai-na-wa/i + rai-sa ("PANIS. *402") tu-ni-ka-ra + d-sa | ARHA-’ | (OCCIDENS)-lá/’-si-ta
   ii) | wa/i-na-’ ("*69") ha + rai-za
   iii) | wa/i-za-na | ARHA-’ || VLA-wa/i-ni-i
   iv) | á-wa/i-wa/i-za | PANIS-ni-na | NEG-’ | á-sa-ti

i) ‘Furthermore, the hara/inawali- tunink-server has removed himself (?).
   ii) ‘Get hold of him
   iii) ‘and send him off to us.
   iv) ‘Look here, we have no _bread.’

In all three examples the required sense is basically ‘get hold of’. This is supported by the presence of sign 69 as a determinative, which is a variant of sign 39 PUGNUS ‘fist’ or some other kind of hand. In the cases where the object is goods or supplies, the sense ‘gather, collect’ is precisely what is called for. In the case of the missing official, ‘lay hands on’ or ‘find’ would be more appropriate, but the step from ‘gather, collect’ to ‘find, get hold of’ is a short one: cf. the uses of Lat. colligere ‘gather’ cited in the Oxford Latin Dictionary 351 under section 3.

Formally, hara/iza- may be analyzed as an iterative in -za- to a base verb har(a)- or hari(ya)-: for -za- as an iterative suffix see Hawkins, Morpurgo-Davies, and Neumann, HHL 184 ff. The attested HLuvian orthography leaves the base stem indeterminate. We could suppose *har < *h213elg(h)- ‘gather, collect’, the base of the noun *h213(e)lg(h)i- ‘gathering’ > ‘harvest’. Such an athematic stem might or might not have been "thematized" to hara- in HLuvian. On the other hand, a denominative stem *h213(e)lg(h)i-ýé- formed when the base noun *h213(e)lg(h)i- still meant ‘gathering’ would lead to a HLuvian *hari(ya)- ‘gather, find’. What seems excluded is a denominative stem *hari(ya)- meaning ‘gather, find’ derived from the noun hari- after it had come to mean specifically ‘harvest’.

Whether the HLuvian verbal base is *har(a)- or *hari(ya)-, we are led to a verbal root *h213elg(h)- meaning ‘gather, collect’. With an eye toward the labial in halkuššar, Ėp, Indogermanica minora I (1971) 31 f., has suggested that the PIE source of halki- is *alg*h-

‘gain, earn’ (Grk. áλγή ‘gain’, Lith. algė ‘wages’, Skt. árhati ‘earns, merits’). This derivation is phonologically impossible. There is simply no evidence in Hittite or Luvian for delabialization of a labiovelar in such an environment. In particular there is no way to motivate the loss of labial articulation in halki- versus its preservation in halkuššar. As noted by Tischler, HEG 134, positing a denominative verb *halkuššar(i)- as the source of halkuššar does nothing to solve the difficulty of the missing -w- in halki-.

On the other hand, if we start from a base *h213elg(h)-, an inner-Hittite explanation of the -w- in halkuššar is possible. The verbal noun of an athematic verb *h213elg(h)- ‘gather; harvest’ would have been *halkušwar, *halkušwaš. Through hypostasis of the genitive *halkušwaš we could obtain an animate a-stem *halkuwaš- ‘(that) of harvesting’; cf. ispanduwaš- ‘libation vessel’ < *(that) of libating’ (see Tischler, HEG 415 with refs.). The attested halkuššar ‘first fruits’ may appropriately be taken as a collective in -eššar from the nominal stem *halkuwaš-: cf. hapiššar ‘shafts, arrows’ < hapiššaš- ‘shaft’ or lala(k)eššar ‘ant-colony’ < lala(k)eššaš- ‘ant’ (via *lala(k)eššar with haploglysis).

Obviously, the intermediate stem *halkuwaš- is purely hypothetical, and I would certainly not insist on this derivation. However, all the steps I have assumed have solid parallels in Hittite, while there are none for the delabialization of a *halkui- to halki-. I therefore derive the Anatolian family of Hitt. halki- ‘crop; grain; barley’, halkuššar ‘first fruits’ and HLuvian (VINUM) hari- ‘harvest’, har(a)-za-‘gather, get’ from a base *h213elg(h)- ‘gather, collect’. I know of no evidence outside Anatolian for a root of this shape with the requisite meaning. This may be due simply to gaps in our documentation.

On the other hand, the partial resemblance of the posited Anatolian *h213elg(h)- to the well-established PIE root *lekg- ‘gather’ is suggestive. I have proposed elsewhere, Phon. 168, that Hitt. hamank- ‘intertwine, knot together’ (sic!) and hakt- ‘close, shut’ contain a preverb *h₂to- (see also in Grk. ὀκέλλο δrive (a ship to land)). This preverb is functionally equivalent to the German prefix zu-, indicat-
ing that one object is brought up against another. Such a preverb would also be quite appropriate in a word ‘gather, collect’. It is therefore conceivable that *h₂j₁elg(h)- should be analyzed as *h₂o-íg- ‘gather together’ (to *íg-), just as Hitt. ḥakt- ‘shut’ is *h₂o-íg- (to *íg- ‘cover’).\(^{17}\)

For a reconstructed Proto-Luvian *hali- ‘harvest’ see also Neumann, FoLaroche (1979) 270, who tentatively compares the Lycian divine name geli- with Hittite ḫalki-. The loss of voiced *g(h) is common to Luvian and Lycian: cf. CLuvian ii(ā)ri-, HLVuvian istr-i-and Lycian izri- ‘hand’ < *ghesr-.

6. HLVuv. (*78)aruni-, CLuv. arut-i-

HLuv. (*78)aruni- occurs four times in the Assur letters, always in conjunction with the tapasali- warama, which are some kind of supplies or goods: see especially ASSUR g, 1–4 (properly g, 2–3), and compare also ASSUR a, 4 and c, 4.\(^{18}\) The contexts suggest that aruti-

\(^{17}\) In the reference cited, I reconstructed the preverb as *h₂e- based on the equation of Hitt. ḫa- and Grk. o-. However, an o-grade in a preverb cannot be excluded, so one could equally well assume *h₂o- or *h₂o-. I now assume *h₂o- on the following basis. First, I am now convinced that the Anatolian conjunction represented by CLuvian/HLuvian -ha/-ha, Palaic -ha, and Hittite gennating -a also, and continues this same preverb functioning originally as an adverb. For the semantics compare English ‘to’ beside ‘to’, and for a preverb/adverb becoming a conjunction see Arm. en ‘and’ < *epi ‘upon, also’. Second, as I will soon argue elsewhere, there is now good evidence that *h₂ is lost intervocally in Hittite and between obstruent and vowel, while it assimilates to a preceding sonant consonant. At least the last rule is also shared by Palaic. Therefore, if one reconstructs the conjunction (and thus the preverb) with *h₂, one must assume that *h₂ is preserved in Palaic and Luvian in positions where it is lost in Hittite: intervocally and between obstruent and vowel. I find this very implausible. I find it preferable to assume *h₂o with a special treatment of *h₂ in enclisis for the details of the form of the conjunction under this assumption see Phon. 165. Furthermore, G. Dunkel, in this journal p.53 ff., has argued that Vedic átha is to be analyzed as *at-h₂o. The aspiration of the preceding stop would of course also require *h₂. Finally, both the consonantism and vocalism of Lyo./Mil. -ke ‘and, also’, which is surely cognate with -ha, require specifically *h₂o. For the argumentation I must refer the reader to my paper to appear in the proceedings of the VIII. Fachtagung of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft.

