ASPECTS OF CUNEIFORM LUVIAN NOMINAL INFLECTION

H. Craig MELCHERT

1. Relational adjectives in -*aššanza*-

CLuvian relational adjectives in -*ašša/i*- show ordinary ablative-instrumental forms in -*aššati* and by-forms in -*aššanzati*. The latter have previously been interpreted as ablative-instrumental plural: tentatively by Laroche (1959: 138), explicitly by Kammenhuber (1969: 307) who speaks of a "plural infix", by Neumann (1982: 159), and by others. Laroche, Kammenhuber, and others also interpret the ending -*anzan* (1x in *malḫaššaššanzan*) as a genitive plural, with the same inserted element -*nz*-, and the equivalent of the Old Hittite genitive plural ending -*an*.

The identification of the inserted element -*nz*- in these examples with the plural ending -*nz(a)* of the CLuvian animate accusative plural and dative plural seems unquestionable. The reading of the forms in -*aššanzati* as plurals also seems compatible with the contexts in which they occur, although in most cases there is no positive evidence for a plural sense. However, there are difficulties with this received interpretation. These have even led Starke (1982: 414ff) to question the authenticity of the -*nz*- forms.

The first problem is: if there was a tendency in CLuvian to extend the distinction of singular/plural to the ablative-instrumental, it is surprising that this development is restricted just to relational adjectives in -*ašša/i*- (see already Starke). One would expect to find such forms in other adjectives and in nouns. Second, and more seriously, the interpretation of other examples of inserted -*nz*- as plurals cannot possibly be correct.

We may begin with the example *malḫaššaššanzan* EN-*ya* (*KUB* XXXV 39 iii 25). Already Mittelberger (1963: 90f) had identified the ending -*an* of adjectives in -*ašša/i*- as dative singular, citing three examples from HLuvian and at least one in CLuvian (*immaraššan* ᵈIŠKUR-*ti* "to the Storm-god of the open country", *KUB* XXXV 54 ii 37). The identification of -*aššan* as dative singular has now been fully confirmed by additional evidence from HLuvian, assembled by Morpurgo Davies (1980: 123ff). Morpurgo Davies, writing in 1980, was cautious about attributing -*aššan* to CLuvian, but we may now add at least one more

certain example: *wallunaš<š>an wāni* "to the woman of lifting", i "midwife" (*KUB* XXXV 88 iii 12). For this example see Starke (198 414³¹ᵃ), who also now properly emends *imrašša* ᵈIŠKUR-*ti* of *KL* XXXV 54 ii 35 to *imrašša<n>* after the correct *immarašsan* ᵈIŠKUR two lines later. He explicitly states that -*(ašš)an* marks dative singul (see also Starke 1985: 67 with note 25). If -*an* is the dative singular en ing of -*ašša/i-* adjectives, then *malḫaššaššanzan* EN-*ya* must be dati singular as well (note the ending of EN-*ya*!)[1].

We also have examples ending in -*anzanza*: ᵈEN.ZU-*anzanza* (*KL* XXXV 103 ii 11) and *[mal]ḫaššaššanzanza* EN-*anz[a]* (*KUB* XXX 78,7). Here the final -*anza* already marks dative plural, making it high unlikely that the preceding -*anz*- also indicates plural. Starke (198 *passim*) consistently emends all forms with -*anz*- except ablative-instr mentals, deleting the final -*anza* of the last two examples cited as d tography and also correcting *malḫaššaššanzan* to simply *malḫaššašša* He also reads the two instances SÍSKUR-*aššanza* (EN-*ya*) (*KUB* XXX 45 ii 7) and EN SÍSKUR-*anza* (*KUB* XXXV 59,7) as -*(ašš)an*. See al his discussion in Starke (1982: 414f with note 33) and (1990: 39ff).

