

Promotiecommissie:

Promotor: Prof. Dr. J. J. S. Weitenberg

Referent: Prof. Dr. Th. P. J. van den Hout

Overige leden: Prof. Dr. R. S. P. Beekes

Prof. Dr. J. G. Kooij

Prof. Dr. F. H. H. Kortlandt

Hittite Neuter Singular - Neuter Plural

Some Evidence for a Connection



ANNA PRINS

//

This research was supported by the Linguistic Research Foundation, which is funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, NWO.

Research School CNWS
School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies
Leiden, The Netherlands
1997

HITTITE NEUTER SINGULAR - NEUTER PLURAL

SOME EVIDENCE FOR A CONNECTION

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van Doctor
aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden,
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus Dr. W. A. Wagenaar,
hoogleraar in de faculteit der Sociale Wetenschappen,
volgens besluit van het College van Dekanen
te verdedigen op woensdag 8 oktober 1997
te klokke 14.15 uur

door

Anna Adriana Maria Prins
geboren te Anna Paulowna in 1957

CNWS PUBLICATIONS
VOL. 60

CNWS PUBLICATIONS is produced by the Research School CNWS, Leiden University, The Netherlands.

Editorial board: R.A.H.D. Effert; K. Jongeling; J. de Moor; F.E. Tjon Sie Fat; W.J. Vogelsang (editor in chief).

All correspondence should be addressed to: Dr. W.J. Vogelsang, editor in chief
CNWS Publications, c/o Research School CNWS, Leiden University, PO Box 9515,
2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands.

Prins, Anna

Hittite neuter singular - neuter plural. Some evidence for a connection / Anna Prins.
- Leiden : Research School CNWS. - (CNWS publications, ISSN 0925-3084; vol. 60)

ISBN 90-73782-93-7

Subject headings: Hittite; linguistics.

Cover design: Nelleke Oosten
Printing: Ridderprint, Ridderkerk

© Copyright 1997, Research School CNWS, Leiden University, The Netherlands

Copyright reserved. Subject to the exceptions provided for by law, no part of this publication may be reproduced and/or published in print, by photocopying, on microfilm or in any other way without the written consent of the copyright-holder(s); the same applies to whole or partial adaptations. The publisher retains the sole right to collect from third parties fees in respect of copying and/or take legal or other action for this purpose.

For Ingrid Almqvist

CONTENTS

Introduction	xv
Abbreviations	xvii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Discussion on the grammatical status of the neuter plural	2
1.2.1 Introduction	2
1.2.2 Was the neuter plural originally a feminine singular?	4
1.2.3 Did the collective belong to the category of number?	5
1.2.4 Was the neuter plural originally a neuter singular?	7
1.3 Preliminary discussion of the Hittite material	9
1.3.1 Introduction	9
1.3.2 Hittite neuter plural already had plural value	10
1.3.3 The endings of the Hittite nom.acc. neuter plural	10
1.4 Criteria for neuter plural	11
1.4.1 Introduction	11
1.4.2 Criteria for neuter plural	11
1.4.3 Sumerian determinatives ^{U1A} and ^{MES}	12
1.4.4 Numerals preceding a neuter plural	13
1.4.5 Enclitics and potential sentence connectives	15
1.4.6 Spellings <i>a-e-a</i> and <i>a-e</i> introduction	15
1.4.6.1 Phonetic value of the sign <E>	16
1.4.6.2 <i>Tamae</i>	17
1.4.6.3 <i>Pal-ḫa-e-a</i> ^{U1A}	17
1.4.6.4 <i>Šu-up-pa-e-a</i>	19
1.4.6.5 Conclusion on the phonetic value of <E>	19
1.4.7 Neuter singulars in <i>-a</i>	19
1.4.7.1 Forms attested in the source material for this monograph	19
1.4.7.2 Problematic cases	21
1.4.7.3 Material for a 'collective' in <i>-a</i> provided by Neu	22
1.4.7.4 Conclusion	24
1.4.8 Distributive singular	24

1.5	Distribution of the Hittite neuter plural endings	26
2	Discussion and evaluation of the Hittite material	29
2.1	Plural of the simple <i>r/n</i> -stems	29
2.1.1	Introduction	29
2.1.2	Material	29
2.1.3	List of plurals of the simple <i>r/n</i> -stems	34
2.2	Characterized plural of the complex <i>r/n</i> -stems	35
2.2.1	Introduction	35
2.2.2	Material	36
2.2.3	Material preceded by numerals	39
2.2.4	List and conclusions	39
2.3	Uncharacterized neuter plurals of the complex <i>r/n</i> -stems	41
2.3.1	Preceded by numerals: Old Hittite	41
2.3.2	Not preceded by numerals: Young Hittite	41
2.3.3	List and conclusion	42
2.4	Plene writing in auslaut	42
2.4.1	<i>Utne</i> 'land, country'	42
2.4.2	<i>Āssū</i> 'goods'. Introduction	43
2.4.2.1	Material	43
2.4.2.2	Enclitic possessive pronoun <i>a-aš-šu-u</i>	44
2.4.2.3	<i>A-aš-šu-u</i> used adverbially	45
2.4.2.4	Evaluation and conclusion	45
2.4.3	<i>Mekki</i> 'a large part'	45
2.4.4	<i>Nakki</i> 'heavy, important'	46
2.4.5	<i>Tar-ru-u</i> 'on all fours'	47
2.4.6	<i>Tuniptū</i> (type of bread)	48
2.4.7	Conclusion for the plene written final vowel	48
2.5	The uncharacterized neuter plural	49
2.5.1	List of uncharacterized neuter plural of the <i>r/n</i> -stems	49
2.5.2	<i>I</i> - and <i>u</i> -stems without numerals	49
2.5.3	<i>I</i> - and <i>u</i> -stems preceded by numerals	51
2.5.4	List of uncharacterized <i>i</i> - and <i>u</i> -stems	52
2.5.5	Uncharacterized neuter plural of <i>r</i> - and <i>l</i> -stems	53
2.5.6	<i>R</i> - and <i>l</i> -stems preceded by numerals	54
2.5.7	List of the <i>r</i> - and <i>l</i> -stems	54
2.5.8	Residual cases	55
2.5.9	Conclusions for the uncharacterized neuter plural	55
2.6	The ending <i>-i</i>	56

2.6.1	Introduction	56
2.6.2	Certain instances from the source material for this monograph	56
2.6.3	<i>Huḫupal</i> (musical instrument)	57
2.6.4	Additional material	58
2.6.5	An ambiguous instance	60
2.6.6	Conclusion	61
2.7	The ending <i>-a</i>	61
2.7.1	Introduction	61
2.7.2	The ending <i>-a</i> with words having common gender	62
2.7.2.1	Introduction	62
2.7.2.2	<i>Alpa-</i> 'cloud'	63
2.7.2.3	<i>Aniyatt-</i> (sumerogram KIN) 'regalia, attire'	66
2.7.2.4	^(GIS) <i>Harpa-</i> 'heap, pile, stack'	70
2.7.2.5	<i>Hašša hanzašša</i> 'offspring'?	73
2.7.2.6	<i>Huda-</i> 'readiness, ability to act swiftly, quickness'	77
2.7.2.7	<i>Hu(wa)hurtalla-</i> 'necklace'	80
2.7.2.8	<i>Kalmara-</i> 'beam, winged object'	81
2.7.2.9	<i>Kuranna-</i> (closing device)	83
2.7.2.10	^(NA4) <i>Ku(wa)nna-</i> 'copper?', 'bead'?	84
2.7.2.11	<i>Šarḫuwant-</i> 'foetus, belly'	87
2.7.2.12	<i>Sarpa-</i> (piece of furniture)	89
2.7.2.13	^(GIS) <i>Šatta-</i> (instrument used for tilling the soil?)	90
2.7.2.14	<i>Šenahha-</i> (<i>šinahha-</i>) 'trap, ambush'	92
2.7.2.15	<i>Šiṭṭa-</i> (pastry)	95
2.7.2.16	<i>Šuḫḫa-</i> 'roof'	96
2.7.2.17	<i>Šupp(a)-</i> 'cattle, animals'	98
2.7.2.18	<i>Tuekka</i> 'body'	100
2.7.2.19	<i>Warsul(a)-</i> 'refreshment, drop, odour'	102
2.7.2.20	<i>Wašpa-</i> 'clothing, cloth'	104
2.7.2.21	<i>Wera-, ura-</i> 'tablet, tray'	107
2.7.2.22	Conclusion	108
2.7.3	Substantivized adjectives from <i>i</i> -stems	109
2.7.3.1	<i>Palḫa</i> 'cups' from <i>palḫi-</i> 'wide'	109
2.7.3.2	<i>Harša</i> 'thick-bread' from <i>harši-</i> 'thick, wide'	110
2.7.3.3	<i>Šuppa</i> 'meat' from <i>šuppi-</i> 'clean'	111
2.7.3.4	<i>Zalta</i> 'cart'	112
2.7.3.5	<i>Wašša</i> 'ingredients' from <i>wašši-</i>	113

2.7.3.6	Evaluation and list of the substantivized adjectives	114
2.7.4	Substantives with the ending <i>-a</i>	115
2.7.4.1	<i>Welluwa</i> 'meadows'	115
2.7.4.2	<i>Iskiša</i> 'backs'	115
2.7.4.3	^{GAD} <i>Huppiyalla</i> (cloth)	116
2.7.4.4	<i>Huhupala</i> (percussion instrument)	117
2.7.4.5	<i>Sahhana</i> from <i>sahhan</i> (feudal services)	117
2.7.4.6	<i>Genuwa</i> from <i>genu</i> 'knees'	118
2.7.4.7	<i>Kuuapalla</i>	118
2.7.4.8	<i>Tuppa</i> 'clay tablets'	119
2.7.4.9	<i>Kinanta</i>	119
2.7.4.10	<i>Mantalli</i>	120
2.7.4.11	<i>Sakuwa</i> 'eyes'	121
2.7.4.11.1	Introduction	121
2.7.4.11.2	<i>Šakunt</i> 'well, spring'	121
2.7.4.11.3	<i>Šakuiš</i> 'well, spring'	122
2.7.4.11.4	IGI ^{BLA} <i>-i</i>	122
2.7.4.11.5	<i>Meni</i> 'face', <i>mena</i> 'cheek'	122
2.7.4.11.6	<i>Šakuiš</i> revisited	124
2.7.4.11.7	The neuter plural <i>šakuwa</i>	125
2.7.4.11.8	Conclusion for the Hittite word for 'eye'	126
2.7.4.12	<i>Wašuwana</i> 'error, sin'	126
2.7.4.13	Evaluation and conclusion	126
2.7.5	<i>Šarāma</i> (type of bread)	127
2.7.5.1	Discussion	128
2.8	The <i>nt</i> -stems	131
2.8.1	Introduction	131
2.8.1.1	Predicative participles with the ending <i>-a</i>	134
2.8.1.2	Predicative participles in singular form	135
2.8.1.3	Attributive participles	139
2.8.1.4	Predicative adjectives in <i>-nt</i>	141
2.8.1.5	Attributive adjectives in <i>-nt</i>	141
2.8.1.6	Evaluation and conclusion	142
2.9	<i>Humant</i> 'all'	142
2.9.1	Introduction	142
2.9.2	<i>Humanta</i>	143
2.9.3	<i>Human</i>	145
2.9.4	Conclusion	146

2.10	The <i>u</i> -stem adjectives	147
2.10.1	Material	147
2.10.2	Evaluation of the <i>u</i> -stem adjectives	150
2.11	The <i>i</i> -stem adjectives	150
2.11.1	<i>i</i> -stems with the ending <i>-a</i>	150
2.11.2	<i>i</i> -stems with the neuter plural ending <i>-i</i>	152
2.11.3	List of <i>i</i> -stem plural adjectives	155
2.12	The <i>a</i> -stem adjectives	156
2.12.1	Material	156
2.12.2	List of the <i>a</i> -stem adjectives	158
2.13	Evaluation of the adjectives which are not <i>nt</i> -stems	158
3	Historical explanation of the Hittite material	159
3.1	Introduction	159
3.2	List of the neuter plurals	159
3.3	Hysterodynamic neuter plurals	163
3.3.1	Introduction	163
3.3.2	Simple <i>r/n</i> -stems	164
3.3.2.1	Introduction	164
3.3.2.2	<i>Widār</i>	166
3.3.2.3	<i>Uddār</i>	169
3.3.2.4	<i>Šakkar</i>	173
3.3.2.5	<i>Huitār</i>	174
3.3.2.6	The genitive of the simple <i>r/n</i> -stems	177
3.3.2.7	Conclusion	178
3.3.3	Complex <i>r/n</i> -stems	178
3.3.3.1	Discussion	178
3.3.3.2	Numerals preceding complex <i>r/n</i> -stems	181
3.3.3.3	Conclusion	182
3.3.4	<i>Utnē</i>	182
3.3.5	^{NINDA} <i>Šarāma</i>	185
3.3.6	Conclusion for the hysterodynamic plurals	186
3.4	Interlude	188
3.4.1	Value of the neuter plural	188
3.4.2	The Hittite material does not fit in	190
3.4.3	Specifications of neuter plurals already dealt with	192
3.4.4	Did PIE have a neuter plural?	193
3.4.5	Nature of the neuter gender	193
3.5	Introduction to the rest of the material	197

3.5.1	Introduction	197
3.5.2	The development of final $*-h_2$	198
3.5.2.1	Conclusion	205
3.5.3	Neuter plural in prehistoric Hittite was rare	206
3.6	The substantives	207
3.6.1	The <i>i</i> - and <i>-stem</i> substantives	207
3.6.1.1	Watkins' theory: $*-ih_2$ and $*-uh_2 > -i$ and $-u$	207
3.6.1.2	Problems with Watkins' theory	209
3.6.1.3	Conclusion for the <i>u</i> -stem substantives	210
3.6.1.4	The <i>i</i> -stem substantives	211
3.6.2	The resonant-stems	214
3.6.3	Conclusion for the uncharacterized neuter plural	214
3.6.4	The ending <i>-i</i>	215
3.6.5	The ending <i>-a</i> ; introduction	218
3.6.5.1	<i>Iskiša</i> 'backs'	218
3.6.5.2	<i>Sakwua</i> 'eyes'	219
3.6.5.3	<i>Welluwa</i> 'meadows'	219
3.6.6	Conclusion for the neuter plural of the substantives	220
3.7	Introduction to the adjectives	220
3.8	Adjectives used as adjuncts	221
3.8.1	Adjectives of the <i>a</i> -stems	221
3.8.1.1	<i>Āra</i> and <i>kunna</i>	223
3.8.2	Introduction to the <i>i</i> - and <i>u</i> -stems	223
3.8.3	The <i>i</i> -stems. Introduction	224
3.8.3.1	<i>Nakki</i> 'important', <i>šanezzi</i> 'odorous' and <i>hantezzi</i> 'first'	225
3.8.3.2	<i>Parkui</i> 'pure, clean'	226
3.8.3.3	<i>Šalli</i> 'great'	228
3.8.3.4	Conclusion for the uncharacterized neuter plural of the <i>i</i> -stem adjectives	228
3.8.3.5	The ending <i>-a</i>	229
3.8.3.6	Conclusion for the <i>i</i> -stem adjectives	231
3.8.4	The <i>u</i> -stem adjectives	231
3.8.5	Conclusion for the <i>i</i> - and <i>u</i> -stem adjectives	231
3.8.6	<i>Tamai</i> 'other'	231
3.8.7	The <i>nt</i> -stems	232
3.8.8	Conclusion for the adjectives used as adjunct	233
3.9	The substantivized adjectives	233

3.9.1	Introduction	233
3.9.2	The <i>i</i> -stems	234
3.9.2.1	<i>Mekki</i> 'big, great'	237
3.9.3	<i>A-aš-šu-u</i> 'goods'	237
3.9.4	The substantivized adjectives revisited	240
3.10	Conclusion for the adjectives	242
3.11	Agreement patterns	243
3.11.1	Introduction	243
3.11.2	Development from neuter singular to neuter plural	245
3.11.2.1	Phase one	246
3.11.2.2	Phase two	246
3.11.2.3	Phase three	247
3.11.3	Conclusion	248
3.12	Concluding remarks	248
	Bibliography	251
	Samenvatting	269
	Curriculum vitae	275

INTRODUCTION

The Anatolian languages written in cuneiform are the oldest recorded Indo-European languages. They have been attested in the second millennium BC in Turkey. The Hittite texts date from 1650-1190. Tablets excavated in Hattuşa (near present Boğazkale), the capital of the Hittite empire, and in other places have yielded a picture of a nation which exercised considerable influence. The Hittite history can be divided into two periods, viz. the Old Kingdom (17th-15th century BC) and the Empire (approximately 1420-1190). For the Hittite language we distinguish three phases: Old Hittite (17th-16th century), Middle Hittite (end of the 15th-beginning 14th century) and Young Hittite (beginning 14th-13th century).

Although we cannot grasp the finest nuances of Hittite, we are able to understand Hittite texts. Hittite is very important for Indo-European linguistics because it is the oldest Indo-European language recorded. Therefore, we would expect Hittite to be the most archaic of all the Indo-European languages.

However, Hittite lacks many features which are typical for the other Indo-European languages. The PIE grammatical categories dual and optative may be mentioned here. Hittite only knows one synthetic preterite tense, whereas other Indo-European languages have at least two preterite synthetic tenses.

Since the decipherment of Hittite in 1915 it has been debated whether Hittite lost such grammatical categories very early or whether it never had them. If it is proved that these grammatical categories have never existed in the Hittite language, the reconstruction of PIE ought to be modified.

This monograph will try to deal with such a problem: the status of the neuter plural. The neuter plural in Hittite can be characterized by an ending *-a* (e.g. *genuwa* from *genu-* 'knee') or by an inherited lengthened grade of the suffix (e.g. *uddār* from *uttar* 'word'). Very often, however, a neuter plural is morphologically uncharacterized and identical to the singular. Only grammatical agreement with plural pronouns and adjectives helps us to determine the number. In other words: in Hittite the nom. acc. neuter is often indifferent to number.

The question is whether the morphologically uncharacterized neuter plural is inherited from prehistoric Hittite or not. If the neuter originally did not have

a plural characterized by $-a < \text{PIE } *-(e)h_2$, the origin and the development of $*-(e)h_2$ will need rethinking.

Connected with the problem of the nature and origin of $*-h_2$ is the fact that there are three grammatical genders in all the older Indo-European languages, viz. masculine, feminine and neuter. The feminine is often characterized by $-a < \text{PIE } *-(e)h_2$. Hittite, the oldest recorded Indo-European language, only has a masculine and a neuter gender. Therefore, one could ask whether or not prehistoric Hittite had a feminine gender.

The feminine ending $-a$ and the neuter plural ending $-a$ are universally regarded as identical: the neuter plural is believed to have been a feminine singular. This is suggested by the fact that sometimes (like in Attic Greek) a neuter plural is accompanied by a verb in the singular.

Since Schmidt 1889 it is agreed upon that originally the neuter plural was a feminine singular, characterized by the ending $*-(e)h_2$. It had collective value: the ending $*-(e)h_2$ often characterized a group of things or people considered a whole. This is illustrated by the $-a$ in e.g. Lat. *familia* 'household'.

Because the older Indo-European languages seem to have had three genders, viz. masculine, feminine and neuter, it is believed that also PIE had three genders.

In Hittite however, the morpheme $-a$ does not characterize the feminine gender. Therefore, the status of the neuter plural, which is believed to be an old feminine singular, becomes problematic. However, it is certain that also in Hittite the verb accompanying neuter plurals appears in the singular. This suggests that also in prehistoric Hittite the neuter plural originally had singular value.

In this monograph I will argue that a good case can be made for the assumption that in prehistoric Hittite the neuter plural was not a feminine singular, but that it was connected with the neuter singular. Hence the title of this monograph: neuter singular — neuter plural: evidence for a connection.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAA	Annals of Archeology and Anthropology, Liverpool
ABoT	Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri, Istanbul 1948
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung, Graz
Av.	Avestan
BiOr	Bibliotheca Orientalis, Leiden
BMECCJ	Bulletin of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan, Wiesbaden
Bo	Inventory numbers of Boğazköy tablets
BoTU	E. FORRER <i>Die Boğazköy-Texte in Umschrift</i> , Leipzig 1922, 1926
BSL	Bulletin de la société linguistique de Paris, Paris
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London
CHD	GÜTERBOCK and H. HOFFNER eds. <i>The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> , Chicago 1980-
CTH	LAROCHE, E. <i>Catalogue des textes hittites</i> , Paris 1971, 2nd ed.
Gk.	Greek
Goth.	Gothic
HAB	SOMMER, F. and A. FALKENSTEIN <i>Die Hethitisch-Akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I</i> , Munich 1938
HBM	ALP, S. <i>Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat Höyük</i> , Ankara 1991
HG	J. FRIEDRICH <i>Die hethitischen Gesetze</i> , Leiden 1959, 2nd ed. 1971
HS	Historische Sprachforschung, Göttingen
HT	<i>Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character in the British Museum</i> , London 1920
HW	J. FRIEDRICH, <i>Hethitisches Wörterbuch</i> , Heidelberg 1952(-54)

- HW 1.,2.,3. Erg. J. FRIEDRICH *Hethitisches Wörterbuch 1.-3. Ergänzungsheft*,
Heidelberg 1957, 1961, 1966
- HW₂ J. FRIEDRICH and A. KAMMENHUBER *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*,
2nd ed., Heidelberg 1957ff.
- IBoT Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzclerinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tablet-
leri(nden Seç me Metinler) 1-4, Istanbul 1944, 1947, 1954,
1988
- IBS Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Innsbruck
- IF Indogermanische Forschungen, Berlin
- IJ Indo-Iranian Journal, Dordrecht/Boston
- JAOS Journal of the American Oriental Society, New Haven
- JCS Journal of Cuneiform Studies, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- KBo Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköy
- KUB Keilschrift Urkunden aus Boghazköy
- KZ Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung, Göttingen
- Lat. Latin
- Latv. Latvian
- Lith. Lithuanian
- MH Middle Hittite
- MHC Middle Hittite Corpus used as source material for this mono-
graph
- MHD Old Hittite texts written in Middle Hittite Ductus used as
source material for this monograph
- MIO Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung, Berlin
- MS Middle Hittite Script
- MSS Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Munich
- MVAeG Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft, Leip-
zig
- NABU Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires, Paris
- NHC Neo Hittite Corpus used as source material for this mono-
graph
- NS New Hittite Script
- OCS Old Church Slavonic
- OE Old English
- OH Old Hittite
- OHC Old Hittite Corpus used as source material for this mono-
graph
- OHG Old High German

- Olc. Old Icelandic
- Oir. Old Irish
- Osc. Oscan
- PIE Proto Indo-European
- RA Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie orientale, Paris
- Skt. Sanskrit
- StBoT Studien zu den Boğazköy Texten, Wiesbaden
- SV J. FRIEDRICH, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethiti-
scher Sprache (MVAeG 31.1, 34.1)*, Leipzig 1926, 1930
- Theth Texte der Hethiter, Heidelberg
- Toch. Tocharian
- VBoT *Verstreute Boğazköy-Texte*, ed. A. GÖTZE. Marburg 1930
- WO Die Welt des Orients, Göttingen
- ZA Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete, Berlin

Part 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Since Schmidt 1889 it is acknowledged among Indo-Europeanists that the neuter plural originally must have had collective value. The collective value of the neuter plural can still be seen in e.g. Greek τὰ δώματα 'palace', which can be regarded as a collection of rooms, and in Latin *loca* 'region'. *Loca* has collective meaning, whereas the common-gender plural *loci* 'places' from *locus* 'place' has distributive meaning. The original collective value of the neuter plural explains the fact that the verb appears in the singular. This situation is still reflected in e.g. Attic Greek and Avestan. In these languages a neuter plural noun governs a predicate in the singular. This is the so-called τὰ ζῶα πρῆξι rule. In this sentence (lit. 'the living creatures walks') the neuter plural τὰ ζῶα is accompanied by the singular predicate πρῆξι. The discovery of Hittite corroborated the theory that the neuter plural originally had collective value, because in this language, too, the neuter plural governs a singular verb, e.g. *ke=ma*¹ *TUPPA*^{U1.Δ} *išhiullaš karū anīyan ēšta* 'These treaty-tablets have already been drawn up.' (see 2.8.1.2).

It is also commonly accepted that PIE had two ways of forming the nom. acc. neuter plural. PIE could use the ending **-h₂*, e.g. PIE **nebhesh₂* which occurs in Gk. νέφη. It also formed the neuter plural by means of a lengthened grade of the suffix, especially in the *r/n*-stems, e.g. **wedōr*, cf. Gk. ὕδωρ. In this connection, the Hittite neuter plural is of high interest for three reasons.

Firstly, it has been claimed that Hittite has preserved the collective value of the neuter plural to a greater extent than the other Indo-European languages. Gertz 1982: 10 points out that *ḫaštai*, which has an ending reflecting a PIE lengthened grade, means both 'bones' and 'skeleton'. This is illustrated in the sentence *n=an munus^{MES} suḫurlaš adanzi ḫa-aš-ta-e=ma ANA É MUḫALDIM pedanzi* 'The maid-servants eat it (viz. the piglet), they bring its *ḫ*. to the

¹ I only write a macron on the *e* when an <CE> or <EC> sign is available. Therefore, I do not transcribe forms like *e-ip-mi* 'I take' and *ti-e* 'not' as *ēpmi* and *īē*. Only forms with true plene writing like *e-eš-ti* 'he is' and *te-e-kán* 'earth' are written with a macron on the *e*.

kitchen.' KUB 17.28 i 23f (24) However, in this sentence it is not clear whether *ha-as-ta-c* means 'bones' (distributive) or skeleton (a collection of bones). A better example might be *ḥastai tepu* 'a small quantity of bone' KUB 7.53 + i 46.

Secondly, some scholars, e.g. Neu 1969 and 1992, Watkins 1975, and Eichner 1985 claim that in Hittite the formations which served in PIE to build collectives were still productive. Melchert 1983a: 144f n. 30 formulates it thus:

"the vitality of the collective plural (type Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca*) as a living category in Hittite has not been fully appreciated."

In other words: formations for building collectives, like the ending **-h₂*, were still used to make collectives, even from common-gender nouns. Stock examples of common-gender nouns which have been claimed to have a neuter plural include *alpa* from c. *alpās* 'cloud' and *šuppala* as opposed to *šuppales* 'cattle'. Eichner 1985: 164 adds e.g. *šankuwai*, which has the appearance of a neuter plural, from c. *šankuwais* 'finger-nail'.

Thirdly, Neu 1969, 1992 and Eichner 1985 claim that Hittite furnishes proof for the hypothesis that the collective originally belonged to the grammatical category of number: besides a singular, plural and dual, PIE would have had a fourth number, a "numerus collectivus" or "Komprehensiv" in the terminology of Eichner 1985: 168.

1.2 DISCUSSION ON THE GRAMMATICAL STATUS OF THE NEUTER PLURAL

1.2.1 Introduction

Gertz 1982 meticulously cites the instances in the Anatolian languages she considers to be neuter plural and provides them, where necessary, with a philological commentary. At the end of her thesis she discusses the neuter plural formations attested in Anatolian. However, despite the extensive material cited and discussed by Gertz, I believe that it is justified to dedicate a separate monograph to the Hittite neuter plural only.

I do not agree with all the interpretations and explanations Gertz offers. It is not necessary to mention all the points I disagree with, because every aspect will be discussed separately. Gertz only discusses the separate endings and deals with their possible Proto-Indo-European origins. This monograph will systematically focus on the original grammatical status of the neuter plural in prehistoric Hittite.

In the source material for this study² there are indications that the endings of the nom. acc. neuter plural showed a distribution. The plural ending *-a < PIE *-(-c)h₂* occurs more frequently in the adjectives than in the neuter substantives. In the substantives Hittite has an uncharacterized plural, e.g. *taru* 'trees', or a lengthened grade in the last syllable, e.g. *ud-da-a-ar* 'words'. The ending *-a* in the neuter substantives occurs mainly in Young Hittite, from Ḫattušili III onwards.

Among the Anatolian languages Hittite may constitute a separate branch. It is generally agreed upon that Cuneiform Luwian, Hieroglyphic Luwian and Lycian A and B belong to the Luwian subgroup. Even Palaic, which is sometimes believed to be closely related to Hittite, has features which rather connect it to the Luwian subgroup. For an exhaustive discussion see Oettinger 1978: 76ff, Wallace 1982 and Melchert 1984b. The data collected by Gertz 1982 and Starke 1990 show that in the non-Hittite Anatolian languages the substantival ending *-a* occurs much more frequently than it does in Hittite. Starke 1991: 47f argues that the ending *-a* and also *-ša/-za* are plural endings because they show agreement with neuter plural adjuncts. He does not know of any instance where *-a* and *-ša/-za* agree with neuter singular adjuncts. Therefore, one must assume that these endings are plural. This also points to Hittite constituting a separate branch in the Anatolian language family.

The source material for this study, especially the Young Hittite material, is considerably smaller than the source material used by Gertz 1982. The Young Hittite texts mainly contain historical texts. Therefore, it is not very likely that copies of old manuscripts containing old forms have been included. Hittite rituals, which have been excluded from the Young Hittite source material, are known to contain Luwisms and irregularities, often caused by modernization of older texts by the scribes. Examples of Luwisms and irregularities are provided by e.g. CTH 446, the ritual for the gods of the nether-world, for which see HW2: 89f, CTH 760, the ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ritual and the rituals cited as CTH 390

² The source material used in this monograph is an augmented version of that used by Weitenberg 1984: 14-21. I added the following texts: for Old Hittite have been added KBo 25.2, 21, 25, 110, 113, 134, 148, 195 and 197 and KBo 30.39 (joins with StBot 25.139). For Middle Hittite KBo 32.1, 197, 198, 201, 202, 203 and 224, the Hittite parts of the Hittite-Hurrian bilingual: KBo 32. 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 24, 27, 29, 37, 47a, 47b, 47c and 122 and finally the Maṣat texts edited by Alp 1991 (cited as HBM). For Young Hittite I also read CTH 566: KUB 22.70 (Tudḫaliya IV) (Ünal 1978: 42ff) and CTH 582: KUB 16.32 + (Tudḫaliya IV) (Ünal 1974: 107 n. 62).

(see Kronasser 1961). As stated by Starke 1990: *passim*, Luwisms frequently occur in 13th century manuscripts. Because the neuter plural ending *-a* occurs frequently in Luwian, it is possible that Hittite borrowed this ending in the 13th century rituals. It is noteworthy and perhaps no coincidence that only from the time of Hattusili III, under whose reign (1264-1239 BC)³ apparently heavy influence from the Luwian sphere began, the ending *-a* in the substantives becomes more frequent.

Before embarking on the discussion of the Hittite material, it is necessary to discuss theories dealing with the grammatical status of the nom. acc. neuter plural.

1.2.2 Was the neuter plural originally a feminine singular?

Schmidt 1889 proposed that the neuter plural originally was a feminine singular. This feminine singular had collective value. His argumentation runs as follows: in the Indo-European languages collectives very frequently are feminine singular. In numerous instances a feminine singular corresponds to substantives with different gender in another language. Feminine nouns characterized by an *-a* frequently have collective meaning, whereas other formations have a more specific meaning, e.g. Lat. *terra* 'land' vs. Osc. *terrum* 'a plot of ground', Lat. *pugna* 'fight' vs. *pugnus* 'fist', *opera* 'trouble, pains, labour' vs. *opus* 'work' and OCS *slama* 'straw' vs. Latv. *salms* 'stalk of straw', and so on. Also Lat. *familia* 'household' is a collective, a collection of *famuli* 'slaves' (Jespersen 1924: 195). Schmidt 1889: 22 has also pointed out that neuter plural forms can have singular meaning, e.g. Gr. *τόξα* vs. *τόξον* both 'bow' and Lat. *regna* vs. *regnum*, both 'power, rule'. All these examples provide evidence that the neuter plural originally had singular meaning.

The hypothesis that the neuter plural originally was a collective, explains firstly the fact that in Attic Greek, Gatha Avestan and sometimes in the Rigveda the neuter plural agrees with a verb in the singular. This is explained by the theory that the neuter plural originally was a feminine singular. Secondly, it accounts for the neuter plurals which are formed from masculine nouns because, according to this theory, they were originally an independent formation, feminine collectives. Stock examples are e.g. Gk. *μῦποι* 'pieces of shin' as opposed to the neuter plural *μῦπα*, which refers to a heap of burnt pieces of shin, Gk. *ὑπὸ καύεω* (usually referring to the sea or the winds/sky) from *ἡ καλευθός* 'road', Lat. *locus* 'place' vs. *loca* 'region' and Gk. *κύκλοι* vs. *κύκλα*. Eichner 1985: 142 n. 56 writes that in the Iliad *κύκλοι* means "konzentrisch um den

Mittelbuckel angeordnete Rippen" on the shield of Achilles. whereas *κύκλα* in Iliad 5.722 and 18.375 can be thought of as a "geschlossenes Ganzes". Eichner 1985: 153 points out that words having the same pattern as Gk. *μῦποι* vs. *μῦπα* do not simply have double gender, because there is no neuter singular. This is illustrated by e.g. Umbrian *uīro*, *uēiro* (= */uīra/*) 'men', a word which corresponds to Lat. *uir* 'man'. Here there is no neuter singular ***uīrom*. We rather have a pattern 'man', pl. 'men' with a collective 'crew'. Eichner 1985: 147 suggests that Umbrian *uēiro* is a direct reflex of PIE **uīrēh₂*.

The Hittite data fit into the theory that the neuter plural originally was a singular, because Hittite also has neuter plurals which have been formed from common-gender nouns, e.g. *alpa* vs. *alpaš* etc. (see 2.7.2).

Secondly, a neuter plural used as subject always agrees with a verb in the singular, e.g. *nu-wa-wa-kan a-pe-ya uddā[r Qa] TAMMA logaru* 'Those words (which caused estrangement between the two clients) must [a]l[s]o fall down.' KBo 2.3 iii 21'f and KUR.KUR^{MES} KUR^{URU} Hatti ... *ḫarganuwan ešta* 'The Hattilands have been destroyed' KBo 6.28 obv. 6.

To sum up, the collective value of the neuter plural is well established. The Hittite material corroborates the view that originally the neuter plural had collective (singular) value.

1.2.3 Did the collective belong to the category of number?

Neu 1969: 240f and 1992 and Eichner 1985 assume that the nom. acc. neuter plural originally did not belong to the category of gender, but to the category of number. Neu and Eichner assume that PIE had, besides a singular, plural and a dual, a separate number category, viz. the collective, in Eichner's terminology "Komprehensiv". Their argumentation goes as follows: many common-gender nouns have, besides their normal common-gender plural ending, an ending *-a*, which has collective value, e.g. Lat. *locus* 'spot', *loci* 'spots' vs. *loca* 'region'. In common-gender nouns the ending *-a* cannot be a neuter ending, because common-gender nouns are not neuter. The *-a* must therefore have a different value. Because the meaning of the ending *-a* is collective, the most logical solution, according to Neu and Eichner, is to regard the collective as a separate number category.

Both Neu and Eichner systematically take the Hittite evidence into account because it fits into the pattern drawn up by Schmidt 1889. As Neu 1969: 240 puts it:

"Das nebeneinander von *alpa* - *alpes* 'Wolken', *suppala* - *suppales* 'Vieh', *ḫašša* *ḫanzašša* - *ḫaššes* *ḫanzaššes* 'Enkel und Urenkel' u.a.m. macht die

³ Gurney 1990: 181.

Herkunft der -a aus einem Kollektivum besonders deutlich."

Neu also points out that in Hittite an attributive adjective agreeing with a nom. acc. neuter plural occurs both as singular and as plural. We have *idalawa uddār* and, more frequently, as Neu states, *idalu uddār* 'evil words'. In Hittite we also find an apparent neuter plural adjective agreeing with a neuter singular, e.g. *dannatta URU-yašēšār* 'empty fortresses' KBo 6.34 iii 29. Neu argues that in this instance the final -a of *dannatta* rather indicates that the -a was a collective ending and not a plural ending. This is all the more likely, Neu contends, because *URU-yašēšār* is singular and not plural. To sum up, Neu 1992: 200 argues that the collective originally was felt as a singular "ohne aber mit diesem identisch zu sein".

Eichner adds that the original collective value of the neuter plural endings is not only found in the nom. acc. neuter plural of the *o*-stems. Hittite also provides evidence that the neuter plural formations of the non *o*-stems had collective value, e.g. c. *šankuwai* 'fingernail'. This word also has a neuter (collective) form *šankuwai*:⁴

GÜB-lašš-a su^{MES}-aš GIR^{MES}-ašš-a *šankuwai dāi* 'And he removes the nails of the left hands and of the feet.' KUB 4.47 obv. 13f (CTH 432)

Eichner mentions further the -att-stem *aniyatt-* 'priestly attire of the king, robes'. The -att-stems always have common gender, e.g. *kartinmīyatt-* 'anger, wrath', see Berman 1972: 155ff. Also important is *šarhuwant-* 'foetus', which has a nom. acc. neuter plural in -a, vs. *šarhuwanta* and an acc. pl. c. *šarhuwantuš*.

Because there are common-gender nouns which also have a neuter plural (e.g. Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca*), both Neu 1969 and Eichner 1985: 167f suggest that we have to reconstruct a four number system for Proto-Indo-European. They claim that PIE had a singular, plural, dual and collective (in Eichner's terminology "Komprehensiv"). The common-gender nouns had all four numbers, whereas the neuter nouns only had a singular, dual and collective. Neuter nouns did not have a plural.

Neu 1969: 240 finds additional proof for his hypothesis that the collective originally belonged to the grammatical category of number, in the results of the investigation by Laroche 1965a: 32ff. Hittite has a genitive ending -an, e.g. *LUGAL-an* in the turn of phrase *LUGAL-an aska-* 'king's gate'. Laroche establishes two things for this genitive. Firstly, it has collective value. Secondly, the ending -an is characteristic for archaic Hittite. The ending -an was used,

⁴ This a hysterodynamic i-stem; see 3.3 where I argue that the nom. acc. neuter plural sometimes has a hysterodynamic form.

according to Laroche, with four categories of nouns. Firstly, it was used with gods, e.g. *DINGIR^{MES}.nan uddār* 'word of the gods' KBo 7.28 41, secondly with people, e.g. dignitaries, family members, etc., e.g. *ta DUMU^{MES}.nan parna paimi* 'I go to the house of the children' KUB 34.119 + iii 17, thirdly with animals, e.g. *šuppalan* (see 2.7.2), and finally it was used with a rest category: e.g. *udniyandan* from *utniyant-* 'country' and *padan* from *pada-* 'foot'. Because the ending -an occurs in archaic texts, Laroche claims that the collective value of the ending -an is original and that this ending only later received plural value. Kammenhuber 1969: 305f and Eichner 1985: 149 n. 99, on the other hand, argue that the plural of the personal pronouns, which ends in -an, e.g. *apenzan* from *apa-* 'that', is a positive indication for the fact that the ending -an originally had plural value. Kammenhuber suggests that in Old Hittite the ending -an is characteristic for animates, whereas the ending -aš is characteristic for inanimates. Eichner similarly points out that the ending -an occurs only in a "gewissen Lexemgruppe" (i.e. animates). He also suggests that, because the dual and the plural coalesced, Hittite created a neo-plural. The old plural ending -an only later received singular/collective value.

To sum up, both Eichner and Neu think that originally the neuter plural did not belong to the neuter gender, because collective formations could also be added to common-gender nouns, e.g. Hittite *alpa-* has a nom. acc. neuter plural form *alpa*. Instead, the collective formed a separate number category besides the singular, plural and dual. Only later the collective number formations became associated with the neuter gender, because they were used to fill the gap for the plural. In other words: both Neu and Eichner posit a transition of the collective from the category of number to the category of gender.

1.2.4 Was the neuter plural originally a neuter singular?

Hardarson 1987: 83 and 1994: 32f suggests that the neuter plural was originally a neuter singular and not a feminine singular. He rejects the claim of Neu 1969: 240f and Eichner 1985 that PIE had four grammatical numbers.

Firstly, Hardarson argues, the verbal system of PIE only shows three number categories. If PIE had a collective number, traces would still be found in the verbal system of the separate daughter languages. This argument has been contested by Neu 1992: 200f. Neu argues that it is not necessary to have verbal agreement patterns for each nominal category. He points out that in the dual too a noun can occur with a verb in the plural (see Schwyzler-Debrunner 1950: 242, 609). Therefore, a collective number in the verb is unnecessary. Moreover, the boundaries between collective and singular vs. collective and plural cannot

be drawn sharply. Ergo, Neu argues, a verb does not need separate collective endings. However, Neu's argument that collective number in the verb is unnecessary is not compelling, since the normal agreement pattern would be dual - dual. The fact that the verb appears in the plural points to a transitional stage in which the dual disappeared in favour of the plural.

Secondly, Hardarson claims, it follows from Eichner's view that PIE did only develop separate endings for the nom. acc. collective and not for the other cases. PIE should have developed separate endings for the other cases of the collective too.

This counter argument can be met by referring to Eichner 1985: 164. Eichner assumes that the neuter plural, which originally was a collective, received its oblique cases from the plural of the common-gender substantives. The reason for this lies in the fact that the neuter gender originally did not have plural endings. Hardarson formulates his hypothesis as follows:

"Der Umstand, der Eichner veranlaßt, eine vierte Numeruskategorie Komprehensiv anzusetzen, nämlich der, daß im Uridg. nicht nur die Neutra, sondern auch die Communia das Kollektivum bilden konnten, hat seinen Grund darin, daß die Kategorie nicht flexionell, sondern derivationell war. Der Übergang vom Kollektivum zum Plural impliziert den Übergang von einer derivationalen zu einer flexionellen Kategorie."

According to Hardarson, the collective, which is the later nom. acc. neuter plural and fem. singular ending, did not have grammatical status. This means that the collective ending was no case ending. It was a suffix which formed derivatives. This was the reason why collective formations could be attached to nouns of both genders. Hardarson 1994: 32f n. 14 also argues against Neu 1992: 200. who posits that the collective was originally felt as a singular without being identical to it. Hardarson remarks that Neu implicitly assumes that originally the collective was a derivational category.

Both the theory that originally the neuter plural was a neuter singular and the hypothesis that originally the neuter plural was a feminine singular, account equally well for the following three facts:

- 1: The neuter plural agrees with a verb in the singular in Attic Greek, Gatha Avestan and Hittite, the so-called τὸ ζῶα πρῆγε-rule.
- 2: Common-gender nouns can form collective nouns in -a by means of derivation, e.g. Lat. *locus* 'place, spot' vs. *loca* 'region'.
- 3: The PIE fem. dual of the *h₂*-stems has the same ending as the nom. acc. neuter dual, viz. PIE *-ih₂*.

A strong argument in favour of the hypothesis that originally the neuter plural

was a neuter singular, is the argument Hardarson puts forward on p. 84, namely that in Hittite the predicative participle referring to a neuter plural usually occurs as singular, e.g.:

ke=ma TUPPA^{U1A} išhiullas karū anıyan ēšta 'These treaty-tablets have already been drawn up' KBo 4.10 i 38 and *kururi^{U1A} kuit meggaya [nini]nkan ēšta* 'Because the enemies mobilized in large numbers' KBo 5.8 ii 35f.

The source material for this monograph seems to confirm this observation. Often, a predicative participle is singular, whereas an attributive participle is plural when it refers to a neuter plural noun. The predicative singular participle contrasts with the attributive participle, which often occurs in the plural, in *šullanda KUR.KUR^{MES}* 'fighting countries' (see 2.8).

If prehistoric Hittite did not have a neuter plural, as is suggested by the nom. acc., it is a legitimate question how the oblique cases of neuter nouns received plural endings. Possibly late in PIE the neuter singular collective ending -a split into a feminine singular and a neuter plural. At this stage the ending -a was both a (collective) singular and a neuter plural and it had two functions. Because the ending -a originally had singular (collective) value, it had no plural endings. Therefore, the neuter plural took the oblique plural endings of the common-gender nouns. Only then it is possible to speak of a true neuter plural paradigm. The plural paradigm kept the old singular ending -a for the nom. acc. and used the original endings of the common-gender nouns in the oblique cases. Nouns which later became feminine, characterized by the suffix **(e)h₂*, remained singular.

Ergo, it is possible to put forward plausible arguments for the hypothesis that the neuter plural in -a originally was a neuter singular. Therefore, the Hittite neuter plural deserves a detailed investigation.

1.3 PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION OF THE HITTITE MATERIAL

1.3.1 Introduction

From 1.4 to 2.13 I will discuss the neuter plural in Hittite from a synchronic perspective. The discussion will be preceded by preliminary remarks on the inner-Hittite situation (1.3.2 and 1.3.3). Very frequently in Hittite a neuter plural is not characterized by a separate neuter plural ending. This means that the plural has the same form as the singular. For instance, *taru* can mean both 'tree' and 'trees'. Therefore, before listing the forms I consider to be neuter plural, it is necessary to discuss the criteria I applied to determine whether a neuter noun is plural or not (1.4). At the end of the introduction (1.5), an

outline will be given of the distribution of the neuter plural forms. From 2.1 onwards, the Hittite material for the neuter plural will be listed and discussed.

1.3.2 Hittite neuter plural already had plural value

Gertz 1982: 10ff points out that in Hittite too the formations used in the other Indo-European languages to form neuter plurals must have developed into a true plural, because in the oblique cases Hittite has plural forms. We have e.g. a dative/locative plural *anīyattas* in *anīyattas-ma-mu kuedas haṭrācs uppi-war-at-mu ne-tta uppaḥhi* 'I will send you the regalia about which you wrote me "send them to me!"' VBoT 1.17 (17) (CTH 151, MHC) and e.g. a dat.loc. plural 11-as ^{GIS} *tuḥupziy[as]* in StBoT 25.27 obv.' 7'. The dat. loc. pl. ending -as added to the numeral 11 indicates that the substantive is plural.

Sometimes it is clearly indicated by the context that the neuter had developed a plural. This is illustrated by e.g. *wedār kue ANA URU^{LIM} arahza n=at udatten šarā=kan kuit watar n=at le udatteni* 'Bring the waters which are outside the city! Do not bring the water which is up (in the city)!' KUB 31.113 i 2f (2) (CTH 275). As Gertz 1982: 10 points out, the single city water source is clearly contrasted with several water sources which are outside the city.

On the other hand, it is sometimes very difficult to establish whether a plural formation is a singular collective or a plural. This is illustrated by *ḥastāi* which can mean 'bone' (singular), 'bones' (plural) and 'skeleton' (collective). This implies that Hittite had kept the original singular/collective value of the neuter plural to a great extent.

1.3.3 The endings of the Hittite nom.acc. neuter plural

The Hittite nouns have a wide variety of nom.acc. neuter plural endings. Friedrich 1960: 43 distinguishes three ways of marking the nom.acc. neuter plural, viz. zero, -a, and -i, whereas Gertz 1982: 5f and passim sees as much as five different formations:

- 1: The ending -a, e.g. *ḥumant-a* from *ḥumant-* 'all'.
- 2: The ending -i, e.g. *iṣḫiul-i* from *iṣḫiul-* 'treaty'.
- 3: Plene writing of the final syllable, e.g. *uddār* (written *ud-da-a-ar*) from *uttar* (written *ut-tar*) 'word'.
- 4: The plural is identical to the singular, e.g. *waṣṭul* 'sin' and *wetan*, the participle formed from *wete-* 'build'.
- 5: Both an ending and a morphophonemic marker occur in one and the same word, e.g. *ḥūpār-i* 'vessels', which has the ending -i combined with a plene written final vowel. Gertz also cites *šaramna*. She suggests that this form contains a zero-grade of the stem suffix -man- and an ending -a.

1.4 CRITERIA FOR NEUTER PLURAL

1.4.1 Introduction

In order to determine whether a given form is neuter plural, it is necessary to apply purely formal criteria. Hittite is an extinct language and consequently, it is not possible to establish a clean-cut distinction between neuter singular and neuter plural based on the meaning only. This is clearly illustrated by *ḥastai*. This word can mean both 'bones' and 'skeleton'. If the plural is not characterized by a separate plural ending, grammatical number can only be determined by means of 'circumstantial evidence'.

1.4.2 Criteria for neuter plural

Gertz 1982: 13 uses four criteria. Firstly, a plural is characterized as opposed to the singular, e.g. *āššawa* vs. *aššu*; secondly, a noun is plural if it is characterized by the Sumerian determinatives ^{U1A} and ^{MES}, e.g. *terippi*^{U1A} 'ploughed fields'; thirdly a noun occurs in a context which clearly demands a plural; finally, if a noun, pronoun or adjective agrees with a neuter plural as identified in one of the above mentioned ways, it is also a plural.

I have used the following criteria and considerations, which to a great extent correspond to the criteria used by Gertz, in order to determine whether a given form is neuter plural.

- 1: Agreement. If an (uncharacterized) neuter agrees with a plural pronoun or plural adjective, it is plural. E.g. *iṣḥarwanta*^{SG} *iš-me-ri* 'bloodstained reins' is plural because of the plural adjective.
- 2: A specific plural marker. This is illustrated by the opposition *ut-tar* 'word' vs. *ud-da-a-ar*. However, one hundred percent proof for plural can only be found in agreement with an adjective of which the plural is different from its singular, e.g. *šuppa ud-da-a-ar* 'holy words' vs. sg. *šuppi*. Therefore, one may state that if two different forms, of which one is clearly a singular, are found, the other can be regarded as plural. Therefore, *ḡenuwa* is plural, because we also have a form *ḡenu* 'knee'.

Consequently, the following formations can be regarded as plural:

- 2a: Plene written final vowel of the *r/n*-stems, e.g. *ud-da-a-ar* 'words' and *ū-i-da-a-ar* 'waters'. However, the material shows that it is sometimes difficult to establish whether a given form is indeed a semantical singular. E.g. *ū-i-da-a-ar* can only be safely established as a neuter plural when it is preceded by a numeral.
- 2b: The *r*-less forms of the *r/n*-stems, e.g. *partawa* without final -*r* as opposed to the form with final -*r*, (e.g. *partawar* 'wing') are considered by

Melchert 1988a to be plurals, because sometimes they agree with neuter plural adjectives or pronouns. However, it must be stated that here also it is sometimes difficult, if not impossible, to establish the grammatical number. This difficulty is perfectly illustrated by e.g. ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*ešša* which has a singular (collective) meaning 'senate'. There is no indication that ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*ešša* is plural. However, because the forms clearly contrast with the forms with an -r, I will discuss these forms sub 2.2 and 3.3.3.

- 2c: The ending -i, if there are also attestations of the same word without this ending, e.g. *išhiul* as opposed to *išhiul* 'treaty'.
- 2d: The ending -a, but only when there are instances where the noun or adjective (or stem class of the adjective) has been attested as singular, e.g. *dannata* is different from *dannatan* 'empty'. However, sometimes the ending -a does not seem to denote a neuter plural but rather a neuter singular (see 1.4.7).

1.4.3 Sumerian determinatives ^{U1A} and ^{MES}

Gertz 1982: 13 also uses the presence of the Sumerian complements ^{U1A} and ^{MES} as a criterion to determine the number of a given noun.⁵ In other words, ^{GIS}^{U1A}-*ru* stands for Hittite /*taru*/ 'trees' and *zuppari*^{U1A} stands for /*zuppari*/ 'torches'. In a few cases neuter plural pronouns refer to uncharacterized neuter plurals, e.g. [*zuppari*]^{U1A} *kue lukkanzi* 'the torches which they light' KBo 27.147 13 strongly supports the claim that ^{U1A} and ^{MES} are complements to plural nouns. In this case to uncharacterized neuter plurals.

However, there are many instances of words with ^{U1A} and ^{MES} having singular pronominal referents. Sometimes they even have a singular Hittite phonetic complement. Therefore, it is not correct to label a form 'neuter plural' only on the basis of ^{U1A} and ^{MES}. I cite:

- a: *anda=ma šumenzan* ^{LÜ}^{MES}*taksulaš* ^{GU4}^{U1A} [*A*] ^{UDU}^{U1A} *anda imiyanza* 'Moreover, the cattle and sheep which belong to you, allies, have been mixed up [with the cattle of the land of Hatti]'. KUB 23.77 a (+) §40.103f (CTH 138, line numbering as in Von Schuler 1965: 117ff, MHC), but cf. ^{GU4}^{U1A} ^{UDU}^{U1A} *anda imiyanteš* ibid. 106 in apparently the same context.
- b: ^{GU4}^{U1A}-*un*. -*Un* is an acc. sg. c. ending. KUB 36.40 + i 6' (CTH 139, MHC)
- c: There are numerous examples of singular verbs and pronouns referring to ^{ERIN}^{MES} 'troops, soldiers' and ^{ANŠE}^{KUR}^{RA}^{MES} 'charioteers', e.g. *nu=šmaš*

⁵ Those complements also mark plural common-gender nouns. Examples are ^{TUG}^{U1A}-*uš* 'garments' StBoT 25.3 i 25' and ^{DINGIR}^{MES}-*eš* StBoT 25.124 ii 3', 9' and 10'.

šusi ERIN^{MES} *ukuuš šarā artaru* 'Sixty heavily armoured soldiers must be at your disposal.' KUB 23.68 + rev. 2 (CTH 133, MHC) and *kuedani=ma=kan ANA ERIN*^{MES} *ukuuš* 'Among which heavily armoured soldiers' ibid. rev. 5. *Kuedani* is a dat.loc. singular. Therefore, behind ^{ERIN}^{MES} *ukuuš* a grammatical singular must be hidden, cf. ^{ERIN}^{MES} ^{URU} *Paḫḫuwaya* [...] *anda ANA ERIN*^{MES} *KUNU QATAMMA iyattaru* 'Just so the troops of Paḫḫuwa shall march with your troops.' KUB 23.72 + 19 (CTH 146). In KUB 23.72 + rev. 18 (CTH 146, MHC) ^{ERIN}^{MES}-*an* has an acc. sg. c. complement. In [*ku*]*iš arḫa tarnumaš=a* [...] ^{ERIN}^{MES}-*az n=an* ^{DUTU}^{S1} *arḫa tarnahḫi* 'Which troops have to be released, I, My Majesty, will release them.' KUB 26.17 i 7f (8) (CTH 261, MHC) ^{ERIN}^{MES} is referred to by the c. sg. relative pronoun *kuiš*.

- d: *mān=za A ŠA*^{U1A}-*na karuḫin šarranzi* 'And when they violate (the boundaries of the) old field.' KBo 6.3 iii 12 f (13) (CTH 291, Laws I §53, MHD). This form is an acc. sg. as is proved by the acc. sg. c. adjective *karuḫin*. The phonetic complement -*na* is an acc. sg. c., cf. the variant KBo 6.6 i "17" *A ŠA*^{U1A}-*an*.

e: [*N*] ^{UMUN}^{U1A}-*ni* StBoT 25.137 iii 9', dat. sg. '[s]eed'.

f: [*takku* *NIM*]*LĀL*^{U1A}-*an kammari kuiški tāiži* '[If] someone steals [bees] in a swarm' KBo 6.3 iv 29 (CTH 291, Laws I §21, MHD). Here ^{U1A} precedes an acc. sg. c. in -*an*, cf. the variant KBo 6.7 15 [*NIM* *LĀL*]-*an*.

g: *nu=wa NAM*^{RA}^{MES} *kuin* [*GU4*]^{MES} ^{UDU}^{U1A} *pe ḫarkanzi nu=war=an=kan daškandu nu=war=an pamawiškandu* 'They shall take the captives, the cat[le] and sheep they are holding and shall confiscate them.' KUB 21.38 obv. 19f. (CTH 176, Ḫattušili III). [*GU4*]^{MES} is referred to by the acc. sg. c. relative pronoun *kuin*.

Therefore, *tamai* in e.g. *nu=šši apēl* [šEŠ-*SU* *kuit* *šamai* *KUR*^{U1A} [*SU*-*i* *šēški* ^{URU} *Ḫattušann=* [*a=šši* *šakuw* [*aššarrit* *zi-it*]] ^{URU} *Kātapann=a* *pešta* 'Because his brother [has handed] the country to him, he wholeheartedly gave [him both] Ḫattušša and the town Kātapa.' KUB 21.27 + i 27ff (28) (CTH 384, Ḫattušili III, NHC) is not a certain instance of a nom.acc. neuter plural.

1.4.4 Numerals preceding a neuter plural

Neu 1970: 57 points out that in the Old Hittite thunderstorm-ritual neuter nouns mostly have a singular form when they are preceded by a numeral higher than one, e.g. 2 ^{NINDA} *wagatas* 2-*aḫḫi* StBoT 12 ii 31. Common-gender nouns, on the other hand, usually appear in their plural form when they are preceded

by numerals higher than one, e.g. 2 ^{NINDA} *harsaus*, StBoT 12 ii 43.

However, as Neu points out, sometimes common-gender nouns occur in their singular form when they are preceded by a numeral higher than one, e.g. 15 ^{NINDA} *harsis* GE₆ ... [(*kitt*)a] 'There [(ar)]e 15 dark bread-loaves' (lit. '15 dark bread-loaves lie') StBoT 12 i 37. In this instance the singular predicate *kitta* proves that 15 ^{NINDA} *harsis* is a grammatical singular. Its plural would be *harsaš*. There are more examples of common-gender singular nouns preceded by numerals higher than one, e.g. *ta ciš-ru kattan* 1^{EN} 5 *alkištāš-šis* StBoT 25.3 iv 16 'Down, there is one tree, five are its branches' (CTH 416, OHC). Here we have c. sg. *alkištāš-šis* instead of c. pl. *alkištēš-šeš*. Also 5 *gapinan* '5 threads' ibid. iv 15 and 3⁷ ^{NINDA} *kištun* 'three k.-loaves' StBoT 25.19 obv. 4 are illustrations of common-gender singular nouns preceded by numerals higher than one.

Occasionally the *r/n*-stems with the suffixes *-eššar*, *-atar*, and *-(a)war* show a characterized form (type ^{NINDA} *wagešša*) in Old Hittite, when they are preceded by numerals higher than one, e.g. 3 *wagešša* (see 2.2.3). These forms do not occur in Young Hittite. Melchert 1988a argues that the *r*-less forms are plurals. However, there is no compelling evidence that these forms are indeed characterized plurals, because their meaning rather seems to be collective, e.g. ^{LU} *šū.GI-ešša* does not mean 'old men's councils' but 'senate' (see 2.2.2 for a survey and discussion of the material). Since these forms are archaisms, the collective meaning of the *r*-less forms must be archaic. Only later, these forms received plural meaning.

Therefore, there is no evidence that the uncharacterized forms of the *i*- and *u*-stems preceded by numerals higher than one are plural. They might just as well be grammatical singulars.

On the other hand, a remark must be added. As Neu 1970: 57, already pointed out, communia preceded by nouns higher than one as a rule, i.e. mostly, occur in their plural form. For the neuters the situation seems to be the opposite: they appear in their singular form. However, the form 11-*aš tuḫupzi* [aš] (see 1.3.2) suggests that neuter words could appear as plural when they were preceded by a numeral higher than one. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that numerals higher than one indicate that a given form is plural.

In summing up, as we saw, Hittite has some examples of common-gender singular nouns preceded by numerals higher than one, e.g. (5 *gapinan*). Therefore, it is not correct to consider any given neuter preceded by a numeral higher than one to be an uncharacterized plural. One must conclude that instances like 8 *etri* 'eight dishes' are possible plurals.

1.4.5 Enclitics and potential sentence connectives

The neuter plural in *-a* must not be confused with instances which simply show the enclitic *-(y)a* 'and'. I cite:

a: [š(*umās*)] *uktūri* ^{NINDA} *harsin išpant* [(*u*)]*zzi-ya* 'F[(or you)] for ever thick loaves(?) and wine-r[(a)]tions' StBoT 25.3 ii 43⁷; *argamanuš h[a]zziu-ya* 'tributes and h.⁶' KUB 17.21 + ii 12 (CTH 375, MHC)
These forms are singulars, followed by the enclitic *-ya* 'and', which connects single words.

b: *nu-kan šā* ^{B1} *KUR^{TI} aššu* <*tarawian takšul aššul mi-ya* [tar]-*r-a* *iyandu* 'They shall create good(ness), tarawian, peace, well-being and pros[pe]rity in the country.' KBo 11.1 obv. 28 and ibid. 31 *nu-kan šā KUR^{TI} aššu takšul mi-ya-tar-r-a kišaru* 'Let good(ness), peace and prosperity arise in the country', cf. ibid. 44. (CTH 382, NHC)
The *-a* in *mi-ya-tar-ra* is the particle *-a* 'and'.

c: *takku* ^{LÜ.NAM.U19.LU-AN} *kuiški parkunuzzi kuptarr-a uk* [(*tūriaš* *peda*)] *takku* (*u*)-*at-a* *an parna-ma kuēka peššizzi n-a* *āki* 'If someone purifies a man, he also [(bring)]s the *k*. to the p[(yre)]', but if he brings it to somebody's house, he shall die.' KBo 6.2 ii 34f. (Laws I §44b, OHC)⁷ Since Old Hittite still had a distinction between *-e*, which refers to plural objects, and *-at*, which refers to singular objects,⁸ *kuptarra* is not a neuter plural in *-a*.

d: *ku-uš-ša-na* KBo 6.2 ii 29 (Laws I §42, OHC), which is paralleled by the Middle Hittite duplicate KBo 6.3 ii 51 *ku-uš-ša-an-na*, is a singular followed by the enclitic *-a* 'and'. The Young Hittite duplicate KBo 6.5 iv 10 gives *ku-uš-ša-an* here, which proves *kuššan-a* 'and' and 'loan'.

1.4.6 Spellings *a-e-a* and *a-e*. Introduction

Word final *-a-e-a* and *-a-e* do not necessarily contain the full grade of the suffix of the *i*-stems (*-aya*) as Watkins 1982: 259 suggests. He mentions the spellings *-a-e-a* in *pa-ha-e-a* ^{B1.A} 'cups' KUB 31.144 ii 22 and *šu-up-pa-e-a* 'meat' KBo 20.24 obv.⁷ ii 6 (= StBoT 25.13 iii 9'). Watkins argues that these forms have to be segmented into *palhae* + *a* and *šuppae* + *a*. He suggests that the *-e* stands

⁶ For this word see Weitenberg 1984: 246f. Von Schuler 1965: 165f also cites a plural *ha-az-zi-wis-ta* KUB 32.133 i 10 and another singular in *apodani UD-ti ha-az-zi-š-e NU GAI kuiti* 'On that day there is no h.' KUB 27.60 ii 14.

⁷ I read the sequence written as *tak-ku-ua-at-a-an* as *takku-a-at-a-an*. *-An* is the particle *-an* which occasionally occurs with verbs of 'bringing, carrying', cf. Boley 1989: 72ff.

⁸ See Otten 1976a: 307.

for *-ya-* followed by *-a* and'. We have to translate 'and cups' and 'and meat'. In addition to *šu-up-pa-e-a* and *pal-ḥa-e-a*, Watkins 1982: 259 reads *ta-ma-a-e* 'other' KBo 20.18 + rev. 4' (= StBoT 25.65) as */tamaya/*.

Therefore, he argues, we have the neuter plurals */palḥaya/*, */šuppaya/* and */tamaya/*.

However, an alternative analysis is possible. One can also read *tamai* and *šuppa-ya* 'and meat'. *Palḥa-ya* may also be interpreted differently. The argumentation will be given in the following sections.

1.4.6.1 Phonetic value of the sign <E>

The sign <E> sometimes stands for */ya/*. In Boğazköy Akkadian this is not uncommon (Durham 1976: 273, 326 n. 451/453). Hittite also gives evidence for this phenomenon, e.g. *anda-e-še* for *anda-ya-še* 'and additionally to him' KBo 6.26 iii 30 (Laws ii §38, OH/NS). Here the reading */ya/* for the sign <E> is unavoidable.

Written <E> can also stand for *i*. There are indisputable instances of *ai*-stems which clearly have singular *-a-e*. Therefore, in these instances *-a-e* must be taken as *-ai*. A very clear example is seen in the sentence ^{UZU}NIG.GIG-*ma kuwapi* [] *nu-ššan* [] *kuitki kallar ša-ga-a-e kišar*[*i*] *n-az* *ul ūḫḫi zig-a-al-kan le wa'* [...] ^{ANA} ^{UZU}NIG.GIG-*ia ta-ma-a-e ša-ga-a-e* [] *dameuman nu kuis apinššuwān*... 'But when there is a liver inspection [] and when some (sg.) sinister (sg.) omen occurs, and I do not see it and you do not [report it], [and when] another strange omen in the liver [occurs], who [sees] such [an omen], the gods of the oaths shall punish him.' KBo 16.46 obv.⁹ 7'f (CTH 212, MHC) The singular adjectives and pronouns *kuitki* and *kallar*⁹ and possibly *dameuman* — if no word preceding it has been lost — prove that the forms in *-a-e* are singular. They are mere spelling variants of *-a-i/-a-t*, as we have in e.g. *ḥa-aš-ta-(a)-i*. Additional proof for *a-e* as */ai/* is suggested by several spellings for the acc. c. of the *ai*-stems, e.g. *li-in-ga-en* KUB 36.108 obv. 10 (OHC) from *lingai* 'oath'. *Li-in-ga-en* certainly stands for */lingain/* (see also Weitenberg 1979: 291 – 293).

Sometimes <E> stands for the glide */y/*. Melchert 1984a: 163 mentions *appa-e-a ḥekta* 'and he bows back' KBo 20.10 i 6 (= StBoT 25.59, OHC), *ḥa-a-l-i-i-e-aš*, the dat.loc. pl. from *ḥali* 'pen, corral' KBo 6.2 iii 48 (Laws I §66, OHC) and *parna-še-e-a* 'and into (?) his house' (Laws, passim). Two

⁹ Starke 1990: 355f suggests that *kallar* is a Luwian substantive meaning 'nefas'. I do not see any reason to take *kallar* as a substantive here. Melchert 1993: 93 points out that there is no positive evidence that this word is Luwian.

other examples for the sign <E> used to denote */y/* are provided by Neu 1968: 35 n. 5, cf. *a-ku-wa-an-na-e-a* 'und (auch) zum Trinken' KBo 11.34 i 10 and *ka-a-e-a* 'and here' KBo 11.51 iv 8. Melchert reads the sign <E> as */ya/* and writes "the OH spelling <E>-(<A>) for */ya/* ... where the value */ya/* for the sign *e* is unavoidable". Therefore, if we want to follow Melchert's train of thought we have to read */ḥa-li-ya-aš/*.

However, it still remains possible that the <E> is simply used to express the glide */y/* and not as */ya/* because the phonetic value of *ḥa-a-l-i-i-e-aš* is */haliyas/* with a glide. Also in *appa-e-a* and in *a-ku-wa-an-na-e-a* the <E> is used to express */y/*.

1.4.6.2 Tamae

For *ta-ma-a-e* Watkins 1982: 259 assumes */tamaya/*, with <E> for */ya/*. However, there are, as far as I know, no nom.acc. neuter plural instances written as *ta-ma-ya*. On the other hand, the instances quoted in 1.4.6.1 provide unambiguous support for a reading */tamāi/*. Therefore, *ta-ma-a-e* quoted by Watkins must be interpreted as */tamāi/*.

Final */āi/* for *-a-a-e* is also found in ^{NA4}*ta-ḥa-ap-še-it-ta-a-e* StBoT 25.29 obv.⁷ ii 3' (OHC). Neu 1983a: 183 n. 543 mentions ^{NA4}*ta-ḥu-pa-aš-ta-i* 594/b obv.⁷ 3' with an <I>, "Wohl der gleiche Stein, aber in anderer Graphie und Lautung(?)".

1.4.6.3 Pal-ḥa-e-a^{H1.A}

In this paragraph I will argue that *pal-ḥa-e-a^{H1.A}* may be read as *palḥa-ya^{H1.A}*. This form occurs in Old Hittite:

- GAL *šukšiši pal-ḥa-e-a^{H1.A}* GAL *šuk[š]iši* StBoT 25.110 ii 22. This sentence can be translated as 'You keep filling the [la]rge [...] and you [keep] filling the large cauldrons.'

This form represents */palḥaya/* followed by the Sumerian determinative ^{H1.A}. On the exact interpretation of this passage the opinions diverge.

Melchert 1984a: 163, limits himself to establishing *palḥa* followed by *-ya* 'and' and states that the context calls for an enclitic.

An objection to this interpretation is raised by Gertz 1982: 18. She points out that, to her knowledge, there are no examples of the enclitic particle *-ya* 'and' followed by ^{H1.A}. She opts for a nom.acc. neuter plural */palḥaya/*. CHD vol. P: 66 also reads */palḥaya/*. This seems to settle the matter.

However, the nom.acc. neuter plural in *-aya* otherwise occurs only in young texts and in adjectives which are not substantivized, in contrast to *palḥa* 'cups' from *palḫi* 'wide'. We have (instance a — c from Gertz 1982: 116ff):

mekki 'great'

a: *nu kūruri*^{U1A} *kuit me-ig-ga-ya* [nini]nkan *ēšta* 'Because enemies had been mobilized] in large quantities' KBo 5.8 ii 35 (CTH 61, NHC), and *nu mān ūnute*^{U1A} *me-ig-ga-ya* KUB 46.42 iii 2 'And if there are utensils in large quantities' (p. 116f).

parkui 'clean'

b: *pār-ku-wa-ya* *tūg*^{U1A} *waššan ḥarkandu* 'Let them wear clean clothes.' KUB 13.4 i 16 (cf. *ibid.* i 23, and iii 62), *ē*^{U1A} *DINGIR*^{MES} *-kunu* [*pār-ku-wa-e ēšdu* 'Let your temples be clean.' KUB 15.42 ii 32f (33). Here the ending *-a-e* must be read as /aya/ for reasons mentioned sub 1.4.6.1, and *GIM-an pār-ku-wa-ya waššēski* 'As you keep wearing clean (clothes).' KUB 24.7 ii 9 (p. 118)

danku 'dark'

c: *zi*^{U1A} *mu tarsikiši da-an-ku-wa-ya-wa* *kur-e* [ki]šširi-tta *teḥḫi* 'Yo!u repeatedly say to me: "I put the dark lands in your [ha]nd".' KBo 3.16 + iii 10f, and *namma da-an-ku-wa-ku-e* [waššān] *harzi* 'The dark (clothes) he has [wor]n ...' KUB 7.53 ii 49f (49) (p. 123f)

warḫui 'rough'

d: [LU]GAL-*uš-za aniyatta dāi ḥargauš*^{KUS} *ESIR-uš kiš[-zi]* *šarkuizzi warḫuin* *tūg-a[n]* *warḫuwaya* *tūg.gū.ē.a waššizi* 'The [king] takes his adornments, he puts on his shining shoes, he wears his rough garment, (and) his rough robes.' KUB 57.76 i 6ff' (9')

The fact that we so frequently find *-aya* added to adjectives used as adjuncts, makes both solutions (*palḫa-ya* 'and cups' and *palḫaya* 'cups', with full grade of the suffix) not very attractive.

Laroche 1947: 202 reads G_AL *šuskiši pal-ḫa-e-a*^{U1A} G_AL *š[us]kiši* as [G_AL] *šuskiši pal-ḫa-e* ^{U1A} G_AL *š[us]kiši* 'You keep filling large [cauldrons] and you keep filling large cauldrons with water.' Laroche takes the sign <A> as the sumerogram A 'water' followed by the Sumerian complement ^{U1A}.

Gertz 1982: 18 objects that *palḫae* would point to an *ai*-stem, which is not likely because in other cases *palḫi* is an *i*-stem. This objection can be met by referring to the fact that <E> sometimes stands for *-ya* (see 1.4.6.1). In that case we have a full grade *-aya*. Gertz also writes that she does not know any parallel to *palḫae* ^{U1A} G_AL. The nearest parallel she knows of is *palḫi*^{U1A} A 'cauldrons of water'.

CHD vol. P: 66 argues against the interpretation offered by Laroche that a translation 'large p.vessels' is not possible because *palḫae* and G_AL would not be separated by ^{U1A} 'water'. The resulting translation 'large p.vessels with

large water' does not make sense. This convincingly eliminates Laroche's interpretation. Therefore, *pal-ḫa-e* ^{U1A} 'cauldrons with water' has to be rejected.

We have to read then *pal-ḫa-e-a*^{U1A} and one can assume with CHD vol. P: 66 and Gertz 1982: 18 /*palḫaya*/ 'cups', with full grade of the suffix followed by the ending *-a*.

Therefore, for *pal-ḫa-e-a*^{U1A} G_AL two solutions are possible: *palḫaya*^{U1A} G_AL 'big cauldrons' and *palḫa-ya*^{U1A} G_AL 'and big cauldrons'. The former solution suggests that this form is the first example of *-aya*.

Despite the obvious difficulties one may still prefer to read this sequence as *palḫa-ya*^{U1A} G_AL 'and big cauldrons'. I think that a strong argument may be found in *palḫa ḥumandan* [da] KUB 17.6 i 6. Here we have the form *palḫa* without an enclitic. Melchert 1989: 182 emends this instance to *palḫan ḥumandan* by pointing to its duplicate KUB 17.5 i 11 *našta*^{DUG} *palḫan ḥumandan ekuer* 'They drunk (of) all the basins.' Melchert suggests that *palḫan* is a genitive plural. This is not necessary, because *palḫan* may also be a acc. sg. c. (CHD vol. P: 66).

In summing up, there is a possibility that in *pal-ḫa-e-a* the *e* may be read as a glide /y/. In that case the form can be read as /*palḫa-ya*/ 'and cups'. If one does not accept this suggestion, *palḫaya*^{U1A} is the first example of the full grade *-aya*. However, KUB 17.6 indicates that *palḫa* actually existed.

1.4.6.4 *Šu-up-pa-e-a*

This leaves only *šu-up-pa-e-a* as evidence that *-a-c-a* represents the full grade of the suffix of the *i*-stems (*suppaya*) as Watkins 1982: 259 suggests. However, this form appears without context. Nevertheless, with Melchert 1984a: 163 and Neu 1983a: 174 "the context calls for an enclitic", one can assume an enclitic particle *-ya*. Moreover, /*šuppaya*/ would be the only nom. acc. neuter plural form of the word 'meat' with intervocalic *-y*.

1.4.6.5 Conclusion on the phonetic value of <E>

In summing up, the hypothesis that *pal-ḫa-e-a*, *šu-up-pa-e-a* and *ta-ma-a-e* stand for /*palḫaya*/, /*šuppaya*/ and /*tamaya*/ is disputable. In older Hittite there is no conclusive evidence for full grade *-aya*- attested in the *i*-stem adjectives.

1.4.7 Neuter singulars in -a

1.4.7.1 Forms attested in the source material for this monograph

Forms ending in *-a* may be singulars and do not necessarily contain the neuter plural ending *-a*. Hittite seems to have words ending in *-a*. They are only

apparent plurals because they seem to have an agreeing singular pronoun or adjective. These words must be left out of the discussion. In my source material I found the following words:

- a: *Kuṣata* 'dowry': *kuṣata-ma kuit piddāit n-aš-kan šamenzi* 'He gives up the dowry he has brought' KBo 6.3 ii 14f (14) (CTH 291, Laws I §30, MHD).¹⁰ *Kuṣata* is referred to by the neuter sg. relative pronoun *kuit*.¹¹

¹⁰ *Šamen* 'withdraw' is an intransitive verb, because it is constructed with the enclitic anaphoric pronoun *-aš*. In Hittite this pronoun cannot be the subject of a transitive verb (Garret 1990: 107ff).

¹¹ The root of *kuṣata* probably has an Indo-European etymology. *Kuṣata* occurs in the paragraphs 29, 30, 34, 35 and 36 and not in the oldest version (text A) of the law-code. Only in the MHD copy B *kuṣata* occurs for the first time. It occurs also in the vocabulary text KBo 1.35 15. A gen. sg. occurs in KBo 2.9 i 36 (35) *nu-ṣta kur URU-pa-ti ku-ū-ša-da-aš ḥašammarāš-ṣe parkuṣ kur-e ēšdu* 'The land of Ḥatti must be a shining country for you (because) of (its) treasure(s) and (its) capacity for procreation.'

The nom.acc. *kuṣata* together with the genitive *kuṣadaš* suggests that *kuṣata* is an *a*-stem.

