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I. Hittite uppi/a- ‘send; bring’

1. Since Hrozný (1917: 122, n. 2), Hitt. uppi/a- has been almost universally assumed to contain the prefix u- ‘her-’ marking motion towards the speaker: see Götze 1933: 22, n. 3 and 1938: 124; Friedrich 1952: 234 ‘(her)schicken’ (sic!); Oettinger 1979: 489 ‘her-schicken’ (sic!); Melchert 1994: 104 and 149; Yakubovich 2005: 245 (implicit in the gloss ‘to bring’); Kloekhorst 2008: 921-2 ‘send (here)’ (sic!). However, there are no attested spellings †uú-up-pí/a-. Kloekhorst (2008: 36) assumes that the unattested OS spelling would be *ú-up-pi/a- (citing the restriction of the plene spelling ú-uš-ši-ya- ‘to throw’ to OS).¹ This is possible, but ad hoc and unlikely, given the very restricted attestation of ‘throw’ (a total of 3x OS ú-uš-ši-° vs. 12x post-OS uš-ši-°) versus the very well attested up-pí/a-° (at least 100x, 22x in MS). The complete absence of any spellings †uú-up-pí/a- can hardly be due to chance.

2. Much more important is that the objection of Pedersen (1938: 116-7) has been wrongly ignored: the actual usage of uppi/a- shows no fixed directionality whatsoever (towards or away from the speaker)! The parentheses in the glosses of Friedrich and Kloekhorst tacitly admit this fact, and a review of the attestations fully confirms Pedersen’s assertion:

---

¹ Carrboro NC USA. melchert@humnet.ucla.edu.

I use the standard sigla OH, MH, and NH to refer to the date of a composition as Old, Middle, or New Hittite and OS, MS, and NS to refer to the date of a manuscript as Old, Middle, or New Script.
1. HKM 18:18-20 (MH/MS)

nu=mu kā katti=mi ÉRIN.MEŠ KUR.UGU ÉRIN.MEŠ KUR URU Išḫēpitta kuški n=an=ta uppaḫḫi

“There are some troops of the Upper Land and Ishupitta here with me. I will send them to you.”

2. KBo 5.4 Vo 22 (NH; Treaty with Targasnalli)

nu=mu ḫatrāši ÉRIN.MEŠ=wa=mu ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ uppi nu=tta ÉRIN.ME.EŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.ME.EŠ uppaḫḫi

“And you write me: ‘Send me troops and horses!’ I will send you infantry and horses.”

3. KBo 3.6+ iii 77 (NH; Apology of Hattušili)

n=an ēppūn n=an=kan A.AB.BA tapuša uppaḫḫun

“I seized him and sent him alongside the sea.”

In (1) and (3) the direction clearly is away from the speaker, while in (2) the verb is used for motion both towards and away from the speaker. See also HKM 25:22-23 and HKM 30:8-10 for further examples of uppi/a- clearly indicating motion away from the speaker.

Naturally, since there is no inherent directionality in the verb, there are also instances where the context shows that the motion is towards the speaker (or more accurately towards the “deictic center”):

4. KBo 15.37 ii 49-59 (MH/NS; (ḫ)išuwa-Festival)

(“When it dawns on the eighth day, the large loaf of cheese and the leavened bread of three parīsu-measures of flour which (are) broken for the gods of the fathers and which are placed back on the sacrificial tables,”) n=aš arḫa paršulānzi namma ANA PANI DINGIR.MEŠ ḫumandaš kuwapiya 1 paršullin GA.KIN.AG 1 paršullin NINDA=ya uppiyanzi n=uš PANI DINGIR.MEŠ zikkanzı
“They crumble them and then bring one morsel of cheese and one morsel of bread before each of all the gods (lit. before all the gods in each place) and place them before the gods.”

