

SUMMARIUM

Commentationes

- R. M. BOEHMER, Die Datierung des Puzur/Kutik-Inšušinak und einige sich daraus ergebende Konsequenzen (tab. XLIII-LVI) 345-376
- H. A. HOFFNER, Jr., Composite Nouns, Verbs and Adjectives in Hittite 377-402
- P. KAPLONY, Das Vorbild des Königs unter Sesostri III. 403-412

Animadversiones

- H. HIRSCH, *Idi ana idi* 413-416
- L. JAKOB-ROST, Zu einigen hethitischen Kultfunktionären 417-422
- W. SCHENKEL, Die Numeri des Substantivs und die Konstruktion der Zahlwörter im Ägyptischen 423-425
- A. F. RAINEY, LUMAŠKIM at Ugarit 426-428
- R. BORGER, Eine schwierige Assurbanipal-Stelle (Prisma B VII 71-74) 429-430

Nuntii

- K. DELLER, Keilschriftchronik. 8 431-433
- R. CAPLICE - K. DELLER, XV^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale 434-435
- J. LECLANT, Third International Conference of Ethiopian Studies 435-439

Res bibliographicae

- J.-Ph. LAUER, Nouvelles remarques sur les pyramides à degrés de la III^e dynastie [V. MARAGIOGLIO - C. A. RINALDI, L'architettura delle piramidi Menfite (Parte II)] 440-448

Recensiones

- H. B. HOFFMAN, Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts. A Structural and Lexical Study (Fr. GRÖNDAL) 449-456
- H. SCHMÖCKEL, Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orients (J. A. H. POTMATE) 457-458
- W. WATKINS, Keilschriftliche Handwörterbuch. Lieferung I (H. QUENEN) 459-460

Composite Nouns, Verbs and Adjectives in Hittite

Harry A. HOFFNER, Jr. - Waltham, Mass.

The subject of composite forms in Hittite has been touched upon many times over the past twenty years in Hittitology⁽¹⁾. And, although in general all such discussions have centered on one or two particular forms thought to be composites rather than attempting a comprehensive review⁽²⁾, in recent years with the appearance of the first fascicles of H. Kronasser's *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache* (hereafter *EHS*)⁽³⁾ a more systematic and scientific review of the subject has been attempted. Kronasser was, of course, anticipated in much of his analysis by the earlier works of Güterbock⁽⁴⁾ and Goetze⁽⁵⁾, yet his attempt at systematization is very useful. It occurs to the writer, however, that more attention needs to be directed to matters of morpheme sequence in order to determine whether any consistent

⁽¹⁾ A selective, alphabetical listing of scholars who have made first identifications of Hittite composites includes: Balkan (*antiyant-*; *Dergi* 6 [1948], 147 ff.), Čop (*hatalkešna-*; *Slav. Rev. Ling.* 11, 52 ff.), Ehelolf (*šiwanzanna-*; *ZA NF* 2 [1935], 318), Friedrich (*pattarpalhi-*; *ZA NF* 5 [1930], 36), Goetze, (*annanega-*, *Symb. Hrozny* I, 289 ff.; *šarri-wašpa-*, *JCS* 10 [1956], 36, n. 42; *šuppiwašhar*, *JCS* 1 [1947], 318-320), Güterbock (*allantaru-*, *appašiwat-*, *kattakurant-*, and *wizzapant-* in *Cor. Ling.*, 63-68; *aššuzeri-*, *RHA* f. 74 [1964], 97 ff.), Hoffner (*ištamaḫura-*, *RHA* f. 72 [1963], 38, n. 21; *hammarš-*, *RHA* f. 72 [1963], 34-35; *walkiḫ-šara-*, *RHA* f. 72 [1963], 36-37; *šerkurant-*, *tapalkuštana-*, and *tarumaki-* in the present study), Laroche (*pirešhannaš*, *RHA* f. 61 [1957], 128; *sal-lakardah-*, etc., *RA* 48 [1954], 47). Cf. also F. Sommer, *HuH* 55 ff.; A. Kammenhuber, *KZ* 77 (1961) 161-218; P. H. Salus, *The Compound Noun in Indo-European: A Survey* (doctoral dissertation, New York University 1963; for an abstract see *Linguistics* 11 [The Hague 1963] 113); P. H. Salus, "The Types of Nominal Compound of Indo-European", *Orbis* 14 (Louvain 1965) 38-62 (51: Hittite).

⁽²⁾ H. G. Güterbock's essay in *Cor. Ling.*, 63-68 was the first attempt to discuss more than one composite in a single article.

⁽³⁾ H. Kronasser, *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*, Band 1 (Wiesbaden 1966). The first fascicle of Band 1 appeared in 1962.

⁽⁴⁾ "Zu einigen hethitischen Komposita", *Corolla Linguistica* (Wiesbaden 1955), 63-68.

⁽⁵⁾ See Goetze's article cited above in note 1.

patterns emerge from the many known examples and a few previously unsuspected examples, which he proposes to discuss in the body of this article.

The purpose of this essay, then, is two-fold: (1) to determine the principal types of composite formations in Hittite, illustrating them with such examples as have been adduced previously by others, and in the process (2) to add a few additional examples of composite forms discovered by the writer during the past few years of his research.

I. Patterns of Composite Formation in Hittite

Composite (or compounded) ⁽¹⁾ nouns, verbs, and adjectives can be found in most languages of the Indo-European linguistic family ⁽²⁾. This feature is more prominent, however, in some of these languages than in others ⁽³⁾. It would be a gross overstatement to claim that such word types are common in Hittite or any other Anatolian language cognate to Hittite, yet examples are far from few.

The components of composite nouns, verbs, and adjectives were not combined in any haphazard fashion in Hittite, but appear rather to have been joined in a limited number of prescribed or preferred patterns. To a certain extent these intra-word sequence patterns are analogous to the intra-clause morpheme sequence patterns in Hittite. Yet they are not in every respect the same. By examining the available examples one may extract the following patterns. For simplicity's sake the following abbreviations will be employed: A = adjectival element, Adv = adverbial element, N = nominal element, Pr/Po = preverbal or postpositional element, V = verbal element, Va = verbal adjective (participle, etc.).

1. A + N₁ = N₂.

a. *Aššuzeri-*, a kind of cup; cf. *HWb*, 38, and Güterbock, *RHA* f. 74 (1964), 97 ff. A = *aššu-* "good", and N = *zeri-* "cup." Just

⁽¹⁾ I trust that my choice of terms in this monograph does not confuse any trained descriptive or comparative linguist. I would consider the terms "composite" and "compounded" to be virtual synonyms. I have preferred to use the term "composite" in this study.

⁽²⁾ *EHS* I, 155 ff.; Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, II, 21-89.

⁽³⁾ Quite common in Greek, Sanskrit and Germanic; less common in some of the other groups.

what is implied by *aššu-* in this compound is not clear ⁽¹⁾. Friedrich and Sommer ⁽²⁾ have enumerated the following nuances of the adjective within the broader range of "good": "suitable" (zweckmässig), "useful" (nützlich), "beneficial" (heilsam), "valuable" (wertgeschätzt), "prized" (beliebt) ⁽³⁾. Both agree that the word does *not* imply "morally good" (sittlich gut) or "well-disposed" (wohl-/gutgesinnt). Friedrich adds the nuance "pleasant" (angenehm) ⁽⁴⁾. In addition *aššu-* may convey the idea of "unspoiled" in KBo III 21 obv. ii 9, where *aššu* *UZU.ì* is contrasted with *huwappan-a* *UZU.ì*. In KBo X 20 obv. i 13-14 *man* *LUGAL-i-ma aššu tašta* *URU* *Katapi šara apeniššan paizzi* seems to presuppose the basic meaning "pleasing/pleasant": "if it is pleasing to the king (i.e., if he wishes), he may go up to Katapa even so" ⁽⁵⁾. But how does one decide what nuance is borne by *aššu-* in connection with a cup? The adjective is used of a vessel in KUB VII 5 rev. iv 12-18: *namma-ši man* *DUG* *haršiyalli aššu n-an-zan* *DUG* *haršiyalli tittanuzi man UL-ma n-an-za* *NA* *huwaši tittanuzi našma-an-za* *ALAM-ma iyazi*, "furthermore, if his *DUG* *haršiyalli* is *aššu*, he will set it on the *DUG* *haršiyalli*; but if it is not, he will either set it on the *NA* *huwaši* or make an image". Goetze translates the first portion of the above passage: "Furthermore, if sacrificial vessels are in order, he will set up sacrificial vessels" ⁽⁶⁾. In doing so, he fails to explicitly translate the enclitic pronoun *-ši* in *namma-ši* and expresses his preference to translate *aššu* "in order". He also understands both *DUG* *haršiyalli* and *aššu* as neuter plurals, an interpretation which is permissible for *DUG* *haršiyalli* but much more questionable for *aššu* (one would expect *aššawa* for the neuter plural). The enclitic *-ši* can be construed with either *DUG* *haršiyalli* ("the to-him *DUG* *h.*" = "his *DUG* *h.*") or *aššu* ("valuable to him"). Either interpretation is possible; I simply prefer the first. The value of the *DUG* *haršiyalli* which determines whether or not it will be the stand is (to my mind)

⁽¹⁾ The word "good" covers such a broad range of nuances that one must attempt to narrow it to a shade of meaning appropriate for a cup.

