

Sonderdruck aus

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR VERGLEICHENDE SPRACHFORSCHUNG

BEGRÜNDET VON ADALBERT KUHN

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

ALFRED BAMMESBERGER

CLAUS HAEBLER

UND GÜNTER NEUMANN

97. BAND

1. Heft 1984

VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT IN GÖTTINGEN

ISSN 0044-3646

Die 1852 von Adalbert Kuhn begründete „Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung“, die seit 1877 den Gesamtbereich der indogermanischen Sprachen berücksichtigt, widmet sich vor allem der historischen Sprachwissenschaft. Sie möchte der Verbindung von Textinterpretation und sprachwissenschaftlicher Analyse dienen, neuentdeckten Sprachdenkmälern zur Veröffentlichung helfen, aber auch neuen methodischen Ansätzen Gehör verschaffen.

„Kuhns Zeitschrift“, im Jahre 1907 mit „Bezzenbergers Beiträgen“ vereinigt, ist die älteste heute noch bestehende sprachwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift.

INHALT

J.P. Mallory/M.E. Huld, Proto-Indo-European ‚Silver‘	1
G.L. Cohen, Reflections on the Primitive Indo-European locative particles	13
H.C. Melchert, Notes on Palaic	22
N. Oettinger, Sekundärwirkungen des Umlauts beim hethitischen Nomen	44
E.P. Hamp, Some Implications of Hittite -z(a)	58
Th.P.J. van den Hout, Einige luwische Neutra auf -ša/-za in überwiegend junghethitischen Texten	60
M. Nyman, Indo-European connections of Greek (ἀμφι)λαχαίνω . .	81
A. Heubeck, Homerisch ὄρορε	88
A. J. Van Windekens, Encore lat. <i>uxor</i> et i.-e. * <i>ukson</i> -	96
W. Mańczak, Das germanische Dentalpräteritum	99
R. Elsie, The Albanian Lexicon of Arnold von Harff, 1497	113
N. Wagner, Belisarius	123
E.P. Hamp, Armenian <i>anurj</i> , ὄνειρο-	130
W. Winter, Zur tocharischen Entsprechung von skt. <i>tokharika</i>	131
J. Hilmarsson, Reconstruction of a Tocharian paradigm: the numeral „one“	135
K.T. Schmidt, Bericht über das Projekt eines sanskrit-tocharischen Wörterbuchs	148
D.B. Kapp, Der Stammesname „Toda“: Eine neue Etymologie	154

Beiträge werden an Prof. Dr. Alfred Bammesberger, Richard-Strauß-Str. 48, 8048 Eichstätt, Prof. Dr. Claus Haebler, Kerßenbrockstr. 16, 4400 Münster, oder an Prof. Dr. Günter Neumann, Thüringer Str. 20, 8700 Würzburg, erbeten. Professor Bammesberger redigiert Band 98–100. Besprechungen können nur solchen Werken zugesichert werden, welche ein Herausgeber erbeten hat.

Preis dieses Bandes 86,- DM (einschl. 7% MwSt.) · Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft.

Notes on Palaic*)

The existence of Palaic as an independent Indo-European language of ancient Anatolia beside Hittite and Luvian was first established by Forrer, *ZDMG* 76 (1922) 241 ff. The pitifully small corpus long delayed further analysis of the language, but the publication of a few more texts and the pioneering efforts of Otten, Laroche, Kammenhuber and others led up to the comprehensive summary of Carruba, *StBoT* 10 (1970), who presents the known corpus in transcription along with a grammatical sketch and provisional lexicon (for specific references to prior works see Carruba's summary, *StBoT* 10.4-5).

Thanks to the above efforts, Oettinger, *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* (1979) 612-613, is able to cite in his index nearly forty Palaic forms which he has exploited for comparative purposes. Watkins, *Flexion und Wortbildung* (1975) 358 ff., has argued that Palaic preserves reflexes of the PIE laryngeal **h₂* in positions where it is lost in Hittite and Luvian. Palaic seems about to assume its rightful place in comparative studies of Anatolian and Indo-European.

However, interpretation of much of the fragmentary Palaic material remains uncertain, and a close look at the use made of it for comparative purposes raises the fear that too much reliance has been placed on interpretations which Carruba himself warns are provisional. For example, Oettinger, *Stammbild.* 151, 281, etc., assumes the interpretation of Pal. *marḫ(ina)-* as 'cut to pieces, break up' (= Hitt. *mark(iya)-* or *marriya-*). Since in the only clear occurrence (*KUB XXXV* 165 Rs 23) the action is performed on the god Zapparwa, this meaning is virtually impossible. Similarly, Watkins' assumption that *ašḫumāuwaga* (ibid. Rs 11) is merely the coll. nom.-acc. pl. of the stem *ašḫumāuwa-* 'sacralized meat' may be shown from the context to be false (see I.3 below).

The individual analyses which follow are intended as one contribution to the continuing effort to elucidate Palaic texts and grammar.

*) Abbreviations of Hittitological works are those of J. Friedrich - A. Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, 2. Auflage, Heidelberg: 1975 ff. Titles of very recent works are given in full at first occurrence.

I. Morphology

1. *-ku(w)ar*

Carruba, *BeitrPal* 5 ff. and *Part* 69 ff., argues that Pal. *-kuwar* is to be analyzed as conjunction *-ku* + *-war*, the particle of direct speech (= Hitt. *-war/-wa*, Luv. *-wa*): cf. also Kammenhuber, *Pal* 49 ff. The distribution of *-kuwar* speaks against this analysis. Particularly instructive for the use of this particle is the following passage from the Palaic version of the myth of the god retired in anger (1 A I 8-13):¹⁾ [*ti*]yaz-kuwar wērti kāt-kuwāt kuit atānti [*ni*]-ppa-ši mušānti aḫuwānti ni-ppa-aš ḫašānti [ḫarāš-kuwar-zi panāganzi šittuwar-an [ḫi]ttan ḫapittalan-kuwar-an šittan [ca. 4 signs] ni-ppa-an ḫantanāti šittan-kuwar-an [ca. 6 signs] šāwitiran-kuwar-an šittan.

Based on the corresponding Hittite myth, it is generally agreed that Pal. *wērti* is a verb of saying, specifically that it is a root present 'calls, cries out, related to Hitt. *weriya-* 'idem': see Carruba, *StBoT* 10.76, Kammenhuber, *Pal* 50, and likewise Oettinger, *Stammbild.* 344.²⁾ If *-kuwar* contains the particle of direct speech *-war*, it is hard to explain why it occurs in the first sentence above, which is to all appearances narrative ('The Sun-god cries out'), but fails to show up in the following sentences, which clearly are direct speech. It then reoccurs in the next sentence about the sending forth of the eagle (*ḫarāš-kuwar-zi . . .*), which again we would expect to be narrative! Given this perverse distribution, the appearance of *-kuwar* in the remaining sentences which are direct speech is hardly probative. It is true that in Hittite the particle *-war* may be inadvertently omitted in one of a series of sentences, or a given text may not use the particle at all, but I know of no examples where *-war* appears and disappears willy-nilly as in the passage above.

It is also strange that the particle *-war* does not appear in any of the passages in Palaic which are unambiguously direct speech (marked by vocatives and/or verbs of saying): 2 A Vs 1 ff., 2 A Rs 11 ff., 19 ff., 21 ff., 3 B III 4 ff., 16 ff.

¹⁾ Unless otherwise noted, the sigla and readings of the Palaic texts are those of Carruba, *StBoT* 10.

²⁾ The interpretation of *tiyaz wērti* as 'the sun turns' by Meriggi, *Athenaeum* 57 (1979) 5 ff., wholly ignores the context of the phrase, which is known to us from the Hittite parallel. The received interpretation of *wer-* as 'call, cry out' (= Hitt. *weriya-*) seems assured.

Furthermore, the position of *-kuwar* in several instances does not fit that of *-war*, which should be enclitic to the first word of the sentence. See e.g. 2 A Vs 21–22 [(*nu-ku*)] *pašhullašaš ti[y]az tabarni LUGAL-i pāpaz-kuar ti [(ānna)]z-kuar ti iška* and 2 A Rs 23–24 *ānni wašū-ḥa [tab]arna ti-kuar šūna*. Carruba's attempts to explain away these exceptions, Part 70–71, are forced, as is his splitting of 1 A I 16 into two clauses in order to save the proper position of *-kuwar*: *nu šāwidār kuit-kuwar . . .* 'Nun (ist) das s.: "Was (ist?)" sagt er.'