Contra Carruba (1966: 20), Oettinger (1979: 489) and Nakamura (2002: 159), there is no basis for a separate verb ‘lift, raise’, but ‘send’ (Güterbock and Hoffner 1995: 193) is also unlikely. The cheese and loaves of bread that had been broken and presented to the gods of the fathers previously, but then put back on the sacrificial tables, are now crumbled, and a morsel of each is brought before the gods, whose images are surely the center of the action.

At least two instances of uppi/a- do not mean merely ‘send’ or ‘carry’, but rather ‘fetch’ (that is, to go somewhere and bring something from there to the starting point):

(5) KBo 17.65+ Ro 38-39 (MH/MS; Birth Ritual)

(“But how the festival of birth (is)—how they perform the festival when she gives birth,”) [(n)=aš GIŠ kurtaš iy]anza n=aš URU Kizzuwatna nu=mu=kan EZEN KAxU-it [ŪL karta n]=an apēz uppāḫḫi

“[It is m]ade [(as) a kurta-tablet], and it is in Kizzuwatna. I [do not know] the festival orally [by heart]. I will fetch it from there.”

The restorations are based on the parallel passage ibid. Vo 45-46, which has rather udanzi ‘they will bring’. See Beckman 1983: 136-7 and 161-4 with differing details, but it is clear that the speaker is in Hattusha and needs to retrieve the tablet in question from Kizzuwatna.

(6) KUB 12.58 ii 36-42 (MH/NS; Ritual of Tunnawi)

(“The ritual client goes to bathe,”) n=ašta MUNUS ŠU.GI 9 GIŠ GA.ZUM ŠA GIŠ TŪG anda upp[āi] GIŠ šēn’an IM-aš anda uppāi

“The “old woman” fetches in nine combs of boxwood. She fetches in a figurine of clay.”
Goetze (1938: 14-15) renders ‘brings in’, but the practitioner has been in the ritual space in the entire preceding context, so she must first go out in order to fetch the objects in.

We must therefore conclude with Pedersen that Hittite uppi/a- means ‘send, bring/take (somewhere)’ without specification of direction to or away from the speaker, occasionally also ‘fetch’ (go somewhere and bring back something). The lack of evidence for directionality combined with the total absence of spellings †u/ú-up-pi/a- means that we must abandon all attempts to force a meaning ‘her-, hither’ that does not exist and likewise the unfounded presumption that the verb contains the directional prefix û-.

The question of the verb’s correct etymology is as always an entirely secondary matter. Given the total lack of evidence for the presence of the prefix ‘her-’ but a strong goal orientation (all 80+ examples of ‘send’ in sufficient context have an explicit or implied goal), perhaps the verb represents a deadverbal stem from the adverb *úpo as in Skt. úpa ‘up to’ (anticipated by Oettinger 1979: 489-90, but with false semantics for a non-existent homonym ‘raise, lift’). For Skt. úpa as expressing ‘(hin)zu’ with mostly horizontal orientation (no trace of ‘from below’!) see Casaretto apud Hettrich, Casaretto and Schneider 2004: 36-42. For the derivational process see Melchert 2009 and compare the rare transitive use of English ‘near’ to mean ‘bring near (to)’ (Ruskin and Wilde). For the unexpected stem uppi- (which clearly is older than uppa-) from *úpo compare the opposite discrepancy in Hitt. šanna-‘conceal’ as if from *sn(h)i o vs. Latin sine and OIr. sain- < *sn(h)i.

II. Cuneiform Luvian (u-)up-pa- ‘carry’ and Hieroglyphic Luvian (CAPERE) u-pa- ‘carry (off)’

Pace Kloekhorst (2008: 922) the basic sense ‘carry’ of the CLuvian verb is not in doubt, but his rejection of the equation with Hittite uppi/a- is surely correct:

(7) *KBo 13.260 iii 13-15 (Birth Ritual)
ā=ṭṭa āduwan=za pariyan adduwaliyan wattaniyan uppanndu
“Let them carry the evil over to an evil land.”

