

The Hittite Word for "Son"*

As is well-known, a large part of the basic vocabulary of Hittite remains unknown to us today, more than sixty years after Hrozný's initial decipherment of the language. This is due to the fact that many common words, particularly nouns, are consistently written by means of Sumero- or Akkadograms, with or without Hittite "phonetic complements": GUD-(u)- "cow", ANŠE.KUR.RA-(u)- "horse", ŠEŠ-(na)- "brother", SAL-(n)- "woman", etc. To this list belongs DUMU-(la)- "son, male child". The fact that the word is a *la*-stem is established by phonetic complements in various case forms: NSg DUMU-*la-aš* (KBo V 13 IV 19), ASg DUMU-*la-a(n)* (KUB I 16 II 4.57), DSg DUMU-*li* (KUB XXIV 7 III 25. IV 36) and DUMU. NITA-*li* (KUB XXIV 8 I 19.20).

We may note further that the same form is used to mean "boy" (in this usage transcribed TUR-*la*-): KBo III 4 II 12-13 *nu-wa-mu-za TUR-lan ḫalzeššešta nu-wa-mu-za tepnuškit* "He called me 'boy' and belittled me". The phonetic complement in this usage is also *-la-*, and it is clear that we are dealing with a single word which means "male child", both as a generic term and as a term of relationship. There are also examples to suggest that the word may in origin be an adjective meaning "young": KBo XI 14 II 5 AMAR-un-man TUR-an-man "my(?) young calf". The semantics are simple enough: "young" is substantivized (cf. German "Junge"), and the noun "boy" is also used as a term of relationship (cf. English "my boy Bill"). Up to now, that is all we have known, and no one has been able to find a phonetically spelled word in *-la-* in a context which argues for an equation with DUMU-*la*-.

I believe that an unrelated fact of Hittite can give us a further clue to the phonetic shape of the word for "boy, son". The

* For the abbreviations of Hittitological works, see Friedrich - Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Zweite völlig neubearbeitete Auflage, Lfg. 1 (Heidelberg 1975) 13-23.

sequence *nu + za* (conjunction plus reflexive particle) is usually spelled *nu-za*, but in Old Hittite there exist other spellings. First of all, there is *nu-uz* (KBo III 40, 2; XVII 36 III 11; see Otten, StBoT. 17, 1973, 31, note 58). This spelling is parallel to that in which *-za* is spelled *-(a)z* after words ending in *-a*: e.g. KBo XVII 74 I 12 *ta-z*, *ibid.* I 50 [(*kui*)]šša-*z*. While the spelling *nu-za* does occur in Old Hittite manuscripts (e.g. KBo VI 2 I 15), it is rare, and there is a clear tendency in Old Hittite to write the particle as *-z* after vowels, but *-za* after consonants (see Neu, StBoT. 12, 1970, 93 ad *-za*). This orthography is now generally accepted as showing that the particle was [-ts] and that the vowel in *-z(a)* is purely orthographic.¹

There exists, however, another spelling for *nu + za* in Old Hittite: *nu-uz-za* (see Sommer, HAB. 114, and Otten, loc. cit.). In the face of the general pattern just described (*-Vz* vs. *-C-za*), this spelling calls for explanation. If the particle was in fact phonetically [-ts], as all other evidence suggests, why would the scribe, after writing *nu-uz*, append a further *-za*?² A careful look at the attestations suggests an answer:

KBo XXII 2 Vs 12 (O. H. ms.) *nu-uz-za anzaš* l-ŠU *hāšta*

KBo VI 2 I.6 (O. H. ms.) *nu-uz-za unattallan-pat arnuzzi*

ibid. II 32 *nu-uz-za apūn-pat danzi*

KBo III 40 Rs¹ 13 (N. H. ms.) *nu-uz-zaišhamaiškizzi*

KBo XVII 32 Vs 11 (M. H. ms.) *nu-uz-za ehu*

KBo XXII 2 Vs 13 (O. H. ms.) *nu-uz-za DUMU.NITA.MEŠ*
karti-šmi . . .

ibid. Vs 17 *nu-uz-za DUMU.SAL.MEŠ-ŠA ANA DUMU.NITA.*
MEŠ-ŠA paiš

KBo VI 2 II 7 (O. H. ms.) *nu-uz-za* [DUMU.MEŠ *ien*]*z[i]*

ibid. I 47 *nu-uz-za* lR-ZU-*pat dāi*

KUB XXVIII 45 VI 14-15 (N. H. ms.) *nu-uz-z[a G]UŠKIN-aš*
GÍR . . .

¹ This interpretation is supported by the spelling of the sequence *-za + šan* (reflexive plus local particle) as *-za-an*, i. e., [-tsan] < [-ts-san]. See already Sommer, HAB. 114, note 4.

² In late copies, of course, *nu-uz-za* could be simply a conflation of old *nu-uz* with the normal *nu-za*, but this will not account for the instances in Old Hittite manuscripts.