\(^{18}\) In ASSUR a, 4, where aruti- precedes tapasali- warama, one could understand aruti- as a measure of *472(-)masrizi which precedes it. However, since elsewhere arut-i- always accompanies tapasali- warama, I assume the same for ASSUR a, 4. An additional argument for this assumption is the likelihood that *472(-)masrizi is to be read as *472-masrizi and equated with (FEMINA.FEM-}

is a measure of some kind. I propose the meaning ‘basket’, based on the following considerations.

First, the shape of the determinative, sign 78, looks like a wing. Second, the basic meaning ‘wing’ for arut-i- is confirmed by CLuv. abl.-inst. arut/dati, which occurs in KBo XII 100 V 9. Rs 1.5 (StBo T 30.244 f.), once next to AMUSEN.HLA-zi ‘eagles’ and once next to Hitt. hamenkanat ‘were knotted together’.\(^{19}\) We are dealing once again with the myth in which various animals were bound together and then released. ‘Wing’ is certainly the body part by which eagles are most likely to be knotted together, and this meaning is assured by the shape of the determinative sign 78 of HLuv. arut-i-. Finally, the attested use of arut-i- ‘wing’ as a measure in HLuv may be accounted for if we assume that the word was also applied to ‘basket’, based on the shape. For the equivalence of ‘wing’ and ‘basket’ compare of course Hitt. (GIKIS)pattar ‘basket’, a special use of pattar ‘wing’.

A possible analysis of a Luvian stem aruti- ‘wing’ is that of an action noun in *-u-ti- (cf. Hitt. -u-zzi-) to the root *ar- ‘fit’ (Grk. ἀγαίνω ‘fit together, join’, Hitt. āra ‘what is fitting’, etc.). For *ar-u-ti- ‘fitting, joint’ as ‘wing’ compare Lat. āla ‘wing’ < *aks-lā with Germ. Achsel ‘shoulder-(joint)’.

7. HLuv. tunikala-/tunikara-

The noun tunikala- appears in CARCHEMISH A 3, 2 in a list of religious functionaries, marked by sign 402 as a determinative. The noun (“PANIS.*402”) tunikara-, which is certainly a rhotacized variant of the same stem, occurs in a more revealing context (ASSUR g, 1–2, properly 3–4). See citation (9) above, sentence i).

The precise meaning of the verb (OCCIDENS)-lāl-i-si-ta still eludes us, but in any case the following direct commands to find the tunikara-official and to send him to the letter writer make it clear

\(^{19}\) For the comparison of CLuv. arut-i- ‘wing’ with HLuv. arut-i- see already Starke apud Hawkins, Kadmos 19.133.
that the tunikara's presence is required. Note furthermore that the
determinative of tunikara- contains the logogram PANIS 'bread',
while the final sentence of citation (9) implies that the need for the
tunikara- is somehow tied to a lack of bread. These two facts plus
the phonetic shape of the word argue that the tunikala- (rotacized
tunikara-) is 'server/caretaker of the tuni(n)k-bread'. For the base
compare the NINDA tuni(n)k- which appears in Hittite rituals: see
Neu, StBoT' 12 (1970) 57, n 37. The noun tunikala- may be analyzed
as a denominative adjective in -ala- which has been substantivized
as the name of a functionary. Compare the many so-called "agent"
nouns in -ala- in Hittite: e.g. waljiwal- 'server of the walji-drink'.
Since the corresponding Luvian suffix is -alli- (e.g. CLuv. tagasi-
alli- 'muleteer' or similar to HLuv. tarsagni- 'ass' or 'mule'), the a-
stem in HLuvian tunikala- is surprising. Perhaps the word is a bor-
rowing from Hittite.

The Hittite word sometimes shows a nasal in oblique forms: gen.
sg. tuningasi vs. nom-acc. tunik. It is of course impossible to tell
whether we should read [tunijkala-] or [tunikala-] in HLuvian.
However, the form in sentence iv) above, PANIS-ni-na, must be neu-
ter nom.-acc. plural and cannot be the usual HLuvian word for
bread (PANIS)turpi-, which is animate. I therefore raise the possi-
bility that PANIS-ni-na is a spelling for *tuninga, i.e. [tunigga]. It is
true that we would expect rather *PANIS-ni-ka, with non-indication
of the nasal, but it seems possible that there was more than one way
to solve the problem of writing a cluster [ŋ] or [ŋk]. Whatever the
precise meaning of PANIS-ni-na, the clear association of tunikala-
tunikara- with bread makes derivation from NINDA tuni(n)k- and
the interpretation 'server of tuni(n)k- bread' a virtual certainty. On
the function of sign 402 as a determinative of tunikala-tunikara- see
the next section.

8. HLuv. (*422) musanuwanti-

This word occurs but once (MARAŞ 1,4) as a title or epithet of
the king in his very lengthy titulature. I read (*422) mu-ia-nu-way/ti-
sá with Meriggi, Manuale II/1.130, instead of mu-hi,9 with Hawkins,
AnSt 30 (1980) 142, for reasons which will become obvious. In many
texts it is virtually impossible to distinguish sa and hi epigraphically.
Laroche's sign 422 consists of PANIS 'bread' over a diamond or
'lozenge'. I will discuss the diamond-shaped element momentarily,
but the presence of PANIS 'bread' is sufficient to put the meaning of
musanuwati- in the general area of food or nourishment.

Formally, musanuwati- is most easily analyzed as a frozen partici-
ple in -ant(i)-. The productive participial suffix in Luvi is
-p(i)mm-, but several lexicalized examples of -ant- (in the extended
form -anti-) are attested: cf. CLuv. u(wa)anti- 'dead' to the HLuv.
verb wa- 'die' and also HLuv. *kwisanti- 'feared' (or more likely
'fearful') to *kwisa- 'be afraid', attested in KARATEPE XXXIII,
174 as REL2-sa-ta (nt. nom.-acc. plural). I therefore read mus(a)-
nwasanti-, originally a participle to a causative stem mus(a)nu-

This causative stem may be plausibly related to the Palaic verb
mus- 'eat one's fill, be satiated', which was previously without cognates
within Anatolian. Eichner, Flexion und Wortbildung 86, makes
an illuminating comparison with Grk. μυσο 'close' (the lips), es-
specially δ-μυσο 'in one gulp, without closing the lips'. For the sense 'be
satiated' compare English 'smack the lips' (with satisfaction). The causative
mus(a)nu- would have meant 'satiate, cause to eat one's fill'. A passive reading of the participle mus(a)nuwasanti- would lead
to 'satiated, well-fed'. This is not impossible as a royal epithet. In
many cultures and eras physical well-being, even to the point of cor-
pulence, has been a mark of high status. However, such an epithet
seems rather weak for the high-flown verbosity of MARAŞ 1 (the
titulature takes half the inscription!). Since verbal adjectives in An-
atolian can be active as well as passive (cf. hitt. ṣakkant- 'knowing' or
HLuvian EDERE-tamisa 'having eaten'), I find it more likely that
mus(a)nuwasanti- means 'causing to eat one's fill', i.e. 'lavishly providing'. Halparuntiyas is boasting that he causes his subjects to be well-
fed.