For this interpretation see Yakubovich (2010: 237). The stem uppanna- shows the Luvian cognate of the Hittite “iterative-durative” suffix -anni/a-. One could suppose here a meaning ‘carry away’ for the verb, but such directionality cannot be proven, since pariyan ‘over to’ already conveys this nuance.

(8) KBo 13.260 iii 16-20 (Birth Ritual)

```
zīla=pa=tta za-x-x-ti DUMU.LÚ.ÚLU₂₁š ŠUM-ŠU ḫalzāi ḫuidumar=ša ḫupannandu wayaḫi=ša ḫaddulaḫi=ša annarumāḫi=ša
```

“Henceforth let them bring to this(?) human—one calls out his name—life, w., health (and) vigor.”

Here the directionality clearly is towards the deictic center, the place where the ritual is taking place, but once again this is furnished by the context, and cannot be shown to be inherent in the verb.

(9) KUB 35.88 iii 11-12 (Birth Ritual)

```
upatta=pa=wa=du šarriyanin 2-šu 9-[n-)za] anta=wa=āš=ta walluna<ś>šan wāni uppanta
```

“She furnished to her twice nine s., and they carried them in to the midwife (lit. woman of lifting).”

Likewise in this example there is no clear evidence for any inherent directionality in the verb, which simply means ‘carry’. See also KUB 35.107 iii 21 (anda uppanta) and KUB 25.39 iv 16 (ūppadda) with limited context. As will become clear presently, it is important that in the two instances of plene spelling the spelling is specifically u-up-pa° with <u>, not <ū>.

For arguments that the HLuvian cognate of CLuvian āppa- ‘carry’ is (“CAPERE”)u-pa- and not (PES)u-pa- ‘dedicate, furnish’ see Melchert 2004 contra Yakubovich 2005, but it is doubtful that the verb (“CAPERE”) u-pa- inherently implies speaker-oriented directionality:
“I devastated those countries,”) *(a-wa/i-ta (SCALPRUM.CAPERE\textsubscript{2}) u-pa-ni-zi a-tá (“CAPERE\textsubscript{2}”) u-pa-ha

“I brought in/collection trophies/spoils” (“and I came up from those countries in glory.”)

(11) KARKAMIŠ A2+3 §7

*a-wa/i-ta *a-mi-ya-za LITUUS+AVIS(-)ta-ni-ya-za REGIO-ni-i a-tá (DEUS)BONUS-na (DEUS)VITIS(-)ti-PRAE-ya-ha ARHA (CAPERE\textsubscript{2}) u-pa-ta

“He (Tarhunza of Carchemish) in my days brought away the grain-god and the wine-god into the country.”

(12) İSKENDERUN §§3-4

a-wa/i za-na\textsuperscript{i} (“*255”) ka-ru-na-na (“CAPERE”) u-pa-ha\textsuperscript{i} wa/i-tu-u-ta\textsuperscript{i} 4xMILLE 4xCENTUM a-ta (“CAPERE”) u-pa-ha zi-i-na (“*256”) zi-pa-ta-na-ti

“I carried off/brought (the contents of) this granary and I collected for it 4,400 with this z-measure.”

In all three examples cited (and the similar ones at KARKAMIŞ A 1a, §§7 and 10) the action involves removal of things from one place and their transportation to another. Since the new location is either explicitly or implicitly associated with the speaker (‘into the country’ in (11) clearly refers to Carchemish), ‘bring’ is the natural rendering, but the directionality is contextual, not inherent in the verb. As attested, HLuvian (“CAPERE/ CAPERE\textsubscript{2}”) u-pa- is neutrally ‘carry’ like its CLuvian cognate.