Carruba rejects a unitary particle *-kuwar* because he sees no function for it, but its usage in Palaic is actually quite consistent: it corresponds functionally to Hitt. *-pat*, indicating identity and less often emphasis. The various examples of *-kuwar* may be directly compared to those of *-pat* analyzed by Hart, *TPS* (1971) 94ff. With nouns and pronouns the effect is that of English 'self' or 'the very . . .': *tiyaz-kuwar* 'the Sun-god himself', *ḥarāš-kuwar* 'the eagle himself', *ti-kuar* 'you yourself' (cf. the frequent *zik-pat* of Hittite, *TPS* (1971) 125f.), *šāwitiran-kuwar-an šittan* 's. him right on his horn/s. him on/by his very horn' (on this and the immediately preceding sentences like it see I. 2 below), *pāpaz-kuar ti ānna-kuar ti* '(May the king have) you as his very father, you as his very mother' (I.4 below). With an interrogative the force is merely emphasizing: *kuit-kuwar* 'why (for heaven's sake)?' (cf. Hitt. *kuwat-pat*, *TPS* (1971) 157). This is also plausible for the exhortation *iu-kuwar(a)-du iu* 'Come to him, come on!' (1 B 5), although one could also adduce the idea of persistence of action shown by *-pat* with verbs in Hittite: *TPS* (1971) 130ff.

Formally, Pal. *-kuwar* may be analyzed as the enclitic conjunction **-k^{we}* 'and' seen in *-kku* plus an adverbial **-r* ending which appears in Lat. *cūr* 'why?', Lith. *kur* 'where', Germanic forms such as 'here' and 'there' and probably also Hitt. *-war* (on the last see Joseph, *KZ* 95 (1981) 93ff., and Joseph-Schourup, *KZ* 96 (1982) 56ff.). The presence of the final *-r* preserves the vowel, which is lost in absolute final position: **-k^{we}* > *-kku*, but **-k^{wer}* > *-k(u)war*. For the development of the meaning compare the use of German *auch* 'also' as 'even': 'and X' > 'X also' > 'even X' > 'X himself' (note that 'even' would fit several of the above examples just as well as 'self' or 'the very'). Pal. *-kuwar* is thus a unitary particle equivalent to Hitt. *-pat*. On the one alleged example of *-war* alone in Palaic see the next section.

2. *šittuwar*

Aside from *-kuwar*, which has just been examined, the only evidence in Palaic for a particle *-war* is found in 1 A I 10 cited above: *šittuwar-an šittan*. The interpretation of this sentence and those following it centers on two issues: the meaning of the verb stem *ši-* and the syntactic analysis of *šittan*.

Kammenhuber, *Pal* 51ff., interprets *ši-* as 'seek', based on the parallel of *KUB XVII 10 I 24ff.* (see especially I 31, where Telipinu, not the places to be searched, is the object of *šanḥ-*). However, Carruba also points out the parallel of Hitt. *šiya-* (*KUB XXXIII 5 II 6* and *XXXIII 9 II 4*), which of course also formally resembles Pal. *ši-*. Kammenhuber's rejection of this equation on the basis that Palaic should have preserved the *hi*-conjugation form *šai* makes no sense. The form *šiyēške-* in the meaning 'shoot' is already OH: see *KBo XVII 44, 6*. The replacement of *hi*-forms by 'thematic' *-ye/-ya-* takes place in different lexemes at different times: cf. *išḫai/išḫiyazi*, *ḫuwāi/ḫuyazzi*.

The issue can be settled by looking closely at the Palaic and Hittite contexts. *KUB XXXIII 5 II 5–6* says: 'Seek Telipinu; when you find him, then *šiya-* his hands and feet and *šarā tittanu-* them'. Given that the addressee here is the bee, *šiya-* has plausibly been taken to mean 'sting, prick' and *šarā tittanu-* 'set in motion' (upward). The bee is to sting Telipinu into moving from his hiding place.³) While I agree with this interpretation of the passage, I would emphasize that the translation of *šiya-* as 'prick, sting' is entirely context-dependent. This single example does not justify attributing such a special meaning to the Hittite verb.

Hitt. *šai-/šiya-* has two distinct basic meanings: 'press' and 'throw', from which are derived respectively the special uses 'seal' and 'shoot'.⁴) In the passages from the Hittite myth, the object of *šiya-* is the god, specifically parts of his body (with a characteristic double accusative construction). The goal of the action is

³) Haas, *UF* 13 (1981) 113, not only takes *šiya-* as 'sting' but also *šarā tittanu-* as 'cause to swell up', claiming that the Hittites attributed special powers to the bee's poison. However, such a meaning for *šarā tittanu-* is even more ad hoc than 'sting' for *šiya-*. The meaning 'set in motion upward' is also unusual, but I believe that it is paralleled in the horsetraining texts, such as *KUB I 13 I 41: n-at 2 Danna šarā tittanuanzi* 'They cause them to move upward for two miles' (i.e., they drive them uphill for that distance).

⁴) For a possible explanation of both 'press' and 'throw' from the same root **seh₁(i)-* see Laroche, *BSL* 58 (1963) 73ff.

to rouse the god.⁵) The basic meaning of *šai-/šiya-* 'press (on)', hence 'prod, urge', thus seems sufficient here as well. That 'press' here means 'sting' is merely due to the special circumstance that 'bee' is the subject. The same basic meaning 'press, urge' also fits the Palaic passage with *š-*, where the eagle is being addressed. This interpretation is confirmed by the fact we have one clear body part as the object of *š-*: I 13 *šawitiran-kuwar-an šittan* 'Press him right on his horn!'.⁶)

As to the syntactic interpretation of *šittan*, Carruba, *BeitrPal* 7, has already seen the problem and the only solution: given one clear instance of the object anaphoric pronoun *-an* in *šittuwar-an šittan*, *šapittalan-kuwar-an šittan* and *šawitiran-kuwar-an šittan*, one can hardly divide *šittan* as *šitt-an*. Such a repetition of the anaphoric pronoun would be unheard of in Anatolian. Interpretation of *šittan* as a participle is excluded because it would have to be neuter, while *-an* is only anim. acc.: we cannot have a construction 'It (is) x-ed'. The only solution is to take *šittan* as imv. 2nd pl. Admittedly, the plural is unexpected when it is the eagle who is being sent forth. Carruba suggests that this command is directed at the gods them-

⁵) This is expressed in Hittite by *n-aš ara[]* (*KUB XXXIII* 10 II 5), which Laroche, *RHA* 23 (1965) 105, restores as *ara[nu]* after II 19 and 20, which show forms of *arnu-* 'remove, carry'. But *a-ra-nu-* is not a possible Hittite spelling for *arnu-*, and we would expect the object to be *-an* 'him', not *-aš* 'them'. More likely is *n-aš ara[is]* 'And he (the god) arose' with *-aš* as anim. nom. sg. In the Palaic myth I A I 15, where the eagle is unsuccessful in rousing the god, this failure is expressed by *nū-kuwat parait* 'He did not p. at all'. I therefore believe that Pal. *parait* is parallel to Hitt. *ara[is]* and thus an intransitive motion verb. This eliminates both of Carruba's suggestions for *parai-* ('blow' and 'chase'), but leaves many possibilities open: 'arose, moved, came forth', etc.