The idea of 'causing to eat one's fill' implies the serving of food. I
believe that this accounts for the other element in the sign 422. The
diamond or lozenge under PANIS 'bread' represents the tray on
which bread or other food was served.20 As elsewhere in HLuvian
hieroglyphs, the elements of the picture have been distracted and
represented in a fixed orientation. In this case both the round loaf
of bread and the square tray have been drawn from above, individu-
ally. However, 'serve food' is still directly represented by 'bread' upon a
'tray'. I therefore propose to read sign 422 as MINISTRARE 'serve
food'.

20) This object is probably represented in Hittite by peran pedumaš/pedunaš
'(object) of carrying before' > 'serving tray'. See Košak, THelH 10 (1982) 37,
with references. The alternate form p. pedunaš with what appears to be a Luvian
verbal noun is noteworthy.
Hawkins, AnSt 25 (1975) 135, transliterates the example cited in section 7 above from ASSUR g,1 as (*422) tunikara-. However, Meriggi’s drawing, Mannuale II/1, Tav. 40, clearly shows PANIS ‘bread’ not over a diamond, but over sign 402, a circle with a small circle within it. Nevertheless, I believe that Hawkins is ultimately correct in viewing this combination as a mere variant of sign 422 = MINISTRARE. Obviously, the sense ‘serve food’ is precisely what we would expect for tunikara-/tunikara- ‘server of tuni(n)k’bread’. How do we account for the difference in sign shape?

I would start by identifying sign 402 (a circle within a circle) with the upper element of sign 336 = ANNUS ‘year’. The lower element of ANNUS ‘year’ is clearly a large jar or pithos, and Larroche, HH 179, tentatively suggests that it represents a year’s worth of provisions. This is on the right track, but it leaves the upper element unexplained. A more precise account of the ANNUS sign is provided by the following Hittite passage (KBo II 7 Rs 16): GIM-an ḥamei ḫanza DÜ-ri tethai DUG harī-kan gimnazi ‘When it becomes spring (and) it thunders, they open the pithoi.’ This formula, which recurs elsewhere, appears to refer to an annual ritual in which the coming of spring (the passage of another year) is marked by the ceremonial opening of pithoi which were filled and sealed the preceding fall (cf. KBo II 7 Vs 6 ff). This suggests that the HLuvian sign for ‘year’ represents a just opened pithos, showing the jar itself and its round lid above it. Sign 402 is certainly a reasonable representation of a round lid with a small knob in the middle (again viewed from above).

While the interpretation of sign 402 as the lid of a jar accounts for its use in sign 336 = ANNUS, this does not seem to explain its appearance before tunikara- ‘server of tuni(n)k’bread’ or in the combination with PANIS ‘bread’ in sign 422 = MINISTRARE ‘serve food’. However, there is evidence from Hittite that lids were indeed used as serving trays. See KBo XI 12 I 13-14: na SAMSUGI I DUG NAKTAMA QADU ALAM ḤİA ĀTU-i [parā] ēpzi The “old woman” holds out one lid with figurines to the Sun-god.’ Compare also KUB XXXVI 38,486: [ ]ANA DUG NAKDAMI tmianzi [ ] [DUG N] AKDAMMU ANA EN SISKUR ēnawās tmianzi ‘They place [ ] on a lid … and place the lid on the celebrant’s knees.’ While the object is missing in the second example, the function of naktamu ‘lid’ as a serving tray is clear.21) This means that the substitution of

21) For jar lids with round knobs which would appear from above as a circle within a circle see Bittel, Boğazköy: Die Kleinfunde der Grabungen 1906–1912.
mean only 'cause to sit' (of people), not 'place' (an object in the hand). Kalâ'c's interpretation of sign 382 as 'scepter' is also dubious, since this sign occurs as the determinative of a wide variety of objects and apparently some abstracts (see also note 25 below). If we limit ourselves to the HLuvian evidence, we can only follow Hawkins, AmSn 31 (1981) 150 f., who translates: "For me they sat on (dwelt in?) the hushulpali’ ('they' = 'the gods').

Fortunately, Hittite furnishes us further information in the form of the word Gìshuhupal(i)-, which is spelled once [Gìšhu]-n-wa-hurpa-al (KBo XII 123,10). Both the alternation hùwa-hù- in the first syllable and the loss of preconsonantal r in the second are well attested elsewhere in Hittite. That HLuv. (*382)hushulpali- and Hitt. Gìšhu(wa)hù(r)pàl(i)- are the same word can hardly be doubted.

It has long been known that Gìšhuhapal- is a musical instrument which is played by being struck, but its precise meaning has not been established ('lute', Tischler, HEG 263, is a mere guess). However, one remarkable text, KUB XXV 37 (a Luvian festival), tells us a good deal more about the nature of the instrument. In lines I 11-12 the hushulpal-instruments are struck, as often, while a song is sung. In I 25-28 we find the following:


‘And when it is poured out of the upper hušupal, it is poured down into the lower hušupal, and from that he drinks it to the Sun-god.’

The ‘it’ clearly refers to a drink, probably mannu (see I 22 [ ]-nu-an). If there is any doubt that the hušupal-instruments are being used as vessels, this is put to rest by the following:

KUB XXV 37 I 34 (StBo T 30.344):
[m]ah-han-ma-kan Gìšhu)p)al ıstu Geštin šummanz[i]

‘When they fill the hušupal with wine.’

The drink-server (tüSilàŠùDu₄(A) then drinks the contents of the hušupal. The fact that we are still dealing with the musical instrument in these passages is made clear from what follows:

KUB XXV 37 II 11-14 (StBo T 30.345):

‘The drink-server again drinks the hušupal thus for refreshment (?). When [he is finished?], the drink-server picks up the hušupal and begins to strike it.’

We thus have a musical instrument played by being struck which is also capable of being used as a drinking vessel. While the latter fact eliminates either stringed instruments or drums built on a frame, it still permits several possibilities: a lyre or similar stringed instrument using a vessel as a sounding-board, a cylindrical or kettle-shaped drum, or a cymbal, which may have the shape of a hollow dish (cf. Germ. Becken 'basin' and 'cymbal').