However, the phrase (SCALPRUM.CAPERE\textsubscript{2}) u-pa-ni- (CAPERE\textsubscript{2}) u-pa- is clearly a figura etymologica, and contra Melchert (2004: 372) ‘spoils’ are inherently something that is carried off, not something that is brought in.\textsuperscript{2} This figure and the use of CAPERE/CAPERE\textsubscript{2} ‘take’ as determinative

\textsuperscript{2} The fact that the noun is marked with the determinative SCALPRUM.CAPERE\textsubscript{2} does not argue against a figura etymologica. The addition of SCALPRUM is surely motivated by the fact that the spoils in question were typically statues or stelae (see e.g. KARKAMIŞ A24\textsuperscript{a} §6 on the Assyrian king’s removal of the Storm-god of Aleppo).
suggest that this verb *u*-pa- originally meant ‘carry off, remove’, although like its CLuvian counterpart it has undergone semantic bleaching to merely ‘carry’. The spelling of the CLuvian cognate as *u*-up- points to /o/-, so the combined evidence argues that this verb contains the reflex of *au- ‘off, away’, matching Latin au-ferō ‘carry away/off’. For the contrast of <u> = /o/ vs. <ú> = /u/ in Hittite see Rieken 2005: 538-9 after Eichner and on sources of Hittite /o(:)/ see Kloekhorst 2008: 35-60.\(^3\) The main point, however, is that Hittite *uppi/a- ‘send’ (with no directionality) and Luvian *ūppa-/(CAPERE)*u*-pa- ‘carry’ < *‘carry off, remove’ are not cognate, as per Kloekhorst (2008: 922).\(^4\)

III. Hittite *uiye/a- ‘send, drive’

This verb (overwhelmingly spelled *u*-i-e-/ya- with <u>!) is universally assumed to be *u-*(i)ye/a- ‘her-schicken’ vs. *pe/i*-ye/a- ‘hin-schicken’: see Pedersen 1938: 198; Friedrich 1952: 232 ‘schicken’ (eigentlich ‘herschicken’); jagen’; Kloekhorst 2008: 910 ‘send (here)’. Once again, however, there is actually no textual evidence for speaker-oriented directionality of *u*(i)ye/a- (note here too the respectively explicit and tacit admissions of this fact by Friedrich and Kloekhorst). Since this actually well-known fact is consistently ignored in discussions of the verb’s morphology and history, it seems necessary to reiterate some of the evidence:

(13) *KBo* 3.40b:9-10 (OH/NS; narrative)

\[am[(\text{mug} = a^d\text{U-aš})]\text{DINGIR} \text{pišenes}[\text{LUG}]\text{AL-i uyēr ūt} = \text{wa} \text{LÜ,MEŠ GAL GAL} \text{wemi}[(\text{a})]\]

“But me the male gods of the Storm-god sent to the king (saying): ‘Go and find the great men!’”

(14) *KUB* 33.5 ii 4 (OH/NS; Telipinu, 2nd version)

\[d\text{MAĦ-aš NIM.LÀL-an uyēt ūt} = za \ldots x d\text{Telipinun zik šanђa}\]

---

\(^3\) This means that the Hittite prefix *u- (regularly spelled <u>) that does mark directionality towards the speaker cannot reflect *au- (contra Melchert 1994: 104 et al.). Its true etymology remains to be determined.

\(^4\) The root *pa- of Luvian /o:pa-/ (sic!) is probably *(s)peh,- ‘set in (violent) motion, draw’ seen also in Greek σπάω ‘tear/pull’ and Armenian hanem ‘pull; take away; lead’: see García Ramón 2009. Thus /o:pa-/ *‘take away, remove’ whence ‘carry’ reflects a virtual *au-(s)p(e)h,-. The inflectional class is unknown, but a third plural *au-(s)p(h)énti would give /o:panti/ in either a mi- or hi-verb.
“Hannahanna sent the bee (saying): ‘Go [ ] and you search for Telipinu!’”