KBo XX 8 Vs 11 (O. H. ms.) *nu-uz-za 2-at 2-at kiššarta ḥ[arkanzi]*
 Compare als KBo III 40 Rs¹ 2 *nu-uz iṣḥama[]* and KBo XVII 36
 III 11 *nu-uz ad[(a)nzi]*.

The total number of occurrences for *nu-uz-za* is admittedly quite small, but it is striking that in all attestations where the following word is spelled phonetically, that word begins with a vowel. I have thus far found no cases of *nu-uz-za* before a consonant. The very narrow data base bids caution, but the hypothesis that the spelling *nu-uz-za* was conditioned by a following vowel accounts for this orthography and also makes sense in linguistic terms.

Kronasser, VLFH. (1956) 102, suggests that the ablative ending *-az/-za* was in reality [-(a)tsy] with a final *y*-glide. The spelling of the ablative ending in Old Hittite is entirely parallel to that of the reflexive particle: *-az* vs. *-C-za*.³ We also know that historically the ablative ending and reflexive particle were homophonous, Common Anatolian **-ti*, which became in Hittite **-zi*, then *-z(a)*.⁴ The claim that the pronunciation (at least before vowels) was [-(a)tsy] is also supported by the unique spelling of the reflexive particle in the Aphasia of Mursili: KBo IV 2 III 58–59 *piran-parā-ya-az-zi apūn GE₆-an IŠTU SAL^{TI} tešḥaš* “And he also abstained from (contact with) a woman the night previous”. Götze-Pedersen, MS. 40–41, see here a pleonastic repetition of enclitic *-ya* “and”, comparable to that of the enclitic pronouns (e.g. *n-at-ši-at*; see Götze, NBr. 19). However, they must assume that *-zi* is standing for *-zi-ya*. Furthermore, there are to my

³ This generalization is based on an exhaustive survey undertaken for my dissertation, Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite (Harvard University, 1977). For *-C-za* see e.g. *nepiṣza* (KUB XLIII 23 Rs 15; O. H. ms.) and *É-irza* = *pirza* (half a dozen times in later copies of O. H. texts). The adverbs *tapuṣza* “aside” and *araḥza* “outside” also represent old ablatives of consonant-stem nouns.

⁴ Luvian has an ablative-instrumental in *-ati* (see Laroche, DLL. 136). Lycian shows *-adi/-edi* in the same functions (Neumann, Lyk 385). These endings represent the form of the ablative ending in the thematic stems: **-a-ti* (> Hitt. *-azzi* > *-az*). In Luvian and Lycian *-ati* has already ousted *-ti* in all noun classes. In Hittite *-az* replaces *-za* in consonant stems within the historical period. For the reflexive particle **-ti* in Anatolian see Carruba, Part (1969) 39–50.

knowledge no actual examples of such a repetition of *-ya* "and". I suggest that we have here a one-time attempt to express [-tsy a-] by *-zi a-*: read [piran p(a)ra-ya-tsy abūn. The Old Hittite spelling *nu-uz-za V-* represents a more widespread (though not wholly consistent) attempt to indicate the final glide: [nutsy V-].

If this hypothesis is accepted, it leads to the conclusion that those words spelled with Sumerograms following *nu-uz-za* also began with a vowel.⁵ Thus the Hittite word for "son" was of the shape V-[]*la-*. This narrows down our search considerably. However, a *la-*stem with initial vowel is only a necessary, not a sufficient criterion. We must find a word of the shape V-[]*la-* not merely in a context which permits the reading "son", but in a context which calls for such an interpretation.

I propose that we do have such a word in *ayawalaš*, which occurs in the "Tawagalawa Letter", KUB XIV 3 I 6-12:

nu-m[u U]KÛ-an IGI-anda/uiyat lR-anni-wa-mu dā nu-wa-mu
LÚtuḫkantin/uiya nu-wa-mu ITTI 𐎶UTUŠI uwatezzi nu-šši/
LÚTARTENU uiyanun it-war-an-zan-k[a]n GIGIR/GAM-an
tittanut nu-war-an uwati a[pašš]-a?-kan/LÚTARTENU kariyanut
nu-za ŪL me[mmaš] LÚTARTENU-ma/ŪL ANA LUGAL aya-
walaš

"He sent a man to (meet) me: 'Take me into servitude! Send me the *tuḫkanti*, that he may bring me to Your Majesty.' I sent him the *tartennu*: 'Go (and) seat him on the chariot beside you and fetch him.' And he—he silenced the *tartennu* and said: 'No!'. But is not the *tartennu* son to a king?"

⁵ This reasoning assumes that what was dictated was Hittite, which the scribe then rendered with a Sumero- or Akkadogram. We have attested errors of audition suggesting that one could dictate either Hittite or the ideogram. E.g., KBo IV 4 IV 12 has *Ū-UL dahḫun* where the duplicate KBo III 4 IV 39 has correctly *katta dahḫun*. Since the signs *kat-tu* and *Ū-UL* look nothing alike, this can hardly be a copying error. Rather, the scribe heard *katta* as *natta* "not" and spelled the latter (as usual) with the Akkadian *Ū-UL*. On the other hand, KUB XIII 2 II 9 has 𐎶GŪ.ZA "throne" for correct 𐎶GU.ZA. Again, since the signs GU and GŪ are not similar, a copying error is excluded. The scribe simply wrote the dictated 𐎶GŪ.ZA with the wrong "GU".