Several facts argue for a cymbal or similar instrument. The meaning 'drum' is made unlikely by the sequence of events described above in which the drink-server drinks from the hušupal and then immediately plays it. In order to be played, the drum would have to be covered with its skin membrane securely in place, but the latter would make it impossible to pour liquid into or to drink from the drum. It is not plausible that the skin was laboriously removed and replaced with each ritual repetition. Further support for the meaning 'cymbal' (or similar) is found in the references to a pair of hušupal (KBo XIII 235 I 2: 1 TAPAL Gìšhu)p)al[i]) and a 'set' of hušupal (KUB XXIX 4 I 24-25: 1 Nutt Gìšhu)p)al mân gìšTÚG mân KA•UD

---

23) The restoration is virtually assured, since there is no other attested Hittite noun ending in -swahulpal(i)- or in -uwpal(i)-.

24) For the first compare ëù(wa)rt 'curse', ëù(wa)lli 'pinecone', ëù(wa)nùwaw 'wave', ëù(wa)tanama '?', ëù(wa)panza(n) '-' etc. For the loss of preconsonantal r note pàšra- for pašra-, waggant- for wargant-, teriapila- for tertapila-, kukkur(i)ya/-kirkur(i)ya-, Gìšluwuwanmužzi/-lušu(wa)mužzi-, among others.

25) This equation, along with the use of the logogram 382 as a building material in CARCHEMISH A 111c,5 and A 11,5, supports the suggestion of Gelb, HH 3.47, that sign 382 means 'wood'.

26) I take the reading ÛTU from Stark, StBo T 30.343, who fails, however, to understand the overall context and reads incorrectly [ ]-ni-ri in line 26.

27) Stark, StBo T 30.345, reads a-zi-ki-wa-an in line 14, but notes that the entire word is written over an erasure. The first sign is damaged, and I read ha-. The reading is assured by the parallel of III 24-25: Gìšhu)p)al danzi n-at hašikivan tianzi.
The latter example, where the set of *huhupal* may be 'either (of) boxwood or (of) ivory' pretty much settles the issue, since neither a drum nor a lyre could have a body of ivory.  

I therefore conclude that the *gīš* *huhupal* (*lī*) refers to a concussive musical instrument consisting of a pair of shallow vessels which are struck together. For an ancient representation of such an instrument see H. Hartmann, *Die Musik der sumerischen Kultur* (1960) 43 (with Abb. 41). Hartmann labels the instrument a cymbal, but in fact there is no way to determine the material used. The *huhupal* in any case appears to have been what is properly termed a 'clapper', a pair of hollow objects made of wood, ivory, nutsheils or other materials which when struck together produce a characteristic dull, hollow sound: see C. Sachs, *Real-Lexikon der Musikinstrumente* (1964) sub *Klapper*.

The above interpretation is further supported by the shape of the word, which is undoubtedly imitative (as already guessed by Kronasser, *EHS* 121, 324). The *huhu(r)p*al- is the instrument that makes the sound *hu(r)p*. The stem *huhu(r)p*al- may be formally analyzed as a deverbalizing ‘instrumental’ noun in -a-: cf. Hitt. *iššiy-* ‘sash, belt’ < *išši-* ‘bind’. We have attested the corresponding Hittite verb, although it has previously been overlooked. *KBo* VIII 74 + III 74 (see now *StBoT* 30.41) reads: *nu-za ḫu[š]huhupalli dāḥ[ḥ]e nu * huppiemi ‘I take the *huhupal* and go *hupp*.’ The verb *hupp*ya- ‘make the sound *hupp*’ is directly comparable to *wappiya-* ‘bark’ (make the sound *wapp*) and must be separated from *ḫu(wa)p*- ‘do evil’ (mi-

---

29) Since the neuter nom.-acc. form *huhupal* (and likewise *huhupalli*) is ambiguous as to number, it is possible that all references to the musical instrument are collective plural. Note also that the use of an ‘upper’ and ‘lower' *huhupal* as vessels requires a pair of objects.

30) Any attempt to solve this problem by supposing that the ivory is merely used as decoration falls victim to the Hittite phrasing of *KUB* XXIX 4. We know from the constant determinative *gīš* that the *huhupal* is normally made of wood. The phrase (of) boxwood' thus surely refers to the basic constituent material of the instrument. Since (of) ivory' puts ivory on a par with boxwood, the former must also refer to the basic material, not mere filagree. An ivory clapper instead of the more common wooden variety is quite possible, as indicated below.

31) Since the class of Hittite nouns in -a- is small, *huhupal* is occasionally remade as *huhupalli- after the large and productive class of neuter nouns in -a-.* Because the only HLuvian example is a dative-locative, we cannot tell whether the noun there is still an l-stem or has been remade to an i-stem *huhur-*

---

verb) and (katta) *ḫu(wa)p*- ‘cast (down)’ (hi-verb). The only other occurrence of the ya-stem *huppiya*- known to me is in a broken context (*KBo* XIX 163 IV 17: [ ] *huppiyanzi*), but the appearance of *hattili S[RRU]’ *they sing in Hatti’ in line IV 14 is consistent with the interpretation ‘they make the sound *hupp*’ and connection with the *huhupal*-instrument, which often accompanies singing. For the HLuvian verb *hurup(a)-*, showing the reduplicated base of *ḫu(r)p*-al-, see below.

The Hittite evidence thus points to a meaning ‘clapper’ for *gīš* *huhu(r)p*al-*lī*-. This seems to produce utter nonsense in our HLuvian example, which would then read: ‘They (the gods) sat on my clapper.’ The following sentence in this passage means ‘they (the gods) ran before me’, which is directly equivalent to Hittite *nu-mu pēr-ana ḫāyēr*, the standard formula for expressing divine favor in battle. We may expect the preceding sentence to have a similar meaning. Given the contrast ‘sat’ versus ‘ran’, a likely pendant for ‘they ran before me’ would be ‘they sat on my war-chariot’.

It is clear that the Hittite meaning ‘vessel-shaped’ clapper' cannot be equated to ‘war-chariot’, but what about a similarly shaped part of a chariot? In fact, several reliefs precisely from the ‘Long Wall of Sculpture’ at Carchemish show chariots which are enclosed in back by a gently convex curve with a knob or boss in the center; see Woolley, *Carchemish III*, plates B41a, 42a-b, and 43a. A very clear photo of B 42a is also available in Vieyra, *Hittite Art* (1955) plate 48. M. G. Amadas, *L’Iconografia del carro da guerra in Siria e Palestina* (1965) 73, reasonably interprets this object as a shield hung on the back of the chariot, but it also has precisely the shape of a cymbal or clapper as described above. In view of this Luvian evidence it is also worth noting the context of the Hittite occurrence *gīš* *ḫwahurpal* (*KBo* XII 123, 9–10): [p] *gē* *gīš* MAR.GID.DA *wawanda[ŋ]... *gīš* *ḫu* *ḫwahurpal* GUSKIN GAR.RA ANA GUD.H₂.A-ya[...] ‘in front a decorated wagon... *hurupal* covered with gold, and on/for...
cattle...'. Nothing here points to a musical instrument, but the gilded *huhurpal could easily be part of the decorated wagon.