The ablative-instrumental forms, however, prove that an inserted eleme -*nz*- exists. In view of this it is highly suspect that three different types scribal error (dittography of final -*anza*, an extra final -*za-an*, and an ex final -*za*) all conspire to produce a formant -*nz*- elsewhere. It is particula hard to see the motivation for the last two alleged errors. As Starke's editi shows, the Hittite scribes were often quite careless in writing Luvian, t nearly all the errors consist of **omission** of signs. The manuscript *KL* XXXV 45 shows nine examples of omitted signs, including some in t Hittite portion (see Starke 1985: 151ff)[2]. This pattern strongly suggests tl SÍSKUR-*aššanza* at *KUB* XXXV 45 ii 7 should be emended not SÍSKUR-*aššan*, but rather to SÍSKUR-*aššanza<n>*, matching attest *malḫaššaššanzan*. Likewise we should read EN SÍSKUR-*anza<n>* in *KL* XXXV 59,7. Recall the necessary emendation of *imrašša* to *imrašša<n>* *KUB* XXXV 54 ii 35 cited above. The forms in -*aššanzan* and -*aššanzan* are real, and they must be explained along with those in -*aššanzati*.

---

[1] The source of the unusual dative ending -*(ašš)an* remains unknown. As pointed by STARKE (1990: 41), the explanation offered by MORPURGO DAVIES is problematic CLuvian, but his own derivation from an archaic locatival *-*en* accounts neither for restriction to -*ašša/i-* adjectives nor for the exclusively **dative** function.

[2] There is one case of an omitted sign which is missed by STARKE and earlier editi In line ii 1, instead of the inexplicable *pu-ú-wa-la-a*, we should read *pu-ú-wa-<ti>-il.* l both the combination *puwatil pariyanallan* "past and future" and the shape of the sig see *KUB* XXXV 43 iii 30.

I believe that the interpretation of inserted -*nz*- as a plural marker is correct, but not in the sense previously assumed. The overall usage of these forms argues that they mark genitive plural: i.e., they indicate plural number not of the noun modified by the relational adjective, but of the base noun, i.e. the modifying noun.

The strongest evidence for this interpretation is found in *KUB* XXXV 103 ii 11-12 and iii 1-3 (see Starke 1985: 222)[3]: *[iū]nni=wa* ᵈEN.ZU-*anzanza kummaya[nza ḫat]ayannanza āpan ḫizzaun[ni]...[p]a=wa iyandu* ᵈEN.ZU-*inzi* x[...] *kummayanza ḫatayannanza apan ḫizzaindu.* The two sentences are obviously completely parallel in structure, except that the first sentence is first person plural, referring to the worshippers, while the second is third person plural, with ᵈEN.ZU-*inzi* as subject. As per Starke (1990: 544²⁰¹⁴), the plural ᵈEN.ZU-*inzi* cannot belong to the noun "Moon-god", which is consistently a singular *a*-stem *Arma-* in the Anatolian languages. I therefore follow him in assuming an underlying *ᵈ*Armašša/i-* "of the moon", substantivized to "month" (note the con- text of a birth ritual).

The nominative plural ᵈEN.ZU-*inzi* (= *ᵈ*Armaššinzi*) establishes beyond doubt that the reference of ᵈEN.ZU-*anzanza* is also plural. We must understand: "Let us go and hand him over/entrust him to the holy *ḫatayanni*- of the months...let the months entrust him to (their) holy *ḫatayanni*". The adjective ᵈEN.ZU-*anzanza* (= *Armaššaššanzanza*) is perfectly well-formed: the first -*nz*- marks the modifier (possessor) as plural, while the final -*anz(a)* marks the adjective as agreeing with the modified noun *ḫatayannanza*. Given this certain example, we may also interpret *[mal]ḫaššaššanzanza* EN-*anz[a]* of *KUB* XXXV 78,7 as "to the lords of the sacrifices" (i.e. the clients), again perfectly grammatical.

The presence of both plural marker -*nz*- and dative singular -*an* in *malḫaššaššan-zan* EN-*ya* (*KUB* XXXV 39 iii 25) is now also explain- able: the phrase can mean simply "to the lord of the sacrifices". Once again -*nz*- marks the number of the modifier, while the case ending -*an*, as expected, marks the adjective as agreeing in case and number with the modified noun EN-*ya*. Actually, since we find consistently *malḫaššaš- šanzan* EN-*ya* (likewise emend SÍSKUR-*aššanza* to -*aššanza<n>* as per above), it is likely that we should still translate "lord(s) of the sacrifice". The word *malḫašša*- "sacrifice" is probably a collective *plurale tantum*, as already suggested by Laroche (1959: 66). The standard writing of the

---

[3] Pace STARKE, the parallel structure demands the reading and restoration *kum-ma-ya-a[n-za]* in ii 11.

logogram as repeated SISKUR.SISKUR (read now SÍSKUR) may be an intentional device to indicate the collective plural.