⁶) This interpretation requires, of course, that the god in question have one (or more) horns. I would point out that since the myth in Hittite exists in versions for several different gods, we have no way of knowing which god is being referred to in the Palaic version. Furthermore, while the principal gods of the pantheon are represented by human figures at Yazılıkaya, we know that storm-gods are often represented by bull figurines: see Brandenstein, *Bildbeschr.* Tafel I (foll. p. 64) and also *KUB XXXVIII* 3 I 1-2, which refers specifically to the Storm-god of Lihzina. Depiction of other gods as animals is likely. Since Pal. *šawit(i)ran* matches Hitt. *šawitra* 'horn' and occurs in the double accusative construction (almost all cases of which in Hittite involve body parts), and since it matches 'hands and feet' in the corresponding Hittite myth, I find the interpretation as a body part unavoidable.

selves. There is no support for this in the Hittite parallel, and the following Palaic narrative shows singular verbs. I suggest rather that we should compare the usage of *KUB XXXIII* 10 II 6ff., where Telipinu, having been roused to activity by the bee, angrily asks the bee why he has disturbed him. Note that although only the bee is present, Telipinu addresses him as *šumeš*. Telipinu seems to be including in his complaint all those who tried to rouse him (such as the eagle), even though they are not there to hear him. I propose that likewise in the Palaic passage the Sun-god, although addressing only the eagle, phrases his commands as if they were being directed at all the searchers.

In the four sentences with *šittan* in I A I 10-13 above we thus have commands to 'press, urge' Telipinu: in the last three a particular body part is specified (*šapittalan*, a missing word of 5-6 signs at the beginning of line 13, and *šawitiran*). We are left with the form *šittuwar-an* in I 10. This has been divided as *šittu-war-an* or *šitt-war-an* with either 3rd sg. or 2nd sg. imv. of *š-*, plus *-war-*, particle of direct speech, plus *-an* 'him'. However, we have seen that: (1) no other evidence for *-war-* in Palaic exists (*-kuwar* is a unitary particle functionally equivalent to Hitt. *-pat*); (2) *šittan* cannot be anything but imv. 2nd pl. The combination of a 2nd or 3rd sg. imv. and a 2nd pl. imv. in the same sentence is highly unlikely.

I suggest rather that *šittuwar* is also a 2nd pl. imv., but middle rather than active. The ending is, of course, exactly what we would expect: cf. Luv. *dadduwar* in *KUB IX* 31 I 26. Compare also the same passage I 26-28 for the alternation (without apparent functional significance) of active and middle: *azzaštan UDU-inza GUD-inza DUMU.NAM.ULULU-in . . . niš aztūwari* 'Eat sheep and cattle, do not eat human . . .'. Aside from the variation in diathesis, we have the same stylistic A B A figure known from Hittite: *tiya-mmu tiya* 'Bind (on) me, bind!' (*KBo III* 40 Rs 14), *karaš-at-kan karaš* 'Cut it, cut!' (*KUB XXIX* 1 I 37). On these examples see Watkins, *Papers from the CLS Parasession on Diachronic Syntax* (1976) 323. The same figure is probably attested elsewhere in Palaic in I 17 of our myth [(*iu kuwara-d*)]*iu iu* 'Come to him, come on!'. Likewise then *šittuwar-an šittan* 'Press him, press!'. We may therefore add imv. 2nd pl. *-ttuwar* to the list of Palaic middle endings, while the Palaic particle *-war* is to be stricken.

3. *kāt* and *kuwāt*

These forms occur once together in 1 A I 8, the beginning of the Sun-god's speech, cited in Section 1 above: *kāt-kuwāt kuit* . . . Carruba has already correctly identified each element of this phrase: *kāt* = nt. nom.-acc. sg. of *ka-* 'this', *kuwāt* = a generalizing particle, *kuit* = nt. nom.-acc. sg. of *kui-* 'who, what' (see *StBoT* 10, Wörterbuch, with references to Kammenhuber, *Pal*). However, Carruba is rather tentative as to the syntactic interpretation of the entire phrase, leaving open several possibilities, including that of Kammenhuber, *Pal* 50: *kāt* . . . *kuit* = 'Deshalb . . . weil'. The use of *kuit* as 'because' is well established in Hittite, but *kāt* as 'therefore' is without parallels in Anatolian. Such a meaning is made very unlikely by the word order: we would expect rather *kuit* . . . *kāt* 'because . . . therefore'. The appearance of *kuwāt* is also hard to motivate if *kāt* is an adverb.

We achieve much more natural syntax by assuming that *kāt-kuwāt kuit* is a complete (nominal) sentence: 'What is this anyhow?'. Both *kāt* and *kuit* (nt. nom.-acc. sg.) now have their expected value. *Pal. kuwāt* formally matches Hitt. *kuwat* 'why?', but functionally equates rather to Hitt. *kuwatqa* 'somehow, anyhow'. This equation is confirmed by the negative *nit-kuwat* in 1 A I 15 = Hitt. *natta kuwatqa* 'not at all'.⁷) In the question *kāt-kuwat kuit*, *kuwat* expresses impatience and dismay: the Sun-god is both vexed and perplexed by the gods' predicament. For a similar impatient question compare *KBo* III 40 Vs 15 *uk-uš punuškim[i ki k]uit walkuwan* 'I ask them: "What monstrosity is this?"'. See also *KBo* XXII 2 Vs 2 and the other examples cited by Otten, *StBoT* 17 (1973) 16.

The form *kat* appears elsewhere in Palaic, most notably in the final section of the Zapparwa Ritual (2 A Rs 11–13): *nu uzūšuppa tianzi nu ki memai nu-ku^a Zapparwaz aškumāua-ga waq^akanta huwašš-[a]nni-kat KI.MIN huwanhuwani-kat KI.MIN qaššūt-at KI.MIN hāriš-at KI.MIN ginu-kat waq^akanta*. Likewise *ibid.* Rs 19–20: *EGIR-ŠU-ma uzūNÍG.GIG tianzi QATAMMA memai nū^a Zappar[wa w]aq^akanta bānnu-kat KI.MIN*.

For a lengthy discussion of the problematic word-final formant *-kat* see Carruba, *BeitrPal* 25–27, and Kammenhuber, *Pal* 29–31. Carruba attempts to explain the form as related to the 'appurte-

⁷) Carruba, *BeitrPal* 6, note 6, also compares *Lyd.* generalizing *-kod*, as in *na-ku(d)-kod* 'wherever'.

nance' suffix *-ika-*, but he does not account for the missing *-i-*, and his distinction between those parts of the victim which are wholly used (*qaššūt-at* and *hāriš-at*) versus those partially used (*x + -kat* = '(meat) belonging to x') is wholly artificial.

I suggest rather that *-kat* (and *-ga*) merely represent enclitic use of the demonstrative stem *ka-* 'this'. For an unambiguous enclitic use of the demonstrative *apa-* in Palaic see 2 A Vs 15: *kuiš-a tū wu[I]ašinaš kārīti a-ti-apan azzikī* 'Whichever *w.*-bread is to your liking, eat that one!'. I therefore see no problem in assuming the same for *ka-* 'this', which fits the context of *-kat* perfectly. Having served sacralized meats (*nu uzūšuppa tianzi*), the celebrant then refers to them specifically (perhaps even with a pointing gesture): 'And now, oh Zapparwa, these pure meats (are) to be eaten!') This *h.* likewise, this *h.* likewise, etc.'. We have a coll. pl. *-ga* agreeing with *aškumāuwa*, nt. sg. *-kat* agreeing with the neuter nouns for the body parts. The deictic function of *-kat* is also clear in other occurrences: 5 A II 21 *arra-kat lūkit* 'One has divided these *a.*' (again immediately following Hitt. *memiškizzi*); 7, 8 and 9 *tarta-kat kištām-mu . . . wār-ra-kat [kištām]-mu* 'Extinguish for me these curses . . . extinguish for me these *w.*' (again following *mema-* and the action of pouring beer and wine on hot stones); 3 A I 3 *šāmuri-kat šāmu[ri-kat]* (following *memahhi*); and finally 3 A I 17–18 *tabarnai tawanannay-a watila-kat wūzzanni-kat wūzzanni-kat* 'But let the king and queen (have) these *w.* and this *w.*' (cf. dupl. *ašendu*). In all cases the *-kat* is attached to objects which are immediately present and can thus be referred to as 'this/these'.