⁽²⁾ Sommer, *HAB* 46 ff.; Friedrich, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 41, 192 and 370 ff. and in *HWb*, 37.

⁽³⁾ I have combined the offerings of the two scholars in one list. They seem to be agreed upon the selection of nuances which are both appropriate and inappropriate for *aššu-*.

⁽⁴⁾ See *HWb*, 37.

⁽⁵⁾ See H. G. Güterbock, *JNES* 19 (1960), 80 and 85.

⁽⁶⁾ *ANET*², 350a.

not sentimental but intrinsic. By "intrinsic" I do not necessarily wish to exclude "immaterial" considerations such as ritual purity. I simply do not believe that $-ši$ is to be directly construed with $aššu$ so as to result in a translation "if the $puḡh$ is valuable to him". The clause "if his $puḡh$ is $aššu$ " must refer to a quality which all persons aware of the nature of the vessel would agree that it possesses. If ritual purity is involved, all persons who knew what had been done to the vessel would agree that intrinsically it was "pure" or "impure". If material value is involved, all persons who examined the vessel would acknowledge that it was either "valuable" (silver, gold, or other material) or "not valuable" (clay, etc.). As I study KUB VII 5 rev. iv 12-18, the last alternative appears to me most likely. The issue is a very simple one: if the sacrificer's vessel is a common earthen one (and not, therefore, valuable), he sets the god on a $ḫuwaši$, which is quite valuable⁽¹⁾, or he makes an $ALAM$, which also would have more intrinsic value than an earthen vessel. If, however, the vessel is valuable (i.e., perhaps made of precious material), he may set it up before the god. And perhaps it is just this nuance which is intended in the composite $aššuzeri$. It is a cup which has intrinsic value, i.e., a cup which is made of some precious material. An $aššu zeri$ (with separate spelling) of gold is attested in KUB I 17 i 5⁽²⁾.

b. $Šuppiwašhar$, "onion" (Goetze, *JCS* 1 [1947], 318-320). Compare also now Kronasser (*EHS*, I, 126). The word is a loan translation⁽³⁾ from the Sumerian $SUM.SIKIL^{SAR}$ ⁽⁴⁾. The Hittite components are $šuppi$ - "holy" and $*wašhar$ "bulb" or "garlic" (not attested in free form in Hittite)⁽⁵⁾. The pattern is again $A + N_1 = N_2$.

⁽¹⁾ In Hittite law #128 the fine set for the person who steals the $ḫuwaši$ -stone is higher than that paid by a person stealing any other kind of stone. On the $ḫuwaši$ -stone see A. Goetze, *Kleinasien*², 162-3.

⁽²⁾ Güterbock, *RHA* f. 74 (1964), 111, n. 6. Güterbock has also shown (*ibid.*, 112) that it is impossible to distribute the three Hittite equivalents of $(puḡ)GAL$ — $zeri$ -(n.), $GAL-i$ -(c.), and $GAL-ma/i$ -(c.) — between "metal goblet" and "earthenware cup", which thus removes the objection that an $aššuzeri$ could not be made of either material.

⁽³⁾ See the discussion of loan translations in *EHS*, I, 124-8.

⁽⁴⁾ Goetze, *JCS* 1 (1947), 318-320.

⁽⁵⁾ I. J. Gelb in *Studies in Honor of B. Landsberger*, 57-58 translates SUM as "onion" and $SUM-SIKIL$ ("pure onion") as "garlic", i.e., the very opposite of Goetze's distribution: SUM "garlic" and $SUM-SIKIL$ "onion".

2. $A_1 + N = A_2$.

A second pattern of morphemes is that in which the first member is A and the second N. The resultant composite has a basic A function, but can be substantivized, when employed as an epithet or name. In examples *a* and *b* the original adjective has been applied to a plant as an epithet or name, thus coming to serve as N. This type of composite requires an English translation: "A of N" or "A with respect to N". Among examples of this pattern in Greek we may cite: βαρυδαίμων "heavy of fate, unlucky", πολύρρην (πολύς + ῥην) "rich in sheep," πολύμητις (πολύς + μητις) "full of devices, tricks".

a. $Ḫatalkeš(ša)na$ -, a kind of thorn bush; "prickly branch", cf. *HWb* Erg. 2, 12, citing Čop, *Slav. Rev. Ling.* 11, 52 ff.; see also the discussions of G. Neumann, *KZ* 77 (1961), 79, and A. Kammenhuber, *ibid.*, 199, n. 1. The components are $*ḫat(a)$ -, by function A, yet not attested as an independent adjective in Hittite texts⁽¹⁾, meaning either "sharp" or "prickly", and $*alkeš(ša)na$ -, presumed by Čop to be a by-form of $alkištana$ - "branch" (*HWb*, 19; cf. also Güterbock, *Oriens* 10 [1957], 354). Kronasser (*EHS*, I, 183) either has not seen Čop's interpretation or disagrees with it, for he analyzes $ḫatalkeš(ša)na$ - as containing the formative $-šana/-šna$ -. Quite aside from the attractiveness of the etymological explanation given by Čop for the name of a thorn bush, there appears to be independent support for the theory in the form $tapalkuštanan^{SAR}$ in KUB XXIV 14 i 6 (discussion under *b*). But the interpretation of $*ḫat(a)$ - as A is not the only possible one. In view of the existence of composites of the type $V + N_1 = N_2$ in some IE languages (see below on $targaš(ša)$ -

⁽¹⁾ Čop, *Slav. Rev. Ling.* 11, 52-68; *HWb* Erg. 2, 12. On the stem vowel see Part II of the present article. The verb $ḫattarai$ -, however, must be kept apart. Laroche has suggested (*MNHMHC XAPIN*, II, 3 with n. 5, without references) a meaning "to cross" for $ḫattarai$ - and "crossing" for $ḫattareššar$. It would not serve the purposes of this study to enter into a thorough lexical disquisition on $ḫattarai$ - or $ḫattareššar$ here, but from a brief examination of my own collection of passages containing these words augmented by additional references supplied to me by Prof. Laroche I am inclined to agree with his proposed translation. A few passages still resist this rendering, e.g., the very difficult $[GİSBA]L.-TUR-az ḫa-at-ta-ra-a-mi$ (KUB XXXVI 35 obv. i 3) of the Elkunirša-Ašertu myth (cf. Otten, *MIO* 1 [1953], 125-150 and *RHA* f. 76 [1965], 6-7, n. 11).

na-) it is possible that both *hatalkeššana-* and *tapalkuštana-* contain V as their first members. Thus *Stech-ast* (as given in *HWb* Erg. 2, 12) is a very apt translation, since *Stech-ast* is also a $V + N_1 = N_2$ type composite. In this case **hat(a)-* could be related, if not identical, with the attested verb *hattai-*, a verb of cutting or piercing. The element **tap(a)-* in *tapalkuštana-* is more difficult to identify.

b. *Tapalkuštana-*, a kind of plant. The syllabic spelling of this name is *ta-pal-ku-uš-ta-na-an^{SAR}* (KUB XXIV 14 i 6), acc. sg. of a noun of common gender. As must be apparent from the previous discussion, I analyze this term as *tap+alkuštana-*. The identity of the second component, **alkuštana-*, can hardly be doubted. It shares with the noun *alkištana-* "branch" eight phonemes, differing only in the second vowel. To disassociate the two forms on the basis of the single vowel in the face of the exact correspondence of the other eight phonemes is surely presuming too much on coincidence, especially in a plant name! I cannot make a positive identification of the first component **tap-*. But obviously some guesses must be made, if we are ever to reach a solution. According, I put forward the following. The reduplicated noun *ḡištaptappa-* designates probably a "(bird-)cage", or less likely a "(bird-)nest" (1). Both a cage and a nest would be characterised by one conspicuous feature, namely, criss-crossed or interwoven wooden sticks. Is it possible then that the element **tap-* denotes this interweaving or criss-crossing? If so, then perhaps *tap+alkuštana-* means "of/with interwoven branches" as a designation for a particular kind of plant. Again the pattern is $A_1 + N = A_2$, the resultant A_2 being "(plant) with interwoven branches". See also above on 2a.

c. *Walkiššara-*, adjective meaning "(manually) skilled" (*HWb*, 243; H. Hoffner, *RHA* f. 73 [1963], 36-37). Kronasser (*EHS*, 186) makes no allusion to components for *walkiššara-*, apparently considering it not to be a composite form. On analogy with such Greek forms as *εὐχειρ* "manually skilled", *δαιδλόχειρ* "cunning of hand", *καρτερόχειρ* "strong of hand", etc., I have previously pointed out (2) that the Hittite adjective *walkiššara-* "skilled" should be segmented into the components **wal-* (not attested to date as a free form in Hittite) and *kiššara-* "hand" (*HWb*, 108). The former of the two components

(1) *HWb*, 212 and literature cited there.

