

# 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

110. Band (1997)

1. Heft

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen

ISSN 0935-3518

Luvian /tāna-/ 'sanctified, inviolable'

In the Hieroglyphic Luvian text of the Emirgazi altars we find the following provision (§§ 24-26 after the text of Hawkins, 1995: 88):  
*REL-i(a)-sa-pa-wa/i* REX *zi/a-i(a)* STELE *sà-ka-la'-tá'-i(a)*  
*REL+ra/i-pa-wa/i tà-na* NEG-*wa/i á wa/i-tu-tá'* (DEUS)SOL  
SOL+*RA/I* (DEUS)TONITRUS.CAELUM ... REX.\*398-*zi/a*  
\*303-*zi/a* INFRA *tara/i-zi/a-nú-wa/i-tu* 'But whatever king damages these stelae, or does not make them TANA, let the Sun-goddess of Arinna, the Storm-god of Heaven (plus further deities) TARZANU down his royal -.'

Although the precise meaning of the verb /tarzanu-/ remains unknown, the general sense of the passage is reasonably clear. King Tut-haliya is asking the gods to punish any later king who dares to harm the stelae he has dedicated as part of a cult complex. The eventuality of such a crime is expressed with a disjunctive generalizing relative clause employing "argument plus negated counter-argument," a well-known Indo-European stylistic figure (see Watkins, 1994: 29&44, following Humbach, 1959). I read the verb of § 24 in the order *sa-ka-la-tá-i(a)* against Hawkins, following Starke (1990: 276f), who convincingly compares the stem /sakalta-/ "damage, harm" with the base of Luvian *šakaltamman-* 'destruction' (or sim.). The verbal stem is denominative to an old unattested participle \**sakkant-* 'cut' < PIE \**jek-* (for other derivatives see Starke, 1990: 515 ff.), with a substitution of /l/ for /n/ before dental stop seen elsewhere in Luvian and Hittite (Melchert, 1994: 171). The meaning of /sakalta-/ may well be more specific than 'harm, damage' ('cut pieces out of' or the like), but this cannot be proven.

Since the stelae already exist, the sense of /a(ya)-/ 'make' in this context can hardly be 'construct'. We should assume rather a usage with a double accusative in the meaning 'treat X (as) Y' or 'bring X in-to the condition Y', as attested in KARATEPE III: *wa/i-i-mu-u* (DE[US])TONIT[RUS]-*h[u-za]-sa* [*Á-tama*] -*wa/i-ya*(URBS) "FEMINA" -*na-ti-na tá-ti-ha i-zi-i-tá* "The Storm-god made me mother and father to Adana.' One may compare the similar figure in Hittite in the Anitta text: [*š*] = *u[š]* *annuš attuš iēt* 'He made them (= treated

them as) mothers and fathers' (*KBo* III 22 Ro 9). The word /tana/ is thus neuter nominative-accusative plural of an adjective (agreeing with /zaya/ STELE 'these stelae'). The stylistic figure assures us that not treating the stelae as /tana/ is a negative act parallel to 'harm, damage'. Hence the meaning of /tana/ itself (a hapax<sup>1)</sup>) must be positive.

I therefore propose that /tāna-/ (for the long vowel see below) means 'sanctified, inviolable', the functional equivalent of Latin *sanc-tus*, on whose sense see Benveniste (1969: 2.187 ff.), especially for the differentiation versus *sacer* 'sacred, taboo' (a point to which we will return). By dedicating the stelae to the gods as part of a cult complex, Tuthaliya has rendered them inviolable, and calls down divine sanctions on any potential violator (cf. Benveniste's discussion of *sancire* and *sancitō*, 1969: 2.190).

Obviously, other positive meanings would also fit this single context. Confirmation for the meaning 'sanctified, inviolable' comes from further derivatives of the stem /tāna-/ in Luvian, as identified by Starke (1990: 205 ff.): *dānit-*, a cult object (perhaps plurale tantum) at least once associated with the <sup>NA4</sup>*huruwaši*, now generally agreed to refer to a stone pillar which in most cases is itself a cult object (see Puhvel, 1991: 438 ff., with refs.). As Starke emphasizes, the religious, cultic associations of *dānit-* are further confirmed by its derivative, the substantivized *tyo-* adjective *MUNUS dāniti(ya)-* 'priestess' or 'hierodule' (the attested nominative and accusative singular show the "i-mutation" established by Starke, 1990: 54 ff.). The word also appears in HLUvian (FEMINA.PURUS.INFRA)*ta-ni-ti-na* (acc. sg.) in TELL AHMAR

<sup>1)</sup> I initially assumed another occurrence of this word in the sequence *ta-NEG URBS AEDIFICARE* of § 16 of the SÜDBURG inscription: (I) built TANA cities.' However, as David Hawkins pointed out to me (pers. comm.), the writing of the first three signs in one vertical column argues strongly for a single word, a city-name with URBS as a postposed determinative: *ta-NEG(URBS)* '(the city) Tana'. He has plausibly suggested that the reference may be to the city Adana (Hawkins, 1995: 42).