In the case of *tarta-kat* etc. vs. *aškumāuwa-ga*, we may have the use of the nt. sg. demonstrative with a nt. pl. noun: cf. in Hittite the use of nt. sg. enclitic possessives with nt. pl. nouns (e.g. *šakuwa-šmet* 'their eyes'). The use of *-at* instead of *-kat* in *qaššūt-at* and *hāriš-at* could reflect deletion of *-k-* after a consonant: **qaššūt-kat*, **hāriš-kat*. However, if *azzikī* is genuine Palaic, then this explanation is unlikely. I find it odd that a language which permits /atski/ would eliminate /hariskad/. I believe it is more likely that *-at* reflects a suppletive use of the demonstrative stem *a-* after consonants. We know that Anatolian inherited the stem **e/o(i)-* in its

⁸) I interpret *waq^akanta* not as pret. 3rd pl. 'they have eaten' (highly implausible in context), but as coll. nom.-acc. pl. of the verbal adjective in *-ant-*. For the meaning 'to be eaten' compare the use of Grk. adjectives in *-tós*: *phertós* 'bearable', *phatós* 'sayable' as well as 'said', *phuktós* 'to be shunned', etc. See Schwyzler, *Gr. Gram.* I. 501 with references.

orthotonic form with deictic function: cf. Hitt. *edi* and *etez*. Thus *-at* could mean 'this' just as well as *-kat*. Such suppletion according to preceding consonant/vowel is attested elsewhere in enclitics in Anatolian: cf. Hittite *-a/-ya* 'and' and *-a/-ma* 'but'.⁹⁾

Pal. *ka-* 'this' is thus well attested in the nt. nom.-acc. sg. *kat* and also once in the coll. nom.-acc. pl. *-ga*.¹⁰⁾ Pal. *kuwat* definitely equates functionally to Hitt. *kuwatqa* 'anyhow, somehow'. Lyd. generalizing *kod* may be an exact cognate.

4. *iška*

This word occurs in the sentence cited above in Section 1 (2 A Vs 21–22): [(*nu-ku*)] *pašhullašaš ti[y]az tabarni LUGAL-i pāpaz-kuar ti [(ānna)]z-kuar ti iška*. The form of the other words in the sentence is clear: a vocative *tiyaz* (with preceding modifier), a dative *tabarni LUGAL-i*, nominatives *pāpaz* and *ānnaz* and a nominative 2nd sg. pronoun *ti*. This leaves *iška*, which must be sentence-final, since there immediately follows *nu-šši-am-pi* . . . (contra Kammenhuber, *Pal* 22–23). According to the autograph, the word *iška* is complete, because there is no room for another sign. Sentence-final position and the vocative plus 2nd sg. pronoun *ti* argue that the form is inv. 2nd sg. of a verb (thus already Kammenhuber and Carruba). Since *ti* is the subject, the nominatives *pāpaz* and *ānnaz* can only be predicative, which means that the verb must be a form of 'be' or similar linking verb. I therefore suggest that *iška* is the inv. 2nd sg. of the 'iterative' of *ēš-*: **h₁éske*. For the vocalism of the first syllable (Pal. *e/i* < PIE **ē*) compare *wērti* 'cries out' < **wérh₁ti* and *iwini* 'we do' or 'we go' < **i(h₁)-wéni*. The final *-a* of *iška* 'be!' versus *azziki* 'eat!' reflects the same fluctuating *e/a* vocalism seen elsewhere in Palaic: cf. *aniehha* and *lukiyyenta* beside *aniyaši* and *marhiya*. Similar inconsistency in the distribution of **e/o* vocalism in the suffixes **-ške/o-* and **-ye/o-* also occurs in Hittite, of course.¹¹⁾

⁹⁾ For geminating *-a/-ya* 'and' see Houwink ten Cate, *Fs. Otten* 119ff. The facts for non-geminating *-a/-ma* have not been published, but an inspection of OH manuscripts shows that they are also originally in complementary distribution (aside from a very few conditioned exceptions).

¹⁰⁾ The nt. nom.-acc. sg. *kāt* vs. Hitt. *ki* is patently analogical after *apāt*. The latter does not happen to be attested in Palaic, but anim. acc. sg. *apan* suggests that both demonstratives were further influenced by the *a*-stem nouns (*-aš*: *-an*: : *apaš*: *x*): hence coll. nom.-acc. pl. *-ga*.

¹¹⁾ I find this explanation in terms of ablaut confusion more likely than different outcomes of **-ške* according to the accent (**h₁és-ske* > *iška* but

As C. Watkins has reminded me, the possessive construction in PIE with the dative demands the substantive form of 'be', a function which may be filled by the 'iterative' in **-ške-*: cf. archaic Latin (Laws of the XII Tables) . . . *cui suus heres nec escit . . . si adgnatus nec escit* 'Who does not have his own heir . . . if (he) does not have a paternal relative'. This sense also fits well in the Palaic passage: 'And now, oh Sun-god *p.*, may the tabarna the king have you as his very father, you as his very mother.'¹²⁾

The form *iška* 'be!' confirms that Palaic inherited the 'iterative' suffix **-ške/o-*. It also supports the interpretation of *azziki* 'eat!', which occurs in a purely Palaic context, as authentic Palaic.

5. *ānni*, *luki* and *wašū(-ha)*

Palaic *ānni* and *wašū-ha* occur together in 2 A Rs 23–24: *mān-aš marhanza ānni wašū-ha [tab]arna ti-kuar šūna a-du piša*. The interpretation of *wašū-ha* as pret. 1st sg. of a verb (thus Kammenhuber and Carruba) is highly unlikely on two counts. First, a pret. 1st sg. simply does not fit the context, which has a conditional clause ('When he (the god) is *m*-ed . . .') and two 2nd sg. imperatives *šūna* 'fill!' and *piša* 'give!'. Second, we would expect double *-hh-* < **-h₂-* in the pret. 1st sg. marker, and Palaic undoubtedly shows this in *aniehha* 'I carried out' and *dahha* 'I placed/took'.

Watkins, *Gedenkschrift Kronasser* 256, has suggested that Pal. *wašū-ha* may mean 'good things' with the preserved collective

**h₁d-ské* > *azziki*). The appearance of anim. nom. pl. **-és* as *-eš* in Palaic (see Section I. 8 below) argues that **ē* is preserved in unaccented as well as accented position.

¹²⁾ The iterative of 'be' *ēške-* may also be attested in Hittite in a possessive sentence, in the Treaty with Hukkana, *KBo* V 3 III 63–65: *apūn-za . . . karū-za kuin harši ŠALNAPTER(TA)-ma-tta āra ēškanzi DAM-an-ma-an-za lē iyabi*. Friedrich, *SV* II. 129, takes this as an iterative to *ēšša-* 'make, do', but in this manuscript *išša-* has consistent *i*-vocalism and 'thematic' inflection: cf. IV 30 *iššahhi*, I 35 *iššatti*, IV 29 *iššatteni*. I suggest rather 'You may properly have as secondary wife the one whom you have already, but do not make her your (legitimate) wife'. The incongruence in number (*ŠALNAPTERTA* . . . *ēškanzi*) is understandable when one thinks that the singulars here refer to one secondary wife representing all of them (it is not likely that Hukkana had only one!). One should also bear in mind that the sign shapes show *KBo* V 3 to be a late Neo-Hittite copy of an earlier original. It is possible that the copyist did not understand the construction and altered the number of either *NAPTERTA* or *ēške-*. The inv. 3rd pl. *ēškandu* in *KBo* III 40 Rs 3 is likely also an iterative to 'be', but unfortunately the context is broken.

ending **-uh₂*. The sense is plausible, but the phonology is dubious. First of all, we have seen that Watkins' other evidence for preservation of final **-h₂* in Palaic does not exist: *-aga* in *ašumāuwaga* is not a writing for [aγ] or the like, reflecting **-ah₂* (*-ga* = 'these', as shown in Section 3 above). Second, why would the Hittite(!) scribe not write simply *wa-a-šu-uh₂* for /wasuh/, as in Hittite *šu-up-ḫa-ah₂* 'Purify'? Compare in fact Palaic *te-ma-ah₂*. Third, as Watkins himself suggests, the scriptio plena in *a-an-ni-i* 'those' probably reflects the old collective ending **-ih₂* with loss of final **-h₂* and compensatory lengthening. Note that *wa-šu-u-ḫa* also shows scriptio plena. I would compare rather Pal. *wašū* alone to Hitt. *āššū*, both reflecting **-uh₂* as established by Watkins (see reference cited). The final *-ḫa* means 'also' and equates to Luv. *-ḫa* and Hitt. geminating *-a* 'and'.¹³) The sentence thus reads: 'May you yourself, oh tabarna, fill also those good things and give (them) to him.'