(2) *RHA* f. 72 (1963), 36-37.

occupies the position normally held by the A in such forms, so that I have posited for this bound morpheme the provisional meaning "strong" or "deft", and have connected it with IE **yal-/ *yal-dh-* "to be strong" (3). Here, as in examples a and b above, $A_1 + N = A_2$. A serious objection to my analysis of this form has, however, been raised by Prof. Güterbock, who points out that in composites of this type one expects the full stem form for the first element. Since neither IE in general nor in particular Nesite and Luwian possess *l-*stem adjectives, **wal-* can hardly be A. Perhaps my analysis of this form has been premature.

d. **Šallakarda-* (4) is the conjectured adjectival base upon which the two verb forms *šallakardai-* and *šallakardah-* were built, just as *walkeššarah-* "to make skilled" was built upon the adjectival base *walkeššara-*. According to the principles which we have laid down for the interpretation of Hittite composites of the pattern $A_1 + N = A_2$ we should render this literally "great of heart". The verbs built upon this base should be rendered (literally) as "to be (or act) great-hearted" and perhaps (for *šallakardah-*) "to make (someone else) great-hearted". Yet such a literal translation would be misleading in English. In Hittite this complex of verbs with their abstract noun (*šallakardatar*) have an unfavorable connotation. E. Laroche has proposed for *šallakardah-* and *šallakardai-* the meaning "to startle, surprise", and for *šallakardatar* "astonishment, surprise" (5). H. G. Güterbock preferred to translate the first two as "to do evil high-handedly/arrogantly", and the third as "arrogance, presumption, high-handedness" (4). Holt has more recently suggested for *šallakardah-* "to make someone irrational, incite to anger", and for *šallakardai-* "to behave irrationally" (6). The present writer prefers Güterbock's renderings, but it is not his intention to enter into the details of the lexicography at this point. It is sufficient for the present purpose to classify these forms within the structure of morpheme sequence in composites.

(1) J. Pokorny, *Indogerm. etym. Wörterbuch*, 1111-1112; *RHA* f. 72 (1963), 37, n. 25.

(2) Discussed by Kronasser *EHS* § 77,4 p. 125 and A. Kammenhuber, *KZ* 77 (1961) 193 f.

(3) *RA* 48 (1954), 47.

(4) *Cor. Ling.*, 65-68.

(5) *BiOr* 15 (1958), 150, n. 18a.

3. Adv + N₁ = N₂.

This group of Hittite composites approximates Brugmann and Delbrück's third category; those whose first member is an old adverb also attested independently. Among the examples cited by Brugmann and Delbrück are several whose second member, though N, is de-verbal: Greek πρό-θεσις, ἀπό-στασις, ἐν-δειξις; Latin *in-dictiō*, etc. ⁽¹⁾. Since these could be derived from preverbs and verbs, they do not match our Hittite group, in which both examples have a primitive noun as their second members. The examples which parallel our examples best are: Greek ὑπ-ώπια, ὑπερώη, ὑπ-ασπίδιος, etc.

a. *Appašiwat-* "future" (*HWb*, 337-338 and *Erg.* 2, 7-8, citing Güterbock, *Cor. Ling.*, 65; *EHS*, I, 124 and 156). The above is the full phonetic writing of the Hittite form which underlies such ideographic writings as EGIR.UD.KAM (KBo III 3 obv. i 7), EGIR-*pa*-UD-*ti* (KBo III 3 ii 7; Laroche, *RA* 52 [1958], 187), EGIR-*U*₄-*MI* (KBo II 9 obv. i 34), and EGIR-*pa*-UD.KAM-*aš* (KUB XXIX 9 i 7). The two components, which have been identified by both Güterbock and Otten in 1952 ⁽²⁾ and further commented upon by Güterbock again in 1955 ⁽³⁾, are *appa* "after, behind" (*HWb*, 25), which normally functions as either adverb or post-positional, but which carries a quasi-adjectival force in this composite, and *šiwat-* "day" (*HWb*, 195). Güterbock and Otten pointed out to Friedrich the alternation of *appašiwatta* with the ideogram EGIR-*U*₄-*MI* (= Akkadian *arkāt ūmi*) in a text found in 1952 (now published as KBo VII 28:40 ff.). Regarding the Akkadian idiom, neither the *AHW* nor the *CAD* have published their material on *(w)arkiu/(w)arkū*, but Friedrich Delitzsch in his *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig 1896) has listed a number of occurrences of the idiom *arkāt ūmi* ⁽⁴⁾. In addition, one should note that virtually the same idiom is found in Biblical Hebrew (בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים). Yet the similarity between the Semitic idiom and the Hittite composite is only semantic and not morphological, for the Akkadian and Hebrew constructions are true genitival phrases, containing *nomen regens* and *nomen rectum*, whereas *appašiwat-* is of the pattern Adv + N₁ = N₂.

⁽¹⁾ See examples in Brugmann & Delbrück, *VGIS*, II, 29-30, 38, and 51.

⁽²⁾ *HWb*, 337-338.

⁽³⁾ *Cor. Ling.*, 65.

⁽⁴⁾ F. Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, 243a.

Another composite, which contains *šiwat-*, but whose pattern is Demonstrative + N₁ = Adv, is *anišiwat* (*anni-* "that" + *šiwat-* "day"; Hrozný, *ArOr* 1 [1929], 284, Otten, *MDOG* 86 [1953], 64, n. 3, *EHS*, I, 124).

b. *Šarriwašpa-*, a kind of garment; *HWb* *Erg.* 1, 18; cf. Goetze, *JCS* 10 (1956), 36, n. 42; *EHS*, I, 125 and 184; Laroche, *RA* 52 (1958), 188. Goetze first pointed out the existence and probable meaning of this term, which is found only in IBoT I 31 obv. 7 in a list of garments. He even suggested that it might be a composite, involving the word for "garment" (*wašpa-*) as its second element ⁽¹⁾. He did not, however, propose any meaning for the first component, **šarri-*. Kronasser (*EHS*, I, 125) has suggested that this **šarri-* is the Hurrian (ultimately Akkadian) word for "king". He translates *šarriwašpa-*, therefore, as "Königskleid(?)". Laroche, on the other hand, has sought to identify this **šarri-* with the Nesite noun *šarra-* "part, portion" (*HWb*, 184), which he proceeds to extend to the sense "(middle) part", more properly to be expressed by *takšan-* "midst" or by *takšan šarra-* "half". Laroche thus proposes to identify ^{TUG}*šarriwašpa-* with the ideogram ^{TUG}E.İB and to draw the equation **šarri-* = *šarra-* = İB "middle". To my knowledge neither *šarra-* nor **šarri-* is yet attested for Luwian or Palaic, but it is always possible that it will turn up in new texts. The principal objections which I raise against Laroche's view are: (1) the inaccurate rendering of *šarra-* (see above), and (2) the discrepancy in the theme vowel (**šarri-* for *šarra-*). It is to the advantage of this view, however, that at least it has an ideographic counterpart (but only a probable one) which may be appealed to for support. Another possibility would be to interpret **šarri-* as the Luwian adverb *šarri* "above" (Rosenkranz, *Luv.*, 44 ff.; Otten, *Luv.*, 70 ff.), which is the Luwian counterpart to Nesite *šer*. Although *wašpa-* itself has not yet appeared in a Luwian text or as a *Glossenkeilwort*, the Luwian form *wašpant-* (an expansion in *-nt-*) reveals that the *-pa-* formative was employed in Luwian as in Nesite to expand the verb *waš-* "to dress" into the noun for "garment". The "above-garment" (i.e., not reaching to the ankles?) would be an appropriate designation for a light tunic ⁽²⁾. For Nesite *šer* in composites of the type Adv + Va₁ = Va₂ see 7b.

⁽¹⁾ *JCS* 10 (1956), 36, n. 42.

⁽²⁾ Perhaps also a garment put on "over" other garments (cf. German "Oberhemd", "Oberkleid"); for this suggestion I am indebted to Dr. Onofrio Carruba.

4. $N + A_1 = A_2$.

