used to wipe out the impurity from the mouth of royal officials, or the cake itself or roasted grain apparently absorbs impurity and is then disposed of. This "toxic waste" may be burned up in the hearth, or it may be disposed of in the ḫekur. These two offerings/cleansings bring up another point: the roasted grain, after being waved over the god, the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag, and over the potentially polluted augurs, seems to be an absorbant of impurities to be disposed of, but also a (recycled?) offering, either to the dead or the hearth. The dual nature of the sweet oil cake and roasted grain as both offering and (apparently) purifying absorbant is puzzling. In each case, with the hearth and the ḫekur, its disposition could be seen as disposal or as a kind of recycled offering. This ritual involves other dual roles. The LÚ.MEŠMUŠEN.DÙ are involved both as "clients" and as officiants in the ritual procedures. The Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag partici- pates both as a deity receiving offerings and as a sort of priest mediating between the officiants and other gods.

The concern with impurity in the augurs, with consequent cleansing with a kind of sponge cake (?), reminds me of the old practice, at least in America, of washing out a child's mouth with soap if he or she was caught lying (the "evil word" of our ritual), as if you could cleanse the mind by washing the mouth. The mouth with its "evil word" is washed out; is this because the word itself is conceived as having power to effect evil directly? This does not necessarily purify the mind which gave existence to this "evil word," but it might be perceived as stopping its effect. Or is the mouth rather than the mind treated simply because it can be treated directly, while the mind is not so easily accessible? We thus have here an official attempt by the Hittites to grapple with the nature of evil, construed in terms of loyalty to the state. Those close to the royal family are so powerful in terms of the evil they can do to the state that the potential evil of their mouths must be ritually averted.

The attempt to control the gods through a combination of offerings, prayer, and mechanical means is familiar to all who study the Hittite mentality. What is intriguing in this ritual is the concept that the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag, once propitiated, will *choose* to remove evil from his presence (the temple).

The Hittites, like most cultures, attempted to control their universe as they saw it through propitiating, cajoling, and reasoning with the forces which controlled it. In the huge corpus of texts which describe the ceremonies designed to accomplish this one sees hundreds of examples of the same basic pattern, but with interesting variations on the pattern. This ritual is intriguing in apparently setting up a kind of dualistic universe and in its attempt to go beyond manipulation to a relationship in which the deity acted for humankind's benefit of his own volition. I will continue to hope that more of this ritual will be found to clarify this manifestation of the Hittite view of their world.

Neo-Hittite Nominal Inflection

H. Craig Melchert (Chapel Hill)

The last quarter-century has seen great progress in chronologizing Hittite texts and manuscripts. In the wake of this development linguists unsurprisingly have concentrated their efforts on establishing the grammar of Old Hittite (OH) on the basis of assured OH manuscripts. However, the OH corpus is quite small. The great bulk of our evidence continues to consist of Neo-Hittite (NH) manuscripts which are either certainly copies of older compositions or represent texts whose date of composition is indeterminate. Barring dramatic new discoveries, we are likely to face this situation for the foreseeable future.

An urgent desideratum is therefore an objective means of evaluating the relative reliability of such manuscripts in terms of their linguistic features. Unusual fea- tures in these manuscripts may be precious archaisms which by accident are not (yet) attested in our limited OH corpus. However, they may instead be neologisms, or even mere creations of the copyists, unreal forms which never existed in the language of any period. I cite as one famous example the preterite first singular *kueršun* "I cut" (KBo X 2 ii 48; NH ms. of OH text). This word may be a genuine archaism, in Indo-European terms a "sigmatic aorist" (Oettinger, 1979: 119). How- ever, given the coexistence of both *kuer-* and *karš-* "cut" in Hittite, it is difficult to exclude the possibility of a blend of the two (genuine or erroneous).

It seems to me self-evident that any evaluation of the features of such copies depends crucially on our first establishing not only the synchronic grammar of Old Hittite, but also that of Neo-Hittite, **based on assured Neo-Hittite compositions**. Only then can we judge the likelihood of a given neologism (or misinterpretation).

