



*Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum
Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer (edd.
D. Groddek & S. Rößle)*
Dresden: Verlag der TU Dresden 2004

The Inflection of Some Irregular Luvian Neuter Nouns

H. Craig Melchert (Chapel Hill)

It is an honor to participate in this long overdue tribute to Emil Forrer, a scholar of unusual brilliance and originality who never received during his lifetime the recognition that he deserved. Among his many accomplishments, Forrer was one of the first to recognize Cuneiform Luvian as a language separate from but closely related to Hittite (Forrer 1919 and 1922: 215-223). He also made pioneering contributions to the decipherment of the Anatolian hieroglyphs (Forrer 1932), the language of which was eventually shown to be a form of Luvian. Thanks to the efforts of several generations of scholars and most recently to the magnificent new corpus of Iron-Age inscriptions by J.D. Hawkins (2000), we may now use the evidence of HLuvian to help solve problems presented by CLuvian.

Calvert Watkins (1993: 469-477) has offered a fundamentally persuasive analysis of the peculiar-looking CLuvian word for 'oath': neuter nom.-acc. sg. *ḫīrūn*, elsewhere *ḫīrūt-* < original **h₂éru*, **h₂éru-t-*. He compares for the root Greek ἀρά, Homeric ἀράη 'prayer; imprecation, curse' < **arw-ā-* from a base **h₂er-w-*. For the morphology he rightly adduces Latin *salūs*, *salūt-* < **s₁h₂-u-t-* beside Sanskrit *sárva-* etc. < **solh₂-w-o-*. He notes that the word ^{NINDA}*ḫarzaz/šūn*, *ḫarzazūt-* 'ribollita, bread soup' appearing in Hittite contexts surely has the same structure, despite the absence of an obvious Indo-European root etymology.

Watkins' derivation is very attractive, impeccable both phonologically and morphologically¹. However, his formulation leaves two points about the CLuvian word unexplained. First, what is the source of the unexpected length in the *-ū-*? This is a serious problem, since it is otherwise unparalleled in an Anatolian neuter noun in *-u(t)-*. Hittite *pūrūt-*

1 The long **ē* is not colored by the adjacent laryngeal by "Eichner's Law" (the validity of which is beyond all doubt, despite the protestations of Lindeman 1987: 56-59 et aliter). It then regularly becomes Luvian *ī*. The **-t-* between unaccented vowels undergoes "lenition" in Proto-Anatolian to **/d/*, spelled with single *-t-* in CLuvian. See on these changes Melchert (1994: 263 and 60 with references).

'mud' is attested forty times without plene spelling of the second *-u-*. CLuvian *lūlut-* 'prosperity' appears twenty-one times without plene for the second vowel versus twice with it. In contrast the noun *hūrūn/hūrūt-* shows twenty-two spellings with plene of the *-ū-* against only six without it. There can be little doubt that this noun has a long *-ū-* in the second syllable whereas the others do not. The long *-ū-* of Latin *salūs* is of no help, since it is equally unexplained.

Second, there is no obvious motivation for the final *-n* of the nom.-acc. singular. Watkins assumes that it is merely analogical to thematic neuter nouns in *-an* < **-om*. However, once again the pattern of other neuter stems of similar structure argues against this: CLuvian *lūlut-* 'prosperity' and *nūt-* 'assent' show only nom.-acc. sg. *lūlu* and *nū* respectively. Likewise HLuvian /*tarud-*/ 'statue' has a nom.-acc. singular /*taru-sa/* with no trace of an /*-n/*. Nor is *-n* ever added to the nom.-acc. singular of the very numerous Luvian neuter nouns in *-it-* (nom.-acc. singular in *-i-sa*)².