When the two components are $A + N$, we have seen that the resultant form can be either N (category one) or A (category two). When the order is reversed, and the components are $N + A$, the result is A in the only clear instance of this pattern which the writer has been able to find.

a. *Pattarpalhi-*, a bird name; *HWb*, 166; Sommer, *HuH*, 56; Güterbock, *Cor. Ling.*, 64; *EHS*, I, 125 and 210. Friedrich himself has suggested the interpretation of this form as "Breitflügel". More literally it is, as Güterbock has rendered it, "Flügelbreit". We classify the form as $N + A_1 = A_2$, because the meaning of the word is not "broad wing", but "broad of wing" or "broad-winged". It is true that the form has become substantivized as the name or epithet of a bird, but strictly speaking it is still an adjective: "(the) broad-winged (one)". The sequence $N + A$ (instead of the prevailing $A + N$) is not out of keeping with Hittite syntax, which permits even in the clause the attributive adjective to follow its noun. Parallels in both IE and Semitic have been cited by Sommer and Friedrich respectively ⁽¹⁾.

b. *Antuwašalli-*, designation of an official; *HWb*, 24; *EHS*, I, 214; N. van Brock, *RHA* f. 71 (1962), 115. I do not include this form because I consider it to be a true composite, but because Kronasser has so designated it. He isolates the **šalli-* and relates it to those titles of Hittite officials which contain *GAL*, i.e., *GAL LÚ^{MEŠ} MEŠEDI*, *GAL DUMU^{MEŠ} É.GAL*, etc. This interpretation is certainly possible, yet in the very few instances in which *GAL* is used with a phonetic spelling of a title, such as *GAL SAL^{MEŠ} ze-en-tu-ḫi-ya-aš* (*KUB* XI 32 obv. iii 19), the Hittite word for "great" seems to precede the title, following the Sumerian or Akkadian word order. Although he does not cite it himself, one might be tempted to adduce the writing *an-tu-GAL* (for *antuwašalli-*) in favor of Kronasser's interpretation. But such writings are all too often simply rebuses with no true etymological bases (e.g., *IGIŠPA-DINGIR^{LIM}* = *Hattusilis*). If we assume Kronasser's view is correct, what would be the initial element? *Antu-*

⁽¹⁾ Sommer, *HuH*, 56; Friedrich cites the Akkadian bird name *šēp-arik* (*ZA* NF 5 [1930], 36; *BAG*, 262b). Cf. *šēp-šu arik* in *MSL* VIII/2, 138, and further the name of Anu's bow in *Ee* VI 89: *išu arik* "longwood".

wahḫaš is a variant form of *antuḫšaš* "man" (*HWb*, 24). One might analyze *antuwašalliš* as **antuwaḫ + šalliš*, which assimilated to *antuwašalliš*. But IE composites of this type require the stem-form for the first element, which would be *antuwaḫ(h)a-*, not **antuwaḫ-*. Furthermore, this analysis yields no really convincing meaning and does not correspond to any of the ideographically written titles. Dietrich and Loretz ⁽¹⁾ have concluded from a study of the three versions of the treaty between Šuppiluliumaš I and Niqmad II of Ugarit that *LÚ^{antubšalli}* of A 37 is the equivalent of *LÚ^{EN} É^u a-bu-si* of B 45 ⁽²⁾. This means that the title *LÚ^{antubšalli}* (at least at Ugarit) designated the superintendent of the *abūsu*-storehouse (*CAD* A¹, 93a). These authors further suggest that the spellings with *PI* be read as *uw* rather than *wa* (i.e., [*an-t*] *u-uw-šal-li* in *Pol. Doc.*, 88, line 22, the treaty of Muwatalliš with Talmišarmaš of Aleppo) ⁽³⁾. This proposal must, however, contend with the objection that *uw* as a reading for *PI* is not elsewhere attested at Boğazköy. An even more serious objection is raised by a consideration of the spellings of *antuwašalli-* at Boğazköy ⁽⁴⁾. It is written: (1) [*an-*] *tu-PI-šal-li* (*AU* II 40), (2) *an-tu-PI-š[al-li-x?]* (*KUB* XXXIX 88 rev. iv 18), (3) *an-tu-GAL* (*HWb*, 24 s.v.), and (4) *an-tu-u-PI-šal-li-iš* (*KBo* V 7 rev. 52). Of these spellings the fourth is the most significant in that the extra *u* before the *PI* sign points to the reading *wa* rather than *uw*. This argument only attacks the assumption that no pronounced **antuwašalliš* ever existed; it does not deny that an original **antuwašalliš* might later have been expanded to **antuwašalliš*. The root of this word does not seem to be IE at all, but either Hattic or Hurrian. A more satisfactory analysis than Kronasser's might be **antuwaš- / *antubš- + -alli-*. No **antuwaš- / *antubš-* is attested yet in Hattic or Hurrian texts, but it might be the semantic equivalent of the **abūsi* in the expression *bēl *abūsi*. The *-alli-* would be the same formative found in the *nomina actoris*: *LÚ^{tapariyalli-}*, *LÚ^{himmalli-}*, *LÚ^{šuppiwašhanalli-}*, *LÚ^{tariyanalli-}*, and *LÚ^{arkammanalli-}*. Unlike Friedrich (*HE*² § 47c) Kronasser (*EHS*, I, § 118:2) seems to recognize that *-alli-* as well as *-ala-* can be employed to form *nomina actoris*. See also van Brock on *antuwašalli-* (*RHA* f. 71 [1962], 115), who pro-

⁽¹⁾ *WdO* 3 (1966), 206-245.

⁽²⁾ *WdO* 3 (1966), 210 and 240, n. 179.

⁽³⁾ *WdO* 3 (1966), 240, n. 179.

⁽⁴⁾ Sommer, *AU*, 123; cf. also Goetze, *RHA* f. 54 (1952), 8, n. 20.

poses a Hattic origin and an original vocalization **antwawāšēl*. Accordingly, this term is *not* a composite, and *an-tu-GAL* is only a rebus without any true etymological basis. The phonetics of *antubšalli*, as compared with *an-tu-GAL* (= **antuššalli*?) is paralleled by *habšalli*–/*haššalli*– (HWb, 55).

5. $N_1 + N_2 = N_3$ ⁽¹⁾.

Composites in this category are often notional equivalents to genitival phrases. In all but one of the following five examples the relationship posited by the advocates of the composite interpretation is a genitival one. *Allantaru*– is the sole exception. In composites of this category which are notionally genitive phrases the normal order of components is *nomen rectum* followed by *nomen regens*. The opposite order is supposed for *piršahhannaš*. In *allantaru*– no genitival phrase is involved. Instead, if my analysis is correct, we have a sequence of two nouns of which the first has a more specific and limited scope of reference.

a. *Pirešhannaš*–/*piršahhannaš*–/*pirzahanaš*, etc. (HWb Erg. 2, 21; Laroche, *RHA* f. 61 [1957], 128; *EHS*, I, 125). This term designates a kind of cattle. It occurs in a number of variant spellings, some semi-ideographic: *é-er-ša-aḥ-ha-an-na-aš* (KBo V 7 ii 42). Laroche has proposed the segmentation; *per* “house” + *šahhannaš* “of feudal due” ⁽²⁾. Several serious difficulties beset this interpretation: (1) the spellings with doubled *n* against the consistent single spellings of the word *šahhan* (gen. *šahhannaš*), (2) the sequence of morphemes (*nomen regens* followed by *nomen rectum*) is the reverse of that which one expects for this category, and (3) the radical divergence of spellings (especially *perešhannaš*) does not fit the identification. For these reasons I am very skeptical about Laroche’s solution.

b. *Ištamahura*– “earring” (HWb, 90; cf. *RHA* f. 72 [1963], 38, n. 21). That this noun should be considered as a composite containing the elements *ištama(n)*– “ear” and **hura*– “ornament(?)” was my contention in *RHA* f. 72 (1963), 38, n. 21. Alp has shown that *ištamahura*– alternates with *ḥub.BI* and denotes an “earring” ⁽³⁾. Laroche has tentatively suggested that *ḥurair* in KUB XXIX 1 iii 39 ff. be trans-

⁽¹⁾ Cf. A. Kammenhuber, *KZ* 77 (1961), 245.

⁽²⁾ *RHA* f. 61 (1957), 128; cf. also Kammenhuber, *KZ* 77 (1961), 245.

⁽³⁾ *Bulleten* 12, 324.

lated “ils l’ont orné(?)” ⁽¹⁾. And Friedrich has included this rendering of *ḥurair*– (“schmücken”) in *HWb*, Erg. 1, 7. The only other examples of this verb to my knowledge are the two occurrences of the participle *ḥurant*– in KUB XXXIX 61 rev. iii 9-10. It is virtually certain

that *ḥurair*– is a reduced grade of the *Glossenkeil* verb *ḥu-u-wa-ra-an-zi*, which is construed with *NA₄kuwannanaza* in KUB VI 24 obv. 6. Whether or not this verbal root is to be connected with the form *ḥu-u-ra-at-ti-ša-an* (KBo III⁴ rev. iii 12, cf. 30) remains to be seen. Laroche’s cautious rendering “ils l’ont orné(?)” for KUB XXIX 1 iii 39 ff. is only one of several possible interpretations. Prof. Güterbock has privately offered another tentative rendering of “pierce, perforate(?)”. In the broken incantation passage, KUB XXXIX 61 rev. iii 9-10 (*ḥu-u-ra-an-za e-eš EME* [.] *ḥu-u-ra-an-za e-eš-du*) the subject may be an evil which is being exorcised. If so, then the practitioner would be more likely to wish it “pierced” than “adorned”. But the context is not that clear. In the fragmentary omen KUB VI 24 (Cat. 202:2) obv. 2? and 6 the text seems to read: [DI]NGIR-ni-

ma-za-pát NA₄ku-wa-an-na-na-za *ḥu-u-wa-ra-an-zi*, “they make a circle (???) for just the god with gems (?; *NA₄kuwannanaz* can be ablative plural as well as singular; on *NA₄ku(wa)nnan*– = *NA₄* see Laroche, *RA* 59 [1965] 85)”. Regarding KUB XXIX 1 (+) (Cat. 308) iii 39 ff., the text runs thus: DINGIR^{MEŠ}-wa GUNNI *da-a-er nu-wa-ra-an ku-un-na-ni-it ḥu-u-ra-i-ir na-an AN.BAR-it ša-an-ḥi-ir nu-uš-ša-an* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *e-ša-an-ta-ri*, “the gods have taken the hearth/brazier; they have encircled(?) it with gems; they have . . -ed it with iron; and (now) they are sitting down”. The translation “encircled(?)” is only a guess. “To adorn” does not fit the incantation; “to encircle (in hostile sense?)” might fit. To summarize: Even if we cannot arrive at a certain meaning for *ḥurair*–, it is reasonably clear that the **hura*– of *ištamahura*– is not a formative, but a nominal component of a composite noun. If we posit a meaning “pierce(?)”, “ornament(?)”, or “encircle(?)”, for the verb *ḥurair*–, we would still be able to arrive at a suitable nominal meaning for **hura*–, which would fit the composite. The noun **hura*– would mean either “hole, perforation(?)”, “ornament(?)”, or “circlet(?)”, depending upon the meaning chosen for the verb.