Concerning the etymology of this word a number of suggestions have been made. Čop 1957: 139ff suggests a connection with OE *hȳr* 'rent'. This has been refuted by Kimball 1983: 461 and 618f n. 17 and 18. Since Čop explains the long vowel by *-u₂*, Kimball considers the long vowel a problem. She argues that Hittite would have had *kuṣ(h)š*, cf. *tuṣš*, *tuṣḫuš*. Eichner 1973: 98 n. 78 connects *kuṣata* with PIE **ǵeus* 'taste, enjoy' and suggests that *kuṣata* is an *r*-less form of **kušatar*. Apart from the semantical difficulties, the genitive *kuṣadaš* argues contra an *r/n*-stem, because we would have had a gen. ***kušannas*. Therefore, it is more likely that *kuṣata* is an *a*-stem.

Kimball 1983: 461 connects *kuṣata* with Goth. *huzd*, OE *hoard* and OHG *hort* 'treasure' < **kūs-d-ō*. For *kuṣata* she (p. 618f n. 19) tentatively suggests a neuter plural/collective **kēus-od*(^h)-*ch₂*. However, a thematic *o* in front of a *d*(^h)-suffix is unusual. We would rather have **kē(e)us-d-ō*, which would have yielded Hittite ***kuša*.

Weitenberg 1975 proposes to connect *kuṣata* with *kuša* 'bride' and ^{LU}*kuša* 'son-in-law'. Because *kuṣata* does not occur in the oldest version of the law-code, it is possible to assume with him, following Otten 1966: 124, that the Hittites took over the tradition of giving dowries from Mesopotamia. According to Weitenberg, this suggests that *kuṣata* was formed in the Middle Hittite period. Weitenberg proposes to derive *kuṣata* from *kuša* with a suffix *-ta*. *Kuša* 'bride' could have the same root as Gk. *xoṓros* 'female genitals'. A connection like this is not impossible, cf. *pešna* 'man' < **pes-no* cf. Lat. *pēnis*, Gk. *πίος* < **pēs-os* 'penis'.

and is an inner Hittite derivative from *kuša* 'bride'. *Kuṣata* must be a neuter singular in *-a* because it is referred to by the neuter singular relative pronoun *kuit*. This may imply that the *-a* was a neuter singular ending.

- b: *Manawa*: 1 *ma-na-wa* KÜ.BABBAR 'one *manawa* silver' KUB 15.5 + ii 23' (CTH 583, Ḥattušili III) *Manawa* is singular because of the numeral 1.

1.4.7.2 Problematic cases

Because Hittite does not seem to object to a neuter singular in *-a*, I do not consider those words a nom.acc. neuter plural of which, to my knowledge, only a nom.acc. in *-a* has come down to us:

- a: ^{GIS}*šamama* KUB 17.10 ii 15 (CTH 324, MHD). See Ertem 1974: 1ff for more attestations.
- b: [(^{KUŠ}*ta*)]*ruša* KBo 6.3 iv 4 (CTH 291, Laws I §78, MHD)
- c: ^{GIS}*murta*: *n-ašta* ^{GIS}*murta* *tuē-ṣa karašandu* 'They shall cut off your *murta*.' HBM 72 obv. 9j¹²
- d: ^{GIS}*eya* (kind of tree): *eya* and *eyan* seem to be mere variants. In Laws I §50 61f *nu apē[li ē-zu] kuela* ^{GIS}*e-ya-an āški-šši šakuwān a[rāuwān]* 'Then hi[s] house is fr[ee] at the gate of which an *eya*-tree is visible.' KBo 6.2 ii 62 (OHC) gives ^{GIS}*eyan* whereas KBo 6.3 iii 2 (MHD) gives ^{GIS}*eya*. In the MHD texts the variants alternate, cf. ^D*Telbinuwaš piran* ^{GIS}*e-ya arta* ^{GIS}*eyaz-kan* UDU-*aš* ^{KUŠ}*kuršaš kankanza* 'In front of Telepinu an *eya*-tree has been placed, a sheep-fleece hangs from the *eya*-tree.' KUB 17.10 iv 27f (28) (CTH 324) and *ištananz* 1.0 ^{DIM-aš} ^{GIS}*e-ya-an katta dāi* 'The man of the storm-god places an *eya*-tree near the altar.' KBo 24.110 + iv 10f (10). This alternation makes me reluctant to attribute the label 'plural' or 'collective' to the final *-a* of *eya*.
- e: *Pi(e)ta* 'allotment', 'something one is lawfully entitled to':¹³ *pi-id-da-ya-kan* ^M*Šahurunuwāš istu* [NA]M.RA^{BI.A} ^{GIS}*tukul-it* [ANA ^M*Taddamaru*] *ū ANA* ^M*Duwattannani pešta* 'And the allotments Šahurunuwa gave [to

It seems better to follow Weitenberg's suggestion than to follow Kimball. Kimball's reconstruction with an *-o* in front of the dental suffix is difficult. Weitenberg's suggestion takes the Hittite chronology into account and is therefore to be preferred.

¹² The stemformation of this word is unusual. In the same letter, l. 35 we find *murtanza*: *zik-mu* ^M*Zūš* ŠEŠ.DUG.GA-YA ^{GIS}*murtanza* EGIR-*pa* PABILA *ū* ḥatrai 'My dear brother, write back to me in Babylonian about the matter of the *murta*-wood.' Alp 1991: 341 suggests that *murtanza* is an ablative.

¹³ Sørenhagen 1985: 56ff.

Taddamaru] along with the [cap]tives he had taken by force' KUB 26.43 obv. 6f (6) (CTH 225, Tudhaliya IV)¹⁴

1.4.7.3 Material for a 'collective' in -a provided by Neu

Neu 1992 gives additional material in order to support his hypothesis that Hittite has preserved the collective value of the neuter plural to a large extent (see 1.2.2 and 1.2.3). He gives additional material taken from the Young Hittite inventory texts (edited by Košak 1982 and Siegelová 1986). In these texts forms which end in -a, and therefore look like a neuter plural, frequently occur preceded by the akkadographic *1^{NUTUM}*, *1^{NUTUM}(M)* (= Akkadian *ISTE(N)NUTUM*, *ISTE(N)NUTI(M)* 'a set of' *ISTĒNŪ* 'a single') or by *TAPAL* 'a pair'. It is generally agreed upon that these akkadographic complements require the plural, e.g. 2 *TAPAL* EMEXAŠ.ME GUŠKIN [ŠA] *1^{NUTUM}* *hašhantes* KUB 42.64 rev. 9' 'two (pair of) fillets and votive discs made of gold, one of which polished'. The common-gender plural participle shows that in this instance the rule is correct. Sometimes words are preceded by Akkadian *TAPAL* 'a pair'. As Neu 1992: 206 argues, an instance like 3 *TAPAL* TÖGNIG.LAM ŠA *1^{NUTUM}* ...

¹⁴ *Pietta* is generally considered to be a neuter plural in -a. It has been attested as *pitta* and *pietta*. However, to my knowledge, no singular ***piettan* has been attested. There are two attestations which suggest that *pi(e)tta* may be plural (see Puhvel 1979: 213f and Sørensen 1985: 58f for attestations):

- ANA ¹⁴ *Zithariya kue ukturi pi-it-ta ešta* 'The u. (and) allotments which belonged to Zithariya' KUB 4.1 i 12f (CTH 422). Sørensen 1985: 60 translates 'Welche beständigen *pitta* dem Gotte Zithariya gehörten' and takes *ukturi* as an adjective agreeing with *pitta*. In that case the relative pronoun *kue* refers to *ukturi* *pitta*. However, if *ukturi* is a substantive as in Laws i §44b, the neuter plural relative pronoun *kue* must refer both to *ukturi* and to *pi-it-ta*. As a consequence, there is no one hundred percent proof that the -a in *pitta* is the neuter plural ending.
- *harkanass-a lu* ¹⁴ *GIS.TUKUL kuš A ŠA¹⁴ Ša-an-na-a-at-ta-ya kue pi-e-it-ta ne-e-tta* *hūmlan gulašsan ešdu* KUB 31.84 iii 66f (67). With Sørensen 1985: 59 one can translate 'Both which field of a deceased small allotment holder (there is) and which separate p. exist, that all must be recorded for you'. Following Neu 1968: 152 n. 2 and Laroché 1949: 73 n. 4, Sørensen takes *šannata* as a neuter plural from *šannati* (?) 'separate', derived from *šanna*- 'one' and argues that the neuter plural relative pronoun *kue* agrees with *šannata* and *pietta* 'which separate p.'. However, *šannatta* (?) is a hapax. Therefore, it is not certain that it is derived from *šanna*- 'one'. Therefore, one might also translate this passage as 'The land of a deceased small allotment holder and which *šs* are p., that all must be recorded for you'. In that case *kue* refers to the nom. acc. plural *šannatta* 'which *šs*'. The neuter plural -e of the anaphoric pronoun in *ne-e-tta* may refer both to *ša-an-na-a-at-ta-ya* and to *pi-e-it-ta*. As a consequence, p. may not have an agreeing adjective or pronoun.

1^{NUTUM}-ma ... 1^{NUTUM}-ma 'three splendid garments, one of which ... one of which, however, ... one of which, however' KUB 38.3 i 16f rather suggests a translation of *1^{NUTUM}* with only a numeral. Therefore, Neu suggests that e.g. *1^{NUTUM} hūhūrtalla* KUB 43.59 i' 8 'one necklace' must be considered a collective, 'ein Gegenstand also, der aus mehreren Einzelgliedern besteht. aber komprehensiv (kollektivisch) zu verstehen ist ...'.

Neu 1992: 211 n. 23 considers a neuter singular ending -a a totally isolated phenomenon. Therefore, he claims that all forms in -a are 'collective' plurals. If a singular has not been attested, it must be regarded as a 'plurale tantum'. These 'pluralia tantum' are, according to Neu p. 207f, relics of ancient collectives.

However, for the neuter nouns this hypothesis raises a few problems. Firstly, the neuter plural is frequently uncharacterized and may in fact be a singular. Secondly, because of that, the outer appearance — to put it bluntly: we have an -a and therefore the word must be plural — is not necessarily indicative. In the following instances (taken from Siegelová 1986) formations which can be considered a neuter plural are accompanied by neuter singular adjuncts (a: the ending -a, b + d: *TAPAL*, c: *1^{NUTUM}*).

- a: 2 *ša-kán-ta-ad-da-ra palhi* '2 wide *šs*.' KUB 42.78 obv. i 22'

If this word were a grammatical plural, we would have *palhaya* or *palha*, especially in young texts (see 2.11).

- b: 3 *TAPAL* *hūbi¹⁴ A* *GUŠKIN pittahwan* 'three pair of earrings made of gold, simple' KUB 42.38 obv. 16
c: *1^{NUTUM} PENKI* *GU[ŠKIN N]_A 2-ŠU harpan* 'One handle made of gold and gems, h-ed twice' KUB 42.64 rev. 7'
d: 3 *TAPAL* *hūbi¹⁴ A* *GUŠKIN EGIR-an išgarān x* } (20') *ŠA* *1^{NUTUM} URUKU*.
BABBAR-aš iwar iyan *1^{NUTUM} []* *1^{NUTUM} SA LUGAL* *UTTI iwar iyan* '3 sets of earrings from gold, studded at the back, one set made as they do it in Hattuša, one set [] and one has been made in the style of kingship.' KUB 42.38 rev. 19'ff

Instance a: and b: are clearly singulars; the referents of the participles in the similar instances c: and d: are probably also singulars. As a rule, predicative participles occur in their singular form when the subject is a neuter plural (see 2.8). The participles in c: d: and e: are therefore probably not to be regarded as predicative participles referring to neuter plurals.

On the other hand, plural agreement is only found in:

- a: 3 *ĦAR ŠU NUNU* [2] *x* [] (12') *NANUNUZ-ya išgaranta* 'three bracelets with

pearl[s], and pearls, fastened' KUB 42.38 obv. 11f (12)

- b: 2 𐎶𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶𐎶^{1A} 𐎶𐎶^{1NU} 𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 [𐎶𐎶] 1^{NU} 𐎶𐎶 [𐎶𐎶]-wanta 'Two pairs of earrings, one of which from gold, 1 ...' KUB 42.64 obv. 10

[𐎶𐎶]-wanta is either a neuter plural participle or an adjective.

As the material shows, agreement of words ending in -a with neuter singular adjuncts, is not unusual. Therefore, at least some of the 'pluralia tantum' may not have had the grammatical status of a neuter plural, because in that case we would have had agreement with a plural adjunct. This gives some additional evidence for the hypothesis that the morpheme -a could have neuter singular value.

1.4.7.4 Conclusion

Hittite may have had an -a, which is not a neuter plural ending, but rather a neuter singular ending, e.g. *kušata* 'dowry'. In any case, there are words in -a which do not have a singular in -an. They are indifferent to number.

1.4.8 Distributive singular

Hittite has a, what we could name 'distributive singular', i.e. words appear in their singular form, when they denote several objects and when everybody, everything has its individual specimen. English has e.g. 'The members of the body-guard occupy their seats (pl.)', whereas Hittite, like Dutch, uses the singular form. This is clearly illustrated in e.g. *nu-za* 𐎶𐎶𐎶^{MEŠ} 𐎶𐎶𐎶^{MEŠ} 𐎶𐎶^{LU} 𐎶𐎶^{MEŠ} 𐎶𐎶^{MEŠ} *petan appanzi* 'And the members of the body-guard take their places (litt. place) in the court-yard of the guard(s)'. IBoT 1.36 Kol. i 9 (CTH 262, MHD), cf. Dutch 'De mensen (pl.) nemen hun plaats (sg.) in'.

Since Hittite has a distributive singular, a form like *peda-šset*, which has to be translated in English as 'their places' (see below sub *peda-*) must be taken as *pedan-šset*, which is a singular form. Here, we have assimilation of the *n* to the following *š*. The alternative interpretation as *peda-šset*, i.e. a neuter plural ending in -a is therefore not very likely. The older Hittite evidence for the 'distributive singular' is the following:

- 1: *aiš-* 'mouth', and *kalulupa-* 'finger'

- *ta* LUGAL-uš MUNUS.LUGAL-ša *iš-ša-a-aš-ma*([𐎶𐎶]) [𐎶𐎶]an-kan *ka-lu-lu-pi-iš-mi kank*[i] [i]š-ša-a-aš-ma
[𐎶𐎶] 'Then the king and queen to (in?) their mouths [...] (?)'. [Wh]en it (?) hangs from their fingers, in their [mo]uths [...]. (Otten-Souček 1969: 17 translate "Dann der König und die Königin in ihren Mund (Pl.)". Wenn er (es) an ihren Fingern (sg.) aufgehängt [𐎶𐎶], in ihren [Mu]nd (Pl.)" StBoT 25.2 i⁷ 6'f (6', 8') (OHC)

iš-ša-aš-ma can be taken as a dir. sg. *išša-ašma* or as a directive plural *išša-ašma*[š]. Neu 1980a: 4, n. 5 points out that it is difficult to determine whether these two forms are singular (*išša-ašma*) 'to their mouth' or plural (*išša-ašma*[š]) 'to their mouths'. He suggests that *iš-ša-aš-ma* is probably singular, because body parts can have a singular form when a plural form is expected (cf. Starke 1977: 126). Otten-Souček 1969: 109, mentioned by Neu 1983a: 11 n. 43, on the other hand, suggest that these forms might be plural. They read *iš-ša-a-aš-ma*[a]. In view of the singular *kalulupit-šmi*, which is unambiguously singular, the forms of *aiš-* are probably singular too: *išša-ašma*.

- 2: *kalulupa-* 'finger' and *kišsar* 'hand'

- *kalulupiz-šmid-ašta iš-ga-ra-an-da* (dai) (20) [𐎶𐎶]n *kišsari-šmi dai* StBoT 25.4 i 14'f (= StBoT 25.3 i 19'f: *kalulupiz-šmid-ašta iš-g*([a-ra])an-ta¹⁵ dai [𐎶𐎶] *x-en kišsari-šmi dai* 'He takes away the fixed things from their fingers and places [𐎶𐎶] them in their hands.'

- 3: *ker-* 'heart'

- *nu-za* DUMU.NITA^{MEŠ} *kar-ti-iš-mi piran mēmīr* 'The sons spoke to themselves.' (lit. 'spoke before their hearts') KBo 22.2 obv. 13f (13) (CTH 3, OHC)

- 4: *ḫaršar* 'head' and *ker-* 'heart'

- a: [(ir-m)]a(n)-šmaš-kan¹⁶ *dāḫḫun kar-di-iš-mi-ya-at-kan dāḫḫun* [(ḫar-š)]a-ni-iš-mi-ya-at-kan *dāḫḫun* '[(The ill)]ness I have taken from you. I [ha]ve taken it from your hearts and I have taken it from your [(he)]ads.' StBoT 25.3 i 12'f (OHC)

The speaker speaks to the king and queen. Therefore, *kardi* and *ḫaršani* refer to plural objects.

- b: *nu-š*(n)aš-kan *niš DINGIR^{MEŠ} DUMU^{1A}-KUNU andan kardi-šmi-pat* [𐎶𐎶] *azzikkandu* 'And the gods of the oaths shall eat [(yo)]ur sons in their hearts.' KBo 8.35 ii 23'f (24')

- 5: *iškiš-* 'back'

- *nu-za-pa utniyanza ḫumanza iš-ki-iš-me-it anda* 𐎶𐎶^{URU} *ḫattuša logan ḫardu* 'The entire population must have their backs bent to Ḫatti.' StBoT 25.140 rev. 9'f (10') (OHC).

The distributive use of the singular -šmit is not restricted to body parts:

- 6: *peda-* 'place'

¹⁵ Read: *kalulupit + -šmid + -ašta* (Neu 1983a: 90).

¹⁶ The text gives [(ir-m)]a-aš-ma-aš-kan.

a: *nu=za* ^{LU.MES}MESEDI SA ^{LU}MESEDI ^Ehili *pi-c-ta-an appanzi* 'And the members of the body-guard take the places in the court-yard of the body-guard.' IBoT 1.36 Kol i 9 (CTH 262, MHD)

b: [*pi*]-*c-di=smi=pa*l ZAG-ni 1-SU *waḥanzi* 'They turn once to the right on their [pi]aces.' StBoT 25.34 obv. 19'

The subject is ^{LU.MES}hāpeš mentioned in l. 18'. Here *pedi* is singular.

c: *nu kuitman* KUR ^{TAM}annali EGIR-*pa* tiyazi DINGIR^{MES} KUR ^Ti-ya an]nišān *maḥhan* *ēššir nu=šmaš pi-c-da-an QATAMMA* EGIR-*pa* *appanzi* 'While the land relapses into the [same situation as before, the gods also reoccupy the position they have held before.' KBo 11.1 obv. 25f (26) (CTH 382, NHC, Muwatadli)

d: [(^{DUMU}^{MES}E.G)]AL *pi-c-da-aš-mc-it* *harkanzi* 'The palace servants hold their places.' StBoT 25.25 i 4

Neu 1983a: 148 n. 444 remarks that in theory *pi-c-da-aš-mc-it* may be a nom.acc. neuter plural in -a. The evidence mentioned in this section taken into account, this is not very likely. Neu 1970: 36 already suggested the correct solution. viz. the double *šš* is the product of assimilation of *nš* to *šš*.¹⁷

1.5 DISTRIBUTION OF THE HITTITE NEUTER PLURAL ENDINGS

The nom.acc. neuter plural ending shows a distribution. In general the situation is as follows:

A: Substantives.

1. The neuter plural is not characterized by a separate plural ending, e.g. *išhiul* 'treaties'. It is only by means of agreement with plural adjectives and pronouns that the number of a given substantive can be established. The uncharacterized plural occurs mainly in the *i*-, *u*-, *l*-, *r*- and *n*-stems.
2. The ending -a is rare and occurs mainly in later texts:
 - a: It occurs in nouns (not only *a*-stems, e.g. *anitiyatt* 'ritual gear') which have both a neuter plural ending -a and endings of the common-gender substantives (e.g. the acc. pl. ending -uš and the acc. sg. ending

¹⁷ I did not find any certain attestations of the neuter plural *peda* from *pedan* 'place' nor did I find one in Gertz 1982. Friedrich 1960: 46 does not list this form. Neu 1970: 36 remarks that there are no certain attestations of a neuter plural *peda* from *pedan*. Held cs. 1987: 13 does list *peda* as the neuter plural form of this word. The nom.acc. neuter plural *peda* must be very rare.

-an). Although these nouns are not all *a*-stems, I will call this type of nouns the *locus, loci* vs. *loca* type.

b: As a plural of the neuter substantives it is secondary, e.g. *genuwa* 'knees'. In Young Hittite the ending -a becomes more frequent.

3. The uncharacterized plural of both the *l*- and the *r*-stems has in some cases later been replaced by the ending -i. This process started early.

4. The *r/n*-stems have a long final vowel, e.g. *ud-da-a-ar* from *uttar* 'word'. Sometimes, however, the *r/n*-stems with the complex suffixes -*ēššar*, -*atar* and -(a)*war* do not show final -r. However, this *r*-less form is not always a plural.

B: The adjectives.

1. The neuter plural in the *u*-stems and sometimes in the *i*-stems is not characterized by a plural morpheme, e.g. *idalu* 'evil'. Predicative participles also often occur in their singular form. The uncharacterized neuter plural occurs much less frequently in the adjectives than in the substantives.
2. The ending -a is very frequent and occurs already in older Hittite with the *a*-, *i*- and *nt*-stems. However, this ending does not often occur in the predicative participles. Only secondarily the *u*-stem adjectives receive the ending -a which is added to the full grade of the suffix.

To sum up, sometimes the substantives have an uncharacterized neuter plural. As a marker of the neuter plural substantives the ending -a is secondary. The adjectives on the other hand, are frequently characterized by the ending -a. In part 2 of this study a synchronic description and, where necessary, a commentary of the Hittite material will be given. At the end of each section the results will be listed. Part 3 gives a historical explanation of the Hittite data.

DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

OF THE HITTITE MATERIAL

A: The substantives

2.1 PLURAL OF THE SIMPLE R/N-STEMS

2.1.1 Introduction

The plural of the simple *r/n*-stems is characterized by a plene written vowel of the final syllable. A form characterized by a plene written vowel in the final vowel often agrees with a plural pronoun, e.g. *ke uddār* 'these words', with a plural adjective, e.g. *šuppa uddār* 'holy words' or with a plural participle, e.g. *ḥaršār iṣṭiyanda* 'bound heads'. Therefore, one can argue that all the forms which have a plene written vowel in the final syllable are plural. Forms which have a plene written final vowel and nevertheless agree with a singular adjective, e.g. *idālu uddār* 'evil words' are also plural. Agreement of singular adjectives and participles with neuter plurals is seen in e.g. *idālu uddār* 'evil words' KBo 4.2 i 19f and in *ē^{MES} DINGIR^{MES}-ta parku iṣṭi^u kù.B* (ABBAR GUŠKIN *unuwanta*)] *INA KUR^{URU} Ḥatti^u pat [(ēšzi)]* 'For you in the land of Ḥatti [(there are)] lofty temples of the gods [(adorned with silver and gold)]' KUB 24.1 i 25f. *Parku* 'lofty' is singular, whereas *unuwanta* 'adorned' is plural.¹⁸

2.1.2 Material

ḥaršār 'head'

A: Old Hittite

- a: *ḥalkiyaš ḥar-ša-a-ar iṣṭiyanda* [ziz]^{H1.A} *ša ḥar-ša-a-ar iṣṭiyanda ke-ššan ḥumanda* [pat] *ttani tēḫḫe* StBoT 25.4 iv 15'f (15,16) (= StBoT 25.3 iv 19') Following Neu 1969: 37 one can translate 'Heads of barley (are) bound together, heads of [spelt] are bound together. I put them all in a [bas]ket.' However, the majority of predicative participles referring to neuter plurals are singular (see 2.8.1.2). Therefore, it is possible to take *iṣṭiyanda* as attributive and translate 'There (are) heads of barley, bound together (and)

¹⁸ The duplicate KUB 36.81 obv.⁷ 12 (older script) shows a neuter plural *pār-ga-u-wo*.

heads of [spelt], bound together. I put them all in a [bas]ket.'

- b: *ta hāhhalit gāpinan dāhhe kalūpi-šmi hūlaban kuitt-a anda halkiyaš-a ziz^{HI.A}-ša har-ša-a-ar-r-a nu apatt-a GIR-SUNU kitta* 'I take the thread with a *h.* and what is wound on their fingers, (and) the heads of barley and spelt, that also lies at their feet.' StBoT 25.4 iv 27ff (29) (= StBoT 25.3 iv 32)

- c: *harkanzi-ma-an* ^D*Hantašepes anduḫsas har-ša-a-a[(r)-r-a* ^{GIS}*šukur* ^{<HI>}*ya* 'The *Hantašepa* gods hold human head[(s)] and lances.'

StBoT 25.3 i 22f (23) (StBoT 25.4 i 18) gives *har-ša-a-ar-ra* here.¹⁹

- d: *[ziz^{HI.A}]-ša har-ša-a-a[r* 'head[s] of spelt]' StBoT 25.7 rev. iv' 2'

hūtār 'creatures'²⁰

- a: *hū-i-ti-a-a-ar šemenzi* 'The creatures pass in review.' StBoT 25.12 ii 16'²¹

- b: *[(INA UD II^{KAM} p)]ereš hū-i-ta-a-ar-r-a nu.GÁL* ['(On the second day there

¹⁹ Here we do not have a distributive singular, because the meaning is general. *Anduḫsas* *haršār* means 'human heads', instead of 'the heads of the men.' Garret 1990: 170ff points out that Hittite makes a distinction between alienable and inalienable possessions. Alienable possessions are characterized by only a genitive, e.g. *LUGAL-aš uddār* 'the words of the king' HAB iii 38. Inalienable possessions, on the other hand, are characterized by a construction which is commonly called the 'pleonastic genitive construction'. In this construction the possessor occurs in the genitive case. To the possessed noun an enclitic possessive pronoun is attached, e.g. *nu ša^{LU} MASDA ešhar-šet natta šanḫiskatteni* 'You do not seek the poor man's blood.' In this particular case, *anduḫsas haršār* shows the syntax of alienable objects. *Lala-* 'tongue', which is usually an inalienable object, can show the syntax of alienable objects. If it is used in the figurative meaning 'gossip', Hittite only uses a genitive, e.g. *[(k)]āša-a-ša-šmaš-kan utniyandan lāuš dāhḫun* '[(Be)]hold, I have taken from you the 'tongues' (= gossip) of the population.' StBoT 25.3 i 11'

²⁰ Gertz 1982: 31 mentions *ISTU É^D Inar [hū-i]-ta-ar KÜBABBAR udanzi* 1 *hupar* *GESTIN ANA PRIG TUR* 1 *hupar* *GESTIN ANA SAH.NITA laḫuanzi [hū-i]-ta-ar šaminuanzi* *perin šaminuanzi* 'They bring the [cre]atures of silver from the temple of Inara. They pour one cup of wine on the leopard (and) one on the boar. They remove [the cre]atures. They remove the bird.' StBoT 25.19 obv. 13ff (14,15) (translation by Gertz). She claims that *[hū-i]-ta-ar* has to be considered a plural, because a sign *<TA-R>* also exists. However, the use of the sign *<TA-R>* is younger than the use of *<TA-AR>*. Therefore, *[hū-i]-ta-ar* might just as well be singular.

²¹ Singer 1983: 95 n. 21 proposes to translate *šamen-*, *šemen-* as 'pass in review, parade'. Since the parallel KBo 22.224 obv. 2' gives *šam[en]zi*, one can safely identify *šemen-* with *šamen-*.

is no b)]ird and there are no (other) creatures.' StBoT 25.12 ii 17'²²

taḫtumar 'incense'

This word has *r*-stem forms. Neu 1970: 70 mentions the inst. *taḫtumarit* now KBo 30.56 v 25, *taḫdumarr-a* 'and incense' Bo 3117 iii 8 and a few neuter plurals in -a, e.g. *taḫtummara* KUB 2.5.1 38. (see also Gertz 1982: 29).

- *[i]STU É^{HA} NA₃ ta-ḫa-at-tu-ma-a-ar udanzi* 'From the mausolea they bring incense.' StBoT 25.19 obv. 5

Gertz 1982: 29 translates 'sticks of incense'. However, there is no positive evidence for 'sticks'. One might just as well suggest 'incense'. In that case the plene writing is not a plural marker. It is then possible that the plene written vowel in the final syllable indicates that *ta-ḫa-at-tu-ma-a-ar* has collective meaning. Because it alternates with *taḫtum(m)ara* Neu 1970:70 suggests that *taḫtumar* may better be considered a 'Kollektivum'.

uttar 'word, thing, affair'

- a: *[ut]ppiaš ut-ta-a-ar šarrit* 'He broke the words on the [ta]blet.' KUB 36.106 rev. 5 (CTH 27)
- b: *nu šuppa ut-ta-a-ar* 'And holy words' StBoT 25.54 ii 5'
- c: *ke ud-da-a-ar [(tuppiya)]z INA KĀ.GAL-YA* 'these words (recorded) on [(a table)]t at my gate' KBo 3.22 obv. 33 (CTH 1)

water 'water'

All instances with plene final vowel of the final syllable seem to be plural because they are characterized as opposed to singular *water*. Moreover, 7 *ū-i-da-a-ar* 'seven vessels of water' KBo 20.21 iii 23' (MHD) seems to suggest a meaning different from the singular.

- a: *[te]šsummi-ya ū-i-da-a-ar* 'and the waters into a [cup]' StBoT 25.139 rev. 2 (no context)
- b: *nu ū-i-[ta]-a-ar dāhḫi n-a-an anda* 'I take the wat[er]s and it in ...' StBoT 25.137 10'²³
- c: *ū-i-ta-a-ar kat-ta* ^{DUG}*GIR.KIŠ-ya laḫueni* 'And we pour the waters into a vessel.' StBoT 25.137 ii 15

²² *pē-ri-eš* (cited in the text as *peres*) must be singular because it agrees with the 3 sg. *wizzi* from *uwa-* 'come' *ibid.* ii 16'. About *pere/-i-*, Melchert 1984a: 96 n. 45 writes 'since *pēre/i-* designates a cult functionary ...'. However, I translate 'bird' because in instance c: *pere/i-* is put on one line with *hūtār*. Both the *p.* and the *h.* are removed.

²³ Because of lack of context it is not possible to determine to which word the enclitic -an refers to.

In the omen text KBo 25.2 obv. 8, unfortunately in mutilated context, a strange form occurs:

d: *janda ü-e-da-ar*

This form seems to be a plural of *watar*. However, the first syllable has an <E> instead of the usual <I>, whereas the last syllable is not written plene. The context is badly mutilated. Therefore, the reading remains doubtful.

Note that in these three instances, there is no indication whatsoever that the forms characterized by a plene written final vowel actually have a plural meaning.

B: Old Hittite texts in Middle Hittite ductus

watar 'water'

- [(*mān* IN)]A UD I¹[(*KAM*-ma)] 7 *ü-i-da-a-r* [(*pianzi*)] '[(When)] they [(give)] 7 rations of water on the first [(day)]' KBo 20.131 iii 23' (CTH 777)

The numeral 7 suggests that probably seven vessels of water or seven rations of water are meant here.

uttar 'word, thing, affair'.

Since *uttar* is the most frequent *r/n*-stem with a plene written final vowel of the final syllable, I only cite those forms which have adjuncts:

- a: *nū-u-ššan parā ke ud-da-a-r* [*memai*] 'And he [pronounces those words]' IBoT 2.39 rev. 10' (CTH 777)
- b: *nu mahhan ke ud-da-a-r memiyawanzi zinnai* 'When he finishes speaking those words.' IBoT 2.39 obv. 51 (CTH 777)
- c: *k[i] ud-da-a-r* 't[h]ose word[s]' KUB 24.4 + 22 (CTH 376)

Ki referring to neuter plurals often occurs in Young Hittite. Gertz 1982: 184 writes "Late Hittite gives up the older distribution of *kī* as only singular and *ke* as only plural and uses the two interchangeably."

C: Middle Hittite

uttar

- a: *kāša^m Mitaš wasta[škit SAPAL NIS DINGIR^{MES}-ya ...] kue ud-da-a-r tiyā[n]* *ēšta opāš-at-kan* (-) *hūmantā šarraš nu ANA^m M[i]ta kue ud-da-a-r pīran katta tehhun* [apā]t *šumēš hūmantēš i[s]tamašēn* 'Behold, Mita sinned and] the words which were sworn (lit. put) [under oath], he violated them all. And the charges I have made against M[i]ta, you have all

heard them.' KUB 23.72 + rev. 3ff (3) (CTH 146) (translation by Gurney 1948: 36)

- b: *mān LUMES URU Pahhuwa=ma ke [u]d-da-a-r ōl ienzi* 'But if the people of Pahhuwa do not do these things' (translation by Gurney 1948: 37) KUB 23.72 rev. 25 (CTH 146)

- c: *nu= [tta] linkiya [ka]ttan ke ud-da-a-r daiš* 'And he spoke (lit. put) the following words f[or you] under oath: ' KUB 14.1 + obv. 13f (14) (CTH 147)

- d: *nu=za ke ud-da-a-r SAPAL NIS DINGIR^{LIM} [dai]s[ta]* 'And you spoke (lit. [pl]aced) the following words under oath: ' KUB.14 1 + obv. 27 (CTH 147)

- e: *[nu]žkan tamāi kuekki ud-da-a-r [h]atrāsi nužnnaš EGIR-pa tamāi ud-da-a-r hatreški[ši]* '[And] whatever other things you [write] to us, [you] always write back other things to us.' KUB 14.1 + rev. 37 (CTH 147)

This passage means 'You always write in different words to us about the same things.'

- f: *kedani UD-ti kue [ud]-da-a-r aniyawen nu=wa=taškan idālu ud-da-a-r katta [QATAM]MA waršan ēštu* 'The [w]ords which we spoke on that day, those evil words must [likewise] be wiped off from you.' KBo 24.1 + i 18f (19') (CTH 404)

- g: *nu EGIR^{MI} [DIN]GIR^{MES}-nan ud-da-a-r irhān ēšt[u] māhhan taknās^{DU}UTU-UN irhāt katta=ma šumās irhāt* 'In future the word of the [go]ds mu[st] go round, when they have reached the sun-goddess of the earth, they have reached you.' KBo 7.28 + rev. 41f (41) (CTH 371)

- h: *nu SA 'Zi alwanzatar=šet idālu ud-da-a-r=šet QATAMMA harakdu n=at=apa EGIR-pa le wizzi* 'The witchcraft of Zi(plantawiya) (and) her evil words shall likewise perish and they shall not come back.' KBo 15.10 iii 57f (58'). cf. [nu SA] 'Zi alwanzatar=šet idālu ud-da-a-r=šet QATAMMA [hara]kdu n=at=apa EGIR-pa le wizzi' ibid. ii 15f (15) (CTH 443)

- i: *ud-da-a-r=mu kue hatraēs* 'the affairs you have written to me about' HBM 8 3

- j: *ŠEŠ.DUG.GA-YA-mu kue tuel ud-da-a-r hatreskimi n=at INA EGAL^{LIM} ōl ammuk=pat memiškimi* 'My dear brother, I would not continually speak in the palace about the things I write you about.' HBM 52 obv. 6f (6)

- k: *ud-da-a-r=wa kue hatreskimi nu=wa=mu uddanās EGIR-pa arkuwur ōl kuishi udai* 'No one ever makes a plea concerning the affairs I keep writing to you about.' HBM 63 obv. 8f (8)

- l: *anda=ma=za an-na-ra-a [k]uit ud-da-a-r* 'Moreover, [be]cause annara

affairs ...' HBM 88 11'f (12'), *ibid.* 14'f : *nu-za* ^m*Šaḫurunuwaš* [*u*d-da-a-ar arḫa dā's 'Šaḫurunuwaš took away these affairs.'

m: *mekki-ma ud-da-a-a[r]* 'but word[s] in great quantities' KBo 32.202 obv. 22'

Mekki is not a neuter plural in -i (see 2.4.3).

n: ^m*Mēkeš ud-da-a-ar aruwanza* ^{rim-umni} *memiskizzi* 'Mēkeš obediently keeps saying words to the storm-god.' KBo 32.15 iii 12f

o: *ud-da-ar-šet* *ibid.* 9 Insufficient context.

D: Young Hittite.

uttar 'word'

I do not list the instances of *uddār* attested in Young Hittite because they are amply represented in older Hittite.

watar 'water'

- *nu paun* ^{uru} *Purandan anda wahnumun* [*n=an-kan anda*] *hatkešnunun nu-šši-kan ú-i-da-a-ar arḫa dalḫun* 'And then I surrounded Puranda, [and I besieged [it], and cut off its (water) source(s).'] KBo 3.4 ii 64f (65) (CTH 61, Muršili II)

2.1.3 List of plurals of the simple *r/n*-stems

The reliable attestations of plene written final vowel of the final syllable of the *r/n*-stems are:

a:	<i>ḫaršār</i>	from <i>ḫaršar</i> 'head'
b:	<i>ḫuitār</i>	from <i>ḫuitar</i> 'creatures, animals'
c:	<i>uddār</i>	from <i>uttar</i> 'word, thing, affair'
d:	<i>widār</i>	from <i>watar</i> 'water'

Instances without plene writing:

a:	<i>u-c-da-ar</i>	from <i>watar</i> (?) (OHC) (very doubtful)
b:	<i>ud-da-ar-šet</i>	from <i>uttar</i> (MHC)

There is also one *r*-stem with a plene written vowel in the final syllable, viz. *taḫatumār* from *taḫatumar*²⁴ 'incense'.

It must be stressed that in cases where a plene final vowel of the final syllable does not agree with a plural adjunct, there is no positive indication that plene writing indicates that the form in which it occurs is a plural form. This is very clear in the Old Hittite instances of *widār*.

²⁴ Because *taḫatumar* ends in -*mar*, it is possible that this word is a derivative of a verb, cf. *minumar* from *minu-* 'to make mild, heal'.

2.2 CHARACTERIZED PLURAL OF THE COMPLEX *R/N*-STEMS

2.2.1 Introduction

The complex *r/n*-stems seem to show two different plural formations: they are either uncharacterized (2.3) or characterized (2.2). In a number of cases, the complex *r/n*-stems ending in -*eššar*, -(a)*war* and -*atar* have a form without final -*r*, e.g. *ḫattata* from *ḫattatar* 'wisdom', *duddumiešša* from *duddumieššar* 'benevolence'. As already established by Neu 1982, these *r*-less forms are archaic. All attestations occur in old texts or in young copies of old texts. In the original Young Hittite texts, which are often historical texts, no such forms have been attested. As pointed out by Melchert 1988a: *passim*, in many younger copies the archaic forms without final -*r* have been replaced by uncharacterized forms with final -*r*, e.g. *ḫattata* 'wisdom' KUB 24.4 obv. 8 (MHD) vs. *ḫattatar* KUB 24.3 ii 18. Also *miyāta* 'abundance, growth, increase' KUB 24.1 iii 12 probably represents a more archaic form than *miyatar* in the parallel KUB 24.2 rev. 6.

Melchert 1988a: 217f argues that the *r*-less forms are plurals. In three cases this is supported by agreement of *r*-less forms with a neuter plural adjective or participle: *išḫa*²⁵*rwanda akwanzata* '[v]ilicious' (lit. bloody) spells KUB 24.9 i 39 (p. 218), *partawa* from *partawar* 'wing' and *ḫattata* 'wisdom' (see 2.2). Melchert also points out that quite often the context demands plural interpretation. This is exemplified in e.g. *kušduwata* from *kušduwatar* 'insult'. *Kušduwata* in KBo 7.28 obv. 48 occurs after a series of insults having the form *takku* ... *kušduwait* 'if ... has insulted.' Plural interpretation is also suggested by the numeral in 3 ^{uzu}*ḫappešša* *cu*₄ 'three limbs of a cow' KBo 16.78 iv 19 (Melchert 1988a: 218). Collective meaning is transparent in the nouns ending in -*atar*, e.g. *miyata* 'abundance' and *iyata* 'mobile wealth' (Melchert 1988a: 219).

Because they only occur in older Hittite, the *r*-less forms of these *r/n*-stems are probably the original form, and the uncharacterized neuter plural in this stem class is an innovation. This is corroborated by the evidence listed below. In older Hittite I did not find any attestations of the neuter plural of the complex *r/n*-stems with final -*r*. In older Hittite those forms only occur preceded by numerals higher than one. In Young Hittite no examples of *r*-less forms have been attested.

However, as the material listed below will show, plural interpretation of the *r*-less forms is doubtful in a number of instances. In fact, only one instance,

viz. *partawa* from *partawar* 'wing' definitely suggests that the *r*-less form has plural meaning. In the other cases one might just as well assume that the *r*-less forms are grammatical singulars. The label 'collective' covers the meaning of many instances.

2.2.2 Material

A: Old Hittite

^{LÜ}SU.GI-*ešša* 'old age?' 'old men (?)', 'old men's council'

- *šumeš* ^{LÜ}MES ^{GI}S ^{TUKUL} *tameškatteni ape-ya* [k]atta[n] *dameškiwan dāir kiššan AWAT ABI-ya paššanuttin takku šumeš natta šaktēni kāni* ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*eš-ša* ^{NU}GAL *nu-šmaš memai AWAT ABI-ya* 'You oppress the ^{GI}S ^{TUKUL} people. Consequently, they have begun to oppress you. Thus you have not heeded the word of my father. If you (pl.) do not know it, there will be no ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*ešša*. It can tell you the word of my father.' KBo 22.1 obv. 1'ff (6')

This text is problematic because the context is not clear: Melchert 1988a: 217 and Archi 1979: 46 translate ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*ešša* as 'old age'. Melchert translates "then there is no old age" and Archi translates "I âge de vieillesse ne sera pas pour vous". Melchert also thinks that ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*eš-ša* has to be understood as a possession of a plural subject, because of the 2 pl. in the subordinate clause: "thus a collective plural here is also quite in order".

Some problems arise if ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*eš-ša* is taken as 'old age'. Firstly, Archi equates ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*eš-ša* with ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*tar* in KUB 1.16 iii 31, which indeed means 'old age'. However, a priori it is better not to regard the suffixes *-ešsar* and *-atar* as interchangeable. Therefore, the conclusion that ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*eš-ša* and ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*tar* have the same meaning is made with too much haste. Secondly, as pointed out sub 1.4.8, Hittite has a distributive singular. Therefore, we would rather expect a singular **^{LÜ}SU.GI-*ešsar* here. Thirdly, a translation like 'then there is no old age (for you)' is difficult in the context here. If we take ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*ešša* as 'old age', the passage must mean something like 'you will not become old.'

CHD vol. L-N: 224 translates "Are there not here also old men?" ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*ešša* is considered an adjective in the nom. c. plural with the particle *-a* 'and'. This makes more sense than 'old age' in view of the following *nu-šmaš memai AWAT ABI-ya* 'It can tell you the word of my father.' In this case we have to infer that the old men are authorized to tell the ^{GI}S ^{TUKUL} people what they have to do. However, *memai*, the verb in the next line is a 3rd person singular form. This forces CHD to assume a non-expressed subject, viz. one of them.

Houwink ten Cate, p.c., suggests 'old men's council'. This is very straight-

forward. If his suggestion is followed, *memai* simply agrees with ^{LÜ}SU.GI-*eš-ša* and one can paraphrase the passage as: 'If you do not know the word of my father, isn't there a council of old men, which can inform you of it?' This is the most logical and correct translation.

Therefore, the *r*-less form here is no plural, but rather a singular. Its meaning can be regarded as 'collective'.

B: Old Hittite texts Middle Hittite ductus

ḫannešsar 'judgment'

- *nu SA UR.GI7 [ū š] A ŠAḫ ḫannešsar zik-ḫ* [pat ^{DUTU}-u-*ḫa*] *natta šuppallann[ā]* ^{DUTU} *ḫa-an-ne-eš-ša iššit ku[e]š ōl memiskanz[i] apatt-a ḫa[n]n[attari idālawāšš-a ḫuwappas antuḫša]š ḫa-a[n]-ne-eš-ša zik-pat* ^{DUTU}-u-*ḫa* *natta* 'You, [sun-god], pass judgment in the case of the dog [and in the case of the swine. The case [of] the animals, [sun-god] tha[t] do not speak with their mouths, also in that case you [pass] judgment. It is you, sun-god, who also judges the case of the evil and wicked men.' KUB 31.135 + obv. 8'ff (9) (CTH 374)

This word occurs in the figura etymologica *ḫannešša ḫanna* 'pass judgment'. The second *ḫannešša* seems to agree with the nom. acc. neuter sg. *apat*.

Melchert 1988a: 222 thinks that *ḫanešša* is used incorrectly for *ḫannešsar*, because *ḫanešša* would require the plural modifier *ape* and not the singular *apat*, which we have here. Therefore, he suggests that the *r*-less plural is probably used incorrectly.

However, one might just as well suggest that *apat* referring to *ḫanešša* is used correctly because *ḫanešša* is a grammatical singular. One wonders whether *ḫanešša* could be a 'distributive singular'.

ḫattatar 'wisdom, understanding, advice'

- kuita imma miešhati nu-za-ḫa SA DINGIR-YA duddumar ḫa-at-ta-ta ḫū-manta šaki[nu]* 'Moreover, ever the more I grew up, the more I acknowledged [e]d the clemency and your wisdom in all respects, my God ...' KUB 30.10 obv. 11' (CTH 373).

Ḫattata seems to agree with the nom. acc. neuter plural *ḫūmanta* 'all'. Melchert 1988a: 217 translates 'all your wisdom'. However, an adverbial translation 'in all respects' fits the context excellently.

- [(n-*as*)]ta ANA DUMU.LÜ.U₁.LU ḫa-at-ta-ta-šummit [(ḫarakta)] nu kunnan kuit iyaeni n-at NU.G[(AL)]* 'Your willingness to advise [(has been taken away from mankind)]. As a consequence, there is no right [(thing)] to do

(for us).²⁵ KUB 24.4 + obv. 8f (8) CTH 376)

The young parallel KUB 23.33 18 gives *ha-at-ta-tar-su-mi-it*, the form with final *-r*.

Melchert 1988a: 217 claims that *hattata* is plural. However, instance a: can be explained otherwise: *humanta* 'in all respects' fits the context excellently. Melchert 1988a: 217 mentions *uddār-mit hattata-mitt-a* 'my words and wisdom' KUB 1.16 ii 56 (and iii 58), another *r*-less form. He claims that the collocation of these two words certainly suggests that *hattata* is likewise plural. This is not necessarily true: a concept like 'wisdom', 'willingness to advise' (instances a: and b:) are better taken as singulars.

hattessar 'opening, pit'

- *[ha-at-te-es-ša]* KBo 13.13 obv. 3' (CTH 536)

iyawar (verbal noun of *iya-* 'go' or *iya-* 'do', cf. Yoshida 1990: 110)

- a: *innarēuwanti-ma-mu pedi i-ya-u-wa zik-pat* DINGIR-YA *maniyahṭa* 'My God, you alone have shown me what to do in a lively place.' [or 'to go to a lively place'] KUB 30.10 obv. 8 (CTH 373)
- b: *nu ANA Kanli i-ya-u-wa ūl pāi* 'He does not give Kantuzili a place to go to' or 'He does not say to Kantuzili what he has to do.' KUB 30.10 obv. 3'

The younger parallel KUB 31.127 + ii 21 gives a form with final *-r*.

There is no indication that *iyawa* has plural meaning.

išhessar 'bond, power'²⁵

- a: *ḫim-ni-aš AMA-SU [labā]mi-ma-aš iš-ḫi-es-ša-ššit* 'For the storm-god she is his mother, but for the [Labā]rna she is (source of) his mandate.' KBo 21.22 obv. 44'f (45') (CTH 820) (translation by Melchert 1988a: 220)
- b: *nu-mu-šša[(n laman-mit)] iš-ḫi-es-ša-mitt-a zik-pat* DINGIR-YA ... *antiwahṭas anda netta* 'It was you, my God, who guided (l. 15) [(my name)] and mandate among men.' KUB 30.10 obv. 7' (CTH 373) (translation by Melchert 1988a: 220)

Here again there is no indication whatsoever that the *r*-less form is plural.

partawar 'wing'

- a: *[pār-ta-a-u-wa-aš-ši-it-wa amiyanta* 'Its [w]ings are small.' KUB 33.5 ii 13 (CTH 324)

²⁵ Glücker 1958: 19 'binding, obligation', Neu 1982: 208 and Melchert 1988a: 220 'mandate'.

- b: *kāš* [NIM.LAL-aš *werniyazi pā*] *r-ta-u-wa* 'aš-še-it-wa *amiyanta* 'And [this bee shall find him. Its wings are small.' KUB 17.10 i 37f (38) (CTH 324)
- c: *ḫsTIR-ma pār-ta-u-wa ḫinganuzi* 'The forest, however, (he) bends the wings.' KBo 20.28 obv. 20' (CTH 670)

This instance may be read with Weitenberg 1984: 133 *pār-ga-u-wa*, in which case *pār-ga-u-wa* is a nom. acc. neuter plural of the adjective *parku-* 'high'. The translation would run as follows: 'He bends the high forests.' This makes more sense than taking this form as 'wings'.

Here the *r*-less forms have plural meaning.

C: Middle Hittite

duddumiesšar 'benevolence, mercy'

- *n-[aš]ta šA ḫutu²¹ du-ud-du-mi-es-ša ḫ[ū]manda' ūl' kued* *anikki merzi* 'And a[ll] benevolence of me, My Majesty, will [disappear for] no one.' KBo 16.24 (+) i 53f (53) (CTH 251)

Note that here too there is no indication that the *r*-less form has plural meaning.

2.2.3 Material preceded by numerals

There are two attestations of complex *r/n*-stems without final *-r* preceded by numerals higher than one. They occur in original Old Hittite texts:

haneššar (vessel)

- 2 *ha-ne-es-ša ma[r]* 'two vessels of b[cer]' StBoT 25.80 iv 8'

wageššar (loaf)

- 3 *NINDA wa-gi-es-ša pa[r]* 'He br[eaks?] three *wageššar*-loaves' StBoT 25.72 iii 7'.

Melchert 1988a: 217 thinks that the grammatical number of *hanešša* and *wagešša* is ambiguous, because in Hittite common-gender nouns can appear in their singular form when they are preceded by numerals higher than one (see 1.4.4). Therefore, as he suggests, a (collective) singular would also be quite acceptable here.

2.2.4 List and conclusions

As to the meaning of the words, the material presented here does not provide much support for Melchert's suggestion that the *r*-less forms are plurals. In fact, a closer look at the material rather suggests that, apart from *partawa* 'wings', the *r*-less forms are grammatical singulars. *lūšo ci-ešša* 'old men's council', the oldest instance, definitely has singular meaning.

Singular meaning is also found in the Old Hittite texts written in Middle Hittite ductus because in one instance *hanešša* seems to agree with the neuter

singular pronoun *apat*.

I have found only one example where the *r*-less form clearly has plural meaning, viz. *partawa*. Two instances are preceded by a numeral higher than one, both in Old Hittite manuscripts. Since common-gender nouns sometimes also appear as singular when they are preceded by numerals higher than one (see 1.4.4), it cannot be established whether the *r*-less forms preceded by numerals higher than one are plurals or not.

However, the *r*-less forms are archaisms, as is shown by the material and they only occur in older Hittite. I list the evidence I found in the source material for this monograph:

A: Without numerals:

Certain plural:

a: *partawa* from *partawar* 'wing' (2x, MHD)

Forms without a certain plural meaning:

b: *hattata* from *hattatar* 'wisdom, understanding, advice' (2x, MHD). However, the agreeing constituent *humanta* can be translated as 'in all respects'.

Agreement with neuter singular:

c: *hanešša* from *haneššar* 'judgment' (1x, MHD).
Hanešša agrees with *apat*.

Other cases without agreement:

d: ^{LU}*šu.gi-ešša* from ^{LU}*šu.gi-eššar*²⁶ 'old men's council' (1x, OHC)

e: *hattesša* from *hattesšar* 'opening, pit' (1x, MHD)

f: *iyawa* from *iyawar* (2x, MHD)

g: *išhiešša* from *išhieššar* 'bond, power, mandate' (2x, MHD)

h: *duddumiešša* from *duddumieššar* 'benevolence' (2x, MHC)

B: With numerals

i: *hanešša* from *hanešša* (vessel) (1x, OHC)

j: *wagešša* from *wagešša* (type of bread) (1x, OHC)

2.3 UNCHARACTERIZED NEUTER PLURALS OF THE COMPLEX *R/N*-STEMS

2.3.1 Preceded by numerals. Old Hittite

A: Old Hittite

NINDA *wageššar*²⁶ (bread)

a: 2 NINDA *wa-gi-eš-šar* StBoT 25.14 ii 13'

b: 3 NINDA *wa-ki-eš-š[ar]* StBoT 25.56 iv 13'

c: 2' ME NINDA *wa-g[í-eš-šar]* StBoT 25.18 obv.' 2' 'two hundred w. loaves'

B: Old Hittite in Middle Hittite ductus

NINDA *wageššar*²⁷ (bread)

- 2 NINDA *wa-gi-eš-šar* KBo 16.68 (+) 79 i 2, i 6, ii 10', ii 12', ii 14' (CTH 523)

To sum up, the only uncharacterized neuter plural of the complex *r/n*-stems preceded by numerals higher than one is *wageššar* from *wageššar*. It occurs 8 times (3x OHC, 5x MHC).

2.3.2 Not preceded by numerals. Young Hittite

hatreššar 'message'

- *nu-tta ha-at-ri-eš-šar kue hatreškimi* 'The messages I keep writing to you' KBo 18.24 i 4f (4) (CTH 187, Muwatalli-Tudhaliya IV)

lahhiatar 'campaign, military obligation'

- URU *Hattušaz-ma-wa-tta ke la-aḫ-ḫi-ya-tar* 'But from Hattuša these are your military obligations: ...' (translation CHD vol. L-N: 10) KUB 21.5.iii 24 (CTH 76, Muwatalli)

As pointed out by Gertz 1982:163, *lahhiatar* is plural because in the following lines more campaigns are mentioned. In Young Hittite *ke* is not a certain indicator that a given noun is neuter plural because *kī* and *ke* are used interchangeably (Gertz 1982: 184).

uppeššar 'sending'

This word occurs in the turn of phrase *uppeššar*^{27,1A} *kue* followed by a form of *upp-* 'send' in the Apology of Hattušili III, iv 53f (CTH 81) and in KUB 23.101 ii 13 (CTH 177, Tudhaliya IV). Also *ibid.* ii 19ff (19.21):

- *up-pi-eš-šar*^{27,1A} *ma-t[ta] kue uppaḫḫu[n] nu ḫūman A[N]A LU TE₄ME-ka*

²⁶ Cf. 1 NINDA *wa-gi-eš-šar* StBoT 25.10 ii 5'.

²⁷ Cf. 1 NINDA *wa-gi-eš-šar* KBo 16.68 (+) 79 iii 18' (CTH 523).

maniya[hhyv] *nu-za kuc up-pi-es[sajr]^{HA}* LÜ TE₁ME-KA *ma[laät]* *n-at-kan ist[ar]na aräa x[...]* 'The sendings [I have sent [to you, I have] handed them all to your courier. He [took] away the send[ings] the courier app[roved] of.'

The use of the neuter singular *human* is 'ad sentientiam'.

LÜ-natar 'heroic deed'

- *nu ABU-YA^m Tudhaliyaš LUGAL GAL GIM-an ašanza LUGAL-uš ēšta nu-kan QATAMMA a-ša-an-da LÜ-na-tar^{HA}* *andan GUL-šun* 'Just as my father, the Great King Tudhaliya was a true king, I chronicled his true heroic deeds accordingly.' KBo 12.38 ii 11 ff (13) (CTH 121, Suppiluliuma II)

2.3.3 List and conclusion

In the original Young Hittite texts I found the following uncharacterized plurals of the complex *r/n*-stems:

- a: *hatreššar* 'message' (1x)
- b: *lahhiatar* 'campaign' (1x)
- c: *uppeššar* 'sending' (3x)
- d: *LÜ-natar^{HA}* 'heroic deed' (1x)

Melchert's observation that the uncharacterized form of the complex *r/n*-stems should be considered an innovation, is corroborated by the material cited above, because there are no *r*-less forms in Young Hittite. It is noteworthy that in the older language the *r*-less forms are frequent. However, only once the meaning of an *r*-less form is plural.

2.4 PLENE WRITING IN AUSLAUT

2.4.1 Utne 'land, country'

Both singular and plural have the form *ut-ne-e*. Examples for singular *utne* include *ut-ne-e* [*kuit k*] *uit-pat arais* '[which]ever country revolted' KBo 3.22 obv. 11f (11) (CTH 1, OHC).

A: Old Hittite

- a: *ut-ne-e hümanda^{URU} Zalpuza and arunaz* 'Alle Länder von Zalpuwa (abl.) drinnen vom Meer (abl.)' StBoT 18 38 (translation by Neu 1974: 13). *Ut-ne-e* agrees with the nom. acc. neuter plural of *human* 'all'.
- b: [*ut-ne-e* LUGAL-aš x[] (6')] *parä utnias(-)* [StBoT 25.118 obv. i 5'f Neu 1983a: 205 lists *utne* as singular. However, *utnē* seems to be plural, because in line 6 we have *parä* followed by the dat. loc. pl. (see also Starke 1977: 136ff and Neu 1983: 206). Because of the poor state of the text, I

will not make an attempt to translate the passage.

B: Young Hittite

- c: *nu* [*dannatt*] *a KUR-e EGIR-pa dān aš[āsta]* 'He [resettled] the [unpopulated] countries again.' KUB 14.13 + i 38 (CTH 378, Mursili II).

Because of the neuter plural [*dannatt*] *a*, *KUR-e* is also a plural.

2.4.2 Āššū 'goods'. Introduction

A-aš-šu-u 'goods' is derived from the adjective *aššu-* 'good'. In older Hittite *a-aš-šu-u* is always written with plene final <U>, and, to my knowledge, never with <Ū>. When *aššū* is followed by an enclitic possessive pronoun, the final vowel is not always written plene.

The plene written final <U> is phonemically opposed to non-plene <U>. In e.g. *kuit a-aš-šu* 'the property which' KBo 3.22 rev. 58 (OHC), *aššū* without plene written final vowel is clearly singular (cf. Weitenberg 1984: 349). In e.g. KUB 43.60 i 22 (*kue aššū*) 'which goods' *aššū* agrees with the nom. acc. neuter plural of the relative pronoun. The data collected by Gertz 1982: 128 suggest that in Young Hittite the difference between plene and single vowel has been given up. Single <U> has been attested in KUB 13.5 + iii 22, KUB 24.8 + ii 2, and in KUB 24.4 + rev 5. However, in none of these instances there is a plural adjunct. As a consequence, we cannot verify her suggestion. I found one instance in which *a-aš-šu-u* is perhaps used as an adverb.

It is noteworthy that in the time of Mursili II *aššū* tends to be replaced by *aššūwa* (instance h: and i:).

2.4.2.1 Material

A: Old Hittite

- a: ^D*Katteshawi*, LUGAL-*ui* ^{URU}*Ḫatt[ūša-at]* *katta a-aš-šu-u utir n-at katta* KIL[AM-na utir] GAL^{HA} SIG₅-*anda* GUŠKIN-an SIG₅-*anda* [*n utir*] *n-at katta* KILAM-na [*utir*] 'Katteshawi! King! They [brought] the goods down from Ḫatt[ūša] and they brought them down [to the market]. [They brought] good cups (and) good gold. And they [brought] them down to the market.' StBoT 25.122 ii 9'f (10)

B: Middle Hittite

- b: *nu-za šumenzan SA* [DINGIR^{MES}] *a²-aš-šu-u KÜ.BABBAR GUŠKIN BİBRI^{HA}* TUG^{HA} *anzel iu[ajr] EGIR-an OL kuiški kappūwan ḫarta* 'No one has kept the possessions of you, [gods], - silver, gold, rhytons, garments - in [u]ch honour as we have done.' KUB 17.21 + i 11ff (11) (CTH 375)
- c: *ma[h]an-ma-ššē* [*katta wer n-aš*] *SA* ^m*Ma[d]duwatta* [DAM]^{MES}-*šu*

NAM. RA^{IIA}-ZUNU a-aš-šu-u-ya šēr URU Šallawašši we[mier] n-at-ši
 āp[pa pier] '[But] when they came down] to him, they found the [wives]
 of Madduwatta, his captives, and his possessions in Šallawašša, and they
 [gave] them ba[ck] to him.' KUB 14.1 + 54f (54) (CTH 147)

d: nu-za SA^m Maddu[watta] DAM^{MES}-SU [DUM]U^M[ES]-SU NAM. RA^{IIA}-ZUNU
 a-aš-šu-[u-ya] EGIR-an^N[^{A4} pirun]i u[nu]ešta n-ašta^m Kupanta^DKAL-aš]
 EG[IR⁷⁷] -ra nu-šši-ē-SU⁷ [-r]an IŠBAT nu DAM^{MES}-SU [DUMU^{MES}-
 SU NAM. RA^{IIA}]-ZUNU [a]-aš-šu-u-ya hūmanta-pat dās 'And he s[e]nt back
 to the r[ock] the wives [of Mad]duwatta, his [chil]dren, captives a[nd] pos-
 sessions. And Kupanta^DKAL came [up with them] and [took his ...]
 ...house? - and his wives, [his children], his [captives], his [pos]sessions,
 all of them.' KUB 14.1 + obv. 49f (49, 50) (CTH 147)

e: [n-aš mán ARAD-aš nu] SA BEL-^{LÜ}SU a-aš-šu-u uđai našma-aš LÜ
 GİS-TUKUL nu SA^{LÜ} TAPP-^{SU} a-aš-šu-u uđai[i] '[If he is a slave and] he
 brings[s] his master's goods, or if he is a GİS-TUKUL person, he brings his
 comrade's goods.' KUB 23.77 a (+) rev. 53 (CTH 138) (line numbering
 following von Schuler 1965: 117ff)

f: SA BAD^{TUM} a-aš-šu-u 'the goods of his master' KUB 26.17 ii 12 (CTH 261)

C: Young Hittite

g: [nu NAM. RA^{MES} GU^{IIA}] UDU^{IIA} a-aš-šu-<še>-it-ta šarā dahhun 'I took
 [their captives, their cattle], their sheep and their goods.' KUB 19.20 Vs
 10' (CTH 154, Šuppiluliuma I).

h: [x-ta DAM^{MES}-SU] DUMU^{MES}-SU eppun SIG⁵-u-wa dapida [GU]ŠKIN URUDU
 panqawēšša NAM. RA^{MES} 'I took his wives, his sons. All his possessions,
 [gold], copper and his captives en masse.' KBo 12.38 i 3'ff (4') (CTH 121,
 Šuppiluliuma II)

As pointed out by Gertz 1982: 127, *aššuwa* is not *aššu* + *a*, 'and goods',
 with the glide *w*, because in that case we would expect *aššu-u-ya*.

2.4.2.2 Enclitic possessive pronoun a-aš-šu-u

If *aššu*, meaning 'goods', in older Hittite is followed by an enclitic possessive
 pronoun, the *s* of the pronoun is usually written double:

a: *aššu-ššet* 'his goods' KBo 6.2 i 5 (CTH 291, Laws I §5, OHC) KBo 6.3
 i 12 (MHD) gives single -š.

b: *aššu-ššet* StBoT 25.123 3 (so Neu 1983a: 33)

c: *aššu-ššet* KUB 36.99 rev. 5. (CTH 2)

Old Hittite texts in Middle Hittite ductus:

aššu-ššet a 'his possessions too' KBo 6.3 i 12 (Laws I §5), *ibid.* ii 1 (§27)
a-aš-šu-še-it.

2.4.2.3 A-aš-šu-u used adverbially

In *a-aš-šu-u* 1G^{IIA}-KA *lāk* 'Turn your eyes kindly' KBo 7.28 obv. 11 (CTH
 371, MHD), *a-aš-šu-u* seems to be used adverbially. As pointed out by Gertz
 1982: 50, *a-aš-šu-u* is otherwise always used as a concrete noun. This makes
 adverbial interpretation problematic, especially because in the following line
 (LUGAL-un *anda a-aš-šu ša-ku-wa-ya* 1G^{IIA}-KA *lāk*) we find *aššu* with single
 <U>. Gertz suggests that the plene written final vowel could be a scribal error
 for *aššu* 'good'.

2.4.2.4 Evaluation and conclusion

A-aš-šu-u 'goods' is plural. In Young Hittite, from Muršiliš II, it tends to
 be replaced by *a-aš-šu-wa*. From the substantives *a-aš-šu-u* received the zero
 grade of the suffix and became *a-aš-šu-wa*. In Old Hittite *a-aš-šu-u* is referred
 to by the neuter singular anaphoric pronoun -at. In Middle Hittite *a-aš-šu-u*
 is once referred to by the neuter plural *hūmanta* 'all'. I have found no other
 adjuncts.

In Old Hittite the enclitic possessive pronoun, always (3 ×) has double
 <šš>. Perhaps it is used once as an adverb 'kindly'.

2.4.3 Mekki 'a large part'

Watkins 1982: 259 suggests that *mekki* is a neuter plural because of the plene
 written final vowel. He compares the plene final vowel in *mekki* with the one in
a-aš-šu-u 'goods'. In *a-aš-šu-u* the plene written final vowel certainly indicates
 a plural. Therefore, Watkins argues, *mekki* must also be plural.²⁸ *Mekki* occurs
 in Old Hittite:

- *takku* LÜ^{GİS}TUKUL-aš A.SA^{IIA}-SU *hūmandan kuitki wāši luzzi ka[rpi]zzi*
takku A.SA^{IIA}-na me-ik-ki-i wāši 'If someone buys all the handworker's
 land, he has to [do] service, if he buys (only) a large amount of the land
 ...' KBo 6.2 ii 45f (Laws, §47a)

Mekki stands in partitive apposition to the A.SA^{IIA}-na which has common
 gender. It has to be interpreted as 'a large amount'.

In HBM 39 obv. 6'ff (MHC) *mekki*, also meaning 'a large amount', occurs
 without plene writing:

²⁸ Watkins suggests that the long final -f was caused by *-a₂ which disappeared with
 compensatory lengthening of the final -i (for a discussion on the diachrony see 3.7 and 3.8.2).

- *nu* ANSE <KUR RA^{BI} >^A *m[e]kki hūittayan ēšdu* 'The horses have to be concentrated in [l]arge numbers.' HBM 39 obv. 6'ff

For similar contexts, always without plene final vowel, I refer to CHD vol. L-N: 248)

Watkins suggests that plural value is corroborated by *meqqaya* in the sentence *nu mān UNUTE^{BI}-ma-kan me-iq-ga-ya nu-kan* 1 KIN *šakuwaššarraza arḫa dāi UNUTE^{BI}-ma-kan hūman* <*zaskitallaza dammela*za arḫa *šakuwaššarraḫhi* 'And if the utensils (are) many, then he takes away 1 sickle from the property. But he makes good/restores the utensils entirely from an untouched *zaskitalla* ...' KUB 46.42 iii 1f (1) (translation by Gertz 1982: 117). Watkins suggests that in this form *-aya* secondarily replaced older *-i*.

Gertz 1982: 17 argues that the parallel is wrong, because we find *mekki* without plene final vowel in the same old manuscript of the Laws (KBo 6.2 iv 42f) in more or less the same context, viz. *takku mekki* [*ta*]zzi 'If he [steal]s a lot', without plene written final vowel. Secondly, *meqqaya* is used as an adjective, whereas *mekki* is used as a substantive. Therefore, she argues that *mekki* is probably not a plural but simply a singular.

The fact that the plene written final vowel in *mekki* in KBo 6.2 ii 45f is thus far the only instance in similar contexts (for which see CHD vol. L-N 248), pleads in favour of Gertz's interpretation. Moreover, as to the meaning there is nothing which suggests that *mekki* is a grammatical plural.

In KBo 5.8 (CTH 61, Mursili II, NHC) *mekki* and *meqqaya* occur in the same context, meaning 'in large numbers':

- a: EGIR-az^{ma} URU *Gasgaz kūruri^{BI} me-ik-ki nininkat* 'In the rear, from the Gasgaean town, enemies mobilized in great numbers.' KBo 5.8 ii 10f (11)
- b: *nu kūruri^{BI} kuit me-iq-ga-ya* [*nini*]nkan *ēšta* 'Because enemies had [mobilized] in large numbers' KBo 5.8 ii 35.

Both *mekki* and *meqqaya* refer to *kūruri^{BI}* 'enemies'. Gertz 1982: 116f regards both instances as neuter plural. However, one might just as well propose that only *meqqaya* is a certain neuter plural, since *mekki* can be classified as an adverb (with CHD vol. L-N: 248 sub *mekki* B.2'). *Mekki* must then be translated as 'in large numbers, in large parts'

In summing up, it is not certain whether *mekki* is a neuter plural.

2.4.4 *Nakki* 'heavy, important, difficult'

A: Middle Hittite

- a: *]-pat* 1^{EN} *uttar na-ak-ki-i ēšdu* 'Let one matter weigh heavily.' (i.e. must be very important) KUB 36.114 20 (CTH 271, MHC)

Nakki is not a plural because it is preceded by the numeral 1.

B: Young Hittite

- b: *nu* L^{OMES} URU *Azzi kuiēš URU^{DIDL} ULIA Bād^{NA} perunuš UR^{SAG} MES^{uš} par-gawēš na-ak-ki-i ASU^{UL} EGIR-pa harkir* 'The people from the town of Azzi who had found refuge in fortified places, rocky caves, high mountains, difficult (= hard to reach) places ...' KBo 4.4 iv 30f (30) (CTH 61, Mursili II)

In the paradigm of *nakki*-plene writing of the final vowel occurs frequently and is not limited to instances which can be regarded as neuter plurals, e.g. nom. sg. c. *na-ak-ki-i-iš* in KBo 15.25 obv. 13 (for more references see Kimball 1983: 476ff, Watkins 1982: 259f and CHD vol. L-N: 364ff).

Therefore, the plene writing of *nakki* is not indicative for plural value. Moreover, in instance a: it is a singular as is proved by the numeral 1.

Nakki in KBo 4.4 iv 30 is probably a neuter plural because it refers to towns mentioned earlier. However, since there are a number of instances where the Sumerian complement *UL^A* is used with grammatical singulars (see 1.4.3), grammatical plural for *nakki* is not more than likely. However, plural value is not indicated by the plene writing of the final vowel. *Nakki* is rather an uncharacterized neuter plural.

2.4.5 *Tar-ru-u* 'on all fours'

This word occurs once in the source material for this monograph:

- *]-x-ni* [*k*]edani *tar-ru-u artari* '[There]fore it stands on all fours.'

This passage can also be translated as '[There]fore it stands spread out, extended.' KUB 31.105 8 (CTH 138 MHC)

Tarrū is used as an adverb. Watkins 1982: 258 analyses this word as neuter plural, because in later Hittite we find *tar-ra-u-wa*. He contends that *tar-ru-u* is a neuter plural, which has the same final <*Ū*> as *āššū* (<**uh₂*>).

Because both neuter singular and neuter plural can function as an adverb, Gertz 1982: 53 rightly states that *tarrū* is not necessarily a plural. She also points out that the plene final vowels in *āššū* and *tarrū* are not necessarily comparable because *āššū* has plene written initial <*A*>, which is the reflex of a stressed vowel, whereas *tarrū* never has plene written vowel in the initial syllable.

On semantical grounds, Kimball 1983: 617 prefers to analyse *tarrū* as a locative. As a parallel she cites *tarrū* in Bo 2489 + 4008 ii 12-14. This text is cited by Neu 1968: 201: *KUR URU Hatti-ma-kan labarnas MUNUS Tawannannas kiššari tarrū wēššittaru* 'Hatti shall graze t. in the hands of the Labarna and

Tawannanna. If we assume that *tarrū* is a locative, we have to conclude that the proto-form of *tarrū* must have had a final stressed vowel. Kimball explains this by assuming *tar-ru-u* to be an endless locative **torréu*, with the original diphthong being reflected in plene final <U-U> <*éu or *éu. As parallel to the plene final vowel Kimball 1983: 455 compares *ka-ru-ú* 'previously, before' <*kréu.

Weitenberg 1984: 115 thinks that a protoform **kréu* is impossible, because according to him, **éu* yields Hittite *iu* (cf. *sius* < **dyéus*). In this word **dy* yields *s*, whereas *iu* cannot be the result of a short diphthong **eu*, because in Hittite **eu* becomes *u*. He analyses *ka-ru-ú* as a petrified nom. acc. adjectival form.²⁹

Because there is no positive evidence for a locative, the interpretation of *tar-ru-u* as an adverb is to be preferred. Moreover, in later Hittite we have *tarrawa*, which is a neuter plural.

To sum up, it is difficult to determine whether the plene vowel indicates that *tarrū* is a singular or plural form. Plural for *tarrū* 'extended, on all fours' is possible but not verifiable.

2.4.6 Tuniptū (type of bread)

For this word see Weitenberg 1984: 250.

- [(LÜ GISBANSUR) NINDA tu]-u-ni-ip-tu-u dāi '[(The overseer of the table)] takes the [t]uniptū-bread.' StBoT 25.12 ii 9'

It is impossible to determine whether this form is singular or plural because the context does not give a clue. In KBo 27.42 v 20 a variant with common-gender [tu-un]-nap-du-ú-un is found. This form also has a plene written final vowel. This suggests that the plene written <U> occurs frequently in the paradigm of NINDA *tuni/aptu*-. Therefore, *tuniptū* is not a plural.

2.4.7 Conclusion for the plene written final vowel

In summing up, one can label the forms with plene written final vowel as follows:

<i>a-aš-tu-u</i>	certainly plural
<i>mekki</i>	unlikely plural
<i>tarrū</i>	uncertain plural
<i>nakki</i>	uncharacterized plural
<i>tuniptū</i>	no plural

²⁹ For a more exhaustive treatment I refer to Kimball and Weitenberg.

2.5 THE UNCHARACTERIZED NEUTER PLURAL

2.5.1 List of uncharacterized neuter plural of the r/n-stems

For the uncharacterized neuter plural of the r/n-stems see 2.3.1 and 2.3.2. I cite the forms, which are found only in Young Hittite:

- a: *ḫatressār* 'message' (1×)
- b: *lahḫiatar* 'campaign' (1×)
- c: *uppeššar* 'sending' (3×)
- d: *lū-natar*^{H1A} 'heroic deed' (1×)

I have found one word preceded by numerals higher than one.

wageššar (type of bread) (8×)

2.5.2 I- and u-stems without numerals

A: Old Hittite

sig *išmeri* 'rein'

- *nu išharwanta* sig *iš-me-ri ḫarzi* 'He holds the bloodstained reins.' KBo 30.39 + StBoT 25.139 rev. 17

B: Old Hittite in Middle Hittite ductus

GIS-ru 'tree, wood, forest'

- a: *-[nēkuwanda GIS-ru še-]* *ū-uk GIS*^{H1A} *ariya(n-)* KBo 17.23 rev. 3' 6' f (6) (CTH 832)

[Nēkuwanda] is either a modifying adjective, in which case GIS-ru is an uncharacterized plural, or it is a 3 pl. med. of an unknown verb. Therefore, Hoffner, p.c., referred to by Gertz 1982: 25, suggests that *(-)[nēkuwanda]* has to be completed to *[ma]nēkuwanta* 'short (trees/pieces of wood)' with omission of *n* in front of *k* (cf. *manikuwandus* in KUB 12.63 obv. 30).

- b: *[nu ḫ]UR.SAG*^{DIDLH1A} *ḫāter GIS*^{H1A} *-ru ḫāzta* 'The [mo]untains dried up, the trees dried up.' KUB 17.10 i 16 (CTH 324)

The only indication that GIS^{H1A}-ru is plural is the complement ^{H1A}. In view of the plural 'mountains' which occurs in the same line, one can argue that **taru* here is plural. Perhaps its meaning is collective 'wood' or 'forest'.

NAA *ḫuwasi* 'stele'

- *nu=kan* NAA *ḫu-wa-ši*^{H1A} *GIS-az laḡari nu kiššan memai kuis=wa kue weteskit kinuna=war=at kāša* BEL S[ISKUR] *pippaš* 'The ḫ-stones rock on their feet and he speaks thus: 'Look, whoever built anything, the client of the [ritual], has now destroyed these things.' KBo 24.1 i 13 f (13) (CTH 404)

Huwasi cannot be established as a certain nom. acc. neuter plural because of *kue* in l. 14, which means 'whatsoever, anything'. In KUB 32.115 + iii 55, also CTH 404, we find *huwasi*^{H1.A} preceded by the numeral 7 (see Gertz 1982: 43).