As a contribution to the ongoing task of establishing the grammar of Neo- Hittite, I offer the following brief overview of NH nominal inflection (substantives and adjectives). This study is based on the NH corpus given in Melchert (1977: 128ff), with two significant changes. First, for obvious reasons I have added the extensive and important text of the Treaty of Tuthaliya IV with Kurunta, found on the bronze tablet edited by Otten (1988). Second, I have excluded the texts of Šuppiluliuma I. Neu (1979a et alit.) has argued that the language of Šuppiluliuma I is Middle Hittite. While I am not yet entirely persuaded that we may simply move the boundary between Middle and Neo-Hittite from the beginning to the end of this

king's reign, it is now indisputable that the language of texts from Šuppiluliuma·I differs markedly from that of later Neo-Hittite. It therefore seems prudent to first establish NH grammar without these texts and then consider them separately.

I will first treat general features of NH nominal inflection and then discuss some problems of specific formal classes. Some of the most important NH innovations are already well-known, and these are confirmed by my survey using the restricted corpus. First, the OH genitive plural ending -*an* is not attested in NH, and the dative-locative plural ending -*aš* also serves for the genitive. Second, the OH allative case in -*a* is moribund in NH, appearing only in set phrases such as *tuliya* "in(to) the assembly". Some apparent exceptions are Luvianisms (e.g. *humma* in KUB I 8 iv 12 and *hadanteya* in KBo XII 38 iii 10). Likewise the instrumental case is restricted to traditional phraseology (*šakuwaššarit* ZI-*it* "wholeheartedly" in KUB XXIII 1 ii 35 and ᴰ*šiunit kaneššant-* "recognized/favored by the god" in KBo VI 28+ Ro 5). There are also no examples of a vocative separate from the nominative in NH.

Contrary to the statements found in several handbooks (Sturtevant, 1933: 162 & 178; Friedrich, 1960: 45; Kammenhuber, 1969: 304), McIntyre (1986) has shown that there is no "confusion" of the plural endings -*eš*, -*uš* and -*aš* in NH. We find rather total replacement of animate nominative plural -*eš* by accusative plural -*uš*, with three clearly defined exceptions: (1) ablauting *u*-stem adjectives unsurprisingly generalize nom. pl. -*aweš* at the expense of the irregular acc. pl. -*amuš*; (2) stems in -*t*- (overwhelmingly participles in -*ant*-) generalize -*anteš*; (3) the relative/interrogative generalizes *kuieš*. The animate nominative and accusative plural thus do merge, but in a much more regular fashion than previously suggested. Use of -*aš* as nominative or accusative plural is highly restricted (see further below). Since Dr. McIntyre herself will soon publish her results in full elsewhere, I forgo any further details.

As a result of the above changes, the NH noun and adjective have only four distinct cases in the singular (nominative, accusative, genitive and dative-locative) and two in the plural (nominative-accusative and genitive-dative-locative), plus the ablative-instrumental which functions as both. The neuter, of course, does not distinguish nominative from accusative in either singular or plural.

I turn now to problems regarding the various formal classes. The basic inflection of *a*-stems calls for no special comment. Of considerable interest, however, are the apparent frequent alternations of *a*- and *i*-stem inflection in NH: e.g. NSgC *dannattiš* beside NAP1C *dannadduš*, NAP1Nt *dannatta*, GDLP1 *dannattaš*. Thanks to the work of Frank Starke, we may now clarify the status of this alternation considerably. Starke (1990: 59ff and passim) has shown that Luvian has "*i*-motion", whereby the animate nominative and accusative of most adjectives and many nouns are marked by an obligatory -*i*- (actually -*ī*-) added to the stem.

It is the effects of this system which are seen in varying degrees in NH inflection of *a*-stems. As per Oettinger (1986: 43ff), Hittite nouns in -*alla*- and -*(a)ttalla*- are either loanwords from Luvian or new creations to Hittite bases. Since the Luvian models are underlyingly *a*-stems, the Hittite words usually inflect as such (e.g. NAP1C *haliyatalluš*, *parā uwattaluš*, etc.). However, in some cases the

Luvian "*i*-motion" is retained, to which is added Hittite inflection (*kupiyatalliuš*, *harpanalliuš*, *arkammanaliuš*). In the case of the hybrid adjective *annalla/i*- "former" (with Hittite base seen in *annaz* "formerly" but Luvian suffix), the NH usage comes close to the Luvian model: we find NSgC *annalliš*, ASgC *annallin*, NAP1C *annalliuš* but NASgNt *annallan* and AbIn *annallaz* (however NASgNt *annalli* as if from an *i*-stem is also found, contrary to the Luvian model). Predictably, more often the Hittites' usage of the *i*-forms is sporadic. We also find occasional apparent backformations (e.g. NAP1 *karuwila* in KUB XIV 8 Ro 9 to what is otherwise an *i*-stem!).