Similarly, the phrase *[pa]rnaššanzanza* DINGIR.MEŠ-*anz[a]* of *KBo* XXII 254 Rs 6 (Starke 1985: 195) could be taken as "to the gods of the houses", but in view of other evidence for "house" as a collective plural in Luvian (see HLuvian *za-ya* DOMUS-*na* "this house" in KULULU 1) we should probably understand this also as "to the gods of the house", again with a grammatical plural functioning as a collective.

A reexamination of the ablative-instrumentals in *-aššanzati* shows that they also refer to the number of the modifier, not the modified noun. The phrase DINGIR.MEŠ-*aššanzati waššaraḫitati* (*KUB* XXXV 45 ii 9 etc.) obviously means "with/by the favor of the gods", where the plural reference of the modifier is assured, while the abstract in *-aḫit-* is most naturally taken as a generic singular. Compare also the common phrase *taparuwaššanzat[i d]ātariyamn[ašša]nzati ḫirutašša[nzati] mayaššanzati* EME-*ti* (*KUB* XXXII 9+ Rs 33-34; Starke 1985: 90): "from the tongue of the *taparu-*, the curses, the oaths, and the *maya-*". The nominative form of the same phrase shows first of all that the modified noun "tongue" is singular in Luvian: cf. *ḫirutašš[i]š* EME-*i[š] ibid.* Vs 8f (Starke 1985: 87). Therefore *-aššanzati* EME-*ti* cannot be grammatically "from the tongues of...". On the other hand, *KUB* IX 6+ ii 13 establishes that the number of the first three modifiers is often plural: *tapāruwa ḫīrūta tatarriyamna* "the *taparu*'s, the oaths and the curses"[4]. While I agree with Laroche (1959: 65) that CLuvian *mayašša/i-* EME-*i-* equates functionally to Hittite *pangawaš lala-* "tongue of the community, common gossip", the referent in CLuvian is probably plural: **mainzi* "adult males", formally matching Hittite *māēš* and functionally matching the collective sense of *panku-*[5].

---

[4] The occurrence of all three nouns beside each other in the nominative (both singular and plural are attested) means that we must take them as coordinated also in the adjectival phrase. I therefore cannot follow NEUMANN (1982: 152), who interprets *tatariyamnašša/i-* as dependent on *ḫirutašša/i-*. We must read rather "lord of the curses (and) oaths". This does not, of course, falsify his manifestly correct general claim that one *-ašša/i-* adjective may depend on another.

[5] For Hittite *pangawaš lalaš* as "tongue of the totality/community, common gossip" see BECKMAN (1982: 437). I believe we may safely assume that in second-millennium Anatolia the community which mattered consisted of the (free) adult males. Hence the Luvian expression "tongue(s) of the adult males" is equivalent to the Hittite. The Lycian institution of the *miñtis* undoubtedly owes its name also to the fact that it was composed of the adult males of the community. For the derivation of *miñt(i)-* from **miyant(i)-* see already LAROCHE (1963: 78). I reject, however, his derivation of CLuvian *maya(šša/i)-* etc. from **meĝh₂-* "much" in favor of his earlier derivation from the root **meh₁(i)-* "grow, mature". STARKE (1985: 254) strangely reads *māēš* as Luvian, but the word is

In the expression *dawaššanzati tititati* (*KUB* XXXV 48 ii 14 etc.) both modifier and modified likely have plural reference: "from the pupils of the eyes". It is not surprising that one also finds the corresponding singular *dawaššati tititati* (*KUB* XXXII 14+, 8) "from the pupil of the eye".

Other examples of adjectives in *-ašša/i-* with inserted *-nz-* are in contexts too fragmentary to determine the number of the modifier, but there is nothing in their usage which is incompatible with the interpretation established for them above. In *KUB* XXXV 43 ii 37f (Starke 1985: 145) we find the expression *malḫaššaššiš=pa=tar* EN-*aš apaššanza waššinanza [(mammannaddu)]*... "But let the lord of the sacrifice look upon his (own) limbs"[6]. On the basis of this and other preserved examples, Starke (1985: 89 and 119) emends the *[(apa)]ššanzanza* of *KUB* XXXV 21 ii 12 and XXXII 8+5 iv 13 to simple *apaššanza*. However, the subject and verb are missing in both examples with *apaššanzanza*, and nothing prevents a restoration *[malḫaššaššinzi* EN-*anzi...mammannandu]* "Let the lords of the sacrifice look upon their limbs"[7]. For a plural "lords of the sacrifice" see *KUB* XXXV 78,7 *[mal]ḫaššanzanza* EN-*anz[a]* (dative plural) referred to above and other examples cited by Starke (1990: 39), whose attempt to dismiss all such cases as misunderstandings is not credible.