⁽¹⁾ *RHA* f. 60 (1957), 14.

c. *Šiwanzanna*- "god's mother(?)" (a kind of priestess; Ehelolf, *ZA NF* 2 [1925], 318; Rosenkranz, *JCS* 2 [1948], 252 ff.; *HWb*, 195; *EHS*, I, 125-126). Kronasser analyzes *šiwanzanna*- as **šiwannants*+*anna*-, becoming by haplography **šiwants*+*anna*-. Similarly (p. 126) he understands the NINDA name *šiwandannanni*- as a form reduced by haplography from **šiwannant*- "god" + a second element meaning "food(?)". Kronasser recognizes the difficulty of positing an *n*-stem form **šiwān*- for a noun of common gender, so he prefers to assume haplography from a form **šiwannant*- expanded from *šiwana*- by -*nt*-. This assumed haplography seems questionable to me. The second questionable feature of his analysis is the assumption of the -*š* genitive instead of the normal -*aš*. If I understand Brugmann and Delbrück correctly, such "Kasuskomposita" (their class 4) are innovations or late developments within the daughter languages. An -*š* genitive, if there ever was one in Nesite or Luwian, would not likely be an innovation. The entire analysis is so fraught with difficulties that the identity of the elements is doomed to remain speculative.

d. *Allantaru*-, a kind of tree and its wood (*HWb*, Erg. 2, 7; cf. Otten, *TR*, 134 f.). Rebus writings like [^{G1}]*šal-la-an-GIŠ-r[u]* (*TR*, 125) prove nothing, of course, about etymology. Whether or not the final part of this word is really *taru*- "wood" must be determined on other grounds. In the present instance, however, it is safe to conclude that a final component **taru* in a tree name is as likely to be "wood" or "tree" as is a final **alkeš(ša)na*- or **alkuštana*- (cf. *alkištana*-) in a plant name to be "branch". As for the first component in this form, I am not sure that I can add anything substantial to the observations of Otten (¹). It is true (*TR*, 135) that there is a wood named *alanza(n)*- (*HWb*, 19) (²), but this is spelled with an undoubted *l*. In KUB XXXIII 32 rev. iii 9 we also find a form ^{G1}*šal-la-ya-na?*-x? (³), which we cannot identify as a tree from the context. But must we assume that all Hittite composites contain only native components? It is certainly possible that a foreign word for a type of

(¹) *TR*, 134 f.

(²) Citing Goetze, *Mel. Pedersen*, 490, n. 4. In addition to the forms and references cited in *HWb* one finds: ^{G1}*ša-la-an-za-aš* (KUB XXXIII 81 obv. i 11), ^{G1}*ša-la-an-za-na-aš* (KBo IV 2 rev. iii 33; KUB VII 23:7; KUB XXXV 142 obv. i 8), ^{G1}*ša-la-an-za-na-an* (KUB XVII 27 obv. ii 17), and ^{G1}*ša-la-an-za-*[] (KBo XIV 98 obv. ii 2).

(³) To be restored on the basis of ^{G1}*ša-al-la-ya-nu-uš* (KUB XXXV 164 rev. iii 5)?

tree would be compounded with the native word for "tree" or "wood". In this regard perhaps we should consider the Semitic word **allānu*, which appears in Hebrew either as אֵלֶן or אֵלָן (¹) and in Ugaritic as *aln* (²). If the source is West Semitic, the word would have derived from a dialect in which the "Canaanite shift" of stressed long *ā* to *ō* (represented in cuneiform as *ū*) had not occurred. The dialects of Ugarit or Alalakh might have been the source. Or again, **allān* "oak" might have been borrowed from Akkadian (through Hurrian?), which also has an *allānu(m)* "oak" (³). For the question of the Semitic case ending see below (Part II).

e. *Annanega*- (*HWb*, 21; Goetze, *Symb. Hrozny*, I, 289 f.; Friedrich, *HG*, 114 with ns. 5 and 6). Goetze has proposed that *annanega*- be interpreted as a composite noun made up of the two nouns *anna*- "mother" and *nega/u*- "sister", the latter of which he maintains is to be read in KBo VI 26 iv 26 (= Hittite law #200A) (⁴). Friedrich questions Goetze's reading *an-na-aš-ša-an ne-ku?*[-*uš-ša-an*], proposing instead *an-na-aš-ša-an-n[a?]* (⁵). Friedrich observes in his footnote 8 to #200A that the hand copy in KBo VI 26 (made by Hronzy) indicates *an-na-aš-ša-an* [*ne-*], but he considers this insufficient evidence. It is true, as Friedrich observes, that copy *k* (KUB XIII 14 rev. 1-3) is broken at this point, but what he fails to note is that the space available between the visible *na* and the fully visible *ū-en-zi* is insufficient to accommodate the eight signs which according to Goetze's view must intervene between the *na* of *an-na-aš-ša-an* and the *ū* of *ū-en-zi*. The space available in KUB XIII 14 rev. 3 will accommodate at best four signs of medium length. Furthermore, the traces of the last sign before *ū-en-zi* do not fit *an*. They may fit *na*, but not well. Friedrich does note that the space in KBo VI 26 is too small to accommodate Goetze's restoration (⁶). Unfortunately, the third manuscript which covers this paragraph (KUB XXIX 22 iv edge; = *o*₃, not *o*₃!) preserves only a few traces. There does seem to be an independent noun *nega*- in Hittite, which is attested

(¹) Ges.-Buhl, *HAHAT*¹⁷, 41a.

(²) *UT*, 359, glossary entry #193.

(³) *CAD* A¹, 354-355; note also the interesting name *allānkaniš* "Kaniš oak".

(⁴) Goetze, *ArOr* 17 (1949), 290, n. 12; Friedrich, *HG*, 114, n. 5.

(⁵) *HG*, 114, n. 5.

(⁶) *HG*, 115.

in the following forms: *ne-ga-aš-t[a?]-aš-ša* (KBo III 28 obv. ii 7 = 2 BoTU 10 6); the autograph copy indicates two vertical strokes in the beginning of the sign which I have transcribed as *t[a?]*; Goetze reads *š[a]*, and *ne-ga-an* (KUB XXXI 74 obv. ii 15 in broken text of instructions). Whether or not this noun means "sister" must yet be established. I have included *annanega-* in this discussion of composites on the basis of Goetze's analysis. Another explanation of the form, however, has occurred to the writer. It is striking that three of the fundamental terms for family relationship in Luwian all begin with **na-* ⁽¹⁾, and the terms for "brother" (*nani-*) and "sister" (*nanašri-*) have in common the root **nan-*. If these Luwian forms were descended from longer stems with initial *a* (**annani-* and **annanašri-*), they would have the same base as *annanega-*, **annan-*. Now the Luwian terms *nani-* and *nanašri-* are masculine and feminine counterparts to each other, formally distinguished from each other by the Luwian feminine ending *-šri-* (from *-šari-/šara-*) ⁽²⁾. Goetze and Landsberger have agreed that the *-ika-* in Nesite personal names is of IE derivation ⁽³⁾. If *-ika-/eka-* is the "Kanishite" (Nesite) feminine formative analogous to Luwian *-š(a)ra-/š(a)ri-*, then the Luwian *nanašri-* (**annanašri-*?) is evidently the semantic and morphological counterpart to Nesite *annaneka-*. If this line of reasoning can be sustained, then *annaneka-* means "sister", and not "sister of the (same) mother". Of course, in the code passage (#191) the resultant meaning "sister (of the same mother)" is assured by the context, since "sisters (*annanekuš*) ...and their (pl.) mother (sg.) (*anna(n)-šman-a*)" can sustain no other interpretation. But this meaning results from factors *outside* of the noun *annanekuš* itself.

6. Pr + Va₁ = Va₂.

That a preverb can become so much a part of the verb which it precedes that it will accompany it even in deverbal noun formations is well known to Hittitologists from such examples as *para handanda-*

⁽¹⁾ In cuneiform Luwian *nani-* "brother" and *nanašri-* "sister"; in hieroglyphic Luwian *namuwa-* "son" (HWb Erg. 2, 41 and 46).

⁽²⁾ Friedrich, *HE* ³ §50a, §383g; *EHS* I, §106:2,6.