C: Middle Hittite

adupli- (garment)

- CTH 375 KUB 17.21 + iii 14ff (15), see *ispanduzi*.

ispanduz(z)i- 'libation, wine jug'

In the following two instances, the uncharacterized neuter plural *ispanduzzi* is followed by the conjunction *-ya*, which connects sentences or constituents in the same sentence:

- a: [NINDA.G(UR₄.RA^{H1.A} DUG^{is-pa-an-d})-u-z]^{is-ya} SIG₅-anta [ECIR-p(a) *pešga-we*)]ni 'Thick (loaves) and good [(wine jugs)]ugs we [(repeatedly offer)]r again.' KUB 31.124 ii 16f (16) (CTH 375)

As Gertz 1982: 44 points out, *ispanduzzi* must be plural because it agrees with the neuter plural SIG₅-anta.

- b: ANA^{DUTU} URU^{Arinna} *sittariuš armanniüss-a* ŠA KÙ.BABBAR GUŠKIN ZABAR URUDU^{H1.A} TUG.SIG^{H1.A}.TIM TUG^{H1.A} *adupli* TUG.GÜ.E.A *kušišiyas* NINDA^{haršauš} DUG^{is-pa-an-tu-uz-zi-ya} *kuez arḫa piddāir* 'From there they have offered the solar discs and the lunulae made of silver, gold, bronze (and) copper, the fine textiles, the curtains(?), the garments, the sacrificial loaves of bread and wine rations to the sun-goddess of Arinna.' KUB 17.21 + iii 14ff (16) (CTH 375)

Isbanduzzi and *adupli* occur on the same level as NINDA^{haršauš} which is acc. pl. of NINDA^{harši-}. Therefore, *ispanduzzi* and *adupli* are probably neuter plurals.

- c: (Because we feel awe for the gods,) *upp([išgawe])ni* NINDA.GUR₄.RA^{H1.A} DUG^{is-pa-an-tu-uz-zi} GU₄^{H1.A} UDU^{H1.A} 'We [(regularly)] offer thick loaves, wine rations, cows and sheep.' KUB 17.21 + iv 10 (CTH 375)

terippi 'ploughed field'

- a: nu URU^{Tapigga} URU^{Anziliya} URU^{Hariya} ù ANA^{URU} *Haninqauwaya* SE^{AM} ù ziz-ya [k]ue anniyān ēšta man 01. apez dā'tta man ape A.ŠA *te-ri-ip-pi* anir 'If you had not taken the barley and bearded wheat which had been sown from the towns Tapigga, Anziliya, Hariya and Haninqauwaya, they would have sown those ploughed fields.' HBM 114 8ff (13)

Terippi is plural because of the pronoun *ape*.

- b: qāša~nu^m Pulli^{URU} Kāšipura^z *hatrāit* A.ŠA *te-ri-ip-pi-za* *kue* URU^{Dapiqqa} URU^{Tah[a]šara-za} A.ŠA *te<r>ippiyan nu-za* NUMUN^m *Himu-DINGIR*^{LIM}-is 01. pāi 'Look, from Kašipura Pulli has written me as follows: 'Himuili does not give seed for the fields which have been ploughed in Dapiqqa and in Tah[a]šara.' HBM 55 (55) obv. 3ff (5)

Terippi is plural because of the pronoun *kue*.

- c: SA^{URU} Kāšipura^{GU₄}^{H1.A} *kue* A.ŠA *te-ri-ip-pi* A.ŠA^[a] *terippiyat* 'Which fields the cows from Kašipura have ploughed' HBM 54 18ff (19)

Terippi is plural because of the pronoun *kue*.

tilipuri- 'district'

- [ti-li-pu-ri]^{H1.A} *paš* 'He has given districts.' KBo 16.47 rev. 28' (CTH 28)
The only indication that this word is plural is the Sumerian determinative ^{H1.A}.

2.5.3 *I-* and *u-*stems preceded by numerals

A: Old Hittite

(GIS) *erḫui-* 'basket'

- 11 GIS^{e-ir-ḫu-i} StBoT 25.13 i 22'

DUG^{hariulli-} (vessel)

- 10 DUG^{ha-ri-ul-li} StBoT 25.15 i 9'

tuḫupzi- (implement)

- 11 *tu-ḫu-up-zi* [g]al StBoT 25.13 i 22' (Cf. 2 ME *tu-ḫu-up-zi* gal in KUB 42.107 iv 12.)

A dative plural which might prove that *tuḫupzi* can be plural has been found in StBoT 25.27 Vs 7' *tu-ḫu-up-zi-i* [a-aš] 'And them on the 11 t.'

B: Old Hittite in Middle Hittite ductus

etri- (dish)

- 8 *e-it-ri* 'eight dishes, eight portions of food' KUB 33.81 iv 7 (CTH 322)

GIS^{hattalu-} 'bolt'

- 7 GIS^{ha-at-ta-lu} 'seven bolts' KUB 17.10 iv 14 (CTH 324)

C: Middle Hittite

GAD^{huzzi-} (garment)

- 3 GAD^{ḫu-uz-zi} 'three garments' VBoT 1 32 (CTH 151)

iṣḥaru 'tear'

- 7 *iṣ-ḥa-aḥ-ru* KBo 15.10 i 6 (CTH 443)

kurdali (bowl)³⁰

- 2 *ku-ur-da-a-h* KBo 15.10 i 2 (CTH 443)

D: Young Hittite

Because the evidence in older Hittite is abundant, I have not collected Young Hittite material.

2.5.4 List of uncharacterized *i*- and *u*-stems

Plurals of *i*- and *u*-stems in older Hittite:

<i>rūg adupli</i> (garment)	MHC (1×) likely
<i>ḫuwaši</i> 'stele'	MHD (1×) uncertain
<i>iṣpanduzzi</i> 'libation'	MHC (3×, 1× certain, 2× likely)
<i>išmeri</i>	OHC (1×) certain
<i>terippi</i> 'ploughed field'	MHC (3×) certain
<i>telipuri</i> (district)	MHC (1×) uncertain
<i>giš-ru</i> 'wood, tree'	MHD (2×, 1× likely, 1× uncertain)

It is difficult to determine whether the uncharacterized neuter forms of the nom. acc. of the *i*- and *u*-stems preceded by numerals higher than one are plural (see 1.4.4). Plural value of these forms is corroborated by the Old Hittite dat. plural 11 *tuhupziyas* 'on 11 t.' as opposed to the possible uncharacterized plural 11 *tuhupzi*. I found the following *i*- and *u*-stems preceded by a numeral higher than one:

<i>erḫui</i> 'basket'	OHC
<i>ḫariulli</i> (vessel)	OHC
<i>tuhupzi</i> (implement)	OHC
<i>etri</i> 'dish'	MHD
<i>ḫattalu</i> 'bolt'	MHD
<i>ḡad ḫuzzi</i> (garment)	MHC
<i>iṣḥaru</i> 'tear'	MHC
<i>kurtali</i> (container)	MHC

³⁰ In 1 *ku-ur-da-a-h iṣḫaš* 'one *kurdali* made of dough' KBo 15.10 i 12 (CTH 443)

kurdali is singular, because it is preceded by the numeral 1.

2.5.5 Uncharacterized neuter plural of *r*- and *l*-stems

A. Old Hittite in Middle Hittite ductus

waštul 'sin, offences'

- *nu-mu wa-aš-du-ul-mit* [tēd] *du n-e-z(a)-šan ganešmi* KUB 30.10 obv. 24f (24'), ibid. 26' [*nu-mu wa-aš-d*] *u-ul-mi-it tēddu ganešmi* 'Let him tell me what my sins are, and I will acknowledge them.' This turn of phrase also occurs ibid. 28' (CTH 373)
- Wašdul* is neuter plural because of the neuter pl. pronoun *-e* in *n-e-z(a)-šan*.

B: Middle Hittite

išḫul 'treaty'

- [*nu-s*] *mas ke* *put[u]*³¹ *kue iṣ-ḫi-ū-ul iṣḫiskimi* 'Those treaties I, my majesty, usually conclude with you' KBo 16.24 (+) i 51' (CTH 251).³¹
- iṣ-ḫi-ū-ul* is plural, because it agrees with *ke*, the nom. acc. neuter plural of *kā* 'this' and because of *kue*, the nom. acc. neuter plural of the relative pronoun. *iṣ-ḫi-ū-ul* is uncharacterized. The plene written final syllable also occurs in e.g. Bo 86/299 i 16 (NHC). Here *iṣḫul* agrees with the singular *kuit*.

C: *waštul* 'sin'

- a: *nu-tta kue kue wa-aš-tul* 'Whichever sins for you' HBM 96 rev. 6'
- b: *nu-za* ^m *Mekiš apel u* [RU^{LAM}] *-su wa-aš-du-la-az parkunūt* ^{URU} *Ebl-la-an ur* *u-an uru-ri šer wa-aš-tul*^{31A} *peššiet* 'Meki has cleaned his city, (viz.) the city of Ebla from sins. In favour of the city he has thrown away the sins.' KBo 32.15 iii 18f (19)

D: Young Hittite

kurur 'enemy'

- a: *ku-ru-ur*^{31A} *-ma-mu kue ešta* [(*n-at-za tar*)] *aḫḫun* '[(I con)] quered the country[s] which were hostile to me.' KUB 1.1 + iv 56f (56) (CTH 81, Ḫattušili III)
 - b: [*k*] *u-u-ru-ur*^{31A} *arān* 'Many enemies had mobilized'. KBo 4.4 i 20f (20) (CTH 61, Mursili I)
- This is a possible neuter plural because of the Sumerian complement ^{31A}.

waštul 'sin'

³¹ The line numbering follows Rizzi Mellini 1979: 522.

- *nu mān* ANA KUR^{URU} *Hatti wa-aš-tūl^{URU}A ēšzi nu kueqa* DUTU^{URU} *Arinna=ma-a* at GĀSAN-YA *daḫangaš memmi šer arḫa=pat peššiya* 'If there are any sins in the land of Hatti, whichever, forgive them, sun-goddess of Arinna, for the sake of *daḫanga*'.

This form is plural because of the neuter plural pronoun *kueqa*. KUB 14.7 iv 9ff (9) (CTH 383, Hattušili III)

2.5.6 R- and l-stems preceded by numerals

A: Old Hittite

ḫuppar-³² (vessel, measure)

- a: 2 *ḫu-up-pár* KAŠ.GEŠTIN StBoT 25.12 ii 24', ibid. iii 17'
- b: 2 *ḫu-up-pár* GĒSTIN 'Two vessels of wine' StBoT 25.83 4'
- c: [G]EŠTIN SA 3 *ḫu-up-pár* StBoT 25.50 6' '[W]ine in the measure of three *ḫuppar*'

One might claim that *ḫuppar* must be left out because measures are singular. This applies for instance c: 'wine in the quantity of 3 *ḫuppar*'. However, in the instances a: and b: *ḫuppar* indicates a vessel, in e.g. 2 *ḫuppar* KAŠ.GEŠTIN one must assume that actually two vessels are meant.

B: Old Hittite texts in Middle Hittite ductus

ḫalḫaltumar 'corner'

- [(^PEN.LIL-aš *attaš=teš* KUR)]-e 4 *ḫal-ḫal-tu-u-mar tuk=pat kiššari=tti* [ti(yan *ḫarzi*)] '[(Enlil, your father)], has put the four corners of the [count]rie(s) in your hands.' KUB 31.130 rev. 6' (CTH 374)

ḫalḫaltumar has been attested both as an *r*-stem and as an *i*-stem (Gertz 1982: 58 mentions e.g. *ḫalḫaltumariya*, dat.loc. KUB 7.41 i 7). Melchert 1983b: 13 argues that the *i*-stem is late and that it probably originated from the Young Hittite neuter plural *ḫalḫaltumari*. This instance is the only one where *ḫalḫaltumar* occurs as an *r*-stem (see Kammenhuber HW₂, Band III, Lief. 11 1991: 28).

2.5.7 List of the *r*- and *i*-stems

There is ample evidence that the *r*- and *i*-stems had an uncharacterized neuter plural:

Older Hittite

<i>wašdul</i> 'sin, fault'	3× (1× MHD, 1× MHC)
<i>išḫul</i> 'treaty'	1× (MHC)

³² In 1 *ḫu-up-pár* *marnuon* StBoT 25.13 iv 1 a singular *ḫuppar* has been attested.

Young Hittite

<i>kurur</i> 'enemy'	1× certain, 1× possible (Hattušili III)
<i>wašdul</i> 'sin, fault'	1× (Hattušili III)

With numerals:

<i>ḫuppar</i> (vessel)	3× (OHC)
<i>ḫalḫaltumar</i> 'corner'	1× (MHC)

2.5.8 Residual cases

ḫar-na-i-šar^{SAR} (type of plant)

- 6 *ḫar-na-i-šar*^{SAR} (followed by *ḫar-zi* 'he holds six ḫ.' StBoT 25.27 rev. 15', 16').

Neu 1980a: 73, n. 272 points out that ^{SAR} may not be a Sumerian determinative, but that it possibly stands for genuine Hittite *-šar*. Therefore we have here either *ḫar-nai* or *ḫar-naišar*.

wagataš- (type of bread)

- a: 2 ^{NINDA} *wa-ga-a-ta-aš* StBoT 25.79 obv. 7 i 8'
- b: 2 ^{NINDA} *wa-ga-da-a-aš* StBoT 25.79 obv. 7 i 7'
- c: 2 ^{NINDA} *wa-ga-ta-aš* StBoT 25.12 ii 11'
- d: 2 ^{NINDA} *wa-ga-da-aš* StBoT 25.19 obv. 12
- e: 16 ^{NINDA} *wa-ga-ta-aš* StBoT 25.13 iv 6

In 1 ^{NINDA} *wa-ga-a-ta-aš* StBoT 25.34 rev. 10' a singular has been attested.

Middle Hittite *peda*- 'place'

- EGIR-*pa=ma* 3 *pi-e-da-an laḫḫumuzi daiš* 'Afterwards he put foliage on three places.' KBo 15.10 iii 62' (CTH 443)

Because Hittite has a distributive singular (see 1.4.8), *pedan* may be a singular. It may also be a singular standing in front of a numeral higher than one, just as common-gender nouns can occur as singular when they are preceded by numerals higher than one (see 1.4.4).

To sum up, *pedan* is a grammatical singular. It is either a distributive singular (see 1.4.8) or a singular preceded by a numeral, just as common-gender nouns sometimes appear in their singular form when they are preceded by numerals higher than one. *Wagataš* can be an uncharacterized neuter plural.

2.5.9 Conclusions for the uncharacterized neuter plural

There is abundant evidence for the uncharacterized neuter plural in the *i*-, *u*-, *r*-, and *l*-stems. In a number of cases positive evidence is provided by agreement with adjectives, participles or pronouns.

If an uncharacterized neuter singular is preceded by a numeral higher than one, the situation is more complicated: because the uncharacterized neuter plural in fact has the same form as the singular, it is not possible to determine its grammatical number. However, the Old Hittite dat.loc. pl. 11 *ḫuḫupziās* (see 2.5.3) provides positive evidence that, at least in some cases, neuter nouns in the oblique cases appeared as plural. Therefore, it is possible that the nom.acc. neuter forms preceded by numerals higher than one, are uncharacterized plurals.

2.6 THE ENDING -I

2.6.1 Introduction

I have found only three words which are unambiguously characterized by the ending -i, viz. *kurur* 'enemy', *arkuwar* 'prayer' and *ḫuḫupal* (musical instrument). *Kururi* 'enemies' and *arkuwarri* 'prayers' occur only in Young Hittite. *Ḫuḫupalli* already occurs in Old Hittite (see 2.6.3 for a more exhaustive treatment).

As to *arkuwarri*, Gertz 1982: 162 points out that *arkuwar* is probably an *r/n*-stem, it being a verbal substantive. This strongly suggests that the ending -i in *arkuwarri* is an innovation: the complex *r/n*-stems do not have a separate neuter plural ending. Their neuter plural is either uncharacterized or characterized by *r*-less plurals (see 2.3.1 and 2.3.2).

As pointed out by Gertz 1982: 313, the replacement of the uncharacterized neuter plural by the ending -i is not complete: in no stem class the ending -i has become the only plural formant. Even in one and the same word the ending -i and the uncharacterized neuter plural co-occur. This can be seen in *kurur* 'enemy', which has both an uncharacterized plural and an ending -i.

To sum up, the ending -i seems to become more frequent.

2.6.2 Certain instances from the source material for this monograph *arkuwar* 'prayer'

- *nu-nu ke ar-ku-war-ri^{HI.A} istamašten* 'Listen to these pleas of mine.'
KUB 6.45 + i 26f (26) (CTH 381, Muwatalli)

kurur 'enemy, (enemy) land'³³

- a: *nu ku-u-ru-ri^{HI.A} kue* [^MES. *aš-pat mienür n-aš-kan pidi*
ḫarganur 'And the enemy (lands) which [...] ... had placated (or: made to thrive(?)), they destroyed in place.' KUB 19.22 rt. col. 2f (2) (CTH 40,

Mursili II) (translation CHD vol. L-N: 291)

- b: *ku-u-ru-ri^{HI.A} kue* KBo 14.42 10 (CTH 40, Mursili II)
- c: *nu ku-u-ru-ri^{HI.A} kuit meggaya* [nini]nkan *ēšta* 'Because enemy countries had [mobilized] in large numbers' KBo 5.8 ii 35f (35) (CTH 61, Mursili II)
- d: *namma ABU-ya kuit ina kur^{URU} Ḫurri ēšta nu kuitman kur^{KUR}MES^{URU} Ḫurri zahḫiskit n-aš istantait* EGIR-az-ma *URU Gāsgaz ku-u-ru-ri^{HI.A} mekki nimitat nu kur^{URU} Ḫatti dammešhair* 'Because my father was in the Hurrian country, and as long as he fought against the Hurrian countries and as long as he stayed there, behind his back enemies from the Gaseganean towns mobilized in large numbers and oppressed the land of Hatti.' KBo 5.8 ii 10f (11) (CTH 61, Mursili II)
- e: *jx ku-ru-ri^{HI.A} daninun* 'I restored order among the enemies.' KBo 16.8 ii 28 (CTH 61, Mursili II)

2.6.3 *Ḫuḫupal* (musical instrument)

This word has a bewildering variety of plurals. A (young) *G^{IS}ḫu-ḫu-pa-a-la* KUB 15.5 iii 11 (CTH 583, NHC, Ḫattušili III) and an uncharacterized plural *kue^{G^{IS}}ḫu-[ḫ]u-pa-al* in KUB 25.37 i 11³⁴ (Gertz 1982: 155) have been attested. We also have Old Hittite *G^{IS}ḫu-ḫu-pa-al-li*, which may be considered a nom.acc. neuter plural in -i.

After a survey of attestations, Melchert 1988b: 231 concludes that *ḫuḫupal* denotes a musical instrument, played by being struck (he suggests that the verb *ḫuppiya-* means 'make the sound ḫupp'). *Ḫuḫupal*-vessels can also be used as drinking vessels because they can be filled with wine (KUB 25.37 i 34). Therefore, he thinks that *ḫuḫupal* denotes a percussion instrument consisting of a pair of shallow vessels. Güterbock 1995: 71 suggests 'drum'. For the verb *ḫuppiya-* he suggests 'tap'.

Melchert thinks that *ḫu-ḫu-pa-al* is a loan word from Hieroglyphic Luwian *ḫuḫurpal(i)*. Proof for this is, he suggests, offered by [*G^{IS}ḫu*]-*wa-ḫur-pa-al*, which he explains as a derivative of the verb *ḫuḫurp-* (p. 235). This means, according to Melchert 'make the sound ḫurp'.

Melchert thinks that Hittite *ḫu-ḫu-pa-al* is a derivative in -al of the verb *ḫuppiya-*.³⁴ *Ḫuḫupal* has been remade after the large and productive class of neuter nouns in -all-. Therefore, Melchert assumes that *ḫuḫupalli* is singular. However, it cannot be determined whether *ḫuḫupalli* is always a singular form.

³⁴ According to Puhvel 1991: 384 this word means 'interlace, ensnare, commingle, make a blend of'. He cites e.g. *ziz memal ḫuppizzi* 'he blends spelt groats'. Puhvel 1991: 385 therefore thinks that Melchert's reconstruction is highly improbable.

³³ I have found only one example of an uncharacterized plural (see 2.5.5).

The form *huhupal* in KUB 25.37 i 11 is an uncharacterized neuter plural. This suggests that this word is an *l*-stem. On the other hand, *huhupalli* may indeed be a singular, because there are more singulars having the suffix *-alli-* (see 2.6.4 for a short discussion).

Old Hittite *huhupal* is an *l*-stem as is indicated by *sawitrān hu-hu-pa-al-la harkanzi* 'They hold a horn (?) and a *huhupal*.' StBoT 25.54 i 10. This suggests singular *huhupal-*. Therefore, already in Old Hittite a neuter plural on *-i* has been attested.

a: *nu-u-za ūk* ^{G15} *hu-hu-pa-al-li dā[h]e nu huppi(y)emi* 'I ta[k]e the musical instruments and I pluck/drum.' StBoT 25.137 iii 13f (13')

b: *h[u-hu-pa-al-li za-[x]]* StBoT 25.138 Rs' 7'.

To sum up, *huhupalli* is a possible case of a neuter plural in *-i*.

2.6.4 Additional material

Because the evidence I have found in the source material is very meagre, I cite additional material collected by Gertz 1982:

a: *a-ni-ya-at-ti* 'adornments' (p. 138f) IBoT 2.130 rev. 4 (CTH 450), KBo 18.196 rev. 4, KUB 21.4 i 7

As Gertz (p. 138) points out, *aniyatti* is an alternative form for *aniyatta* because the contexts are exactly the same in a number of cases.

b: *iš-ḫi-ū-li* ^{H1A} 'treaties' (p. 156) KUB 32.133 i 4 (CTH 482). This is an exceptional form: in the source material for this monograph I only found uncharacterized plurals.

c: *2 ka-az-za-ar-nu-ul-li* (type of cloth) from *kazzarnul-* (ibid. i 18)(p. 156). KBo 5.2 i 45 (CTH 471)

d: ^{D[UG]} *h[u-u-u]p-pa-a-ri* ^{H1A} (p. 157) KUB 27.1 iii 14 (CTH 712)

e: *mi-nu-mar-ri* ^{H1A} 'prosperity' (p. 164) KUB 5.5 ii 3 (CTH 578), KUB 22.64 ii 4' (CTH 582)

f: *[šu-up]-pī-es-sar-ri* ^{H1A} 'cleanness, purity' KUB 18.24 iii 5, iii 9

More instances are cited by Oettinger 1993: 207 and 1995a: 313f. He considers more forms to be neuter plurals in *-i*. Oettinger suggests that the ending *-i* originated in the *i*-stems and that the plural in *-i* has been derived from an original nom. acc. neuter plural **-i*₂ (Oettinger 1993: 211). Oettinger 1993: 210f suggests that this ending received its accent on the analogy of the plurals *wāda* and *āssu* (plene writing implies accent). Main proof for his hypothesis is furnished by the double <LL> in e.g. *kurtalli* (container) in instance a: below. Oettinger suggests that double written <LL> implies following accent. This

double <LL> is opposed to the single <L> in the genitive.³⁵

However, one can object that *kurtalli* (instance a:) and *paršulli* can be grammatical singulars because sometimes they are preceded by the numeral one. The other problems raised by Oettinger's theory will be discussed in 3.6.4, because they deal with historical phonology.

I cite and discuss relevant material (partly given by Oettinger 1993 and 1995a) not mentioned above:

a: *nu* ^{G15} *kur-ta-al-li* ^{H1A} *kitta* ... *n-ašta* DUMU-AN ^{G15} *kur-ta-li-aš* [*-i*]t *parkunumi* 'The containers are present ... and I clean the baby with the ...' from the container.' KBo 17.61 16f (MH, Beckman 1983: 47). This instance is discussed by Oettinger 1993: 207f.

Here we would have a plural *kurtalli* with double <LL> as opposed to the single <L> in the genitive. Singular *kurtal* has been attested in KBo 10.45 iii 7 (MH/NS), KUB 32.103 i 15' and KBo 19.145 iii 18'. (CTH 788, young manuscript according to Haas-Tiel 1978: 60ff)

However, in Middle Hittite we have a nom. acc. sg. (preceded by the numeral 1) in 1 *ku-ūr-da-a-li isnās* 'one *kurdali* bowl made of dough' KBo 15.10 i 12 (CTH 443, MHC). This suggests that in Middle Hittite also singular forms with single *l* occurred. This makes me reluctant to attribute the label 'plural' to a given form based on the writing of the *l* in the suffix only. Therefore, the interpretation of *kurtalli* as plural is not as attractive as it may seem at first sight.

b: *ḫar-ši-ya-a[l-l-i]-ma* 2-e (StBot 12 i 37, OH/NS) has a singular in *ḫaršiyal* KUB 27.70 + ii 22. Puhvel 1991: 194 sub *ḫaršiyal-* only cites forms in *-alli-*. The form *ḫaršiyal* must therefore be rare.

c: *i-pu-[(u-li-šet)]* StBoT 25.33 i 20' has in KBo 10.23 + iv 2 a singular *ipul-šet* (CTH 627, OH/NS according to Melchert 1977: 60). Because of the duplicate KUB 54.88 ii 2, Singer 1984: 3 emends this form to *ipul<k>-šet*.

d: *paršul(i)* 'bit, morsel'. 3 *pār-šu-ul-li* may be a plural in StBoT 25.64 8'. We seem to have a singular *paršul* in KUB 10.75 i 9 (CTH 595, OH/NS according to Melchert 1977: 59). However, in the same tablet i 3', 5',

³⁵ Cf. Kimball 1983: 869. She also suggests that resonants may have been doubled when they are followed by an accented syllable "or at least when they were not immediately preceded by one." She mentions the double <MM> in *kam-ma-ru-a-aš* 'smoke, swarm' KUB 17.10 i 5 and in *gi-im-mi*, the dat. loc. of *gimma-* 'winter' and *gimman-* 'winter' vs. *gi-e-mi*, where the <E> suggests preceding accent.

13', 17' we only have *paršulli*. Therefore, one may emend this form to *paršul*. In KBo 10.28 v 13 we do find [1] *paršul* (CHD vol. P 192 f). *Paršulli* as plural is doubtful because of 1 *pār-šu-ul-li* [i] StBoT 25.88 11' and ibid. 12' [1] *pār-šu-ul-li*. The attested forms suggest an *i*-stem rather than an *l*-stem. This makes a plural in *-i* unlikely. Therefore, one has to follow Hoffner 1974: 176 and regard *paršulli* as a deverbal substantive in *-ulli-* from *parš-* 'break, crumble'. The grammatical number of *paršulli* in the next instance can be both singular and plural: [^{NINDA} *mi-u-mi*]-*i-ū-uš* *pār-šu-ul-li* [^{NINDA} *wageššar pār-šu-ul-li* (16)]*x-an dāi* 'He takes crumbs of [*miu*]mūs (bread) and crumbs of *wageššar*-loaves.' KBo 25.109 ii 15f' (MHD)

e: [^{DU} *ga-aḫ-hu-na-al-li* in KBo 21.57 ii 2 is, according to Oettinger 1993: 208, a nom. acc. because of ^{DU} *ga-aḫ-hu-na-li-az* ibid. ii 7. The abl. is written with single <L>, whereas the nom. acc. is written with double <LL>. Because of similar alternations in other words with the suffixes *-ulli-*, *-alli-*, *-ul-* and *-al-*, Oettinger suggests that also in this word the double *ll* indicates that *paḫhunalli* is a nom. acc. neuter plural. However, the double *ll* is the only indication that the nom. acc. might be plural.

f: Oettinger 1995a: 314 points out that *zeriyalli*, a vessel or a vessel container is often a neuter plural because it is accompanied by a neuter plural adjunct, e.g. in KBo 4.9 v 18 f: ^E *ḫīli-ma=kan zé-ri-ia-al-li* GAD-*it waššanta karū arta* 'The z. (which have been) covered with a cloth are already present in the court-yard.' Oettinger suggests that also forms which are not accompanied by neuter plural adjuncts are plural because the verb is plural, e.g. in KUB 25.1 i 13' ff ^{GIS} *zé-ri-ya-al-li-ma=az ... karū ḫarkanzi* 'They already hold the z.'. A single *l* has been attested in the genitive ^{PLAMMA} *zé-ri-ya-li-ya-aš* KUB 55.54 i 32' 'the tutelary deity of the z.'. However, because Hittite has a distributive singular (see 1.4.8), the forms accompanied by a plural verb-form, might just as well be singular.

2.6.5 An ambiguous instance

paršul-(*li*)- 'fragments'

- *namma* NINDA.GUR₄.RA NINDA.SIG^{MES}-*ya paršiya n=an=šan ḫašši dāi pār-ši-ū-ul-li-ma=kan aran ari anda nāi* 'Then he breaks up thick loaves and thin loaves and puts it (the bread) on the hearth. (But the fragments be turns to face one another.' IBoT 2.39 rev. 25 (CTH 777, MHD) (translation by Hoffner 1974: 176).

This form is a hapax and may be a neuter plural in *-i* or an *i*-stem *paršiu*li.

2.6.6 Conclusion

Apart from *ḫuḫupalli* StBoT 25.137 iii 13', the certain examples of a plural in *-i* in the source material for this monograph are young. The ending has not become the only neuter plural formant in any stem class. The possible instances cited by Oettinger 1993 and 1995a are not certain, because a number of possible singular forms have been attested in young texts or manuscripts. Some forms which might be neuter plurals in *-i* can also be interpreted as singulars. This rather suggests that in later Hittite *i*-stems have been replaced by consonant stems: e.g. Old Hittite *paršulli* 'crumbled bread' (proved to be singular by the numeral 1) has in later Hittite been replaced by *paršul*. Moreover, there are also instances where the apparent neuter plural ending *-i* is preceded by the numeral one, e.g. 1 *paršulli*.

The neuter plurals in *-i* attested in the texts read for this monograph are:

Old Hittite

ḫuḫupalli from *ḫuḫupal* 'musical instrument' (1 × OHC)

Young Hittite

arkuwarri from *arkuwar* 'prayers' (1 × NHC)

kururi from *kurur* 'enemy' (5 × NHC)

2.7 THE ENDING -a

2.7.1 Introduction

The substantives seldom show the ending *-a* < PIE **(e)h₂*. In the majority of instances the ending *-a* occurs in late Hittite, only after Ḫattušili III. It is possible that in Old Hittite the ending *-a* for the neuter substantives is secondary. For a more elaborate discussion see 3.6 and 3.12.

On the other hand, already in older Hittite there are instances which seem to fit into the pattern exemplified by Latin *locus*, *loci* <-> *loca* 'place, places <-> region'. In this type the neuter plural ending *-a* occurs in words which have common gender. This means that the *-a* may provide a collective neuter plural from words having common gender. In *loca* the neuter plural does not mean 'places' but rather indicates a collective (for a discussion see 1.2.2). Therefore, in older Hittite the ending *-a* has affinities with substantives of common gender.

There is also some evidence that the ending *-a* in Hittite occurs in adjectives and possibly in substantivized adjectives. This seems to suggest that the ending *-a* also had ties with the adjectives. To sum up, the ending *-a* occurs in the following categories:

- a: Substantives of common gender.
- b: Substantivized adjectives. For the most part they are *i*-stems.
- c: In neuter substantives. In the majority of instances these forms are late.
- d: Rest category.

2.7.2 Ending -a with words having common gender

2.7.2.1 Introduction

Eichner, Neu, Watkins (see 1.2.2) claim that in Hittite, like in the other Indo-European languages common nouns can have a neuter plural, which is a collective, cf. Lat. *locus, loci* 'spot, spot' vs. *loca* 'region'.

For Hittite the stock examples are (taken from these three scholars):

šuppala vs. *šuppaleš* 'cattle'

ḫašša ḫanzašša vs. *ḫaššeš ḫanzaššeš* 'grandchildren and great-grandchildren'

alpa vs. *alpuš* 'cloud'

wašpa vs. *wašpaš* 'cloth'

In the source material for this monograph the evidence concerning this phenomenon is limited to a few words only. I have found the following forms in the texts (for a list of words discussed I refer to the table of contents):

alpa- 'cloud'

alpa[s] nom. c.

aniyatti- 'apparel, regalia'

aniat ?

aniyatta nom. acc. n. pl.

aniyaz nom. c. 'work'

ḫarpa- 'heap'

ḫarpa 'heap' nom. acc. n. pl.

ḫarpan This form is either an acc. c., a nom. acc. neuter sg. or a participle from the verb *ḫarp*- 'heap up, pile up'.

ḫuda- 'haste, alacrity'

ḫudaš nom. sg. c.

šarḫuwant- 'foetus'

šarḫuwantuš acc. pl. c.

šarḫuwanta nom. acc. n. pl.

šenahḫa- 'trap'

šenahḫaš nom. c.

šenahḫa nom. acc. n. ? pl.

NINDA šiluhā- (type of bread)

NINDA šiluhā nom. acc. n. pl.

tuckka- 'body, limb'

tuckkuš acc. pl. c.

tuckkeš nom. pl. c.

wašpa- 'cloth'

The ideogram TUG referred to by *kue* (= *wašpa* ?)

waršula- 'refreshment'

waršulaš nom. sg. c.

wera- 'tray'

weraš nom. c.

In the next paragraphs I will cite the evidence I know of. The material has been augmented with additional material, because often the texts do not furnish enough material. It is necessary to give these words an exhaustive treatment, because they play such an important role in the literature concerning the neuter plural.

As I will show by a detailed examination of the material the Hittite evidence is rather tiny. The stock examples are not as strong as suggested in the secondary literature.

2.7.2.2 *Alpa*- 'cloud'

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW: 20 and HW₂: 60 cite this word as 'c.'. They also mention the nom. acc. neuter plural *alpa*^{91A}. Puhvel 1984: 37 'c., plur. also n.'. Tischler 1983: 18 'c.'. Tischler: 1982: 2 'c.'

Situation

Alpa- 'cloud', has common gender in almost all its attestations (see HW₂: 60 and Puhvel 1984: 37). There are only two instances which are believed to have neuter gender: a neuter plural *alpa*^{91A} and *alpan*. Neuter singular *alpan* depends on *idahu al-pa-an wizzi*. This means either 'an evil cloud comes' (Hoffner 1978: 246) or 'evil comes to the cloud'.

Discussion

Alpa is considered to be one of the stock examples for *a*-stems having, besides the normal ending -eš, a nom. acc. neuter plural ending -a. Representative are Neu 1969: 240, Watkins 1975: 365f and Eichner 1985: 148. Eichner adds that collective value for *alpa* must be assumed because of parallels like *šuppala* vs. *šuppaleš* 'cattle, animals'. Therefore, he translates *alpa* as "Gewölk". According to him, the ending -a originally had collective value, whereas the ending

-es had distributive value (for a more elaborate discussion on this phenomenon see 1.2.3). Gertz 1982: 10 and 207 cautiously argues that *alpa* might just as well mean '(individual) clouds' as 'cloudmass'. Old Hittite only has *al-pa-a[s']* StBoT 25.54 iv 22 (OHC). This is listed as a nom. sg. c. by Neu 1983a: 13. For a number of attestations contexts are missing. Therefore, it is at best very difficult to establish a difference in meaning between the (only) neuter plural form and the common-gender plurals. Common-gender forms seem to refer to the 'clouds' as natural phenomena (for attestations I refer to HW₂: 60 and Puhvel 1984: 37). In the two instances (the only common-gender plural forms having clear context) cited below, *alpus* is personified:

- a: [HUR.SAG^{MES} ID^{MES} PU^{MES} šallis arunaš [nepiś tekan] IM.TE^{MES} hē[ti]š alpus
'[Mountains, rivers], wells, the big sea, [the sky, the earth], the winds, the ra[ji]ns, the clouds.' KUB 19.50 + iv 26f (27) (CTH 69, NHC)
Alpus occurs in a list of natural phenomena which are preceded by an enumeration of gods, at the end of a treaty.³⁶
- b: (Hittic gods are implored to listen to the plea made by Muwatalli): n-aš
LÜ^{MES} SANGA šippanzakanzi DINGIR.LÜ^{MES} DINGIR.MUNUS^{MES} AN-aš GE₆-iś
KI-aš (var. nepiś dankuyaš danganzipaš) nepiś tekan al-pu-uš IM^{HI.A}-uš
(var. hūwantēš) i[(e)]thi-maš wantewanmaš tuiyaš pēdaš (var. tuiya
pidi) DINGIR^{MES} kuedani pidi tuiya tiškanzi '(but) priests make offerings
to them. male gods (and) female gods of the [sk]y (and) of the dark nether-
world, sky (and) earth, clouds (and) winds, thunder (and) lightning, place
of assembly, at which place the gods are wont to assemble.' (translation
Singer 1996: 39) KUB 6.45 iii 9ff (10) (CTH 381, NHC)

Neuter plural

Z[ah]hiyawanz[i t]iyat namma-a za UNUT M[E and] a epta
GI⁵MAR.GID DA^{HI.A} ya[-za] anda epta nū nepiśa za arha al-pa^{HI.A} pēdaš[i]
'He [pr]epared himself for [b]attle, he too[k] the military equipment, the
carts and he brou[gh]t the clouds from [the sky].' KUB 33.78 + iv 9'ff
(CTH 345, NH)

Alpa is treated on one line with the carts by means of which Dašmišu (mentioned ibid. iii 15') prepares himself for battle. The clouds may be considered

³⁶ A parallel passage in the treaty concluded between Šuppiluliuma I with Duppi-Tešub §19 (NHC, ed. Friedrich SV I 24) informs us that it is not uncommon for natural phenomena to be invoked as witness: HUR.SAG^{MES} ID^{MES} PU^{MES} A.AB.BA GAL AN Ū KI [(IM^{MES})] URPI^{MES} ANA ANI RIKSI [Ū] ANA MAMETUM LÜ SEBUTUM ... 'The mountains, rivers, wells, the big sea, the heaven and earth, [(winds)], clouds (shall be) witness to this treaty [and] oath.'

a weapon by means of which Dašmišu wants to enter in combat. Perhaps the composer of the song wanted to depict *alpa* as a force of nature (Hoffner p.c.).

Neuter singular

The text runs as follows: (Anger, [rage] and the evil word must be 'likewise' cut out like *waršanna*. Mention is made of the queen, something is put down and NINDA.I.E.DĒ.A [is put down?] in front of the god) (14) [3-šū-pat kišan memai (15)] x idalu al-pa-an wizzi (16) LÜ^{PU} tiyazi (17) al[pa]ša arha paizzi (18) al[pa]-aš-ša wizzi DUGUTUL-aš-kan (19) [wizzi n-a-an GI⁵] tēpaš arāizzi 'He speaks thus three times.[...] A bad cloud comes/evil comes to the cloud [...] The servant (?) of the storm-god steps [...] and the [cl]oud leaves [...] the cloud comes [...] the porridge [comes and the tēp]aš lifts [it].' KUB 33.21 iv 15 (CTH 326, MH/NS) In the following lines the anger and rage, the evil word (yul-lun memian) are likewise washed out.

Sommer 1953: 11 and Hoffner 1978: 246 think that *alpan* is probably a neuter singular because it seems to agree with the nom.-acc. neuter sg. *idalu* 'bad'. Because of the neuter plural *alpa*, Hoffner contends that *alpan* in *idalu al-pa-an wizzi* KUB 33.21 iv 15 does not have common gender but neuter gender. Therefore, he translates 'an evil cloud comes'. Not making an attempt to translate the passage, Eichner 1985: 148 n. 87 argues that this is contradicted by the nom. c. *alpaš* in the same passage. Because in line 17 and 18 *alpa* has common gender, it is likely that *alpan* in line 15 also has common gender. If we take *idalu alpan wizzi* as 'the evil comes to the cloud', it is possible to suggest that the 'anger, rage and evil word' are summarized as *idalu* and go to the cloud. Something happens to the *idalu* after which the cloud leaves and returns in line 18.

To sum up, evidence for neuter singular *alpan* is weak.

Conclusion

The double gender in the plural may be caused by semantical difference. The attested common-gender plural forms, all young, are clearly 'clouds' as natural phenomena and may be personified. The neuter plural *alpa* (used as an object in a young text) may have been used figuratively and was possibly meant to be a kind of weapon.

However, it is hard to maintain that the neuter plural *alpa* has collective value. Eichner's translation as "Gewölke" is more inspired by his theory (see 1.2.3) than by the text itself. However, because this word has the same pattern as Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca* it is possible, despite semantical difficulties, that also in *alpa*-this pattern is old.

Evidence for a neuter singular instance is not as strong as for neuter plural.

2.7.2.3 *Aniyatt-* (sumerogram KIN) 'regalia, attire'

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW: 22 "c. tt-St. 'Leistung, Nachricht' ... Pl. n. *aniyatta* (KIN^(U)-ta) 'priestliche Kleidung des Königs, Ornat'", HW 2. Erg.: 7 "auch Opferzurüstung" (Pl. A. *aniyadduš*), HW₂: 88 "aheth. n., erst jheth. auch c., was man bei deverbalem -att- erwartet." Tischler 1982: 3 "n. später c." Tischler 1983: 30: "Leistung-Opferzurüstung (d.h. Gegenstände, die für das Ritual bzw. Opfer zu Leisten sind —> daher Pl. *aniyatta* 'priestliche Kleidung des Königs, Ornat' ", Puhvel 1984: 69 "(c. and n.) 'work, task, ritual gear or garments; message' ", Berman 1972: 156 "in the plural this word may be either common gender or neuter gender and means 'apparel, regalia.'"

Situation

Singular *aniyatt-* has common-gender (acc. sg. *aniyattan*), which we would expect because words having the suffix -att- have common gender (Berman 1972: 155). In the plural both common-gender (*aniyattuš*) and neuter forms (*aniyatta*, *aniyatti*) have been attested. The alternation of *aniyatta* with common-gender forms *aniyattan* and *aniyattuš* suggests that to *aniyatt-* a collective suffix -a could be added.

Discussion

Aniyatta contains the suffix -att-, which is used only in common-gender nouns. The ending -a here may suggest that this ending could also be added to common-gender nouns. Neu 1970: 56 suggests that *aniyatta* may be a collective from c. *aniyaz* 'work, task, performance'. Puhvel 1984: 70 compares the pattern *aniyatta* vs. *aniyattuš* with *alpa* vs. c. *alpaš*. Eichner 1985: 164f suggests that the occurrence of the neuter plural *aniyatta* 'priestly attire of the king, regalia', from c. *aniyatt-* 'performance, work, ritual gear' has been caused by the ancient collective value of the -a. Neu 1992: 211 n. 37 does not believe that *aniyatta-* is a neuter plural from *aniyatt-* (as suggested by Starke 1990: 458 n. 1666), because this word contains the suffix -att-, which normally characterizes words with common gender: we do not posit singular ***locum* because of *loca*.

Gertz 1982: 10 is more sceptical. She argues that a neuter singular *aniyatt-* also exists and that therefore we rather have to reckon with two words both derived from *aniya-* 'do, work', viz. neuter *aniyat-* (with plural *aniyatta*) and c. *aniyatt-* 'performance'. Therefore, she suggests that we do not have an opposition of collective vs. non-collective.

As the material cited below shows, Gertz's suggestion causes difficulties. Common-gender *aniyatt-*, which mostly means 'performance, work, task' (HW₂: 88 and Puhvel 1984: 69f) also appears as an acc. sg. c. *aniyattan* which means 'ritual gear'. We would expect neuter pl. *aniyatta*. The neuter singular *aniat-* is a hapax.

The pattern suggested by HW₂: 88ff is as follows:

- 1: Firstly, there is a neuter *aniyan* 'work'. This proved to be plural by agreeing neuter constituents, e.g. the neuter relative pronoun *kuit* in KUB 24.7 i 16 (KIN-an *kuit anniskanzi* 'the work they do').
- 2: Secondly there is *aniat-*. This word has two genders.

2a: The most usual form is the neuter plural *aniyatta* "Ornat", *passim*. In *aniyattan* "Opferzurüstung" (p. 89) KUB 30.35 i 3 *aniyatta* has a common-gender counterpart.

Aniyatt- 'ritual gear' can be hidden (HW₂: 89) behind the sumerogram KIN.

2b: There is also a common-gender *aniyatt-* "Leistung" (e.g. KUB 13.8 obv. 18).

HW₂: 90 claims that the instances found in CTH 446 (13th century), in which text e.g. acc. c. pl. *aniyadduš* meaning 'ritual gear' occurs, are not to be regarded as genuine Hittite, because of the many mistakes that occur in this text.

KIN-an (= *aniyan*) and c. *aniyatt-* 'work, performance' will be left out of the discussion, because the pattern exemplified in Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca* is only found in *aniyatta* vs. *aniyattuš*.

Aniyatta is by far the most frequent form. I cite the forms I found in older Hittite:

- a: LUGAL-*u*š-za a-ni-ya[at]-ta-še-it [dāi] '[The ki]ng takes his [rega]lia.' StBoT 25.25 iv 20'
- b: LUGAL-*u*š-za a-ni[ya-at-ta] StBoT 25.92 r. col. 4'
- c: nu-za ^DŠiunaš a-ni-ya-at-ta dāi 'He takes the regalia of the god.' KBo 21.90 obv. 12' (CTH 738, MHD)

For more instances I refer to Gertz 1982: 77 (KUB 31.64 iv 8, KBo 17.74 i 31', ii 28).

Neuter plural *aniyatti*

In the source material for this monograph no neuter plurals in -i have been attested. An example is provided by IBoT 2.130 obv. 3ff *parnaš aniyatti* 'adornments of the temple' and LUGAL-*u*š-za a-ni-ya-at-ti dāi 'The king takes

adornments for himself' KUB 7.25 i 3. For more examples see Gertz 1982: 138 f., Puhvel 1984: 69f and HW₂: 89.

Common-gender forms

It has been claimed by HW₂: 88 and Tischler 1982: 3 that common-gender forms are young.

- a: *«kša paprannaš antiūr anneškimi nu [pa]prannaš GE₆-in KIN-an ḫarmi n=at arḫa tarīn)a* 'I am performing the ritual against [im]purity. I hold the black equipment of impurity – remove it (viz. the *papratar*)'. KUB 7.53 + ii 57f (CTH 409, MH/NS Starke 1985: 45)
- b: *UMMA "Iriy[(a^{LU} ḫal nu)] mān URU-an iṣḫanaš linkiyaš pangauwaš lalaš aniyami nu aniyattan ḫandāni n=an katta tianzi G^{IS}AL ZABAR G^{IS}MAR ZABAR G^{IS}šattan i LAL NINDA SIG^{MES}* 'Thus (speaks) Iri[(ya, the priest)]: 'When I perform (the rite of purifying) the town from bloodshed, perjury and slander of the multitude, they prepare the ritual gear, they put it down, the hoe made of bronze, a spade made of bronze, a *šatta*, oil, honey and thin breads.' KUB 30.35 i i ff. (CTH 400, MH/NS)
- c: *GAL-in KIN-an* 'black equipment' KUB 30.67 10' (CTH 400, MH/NS)
- d: *GAL-in KIN-an VBoT 133 obv. 5*

The evidence in this section suggests that the common-gender forms occur in young texts, but that they date from MH compositions.

Likely common-gender instances

I cite the instances of *aniyattan*, which do not have an agreeing constituent, because they are either neuter singular or common-gender accusative. It is likely that they too are common-gender because words with the suffix *-at-* always have common gender.

- a: *nu a-ni-ya-at-ta-an teḫḫe MARG.ID.DA IM-aš GU₄^{HI}-uš IM-aš šef=a=ššan MARG.ID.DA-aš IM-aš [L]Ú D^{IM}-an iyami* 'I put down the a., the cart made of clay, the cows made of clay, and on top of the cart made of loam and I make a human [fi]gurine in the form of the storm-god.' KBo 30.39 + KUB 35.164 rev. 14'ff (14') (= StBoT 25.139, OHC)
- b: *mahḫan=ma=ššan SA D Tetešḫapi GAL-ri ari nu=kan NIN.DINGIR É.ŠA-naš anda paizzi KIN-ta-an katta dāi* 'When the cup of Tetešḫapi arrives, he enters the inner room of the priestess and fetches the ritual gear.' KUB 11.32 + v 18ff (21) (CTH 378).

The parallel KBo 21.90 obv. 12' gives *nu=za D Šiunaš a-ni-ya-at-ta dāi*. The claim that *aniyattan* only occurs in later Hittite is falsified by Old Hittite KBo 30.39 + KUB 35.164 rev. 14 ff.

CTH 446

In this textgroup many forms of *aniyatt-* 'ritual gear' occur. I cite the evidence, following the line-numbering of Otten 1961.

- a: *purut=ma kuit daškit nu kuwapi KIN-az ḫuman kittat apūnna apiya pedā[i]* 'The loam he has repeatedly taken, he bring[s] to the place where all his ritual gear has been put down', i 36 f (attested in KBo 10.45 i 30. KUB 41.8 i 14 gives *[da]pian.*)
- b: *KIN-an dapian PANI D^{ANUN}.NAKE₄ dāi* 'He puts down all the ritual gear in front of Anunnage.' ii 32' (= KUB 41.8 ii 32')
- c: *D^{API} parkunumaš=za G^{IS}ŠÜ.A da nu=za=kan IG₁-anda parkunumaš KIN-ti⁷⁷* au 'Take the throne of the purification, god of the sacrificial pit, and look at the ritual gear of the purification.' iii 17f (18) (attested in KUB 41.8 iii 18) KBo 10.45 iii 27 gives *a-ni-ya-an*)
- d: *nu=kan LÚ ḫal a-ni-ya-an-ta-an ANA URUDU^{KA}PA dāi* 'The priest puts the ritual gear on the container.' iv 41 f(41) (attested in KBo 10.45 iv 41f (41). KUB 7.41 iv 9 gives *KIN-an*)
- e: *nu=kan kuwapi GUL-šanza nu DINGIR^{MES} ašaš a-ni-ya-ad-du-uš-šmaš piran<š>mit dāi* 'Where the place has been marked, he places the gods, he puts down the ritual gear in front of them.' iv 44f (45) (attested in KBo 10.45 iv 44f, KUB 7.41 iv 13 gives *a-ni-ya-at-ta-an*)

To sum up the evidence:

KBo 10.45 gives *aniyattuš*, *aniyantān*, *aniyan*, and *KIN-az* for the same word in the sense 'ritual gear'. KUB 7.41 gives *aniyattan*. KUB 41.8 gives *KIN-ti* (or *KIN⁷⁷*) and *KIN-an*.

The evidence provided by CTH 446 is not consistent. Therefore, following HW₂: 89f, it is better to leave these forms out of consideration.

Conclusion

Already in Old Hittite we have the neuter plural *aniyatta*. There is also, already in Old Hittite, a form *aniyattan*. Those two forms mean 'ritual gear'. It is likely, but not certain, that the latter form is an acc. c., because there are other instances where *aniyattan* agrees with an acc. c. adjunct.

As the material compiled by Gertz suggests, in some cases the neuter plural *aniyatta* has been replaced in later Hittite by *aniyatti*.

CTH 446 provides a bewildering variety of forms. Following HW₂: 90, these instances are doubtful at best.

To sum up, the very frequent neuter plural *aniyatta* has a few, possibly old, acc. sg. c. parallels (*aniyattan*).

The form *aniat-*

- *ja-ni-at-se-it ku-iš* KBo 7.14 + obv. 29 (CTH 15, OHC)

This form occurs in mutilated context and therefore speculations on its meaning are useless. This form is the only *a*-less form of this word attested thus far. Therefore, Neu 1983a: 16 n. 17 suggests that *a-ni-at* has to be emended to *a-ni-at-<ta>-set*. Melchert 1987: 20 n. 4, Puhvel 1984: 69, HW2: 89 and Gertz 1982: 10 do not propose to emend *a-ni-at* to *a-ni-at-ta*. Gertz suggests that there are two separate derivatives of the verb *aniya-* 'do, make', viz. a common-gender *aniyaz* 'work, task' and a neuter *aniyatt-* 'apparel, regalia'. *Aniat* here might represent the neuter singular *aniyat-*, of which otherwise only the neuter plurals *aniyatta* and *aniyatti* have been attested. However, it is better to leave *a-ni-at* out of the discussion, because nothing in the context suggests a translation like 'attire, regalia'. For a discussion on the problems with the historical phonology (*aniat* < **en-yót-h₂* as Melchert 1994: 87 suggests) see 3.5.2. In favour of an emendation of *ja-ni-at-se-it* to *a-ni-at-<ta>-se-it*, one can argue that words having the suffix *-att-* otherwise have common gender. Words having common gender can have an ending *-a*, cf. Lat. *locus*. In older Hittite neuter words only very seldom have a characterized neuter plural in *-a*, whereas there are slight indications that common-gender words could be characterized by *-a* (e.g. *šihuša*). Thus *aniat<ta>* would be the normal, what might be called "collective" form.

Conclusion

It is very well possible that *aniyatt-* is a representative of the Lat. *locus*, *loci* vs. *loca* type: the suffix *-att-* only occurs in words having common gender. It therefore has common gender (only *aniyattan* is a safe form) forms and neuter forms in *-a*.

2.7.2.4 (^{GIS}) *Harpa-* 'heap, pile, stack'

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW: 59, its supplements, Tischler 1982: 17, and Tischler 1983: 180 do not mention the gender of *harpa*. Puhvel 1992: 180 "c., plur. also n.", Neu 1983a: 56 and n. 263a "Genus neutrum ... auch Genus commune bezeugt."

Situation

Normally *harpa-* has common gender (see Puhvel 1991: 180f for a representative overview of instances). Evidence for neuter gender is based on two instances, viz. on ^{GIS}*harpa=ma* (OHC) which seems to be modified twice by 1-*anta* and on the turn of phrase *harpan* DUG KAS^{III.A}-*ya arta* which occurs in CTH 627.

Here *harpan* is either a neuter participle of the verb *harp-* 'to pile up' or a substantiv.

Harpa can be considered a word supporting the 'collective theory' because it seems to have, besides common-gender plural forms, a neuter plural ending *-a* (for a more elaborate discussion of this phenomenon see 1.2.3). *Harpa* vs. *harpuš* finds its parallel in e.g. *alpa* vs. *alpuš* 'cloud' and *hašša* *hanzašša* vs. *haššus* *hanzaššus* 'grandchildren and great-grandchildren'. As such it may support the theory that Hittite also had nouns which had the same pattern as Lat. *locus*, *loci* vs. *loca*.

Neuter plural and discussion

A neuter plural has been attested only once.

- LUGAL-uš MUNUS.LUGAL-š-a *ašanzi ta kalulupu(s) šmuš gāpinit hūlūlyemi* SA QAT^I-SUNU *uga hāhhal harmi šinnanz-a harmi* ^{GIS}*har-pa=ma* 1-*anta* LUGAL-aš GIR-ši *kitta munus LUGAL-ša* 1-*anta kitta ta šini tēmi* 'The king and the queen are (present). Then I wrap their fingers with a thread, of their hands, and I hold a *hāhhal*³⁷ and I hold a figurine. But [concerning] woodpiles, 1-*anta* lies at the feet of the king and 1-*anta* lies at the feet of the queen and I speak to the figurine: ' StBoT 25.4 iv 22f (25) (CTH 416, OHC)

Neu 1983a: 56 and ibid. n. 263a mentions two possibilities for ^{GIS}*harpa=ma*. Firstly, it may be the result of ^{GIS}*harpan=ma*, with loss of *n* in front of *m*. In that case we may have a neuter singular *harpan* 'pile', which is paralleled by stereotype phrases like *harpan* DUG KAS-*ya arta*. We then have to translate 'a pile and a beer-vessel stands.' Secondly, ^{GIS}*harpa=ma* may be a collective nom.acc. neuter plural.

Mentioning the parallel neuter plural *alpa* 'clouds', from *alpa-* which otherwise has common gender, Puhvel 1991: 181 suggests that ^{GIS}*harpa=ma* can be a neuter plural in *-a*, formed from *harpa-*, which otherwise has common gender. Eichner 1992: 36ff argues that 1-*anta* is a numeral agreeing with ^{GIS}*harpa=ma*. He thinks that 1-*anta* is the nom.acc. neuter plural of an *nt*-stem *ant-* 'only a single one, one unit, something which forms a unit'. Proof for this meaning is furnished by the equation of the nom.acc. sg. 1-*an* with akk. 1^{NUTUM} '(indi-

³⁷ The addition 'of their hands' is probably a (superfluous) explanation of *kalulupu(s)-šmuš* and indicates that their fingers, and not their toes are wrapped up. The translation of Otten-Souček "Dann umwinde ich ihre Finger mit dem Faden (und zwar) ihrer Hände, und ich halte einen *hāhhal*", is an elegant way of saying that the turn 'of their hands' is difficult to understand.

vidual' unit' in the treaty with Targašalli (SV I: 60). Its singular seems to occur in the vocabulary KBo 13.10 obv. 6.7: 1-*anza* INIM-aš *kuedani* *ēst*[a which is translated by Eichner as 'somebody who had one single thing'. Its nom.acc. neuter 1-*arta* furnishes a nom.acc. neuter plural for this numeral. Therefore, Eichner argues, *ḫarpa* in combination with *ḫarpuš* (cf. Kümmel 1967: 78 n. 8) points to collective inflection: we have a pattern *ḫarpa* vs. *ḫarpuš* :: *alpa* vs. *alpuš*. The sentence LUGAL-uš-kan SA LU ^{IM} ^{GIS} *ḫar-p[u-u]š istarna arḫa paizzi* 'The king walks through the piles of the man of the storm-god' KUB 25.13 + 25.1f. (25?) (CTH 626. OH/NS) furnishes an acc. pl. c. This seems to point to *ḫarpaš*, *ḫarpeš* vs. *ḫarpa*.

However, there is no independent indication which allows us to define the neuter plural attestation as 'collective' and the common-gender plural as 'distributive'.

Neuter singular

Singer 1984: 136 and Neu 1983a: 56 n. 263a mention the possibility that *ḫarpan* may be, besides a neuter participle of *ḫarp-* 'to heap up', a neuter sg. *ḫarpa*- 'pile'. Evidence for neuter singular rests on the following stereotype phrases in the KILAM festival (CTH 627), all OH/NS):

- a: nu ^E *arkiu* kattan *istū* ē ^{URU} *Ankuwa* *ḫar-pa-an* DUG KAŠ-ya *arta* KBo 10.24 iv 21ff (23)
- b: [*ist*]u ē ^{URU} *Tūwanuwa* [*ḫar-pa*]-an DUG KAŠ-ya *arta* ibid. v 1f (2).
- c: [*nu-ššan istū*] ē ^{URU} *Hūpi* <š> na ([*ḫar-pa-an* DUG K)A]š^{HLA}-ya *arta* ibid. v 11f (*ḫarpan* is found in the parallel KBo 30.6 2)
- d: Ibid. v 22 ... y]a *ḫarpan*. This instance probably had a similar context.

If *ḫarpan* is a neuter participle, we have to translate these passages as 'Beside the passageway³⁸ stands a pile (that which has been piled up) and (a) vessel(s) of beer from the house of the town of ...'. This presupposes a development from a neuter participle to a substantive and makes perfect sense.

Conclusion

There is a possible neuter plural in -a attested in Old Hittite ^{GIS} *ḫarpa*-ma. This form is matched by a common-gender plural ^{GIS} *ḫarpuš* in a late copy of an Old Hittite text, which also means 'woodpile'. To define the difference between these two forms as 'collective' vs. 'distributive' seems too arbitrary, however. We also have *ḫarpan* which is likely to be a neuter participle. In theory, it can be either a neuter *n*-stem or a neuter *a*-stem. The former is less probable

since we do not have resultative nouns from verbs which are *n*-stems (cf. *parša*- 'crumb' from *paršiya-* 'to break').

To sum up, *ḫarpa* is a possible neuter plural formed from a noun which otherwise has common gender.

2.7.2.5 *Ḥašša ḫanzašša* 'offspring'?

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW: 62 "c.", Tischler 1982: 18 *ḥašša*- "c.", *ḥašša ḫanzašša* "Enkel (und) Urenkel". Puhvel 1991: 224 "c."

Situation

Ḥašša- has common gender, e.g. *āššiyanza ḥaššaš* 'beloved progeny' KUB 21.27 iii 44. *Ḥašša*- mainly occurs in the sequence *ḥašša ḫanzašša*. In this sequence *ḥašša* seems to have both genders. Common gender has been attested in e.g. nu DUMU.NITAMES DUMU.MUNUSMES *ḥaššeš ḫanzaššeš makeššandu* 'May the sons, daughters, progeny of progeny become many!' KUB 29.1 iv 2. There are also many attestations which show an ending -a (see below). It is noteworthy that *ḥašša*- alone, as far as I know, never has an ending -a.

The pattern *ḥaššeš ḫanzaššeš*, *ḥaššuš ḫanzaššuš* vs. *ḥašša ḫanzašša* seems to be exactly parallel to Lat. *locus*, *loci* vs. *loca*.

For exhaustive secondary literature, also on the exact meaning of *ḥašša ḫanzašša* I refer to Puhvel 1991: 224ff and Tischler 1983: 195f. For our present purposes only the explanations of the apparent double gender are important.

The sequence *ḥašša ḫanzašša* has been explained by Sturtevant 1933: 165, Federsen 1938: 34 and Kronasser 1956: 156f as a Dual-Dvanda (the type *Mitrā Várūna*). Sturtevant suggested that *ḥašša ḫanzašša* only occurs as a nominative or accusative and that the final -a in *ḥašša ḫanzašša* is a relic of an old dual (PIE *-ō).

The explanation most frequently adopted is that *ḥašša ḫanzašša* is a neuter collective plural: e.g. Neu 1969: 240 ("Das Nebeneinander von ..., *ḥašša ḫanzašša* - *ḥaššeš ḫanzaššeš* ... macht die Herkunft des *-ā aus einem Kollektivum besonders deutlich."), Eichner 1985: 148 and Eichner 1992: 36.

It follows from the views mentioned above that *ḥašša ḫanzašša* only occurs as a nominative and accusative. Melchert 1973 (followed by Puhvel 1991: 225) argues against this. On p. 66 he points out that there are at least three cases where *ḥašša ḫanzašša* is neither an accusative nor a nominative.

- a: nu zikk-a ^m *Alakšanduš* [*ḫa-aš-ša ḫa-an*-(*za-aš-ša iṣṭiulaš* ṭ)] *UPPA* *kišan* iya Alakšandu treaty A ii 9f. Melchert points out that *ḥašša ḫanzašša*

³⁸ See Singer 1983: 106ff for this meaning of ^E *arkiu*.

cannot be part of the subject, which can only be Alaksanduš, because the verb is singular. Nor can it be the object, because this is *TUPPA*.

- b: *tuel* [(LUGAL^{UTTA})] *katta ha-aš-ša* [(*ha-an-za-aš-ša uk*)] *tūri ēšša*³⁹ KBo 30.19 + iv 3f (4) Melchert signals that we would rather have a dat. loc. pl. *haššaš hanzaššaš* if the translation 'for your grandsons and great-grandsons' is correct.⁴⁰

- c: *kuiš-ma SA DUMU-YA* [DUMU.DUMU-YA] *ha-aš-ša ha-an-za-aš-ša* ^{LU}SANGA ^{UTTA} SA ^DIŠTAR ^{URU} *Šamuha hullai* 'Whoever challenges my son's, [my grandson's] (my) *h. h.* ('s) priesthood of Istar of Šamuha ...', or 'Whoever of my sons, [my grandsons, *h. h.* challenges the priesthood for Istar of Šamuha' KBo 6.29 iii 41ff. In this case *hašša hanzašša* cannot be a nom. or an acc. because the subject is *kuiš-ma* and the object is ^{LU}SANGA ^{UTTA} 'priesthood'. Therefore, Melchert suggests that the *-a* is a relic of the old directive *-a*. In the expression *hašša hanzašša*, this directive was preserved until Young Hittite and became essentially an adverb meaning 'to the first and second generation'. Support for his hypothesis is found, as he suggests (p. 67), in the fact that it mostly occurs with the adverb *katta* 'down, later, afterwards', which is likewise a directive.

Boysan-Dietrich 1987: 53 n. 66 also assumes that *hašša hanzašša* is a nom. acc. neuter plural. She cites KBo 4.1 obv. 45f *EN SISKUR-ya=kan DINGIR^{MES}-aš TI-anni aššuli INA EGIR UD^{MI} katta h[a-aš-ša] ha-an-za-aš-ša QATAMMA aššu ēšdu* 'Also the requirer of the ritual must in life and health in future (INA EGIR UD^{MI}), *katta h. h.* be likewise dear to the gods.' She argues that *katta* must mean 'dabei', probably because INA EGIR UD^{MI} already means 'in the future'. If we follow her suggestion, we have to translate this passage as 'The requirer of the ritual must in future in life and in health be dear to the gods and also his offspring must be dear (to the gods)'. Therefore, here *hašša hanzašša* may be a collective in *-a*.

Against "dabei", also in KBo 4.1 obv. 45f, it is possible to argue with Melchert 1973: 67, following Friedrich 1926: 34, that there are places where translations like 'corresponding', or 'also' are inappropriate. There are instances where *katta* does not correspond to anything in the sentence, e.g. *nu katta INA KUR^{URU} Amurri apāš LUGAL-uš ēšdu* 'Let him afterwards be king in Amurru.' Also KUR^{URU} D^U-tašša=ta *kuit pihhun n=at katta tuel=pat NUMUN-*

anza harzi 'The land Tarhuntašša which I have given to you, must in future be kept by a descendant of yours.' Bo 86/299 ii 97f (98). Also in KUB 57.63 ii 1ff *halk[iy]aš [SA] GESTIN[ū] A-y[a GU, UDU] miyatar katta ha-aš-[š]a-aš ha-an-za-aš-ša-aš paš* 'Afterwards he gave wealth and abundance of c[oi]rn, wine, [and cattle and sheep] to his offspring (dat. pl.)' there is nothing to which *katta* corresponds. Therefore *katta*, also in KBo 4.1 obv. 45f, is better translated as 'later, afterwards' and we have to accept that in this sentence two words, viz. *katta* and INA EGIR UD^{MI}, more or less have the same meaning: 'and later on, in future'. Accumulations of words relating to the future also occur in many instances cited below.

To sum up, in the secondary literature there is no counterexample for a directive *hašša hanzašša* that cannot be refuted.

Common-gender forms

Common-gender forms attested in the source material for this monograph are:

- a: *nu labarnašša LUGAL-w[aš] ha-a-aš-še-eš ha-an-za-[aš-še]-eš QATAMMA wai[kuandu]* '[Let] the off[spring] of the king likewise abou[nd]. StBoT 25.122 5f (6) (OHC)
- b: LUGAL-uš (16) *ha-aš-šu-uš ha-an-z[]* KUB 43.23 obv. 15f (16) (CTH 820, MHD)
- c: [*nu=za haššus hanzaššus karapdu* 'He shall lift *h. h.* KBo 15.10 i 37, *h[aššus hanzaššus dāwen* ibid. ii 60', *nu=za haššus [hanzaššus karapdu]* ibid. iii 37f (37)', *nu haššus* ibid. iii 42' (CTH 443)
- d: [*mān=ma* ^{DUTU}ŠI] INA EGIR UD^{MI} *aššuli OL [pahhašteni]* DUMU^{MES}.YA DUMU.DUMU^{MES}.YA *ha-aš-šu-uš [ha-an-za-aš-šu-uš pahhašteni]* '[If] you in future do not willingly protect [me, My Majesty], my sons, my grandsons and *h. h.*' KBo 5.3 + (=A) iv 37 9f (9,10) (CTH 42, Suppiluliuma I).

For more instances of common-gender *h. h.* I refer to Puhvel 1991: 224.

Hašša hanzašša not as subject or object

In the source material for this monograph many instances occur, many of which are ambiguous or unclear. In favour of Melchert's hypothesis I will firstly cite the few instances in which *hašša hanzašša* is neither subject nor object.

- a: [*nu k[aš]ša ITU-mi ITU-mi ANA SAG.DU^m Suppiluliuma [ū ANA] Daduhepa MUNUS.LUGAL GAL ū ANA DUMU^{MES}.LUGAL [DUMU MUNUS^{MES}.LUGAL] katta ha-aš-ša ha-an-za-aš-ša [šer link]iškiuwani* '[Lo]ok, from month to month, we will swear allegiance to the person Suppiluliuma [and to] Daduhepa, the queen, and to the princes [and princesses] down to the grandchildren and great-grandchildren' KUB 26.57 8ff (10) (CTH 253, Suppiluliuma I)

³⁹ Dupl. *ēšdu*.

⁴⁰ Already Otton 1958: 45 regarded *hašša hanzašša* not as a nom. acc., but as a dat. loc., and translated "Dein Königtum soll weiter für Enkel und Urenkel dauern."

Here the subject is 'we', expressed in the verb [link]iškiuwani 'we swear allegiance'. From this verb depends a dative (CHD vol. L-N: 63) as is also indicated by Akkadian ANA 'to'. Therefore, *h.h.* cannot be subject or object.

- b: *kuiš-ma ša DUMU-YA [DUMU.DUMU-YA ha-aš-ša] ha-an-za-aš-ša* LÜSANGA UTTA SA DİSTAR URU Šamuha hullaī 'Whoever challenges my son's, my grandson's (my) *h.-h.* ('s) priesthood of Istar of Šamuha ...' or 'Whoever of my sons, [my grandsons, *h.h.*] challenges the priesthood for Istar of Šamuha,' KBo 6.29 iii 41ff (41) (CTH 85, Hattušili III)

The subject is *kuiš* 'whoever' and the object is the priesthood of Istar.

Difficult instances

The other instances are ambiguous, *h.h.* being used as an adverb, subject or object. I cite a few representative examples:

- a: *mān-aš kardimiyanza [nu] kardimiyattan keti UD-ti arha peššecaddu mān-aš tamatta-ma KUR-ya n-an tamēdaz KUR-az uwattelten n-ašta LUGAL-aš-za DAM-ZU DUMU^{MES}-SU ha-a-aš-ša ha-an-za-aš-ša x-x-x [(ta) aššu memiskitten* 'If (the storm-god mentioned in l. 1) is angry, he has to lose his wrath on that same day, if he has gone to another country, you have to bring him from this other country, and you have to speak favourably [] to the wife, and children of the king *h.h.*' KUB 43.23 obv. 3ff (7) (CTH 820, MHD)

H.h. may be the object depending on *aššu memisk-* 'speak favourably'.

- b: [Now you have to be ...] *x-eš ARAD^{MES} DUTU^{SI} nu-ššan ANA LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU^{MES} x[...]* *katta ha-a-aš-ša ha-an-za-aš-ša a[']* 'Ser-vants of My Majesty, and for the king, the queen, the sons of the king [the grandsons of the king], afterwards *h.h.*' KUB 23.72 + rev. 38 (CTH 146, MHC) The same turn of phrase occurs *ibid.* 39.

- c: *nu ANA EGIR UD^{KAM} LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU^{MES}.LUGAL [kat]ta h[ha-aš-ša ha-an-za-aš-ša pahhašten* 'In future you must protect the king, the queen and the sons of the king la[ter] *h.h.*' KUB 23.68 + rev. 10' (CTH 133, MHC)

- d: *zilitiya-ta katta [(ha-aš-š)]a ha-an-za-aš-ša tuēl DUMU-an ammel DUMU^{MES}.YA DUMU.DUMU^{MES}-YA [pahhaš]šantari-pat* 'And in future, later, [(*h.h.*)] my sons, and my grandsons will [pro]tect your son.' KUB 19.6 + i 73' ff (73) (CTH 76, Muwatalli)

Note that here we have *katta* 'later, afterwards', *h.h.* and *zilitiya* 'in future'. The amount of references to the future may be caused by the

explicit declaration. We also have this accumulation in the treaty with Kupanta.¹ KAL §11.36 sq.: [(kat)t(a-ma DUMU^{MES} DUTU-)]^{SI} [(ha-aš-ša ha-an-za-aš-ša zil)a(tiya) ASSUM BEL)]^{UTTIM} pahši 'But protect [(my sons, My Majesty, *h.h.* in future) together with his auth]ority.' (CTH 68, Mursili II) and in the treaty with Manappa-Datta §19.29 ff (31-32) (CTH 69, Mursili II)

- e: *zik mAlakšanduš DUTU^{SI} aššuli pahši katta-ma ammel DUMU-YA DUMU.DUMU-YA ha-aš-ša ha-an-za-aš-ša pahši* 'You, Alakšandu, shall willingly protect me, My Majesty, and afterwards you will protect my sons and my grandsons *h.h.*' KUB 19.6 + i 69' ff (70) (CTH 76, Muwatalli)

- f: [nu DUMU^{MES}.K(A ha-aš-ša ha-an-za-aš-ša DUMU^{ME})]^S DUTU^{SI} [(l'-pat katta)] ASSUM BELU^T (IM pahši)]^{andaru} 'Your sons, *h.h.* shall later on protect the sons of mine, My Majesty, as far as they have the power.' KUB 19.6 + ii 11f (11, 12) (CTH 76, Muwatalli)

- g: *kuiš-ma ke AWATE^{MES} pahšari nu DUMU-YA DUMU.DUMU-YA hašša hanzašša [ka]tta NUMUN-YA İSTU LÜSANGA UTTIM SA DİSTAR URU Šamuha arha ul ti[ttanuzi]* 'Whoever keeps this oath, my son, my grandson, *h.h.*, in future, my offspring, shall not dismiss him from the priesthood of Istar of Šamuha.' 186/v + KUB 21.15 iv 6' 7) (CTH 85, Hattušili III)

It is noteworthy that here all the subjects have the Akkadian enclitic possessive pronoun -YA 'my'. *Hašša hanzašša* however does not have the Hittite enclitic possessive pronoun. This may indicate that *h.h.* here is not used as a subject.

- h: ASSUM EN^{UTTI} *katta ha-aš-ša ha-an-za-aš-ša NUMUN mTudhaliya-pat pahāš(tin)* 'In future you must protect the offspring of Tudhaliya as to their authority *h.h.*' KUB 26.1 i 15f (15) (CTH 255, Tudhaliya IV)

Conclusion

One must conclude that *hašša hanzašša* is ambiguous. In a number of attestations it cannot be a subject or an object. It is not possible to determine whether in the rest of the attestations this expression is used adverbially or as object or subject.

To sum up, there is only a slight possibility that *hašša hanzašša* is an old inherited collective.

2.7.2.6 Huda- 'readiness, ability to act swiftly, quickness'

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW: 78, Tischler 1982: 25 "c./n.", Puhvel 1991: 414 "c. and n.". Starke

1990: 362 suggests that in Middle Hittite *huda-* has common gender, whereas in Young Hittite *huda-* has neuter gender.

Situation

The majority of instances suggest c. *huda-*. In a few cases a nom.acc. neuter in *-a* seems to be attested.

Literature

Starke 1990: 362 claims that *huda-* is a loan word from Luwian. In KUB 23.1 + iv 20 *huda* is preceded by a Glossenkeil (nom. c. *hudaš*). Because the majority of words preceded by a Glossenkeil are Luwisms, Starke assumes that *huda-* must be a Luwian word. Starke 1990: 27f argues that many words having double gender are in fact loan words from Luwian. According to Starke, these words are related, the Hittite word having common gender, whereas the related word in Luwian has neuter gender. In the Young Hittite period, Hittite was heavily influenced by Luwian. Consequently, Hittite borrowed neuter Luwian words which had common gender cognates in Hittite itself. These loan words kept their Luwian gender. Therefore, according to Starke, the nom.acc. neuter plural *huda* must be Luwian.

Neuter forms

The neuter plural form *hūda* occurs in the sequence *hūmanza hūda hardu* 'Everyone must have agility'. It seems to have the same meaning as *hūmanti hūdaš ēšdu* and as such replaces the nominative preceded by a possessive dative or genitive. I cite the material:

- a: *hūmanza hūda hardu* 'Let everybody have agility.' KUB 21.47 + KUB 23.82 i 18' (CTH 268)

According to Starke 1990: 362, n. 1292 this manuscript has been written by the end of the 14th century. However, Košak 1990: 78 suggests that this manuscript dates from 1400, a hundred years earlier.

- b: *nu <maḥḥan> ša ḏutust [išiḫūl apell-a QATAMMA] išsatten nu hūmanza hū-u-da hardu nu ḫūr karši zahḫiyadduma[t]* 'Just as according to My Majesty's (instruction), you must act [according to his instructions too], and everyone of you shall have agility, and shall fight with perseverance.' KUB 13.20 i 18f (19) [end 14th century, Starke 1990: 362, n. 1292].
- c: In KBo 22.105 obv. 9' (CTH 487, [13th century, Starke 1990: 362 n. 1292]) a form *hū-u-da-ya-wa-ra-as-ma-aš* occurs.