I therefore suggest that the term *Gis*huhu(r)pal- was used to refer not only to the musical instrument defined above (which accounts for the formation of the word), but also to a round shield of similar shape which was mounted on the war-chariot. The HLuvian passage A 11 b,4 'they sat on my huhurpal' does in effect mean 'they (the gods) sat on my war-chariot', a sign of divine favor in battle. The general HLuvian word for 'shield' is (SCUTUM)har(a/i)/li-, but we can be reasonably sure that the Hittites and Luvians used shields of various sizes, shapes and materials. The term huhu(r)pal- designated one of these which resembled the musical instrument. It also cannot be excluded that the larger shields were actually banded together to make noise like the two halves of the smaller clapper. Direct evidence for the use of noise-makers in battle by the Hittites is lacking, but such a practice would not be surprising.

I have already analyzed *Gis*huhu(r)pal- as a deverbative noun in -al-, but the corresponding Hittite verb is simple huhiya-. As Kalaq, KZ 92.124, has already seen, the expected reduplicated verb stem *huhurpa(a)- is attested in HLuvian:

(14) ALEPPO 2,2:
   i) wa/i-mu- | REL-ta₁-y 'ha | (BESTIA)REL₂-sà-rá/i-sá
   ii) wa/i-ta | PRAE-na ARHA | (PUGNUS + PUGNUS)hu-
               hu + rá/i-pa-ti-i

Kalaq translates PRAE-na ARHA huhurpati as 'schlägt (er) weg voran'. The third singular subject 'he' makes no sense in the context. We must assume with Hawkins, AnSt 30 (1980) 152 f., either: (1) the subject is 'the gods' from a preceding sentence ('They (the gods) shall parran arha huhurpa- them (-ata, the wild beasts); or (2) the subject is -ata (the wild beasts) and the verb is intransitive ('They (the wild beasts) shall parran arha huhurpa-').

The interpretation of the sentence with huhurpa(a)- depends crucially on that of the preceding sentence. Hawkins reads wa/i-mu- x-a-y 'ya, but already suggests that the second word is best taken as a present third singular verb in -ya, agreeing with the neuter singular (with collective sense) *hwisar-sa 'wild beasts'. I read the verb tentatively as REL-ta₁-y 'ha, which seems compatible with the traces in Hawkins' drawing, AnSt 30.145.35) HLuvian REL-ta₁-y would match

35) The first sign has the basic spade-like shape of the REL sign, though it is necessarily smaller than the examples in line 4 of the same text. The second sign

exactly CLuvian kuvatayi ‘fears, is afraid’. Sentence i) thus reads: 'The wild beasts (shall) fear me.' This reading and interpretation are supported by the preverb sequence of the following sentence. HLuv. parran arha (= Hitt. pérar arha) indicates motion away from in front of. Sentence ii) is then 'and they shall huhurpa- away before (me).34) We thus arrive at a coherent and appropriately stirring image: even the wild beasts are to fear Arpas and flee at his approach. Such imagery seems especially plausible in view of the well-attested hunting activities of the Hittite and Luvian kings.

This interpretation seems to require that huhurpa(a)- be an intransitive motion verb, which fits neither the determinative PUGNUS + PUGNUS nor the apparent connection with huhu(r)pal- 'clapper'. However, it is possible in more than one language for a verb which inherently does not imply motion to gain such a sense with the addition of preverbs (cf. English 'roar off, splash away', etc.). If we look for a common denominator between fleeing animals and a clapper, it is not hard to find one: the sound made by both. In English, horses' hooves go 'clop', and the sound of hooves is commonly imitated in radio and movies with wooden devices not too unlike the clapper described above. Just like Hitt. huhiya-, HLuvian huhurpa(a)- means nothing more than 'make the sound huhurpa', which is the sound made by the musical instrument and by pounding hooves. As Kalaq has already suggested, the determinative PUGNUS + PUGNUS should probably be read as VERBERARE 'beat, strike', referring to

is only partially preserved. In Hawkins' drawing it appears to be the bottom of a vertical shaft with two vertical lines within it. This basically agrees with the form of ta₄ which is attested, e.g., in line 6 of the same text (in MALUS₁-ta₄-d-ti). We must assume only that the pointed top is missing. I admit that the vertical sides of the ta₄ sign usually flare outward, but this is not always the case. Note the shape of ta₄ in CARCHEMISH A 11 c,2 (in MALUS₁-ta₄-ti-i and LOCUS-ta₄-ti). The use of ta₄ to spell *kuvatayi would be in order, since the signs ta₄ and ta₄ regularly correspond to a single dental stop in cuneiform.

34) The verb stem kuvatayi-ta(i)- 'fear' is derivative from the noun kuvatayi- 'fear', derived in turn from the verb kuvatay- 'fear' (for the CLuvian evidence see Laroche, DLL 58 f.). One would expect a derivational verb in -di(i)- to inflect as a mi-verb, but third singulars in -at after the 'thematic' hi-conjugation are also attested in Hittite: cf. bandaz for bandatzz 'arranges, determines'. In any case, HLuvian REL-ta₁-y (huvatayi) would match directly CLuvian kuvatayi.

35) It is impossible to determine whether we should take -ata as 'it', agreeing strictly with its neuter singular antecedent *hwisar-sa, or as 'they' according to sense. The verb may be accordingly either third singular huhurpati or third plural huhurpati. The meaning is the same in either case.
how the noise is typically made.\textsuperscript{35} Since the entire family of Hittite hupiya-, HLuvian hupur(a)- and Hittite GIS\textsuperscript{36} hu(wa)hu(r)pal(l)i- /HLuvian (*382)huhur pal(i)- is imitative in origin, a search for a PIE etymon is pointless.

10. CLuvian *hapanzu-, HLuvian (VAS)hapa(n)zu-, CLuvian hapâ(i)-

CLuvian *hapanzu- is indirectly attested in KBo I 42 I 13 in the extended form hapanzwawant-: Akk. là taklu = Hitt. UL ha-pa-an-zu-[w]a-[n-z]a ‘disloyal, untrustworthy’.\textsuperscript{36} As often in Hittite, the basic adjective has been enlarged by -ant-: cf. daššu-, daššuzawant-‘mighty’. For the form of the adjective *hapanzu- compare CLuvian kwanzu- ‘heavy; important’: see Weitenberg, \textit{Die hethitischen u-Stämme} (1984) 292.

The stem *hapanzu- also occurs in the hapax hapazuwalanni at KUB XXIV 7 IV 51, which is marked by a Glossenkeil, suggesting that the word is Luvian in origin. The context points to a meaning ‘(state of) obedience, subordination’: SAL-as-ma ḫapazuwalanni ananza nu-kan LÚ-as [memi]yan UL waḫnuzi ‘But (if) a woman has reached a state of obedience, she does not contradict the word of her husband.’ The speaker of these lines is the fisherman, who is trying to persuade his wife to join him in a deception. He therefore recites his version of the behavior of a dutiful wife, which of course includes obedience to her husband: see for the entire passage Fried- rich, \textit{ZA} 49 (1949) 232f.