Besides *ānni*, *wašū* (and *ašumāuwa-ga*), Palaic appears to have one more example of a collective in *-V̄ < *-Vh₂*. I refer to *luki lukinta* = *luki(-)lukiyenta* (2 B, 3 = 2 C Vs 8).

Carruba, *BeitrPal* 16f., has already disposed of Kammenhuber's interpretation of *luki-* as 'set fire to, burn', which was based entirely on the resemblance to Hitt. *lukke-*. One does not burn offerings in Hittite rituals, at least not bread and liquid offerings. A meaning for *luki-* such as 'divide, distribute' is tolerably certain, whatever

¹³) Carruba, *StBoT* 10.49, defines Pal. *-a* as 'and', alternating with *-ya*, and equates it to Hitt. *-a/-ya*, Luv. *-ḫa*. However, Pal. *-a* does not geminate a preceding consonant like Hitt. *-a* 'and'. Furthermore, in its 'generalizing' use with a relative (*kuiš-a* 'who/whichever'), it equates functionally to Hitt. non-geminating *-a*. The lightly adversative sense of the latter is also visible in Palaic: see Section 3 above on 3 A I 17 'But let the king and queen have . . .' (as noted by Carruba, *StBoT* 10.74, the division here must be dat. sg. *tawanannai* + *-a*, not *-a* + *-ya*). We thus have no evidence for a meaning 'and' (geminating or otherwise). The only evidence for a conjunction *-ya* is 2 A Rs 22 *šāwaya-ya šūnat* 'One has filled the š.'. A meaning 'And one has filled the š.' is possible from the context, but the use of enclitic *-ya* 'and' in utterance-initial position is surprising, and one may legitimately suspect dittography: *šāwaya[ya]*. I therefore find it possible to suppose that Palaic has an enclitic *-a* (non-geminating) equating to Hitt. *-a/-ma* 'but' and an enclitic *-ḫa* 'and' equating to Hitt. geminating *-a/-ya* and Luv. *-ḫa*. The rarity of *-ḫa* 'and' in Palaic would be due to the fact that *-kku* 'and' is used for linking clauses, while nouns appear to be normally linked asyndetically.

its etymology.¹⁴) Carruba adopts the reading of 2 A Vs 2 and 2 C Vs 8 *luki[n] lukinta* and *lukilukiyenta*, taking the form as pret. 3rd pl. of a reduplicated stem *lukiluki(ye)-*. Such reduplication is possible, but the scriptio plena of the reduplicating syllable is surprising. Furthermore, his explanation of the A form by anticipatory nasalization is unsupported.¹⁵) Thus A's *luki[n] lukinta* (NB: with space!) is certainly faulty. This is not the only place where ms. A is defective (see Kammenhuber's remarks, *Pal* 2 ff.).¹⁶)

Copy B has rather (paragraph initially) *luki lukinta*, which has the appearance not of reduplication, but of a figura etymologica. This also works nicely syntactically: 'They have distributed (*lukinta/lukiyenta*) the distributions (*luki/luki*).' We have a collective plural *luki/luki* to a noun *luki-* (which also fits well as the base for the derived verb *lukiye-*). Copy A has apparently substituted an acc. sg. *lugin* for coll. acc. pl. *luki*, but the sense remains the same: 'They have distributed the distribution'.

Palaic thus agrees with Hittite in showing a collective plural ending *-V̄* reflecting PIE **-Vh₂*.¹⁷)

¹⁴) Derivation from PIE **leuǵ-* 'break' (Skt. *rujāti* 'breaks' etc.) seems reasonable. I note that R. Wallace (personal communication) and Carruba, *BeitrPal* 17, note 6, have already seen the same possibility.

¹⁵) The proposal of Carruba, *StBoT* 10.39, that the writing *-en-* for expected *-in-* or *-an-* represents a nasalized vowel (such as [ẽ]) is worthy of consideration (though other explanations are also possible). However, this tendency, if real, is something quite different from the anticipatory nasalization he implies in *luki[n] lukinta* and in the sequence *a-an-ti-en-ta* (1 A I 6 and 17): see *Satzpartikeln* 26, note 12. That the latter example shows a unique form *-nti* of the Anatolian reflexive particle *-ti* is dubious. The *-an* may also be taken as anim. acc. sg. 'it', referring to the feast to which the gods have been invited (cf. *KUB XVII 10 I 19*).

¹⁶) The fact that ms. A is in old ductus (Carruba, *StBoT* 10.12) does not preclude its being a copy of a still older archetype, nor does it guarantee that the readings of A are necessarily superior to those of B in every case.

¹⁷) The collective plural *ašumāuwa* to an *a*-stem also presumably represents **-eh₂*. As pointed out by Watkins, *Gedenkschrift Kronasser* 256, note 14, the fact that thus far no examples of the thematic collective ending *-a < *-eh₂* show scriptio plena has two possible explanations. First, since notation of vowel length by scriptio plena was never obligatory and there are few examples in OH manuscripts, the ending may still have been /-ā/. On the other hand, since the change of coll. pl. *-ā* to *-a* resulted in no functional merger with the nt. sg. *-an*, it may have occurred earlier than the change of final *-ū* and *-ī* to *-u* and *-i*, which made the nom.-acc. sg. and pl. of *u*-stem and *i*-stem neuters homophonous.

6. *kiat*

Pal. *kiat* (2 A Vs 7.10.24 and duplicates) has been interpreted as 'here' and compared to Hitt. *kēt*. This equation is not possible. Hitt. *kēt* does not mean 'here', but 'on this side' (explicitly or implicitly opposed to *edi* or *kēt* 'on that side'). Hitt. *kēt* can only represent **kēd* or **kē/oid*, neither of which could lead to Palaic *ki-i-at*. The latter may rather be analyzed as *kī* 'here' < **kē/oi* (cf. Grk. (e)*kei* 'there')¹⁸ plus neuter enclitic pronoun *-at*, referring to the preceding offerings: 'Here they (are)'. This fits all occurrences.

For *-at* in Palaic with a plural reference compare 2 A Vs 5–6: [I]ukit-ku tabarnaš ^{SAL}tawanannaš pulāšin[a] [š]unnuttila šarkut-at 'And the tabarna and tawananna have distributed the p.-bread (and) the liquid offerings. They have š-ed them.' The second clause consists of an initial pret. 3rd sg. verb with the royal couple as subject (just like the preceding sentence!) plus the enclitic neuter pronoun *-at* referring back to the two collective plurals *pulāšina* and *šunnuttila*. Old Hittite manuscripts also show *-at* referring to a series of neuter nouns: see Otten-Souček, *StBoT* 8 (1969) 69. It is not clear whether we are dealing with the first stage of the replacement of nt. nom.-acc. pl. *-e* by *-at* or merely with a different form of number agreement from our own (i. e., *-at* referring distributively to each of the preceding items).

7. *maš*

The only occurrence of Pal. *maš* in a complete context is in 2 A Rs 9–10: *lālan-ta kuiš tartan marišši maš-pa-ši mūši gāni-du-tta kuiš anitti maš-ta aniyaši aniya-ku-an-ta tabarnani(!) ^{SAL}tawanani*. Both this and the lines 2 A Vs 25–26 were interpreted by Kammenhuber, *Pal* 23f., as 'curse formulas'. Carruba, *BeitrPal* 21f., tries to keep this interpretation, although his grammatical analysis is quite different (forms in *-du* = 'to him', not inv. 3rd sg.). The presence of the verb *mūši*, however, is more than mildly awkward, since its positive value 'satisfy/enjoy yourself' cannot be reconciled with a curse. The insertion of 'curse formulas' in the middle of a set of offerings is not Hittite practice, and there is no good evidence for such a thing here either. What we have is another example of the reciprocity between gods and men—the sometimes almost brazen

¹⁸ The form **kēi* 'here' may also be attested in Hittite *ki-nun* 'now', but the latter could also reflect **kē-nūn*, with the same elements as Lat. *nunc* in reverse order.

insistence of the Hittites on a quid pro quo. The god is to enjoy the offerings and in exchange is to bestow blessings on the king and queen.