Unfortunately this form occurs without any context whatsoever. It is therefore not possible to be certain about the grammatical status of

hū-u-da-ya-wa-ra-as-ma-aš. In l. 3 there is a form *hū-da-aš*, which can be a nom. common-gender. If *hūda* here is a nom.acc. plural, it is a young form.

Common-gender forms

Common-gender nominative forms often occur in the turn of phrase *hūmantiya/hūmanti hūdaš ēštu* 'everyone must have agility':

- a: *nu ša [lū]^{MES} apiya-ya hūmandas hū-u-da-aš ēštu* 'Let all the [men] then too have agility.' KUB 13.20 i 7 (CTH 259, [14th century, Starke 1990: 362 n. 1291])
- b: The same construction is also found in KUB 26.17 i 4f (5) (CTH 261, MHC [beginning 14th century, Starke 1990: 362 n. 1291]).
- c: *[hūmanti-ya hū-u-da-aš ēštu* 'And let everyone have agility.' KBo 16.24 (+ i 57'), (CTH 251, MHC [end 15th century, Starke 1990: 362, n. 1292])
- d: *GIM-an [hū-u-ta-aš upaḫilešša tuqqas QATAMMA] [hū-u-ta-aš upaḫilešša ēšdu* 'And just as it means to me, My Majesty, fastness and firmness, (just so) it must mean fastness and firmness to you too.' KUB 23.1 + iv 20f (20, 21) (NHC, Tudḫaliya IV). Note that *hūtaš* is preceded by a Glossenkeil.
- e: The acc. *hutan* occurs in KUB 35.92 obv. 27', 30', rev. 28', 41' (CTH 440) and in KUB 28.45 vi 10' (*kuin hūl[an]*)

Conclusion

Starke 1990: 362 suggests that *hūda*, a form which he considers to be Luwian, occurs in young texts (*hūda hardu* 'he must have agility') and replaces older *hūdaš* preceded by a possessive dative or genitive. According to him, the ending *-a* points to Luwian influence. However, the Glossenkeil – which often indicates that a given form is Luwian – to common-gender *huda-* in instance d: makes it difficult to assume without further thought that the neuter form is Luwian and that common-gender *hūdaš* is Hittite. The texts in which the common-gender forms occur, seem to be older than the texts in which the neuter forms have been attested. However, the date of KUB 21.47 + KUB 23.82, in which text an allegedly young *huda* occurs, is not unquestioned. Therefore, it is possible that *huda* (nom.acc. plural) and *hūdaš* are contemporary.

The fact that the neuter plural forms may be late, makes it difficult to assume that the nom.acc. plural is a direct inheritance from Proto-Indo-European.

To sum up, a 'collective' neuter plural *huda* from *hūdaš* is possible.

2.7.2.7 *Hu(wa)hurlalla-* 'necklace'

Dictionaries and glossaries

Berman 1972: 122 'c. and n.', Puhvel 1984: 418 'n.'. Melchert 1993: 73 identifies this word as Luwian.

Situation

Huhurtalla only occurs in young texts. In inventory texts it occurs twice as a neuter plural, viz. 1^{NU(TUM)} *huhurtalla* 'a set of necklaces' (once without 1^{NU(TUM)} and preceded by a Glossenkeil). In one text it has been attested as a sg. common-gender. A form in -a, from a noun which otherwise has common gender, fits into the pattern exemplified by Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca*.

Common gender plural

- ('[I describe my mother] for the second time' (1.9)) (11) *annaš-miš* ... (24) *GI.DUR₅-aš-ma-a(a)š hu-uh-hur-tal-laš* ^{UZU}*GÜ.ĜAL-i-ššan kuyēš* *kal[ka]ll[i]š* 'My mother ... She is a necklace(?) from plaited reed, which (pl.?) rustles(?) around one's neck.' RS 25.421 24f (24), ed. Laroche 1968: 773ff (CTH 315, "signalement lyrique", NH)

If *huhurtallaš* agrees with *kuyēš*, *huhurtallaš* must be a common-gender plural.⁴¹

Neuter plural forms

The form *huhurtalla*, which looks like a neuter plural, occurs in inventory texts and in a vow (all NH). In instance c: *huhurtalla* is preceded by a Glossenkeil.

- a: 1^{NU(TUM)} *hu-hur-ta-al-[a]* KUB 42.69 ii 20' (CTH 245)
- b: 1^{NU} *hu-uh-hur-tal-la* *GUŠKIN* (NA₄) 'One golden necklace made from gold (and precious stones).' KUB 42.43 obv 7'⁴²
- c: *mān DINGIR^{LIM} ANA mTuthaliya pian hūeyaš nu ANA DINGIR^{LIM} TUG.GÜ.EA HURRI URUDU GUŠKIN appanna ĞUB.BI GUŠKIN iyami ANA NIN.DINGIR <URU> Kuššara x* [(13) *apedani-pat memin[š] šer KILULU GUŠKIN hu-wa-aš-hu-wa-ar-ta-al-la dū-mi* 'If you, God, support Tuthaliya, I will make for the goddess a Hurrian cloak made of copper and gold, so that she will accept it, and golden earring(s). For the priestess of Kuššara I will make a golden wreath as necklace just for this reason.')] KUB 15.23 8ff (15) (CTH 584, NH)

Evaluation and conclusion

All attested forms are young. The apparent neuter plural forms can be accounted for by the rule that the occurrences of 1^{NU(TUM)} 'a pair of, a set of' "im Plural zu stehen pflegen" (Neu 1992: 203), but this rule poses its problems (see 1.4.7). In inventory texts it is not unusual that words which otherwise have common gender, appear without the final -š (see the indexes of Siegelová 1986 and Košak 1982). Therefore, it is difficult to assume that *huhurtalla* is a neuter plural.

The last attestation is problematic. This form is preceded by a Glossenkeil. Moreover, it has -wa instead of the -u which is found in the other forms. This may suggest that it is a Luwian form (so Melchert 1993: 79). In Luwian many neuters have been attested only in their plural form and often neuter plural forms are used when actually a singular is meant. In fact, very often the neuter singular has been ousted in favour of the neuter plural (Starke 1990: passim). *Huwahhewartalla* may be such a form.

To sum up, it is difficult to assume that the plural *huhurtalla* (neuter plural) to common-gender *huhurtalla-* is old and that this word shows the *locus, loci* vs. *loca* pattern.

2.7.2.8 *Kalmara-* 'beam, winged object'

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW: 96 "c./n.", Tischler 1982: 38 "c./n.", Tischler 1983: 476 "c./n."

Situation

Both forms in -a (*kalmara*), which can be a nom.acc. neuter and an acc. pl. c. (*kalmaruš*), have been attested. This suggests that *kalmara-* has the same pattern as Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca*.

Literature

Güterbock 1946: 69 suggested "mountain". This suggestion is based upon KUB 17.1 ii 14 (dupl. of KUB 36.62 1') (CTH 361) *nū gim-an lūkkatta* ^D*u[ru]-uš-kan kal-ma-ra-az wit*. The dupl. KUB 36.62 1' gives [(*nu*) *x lu(kkatta* ^D*uru-uš-kan kalmaraz wit* 'When dlaybreak came, the s[un]-god came from the *kalmara-*'. Güterbock argues that the *kalmara-* is the place where the sun rises. Güterbock 1952: 38 suggests that also the phonetic complement in *HURSAG-ri* in KUB 29.1 i 14 points to *kalmara* 'mountain'. Laroche 1967: 33f, on the other hand, plausibly argues that *kalmara* cannot mean 'mountain'. Firstly, he points out that *kalmara-*, which is often used as an object in a *huwaši*-stone, cannot mean 'mountain' because *kalmara-* is often accompanied by *ugu*

⁴¹ For a nom. pl. c. in -aš see Neu 1979: 192

⁴² The parallel KBo 18.170 (+) 170a obv. 4 gives 1^{NU(TUM)} *hu-uh-hur-tal-la GUŠKIN NA₄* (CTH 243, NH).

'on top' or *ser-ši-kan* 'on top of it [a k.]. Moreover, to denote a mountain Hittite used *hur-sag-tar*. Secondly, Laroche argues contra Güterbock that it is not necessary to take *kalmaraš* as an ablative originis. A comitative ablative 'accompanied by a *kalmara*' is also possible.⁴³ Thirdly, KBo 26.58, the supplement to KUB 33.93 iv 36 gives *waḥnut* as verb accompanying *kalmaraš*: 'he averted his beams'.

Therefore, *kalmara*- rather designates the winged object which can be found on *ḫuwaši*-stones. As the instance cited in this paragraph shows, it can also mean 'sunray'.

Neuter forms

a: *[juḡ⁷ gal-ma-r]a x (3')* -[tar|x] *unuw[aj]nzi* 'On top of it, ... a k.' they decorate. KUB 38.26 2', ibid. 29 *uḡu gal-ma-ra kù.[BA]BBAR DÜ-anzi* ibid. rev. 7 *ga[l]-ma-ra kù.[BA]BBAR* 'a silver k.' (CTH 507)

b: *ALAM MUNUS TUŠ-aš KÜ.BABBAR 1 šekan GAM-SU 2 UDU KUR.RA AN.BAR GAM-SU* ^{GIS} *palzaḡaš* AN.BAR 10 *ka[-ma-ra] GUŠKIN* 'One statue of a woman, seated, made of silver, one *šekan* in size, under which are 2 mountain sheep of iron, under which is a base of iron with 10 k. of gold.' KBo 2.1 iv 4f (5). (CTH 509)

Because of the numeral 10 this form can be a neuter plural in -a.

c: In KBo 2.1 ii 12f (13) *kalmara* agrees with a neuter sg. participle: 1 ^{NA4} *ZI.KIN KÜ.BABBAR DUTUŠ¹ ser-ši-kan kal-ma-ra KÜ-BABBAR DÜ-an* '1 *ḫuwaši* made of silver for me, My Majesty, and on top of it (a) k. of silver has been made.'

The number is ambiguous because the predicate noun *DÜ-an* can refer to both neuter singulars and neuter plurals (see 2.8.1.2).

The material shows that the forms in -a represent an object. *Kalmara* has neuter gender.

Common-gender forms

The accusative plural *kalmaraš* occurs twice in the same passage:

- *nu DUTU-uš kal-ma-ra-uš [d]ān EGIR-p[a waḡ]nut* 'The sun-god averted his rays once again', ibid. 37 [(*nepišaš*)] *DUTU-uš kal-ma-ra-uš (wa-aḡ-nu-u)t n-aš aruni parā pait*. 'The sun-god [(of heaven averted)]d his rays and went

⁴³ A comitative ablative is supported by the conclusions reached by Melchert 1977: 424ff. After investigating the usages of the instrumental and ablative, Melchert concludes that in Young Hittite the instrumental is a moribund category. The ablative took over its functions and came to be used in the basically instrumental functions (means and accompaniment).

on to the sea.' KUB 33.93 iv 36 + KBo 26.58 + iv 41'f (CTH 345)

Conclusion

As is shown by the material cited, *kalmara* used as object may be a neuter in -a. It is not possible to establish its number. *Kalmara*- 'sunray' has common gender. This suggests that the difference in gender is based on the meaning. One might suggest that the meaning 'winged object' originated in the collective value of the ending -a.

2.7.2.9 Kuranna- (closing device)

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW 117: "c./n.?", HW 2 Erg.: 16 "c./n.", Tischler 1982: 41 "c./n.", Tischler 1983: "n.", Berman 1972: 46 "c.".

Situation

The form *kuranna* only occurs in CTH 261 (Instructions for the commander of the Borderguards) in the turn of phrase *kuranna/kurannuš šanḡ*- 'scan the k.'. Güterbock and Van den Hout 1991 point out that in IBoT 1.36 i 8 the turn of phrase *n-a-t kurannit karpanzi* 'and lift them (viz. the doorbolts) (together) with a k.', suggests that a k. can be lifted. They suggest that it may have been a closing device. Because of this, the usual translation 'foreground' is probably not correct.

In KUB 13.1 it occurs as an acc. pl. c., as nom.acc. neuter plural and as *kurannan*, which is either an accusative of a common-gender a-stem or an nom.acc. of a neuter a-stem. The pattern of double gender: a nom.acc. plural in -a vs. a common-gender plural in -uš seems to fit into the collective theory (see 1.2.3).

Literature

Götze 1960: 73 only points out that the inflection is "strangely unstable" and that the accusative forms seem to interchange at random. Güterbock and Van den Hout 1991: 45 suggest that *kuranna* is a collective to c. *kuranna*-.

Material

I cite all the forms I know of. They all occur in KUB 13.1 (CTH 261, MH).

- a: *n-ašta ku-ra-an-na SIG₅-in [(ša)]nḡandu nu memian EGIR-pa udu n-ašta* [(LÜ.MEŠ^{EN}.NU.)]UN *katta ḡaliyaz QATAMMA widdu nu* LÜ.MEŠ^{NILZU} SA KAS-KAL.GID.DA *au[ware]š epdu n-ašta* LÜ.MEŠ^[NILZU] URU-az *katta ku-ra-an-na šaḡnḡuwa(n)zi (i ün)niyandu n-ašta ku-ra-an-na-an š(aḡnḡandu)* 'And they must [(in)]spect well the k. and report back and (then) the [(watch)]-

men must come down from (their) watch likewise. The long-distance look-
[[out]]s must take (their) posts. The lookouts must drive down from the
city to inspect the k., and they must inspect the k.' (translation Güterbock
and Van den Hout 1991: 45) KUB 13.1 + i 9ff (9,13, the reading of k. is
difficult)

- b: A common-gender accusative is attested *ibid.* i 29f (30): *maḥḥan-ma luk-
katta n-ašta URU-az LU[]* (30) *n-ašta ku-ra-an-nu-uš SIG₅-in
šanḥa<n>d[u* 'When the next morning the ... from the town, they have
to carefully scan the foregrounds⁴⁴.'

Evaluation and conclusion

Gender and number seem to change in the same text, apparently without
change of meaning: we have acc. pl. c. *kurannuš*, a nom.acc. neuter plural
in -a, viz. *kuranna* and we have *kurannan*, an ambiguous form in -an which
is either a acc. sg. c. or a nom.acc. neuter singular. The ending -a in a word
which normally has common gender fits into the pattern exemplified by Lat.
locus vs. *locia*.

2.7.2.10 (^{NA4}) *Ku(wa)nnan*- 'copper'?, 'bead'?

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW: 122: "c./n.". Berman 1972: 75, Tischler 1982: 43 and Tischler 1983: 866
only mention neuter gender. Gertz 1982: 174 cites neuter and common-gender
forms. Polvani 1988: 47 "c./n."

Literature

Gertz 1982: 174 cites *kunnanaš* in KUB 17.21 iii 2 as acc. pl. common gen-
der, *kunnanan* KUB 29.4 i 71 as acc. sg. common gender, and ^{NA4}*kuwanna*
as nom.acc. neuter plural. In HW: 122 the claim for double gender is not ac-
counted for. Polvani 1988: 47 cites neuter sg. acc. forms and a nom. acc. plural
form. She does not cite acc. or nom. common-gender forms.

Situation

^{NA4}*Ku(wa)nnan*- has two stems: *kuwanna* and *kunna*- with contracted -*wa*-.
Götze 1947: 307ff suggests 'copper', 'azurite', 'bead'. On p. 310 he assumes
an original n-stem *kuwannan*- (occasionally shortened to *kunan*-) which was
later replaced by an a-stem. He therefore interpretes *kuwanna* as the neuter
plural of this a-stem. Tischler 1983: 688 (with reference to relevant passages)

⁴⁴ KUB 31.108 i 7, which shows strong parallels to KUB 13.1 27-34, gives *kurann[us]
SIG₅-in šanḥandu*

suggests that *ku(wa)nnan*- always has neuter gender. Polvani 1988: 57 points
out that 'copper' does not cover all the attestations and that *ku(wa)nnan*- can
also mean 'azurite' or something similar. I leave the semantics undiscussed,
because they do not have any repercussions on the gender. About the gender
of *ku(wa)nnan*- opinions are conflicting. Therefore, it is necessary to cite the
relevant instances. I only cite those instances which have sufficient context.

Kuwannan used as an object

- a: [^D]MAḥ-aš>šan KASKAL-ši ēši^{NA4} *ku-un-na-an išgareškizzi* *ḫīran*
kuit apāt iška<r>iškizzi 'The mother-goddess is on her way. She pins on
a bead, ... and what is in front, that she repeatedly pins on.' KUB 28.82
+ i 25f (25)
- b: *ku-un-na-an išgareškizzi* 'He repeatedly pins on a bead.' IBOT 3.98 12'
- c: *kuwannan dāi* 'He takes a k.' KBo 4.2 iii 18 (CTH 398, OH/NS)
- d: [^D]Kumarbiš>za zi-ni pian ḫa[(ttatar) daškizzi] *n>at* ^{NA4}*ku-un-na-an mā[(n
išgariskizzi)]* 'Kumarbi [takes] wis[(dom)] in his mind and like a gem,⁴⁵ he
[(fastens)] it.' KUB 17.7 + 9f (10)
- e: LUMES DINGIR^{LIM}-*ma kī dānzi* 1 *tarpalaš* SIG.SA₅ 1 *tarpallaš* SIG.ZA.GIN 1
SIG *kīšrin* 1 TUG *kureššar* BABBAR 1 ^{NA4}*ku-un-na-na-an* ^{NA4}*kīrinniš* 'The
servants of the god take the following objects: one bundle of red wool, one
bundle of blue wool, one *kīšri*, one white headgear, one gem ...' KUB 29.4
i 69ff (71) (CTH 481).
- Kunnanan* here occurs in a list of objects taken by the servants of the god.
- f: *takku MUNUS-z[a ḫ]āši nu>šši* K[A×KAK-SU] SA *PIR[IM kiš]a tiya-z[]* [*k]išari
alp[ā]t* KUR-e [*k]u-un-na-an [ū-emi]y[azi]*?' 'If a woman gives birth and its
nose(?) is that of a ??, and ... will happen. That country will find(?)
copper.'⁴⁶KBo 13.34 21f (22)

Common-gender form

Gertz 1982: 175 suggests that in the following passage *kunnanaš* is an acc. pl.
common gender. However, the form *kunnanaš* is in fact a genitive:

- *nu>za* KÜ.BABBAR G[(UŠKIN BİBRI)]^{U1A} GA[(L^{U1A} SA KÜ.BABBAR GUŠKIN)]

⁴⁵ In the parallel KUB 33.96 + 9 ^{NA4}*kunnān* is paralleled by ^{NA4}*kunūz*. This justifies
the translation 'gem'.

⁴⁶ This translation is contradictory to the rule first posed by Laroche 1962 and elaborated
by Garret 1991: 40ff that a neuter cannot be the subject of a transitive verb. If one wants
to apply this rule to this sentence one must propose a different translation 'copper will find
that country', in which case we have a nominative without -š.

- b. *takku* GEME-as *šar-hu-wa-an[du-u]š-šuš kuiški pe[(ššiy)]azi* 'If somebody aborts foetus of a female slave' HG I §18.43 (= KBo 6.3 i 43, text B (MHD)).

The parallel (KBo 6.4 i 42 OH/NS) has *šar-hu-u-wa-an-da-an*, whereas text C (KBo 6.5 i 23 (OH/NS)) gives neuter *šar-hu-u-wa-an-da*.

- c. *takku* ^{GUA}AB *armawandan kuiški walaḫzi nu šarḫuwanda* [?] *peššiyazi* ... *takku* ANŠE.KUR.RA *armawandan ku[tiški] walaḫzi nu šar-hu-wa-an-da peššiyazi* 'If someone slays a pregnant cow and (thus) aborts its foetus ... , if some[one] slays a pregnant horse and (thus) aborts its foetus' HG I §77a 78ff (KBo 6.3 iii 78ff (78, 80)), text B (MHD). After the first *šarḫuwanda* there is an erasure. Therefore, it is possible that we have to read *šarḫuwandan*.

Unfortunately, the Old Hittite text A gives *ša ša^{BI}-ša* 'of its intestines' and not a form of *šarḫuwant*.

The evidence provided by the Laws suggests that originally common-gender *šarḫuwant*- was used to denote human foetuses. Neuter *šarḫuwant*- was used to denote animal foetuses. Later, also human foetuses received neuter gender.

Other attestations of common-gender *šarḫuwant*-

- a. [^UZU *šar-hu-u-wa-an-ta-an* (57) [] *šipanti*. (In the preceding lines a goat is sacrificed (*šipanti* in 47). Its shoulders and liver are cut up and cooked, the shank is put in front of the gods. The shoulder is sacrificed, mention is made of an ankle (^UZU *KURŠINNU*), and of half of the head of the goat), in ii 56 the *šarḫuwant* is mentioned and she makes an offering. KUB 27.67 ii 56 (CTH 391, MH/NS)
- b. (He puts a figurine full of water in the hands and speaks. 'Who is he? Didn't he swear? Didn't the gods of the oath take him?') [*nu*] DINGIR^{MES}-as *piran* [link] *atta namma-zan niš* DINGIR^L [^{IM} *šar*] *radda n-an linkiantes eppir n-aš-šan ša-šu* *suttati nu-za šar-hu-wa-an-da-an QATI-šu* *piran uḡu-a* *karpan ḫarzi* 'He [swore] an oath before the gods, afterwards he has [br]oken his oath. The oath-deities took him, he swelled up (lit. 'he, i.e. his insides') and his hand holds up his *šarḫuwant*.' KBo 6.34 + iii 15ff (18) (CTH 427, MH/NS)

Ambiguous is *našma-zan munus-ni DUMU^{MES}-šu akkiškanzi našma-zšš-zan* ^UZU *šar-hu-u-wa-an-da-ma mauškizzi* 'Or (if)⁴⁹ a woman's children keep dying or if her foetuses keep falling (= if she continually has miscarriages)' KUB 7.53 + i 4f (5) (CTH 409). Here ^UZU *šar-hu-u-wa-an-da-ma* is a neuter plural

(or, less likely, a neuter singular n-stem). In that case the *n* is assimilated to following *m*. This assimilation also occurs in *šahhan-ma* > *šahha-ma*, Laws passim.

Evaluation and conclusion

Šarḫuwant-, used as a body part, is found three times in young copies of Middle Hittite compositions. It occurs twice as a common-gender singular, once as a neuter plural.

When *šarḫuwant*- is used to indicate a foetus, text B of the laws (Middle Hittite) gives neuter plural for animal foetuses and common-gender plural for human foetuses. This probably represents the older distribution. The Young Hittite copy C gives a neuter plural for human foetuses. Because the young copies of the law code give neuter forms for human foetuses, it is possible that in Young Hittite both human and animal foetuses had neuter gender. The parallel text follows the older distribution, with the restriction that it kept the common gender for human foetuses but used the singular instead of the plural.

To sum up, notwithstanding the paucity of attestations, it is possible that originally common-gender singular forms were used to denote the body part *šarḫuwant*-. Originally human foetuses had common gender, whereas animal foetuses had neuter gender. This opposition has later been levelled out in favour of the neuter gender. It is difficult to account for this in terms of collective vs. distributive.

2.7.2.12 *Šarpa*- (piece of furniture)

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW: 187 "c.", HW 2. Erg: 18, "c.", Berman 1972: 52 "c."

Situation

Because apparent nom.acc. neuter plurals (*šarpa*) and common-gender forms (*šarpaš*) have been attested, *šarpa* seems to show the same pattern as Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca*.

Literature

Šarpa- has two determinatives, viz. ^{KUS} and ^{GIS}. Gurney 1940: 90ff established that *šarpa*- designates a piece of furniture and that it belongs to the agricultural sphere as is indicated by KUB 10.92 v 13. For its meaning see HW: 187. Güterbock 1957: 357 (deletes ^{GIS}*šarpa* 'Baum') and Rost 1956: 338ff.

Neu 1992: 204 uses the evidence provided by *šarpa* vs. *šarpaš* to corroborate his theory that this pattern has been inherited from PIE.

⁴⁹ 'If' is *našku* ibid. 1.

Neuter plural forms

- a: [...] ^{GIS}šarpa GUSKIN GAR.RA 1 ^{GIS}GIR.GUB GUSKIN.GAR.RA 'Š. inlaid with gold, one footstool inlaid with gold' KUB 42.21 obv. 9 (CTH 241)
- b: 2-ta ^{GIS}šarpa TUR TUR ŠA.BA 1 ^{GISE} 'Two (pair) of š., one of which inlaid with ebony' KBo 18.172 obv. 10' and ibid. obv. 17' 1^{NU} ^{GISE}šarpa ^{GISE} 'GUSKIN tiyan[zi?]' '[They] place one š. inlaid with gold and ebony.' (CTH 625)
- This form may be read with Eichner 1992: 52 as a nom. acc. plural of an nt-stem. It is also possible that we have to emend 2-ta to 2 TA<PAL> 'two pair'.
- c: [gimar]az ^{GISE}šarpa n=at=kan KUB 26.50 obv. 1
- d: 3 ^{GISE}GU.ZA ^{GISE}šarpa BA.NA-[A? GUSKIN] GAR.RA '3 thrones of ebony, with beautiful (?) š., [inlaid with] gold' VBoT 1 36f (36) (CTH 151)

Common-gender forms

- a: 1 ^{GISE}ŠU.A 1 ^{GISE}GIR.GUB 1^{KUS}šarpaš 'One chair, one footstool, one leather š.' KBo 5.2 i 31 (CTH 471)
- b: EGIR-ŠU ^{GISE}APIN ^{GISE}šar-pa-an GUB-[aš ekuzzi] 'Afterwards [he drinks], standing up, in honour of the plough and the š.' KUB 10.92 v 13

Evaluation and conclusion

The material of šarpa- seems to show the same pattern as Lat. *locus*, *loci* vs. *loca*. However, in inventory texts and other list-like texts forms in -a alternate freely with common-gender forms.⁵⁰ This would imply that all these nouns have the *locus*, *loci* vs. *loca* pattern as assumed by Neu 1992.

To sum up. šarpa- shows the same alternation as Lat. *locus*, *loci* vs. *loca*. It has common-gender forms, eg. šarpaš. If this pattern has been inherited from PIE, one has to assume that all words in inventory texts and other list-like texts having besides common-gender forms ending in -aš, also forms in -a, show the pattern exemplified by Lat. *locus*, *loci* vs. *loca*.

2.7.2.13 ^{GISE}Šatta- (implement used for tilling the soil?)

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW: 188 and Tischler 1982: 73 "n./c."

Situation

Double gender for this word depends on the variation between ^{GISE}šatta and ^{GISE}šattan, which has been attested in a parallel text.

I do not know of any secondary literature concerning the double gender of šatta-.

Common-gender forms

This word occurs only twice. Šattan occurs in:

- a: UMMa ^mIri[(a ^{LU}HAL nu)] mān URU-an iṣhanas linkiyaš pangarwaš lalas aniyami nu aniyattan ḥandānzi n=an katta tianzi ^{GISE}AL ZABAR ^{GISE}MAR ZABAR ^{GISE}ša-at-ta-an i LAL NINDA.SIG.MES 'Thus (speaks) Iri[(ya, the priest)]: 'When I perform (the rite of purifying) the town from bloodshed, perjury and slander of the multitude, they prepare the ritual gear, they put it down, the hoe made of bronze, a spade made of bronze, a šatta, oil, honey and thin breads.' KUB 30.35 i 1 ff (4). (CTH 400, MH/NS)⁵¹
- No evidence for the grammatical function and gender can be gathered from this passage, because in the sentence there is no verb, probably katta tianzi 'they put down' has been omitted. In that case šattan is object. If the omitted verb is a form of aš-/eš- 'to be', šattan is subject. These two options yield the following possibilities for šattan: neuter a-stem, a common-gender a-stem or a neuter n-stem.
- b: The paralleltext to KUB 15.31 ii 12ff (šatta) viz. KUB 15.32 ii 8 gives š[a-at-ta-an.

Neuter plural in -a

- ḥūdāk=ma=za ^{GISE}AL dāi nu paddāi EGIR-ŠU=ma=za TUDITTUM dāi nu apex paddāi⁵² EGIR-ŠU=ma=za ^{GISE}ša-at-ta ^{GISE}MAR⁵³ ^{GISE}ḥūpparann=a dāi nu=kan šarā līšaizzi 'Quickly he takes a hoe, and digs, afterwards he takes a pectoral and brings (it)/digs with it. Afterwards he takes a šatta, a spade and a ḥ-vessel and clears out.' KUB 15.31 ii 12ff (14) (CTH 484, MH/NS) Gertz 1982: 373 argues that the ending -a in ^{GISE}šatta is probably an error for -an. We therefore have to assume ^{GISE}šattan. She finds support for this in the form šattan in KUB 30.35 i 4 cited above. According to her, we only have to reckon with a form šattan.
- It is known, however, that the ritual of Drawing Paths, in which šatta has been attested, belongs to the Luwian-Hurrian sphere (see Haas/Wilhelm

⁵¹ The parallel KUB 39.102 i 5 also gives š[a-at-ta-an.

⁵² Spelled as pād-da-a-i. The first syllabic sign can be read as <PAD> or as <PID>.

Oettinger 1979: 505 signals that all the occurrences known to him give pa/īd. Therefore, the value of this sign depends on whether pī-e-da-i in KUB 29.30 iii 9' is a form from this verb (padda- 'dig') or from pēda- 'bring'.

⁵³ After ^{GISE}MAR there are some traces of another sign.

⁵⁰ For the material see the indexes of Siegelová 1986 and Košak 1982.

1974: 143ff). In this ritual many Luwisms occur (e.g. the Luwian plural in *-ta* in *ḫazizita* KUB 15.31 ii 20). This may have consequences for our opinion on the form *ṣatta*. Starke 1990: passim has shown that in Luwian many neuters do not occur in their singular form. Instead, this language often uses the neuter plural in *-a* instead of the singular. If one is willing to recognize Luwian influence for *satta* here, one may suggest that the scribe, Anuwanza, did not make a spelling mistake (i.e. omitted <an>), but used a Luwian formation to express a neuter singular. We then have a neuter plural in *-a*.

Conclusion

It is not unlikely that *ṣatta(n)* has neuter gender. If, however, one wants to follow Gertz and claim that the attested *ṣatta* is a spelling mistake, nothing can be said about the gender of this word: this leaves us with *ṣattan* used as object.

To sum up, the claim for double gender in this word is doubtful. It is therefore not certain that this word shows the same pattern as Lat. *locus*, *loci* vs. *loca*.

2.7.2.14 *Ṣenahḫa-* (*ṣinahḫa-*) 'trap, ambush'

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW: 190 "n" ? . Tischler 1982: 74 "n. (?)", Alp 1991: 400 "n.?"

Situation

Ṣenahḫa- mostly occurs in the standard phrase *ṣenahḫa tišk-, ṣenahḫa dai-* 'set a trap'. The *-a* might suggest a neuter plural. The translation for *ṣenahḫa tišk-* 'walk into an ambush' (CHD vol. L-N: 284) suggests that *ṣenahḫa* is a directive. Also a form *ṣenahḫas* which might suggest a nom. c., and *ṣinahḫan*, perhaps an acc. c., have been attested. As such *ṣenahḫa-* seems to show the same pattern as Lat. *locus*, *loci* vs. *loca*.

Literature

In the secondary literature there is no reference to the double gender of *ṣenahḫa-*.

Sommer 1932: 63f proposed "Schnelligkeit, Eilmarsch" because of KBo 5.8 i 10, 16f, 20f. He pointed out that hostile troops march in order to help the threatened countries and that 'they proceed in quick march' *piran ṣenahḫa tiṣkanzi* (for attestations see below sub *ṣenahḫa tišk-*). This has been contested by Götze 1933: 250. He claimed that, instead of marching up through the night, troops were more likely to be hiding. Since then, the standard trans-

lation has been 'trap, ambush'. Because considerations like these do not have repercussions on the gender and syntax, I leave the meaning of this word out of the discussion.

The literature is mostly concentrated on the phrase *ṣenahḫa dai-* followed by a dative. This expression means 'lay an ambush for someone'. However, the literal meaning is ambiguous. *Ṣenahḫa dai-* may mean literally 'put in an ambush' in which case *ṣenahḫa* is a directive case. The translation 'lay snares' suggests that *ṣenahḫa* is an object and therefore a nom. acc. neuter plural. As Gertz 1982: 177 remarks, a translation 'walk into an ambush' leaves no object for the verb. She therefore prefers to translate "to set a trap before somebody". She also thinks that neither number nor case of *ṣenahḫa* can be established because there are no adjectives or pronouns agreeing with the substantive in the phrase *ṣenahḫa dai-*. *Ṣenahḫa* may be, she thinks, a nom. acc. neuter plural, in which case *ṣinahḫan* KUB 13.77 85 may be its nom. acc. singular.

Sommer 1932: 64 n. 2 thinks that *ṣinahḫan* in *ṣinahḫan ḫarkanzi* belongs to the verbal substantive *ṣinahḫuwar*, which has been attested in KUB 8.14 iii' 9.

The phrase *ṣenahḫa tiyan ḫarkanzi-* is ambiguous because of the verb form *tiya-*, which is either a form from *dai-* 'put' or from *tiya-* 'step'. We therefore have to translate 'lay a trap', or 'make someone fall into an ambush' or 'walk into an ambush' (Götze 1933: 251), "in Eilmarchstempo setzen" or "einen Eilmarsch in Szene setzen" (Sommer 1932: 64 n. 2). I cite all the occurrences known to me which have sufficient context.

Ṣenahḫa tišk-

Tišk- is ambiguous. It is the distr. iter. derived from either *dai-* 'put' or *tiya-* 'step'. However, as pointed out by Sommer 1932: 64 (+ n. 1), the distr. iter. of *dai-* 'put' is mostly *zikk-* and seldom *tesk-*, whereas the iterative from *tiya-* 'step' is always *tišk-*. A literal translation would be: 'to step into an ambush', which means 'to set a trap'. Therefore, *ṣenahḫa* here is probably a directive.

- *nu mahḫan* LUMES URU *Taggašta iṣṭamašsir* *na al* ISTU ERINMES *anda warriṣṣanzi nu-mu piran ṣe-e-na-aḫ-ha tiṣkanzi* ISTU ERINMES *ya-al-mu-kan menahḫanda eṣan ḫarkir* 'And when the men from Taggašta heard this (viz. that Muršiliš had come to attack them), they sent auxiliaries and set a trap (lit. did not step into an ambush) for me and then with troops sat there in order to wait for me.' KBo 5.8 i 8ff (10) (CTH 61, Muršiliš, NHC) This turn of phrase has also been attested *ibid.* i 16-17: *nu-mu eniṣṣan kuit* LUMES URU *Taggašta ṣenahḫa piran teskanzi*. It is also found *ibid.* 20-21 (the auxiliary troops of the people from Taggašta had come to

help, I scattered them) *še-c-na-aḥ-ḥa-ya-mu namma piran natta tiškir* 'and they did not set a trap for me (lit. step into an ambush) anymore.'

Šenahḫa dai- 'set a trap'

Unfortunately, this turn of phrase does not occur as often as is suggested in the secondary literature:

- a: *nu pait ANA PANI x* [] *še-c-na-aḥ-ḥa dais* 'And then he set a trap for ...' KUB 19.11 iv 3f (4) (CTH 40.II)
- b: (And [in the country(?)] which had been laid waste by i[ts] enemy, a[ll] the enemies stood (artat). [(Even) the ...] and the shepherds [had come to] help) *še-c-na-aḥ-ḥa dais nu URU Gašga* '[My father] set a trap [for them] and [smote] the Gašgaeans. KUB 19.11 i 15 (CTH 40.II)

Šenahḫa dai- 'lay snares(?), make some fall into (lit. 'put a trap') or *šenahḫa tiya-* 'walk into a trap'

- *nu-ṭta šē-na-ḥa* [ti]yan *ḥarkan[zi]* 'And [they have] set a trap for you.' or 'They have walked into an ambush for you (i.e. they have set a trap for you).' HBM 17 obv. 31, (MHC).

The participle *tiyan* is either from *dai-* 'put' or from *tiya-* 'step'. However, the evidence cited above sub *šenahḫa dai-* rather suggests that [ti]yan is the participle from *dai-* 'put'.

Common-gender *šenahḫas*

- *maḥḥan UD.KAM-ti putalliyanḫa iyatta[ri]* GE₆.KAM-az₂ma-at₂kan *še-c-na-aḥ-ḥa-aš QATAMMA ēši* ('When I, My Majesty, heard "the men of Azzi are coming to attack the heart of your army tonight", I, My Majesty, instructed my troops:) "Just as one march[es] ready for battle during the day, likewise at night there has to be an ambush (lit. 'it (-at) is an ambush")' KBo 4.4 iii 69f (70) (CTH 61, NHC).⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Another nom. sg. is suggested by Götze 1933: 251: *mān-kan šenahḫas AN.TA UL ŠED-zi* (followed in the next line by *mān-kan L⁶KUR GE₆-za AN.TA UL RA-zi*). He translates this sentence as 'Wenn ein Hinterhalt oben nicht liegt, wenn der Feind zur Nachtzeit oben nicht losschlägt.' KUB 16.13 ii 7' (CTH 582) This interpretation is dubious. For RA the KUB copy suggests rather *ŠIXŠA-zi* (Hittite *ḥandaizzi*). AN.TA can also be read as *Hitt anta*, an infrequent spelling of *anda*. A proper translation of this line would be then: 'If he does not make preparations for the ambushes' (cf. Cotticelli 1988: 28). This sentence is paralleled by [*mān*]-ma-kan *šē-na-aḥ-ḥa-aš anda UL kuwapikki ŠIXŠA-iz-zi* 'If he does not make preparations for the ambushes' KUB 52.85 iii 7.

Šinahḫan

- *anda-ma mān kururaš takšula* [] [ER]N^{MES} URU *Hatti-ma šē-na-aḥ-ḥa-an ḥarzi n-a-uš walḫzi* 'But when (of the) enemy or confederates ..., but the Hittite troops have set a trap and they attack them ...' (KUB 13.27 + KUB 23.77 85-86 rev.¹ 14f (CTH 138)

Šinahḫan here may be a neuter singular participle occurring in a *ḥark*-construction of an otherwise unattested verb *šinahḫ-* 'set a trap'. Its verbal substantive then may be found in KUB 8.14 iii⁹ 9: *šinahḫuar ki[ša]* 'A setting of a trap will occur.'

Evaluation and conclusion

Despite the semantic difficulties one may propose a nom. sg. c. *šenahḫas* (attested once in Young Hittite) and a nom. acc. neuter plural *šenahḫa*. This suggests double gender for *šenahḫa* and as such *šenahḫa* fits into the 'collective' theory (see 1.2.3). A closer look at the attestations also suggests a new lemma *šinahḫ-* 'set a trap' of which a verbal substantive and a neuter participle have been attested.

Nevertheless, the evidence is not conclusive. In *šenahḫa dai-* + dat., *šenahḫa* is probably used as an object and can be explained as an accusative 'lay snares for someone'. However, it is also possible to take *šenahḫa* as a directive: 'make someone walk (lit. put) into a trap'. In *šenahḫa tiya-* (from *tiya-* 'step') 'step into a trap' the form *šenahḫa* is certainly a directive case. *Šenahḫas* in *n-a-t šenahḫas ēši* is a possible example of a nom. common gender.

To sum up, *šenahḫa* is a possible representant of the Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca* type.

2.7.2.15 *Šiluḫa-* (pastry)

Dictionaries and glossaries

In the dictionaries there is no claim for double gender. HW 1. Erg.: 18 "c.", Tischler 1982: 76 "c."

Situation

Šiluḫa- consistently shows common gender (for a representative enumeration see Hoffner 1974: 182). Only twice apparent neuter plurals have been attested. However, the occurrence of *šiluḫa*, the apparent neuter plural, besides *šiluḫas*, the common-gender forms (see Hoffner 1974: 183f) suggests the same pattern as found in Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca*.

Literature

Neu 1983a: 167 n. 493 suggests that the forms ending in -a, one of which occurs in Old Hittite, are collective formations from common-gender *šuluha*.

Neuter forms

- a: NINDA *ši-lu-ḫa-a* bo 3562 obv. i? 9' (Neu 1986 167 n. 493)
 b: [x-ni 3 NINDA *ši-lu-ḫa-a pašš[ulū]* KBo 25.150 2' (OHC)

Common-gender forms

I refer to Hoffner 1974: 182 for a representative overview of common-gender instances. In IBoT 3.1 35 there is a common-gender form preceded by the numeral 3, which parallels 3 NINDA *ši-lu-ḫa-a: šer-a-ššan* 3 NINDA *šuluḫaš kianta* 'on top of it three š-loaves are lying.'

Evaluation and conclusion

The form in -a already occurs in Old Hittite. Therefore, it is not unlikely that *šuluha* shows the pattern represented by Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca*. However, *šuluha* is an 'oligopax' and there is no evidence whatsoever that its meaning is collective.

2.7.2.16 *Šuhḫa* 'roof'

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW 196: "c./n.", HW 1. Erg.: 18 "c./n.", Tischler 1982: 77: "c./n."

Situation

Šuhḫa 'roof' mostly has common gender. There is one attestation which points to a neuter plural *šuhḫa*. For an exhaustive treatment, with attestations, I refer to Boysan-Dietrich 1987: 90ff.

Common-gender *šuhḫa*

I know of the following attestations where *šuhḫa* has common gender:

- a: The accusative *šuhḫan* occurs in the turn of phrase *šuhḫan purut danzi*:
 [(n)]a-aš-ša-an INA É DINGIR^{LIM} šarā 9-kan *pedanzi n-uš* [(^cTelepinuas)]
šu-uh-ḫa-an purut danzi 'Nine times they bring up (loam) into the temple and they take loam for the roof [(of the temple of Telepinu)].' KUB 53.4 iv 27f (28'), also in KUB 53.3 iii and KUB 53.6 + iii 21' (Festival for Telepinu in Kašša).
 Boysan-Dietrich 1987: 92 points out that the space between *purut* 'loam' and *danzi* 'take' is very small. She therefore suggests that it is possible that *purut da-* or *tiya-* is a fixed expression: 'to loam-take', followed by the object 'roof'. This explains the use of the accusative *šuhḫan* instead

of a dative. As she points out, also a double accusative is possible.

- b: In KBo 10.45 iv 38 we find *šu-uh-ḫa-ma-kan*.⁵⁵

šu-uh-ḫa-m[a a-az ārri] '[the water washes off] the roof.' This is not a neuter plural *šuhḫa* followed by the adversative particle -ma, but rather a product of assimilation of the n to following m. This assimilation also occurs in e.g. *šahḫa-mit* < *šahḫan-mit* 'my obligation' (Laws passim). The interpretation of *šuhḫa-ma-kan* as an acc. c. is confirmed by the duplicate KUB 41.8 iv 36, where we find *šu-uh-ha-an-kan*.

- c: An accusative plural *šuhḫuš* occurs in *nu É DINGIR^{LIM} andurza araḫza ḫurniyanzi šu-uh-ḫu-uš zappiyaz paḫṣanuwanzi* 'They spray the temple inside and outside, they protect the roofs from leaking.' KUB 9.15 iii 7f (8) and ibid. 13.

Neuter plural *šuhḫa*

- [*šu-uh-ḫa le warḫui zappiya[ttari]*] KUB 31.89 ii 7. Here *šuhḫa* seems to agree with the neuter adjective *warḫui* 'rough'.

There are two possible interpretations of *šuhḫa*, viz. a nom.acc. neuter plural and a directive in -a.

Von Schuler 1957: 43 and 54, followed by Gertz 1982: 90, takes *šuhḫa warḫui* as a noun plus adjective ("Gestrüppdach"). Gertz 1982: 90 translates: "And let the roof(s) covered with brushwood not be leaky." CHD vol. L-N: 56 translates "Let the roof not be weed-grown! It will leak." CHD considers this instance to be a nominal sentence. This may provide an explanation for the position of *le*, which normally stands in front of the verb. Kammenhuber 1979: 126, on the other hand, takes *šuhḫa* as a directive case and translates: "Es soll nicht in dem rauhen Dach tropfen". This translation does not account for the unusual position of *le*.⁵⁶

Therefore, the hapax *šuhḫa* is a neuter "plural".

Conclusion

To sum up, *šuhḫa* has common gender. There is one possible attestation of a

⁵⁵ Also in the parallel KUB 7.4 4'.

⁵⁶ The parallel KUB 31.86 ii + 16ff (18) does not help: *purut tiyawanzi x x [nam]ma-aš istalga ešdu n-ašta [šuhḫa warḫui zappiyattari] [e] 'to put loam' ... let it [also] be levelled (viz. the loam).* Here *šuhḫa* can be taken both as a directive and as a nom.acc. plural. CHD vol. L-N: 56 translates this line as: "A roof (which is) weed-grown will leak. Let it not be (so)!". Mutatis mutandis an interpretation following Kammenhuber would run like: "And in a weed-grown roof it will leak. Let it not be so! (viz. that the roof is weed-grown)."

nom. acc. form in -a. This may indicate that c. *šuhha-* had a neuter collective.

2.7.2.17 Šuppala(a)- 'cattle, animals'

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW 198: "n./c.", Tischler 1982: 78, Berman 1972: 70 "šuppala- n. ... šuppala- c."

Situation

In OH/NS texts we find nom. sg. c. *šuppalaš*. Neuter gender is suggested by the form *šuppalan* which occurs in a divination text (a-stem), and by the neuter enclitic possessive pronoun in *šuppalašset*. Neuter *šuppala-* has been attested once in a MH/NS text.

Literature

Tischler 1982: 78 and Berman 1972: 70 contend that the a-stem has common gender, whereas the l-stem has neuter gender. The form *šuppalan* is not accounted for in the secondary literature.

Neu 1969: 240, Eichner 1985: 148 and Watkins 1975: 365f, explain the alternation between common-gender *šuppalaš*, plural *šuppalaš*⁵⁷ and the neuter plural *šuppala* (apparently abstracted from *šuppalašset*) by means of the 'collective' theory (see 1.2.3).

This claim might be correct. However, there is also a neuter singular *šuppalan*. This implies that the existence of (the hapax) **šuppala* cannot be proved, because it can also be singular *šuppalan*, followed by a neuter enclitic possessive pronoun -*set*.

Common-gender forms⁵⁸

- a: takku munus-aš hūši nu-šši sag.du-šu ša šaḫ kiša šu-up-pa-la-aš 0L SIG-
in 'If a woman gives birth and its head is the head of a pig, the cattle will not prosper.' KBo 13.34 iii 8'ff. (10') (CTH 540, OH/NS)
- b: šu-up-pa-la-aš-mi-tš apāš-kan KBo 3.60 ii 1 (CTH 17, OH/NS)

⁵⁷ HW's claim for *šuppales* in VBoT 124 i 6 as c. pl. is not correct. The text (with young duplicate bo 1212, cf. Neu 1980: 189) runs as follows: *šuppalaš*[(ni le šuwayeš)]]. Here we have a dative of **šuppaleštar*.

⁵⁸ KUB 31.127 i 43 *šu-up-pa-la-an-n-a ha-nešsar iis[ti] kuyēš 0L memiškanzi apāt-a ha[n]jattari* 'He will decide about the verdict on the animals that cannot speak with their mouths' (CTH 372, OH/NS) gives indirect evidence for c. *šuppala-*. *Šuppalan* is probably a gen. plural. It is resumed by the c. pl. relative pronoun *kuyēš* and therefore *šuppala-* here has common gender.

Although the text is mutilated, it is clear that *šuppala-* here has common gender. This form must therefore be read as *šuppalaš-smiš*. The sg. c. enclitic possessive pronoun (and perhaps also c. *apāš*) suggests that *šuppala-* here has common gender.

Neuter forms

- a: nu ^DEa-na šu-up-pa-al EGIR-pa kiššan punušta [kuiš-wa] DINGIR^{LUM}
DINGIR^{MES}-aš ištarna tarḫilešzi 'She asked the cattle of Ea thus: "[Who] is the strongest among the gods?"' KUB 36.55 ii 30⁵⁹ (CTH 351, OH/NS)
- b: [mān] INA UD.15^{KAM} ^DXXX-aš aki arunaš āššu ḫaraki [naša š]u-up-pa-la-an tepawešzi '[If] a lunar eclipse occurs on the fifteenth day, the abundance of the sea (= the fishes) will perish and the (amount of) cattle will decrease.' KUB 8.1 iii 12f (13) (CTH 532, OH/NS)
- Starke 1990: 323 reads [h]uppalan. According to him, it is a gen. pl. of **huppala* 'net' and translates "so dass [der Ertrag] der Fangnetze gering werden wird.". Unfortunately, it cannot be determined whether we should read <šv> or <yv>. Starke thinks that it is not likely that *šuppala* is a neuter a-stem. I follow the suggestion of Riemschneider mentioned by Starke, n. 1134a (via Neu) who reads in an unpublished manuscript *š]u-up-pa-la-an* because this is an existing form (see c.).
- c: [mān] INA ITU.N.KAM ^DXXX-aš aki BURU⁷ kiša []x-ar šu-up-pa-la-an ḫara[kzi] "[If in the x-th] month a lunar eclipse occurs, there will be harvest ... (but) the cattle dies." KBo 13.16 7f (8) (CTH 532)

In view of LUGAL.GAL aki 'the Great-king dies' and line 6' KUR-e tepawešzi 'the land will diminish (in prosperity)', *šuppalan* is subject: the lines preceding and following *šuppalan* all show entities which will die or diminish.

- d: takku šu-up-pa-la-aš-še-it kuēla šteuntiahta t-at parkunuzi n-at arḫa pennāi išuwanalli-ma-kan išuwan dāi ariši-ma-at 0L tezzi ^Uarašš-a 0L šakki šu-up-pa-la-aš-še-it pennāi n-at aki šarnikiz 'If someone's cattle has been struck by a god, he purifies it and drives it away. (When) the contagion begins to affect them and he does not tell it to a friend and his friend does not know it, and he drives his cattle to (the place) and they die, there will be recompensation.' KBo 6.26 I 22ff (22, 26) (CTH 292, OH/NS, ed. Friedrich HG II §48)

This form is usually analysed as *šuppala* followed by the neuter enclitic possessive pronoun -*set* and as such it plays a role in the 'collective' theory. Gertz

⁵⁹ In the same CTH number, KUB 36.32 5, 8 this word occurs with the -ant-suffix: *šu-up-pa-la-an-za*.

can also regard *parkūš* as a by-form of */parkūš/* and take *NÍTE hūmānda* as an accusative of respect. This sentence may then be translated as 'For the sun-god of heaven and the upper gods he shall be pure as far as all his body-parts are concerned.' However, *ANA* followed by an accusative is problematic, because we would expect a dat. loc.

- b: ^DISTAR-*iš-ma-k*[an ANA ^{MUS}H[*edanmu* (IG-*anda*)] NÍTE^{MES} *ne-ku-ma-an-ta šarā cpa* 'Istar proffers her naked limbs to Hēdammu.' KUB 33.86 ii 9' F(10) (CTH 384)
- c: *kāša-kan* NÍTE *hūmānda šahhiskimi* 'Look, I am now scrubbing all the limbs.' KUB 7.53 + iii 2 (CTH 409)

The suggestion made by Tischler 1994: 402 (see above sub Literature) that the instances in which the nom. acc. neuter plural agreeing with *NÍTE* are not to be regarded as genuine Hittite is an ad hoc suggestion, because he does not give arguments. Nevertheless, we are not allowed to assume that *tuekka* could have neuter gender, like Kammenhuber suggests, because there is one instance weakening Kammenhuber's claim that *NÍTE* can only be *tuekka*- and not the neuter *happešsar* (or ^{UZU}ÜR). In the Malli ritual *NÍTE* alternates with ^{UZU}ÜR. KBo 12.126 + i 56 reads: *kinuna-šši-kan kāša hūmandaz* ^{UZU}ÜR-na-a[(z *daškimi*)] 'Look, I am taking [(it)] now from him from all his limbs (^{UZU}ÜR-na-z = *happešnaz*). The duplicate KUB 41.1 i 9 reads here: *kāša ANA EN.SISKUR hūmandaza NÍTE^{MES}-za daškimi*. This implies that there is nothing against considering the above mentioned neuter plural constituents to be "sprachwirklich" and suggest that they agree with the neuter plural *happešsar*. This weakens plural ***tuekka* 'limbs'.

Conclusion

The only certain evidence for neuter **tuekka*- are the two cases in the vocabulary text KBo 1.51. Taking into account the many mistakes occurring in the vocabulary texts, one might suggest that even neuter **tuekkan* did not exist. In any case, it is rather uncertain that *tuekka*- shows the same pattern as Latin *locus, loci* vs. *loca*.

2.7.2.19 Waršul(a-) 'refreshment, drop, odour'

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW 247: *waršul* "Besänftigung, Beruhigung", *waršula*- "Erfrischung", HW 3. Erg.: 36: "c./n." "Tropfen, Saft, Duft", Tischler 1982: 102 claims that *waršul*- has neuter gender ("Beruhigung") when it is an l-stem, whereas as an a-stem ("Beruhigung, Besänftigung") it has common gender.

Situation

Warsula- has common gender. The claim for neuter gender is based upon the hapax *waršula-ya*.

Common-gender waršula-

Examples include:

- a: *šanizziš wa-ar-šu-la-aš* 'a reinvigorating refreshment, odour' KUB 17.10 ii 7 (CTH 324, MHD)
- b: [*w*]a-ar-šu-la-aš-ši-iš KBo 6.34 + i 7 (CTH 427)
- c: ^{GIS}SAG^{MES}-aš *widār* ^{GIS}SAR^{HA} *wēllu nu tuel wa-ar-šu-la-aš-teš paışqataru n-uš le tinnuz[i]* 'The waters of the mountains, the gardens, the meadows, may your refreshment be continued, but it shall not paralyse them.' VBoT 58 i 10f (11) (CTH 323)
- d: *nu wa-ar-šu-la-aš-teš ammel katta uwaru* 'Let your [divine] emanation be seen by me.' KUB 36.44 iv' 4 (CTH 323)
- e: *kinuna-tta šanezziš wa-ar-šu-la-aš* ^{GIS}ERIN-*anza i-anza kallišdu* 'Let now the sweet odour (from) the cedar-oil call you here.' KUB 24.2 i 10f (10) (CTH 377)
- f: *le-ma* ^{GIS}ER[(IN) *w*]a-ar-šu-la-an *ištahtēni* 'Do not taste the aroma of ced[(ar)].' KBo 10.45 iii 40 (CTH 446)
- g: In KUB 24.14 i 22 (CTH 729) *wa-ar-šu-la-an* occurs as object to *awan arha parhun* 'I expelled the odour.'
- h: [(*nu* GIM-an ^{MUS}Hedammuš) *wa-ar-šu-la-an* KAŠ *ištahta* '[(And when Hēdammu)] tasted a drop of beer ...' KUB 33.84 iv 8'

Neuter plural

The neuter plural in -a is a hapax:

- *n-aš katta ašnuanzi wa-ar-šu-la-ya-šmaš katta pedai* 'And they take care of them (viz. the horses) and they bring refreshment to them.' KBo 3.2 rev.' 11 (CTH 284)

Here *waršula* seems to be a certain neuter plural of common gender *waršulaš*. However, this instance is not as reliable as it seems to be at first sight. It is generally agreed upon⁶⁰ that KBo 3.2, the 'Kikkuli-tablet', has not been composed by a native speaker of Hittite.

Moreover, *wa-ar-šu-la-ya-šmaš* ('w. to them') is probably a clumsy expression for 'break' (Kammenhuber 1961: 137, n. 53) and does not mean 'drop,

⁶⁰ Kammenhuber 1961: 42 and Neu 1983b: 156ff argue that the author was Hurrian, whereas Starke 1995: 116f contends that the author was Luwian.

refreshment'. These two facts suggest that *waršula* is not a reliable instance of a nom. acc. neuter plural in *-a*.

Conclusion

To sum up, it is not very certain that *waršula* actually showed the pattern *locus, loci* vs. *loca*. There is only one form in *-a* in a text written by a non-Hittite scribe.

2.7.2.20 *Wašpa* 'clothing, cloth'

Dictionaries and glossaries

Tischler 1982: 103 "c.", Berman 1972: 55 "c."

Situation

Wašpa, which might be represented by the sumerogram *TUG*, always has common gender. However, the sumerogram *TUG* sometimes shows agreement with neuter plural adjuncts. If *TUG* always stands for *wašpa*, the neuter plural constituents point to **wašpa*. In that case *waspa-* shows the pattern *wašpaš*, *wašpeš* vs. *wašpa* and has the same pattern as Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca*.

Literature

Götze 1955: 50ff suggested *TUG* = *wašpa*, because of the passage *tuel-za wa-aš-pa-an lu-aš iwar waššiyaši* 'You put on your *wašpa*-like a man' KUB 31.69 5f. The verb used with the object *TUG* is also *wašš-*, *waššiya-*. This, according to Götze, points to *TUG* = *wašpa*. He pointed out that *TUG* is an *a*-stem. In the plural *TUG* can be constructed as a neuter, e.g. *parkuwai TUG^{HI.A}* 'clean clothes' KUB 13.4 i 16. Watkins 1969: 239 concludes that therefore one must assume Hittite *wašpa* vs. *wašpaš*. He claims that *wašpa* shows the same pattern as Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca*. Melchert 1983a: 145 suggests that *TUG* may also represent *šeknu-*.

A neuter plural **wašpa* has never been attested as such but can only be inferred from the sumerogram *TUG*, because this sumerogram can agree with neuter plural adjuncts.

Common-gender *wašpa*-

Wašpa has common gender when it is written in Hittite and not represented by a sumerogram. I know only of one nom. sg.: *waššapaš* KBo 8.114 obv. 8. The accusative *wa-aš-pa-an* has been attested in e.g. KUB 31.69 i 16 and in 2312/c obv. 11 (Ottén 1958: 95, n.1). In KUB 35.93 obv. 3' (CTH 827) a nom. c. plural [*iš-har-wa-an-te-eš wa-aš-pi-eš*] may have been attested.

TUG with phonetic complement

The ideogram *TUG* having a Hittite phonetic complement is often an *a*-stem, e.g. *TUG-aš* in KUB 17.7 + iv 30. Other instances include KUB 57.76 i 8 (*warhuin TUG-an* 'rough cloth'), KBo 17.1 + i 24f (25') (*weššanda-ma išharwantuš TUG^{HI.A}-uš* 'and they wear bloodstained clothes', -uš in the parallel KBo 17.3 + i 20).

TUG agreeing with common-gender constituents

Instances include KUB 4.3 + KBo 12.70 30' ii 17 (*nu-za wekantan TUG-an waššiya[zi]* "elle se vêt d'un habit de louage", Laroche 1968: 773), KUB 35.57 1 (here *TUG* agrees with the common-gender enclitic pronoun *-an* and the c. participle *wekantan*), KUB 55.28 iii 16 (*apūn TUG-an*), KUB 33.95 + 30' (*TUG-aš mān anda pedanza*), KUB 59.17 obv. 8' (*TUG-an epi n-a[n]*) and KUB 29.4 i 44 (1 *TUG šarā huittiyanza*).

TUG agreeing with neuter plural constituents

- a: *nu TUG^{HI.A} kuc waššan [šarz]i n-at-š-kan* MUNUS^{SU.GI} *arḫa dāi* 'And the Old Woman takes away from him the clothes he has worn.' KBo 24.1 obv. 15' (CTH 404, MHD)
- b: Götze 1955: 51 cites *TUG^{HI.A}* agreeing with: *išharwanta* 'bloodstained' KUB 34.76 i 3, *išharuwanda* 'bloodstained' KUB 9.31 i 37 (= HT 1 i 30), also in VBoT 111 iii 9, *dankuwai* in KUB 17.8 iv 18, *dankuwai[da]* 'blackened' VBoT 111 iii 9 and *ḫarki* 'bright' KUB 34.76 i 2.
- c: *TUG^{HI.A}-ya GIM-an ōl sigs-anda* 'And as the clothes are not good.' KUB 50.91 iv 10'

Neuter singular *TUG*

Neuter singular is suggested by the inventory text KUB 42.56 obv. 11:1 *TUG UGU sud-an* 'one robe tucked up'. In line 8 *TUG* agrees with the neuter sg. participle *dū-an*.

Other words behind *TUG*

There is some evidence that behind *TUG* not only *wašpa* is hidden:

- a: A common-gender *u*-stem may be represented by *TUG* as is demonstrated by KUB 20.4 i 12 *TUG^{HI.A}-muš*. (CTH 627)
In the sequence *šeknu-šmet anda nēan nu TUG^{HI.A}-uš arḫa nār* 'Their robes are turned in'. 'They opened their robes.' KBo 3.34 i 21f. (OH/NS) the sumerogram *TUG* may represent the *u*-stem *šeknu-*, as pointed out by Melchert 1983a: 145.

- b: De Roos 1984: 211 n. 4 suggests that in KUB 15.5 + i 7 (CTH 583) *rūg-ma-a-ya-a* {*wa ANA*} ^{MENUS} *Danuḫpa piandu* 'They must give a garment (garments) [to] Danuḫpa', we may have a phonetic complement *-maya*, which suggests a word other than *wašpa*.
- c: There is a phonetic complement *-ti* in KUB 57.79 iv 37 [*n-a*] *te-kan ANA* ^{GIS} *PISAN rūg-ti anda tianzi*. This *-ti* is either a Hittite phonetic complement or the Akkadian complement ^{TI}.

The evidence presented is not clear: *wašpa* is common-gender, whereas *rūg* has been attested as a common-gender *a*-stem, a common-gender *u*-stem, a neuter plural and as a neuter singular. It also has *-maya* and perhaps *-ti* as phonetic complements. All this suggests that behind *rūg* more than one word is hidden.

rūg in KUB 13.4

Only in KUB 13.4 (CTH 264) *rūg* seems to have both neuter and common gender. The sumerograms without phonetic complement seem to be neuter plural, whereas the sumerogram written with a Hittite phonetic complement seems to be a common-gender *a*-stem. If the word concerned is the same, we have an instance of an *e*-stem which has a neuter plural. Neuter plural instances are:

- a: KUB 13.4 i 16: *parkuwaya rūg^{IIA} waššan ḫarkandu* 'They must wear clean garments.'
- b: *n-aš warpanza nu parkuwaya waššan ḫarzi* 'He has been washed and wears clean clothes,' *ibid.* i 23
- c: *nu rūg^{IIA} parkuwaya w[ē]šten* 'You must wear clean garments.' *ibid.* iii 62

There is one instance which seems to show common gender for *rūg*:

- *nu nekumanza rūg-aš-ši-kan nī-te-iš-ši le-pat ēšzi* 'While naked, let there be no garment on his body' *ibid.* iii 32.
- rūg-aš-ši-kan* can be explained as a common-gender singular *wašpaš*, followed by *-ši*, the dative of the enclitic anaphoric pronoun. It might also be a nom. acc. neuter plural in *-a*: *wašpa-aš-ši-kan* or even a neuter singular *a*-stem.

Conclusion

Only in KUB 13.4 there is a slight possibility that c. *wašpa*- (*rūg-aš-ši-kan*) indeed has a neuter plural **wašpa*-. This neuter plural must be inferred from agreement with neuter plural constituents. However, there is nothing against assuming that in this text *rūg* represents another word than *wašpa*-.

Behind *rūg* more Hittite words are hidden. Therefore, it is not certain that *rūg* accompanied by a neuter plural constituent must be **wašpa*.

To sum up, the evidence for *wašpaš*, *wašpeš* with a neuter plural **wašpa* as inferred by Watkins 1969: 239 is not certain.

2.7.2.21 *Wera*-, *ura*- 'tablet, tray'

Dictionaries and glossaries

HW 3. Erg.: 37 'c., vereinzelt n.a. N.' Tischler 1982: 'c.', Berman 1972: 55 'c.'.

Situation

Common-gender *wera*- seems to have a neuter plural counterpart in *wera* and *ura*. This word seems to occur both as *wera*- with an *e* in the root and as *ura*- with apparent zero grade.

Common-gender *wera*-

In the vast majority of instances, *wera*- has common gender, e.g. 5 *ú-e-ra-aš* DAR 'five colourful tablets' KBo 2.12 ii 18 (CTH 627), *ANA* [^{GIS} *GIGIR-m*] *a-aššan* 2 *antuḫšeš* IM-*aš arantari ú-e-ra-a*[(*š-ša* S)] *IM ḫimmaš iyanza* 'On [the chariot] two human figures made of loam are standing. [(And also)] a model of *wera* of clay is made.' IBoT 3.93 + KBo 15.21 i 8f (9) (CTH 436),⁶¹ *ú-e-ru-uš* KBo 23.82 rev. 6', *nu-mu EN SISKUR* 1 *UDU* 1 ^{DUG} *ḫa-ni-eš-ša-an KAŠ GEŠTIN* 3 NINDA GUR₄ RA ^{IIA} 1 ^{GIS} *ú-e-ra-an BU*[LUG] 1 ^{GIS} *ú-e-ra-an BAPPIR pa-a-i* 'The requirer of the sacrifice gives me one sheep, one vessel of beer, wine, three thick loaves, one tray with malt, one tray with wort.' KBo 12.96 iv 22f (23, 24) and 5 *ú-e-ra-aš* in KBo 20.16 rev.⁷ 2. We also have ^{GIS} *ú-e-ru-uš-ša*, an acc. pl. in KUB 36.83 iv 10.

Common-gender *ura*

Ura- occurs in KBo 8.72 i 7 (CTH 500): *kit*[*kar* GIR^{MES} *su-ya* ^{GIS} *ú-ra-an*], a nom. c. ^{GIS} *ú-ra-aš*... occurs in KBo 11.5 vi 7 (CTH 703), in KUB 11.26 v 5: 2 ^{DUG} ^{IIA} *u'-ra-a-aš marnuan arta* 'Two u.-vessels *marnuan* are standing', and ^{GIS} *ú-ra-an* KUB 42.98 obv 18'.

Neuter plural in *-a*

The neuter plural in *-a* has been attested only in KBo 11.32 obv. 16ff (16, 18) (CTH 645) EGIR-*su-kan* ^{GIS} *ú-e-ra suḫḫaza GAM pēdāi SA* ^{IIA} *ḫali<n> tuaš-kan*

⁶¹ Kummel 1967: 139 n. 16 suggests that the context here pleads against 'tablet' for *wera*-. This is not necessary, because *weraš* is an explicative genitive.

^{GIS}AB-t anda tianzi nu DINGIR^{MES} LÜ.MEŠ BAL-ti LUGAL-uš EGIR-SU šuhhi⁶²
 wizzi ^{GIS}ú-ra-ša⁷ wehzi 'Afterwards he takes the tablet down from the roof.
 In the window of the h. they put [it] down. He libates in front of the male
 gods. Afterwards the king comes on the roof and he turns the tablets.' In
 this text only *wera* in line 16 is a neuter form. The form ^{GIS}ú-ra-ša⁷ is not
 clear. Therefore, Gertz 1982: 71 suggests that in line 16 the sign -an has been
 omitted and that no neuter actually existed.

Conclusion

To sum up, the evidence for a neuter plural *wera* to c. *weraš* is weak.

2.7.2.22 Conclusion

Hittite seems to have had common-gender substantives which also had a plural
 in -a. Some restrictions have to be made, however. In a number of cases
 there is only one example of a neuter plural in -a. Often this form is young,
 as in *alpa*. *Wašpa* and *suppala* do not occur as such and have to be inferred.
Hašša hanzašša can be explained as a directive case. In summing up, I have
 divided the possible representatives of the *locus, loci* vs. *loca* according to the
 parameters 'possible', 'slightly possible' and 'unlikely':

Possible representatives are:

(^{GIS}) <i>harpa</i> -	'heap, pile, stack'
<i>huda</i> -	'readiness, ability to act swiftly, quickness'
<i>kuranna</i> -	(closing device)
<i>šenahha</i> - (<i>šinahha</i> -)	'trap, ambush'
<i>šuhha</i> -	(pastry)

Slightly possible representatives are:

<i>alpa</i> -	'cloud'
<i>aniyatt</i> -	(sumerogram KIN) 'regalia, attire'
<i>hū(wa)hurtalla</i> -	'necklace'
<i>kalmaru</i> -	'beam, winged motif'
<i>saḫuwant</i> -	'foetus, belly'
<i>sarpa</i> -	'piece of furniture'
<i>šuhha</i> -	'roof'
<i>wera</i> -, <i>ura</i> -	'tablet, tray'

Unlikely representatives are:

<i>hašša hanzašša</i>	'offspring'?
(^{NA4}) <i>ku(wa)nnu</i> -	'copper'?, 'bead'?

⁶² The text reads *šu-uh-hu-ḫi*.

^{GIS} <i>šatta</i> -	(instrument used for tilling the soil?)
<i>suppal(a)</i> -	'cattle, animals'
<i>tuekka</i> -	'body', plural 'limbs'
<i>waršul(a)</i> -	'refreshment, drop, odour'
<i>wašpa</i> -	'clothing, cloth' ⁶³

The evidence indicates that Hittite has words with an inflection like e.g.
 Lat. *locus, loci, loca*. In the historical account of the neuter plural (part 3), I
 have considered this to be a fact.

2.7.3 Substantivized adjectives from i-stems

2.7.3.1 *Palḫa* 'cups' from *palḫi*- 'wide'

Old Hittite:

- GA]L *šuskiši pal-ḫa-e-a*^{H1A} GAL *š[š]kiši*

'You keep filling large [cauldrons] and you [keep] filling the large cauldrons.'
 StBoT 25.110 ii 22

Pal-ḫa-e-a means 'cups' and is a form from *palḫi*- 'wide'. As argued sub
 1.4.6.3, *pal-ḫa-e-a* may be read as *palḫa* 'large cups' followed by the enclitic
 -ya 'and'. It is also possible that *pal-ḫa-e-a* here has to be read as *palḫaya*
 'cups' (see 1.4.6.3 for an elaborate discussion.) If we assume *palḫa*, this
 form has been attested twice, here and in KUB 17.6 i 6. Due to its ad-
 jectival origin, this word may have both common-gender and neuter forms
 (^{DUG}*palḫi* and ^{DUG}*palḫis*). Both i-stem forms and a-stem forms have been
 attested (see CHD vol. P: 66).

In the next instance *palḫi*- 'kettle' has already acquired full substantival inflec-
 tion:

- *kattan dankui takni ZABAR palḫi arta istappulli-šmet* A.BAR-aš *zakkiš-*
(š)meš AN.BAR-aš 'Down in the dark earth p.-vessels stand, made of bronze.
 Their lids are made of lead, their handles are made of iron.' KUB 17.10

⁶³ Melchert 1996: 778 has recently suggested that KASKAL-ša in *nu-ššan* ^D*Telepinu*
 i ^{DUG}GA-it *papparašanta* KASKAL-ša *iganni* 'So walk, Telepinu (on) the paths sprinkled with
 fine oil' KUB 17.10 ii 28-30 (30) (CTH 324, MHD) is a neuter collective plural in -a (*palša*
 from *palša*- c.). The acc. sg. comm. in *mān* LUGAL-uš KASKAL-an *igatt[ar]* 'When the king
 travels the road' KUB 40.40 ii 10 seems to support this view. Melchert's opinion, however,
 is contradicted by a reference like *nu-šmaš ke* ^{TUG}^{H1A} KASKAL^{MES} *aḫ[anda] nu-kan kedaš*
šer arḫa iyanniyatin 'Those clothes shall be roads for you, and walk along those roads' KUB
 7.70 ii 28f(29) (also with the verb *iyanniya*-!). The form *kedaš* suggests that KASKAL-še
 in KUB 17.10 ii 30 is a directive.

iv 15 (CTH 324)

Palhi is plural because it is referred to by the 3 plural enclitic possessive pronouns *-šmet* and *-šmes* 'their'.

2.7.3.2 *Ḥarša* 'thick-bread' from *ḥarši-* 'thick, wide'

Ḥarši- is usually considered to be an adjective, from which two words have been derived, viz. ^{NINDA}*ḥarši-* (type of bread) and ^{DUG}*ḥarši-* (vessel). Götze 1954: 198 suggests a meaning 'right, proper'. Adjectival inflection is suggested by the oblique cases which show full grade, e.g. *ḥaršaś* KBo 17.3 iv 20 and *ḥaršaś* KUB 34.123 i 22. Güterbock 1957: 352f equates *ḥarši-* with Sumerian GUR₄.RA 'thick'.

Puhvel 1991: 197f argues that ^{DUG}*ḥarši-* and ^{NINDA}*ḥarši-* are not adjectives, but *i*-stem substantives from the same root as *ḥaršar* 'head'.⁶⁴ Because *ḥarši-* is only preceded by the determinatives ^{NINDA} 'bread' and ^{DUG} 'vessel', Puhvel argues that it must be a substantive. He suggests that the adjectival inflection had been fueled by the sumerogram NINDA.GUR₄.RA (thick bread), because GUR₄.RA means 'thick'.

Puhvel's argumentation is not compelling, because one can also assume an old adjective which was only retained in the specialized meanings 'thick-bread' and 'broad vessel'. Moreover, the French parallel is incorrect. The word 'boule' primarily means 'ball, sphere, globe'. Only as a slang word it means 'head'. The meaning 'head' is derived from the meaning 'ball, sphere'. There is no reason at all not to assume that the Hittite word *ḥaršar* is derived from the meaning 'thick, round', just like French 'boule' is derived from 'ball, sphere'. Words for 'head' are often words which originally meant something else, e.g. French *tête* < Lat. *testa* 'tile, potsherd'.

Further, Puhvel claims that in the *i*-stem inflection the full grade of the suffix *-i-* is an archaism. The adjectives would have kept the archaic forms, viz. *šallaḡaś* > *šallaś*, whereas the substantives innovated by introducing the zero grade in the oblique cases. This is unlikely because the full grade of the *i*- and *u*-stem adjectives is an innovation as has clearly been demonstrated by Weitenberg 1984: 381.

Therefore, it is better to follow Güterbock et al. and claim adjectival inflection for *ḥarši-*.

Adjectival inflection is supported by the following Old Hittite passage in which a nom. acc. neuter plural *ḥarša* may occur:

⁶⁴ For the development of meaning he parallels French *boule* which means both 'ball, head' and 'military ration loaf'.

- A.ŠA A.GAR *taḥātaūššaś māu* [] ^{NINDA}*ḥar-ša-ša-aš-ma-aš*
^{URU}*Kākumaḥi-ma mā* [] *išpantuzzišmaś tuwā[ttu ... StBoT 25.112*
 ii 7f (8')

Neu 1986: 57 analyses ^{NINDA}*ḥar-ša-ša-aš-ma-aš* as *ḥaršaś-šmaś*, the dat. loc. pl. followed by an enclitic possessive pronoun. Neu 1986: 183 considers *taḥātaūššaś* to be a nom. sg. of a noun with unknown meaning. He (p. 115) guesses that *mā* [] is from *mān*. If Neu is right, the passage has to be translated as 'The *t.* of the field and tallow must grow. But just as in the town Kākumaḥi (there is mercy) for their breads, let there be mercy for their libations'.

CHD vol. L-N: 115 reads A.ŠA A.GAR *taḥātaūššaś māu* [...] ^{NINDA}*ḥarša-šmaś* ^{URU}*Kākumaḥi-ma mā[u]* and translates 'Let the field and fallow of *t.* grow/increase(?). Let the bread be plentiful for them in (?) K.' A transliteration *ḥarša-šmaś* 'bread for them' suggests a nom. acc. neuter plural.

Both interpretations seem to be possible. In favour of the interpretation offered by CHD, one can argue along the following lines: in this text *tuwaddu* always precedes the noun to which it refers (ii 11', 18', iii 6', 11', 14', e.g. *tuwattu Kazitaieti dandukišni* 'K., (have) mercy for mankind.' If *tuwaddu* refers to the breads and the libations, we would rather have it placed in front of the substantive than behind it. Therefore, the interpretation offered by CHD seems preferable and the best translation of this passage is 'Let the field and fallow of *t.* grow, let the bread be plentiful for them in (?) Kākumaḥi. For them their libations [must prosper]. 'Mercy.'

To sum up, *ḥarša* 'breads' is a substantivized adjective from *ḥarši-* 'thick', just like *palḡa* is a substantivized adjective from *palḡi-* 'broad, wide'. The neuter plural *ḥarša* 'breads' is an archaism.