As suggested to me by Norbert Oettinger, the Luvian "*i*-motion" is also surely the source of many other secondary *i*-stems in NH manuscripts (but which are not assured NH compositions). The combination of the Luvian restriction to animate nominative and accusative plus the generalization of -*uš* as the animate nominative-accusative plural explains why forms in -*iuš* are especially frequent: *garātiuš*, *gimriuš*, *kiššariuš*, *lahhanziuš*, *šarhuliuš*, *šepiuš*, and so forth. There is one famous example in a NH composition: *išpantiuš* (KBo IV 4 iii 31). The alternative explanation still entertained in Melchert (1990: 198[2]) may now be abandoned.

Ablauting *i*-stem adjectives are mostly unproblematic in NH. Contracted forms are extremely rare and probably isolated archaisms (*šuppa* in KUB XIV 10 iv 13 and KBo XI 1 Ro 32.40, both prayers). For the dative-locative singular we find both regular -*ai* and analogical -*i*: *šallai* beside *šalli* in KBo IV 10 Ro 5 and 33 (but not -*iya*; see further below).

Neuter *i*-stem nouns are perfectly regular. In stems in -*āi*- there is a clear tendency to generalize -*āi*- throughout (e.g. GSg *lingayaš*, DLSg *lingai*, *šaklāi*, DLP1 *šaklāyaš*, AbIn *zahhayaz*), but oblique forms in -(*i*)*ya*- are also well attested: GSg *linkiyaš*, *haštiyaš*, DLSg *linkiya/zahhiya*, AbIn *zahhiyaza*.

In general non-ablauting *i*-stem nouns inflect regularly. The dative-locative singular is notably always in -*i*, never in -*iya* (cf. Kammenhuber, 1969: 302, on OH). However, in the animate nominative-accusative plural there seems to be serious confusion, with four(!) competing forms. As cited above, we do find expected -*iuš*: *annaliuš*, *išpantuzziyaliuš*, etc.). However, -*iēš* is equally well attested: *karuwiliēš*, *lulahiēš*, *hapiriēš*. This is also the one place where there are genuine examples of -*aš* as a nominative-accusative: *lulahiyaš* (KBo IV 10 Vo 3), *hapiriyaš* (ibid.), EGIR-*aš* (KBo VI 29 ii 23). Thanks to the confusion caused by the "*i*-motion" (see above), we even find backformed -*aš* as if to an *a*-stem: *hapiraš* (KUB XIX 50 iv 19), *išpantuzziyalaš* (KUB XIV 14 Vo 27, XIV 8 Vo 39). Finally, there are also a few examples of -*iš*: *lulahhiš* (ABoT 56 ii 25), *altanniš* (KBo XI 1 Ro 16), ᴸᵁ.ᴹᴱˢ*pahhuršiš* (KUB XXIII 1 ii 13).

Any account of this bewildering variety must be tentative. The appearance of -*iēš* instead of -*iuš* against the general rule may be related to the exceptional behavior of *kuiēš* cited above. However, the reason for the latter is itself quite unclear, and I cannot explain why *kui*- should form *kuiēš* without exception, while -*iēš* elsewhere is sporadic.

The ending -(*i*)*yaš* beside -*iēš* reminds us of the replacement of -*ye*- by -*ya*- in the verb in NH (see Carruba, 1962: 157ff., et al.). However, the latter seems to be a

gradual analogical process which by late NH is thoroughly complete (see Melchert, 1977: 32ff). The chronological distribution of nominal -(i)yaš for -iēš is not at all comparable (NB *lulaḫḫiēš* in Bo 86/299 iv 2 vs. *lulaḫiyaš* in KBo IV 10 Vo 3, both Tutḫaliya IV). Nevertheless, one still thinks of a possible "polarization" or "dissimilation" of /-ye-/ to /-ya-/. Finally, the examples of -iš may be taken as cases of syncope (of either /-yes/ or /-yas/). The adverb SIG₅-in "well" (*lazzin* < NASgNt *lazziyan* to *lazziyant-*) seems to be a certain example of syncope. Compare also EGIR-*izzin* "afterwards" at KBo IV 14 iii 71 (N-ASgNt *appizzin* < *appizziyan* used adverbially). It remains likely that such syncope contributed to the transfer of OH adjectives in -zziya- to i-stem inflection in NH. It is also true that there are very rare examples of a NPlC -iyaš just to iya-stems in OH (Neu, 1979b: 192), but it seems to me implausible that this is the source of NPlC -iyaš in i-stems in NH.