\textsuperscript{35} The crossed-arms here would thus have a different meaning from that in (*31)yhi-sa-hi-mi-na ‘we bind’ (CEKFE rev. 5), although epigraphically they may be difficult to distinguish. Note once again that the interpretation ‘clapper’ as suggested above does require the use of both hands.

\textsuperscript{36} The previous reading ha-pa-an-zu-[a] [Laroche, \textit{DLL} 41, and Weitenberg, \textit{Die heth. u-Stämme} 185] not only produces a morphological monstrosity, but also fails to take into account the epigraphic and orthographic features of the manuscript. The sign following ha-pa-an-zu- is a wa with the lower Winkelhaken missing. This is followed by the head of a horizontal stroke which we may read as a[n]. Only traces of the final -za are visible, but it is certain, since the lexical texts consistently cite Hittite adjectives in the anim. nom. singular: cf. the immediately preceding sekkanza and turiyanza! The reading ar is not possible, because in this manuscript the initial Winkelhaken of ar is consistently large and spreads across the first vertical: cf. I 7 & 8 e-[š]-u-n-wa-ar and I 20 ka-ri-wa-ri-wa-ar. The spelling e-[š]-u-n-wa-ar with -wa- also argues against a spelling ha-pa-an- zu-[a]. I therefore read ha-pa-an-zu-[w]a-[n-z]a.
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We may account for the usage of both hapanzuwant- and hapa(n)zawalatar by assuming a base adjective *hapanzu- ‘obedient, loyal’. Both the sense of the adjective and its status as Luvian are confirmed by a cognate in HLuvian:

(15) KÖRKÜN 1-2:

\begin{align}
\end{align}

‘With my loyal person I never in any way transgressed the command/pronouncement of my lord, by the authority of Kubaba and the Storm-god.’

Hawks, \textit{AnSt} 25.136, reads ha-pa-si-ru/ra/i-wa-li-ti, following Kalaç, who first edited the text. However, Kalaç himself, \textit{Athenaeum} 47 (1969) 166, stresses that the presence of the ‘thorn’ in the third sign is quite dubious, and the photograph he presents (ibid. Tav. IV) shows clearly that the mark he reads as ‘thorn’ is far removed and in an odd position. I therefore ignore it as a stray mark. Kalaç himself already cites the resemblance of the HLuvian word to hapazuwalanni. For the reading of sign L 448 as zu instead of su see my article to appear in \textit{Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill}, where I cite the equation of HLuv. (DEUS) Á-la-zu-wa-li-sa (ÇIFTLIK 4) with cuneiform *Allanzu-. The equation of CLuv. *hapanzu- and HLuv. (VAS)ha-pa-zu- ‘obedient, loyal’ adds further support for the reading zu, in this case in a genuine Luvian word, not merely a name.

Hawks and Kalaç interpret DOMINUS-na-sa ha-ti-sa as an apposition to the subject, but the word order would be quite peculiar, and this analysis leaves the otherwise transitive verb PES-hinus without a direct object. Since the sense of the verb is ‘cross’ or ‘cause to cross’, I assume here the meaning ‘transgress’: literally ‘I caused myself (-mu) to cross’ = ‘transgressed’ (cf. Hitt. šarra- both ‘cross’ and ‘transgress’). The form hati-sa is neuter accusative singular (with usual postposed -sa) meaning ‘injunction, command, solemn pronouncement’ or the like. This neuter i-stem noun hati- is the base of the HLuvian verb hatiya/-hariya- ‘solemnly declare, pronounce’ (see section 11 below).

We thus have a Luvian adjective hapanzu- ‘obedient, loyal’. This recalls the Hittite univerbation hapa(-)tiya- ‘obey’, attested in KBo I 42 II 30: Akk. mugequ = Hitt. anda ḥapatiyawar. The above interpretation, that of Götze, \textit{Madd.} 105, following Holma, has recently
been challenged: see Tischler, HEG 163ff. However, the fact that the noun hapati- now has been shown to mean 'river valley' means merely that it must be separated from hapata(-tiya- and says nothing about the meaning of the latter, as Tischler points out.

Riemschneider, StBoT 9 (1970) 65 f., proposed an entirely different explanation for hapatiya-, reading the Akkadian of the lexical entry as muditu 'killing, slaying', and taking the Hittite as meaning 'harm, strike'. He was influenced in this analysis by the occurrence of the participle ha-pa-a-ti-an-te-es in the omen text KBo XIII 3 Rs 3, where it refers to some body part (see StBoT 9.62 f.). It is obvious that 'obedient, loyal' cannot be applied to a body part.

As to the Akkadian equivalent, which is hapax, it is clear that its interpretation must depend on the Hittite, not vice-versa: see both the CAD and von Soden, AHKE, sub mudekkâ. In the Hittite context Riemenschneider's interpretation 'harm, strike' is possible but by no means assured, and this assigned meaning leaves hapata(-tiya- morphologically and lexically obscure.

The morphological analysis as a univerbation of hapatâ tiya- (e.g. Neu apud Otten, StBoT 11 (1969) 14) remains attractive. Compare the OH hapax arga(-)tiya- 'zum Kampfe treten': thus Friedrich-Kammhuber, HW2 1.306, following Rosenkranz. One may likewise interpret hapatâ tiya- as 'zu X treten'. This analysis further suggests a source for both Luvian hapanzu- and Hitt. hapatâ tiya-: Hitt. hapatâ 'subject oneself to, submit'. The original meaning of hapatâ was 'fit, fasten (oneself to)', reflected in hapatâ-epâ 'limb, member' < *'joint'; cf. German sich fügen 'submit, comply' < Fuge 'joint'. The concrete meaning would still be reflected in the occurrence of the participial phrase hapatâ(-)tiantel 'fastened to' (of Fuge 'joint'). The lexical entry hapata(-)tiyaswar may be taken with Götzte in the derived sense of 'submission, obedience'. Obviously, Luvian hapanzu- 'obedient, loyal' continues the derived meaning as well, with a suffix -(-a)nuzu- whose source is unclear.

The first element of the phrase hapatâ tiya- is most easily interpreted as a frozen allative in -a of a root noun hapatâ 'joint, Fuge' beside the asserted verb root hapatâ 'fit, lasten'. The consistent single -p- in hapata(-)tiya- and hapanzu- is not an obstacle to deriving these forms from the root of hapatâ. Whereas the root-present hapatâ surely continues *h231ep- in the strong stem, the allative of the root noun and the derived hapanzu- may reflect a zero-grade *h231p-: note the spelling hapata-a-ti-an-te-es with scriptio plena of the noun ending. For the regular Hittite spelling of an initial cluster *h231T- as haT- with a single stop see Watkins, Fs Neumann (1982) 455ff., who compares the regular spelling si-pa-an-dV- for /spand-/ 'libate'.