A solution to these two problems is suggested by the inflectional pattern of two other HLuvian neuter nouns. The first of these is the word for 'fort(ress)', for which we have the following relevant evidence: nom.-acc. sg. ("CASTRUM")*hā+ra/i-ni-sā-za* (KARATEPE, §LIII), nom.-acc. pl. ("CASTRUM")*ha+ra/i-ni-sā* (KARATEPE, § XIX), dat.-loc. sg. "CASTRUM"-*si* (KARATEPE, § XL). These are to be read as /*harnisan-za/*, /*harnisa/*, and /*harnisi/* respectively. The second crucial example is a word for 'blood sacrifice' (or similar): nom.-acc. sg. []*ā-sa-ha+ra/i-[mi]-sā-za* (KARKAMIŠ A29h, frag. 3, 1), nom.-acc. pl. ("*350")*ā-sa-ha+ra/i-mi-sā* (KARKAMIŠ A11b+c, § 18 and A12, § 11). These must be read as /*asharmisan-za/* and /*asharmisa/*. For the sense see Hawkins (2000: 114), but the first example proves that the noun is a neuter and that /*asharmisa/* must thus be analyzed as neuter nom.-acc. plural, not animate nom. singular (contra Hawkins loc. cit. and Starke 1990: 556-557).

These nouns appear to show stems /*harnisa-/* and /*asharmisa-/*, but original thematic stems in /*-is(s)a-/* are extremely unlikely. The only Luvian stems of this shape are CLuvian *luḡarišša-* (a topographic feature) and *mašharišša-* '?' (NB the same sequence

2 In the few cases where these nouns do alter their nom.-acc. singular, what they show is rather restoration of the final dental stop from the rest of the paradigm: HLuvian /*wanid-/* 'stele' with nom.-acc. sg. *wa/i-ni-za* (i.e. [*wanit-sa*] < /*wanid-sa/*). That the spelling *wa/i-ni-za* is to be analyzed thus (and not as a possible /*wanin-za/*) is shown by CLuvian *zār-za* = HLuvian *za+ra/i-za* 'heart' ([*tsa:rt-sa*] < /*tsa:rd-sa/*) after oblique /*tsard-/* (for expected **zār-sa*): see Hawkins 2000: 91 & 179-180.

-arišša-!), and perhaps the very unclear hapax legomena *ališan* and *ḫantišan*³. On the other hand, there is a well-established class of Luvian neuter nouns in *-is-*: CLuvian *ḫalliš-* 'illness' (cf. *ḫallina-* 'to sicken'), *ḫappiš-* 'limb, member', *kuppiš-* 'foot-stool'. One may further add **ariš-* (in *arišūant(i)-*) and **ḫiḫiḫiš-* 'spell-binding' (cf. on all these Starke 1990: 109-113). For /asharmis-/ one may compare specifically CLuvian *šarlamiš-* 'exaltation' (Starke 1990: 119).

I suggest that our two HLuvian nouns likewise reflect original neuter stems in *-is-*, with secondary thematic inflection, or perhaps simply addition of the thematic ending *-an* in the nom.-acc. singular, which for Luvian amounts to the same thing. What is crucial is that due to prehistoric changes the inflection of thematic and athematic neuter nouns became identical in Luvian except for precisely the nom.-acc. singular. Under these circumstances analogical spread of the thematic ending *-an* (NB the entire ending, not merely *-n*!) to the athematic type seems a trivial process. The model would have been original thematic neuters such as HLuvian /i:starta-/ 'throne, seat' from a virtual **ēstro-to-* (for the secondary suffix **-to-* see Starke 1990: 117 & 416 and Melchert 1999: 366)⁴:

N.-A. */harnis/ */hi:ru/ /i:starta/* /harnisa/ /hi:ruta/ /i:starta/*
 D.-L. /harnisi/ /hi:rudi/* /i:stardi/ /harnisanz/* /hi:rudanz/* /i:stardanz/*
 Ab.-Ins. /harnisadi/* /hi:rudadi/ /i:stardi/*