The inflection of u-stem nouns is completely regular in NH. So is that of ablauting u-stem adjectives, with the exception cited above that -aweš is generalized to the anim. acc. plural, ousting -amuš.

The inflection of neuter l-stems, n-stems and r/n-stems remains unchanged in NH. It is worth noting that this includes the irregular paradigms of *ēšḫar/išḫan-* "blood", *tēkan/takn-* "earth", *wātar/widār* "water", and *uttar/uddār* "word". In the case of verbal nouns in -war/-waš, where other case forms are rare throughout Hittite, we do find competing forms with and without -r-: AbIn *hanieššuwaz* (KUB XXVI 43 Vo 11) but *šallanumarraza* (KUB XXVI 32 i 12). However, in the absence of a thorough survey of OH and MH examples, this alternation may or may not be a NH innovation.

As is well-known, animate n-stems of the type *ḫāraš/ḫāranan* "eagle" are subject to two competing analogical levelings, and the resulting uncertainty appears to have continued in NH. On the one hand, we find NSg *arkammaš*, ASg *arkamman*, APl *arkammuš*, DLSg *kutrui* and NPl *kutruwēš*, but also GSg *arkammanaš* (KUB XIX 37 iii 47). In the case of the extremely common word *memiya(n)-* "word", we find consistently ASg *memiyan* after NSg *memiyaš* (and once NAPl *memiyaš* for *memiyēš as per above), but otherwise an n-stem throughout: DLSg *memiyani/memini*, APl *memiyanuš*, GDLPl *memiyanaš*, AbIn *memiyanaz/meminaza*.

Stems in -tt- (such as *šiwatt-* "day") and -ant- call for no special comment. As indicated above, stems in -ant- do for some reason tend to generalize -ēš in the animate nominative-accusative rather than -uš, although there are some examples of -uš following the general pattern.

Among irregular nouns, *utnē* "land" has completely generalized *utnē-*. I note in particular that only *utnē* is attested in NH for the dative-locative singular. The noun "heart" appears to have retained its irregular paradigm: NASg ŠA-*er* but DLSg *kartī*. Likewise we find NASg É-*er* "house", but GSg *parnaš* and DLSg É-*ri*. Particularly striking is the case of the word for "god". The NSg is consistently DINGIR(LIM)-*iš*, pointing to an i-stem, and the phonetic complements of most other case forms are consistent with this (although most are strictly speaking ambiguous). However, in KUB XXVI 33 iii 20 we find the remarkable NAPl DINGIR.MEŠ-*muš*, which cannot belong to a regular i-stem declension. It also

seems worth mentioning that we appear to have no NH examples of the accusative singular.

The example of "god" raises the thorny issue of variation, even in the restricted corpus of assured NH compositions. As exemplified several times above, some variation is due simply to the irregular nature of analogy. We must also take into account the gradual nature of all linguistic change: the spread of -uš for -ēš or that of -ya- for -ye- in verbs both take place before our eyes as we move through the texts of succeeding NH kings. Both changes are complete only by the texts of Tutḫaliya IV and Šuppiluliuma II. We must therefore reckon with "transition phases". As shown by the NAPl DINGIR.MEŠ-*muš* or AbIn ᴰ*šiunit*, even NH compositions may contain archaisms. This fact is hardly surprising, given the strong traditional bent of the Hittite scribal bureaucracy. We can also easily find similar features in our own religious and political discourse.

I readily concede that the sources of variation just cited, especially the archaisms, reduce the value of NH compositions as a diagnostic of the sort I proposed earlier. Nevertheless, we have seen that such variation is generally limited to certain formal classes or particular items of vocabulary. More importantly, **innovations** in Neo-Hittite are highly restricted. We may therefore reasonably conclude that features of NH copies of older texts which are not explainable in terms of these innovations (either directly or as hypercorrections) are likely to reflect genuine archaisms.