It is likely that the root noun seen in hapatâ and hapanzu- is also the base of the CLuvian verb hapâ(-i)- 'fasten (oneself) to'. While several examples of this verb are in incomplete contexts, at least two establish its meaning:

- (16) KUB XXXII 9 + Vs 7 ff. (StBoT 30.87): niš-an hapiti ma[ hxâtššin EN-an a/dduwalli EME-iš] adduwalli iš[tarı ūparuwašši dâtaryâmašši] širutasši iš EME-iš

'may the evil tongue, the evil hand, the tongue of the ūparu-, of the curses, of the oaths not attach itself to him, the lord of the sacrifice.'

- (17) KUB XXXV 48 III 10–11 (StBoT 30.156): [...-d]u-r DINGIR MEŠ-inzi zammân ūparu [tæ]tariya[mm]a širu ūwašši niš šh[apai(ni)]

'may the gods not attach/fasten the zammân, the ūparu, the curses (and) the oath to his body.'

The first passage would also permit several other possibilities, such as 'strike, harm' or the like, but the second, with 'gods' as subject, dative-locative of 'body', and accusative of the evils narrows the range for hapatâ(-i)- considerably, calling for a meaning 'bind' or 'fasten'. This sense is also suggested by the sequence hapita ... šutta in KUB XXXV 105 I 1 ff.: 'fastened ... released' (cf. Hitt. ḫamikta ... 3)

3) I tentatively assume a stem hapâ(-i)-, contra Oettinger, Stammbildung 563, who suggests hapati(-ya)-. I do so based on the pres. 3rd singular hapiti and pret. 3rd singular hapita. As shown by Morpurgo-Davies, KZ 96.265ff., Luvian stems in -a(-i)- show consistently -iti with elision in the third singular, while stems in -i(-ya)- have unelided -itti. The Luvian stem hapâ(-i)- 'attach, fasten' must be distinguished from Hitt. hapatâ(-i)- 'wash', Lyce. Ḫbâi- 'irrigate, flood', for which see Laroche, Fs Otten (1973) 182ff., and Fouilles de Xanthos 6 (1979) 68. It cannot be excluded that some instances of Luvian hapâ(-i)- in incomplete contexts belong to the latter verb rather than to hapatâ(-i)- 'attach, fasten'.

Likewise KBo XXIX 7.2 ff. and KBo XXXI 262.5 ff., which are part of the basis for the restorations, in which I follow Starke.

9) My restoration of the verb is based on the parallel passage KUB XXXV 45 III 9–10. Starke, StBoT 30.145, reads in line 10 [...-i]-t-r, but a disyllabic Luvian verb stem ending in -i-r is quite improbable. More importantly, the plural subject 'gods' demands a plural verb. We must therefore read the visible element ir as the end of an in. The first sign of the verb is provided by XXXV 48 III 11. Given the context, I believe the restoration of šh[a-x-i(n-ni)] as ha-pa-in-ir is tolerably certain.
lattat in KUB VII 1 + III 1 ff.\(^{49}\) CLuvian \(\textit{hap\textbar a}(i)\) - 'fasten, attach to' is thus a denominative in \(-\bar{a}(i)\)- to the root noun seen in Hitt. \(\textit{hap\bar{a} tiya}\) - 'fasten oneself to, submit'. The denominative verb, derived from the oblique stem of the root noun likewise reflects \(*_{h2/3}p\bar{a}\)- spelled \(\textit{hap}(V)\)-.

11. HLuv. (LOQUI)\(\textit{hari}(ya)\)- /\(\textit{hati}(ya)\)- and \(\textit{hati}(sa)\)

The verb stem (LOQUI)\(\textit{hari}(ya)\)- occurs only in the Assur letters, as part of the standard opening:

\[(18)\ \text{ASSUR c,1:}
| \text{\(\bar{a}-\text{sa},-za-wa/i\) | Ka-ka-ya | REL.-si-si-ti-mi-ha Ta-ka-sa-la-sa-wa/i | ("LOQUI")ha-ri + i-ti}
\]

'Say to Kaka and \(*K/\text{Hwisisitimi}: "Taksala declares."!

Although Laroche, \(\textit{HH}\) 17, and Meriggi, \(\textit{HHGl}\) 183, translate (LOQUI)\(\textit{hari}-\) as 'say, speak', the sense is certainly much stronger. The simple meaning 'say, speak' belongs to \(\textit{asaza}\)- see Hawkins and Morpurgo-Davies, \(\textit{JRAS}\) (1975) 132f. In view of the tone of the Assur letters, which consist mostly of impatient criticism of the addressee and a series of direct commands, a meaning 'declare' or 'solemnly pronounce' seems more apt. This meaning is also suitable for the single occurrence of the causative (LOQUI)\(\textit{harinu}\)- in ASSUR 6,7, where the speech is addressed to the goddess Kubaba (see Morpurgo-Davies, \(KZ\) 94.90).

The stem (LOQUI)\(\textit{hari}-\) occurs once in ASSUR f,1 as \(\textit{hati}-.\) While it is conceivable that this represents a false "reverse-spelling", it is more likely that \(\textit{hati}-\) shows the original form of the stem, which is usually rotaced to \(\textit{hari}-\) for the process of rotacism see especially Morpurgo-Davies, \(KZ\) 96 (1982) 245 ff. We may thus interpret (LOQUI)\(\textit{hari}(ya)\)- 'declare, solemnly pronounce' as \(\textit{hati}(ya)-\), a denominative verb in \(*_{y}o\)- from the noun \(\textit{hati}\)- which occurs in citation (15) above. As we have seen, the context there suggests independently a meaning such as 'command, solemn pronouncement' or the like for \(\textit{ha-ti-sa}\).

The rotacism of \(\textit{hati}-\) to \(\textit{hari}-\) points to an underlying stem with voiced stop \(\textit{hadi}-/\)- see Morpurgo-Davies, \(KZ\) 96.250. A Luvian stem \(\textit{hadi}-/\) meaning 'solemn declaration/declaration' may be

\[\text{Luv Lexical Notes}\]

The element -\(\textit{zalma}\)- occurs as the second member of several proper names, alternating with the logogram PAP: cf. \(\textit{m\textbar U-za-al-ma\bar{n}}\) (\(KBo\ V\ 6\ III\ 2\) and \(KUB\ XXXI\ 121\ a\ II\ 8\) ) with \(\textit{m\textbar U-PAP}\) (\(KUB\ XL\ 95\ II\ 15\) and likewise \(\textit{m\textbar Yarrazalma}\) (\(KUB\ XIII\ 35\ III\ 15.21.4\ 50\) ) beside \(\textit{m\textbar Ya\textbar r-PAP-a\bar{s}}\) (ibid. III 18). See also \(\textit{m\textbar E\textbar G\textbar AL-PAP-ma}\) in \(KUB\ VI\ 41\ III\ 48\) and \(\textit{m\textbar H\textbar u\textbar hazalma}\) - in \(KBo\ XVI\ 47\) passim and \(KBo\ V\ 7\ Vs\ 6\). The same element may occur alone or as a first member in \(\textit{m\textbar Za-al-ma\bar{\neg}}\) in \(KUB\ XXXI\ 64\ II\ 44\). For all of these examples see Laroche, \(\textit{NH}\) (1966). The equation -\(\textit{zalma}-\) = PAP 'protect' gives a basic idea of the meaning, but with no instances of the word as an appellative Laroche, \(\textit{NH}\) 327, found no basis for deciding the language or the precise sense of zalma-.