The dative singular ᵈUTU-*šanza[n]* (*KUB* XXXV 90,7; Starke 1985: 246) is perfectly well-formed and may mean "to the [ ] of the Sungods". The reference to more than one Sun-god is unusual, but hardly disturbing. There is certainly no dearth of solar deities in second-millennium Anatolia: we know of at least the Sun-god of heaven, the Sun-goddess of Arinna, and the solar deity of earth from Hittite sources.

---

perfectly regular Hittite, as is the dat.-loc. plural *māy[aš]* which is to be restored six lines earlier. See also nom. sg. ᴸᵁ*mayaš* at *KUB* XXXI 61 + XXVI 61 ii 8. Hittite *maya-* (extended *mayant-*) is cognate with CLuvian **maya-* "adult male" contained in *mayašša/i-*, from a preform **móh₁yo-* (see MELCHERT 1984: 46 for details). Lycian *miñt(i)-* from **miyant(i)-* matches the Hittite participle *miyant-* "grown, mature" with the "motion-suffix" *-i-*. HLuvian *mi-ya-ti-zi u-si-zi* (KARATEPE 293-294) certainly means "many years" in context, but this may also be derived from *miyant(i)-* "full-grown, mature". Compare the Hittite expression *dalugaeš* MU.KAM.ḪI.A-*eš* "long years".

[6] The plural *waššinanza* to *waššina/i-* "body" would seem to require a plural possessor, but this seems impossible in the fully preserved passage with EN-*aš* as the subject. There is no plural referent in the preceding context which could serve as the antecedent of *apašša/i-*. I therefore assume the same double usage for *waššina/i-* as for Hittite *tuekka-*: singular "body" but also plural "limbs, members".

[7] STARKE (1985: 119) naturally restores the verb in *KUB* XXXII 8+5 iv 14 as singular *[ma-am-ma-an-na-a]d-du*, but only the final vertical of the broken sign is preserved, so that we also may read *[ma-am-ma-an-na-a]n-du*.

The adjective [URUKap]lawiyaššazati in *KUB* XXXV 30-31 ii 4 obviously cannot refer to more than one city, but the derived adjective *Kaplawiyašša/i-* would mean "Kaplawiyan", permitting an interpretation "with/from [ ] of the Kaplawiyans"[8].

The above analysis of inserted *-nz-* as marking plural number of the modifier rather than the modified is the only one which can account for the combinations *-aššanzan* and *-aššanzanza*, and it is consistent with all occurrences of *-aššanzati*. It also provides an immediate explanation for why *-nz-* occurs only in the relational adjective in *-ašša/i-*. The principal use of these stems in Luvian is to express a genitival relationship (Starke 1985: *passim* terms them "Adj. gen."; likewise Neumann 1982: 150ff). This function is particularly important in CLuvian, where so far as we can tell the genitive case of the noun has been entirely lost. One disadvantage of the use of the relational adjective instead of a case form of the noun is that there is no means for distinguishing the number of the possessor. In order to meet this need, the plural ending *-nz(a)* was added to stems in *-ašša-* in front of the non-direct case endings[9].

One question which immediately arises is why this device was applied only to the dative (singular and plural) and the ablative-instrumental. We do not find the inserted marker *-nz-* in the nominative and accusative forms of *-ašša/i-*. I believe the answer to this problem lies in the shape of the respective case endings. The very limited evidence for consonant stems in CLuvian makes segmentation of stems and case endings rather ambiguous, but we may reasonably suppose that the dative plural and ablative-instrumental endings are inherently *-anz(a)* and *-ati*. The unique ending of the dative singular *-aššan* may also be taken as *-an*, though we can hardly prove this segmentation. Thus in these three cases the insertion of *-nz-* between the stem *-ašša-* and endings with initial vowel causes no formal difficulties: *-ašša-nz-an*, *-ašša-nz-anz(a)*, and *-ašša-nz-ati*. However, in the animate nominative and accusative singular we find *-aš, -iš, -uš* and *-an, -in, -un*. Likewise animate nominative and accusative plural *-anzi, -inzi* and *-anz(a), -inz(a)*. This pattern suggests that the endings here are *-š, -n, -nzi* and *-nz(a)* without inherent vowel, the latter belonging to the respective stems. In these cases, then, insertion of *-nz-* between stem and ending would have led either to unacceptable sequences (acc. sg. *-*ašši-nz-n*) or to running together of the *-nz-* and the case ending (nom. sg. *-*ašši-nz-š*, i.e. /-assints/, nom. pl. *-*ašši-nz-nzi*, i.e. /-assintsi/, etc.).