My translation, apart from *ayawalaš*, follows Sommer, AU. 3. The author, an unidentified Hittite king, is defending the propriety of his actions toward Tawagalawa. Specifically, he is justifying his sending of the ^{LÚ}*tartennu* (the crown prince) instead of the ^{LÚ}*tuhkanti* whom Tawagalawa had requested. The Hittite king is insisting on the legitimacy and prestige of the *tartennu*, who he feels is fully as worthy an ambassador as the *tuhkanti*. Hence Tawagalawa's reaction was unjustified (for this general view of the situation see already Sommer, AU. 50-54).

The Hittite king belabors the point, and in Column II, some sixty lines later, he is still speaking of it. In II 4 he says: *nu-šši ŪL DUMU-YA LÚTARTENU IGI?-anda uiyanun* "Did I not send my son, the crown prince, to (meet) him?". The passages are not, of course, exact parallels, but the overall context of the letter and the inherent meaning of the terms *tartennu* and *tuhkanti* argue strongly that the content of the two sentences is the same: the king is insisting on the fact that the *tartennu* is a king's son just as much as the *tuhkanti* and just as proper a choice as ambassador.

A. Bin-Nun, RHA. 31 (1973 [1976]) 5-25, has shown that the *tuhkanti* was always a king's son, although not, in the cases we know about, son of the reigning king, but rather his brother. The *tartennu* was the designated heir to the throne, thus the "crown prince". His role is most clearly defined in the "Barga" text, KBo III 3 II 6-9, where Mursili II installs Abimarda as King of Barga and the latter's son Irtešub as the *tartennu*, who will reign as king after his father's death. Bin-Nun, op. cit. 13, without reference to *ayawalaš*, comments of the Tawagalawa letter: "That the Tartennu was a son of the king is stressed in the same text." In reading the letter, one has to agree that the Hittite king's self-justification does tend to run on. In lines I 67 to II 8 he essentially repeats the points already made in Col. I 6-15.

Actual proof of the equation DUMU-*la*: *ayawala-* could only be furnished by their occurrence in duplicate texts, but the context of the Tawagalawa letter argues for their equivalence, and the reading *ayawala-* is supported secondarily by the facts thus far observed about the spelling *nu-uz-za*.

If there were a transparent etymology for *ayawala-* "male child, son", it might further support the proposed interpretation. To me, at least, the etymology is anything but transparent. The fact that the word for "son" is not from IE. **sūnu-* need hardly surprise us, in view of the other Hittite terms of relationship known to us. Furthermore, in the face of *nega-* "sister", I see no compelling reason to assume that the word is Indo-European at all.⁶ I merely wish to insist, in agreement with Friedrich-Kammenhuber, HW². sub *aīayala-*, that there is no valid reason to take the word as Luvian (despite Sommer, AU. 50-51, and the references in Friedrich-Kammenhuber, loc. cit.). Whatever one makes of the first part of the word, both *-la-* and *-ala-* are Hittite, not Luvian, suffixes.

In closing, I wish to mention the other consequences of the hypothesis concerning *nu-uz-za*: it implies that *İR-(na)-* "male slave", DUMU.SAL "daughter", GUŠKIN "gold" and the numeral 2 (in the form 2-*at* 2-*at*) have an initial vowel. The case of the numeral "two" seems to argue against the hypothesis, for we hardly expect the Hittite word for "two" to begin with a vowel (cf. *dān* "twice" and the Luvian word *duyanalli-* "officer of the second rank"). However, I would point out that the meaning of 2-*at* 2-*at* is not simply "two", but rather "by twos, in pairs, in couples". As the English glosses alone suggest, languages may express the notion of "pair" by lexemes other than derivatives of the numeral "two". Thus there is no way to predict what form may lie behind the spelling 2-*at* 2-*at*.

4216 Garrett Rd, K-31,
Durham, N. C. 27707,
U.S.A.

H. Craig Melchert

⁶ Merely to forestall its appearance elsewhere, I mention the following possibility: given a sequence *ayaw-*, one could derive *ayawala-* from a virtual **h₂iēu-olo-/h₂iēu-lo-* "young, youthful" to the root **h₂iēu-* "vigor, vitality" (cf. for the general derivation Skt. *yuván-* "young", etc.). However, this etymology requires that **h₂* vocalize to *a* in Hittite, for which no compelling examples have yet been adduced. Worse, it would require vocalization to *a* before *i*, while we know that internally at least **h₂* > *∅* before *i*: **(s)teh₂i-* > Hitt. *tāy-* "steal". For these reasons the etymology must be rejected.