Proper treatment of the stelae by a future king is expressed in EMIRGAZI § 27 by the expression *za-i(a) STELE PUGNUS-MI-na á* 'makes/treats these stelae ...' (and does not destroy them). Given the phonetic complement in *-na*, it is tempting to suppose that this represents the direct opposite of § 25: 'But whatever king does treat these stelae as TANA ...'. But I see no way to account for the very different spelling within the space of a few lines, and it seems hard to avoid the conclusion of Hawkins (1995: 100) that we should relate PUGNUS-*MI-na* to the verb PUGNUS-*MI-tu* of § 29, although his suggested solution of an infinitive is very hard syntactically.

1, § 7, as independently identified by Hawkins (1980: 141 & 151). Note the presence of PURUS in the determinative of the HLUvian word.

The neuter nominative-accusative plural /tāna/ would fit several stem types, but an *a*-stem /tāna-/ is by far the most likely, quite possibly with "i-mutation" in the unattested animate nominative and accusative.<sup>2)</sup> Luvian /ā/ may represent prehistoric \*ā, ō, or \*eh<sub>1</sub>, but probably not \*ē (see Melchert, 1994: 264 f.), and the initial dental stop could have been voiceless, voiced, or voiced aspirate in PIE. These ambiguities leave open a number of possibilities for the etymon, but the clearly religious meaning of /tāna-/ strongly suggests a derivation from PIE \**dheh*<sub>1s-</sub>, seen in Armenian *dik* 'gods', Latin *fēriāe* 'holidays' and *fānum* 'sanctum, temple', Oscan *fīsnam* 'temple', etc.. In fact, the shape of the Luvian word suggests a word-equation with either the Oscan or Latin form: \**dheh*<sub>1s-no-</sub> or \**dhh*<sub>1s-no-</sub>.<sup>3)</sup> The Italic noun would be a substantivization of the adjective seen in Luvian, for which one may compare the eventual substantivized use of *sancitum*.

Such a direct equation would require that an original cluster \**-sn-* was simplified in Luvian (with or without compensatory lengthening). Such a development cannot at present be affirmed or denied, but as noted in Melchert (1994: 268 & 273) it is striking that there are no assured examples of inherited \**-sn-*. The only such cluster attested is likely to be secondary: \**targāš(ša)na-* 'ass' (in *targāš(ša)nalla/i-* 'ass-driver') probably shows syncope of an unattested form of the same word seen in Latin *asinus*, however one explains the first part of the word (see Tischler, 1993: 176 f., with refs.).<sup>4)</sup>

Further support that the Luvian adjective is based on the extended root \**dheh*<sub>1s-</sub> (and not on the mechanically deducible base \**dheh*<sub>1-</sub>) comes from the other Anatolian derivatives from a base \**dhh*<sub>1s-</sub> with clearly religious-cultic associations: Palaic *tašūra-* 'sacrificial table/stand' (Melchert, 1994: 191) and the various reflexes of a Proto-Anatolian \**dhh*<sub>1sóm</sub> 'votive offering' (HLuvian /*tasanza*/ 'votive stele' =

<sup>2)</sup> The tentative suggestion of Starke (1990: 206) that the base of *dānit-* is to be found in the word *dān* of *KUB XXXV* 57 i 5, in Hittite context, is unlikely to be true, despite my approval in Melchert (1993: 204).

<sup>3)</sup> In the case of the zero-grade preform it is immaterial whether the first *a* of a Pre-Luvian \**dama-* directly reflects the laryngeal of \**dhh*<sub>1s-no-</sub> or an anaptyctic vowel inserted into a preform \**dmo-* (for possible Proto-Anatolian deletion of \**h*<sub>1</sub> in a sequence *Ch*<sub>1</sub>CC see Melchert, 1994: 65).

<sup>4)</sup> The 'etc.' following *targāš(ša)nalla/i-* in Melchert (1994: 249) is an error and should be stricken.

Lycian  $\theta\theta\bar{\epsilon}$  'altar' = Lydian  $taf\bar{e}n$  'votive object', as shown by Eichner, 1983: 60ff.). In the absence of counterevidence I therefore tentatively derive Luwian /tāna-/ 'sanctified, inviolable' from  $*dh(e)h_1s-no-$ , directly cognate with the Italic reflexes. Further evidence for the outcome of  $*-sn-$  in Luwian is sorely needed.