It is true that in the case of the *-ašša-* adjectives the *-i-* of the animate nominative and accusative endings is not an inherent part of the stem, but rather a "motion-suffix", as established by Starke (1990: 59ff). However, as he shows, the function of this suffix is to mark overtly the animate gender of the stem. To insert the number marker *-nz-* in front of the *i*-suffix would violate the general principle that inflectional affixes do not occur inside derivational affixes. We would therefore not expect to find *-*ašša-nz-i-š* and so forth.

Insertion of the marker *-nz-* into the neuter nominative and accusative singular and plural would also have been problematic. The basic neuter nom.-acc. singular of *-ašša-* is *-aššan*. Insertion of *-nz-* here would have led to *-ašša-nz-an*, identical with the dative singular. Moreover, the neuter nom.-acc. singular of stems in *-ašša-* is not usually mere *-aššan*, but rather *-aššan-za*, with an added particle *-ša* which regularly becomes *-za* after nasal[10]. Thus insertion of *-nz-* marking plural of the possessor into the neuter nom.-acc. plural *-ašša* would have led to *-ašša-nz-a*, homophonous with the usual neuter nom.-acc. singular. Under these circumstances the absence of inserted *-nz-* in the nominative and accusative is not hard to understand.

To summarize: forms of the CLuvian *-ašša/i-* adjectives in *-aššanzan*, *-aššanzanza*, and *-aššanzati* are real. The marker *-nz-*, borrowed from the animate plural case endings, is inserted between stem and regular case ending to indicate plurality of the possessor, not that of the modified noun.

2. Third person enclitic pronoun *-aš*

Laroche (1959: 141) lists *-aš* as the animate nominative singular of the third person enclitic pronoun, and it is well attested in this function.

---

[8] STARKE (1985: 154) reads in *KUB* XXXV 45 iii 8: [...(kuwar)šaššanzat]i tūl[iyaš-šanz]ati. This reading and restoration is quite possible, but by no means assured. The ending of the first adjective is entirely restored, while one could read the second instead as tu-ú-l[i-ya-aš-ša]-a-ti (which would fill the space). If the forms in *-aššanzati* are real, the use of the plural marker *-nz-* could be due to the collective sense of the base nouns: *tūliya-* "assembly" is assured, and the frequent pairing with *kuwarša-* in sets of merisms argues that the latter is a corresponding unit referring to a group of people, whatever its precise sense. My suggestion "military division" as opposed to the *tūliya-* as "(civilian) assembly" (MELCHERT 1993: 117) is a mere guess.

[9] As per STARKE (1990: 44), the animate accusative and dative plural endings are /-nts/ and /-ants/. The final *-a* is merely graphic.

[10] Contra STARKE (1990: 46ff) it is quite clear that the case ending in *-ša* (a-stem *-anza*) marks neuter nominative-accusative **singular**, not plural! See now ARBEITMAN (1992, especially 12ff).

He lists *-ata* not only as neuter nominative-accusative singular and plural, but also as animate nominative and accusative plural.

Evidence for *-ata* as anim. nom. plural is scarce, but there is at least one sure example (*KBo* IV 11,46; Starke 1985: 341): *aḫḫa=ata=ta alati awienta wilušati* "When they came from steep Wilusa"[11]. The initial sequence is to be analyzed with Laroche (1959: 22) and Watkins as *aḫḫa* "when" + *-ata* "they" + *-tta* (functionally = Hitt. *-kan*). The particle *-tta* is usually written with a geminate, but other single spellings occur. Given the Hittite scribes' penchant for omitting signs in CLuvian texts, one could emend to *aḫ-ḫa-ta-<at>-ta*, but this is not strictly necessary. In any case, there is no justification for the assumption that *aḫ-ḫa-ta-ta* is an error for *aḫ-ḫa-at-ta* (i.e. simply *aḫḫa=tta*), as suggested by Starke (1985: 341[173]). We may thus accept *-ata* as anim. nom. plural "they".