As Carruba has already determined, *aniya* in Rs 10 and *mūši* in Rs 9 must be inv. 2nd sg. Since *aniyaši* is also certainly ind. 2nd sg., I see no reason not to take *marišši* as ind. 2nd sg. A relative clause with the second person is surely as possible in Palaic as anywhere else. In view of the use of *lāla-* 'tongue' in Hittite rituals to mean 'evil tongue, gossip', Carruba is also undoubtedly right in assuming that meaning here. The context also supports his view that *tartan* is related to Luv. *ta-tar-iyaman-* 'curse'. We may interpret *tartan* as either an adjective modifying *lālan* or (more likely) a noun 'curse' in asyndeton with it. The formation of *tarta-* is of interest in showing the suffix **-to-* in Anatolian. Thus line 9 is basically 'You who smash/crush the (evil) tongue and curse, enjoy yourself!'. We will treat *maš-pa-ši* in a moment.

Carruba consistently interprets Pal. *-du* as 'to him'. This sense is sure in 2 A Rs 24 *a-du piša* 'and give to him' (see Section 5 above). However, the use of *-du* for the third person is clearly secondary, and in view of orthotonic *tū* 'you' (dat.-acc.), we would also expect *-du* to mean 'to you'. Given *marišši*, *mūši*, *aniyaši* and *aniya*, all second person singular, I find it unlikely that the *-du* of *gāni-du-tta* is anything but 'to you'. The parallel *apāni* in 2 A Vs 25 from *apā* 'that' supports Carruba's alternate reading *gāni* in Rs 9 (from *kā* 'this'). For the form compare Hitt. *kāni* (see Otten, *StBoT* 17. 27–28. The Hittite form seems to be adverbial, but the ending is also reminiscent of the fixed nt. nom.-acc. *eni* 'the aforementioned'. We may thus interpret *gāni* as 'this' or 'thus'. The sentence of Rs 9–10 (omitting *maš-ta aniyaši* temporarily) is thus a regular Anatolian relative construction: 'The one who does this for you—may you do for the tabarna and the tawananna', i. e. (with the usual singular reference for the royal couple) 'May you do for the royal couple who does this for you'.¹⁹ Here we have an explicit case of reciprocity.

We are left with the clauses introduced by *maš*. Carruba compares Lyc. *me*², which appears to introduce the apodosis. However, this does not fit line 10, where the apodosis is the imperative clause *aniya*... I believe a much closer comparandum is Hitt. *maši*

¹⁹ For the resumption of a relative by a full noun see Held, *RelSent*, examples 166, 167, 182 and 183.

'how, as much', a frozen form of the anim. nom. sg. **mas* plus deictic *-i or *-i, which functions as an adjective (cf. *aši* 'the aforementioned' for the formation). Pal. *maš* is identical except for the -i, and it functions as a conjunction: 'as much as'. The sense of Rs 9-10 is: 'Do as much as you (may) do for the royal couple who does this for you'. The sentence of line 9 is the same, except that the verb of the subordinate clause has been omitted: 'You who crush the (evil) tongue and curse, enjoy yourself as much as (you can enjoy yourself)'. In the one example we have the full construction: *maš... aniyaši aniya... -an...* 'As much as you (may) do... do it...'. However, since the verb in such a construction will virtually always be the same in the two clauses, the 'gapped' construction *maš... mūši* 'As much as (you can)... enjoy!' is not surprising (cf. the English).²⁰

8. Animate Nominative Plurals in -aš, -eš and -iš

Carruba, *StBoT* 10.42, has already pointed out the existence of anim. nom. pl. endings -aš, -eš and -iš in Palaic. What he does not indicate is the apparent complementary distribution of these endings. The examples *marḥaš* 'gods', *ašḫumāuwaš* 'sacralized meats' (and *ilaš* 'passions', see II.3 below) are all surely to *a*-stems: animate stems in -ḥ, -aw and -l are highly unlikely. On the other hand, stems in -ant- show consistently -eš: *takkuwanteš* (3×) and *ḥalīyanteš* (2×). At least one example of a nom. pl. in -iš is probably to an *i*-stem: *warlaḥiš* (on Palaic nouns in -aḥi- see Watkins,

²⁰ The interrogative-relative stem **me/o-* (cf. Toch. A *mānt* 'how?') is also the base of the Anatolian conjunction *mān*, which is attested in Old Hittite as 'how?', 'as' (comparative) and 'as, when' (temporal). In later Hittite and in Luvian the meaning is 'whenever, if'. The two Palaic examples may be interpreted as 'when' or 'whenever'. For the first three uses one may compare Germ. *wie*. Comparable in both form and meaning is PIE **k^wom*, which appears as Lat. *quom* (*cum*) 'when' and 'whenever', Av. *kam* 'as', Goth. *han* 'when', OPr. *kan* and Lith. (dial.) *kq* 'whenever, if'. With a **-de* extension one also finds Umbr. *pon(ne)* and Osc. *pūn* 'when'. Buck, *Gram. Osc. and Umbr.* 137, and Pokorny, *IEW* 645, label *quom* etc. as nt. acc. sg. However, Lat. *quod* (= Osc. *pūd*) 'because' shows the pronominal nt. acc. sg. ending and also functions as a conjunction: cf. also Hitt. *kuūt* 'because'. Furthermore, Lat. *quam(-de)* (= Osc. *pan*, Umb. *pāne*) 'as, than' shows the fem. acc. sg. of the interrogative-relative in use as a conjunction. It therefore seems easier to suppose that **k^wom* represents the masc. acc. sg. functioning as a conjunction. Likewise, Anat. *mān* would reflect masc. acc. sg. **mom* (or possibly fem. acc. sg. **meh₂m* [*mām*]): a nt. acc. sg. in *-om in a pronoun would be unexpected in Common Anatolian.

Flexion und Wortbildung 365). The example *kuwaniš* is indeterminate as to stem-formation, but an *i*-stem is quite possible.

This leaves the plurals of the derived adjectives *ḥulzannikeš*, *ḥalīyanteš* and *wašunikeš*. Carruba assumes a suffix -ika- (cf. Grk. -iko- etc.), but -ik- is equally possible: cf. Lat. nouns in -ex, -icis.²¹

The small number of examples bids caution, but there is a good chance that Palaic -aš directly continues PIE *-ōs of the *o*-stems, while Palaic -eš reflects the consonant-stem ending *-ēs. In this regard Palaic would thus be more conservative than Hittite.²² The nom. pl. ending -iš of the Palaic *i*-stems could reflect a syncopated form of *-yēs (cf. 2nd sg. *ḥapari-ši* probably to *ḥapariya-*). Obviously, however, with so few examples a phonemic contrast between *e* and *i* in Palaic is far from assured.

9. Verbs in -nā-

Palaic shows a number of derived verbs in -nā-: *ḥantana-*, *marana-*, *marḥina-*, *parina-* and *paḥḥina-*. Carruba, *StBoT* 10.46, appears to equate this -nā- to Hittite durative -anna/i-, but no durative sense is discernible, and the inflection differs: Palaic verbs in -nā- show *mi*-forms: *ḥantanāti*, *parinat*, etc. Furthermore, the Palaic verbs have consistent single -n- versus Hittite durative -anna/i-.²³

Hittite has a much better comparandum: verbs in -nā(i)- with single -n- and *mi*-inflection: *piyanā(i)-* 'bestow gifts on', *impanā(i)-* 'worry' < 'burden oneself'. The meaning and inflection in -nā(i)- argue that these are in origin denominatives to *n-* or *na*-stems, although to my knowledge the base nouns are not yet attested. Likewise, then, Palaic verbs in -nā- may reflect original denomina-

²¹ The comparison to Grk. -iko- etc. is already made by Kammenhuber, *OLZ* (1955) 369. The ultimate connection of these forms to Pal. -ik- remains likely, since *-(i)ko- is apparently built on *(i)k-: cf. Lat. *mordex* 'incisor tooth' beside *mordicus* '(by) biting' and see Meillet-Vendryes, *Gram. comp.* 384, 419-420.