Luwian /tāna-/ furnishes additional welcome evidence for the PIE root  $*dheh_1s-$  in Anatolian. However, its presence raises the question of its range of meaning versus the family of CLuwian  $kumma(ya)$  'pure', HLUwian  $ku-ma-ya-la-$  'sacrificial animal',<sup>5)</sup> Lycian  $kumaza-$  'priest',  $kumehe/i-$  'sacred' and 'sacrificial victim', and  $kumez(e)i-$  'to sacrifice', and Palaic  $a\check{s}-kum\bar{m}\bar{a}m\bar{u}wa-$  'sacralized meats' (i.e. 'mouth-pure'), the last as per Watkins (1987: 399f.), following Szemerényi.

The answer has already been given by several scholars:  $kumma-$  and its derivatives are the functional equivalent of Hittite  $\check{s}urpi-$  'pure, sacred; taboo' and Latin  $sacer$ . For the meaning and derivation of  $\check{s}urpi-$  see Watkins (1975). The same double-edged sense - 'sacred' to gods but 'taboo' for humans - was expressly attributed to the Palaic by Watkins (1987: 399f.) and to the Luvo-Lycian terms by Poetto (1989: 193, with refs.). With its contrast of  $kumma(ya)$  'sacred; taboo' versus  $tāna-$  'sanctified, inviolable', Luwian appears to make a distinction for which there is no direct analogue in Hittite.

#### References

- Benveniste, Émile (1969): *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. Paris: Klincksieck.  
 Eichner, Heiner (1983): Etymologische Beiträge zum Lykischen der Trilingue vom Letaon bei Xanthos. *Orientalia* 52. 48-66.  
 Hawkins, David (1980): The "Autobiography of Ariyahinas's Son": An Edition of the Hieroglyphic Luwian Stele *Tell Ahmar* 1 and *Aleppo* 2. *AnSt* 30. 139-156.

<sup>5)</sup> The attested meaning of  $ku-ma-ya-la-$  is due simply to the common use of animals as sacrificial offerings. Compare Lycian  $kumehe/i-$ , both 'sacred, sacral' as an adjective and 'sacrifice' as a noun. The substantivized use may or may not be a calque on Greek  $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$  'sacrificial sheep', as suggested by Oettinger (1981: 11f.), but the latter furnishes another example of this trivial semantic development. I can not therefore follow Poetto (1989: 194f.) who argues that Hittite  $\check{s}urpal(a)$  'animal' (in general) is a parallel derivative of  $\check{s}urpi-$  'pure'. There is not a shred of evidence that  $\check{s}urpal(a)$  has any associations with the sacred or the cult, and his claim that only wild animals are viewed as belonging to 'the sacred' is patently contradicted by Hittite ritual practice. For the correct derivation of  $\check{s}urpal(a)$  from a base seen in Latin  $\check{s}urpus$  'supine' see Watkins (1973).

Hawkins, David (1995): *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*. *StBoT Beiheft* 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Humbach, Helmut (1959): *Aussage plus negierte Gegenansage*. *MSS* 14. 23-33.

Melchert, Craig (1993): *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill: self-published.

Melchert, Craig (1994): *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Oettinger, Norbert (1981): Probleme phraseologischer Interferenzen zwischen orientalischen und klassischen Sprachen. *Glotta* 59. 1-12.

Poetto, Massimo (1989): *Luvio geroglifico ku-ma-ya-la 'animale da sacrificio'*. *OA* 28. 193-196.

Puhvel, Jaan (1991): *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 3. Words beginning with H*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Starke, Frank (1990): *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens (StBoT 31)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Tischler, Johann (1993): *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar. Lieferung 9*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Watkins, Calvert (1973): *Latin suppus. Papers on Italic Topics presented to James Wilson Pouligny*, ed. Eric Hamp, 394-399 (= *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1/3).

Watkins, Calvert (1975): *La désignation indo-européenne du 'tabou'*. *Langue, discours, société. Pour Émile Benveniste*, ed. Julia Kristeva et al., 208-214. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Watkins, Calvert (1987): *Two Anatolian forms: Palaic aškummaṁwa-, Cuneiform Luwian wāšša. Feitschrift für Henry Hoenigswald*, ed. by George Cardona & Norman H. Zide, 399-404. Tübingen: G.Narr.

Watkins, Calvert (1994): *How to kill a dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The University of North Carolina  
 CB#3155, 3/8 Dey Hall  
 Chapel Hill N. C. 27599-3155, USA

H. Craig Melchert