2.7.3.3 *Šuppa* 'meat' from *šuppi-* 'clean'

A: Old Hittite

- a: [*maḡhi*]a[n *šu-u*]-pa *zinnanz[i]* [As s]oon as one is finished with the mea[t parts] StBoT 25.27 obv.' 19'

- b: *šu-up-pa-e-a* StBoT 25.13 iii 9' (no context)

This form has to be read as *šuppa-ya* 'and meat', see 1.4.6.4.

- c: [UDU]^{U1-A}*-aš šu-up-pa* 'mutton' StBoT 25.24 obv.' 12'

- d: LÜ.MES^{MUḤALDIM} *anda wenzī ta šuppa k[uranz]*⁶⁵ 'The overseers of the cooks enter and c[ut] the sacrificial meat.' StBoT 25.25 iv 24'

- e: UGULA LÜ.MES^{MUḤALDIM} *ū LÜ.MES^{MUḤALDIM} šu-up-pa tianzi* 'The overseer

⁶⁵ The restoration to *kuranz* is suggested by Neu 1980a: 68 n. 251.

of the cooks and the cooks put down the meat.' StBoT 25.25 iv 29'

f: [s]u-up-pa StBoT 25.87 9', StBoT 25.27V's' 1'

g: GU₄-aš UDU-aš šu-u[p-pa] 'beef and mutton' StBoT 25.13 iii 6'

h: [GU₄.MA]h 10 UDU^{U₁A} šu-up-pa-šmit and [a-ma] StBoT 25.13 iv 18', 2 GU₄.MAh 10 UDU^{U₁A} šu-up-pa-šmit, ibid. 20'

i: nu-ššan^{UZU} šu-up-pa(-)x StBoT 25.54 i 2

B: Old Hittite texts in Middle Hittite ductus

- šu-up-pa-c-x KBo 25.109 ii 20

This form occurs in unintelligible context. It may also be an oblique case.

C: Middle Hittite

- nu šu-up-pa^{UZU} NIG.GIG^{U₁A} UZU ZAG UDU^{U₁A} hāppinit zanuir 'Then they cooked the meat, the liver and the shoulders in the fire.' KBo 15.10 iii 69f (69') (CTH 443)

It is generally agreed upon that *šuppa* is a derivative of the adjective *šuppi*- 'pure, clean'. As shown by the genitive *šuppayaš* in KUB 20.88 vi 15, *šuppa* is an *i*-stem. Watkins 1975: 338-342 and Neu 1983a: 174 n. 524 consider this word an old collective in -a. The conclusion that we have *šuppi*- 'clean, pure' alongside *šuppa* 'meat' seems to be justified (for a diachronic discussion see 3.9.2).

2.7.3.4 *Zalta* 'cart'

Middle Hittite

A neuter plural in -a is suggested by:

- []-kan ĒRIN^{MES} GIS za-al-ta (35) []-d)a²-ah-ḫi 'I will take] the troops and chariots.' HBM 24 obv. 34

A full grade of the suffix, which is characteristic of the *i*-stem adjectives, is found in:

- a: kāsma ĒRIN^{MES} URU Iṣḫupitta ĒRIN^{MES} GIS za-al-ta-i-ya-aš-sa kuin ḫalkin tukanzi ḫark[anz]i kinuna apedani ḫalki^{DU₁U₁S} ser mekki ḫaskit 'Behold, because of the barley and straw the troops of Iṣḫupitta and the chariot troops (litt: troops of the chariots) [possess], because of that corn I, My Majesty, am now very weary.' HBM 18 obv. 23f (24)

Zaltayaš is probably the genitive of *zalti*.

- b: ĒRIN^{MES} GIS za-[a]-ta-ya[-aš-wa k]uis 'the chariot tr[oo]ps wh[ic]h' HBM 24 obv. 5.

Here we also have a genitive.

Zalta may be connected with *za-al-ta-i-ya* in KUB 23.68 + obv. 18' (CTH 133, also MHC):

- tuzzin^{ma} za-al-ta-i-ya šummenzan AN[A ĒRIN]^{MES}-KUNU šer waḫnuškitten This sentence has been translated by Kempinski/Košak 1970: 195 as "Das Heer aber *zaltaiya* über euere [Trupp]en 'wendet' jeweils!" Because of *zalta* 'cart' in the Mašat letters, one can translate 'But make the army and chariots 'turn' above your troops', whatever the verb *waḫnušk-* may mean here. *Za-al-ta-i-ya* can be taken as *zalta-ya* 'and chariots.'

In the commentary on the previous passage, Kempinski/Košak 1970: 208 mention the following instances:

- a:]x parā nāiš ĒRIN^{MES}-ya-šši [...x za-al-ta-ya-aš dapian KUB 19.22 12f
b:]GIR^{MES}-šU aušdu za-al-ti-in parā-ma aušdu KUB 35.145 iii 16

They point out that if all these attestations belong together, we have to assume an *i*-stem with adjectival inflection. Starke 1990: 282, on the other hand, takes *za-al-ti-in* *parāma* *a-u[-š-du]* as Luwian. 'He shall see the *parammar-* of the *zalti*.' Starke also mentions *za-al-ti-ša-an* (*zaltiš-ān*) KBo 29.25 (early 14th century) ii' 4', 13'. See also Melchert 1993: 275.

However, there is no positive evidence that *zalta* is Luwian. Thus, we have a Hittite nom.-acc. neuter plural *zalta* which means '(war) chariots'. It has a genitive *zaltayaš*. The full grade of the suffix suggests an original adjectival *i*-stem.

Zalta is probably a substantivized adjective, because it has full grade in the suffix of the oblique cases. The form *zaltiš* which has been attested in KBo 29.25 ii' 4' and 13' could be a common-gender form which belongs to the same adjective. It is also possible that because of Luwian *parammar*, *zaltiš* in KUB 35.145 iii 16 is a Luwian word belonging to the same root.

2.7.3.5 *Wašša* 'ingredients' from *wašši-*

Old Hittite in Middle Hittite ductus

wašši- 'ingredient', (medicine)

- [(mān zin)]nizi nu-ššan wa-aš-ša^{U₁A} INA 5 [(GAL G)]IR₄ [(lāḫuwai)] KBo 21.8 iii 4' (CTH 402) '[(When wh]e is read]y, she [(pours)] the ingredients in five [(cups of dark c)]lay.'⁶⁶

Gertz 1982: 113 also lists *wašša* in KBo 8.130 ii 2: *ke wašša*^{U₁A} 'these ingredients'. A singular form *wašši* has been attested in KBo 17.61 obv. 23 [nu]šši

⁶⁶ The main text (Malli ritual iii 27) gives *wa-a-tar* instead of *wa-aš-ša*^{U₁A}. The variant text B gives *nu-ššan wašši* and text C gives *wašši*^{U₁A}.

ḫiṣu wa-aš-ši karū piḫḫi 'I have already given him the fresh ingredient'.

Gertz 1982: 113 suggests that *wašši* is probably of foreign origin because it occurs in a sentence like *n=at ANA wa-aš-ši*^{11A} *dāi* 'and he puts it on the ingredients' KBo 5.2 iv 40 (CTH 471). Gertz claims that *wašši* is uninflected. She argues that *wašši* acts as a quasi-ideogram and that, as a result, it only partly received Hittite inflection. This conclusion is overhasty, because *wašši* appears to be an *i*-stem. Since in the *i*-stem substantives dat.loc. endings *-i* have been attested, e.g. ^{GIS} *ḫalukanni*, (see Starke 1977: 50), one might as well maintain that *wašši* is a normal Hittite word. Moreover, forms which follow Akkadian prepositions can have Hittite caseforms, e.g. *[AN]A MUNUS.LUGAL-ri pāi* 'he gives (it) to the queen' KUB 43.28 ii 8f. Finally, the complement ^{11A} can also be added to singular nouns (see 1.4.3).

There is nothing against taking *wašši* as a normal dat.loc. sg. of an *i*-stem substantive. Therefore, *wašši* is probably a normal Hittite word. However, the mere ending *-a* is anomalous for an *i*-stem substantive, because we would rather have an uncharacterized plural (see 2.5.2). The pattern sg. *wašši* vs. pl. *wašša* closely resembles the pattern attested in the substantivized adjectives represented by *palḫi* vs. *palḫa* 'broad' vs. 'cups'.

Therefore, one can assume that *wašša* is an *i*-stem with adjectival inflection.

2.7.3.6 Evaluation and list of the substantivized adjectives

There is some evidence that Hittite has an ending *-a* in the substantivized adjectives. They belong to the class of the *i*-stems. I cite the evidence:

<i>šuppa</i> 'meat',	from <i>šuppi</i> 'clean'; certain
<i>zalta</i> 'cart'	no adjective attested
<i>palḫa</i> 'cup',	from <i>palḫi</i> 'wide'; likely
<i>ḫarša</i> 'breads'	from <i>ḫarši</i> 'thick'; possible
<i>wašša</i> 'ingredient'	no adjective attested; possible

It is noteworthy that this pattern (ending *-a* from *i*-stem adjectives) seems to be old, since in later stages of Hittite this formation has been replaced by forms containing an *-i*, e.g. *zalta* shows *zaltin* in the beginning of the 14th century. *ḫarša* is already replaced in Old Hittite by *ḫaršiš* (see Neu 1983a: 56f), the neuter gender of *palḫa* seems to be more stable: we have *palḫi* 'cup' besides *c. palḫiš*. On the other hand, the form *palḫi* 'kettles' is a perfectly normal uncharacterized neuter plural form. This is typical for the *i*-stem substantives. Only *šuppa* 'meat' is always written as *šuppa*.

2.7.4 Substantives with the ending *-a*

In this chapter I will discuss the substantives with the neuter plural ending *-a*. I will try to show that this ending is secondary.

2.7.4.1 *Welluwa* 'meadows'

Old Hittite

wellu- 'meadow'

- *nu ḫāriuš ú-e-el-lu-u[a]* 'vales and meadows' StBoT 25.109 ii. 16'

Several interpretations of *welluwa* can be offered. It is either a nom.acc. neuter plural in *-a* (Weitenberg 1984: 183) or an uncharacterized plural followed by the enclitic *-a* 'and'. To the latter one can object the following: Old Hittite had two morphemes meaning 'and, also'. One of them conjoined two elements in one sentence and had an allomorph *-ya* which was used after vowels as well as after sumero- and akkadograms (Friedrich 1960: 154). The other *-a* morpheme connected two sentences, but did not have an allomorph *-ya* (Otten/Souček 1969: 68, Houwink ten Cate 1973a: 119ff). In the sentence *jimiluz a=šmaš welku=ya úl pi[škanzi]* 'And they do not [give them mixture and hay]' KUB 29.41 8' (CTH 285, MHD) we have both the sentence connective *-a* and the allomorph *-ya* of the particle which conjoined two elements in one sentence.

Therefore, if the *-a* in *wellu[a]* were an *-a* conjoining two elements in one sentence, we would have had ***welluya*. Therefore, *ú-e-el-lu-u[a]* is probably a nom.acc. neuter plural in *-a*. *Ḫāriuš ú-e-el-lu-u[a]* may be asyndetic, which is quite normal for Hittite, cf. *mallanzi ḫarranzi* 'they grind and pulverize' KBo 2.7 i 10 and *arḫzeneš antüres* 'foreign and indigenous' KBo 5.3 + i 7 (CTH 42, Šuppiluliuma I). It is also possible that we have to read *wellu[a=ya]*.

To sum up, *welluwa* is a neuter plural in *-a*. It is the only Old Hittite example of a nom.acc. neuter plural in *-a* of an *i*-stem substantive.

2.7.4.2 *Iškiša* 'backs'

This word is an *š*-stem, cf. *iš-ki-iš-(š)met* StBoT 25.140 rev. 10' (OHC).

Middle Hittite:

- a: *nu=wa=za=kan iš-ki-ki⁷⁷-ša appa ina kur^{[HUR SA]G} Zippašla tiyān ḫarak* 'Be supported in the rear by the [mountain] in Zippašla.' (lit. 'have your backs put in the mountain Zippašla') KUB 14.1 obv. 16f (16) (CTH 147).

Only a few traces of *iškiša* can be discerned. This makes the reading uncertain.

Better references for the neuter plural *iškiša* are e.g. *n=asta ANA kur¹⁰ KUR* [] *iš-ki-ša naišten* 'And turn your backs on the enemy land' KUB 13.29

a: *nu=za* SA DINGIR^{LIM} *ša-aḥ-ḥa-na* ISTU KUR^{T1-SU} DL *tarḥta nu=lla* LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL-*ya* *kī iṣḫil ier* 'He did not perform the feudal services his land had to perform, and the king and the queen concluded the following treaty with you: ' KBo 4.10 + obv. 42' (CTH 106, Tudḫaliya iv).

In line 40' there is a singular, which apparently refers to the same *ṣaḥḥan*: (When I, My Majesty, came in the town Tarḫuntašša) *nu* SA DINGIR^{LIM} *ša-aḥ-ḥa-an iṣḫil uḥḥun n=at dašṣešta* UL-*ṣiy=at tarahḫuwaa* 'I saw the feudal service, the treaty: it became too oppressive and he could not fulfill it.'

b: *nu=za* SA DUTU URU A[ri]nna *ša-aḥ-ḥa-na ki=m[a eššanzi]* 4 UDU 1/2 SĀTI 1NUN 5 GAKINAG 5 EM.SU 10 [SIG] *kešriš ... ki=pāt ṣaḥḥan eššanu* arḥa-s[m]aš-at-kan le kui[ški dāi] EGIR-anda-*ya=šmaš=kan tamai ṣaḥḥan le kuiš dāi* 'And they [supply] the following (things required as) feudal service for the sun-goddess of A[ri]nna: four sheep, half a measure of butterfat, 5 cheeses, 5 (units of) rennet, 10 woolen *kešriš*. They have to give this (as objects required as) feudal service, no/body shall take it away from them nor shall anyone afterwards impose another *ṣaḥḥan* on them.' KUB 26.43 + i 54ff (CTH 225, Tudḫaliya IV)

My translation follows Götze 1930: 56. Götze, followed by Imparati 1974: 31 considers *ṣaḥḥana* a neuter plural in -a. Note that the apparent plural agrees with *kī*, which looks like a neuter sg. pronoun. However, in Young Hittite *kī* as nom. acc. neuter plural is not uncommon, cf. *kī ud-da-a-ar* KUB 33.112 + iii 24. For more instances I refer to Gertz 1982:184ff. These forms occur in Young Hittite, from the time of Muwatalli onwards.⁶⁸

To sum up, the form *ṣaḥḥana* is a neuter plural in -a.

2.7.4.6 Genuwa from genu- 'knees'

- *x-z-an-da* DXXX *gi-e-nu-wa* 'The knees of the moon-god' KBo 4.14 iv 46' CTH 123 (Tudḫaliya IV)

It is possible that *genuwa* is a directive.⁶⁹

2.7.4.7 Kuwapalla

a: *ina* URU *Dunnaya* 1^{NU TI} *ku-wa-ap-pa-la* ANA DUTU *Piḫaššašši pi-ya-an n=at=kan* ANA LUGAL KUR DUTU-*tašša aššan mān=ma* D^{LAMMA}-aš LUGAL KUR URUDUTU-*tašša* EGIR-anda 1^{NU TI} *ku-wa-ap-pa-la iyazi n=at=ši* ABU-*ya*

⁶⁸ Melchert 1984a: 143f suggests that the confusion of *kī* with *ke* is due to merger of closed *fe*, which resulted from **Vi*, with */i/*.

⁶⁹ For neuter more plural instances (written *genuwa*) see Weitenberg 1984: 121.

^mHattušiliš LUGAL.GAL *a-a-ra iyat* DUTU-*ši-ya=at=ši* ^mTudḫaliyaš LUGAL.GAL *a-a-ra iyanun n=at=ši* *a-a-ra ešdu* 'In Dunnaya one *kuwapalla* has been reserved for the storm-god Piḫaššašši and this belongs to the king of the land Tarḫuntašša. Also when Kurunta, king of the land Tarḫuntašša, afterwards carries out a *kuwapalla*, (then realize that) my father Hattušili, the Great King, has done this legally, and that I too, My Majesty, Tudḫaliya, the Great King have done this legally, and let this be right for him.' Bo 86/299 ii 15ff (15, 18) (Tudḫaliya IV)

b: *ina* URU *Dunnaya* 1^{NU TI} *ku-wa-ap-pa-la* ANA DUTU *Piḫi-āšši piyan n=at=kan* ANA LUGAL KUR DUTU-*tašša aššan* KBo 4.10 + obv. 36' 'In Dunnaya one *kuwapalla* has been given to the storm-god and to the god of the thunder. It will remain in possession of the [king] of Tarḫuntašša.' (CTH 106, Tudḫaliya IV).

Because it is preceded by a Glossenkeil, *kuwapalla* is probably Luwian, see also Starke 1990: 316f. Starke 1990: 300ff points out that Luwian had a number of words having the suffix -al. Since in Luwian the ending -a is very frequent, it is likely that *kuwapalla* is a Luwian neuter plural.

2.7.4.8 Tuppa 'clay tablets'

This word is a loan word from Akkadian *tuppu*, which has been borrowed from Sumerian DUB 'clay tablet' (or from Hurrian *tuppe-* 'clay tablet'). In Hittite it appears to have been borrowed as an i-stem *tuppi-*. It has received Hittite inflection in e.g. *nu ABU-ya iṣḫiulas namma tup-pi wekta* 'My father asked for the tablet of the treaty again.' KBo 14.12 iv 26f (26) (CTH 40, Mursili II. NHC). In *tup-pi-aš* KUB 36.106 rev. 5 (OHC) we have a regular genitive of an i-stem.

The apparent neuter plural in -a, however, is probably an akkadogram. Gertz 1982: 368 and Tischler 1994: 450 point out that DUB.BA is the Sumerian plural, whereas *TUPPA* is the Akkadian form. This is proved by instances where *TUPPA* acts as a dat. loc. pl., e.g. *apidd[an kün'] memian karū [t]UP-PA^{U1A} [h]a[ri]ānun nu=kan māḥḥan ape* DUB-BA^{U1A} MAḤAR DUTU-*ši* BELI-*ya* *para neḥḫu[n]* 'Therefore, I have already [written [this] affair on tablets and as I had sent these tablets to My Majesty, My Lord ...' ABoT 60 obv. 3ff (4) (CTH 200, MHC).

To sum up, *TUPPA* is not a reliable Hittite neuter plural in -a.

2.7.4.9 Kinanta

Concerning *kinanta* the following suggestions have been made: Sommer 1932: 132 and Götze 1956: 36 regard *kinanta* as a participle of the verb *kinai-* 'assort'.

Gertz 1982: 148 accepts this suggestion and transcribes instance b: as *rûg ki-na-an-ta-ya* and translates 'assorted women's clothes'. Haas/Wilhelm 1974 propose a connection with *ki-'lie'*. Both proposals cannot be verified, because it is possible that the *kinanta*, used here in the meaning 'textile' or the like, and the participle from *kinai-* are only homonyms. Ünal 1978: 117f proposes a different solution. He suggests that *kinanta* is Hurrian. The crucial instance is KUB 47.73 obv. 5ff: 1 ziz 1 NINDA.GUR4.RA 1 GA.KIN.AG 1 ^{DUG}haškuwanni GĒŠTIN ŠA KUR^{TI} danzi ANA ^DAtammira ^DWatammira ki-i-na-an-ta-aš ^Ekarimmanas šipandanzī 'They take 1 (ration of) spelt, one thick loaf, one piece of cheese, one *h*-vessel of local wine. They pour out a libation for Atammira and Wattamira, for the *kinanta*'s and for the temples.' Ünal concludes that *kinanta* is a cult object of textile, because of the determinative TUG 'cloth', and that it is of Hurrian origin.

a: TUG¹termaza 1 TUG 1 TUG¹kariulli ki-na-an-da-ya]x ŠA MUNUS^{TI} [()] SIXSÁ-at 'A *termaz* garment, a (further) garment, a hood and (a) woman's *kinanta* have been ascertained.' KUB 22.70 rev. 34 (CTH 566, Tudhaliya IV)

b: nu 1 TUG^{TUM}-na 1 TUG¹kariulli TUG¹ki-na-an-ta-ya ŠA MUNUS^{TI} pianzi 'They give one garment, one hood and (a) women's *kinant*.'

The -a's in instance a: and b: suggest plural number. However, it is difficult to establish the number of *kinanta*, because in the instances a: and b: the other items are preceded by the numeral 1. The dat.loc. pl. *kinantaš*, mentioned by Ünal indicates that *kinanta* can be plural.

To sum up, *kinanta* may be a neuter plural in -a-. It has been attested in late Young Hittite.

2.7.4.10 Mantalli

For an overview of instances see CHD vol. L-N: 177ff. The instances I have found depend on BAL (= *šipant-*) 'sacrifice, offer':

a: SISKUR ma-an-tal-li-ya-za ō BAL-anti 'He will not offer m.-rituals.' KBo 2.6 iii 21 (CTH 569, Hattušili III), ibid. iii 30 (SISKUR ma-an-tal-li-ya-<<aš>> and ma-an-tal-li-ya in l. 31, 32

b: nu-šmaš-za ^DUTU^{SI} ma-an-tal-li-ya 1GI-anda arha B[AL-anti] 'I, My Majesty, [will perform] the m.-ritual for them.', ibid. ii 14'f (14'), ibid. ii 23'

The -a in *mantalliya* suggests neuter plural. However, the Glossenkeil in KUB 16.32 ii 14 and the Luwian ending -za in SISKUR¹mantalliyanza in KUB 22.35 iii 7 suggest Luwian provenance, cf. also Laroche 1959: 68 who suggests that m.

may be a Luwian adjective *mantalli-*. Luwian origin is also suggested by the anomalous -iya, because the neuter plural of the Hittite i-stem substantives ends in -i. -Iya is not an adjectival neuter plural, because the normal ending of the adjectives is -a or -aya.

2.7.4.11 Šakuwa 'eyes'

2.7.4.11.1 Introduction

The word for 'eye' seems to have four forms. The most frequent form is *šakuwa* 'eyes', which is a neuter plural. Secondly, we have a common-gender i-stem 1GI¹A-i-. Thirdly, there is a common-gender word *šakuni-* which means 'well, spring'. It is thought that the basic meaning of *šakuni-* is 'eye' and that the secondary meaning is 'well'. This is paralleled in Semitic where 'well' and 'eye' are one and the same word. Finally, we have a c. *šakui-*. This form is a hapax (KUB 12.58 + i 12) and occurs in the same text as *šakuni-*. *Šakui-* and *šakuni-* are equivalents and seem to mean 'well, spring'. This might indicate that also in Hittite 'well, spring' and 'eye' are the same word.

Friedrich HW 2. Erg.: 21 connects c. *šakui-* with 1GI¹A-iš, because he thinks that *šakui-* also means 'eye'. Götze and Sturtevant 1938: 64 emend *šakui-*, which occurs in the Tunnawi ritual, to *šakuni*, because *šakuni-* has been attested elsewhere in the same text.

1GI¹A-i- vs. *šakuwa* suggests a common-gender i-stem *šakui-* which has a neuter plural in -a, *šakuwa*. The plural, however, does not look like an i-stem because of the gen. *šakuwaš*: if it were an i-stem, we would expect ***šakuniyaš*.

Because the evidence for the singular (*šakuni-*, *šakui-* and 1GI¹A-i-) is not transparent, it is necessary to cite the relevant instances.

2.7.4.11.2 Šakuni- 'well, spring'

Šakuni- is also believed to mean 'eye'. HW 2. Erg.: 21 writes "Auge > Quelle". However, all the attestations of *šakuni-* suggest 'well, spring' and never 'eye', e.g. nu *šakuniyaš purut dāi* 'he takes the clay of the spring' KUB 17.27 ii 4. and in the Tunnawi ritual *namma wappuāš im-an dāi namma-aš ša-ku-ni-ya paizzi nu 1 NINDA SIG paršiya n-aš ša-ku-ni-ya-aš purut dāi* NIN[DA.IE.DE]A memal šuhai GĒŠTIN 1-ŠU šipanti nu memai zikkān mahhan ša-ku-iš GE6-a2 KI-az purut EGIR šarā šakunešikiši 'Then she takes the loam of the riverbank and goes to the well, she breaks one thin loaf and places it in the mud of the spring, she scatters [sweet cake] and meal, she libates wine once and speaks: 'As you, well (*šakuiš*), keep gushing mud from the dark earth' KUB 7.53 + i 33ff (33), cf. ibid. iv 3 *namma šakuniya paizzi* 'then she goes to the well'. In the same text (iv 38f and iv 43) mention is made of *šakuniyaš im-an* which

also suggests loam taken from a spring. In *ša-ku-ni-ya-aš im-aš danza* 'loam from the spring has been taken' KUB 35.40 + i 2, again nothing contradicts the meaning 'spring'. There is no evidence whatsoever which suggests 'eye'.

2.7.4.11.3 Šakuiš 'well, spring'

Šakuiš is a hapax and occurs in the sentence *zik=kan mahhan ša-ku-iš* GE₆-az KI-az *purut EGIR šarā šakuneškiš* KUB 7.53 + i 33 i 36, the same text in which *šakuni-* occurs. The most obvious translation of *šakui* here is, of course, 'well, spring' and the sentence must be translated as 'As you, spring, keep gushing mud from the dark earth ...'. Therefore, Götze and Sturtevant 1938: 26 emend *ša-ku-iš* to *ša-ku-<ni>-iš* because *šakuniš* in the sense 'well', with the sign <NI> has been attested several times in this text (see the instances sub 1). This emendation is plausible, because *šakuiš* meaning 'well' would otherwise be a hapax. Moreover, the verb *šarā šakunesk-* 'gush' also suggests that *ša-ku-iš* must be emended to *ša-ku-ni-iš*.

To sum up, *šakuiš* 'well, spring' probably did not exist at all.

2.7.4.11.4 IGI^{III}-i-

IGI^{III}-i- suggests *šakuin*, if the ideogram IGI for 'eye' represents Hittite *šakuwa*. I cite:

- a: *nu=kan DU-aš NA⁴[ŠU.U-zi IGI^{III}]-a-in dāiš* 'The storm-god set his [e]yes upon the *ku[nkunuzzi]*'. KUB 33.113 iv 5 + KUB 36.14: 6 (= Ullik. II B iv 12)
- b: *nu=kan LUGAL URU Kummiya IGI^{III}-a-in tiškizzi nu=wa=kan IGI^{III}-a-in teskizi <šapiduwa kunkunuzzi* 'The king of Kummiya set his eye, he set his eye upon the formidable *kunkunuzzi*.' KUB 33.113 f + KUB 36.12 24f (25)
- c: *uwandan IGI^{III}-a-in* 'the seeing eye' KUB 9.34 iii 34, 38'
- d: *[id]āluš IGI^{III}-iš* '[e]vil eye' KBo 16.56 + KUB 34.85 i' 23
- Starke 1989: 666 argues that IGI^{III}-iš stands for Luwian *tāwiš* and compares the Luwian turn of phrase *[a-ad-du-wa]-a-li-iš da-a-u-i-iš* in KUB 35.49 iv 9'. Furthermore, Starke argues, the contents of KBo 16.56 + KUB 34.85 and KUB 35.49 iv 9' run parallel. Therefore, it is possible that the KBo copy has borrowings from Luwian.

2.7.4.11.5 Meni- 'face', mena- 'cheek'

Güterbock 1952: 39 suggests *menin* for IGI^{III}-a-in, a common-gender form of *mene-* 'cheek', which otherwise has neuter gender, because *šakuwa* 'eyes' does not look like an i-stem. He is followed by Kühne 1973: 164 who interprets

instance d: as *idāluš meniš*. However, as will be shown below, the evidence for c. *meni-* is weak. Moreover, there is no positive evidence that *mene* means 'eye'. In the next paragraphs I will discuss the instances in which *meni-* is claimed to mean 'face, cheek' or the like.

Meni is believed to have two genders (see e.g. Tischler 1990: 195, CHD vol. L-N: 289). Both an i- and an a-stem have been attested. In addition, there exists an u-stem *menu-* (Weitenberg 1984: 42), which can be an adjective, a substantive or a verb. In the substantive *menu-* we seem to have a disease and a vegetation product. The adjective *menu-* is usually written with <I>, cf. *mi-e-nu* or *minu-* (Weitenberg 1984: 42f, Tischler 1990: 198). The adjective is listed by CHD vol. L-N: 242f as *mienu-*, *minu-* 'mild, gentle'. Tischler and Weitenberg list this adjective as *menu-*. Since we do not have spellings which may suggest *menu-* (see CHD vol. L-N: 242f), it is better to follow CHD and assume *mienu-*.

Evidence for 'face' is given by *meni-* and *mena-*. The relevant nom. acc. instances of *meni* 'face' are:

- a: *URU Šalatiwara me-e-ni=mmet nēh[hun]* 'Towards Šalatiwara I tur[ned] my face.' KBo 3.22 obv. 52 (CTH 1, OHC)
- b: *kel me-n[e]-iš-iš-i diwān kella me-ne-(i)=ššit diwān nēyanzi* 'They turn this one's face in one direction and that one's face in that direction.' KBo 6.26 i 36ff (36, 37) (CTH 292, Laws II §51, text j)
- c: *[nu=za=kan] me-e-ni-eš-mi-i* LUGAL-i *nēyanta nu=za=kan* *iškīša LUGAL-i nat[ta] nēyanta* [And] they [turn] their faces towards the king, but they do not [turn] their backs towards the king.' KUB 20.38 obv. 14ff(15)

The relevant instances of *mena-* 'face', or the like, are:

- a: *me-e-na-aš-e-el* [*lipta š*] *u=wa ešhar=šet lipta li<p>ta=wa šakuwa ištarkiyawar* 'It [licked] his face, its licked his blood and it licked the sickness of the eye.' KBo 14.98 i 8ff (9) (OH/NS, CTH 485)
- The enclitic possessive pronoun suggests neuter *menan*.
- b: *nu MUNS.MEŠ huwašsannališ kuin SA NINDA antuḫšaš ŠAG.DU-SU me-nu-uš-ša iyan ḫarkanzi* 'The human heads and cheeks the ḫ. women have made of bread.' KUB 27.49 iii 17 (CTH 692) CHD vol. L-N: 289 contra Laroche 1970: 37 ('visages') translates 'cheeks' because there is reference to only one head.
- c: *našma kattan kudedanikki me-e-nu-[uš] war=nuzi* 'Or if he burns 'chee[ksi]' with someone (i.e. angers(?)) some man from Ḫapalla' (translation CHD

vol. L-N: 289) KBo 5.4 rev. 34 (NHC, Mursili II)⁷⁰

The evidence points to two stems: a neuter i-stem *meni* and an a-stem *mena-*. *Mena-* seems to have double gender: the form *mena-ššet* suggests neuter because of the neuter enclitic possessive pronoun, whereas *menuš* suggests a acc. pl. c.

The material clearly shows that common-gender *meni-* has not been attested. 'Face, cheek' could have neuter gender, but it was an a-stem *mena-*.⁷¹ Therefore, c. *meni-* is not likely.

2.7.4.11.6 *Šakuiš* revisited

Meriggi 1960: 92 suggests that Hittite did have a noun *šakuiš* 'eye'. He points to *šakuiš* (see above, for the refutation) and to the Semitic parallel. Meriggi further suggests that Luwian *tawiš* 'eye' and Hittite *šakui-* are close parallels and that *igi^{BI.A}-in* could stand for Hittite */šakuin/*.

CHD vol. L-N: 289 refers to Meriggi's suggestion that *igi^{BI.A}-in* stands for *šakuin* and contends that *igi^{BI.A}-in* in the Ullikummi myth simply stands for *šakuin*. CHD cites the dat. sg. *igi^{BI.A}-i* KUB 33.98 iii 9,⁷² which has the

⁷⁰ There are also instances of c. *mena-* which do not mean 'cheek, face' or the like: the first instance is *nepiši DINGIR^{DIDL} ištarnikūš (aknā-)-ma mi-e-nu-uš ištarnik*. CHD vol. L-N: 243 lists *mi-e-nu-uš* sub *mienu-*, *minu-* 'mild, pleasant, friendly'. The passage is about an offender. He shall not be punished. CHD vol. L-N: 243 translates: "(For if you do,) you will make the gods sick in heaven, and on(!) earth you will make the *mienu-s* sick". Laroche 1973: 187 translates "au ciel ne fais pas souffrir les dieux, sur terre fais (plutôt) souffrir les visages". As CHD argues, there is no indication for a meaning 'visages'. Because of the opposition of *mi-e-nu-uš* on earth vs. *DINGIR^{DIDL}*, CHD suggests that *m.* is a 'class of humans or spirits found in the netherworld'. In that case *mienu-* could be a substantivized adjective. Tischler 1990: 198 argues that this is not compelling, but offers no other possibility. Whatever *mi-e-nu-uš* might mean here, there is not much support for a translation 'cheeks, faces'. The second instance is *P^U-aš-za dapiāš KUR-eaš mi-e-nu-uš z [] KUB 31.36 ii 1*. This passage is part of a prayer to the storm-god. Laroche 1970: 37 suggests that *m.* means "visage". CHD vol. L-N: 242 reads the trace after *m.* as <#E>, in which case we might have *hēuš* 'mild rains', cf. {mi-je}-uš-za *hēuš* ibid. ii 5. CHD suggests that *m.* could also be a noun: 'Storm-god, in all the countries m.' Whatever the exact meaning of this passage may be, there is nothing which might suggest 'face, cheek'.

⁷¹ Rieken 1994 argues that the alternation between the neuter a- and the neuter i-stem can be explained by assuming an original neuter **men-*. The i-stem forms were caused by Luwian influence, whereas the a-stem forms can be explained by thematization.

⁷² The first tablet.

variant *igi^{BI.A}-wa-aš*, the dat.loc. pl. of *šakuwa*. Therefore, *igi^{BI.A}-i* = *šakui-* is likely. This is more acceptable than taking *igi^{BI.A}-in* as **menin* as proposed by Güterbock 1952: 39, because the evidence for c. *mene-* is dubious: no such form as **menin* has been attested.

Starke 1989: 665f offers an alternative possibility: *igi^{BI.A}-iš/in* represents Cuneiform Luwian *dāwis/in*. This suggestion is appealing, especially because Hittite seems to have had more Luwisms than previously assumed (Starke 1990: passim).

To sum up: instead of assuming with HW 2. Erg.: 21 one word, viz. *šakui-* 'eye, well', one can assume two different words for Hittite: *šakuiš* 'spring, well' and *šakuiš* 'eye'. The word *šakuiš* has not been attested as such. With Götte and Sturtevant 1938: 26, I prefer to emend the hapax *šakuiš* to *šakuiš*. The noun *šakui-* can be discerned in the ideogram *igi^{BI.A}-t*. Its plural is the frequently attested *šakuwa*.

To sum up, we probably have a common-gender *šakuiš* and a plural *šakuwa*, which had the inflection of the substantivized adjectives. This is exactly paralleled in Luwian *tawiš* vs. *tawa* 'eye'. However, it remains possible that *igi^{BI.A}-in* represents Luwian *tawin* (see also with Starke 1989: 665f).

2.7.4.11.7 The neuter plural *šakuwa*

I have found only two instances in which *šakuwa* agrees with a plural constituent, one of which is an adjective:

A: Old Hittite

- a: *ša-a-ku-wa-šmet iššakanta* 'Their eyes are bloodshot.' StBoT 25.3 obv. i 24'.

Šakuwa is plural because it agrees with the adjective *iššakanta*.

B: Old Hittite texts in Middle Hittite ductus

- b: *dāḫḫun-za pattar 1 LIM igi^{BI.A}-wa* 'I have taken a basket, 1000 eyes.' KUB 17.10 iii 6 (CTH 324) Popko 1974: 181 suggests 'I have taken the sieve of a thousand eyes.' As a parallel he mentions Slavic *oko* 'eye', which can also mean 'mesh, hole'.

C: From the numerous instances where *šakuwa* occurs without agreeing constituents, I only cite Middle Hittite evidence:

- c: *namma-ššan ANA E-YA igi^{BI.A}-wa ḫarak* 'Moreover, direct your atte[n]tion towards my house.' HBM passim, e.g. HBM 27 24f.
d: *DL ša-ku-wa-a epta* 'He did not cheat him.' KBo 32.201 35'⁷³

⁷³ The expression *šakuwa ep-*, which is accompanied by *-za* or *-kan*, is also found in KUB

e: *tām-ma-ššan*⁷⁴ *telipuriya ša-a-ku-wa zikkizi* 'But twice he set his eyes on the *telipuri*.' KBo 32.14 ii 34f (34)

2.7.4.11.8 Conclusion for the Hittite word for 'eye'

The Hittite word for *eye* is probably a common-gender *i*-stem *šakuiš* occurring as *ig*^{11A} *-i*. However, there remains a possibility that *šakuiš* stands for Luwian *tawi*- (Starke 1989: 665f). The neuter plural *šakuwa* occurs frequently.

2.7.4.12 *Waškuwana* 'error, sin'

This word contains the element *waš-* found in e.g. *wašku-* 'sin' and *waštul*. As far as I know, the form *waškuwana* is a hapax.

- ANA DINGIR^{MES} *piran ape wa-aš-ku-wa-na ešzi-pat kuitki nūwa nu-kan apedan*; *hul-ai uddan* DINGIR^{LIM} *-iš [k]uiški werizzi* 'If in one way or the other these sins have not been expunged (lit. still exist) for the gods and if for this evil matter some god indicates his displeasure ...' KUB 21.19 iv 14f (14') (CTH 383, Hattušili III).

Gertz 1982: 374 suggests that *waškuwana* is a neuter singular and argues that it agrees with *kuitki* 'some'. Instead of *ape* she reads *apiya* 'then' and translates ... "before the gods then (there is?) still some error(?). And for that evil word some gods calls." However, because the KUB copy reads *a-pi-e*, *waškuwana* must agree with *ape*, the neuter plural of *apa-* 'that'. Therefore, *waškuwana* is a neuter plural in *-a*.

2.7.4.13 Evaluation and conclusion

The ending *-a* for the substantives in older Hittite has been attested in:

<i>welluwa</i> 'meadows'	1 × (OHC)
<i>iškisa</i> 'backs'	1 × (MHC) possible
<i>šakuwa</i> 'eyes'	passim; certain
<i>iškisa</i> 'backs'	difficult to read

The ending *-a* occurs mainly in Young Hittite, from Hattušili III onwards: we have as reliable instances:

<i>iškisa</i> 'back'	1 × (Mursili II)
GAP <i>hūpiyalla(ya?)</i> 'horse-cloth'	1 × (Hattušili III)
<i>hūpūpāla</i> (musical instrument)	1 × (Hattušili III)
<i>šahhana</i> 'feudal service'	2 × (Tudhaliya IV)

27.20 obv. 8 (CTH 566, Tudhaliya IV): 'Ammat[*tal*]*laša-za-kan* kuit DINGIR^{LIM} *ig*^{11A} *-a*. *wa epta* 'Because Ammatella seized the god (by/in) his eyes, i.e. 'cheated on him'. For this expression see Ünal 1978: 105.

⁷⁴ Read *tām-ma-ššan*.

genuwa 'knees'
waškuwana 'sins'

1 × (Šuppiliuma II), not certain
1 × (Hattušili III), certain

2.7.5 *Šarāma* (type of bread)

This word is treated separately, because of its inflection. Friedrich HW: 184 cites the form *šarāma* as a neuter plural of the word ^{NINDA}*šara(m)a(n)-*. As is shown by the following Old Hittite forms, this word is an ablauting *n*-stem (for references see Neu 1983a: 159f).

inst.	^{NINDA} <i>ša-ra-am-ni-it</i> .
gen.	<i>ša-ra-am-na-aš</i> . This case form occurs in the turn of phrase ^{NINDA} <i>ša-ra-am-na-aš hališ</i> 'h. bread for on top'.
?	^{NI} ^{NDA} <i>ša-ra-am-na-aš</i> . Neu 1983a: 159 points out that a reading ^{NI} ^{NDA} <i>ša-ra-am-na-az</i> is also possible.
?	<i>ša-ra-a-ma-aš</i> . This enigmatic form is Old Hittite. Neu 1983a: 159: suggests a loc. plural. It occurs in fragmentary context. In the preceding line we find ^{NINDA} <i>ša-ra-a-ma da</i> (StBoT 25.48 rev ⁷ 9').

Šarāma has two neuter plurals forms, viz. *šarāma* (e.g. Friedrich HW: 184, Melchert 1983b: 2f) and *šaramna*. The latter form is young and occurs in tablets dating from the 13th century (Starke 1990: 281), e.g. IBoT 1.29 obv. 55. The form *šarāma* already occurs in Old Hittite.

We also have ^{NINDA}*ša-ra-a-ma-an* KBo 30.82 12' (13th century),⁷⁵ outside the source material. This form is claimed by Melchert 1983b: 2f to be the singular to the plural ^{NINDA}*šarāma*.

I cite the material I found in the texts used for this monograph:

A: Old Hittite

With a numeral

- a: *t[ianzi]* 1 ^{NINDA}*ša-ra-a-ma kattan* 1 ^N[^{INDA}*pianta*]*llis*⁷ 40-i[s] KBo 20.3 StBoT 25.14 iii 12'
- b: [1]⁵^{NINDA}*ša-ra-a-ma* L^{UMES} G^{IS} *BANŠUR udanzi* StBoT 25.25 iii 9' 'The overseers of the table bring 15 *šarāma* loaves.'

⁷⁵ This is the instance quoted by Hoffner 1974: 179 as 2/i. The number has to be 2/i. Starke 1990: 280 cites this form as *ša-ra-a-ma-an*. This is misleading, because the form attested might just as well be incomplete. Starke cites line 13' as *šaramna*. This is also misleading, because here only 1 ^{NINDA}*ša-ra-a* has been attested.

- c: 15 ^{NINDA}ša-ra-[a-ma da]nzi 'They [ta]ke 15 šara[ma] loaves' StBoT 25.33 obv. 16f (16')

^{NINDA}šarāma without numeral, e.g.: StBoT 25.68 i 15' ^{NINDA}š[a-ra-a-ma] and in StBoT 25.23 rev. 1' ^{NINDA}ša-ra-ma (in rev. 2' we have ^{NINDA}š[a-ra-a-ma], (both without context) and StBoT 25.48 rs' 9s' ^{NINDA}ša-ra-a-ma da[-.

Old Hittite texts in Middle Hittite ductus

- d: 15 ^{NINDA}ša-ra-a-ma KBo 16.68 (+) iii 5' and 15' (CTH 523)

Without numeral:

- e: mān ninkunatar kiša nu ^{NINDA}ša-ra-a-ma []x-u' šišnit šunanzī n=at ANA DIM pianzi 'When it becomes n., šarāma [is present]. They fill [?] with beer and offer it to the storm-god.' KBo 25.109 iii 12f (12') (MHD)

- f: [^{NINDA}ša-r]a-a-ma ^{UZU}ya pianzi KBo 20.28 obv. 3, ibid. obv. 11' ^{NINDA}ša-ra-a-ma ^{UZU}GEŠTIN pi[an]zi ibid. obv. 23' ^{NINDA}ša-ra-a-ma ti-anzi and ibid. obv. 6' ^{NINDA}š[a-ra-a-ma] 1 DUG ḫaniššan GEŠTIN KAŠ pianzi 'They [gi]ve š. and one ḫ.vessel.' (CTH 670)

- g: ^{NINDA}ša-ra-a-ma pianzi 'They give š.loaves.' KBo 25.109 ii 14'

The form ^{NINDA}šarāma, which can be considered a neuter plural, is usually written with plene writing. It is noteworthy that šarāma occurs both after the numeral one (StBoT 25.14 iii 12') and after numerals higher than one. This may mean that singular and plural have the same form and that the form was indifferent to number. Unfortunately, I do not know of any agreeing neuter plural or pronoun. Nevertheless I discuss this noun here because it is cited by HW: 184 as a neuter plural.

2.7.5.1 Discussion

Forssman 1965: 11-28 tentatively identified šaram(m)a-/šarāma- with the adjective šarāma- 'located above'. Forssman suggests that this word contains the suffix -mno-. Hoffner 1974: 180 adds that in the annals of Muršili II, the šarāma(n), the acropolis where the inhabitants seek protection during siege, possibly gave its name to this type of bread 'by virtue of its being a type of provisions laid against siege'. This equation is accepted by Melchert 1983b: 2f, who suggests that šarāma(n) means 'bread located above, bread for on top'.

The first element of šarāma possibly contains the adverb šarā. Melchert 1983b: 2 suggests that the identification of the šarāma-bread with the adverb šarā is proved by KUB 17.9 7f: kattan 1 ^{NINDA}ÉRIN^{MES} 20-i[š] šēr-r>a-ššan 10 ^{MESLU}šarāmas ^{NINDA}ḫališ 'Below is twenty-(weight?) troop-bread, and on

it are ten half-(loaves) of ḫālī-bread for on top' (translation Melchert 1983b: 2). Here the šarāma is laid on top (šēr).

Because we do not have *-mna, the plural šarāma cannot be explained as a plural of the suffix -mno-. Therefore, Melchert refutes Forssmann's view that the suffix in šarāma(n) contains the suffix -mno-. Melchert's view is shared by Oettinger 1986: 23 who points out that Anatolian probably did not even have an adjectival suffix -mno-. Moreover, the evidence points to an ablauting n-stem.

Melchert 1983b: 3 argues that šaraman[⁷⁶], which he considers to be the singular of šarāma, originally was an adjective having an old hysterodynamic paradigm with a nom. sg. c. *-mō(n) and a nom. acc. neuter singular *-mon. He suggests that the old neuter form occurs as (the young hapax) šaraman[. Melchert also states that the neuter plural form šarāma has been formed from the neuter singular šaraman by the analogy with the neuter a-stems, cf. kunnan : kunna :: šaraman : x → šarāma.

One can object to Melchert's theory that the neuter form ša-ra-a-ma-an[dates from a young (13th century) manuscript and that it is difficult to assume that this young form is the base of old šarāma. Moreover, the form šarāman[is broken off at the end and might just as well be another case form.

Starke 1990: 279ff offers an entirely different theory: he suggests that šarāma is Luwian. He establishes (p. 243f) that Luwian had ablauting mnn-stems having the zero grade in the oblique cases. Mn is sometimes assimilated to -mm-, which we would have in the nom. acc. neuter plural šarāmma < -mna. Therefore, Starke assumes that Hittite has borrowed the ablauting n-stem šarāma from Luwian. For Luwian origin Starke gives four arguments. Firstly, he argues that Hittite šarāma shows common gender. The nominative would be šarāmas. This contrasts to the Luwian neuter in ^{NINDA}šaramman in KBo 30.82 12'. Proof for an a-stem ("ergibt sich klar"), would be provided by the (as he suggests) akkadographic spelling ša 1 ^{NINDA}ša-ra-a-ma katt[an] 'under the š. bread'. Secondly, he suggests that the plural form šarāma is the predominant form.⁷⁷ Thirdly, he argues that the stemformation of šarāma(n) is unusual. Finally, this word has many variant spellings, with single and double consonants: he argues (passim) that Hittite words borrowed from Luwian normally show variation in single and double consonants. In Old Hittite those

⁷⁶ Melchert 1983b: 2 cites this form as šaraman.

⁷⁷ Starke 1990: passim contends that the plural is the predominant form of the Luwian neuter words.

words were normally spelled with single consonants, whereas in younger Hittite they were gradually adapted to the Luwian orthography. Therefore, in the young manuscripts those loan words had double consonants. E.g. Middle Hittite *argama* with single *m* occurs in Young Hittite with double <MM>: *arkamma*-. *Arkama*- is a loan from Luwian *arkamman*- 'tribute, tax'. In the 13th century we very often find *šaramma* with double <MM>.

To support his hypothesis that in Hittite *šarāma* was an *a*-stem, Starke argues that the OH form *šarāma* in e.g. OH ^{NINDA} *ša-ra-a-ma ḫalziya* 'š. is called for' is uninflected. Its final vowel is an *-a* and therefore *šarāma* must be an *a*-stem. Starke assumes *šarāma* to be Hittite and not Luwian because in Old Hittite we do not expect Luwian words and expressions.

Starke's argumentation causes serious difficulties. First, there is no positive evidence that in Hittite *šarāma* has common gender: the examples Starke gives for ^{NINDA} *šarammaš* as common-gender nominatives (KBo 16.71 + i 18', 26' (= StBoT 25.13), KBo 17.29 + iv 2, KBo 20.21 obv. 6', KUB 7.17 9', 16' and KUB 31.57 iv 9) are in fact genitives: they all occur in the turn of phrase ^{NINDA} *ša-ra-am-na-aš ḫa-a-li-iš* 'š. for on top' or *ḫališ*-bread (made) of *šarāma*. *Ḫališ* followed by a genitive is paralleled in e.g. 1 ^{NINDA} *ḫališ ḫaštiyaš* 'one ḫ. 'one (portion?) of bonemeal' KBo 20.8 iv 7. Secondly, the hypothesis that *šarāma* is an uninflected form is weak, because *šarāma* clearly shows case forms which suggest that this word is an ablauting *n*-stem. Moreover, *šarāma* can also be used as a normal accusative. Therefore, there is nothing against assuming that *ša-ra-a-ma* is a normal Hittite nom.acc. plural form and not an uninflected form⁷⁸ (see also Melchert 1993: 189).

Therefore, the indications that *šarāma* is Luwian are not convincing. One can also assume that Hittite *šarāma(n)* and Luwian *šaramman* are merely related and that there has been no borrowing relation.

To sum up, it is best to consider *šarāma(n)*- a normal Hittite word. In Old Hittite it is an ablauting neuter *n*-stem. *Šarāma* can be preceded by the numeral 1, which implies that it is in any case a singular, and by numerals higher than one. Perhaps *šarāma* was indifferent to number. The formal explanation of this form will be given sub 3.3.5.

⁷⁸ The hapax *šardmaš* can also be explained as a genitive, as Starke 1990: 280 points out.

The adjectives

2.8 THE *NT*-STEMS

2.8.1 Introduction

In the *nt*-stems the neuter plural ending *-a* has been widely attested. We have e.g. *amiyanda* from *amiyant*- 'small' and *tarnanta*- the participle of *tarna*- 'loosen'.

Before embarking on the discussion it is necessary to point out that there are two types of adjectives ending in *-nt*. Firstly we have the participles, e.g. *amiyant*- from *aniya*- 'make, do', secondly the adjectives in *-nt*, e.g. *wezzapant*- 'old'. I list them separately because a participle is derived from a verb and its meaning is verbal, whereas an adjective, even an adjective in *-nt* has no connection with a verb.

In the next paragraphs I proceed on the assumption that there exists a fundamental difference between participles in *-nt* and adjectives in *-nt*.

Hittite often shows a singular predicative participle, when the subject is a neuter plural, e.g. *n-e-e-ššan wetan* '[The palace (thought as a collection of chambers)], it (pronoun in the plural) has been built ...' Van den Hout 1984: 62f (with literature) and Hardarson 1987: 84 point out that Hittite is the only Indo-European language having this construction.

Van den Hout suggests that this construction is an inner-Hittite innovation, in other words: *kue arḫa tarnanta* 'the things which had been released' is more archaic than *n-e-e-ššan wetan* 'the palace (which has to be understood as plural because of the plural anaphoric pronoun *-e*) has been built' (both examples Old Hittite).

To support this hypothesis, Van den Hout 1984: 63f cites seven passages, where a predicative adjective or pronoun in *-a* agrees with a neuter plural substantive. In two instances the predicative adjective is not necessarily a participle, because the verb has not been attested as such: *šakuwa-šmet iṣḫaškanta* 'their eyes are bloodshot' StBoT 25.3 i 24' (OHC) and [(TUG)]-*zunu TUG iṣḫial-šeme*[(tta kuit natta eṣḫ)as(kanta)] '[(Why are their robes)] and belt[(s not bloodstained?)]' KUB 36.104 obv. 18'.

In three instances the participle is used attributively: for the first instance see sub 2.8.1.3 *iṣḫiyant*-. Also the second instance is probably an attributive participle: *apiniššuwanda* [o]L *ša-ak-kān-ta* oL *ū-wa-an-da uddār* [ešš]ūwan daier 'They began to do such [un]heard and unseen things' KBo 12.62 rev' 14f. Van den Hout translates this sentence as 'Solche Sachen (sind) [nicht] gekannt,

nicht gesehen." However, the following [*ēšš*]ūwan daier 'they started [doing ...]' rather suggests that *šakkanta unanda uddār* is object. Also in the third instance, *ē^{MES} DINGIR^{MES} -ta parku⁷⁹ išt⁷⁹ u ku.b(ABBAR GUŠKIN unuwanta)* *ina kur^{URU} Ḫatti=pat* [(*ēšzi* KUB 24.1 + i 25f the plural participle *unuwanta* is probably not used predicatively, because of *ēšzi*. In the present tense the copula *ēš-* is in general not used with the participles (Cotticelli-Kurras 1991: 39ff and 126–138). Therefore, *ēšzi* must be translated as 'there are'. The complete translation runs as follows: 'For you in the land of Ḫatti there are lofty temples, (adorned) with sil(ver and gold).'] Here we have an attributive participle *unuwanta*. *Tarnanta in kue arḫa tarnanta* 'which ... have been released' KUB 36.108 obv. 7' (OHC) might just as well be taken as a med. plural (see Yoshida 1990: 202).

Therefore, of the seven examples only one remains: the Young Hittite *ke=ya=wa ÉDINGIR^{LIM} QATAMMA paḫḫašnuwanda ēšdu* 'Also these temples must be protected' KBo 4.1 obv. 9. This weakens Van den Hout's hypothesis that the construction with a singular predicative participle is old: out of the seven instances Van den Hout cites, only one is a certain predicative participle.

Houwink ten Cate 1973b: 203–306 suggests that a predicative participle can be used impersonally without a formal subject. He suggests that in those cases the activity of the verb occupies the central position. The examples Houwink ten Cate cites include *ana kur.kur-[y]A nakkeššan* '(Assuming that) there has arisen a pressing problem for my countries' and KBo 4.14 ii 62 (CTH 123, Tudḫaliya IV) *namma=šmaš=kan iṣḫieniuš DUBBIN^{MES}-ya dān ēšdu* 'Furthermore, let also your hair and fingernails be removed' KUB 4.47 (CTH 432) iii 61ff, cf. *ibid.* 15f.

However, as Houwink ten Cate 1973b: 205 n. 32 points out, if the subject has neuter gender, it cannot be proved that the predicative participle is used impersonally: in e.g. *walḫi irḫān* KUB 1.17 iii 45 we can translate the sentence as 'walḫi passed around' and argue that *irḫān* agrees with *walḫi*.

One cannot claim that the predicative sg. participle *wetan* in e.g. *n=ē=ššan wetan* 'it (the palace) has been built' is used impersonally because in the instances concerned we have a subject in the neuter singular, because *wetan* is referred to by the neuter plural of the anaphoric pronoun.

Gertz 1982: 26 also mentions the phenomenon that Hittite has a neuter sg. participle agreeing with a neuter plural, and thinks that examples like *n=ē=ššan wetan* are reflexes of an old lengthened grade: **-ōn(t)* → *-an*. She signals (p.

54) that e.g. *GIS^{U1A} ḫadan* 'dried wood' KBo 21.33 + i 12 has been replaced in the younger parallel KBo 23.44 i 11 by *GIS^{U1A} ḫadanta*. She therefore suggests that in the participles the old uncharacterized forms have been replaced by characterized endings.⁸⁰

Gertz's suggestion causes problems: the evidence for an inherited lengthened grade neuter plural **-ōn(t)* inherited from PIE is weak. Moreover, in that case we would expect the final syllable in predicative neuter participles to show frequent plene writing: plene writing as a rule implies inherited accent.⁸¹

Harðarson 1987: 84 takes the sg. predicative participle at face value and points out that it supports his hypothesis that the neuter plural originally was a neuter singular: therefore, not only the verb, but also the adjectives agreeing with a collective originally must have appeared in the singular. 'Diesen Zustand bewahrt das Hethitische noch beim Prädikatsnomen, das mit einem Neutr. Plur. gewöhnlich in der Singularform steht, cf. z.B. KBo 4.10 obv. 38 *ke=ma tuppā^{U1A} ... aniyān ēšta* "diese Tafeln aber waren ausgefertigt" ... Dies erklärt die bisher merkwürdig erscheinende Konstruktion im Hethitischen.'

It is useful to have a closer look at the *nt*-adjectives because they appear both as singular and as plural when they refer to neuter plural objects. Since adjectives and participles can be used both attributively and predicatively, I have made a four-fold division according to which I quote the material found in the source material for this monograph.

- a: predicative participles
- b: attributive participles
- c: predicative adjectives
- d: attributive adjectives⁸²

⁸⁰ Other instances of a neuter sg. participle include *parsiyan* in KBo 17.65 rev. 21 (OH/NS) *piran=ma āški NINDA a-a-an-la parši[y]an n=at NINDA paršu[!]⁸⁰ ien[zi]* 'But in front of the gateway, hot loaves (are) broken. And th[ey] transform them into bread crumbs' (pag. 96). Gertz suggests that the form *a-an-la* is the neuter plural of *NINDA⁸⁰ a-a-an* and that *-la* has wrongly been added to *a-a-an*.

⁸¹ Plene writing of the final syllable in participles is not a morphological characterized neuter plural, because it often refers to apparent singular items, especially in Old Hittite original texts. I cite a few instances: *takku kuššan pi-ya-a-an* 'When loan is given' KBo 6.2 ii 28 (Laws I §42, OHC) and *nu apē[! ē-zu] kuēla⁸¹ eyan āški=šši ša-ku-wa-a-an a[rāwuan]* 'The house at the gate of which an eya-tree is visible, [is free]' KBo 6.2 ii 60f (61) (Laws I §50, OHC). *Šakuwān* refers to *GIS⁸¹ eyan*. This plene writing is limited to *āi*-stem verbs.

⁸² For the instances of *humant*- see 2.9.

⁷⁹ The duplicate KUB 36.81 obv⁷⁹ 12 (older script) shows a neuter plural *pār-ga-u-wa*.

2.8.1.1 Predicative participles with the ending -a

A: Old Hittite

iṣhaskant- 'bloodshot'

- *šakuwa=šmet iṣ-ḥa-aš-kán-ta* StBoT 25.3 i 24' 'Their eyes are blood-shot.' Puhvel 1984: 309 takes *iṣhaskant-* as a syncopated participle of **eṣḥaniya-*, iter. **eṣḥaneški-* 'to bloody'. In that case we would have a neuter plural predicative participle. However, this verb has not been attested as such. Therefore, I consider the word a pure adjective.

tarnant- 'released'

- *ḫutu⁸¹ witanuṣ URU^{DIDL} ḫi-a-uš kui^{uṣ} KURKUR^{ḫi-a} kuc arḫa tar-na-an-ta* 'Which fortified cities I My Majesty [...]. The [lands?] which (had been) released.' KUB 36.108 6f (7) (CTH 25)
Neu 1968: 168 n. 1 regards *tarnanta* as a nom. acc. neuter plural. The referent of *tarnanta* has not come down to us. KURKUR^{ḫi-a} is a proposal of Gertz 1982: 25. Yoshida 1990: 202 cites this form as a 3 pl. med.

B: Middle Hittite.

aniyant- 'done'

- *nu=nu zik kuc ¹⁰ḫimu-dingir^{11M}-iṣ numun^{ḫi-a} mematta kinu<n>wa^{URU} Dāpiqqa a-ni-ya-an-da ke=ma=wa^{URU} Anziliya¹² ke=ma=wa^{URU} [ḫ]āriya ke=ma=wa^{URU} [ḫ]āniqqa=wa* 'The seeds you have told me about, ḫimuili, now they have been sown in Dāpiqqa, one part has been sown in Anziliya, another part in [ḫ]āriya, and another part in ḫāniqqa.' HBM 55 obv. 10ff (10)
In this letter there is also an instance of a sg. participle used predicatively (see 2.8.1.1)

taksant- from *taks-* 'join, assemble'

- *DIM₄ BAPPIR zi-it māḫḫan taksant[a ū sa^D Telibinu] zi-ka sa DUMULU. ULU₁₉.LU^{MES} uddanās QATAMMA taksanza e[šdu]* 'Just as malt and wort are harmoniously fuse[d], so let your soul, [Telepinu], be in harmony with the affairs of mankind.' KUB 17.10 ii 23f (23) (CTH 324)
The text by Laroche 1965b: 93 suggests a nom. acc. neuter plural *taksanta*. Note, however, that *taksant*[a can also be completed to *taksandari* as in the parallel KUB 33.6 (+) 7 iii 8f (9): *nu BAPPIR DIM₄-ša [maḫḫa]n iṣtananzi taksandari*. Therefore, a predicative plural participle cannot be proved.

tarnant- from *tarna-* 'release'

- *ḫi^{11A} tar-na-an-ta ēšta* KBo 32.242 13' MHC

waršiyant- from *waršiya-* 'be soothed, be calm'⁸³

- *{(wa-a)}rši-ya-an-da šullanda KURKUR^{71M} KUR^{URU} ḫatti=ma ta-ri-e-an[KUR-e n]u ta-r[(i-e-a)]ndan lāttēn wa-ar-si-ya-an-da-a[(n-n)]a tur[(yatten)]* 'The revolting countries are [(qu)]iet, but the land of ḫatti is a weary [land], now loosen your grip on the w[(ca)]ry, and har[(ness)] the rested.' KUB 24.4 + obv. 23f (23) (CTH 376)

This form is ambiguous: it is either a neuter plural participle or a 3 pl. med. passive. If it were a predicative participle, the position in the text would be unusual: predicative participles usually follow their referent. Therefore, *waršiyanda* is probably a verbal form.

To sum up, we only have two certain cases of a plural predicative participle, viz. *aniyanta* 'sewn' and *tarnanta* 'released'.

2.8.1.2 Predicative participles in singular form

A: Old Hittite

ḫandant- 'arranged'⁸⁴

In Old Hittite the neuter participle *ḫandān* occurs only in the text group CTH 733 in the turn of phrase *ke ... ḫandān* 'and so is decided in ...' or 'Dies ist bestimmt ...' (Starke 1977: 13). Unfortunately, no complete sentences have been found and we have to complete the picture by combining all the evidence. Therefore, I cite the relevant material: the instances with the most complete context, unfortunately without a complete participle⁸⁵ are:

- a: *ke=a ANA AWAT [ḫa]-an-d[a-a-an] StBoT 25.111 iii 23'*
- b: *ke=ma=āšta^{DIM} aš maltešna ḫa-an-t[a-a-an] StBoT 25.109 ii 13*

⁸³ For this verb see Neu 1968: 191.

⁸⁴ In Middle Hittite this word is used adverbially: *nu mán pānā[ḫi] LU^{MESURU} Paḫḫuwa ḫa-an-da-a-an* 'If the people of Paḫḫuwa go loyally' KUB 23.72 + rev. 5 (CTH 146), *nu mán ḫa-an-da-a-an ammel DUMU.MUNUS-YA šanḫiškiri* 'If you really desire my daughter' VBoT 2 7f (7) (CTH 152) and *nu ḫa-an-da-a-an ANA¹⁰ Atiūna INA E.DUB.BA.A kiššan memaḫḫun* 'And I have spoken thus faithfully in the archive to Atiūna: 'ABoT 65 rev. 8 f'. (8) (CTH 199) This adverbial usage already occurs in Old Hittite: *ḫa-an-da-a-an paiwani StBoT 25.109 iii 13* 'we go loyally(?)'.

⁸⁵ I nevertheless include the instances here, because the instances with a complete participle all show that this participle is singular.

Neuter plural pronouns are:

- c: [k]e-ašta ^DInaraš ha-an-da-a-an StBoT 25.119 6'
d: ke-ašta ANA AWAT h[a-an-da-a-an] StBoT 25.109 ii 9

Examples with only a participle are:

- e: [m]altešnaš ha-an-da-a-an StBoT 25.110 ii 10
f: ^DInaraš maltešnaš ha-an-da-a-an StBoT 25.110 ii 17, 23, 31, 35
g: [nu nēpīs tē]kanna ḥarši ANA AWAT ha-an-da-a-an 'You hold [heaven and ea]rth. It has been determined according to the words.' StBoT 25.111 ii 5'
h: [ma]ltešnaš ha-an-da-a-an StBoT 25.111 ii 8', 19'
i: ^DInaraš malteš[naš] ha-an-da-a-an StBoT 25.111 ii 12'

wetan- from wete- 'build, fortify'

- labarnaš ē-ir-šet tuškarattaš ḥaššaš-šaš ḥanzaššaš-šaš ne-ššan ^{NA1}peruni ū-c-ta-an appaliyallaš-a ē-ir-šet karaitti peran ū-[c-tan] 'The house (sg.) of the king is (one) of joy for his descendants. And they (pl.) are b[uilt] (sg.) on a rock. The h[ouse] of the enemy is built before the flood. StBoT 25.140 rev. 13ff (16')

The neuter sg. participle *wetan* agrees with the plural anaphoric pronoun -e in l. 15'. Gertz 1982: 26, following Beckman 1977: 217f, and Van den Hout 1984: 63 (with literature) explain the plural -e by pointing out that a palace can be thought of as a collection of rooms (Van den Hout "Palastanlage"). Because a palace had several rooms, it was a grammatical plural (cf. Lat. *aedes* 'house' as a collection of more than one *aedis*.)

B: Old Hittite in Middle Hittite ductus

irḫant- from irḫai- 'circulate, go round'

- nu EGIR.UD^{M1} [DIN]GIR^{MES}-nan uddār ir-ḫa-a-an ēšt[u] 'Let in the future the matters of the [go]ds be concluded.' KBo 7.28 rev. 41f (41) (CTH 371) Irḫān refers to uddār. However, the final syllable is not an inherited lengthened grade, because irḫai- belongs to the āi-class (see n. 81)

waršant- from warš- 'wipe off'

- kedani UD-ti kue [u]dār aniyawen nu-wa-ta-ḫkan idālu uddār katta [QA-TAMMA] wa-ar-ša-an ēštu 'The evil [wo]rds must be wiped off from you, [just like] the words we spoke on that day.' KBo 24.1 i 18f (20) (CTH 404) Wa-ar-ša-an refers to idālu [u]dār.

C: Middle Hittite

aniyant- from aniya- 'do'

- nu URU Tapigga URU Anziliya URU Hariya ū ANA URU Ḥaninqauwaya še^{AM} ū ziz-ya [k]ue anniyan ēšta man ūL apez da'tta man ape a šā terip[p]i anir 'If you had not taken from there the barley and bearded wheat which has been sewn for the towns Tapigga, Anziliya, Hariya and Ḥaninqauwaya, they would have sown those fields.' HBM 54 8ff (13)

išḫuwant- from iḫuwa(i)- 'shake out, pour out'

- a: [nu k]i danzi 2 kurdāli išnaš nu-ššan kedani 7 EME išnaš iḫu-wa-a-an kedani-ya-ššan 7 EME išnaš iḫuwantēš 'They take the [follo]wing things: 2 containers made of dough, in one of them seven tongues of dough have been scattered, in one them also seven tongues of dough have been scattered.' KBo 15.10 i 2ff (3) (CTH 443)

Note that we have here two constructions, one with a neuter singular participle and one with a nom. pl. c. participle.

- b: UR.TUR₇ qalulupūš išnaš 7 iḫaḥru išnaš n-at-šan paddani iḫu-wa-a-an 'One puppy, seven fingers made of dough, seven tears made of dough, this has been shaken out in a basket.' (CTH 443) KBo 15.10 i 6f (7).

I list this participle here because the enclitic -at is either singular or plural.

piyant- from pai- 'give'

- ē^{BI.A} pi-ya-a-an 'houses have been given.' KUB 36.118 4 (CTH 271)
- It is not certain that ē^{BI.A} is plural because the Sumeric complements ^{BI.A} and MES can be used after singular nouns (see 1.4.3).

terippiyant- from 'terippiya-' 'plough'

- kāša-mu ^mPullis URU Kašipuraz ḫatrāit a šā terippi-wa kue URU Dapiqqa URU Taḫ[a]šara-ya a šā te-<R>i-ip-pi-ya-an nu-wa NUMUN ^mḪimudingir^{LIM}-is ūL pāi 'Look, from Kašipura Pulli has written to me as follows: 'Ḫimuili does not give seed for the fields which have been ploughed in Dapiqqa and in Taḫašara.' HBM 55 obv. 3ff (5), 7

tiyant- from tiya- 'put, lay'

- kāša ^mMitaš waštaš[kit šAPAL NIS DINGIR^{MES}-ya] kue uddār ti-ya-[a-an] ēšta apāš-at-kan () ḫu-u-ma-an-ta šarraš 'Behold, Mita sin[ne]d and [the words which had been p[ut] under oath], he violated them all.' (translation by Gurney 1948: 36) KUB 23.72 + rev. 2f (3) (CTH 146)
- There is not enough space in the KUB copy to justify *ti-ya-an-ta*. One can therefore safely assume *tiyān*.

tuhšant- from *tuhš-* 'cut off' and *wəḫ-*, *wəḫ-* 'turn'

- [n] > at *arḫa tuhšan ēštu šA* 'Zi idālu uttar alwanzatar [n] > at EGIR-pa ANA 'Zi > pat wa-ḫa-a-an ēštu 'Now it must be cut off, the evil word and the witchcraft of Ziplantawija and Ziplantawija has to get these things back (lit. 'they must be turned back against Ziplantawija'). (CTH 443) KBo 15.10 ii 27f (27.28)

These participles initially refer to the anaphoric pronoun *-at* which in its turn refers to *idālu uttar* and *alwanzatar*.

D: Young Hittite

aniyant- from *aniya-* 'make, do'

- *ke=ma TUPPA^{III A} iṣḫiullaš karū aniyān ēšta* 'Those tablets of the treaty had already been drawn up.' KBo 4.10 + obv. 38' (CTH 106, Tudḫaliya IV)

āssant- from *āss-* 'remain'

- *URU Zarniyāš=ma=kan <<kantanna INA KUR^{ID} Ḫulaya a-aš-ša-an* 'The *kantanna* of the village Zarniya, however, remains in possession of the land of the river Ḫulaya.' Bo 86/299 i 20 (Tudḫaliya IV)

This instance is uncertain because of the Glossenkeil preceding *kantanna*: *kantanna* is probably Luwian.

ḫarganu- 'destroy'

- *karū KUR.KUR^{MES} URU Ḫatti [r]šTU LÜ KÜR arḫa ḫarganuwan ēšta* 'Formerly the Hatti-lands had been completely destroyed by the enemy.' KBo 6.28 obv. 6 (CTH 88, Ḫattušili III)

This is not a certain example, because behind words followed by the Sumerian complements ^{III A} and ^{MES} grammatical singulars can be hidden, see 1.4.3.

iskiyant- from *iskiya-* 'anoint'

- *i-[anza GIM-an katta] iškikiši ke=ya=ta=kan MAMIT^{III A} Q[ATAMMA] katta iškiyan ēšdu* '[As] you anoint yourself [with] oil, [s]o let these oaths be [likewise] anointed on you.' KUB 26.25 ii 4ff (6) (CTH 126, Šuppiluliuma II).

nininkant- from *ninink-* 'revolt'

- *nu kūruri^{III A} kuit meggaya [ni-ni]-in-kán ēšta* 'Because enemy-lands had [mob]ilized in large numbers' KBo 5.8 ii 35f (35) (CTH 61, Muršili II)

piyant- from *pai-* 'give'

- *ARAD-anni=ya=mu kuc KUR.KUR^{MES} kuc piyan [ēšta] nu=mu=kan ap=ya arḫa datt[at]* 'The countries which [had been given] to me in servitude, those were also taken from me.' KUB 21.15 i 17 (CTH 85, Ḫattušili III)

To sum up, Hittite shows an explicit preference for the singular form of the predicative participle.

2.8.1.3 Attributive participles

This category also includes the *nt*-stems which appear in mutilated context.

The following Old Hittite instance is ambiguous:

iṣḫiyant- from *iṣḫiya-* 'bind'

- *ḫalkiyaš ḫaršār iṣḫiyanda [zizū]^{IA} > ša ḫaršār iṣ-ḫi-ya-an-da kē=ššan ḫu-u-ma-an-da p[al]ttani teḫḫe n=e LUGAL-aš MUNUS.LUGAL-ša kitkar=šamet teḫḫe* StBoT 25.4 iv 15ff (15, 16) (= StBoT 25.3 iv 20ff)

This passage can be translated as 'Head[s] of barley' and heads of spelt are bound together. And all these things I place in a b[asket] and these things I put on the heads of the king and queen.' (Van den Hout 1984: 64 following, Neu 1970: 37 translates: "(sind) (zusammen)-gebunden" and Gertz: 1982: 24 "(are) bound.")

However, it is also possible that *iṣḫiyanda* is an attributive participle. One can translate '(there are) bound heads of barley, bound heads of wheat, and I put them all in a basket.'

A: Old Hittite

ḫuyant- from *ḫuwai-/ḫuya-* 'run'

- *-[e ḫu-ya-an-ta mān tūrian]-*] StBoT 25.105 3', *-[e ḫu-ya-an-ta a-pi-e-a kunni]* ibid. 8'

Neu 1968: 61 classifies *ḫuyanta* as 3 pl. med.pass., which is also possible.

išgarant- from *iškar-* 'stick'

- *kahulu-pi=šmid=šta iṣ-ga-ra-an-da dāi* 'He removes the fixed things from their fingers.' StBoT 25.4 i 14' (= StBoT 25.3 i 19')

miyant- from *mai-* 'grow'

- (-) *mi-ya-an-ta* K1.v. StBoT 25.9 i' 4' (mutilated context)

wəchant- 'turned' from *wəḫ-/wəḫ-* 'turn'

- *ú-e-ḫa-an-ta* StBoT 25.47 obv. 17'.

This is either a pres. pl. 3 med. of *wəḫ-/wəḫ-* 'turn' or a nom.acc. neuter plural of the participle *wəḫant-*.

B: Old Hittite text written in Middle Hittite ductus

appant- 'loaded' form *ap-/ap-* 'take'

- [^{GIS}MAR.GI|D.DA *ap-pa-an-da* KBo 16.68 (+) 79 i 27 (CTH 523)

Appanda refers to [^{GIS}MAR.GI|D.DA

išgarant- from *išgar-* 'stick'

- [*a*]nda^{UZU} NIG.GIG-ya *zanuanzi* (6) [*x-iš-ga-ra-an-ta* ANA^D *Zithariya* (7) *z*]i
'They cook the liver as well, the things which are stuck, he ...s for the goddess Zithariya'. KBo 8.97 5 + iv² 5'ff (CTH 685)
It is not clear to which word this form refers to.

išhiant- from *išhiya-* 'bind'

- [*iš-hi-ya-an-ta*] KBo 17.51 Vs? 7' (CTH 670)
(mutilated context)

šullant- 'quarrelsome'

- [(*wa*)*ršiyanda* *šu-ul-la-an-da* KUR.KUR^{TIM} KUR^{URU} *Ḫatti-ma ta-ri-e-an*]
KUR-e *n*ju *ta-r*[(*i-e-a*)]*ndan* *lätten* *waršiyanda*[(*nn*)]*a turi*[(*yatten*)] 'The
revolving countries are [(*qu*)]iet, but the land of Ḫatti is a weary [land],
now loosen your grip on the w[(*ea*)]ry, and har[(*ness*)] the rested.' KUB
24.4 + obv. 23f (CTH 376)

C: Middle Hittite

ašant- 'true' from *eš-* 'be'

- e[*GIR*?]-az SA^D U^{TU}U^{SI} *nanma a-š*[-*a-a*]-*n-ta* KUR.KUR^{TIM} *dās* '[Afterwar]ds,
he took the countries which be[lon]ged to me, My Majesty.' KUB 14.1 +
rev. 29 (CTH 147)

D: Young Hittite

ašant- 'true' from *eš-* 'be'

- *nu ABU-^YA^m Tudḫaliyaš* LUGAL.GAL GIM-*an ašanza* LUGAL-*uš ēšta nu-kan*
QATAMMA a-ša-an-da LÜ-natar^{U¹A} *andan* GUL-*šun* 'Just as my father was
a true king, I chronicled accordingly the true heroic deeds.' KBo 12.38 ii
11'ff (13) (CTH 121, Suppiluliuma II)

pant- from *pāi-* 'go' or *pāi-* 'give'.

- *katta pa-a-an-ta-ma kue* KBo 11.1 rev. 5 (CTH 382, Muwatalli)

To sum up, attributive participles appear in their plural form, whereas Hittite shows an explicit preference for a singular when the participle is used predicatively.