⁽³⁾ Landsberger, *JCS* 8 (1954), 124, n. 4 (includes *-ika* names, even with reference to Czech); Goetze, *RHA* f. 66 (1960), 48.

tar ⁽¹⁾, *piran huyatalla-* ⁽²⁾, *ḫpara uwant-* ⁽³⁾, etc. The convention followed in transcribing these forms indicates that Hittitologists do not regard them as having fused into one word. Hence, we transcribe *pi-ra-an hu-ya-tal-la-aš* rather than *pi-ra-an-hu-ya-tal-la-aš*. Yet there exists a class of composites the first element of which is a preverb and the second a participle in which fusion has clearly taken place ⁽⁴⁾. The following single example will illustrate this statement.

a. *Antiyant-*, a special kind of son-in-law similar to Turkish *içgüvey* (Balkan, *Dergi* 6, 147 ff.; *HWb*, 23, Erg. 2, 7). Balkan, who first analyzed this form correctly, suggested that the components were the preverb *anda* and the participle of the verb *iya-* (Vmp) "to go". Subsequently, Machek ⁽⁵⁾ has preferred to identify the second element with the verb *tiya-* "to enter". Without attempting to settle the difference of opinion on the precise identity of the verbal element ⁽⁶⁾, I believe it is sufficient to point out here that the elision of the final vowel of the preverb *anda* takes place here, whereas it fails to take place in *ḫandayandatar*. Presumably the elision would also occur, if the second component began with *a*. When, however, the second component begins with *u*, the final vowel on the first member may remain (*ḫpa-ra-a-ú-wa-an-da-an-na?*; *Cor. Ling.*, 64). The final vowel of the preverb/adverb also remains, when the second component begins with a consonant (*kattakurant-*). Note also the additional occurrence of this term in the new fragment of the Telipinuš Proclamation, KBo XII 4 obv. ii 8: *ḫan-ti-ya-an-[d]a-a[n]*.

⁽¹⁾ *HWb*, 52.

⁽²⁾ *HWb*, 71.

⁽³⁾ *HWb*, 239; Zuntz, *Ortsadv.*, 68; Güterbock, *Cor. Ling.*, 64.

⁽⁴⁾ One cannot be absolutely certain that *DUGkattakurant-* or *NINDAšerkurant-* were not conceived as *DUGkatta kurant-* or *NINDAšer kurant-*, since no writings like **DUGkat-ta-ak-ku-ra-an-za* exist. On the other hand, when the adverb or preverb ends in a vowel and the second element begins with a vowel of a different quality, the fusion will be evident (e.g. *ḫan-ti-ya-an-za* instead of **ḫan-da i-ya-an-za*; yet *ḫan-da i-ya-an-da an-ni* of KUB XIII 8 obv. 14 may be related to a nominative which is normalized **ḫanda iyandatar* just as well as **ḫandayandatar*).

⁽⁵⁾ *Lingua Posn.* 7, 81 ff.; cf. also Güterbock, *Cor. Ling.*, 64.

⁽⁶⁾ In favor of Balkan's original analysis (*anda+iyant-*) and against Machek (*anda+tiyant-*) is the observation that the final vowel of the preverb *anda* would not be expected to elide before a verbal beginning with a consonant (cf. *hanti+tiyatalla-*, *katta+kurant-*, etc.).

Although *katta* may be either preverb or adverb by form, I have included it in my seventh category rather than here, because of its apparent relationship to *še-er-ku?-ra-an-te-eš*, the first element of which cannot be a preverb but must be an adverb. Furthermore, the meaning attributed to *ḡkattakurant-* requires an adverbial rather than preverbal force for *katta*.

7. Adv + Va₁ = Va₂.

The two examples in this category contain an adverb in the first position and a participle (verbal adjective) in the second.

a. *ḡKattakurant-*, a kind of vessel, cut off or incised at the bottom; (Güterbock, *Cor. Ling.*, 63-64; *HWb*, 105). The final vowel of the adverb has not elided in composition, since the second component begins with a consonant. The first component could, of course, have been *kattan*, in which case the final *n*, which assimilates to the *k* of *kurant-*, has protected the *a* vowel from eliding. The second component appears to be the participle of the verb *kuer-* "to cut" ⁽¹⁾.

b. *nindašerkurant-(?)*, a kind of bread, cut off or incised at the top(?). The only occurrence of this bread name is KUB IX 2 obv. i 19: 3 *nindaše-er-ku(?) -ra-an-te-eš*. It is not listed in *HWb*, but, its significance must be evident to all. For it is the semantic opposite of the vessel name *ḡkattakurant-*. Whatever the exact significance of the verb *kuer-* might be in this compound, it seems probable that in general it has to do with the shaping of the unbaked dough, just as presumably the *ḡkattakurant-* was manufactured by some kind of distinctive shaping of the unfired clay.

A problem arises, as I have indicated above by my question marks, in connection with the drawing of the sign *ku(?)* in KUB IX 2 obv. i 19. It is longer than the usual *ku* and looks more like a *ma*. On the other hand, an examination of the autographed copies of the writings of *ḡkattakurant-* reveals variation in the representation of the *ku* sign. In KUB XI 35 obv. ii 26 the *ku(?)* in *ḡkattakurant-* is the same size as the *ma*'s in lines 21 and 25. In KUB X 28 obv. ii 7 the *ku(?)* in *kattakurant-* is smaller than the *ma* in line 6, but larger than the *ku* in col. i, line 19. In KUB II 6 rev. iv 19 the *ku(?)* is smaller than the *ma* in line 32. It is likewise smaller than adjacent

⁽¹⁾ So presumed by Güterbock, *Cor. Ling.*, 63.

ma's in KUB X 10 obv. i 2; 15 rev. iv 15; 90 rev. 2; and KUB XI 19 rev. iv 8. The relevant sign is obliterated in KUB X 90 rev. 3. It does not seem possible to me to read the sign in *ḡkattakurant-* as *ma*, so as to arrive at **ḡkattamarant-*. On the other hand, to disassociate *nindaše-er-ku(?) -ra-an-te-eš* from *ḡkattakurant-* on the basis of this one occurrence and the longer drawing of *ku* is unacceptable to me. Furthermore, the *ninda ša-ra-a mar-ra-an-te-eš* of KBo X 34 obv. i 11 does not prove the reading *nindaše-er-ma(?) -ra-an-te-eš*, since *šara* is a preverb, while *šer* is an adverb. The two forms, even if *ma* is correct for *nindašermarant-(?)*, would not mean the same thing! One would expect too a double writing of the second *r* in *nindaše-er-ma(?) -ra-an-te-eš*. Because the *katta* in *ḡkattakurant-* is an adverb (not preverb), and the *šer* in *šerkurant-(?)* is also, I would maintain that the two cannot be disassociated despite the "long" *ku* (found at least once in the writings of *ḡkattakurant-* too; see above).

8. N + Va₁ = Va₂.

Of the two examples adduced below the first has retained its originally adjectival force, while the second in its use as an epithet or name for a bird has become substantivized (see above on category two).

a. *Wizzapant-* "old" (Güterbock, *Cor. Ling.*, 64-65; *HWb*, 256; *Erg.* 2, 27; *EHS*, I, 126-127). Güterbock first identified this form as a composite, containing the elements *wet-/wit-* "year" and *pant-* (the participle of *pai-*) "advanced" ⁽¹⁾. The participle *pant-* from *pai-* "to go, proceed, advance" may refer to the aged individual; he has "advanced" in years ⁽²⁾. The form *wizza* poses problems in its vocalization. Is this a *Kasuskompositum* of Brugmann's fourth category? If so, what case is represented by *wizza*? The cuneiform writing *wizza* (*ú-iz-za*) regularly represents the nominative singular of the common gender *t*-stem noun *wit-* "year", usually written. *MU.KAM-za* ⁽³⁾. But, as Friedrich has observed, it is difficult to

⁽¹⁾ Güterbock, *Cor. Ling.*, 64-65.

⁽²⁾ Participles of transitive verbs are normally passive in Hittite, whereas those of intransitives (as here) are active, sometimes with a kind of perfective nuance ("having gone/advanced"). Cf. *HE*², 144-145.

⁽³⁾ *HWb*, 255.

construe the nominative with the participle here ⁽¹⁾. *Kasuskomposita* are not clearly attested in Hittite, the only other suggested example being the problematic *šiwanzanna-* (see above under 5c).

b. *Tarumaki-*, a bird name (*HWb*, 217). This noun occurs only once in Hittite texts, in KUB VIII 62 i 6, where we read: *tar-la-a-an^{MUSEN} ta-a-ru-ma-ki-i[n^{MUSEN}]*. Neither *tarla-* nor *tarumaki-* occur elsewhere as bird names, yet the above reconstruction of the text seems the most probable ⁽²⁾. I believe that *tarumaki-* is simply a compounded form of *taru-* "wood" and *wak-* "to bite, chew" ⁽³⁾. The resulting "wood-biter" or "wood-pecker" is an intelligible designation of the bird species *picus*. Woodpeckers are common in the Near East today, and there is no reason to suspect that they were not so in antiquity. The Arabic name for the woodpecker is نَقَّارُ الخَشَبِ. The spelling of pronounced *w* with the *m* signs in Hittite cuneiform has been discussed at length recently by Kronasser ⁽⁴⁾. The question may arise: Why would "wood-pecker" not be written **taru-w/ma-kant-* (i.e., with the participle)? In the final analysis no one can answer such hypothetical questions. But it should be observed that in other IE languages there are non-participial verbal adjectives which serve the purpose here proposed in composites. Compare Greek αίμο-βόρος "blood-sucking", δρυ-τόμος "wood-cutting", ιππό-δάμος "horse-taming", βουλη-φόρος "counsel-giving", Vedic *ukha-chid-* "vessel-smashing", etc. **W/maki-* could be just such a non-participial verbal adjective in Hittite composites.