It is quite certain that the direction in these two passages is not oriented towards the speaker or the “deictic center”. It is noteworthy that the duplicate to (14) KUB 33.4 ii 17 (also NS) has piyēt, while KUB 33.8 ii 22 (NS) in a similar context also has uyēt.5

(15) KUB 14.3 i 6-9 (NH; Tawagalawa letter)

\[\text{nu=m[u U]N-an IGI-anda uiyat ARAD-anni=wa=mu dā nu=wa=mu }\]
\[\text{LUtuḥkantin uiya nu=wa=mu }\text{ITTI }\text{dUTUŠṭi uwatezzi nu=šši }\text{LU }\text{TARTENU}
\text{uiyanun}\]

“He sent a person to meet me (saying): ‘Take me into servitude! Send the crown-prince to me, and he shall bring me to Your Majesty.’ So I sent the crown-prince to him.”

This example confirms that uiya- has no inherent directionality, since it is used indifferently for both motion towards the speaker in the first instance and motion away from the speaker in the second.

(16) KBo 4.8 ii 13-14 (NH; Tawananna Affair)

\[\text{kī=ya=an 1-an dammešḥanumun IŠTU }\text{É.GAL-LIM=pat=kan kuit katta uiyanun}\]

“And I also did her this one harm, that I sent her down from the palace.”

The banishment of the tawananna undeniably refers to motion away from the speaker.

(17) KUB 1.1+ iii 10-11 (NH; Apology of Hattušili)

\[\text{URU }\text{Ḫakpiššaš=ma kururiyahaṭa [nu] LÚ.MEŠ GašgaHI.A uiyanun n=an IŠTU}
\text{NÍ.TE=YA SIG₅-ahḫun}\]

5 It is mildly unfortunate that KUB 17.10 i 35, a MS copy of the Telipinu myth, has [IŠ-P]UR, so that we cannot determine which Hittite verb was used. Both uiye/a- and pe/iye/a- are securely attested in OH/OS: x-x-x[ ] iššāz LUGAL-i atti=mi u-i-x[ ] (KUB 26.35:3) and [º-a]n arḫa imma piyēzzi (KUB 36.106 Ro’ 5).
“But Hakpis became hostile, [so] I drove out the Kaskeans and on my own put it (the city) in order.”

The context argues for the given interpretation with Otten (1981: 17) contra van den Hout (2003: 199). The sense is confirmed by the parallel KUB 1.7 ii 6, which adds arḫa, but it is crucial to note that there is no space in KUB 1.1 iii 11 for any restoration beyond [nu]. Thus uiya- by itself could mean ‘banish, drive away’. This passage is surely also the source for the second meaning ‘jagen’ given by Friedrich (1952: 232). For the sense ‘banish, drive away’ for the combination arḫa uiya- see also KUB 14.8 Vo 17-18 and the Plague Prayers passim, but here of course the directionality is overtly signaled by the preverb.

The sense ‘banish, drive (away)’ of enemies shows that uiya- did not originally necessarily imply control of the object by the subject. Thus the meaning ‘send’ is secondary. Example (17) also shows that the preverb arḫa also was not originally required for the meaning ‘drive away, banish’. These facts argue for an original *au-(Hi)Hyeh₁- *cast away’. However, as in the case of Luvian u-up-pa- ‘carry’ from original *‘carry off, remove’, the sense of Hittite uiya- was mostly bleached to a more general ‘drive, send’, without implication of direction. This led already in Old Hittite to creation of a new univerbation with the productive pē- for ‘send off, hin-schicken’.⁶

IV. Conclusions

Hittite uppi/a- means ‘send’ without specification of directionality and contains no prefix. CLuvian (u-)up-pa- ‘carry’ and HLuv. (CAPERE)u-pa- ‘carry’ contain a prefix /o/-/ originally indicating motion away, but the meaning was bleached to simply ‘carry’. Likewise, Hittite u-i-e/ya- contains a prefix /o/-/ and originally meant ‘send/drive away’, but was bleached to simply ‘send/drive’. None of these verbs has anything to do with the Hittite prefix /u/-/ spelled <ú> indicating motion toward the speaker (contra Melchert 1994: 104 and all others).

⁶ It seems likely, though not strictly provable, that the “bleaching” of the sense of *au- ‘away’ was tied to its relative lack of productivity in both Hittite and Luvian.
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