²² For reasons which I will discuss elsewhere, the general Hittite anim. nom. pl. ending -eš must represent /-ēs/ < *-eyes, generalized from the *i*-stems: cf. already Sturtevant, *CGT* 2 90, and Pedersen, *Hitt.* 28.

²³ The contrast of -n- and -nn- is phonemic in Palaic as in Hittite. Pal. *šūna-* 'fill' continues the old strong stem **su-né-h₂-*, while *šunnuttil-* (a liquid offering) reflects the weak stem **su-n-h₂-* like Hitt. *šunn(a)-* 'fill', both showing the change **VRHV* > *VRRV*.

tives in **-neh₂-*, which would account for their inflection.²⁴⁾ Obviously, this does not require the reconstruction of base nouns in all cases. The form *-nā-* may have been abstracted as a unitary suffix: cf. the history of *-nu-* in Hittite. The extended form in *-nā-* seems to be virtually equivalent to the base in some Palaic examples (*marḥiya-/marḥina-*): cf. Hitt. *impā(i)-* and *impanā(i)-* 'worry'.

II. Lexicon

1. *ulānna*

Carruba, *BeitrPal* 5, has already suggested that *ulānna ki-ī* [] in 1 A I 2 probably represents 'lay/lies in the u.' with a form of *ki-* 'lie' and a preceding locative in *-a*. The reference is to the hiding of the god in the vicinity of Lihzina: cf. 1 A I 14 ^{URU} *Lihzina ulānna ḥanta-* [] 'met/found in Lihzina in the u.'. Along with Carruba we may compare the Hittite in *KUB XVII 10 I 11-13*: . . . *išpiyatarr-a pēdaš gimri wellui marmaraš andan* ^a*Telipinuš-a pait marmarri andan ulišta* 'He carried off . . . and abundance into the open country, into a meadow, into a thicket. Telipinu went and camouflaged himself in the thicket.'²⁵⁾ Carruba compares *ulānna* to *wellui*, but in addition to the alternation *we-*: *u-* this fails to account for the difference of *-ll-* vs. *-l-* and the difference in formation (Hitt. *u-* stem: Pal.?). The Hittite verb which I have translated freely as 'camouflaged himself' means basically 'draw close to, unite with' with particular emphasis on the inseparability of the union.²⁶⁾ I

²⁴⁾ From **-neh₂-* we would expect in the first instance Pal. **-naḥḥ-*, but **-aḥḥ-* was probably weakened to *-ā-/aga-* ([aγ] or the like) regularly before a stop (e.g. 3rd sg. **-aḥḥ-ti* > *-a(ga)ti*), and this allomorph was then generalized in Palaic: see Oettinger, *Stammbild.* 559 and also 152ff. and 547-548. Pal. *ḫinat* 'filled' also represents **su-ne-h₂-t*, but the laryngeal is uncertain (cf. note 23).

²⁵⁾ The conjunction *-a* of ^a*Telipinuš-a* suggests that the locative expressions *gimri* . . . *andan* belong to the preceding sentence. Such 'extraposition' is well-attested in Hittite.

²⁶⁾ This is the common denominator of the various occurrences, where in all cases the emphasis is on one thing becoming inextricably tangled up with another. In *KBo III 1 I 33* one person has 'conspired with' another; in *KUB XXXIII 120 I 26*, after Kumarbi bit Anu's loins, Anu's sperm 'fused with Kumarbi's insides like bronze'; in *KUB XLIII 62 II 7* Fire, like Telipinu, has retired into the night in anger, 'united with' the night and curled up like a snake; in *KUB XXIX 1 I 34*, the King, addressing the trees on the mountain, insists on his close association with them: 'I, the king, the labarna, have communed with you'. Oettinger, *Stammbild.* 363-364, assumes 'conceal, hide

therefore suggest that Pal. *ulānna* is the regular locative in *-a* of a verbal abstract **ulātār* 'uniting, entangling' > 'thicket'. Pal. *ulānna* thus equates functionally to Hitt. *marmarri*, but shows the same lexical base as the Hitt. verb *ulešš-*. For **-tn-* > *-nn-* in Palaic see already ^a*Gulzannikeš* < **Gulzatn-* cited by Carruba, *StBoT* 10.61. Pal. *malitannaš* (also with double *-nn-*!) likewise represents the gen. sg. of an abstract **malitātār* 'honiedness, sweetness'.²⁷⁾ The form *šehḥannaš* (3 B III 11) is also surely gen. sg. of a **šehḥātār*, but the sense remains obscure.

2. *arūn*

The sentence *a-ru-u-na-am-pi ti witeši/witiši* occurs in 2 A I 23 = 2 B₂ 9, shortly after the sentence discussed in Section I.4 above, where the Sun-god is to become father and mother to the king. Carruba suggests two possible analyses for both the opening sequence and the verb. One may read either *arūn-ampi* or *arūnan-pi*, and *wite/iši* may be either 'you build' or 'you carry'. Carruba finds *arūnan* 'sea' more likely, presumably because there is evidence elsewhere only for a particle *-pi*, not for *-ampi*. However, mention of the sea makes no sense in the context, which concerns the Sun-god's close relationship to the king. In particular, neither the Sun-god's 'building' nor 'bringing' the sea seems likely. Since we know

oneself' as the basic meaning and analyzes the verb as *ulae-*: preverb *u-* plus **leiḥ₂-* 'hide' (cf. Skt. *ny-ā-leṣṭa* 'has hidden oneself'). However, this meaning will not do at all for the Kumarbi passage with its comparison to (molten) bronze, nor is it likely that the Hittite king has 'hidden himself' in the trees. Oettinger's attempt to unite all attested forms into one paradigm is also forced and unnecessary. The intransitive forms *ulešzi* and *ulešta* may reflect an inchoative in *-ešš-* 'become united with', while *ulanun* and *ulaed(-aš)* may belong to a transitive *ulā(i)-* 'unite with' (in XXIX 1 I 34 the reflexive *-za* then turns this into 'unite oneself with'). For the coexistence of stems in *-ešš-* and *-ā(i)-* from the same base, cf. *šallešš-* 'grow large' and *šallā(i)-* 'make large' > 'spread out' to *šall(i)-* 'large'. The sense of the verb suggests ultimate derivation from the PIE root **wel-* 'press, crowd together' seen in Grk. *eiléo* 'idem', *haléo* 'crowded together', etc. Greek evidence for an initial laryngeal in this root is weak (see Beekes, *Develop. PIE Laryng. in Grk.* 56 and 62), and initial **h₁* would in any case not show up in Hittite. Since in all clear cases *-ešš-* and *-ā(i)-* are denominative, we should probably start with a root noun **wel-/ul-*: cf. *ḫandā(i)-* 'arrange' < *ḫant-* 'front, forehead'. I know of no direct evidence for such a root noun, but the same is true of *ḫatešš-* 'become dry' to the root **h₂ed-* (> Hitt. *ḫat-* 'be dry, dry up').

²⁷⁾ For the deletion of the *-u-* of *m(a)līddu-* 'sweet' in the abstract **m(a)lītātār* cf. Hitt. *pargātār* 'height' to *parku-* 'high'.

that *aru-* 'high' occurs in a Palaic context (cf. Text 4, 5), I would analyze rather *arūn-an-pi ti witeši* 'You shall also build him (the king) high'. Such a predicative use of the accusative is attested in Hittite: cf. *KBo* III 34 II 16 *š-an INA URU Utaḫzumi LU maniaḥḥa-tallan iet* 'He made him administrator in U.' and *ibid.* II 22 *apūn-a LU uralla-ššaman iet* 'He made that one their u.'. Compare also the construction with verbs of saying: *ammug-war-an akkantan IQBI* 'To me he said him dead' = 'He said to me that he was dead' (*KUB* XIII 35 III 17). In view of the Hittites' construction of concrete images of gods, the use of the verb 'build' referring to a person is not particularly strange: cf. the phraseology of *KUB* XX 54 + *KBo* XIII 122 VI 6–8.²⁸⁾