9. Bound morpheme + $Va_1 = Va_2$.

This example actually belongs to Brugmann's second category (see below in Part II for further discussion on this point). The first member is a bound morpheme and never occurs independently. To this category belongs IE **n* (Greek alpha-privative, etc.).

⁽¹⁾ *HWb*, Erg. 1, 23; but see further on the syntactical side G. Neumann, *Indogermanica*, 143 ff.

⁽²⁾ Another possible transliteration would be: *tar-la-a-an hu-ta-a-ru-ma-ki-i[n]*, but **hutarumaki-* cannot be related to any known Hittite or Luwian root in a satisfactory fashion.

⁽³⁾ *HWb*, 241.

⁽⁴⁾ *HE*², 33; *EHS*, I, 81-88.

a. *duddummi-* "deaf" Ehelolf, *KlF* 1 [1930] 393-400; *HWb*, 230-231). The basic adjectival form which is adduced for "deaf" is *duddummi-*, although this occurs only in the adverbial derivative *duddumili* and in the expanded adjective in *-ant-*, *duddummiyant-*. Also built upon *duddummi-* are the verbs *duddummeš-* "to be deaf" and *duddummiyah-* "to make deaf". Ehelolf has suggested on the basis of Bo 2527 (= *Song of Ullikummiš*, Tabl. II, col. ii, line 11; *JCS* 6 [1952] 32) with its spelling *du-ud-du-ud-mi-ya-an-za* that the form be analyzed as *du+dudm-*, which becomes by assimilation *du+dumm-* ⁽¹⁾. I find the form *duddummiyanza* quite difficult and tend to agree with Friedrich's exclamation point behind it in *HWb*, 231. I do not wish to discard the form as evidence, yet I suspect that we are confronted with a scribal slip of some kind ⁽²⁾ and would not base much analysis on it. In other respects I am inclined to analyze the form just as did Ehelolf: *du+dummi-*. The first element fits into the same category as IE **dus-* ⁽³⁾. Brugmann and Delbrück indicate that IE **dus-* appears in Sanskrit as *dur-*, in Greek as *δυσ-*, and in Old Irish as *do-* ⁽⁴⁾. I would suggest that the **du-* of *duddummi-* is this same IE **dus-*. One of the words which in Greek express the adjectival notion "deaf" is *δυσ-παράλητος* "hard to move by prayer, deaf". The same *δυσ-* occurs in the verb *δυσ-βλέπω* "to see badly, be partially blind". The second element may be connected with the Luwian noun *tumman-* "ear" (= Nesite *ištamana-*) ⁽⁵⁾ or the Luwian verb *tumma(n)tai-* "to hear(?)" ⁽⁶⁾. The loss of the final *-an-* is admittedly difficult for the identification. The literal meaning would be "hard (*du-*) of hearing (*-dummi-*)". Words expressing defects of hearing and sight often contain within them either the noun which denotes the sense organ or the verb which denotes the exercise of that sense. The Sumerogram which means "blind" in Hittite texts is a good example; *IGI.NU.GÁL* literally means "having no eye". The Sumerogram for "deaf", on the other hand is *Ú.ĜUB*, yet a rare example of *GEŠTUG.NU.GÁL* does exist at Hattušaš (KUB XVIII 16 ii 1). The Hittite adjective "blind" (*dašuwant-*) may also fit into this category. Ehelolf once pointed out that the single writing of the

⁽¹⁾ *KlF* 1 (1930), 395, n. 1.

⁽²⁾ *Ud* for *wa*?

⁽³⁾ Brugmann & Delbrück, *VGIS*, II, 28-29.

⁽⁴⁾ *Ibid.*

⁽⁵⁾ Bossert, *MIO* 4 (1956), 208.

⁽⁶⁾ *HWb* Erg. 2, 43 citing *DLL*.

š militated against a connection with *daššu-* "heavy" ⁽¹⁾. At the time Ehelolf wrote those words the only verb of seeing which was known in Hittite was *auš-*. Since that time others have come to light, such as *šakuwai-* (*HWb*, 177; proposed in 1946 by Güterbock) and *šuwaiya-* (Güterbock, *RHA* f. 58 [1956], 22-25). The latter in particular seems a likely candidate for the second element of *dašuwant-* "blind". As for the first element **da-*, I have no proposal.

10. $V + N_1 = N_2$.

This category was suggested to me by Prof. Güterbock on the basis of several examples from modern German and English. Neither he nor I can be very sure that such a type of composite existed in the early phases of the IE languages, yet this analysis of the one example discussed below is somewhat appealing.

a. *Targaš(ša)na-*, an ass or a kind of ass ⁽²⁾. This term is only attested to date in Luwian, where it appears in cuneiform in the derivative noun *targaššanalli-* "ass-driver" (*HWb* Erg. 2, 42, citing *DLL*) and in hieroglyphic in the simple noun *targašna-* (Laroche, *HH*, I, 62-3, entry 100). In addition it occurs in the personal name ¹Targašnalliš, king of Ḫapalla (*Onom.* #684). Kronasser (*EHS*, I, 183) does not cite *targaš(ša)na-* as an example of the *-šana-/šna-* formative. It is possible that the ending is nothing more than this, but another interpretation should be considered. The common IE root behind the Latin (*asinus*) and Greek (*ὄνος*) terms for the ass is believed to be **osono-* ⁽³⁾. A normalization **onoī* for the Mycenaean nom. pl. noun *o-no* is posited by Ventris & Chadwick ⁽⁴⁾, and Frisk ⁽⁵⁾, who likewise translate it "asses". The use of the term for the ass as a personal name can be established for Old Akkadian (¹Imāru) ⁽⁶⁾, Ur-III Akkadian (¹Emāru) ⁽⁷⁾, Mari Amorite (¹Ḫimarāti) ⁽⁸⁾, early

⁽¹⁾ See p. 397, n. 1 above.

⁽²⁾ Laroche, *Syria* 31 (1954), 109; Laroche, *HH* I, 62-63, entry 100.

⁽³⁾ Brugmann and Kretschmer cited in Frisk, *GEW*, II, 398.

⁽⁴⁾ *Docs.*, 401.

⁽⁵⁾ *GEW*, II, 397.

⁽⁶⁾ *CAD* I 112b.

⁽⁷⁾ *Ibid.*

⁽⁸⁾ *ARM* VIII 6:31.

Canaanite (*חֲמֹר*) ⁽¹⁾, and Republican Roman (Asinius) nomenclature ⁽²⁾. Frisk and others ⁽³⁾ believe that the linguistic ancestor of *ὄνος* and *asinus* derived from Anatolia, specifically from the Pontus region. This theory would lead one to seek some trace of **os(o)no-* in the languages of second millennium Anatolia. If *targaš(ša)naš* can be analyzed as **targ+*aš(ša)naš*, the second component might well be identified with this **os(o)nos*. As for the element **targ-*, I am inclined to connect it with IE **dherāgh-* "to pull, drag, carry" ⁽⁴⁾. The animal called *targaš(ša)na-* then would be either a "pack-ass" or a "draught-ass". From the writing ANŠE-aš in the *Syllabar A* (Sa) lexical text cited apud *CAD* I, 110b sub *imēru* we learn that the Hittite word for "ass" was an *a*-stem noun of common gender. We know also from Mesopotamian texts (information assembled in *CAD* I, 112-113) that asses were used as draught, pack, and riding animals. Certainly they must have been used thus in Asia Minor. Textual evidence is usually drawn from Sumerograms which contain the final element(s) LÁ or AL.LÁ ⁽⁵⁾. While writings with simple LÁ or AL.LÁ (reading b á r a-l á would be attractive, but BÁR is usually quite distinct from AL at Boğazköy) might signify a draught animal, the writer is very skeptical of the more familiar writings with SAL (i.e., SAL.AL.LÁ). Oppenheim once suggested that "the quality termed a l [or a l-l á] was important for the value of the hide" ⁽⁶⁾. The animal called AL in Oppenheim's examples is the cow (á b). Professors Oppenheim and Civil now inform me that the sign which Oppenheim read a l in *Eames Catalogue* must now be read m a ḫ_x. This information is supported by the observations of Landsberger in *MSL* VIII/1, 63, n. 1, who translates á b.AL as "a full-grown cow that has calved". Since, as Landsberger notes, MAḪ in Hittite texts connotes more than just age, pointing to a bull which has been spared from agricultural work and/or not castrated, so as to be suited for stud purposes, AL (m a ḫ_x) may also extend beyond the designation of age in itself at Boğazköy and point to a female animal which is

⁽¹⁾ *Genesis* 34:2ff.

⁽²⁾ *Der kleine Pauly*, I, 638-640.

⁽³⁾ See p. 398, n. 3 above.

⁽⁴⁾ Pokorny, *IEW*, 257.