REFERENCES

Carruba, Onofrio
    1962   Review of J. Friedrich, *Die hethitischen Gesetze*. *Kratylos* 7.155-160.
Friedrich, Johannes
    1960   *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* I². Heidelberg: Winter.
Kammenhuber, Annalies
    1969   "Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch und Hieroglyphenluwisch". *Handbuch der Orientalistik* I.2.1/2.2 (*Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*), 119-357. Leiden: Brill.
McIntyre, Linda L.
    1986   *Animate Plural in Neo-Hittite*. University of North Carolina M.A. thesis. Chapel Hill.
Melchert, H. Craig
    1977   *Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite*. Harvard University Ph.D. dissertation. Cambridge MA.
    1990   "Adjective Stems in *-iyo- in Anatolian". *HS* 103.198-207.
Neu, Erich
    1979a   "Zum sprachlichem Alter des Ḫukkana-Vertrages". *KZ* 93.64-84.
    1979b   "Einige Überlegungen zu den hethitischen Kasusendungen". *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, edd. Erich Neu and Wolfgang Meid, 177-196. Innsbruck: Institut f. Sprachw. d. Univ. Innsbruck.
Oettinger, Norbert
    1979   *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
    1986   "Anatolische 'Kurzgeschichten' ". *KZ* 99.43-53.

Otten, Heinrich
    1988 *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy* (= StBoT Beiheft 1). Wiesbaden: Harras-
          sowitz.
Starke, Frank
    1990 *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschriftluwischen Nomens* (=
          StBoT 31). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Sturtevant, Edgar H.
    1933 *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Philadelphia: LSA.

I Luvi e la scrittura geroglifica anatolica

Clelia Mora (Pavia)

1. *Premessa*

È innegabile, come è stato messo in rilievo più volte, che vi sia stato un appor-
to luvio alla formazione del sistema di scrittura chiamato "geroglifico anatolico":
sia la lingua in cui sono redatte nella maggior parte dei casi le iscrizioni gero-
glifiche, sia la provenienza di alcune testimonianze importanti ne costituiscono una
conferma1; la mancanza di adeguata documentazione ha impedito però fino ad ora
di definire meglio l'entità, le fasi, le modalità di questo contributo luvio alla cultura
anatolica. Alcuni studi recenti dedicati all'analisi dei sistemi amministrativi basati
sull'utilizzazione di cretule sigillate, pur toccando solo marginalmente queste
tematiche, offrono tuttavia, a mio parere, una chiave utilissima per la compren-

---

[1] Cfr. recentemente, a questo proposito, G. Neumann, *System und Ausbau der hethi-
tischen Hieroglyphenschrift*, Nachrichten der Akad. der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I.
Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1992 (in seguito abbreviato: *System*), in particolare p. 3/25 e nota 1 (con
rimandi a bibliografia precedente).
[Nel corso del lavoro sono usate inoltre le seguenti abbreviazioni:
    BoHa XIV = R.M. Boehmer-H.G. Güterbock, *Glyptik aus dem Stadtgebiet von
Boğazköy. Grabungskampagnen 1931-1939, 1952-1978*, Boğazköy-Hattuša XIV, Berlin
1987.
    Boehmer, *Fs T. Özgüç* = R.M. Boehmer, "Zur Datierung des Karahöyük", in: K. Emre,
M. Mellink, B. Hrouda, N. Özgüç (eds.), *Anatolia and the Ancient Near East, Studies in
Honor of T. Özgüç*, Ankara 1989, pp. 39-44.
    Lumsden, *Symbols* = St.P. Lumsden, *Symbols of Power: Hittite Royal Iconography in
Seals*, Ph. D. Diss., Berkeley 1990.
    Weingarten, "Sealing Structure" = J. Weingarten, "The Sealing Structure of Karahöyük
and Some Administrative Links with Phaistos on Crete", *OA* 29 (1990), pp. 63-95.
    Weingarten, "Sealing Studies" = J. Weingarten, "Two Sealing Studies in the Middle
Bronze Age. I: Karahöyük; II: Phaistos", in: P. Ferioli, E. Fiandra, G.G. Fissore, M.
Frangipane (eds.), *Archives before Writing* (Proceedings of the Intern. Colloquium,
Oriolo Romano, October 23-25, 1991), Torino 1994, pp. 261-295].