2.8.1.4 Predicative adjectives in *-nt*

Only one form has been attested:

amiyant- 'small'

- [*part*] *āuwa-ššit-wa a-mi-ya-an-da* 'Its [w]ings are small.' KUB 33.5 ii 13 (CTH 324)
- kāš* [NIM.LAL-*aš wemiyazi pa*] *ṛtauwa-ššet-wa a-mi-y-a-an-ta apašš-*
a-(u)wa amianza 'And this [bee shall find him. Its w]ings are small,
he himself is also small.' KUB 17.10 i 37ff (38) (CTH 324)

C: Middle Hittite

wazzapant- 'old'

- *kue UNUTE^{MES} ū-iz-za-pa-an-ta n-at anz[e]l iwar* EGIR-*pa 0L* *kuiški*
newwahḫa[n ḫart]a 'Which regalia were old (pl.), these things nobody [had
re]newed in the way we would have done.' KUB 17.21 + Dupli 16ff (16)
(CTH 375)

2.8.1.5 Attributive adjectives in *-nt*

A: Old Hittite

SIG₅-ant- 'good'

- ^D *Katteshawi*, LUGAL-*ui URU Ḫatt[ušaz⁷]* *katta āššū utir n-at katta* KIL[AM-
na utir] GAL^{U¹A} *SIG₅-anda GUŠKIN-an SIG₅-anda[n utir n-at katta* KILAM-
na [utir] 'Katteshawi! King! They brought the goods down from(?)
Ḫat[*tuša*], and they brought them [to the m]arket. [They brought] good
cups (and) good gold. And they [brought] them down to the market.'
StBoT 25.122 ii 9'ff (11')

išharwant- 'bloodstained'

- *nu išharwanta* ^{SIG₅} *iš-me-ri ḫarzi* 'He holds the bloodstained reins.' KBo
30.39 + StBoT 25.139 obv. 17

B: Old Hittite in Middle Hittite ductus

[*ma*] *nekuwant-* from *mani(n)kuwant-* 'short'

- [*ne-e-ku-wa-an-da* *GIS-ru še*] (7) *ū²-uk GIS^{U¹A}* *ariy-a[n(-)]* KBo 17.23
rev. 6f (CTH 832)

The exact grammatical status of *nekuwanta* cannot be determined. It is either a nom.acc. neuter plural agreeing with *GIS-ru* or it is a verb. *GIS-ru* can also be the first word of a new sentence. Hoffner p.c. referred to

by Gertz 1982: 25, suggests that this word may have to be completed to [ma]nēkuwanta. 'short trees/pieces of wood' with omission of *n* in front of *k*.

C: Middle Hittite

SIG₅-ant- 'good, outstanding'

- NINDA.G(UR₄.RA^{IIA} DUG^{IIA} *išpand*)uzⁱya SIG₅-an-ta [EGIR-p(a *pešgawe*)]ni 'Thick (breads))and good [(wine)u]gs we re[[peatedly give] again]. KUB 31.124 obv. 16f (16) (CTH 375)

D: Young Hittite

SIG₅-ant- good, outstanding'

- INIM^{IIA} *ya-šmaš* SIG₅-anta *memi* 'And speak kind words to them.' KBo 5.9 iii 16f (17) (CTH 62, Mursili II)

dapiyant- 'all'

- a: nu KUR.KUR^{IIA} BA[L d]a-pí-an-da 1-etta naišittin 'You have united all the rebellious countries.' KUB 21.42 ii 29f (30) (CTH 255, Tudḫaliya IV)
- b: nu=za KUR.KUR^{MES} ḫURRI da-pí-an-da taraḫta 'He conquered all the Hurrian countries.' KUB 19.9 i 11f (12) (CTH 83, Ḫattušili III)
- c: EGIR-az=ma KUR^{URU} Išḫupittaš [kurur]iaḫta nu=kan KUR.KUR^{MES} da-pí-an-da [kurur]iaḫta nu KUR.KUR^{MES} dalpianetš' kururiahḫir 'But behind his back, the land of Išḫupitta [became hostile]. It [stirred up all the lands and a]ll the lands became hostile.' KUB 19.9 i 23f (24) (CTH 83, Ḫattušili III)

2.8.1.6 Evaluation and conclusion

The *nt*-stem adjectives appear in their plural form when they accompany neuter plurals. The attributive participles also show their plural form. If a participle accompanying neuter plurals is used predicatively, Hittite prefers to use the singular.

2.9 HUMANT- 'ALL'

2.9.1 Introduction

I have found a few indications that Hittite made a distinction between neuter singular *human* and its plural *humanta*: the latter refers to different objects, whereas the former refers to living beings when they are considered to be a whole. Although it is not directly relevant to the problem of the neuter plural, I cite the pertinent material concerning the neuter singular *human* sub 2.9.3.

2.9.2 *Humanta*

A: Old Hittite

- a: uga[(*an ke*)] ḫu-u-ma-an-da [a]nda petahḫe StBoT 25.4 iii 29f (30) 'I bring all [(these)]things inside.'

The referent of *humanda* is not clear: it can refer to 1^{EN} *zuwāluwal* and *tiššummi*[nn=]a *ḫalinas*, 'z. and a cup' in the next lines or to several things mentioned before.

- b: ḫalkiyaš ḫaršār iṣḫiyanda [ziz^{IIA}]=ša ḫaršār iṣḫiyanda *ke=ššan* ḫu-u-ma-an-da [pa]ltani teḫḫe *n=e* LUGAL-aš MUNUS LUGAL-ša kitkar=šamet teḫḫe 'Heads of barley (are) bound and heads of [spelt] (are) bound, all these things I put in a [b]asket and I put them on the heads of the king and queen.' StBoT 25.4 iv 15ff (15, 16) (= StBoT 25.3 iv 20ff)

Ḫumanda refers to *ke=ššan* which, in its turn, refers to *ḫalkiyaš ḫaršār iṣḫiyanda* *ziz^{IIA}]=ša ḫaršār iṣḫiyanda*.

- c: utnē ḫu-u-ma-an-da^{URU} Zalpuaz anda arunaz['All the lands between Zalpuwa and the sea' (Gertz: 1982: 23) or 'All the lands from Zalpuwa on the sea' (Melchert 1977: 157) KBo 3.22 obv. 38 (CTH 1). Neu 1974: 13 translates "alle Länder von Zalpuwa drinnen von Meer".

Ḫu-u-ma-an-da refers to *ut-ne-e*.

- d: nu=ššan *ke* ḫu-u-ma-an-ta^{GIS} padda[ni] ^{GIS}paddar=a=ššan ḫaššī teḫḫe 'And all these things in a basket[] and the basket I place on the hearth.' StBoT 25.137 iii 10f (10)

The referent of *ḫumanta* is *ke*, which in its turn refers to several objects in the preceding lines. Mention is made of *mu-u-ri-y(a* (gap) (9') *iskarante[š* NUMUN^{IIA}-ni] 'grape bre[ads] hanging, on the seeds'.⁸⁶

B: Old Hittite in Middle Hittite ductus

- e: *n=at=šan* ḫu-u-ma-an-da katta epzi 'And he takes everything.' IBoT 2.39 rev. 30 (CTH 777)

Ḫumanda refers to *n=at*. It is not possible to determine to which things *ḫumanda* refers to.

- f: kuita imma micšḫati nu=za=ta SA DINGIR-YA duddumar ḫattata ḫu-u-ma-an-ta šaki[nu]n 'The more I grew up, the more I acknowledged[ged] the clemency and the wisdom of my god in all respects.' CTH 373 KUB 30.10 obv. 11' (CTH 373)

⁸⁶ Neu 1983a: 263 n. 48 translates the last word as 'und der gesamte Nachkommenschaft'.

Hu-u-ma-an-da refers to *ha-at-la-ta* or it means 'in all respects' (for the r-less plural see 2.2).

- g: *apās-a* ^{GISEN} *iskallan* ^{GISEN} *eyan* ^{GISEN} *š[a⁷ a]n⁷ GISantar⁷[a]n GISlaprinnin*
šanizzi hu-u-ma-an-da GISx[]x-in GIS[]GISpamnuli huppuriyan alil
hu-u-m[a-a]n dāi 'And he takes a chip of cedarwood, a piece of *eya*-wood
 [], *antar*-[], *tapri*-wood, everything odorous, []wood, []reed,
parnuli-wood, greenery, all the blossom and spreads it out in a thurible.'
 IBoT 2.39 rev. 20 ff (22) (CTH 777)

Hu-u-ma-an-da may refer to *šanezzi*, in which case *šanezzi* is plural.

C: Middle Hittite

- h: *kāša* ^M *Mitaš waštaš[kit šapal nis DINGIR^{MES}-ya] kue uddār tiyān] ēšta*
apās-at-kan () hu-u-ma-an-ta šarraš 'Behold, Mita sinn[ed and] the
 words which had been sworn (lit. laid) [under oath], he violated them all.'
 (translation by Gurney 1948: 36) KUB 23.72 + rev. 2f (3) (CTH 146)
Humanda refers to -at which in its turn refers to *kue uddār tiyān] ēšta*
 'the words which had been sworn (lit. laid) under oath'.

- i: *n-ašta* ^M *Kupanta* <sup>[KAL-as] EG[IR⁷]-ra nu-šši ē-šū⁷ [rjan ISBAT nu
DAM^{MES}-šU [DUMU^{MES}-šU NAM.RA^{HA}]-ZUNU [ā]ššū-ya hu-u-ma-an-ta-pat
dās 'And Kupanta-[KAL] came after (him) and took his house, his wives,
 [his sons, his captives], and all the [g]oods.' KUB 14.1 + obv. 49f (50)
 (CTH 147)</sup>

Humanta refers to *āššū-ya* 'and the goods'.

- j: *istamaššun zinnuk hu-u-ma-an-da* 'I have heard that everything is finished.'
 VBoT 1 25f (26) (CTH 151) This translation follows Güterbock 1967: 145.

D: Young Hittite

In Young Hittite texts *humanta* mostly refers to countries:

- k: *hu-u-ma-an-ta harganut* KUB 21.6a rev. 11' (CTH 82, Hattušili III) 'He
 destroyed them (countries referred to in the preceding lines) all.'
 l: *nu-kan kuitman KUR^{URU} Ištallupa istarna arha iyahhat LUKUR*
URUKabbubba-ma KUR.KUR^{MES} URUGaša-ya hu-u-ma-an-da niniktat
 'While I marched through the country of Ištallupa, the enemy of Kab-
 bubba and all the Gašgacan countries mobilized.' KBo 5.8 i 31ff (33)
 (CTH 61, Muṣili II)
 m: *[(KUR.KUR^{MES}-ya kue dan-na-at-ta ammu)uk EGIR-pa [(ašesanunun*
nu-mu-kan ape-ya hu-u-ma-an-da)] arha dās '[(The countries which
 were unpopulated and (which) I had repopulated, he took) them all from
 me.' CTH 81 iii 57' sq. (58') (Hattušili III, line numbering Otten 1981)

- n: *[(KUR.KUR)]^{MES} URU Hatti-ma-wa-k[an] hu-u-ma-an-da D¹ISTAR ANA*
"Hat[(tušili)] andan nehūn 'All the [(country)]s, Istar, I have brought
 them to Hatti.' CTH 81 iv 21ff (22) (Hattušili III, line numbering Otten
 1981)
 o: *nu-šši ke KUR.KUR^{MES} hu-u-ma-an-da pi[r]an maniyahheškinun* 'And I
 governed all those countries for him.' KBo 6.29 + i 29f (29) (CTH 85,
 Hattušili III)
 p: *ediz-ma LUKUR URU Azzi wi[t nu KUR.KUR^MES UGU^{TJ} hu-u-ma-an-da*
h[arg]anut 'From beyond, the Azzian foe [came] and destroyed all the up-
 per[lands].' KBo 6.28 + obv. 11 (CTH 88, Hattušili III)
 q: *hu-u-ma-a[n-d]a tarah[ta]* 'He conquer[ed them all]'. KBo 6.28 + obv. 27
 (CTH 88, Hattušili III)
 r: *[nu kuitman URU Nerik URU-AN EGIR-pa epta KUR.KUR^{HA}-ya-ši hu-u-ma-*
an-da zahh[ya] menahhanda tiyat] 'As as he (tried) to recapture Nerik],
 all the countries went to war against him.' KUB 21.9 obv. 8 (CTH 90,
 Hattušili III)⁸⁷

2.9.3 Humant

A: Middle Hittite

- a: *SA KUR URU Išuwaya kuit kuit harkanzi antuhsan GU^{HA} UDU^{HA}*
huyanazašš-a⁸⁸ šmaš-kan [] anda pānza (...) nu hu-u-ma-an parā
pianzi āppa da[] n-at parā pianzi 'And whatsoever property of the
 land of Išuwa they are holding (... (whether) men, cattle or sheep, and
 any fugitive [that] has entered their (territory)) - they hand everything
 over, ... [] they hand that over.' KUB 23.72 + rev. 13ff (15) (CTH 146)
 (translation Gurney 1948: 36)

Hu-u-ma-an refers to cattle and people. Goods or other objects are not
 mentioned here.

- b: *KA)RAŠ-za-kan kuitēš tepawēš i[špar]ter apāt-ma-kan hu-u-ma-an a[rh]a*
hašpir-pat 'And the few of the army, that escaped, they (i.e. the enemies)
 disposed of them all.' KUB 14.1. obv. 48 (CTH 147)
 c: *kappū[wantes-pa]t antuhsēš išparter [ap]āt-ma-kan [hu-u-ma]-an arha*
hašpir 'A count[able] amount of people escaped, and they disposed of them
 all' KUB 14.1. + obv. 52 (CTH 147)
 d: *ke-kan [hū]man arha haš[p]ir* 'They all escaped.' *ibid.* obv. 57. In the lines

⁸⁷ For the reconstruction of this line I follow Ünal 1974: 8.

⁸⁸ This is the particle -a 'and, also'.

preceding l. 57 women, children, goods which had been left in Sallawašša are mentioned.

B: Young Hittite

- d: $\text{ÉRIN}^{\text{MES}} \rightarrow \text{ma} \rightarrow \text{šši} \rightarrow \text{kan}$ ANŠE.KUR.RA^{MES} *hu-u-ma-an arḫa dahḫun* 'But I took all his troops and his charioteers.' KBo 5.8 iii 32f (CTH 61, Muršili II)

Human refers to troops and charioteers, which is a group of people.

- e: $\text{uppeššar}^{\text{H}1\text{A}} \rightarrow \text{ma} \rightarrow \text{tta}$ *kue uppaḫḫu[n] nu ḫu-u-ma-an a[n]A LÚ TE₄.ME₂ → KA maniya[hḫun]* 'The parcels I sent to you, I have given them all to your courier.' KUB 23.101 ii 19f (20) (CTH 177, Tudḫaliya IV).

Here *human* refers to $\text{uppeššar}^{\text{H}1\text{A}}$ (plural because of *kue uppaḫḫun*).

- f: $\{(\text{KUR.KUR}^{\text{MES}} \text{ ya } \text{kue } \text{IN})\} \text{A } \text{URU Nerik } \{(\text{arāḫzanda } \text{ēšta}) \text{ } \text{U}^{\text{(RU)}} \text{Neran } \text{URU } \text{Ḫašt}\} \text{iran } \{(\text{ZAG-an}) \text{ i} \text{yan[un] (n} \rightarrow \text{at} \rightarrow \text{za } \text{ḫu-u-ma-an}) \text{ AR(AD-} \rightarrow \text{a)} \text{[ḫun] (n} \rightarrow \text{at} \rightarrow \text{z(a)} \text{[arkamman]([allius'}) \text{ }} \text{ }} \text{'I made the countries which surrounded Nerik, Nera, Ḫaštira, the border, and I subjected them all and [I made] them subject to tax.' CTH 81 iii 48'ff (50') (line numbering according to Otten 1981: 20 (Ḫattušili III))$

Human refers to several countries. Because *human* in the next line is taken up by *arkamman*([*allius'*]) it is possible that the scribe had common-gender *utniyanteš* in mind.

- g: *nu ḫatrānun kueda[s KUR.KUR]-caš EGIR-an → wa → mu tiyatten n → at → mu EGIR-an tier UL → ya kuedaš KUR-caš ḫatrānun nu ḫu-u-ma-an → pat ammetaz tiyat* 'And which countries I wrote to: "Follow me", (those countries) followed me, and the countries I did not write to, they all came over to me.' KBo 6.29 + ii 14ff (17) (CTH 85, Ḫattušili III)

Human refers to countries. The scribe did not have neuter *utnē* in mind, because *utnē* would have governed a verb in the singular, but *utniyanteš*, which is common gender and therefore governs the 3 pl. pret. *tier*.

2.9.4 Conclusion

The material concerning *human*- indicates that the neuter singular *human* refers to a collection, or a group of people. If things which are thought to be animate (countries in instance g: in 2.9.3) are considered a collection, Hittite puts the word for 'all' in the neuter singular. When a neuter plural is accompanied by the word *ḫumanit*-, Hittite put the word for 'all' in the neuter plural.⁸⁹

⁸⁹ In IBoT 2.39 rev. 26ff (26) (CTH 777) *human* may refer to the neuter sg. *sanezzi*

2.10 THE U-STEM ADJECTIVES

In this paragraph I list the attestations of u-stem adjectives. The material suggests that the ending -a is young.

2.10.1 Material

A: Old Hittite

šuwaru- 'full'⁹⁰

- a: *šu-wa-a-ru kue GAL^{H1A} akkušiz[i (ta ape → pat) ekuzi]* 'The cups he usually drinks to their bottom, [(exactly those)] he drinks.' StBoT 25.25 iv 26'f (26')
- b: *šu-wa-a-ru kue GAL^{H1A} akku[(škanzi) ta (apūš → pat akua)]nzi* 'The cups they usually[(y drink)] to their bottom, [(exactly those they drink.')] StBoT 25.25 iv 34'f 111.

Weitenberg 1984: 194 points out that *šuwaru* is used as an adverb. Therefore, there is no indication for number.

B: Old Hittite texts written in Middle Hittite ductus.

idalu- 'evil, bad'

- a: *kedani UD-ti kue [ud]dār aniyawen nu → wa → ta → kkan i-da-a-lu uddār katta [QATAM]MA waršan ēštu* 'The things we did on that day, those evil things must be [likewise] wiped off from you.' KBo 24.1 obv. 18'ff (19) (CTH 404)

Graphical sequences *i-da-(a)-lu-wa*, viz. *idaluwa* which may suggest a nom. acc. neuter plural have to be interpreted as nom. acc. neuter sg. *idalu* followed by a particle -a (instance a:) or by the particle -wa (instance b:)

- a: *mām → man⁹¹ dandukišnaša DUMU-aš uktūri ḫui[s]wanza ēšta man → ašta mān [a]ntuwaḫḫaš i-da-a-lu-wa inan arta man → at → wa natta kattawatar* 'If man were to [live] forever, would it not be a reason for concern for him, if he became afflicted by a serious illness?' KUB 30.10 obv. 22f (23) (CTH 373)

'sweet, odorous': *namma → ššan LÁL I.GIS I.DUG GA L[NUN] [aḫui [šaniziz] → ya → ššan ḫu-u-ma-an šer išḫuwāi* 'Further he pours out honey, sesame oil, fine oil, (and) butter, and every odorous thing he spreads on it.' This instance cannot be used as a counter-example to the rule proposed here.

⁹⁰ For the translation and more references see Weitenberg 1984: 192.

⁹¹ This has to be interpreted as *mām → man*, 'if' followed by the particle *man*.

Idaluwa has to be read as *idalu-wa*. It is a neuter singular *idalu* followed by -a 'even' with a glide /w/.

- b: 'Āškiliya arašš i-ta-lu-wa baīt 'Āškiliya got up. The evil has gone.' KBo 18.151 rev. 18f (19) (CTH 827).

For *idaluwa* in this sentence two interpretations are possible. Firstly, *idaluwa* can be interpreted as a nom. acc. neuter plural in -a (Weitenberg 1984: 212). In this case the unusual — for an adjective — zero grade *idaluwa* may have arisen on the analogy of the *u*-stem substantives. Kammenhuber 1974: 165 suggests that *idaluwa* is the neuter singular *idalu* followed by the particle of direct speech -wa. We have to translate 'Āškiliya got up (and said) "the evil has gone".' Note, however, that there is nothing in this oracular text which suggests that these words were actually spoken.

partu 'high, lofty'

- ^{GIS}TIR-ma *pār-ga-u-wa* *hinganuzi* 'He bends the high forests' KBo 20.28 obv. 7 20

This KBo copy does not read *pār-ga-u-wa*, a form which has been attested in KUB 36.81 obv. 12, but *pār-ta-u-wa*, which would be the neuter plural of *partawar* 'wing' (see 2.2.2).

C: Middle Hittite

idalu 'evil'

- a: [nu šA 'zi alwanzatar-šet i-da-a-lu uddār-šet QATAMMA [hara]kdu n-at-apa EGIR-pa le wizzi 'Let the witchcraft and the evil words of Zi(plantawiya) [peri]sh likewise. They shall not come back.' KBo 15.10 ii 15f and ibid. iii 54f (CTH 443)

I-da-a-lu refers to the plural *uddār-šet*.

- b: nu i-da-a-lu *kue* ITT[ī] ^mDuthaliya(a ū) 'Nikalmāti ANA DUMU^{MES}-SUNU mēmiskit 'The evil she repeatedly uttered to Tutḫaliya [and] to Nikalmati and their sons'. KBo 15.10 i 18f (18)

I-da-a-lu is plural because it is referred to by the nom. acc. neuter plural anaphoric pronoun -e.

To sum up, in older Hittite the apparent singular *idalu* is clearly used as plural. The instances of *idaluwa* which suggest a nom. acc. are singular: *idalu* followed by a particle.

D: Young-Hittite

aššu 'good, favourable'

- a: *namma-wa* *kue mekki-ya*] (16) INIM^{MES} *a-aš-ša-u-wa memisk[izzi]* KUB 23.77 iii 15f (16) 'And further, the favourable words he repeatedly speaks in large quantities ...' (CTH 584, Ḫattušili III)
- b: *mān šA KUR^{URU} Kummanni a-aš-ša-u-wa AWATE^{MES} ki pešta* 'If you have spoken those good words about the land of Kumanni ...' KBo 11.1 rev. 12 (CTH 382, Muwatalli)

idalu 'bad, evil'

- a: [*apās-ma* *mu kuit i-da-a-la-u-wa AWATE^{MES} memiskian dāis* 'Because that man] began speaking [ev]il words to me' KUB 14.17 iii 20 (CTH 61, Muṣṣili II)
- b: *mān-kan tuk ANA^m Duppi^D Tešup^{UP} i-da-a-la-u-wa AWATE^{MES} kuiški ANA LUGAL našma ANA KUR^{URU} Ḫatti piran widaizzi zik-an ANA LUGAL le šannatti* 'If someone speaks [lit. brings] evil words to you, Duppi-Tešub, about the king or the land of Ḫatti, you are not allowed to hide him from the king.' KBo 5.9 ii 46 (CTH 62, Muṣṣili II)
- c: *našma-šmaš i-da-la-u-wa INIM^{MES} piran mematti* 'or speaks malevolent words to them' (i.e. deliberately lies) ibid. iii 21
- d: *nu-kan DINGIR^{MES} BELU^{MES} u[watten] hink[an arḫa wi] gatten *kue-ya-kan* *kue i-da-a-la-wa ANA KUR^{URU} wēyatten* 'Gods, lords, [come] and [re-move the plague] and send all evils to a hostile country.' KUB 14.14 + rev. 45f (46') (CTH 378, Muṣṣili II)*

daššu 'thick, heavy, difficult'

- *nu-kan ABI ABI-ya^m Šuppiluliumaš INA KUR^{URU} Amurru anda ištantait KUR.KUR^{MES} kuit da-aš-ša-wa ēšta nu-kan MU.6^{KAM} anda pedas kuitman-at taninut* 'My grandfather Šuppiluliuma lingered in the land of Amurru and because the countries caused problems, it took him six years to appease them.' KUB 19.9 i 20f (21) (CTH 83, Ḫattušili III)

tepu 'little'

- *UNUTE^{MES}-wa kuega te-pa-u-wa DUMU.MUNUS.GAL ANA UNUTE^{MES} menaḫḫanda iyat nu-war-at ANA DINGIR^{LIM} URU Aruṣna uppešta* 'The oldest daughter sent the utensils she had exchanged, present in small quantities, to the god of Aruṣna' KUB 22.70 obv. 83f (CTH 566, Tudḫaliya IV)

2.10.2 Evaluation of the *u*-stem adjectives

In later Hittite the old uncharacterized neuter plural in *-u* has been replaced by a characterized form consisting of a full grade of the suffix followed by the ending *-a*. If the MH form *pār-ta-u-ua* has to be emended to *pār-ga-u-ua*, the nom. acc. neuter plural of *parku* 'high', this process started rather early.

Older Hittite:

<i>idātu</i>	3× (1× MHD, 2× MHC)
<i>pargauwa</i>	1× (MHD) (possibly)

Young Hittite

<i>aššawa</i>	2× (Ḫattušili III, Muwatalli)
<i>idalawa</i>	4× (Muršili II)
<i>daššawa</i>	1× (Ḫattušili III)
<i>tepawa</i>	1× (Tudḫaliya IV)

2.11 THE *I*-STEM ADEJECTIVES

In the *i*-stems the ending *-a* already occurs in Old Hittite in *šuppa* from *šuppi* 'clean'. There are also examples in Middle Hittite of uncharacterized neuter plurals.

2.11.1 *I*-stems with the ending *-a*

A: Old Hittite

šuppi 'clean'

- a: *nu šu-up-pa utlār* 'and holy words' StBoT 25.54 ii 5'
 b: *[nu GAL^{IIA} š]u-up-pa ti[anz]* 'They put down purified cups.' StBoT 25.54 iv 24'.
 Neu 1983a: 124 n. 417 points out that there is not enough space for ^{IIA}.
 In the duplicate StBoT 25.57 iv 5 only GAL can be discerned.

B: Young Hittite

ḫatugi 'terrible, horrible'

This adjective has both *i*- and *a*-stem forms. An *i*-stem has been attested in e.g. *ḫadugaēs* KUB 46.54 obv. 11, an *a*-stem form in KBo 17.6 iii 1 *ḫatukan ešhar* (see also Puhvel 1991: 274). Because of instance b: I classify *ḫatuga* here as an *i*-stem adjective.

- a: *nu ḫaršiharši udaš namma* ^DU-aš *ḫa-tu-ga tetḫiskit* 'Thunder and lightning broke out, the storm-god thundered vehemently.' M.Spr. obv. 2f (2) (CTH 486, Muršili II)

2.11 THE *i*-STEM ADEJECTIVES

- b: *ḫatugaya tetḫit* 'It thundered vehemently.' KUB 19.14 11 (CTH 40, Muršili II)

This instance can also be read as *ḫa-tu-ga-ya*. In that case we have to translate 'and it thundered vehemently'.

karuili 'old'

- *[nu-za ka]rūila* DUB.2^{KAM}.^{IIA} *piran* [*wcniyanun*] '[And I found for myself] two [old] tablets.' KUB 14.8 obv. 9' (CTH 378, Muršili II)⁹²

mekki 'many'

- *[maḫḫ]an-ma-za-kan anmuk* ANA ^{GI8}GU.ZA *ABI-ya* [*ēšḫ*] *at nu kūruri* ^{IIA} *kuit meggaya nininkan ēšta* '[Whe]n I [sa]t down on the throne of my father, because the enemies mobilized in large numbers ...' KBo 5.8 ii 34f (35) (CTH 61, Muršili II)

šuppi 'clean'

- a: *našma* ANA ^{LÚ}MES^{SANGA} *kuit* [*ḫū*] *mandas watarnahḫun n-at-za šu-up-pa* [*(šešk)*] *iškanzi* 'According to the instructions I gave to them all, the priests have to sleep on it in order to purify.' KUB 14.10 + iv 12ff (13') (CTH 378, Muršili II)

Šuppa is used as an adverb. Here KUB 14.8 rev. 44 has *su-up-pa-ya*.

- b: *maḫḫan-ma-kan* GU₄ *pūḫugarin parā nāir* ^{DUTU}SI^{ma-za} GU₄ *pūḫugari EGIR-anda* INA UD.7^{KAM} *šu-up-pa warapzi* 'When they had sent the substitute cow away, I, My Majesty, bathed for seven days after the substitute cow (had been sent away) in order to be purified.' M.Spr. obv. 22ff (23) (CTH 486, Muršili II)

Šuppa is used as an adverb.

- c: *mān-ma* ḪUR.SAG^{ma} *kuiški našma šinapši šu-up-pa* ^{ASRU} *kuitki* ḪUL-*aḫḫan nu* ANA ^DU *arkuwait kinun-at kašša* ^{DUTU}SI^m ^{NIR.GÁL} *EGIR-pa SIGS-ahmi* 'But if some mountain, or some pillared hall — a holy place — has been defiled, and it has pleaded with the storm-god, [I, My Majesty Muwatalli], will restore it.' KBo 11.1 obv. 32f (32) (CTH 382, Muwatalli)
 Here *šuppa* refers to *ASRU kuitki* 'some holy place'. This agreement pattern is strange, because an apparent plural adjective in *-a* agrees with a singular noun and pronoun. It is also possible to translate *kuitki* with 'somehow', in which case we do not have an ending *-a* agreeing with a singular noun.
- d: *mān* ^{GI8}GU.ZA ^DU ^{NA4}ZI.KIN *kuiški katta laknul našma-kan šu-up-pa* ^PU *kuiški šahta* 'If someone has overthrown the throne of Tešub or a stele, or

⁹² Restoration and translation by Gertz 1982: 116.

has defiled a holy well' KBo 11.1 obv. 40 (CTH 382, Muwatalli)
Also here plural *šuppa* agrees with a singular item, viz. *pū*, which stands for *wataru* 'well'.

dammeli- (?)

- EN-YA-mu UL GUR-in U[N]an ME-aš L⁶MES URU *Hatti* GIM-an DUTU⁵¹ EN-YA *dam-me-la* KAR-at 'My Lord has taken me and not another per[son], as he, My Majesty found the people of *Hatti* uncultivated.' KUB 26.32 i 5f (6) (CTH 124, Suppiluliumaš II)

The nom. acc. neuter plural has been used attributively to L⁶MES URU *Hatti*-, whatever Hittite word lies hidden behind it.⁹³ Tischler 1991: 68 however lists *dammela* as a gen. sing. of *damai*- 'other'. If we follow this interpretation we have to translate: 'As he, My Majesty, discovered that the Hittites were loyal to someone else (lit. belonged to someone else).'

2.11.2 *I*-stems with the neuter plural ending -i

karši- 'unrestrained, frank[ly]'

Watkins 1982: 260 regards *karši* as an adverbial nom. acc. neuter plural. I have found several forms of this adjective, which have the outlook of a neuter plural, e.g. *kar-ša-ya* QATAMMA SUPUR 'Write without hesitation' KUB 6.44 iii 57 (CTH 68, Muršili II). But, as Gertz 1982: 366 points out, *karši* is not a nom. acc. neuter plural, because an instance like KBo 5.9 ii 4 *kar-aš-ši-ya* forbids it. *Kar-aš-ši-ya* is certainly not a nom. acc. neuter plural, because in Hittite the nom. acc. neuter plural ending of the adjectives ends in -i or -aya. It is the dative which can end in -iya. No adjectival nom. acc. neuter plural ending -iya has come down to us.

ukturi- 'eternal'

- [ma]h^handa DUTU-uš D¹IM-aš nepiš tē[kann-a] uk-tu-u-ri LUGAL-uš MUNUS. LUGAL-ašš-a DUMU^{MES}-ša uk-tu-u-ri-eš ašand[u] 'As the sun-god, the storm-god [and the sky and the earth (are)] eternal, so let the king and the queen and their children be eternal.' StBoT 25.3 iii 2 1f (2).

Originally this text had nom. pl. c. *ukturics*, but the last two signs have been erased. The duplicate StBoT 25.4 iii 2 gives [uk-tu-]ri-eš for the first form of this adjective and a trace of the sign <ES> for the second form. *Ukturi* can be explained by the neuters *nepiš*- 'sky' and *tekan*- 'earth', to

which the scribe felt it should agree with. This means that *ukturi* here is a neuter plural. It is also possible that *ukturi* agrees only with *tē[kann-a]*, the last element in the enumeration.

Gertz 1982: 15 suggests that *ukturi*, as pronouns sometimes are, may be used collectively with a group of nouns of both genders. *Ukturi* would be the only noun (according to Gertz) behaving thus.⁹⁴

Old Hittite in Middle Hittite ductus

šanezzi- 'sweet, odorous'

- a: *namma-ššan* LAL I.GIŠ I.DÜG.GA I.[NUN] I[ā]hui [šaniiz]i-ya-ššan *hūman* šer išhūwāi 'Further he pours honey, sesame oil, fine oil, (and) butter, and every odorous thing he spreads out on it.' IBoT 2.39 rev. 26ff (26) (CTH 777)

Šanezzi may refer to several things: LAL I.GIŠ I.DÜG.GA I.[NUN] 'honey, sesame oil, fine oil, (and) butter' or, more probably, simply to *hūman*. This would imply that *šanezzi* is singular (see note 89).

- b: *apāš-a* G¹IS^{ERIN} iškallan G¹IS^{ayan} G¹IS^š[a⁷-]a⁷n⁷ G¹IS^{antar}[-a]n⁷ G¹IS^{taprinnin} ša-ni-iz-zi *hūmanda* G¹IS^z [x-in G¹IS^z] G¹IS^{parnulli} huppuriyan alil hūm[a]n dāi 'And he takes a chip of cedarwood, a piece of *eya*-wood [], *antar*[-], *tapri*-wood, everything odorous, []wood, []reed, *parnulli*-wood, greenery, all the blossom and spreads it out in a thurible.' IBoT 2.39 rev. 20ff (21) (CTH 777)

Šanezzi seems to refer to *hūmanda* and may therefore be a plural.

B: Middle Hittite

parkui- 'clean' and *šalli*- 'beautiful'

- *sisKur*^{BIA}-(a)šmaš pā-ku-i šal-li [(šanezzi)] URU *Hattusaš-pat* KUR-ya piš[*gaweni*] 'We [(frequently)]ve clean, large and [(tasty)] offerings to you in the land of *Hatti*.' KUB 17.21 + Dupl. i 2f (2) (CTH 375)
- sisKur*^{BIA} can be singular because the Sumerian plural determinative ^{BIA} does not necessarily indicate a characterized plural, cf. [NIM].LAL^{BIA}-an KBo 6.3 iv 29 (Laws I, §91, MHD) 'swarm', which has a singular phonetic complement. See also 1.4.3. Therefore, *parkui* and *šalli* are only possible instances of neuter plural adjectives.

⁹³ Laroche establishes the following paradigm: singular acc. *dammelin*, dat. *dammeli* and the nom. acc. neuter plural *dammela* (he also suggests *dam-me-la-an-n[a]*) in KUB 12.50 2).

⁹⁴ It is possible to consider *ukturi* an adverb in *māman* (= *mān-man*) *dandukina* DUMU-aš uk-tu-u-ri hui[s]wanza ēšta 'If a man were to live for ever' KUB 30.10 obv. 22 (CTH 373, MHD) and in *uk-tu-u-ri-at-kan* [ma]hhan ištarnišmami āšiyantēš 'how they were always friendly with each other' KBo 14.12 iv 31f (CTH 40, Muršili II).

C: Young Hittite

appezzi- 'last' (EGIR-zi-)

- a: *mān=ma namma* OL *kuitki ēši nu* IGI-zi KUŠ^{MES} SIG₅-du EGIR-zi=ma NU.SIG₅<-ru> 'If there is further nothing the matter, let the first signs be favourable, however, let the last signs be unfavourable.' KUB 22.70 obv. 39 (CTH 566, Tudḫaliya IV)
- b: *nu* IGI-zi [KUŠ^{MES}] SIG₅-ru [EGIR-zi=ma NU.SIG₅-du IGI-zi KUŠ^{MES} ni.ēš=kan ZAG-na peššiyat GUB-za=ma=aš arḫayan uk-tu-riš=šmaš GUB-za RÁ^{TS} 'Let the first signs be favourable, but let the last ones be unfavourable, the first signs: The n.: it 'threw' to the right, but on the left it is separate. On the left for them there is an u. 'damaged' KUB 22.70 rev. 2 (CTH 566, Tudḫaliya IV)

hantezzi- 'first' (IGI-zi-

- a: *namma=ma=za* GIDIM *damedani memini šer* OL *kuedanikki* TUKU.TUKU-wanza nu IGI-zi SU^{MES} SIG₅-ru EGIR-ma NU.SIG₅-du IGI-zi SU^{MES} (18) SIG₅ 'If you, ghost, are not angry about another affair, let the first omens be favourable, but let the last ones be unfavourable, the first signs are favourable.' KBo 2.6 i 15ff (16, 17) (CTH 569, Hattusili III)
- b: *mān=za* DINGIR^{LIM} *apadda šer* TUKU.TUKU-wanza IGI-zi KUŠ^{MES} SIG₅-ru 'If you, god, are angered because of that, let the first signs be favourable KUB 22.70 obv. 2 (CTH 566, Tudḫaliya IV)
- c: KUB 22.70 rev. 2 (CTH 566, Tudḫaliya IV) see sub appezzi-

mekki- 'much, many'

- EGIR-az=ma URU Gašgaz ku-u-ru-ri^{U^{1A}} mekki niniktat. KBo 5.8 19f (11) (CTH 61, Muršili II).
- Gertz 1982: 116 translates 'But many enemies arose in the rear from Gašga.' This sentence is paralleled by *nu=kan kūruri^{U^{1A}} kuit meggaya* [nini]nkan ēšta 'And since many enemies have arisen ...' ibid. ii 35. In this sentence *meggaya* is clearly a nom. acc. neuter plural.

nakki- 'difficult, heavy'

- nu LÜ.MES URU Azzi kutēš URU DIDLI^{U^{1A}} BÄD NA⁴ perunus^{U^{1A}} HUR.SAG^{MES}-uš par-gawēš na-ak-ki-i ASRI^{U^{1A}} EGIR-pa ḫarkir 'And the men from Azzi who held the fortified places, the rocks and the high mountains, places which are difficult to access ...' KBo 4.4 iv 29f (30)
- Because of the Sumerian determinative ^{U^{1A}} and because of the clear plural meaning *nakki* is a plural and agrees with ASRI^{U^{1A}}.

tamai- 'other, different'

- {nu=kan ta-ma-a-i kuekki uddār [ḫatrāši nu]=nnas EGIR-pa ta-ma-a-i uddār ḫatreski[sā] 'You write some other words and then you write us again other words.' (This passage means 'You always write to us different things about the same affairs.') KUB 14.1 + rev. 37 (CTH 147, MHC)
- Tamai refers to *uddār* and is plural, because of *kuekki*, the nom. acc. neuter plural of *kuiški* 'some'.

2.11.3 List of i-stem plural adjectives

I-stems with the ending -a:

<i>šuppa</i>	3× OHC (certain)
<i>ḫatuga</i>	1× NHC (Muršili II, certain)
<i>karuila</i>	1× NHC (Muršili II, certain)
<i>meggaya</i>	1× NHC (Muršili II, certain)
<i>dammela</i>	1× NHC (Šuppiluliuma II, possible)
<i>šuppa</i>	4× NHC (2× Muršili II, adverbial. 2× referring to singular item, certain)

I-stems with the ending -aya:

<i>suppaya</i>	1× NHC (Muršili II, adverbial)
----------------	--------------------------------

I-stems with an uncharacterized neuter plural:

<i>appezzi</i>	2× NHC (Tudḫaliya IV, possible)
<i>karši</i>	passim NHC (Tudḫaliya IV, unlikely)
<i>ukturi</i>	1× OHC (unlikely)
<i>šanczzi</i>	1× MHD (certain)
<i>parkui</i>	1× MHC (possible)
<i>šalli</i>	1× MHC (possible)
<i>ḫantezzi</i>	3× NHC (Tudḫaliya IV, possible)
<i>mekki</i>	1× NHC (Muršili II, possible)
<i>nakki</i>	1× NHC (Muršili II, possible)
<i>tamai</i>	1× MHC (certain)
<i>ukturi</i>	1× OHC (possible)

Note that the uncharacterized neuter plurals are less securely established than the characterized ones ending in -a.

2.12 THE A-STEM ADJECTIVES

2.12.1 Material

Āra 'just, right'

Āra is an *a*-stem, which is proved by the substantivized adjectives derived from it: ^{LÜ}ara- 'friend' and ^{MUNUS}ara- 'girl-friend'. We also have ^DĀra- which occurs besides ^Dĥinkalluš 'Abundance' and ^{Kelti} 'well-being' (Puhvel 1984: 118).

Benveniste 1962: 108-110 has argued that *a-a-ra* 'le bien' is in Hittite, in any case, a secondary abstract from an adjective *ara- 'fitting'. The development of the meaning would run like this: "état de ce qui est adapté → conformité, justice". This has been concretized in *ara*- 'friend'.

However, the evidence cited below does not necessarily suggest that *a-a-ra* is a secondary abstract. It may be an *a*-stem adjective, of which the neuter form is used adverbially:

a: *nu-uš-ma-at-ša* (read: *nu-uš-ma-ša-at = nu-uš-maš-at*) *le a-a-ra ienzi* 'And they (the oaths) will not act rightly to you.' KBo 5.3 + ii 8 (CTH 42, Suppiluliuma I)

b: *n-at-ši ABU-YA* ^m*Ĥattušiliš LUGAL.GAL a-a-ra iyat* ^{DUTU-SI}*-ya-at-ši* ^m*Tudḫaliyaš LUGAL.GAL a-a-ra iyanun n-at-ši a-a-ra ēšdu* 'Also when Kurunta, king of the land Tarḫuntašša, afterwards carries out a *kuwappala*, then know that) my father Ĥattušili, the Great King, has done this legally for him, and I too, My Majesty, Tudḫaliya, the Great King have done this legally for him, and let this be right for him.' Bo 86/299 ii 18ff (19) (Tudḫaliya IV)

Āra is used in the first two instances as an adverb meaning 'legally', the third āra is used predicatively.

Puhvel 1984: 118 considers *a-a-ra* to be a nom. acc. neuter plural 'right, proper concern, due'. This is suggested by KUB 29.1 i 4: [^{DUTU-un} ^Dim-ann-a *a-a-ra ier* 'They did justice [to the sun-god] and the storm-god'. Here *āra* seems to be an object. However, it can also be used as adverb, as is indicated by the two instances cited sub a: and b: and may therefore be considered an adjective. It may also be a substantivized adjective, 'they/I did right (things)'. The nom. acc. neuter plural occurs mainly predicatively in the expression *ūl āra* 'it is not just, it is forbidden'. I cite representative material.

A: Old Hittite

- [*ūl*] *a-a-ra* 'It is [not] just.' KBo 22.2 obv. 20 (CTH 3)

B: Old Hittite in Middle Hittite ductus

- *šuni-mi-ma-mu kuit šuppi adanna natta a-ra n-at ūl kuššanka edun* 'What is set aside for my god, and therefore not permitted for me to eat. I have never eaten.' KUB 30.10 obv. 13' (CTH 373)

C: Middle Hittite

- [*n-at-ši*] *a-a-ra ēštu* '[Let] it be permitted [to h]im.' KBo 16.24 (+) iii 20 (CTH 251)

D: Young Hittite

Āra occurs mainly in the expression *ūl a-a-ra* 'it is not right, not permitted'. From the numerous instances I cite:

a: ^{LÜ}*MUN* [^{NABTUM} *EGIR piyan*] *na ūl a-a-ra* 'It is not permitted [to give ba]ck a [fugitive].' KUB 19.6 + iii 64 (CTH 76, Muwatalli)

b: ^{URU}*Ĥattuša-ma-at ūl a-a-ra* 'But in Ĥattuša it is not permitted.' KBo 5.3 iii 43 (CTH 42, Suppiluliuma I).

c: *šaklāš kuit ANA LUGAL KUR* ^{URU}*Kargamiš a-a-ra ANA LUGAL KUR* ^{URU}*Du-tašša-ya apāš a-a-ra ēšdu* 'Whatever measure is right for the king of Kargamiš, must be right for the king of Tarḫuntašša.' Bo 86/299 ii 81f (82) (Tudḫaliya IV). Āra here might literally mean 'proper things'.

The accumulated evidence does not unambiguously support Benveniste's view that *a-a-ra* is a substantive. There is nothing against taking *a-a-ra* as a (petrified) adjectival expression.

Other *a*-stem adjectives

Young Hittite

arahzena- 'neighbouring'

- [*n*] *amma-ya-za damāi a-ra-aḫ-zé-na KUR.KUR* ^{MES}*LUGAL-weznann* [(i anda *tarḫanta*)] 'Furthermore, [(he conquered)] the other foreign countries during his reign.' KUB 14.14 + obv. 28 (CTH 378 Mursili II)

kunna 'proper'

- [*n*] *ān tuk-ma ūl ZAG-na* '[Wh]en it is not appropriate for you' KUB 6.41 + iv 3 (CTH 68, Mursili II)

Kunna, like *a-a-ra* is used predicatively

dannatta- 'empty, unpopulated, uninhabited'

- a: *nu-mu ke KUR.KUR* ^{MES}*dan-na-at-ta ASSUM MUIRDUTTIM pešta* 'And he gave me those unpopulated countries in order to govern them.' CTH 81 ii 56 (Ĥattušili III, line numbering Otten 1981)

- b: *nu-mu-kan* ŠES-YA *kue* *kī* KUR.KUR^{MES} *dan-na-at-ta* šu-i *daiš* 'Concerning those lands which my brother gave to me unpopulated ...' CTH 81 ii 63f (63) (Hattušili III, line numbering Otten 1981)
- c: *nu-za-ke* KUR.KUR^{MES} *dan-na-at-ta* ISTU NITE-YA EGIR-pa *aššanunun* *n-at* EGIR-pa^{URU} *Hattušan* *yanun* 'I repopulated those unpopulated countries with my power and I made them part of Hattuša again.' CTH 81 ii 66ff (66) (Hattušili III, line numbering Otten 1981)
- d: [(*n->*)*at* *dan-n*(*a-at-ta* EGIR-pa *aššanunun*)] '[(I repopulated them again because they were unpopulated)].' CTH 81 iii 32' sq. (Hattušili III, line numbering Otten 1981). *Dannatta* refers to several countries.
- e: [(KUR.KUR^{MES} *ya* *kue* *dan-na-at-ta* *amm*)]*uk* EGIR-pa [(*aššanunun* *nu-mu-kan* *ape-ya* *hu-u-ma-an-da*)] *arḫa* *dāš* '[(The countries which were unpopulated and which) I had re[(populated)], he took [(these all)].' CTH 81 iii 57' sq. (57) (Hattušili III, line numbering Otten 1981)
- f: *nu* [*dan-na-at-ta*] *a* KUR-e EGIR-pa *dān* *ašā[š]ta* 'And he occupied] the [unpopulat]ed countries again.' KUB 14.13 + i 38 (CTH 378, Muršili II)

Note that in all the instances, except in f., *dannatta* is placed behind its regens. It is used predicatively in b., d., and e.

2.12.2 List of the *a*-stem adjectives

<i>āra</i>	passim (possible)
<i>arḫzena</i>	1 × (Muršili II, certain)
<i>kunna</i>	1 × NHC (Muršili II, certain)
<i>dannatta</i>	6 × NHC (Hattušili III, certain)

2.13 EVALUATION OF THE ADJECTIVES WHICH ARE NOT NT-STEMS

The pattern for neuter plural endings of the non *nt*-stem adjectives is as follows:

<i>a</i> -stems	- <i>a</i> . All periods.
<i>u</i> -stems	- <i>u</i> . older Hittite.
	- <i>awa</i> , the full grade of the stem + <i>a</i> is secondary.
<i>i</i> -stems	- <i>a</i> . placed immediately behind the root. All periods.
	- <i>i</i> . not as certain as - <i>a</i> . All periods.
	- <i>aya</i> . Young Hittite.

It is noteworthy that in Young Hittite *šuppa* 'purified, holy' once agrees with *pú* 'well' and once with *asru* *kuitki* 'some place'.

Āra and *kunna* are used predicatively in the unpersonal expressions 'it is not right, it is not propitious'.

Part 3

HISTORICAL EXPLANATION OF THE HITTITE MATERIAL

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this part the Hittite material will be provided with a diachronic commentary. I will often abstract from the notions Old Hittite, Middle Hittite and Old Hittite texts in Middle Hittite ductus. Instead, these stages in the Hittite language will be classified under the designation "older Hittite" (only when necessary a more precise distinction will be made). It is fully justified to use only the denominator "older Hittite" because in the three above-mentioned stages the neuter plural has the same pattern.

I will use the evidence taken from part one and two. Because this evidence has been discussed in detail, I will not discuss or explain the words or forms again.

Because this part deals with the diachronic neuter plural, it is useful to present the material in a different order than it has been presented in the first part of this study. The order will be as follows: firstly, the hysterodynamic plural formations (those having original lengthened grade of the suffix), secondly the substantives and thirdly the adjectives.

I will argue that in prehistoric Hittite the formations used later to form neuter plurals were already present. However, they were used as neuter singular. Therefore, the neuter nouns and adjectives only rarely had a plural.

3.2 LIST OF THE NEUTER PLURALS

I only list the reliable instances here. Words which are provided with the label '+/-' are probable instances of neuter plurals. Note that *partawa* is the only complex *r/n*-stem without final -*r*, which has plural meaning. The rest of the "plurals" in this stem class are probably grammatical singulars. I have made a distinction between adjectives and substantives and subdivided them into the categories with and without the ending -*a*. This leads to a fourfold division.

I have excluded the nouns which are preceded by numerals higher than one.

1. Substantives

A Substantives characterized by the ending -a

	Old	Young
u-stems:	<i>welkuwa</i>	<i>genuwa</i>
l-stems:	-	<i>ḫuḫupalla</i>
n-stems:	-	<i>šaḫḫana</i>
s-stems:	<i>iškiša +/—</i>	<i>iškiša</i>
?	<i>šakuwa</i>	<i>šakuwa</i> <i>ḫupiyallaya</i>

The -a in words having common gender

	Old	Young
tt-stems:	<i>aniyatta</i>	-
nt-stems:	<i>šarḫuwanta</i>	-

B Substantives without the ending -a

	Old	Young
ei-stems ⁹⁵ :	<i>utnē</i>	-
i-stems:	<i>išmeri</i>	-
	<i>ḫuwaši</i>	-
	<i>išpanduzzi</i>	-
	<i>terrippi</i>	-
u-stems:	<i>Giš-ru +/—</i>	-
r-stems:		<i>kurur</i> <i>arkuwarri</i> <i>kururi</i>
l-stems:	<i>wašdul</i>	<i>wašdul</i>
	<i>išhiul</i>	-
	<i>ḫuḫupalli</i>	-
r/n-stems:	<i>ḫaršār</i>	-
	<i>ḫuitār</i>	-
	<i>uddār</i>	<i>uddār</i>
	<i>widār</i>	<i>widār</i>

⁹⁵ See 3.3.4.

<i>partawa</i>	<i>ḫatreššar</i>
<i>ḫattata</i>	<i>laḫḫiyatar</i>
<i>LÜ.SU.GI-ešša</i>	<i>uppeššar</i>
<i>ḫattešša</i>	<i>LÜ-natar</i> ^{91A}
<i>iyawa</i>	
<i>išḫiešša</i>	
<i>duddumiešša</i>	
<i>ḫannešša</i>	

2. Adjectives

A. Adjectives with the ending -a

	Old	Young
a-stems:	<i>āra</i>	<i>āra</i> <i>arahzena</i> <i>kunna</i> <i>darnata</i>
i-stems:	<i>šuppa</i>	<i>ḫatuga</i> <i>karuila</i> <i>meggaya</i> <i>suppaya</i>
substantivized:	<i>šuppa</i> <i>zalta</i> <i>palha</i> <i>ḫarša</i> <i>wašša</i>	
u-stems:		<i>idalawa</i> substantivized: <i>aššuwa</i> <i>aššawa</i> <i>daššawa</i> <i>tepawa</i>
	<i>pargauwa +/—</i>	
nt-stems: predicative participles:	<i>tarnanta</i> <i>aniyanta</i>	
nt-stems: other participles:	<i>išḫiyanta</i> <i>išgaranta</i> <i>appanda</i>	<i>ašanta</i> <i>pānta</i>

išgaranta
šullanda
ašanta

Other *nt*-stem adjectives:

<i>išharwanta</i>	SIG ₅ - <i>anta</i>
<i>išhaškanta</i>	<i>dapiyanda</i>
<i>amiyanta</i>	
<i>wezzapanta</i>	
SIG ₅ - <i>anta</i>	

B. Adjectives not characterized by the ending -a

i-stems:	<i>šalli</i>	<i>apezzi</i>
	<i>parkui</i>	<i>hantezzi</i>
	<i>šanezzi</i>	<i>nakki</i>
		<i>tamai</i>

u-stems:	<i>idālu</i>
substantivized:	<i>aššū</i>

nt-stems: predicative participles:

<i>handān</i>	<i>aniyan</i>
<i>wetan</i>	<i>iškiyan</i>
<i>irhan</i>	<i>nininkan</i>
<i>waršan</i>	<i>piyan</i>
<i>aniyan</i>	
<i>išhūwān</i>	
<i>terippiyan</i>	
<i>tiyān</i>	

The bare essentials of the list above are represented by the list printed below. Every category has only been given one example. In this list it can be seen very clearly that the adjectives are more often characterized by the ending -a than the substantives are characterized by this ending. This is also the most important conclusion reached in part one and two.

SUBSTANTIVES

I. ZERO

i-stems:	<i>terippi</i>	(old)
u-stems:	<i>taru</i>	(old)
l-stems:	<i>išhiul</i>	(old)

r-stems:	<i>kurur</i>	(old)
ei-stem:	<i>utnē</i>	(old)

2. The ending -a

- a: latin *locus*, *loci* vs. *locu*-type
- b: secondary: e.g. *genuwā*
- c: neuter singular: *kušata*

3. Lengthened grade

r/n-stems:

- a: *uddār* (old)
- b: *partawa* ($r > \emptyset$) (old)

4. The ending -i

- r-stems: *arkuwarri* secondary
- l-stems: *huhupalli* secondary

ADJECTIVES

1. ZERO

u-stem adjectives:	<i>idālu</i>	(old)
i-stem adjectives:	<i>parkui</i>	(old)
predicative participles:	<i>wetan</i>	(old)

2. The ending -a

a-stem adjectives:	<i>arahzena</i>	
i-stem adjectives:	<i>šuppa</i>	(old)
adjectives in -nt:	<i>amiyanda</i>	(old)
attributive participles:	<i>ašanta</i>	
u-stem adjectives :	<i>idalawa</i>	secondary

3. Lengthened grade of the suffix

tamāt:

3.3 HYSTERODYNAMIC NEUTER PLURALS

3.3.1 Introduction

In this section I will discuss those neuter plural formations which have a hysterodynamic structure *CCōr or *CēCōR [gen. *CC-R-ōs]. In the *r/n*-stems the last syllable is characterized by a plene written vowel. This type of accent is not only attested in the *r/n*-stems: it is possible that also the proto-forms of *utnē* 'land' and *NINDA* 's-bread' were hysterodynamic. These formations are usually regarded as plurals: e.g. *ū-i-da-a-ar* is considered characterized (and

plural) as opposed to *watar* 'water'. However, it is often difficult to establish whether a given form with plene written vowel in the final syllable has plural meaning or not. In fact, there is evidence (see below) that a hysterodynamic form can serve as neuter singular as well. However, I will use the term "plural" here.

3.3.2 Simple *r/n*-stems

3.3.2.1 Introduction

The plural of the simple *r/n*-stems is often characterized by a plene written <A> in the final syllable. This *a* is the regular reflex of PIE **ā*. In the source material for this monograph, the lengthened grade occurs in only a few words. All of them, except *taḫattumār* 'incense' (see 2.1.2), are simple *r/n*-stems. Lengthened grade occurs also in *ḫarsār* 'heads', *ḫuitār* 'creatures', *uđdār* 'words, affairs', and *widār* 'waters'.

The plene written vowel of the final syllable is usually identified with the PIE lengthened grade, which is reconstructed for the nom.-acc. neuter plural. The reflex of this ending can still be seen in e.g. Skt. *āhā*, Av. *ayār* 'days', Gk. *ῥῶρ* 'water', Goth. *namona* 'names' < **namōn-a* (< *ā*). The Greek form has singular value. This fits into the theory first proposed by Schmidt 1889: 119ff that the lengthened grade in these words originally indicated a singular collective.

Before embarking on the discussion, I will list the apophony patterns of the *r/n*-stems proposed by Schindler 1975. He reconstructs:

- a: A plural/collective paradigm with the structure nom. **CēC-ār*, gen. **CC-n-ós*, loc. **CC-én*. This is exemplified in 'water', for which word he reconstructs nom. **wédōr*, gen. **uđnós*, loc. **uđén*. This reconstruction is also the basis of this particular plural/collective paradigm. The zero grade in the oblique cases formed the basis of Gk. *ῥῶρ*. Schindler suggests that Hittite *ú-i-da-a-ar* is the direct reflex of the nominative **wédōr*. According to Schindler, the original *e*-grade in the root can still be seen in Greek words like Gk. *πῆλωρ* 'monster' and *τέκωρ* 'token', which kept the original structure.
- b: A static paradigm with the structure nom. **CóC-r*, gen. **CéC-n-s*. This type is represented by Hittite *wa-a-tar* 'water' (< **wódr*), gen. *witenaš*. Schindler also compares Hittite *šakkar* 'dung'. He reconstructs < **sókr*, gen. *šaknaš* 'dung, manure'.

Hoffner 1994, however, has clearly shown that many of the forms which are believed to be genitives of *šakkar* are likely to be genitives of the *n*-stem

**šakan* (declined like *laman* 'name') or of **šakna-* (sumeroqram i 'oil'). This does not exclude *šakkar*, gen. *šaknaš* 'dung, manure'. As Hoffner 1994: 225ff shows, Hittite possesses two words *šaknuwant-*. One has been derived from **šakan* or **šakna-* 'oil' and meant 'oily, fatty', whereas the other *šaknuwant-* meant 'defiled'. The latter must be derived from *šakkar*. The genitive of this *šakkar* must have been **šaknaš* as is proved by the *n* in the adjectival derivative *šaknuwant* 'defiled'.

Schindler does not clearly formulate his thoughts about the origin of the genitive *šaknaš*: "Pour le degré *o* radical, cf. en outre i.e. **sókr-r* dans hitt. *šakkar*, gen. *šaknaš* 'excrément' (à côté du collectif gr. *ῥῶρ*, gen. *ῥωστός*). c: A proterodynamic paradigm with the structure nom. **CēC(C)-r*, gen. **C(C)-én-s*, loc. **C(C)C-én*. This is exemplified in Hittite *paḫḫur* 'fire', gen. *paḫḫuenaš*. The genitive of *watar*, viz. *wetenaš* originated analogous to the proterodynamic *paḫḫuenaš*.⁹⁶

Ablaut pattern *a*: is hysterodynamic, ablaut pattern *b*: is static and ablaut pattern *c*: is proterodynamic (for the terminology, see Beekes 1985 *passim*).

Beekes 1990: 215 distinguishes the following subtypes for the hysterodynamic paradigm:

- a: nom. **CC-ēr*, acc. **CC-ér-m*, gen. **CC-R-ós*, represented by **ph₂ēr* 'father'.
- b: nom. **CēC-ōr*, acc. **CC-ér-m*, gen. **CC-R-ós*, represented by **a^héḡōm*.
- c: nom. **C(e)C-ōr*, acc. **C(e)CoR-m*, gen. **C(e)C-R-ós*, indirectly represented by Gk. *ῥῶρ* 'giver'.
- d: nom. **CēC-R* acc. **CCēr-m* gen. **CC-R-ós* represented by Goth. *bandi* 'handcuff, band'.

The system offered by Schindler is attractive. However, Schindler's type *a*: does not directly yield the Hittite forms. As I will argue in 3.3.2.2 - 3.3.2.7. their proto-form rather has the structure *CCōR*. This has also been argued by Oettinger 1993: 213. Oettinger suggests that in late PIE the accent in collective formations shifted to the last syllable: e.g. **sékōr* > **sekōr* > **škōr* 'dung, manure'. Hittite *šakkar* and Gk. *ῥῶρ* may be the reflex of this form.

In the next sections I will discuss the accentuation of the simple *r/n*-stems which have an etymology. Only *watar* 'water' and *šakkar* 'dung' (no neuter plural has been attested, but since there are forms which point to hystero-

⁹⁶ Not important for our present purposes are the types reconstructed by Schindler **sék^hr* gen. *sék^hns* 'liver' and the type with long final *-ā* represented by Hittite *ḫaldūr* 'brushwood, waste, stubble'.

dynamic inflection, this word must be included in the discussion) have certain etymologies. The etymology of two other words causes more problems: *uttar* 'word, thing, affair' has been compared to Gk. αὔρη (Eichner 1980: 146 n. 69 and 1988: 141) and to Goth. *waiths* (Puhvel 1972: 112). *ḫuitar* 'creature' has been compared to Oic. *vitnir* by Puhvel 1986 for which word he proposes the same meaning.

3.3.2.2 *Widār*

Widār, written *ú-i-da-a-ar*, seems to be the plural of *watar* 'water'. In Old Hittite a difficult form *ú-e-da-ar* which may be a parallel form of *ú-i-da-a-ar* has been attested.

Sometimes in Old Hittite the spelling of *e* in the sequence *we* + dental obstruent varies between <*E*> and <*I*>: we have *wett-* (e.g. *wet[(landanni)]*) KBo 3.22 rev. 64) vs. *witt-* (e.g. *ú-i-it-ti* KUB 29.32 2) from *wett-* 'year'.⁹⁷ Sometimes the plural of 'water' also shows an <*E*>. However, as pointed out by Melchert 1984a: 113 and Starke 1990: 563 n. 2098 *ú-e-da-a-ar* with *e* in the first syllable occurs in later Hittite. Therefore, for Old Hittite I assume phonetic /widār/. Moreover, both the reading and the context of the Old Hittite *ú-e-da-ar* are uncertain.

Most scholars reconstruct the PIE word for 'water' as **wódr*, pl. **wédōr* (e.g. Schindler 1975: 5, Melchert 1984a: 107 and Beekes 1990: 228). However, the Hittite plural *widār* cannot be the direct reflex of **wédōr*.

Firstly, the regular reflex of accented PIE **é* in Hittite is *e*, e.g. *ēšzi* < PIE **ésti* 'he is', *tēkan* < **d^heg^h-m* (Beekes 1985: 46) or **d^hēg^hōm* (e.g. Melchert 1984a: 87ff, Beekes 1990: 218). Therefore, we would always have ***ú-e-da-a-ar* instead of the very frequent *ú-i-da-a-ar*. On the other hand, Melchert 1984a: 104ff (see also Melchert 1994: 101 with ref.) has shown that there is some evidence that unaccented short **e* became Hittite *i*, e.g. *nēpiš* < **nēb^hes* < PIE **nēb^hos*.⁹⁸ Therefore, the *i* in *ú-i-da-a-ar* rather suggests a proto-form **wédōr*. A proto-form **wédōr* is not very likely.

Secondly, the regular reflex of **wédōr* would be ***ú-e-da* without final *r*, because final *r* probably disappeared after an unaccented long vowel (see 3.3.1).

This suggests that the attested Hittite *ú-i-da-a-ar* cannot be the regular

⁹⁷ Melchert 1984a: 112.

⁹⁸ This word has a generalized *e*-grade in the suffix and a fixed stress accent on the root. In *nēpiš*, the first vowel was probably stressed as indicated by the plene writing of the *e*. According to Čop's law 1970: 90f, the geminate *-pp-* in Luwian *tappas-* 'heaven' confirms the root accent in Anatolian (Melchert 1984a: 104f, Melchert 1994: 74, 252f, with ref.).

reflex of *wédōr*, the form reconstructed by Schindler 1975: 4. and that the proto-form may have been **wedōr*.

Melchert 1984a: 107 and 1994: 101 offers the following solution: he assumes a development in which the accent secondarily shifted to the second syllable: **wédōr* > **wedōr*. For this shift of accent Melchert 1988a: 227 n. 1 parallels the hysterodynamic *ai*-stems, e.g. *ḫastāi* 'bone(s)' < **h₂ésti(h₂)ōi*, *luttāi* 'window' < **léu(h)toi* 'open space' and the *au*-stem *ḫarganāu* 'palm' < **h₃regnōu* 'surface'. Melchert assumes that this stem class originally had the same accent pattern as **wédōr*. Since plene writing as a rule implies accent (Kimball 1983: passim), the frequent plene writing of the final syllable in the *ai*-stems probably also indicates accent. According to Melchert this proves the shift of accent to the last syllable.

Oettinger 1993: 212f also suggests that the accent secondarily shifted to the final syllable. For this he parallels, among other forms, *a-aš-šu-u* < *h₃osūh₂*, where the accent shifted to the final syllable. He suggests that the zero grade in the nom. acc. of e.g. *uddār* originated in the oblique cases. From the oblique cases the zero grade expanded to the nom. acc. He suggests "Als reliktfom überlebte **wédōr* im Hethitischen."

Melchert's explanation is logical, but not compelling: firstly, we have to assume a three step chronology 1: shift of accent, 2: *r* > *θ* after long unaccented vowels, 3: in **wedōr* the *r* was restored on the analogy of singular *watar*. This problem can be met with the assumption that in this constellation the loss of final *-r* took place only after the shift of accent to the final syllable.

The following objection is more serious: the *ai*-stems in Hittite do not give much evidence for a shift of accent to the final syllable: as will be explained in the next paragraphs, we would have more cases of *i* in the first syllable as remnants of an original *e*.

The material of the *ai*-stems is difficult to interpret. Often it is not possible to determine the original value of the vowel in the root syllable. This can easily be illustrated by *ḫastāi* 'bone, skeleton' < **h₃estoi*. The sequence **h₃é* becomes *ḫa*, cf. *ḫaran-* 'eagle' < **h₃er-*, Gk. ὄρνις. **h₃C* also becomes *ḫa*, e.g. *ḫarganāu* 'palm, sole' < **h₃regnōw* 'that which can be stretched' and *ḫapus* 'shaft, penis' vs. Gk. ὄρτω < PIE **h₃pus-ye/o-* 'marry, mount sexually' also indicate that **h₃C* becomes *ḫa*. If the proto-form were **h₃ce/pus-*, Hittite would have had *pp*, because of Sturtevant's law (PIE *T* > *TT*). Hittite also fails to indicate the second member of a cluster if this is a geminate stop in e.g. *sipant* (/spant/), cf. Lat. *spondēo*. Therefore, also *ḫapus* points to **h₃C* > *ḫa* (see also Melchert 1987 and 1994: 72 with ref.). Moreover, there is no evidence for the outcome of unaccented **h₃e*.

Therefore, it is not possible to determine the original root vocalism of *haštai-*, and *haštai* gives no conclusive proof for shift of accent. The same applies for *luttai*: the proto form of this word can be **léutōi*, **lutōi* or **leutōi*. Again, no positive evidence is found for shift of accent.

It is only possible to prove shift of accent in the *ai*-stems if one looks for words which have an *i* in the first syllable. The *i* would be reflex of unaccented *e* which resulted from the shift of accent to the last syllable. Weitenberg 1979 passim mentions four *ai*-stems with an *i* or *e* in the first syllable: *ištarnigai-*, *lingai-*, *šeḫuwai-* and *ši(e)ššai-*. These four words do not appear to be primary. Two of them are derivatives: *ištarnigai-* (KUB 29.1 ii 32) is a derivative of *ištarni(n)k-* 'fall ill', and *lingai-* 'oath' is a derivative of *link-* 'swear'. *Šeḫuwai-* (a hapax in KBo 1.11 ii 15) occurs in an unintelligible line in an Akkadian text and proves nothing. *Ši(e)ššai-*⁹⁹ may be, with Oettinger 1979: 474 ("Raubtier-zahn") a derivative of the verb *šišie-(h)hi-* 'press'.

The evidence for *i* < unaccented **e* in the *ai*-stems, which we would expect if the accent shifted to the last syllable, is difficult. Therefore, one cannot be certain whether the *ai*-stems show shift of accent: the *a* in *šagai*, *haštai-* etc. may point to an *o* grade or to a zero grade.

Therefore, it is possible that the pene-*-āi* in the hysterodynamic *ai*-stems is the reflex of an originally accented long vowel and that we have zero grade in the root. Two factors point to an original structure **CCōi* for the hysterodynamic *ai*-stems: firstly, the absence of any trace of an original **e* and, secondly, the frequent pene writing of the last syllable. As a consequence, there is no overall proof for shift of accent in the hysterodynamic neuter *ai*-stems.

Because there is no positive proof for shift of accent and because of the restructuring needed if one derives *widār* from *wédōr*, it is necessary to look for other explanations of Hittite *ú-i-da-a-ar*.

Gertz 1982: 295 argues that the final pene <A> reflects an originally long accented vowel. She points out that among the cognates we do not find good evidence for an accented *e*-grade in the root: Armenian *get* 'river' is regarded by Meillet 1936: 73 as an original *s*-stem **wedēs*, cf. Skt. *út-s-ah*. Forms like

⁹⁹ KUB 29.1 ii 42c: *Ki-nu-pi-ma-aš-ša-an anda SA URMAḫ ši-e-ša-i pašanaš UZU* (or *šū-ši-ša-i šumamaḫ n-a-al* *harak*. Kellerman 1980: 28 translates "dans le *kinubi* un *šišai* de lion et un *šišai* de panthère et tiens le." In the commentary (with lit.) she concludes that the *šišai* is a small organ, which can be put together with an other *šišai* in a human heart. In KUB 9.31 18 it is combined with the adjective *daššu* 'strong'. Therefore, *šišai* may be small strong organ.

OCS *wědro* 'bucket' and OE *wæt* are derivatives "and "Phrygian" *bedu* 'water' is not at all well established." Because she finds no good comparative evidence for an *e*-grade, Gertz follows Hart 1980: 13 n. 29 and considers <*ú-i-*> to be an original zero grade containing an *i* which replaced inherited *u* "for some as yet undiscovered reason" (p. 295).

Gertz proposes original singular **wōdr* and plural **uōdr*. According to Gertz, Gk. *ῥῶρ* is the genuine reflex of the plural with the recessive shift of accent in neuters, which is usual in Greek.

Melchert 1988a: 227 n. 1 rejects the interpretations of Gertz and Hart, because they do not offer an explanation for the *i* in *widār*: Melchert simply explains this *i* by means of an originally unaccented **e*.

For the unexplained *i*, I propose the following: a paradigm sg. */watar/* (with *u*), pl. */uđār/* (without *u*) seems awkward. That is why the *w* was reintroduced. In other words *uđōr* >> *widōr*, perhaps via *uđōr*. The *i* must have come from the oblique cases in the singular (**witen-*). If this *i* originated from *e*, one can assume that the replacement of *uđār* for *widār* took place early, in any case before unaccented *e* became *i*. Support for zero grade in the paradigm of *watar* is furnished by Luwian *ú-tar* (for textual references see Starke 1990: 565f). Despite Melchert 1993: 247 ("preposterous"), there is nothing against taking *útar-ša* as 'water' in e.g. KUB 35.54 iii 37 because it is used as object of the verb *lahunji-* 'pour out'. In KUB 35.88 iii 1'ff *útar-ša* is used near *šūwa-* 'fill'. Luwian also points to *uđār*.

To sum up, a plural **uđōr* from *watar* does not fit into the pattern proposed by Schindler. If PIE indeed ever had a proto-form *wédōr*, it would have been restructured in Proto-Anatolian. Hittite does not give positive support for PIE *wédōr*. **Uđōr* has a consonant structure *CCōR*, which is one of the sub-types reconstructed by Beekes 1990: 215. As such, it perfectly parallels Gk. *ῥῶρ*.

3.3.2.3 Uđār

Uđār, the plural of *uttar* 'word, thing' is written <*UD-DA-A-AR*>. Two etymologies have been suggested: the first connects *uttar* with Gk. *αὐδή* 'voice, sound' (e.g. Eichner 1980: 146 n. 69, Schindler apud Eichner 1988: 141, Oettinger 1979: 458), while the other connects this word with Goth. *wathts* 'thing' (Puhvel 1972: 112). These two etymologies both offer problems, and the details remain unexplained.

Schindler and Eichner reconstruct a PIE nom. sg. **h₂wódh₂r*. They suggest that this word existed alongside **h₂eud-eh₂*, which is reflected in Gk. *αὐδή* and

Skt. *vádati* 'speak'.¹⁰⁰ Eichner 1988: 141 suggests that **h₂wódh₂r* regularly yields Hittite ***waddar*, with loss of the first **h₂* in the vicinity of an *o*-grade (Saussure's Law).

Eichner 1980: 146 n. 69 and Oettinger both claim that ***waddar* can still be found in *watarnah₂*- 'inform' and in the singular *uttar* 'word, thing, affair', with zero grade from the oblique cases (Eichner 1980: 146 n. 69).

For several reasons this connection is problematic. Firstly, the alleged allomorphs *utt-*, found in *uttar*, and *wat-*, found in *watarnah₂*- 'instruct, charge', cannot belong to the same root. Eichner fails to account for the single *<T>* in *watarnah₂*- 'inform'. Oettinger 1979: 458 offers an explanation for the *<TT>* in *uttar*. He also identifies *uttar* with Gk. αὐδή *< *h₂wed-* and reconstructs **h₂wodr* with only one laryngeal. He suggests that the *tt* originated from "Verschärfung" of the *d* in front of syllabic *r*. In *watarnah₂*- *< *h₂wod-r-neh₂* we would also have had double *<TT>*, if it were indeed a derivative of *uttar*, as Oettinger suggests. Moreover, if "Verschärfung" in *uttar* occurred in front of a syllabic resonant, we would have had **wattar* for 'water' instead of *watar*: this has been reconstructed as **wódr*. Therefore, the connection between *watarnah₂*- 'inform' and *uttar* 'word' is not as attractive as it looks at first sight. Melchert 1994: 50, ignoring Oettinger's solution, simply denies the connection of *uttar* with Gk. αὐδή and writes "this is precluded by the lack of aspiration in Skt. *vad-* 'speak'". For the aspiration cf. Skt. *mahás* *< *mégh₂*. To Melchert one can object that the second **h₂* is not necessarily a part of the root. In αὐδή the laryngeal may be part of the suffix, in *vad-* the laryngeal may never have been present at all.

Secondly, the loss of **h₂* in the vicinity of syllables containing an *o*-grade is not unproblematic in Hittite. The evidence cited by Eichner (*warša-* 'gutter'(?), *innaru-* 'strong' and *wawarkima-* 'door-hinge') poses some problems.

Eichner 1980: 129 n. 41, followed by Melchert 1994: 49, remotely compares *warša-* with Gk. ἀέρος. He (Eichner 1988: 140) reconstructs this form as **h₂worso-* or **h₂worsel₂*. In Greek, however, this form is only attested in Hesychius, who signals that it is a Cretan form meaning 'dew'. Semantically, therefore, this etymology is difficult. There are also phonological difficulties: in Cretan the reflexes of initial laryngeals in front of consonants seem to be different from the reflexes in other dialects, cf. ἀναπρος, which parallels ὄνειρος 'dream' (Beekes 1969: 260f). For 'dew' Homer only has ἑρση. This form suggests PIE **h₁wers-* (Beekes 1969: 64).

In **innaru* 'vigorous' (attested in e.g. *innarawant-* 'strong'), which is reconstructed by Eichner 1988: 141 as **en-h₂noru* 'having strength inside', cf. Gk. ἀνῖπ, one can assume loss of **h₂* because of Saussure's law (loss of **h₂* in the vicinity of *o*) as suggested by Melchert 1994: 50. Melchert does not exclude regular loss of **h₂* between nasals. This may be corroborated by the fact that there is no further evidence for the reflex of a laryngeal between two resonants in Hittite (Beekes 1988a: 85). It is also possible that **h₂* vocalized and that **innaru* *>* *innaru* with haplology.