On the other hand, in repeated readings of the CLuvian corpus in Starke 1985 I have been unable to find a single occurrence of *-ata* which suggests an interpretation as animate accusative plural. This absence could be due to chance, but it certainly brings into question Laroche's assignment of *-ata* to this functional role.

Our doubts increase when we find examples of enclitic *-aš* which cannot possibly be read as animate nominative singular. A close examination of these examples shows that they in fact must be interpreted as animate accusative plural.

We may begin with *KUB* XXXV 88 iii 11-12 (Starke 1985: 227): *upatta=pa=wa=du šarriyanin 2-šu 9-u[(n)-za] anta=wa=aš=ta walluna<š>šan wāni uppanta* "He granted her eighteen *sarriyani*. They brought them into the 'woman of lifting' (midwife)"[12]. Starke, to whom we owe identification of *wāni* as "woman", translates the second sentence as: "Man schickte hinein nach der Frau des Hebens" (Starke 1985: 207). This translation surprisingly leaves the transitive verb *uppa-* "bring" without an object and also leaves *-aš* untranslated. The conclusion is obvious: *-aš* is the missing object, animate accusative plural "them", referring to the eighteen objects named in the preceding sentence (*šarriyanin* is of course animate). Note that an interpretation of *-aš* as anim. nom. singular is excluded by the plural verb. Nor can *-aš* be anim. nom. plural, since that function is filled by *-ata*.

A second indisputable example of *-aš* as anim. acc. plural is found in *KUB* XXXV 133 ii 10 (Starke 1985: 280): *[(a=d)]u=aš* EGIR-*an šandu* "May they grant them to him". For *āppan šā-* as "grant (permanently), cede", equivalent to Hittite *āppan tarna-*, see Melchert (1989: 33ff). Whether one accepts this interpretation of *šā-* or not, the function of *-aš* as anim. acc. plural is unquestionable. Once again the plural verb eliminates *-aš* as anim. nom. singular. Since the only other conceivable functions (anim. nom. plural, nt. nom.-acc. plural) are already filled by *-ata*, we have no alternative but anim. acc. plural. Note further that *šā-* is a transitive verb (see the other examples in Laroche 1959: 84). We therefore expect an expressed direct object. Seeing that this occurrence of *-aš* must be anim. acc. plural, is is very likely that that of the preceding sentence is as well: *a=ti=aš išta=ḫa wāš[u...]* "He also __ed them (for himself) well...". The antecedent of *-aš* is missing in this passage, but the structure of *a=du=aš* EGIR-*an šandu* forces a reading of *-aš* as animate accusative plural.

The realization that we must recognize *-aš* as anim. acc. plural also permits a better interpretation of several other passages. *KUB* XXXV 45 ii 18ff (Starke 1985: 152) offers the following (dupl. XXXV 48 ii 11ff): EN-*ya tiwāliya piya=aš* ᴸᵁKÚR.MEŠ-*inz[(i)]*! (scil. *-inza*) *kattawatnallinza ūtnaššinza ḫišḫišašši[n]za taparuwaššinza tātariyammanaššinza ḫīrut[(aš)]šinza* EN.MEŠ-*anza*. It is clear that we have a vocative, followed by a form of the verb *piya-* "give" and a series of direct objects which name enemies of various sorts. Laroche (1959: 82 and 147) conjectures *piyaš* as second singular preterite "you gave". The preceding vocative demands a second person, but the following context (*ibid.* ii 25-27) speaks of what the gods **should** do to the enemies. This argues against the idea that the god has already delivered up the enemies in the preceding passage. I therefore propose rather that we should read *piya=aš*, second singular imperative plus *-aš* "them" (proleptic, as often; see the very next sentence, *ibid.* ii 21ff): "Oh [ ], *tiwali-* lord, deliver them, the enemies, the opponents at law, the 'lords' of the spells, the *ḫišḫis-*, the *taparu-*, the curses and the oaths".