3. *tiunaš* and *ilaš*

These two words occur in Carruba's Text 3, a relatively new Palaic text which has been analyzed in detail by Watkins, *Linguistic . . . studies . . . Archibald A. Hill* (1978) 305–312. Watkins takes *ms. A* as his base and concludes that *šameiriš šameiriš* (3 A I 9) and *tiunaš tiunaš* (3 B III 16) are vocatives addressed to the sacrificial animal, a ram and a bull respectively: see already Otten, *A/O* 22 (1968) 112, for the suggestion that *šame(i)ri-* = *UDU.NITÁ* and *tiuna-* = *GUD.MAH*. However, nothing in the existing Hittite portions proves this equation. In fact, one can restore A I 20–21 with Carruba as [*ḫZaparwa*]tan *lāman tiunaš* [-a]ḥḥi 'I [call/summon] Zapparwa (by) the name *tiuna-*'. While this restoration is by no means assured, Watkins' interpretation wholly ignores the preceding *nū ḫZaparwā* of copy B III 4 and 16. Furthermore, it is clear from comparing A I 22 and C 4, 7 and 18 that the repeated formula beginning *ḫalāiš-ta nī . . .* is addressed in turn to each member of the Palaic pantheon, in the canonical order seen in 2 A Rs 13ff. Finally, C 8 shows that, when the Ilaliyant-gods are the addressee, their name is followed by an appropriate epithet *wāšunikeš ilaš* in place of *šameiriš šameiriš* and *tiunaš tiunaš*. There can be no doubt that *š.* and *t.* are epithets of Zapparwa, who is the

²⁸⁾ I would construe the following sentence in parallel fashion: [*x*]-*a-an-ta-na-an ti witeši* 'you shall build him [*x*]āntan'. According to the autograph, there is very little space for the missing initial sign. I therefore venture the restoration [*A*].*A-antan* (= **muwantan*) 'powerful, mighty', which would make a suitable pendant to *arūn* 'high'. I readily acknowledge that the appearance of the idiographic spelling in a Palaic text would be surprising.

first addressee of the formula, not the sacrificial animal.²⁹⁾ Since *tiunaš* is an epithet of the god Zapparwa, I find it unlikely that it is anything else but the expected exact formal equivalent of Hitt. *šiu-na-* 'god'. The existence of *marḥa-* in Palaic for 'god' is no counterargument, since *tiuna-* may be functioning in Palaic as an epithet: 'divine' or 'celestial'.

As noted above, *wāšunikeš ilaš* in C 8 is the epithet of the immediately preceding [*ḫ*]alaliyanteš. The adjective *wāšunikeš* is clearly a derivative of *wāšu-* 'good': a meaning such as 'beneficent' is likely. The following *ilaš* must likewise be nominative (vocative) plural. The stem *ila-* is surely the base underlying *ḫ*alali-, which in turn is the base for the denominative verb *ilaliya-* 'desire', whence finally *ḫ*alaliyant-. The stem *ila-* also occurs in Hittite (*KUB* XXIX 1 I 46), where it appears to be a noun designating some undesirable quality which lies in the heart. Since 'passion, desire' may often be a destructive force, I see no reason not to identify the Pal. and Hitt. *ila-*. We probably have a substantivized adjective **i-lo-* to the PIE root **ai-s-* 'desire' (a noun **i-leh₂-* is also possible). The participle *ilaliyant-* as a divine name is probably active like *ḫ*Wišuriyant- 'the one who oppresses' (see Carruba, *StBoT* 2.49): thus 'the ones who desire'/'the desirous/passionate ones'. An epithet *wāšunikeš ilaš* 'beneficent passions', or the like, is thus appropriate for *ḫ*alaliyanteš.

4. *ḫā-*

This verb occurs in 3 A I 14: *aškummāruwaš ḫānta tīlila ḫāri*. The sense of this line as analyzed by Carruba, *BeitrPal* 16, can hardly be doubted: 'The sacralized meats are warm; the *tīlila* are warm' (in the second sentence the collective plural takes a singular verb, as in Hittite, the *tā zōta trékhei* rule). His equation of *ḫā-* to Hitt. *a-a-* 'be warm' is another matter. The Hittite verb *a-a-ri*, *a-a-an-ta* may be analyzed as **ay-o-ri*, *ay-onto* from the root **ai-* 'burn, heat' seen also in Hitt. *inu-* 'make warm' < **i-néu-*, Skt. *idh-* 'kindle', Grk. *aithō* 'kindle', etc. (see Neu, *StBoT* 5.1 with refs.).

²⁹⁾ The parallel which Watkins cites for an address to the sacrificial animal (*KUB* XXXV 148 III 38f.) is far from assured. Rather than vocative, *iyanza iyanza* may be nominative, with the repetition indicating plurality: 'every beast which walks' (see the immediately following lines about various domestic animals). The problematic *dakkudakuwa-* and *šarakuwant-* leave the entire passage obscure.

The equation of Hittite initial *a-* with *a-* elsewhere points to PIE **a-*. This cannot be reconciled with Palaic initial *h-*, nor need it be by an ad hoc assumption of an **h₁* or other device. There is another PIE and Anatolian stem with initial *ha-* pointing to 'heat, set fire to', that of *hašša-* 'hearth'. The equation of Hitt. *hašša-* and Lat. *āra* demands a preform **h₂eh_{1/3}s-eh₂*. The second laryngeal, which is already required by Lat. long *ā*, is confirmed by Hitt. double *-šš-*: cf. inchoative *-ešš-* < **eh₁s-* and *pašš-* 'swallow' < **peh₃s-*. Compare also Skt. *āsa-* 'ashes, dust'. By definition a PIE 'root' of a shape **h₂eh_xs-* is complex, being analyzable into a root **h₂eh_{1/3}-* plus enlargement *-s-*. Palaic *hā-* is the missing **h₂eh_{1/3}-*. The loss of the second laryngeal (whether it is **h₁* or **h₃* is indeterminate) in **h₂eh_x-o(-ri)* would have produced a hiatus (or long vowel), which is reflected in *ha-a-ri*, *ha-a-an-ta*. It is the same root **h₂eh_x-* which is the base of Hitt. *handaiš-* 'heat, warm season', but the formation of the latter is obscure.

5. *bānnu*

It is clear from the context of 2 A Rs 19–20 that Pal. *bānnu(-kat)* is equivalent to *uzūNÍG.GIG* 'liver'. Poetto, KZ 95 (1981) 274, note 3, has attempted to equate *bānnu(-kat)* to Hitt. *uzūpanduḫa-* 'stomach' (or similar). However, we have seen above (Section I.3) that *-kat* is not part of the noun stem, but an enclitic form of *kāt* 'this', referring to the liver which has just been served. As Poetto himself admits, the equation of Pal. *-nn-* to Hitt. *-nd-* is also problematic.

The Palaic word for 'liver' is simply *bānnu-*. This may be derived from a PIE adjective **pen-nu-* 'fattened': cf. Lith. *penù* 'fatten'. As elsewhere in IE languages, the epithet of the fattened liver has replaced the original name for the organ itself. Compare English 'liver' and relatives, which are cognate with Grk. *liparós* 'fat' and Ital. *fegato*, Fr. *foie* 'liver' < Lat. *iecur ficātum* 'liver of a goose fattened with figs'.

Pal. *bānnu-* < **pen-nu-* is phonologically regular, showing the usual change of **ē* to *a* before a tautosyllabic nasal: cf. athematic pres. 3rd pl. *-anti* < **-enti* and impv. 2nd pl. *-ttan* < **-ten*. It is true that most adjectives in *-nu-* attested elsewhere are active in sense: see Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altind. Gram.* II 2.741, with references. However, **suh_x-nu-* 'son' appears to be '(the one) born'. I have also suggested recently (JCS to appear) that Hitt. *šeknu-* 'robe' represents a substantivized **piece of cloth* < **sek-nu-* 'that

which is cut' to PIE **sek-* 'cut'. As is well-known, other verbal adjective suffixes such as **-to-*, **-no-* and **-ent-* produce adjectives with either active or passive meaning from transitive roots. There thus seems no difficulty in assuming a meaning 'fattened' for **pen-nu-*, whence Pal. *bānnu-* 'liver'.

Some of the individual morphological and lexical analyses presented above have significant consequences for Palaic phonology and its dialectal position within Anatolian. I hope to treat these issues soon in a separate discussion.

Curriculum in Linguistics
University of North Carolina
320 Dey Hall
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

H. Craig Melchert