The third piece of evidence for the loss of **h₂* in the vicinity of **o* is better: *wawarkima-* 'door-hinge, door-socket' and *hurki-* 'wheel' may be an allomorph pair derived from the PIE root **h₂werg^(h)*. (The connection of these two words has firstly been suggested by Kronasser 1957: 122). Semantically, the etymology runs as follows: 'turn' *>* 'turning point' *>* 'the place where the door turns' *>* 'doorhinge'. This root is also found in e.g. Skt. *urnākti*, *várjati* 'turns', aor. *áurnák* (here the laryngeal has disappeared with compensatory lengthening of the augment) and Lat. *vergo* 'bend, incline'. According to Eichner 1988: 141 and Schindler apud Eichner, *hurki-* represents the zero grade of this root. In *wawarkima-* the root is attested in the *o*-grade (**h₂worg-* with reduplication).¹⁰¹ *Wawarkima* can be a derivative of PIE **h₂worgéie-*, in which **h₂* has disappeared in front of a syllable containing an *o*. Thus, the outcome of **worg-* would be Hittite *wark-* and there are no objections against a derivative of *wawarkima-* from **h₂work-*.

In addition to the evidence for "Saussure's Law" cited above, Melchert 1994: 50, following Catsanicos 1991, mentions among other things *wašta(i)-* 'sin, miss the mark'. Melchert reconstructs a root **h₂wemst-*. Hittite *wašta(i)-*, without initial *h* has been caused by the original *o*-grade in the strong stem of the *hi*-conjugation verbs: **h₂wemst-* *>* **wemst-* *>* *wašt-*. Melchert, citing Catsanicos 1986: 168, further mentions Hittite *kalmara* 'ray, beam' *<* **Kolh₂moro-*.

Thus, *wawarkima* *<* **wo-worg*, *kalmara* *<* **Kolh₂moro-* and *wašta(i) <* **h₂wemst-* might support the loss of **h₂* in *uttar* *<* **h₂wódh₂r*.

However, if we accept the proto-form reconstructed by Schindler and Eichner, more obstacles have to be surmounted:

The two proto-forms sg. **h₂wódh₂r*, pl. **h₂wédh₂ör* – according to the

be **h₂wed-* and therefore we would have a Schwebelablaut, which is unusual.

¹⁰¹ Berman 1972: 178 points out that the suffix *-ima-* is frequently used with reduplicating roots, e.g. *lalukkima-* 'illumination'.

¹⁰⁰ The connection with Skt. *vádati* is problematic. For this word the reconstruction would

scheme drawn up by Schindler – do not directly result in the attested *uttar*, pl. *uddār*: we would have ***waddar*, pl. ***huddār*. Neither the singular, nor the plural can be regular.

Eichner 1980: 146 n. 69 and Starke 1990: 500 n. 1843 reconstruct a nom. acc. neuter plural with zero grade in the root (also Starke reconstructs a zero grade **h₂udh₂-ōr*). This is also problematic: we would expect a neuter plural ***huddār* because initial **h₂wC* yields Hittite *hu-*, e.g. *h₂want-* 'wind' < PIE **h₂wh₁ént_s*. The regular outcome of the singular **h₂wódh₂-r* would be ***waddar* (with loss of initial **h₂* in front of a syllable containing an *o*-grade). Thus, Starke and Eichner need extensive analogous levelling in order to get attested *uttar*, pl. *uddār*.

To sum up, the connection of Hittite *uttar* with Gk. αὐτή is difficult, although it is semantically attractive.

Puhvel 1972: 112 thinks that the connection of *uttar* with Gk. αὐτή does pose semantic difficulties. He points out that the meaning of *uttar* is not confined to the notion of sound: besides 'word', it also means 'affair, matter'. Puhvel 1972: p. 112 offers a semantically more straightforward etymology. He connects *uttar* with, among others, Goth. *waits* and OCS *vesti* 'thing, affair'. He reconstructs a PIE root **wekt-* and suggests that the double <TT> in Hittite *uttar* is the product of assimilation. He suggests that assimilation of **kt > tt* is paralleled in *luttai* 'window' < **leuk-* plus a dental suffix. The development of meaning in Hittite *kallar uttar* 'malicious entity, demon' finds its parallel in OE and OHG *whit* 'demon'. Semantically, this suggestion is very attractive.

However, a PIE **wekt-* seems unusual. The forms outside Hittite can be reconstructed as **wek + ti-* (Pokorny 1949-1959: 1136). If Puhvel's etymology is correct, prehistoric Hittite must have had a dental suffix without *i*. This **wekt-* must have been adapted to the simple *r/n*-stems and must have received a syllabic final *r*, thus becoming, with zero grade **ukr-*. Kimball 1983: 775 accepts Schindler's ablaut pattern and Puhvel's etymology. She suggests that the singular *uttar* and the plural **uktōr* both received their zero grade from the oblique cases because there is no basis for assuming a sound change **wē > u*. The singular *uttar* probably received its zero grade from the plural. Melchert 1994: 156 rejects assimilation of **kt > tt* because of *saktā(i)-* 'sick-maintain' < Proto-Anatolian **sokto-* 'sickness'. For the source of *luttai* see Melchert 1984a: 71.

Therefore, phonologically, to derive *uttar* from a root **wekt-* is also problematic.

To sum up, the plural *ud-da-a-ar* is a difficult form. At the very best, it is possible to contend that it is a hysterodynamic formation because of the plene written vowel in the final syllable. In favour of original zero grade in the root, one can argue that *uddār* cannot have originated from *wéktōr*, because this form would yield ***wétta*, if **kt > tt* (for the lack of final *-r* see 3.3.1). A plural **h₂wédh₂ōr* would yield ***huetta*, whereas a form with zero grade **h₂uddōr* would yield ***huddār*. Therefore, it is only possible that the initial *u* in *uddār* may be the reflex of an original zero grade.

3.3.2.4 Šakkar

Although in the source material for this monograph the neuter plural of *šakkar* has not been attested, it is instructive to discuss this word, because of its etymology.

Šakkar 'dung, manure' is related to Gk. αῶπ 'dung'. As its plural/collective Schindler 1975: 4 reconstructs **sēkōr*, gen. **sknēs*. According to Schindler, the Greek word received its zero grade from the oblique cases.

In Hittite this word is an *r/n*-stem, as is indicated by *šaknuwant-* 'defiled', the derivative in *-want-* (see 3.3.2.1). Its genitive must have been *šaknaš* with zero grade in the suffix.

For Hittite *šakkar* Schindler (p. 5) assumes original singular **sōk-r*. Phonologically, this reconstruction is impeccable: **sōk-r* would indeed yield *šakkar* with double *kk* because of Sturtevant's law. Also in front of a syllabic resonant, original PIE voiceless stops are written double, e.g. *appan* 'behind' < **h₁op-m*. From Schindler's article we have to infer that he thinks that originally the genitive was **sēk-n-s*, as he reconstructs for the "flexion acrostatique I". He suggests that this **sēk-n-s* had been replaced by a hysterodynamic, accented, genitive. Therefore, in Schindler's train of thought, there is a static nominative < **sōk-r*, with a secondary hysterodynamic genitive.

It is also possible to reconstruct for both Greek and Hittite a proto-form *skōr* for the following reasons:¹⁰² firstly, the first syllable is never written plene, which would be expected for the proto-form **sōkr*.¹⁰³ Secondly, there is also a variant *zakkar* 'faeces'. Melchert 1994: 121 points out that the initial *z-* is paralleled by *zašgaraiš-* 'anus', which normally has initial *š*. He suggests that this is probably due to a zero grade: **/sk/ > /tsk/* and that the zero grade is

¹⁰² See also Oettinger 1993: 213 for Gk. ὄωπ and αῶπ.

¹⁰³ This argument is not compelling. Plene writing is more frequent in Old Hittite than in Young Hittite, *ša-ak-ka-ar* as nominative occurs only in young manuscripts (see Kimball 1983: 773).

the weak stem of the collective plural.

Therefore, one may assume that the final syllable of the nom. acc. did not contain a syllabic resonant in prehistoric Hittite but a "full" vowel.

To sum up, in view of the genitive *saknas* and because of the indications that the spelling suggests *skōr*, I assume that prehistoric Hittite had a hysterodynamic paradigm: for the prehistoric nominative I suggest **skōr*. Perhaps its prehistoric genitive was **sk-n-ós* with zero grade in the root just like Gk. *οξάτος* may have contained a zero grade in both the suffix and the root.

3.3.2.5 *Huitār*

Huitār 'creatures', the plural of *huitar*, is written *hu-i-ta-a-ar*. The plene written vowel of the final syllable resembles the plene written vowel in *ú-i-da-a-r* 'quantities of) water' and in *ul-da-a-ar* 'words'. Because the plene written vowel of the final syllable contrasts with the non-plene written vowel of the final syllable in *[hu]-i-ta-ar* StBoT 25.19 obv. 14', 15' (OHC) and *hu-i-tar* KBo 10.29 iv 11 (13th century, Starke 1990: 561), one can safely assume that the plene written vowel of the final syllable in the Old Hittite instances indicates plural number.

However, it is not certain whether *huitār*, attested in Old Hittite, has directly been inherited from Proto-Anatolian: there are indications suggesting that *huitar* is a Luwian word.

In the Anatolian languages several words seem to belong to the same cluster as *huitar*: words having an *s* in the root are Hittite *hūšu-* 'raw, fresh, alive', *hūi(s)-* 'live', *hūšwai-* 'live', *hūšwant-* 'alive' and *hūšnu-*, its causative. Words having a dental in their root are Luwian *huidwali-* 'alive' and *huidumar* 'life'. We also have *huitar* pl. *huitār* 'creature(s)'. Finally we have HLuv. (BESTIA)CURRERE-*sā-ra/i* /Huisar/ and (BESTIA)CURRERE-*tara/i* /Huitar/ (Melchert 1994: 240, 262 and 273).

Oettinger 1979: 116f, followed by Starke 1990: 560ff, suggests that the <I> in the Hittite words represents /e/: we have Hittite */hues-/* 'live'. According to Oettinger, its zero grade is found in e.g. Old Hittite *hūšwant-* 'alive' < PIE **h₂us* 'dwell, reside'. Oettinger concludes that Hittite *hues-* and Luwian *huid-* are not derived from the same root: if *huid-* had *e*-vocalism, Luwian would have had an *a* (cf. Luwian *kuwar-* as opposed to Hittite *kuar* 'cut').

The assumption that the Hittite words had an *e* in the root is problematic, however: Weitenberg 1984: 104 signals that the instances with *e* only occur in young manuscripts. Thus, we have to assume for older Hittite *hūi-* and not **hues-*. This makes the connection with PIE **h₂u(e)s-* weak. Moreover,

Kimball 1983: 74 points out that Hittite *hūi-* shows no trace of the meaning 'dwell, reside', which is the meaning for PIE **h₂wes-*: all the instances of *hūi-* point to 'live'.

Therefore, as pointed out by Weitenberg 1984: 106, *hūi-* vs. *hūs*¹⁰⁴ cannot be caused by inherited ablaut. We rather have (with Kimball 1983: 80) a misinterpretation of a full grade on the analogy of e.g. *kuw/ku-* 'cut' and *huk/huk-* 'conjure'. Therefore, *hūs-* must be a secondary zero grade.

To sum up, Hittite has *hūi-* 'live' and not *hues-*. Therefore, we have Hittite *hūi-* 'live' and Luwian *huit-* 'live'. Both words have *i*-vocalism in the root.

As to the origin of *huitar*, 'creatures' the opinions diverge. Because *huitar* would be the only Hittite word in the cluster 'live' having a dental, it has been argued that this word is a loan from Luwian.

Puhvel 1986 connects *huitar* with Oic. *vitnir*. This word occurs only, and very rarely, in poetry and probably means 'wolf', because it refers to the wolf Fenrir. *Vitnir* is normally connected with *vita* 'know' or *vita* 'observe'. Therefore, *vitnir* originally meant 'the clever one'. Puhvel, on the other hand, argues that *vitnir* does not only mean 'wolf' (for 'wolf' we have *úlfr* and *vargr*), but that it means rather 'creature', because in compounds, e.g. *mávitnir* 'sword' and *grafvitnir* 'snake' (lit. grave-creature) *vitnir* cannot mean 'wolf'. Therefore, he suggests that 'creature' is a more appropriate meaning. This suggestion is questionable because kennings like *graf-vitnir* frequently occur in Old Icelandic poetry, e.g. *gjálf-eldr* (lit. 'sea-fire') 'gold', *gjálf-dýr* (lit. 'sea-animal') 'ship' and *vág-marr* (lit. 'wave-horse') also meaning 'ship'.¹⁰⁵ Here we can easily see that the separate parts of these kennings consist of words of which the meaning is different from the compound itself. Therefore, there is nothing against taking *graf-vitnir* as 'grave-wolf' meaning the snake 'Ormr'.

As to the phonology of *huitar*, Starke 1990: 563 n. 2098 has pointed out that Puhvel's reconstruction **Huedr-/Huedn-* fails to account for Hittite *i*.

To sum up, Puhvel's etymology of *huitar* is not very strong.

Weitenberg 1984: 111 tries to explain the difference between *huit-* and *hūi-* by suggesting Proto-Anatolian **huid-*. The Hittite word family *hūi-* originated from **huid-y*, which became *hūi-* through assimilation. Luwian *huid-* would be a direct descendant, whereas *huitar* originated from *huit-ar*, without *y*.

¹⁰⁴ E.g. LUGAL-*u* *hūšuwanza* *Éštu* 'Let the king be alive!', i.e. 'Hail to the king!' KBo 25.112 ii 4.

¹⁰⁵ Kindly mentioned to me by A. de Leeuw van Weenen.

Starke 1990: 560ff objects that in Hittite *hūiš-* the development **dy > š* cannot be proved. He posits two different roots: *hūit-*, (he suggests that this word is Luwian) and Hittite *hues-* (*hues-*, however, is questionable because Hittite has *hūiš-*). In favour of Luwian origin he argues that in the genitive *hūitnaš* there is no assimilation of **tn* to *nn*. This assimilation is normal in Hittite, e.g. in *-annaš < *atnaš*, the genitive of nouns containing the suffix *-atar*. This argument, however, is not compelling: *utnē* (see 3.3.4) provides some evidence for Hittite **tn < dn*. Secondly, the *t-* may have been retained because of paradigmatic pressure, which was strong because the *t* belongs to the root (see Weitenberg 1984: 110, Tischler 1983: 269 with lit.).

The following arguments adduced by Starke are more convincing: in Bo 4143 i? 3' a Luwian nom. acc. neuter in *-ša* has been attested: *hū-u-i-tar-ša*. Secondly, the last syllable of *hūitar* has never been found written with the sign <TA-R>, it always has <TA-AR> or <TA-A-AR>. Starke argues that this constellation never occurs in genuine Hittite: we never have **wa-a-ta-ar*. In Luwian words <TA-AR> is not uncommon, e.g. *ū-ta-a[r-ša]*.

In summing up, it is not possible to state with certainty whether *hūitar* is Luwian or Hittite or both Luwian and Hittite.

To explain the *i* in *hū-i-ta-a-ar*, there are several possibilities.

A first solution is offered by Kimball 1983: 70ff. She implicitly assumes that *hūitar* is Hittite. Because a short accented vowel followed by *d* yields Luwian *dd*, (Luwian *adduwāl(i) < *ēdwāl-*, vs. Hittite *idāhu* 'evil, bad'), the single dental, according to Kimball, points to a Proto-Anatolian long root vowel. Kimball reconstructs an *i*-diphthong in the root, attested both in Hittite and Luwian, and assumes **h₂/3wēid^(h)-* or **h₂/3wēit-* to be the proto-form. In this root the diphthong **ei* monophthongized and yielded long *i*, which subsequently caused lenition of the following consonant.

However, it is not likely that this word contained an *ei*. If the root contained an **ei* which was monophthongized we would have an *e* and not an *i* in *hūitar*, because **ei* in Hittite probably monophthongized into *e* (Melchert 1984a: 67ff). Therefore, we have to assume a prehistoric Hittite root **hūid-*. A voiceless *t* is impossible because of Sturtevant's law. If the assumption of *hūid-* with voiced *d* is correct, *hū-i-ta-a-ar* must have had a zero grade in the root, just like the predecessors of *ū-i-da-a-ar* and *ud-da-a-ar*.

On the other hand, if *hūitar* is Luwian, as suggested by Starke, there are more possibilities for the origin of the root vocalism: firstly, the full grade **h₂/3wēid^(h)-* or **h₂/3wēit-* as assumed by Kimball, because Luwian **ei* monophthongized into *i* (cf. *itar < *h₁ei-t(o)r*). Secondly, we may have a zero grade

**h₂/3wid^(h)-* or **h₂/3wit-*. A last possibility is mentioned by Melchert 1994: 273. He assumes that *hūitar* is Luwian < Proto-Anatolian **Hues*. Following Čop 1965: 117, he assumes that Hieroglyphic Luwian **s > voiced z* before a sonorant in Luwian and then became *d* before a voiced consonant. This would explain the Luwian *d*. The *i* can be explained by the Luwian sound law **e > i* after *w* in front of a dental stop (Melchert 1994: 241). Since this is the only Luwian example of this sound law Melchert gives, his explanation of *hūitar* remains uncertain.

To sum up, if *hūitar* is Hittite, we can reconstruct here too the same zero grade in the root and lengthened grade in the suffix as in *uddār* and *widār*. If *hūitar* is Luwian we have either a zero grade or an old full grade in the root.

3.3.2.6 The genitive of the simple *r/n*-stems

Hittite provides some evidence that the nom. acc. neuter plural of the simple *r/n*-stems had the structure *CCōR*, e.g. *ū-i-da-a-ar*, *ša-ak-ka-ar* and *ud-da-a-ar*. *hūitar* is less certain, but it shows the same long vowel of the final syllable, which is characteristic of the hysterodynamic inflection.

One may argue that the genitive of these words is hysterodynamic (structure *CC-n-ōs*) too.¹⁰⁶ An argument is provided by the structure of the genitive: if the paradigm of these words were proterodynamic or static, the suffix of the simple *r/n*-stems would have had accented **ē*. This is not what we find: in Hittite we do not have e.g. ***uddenaš* from *uttar* 'word, thing, affair', ***šakkenaš* from *šakkar* or ***hūitenaš* from *hūitar*. Instead, the genitive of the simple *r/n*-stems only shows *-n-* or *-an-*: *uddanaš*, *hūitnaš* et cetera. This implies that the suffix appeared in the zero grade.

Not important for our argument is the distribution between *-n-* and *-an-*: we have *uddan-* from *uttar*, 'word', *paddan-* from *pattar* 'basket', which can be derived from PIE **peth₂-* 'spread wide, spread open' (Kimball 1983: 774 remarks that *pattar* presumably was a wide-mouthed, relatively small basket) and *kuttan-* from *kuttar* (part of the body), which can be compared to Lat. *guttur* 'neck'. The oblique cases of these words are formed with the suffix *-an-*. On the other hand, we find *šakn-* from *šakkar* 'dung, manure' and *lamn-* from *lammar* < **nōm-r* 'moment, instant' (not attested in older Hittite). This word is related to Lat. *numerus* 'number'.

At first sight there is an unpredictable variety. However, a closer look suggests a distribution between *-n-* and *-an-* (I only cite words which have a

¹⁰⁶ Only *wetenaš*, the genitive of *watar* has an *e* in the suffix. This *e* may have arisen analogous to *paḥḥuenaš* (Schindler 1975: 7).

relatively simple and straightforward explanation):

A: *CCCN-* (the third consonant is *h*₂) yields *-an-*:

- 1: **h₂udh₂-n-ós* (among others Eichner) yields *uddanaš*.
- 2: **pth₂nós* yields *paddanaš*.

B: *CCn* yields *-n-*:

- 1: **sknós* yields *šaknaš*.
- 2: **nomn-ós* yields *lamn-aš*.

3.3.2.7 Conclusion

The simple *r/n*-stems show traces of original hysterodynamic inflection. In pre-hittite Hittite the nom. acc. neuter plural had zero grade in the root, whereas the suffix had an accented long vowel: **CēCōR*. The oblique cases, on the other hand, had zero grade in the suffix.

It is necessary to emphasize explicitly that, from the semantic point of view, plural value is not always clear: in older Hittite *ú-i-da-a-ar* only seems to be plural when it is preceded by a numeral (see 2.1.2) higher than one. The instances of *huitār* do not give positive evidence for plural meaning either. Only *uddār* seems to mean 'words' in contrast to singular *uttar*. And even in this word, it is easy to translate *uddār* as a collective, viz. 'speech' > 'words', when it is not preceded by a plural pronoun: only *kē uddār* must be translated as 'these words'.

Bearing in mind that it is often difficult to draw a sharp distinction between singular and plural in the simple *r/n*-stems, we now turn to the *r/n*-stems with the complex suffixes *-ēššar*, *-atar* and *-(a)war*.

3.3.3 Complex *r/n*-stems

3.3.3.1 Discussion

The plural of the complex *r/n*-stems *-atar*, *-ēššar* and *-(a)war* rarely has a final *-r*, e.g. *hattata* from *hattata* 'wisdom'. The first attempts to account for the *r*-less forms have been made by Eichner 1973: 92 n. 35 and Neu 1982. Eichner 1973: 98 n. 78 suggests that final *-r* disappeared after an unaccented final vowel. For the *-r* attested after an original unaccented final vowel he gives the following explanation: the *-r* in the *r/n*-stems which did not have an accented final vowel (e.g. *watar* < **wōdr* 'water' and *pahhur* < *pēh₂ur* 'fire') has been restored on the analogy of the final *-r* in e.g. *uddār* and *widār*. An essential result of Neu's investigation is the observation that the *r*-less forms of the complex *r/n*-stems are archaisms.

Gertz 1982: 297 suggests that the difference between *uppeššar* 'sending' and *widār* 'rations of water', i.e. plene written vowel of the final syllable

vs. non-plene written vowel of the final syllable, may have been caused by a different position of the accent. However, she does not elaborate on this in detail, nor does she take the *r*-less forms into account.

Melchert 1988a: 222 discusses the origin of the *r*-less forms in detail. He signals that these forms are only found in the complex *r/n*-stems, which have the suffixes *-atar*, *-ēššar* or *-(a)war*. He modifies Eichner's rule and suggests that the loss of final *-r* occurred only after an unaccented long vowel. Melchert reconstructs the structure of the *r*-less forms as **CVCēCōR*. He (223ff) suggests the following subsequent phonological rules:

- 1: Final *-r* disappeared after unstressed long vowels (here originated the forms without final *-r*, e.g. *wagešša*, < **CēCōR*). Additional proof for accented *e* in nouns with the suffix *-ēššar* is, of course, given by the fact that we always find *e* in the nouns with the suffix *-ēššar*, which reflects earlier **ē* (Melchert 1984a: 87ff). The fact that this *e* is the reflex of older accented **ē* proves that the last syllable was unaccented. This rule did not apply to the forms with final *-r*, because we always have final *-r*, e.g. 1^{NINDA} *wageššar* < **ēšš₂r*.
 - 2: Final *-r* disappeared after every unstressed vowel. This law ceased to operate before syllabic *-r* became *-r*.
 - 3: Syllabic *-r* vocalized. Hence we always have final *-r* in *watar* < **wōdr*.
- The proto-forms of the *r*-less forms are: **-ēššōr* (for the nouns ending in *-ēššar*) and *-ēh₂tōr* (for the nouns ending in *-atar*).

For the nouns in *-(a)war* the situation is more complicated. Most of the nouns in *-war* are verbal substantives, e.g. *tiy₂war* from *dai-* 'put' and *ninink₂war* from *ninink-* 'offer'. There is also a small set of nouns in *-āwar*, of which the most frequent are: *karāwar* 'horn', *partāwar* 'wing', *ašāwar* 'sheepfold' and *haršāwar* 'plowed field'. The first element of this set of nouns is *karā-*, *partā-*, *ašā-* and *haršā-*. The second element is *-war*, probably the same suffix as *-war*, which is found in the verbal substantives. Eichner 1973: 92 n. 35 and Nussbaum 1986: 32ff suggest that the suffix *-war* is a collective suffix. For e.g. *karāwar* Eichner suggests **kreh₂* plus *-war*, Nussbaum **kreh₂* plus **wōr*, and *-un-* in the oblique cases. Melchert 1984a: 63 objects that if the proto-form were to have had a long final vowel we would have had ***-wār* as e.g. in *ú-i-da-a-ar*. However, Melchert 1988 himself solves this problem: he convincingly argues that **CēCōR* > Hittite *CēCa*: the *r*-less form is exactly what we expect. This suggests sg. *-ēh₂-ur* and pl. *-ēh₂-wōr*.

As to the phonetics, Melchert's argumentation seems sound and convincing. Thus, the *r*-less forms originally had a structure *CVC-ēCōR*.

The material mentioned sub 2.2.2 clearly shows that the semantics of

Melchert's argumentation are weaker: only *partawa* 'wings' is a simple and straightforward plural. In fact, there is nothing which suggests that the oldest instance, Old Hittite *L0SU.GI-ešša* is plural. It rather means 'senate, old men's council'. We would rather label this form as singular (collective).

As the material presented in part 2 clearly shows, grammatical number for the neuter nouns can often only be established by means of 'circumstantial evidence', i.e. agreement with adjectives or pronouns. Melchert 1988: 217f lists the following evidence in which the *r*-less form agrees with plural modifiers:

- a: *partawa-šše/its-wa amiwanda* 'Its wings are small.' KUB 17.10 i 38, KUB 33.5 ii 13

This instance has been cited sub 2.2.2.

- b: *hattata humanta* 'all your wisdom' KUB 30.10 i 11

This instance has been cited sub 2.2.2.

- c: *[išha]rnuwanda alwanzata* 'vicious (lit. bloody) spells' KUB 24.9 i 39

In the following two instances the *r*-less form agrees with a neuter *u*-stem adjective. Melchert p. 218 follows Watkins 1982: 250ff and regards the *-u* as an old plural (< **-uh₂*). However, as will be argued sub 3.6.1.2 and 3.9.3, this is not necessary.

- a: *kī yul-lu alwanzata šumeš tarman harten* 'May you hold these evil spells tied down.' KUB 24.11 13

- b: *daššu iš[hī]šša tuk-pat piyan* 'A mighty mandate has been given to you.' (KUB 31.127 i 19)

In this instance there is no indication whatsoever that the *r*-less form has plural meaning.

Melchert (p. 221) lists the following instances with singular agreement:

- a: *našma kušdu[wa]a kuitk[i našma harnam]ma kuitki* 'or some slander or some [revo]lt' KUB 1.16 i 35. The *r*-less forms are modified by the neuter singular indefinite pronoun *kuitki*.

- b: *É.A.-aš-kan huwanhušni kuit hatriešša anda kitta* 'The message which lies in the wave/flood of Ea ...' The *r*-less form is modified by *kuit*.

- c: *suppalann-a hannešša iššit kui[(eš)] OL memiškan[(zi)] apatt-a hannattari* 'Also the case of the animals who do not speak - also that you judge.' KUB 30.10 obv. 11f. *Hannešša* is modified by the neuter singular *apat*.

This instance has been cited sub 2.2.2.

Melchert 1988: 222 suggests that the *r*-less forms in the younger manuscripts have been used incorrectly, because they were no longer understood by the scribes.

However, it is not necessary to assume that the *r*-less forms should always agree with a plural modifier: the meaning of the *r*-less forms is seldom unambiguously plural. It rather has singular collective meaning. Therefore, the cases of agreement with singular modifiers can be grammatically correct too: Hittite can use the *r*-less forms both as singular (collective) and as plural.

This conclusion changes the overall picture: in Hittite the forms having the structure *CVC-éC-ōr* can be used to denote both singular items (collectives), e.g. *L0SU.GI-ešša* 'senate' and plural items, e.g. *partawa* 'wings'. Only when these forms agree with a singular or a plural modifier, it is possible to determine their grammatical number.

In other words: the hysterodynamic nom. acc. neuter with a long final vowel of the *r/n*-stems is neither a singular, nor a plural. It is indifferent to number (see 2.2 for discussion and overview of the instances)

The genitive of these words is hysterodynamic too: the nouns with the suffix *-atar* have a zero grade *-annaš* < **-atnaš* in the suffix. nouns with the suffix *-eššar* have *-cšnaš*. There are no attestations of proterodynamic genitives in ***-atenaš* or ***-iššenaš*.

The nouns in *-war* also have hysterodynamic characteristics. The genitive suffix of the nouns in *-āwar*, sc. *-un-* can also be hysterodynamic, e.g. *partaunaš*, from *partawar* 'wing'. Here again the suffix has zero grade. However, since in Hittite the *u*-diphthongs were monophthongized (Melchert 1984a: 59ff), the *u* can also be the result of **éu*. The genitive of the verbal substantives *-waš* goes back to Proto-Anatolian **-wans*. This suggests a proterodynamic form **-wéns* or **-wons*. The infinitive in *-una* also has zero grade in the suffix. But the supinum in *-uwan* definitely goes back to an endless locative (Eichner 1973: 92), which is characteristic for the hysterodynamic inflection. Therefore, the verbal substantives in *-war* may contain some hysterodynamic traces too: the *r*-less form, the supinum and the infinitive.

To sum up, both the nom. acc. neuter 'plural' and the genitive of the paradigm of the *r/n*-stems (except the genitive of the verbal substantives *-waš* < Proto-Anatolian **-wans*) with complex suffixes are hysterodynamic. The nom. acc. neuter 'plural' was indifferent to number.

3.3.3.2 Numerals preceding complex *r/n*-stems

When they are preceded by numerals higher than one, *r/n*-stems with complex suffixes show both an *r*-less 'plural' and a singular, e.g. 2 *hanešša* (see 2.2.3) vs. 2 *NINDA wagaššar* (par. 2.3.1). As is clearly demonstrated by the material cited sub 2.3.2, the singular with final *-r* replaces the *r*-less form: in Young

Hittite no *r*-less form has been attested. The *r*-less form is either a singular or a singular collective. Therefore, it seems possible that also the *r/n*-stems with complex suffixes preceded by numerals higher than one, have to be interpreted as singular collectives. In other words, the plural 8 ^{NINDA} *uagesšša* may have been a singular collective.

This implies that originally also the neuter plural of the simple *r/n*-stems, e.g. *ú-i-da-a-ar* was a singular collective.

3.3.3.3 Conclusion

Hittite inherited two types of hysterodynamic formations for the 'plural' of the *r/n*-stems:

- The plural of the simple *r/n*-stems (e.g. *widār*, the plural of 'water') originally showed the pattern *CCōR*.
- This type remained stable during the whole period Hittite was recorded.
- The plural of the *r/n*-stems with the complex suffixes *-eššar*, *-atar* and *-(a)war* showed the pattern **CVC-ēCōR*. Here *ōr* became *-a*.

In Young Hittite this type has disappeared.

Original singular collective meaning (or indifference to number) can easily be discerned in type b. This formation secondarily became plural as can be seen in *partawa amiyanda* 'its wings (are) small' which is secondary to ^{LÜ} *su.GI-ešša* 'senate'.

3.3.4 *Utnē*

In this section I will argue that the uncharacterized plural of *utnē* 'land, country' was, like the nom. acc. neuter plural of the *r/n*-stems, hysterodynamic.

Singular and plural are identical: in *ut-ne-e* [kuit] *kuit-pat araiš* 'which-ever country revolted' KBo 3.22 obv. 11f (11) (CTH 1, OHC), *utnē* is singular because it is modified by the neuter singular pronoun *kuit*. In the turn of phrase *ut-ne-e hūmanda* ^{URU} *Zalpuaz anda arunaz* 'Alle Länder von Zalpuwa (abl.) drinnen vom Meer (abl.)' KBo 3.22 obv. 38 (CTH 1, OHC) (translation Neu 1974: 13), *utnē* is plural because it is modified by the nom. acc. neuter plural *hūmanda* 'all'.

Neu 1974: 109ff argues that also in prehistoric Hittite *utnē* was an old *i*-stem, because in the derivation *utniyant-* the suffix *-ant-*, which normally follows the stem, is preceded by *i*: *utniandan* in KBo 3.22 obv. 25 (CTH 1, OHC). He suggests that this **utni-* was adjectival and that it was followed by an *-a* of collective origin. In that case *utnē* would be the regular reflex of **utniya*, which contracted via **ut-ni-e* to *utnē*.

Neu parallels the apparent contraction of **iya* to *-e* with *i-ya-at* > *i-et* 'he

made'. However, in this verb no such contraction exists, because *iyat* and *iyet* are mere variants (Oettinger 1979: 26). Besides, there is evidence that *-iya* contracted to *-i* and not to *-e*: *memini* < *memiyani*, dat. sg. from *memia(n)-* 'word' (for more evidence see Melchert 1984a: 58). Therefore, one cannot claim that *utnē* originated from **utniya*.

Gertz 1982: 34 does not consider *utnē* relevant for the neuter plural. She argues that the *-e* is inexplicable: she suggests that *utnē* cannot be an inherited *i*-stem < **utniya*, because there is evidence that *-iya* contracted to *-i*. We do not have ***utni*. Moreover, it would have had a nom. acc. neuter plural in *-i*, like all neuter *i*-stems. And because *-tn-* developed into *-nn-* (cf. the genitive of the nouns ending in *-atar*, gen. *annas* < **atnas*), she suggests that *utnē* may be a recent loan word which only partially adopted inflection.

The latter argument is not decisive. Puhvel 1986: 56 suggests that the non-assimilation of *-tn-* to *-nn-* in *utnē* may have been caused by an etymological *d*. He parallels Hittite *huitar* 'creature(s), animal', which also has a non-assimilated gen. sg. *huitnaš*, with Oic. *vitnir*, for which word he suggests the same meaning. According to him, this noun reflects **Hwedr*, gen. **Hwed-niyos*. However, *vitnir* is semantically unclear (see 3.3.2.5). In *utnē* the dental would also have been retained because it originated from *d*. Puhvel parallels *utnē* with Gk. οὐδᾶς 'ground, soil, land'. If his equation is correct, we have a PIE root **h₃eud-*, with different formations in Greek and Hittite. However, this would imply that *h₃* disappeared in this word. Since there is evidence that *h₃* becomes *h* in Hittite, cf. Beekes 1988a: 81, Kimball 1987: 185 and Melchert 1987: 20ff, the etymology suggested by Puhvel is uncertain at the very best. If Armenian *getin* 'ground, land' < **ucedeno-* (Götze-Pedersen 1934: 79f) is related to *utnē*, we still have a root etymology with a PIE **d*.

The lack of assimilation of *dn* to *nn* in *utnē* may be caused by more factors. One can think of an original laryngeal between the *d* and *n* (**dHn*). It is also possible that assimilation occurred only after *a* (**atn* (< **-adn-*) > *-ann-*) and not after *u* or *i*.¹⁰⁷ Perhaps the conditioning factor was accent: **udnē* > *utnē* whereas **-atnas* > *-annas*.

Melchert 1994: 161 suggests that the lack of assimilation in *utnē* can be explained differently. The suffix *-atar* must have originated from **-eh₂-tr*. In this form the **h₂* disappeared with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel: **-ātr*. Later the *t* was lenited because of the *ā* and became *d*. This yielded the abstract suffix *-ādr*, gen. *-annas*. This reasoning implies that also

¹⁰⁷ This may have caused the sequence *tn* in the genitive *huitnaš* from *huitār* 'creatures'.

older **dn* could have assimilated to *nn*. If Melchert's reasoning is valid, the explanation of the sequence *nn* in *utnē* by etymological *dn* remains difficult.

Zucha 1988, 300f. mentioned by Melchert 1994: 161, suggests with Götze-Pedersen 1934: 79f, a connection with *weden-*, the weak stem of *watar* 'water': *wed(e)n-o-* 'of water' > 'watered land' > 'land'. This adjective was substantivized by the *-i*: **wedn-i*. Hittite *udnē/udniy-* would then be a collective to this **wed-n-i*. This is only a guess because the semantic development is unverifiable. To sum up, *utnē* causes phonological and etymological difficulties.

Nevertheless, its formation is a matter of great interest. Schindler 1975: 9, Melchert 1984a: 73 and Melchert 1994: 161 suggest that *utnē*, gen. *utniyaš* has a hysterodynamic formation: **utnēi*, gen. **utniyaš*. A strong argument in favour of original diphthong is given by Melchert 1984a: 73 n. 135. He points out that when the stem of *utnē* is generalized (e.g. *utnēante(m)eš* KUB 24.4 + rev. 7), its final *ē* behaves as close /*e*/: it soon develops a hiatus filling glide /*y*/ . This glide can be seen in *utnēaš* > *utne-yaš*, which suggests that the final vowel of *utnē* is a close /*e*/ . This close /*e*/ . reflects an old diphthong (for this development see Melchert 1984a: 46) The /*e*/ may be compared to the /*e*/ in *hašduer* 'brushwood, bush'.

In the paradigm of *utnē*, there is another form which supports Schindler's and Melchert's suggestion that *utnē* was hysterodynamic. This form is the dat.loc. sg. *ut-ne-e*. Neu 1980b: 9 has established that in Hittite an endless locative can also indicate direction, e.g.: *ne-aš dagān t[tiy]ezzi* 'And he (the king) gets out on the land.' (previously he was in a coach) KBo 17.75 i 5 and *ut-ne-e kuedani pāmi* 'to which country I go' KBo 22.6 i 13'. Neu 1974: 112 suggests that this form is the result of a contraction of the directive *utniya* to *utnē*. Because such contraction never existed, Neu's assumption does not hold. <*E*> in Hittite can be the reflex of an old diphthong **ei* (for PIE **ei* > Hittite *e*, see Oettinger 1979: 544, Melchert 1984a: 67f, Melchert 1994: 145). As such, it is possible that *ut-ne-e* continues **utnēi*. This is a normal endless hysterodynamic locative, cf. e.g. Gk. αἰών 'always'. Therefore, *utnē* has a fair chance of being the regular outcome of an old endless locative, which is characteristic of the hysterodynamic inflection.

To sum up, *utnē* < **utnēi* was hysterodynamic. The nom.acc. neuter *utnē* is both singular and plural. Proof is furnished by cases of agreement. Additional support for hysterodynamic inflection is given by its endless locative *utnē* < **utnēi*. The structure of the nominative is the same as the structure of the nominative in the *ai-* and *au-*stems. Therefore, one might consider *utnē* an *ei-*stem. Because of phonological developments (long and short *ei-*

diphthong both yielded *e*), both the nom.acc. neuter and endless locative became *utnē*.¹⁰⁸

3.3.5 NINDA Šarama

The singular and the plural of NINDA *šarama* may be identical. This is suggested by the fact that NINDA *šarama* can be preceded both by the numeral one and by numerals higher than one (see 2.7.5).

Melchert 1983b: 1ff does not recognize singular value for NINDA *šarama*. According to him, the basic form is *šaraman*, an original neuter form of a hysterodynamic adjective having the structure anim. nom. sg. **-mō(n)*, neuter nom. acc. sg. **-mon*. He suggests that NINDA *šarama* is a derivative of an original noun with a suffix *-men-* which expresses location (cf. Skt. *várman-* 'height').

With this suffix *-men-* indicating location Melchert parallels, among other things, the gentilic suffix *-um(n)a-*. The nom. sg. attested in e.g. *Zalpumaš* < **-men+s* never shows an *n* in the nom. sg., whereas this *n* frequently occurs in the oblique cases, e.g. dative ^{LÜ}*hestumni*. The *š* in the nom. sg. of this gentilic suffix can be explained in the same way as the *š* in *ḫaraš*, (gen. *ḫaranas*) 'eagle' < **h₃erōn*. In *ḫaraš* the *n* disappeared. Later this word received an *s* because it had common gender. Therefore, Melchert reconstructs nom. **-mēn+s*, gen. **-mnós*.

As pointed out sub 2.7.5, it is difficult to take the neuter form *šaraman* as basis for *sarama*, because it occurs in a very young text and because the tablet is broken off after *šaraman*]. Therefore, the proportion *kunna*: *kunna* :: (young) *šaraman* : *x* → (old) *šarama* as suggested by Melchert 1983b: 3 is difficult. In other words, it is not likely that final *-a* in *šarama* is analogous to the *a*-stem adjectives.

The explanation Starke 1990: 279ff offers, viz. Luwian provenance for NINDA *šarama* also causes serious difficulties (see 2.7.5).

Therefore, alternative explanations for NINDA *šarama* can be taken into account. Neu 1983a: 159 n. 469 points out that *šarāma* can be preceded by the numeral 1 and suggests that the final *-a* indicates that *šarama* was a collective. We have to assume 'one (portion of) *šarama*'. However, Neu does not

¹⁰⁸ Oettinger 1995b parallels the building of *ut-ne-e* to A.SA (U^{1A}) *ku-ḫ-e-i* 'fallow field(s)'. Because of the Sumeric determinative U^{1A} he suggests that this word must be a collective. He reconstructs PIE **k^u-h₂-ē(i)*. However, one cannot compare *ut-ne-e* to *ku-ḫ-e-i*, because the former is consistently written with final *plene* <*E-E*>, whereas the latter is written with final <*I*>. If the formation of these two words were parallel, *kulei* would have been written ***ku-ḫ-i-e* without final <*I*>. Therefore, Oettinger's suggestion is not attractive.

explain why the final *-n*, which is attested elsewhere in the oblique cases, has disappeared.

However, if Hittite *šarama* is old, one can propose with Gertz 1982: 27 that *šarāma* originally had a lengthened grade in the suffix with an unaccented long final vowel: **šarāmōn*. Its gender must have been neuter as is suggested by the Hittite material.

One can assume then, that in ^{NINDA}*šarama* the final *n* disappeared under exactly the same conditions as in **h₃ērōn*. Here the *n* disappeared after a long unstressed vowel and prehistoric *hara* received a secondary *s*. This yielded Hittite *haraš* 'eagle'. The loss of final *-n* parallels the loss of the *-r* in the *r*-less plural found in e.g. *partawa* (for a discussion see 3.3.3.1). A hysterodynamic form, which had collective value, nicely accounts for the apparent collective meaning in e.g. ^{NINDA}*šarāma danzi* 'they take *šarāma*' and 1 *šarāma* 'one (portion of) *šarama*'.¹⁰⁹

The young form *šaraman* [which Melchert 1983b: 2f regards as the basic form of *šarāma*, can be explained as an innovation by analogy with the nom. acc. sg. of the *a*-stems: ^{NINDA}*šarama*: *kunna* :: *x*: *kunnan*. In other words: because *šarāma* looked like a neuter plural in *-a*, Hittite created an analogous *šaraman*.

This solution has the advantage of chronology since *šarama* is the old form, whereas *šaraman* is definitely very young.

To sum up, *šarāma* is a nom. acc. neuter "plural" with collective value. It has been argued contra Starke 1990: 279ff that it is a genuine Hittite word. Contra Melchert 1983b: 1ff, who proposed that young *šaraman* was original and that *šarama* is analogous, I propose that *šarāma* in fact is the older form. It shows the hysterodynamic structure *CéCōR*, which had collective value. This is the reason why *šarāma* 'one (portion) of *š*' can be preceded by the numeral 1.

3.3.6 Conclusion for the hysterodynamic plurals

Utnē 'land' and *šarama* 'š.bread' are original hysterodynamic forms. *Utnē* is both singular and plural: it has singular (*kuit* ~~*kuit=pat*~~) and plural (*hūmanita*) adjuncts. *šarama* is never accompanied by neuter singular or plural adjuncts. It can be preceded, like the other neuter nouns (see 2.5), by the numeral 1 and by numerals higher than one. Because nouns with common gender sometimes also appear (see 1.4.4) in the singular when they are preceded by numerals

higher than one, it cannot be proved that the singular and the plural were identical. Nevertheless, as argued sub 3.3.5, the proto-form of *šarama* was probably hysterodynamic. Therefore, it is possible that the singular and plural of *šarāma* were identical too. In fact, it is likely that neither *utnē* nor *šarāma* had a plural and that they were, like the *r/n*-stems with complex suffixes, indifferent to grammatical number.

The nom. acc. of the *ai*- and *au*-stems, which also had lengthened grade in the final syllable (cf. Melchert 1984a: 61ff and Weitenberg 1979), is also a hysterodynamic formation. In these two stem classes too, it is difficult to establish a difference between neuter singular and neuter plural. If only formal criteria are applied, one is at a loss: the only way to establish a difference between singular and plural is to look for agreeing pronouns or adjectives. However, neuter *ai*- and *au*-stems do not occur very frequently and agreeing constituents are even more rare. In the Old Hittite source material for this monograph only a form *haštai* 'bone(s)' without agreeing constituent has been attested: *haštai zanuani* 'they cook the bone(s)'. StBoT 25 24 obv. 9'. Therefore, one cannot determine its number (for other instances of *haštai* see Gertz 1982: 124). In the source material for this monograph only *šagai*- 'omen, portent' shows agreement with a neuter singular adjective: *kuitki kallar ša-ga-a-e* 'some sinister omen' and *tamae šagae* [] *dameuman* 'another strange omen' (see 1.4.6.2). Weitenberg 1979: 295 lists the neuter plurals *ape šagae* 'these portents' KBo 23.55 i 13 and *hupuwai hūmanita* 'all pots' KBo 9.146 obv. 6. The fact that final *-ai* can be used both as singular and as plural suggests the same for the *ai*-stems as for *utnē* and *šarama*: the nom. acc., which had a hysterodynamic structure, could be used for both singular and plural number. The *ai*-stems were also indifferent to grammatical number.

In the rarely attested category of the *au*-stems, the situation is the same. Weitenberg 1984: 352 points out that no plural in *-a* has been attested. Therefore, also in this stem class the neuter nom. acc. in *-au* was probably indifferent to number.

Outside the source material for this monograph, *hašduer* 'brushwood' has the same pattern as *utnē*: its singular is identical to the plural. Proof can be found in the following instances:

- a: *ke=ma=kan ha-aš-du-ir mahhan* ^{LÜ} APIN.LA i arha merta 'As these dead pieces of withered brushwood disappear under the labour of the plougher' VBoT 24 iii 42f (42). Here *hašduir* agrees with the neuter plural pronoun *ke*.

Ha-aš-du-e-ir merranda 'withered brushwood', *ibid.* iii 27, 30.

¹⁰⁹ Note that in this way Neu's explanation of the final *-a* in *šarama* as a collective marker is not correct: the *-a* only misleadingly resembles the reflex of PIE *-(e)h₂; it originated from the reflex of long unaccented *ō*.

Here *ḥašduer* agrees with the plural *merranda*, the participle of *mer-* 'vanish, disappear'.

- b: *āši-ma-kan kuit ḥa-aš-du-e-ir n-at arḥa warnuanzi* 'What brushwood has been left, they burn it.' KUB 17.28 iv 44

Ḥa-aš-du-e-ir agrees with the neuter sg. pronoun *kuit*.

In instance b: the singular *kuit* refers to *ḥašduer* and in instance a: the same form is referred to by the neuter plural participle *merranda*. *Ḥašduer* also seems to be a hysterodynamic form: **h₃(e)šduēr* (Melchert 1984a: 61 n. 111). It is indifferent to number.

The *r/n*-stems with the complex suffixes *-atar*, *-ešsar* and *-(a)war* show the same pattern: the *r*-less form is accompanied by both singular and plural adjuncts, e.g. *apāt ḥanešša* 'this judgment' vs. *partawa amiyanda* 'its wings are small' (both MHD). As to the semantics, the *r*-less forms often seem to be singular collectives (e.g. *LOŠU.GI-ešša* 'old men's council'). After the Middle Hittite period the *r*-less form has been replaced by an uncharacterized form: **uppešša* 'sendings' > *uppešsar*.

Only the simple *r/n*-stems seem to have a true plural: *uddār* 'words' vs. *utter* 'word, thing, affair'. However, also in this stem class it is difficult to establish whether e.g. *widār* means collective 'water' or 'rations of water'.

To sum up, prehistoric Hittite had neuter hysterodynamic formations which were grammatical singulars which had collective value. These formations only became plural when they were accompanied by a plural adjunct (e.g. *utnē ḥumanta* 'all countries'). In other words: the Hittite hysterodynamic neuter forms were indifferent to number.

3.4 INTERLUDE

3.4.1 Value of the neuter plural

Now that it has been established that the Hittite hysterodynamic neuter plural had strong affinities with the singular number, it is useful to have a look at the status of the neuter plural again.

It is commonly accepted that the PIE neuter plural was only weakly developed, because it was originally a singular collective. This has already been shown by Schmidt 1889: 225. Schmidt called the formation, which we call hysterodynamic "die zweite Pluralbildung", the first one being the neuter plural in -a.

Evidence for hysterodynamic plural formations is also found in Indo-Iranian. Beekes 1981 convincingly argues that in Avestan the regular reflex

of final laryngeal after consonants is *-i* (e.g. 1 plural med. *-madi* < **med^hh₂*). This implies that the Avestan neuter plural in *-i* was a secondary creation; *anašmām* '(non-)verse' is the inherited neuter plural formation (with lengthened grade of the suffix). This only secondarily received an *-i* in *anašmāmi*. Final *-mām* reflects *-mān*. Gertz 1982: 383 puts it thus: "What we can establish is rather the lengthened grade with no ending."

Hysterodynamic formation for neuter plurals is attested in the *s*-stems too: Skt. *-ānsi* (attested in *jānāmsi* < **ǵénh₁ōs*) and Av. *-ā* < **-ās* point to PIE **-ōs*.

The Hittite material discussed above also shows this pattern. Therefore, Hittite probably preserved the collective singular value (or rather its indifference to number) of the hysterodynamic forms ("die zweite Pluralbildung") to a great extent. The fact that the Hittite neuter plural is accompanied by a verb in the singular also strongly suggests that the neuter plural still had strong ties with the singular.

Beekes 1981: 279f. writes: "Neuter plurals were rare. There were in fact no plurals at all, only collectives. These became neuter plurals when the adjectives received special neuter endings. In the *r*-, *r/n*-, *n*- and *l*-stems the collectives with lengthened vowel may have been more frequent than those with **-H*."

The fact that the neuter plural originally was a collective singular explains the following facts:

- a: The *τὰ ζῶα τρέχει* rule: in Attic Greek a neuter plural is accompanied by a verb in the singular. This rule is exemplified in e.g. Gk. *τὸν δ' οὐ ποτε χύματα λείπει* 'Breakers never leave it' B 396. Gatha Avestan also consistently has a verb in the singular when the subject is a neuter plural, e.g. *yā vāuvərəzōi* '(things) which have been done'. Neuter plurals accompanied by a singular verb can also be found in the Rig-Veda: *dhiyate dhānā* 'the winnings are at stake' (RV I 81.3) and *sārvā tā te āpi devēṣu astu* 'May all your things belong to the gods' (examples taken from Kurylowicz 1964: 205f).

- b: In the type exemplified in Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca*: 'place, place' vs. 'region' the *-a* < **-(e)h₂* originally was a singular collective suffix. That is why it could also be added to nouns of all genders.

It is also generally accepted that the collective formations in late PIE must have developed into a true plural. This explains why elsewhere in Indo-European a neuter plural is accompanied by a verb in the plural and that the original collectives received real plural value.

For the line of thought in the following sections, it is important to remember that the two neuter plural formations, viz. the ending *-a* and the lengthened grade formations originally were collectives and that they were grammatical singulars.

3.4.2 The Hittite material does not fit in

Hittite has the same neuter plural morphemes as the other Indo-European languages: it has a lengthened grade and it has an ending *-a* < **(e)h₂*. However, the Hittite neuter plural morphemes require additional comment.

Because Hittite did not have a feminine gender with the suffix *-a* its neuter plural is of the highest importance: both the feminine singular and neuter plural are characterized by the ending *-a*. The fact that the verb occurs in its singular form suggests that the neuter plural was originally a singular.

Hittite does not show a connection between the neuter plural (read: collective formations like **-h₂* and the lengthened grade) and the common gender. The neuter plural formations discussed sub 3.3 show more affinities with the neuter singular.

However, if prehistoric Hittite had a feminine singular characterized by *-a* and if the neuter plural in prehistoric Hittite were originally a feminine singular, we would expect the Hittite neuter plural to behave like a feminine singular, i.e.: it would show consistent agreement of the neuter plural substantives with neuter plural adjectives and pronouns. In other words: substantives, adjectives and pronouns would always appear in their plural form. In any case, a neuter singular would occur far less frequently. In this respect Hittite shows a number of peculiarities:

1: For the *nt*-adjectives we seem to have a distribution:

- A predicative participle mostly appears in its singular form: *terippi kue terippiyan* 'the fields which have been ploughed'.
- An attributive participle appears in its plural form: *sullanda utnē* 'quarrelling countries'.
- A predicative adjective appears in its plural form: *partawa-ssit amiyanta* 'its wings are small'.
- An attributive adjective appears in its plural form: *utnē dapiyanda* 'all the countries'.

The predicative singular participle referring to neuter plurals is exceptional. If Hittite had consistent agreement, the predicative participle would have shown the reflex of **-onth₂*. In any case, we would not find a singular predicative participle. This may imply that the Hittite predicative neuter

singular participle referring to neuter plurals represents an archaism and that in prehistoric Hittite the neuter gender did not have a plural. For a more detailed discussion and presentation of the material concerning this phenomenon see 2.8.1.2.

- 2: The fact that the *u*-stem adjectives agreeing with a neuter plural¹¹⁰ appear as singular: we have *idālu uddār*. This shows non-agreement of the neuter singular adjective with a neuter plural noun. Only later we find the ending *-a*, added to the full grade.

In other words: for the *u*-stems, the neuter plural adjective (*idalawa*) seems to be an innovation as opposed to the singular. For an elaborate discussion see 3.6.1.2 and 3.4.8.

- 3: Moreover, if we assume that prehistoric Hittite had a morpheme *-a* which formed neuter plurals, we have to account for some strange looking forms and formations. In the following cases the ending *-a* agrees with neuter singular formants:

- a: The neuter singulars *kušata* 'dowry' and *manawa* (coin) (see 1.4.7).

These words have been attested in the source material of this monograph.

- b: *šuppa asru kutki* 'some holy place' and *šuppa pū* 'a clean well'. Here the ending *-a* has singular value (see 2.11.1). Although the text is young, I think that the agreement type requires an explanation.

- c: Gertz 1982: 122 cites KBo 4.11 obv. 19¹¹¹ *EGIR-SU UZU šuppa zé-ya-an tianzi* 'Afterwards they put down the cooked meat.' The singular participle suggests that the ending *-a* had singular value. *šuppa* agreeing with a neuter singular constituent is also found in *šuppa hūšu zeyan tianzi* 'they put down raw and cooked meat' KUB 25.23 53.¹¹² *šuppa* 'meat' occurs in older Hittite (see 2.7.3.3). Therefore, already in older Hittite this word might have been felt as a neuter singular. However, it is also possible that *hūšu zeyan* is adverbial, cf. *šuppa hūšawaz ziyandazzi-ya tianzi* 'They serve the meat raw and cooked.' KUB 11.21 iv 6ff (81). In this text the ablatives are used

¹¹⁰ I am aware that the only adjective I can refer to is *idālu*. Because of the nature of the material we are often forced to deal with hapaxes and what might be called 'oligopaxes'. Therefore, I assume that *idālu* represents the whole class of *u*-stem adjectives.

¹¹¹ This text dates from the 13th century (Starke 1985: 424) and is no part of the source material for this monograph.

¹¹² This text is also young and not incorporated in the source material for this monograph.

adverbially, cf. Melchert 1977: 218f.

- d: In KBo 13.34 iv⁷ 11'f (12') *ḫatuga* is used as a neuter singular adjective and not as an adverb: KUR-e-kan and[*a*] *ḫatuga kuitki uttar* [kišar]i nu KUR-e anda tanatēšz[i] 'In the country an evil thing will [happ]en and the land will become waste.' For the position of the indefinite pronoun cf. *tamai kuitki uttar* 'something else' KUB 13.4 ii 60 (this instance is cited by Riemschneider 1970: 37).
- e: *mān UN-aš šuppiš nu-šši marša kuiški kuitki pāi* 'If the man is clean and someone gives him something contaminated to eat.' KBo 5.2 iv 64f. Here *kuitki* agrees again with an apparent neuter plural adjective ending in -a.

This material — a neuter (plural) ending -a agreeing with a neuter singular — looks awkward, because neuter plural formations 'agreeing' with neuter singular formations are not what we would expect. One can assume that these irregularities have been caused by copying mistakes, or that they are just 'wrong'. However, we have to look for an explanation. I will try to show that these cases of non-agreement reflect an earlier stage in which the later neuter plural formations had singular value.

3.4.3 Specifications of neuter plurals already dealt with

The formations which are used in other Indo-European languages to form neuter plurals in -a have also been attested in Hittite. These formations have the following specifications:

- a: They can be neuter plural by agreement, e.g. *šuppa uddār* 'holy words', *ḫašduēr merranta* 'withered brushwood'. This situation is the same as in the other Indo-European languages.
- b: They can be neuter singulars as is also proved by agreement, e.g. *iḫālu uddār*, *ḫašduēr kuit* and *kušata kuit*. Singular value for the lengthened grade has also been attested for e.g. Gk. ὕδωρ. Hittite would be unique if it has indeed a neuter singular in -a as I have suggested in 1.4.7.
- c: Agreeing constituents having a neuter plural formation can sometimes refer to neuter singulars, e.g. *šuppa ašnu kuitki* 'some holy place'.

Therefore, as the agreement with both singular and plural adjuncts shows, not only the neuter plural of the *r/n*-stems and the other hysterodynamic formations had strong ties with the neuter singular. Also the ending -a seems to have had ties with the neuter singular. This fits into the theory that the neuter plural originally had neuter singular value (see 1.2.4)

To sum up, Hittite -a seems to be, at least partly, a neuter singular. The

hysterodynamic formations have both singular and plural value. This implies that the Hittite neuter plural, at least partly, originated from a prehistoric Hittite neuter singular.

3.4.4 Did PIE have a neuter plural?

If we want to account for the rest of the material, we are faced with two models or rather with two possibilities. The first possibility is that PIE did indeed have a neuter plural (or singular collective) in -a. Nussbaum 1936: 129f is on one extreme of the scale: for the earliest stages of PIE he reconstructs a uniform neuter plural morpheme *-h₂. The loss of the final *-h₂ caused compensatory lengthening in those cases where it is not attested: this would explain the lengthened grade of the plural in the *r/n*-stems, e.g. **wédōr* (reconstruction Schindler 1975: 4) < **wedorh₂*.

However, this is not necessary, since it is not unusual that a language has several collective formations: they can be inherent in the meaning of the substantive, e.g. Eng. 'cattle' is a collection of grass-eating animals, or they can be formed by means of derivation: German 'Gebirge' from 'Berg' and 'Bürgertum' 'citizenry, citizens' from 'Bürger' are just two illustrations of different collective formations in one and the same language. Secondly, since there is no branch in Indo-European where traces are found of this original *-h₂ in the *r/n*-stems, the use of Nussbaum's reconstruction is limited: it only simplifies the system of the neuter plural.

The other extreme of the scale is occupied by followers of the theory that the neuter plural was, at best, only weakly developed (e.g. Beekes 1981: 279, 1990: 212f, Neu 1969: 240f, 1992 and Eichner 1985). They suggest that the neuter gender did not have a plural number, but only a singular and a collective. As the -a was a suffix making collectives and not an ending, it could be added to both neuter and common-gender nouns (Neu 1969: 240f, Watkins 1975, Eichner 1985).

I do not know of a coherent discussion why the neuter gender only had a singular and a collective and not a distributive plural.

3.4.5 Nature of the neuter gender

In this section I will attempt to explain why the plural of the neuter gender was only weakly developed. This was caused by, what I will call provisionally, "factor x". This "factor x" was responsible for two things which made the PIE neuter gender different from the common gender.

Firstly, the fact that the neuter nominative and accusative were identical. This can be explained by the theory that PIE was an ergative language (e.g.

Beekes 1985, 1990 etc.): both the subject of an intransitive verb and the object of a transitive verb were expressed by the absolutive case, whereas the subject of a transitive verb was expressed by the ergative case. The absolutive was endingless. The neuter gender must partly have had its origins here. Beekes 1990: 233f suggests that originally the neuter nouns mostly occurred in the absolutive and not, or hardly, in the ergative. When the ergative system disintegrated, these words (proto-neuters) became neuter.

Secondly, the neuter gender, as is widely accepted, only marginally had a plural. The ending which has been reconstructed for the neuter plural, viz. **-h₂* must originally have been a grammatical singular. This is illustrated by the fact that the verb which accompanies a neuter plural was in the singular. I do not see how only the ergative theory can account for the reason why the neuter forms could not have a plural.

"Factor x" may be partly found in the theory about the origin of the PIE gender system by Ostrowski 1982 and 1985. Ostrowski 1985: 315f divides the Indo-European substantives into 5 classes: the first class is represented by the masculine nouns (nom. sg. in **-s*, plural in **-es* and acc. sg. in **-m*). The second class is represented by the feminine nouns and only differs from the first class by agreement. The third class is represented by the "Motionsfeminina" (with suffixes **-ih₂* and **-h₂*).

For our present purpose only the last two classes are important: these two classes are formed by the neuter nouns. Class four is formed by the thematic neuter nouns (in *-om*). The *-m* is the same *-m* (used to denote a grammatical object) which is also found in the first three classes. The fifth class also consists of neuter nouns, but these nouns do not have a final *-m*: they have a nom.acc. ending *-Ø*.

Class five, which does not have a characterized nom.acc., is the oldest class. It consists¹¹³ of mass nouns, e.g. Skt. *áśrt* 'blood', *māh* 'meat', Gk. μέλι 'honey', Lat. *glūs* 'glue', Skt. *dāru* 'wood'. Parts of the body are also found in this class, e.g. Skt. *ākṣi* 'eye', *yákr̥t* 'liver'. Verbal abstracts also occur in this class, e.g. Skt. *dīvaḥ* 'adoration', *ōkaḥ* 'accustomizing, dwelling', Gk. τάφος 'astonishment' and *xīdōs* 'sorrow, grief'. Ostrowski 1982: 272 signals that these neuter nouns share the notion of uncountability. They do not represent an individual entity and only express "ein Solches, eine Qualität".

Class four, the thematic *o*-stems, is younger than class five.¹¹⁴ In this class

two sorts of neuter nouns have their place: firstly, individual entities which are not considered to be capable of acting, e.g. Skt. *drónam* 'wooden vessel', *gotrám* 'cowstall', *yugám* 'joke', Lat. *tectum* 'roof', *folium* 'leaf', and Gk. ξύλον 'wood'. Secondly, it also contains words with the same notion as the neuters in class five, e.g. mass nouns (cf. Lat. *aurum* 'gold' and *ferrum* 'iron'), bodyparts, e.g. Skt. *hṛdayam* 'heart' and abstract, e.g. Lat. *gaudium* 'joy'. The neuters of this class have the same *-m* as the other non-neuter classes.

The five classes are characterized by decreasing individuality. The first class has the highest degree of individuality, class five has only a minimal degree of individuality. Ostrowski 1985: 316 suggests that traces of this system can still be found in the separate Indo-European languages: in words derived from the same root, the neuter nouns often have a more generic sense than their common-gender counterparts, cf. Lat. *pecus* f. 'piece of cattle' vs. *pecu* n. 'cattle', *fluvius* m. 'river' vs. *flumen* n. 'stream, current' and Gk. ῥῆς 'tree, oak', f. vs. ὄψον n. 'wood, trunk'.

Ostrowski 1985 suggests that the *-m* originally characterized nouns which were considered to be individualized. This can explain why there are two types of neuter nouns (with and without a nom.acc. in *-m*). Ostrowski 1985: 317 suggests that the *-m* originally was not lexically determined, but that it depended on the syntax whether or not this *-m* was added to a particular noun. When a noun represented a specific or particular thing it received the ending *-m* as object marker. A noun was not characterized by *-m* if it represented "ein Solches, ein Etwas" (p. 317). Therefore, a particular noun could, according to its function, occur with and without *-m*, cf. e.g. the constructed example: **mems-Ø edmi* 'I eat meat' vs. ****memsom edmi* 'I eat the meat'. This explains the two Vedic words for 'meat', viz. *māh* and *māmsá-m*.¹¹⁵ Only in a

because some common-gender nouns used this ending also in the nominative and were subsequently transferred to the neuters. This is an ad hoc explanation. Beekes 1985: 194 gives a better account: he suggests that the PIE ergative was the genitive **-os*. After the collapse of the ergative system, the old genitive/ergative **-os* became the nominative of a new noun class, viz. the *o*-stems. Beekes suggests that the neuter nouns in *-om* must have been a late creation: the old proterodynamic neuters, were not characterized by the ending *-m*. Instead, they were endingless. The most likely source for this *-m* is to be found in the acc. sg. *c*. *-m*. Because the neuter nominative is identical to the accusative, the ending *-m* came to be used for the nominative too and hence a new neuter stem class arose.

¹¹⁵ Ostrowski parallels this phenomenon to south-east Wogulic. He points out that in this language an opposition exists in the marking of an object. If the object is thought of as being

¹¹³ Examples have been taken from Ostrowski 1982: 272 and 1985: 314f.

¹¹⁴ Ostrowski 1982: 272 thinks that the *-m* originated in the common-gender nouns,

later phase of PIE the ending **-m* became lexicalized: nouns which were more often thought of as not individualized (the later class five) received the zero morpheme, whereas nouns which were more often thought of as individualized acquired the **-m* in the accusative.

Ostrowski 1985: draws up the following parameters for individuality as opposed to non-individuality:

specific	generic
countable	uncountable
concrete	abstract
particular	non-particular
representing a part	total
animate	inanimate

This may provide a clue to the question why the neuter plural was only weakly developed: if neuter nouns had a low degree of individuality, and basically denoted a quality, "ein Solches, ein Etwas" (Ostrowski 1985: 321) and were not separate entities, neuter nouns could not have had a distributive nom. plural ending. The neuter nouns had a lesser degree of individuality than the common-gender nouns and consequently they had more of the specifications generic, uncountable, abstract. This was the reason why the collective **-h₂*-suffix was not needed in the nouns of class five, because non-individualized nouns had, among other things, the notion of collectivity: it is not necessary to add a collective suffix to e.g. 'blood', 'water' and 'honey'.

Neuter nouns of class four seem to be younger (see above). Because they had a higher degree of individuality, they needed a plural. Since neuters originally could not have a plural and were not individualized, Ostrowski 1982: 273 suggests that PIE resorted to the collective suffix **-h₂* and not to the distributive plural in **-es*. Since the collective **-h₂* was originally a singular, neuter nouns consequently took their verb in the singular.

I do not follow this part of Ostrowski's reasoning: neuters of class four (the thematized *o*-stems) are individualized and therefore countable and should have a normal distributive plural. Why can words like 'cowstall' (Skt. *gotrá-m*) and Gk. *ἄρνον* 'pear' not have a distributive plural?

The answer to this question can be found in the hypothesis that already in (late) PIE the ending **-h₂* was felt to be a normal plural marker of the nouns of class four, the thematic neuter *o*-stems.

The reason for this may have been purely formal: the original gender

individualized it is characterized with *m*⁹, whereas an indefinite object is uncharacterized.

system of PIE had a syntactic base: individualized (definite etc.) vs. non-individualized (indefinite etc.). The endings **-m* and **-es* characterized individualized entities, whereas the endings **-Ø* and **-h₂* characterized entities which were not individualized. In principle, those four endings could be added to all substantives. At a particular point in the history of PIE this system changed and the marking of the substantives also changed. The cases **-m*, **-Ø*, **-h₂*, and **-es* ceased to be applied depending on what PIE wanted to express: the original system of individualized (definite) vs. non-individualized (non-definite) fell apart. Fixed classes arose and endings were lexicalized. The nouns with a high degree of individuality became common-gender. These nouns still needed a morpheme in order to build collectives and kept the **h₂*-suffix (the *locus*, *loci* vs. *loca* type).

The nouns which did not have a high degree of individuality became neuters and received the zero ending. At this stage PIE became a gender language in which gender was assigned on formal grounds: it depended on the form of the substantives involved rather than on the meaning, to which gender they were assigned. As a logical consequence nouns which needed a plural invaded the territory of the original unindividualized words. Therefore, also the neuter gender needed a plural. If the neuter nouns had taken the distributive plural ending *-es*, the neuter gender would have been associated with the common gender. Therefore the neuter nouns took their own plural. They took the original collective suffix *-h₂* and made it a genuine plural ending.

To sum up, the reason why the neuter plural is only sparsely attested ("factor x") may have been a semantical one: the neuter gender may have denoted unindividualized nouns. It was indefinite.

3.5 INTRODUCTION TO THE REST OF THE MATERIAL

3.5.1 Introduction

Sub 3.3 and sub 3.4.1-3.4.3 it has been shown that there are some formations which can serve both as neuter singular and as neuter plural. This means that they are indifferent to number.

For the rest of the material (the *a*-, *i*-, *u*-, resonant- and *nt*-stems) there are two possibilities.

Firstly, Hittite did not, or hardly, inherit a neuter plural, just like it did not inherit a neuter plural in the hysterodynamic nouns. In that case no final **-h₂* has been lost in the *a*-, *i*-, *u*-, resonant- and *nt*-stems, because the neuter never had a plural in **-h₂*.

Secondly, if those stemclasses did possess a neuter plural in **-h₂*, this **-h₂* disappeared in the *a*- and *nt*-stems (*-a* and *-anta* have been attested).

If final **-h₂* disappeared in prehistoric Hittite one may assume that Hittite did inherit a neuter plural in the substantives, pronouns and adjectives. If final **-h₂* resulted in *-a*, one can believe that the neuter plural was rare in the substantives, pronouns and adjectives.

However, a more detailed look at the evidence for final **-h₂* suggests that the situation was different. There are instances where it is hard to deny the existence of an original laryngeal, on the other hand it is sometimes difficult to prove that originally prehistoric Hittite possessed a laryngeal.

3.5.2 The development of final **-h₂*

In this section I will discuss the fate of final **-h₂*. Although the material is very scanty, I will suggest that undeniable evidence for final laryngeal can be found in pronouns and in the *a*-stem adjectives. The evidence for original final **-h₂* in the pronouns has been attested in Palaic. There is no conclusive evidence for final **-h₂* in the substantives. There is not much evidence in the substantives which proves that **-uh₂* and **-ih₂* > *-ū*, *-ī*. In the communis opinio, the loss of *-h₂* caused compensatory lengthening of the final syllable. Relics of this long vowel would directly be attested in Hittite *a-aš-šu-u* 'goods' and *mekki* (for a discussion see 3.6.1). Palaic also seems to give evidence that Proto-Anatolian originally had a neuter plural in **-ih₂* and **-uh₂*. The final laryngeal disappeared, which caused compensatory lengthening of the final syllable. This has been argued in detail by Melchert 1984b: 31ff. Melchert 1994: 215, 216 and 225 considers this a fact. The Palaic material consists of three forms: *ānnī*, which may be a neuter plural of a pronoun, *wašū*, which perhaps means 'good things' and *luki* 'distributions'.

Ānnī and *wašū* occur in 2 A rev. 21'ff *n-ašta GAL^{BI}A DINGIR^{LIM} šunnanzi nu ki si^{ku}* (this sentence is Hittite: 'And they fill the beakers of the god, and they sing the following:') *šāwayaya šūnat^D zaparwa_a-a-i ašūna huššinta* [*-an marhīnanta mān-aš marhanza a-an-ni-i wa-šu-u-ḫa* [*tab*] *arna tikuar* [] *šūna adu piša* "And (?) he has filled the beakers. They have offered them to Zaparwa to drink. They have *marhīna*'d [him?]. If he is angry, *ānnī wašūḫa*, oh, Tabarna, fill and give (them) to him".¹¹⁶

Watkins 1982: 256 argues that *ānnī wašū-ḫa* are neuter plurals meaning 'these good things'. He suggests that *wašūḫa* has preserved the laryngeal **-h₂* as *ḫ*. This has been refuted by Melchert 1984b: 32. He argues that *-ḫa* means

'also'. This *-ḫa* has to be compared to Luwian *-ḫa* and Hittite geminating *-a* 'and'. Therefore, only the pene written <U> (and not the <H>) is the reflex of final **-uh₂*. Melchert suggests that the pene written final vowel of the final syllable must be compared to Hittite *āššū* 'goods'.

Melchert and Watkins compare *ānnī* to Hittite *anni* 'that' and conclude that Palaic *ānnī* must be related to this Hittite pronoun. They suggest that *ānnī* is a nom. acc. neuter plural. Melchert 1984b: 32 translates *a-an-ni-i wa-šu-u-ḫa* [*tab*] *arna tikuar* [] *šūna adu piša* as 'May you yourself, oh Tabarna, fill also those good things and give (them) to him.'

The semantics of this phrase are, however, not as simple as Melchert's translation suggests. Gertz 1982: 198 points out that the identification of the hapax *ānnī* as 'those' is only based on the Hittite pronoun *anni*. She also points out that identification of *ānnī wašūḫa* as a neuter plural 'these good things' is neither contradicted nor confirmed by anything in the passage.

However, if *ānnī* and *wašū* indeed are neuter plurals as Melchert 1984b: 32 suggests, a few remarks must be made.

With Melchert, the final vowel in *wašū* can be compared to the pene written final <-U-U> in *āššū*. However, the final <-Ū> in *āššū* <**-uh₂* may be explained otherwise. My own suggestion will be **-ouh₂* (see 3.9.4). There is no evidence that also in Palaic the *u*-diphthongs did not monophthongize. Monophthongization of /ow/ into /u/ is suggested by the absence of the diphthong /aw/. Perhaps *mūs* 'be satiated' represents the reflex of an originally accented diphthong (Melchert 1994: 216, for etymology see Eichner 1975: 86 n. 6). If this were true, *wašū* might also represent the reflex of an original diphthong (see 3.9.4 for a more elaborate discussion). In any case, if one does not accept that the final <-U-U> is the reflex of an original diphthong, one can safely assume that the final syllable in *wašū* contains the reflex of **-h₂*.

If *ānnī* is a neuter plural, the final pene written <I> in *ānnī* is strong evidence for **-ih₂* > *-ī*. In Palaic the neuter plural pronoun shows two endings, viz. the *-c* in e.g. *n-e* 'and those (things)' and secondly the *-i* in the hapax *ānnī*. Old Hittite, on the other hand, only has one neuter plural pronoun ending, viz. *-e*. This *-e* has been attested in e.g. *ke* and in the anaphoric pronoun *-e*. It is probably the result of monophthongization of **oi*¹¹⁷ or *ai* (<**-eh₂* followed by the deictic particle *-i*, for which see 3.5.3) to *e*.

Palaic *ānnī* may contain a remarkable archaism. If this pronoun is an

¹¹⁶ Translation by Gertz 1982: 198.

¹¹⁷ Melchert 1984a: 70f suggests **oi*, the thematic stem followed by the neuter plural ending *-i*, attested in *ḫaḫaltumar-i*.

i-stem, it did not replace its old neuter plural ending $*-ih_2$ by a diphthong as e.g. Hittite did in *ke* and *kue*. *Ānni* originally ended in long $*-i < *-ih_2$, as Lat. *quā* $< *quā + a$ suggests. Palaic may, just like Latin, also have conserved the $-i$. As such it provides evidence that PIE $*-ih_2$ resulted in $-i$. Therefore, also prehistoric Hittite may have inherited a $*-h_2$ in the pronouns.

The third form to be discussed is *lukkī* 'distribution, portion'. This form occurs in the turn of phrase *luki lukinta* = *luki(-)lukiya* (2 B1 3 = 2 C obv. 8). Text 2 A obv. 2 has *luki[n]*. Melchert 1984b: points out that *luki lukinta* is probably a figura etymologica: 'they have distributed the distribution(s)'. He suggests that we have a collective plural *luki/luki* to a noun *luki-* ("which also fits well as the base for the derived verb *lukiye-*"). He explains c. *lugin* in copy A as a substitution for the collective accusative plural *luki*. However, there is nothing which supports the hypothesis that the forms *luki* and *luki* are plural. In fact, only the long final \bar{i} might suggest that *luki* is plural. This in itself is not conclusive. On the contrary, the parallel form *lugin* is definitely singular. Melchert himself 1994: 193, 197, 200 suggests that the noun *luki-* (no gender is given) comes from Proto-Anatolian $*lugi$ (with accented final \bar{i} !). Therefore, the long \bar{i} in *luki* can also be the reflex of $*-i$.

To sum up, if *wašū* and *ānni* are neuter plurals, they might indicate that at least Palaic gives some positive evidence for $*-ih_2 > -i$ and $*-uh_2 > -ū$. However, the \bar{u} in *wašū* may also be the reflex of an original diphthong followed by $*-h_2$ (see 3.9.4).

Melchert 1994: 87 argues that final $*-h_2$ disappeared after stops. As evidence he mentions *uk* 'I' $< *eḡh_2$, *mēk* $< *megh_2$ 'big', and *aniat* 'gear' $< *enyoth_2$.