The preceding complete passage and what immediate context remains suggest that we should analyze *āyaš* in *KUB* XXXV 65 iii 5 (Starke 1985: 180) in a parallel fashion: not preterite second singular (thus hesitantly Laroche 1959: 24), but imperative second singular plus *-aš* "them". The form *āyaš* follows *ḫaratnaššinza [...]šinza* EN-*anza* in the preceding two lines. The adjective *ḫaratnaššinza* "of the offenses/crimes" shows that this passage is parallel to that of *KUB* XXXV 45.

---

[11] For the details of the interpretation of this passage see WATKINS (1986: 58ff).

[12] The antecedent of the dative enclitic *-du* is by no means certain, but this does not affect the issue of *-aš* in the following sentence.

The incomplete adjective in -(aš)šinza should therefore also be restored as [ḫirutaš]šinza "of the oaths" or the like, not as [malḫaššaš]šinza with Starke (1985: 180) and Laroche (1959: 66). It is not the "lords of the sacrifice" (the clients) who are being referred to, but rather the enemies who have caused the trouble which the ritual is designed to get rid of. In lines following āyaš we find a-aš-ta ḫannā and zīla dūdupa. The form dūdupa is surely to be taken with Laroche (1959: 99) as imperative second singular to a reduplicated stem related to dūpi-/dūpai- "strike". This strongly suggests that a-aš-ta ḫannā should be read as conjunction a- plus -aš "them" plus particle -tta plus another imperative second singular ḫannā. Whether the verb is to be identified with Hittite ḫanna- "judge" may be left open, but the sense would fit the context: "Judge them (the enemies)! ... thereafter strike (them)!". In any case, the immediately preceding animate plural antecedent [ ]šinza EN-anza and the following imperative second singulars argue that we should likewise divide āyaš as aya=aš "Make/treat them [ ]!".

Having now recognized -aš as anim. acc. plural, we can now notice that the context of *KUB* XXXV 90,8 (Starke 1985: 246), XXXV 89,16 (Starke 1985: 228), and *KBo* XXIX 34+ i 6 (Starke 1985: 378) also favors this interpretation for -aš. We have definitely found two examples of -aš which must be taken as anim. acc. plural, and two more cases where this interpretation improves our understanding of the text. We find no examples for -ata as anim. acc. plural. We must therefore conclude that the nom.-acc. plural forms of the third person enclitic pronoun in CLuvian agree with those of Neo-Hittite (anim. nom. pl. -ata = Hitt. -at; anim. acc. pl. -aš = Hitt. -aš) rather than with those of HLuvian, which has indeed generalized -ata for the entire nom.-acc. plural, animate and inanimate.

REFERENCES

ARBEITMAN, Yoël L. 1992. "Luwian za- and -sa (/-za): How I have changed my mind (with ruminations on Palaic)". *Linguistique Balkanique* 35. 3-58.

BECKMAN, Gary. 1982. "The Hittite Assembly". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102. 435-442.

KAMMENHUBER, Annelies. 1969. "Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch und Hieroglyphen-luwisch". In: B. SPULER (ed.), *Handbuch der Orientalistik I.2.1/ 2.2 (Altkleinasiatische Sprachen)*, 119-357. Leiden.

LAROCHE, Emmanuel. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. Paris.

—. 1963. "Études lexicales et étymologiques sur le hittite". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 58. 58-79.

MELCHERT, H. Craig. 1984. *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Göttingen.

—. 1989. "New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses". *Historische Sprachforschung* 102. 23-45.

—. 1993. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill NC.

MITTELBERGER, Hermann. 1963. "Bemerkungen zu Meriggis hieroglyphisch-hethitischem Glossar". *Sprache* 9. 69-107.

MORPURGO DAVIES, Anna. 1980. "Analogy and the -an Datives of Hieroglyphic Luwian". *Anatolian Studies* 30. 123-137.

NEUMANN, Günter. 1982. "Die Konstruktionen mit Adjectiva genetivalia in den luwischen Sprachen". In: Erich NEU (ed.), *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae. Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, 149-161. Wiesbaden.

STARKE, Frank. 1982. "Die Kasusendungen der luwischen Sprachen". In: Johann TISCHLER (ed.), *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann*, 407-425. Innsbruck.

—. 1985. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. (StBoT 30). Wiesbaden.

—. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. (StBoT 31). Wiesbaden.

WATKINS, Calvert. 1986. "The Language of the Trojans". In: Machteld MELLINK (ed.), *Troy and the Trojan War. A Symposium held at Bryn Mawr College, October, 1984*, 45-67. Bryn Mawr PA.