Confirmation for this reshaping of neuter stems in *-is-* in the nom.-acc. singular is furnished by the HLuvian word for '(memorial) stele' /tanis-/⁵. Beside the ambiguous dat.-loc. sg. (STELE)*ta-ni-si* (MEHARDE, § 3) we find on the one hand nom.-acc. sg. (STELE)*ta-ni-sâ* (SHEIZAR, § 4), which must be read as /tanis-sa/ (with Hawkins 2000: 418), but on the other hand also nom.-acc. sg. (STELE)*ta-ni¹-sâ-za* (MEHARDE, § 1), which must be /tanisan-za/ with the added *-an*. A further example of a renewed athematic neuter nom.-acc. singular with *-an* is *parnan-za* 'house' (i.e. oblique stem *parn-* + *-an* replacing **pīr*, the expected cognate of Hittite *pēr*).

3 The suggested meaning 'flatland' for *luḫarišša-* and the etymological comparison with Greek λευγός by Puhvel (2001: 127-128) are attractive, but his morphological analysis fails to explain the geminate *-šš-*. As shown below, Luvian neuter nouns in *-iš-* show consistently single intervocalic *-š-*.

4 As E. Rieken points out (pers. comm.), we should probably view this process as taking place in two steps. First, the pattern of /i:starta-/ was spread to invariant consonant stems like /harnis-/. Then the nom.-acc. singular ending *-an* was generalized to other neuter nouns. A direct influence of /i:starta-/ on /hi:ru(d)-/ would likely have led to nom.-acc. singular **/hi:rudan/*.

5 This word is transparently derived from the Luvian stem /ta:na-/ 'sacralized' (for which see Melchert 1997). It thus probably did not refer to a stele in the general sense, but specifically to one used for cultic purposes such as in memory of the dead.

We may now account for the existence and shape of CLuvian nom.-acc. sg. *ḫīrūn*. As in the other cases cited above, thematic *-an* was added to the inherited form with zero ending and the new form then underwent syncope: **ḫīru(w)-an* > *ḫīrūn*. For the syncope one may compare CLuvian ^{NINDA} *alalun-za* < **alaluwan-za* (contra Starke 1990: 46 the word cannot be a *u*-stem, which would have led only to **alalu-sa*) and the frequent reduction of neuter nom.-acc. singular *-iyan-za* to *-in-za* in HLUvian. That the resulting vowel is long is not unexpected and is paralleled in Luvian: cf. CLuvian *a-an-ni-i-ti* 'carries out' < **ānniyati* or *du-ú-un-du* 'they put' < **dúwantu*. In the word for 'oath' the long vowel was trivially generalized from the nom.-acc. singular *ḫīrūn* to the oblique stem *ḫīrūt-*, replacing inherited **ḫīrut-*. We thus can and should maintain Watkins' derivation of the Luvian word from a preform **h₂éru*, **h₂éru-t-*, with all of its implications for the PIE inflection of nominal stems in **-u-t-*.

References

- Forrer, Emil. 1919. Die acht Sprachen der Boghazköy-Inschriften. *SPAW* 1029-1041.
- . 1922. Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Ḫatti-Reiches. *ZDMG* 76 174-269.
- . 1932. *Die hethitische Bilderschrift* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 3). Chicago.
- Hawkins, J. David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Volume I. *Inscriptions of the Iron Age* (Studies in Indo-European Language and Culture 8/1). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lindeman, Fredrik O. 1987. *Introduction to the 'Laryngeal Theory'*. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- . 1997. Luvian /tāna-/ 'sanctified, inviolable'. *HS* 110 47-51.
- . 1999. Two problems of Anatolian nominal derivation. In *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler* (edd. H. Eichner and H.C. Luschützky) 365-375. Prague: Enigma.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 2001. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Volume 5: *Words beginning with L*. *Indices to volumes 1-5*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Starke, Frank. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (StBoT 31). Wiesbaden.

Watkins, Calvert. 1993. Some Anatolian words and forms. In *Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. G. Meiser) 469-478. Innsbruck: IBS.