⁽⁵⁾ For LÁ, compare GUD APIN.LÁ; for AL.LÁ, compare ANŠE.KUR.RA SAL.AL.LÁ, ANŠE.GIR.NUN.NA SAL.AL.LÁ, and ANŠE.SAL.AL.LÁ. Compare *HWb* on each of these Sumerograms.

⁽⁶⁾ *Catalogue... Eames*, 38.

old enough to bear. However, Prof. W. W. Hallo has been good enough to suggest to me yet another way of interpreting SAL.AL.LÁ. He suggests very cautiously that SAL.AL.LÁ *may* be read šal¹-lá for šallam = šilam "female, milk-producing". He advises me that šilam was applied originally to cows, but in the context of KUB XXXV 142 rev. iv (which I discussed with him) extended to all kinds of animals whose gender is not differentiated in the logogram (ANŠE.KUR.RA, ANŠE.GIR.NUN.NA, ANŠE, ŠAH, UR.GI, and Akkadian *lulimu* as contrasted with ^{GU}AB, UDU.SIG+SAL, and ŪZ in the same listing). KUB XXXV 142 rev. iv is an excellent test passage for SAL.AL.LÁ, since here we have a simple listing of male and female counterparts of animals. There is nothing to indicate that qualities other than those related to sex are involved. Hence, the idea of "draught (animal)" is out of the question. Furthermore, the sow, the bitch, and the doe would certainly be less likely to be used as draught animals than horses, mules, or donkeys. The shorter ANŠE.KUR.RA SAL AL of KBo XIV 132 rev. iii 5 is probably not a mistake for ANŠE.KUR.RA SAL AL<.LA>, but a genuine variant. The element *targ- in *targaš(ša)na-* is not attested as an independent verb in published texts, but it may function as a verb in this compound. For more discussion of the composite type $V + N_1 = V_2$ see below in Part II. Finally, with regard to the theory that there is a connection between IE *osono- and Sumerian a n š u, the metathesis of *a š n u to *a n š u required by this theory is possible, but to my mind only remotely so.

II. Integration with Rules of IE Composite Formation

Brugmann and Delbrück have segregated the various known composites in the IE languages into four categories: (1) those whose first member is a morpheme with independent existence and which is declinable, (2) those whose first member is without independent existence (i.e., a bound morpheme), (3) those whose first member is an old adverb also attested independently, and (4) those whose first member is a declined noun or a form which only developed into an adverb in the recent and separate development of the individual language. Composites belonging to class one exhibit the stem form (including theme vowel, but no case endings) in the first member. Composites of type two have indeclinable first members, as do those

of type three. The first member of composites belonging to class four, if nouns, pronouns, or adjectives, will be declined, the most common type being nouns in the genitive case. The only type of composite suggested for our examples but not represented in Brugmann and Delbrück is $V + N_1 = N_2$. Prof. H. G. Güterbock has suggested several modern examples to me (modern German *Stehplatz* and modern English *go-cart*). Other English examples are: *tread-mill*, *plow-ox*, *watch-dog*, *throw-rug*, etc. This pattern may represent an innovation in modern English and German and not a legacy of IE. Yet it is worth considering if Hittite *targ+aš(ša)na-* is not just such a form, even if we must conclude that the pattern $V + N_1 = N_2$ is also an innovation in Luwian.

Of the remaining Hittite examples cited above whose status as composites I have not questioned all first members exhibit the stem form of the noun, verb, or adjective involved. It is notable that the *r/n* stem noun *pattar* (gen. *pattanaš*) exhibits the consonant of the overt rather than oblique stem. If *pirešhannaš* is really a composite (*per*+*šahhan*), it exhibits its *r* stem consonant. *U*-stem forms are *aššu-* in *aššuzeri-* and *taru-* in *tarumaki-*. An apparent *n*-stem is **ištaman-* "ear" in *ištamahura-* (the *n* has assimilated to the *h*, as in *ištanh-|ištahh-*) instead of the usual *a*-stem *ištamana-*. The only *i*-stem is *šuppi-* in *šuppiwashar*. An unusual *a*-stem instead of the usual *i* is **šalla-* in *šallakardai-|šallakardah*. *Wizzapant-* poses a problem: the stem is *welit-* i.e., a *t*-stem. It is true that in Greek the stem was **wetes-* (Fέτος, gen. Fέτεος), but there is no evidence for the *š*-stem in Nesite or Luwian. It is this consideration, along with the unusual order ($N + Va_1 = Va_2$), which renders its status as a composite questionable. The apparent lack of a stem vowel on the first elements of *hatalkeššana-* and *tapalkuštana-* is doubtless because the second element begins with a vowel. In another Hittite example compare *antiyant-* from **anda+iyant-*. Brugmann and Delbrück cite many other examples, such as: Sanskr. *yukta-ašvas* > *yuktašvas*, Greek **τιμα-ορός* > *τιμωρός*, **ιππο-αγωγός* > *ιππαγωγός*. The true stems of the adjectives(?) in *hatalkeššana-* and *tapalkuštana-* may have been **hata-* and **tapa-*. A more serious problem is posed by *walkiššara-*. No *l*-stem adjectives are attested for Hittite or for IE. According to the rules this member should exhibit a vocalic stem-ending (**wala-*/**wali-*/**walu-*). It may be that this jeopardizes its status as a genuine composite. The word "god" in *šiwanzanna-* should be the *n*-stem *šivan-|šiu-*. The only plausible explanation

for the *z* (**ts*) is the emergence of a *Sprosskonsonant* *t* from **šiwantš* to **šiwantš*. But even here there is difficulty. What is the *š*? If it is an indication of the genitive singular, where is the *a* (IE **o*) which belongs to the genitive singular ending (IE **-os*; Hittite *-aš*)? And finally in the case of *allantaru-*, if our thesis that **allan-* is Semitic *allānu*, the Hittite speakers who coined the word *allantaru-* simply recognized from the spoken variations *allānu* (nom.), *allāni* (gen.), *allāna* that the "stem" (Semitic root) ended with the *n*.

Into Brugmann and Delbrück's second category falls *duddummi-* (*du*+*dummi-*) "hard of hearing, deaf." The element **du-*, like Sanskrit *dur-*, Greek *δυσ-*, and Old Irish *do-*, derives from IE **dus-* which is a bound morpheme.

Into Brugmann and Delbrück's third category fall *appašiwat-*, *šarriwašpa-*, *kattakurant-*, and *šerkurant-*, whose first members are primitive adverbs.

Of the fourth category there seems to be no trace in Hittite, unless we consider *pirešhannaš* to contain the genitive singular **peraš*/**perš*, which is not likely.

Notae bibliographicae

- W. S. SMITH, Interconnections in the Ancient Near East. A Study of the Relationships between the Arts of Egypt, the Aegean, and Western Asia (R. CAPLICE) — J. ARO, Die Vokalisierung des Grundstammes im semitischen Verbum (R. CAPLICE) — K. BITTEL - E. HEINRICH - B. HROUDA - W. NAGEL, Vorderasiatische Archäologie. Studien und Aufsätze Anton Moortgat zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern (R. CAPLICE) — M. RIEMSCHEIDER, Das Reich am Ararat (R. CAPLICE) — F. IMPARATI, I Hurriti (R. CAPLICE) — A. VANEL, L'iconographie du dieu de l'orage dans le Proche-Orient ancien jusqu'au VII^e siècle avant J.-C. (R. CAPLICE) — W. ATALLAH, Adonis dans la littérature et l'art grecs (É. DES PLACES) — The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XXXI (É. DES PLACES) — G. GERSTER, Nubien - Goldland am Nil (H. QUECKE) — P. DU BOURGUET, Musée National du Louvre. Catalogue des Étoffes Coptes. I (H. QUECKE) — M. ALLARD, Le problème des attributs divins dans la doctrine d'al-Aš'ari et des premiers grands disciples (R. KÖBERT) — J. BLAU, The Emergence and Linguistic Background of Judeo-Arabic (R. KÖBERT) — W. LESIAU, Ethiopians Speak: Studies in Cultural Background. II. Chaha (P. NOBER) 464-472
- Libri ad Directionem missi 473-476

Bibliographiae

- J. SIMON, Bibliographie copte. 18 (1965) 139*-171*

ORIENTALIA

Rafael SAMPEDRO, S.J. — Amministratore

La rivista si pubblica in quattro quaderni annui comprendenti circa 600 pagine. Il prezzo di abbonamento è di lire 8.800 per l'Italia e di 16 dollari U.S.A. per gli altri paesi, e va versato in anticipo. Non si vendono fascicoli separati. I volumi 1 (1932) - 14 (1945) sono disponibili in riproduzione fotomeccanica al prezzo di lire 9.000 (o 16 dollari), oltre le spese di spedizione. I volumi 16 (1947) - 34 (1965) sono in vendita al prezzo attuale di abbonamento per l'estero, con l'aggiunta delle spese di spedizione.

La corrispondenza amministrativa deve essere indirizzata a: «Amministrazione Pubblicazioni» Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Piazza della Pilotta 35, Roma 2, Italia (conto corrente postale: Roma 1/11534, intestato a «Amministrazione Pubblicazioni Pontificio Istituto Biblico»).