In an article to appear in \textit{Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill} I have shown that PIE palatal \(*_{k}\) becomes Luvian \(z\), although not as part of a "satem" treatment as sometimes previously claimed. If we make the likely assumption that zalma- is Luvian (like the other second members of compound names such as -\(z\textit{iti}-, -\textit{mwa}-\) and -\(\textit{pi\bar{a}}\)-,)

---

\[49\] A. Lehman, \textit{Simple Thematic Imperfectives in Anatolian and Indo-European} (unpub. Ph. D. diss., Yale University, 1985) 205f., interprets (LOQUI)\(\textit{hari}-/\textit{hati}\)- as 'write', a specialization of 'strike' also appearing in HLuvian \(\textit{ARHA hara\bar{l}}\)- (i.e. \(\textit{hari}(ya)-/\)-). He equates this \(*_{y}o\)-stem with Hitt. \(\textit{hazziya}-\) 'strike; play' < \(\textit{hatta}-\) 'strike'. This derivation is impossible. The sequence \(*_{y}\) also assimilates in Luvian, and indeed we have the HLuvian equivalent of Hitt. \(\textit{hazziya}-\) in \(\textit{ha\bar{z}i-mi-na}\) 'we shall inscribe' in CEKKE B5. Furthermore, all proven cases of rotacism in HLuvian involve voiced or lented stops: see Morpurgo-Davies, \(KZ\) 96.245 ff. Thus neither (LOQUI)\(\textit{hari}-/\textit{hati}\)- nor \(\textit{ARHA hata\bar{l}}\)- can have anything to do with Hitt. \(\textit{hatta}-\) 'strike'.

On the other hand, his suggested connection of the verb (LOQUI) \(\textit{hatti}-/\textit{hari}\)- and the HLuvian noun \(\textit{hatura}\)- seems attractive. The latter is conventionally translated as 'to write; writing; letter' and compared with Hitt. \(\textit{hatr\bar{a}}(i)-\) 'write'. However, the latter never means 'inscribe', but only 'communicate, send a message' (see Tischler, \textit{HEG} 226). The constant spelling with \(-a-r\bar{a}\) also leaves the quality of the stop indeterminate. We should therefore consider also separating \(\textit{hatura}\)- 'message, communication' and \(\textit{hatr\bar{a}}(i)-\) 'send a message' from \(\textit{hatta}\)- 'strike' (against the references in Tischler) and deriving them rather from the root \(*_{h2/3}p\bar{a}\)- 'declare'.

\[69\] I will soon justify in detail elsewhere the equation of CLuv. \(\textit{sa}\), HLuv. \(*_{h2/3}p\bar{a}\)- and Lyc. \(\textit{ha}\)- as 'release, let go' < \(\textit{*th\bar{a}}\)-.
then we have an immediate explanation for the sense and origin of this morpheme. We may interpret *zalma- as 'shield, protection' < PIE *kel-mo(n)-: cf. Skt. *śarman- 'protection; cover; refuge', OE helm 'protector; helmet' and other related Germanic forms. Note that we have here not merely a common root, but a word equation with a *-mo- or *-men- suffix.

It is quite likely that we also have a Hittite cognate, previously unrecognized. There is a poorly attested Hittite noun GIŠ galam(m)a, which is part of a door: see Tischler, HEG 463, with references. The precise meaning of the term is difficult to determine, but it is possible to suppose that it refers to a long wooden beam used to block a door or gate.43) Such a specialization from 'protection, shield' seems reasonable.

The Hittite, Luvian and Germanic reflexes could continue *kelmo-,43) but the Hittite word is probably a collective plural tautum and could just as easily match exactly Skt. *śarman- < *kelmp-.44) Likewise CLuv. -zalma- as the second member of a compound could reflect *kelmo(n)-: cf. Grk. ἀ-πημιων beside πημα etc. The Germanic stem *kelma- could just as well be from *kel-mo-. For *-mo- beside *-men- see my discussion in Sprache 29 (1983) 1 ff. Thus we could derive the entire set starting from a men-stem *kelmp-.

The names with -zalma- as second member could be taken as "Satznamen" of the type: "4X (is my) protection/shield'. However, parallels with other names of this structure argue for Laroche's analysis, NH 285ff., as determinative compounds: 'shield of 4X'. This interpretation certainly seems more likely for É.GAL.PAP 'shield of the palace'.

While the interpretation of Hitt. GIŠ galamma- must remain tentative, ClLuv. zalma- 'shield, protection' may definitely be added to the list of examples of Luvian z < PIE *k.

Neumann, KZ 90 (1976) 141, presents evidence for a rhotacized variant -zarma- beside -zalma- and argues both for the interpretation of -zalma- as Luvian and for the names as "Satznamen".
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43) It is true that GIŠ batalmaš GIŠ-ru- 'door-bolt' seems to already fill this functional slot, but the 'door-bolt' could easily belong to the localized apparatus by which the two halves of the door were locked together. The GIŠ galamma would be instead a long wooden beam (or beams) placed across the closed doors for added security (presumably held in place in a manner similar to more modern versions of this device). Although Haas-Thiel, AOAT 31.125, are undoubtedly correct in rejecting Rost's meaning 'paint-brush' for galamma, their translation of arha warri in IBOT 36 1 69 as 'throws open' is entirely ad hoc and impossible. The sentence must mean 'wipes off the gate', however we are to account for this. I do not find it impossible that in a ritual context the "barber" scrapes the door with the same wooden beam normally used to blockade it.

44) The spelling ga-la-am-ma would reflect the gemination of *m next to another consonant also seen in ga-im-(ma)-ra- 'open field' < *gḗsmo-. While the spelling ga-la-a-ma certainly raises doubts about the interpretation /galamma/- < *kelma-, it is not a compelling counterargument: cf. pár-at-na- hip' beside pár-le-na- and even pár-le-e-V-, or occasional ka-ra-pV- beside usual ki-ga-ra-pV- and once gi-ri-pV- 'devour'.
Zur lydischen Betonung


In einer früheren Arbeit) hatte West im Rahmen einer Analyse der lydischen poetischen Inschriften, die wie andere derartige An-

2) Der Vorwurf wird von E. viermal wiederholt: KZ, 210 Anm. und 219; Spr, 15 mit Anm. 18.
4) In Kadmos 11 (1972), 165 ff.
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