The PIE word for the 1. sg. personal pronoun is usually reconstructed as $*eḡ(Hom)$ (e.g. Beekes 1990: 249). Lat. *ego* and Gk. *ἐγώ* are ambiguous. Skt. *ahám* suggests $*eḡHom$. Latin and Greek suggest $*eḡo$ or $*eḡoH$ (or perhaps $*eḡeH_3$). However, Gatha-Avestan once has *aš* $< *h_1eḡ$ (Beekes 1990: 249). This implies that PIE must have had forms without final $*-H$. Even if Hittite *ūk* contained a laryngeal, it is not certain which laryngeal we have to reconstruct. Therefore, *ūk* cannot be used as evidence for the fate of final $*-h_2$.¹¹⁸ There is no positive evidence that Hittite *ūk* inherited final $*-h_2$.

¹¹⁸ The u in Hittite *ūk* is probably analogous to the 2 sg. $*tū$ (Melchert 1994: 7) or from the accusative *ammak* (Beekes 1990: 249). Shields 1993 argues that *ūk* is a combination of two deictic particles, viz. $*u$ meaning 'here' (attested in e.g. Lat. *utr* 'so' and *ubi* 'where') followed by k , attested in e.g. Lat. *cis* and Gmc. *kēr*. As Melchert 1994: 84 points out, this

The second piece of evidence is provided by Old Hittite *mek*. The adjective for 'big, great' is the i-stem *mekki-*. This word finds a certain etymology in e.g. Gk. *μέγας, μέγα* 'great, big'. For PIE we can reconstruct $*megh_2$ acc. $mēgh_2-m$ (Gk. *ἄγαν* 'very, too much'). The double $<KK>$ in *mekki* is a safe indication for a laryngeal: if we had single PIE \bar{g} here, the Hittite $<K>$ would have been written single. The adjective *mekki* also has common-gender a-stem forms. Many of those forms are old. We have *mekkan*, *mekkuš* (see CHD vol. L-N: 245). And in Old Hittite we have the hapax *me-e-ik*. The context runs as follows: *takku mēkēs*¹¹⁹ (6') [... *mēk* *tianzi takku tēpus* (7') *tepu tianzi* 'If they are many(?), they put down much, if they(?) are few, they put down (a) little' StBoT 25.23 rev. 5'ff (6'). In this turn of phrase *tepu* and *mēk* probably have the same grammatical function, viz. object: 'a few' vs. 'a lot'. If we regard *mēk* as a neuter sg., it seems correct to assume that $mēgh_2 > mek$ and that *mēk* is a safe instance for $*Th_2 > -T$. However, this is not certain. Firstly, one can think of the following objections to *mēk* $< *megh_2$: as Neu 1983a: 119 suggests, *me-e-ik* is either a stem variant ending in a consonant or a mistake. Secondly, a neuter sg. *mēk* is unexpected: synchronically Hittite has either a-stem forms or i-stem forms. A neuter sg. would be either *mekkan*, the a-stem variant *mekki* (the i-stem variant). Thirdly, it is also possible that *mēk* is not the regular reflex of $*megh_2$. It can be the result of shortening in Hittite itself. In Old Hittite we have e.g. *turna* StBoT 25.59 i 6 instead of *turnakišna*. Finally, the i-suffix in Hittite is very old: it has been added to $*megh_2$ at a time when the laryngeal was still present: otherwise the double *k* would be unexpected.

The third form to be discussed is the enigmatic form *aniat* (see 2.7.2.2). Neu 1983a: 16 n. 74 emends this form to *aniyatta*. Melchert 1987: 19f n. 3 suggests that *aniyat-* is the regular form with normal loss of $-h_2$ after stops and that the form *aniyatta* is analogous. This explanation seems attractive, because we do not have to emend this form *aniat* to *aniyatta*. Gertz 1982: 10, on the other hand, considers *aniat-* to be the neuter singular of the word of which *aniyatta* is the regular plural. However, neuter gender is not attractive because all nouns with the suffix $-att-$ are common gender (Berman 1972: 155ff). Thus, we may have c. *aniyat-š* and as collective plural *aniat* $< *en-yōt-h_2$ as posited

explanation fails to account for the plene written $<U>$ and is "based on several dubious premisses".

¹¹⁹ Neu 1980a: 61 n. 229 suggests that this form may have to be corrected to *me-e-ik* $< ke > e-ēš$ with double $<K>$. However, he signals we also have *me-ek-ēš* in KUB 42.29 obv¹ ii² 6.

by Melchert 1994: 87. A c. *aniyatt-* with a neuter plural fits in the scheme represented by Lat. *locus, loci* vs. *loca* because Hittite also seems to have had words with this pattern (see 2.7.2). We can assume that at a very early stage Hittite replaced the old regular form (**ani(y)at-*) with *aniyatta* and that it took the *-a* from the adjectives or the *a*-stems. It is not surprising that the neuter plural collective *aniyatta* was the most common form: it was used in a specialized sense, viz. the attire the king wore during sacrifice, or the objects needed to perform a ritual or sacrifice (Kammenhuber HW₂: 88ff). Contra *aniat* < **en-yót-h₂* (Melchert 1994: 87) one can argue that the context gives us no clue whatsoever to the meaning of *aniat*. It is a hapax, and *a-ni-at* is an unusual form, because all the other instances of *aniyatta* show a glide (see HW₂: 88ff). Therefore, this form may have to be emended to *a-ni-ya-at-ta*. Perhaps *a-ni-at* does not even belong to the lemma to which *aniyatta* belongs. In short, also *aniat* does not provide conclusive evidence for **-Ch₂* > *-C*.

To sum up, there is no safe evidence that **-h₂* disappeared after stops.

For the loss of *-h₂* after resonants, Melchert 1994: 87 mentions two pieces of evidence, *mema*l < **mema*l_{h₂} and (*kit*)*kar* 'at the head' < *kerh₂*.

Kit in *kitkar* is identical to *kēt*, which means 'here'. As to form, *kit* is probably an ablative (Melchert 1977: 207). The element *kar* contains the word for 'head' attested in e.g. Gk. *ῥῆτι* 'head'. The Hittite element *kar* finds, according to Nussbaum 1986: 98, an exact parallel in Gk. *ἐν ῥῆτι* 'headlong'. Nussbaum suggests that both *kitkar* and *ἐν ῥῆτι* are old endingless locatives. These locatives had a proto-form **kerh₂*. In univibration this **kerh₂* was reduced to *-k₂h₂* with elision of the *e*. Gk. *ῥῆτι* 'as far as, until' shows the same elision of the *e* in univibration. This word can be reconstructed as **me-ḡ^hsri*. The second element contains **ḡ^hesr* 'hand', with elided *e*. For *kitkar* Nussbaum suggests a parallel process: **kerh₂* > *k₂r* > *-kar* with loss of *-h₂*.

This causes problems. Firstly, as pointed out by Beekes 1989: 56, the loss of **-h₂* is unparalleled (instead of *ῥῆτι* we would rather have **ῥῆπα*). For the development of *-h₂* in the position *-Th₂h₂* one can compare with Beekes 1969: 161 the feminine participles in **-ia*. As Beekes also points out, there is no evidence for loss of final **-h₂* in Greek, e.g. *μέγα* < **még^hh₂* and *γένεα* < **genes^hh₂*. Secondly, Nussbaum 1986: 79f assumes that PIE did not have an endingless locative **-Ker* > **k₂r* > *-kar* of a root noun **Ker-*, without final *-h₂*, because he assumes that all the words for 'head' derived from **Ker-* had a laryngeal. "If there was an endingless locative to this word for 'head' at all, it would have been to the **-(e)h₂*-stem." In other words: because all the other words for 'head' originally contained a laryngeal, Hittite *kitkar* and Gk. *ἐν ῥῆτι* must also have had a laryngeal.

This is not necessarily true. Nussbaum 1986: 98 suggests that the reduction of the endingless locative **-K₂h₂* > **-K₂h₂* in univibrated expressions has to be dated already in PIE. He suggests, p. 2ff that PIE must have had a root noun **Ker*. This root noun received the extensions *-n(o)-* and *-u-*, both made on **k₂(e)r* meaning 'horn'. There were also extensions containing the suffix **-h₂*. They could mean both 'head' and 'horn' (19f). There, Nussbaum argues, *kitkar* must have contained a laryngeal too.

This too is not necessarily true. Since he himself argues that the formation of *kitkar* must have been very old, there is nothing which proves the existence of a final laryngeal here. Therefore, one might just as well suggest PIE **Ker* meaning 'bone substance' > 'head', which received a laryngeal everywhere except in the pre-forms of *kitkar* and Gk. *ἐν ῥῆτι*. These two forms do not show any trace of a laryngeal, because already in PIE the form **k₂r* in univibrated forms was fossilized. Note also that final **-Cr* in Hittite becomes *-ar*, e.g. *kessar* 'hand' < PIE **ḡ^hésr*. Therefore, *kitkar* does not prove that **-h₂* became zero after resonants.

The second form for **-Rh₂* > **-R* adduced by Melchert 1994: 87 is *mema*l 'groats'. The root of this word certainly contained a laryngeal, which can still be seen in its Luvian cognate *malhu-*, *malu-* 'break' (Melchert 1988b: 215f). For *mema*l this suggests **mema*l_{h₂}. However, as pointed out by Melchert 1994: 87, levelling of the oblique stem *mema*l- without laryngeal (we do not have ***mema*l_{h₂} in the oblique cases) is also possible. Therefore, also *mema*l does not provide conclusive evidence that after resonants final *-h₂* disappeared. There is no positive proof that **-h₂* disappeared after resonants.

To sum up, there is no positive evidence that **-h₂* disappeared after stops or after resonants. On the other hand, Palaic may indicate that **-ih₂* and **-uh₂* resulted in *-i* and *-u*.

However, one may also defend **-Ch₂* > *-a*. It has been suggested by Beekes 1988a: 82 that in word final position **-h₂* became *-a*. As evidence he mentions the nom. acc. neuter plural in *-a*, the *-e* in the neuter plural ending of the pronouns (e.g. *kē*) and the 1 pl. med. *-wasta*, roughly < **mesad^hh₂*. I will discuss the ending *-a* first and conclude that Beekes may be right in assuming **-Ch₂* resulted in *-a*.

It is widely agreed upon that the sequence **-eh₂* resulted in *-a*. The neuter plural in the *o*-stem substantives is very rare. The *a*-stem adjectives, on the other hand, do have a neuter plural in *-a*, e.g. *dannata* 'uninhabited, empty'. According to the communis opinio (e.g. Oettinger 1979: 546, Watkins 1982: 256 and Melchert 1994: 85f) this *-a* originated from **-eh₂*. This ending is

usually equated with the neuter plural ending in Skt. *priya* 'dear'. Oettinger 1979: 546 assumes that this development already took place in PIE. He, p. 455, suggests that proof for **-eh₂* can still be found in the *-ah₂hi-* verbs, e.g. *newadh₂-* 'renew' from *newa-* 'new'.¹²⁰

Watkins 1982: 256 points out that this ending does not show plene writing, which we might expect if the *-a* originated from **-eh₂*. Melchert 1994: 86 points out that this vowel was probably short because there is no orthographic constraint on final *-Ca-a*.

Beekes 1994, however, signals that deriving the neuter plural of the PIE *o*-stems from *e*, ablauting with *o* followed by **-h₂* is problematic. As he points out, the **-h₂* was a derivational suffix making collectives. If the standard theory were correct, this collective suffix would be added to the stem in *-e* from the thematic nouns. He finds strong indications that such a derivation is not possible. In other words: there is no evidence that the thematic nouns had a stem in *e-*. Therefore, Beekes suggests that the Greek *o*-stem neuter plural ending in (short) *-a* is older than the neuter plural in *-ā* we find elsewhere. Beekes 1994: 14 suggests that the long *-ā* < **-eh₂* which we find in e.g. Skt. *priyā* in the *o*-stems may have originated in the pronouns.

Beekes' suggestion that the neuter plural in the PIE *o*-stems cannot have been **-eh₂* has repercussions on the Hittite material. Firstly, as already pointed out by Watkins 1982: 256 the neuter plural ending never shows plene < *-A-A* >. With Melchert 1994: 85f one must conclude that his ending was short. Therefore, this ending may not contain the reflex of **-eh₂*, which would have been written plene in at least some cases. Instead, it may be the reflex of just **-h₂*.

Therefore, also prehistoric Hittite, like Greek, possessed a neuter plural ending **-h₂* after stops which resulted in *-Ca*. This solves the problem why the neuter plural ending *-a* is never written plene.

The second piece of evidence provided by Beekes for the development of **-eh₂* > *-a* is the 1 sg. med. ending *-wašta*. The final *-a* might be the regular reflex of **-h₂* if this ending were **-mesah₂*. However, this *-a* can be explained in different ways. It can be analogous to the other plural medio-passive plural endings, the 2 pl. *-duma* and the 3 pl. *-anta(ri)*. Secondly, this *-a* can be graphic. Thirdly, it can be explained as a propvowel inserted in order to keep intact the final cluster, just as in the pret. 3 sg. ending *-Cta*, cf. Melchert 1994: 87.

For *ke* Beekes 1988a: 82 suggests **kh₂* or **ko-h₂*, which yielded **ka*, fol-

lowed by a particle *i*. The diphthong **-ai* monophthongized into *e*. Melchert 1984a: 70 mentions other possible sources for this *e*. He suggests "undoubtedly an *i*-diphthong". Melchert dismisses Sturtevant 1933: 99 who connects this *-e* with Lat. *quac* < **k^weh₂-i*, because this proto-form would have yielded ***kuwah₂hi*. The argument that **k^weh₂-i* > ***kuwah₂hi* is weak. Gertz 1982: 327 easily meets this by positing **-eh₂* followed by an optional particle *-i*.

Melchert points out that the suggestion by Eichner 1973: 79, viz. dual from *-oih₂* or a plural in **-eh₂* is falsified by the *-e* in *ke*, because an *ei*-diphthong in front of velar becomes *i*, cf. *kitta* < **keito*. Melchert himself considers *o-i*, the thematic stem *o-* plus the neuter plural ending *-i*. This suggestion implies that this *i*-ending is very old. If this were true, we would have had more cases than just *huhuppalli* (see 2.6.3) in Old and Middle Hittite. Therefore, Melchert's suggestion can be dismissed. Beekes' suggestion for **kh₂+i* > **kai* with vocalisation of laryngeal is not compelling either. One may think of other solutions. A phonological **-eh₂* > **-a* followed by *i* is impeccable and the Hittite forms can be compared to the Vedic pronouns neuter plural ending *-ā* which is attested in e.g. *tā* 'that' and *tyā*. To sum up, both **-h₂* and **-eh₂* in word final position may have resulted in *-a*.

3.5.2.1 Conclusion

The evidence for the fate of Hittite final **-h₂* is small. However, one might propose the following developments:

- a: **-ih₂* > *-ū*
- b: **-uh₂* > *-ī*
- c: **-Ch₂* > *-Ca*
- d: **-eh₂* > *-a*

There is no positive evidence that **-Rh₂* > **R* nor is there any positive indication that final **-h₂* disappeared in consonant clusters or after stops.

To put it mildly, the material is not abundant. However, it is necessary to point out that the positive evidence comes from pronouns and from substantivized adjectives, viz. the Palaic neuter plural pronoun *ānni* and *wasū* 'goods' and perhaps from Hittite *āššu* 'goods'. Some evidence for **-eh₂* > *-a* is provided by the pronouns. Note that this development is old: it has to be inferred from e.g. *ke* < **keh₂* + *i*. The fact that **-Ch₂* > *-Ca* is significant. If prehistoric Hittite possessed a neuter plural in **-h₂* the ending *-a* would have been frequent. This is not what we have: the ending *-a* occurs not very often. There is no material suggesting that in prehistoric Hittite **-h₂* was present in the substantives and adjectives used as adjunct.

¹²⁰ Beekes 1994: 13 n. 4 denies this.

I will tackle the rest of the material without any preconceptions whatsoever. In the next section I will put forward some non-laryngealistic arguments that the material discussed in 3.3 and in 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 suggest that prehistoric Hittite did not have, or hardly had, a neuter plural.

3.5.3 Neuter plural in prehistoric Hittite was rare

Indifference to number, which implies that the neuter originally did not have a plural, is firstly seen in the hysterodynamic forms: the neuter hysterodynamic nom.acc. can be both singular and plural. It is only by means of agreement with adjectives or pronouns that the number can be established. Only the few simple *r/n*-stems seem to have a difference between singular and plural. And even for this stem class it is possible that the hysterodynamic neuter plural form has singular (collective) meaning: e.g. *uddār* can be considered a collective: 'speech' instead of 'words'. Even *widār* in 8 *widār* lit. 'eight waters' might be considered a grammatical collective. Dutch provides nice parallels, e.g. 'acht koffie', where English has 'eight coffees'.

Even *-a* seems to have been used both as a singular and as a plural ending. Singular value is seen in e.g. *kušata* 'dowry'. This word is referred to by the neuter sg. relative pronoun *kuit* in the phrase *kušata-ma kuit piddait* 'the dowry he has brought'. In *uzu šuppa zeyan* 'roasted meat', *šuppa* 'meat' is perhaps referred to by an attributive neuter sg. participle (see, however, 3.4.2 for an alternative explanation).

Also in the adjectives, the ending *-a* sometimes seems to have singular value. This can be seen in e.g. *šuppa asru kuitki* 'some holy place'. One may even contend that in sequences like *öl āra* 'it is not allowed', the adjectives in *-a* are indifferent to number: there is nothing which suggests that the *-a* in *āra* 'right, allowed' and in *kunna* 'propitious' has plural meaning (see 3.8.1.1).

There is evidence, then, that the Hittite neuters were, at least partly, indifferent to number. It is clear that formations used in other Indo-European languages to form neuter plurals could be used in Hittite to make neuter singulars too. Consequently, it is legitimate to ask to what extent prehistoric Hittite had a neuter plural. Neu 1969, Beekes 1981: 279f and Weitenberg 1984: 370 argue that Hittite cannot have lost the neuter plural, because it never had one.

This view is supported by the evidence cited sub 2.7.4, where one can easily see that the substantival ending *-a*, which is the standard neuter plural ending, is young.

Taken at face value, the material suggests that in the period before it was recorded Hittite did not, or hardly ever, have a neuter plural. In order to

give additional support for the hypothesis that prehistoric Hittite did not have a neuter plural, one can argue along the following lines: the *r*-less forms of the secondary *r/n*-stems are mostly singular collectives: *lušū GI-ešša* means 'senate, old men's council'. It does not mean 'senates'. Therefore, it is a grammatical singular. The consequence of this observation is that the *r*-less forms, e.g. 4 *wagešša* 'four *wagešsar*-loaves' are also singular. Plural meaning is only suggested by the numeral 4.

This fits into with the observation made by Neu 1970: 57, who points out that in the Old Hittite thunder-storm ritual neuter nouns preceded by numerals higher than one appear in their singular form. The common-gender nouns, on the other hand mostly occur in their plural form when they are preceded by numerals higher than one. This also strongly suggests that the Hittite neuter substantives did not have a neuter plural.

Moreover, if prehistoric Hittite had a neuter plural, the neuters preceded by numerals higher than one would have had a characterized neuter plural form in *-a*: we would expect e.g. 7 ***hattaluwa* instead of 7 *hattalu* 'seven bolts', because the common-gender nouns appear as plural, e.g. 2 *hupparus* StBot 12 ii 31f.

In view of the arguments put forward in this section, one can assume that in prehistoric Hittite the nom.acc. neuter plural was rare.

3.6 THE SUBSTANTIVES

3.6.1 The *i*- and *u*-stem substantives

3.6.1.1 Watkins' theory: **-ih₂* and **-uh₂* > *-i* and *-u*

As the material cited sub 2.5.2 and 2.5.3 shows, the uncharacterized neuter plural of the *i*- and *u*-stem substantives occurs frequently. The ending *-a* is rare. This *-a* is attested only once in Old Hittite, in *wēlluwa*, the plural of *wēllu*- 'meadow'. In Young Hittite, from *Ḫattušili III* onwards, the ending *-a* seems to spread. This indicates that the ending *-a* is secondary. In the following paragraphs it will be investigated whether, and to what extent, the uncharacterized neuter plural in the *i*- and *u*-stems is old.

There are scholars (e.g. Gertz 1982: 279ff, Watkins 1982, Kimball 1983: 486ff and most recently Melchert 1994: 85f) who suggest that the short final vowel in e.g. *idālu*, the nom.acc. neuter plural from *idālu*- 'evil, bad'¹²¹ is the

¹²¹ This is plural as is indicated by *idālu uddār* 'evil words'.

result of shortening: $*-uh_2 > -\bar{u} > -u$. Watkins 1982 gives the most elaborate account.

He suggests that in prehistoric Hittite $*-ih_2$ and $*-uh_2$ resulted in $*-i$ and $*-\bar{u}$. These long vowels were later shortened. Therefore, plurals like *i-da-a-lu* 'evil, bad', *a-aš-šu* 'good'¹²² and $^{G1S}zu-up-pa-ri-ri^{H1A}$ 'torches'¹²³ have a short final vowel. These forms are plural, as is confirmed by grammatical concord. The shortening of $*-i$ and $*-\bar{u}$ resulted in a complete merger of the singular and plural of the neuter *i*- and *u*-stem substantives and adjectives. Therefore, Watkins assumes that all the uncharacterized plurals of the *i*- and *u*-stems originated from $*-ih_2$ and $*-uh_2$.

Watkins claims that in some words traces of the ending $*-h_2$ can still be found. The most important word is *a-aš-šu-u* 'goods'. This form is plural as is proved by agreement with the plural relative pronoun *kue*: *kue a-aš-šu-u* 'which goods' KUB 43.60 i 22. Watkins parallels *a-aš-šu-u* with Vedic *vásu* 'goods', which nearly always acts as a substantive (this word has a different etymology but the same meaning). The long final vowel in *vásu* is the reflex of PIE $*-uh_2$, which is the zero grade of the suffix *-u-*, followed by the neuter plural ending $*-h_2$.¹²⁴ Watkins further mentions *tarrū* 'on one's stomach, on all fours'. In *wizzi-ma-za pa-ri tar-ru-u šeši* 'Il vient se coucher plat ventre' (translation Laroche 1959: 149f) KUB 9.4 ii 25f, we find *tarrū*, which is paralleled by *tarrawa* in the duplicate KUB 9.34 iii 9. *Tarrawa* may be a neuter plural used as an adverb. Therefore, Watkins claims that *tarrū* too must be plural. However, there is no positive proof that the plene <-U-U> indicates that *tarrū* is a plural form (see 2.4.5).

Watkins (p. 259) also mentions *mekki* in *takku LÜ* $^{G1S}TUKUL-aš A.S^{H1A}-šu$ *humandan kuisi wāši ... takku A.S^{H1A}-na me-ik-ki-i wāši* 'If someone buys all a ^{G1S}T -person's land ... but if he (only) buys a lot of the land' KBo 6.2

¹²² Watkins 1982: 257 beautifully proves plural value for *aššu* and *idātu* by pointing to KUB 33.68 ii 11f (OH in Middle Hittite ductus according to Melchert 1977: 53) *ziḡ-a ʾu i-da-a-lu uddār arḫa peššiya nu-za a-aš-šu uddār dā* 'But you, storm-god, cast away the evil words, and accept the good words.'

¹²³ The gender and number are proved by 1926/u 13' (Otten 1971: 46) *[zup]pari-ri^{H1A} kue lukkanzi* 'the torches which they light' (p. 259, n. 18), where *zuppari* agrees with a neuter plural relative pronoun.

¹²⁴ As Watkins 1982: 255 points out, in Vedic this word is more often written with short final vowel. The short vowel resulted from sandhi-loss of the laryngeal ending in verse-final position or verse break (so Kuiper 1955).

ii 45ff (46) (Laws I §47 (OHC)). *Mekki* here stands in partitive apposition to *A.S^{H1A}* 'land'.

The last form claimed by Watkins to be a neuter plural is *karši* (p. 260). This word occurs in the sequence *karši zahḫiya* 'to fight without restraint, without hesitation' KUB 14.1 + 30, 31, 32 (CTH 147, MHC). In later Hittite *karši* is replaced by *karšaya*, which seems to be a morphological renewal of an *i*-stem neuter plural. *Karšaya zahḫiya* occurs e.g. in KBo 5.4 ii 30 (CTH 67, NHC). According to Watkins, this also points to an old $*-ih_2$ which has later been replaced by secondary *-aya*.

3.6.1.2 Problems with Watkins' theory

At first sight Watkins' arguments are very appealing. However, they offer problems.

The data collected by Weitenberg 1984: passim for the *u*-stems and the material presented by Friedrich 1960: 50f show a clear contrast between *u*-stem adjectives and substantives: in the oblique cases the *u*-stem adjectives have full grade in the suffix throughout the paradigm (p. 309). The substantives, on the other hand, consistently show zero grade (p. 308). In the *i*-stems the situation is the same, e.g. *šallayas* or *šallaš* from *šalti* 'big, great' with loss of intervocalic *-i*.¹²⁵ In the adjectives, whereas the substantives have zero grade in the suffix throughout the paradigm. This implies that the adjectives and the substantives have to be treated separately. Because we expect full grade (*-aya-* or *-awa-*) in the adjectives and not the attested zero grade, Watkins' theory offers difficulties. In the next paragraph I will discuss the evidence offered by Watkins.

The *i*-stem adjectives present the following problems: *karši* < $-ih_2$ in *karši zahḫiya* has alongside *karšaya*, which looks like a neuter plural, a by-form *karšiya* in KBo 5.9 ii 4 (CTH 62, NHC). Friedrich 1952: 103 considers these forms to be a dat.loc. singular. Gertz 1982: 366f points out that both *karši* and *karšaya* can be well-formed neuter plural adjectives and well-formed dat.locatives. *Karšiya*, however, is not likely to be neuter plural because in the nom.acc. neuter plural no *-iya* has been attested. It is probably a noun dative. Adjectives sometimes have noun inflection (e.g. *parkuyaš* KUB 5.6 ii 61). Because *karšiya* is certainly not a well formed nom.acc. neuter plural, there is no compelling reason to take *karši* as a neuter plural. Gertz therefore suggests to follow Friedrich and takes *karši*, *karšaya* and *karšiya* as datives. An additional argument contra neuter plural is that there is no positive evidence

¹²⁵ For the loss of intervocalic *-i* see Melchert 1984a: 31f.

that the form ending in *-i* is a grammatical plural. If *karši* is a nom. acc. neuter, it might just as well be a singular.

It cannot be proved that *mekki* is a plural (see 2.4.3) either. Moreover, the final long *-i* cannot be a direct reflex of PIE **-ih₂*. *Mekki* is directly related to Gk. μέγας, nt. μέγα. The PIE root was **megh₂* and Hittite only secondarily received an *i*-suffix. Therefore, even if the *i* in *mekki* would be plural, the long final *-i* cannot be the direct reflex of PIE **-ih₂*.

The neuter plurals in *-i* < **-ih₂*, mentioned by Watkins are open to discussion and the parallel between the Hittite and Sanskrit neuter adjectives is not necessarily correct. The evidence comes from the *u*-stems *a-aš-šu-u* 'goods' and perhaps from *tar-ru-u* 'on all fours', but not from the *i*-stems.

Another serious problem with Watkins' interpretation has been signalled by Gertz 1982: 303. She objects that if the final vowel of *a-aš-šu-u* is indeed a long vowel < PIE **-uh₂*, we would expect more cases of final plene written vowel in the nom. acc. neuter plural of the *u*- and *i*-stems: they also originated from **-ih₂* and **-uh₂*. She then argues that the final vowel in *a-aš-šu-u* is not the result of compensatory lengthening of *-u* because of loss of final laryngeal **-h₂* for "plene spelling and inherited vowel length are not necessarily linked". For a more elaborate discussion on *a-aš-šu-u* see 3.9.3 (and 3.9.4), where I will demonstrate that the history of *a-aš-šu-u* is too complicated to believe, as Watkins does, that all short *u*'s and *i*'s in the neuter plural of the adjectives and substantives originated from **-uh₂* or **-ih₂*. This only leaves *tar-ru-u* as a possible neuter plural. However, there is nothing which suggests that this form actually is a neuter plural (see 2.4.5).

Kimball 1983: 487 suggests that the lack of plene writing in e.g. *idālu* 'evil', *wēllu* 'meadow' etc. is a coincidence. This cannot be proved, because we do not have any evidence: we always have short *-u* or *-i*.

To sum up, the evidence and argumentation that in Hittite **-ih₂* and **-uh₂* > *-i*, viz. *-u* is weak. The evidence for plural value of plene writing has not been found in the substantives but in two adjectives: *aššu* 'good' and *tar-ru* 'on all fours'. Therefore, there is no proof whatsoever that the final *-i* and *-u* in the substantives is the reflex of **-ih₂*, viz. **-uh₂*.¹²⁶

3.6.1.3 Conclusion for the *u*-stem substantives

Because the proof for prehistoric Hittite final **-uh₂* > *-u* is weak, it seems

¹²⁶ For a discussion of the instances with plene written final vowel see 2.4. The material presented there clearly shows that synchronically there is no indication whatsoever that the *-i* and *-u* are plural forms.

more likely that prehistoric Hittite did not have a laryngeal in this position and that the prehistoric Hittite *u*-stem substantives originally did not have a neuter plural.

The ending *-a* in e.g. *wēlluwa* and *genuwa* is secondary. This is indicated by the fact that this ending spreads in young Hittite (from Hattušili III onwards). If one prefers to believe that prehistoric Hittite had an *u*-stem neuter plural in **-uh₂*, the *-a* still should be considered secondary because of the arguments given by Watkins 1982 on e.g. **wēllu₂*. If Watkins' argumentation and the argumentation sub 3.5.2 is correct, this form could not have developed to *wēlluwa*.

3.6.1.4 The *i*-stem substantives

The short *-i* is usually paralleled with e.g. Gk. τρία, Lat. tria, Skt. trī, OIr. trí < **trih₂*. Hittite short *-i* is usually considered to be the regular reflex of **-ih₂*. However, the evidence for **-ih₂* > *-i* is weak. Moreover, the words with final *-i* are probably no plural forms (see 2.4.3 and 2.4.4).

Therefore, the same arguments used for the *u*-stems (see 3.6.1.3) are also valid here. Thus, the short *-i* could be the reflex of prehistoric Hittite short *-i*. In this case the *i*-stems had, like the *u*-stems, no neuter plural. The situation of the *i*-stems needs some more comment. Firstly, there is some evidence that in Hittite the unaccented final *-i* disappeared (Joseph 1984: 11f). If unaccented *-i* disappeared, a neuter singular in *-i* would not be the regular outcome of prehistoric Hittite **-i*. Only the plural in *-i* < **-ih₂* would be regular.

Oettinger 1993 and 1995a: 315 starts from this theory in order to suggest that forms like *huḫupalli*, *zerialli*, written with double <LL>, are plural. He suggests that in prehistoric Hittite these words were *i*-stems. Only in the nom. acc. neuter plural the *-i* was accented because it was the reflex of **-i* < **-ih₂*. Because the nom. acc. sg. was unaccented, the *-i* disappeared and forms without final *-i*, like **huḫupal(l)* and **zerial(l)* originated. Oettinger 1993: 210ff suggests that this shift of accent may have been inherited from late PIE: collectives received final accent "als der Ablaut sicher nicht mehr phonologisch geregelt war", e.g. late PIE **sekōr* < **sek-ōr* 'dung'. As I have shown in 2.6.4, the Hittite material of these nouns is more difficult to interpret than Oettinger suggests. Sometimes words ending in *-alli* and *-ulli* are singulars. Moreover, Hittite does not give unambiguous support for a shift of accent in the collectives,

like *a-aš-šu-u* 'goods'¹²⁷ and *ú-i-da-a-ar* 'water(s)'.¹²⁸

Other examples for the loss of final *-i* include *šer* 'above' < **seri*, cf. Luw. *šarri*, Lyc. *hri*, *it* 'go' < **id^hi*, the ablative ending *-az* < **-ati*, (cf. Luwian *-ati*, Lyc. *-c/adi*), *hanza* 'in front' < **h₂enti*. OH *nepišza* (/nepists/), the abl. of *nepiš* 'sky', may be the regular development of **nepisti* > /nepistz/. In *ešza*, the 3 sg. pres. from *eš-* 'to be' (KBo 6.2 iv 54, OHC), *harza* 3 sg. pres. from *har(k)-* 'hold' and *kappuwanza* 3 pl. pres. from *kappuwa/a-* 'count' (Melchert 1994: 183) *-za* (/ts/) may be the regular development of the PIE 3 sg. ending **-ti*. We have to assume assimilation of *-ti* > *-zi* with subsequent loss of final unaccented *i*.

However, Melchert 1994: 182 argues that final unaccented *-i* seems to be clearly preserved after most consonants; e.g. *kuwapi* 'where, when' < **k^wōbi*, 3 pret. med. *-ati* < **-odi*. He points out that the deletion of final *-i* here takes place only in the historical period. Secondly, Melchert compares the apocope in *it* < **id^hi* to the Latin allegro forms Lat. *fac* and *duc*. Thirdly, Melchert points out that the particle *-i* in *eni*, *aši* and *uni* must be unaccented. Finally, the *-i* in the verbal endings *-mi*, *-ši*, *-weni*, and *-teni* are unaccented. Therefore, Melchert points out, the only good case for unaccented **-i* > zero is final *-ti*. Here final *-t* developed into /-ts/ with assimilation and subsequent loss of final *-i*, e.g. *harza* < *harzi* and *ešza* < **ešti*, *hanza* < old loc. sg. **h₂enti* and the abl. sg. *-(z)a* < *-ti*. However, this development is recent as is shown by *-ziya*, the abl. followed by the particle *-a* and the doublet *kez* and *kezziya* (Melchert 1977: 440). This leaves only *šer* < **seri*, cf. Luw. *šarri*, Lyc. *hri*. Melchert 1994: 183 "marginally" considers the loss after *r* here to be regular. However, as he himself points out, an endless locative **ser* cannot be excluded. To sum up, it is more likely that if the *-i* disappeared, this development is recent.

For the neuter plural of the *i*-stem substantives one can conclude that prehistoric Hittite had an uncharacterized neuter plural.

Therefore, for the *i*-stem substantives one can use the same arguments as for the *u*-stem substantives: prehistoric Hittite had an uncharacterized neuter plural.

There is another factor which makes the *i*-stem substantives different from the *u*-stems. The *u*-stems have a secondary neuter plural ending *-a*, viz. *-uwa*,

¹²⁷ See 3.9.4, where I will argue that the plene < *-U-U* > in this word may be the reflex of earlier **-owh₂*.

¹²⁸ See 3.3.2, where I have shown that prehistoric Hittite rather points to a zero grade in the first syllable and to long accented final syllable.

whereas the *i*-stems do not have a parallel secondary neuter plural ending ***-iya*.

Gertz 1982: 280 suggests that because Hieroglyphic Luwian has a neuter plural ending *-iya* Proto-Anatolian had developed an analogous ending **-iya*. Therefore, she argues, Hittite must have had **-iya* too. In order to account for the loss of this ending, Gertz discusses Starke 1977: 107f and Brosman 1964: 347f. They claim that the formation of *-iya* was blocked in order to avoid confusion with the directive ending *-iya*. The directive probably came from **-ō* (**-oH*), cf. Gk. *ἄνω* 'up',¹²⁹ see also Laroche 1970: 46ff.

As Gertz points out, a counterargument can be found in the fact that *u*-stems do have both a directive in *-uwa* (e.g. *halentuwa* 'to the *h₂-* house and *wappuwa* 'to the river bank')¹³⁰ and a nom.acc. neuter plural in *-uwa*, e.g. Old Hittite *welhuwa*.

She suggests that if Hittite inherited a neuter plural in **-iya*, there must have been a sound change which blocked the coalescence of the dir. sg. with the neuter plural. Gertz suggests a development of *-iya* to *-i*, e.g. old *hantezziya* > *hantezzi* in late Hittite. This development also occurs earlier: Middle Hittite *sig₃-in* /lazzin/ 'good' < **lazziyan* points to an earlier development in some cases. Gertz suggests that already in prehistoric Hittite **-iya* must have become *-i* in some positions. Therefore, in prehistoric Hittite the nom.acc. neuter plural ending of the *i*-stems could have been **-iya*. Already in prehistoric Hittite this *-iya* had become *-i*. Gertz suggests that this **-iya* became *-i* before the proto-form of the directive (**-ō*) became *-a*, because otherwise the directive of the *i*-stems could not have been *-iya*.

She objects to her own suggestion that we have to assume that the change of **-iya* > *-i* occurred much earlier in Auslaut than in Inlaut, because until late Hittite forms like *hantezziyan* have been attested. In this form *-iya* occurs in Inlaut.

The nom.acc. neuter plural *-i* of the *i*-stem adjectives, e.g. *nakki* and *hantezzi*, seems to support her suggestion. These adjectives are old *iya*-stems. They have substantial inflection: the *i*-suffix consistently appears in the zero grade (e.g. *nakkiyaš*, gen. of *nakki* 'heavy' instead of ***nakkayaš* or ***nakkas*). The oblique cases, e.g. the genitive in *-iyaš* shows that these adjectives originally were adjectives in *-iya* < PIE **-iya*. Therefore, the reflex of prehistoric

¹²⁹ Weitenberg 1984: 348 denies **-ō* as source for the *-a* in the directive because the *-a* is never written plene.

¹³⁰ Weitenberg 1984: 320f.

Hittite *-iya* may be attested in e.g. *nakki* and *hantaczi*. However, the suggestion that prehistoric **-iya* > *-i* in Auslaut, is not verifiable, because the material adduced for this hypothesis, comes solely from the old adjectives in *-iya*. Sub 3.8.3.1 it will be argued that the shift of *-iya* stems to *i*-stem forms is not due to phonological causes but to morphological causes.

The argument put forward by Gertz that **-iya* > *-i* is not conclusive.

This implies that Hittite does not give positive evidence that Proto-Anatolian had an *i*-stem neuter plural ending **-iya*. It was perhaps Hieroglyphic Luwian which renewed the old uncharacterized neuter plural ending *-i* to *-iya*. Therefore, one can conclude that the Hittite *i*-stem neuter "plural" in *-i* is more archaic than the ending *-iya* in Hieroglyphic Luwian.

Therefore, the problem should be posed as follows: why did the *i*-stems not develop a neuter plural on *-iya* and why did the *u*-stems develop a neuter plural *-uwa*?

To sum up, the uncharacterized neuter plural of the *i*-stems (e.g. *išmeri*) is probably archaic. There is no evidence that prehistoric Hittite had **-iya*.

3.6.2 The resonant-stems

It has been shown sub 3.5.2 that the evidence outside the neuter plural for final *-Rh₂* > zero is not conclusive. This implies that it is impossible to state that in prehistoric Hittite the resonant-stems had a neuter plural in *-h₂* which was lost.

In older Hittite I have not found evidence for a nom. acc. neuter plural in *-a* of stems ending in a resonant. They are uncharacterized, e.g. *išhiul* 'treaties'. Later the uncharacterized plural was replaced by the ending *-i*. The resonant-stems did not or hardly receive the neuter plural ending *-a*: we find *išhiuli* and not ***išhiula*.

As Beekes 1981: 279f already pointed out, it seems strange that the resonant-stems would have replaced an existing neuter plural ending *-a* by an ending *-i*: there is no need to replace an already existing ending *-a* by an innovation. This also indicates that prehistoric Hittite did not have the nom. acc. neuter plural *-a* in the resonant-stems.

3.6.3 Conclusion for the uncharacterized neuter plural

There is no positive evidence that prehistoric Hittite had a characterized neuter plural in the *u*-, *i*- and resonant-stem substantives. This implies that in these stem classes the neuter substantives did not have a plural: only by means of agreement Hittite was able to distinguish between singular and plural.

The resonant-stems sometimes show a nom. acc. neuter plural ending *-i*.

This indicates that they did not have a nom. acc. neuter plural ending *-a* and that these nouns originally did not have a neuter plural.

3.6.4 The ending *-i*

The bulk of the evidence for the neuter plural ending *-i* has been attested in Young Hittite. However, this ending already occurs once in Old Hittite: we have *huhupalli* from *huhupal-* (musical instrument). A form *huhupall-a* 'and *h.*' StBoT 25.54 i 10 (see 2.6.3) proves that this noun is an *l*-stem.

The ending *-i* is more or less confined to the *r*- and *l*-stems. In a number of cases it clearly replaces old uncharacterized plurals (for the evidence see 2.6). Hittite is the only Anatolian language having the ending *-i*. Attestations suggested for the other Anatolian languages are not certain (Hawkins et al. 1973: 30f n. 111 and Starke 1990: 298 n. 984).

For this ending a number of solutions have been proposed:¹³¹

A: PIE dual ending **-ih₁* (Milewski 1936: 32ff). Gertz: 1982: 320ff rejects this theory by pointing out that most of the words having this ending are verbal derivatives (e.g. *išhiul-* 'treaty' from *išhi-* 'bind') and that words of which a dual is to be expected do not show any trace of *-ih₁*.

B: PIE *-i* as found in Skt. *nāmāni* 'names', and *catvāri* 'four', Lat. *qua-i*. This *-i* would be an optionally added particle as has been suggested by Schmidt 1889: 227f (see also Burrow 1965: 236f). After a thorough examination of the evidence put forward by Schmidt, Gertz 1982: 315ff concludes that the only pieces of evidence provided by Schmidt that hold are the Italic pronouns such as Old Latin *qua-i*, Classical Latin *quae* (the *i* for the neuter plural in Skt. is of course from PIE **-h₂*) and that it is not necessary to posit PIE **-i*.

C: Sturtevant 1933: 178 derives the *i*-plural from the Luwian *i*-stems. Gertz 1982: 321 points out that this is problematic because in Luwian the neuter plural of the *i*-stems ends in *-a* and not in *-i*. This makes a transfer to the resonant stems in Hittite problematic. Moreover, there is no evidence that in Luwian the *i*-inflection spread to the *n*-stems. Thirdly, Luwian neuter words attested in Hittite do not have a plural ending *-i*. The *i*-plurals are attested in texts without Luwian influence. This suggests that there has been no Luwian influence whatsoever on the Hittite neuter plural on *-i*. Recently Starke 1990: 59ff has suggested that *i*-stems in Luwian do not occur as frequently as is often believed: in fact, the *-i* only served to mark the nom. and acc. sg. and pl. of the common-gender nouns and adjectives. The *-i* has not been found in the neuter

¹³¹ What follows sub A-D is a brief outline of the elaborate discussion by Gertz 1982: 312ff).

nouns. This makes it less than likely that the neuter plural ending *-i* has been derived from the Luwian *i*-stems.

D: Gertz 1982: 325ff herself proposes to derive the neuter plural in *-i* from the pronouns. She considers the particle *-i*, attested in the Italic pronouns (e.g. in Lat. *quac*), to be the most likely source: Lat. *quac* has to be analysed as *qua* + an original optional *-i* (cf. *aliqua*). She argues that we have two proto-forms: **k^weh₂* and **k^weh₂+i*. She then argues that *k^weh₂* developed into **kua*. This form also received the optional particle: *kua+i*, which yielded *kue* through monophthongization. However, she does not give any reason why and how this optional *-i* of the pronouns shifted to the resonant stems. Therefore, her suggestion cannot be proved.

E: The most widely accepted theory is that the *i*-plural originated from the *i*-stems. Gertz 1982: 222 rejects this hypothesis: she claims that within Hittite a spread of the neuter plural ending *-i* from the *i*-stems is problematic, because there is no reason not to take an already existent ending *-a* as a neuter plural ending from e.g. *aniyatta* and *genuwa*. Moreover, in the *i*-stems, the neuter plural is not characterized by a separate plural morpheme. Therefore, Gertz dismisses this explanation as artificial.

G: Oettinger (hand-out of the Akten des II. Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia, Pavia, 28.6.-2.7.1993) and 1993: 207ff takes up the old idea that the neuter plural ending *-i* has to be derived from the *i*-stems.¹³² He suggests that the neuter plural in *-i* finds its origin in the (original) nom.acc. neuter plural **-ih₂*. This ending received accent analogous to *widār* and *āssū*. The plene written final vowel in these words is universally believed to represent an accented vowel. He suggests that *āssū* and *widār* secondarily shifted their accent to the last syllable. **H₁ōsu > a-aš-šu-u* and *wédōr > widār*. As example he takes the Old Hittite neuter plural *hūhupalli* from *hūhupal-*, which has some oblique cases with single *<L>* in the suffix (also forms with double *<LL>* have been attested) and a nom.acc. neuter plural with double *<LL>*. Oettinger reconstructs a prehistoric Hittite *i*-stem, sg. **hūhūbali > Hittite *hūhūbal* with loss of the unaccented **-i*. Its plural, **hūhūbalih₂* secondarily received accent on the analogy of *āssū* and *widār*: *hūhūbali*. This regularly yielded attested *hūhupalli*. In the nom.acc. neuter plural the *-i* remained because it was accented. He suggests that the double *<LL>* is a strong indication for accented *-i* (see also Kimball 1983: 869 who suggests that resonants were written double when followed by accent). The oblique cases of *hūhupal*, however, have sin-

gle *<L>*. Proof, according to Oettinger, is furnished by e.g. KBo 17.61 16f (MH according to Oettinger) *nu GIS¹kur-ta-al-i¹ A kitta ... n-ašta DUMU-an GIS¹kur-ta-li-aš [-i]t parkunumi* 'The containers (are present) ... and I clean the baby with the ... of the container.' Here we have plural *kurtalli* with double *<LL>* as opposed to the single *<L>* of the genitive. Moreover, there are several attestations of singular *kurtal*: e.g. KBo 10.45 iii 7, KUB 32.103 i 15' and KBo 19.145 iii 18'.

Thus, Oettinger suggests that prehistoric Hittite sg. **hūhūbali > hūhūbal* while the regular plural ends in *-i*. Later this *-i* was considered a plural morpheme and from there it was transferred to the resonant-stems and from there to other stem classes. However, some serious problems remain.

Firstly, Beekes 1987 pointed out that the PIE neuter *i*-stems are rare. This implies that the Hittite neuter *i*-stems are an innovation. Therefore, if one accepts Oettinger's suggestion, we have to assume that Proto-Anatolian secondarily developed neuter *i*-stems. They received an accented neuter collective ending, which remained, and the *-i* in the singular disappeared. The *-i* in the singular would be analogous. A complicated development like this is too much for a category which seems to have arisen only secondarily.

Secondly, as already pointed out sub 2.6.4, instances like 1 *kurtalli* in KBo 15.10 i 12 (MHD) suggest that the *-i* could have singular value. This implies that we have to assume two stems, an *i*-stem *kurtalli* and an *l*-stem *kurtal*.

Thirdly, the loss of unaccented final *-i* is not unproblematic (see 3.6.1.4). If an unaccented final *-i* did not disappear, Oettinger's suggestion loses much of its credibility: e.g. **hūhūbali*, the singular reconstructed by Oettinger, cannot have lost its final *-i*, because final *-i* did not disappear and we would not have an *l*-stem. Since unaccented *-i* remained in most cases, there is no way of distinguishing an alleged old accented final *-i* (*<-ih₂>*) in the plural from an old unaccented final *-i* in the singular. Therefore, there is no positive evidence that the ending *-i* in the plural has to be reconstructed as **-ih₂*.

Finally, the parallels drawn by Oettinger for shift of accent in the nom.acc. neuter plural **hūhūpalih₂ > *hūhūpalih₂*, viz. *wédōr > widār* and **h₁ōsu_{h₂} > a-aš-šu-u* are not very strong: *ú-i-da-a-ar* (see 3.3.2.2) rather has a zero grade in the root and *a-aš-šu-u* is not a substantive, but a substantivized adjective and its history (see 3.9.3 and 3.9.4) is too complicated to draw such far-reaching conclusions.

To sum up, the plural ending *-i* is not necessarily the reflex of accented **-ih₂*. This fits into what has been argued above: the neuter did not have a plural.

¹³² For an enumeration and discussion of the material, see 2.6.4.

For our present purposes the origin of the ending *-i* is not important, because it is a secondary ending.

3.6.5 The ending *-a*; introduction

As shown sub 2.7.4, in the neuter substantives the ending *-a* is only marginally attested: it is young, it belongs to nouns which have common-gender features and it has its place in the adjectives. The only old neuter plurals in *-a* are *iškiša*, *welluwa* and *šakuwa*. In the next three sections I will discuss these forms shortly.

3.6.5.1 *iškiša* 'backs'

As pointed out by Gertz 1982: 101, *iškiš* is the only *s*-stem (singular *iškiš* in KUB 36.110 rev. 10') of which a neuter plural has been attested. *iškiš* has a parallel in Gk. ἰσχίον 'hip joint, hip, haunches'. Puhvel 1984: 425 suggests that the sexual term *iškiša pāi* 'to mount (someone's) back' points to the lower parts of the back. The parallel between the Hittite and Greek words is therefore striking. Because of this parallel Melchert 1984a: 105 n. 62 reconstructs a *-iš*-stem **išk^hiš*.

In the Greek word the original *-iš*-stem seems to have undergone thematization. However, the evidence for PIE *-iš*-stems is very meagre: Meillet 1937: 259f only lists *s*-stems with the suffixes *-es*- and *-os*-. Therefore, the existence of PIE **-iš*-stems is uncertain. Moreover, the Hesychian gloss ἰσχι - ὀππός rather indicates that ἰσχιόν is an original *i*-stem. The Hittite material for the suffix *-iš* is also meagre: we have *ankiš(a)-*, (type of plant), *iškiš-* 'back', *nepiš-* 'heaven', *pupuriš-* (vessel) and *tunnakiš-*. In this stem class only *nepiš* 'heaven' has an etymology and in this word the final *-iš* is the reflex of unaccented **/e/* (Melchert 1984a: 90).

Both the Greek and Hittite evidence for PIE **išk^hiš* is not clear: Greek rather points to an *i*-stem, whereas Hittite has an awkward looking *-iš*-stem.

As to the neuter plural *iškiša* there are also some peculiarities. If Hittite used the distributive singular, *iškiša* may be a grammatical singular. Starke 1990: 101 n. 253 points out that in Young Hittite mostly the form *iškiša* occurs, which seems a plural in *-a* (e.g. the vocabulary text KBo 1.42 ii 24'), but that its meaning is singular. He suggests that this is to be attributed to Cuneiform Luwian influence, because the neuter plural in this language is often used to denote a singular.

In summing up, we can be fairly certain that *iškiša* is not directly inherited from PIE.

3.6.5.2 *Šakuwa* 'eyes'

As pointed out sub 2.7.4.11, Hittite has a common gender singular *šakuiš* 'eye'. It has a neuter plural *šakuwa*. This word contains the PIE root **sek^w-*. The form *šakuwa* has been reconstructed as a neuter plural in **-eh₂* by e.g. Oettinger 1979: 395 (**sh₃ek^w-eh₂*). However, a reconstruction in **-eh₂* is unlikely, because the neuter plural ending of the nouns must have been **-h₂* (see Beekes 1994) without *e*. If we reconstruct a single **-h₂*, we would have had ***šakū* (see 3.5.2).

One might think of an original dual. However, if it were a PIE dual, we would have ***šakui < sek^w-ih*. This is not satisfactory because it leaves the *-a* unexplained. Since neither of the two explanations is satisfactory one can follow Čop 1955a: 69 and Melchert 1994: 61 (with references) and assume that *šakuwa* is a derivative of an adjective *sak^wo-* 'seeing'. If this is correct, the *-a* in *šakuwa* does not have substantival origin. Its origin must be sought in the adjectives. We have three possibilities.

The most straightforward explanation is a neuter plural of an adjectival *o*-stem (see 3.8.1). In that case we can reconstruct **sok^wo-(e)h₂*. Secondly, we can reconstruct an original dual **sok^woh₁* of an originally substantivized *o*-stem meaning 'seeing'. This dual yielded the attested *šakuwa*. Thirdly, the singular *šakuiš* vs. *šakuwa*, suggests that also here we might have the same pattern as discussed sub 2.7.3. In that section I demonstrated that Hittite had substantivized *i*-stem adjectives, which had, besides a singular form in *-i*, a neuter plural in *-a* (e.g. *palhi-* 'wide' had a neuter plural *palha*). Perhaps *šakui-* vs. *šakuwa* belongs here (see 3.9.2 and 3.9.4 for possible explanations for this type).

To sum up, the *-a* in *šakuwa* is not substantival.

3.6.5.3 *Welluwa* 'meadows'

Sub 3.4 a theoretical account has been given as to why the neuter plural in *-a* is only marginally attested in the substantives: the proto-neuter nouns originally denoted indefinite objects. They had, among other features, the notion of wholeness, "ein Solches, ein Etwas" and they had the notion of collectivity. Therefore, neuter nouns originally did not need a collective suffix *-a*. At a given moment, nouns were assigned automatically to a specific gender. Consequently, nouns without the notion 'indefinite, wholeness, collectivity' entered the domain of the neuter nouns. At this stage the neuter nouns needed a plural and took the *-a*, which originally served as a derivational suffix.

For *wellu-* it is possible to think of the following development: *wellu-* which

meant 'pasture' came to mean 'meadow' and because of this meaning it needed a plural 'meadows'. It is noteworthy that *welhuwa* is the only neuter plural form of *welhu* mentioned by Weitenberg 1984: 183. Perhaps *welhu* kept its collective notion to a great extent.

3.6.6 Conclusion for the neuter plural of the substantives

Apart from the simple *r/n*-stems, the hysterodynamic forms were indifferent to number. In the *u*-stems, the resonant-stems and the *i*-stems prehistoric Hittite does not seem to have had a neuter plural.

The ending *-i* is secondary and replaces an uncharacterized neuter plural. In the neuter substantives the ending *-a* is secondary. The Hittite material clearly shows that in Young Hittite the ending *-a* spread. Originally, neuter nouns did not need a collective because the notion of collectivity was inherent in the noun itself.

3.7 INTRODUCTION TO THE ADJECTIVES

In the previous sections it has been argued that the prehistoric Hittite neuter substantives rarely had a plural in *-a*. In fact, neuter substantives were often indifferent to number. The adjectives modifying neuter nouns, on the other hand, frequently show the plural ending *-a*.

From older Hittite onwards this *-a* occurs in the *a*-stems, in the *i*-stems, which have besides *-i* an ending *-a* (this *-a* was later replaced by *-aya*), and in the *nt*-stems (predicative participles, however, hardly have an *-a*). In the *u*-stems the ending *-a* occurs mainly in young texts: in older Hittite there is only one instance, viz. *pár-ga-u-wa* (see 2.10.1). Here it is clear that the old form in *-u* has been replaced by *-awa*. This *-awa* is the full grade of the suffix *-u*, followed by an *-a*. There is (already in old texts) also a plene written final *<-U-U>* in *a-aš-su-u* 'goods', the substantivized adjective from *ašsu* 'good'. *Ašsu* is usually claimed to be a neuter plural because of the final plene written **-u <-u>*. Further, we have *tamāi* 'other' which modifies *ud-da-a-ar*, the plural of *uttar* 'word, thing, affair'.

In the next sections it will be investigated whether, and to what extent, the formations used in other Indo-European languages to form neuter plurals occurred in the adjectives and whether they had singular or plural value.

I will demonstrate that in prehistoric Hittite the adjectives occurred in their singular form when they accompanied plural objects. In other words: the adjectives too provide evidence that in prehistoric Hittite the neuter gender hardly had a plural. The ending *-a*, which is the normal neuter plural ending,

seems to have singular value in some instances. The neuter plural of *tamāi* 'other', an adjective with a long final vowel, is indifferent to number. As such, it shows the same pattern as the hysterodynamic neuter substantives. Therefore, the adjectives used as adjunct had the same pattern as the substantives.

On the other hand, the substantivized adjectives do seem to have had a plural in **-a (-h₂)* in prehistoric Hittite. However, only scanty traces remain.

This is the reason why I have divided the adjectives into substantivized adjectives and in adjectives used as adjunct (predicative and attributive).

3.8 ADJECTIVES USED AS ADJUNCTS

3.8.1 Adjectives of the *a*-stems

The *a*-stems have a neuter plural in *-a*, e.g. *dannatta* from *dannatta*- 'empty' (see 2.12). In the other Indo-European languages we find long and short *-a*, which is the reflex of either **-h₂* or **-eh₂*. Single **-h₂* is reflected in e.g. Skt. *-i* (e.g. *b^haranti*, neuter pl. part. from *bhr̥* 'bear'), Gk. *-α*, e.g. *μῆλω <-οσα < *-osh₂*, cf. Mycenaean *mezoa₂*, and Lat. *-a*, e.g. *genera* from *genus* 'race, kind, class'. Greek and Latin also show short *-a* in the nom. acc. neuter plural of the *o*-stem adjectives, e.g. Lat. *nova* from *novus* 'new' and Gk. *νέα* from *νέος* 'new'. This short *-a* faithfully reflects **-h₂*. Vedic, on the other hand, has a long *-ā*, in e.g. *priyā* from *priyā*- 'dear'. This *-ā* is usually considered to be the reflex of **-eh₂*.

If the neuter plural of the *o*-stems was indeed **-eh₂*, Hittite *newah₂*- 'renew' from *newa*- 'new' < PIE **newo-* may contain the reflex of the laryngeal. One can argue along the following lines.

The reflex of **-eh₂* is, besides in the neuter plural of the *a*-stem adjectives, also attested in the Hittite factitive suffix *-ah₂*. This suffix is almost consistently written as *-Ca-ah₂* and rarely as *-Ca-a-ah₂*. Oettinger 1979: 239 suggests that verbs with the suffix *-ah₂* were originally factitives of the *a*-stem adjectives, e.g. *arawah₂* from *arawa*- 'free', *ikunah₂* from *ikuna*- 'cold' and *maršah₂* 'spoil' from *marša*- 'evil'. Therefore, *newah₂*- 'renew' must have been formed at a stage when the *-h₂* was still present in Hittite. A strong argument that *newah₂* is from **neweh₂* and not from **newh₂* is provided by the verb *wah₂*- 'strike' < **h₂welh₂*- (see e.g. Melchert 1984a: 16). The forms *wa-al-ah₂-zi*, 3 sg., and *wa-al-ah₂-mi*, 1 sg., form a contrast to the factitives exemplified in *ne-wa-ah₂-mi*. This group of verbs has consistent *-Ca-ah₂*, whereas the forms of *wah₂* only show *-C-ah₂*. The 3 pl. *wa-al-ha-an-zi* vs. *ne-wa-ah₂-ha-an-du* shows that the verb is *wah₂*. Therefore, *wah₂* shows the reflex of single **h₂* in Inlaut.

Thus, the opposition of *ne-wa-aḥ-mi* (/ne₂wa₂mi/) vs. *wa-la-aḥ-zi/wa-al-aḥ-zi* (/wal₂zi/) may suggest that the nom. acc. neuter plural of the *a*-stem adjectives ended in **-eh₂*.

*-Eh₂ is also reflected in *paḥš-* 'protect' < **peh₂-s-* (for the long vowel cf. Skt. *pāti* 'tend' and Lat. *pāscō* 'graze, feed') and in *naḥ-* 'fear'. This word may be related to Oir. *nār* 'modest' < **nch₂-sro-*. The long *-ā* points to **-eh₂*.¹³³ To sum, up, one can argue that the neuter plural ending *-a* of the *a*-stems goes back to **-eh₂*.

Beekes 1994 suggests that the neuter plural of the thematic nouns cannot have been **-eh₂*, because in derivations there are no instances with a suffix from a stem in *c*. Therefore, Beekes 1994: 13 argues, the factitives in *-aḥḫ-* cannot be derived from **-e-h₂*, the *e* being the stem vowel of the *o*-stems. He proposes to connect the Greek denominatives in *-όω-* with the Hittite factitives in *-aḥḫ-* excluding the Latin verbs in *-āre*.

However, as established by Oettinger 1979: 238ff, in Hittite there is a strong connection of the factitives in *-aḥḫ-* with the *a*-stem adjectives. The factitives are not connected with the *a*-stem substantives, which reflect the PIE thematic nouns, but rather with the adjectives. Moreover, there is evidence (see Melchert 1994: 72ff for an elaborate discussion and references) only initial **-h₃* has been preserved.

Therefore, the neuter plural ending of the Hittite *a*-stem adjectives can be connected with the *-ā* in Sanskrit. In order to explain the long *-ā* one can reconstruct **-eh₂*.

This ending may have originated in the pronouns, as argued by Beekes 1994: 14. From there the neuter plural in **-eh₂* may have gone to the *o*-stems. If this were true, originally the *o*-stem adjectives did not have a plural. Hittite shows the same development as Sanskrit. Both these languages took **-eh₂* in order to build the neuter plural.

We now have two possibilities. Firstly, Hittite and Sanskrit independently used the same formation to build a neuter plural. This is easily conceivable because the pronouns must have been the only source for the neuter plural ending. In that case prehistoric Hittite may not have inherited a neuter plural in the thematic adjectives. Secondly, both Hittite and Sanskrit inherited a neuter plural in the thematic adjectives.

In summing up, prehistoric Hittite possessed a neuter plural in the *a*-stem adjectives. This ending however, was an innovation.

¹³³ For a discussion on the spelling of *naḥ-*, which is written with either single *ḥ* or double

3.8.1.1 *Āra* and *kunna*

Concerning the grammatical status of the *-a* in prehistoric Hittite it is instructive to mention again the two sequences *ul āra* 'it is not right'¹³⁴ and *ul kunna* 'it is not favourable' (see 2.12 for a discussion of the attestations). *Āra* and *kunna* are used predicatively. Other Indo-European languages have a neuter singular here, e.g. Gk. *ἐξόν* 'it is allowed'. Latin examples are *permissum* (*est*) 'it is permitted' and *opportunitum* (*est*) 'it is advantageous'. This may support the hypothesis that in prehistoric Hittite the *-a* < **-(e)h₂* had singular value: not only in the substantives the *-a* could have singular value as in *kušata* 'dowry', but also in the adjectives the *-a* could have singular value. This also accounts for the *-a* in e.g. *šuppa* from *šuppi-* 'holy, clean'. In *šuppa asru kuiti* 'some holy place' the *-a* also seems to have had singular value.

Thus, it is possible that the ending *-a* in *āra* and *kunna* had singular value.¹³⁵

3.8.2 Introduction to the *i-* and *u-*stems

In Vedic the nom. acc. neuter plural of the adjectives of the *i-* and *u-*stems shows parallel formations, e.g. *śuci* 'bright' < **-ih₂* and *mādhū* 'sweet', < **-uh₂*.

In older Hittite, the situation is different. For the *u-*stems Hittite has

ḫḫ, I refer to Kimball 1983: 266ff.

¹³⁴ Although scholars generally assume that *āra* is a substantive, it might just as well be an adjective (see 2.12.1).

¹³⁵ There are instances in which neuter singular forms are used predicatively when they refer to communia:

- a: *mān ḫalkišš-a ḫandān ēzzi nu-a-za* ERIN^{MES} ḫ^U.A *dāu* 'If corn has been harvested(?), the troops must take it.' HBM 17 obv. 22 (MHC)
- b: *nu kās L^O TEMI tametani pidi aran* 'This messenger has arrived at a different place.' HBM 64 20f (21) (MHC)
- c: *kuit munus^{MES} tarnan ēšdu* 'Because the women have to be released.' KUB 26.1 iv 29 (CTH 255, Tudḫaliya IV)
- d: *nu LUGAL-waš ARAD^{MES} dammiššan le ak[kanzi]* 'May the slaves of the king not die suppressed.' KBo 3.23 i 8
- e: *nu ANŠE <KUR.RA^U>^A m[e]kki ḫuitiyan ēšdu* 'The horses have to be concentrated in large numbers.' HBM 39 6ff (7)
- f: *mān antiwawḫaš šuppi* 'If a person is clean' KBo 5.2 i 3 (ibid. iv 64: *šuppiš*)
- g: 7 EME *išnaš iḫḫuwan* 'Seven tongues made of dough have been scattered' KBo 15.10 + i 3 (CTH 443). Szabó 1971: 53 remarks that EME here is the only place where it has neuter gender. In i 4 we have the expected 7 EME *iḫḫuwanēš*.
- h: *kalušepš su <si> ḫ^U.A. aš ḫandān* 'The fingers match the fingers' KUB 9.34 ii 44. Hutter 1988: 78, however, signals that the text here may be corrupt.

as many as three neuter plural endings. The long \bar{u} in Sanskrit seems to be paralleled by $a\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{s}\bar{u}$ 'goods', with plene written final vowel. In most cases, however, Hittite has a short \bar{u} , e.g. in *idālu* 'evil'. Since Watkins 1982, both the short \bar{u} in *idālu* and the long \bar{u} in $a\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{s}\bar{u}$ are thought to reflect older $*\bar{u}_2$ (see 3.6.1.1 and 3.6.1.2 for a discussion). Finally, the neuter plural of the adjectival u -stems can be $-awa$, which is an innovation.

In contrast to the u -stems, in which stem class the neuter plural is uncharacterized, the i -stems, already have in older Hittite a neuter plural ending $-a$. Until Young Hittite this $-a$ remained the predominant ending. Sometimes the i -stems have an ending $-aya$ which parallels $-awa$ of the u -stems. The uncharacterized $-i$, e.g. *šalli* 'big, great', seems a parallel to the uncharacterized plural forms of the u -stems in e.g. *idālu*. In one instance, a plene written final vowel \bar{i} is claimed to be neuter plural, viz. *mekki* (OHC). Since Watkins 1982 this long final vowel is often believed to be the reflex of $*\bar{i}_2$, because of the plene written final vowel, which seems to be parallel to the long \bar{u} in $a\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{s}\bar{u}$. However, this parallel is difficult, because plene writing of the final syllable indicating plural number is limited to *āššū* (see 3.6.1 for the argumentation.). In the next sections I will try to account for the difference between the uncharacterized form in \bar{u} in the u -stem adjectives and the characterized ending $-a$ in the i -stem adjectives.

3.8.3 The i -stems. Introduction

The i -stem adjectives have three endings, firstly an $-i$, attested in e.g. *nakki* 'heavy, important', *hantezzi* 'front, first' and *šalli* 'big'. There is also an ending $-aya$, attested in the adverbially used *hatugaya* 'vehemently' from *hatugi*, *mekkaya* from *mekki* 'big, great', and in *šuppaya* from *šuppi* 'clean, pure'. Finally, the most frequent ending is $-a$. This ending is attested in e.g. *šuppa* from *šuppi* 'clean' and in *karuila* from *karuili* 'old'. Both the endings $-a$ and $-i$ are attested in older Hittite.

As the evidence cited sub 2.11 shows, the ending $-aya$ is young. The ending $-aya$ must be young because intervocalic $-i$ already disappeared at an earlier stage (Melchert 1984a: 31ff).

This leaves the ending $-i$ and the ending $-a$ to be discussed. The ending $-a$ occurs more frequently than the ending $-i$: the ending $-i$ often accompanies akkadograms and sumerograms followed by the plural determinatives ^{MES} and ^UA. These akkadograms and sumerograms sometimes have a singular referent or sometimes even a singular Hittite phonetic complement (see 1.4.3). Therefore, the instances of the uncharacterized neuter plural in $-i$ are less certain.

For an enumeration of these adjectives and their occurrences see 2.11.1 and 2.11.2. However, semantically these forms are often unquestionably plural because of their meaning (see 2.11). Therefore, one can argue that the ending $-i$ is an uncharacterized plural.

In the next sections the evidence for the ending $-i$ will be discussed. I will argue that this $-i$ hardly occurs in old i -stems. The only i -stem adjectives having an uncharacterized neuter plural are *šalli* 'great' and *parkui* 'clean'.

3.8.3.1 *Nakki* 'important', *šanezzi* 'odorous' and *hantezzi* 'first'

Before embarking on the discussion it is necessary to point out that, unlike in other i -stem adjectives, the oblique cases are formed with a zero grade: *nakkiyaš*, *šanezziyaš* and *hantezziyaš*.

Nakki- is a derivative of the PIE root $*h_1nek-$ attested in e.g. Gk. *ἐννεκίον*, OCS *nesti* and Lith. *nėsti*.

As the material cited by CHD vol. L-N: 364 shows, *nakki* inflects as a substantive: in the oblique cases no full grade of the suffix has been attested: we have¹³⁶ e.g. dat. *nakkiya*, abl. *nakkiyaz*, and nom. pl. c. *nakkieš*, acc. pl. c. *nakkius*.

Plene writing of the $\langle I \rangle$ occurs throughout the paradigm, e.g. nom. c. *na-ak-ki-i-š* KBo 15.25 obv. 13, nom. pl. c. *na-ak-ki-i-e-eš* KUB 23.11 rev. 23 and a dat. sg. *na-ak-ki-i* (see Kimball 1983: 476f and CHD vol. L-N: 364). Therefore, one can safely argue that the plene $\langle I \rangle$ in *nakki* is not indicative for \bar{i}_2 .

Watkins 1982: 259 suggests that the plene writing indicates that the last syllable of this adjective was stressed: $/nak\bar{k}i/$. Kimball 1983: 481 suggests that the plene $\langle I \rangle$ in *nakki-* is the result of lengthening caused by accent. She (p. 480) suggests $*h_1n\bar{a}ki$: $*h_1nk\bar{e}y$. $*H_1n\bar{a}ki$ became Pre-Hittite *nak-i* with accent on the final syllable on the analogy of $*nak\bar{e}y$ < $*h_1nk\bar{e}y$. Kimball proposes that the (young) \bar{i} in the dat. sg. might be the reflex of $\bar{e}y$ - $\bar{e}i$ and that the nom. pl. c. *na-ak-ki-i-e-eš* is the regular outcome of $nok\bar{e}y$ - $\bar{e}es$ (with $\bar{e}y$ > \bar{i}). She suggests that the long \bar{i} in the neuter plural is the reflex of $*\bar{i}_2$.

Kimball's proposal, however, offers problems: the evidence for $*\bar{i}_2$ (for $*\bar{a}ššū$ see 3.9.3) and \bar{i}_2 is meagre (see 3.6.1). Secondly, her suggestion that the lack of plene writing in the other forms, e.g. *idālu* etc. is due to accident is an ad hoc suggestion. As far as I know, there is not a single instance of a word with plene final \bar{i} and \bar{u} , which unambiguously indicates that the form is plural. Moreover, there is evidence that in prehistoric Hittite the i -stem

¹³⁶ For references see CHD vol. L-N: 364

adjectives did not have an *e*-grade. E.g. *šalla-es* < **šallayes*, the nom. pl. c. from *šalli*- 'big, great' has an *a* in the suffix and not an *e*.

Even if Kimball is right in explaining the plene <I> in the paradigm of *nakki* as the result of lengthening caused by accent, one has to admit that *nakki* is an exceptional *i*-stem adjective: it has substantival inflection and the nom. acc. neuter plural is *-i*.

Therefore, it is preferable to look for an alternative explanation for the substantival inflection of *nakki*. This explanation and also the explanation for the substantival inflection of *hantezzi*- and *šanezzi*- can be found in the domain of the verbs. Oettinger 1979: 239ff points out that the *-ahh*- factitives were originally confined to the thematic adjectives (e.g. *newahh*- 'renew' from *newa*- 'new'). On p. 246 he also signals that, as a rule, the *i*- and *ui*-stems (see 3.8.5.2) form their factitives with the suffix *-nu*-, with deletion of the *i*: *parkunu*- 'clean' from *parkui*- 'clean' and *harganu*- from *harki*- 'bright'. On page 251ff he draws attention to the fact that the originally *yo*-stems form their factitives with the suffix *-ahh*-, e.g. *hantezzi*- 'first' has *hantezziyahh*-, *šarazziyahh*- comes from *šarazzi*- 'high' and *nakkiyahh*- comes from *nakki*- 'difficult'. If those verbs were factitives from *i*-stems, they would have been formed with the suffix *-nu*:- ***hantezzanu*-, ***šarazzanu*- and ***nakkanu*-.

Therefore, *šanezzi*-, *hantezzi*-, *appezzi*-, and *nakki*- are original *yo*-stems. The process of transferring the *yo*-stem adjectives into *i*-stems probably began with the substantives (Oettinger 1979: 251f), because the oblique cases of the *i*- and *yo*-substantives were the same (e.g. the genitive of both the *i*- and the *yo*-stems ends in *-(y)as*). This led to the replacement of the nom. sg. as well: **teut-yo* > *tuzzi*- 'army'. This process can still be seen in the adjectives: older *appezziyaš* 'last' and *hantezziyaš* 'first' later became *appezziš* and *hantezziš*.

Therefore, the neuter plural in *-i* in *nakki*, *šanezzi*, *appezzi*, and *hantezzi* is not a direct reflex of PIE **-ih₂*. The resemblance to Skt. *śuci* from *śuci*- 'bright' is only superficial. *Nakki*-, *šanezzi*-, *appezzi*-, and *hantezzi*- were originally *yo*-stems. In these adjectives the nom. acc. neuter plural ending *-i* probably originated on the analogy of the substantives where the use of single *-i* is amply attested (see 2.5.4).

3.8.3.2 *Parkui* 'pure, clean'

In this section it will be argued that prehistoric Hittite had an *i*-stem *parkui*-. Consequently, the form *parkui* is an old uncharacterized neuter plural.

Since Pedersen 1938: 35ff (for lit. see Weitenberg 1984: 277 and Oettinger 1987) the Hittite adjectives in *ui*-¹³⁷ have often been equated with the Latin adjectives ending in *ui*-, e.g. *tenuis* 'thin' and *suaavis* 'sweet'. The *-i* is usually considered a relic of the feminine suffix **-ih₂*.¹³⁸ However, the presence of a feminine *i*-suffix presupposes the presence of a prehistoric Hittite feminine gender, an issue which has not been settled yet (for new approaches which leave the *ui*-adjectives out of consideration, see most recently Weitenberg 1987, Melchert 1992a and Hardarson 1994: 32ff). Thus, with Weitenberg 1984: 277, the presence of a relic of a feminine **-ih₂*-suffix is unproved at best.

Synchronically, the Hittite *ui*-adjectives are ablauting *i*-stems, e.g. *parkuwaya*, nom. acc. neuter plural from *parkui*- 'high' (HW: 261) and *dankuwayaz*, abl. sg. from *dankui*- 'dark' (HW: 210).

Starke 1990: 77 suggests that the *ui*-adjectives were originally *u*-stems. He suggests that this is strongly supported by the factitives of this stem class: they are formed with the suffix *-nu*:- e.g. *parkunu*- 'raise' from *parkui*- 'high', *dankunu*- 'darken' from *dankui*- 'dark' and *warḫunu*- 'make rough' from *warḫui*- 'rough'. Oettinger 1979: 245 and Starke 1990: 77¹³⁹ suggest that the factitive *-nu*-suffix was reserved for the *u*-stem adjectives only. Therefore, Starke thinks that the adjectives in *ui*- are old *u*-stems.

However, it remains possible that already in prehistoric Hittite the *ui*-adjectives were *i*-stems. A closer look at the Hittite factitives of the original *i*-stems, mentioned by Oettinger 1979: 249, suggests that they are also formed with the suffix *-nu*-. Those factitives do not contain an *i*: we find *harganu*- from *harki*- 'white', *maknu*- from *mekki*- 'big', *šalkanu*- from *šalti*- 'great', *dalugnu*- from *daluki*- 'long' and *zalugnu*- from **zalugi*- 'long'.

If the factitives of both the original *i*- and *u*-stems were formed with the suffix *-nu*-, there is nothing against assuming that already in prehistoric Hittite the *ui*-adjectives were *i*-stems. Therefore, prehistoric Hittite may have

¹³⁷ Starke 1990: 27 lists *parkui*- 'clean', *dankui*- 'black', *warḫui*- 'rough, shaggy', *šaltui*- 'deep' and *manenkui*- 'near'. He reconstructs **alpu*- 'soft, delicate', **dampui*- 'rough, pointed' and **maleskui*- 'weak' because their fientive verb stems begin with *-uēss-*. Oettinger 1979: 253 has established that the fientives, except the *ant*-stems, are normally formed with elision of the stemvowel. In the case of the three adjectives reconstructed here the stemvowel must have been *-i*.

¹³⁸ Oettinger 1979: 247 and, more hesitantly, Kimball 1983: 494, suggest that the plene *i* in *da-an-ku-i-iš* KBo 4.2 i 54, KUB 33.66 ii 7 etc. might be an indication for long *-i* < **-ih₂*.

¹³⁹ Also Oettinger 1979: 245.

inherited an *i*-stem for *parkui*-. The uncharacterized neuter plural *parkui* is older than *parkuwaya* in KUB 24.7 ii 9.

3.8.3.3 Šalli 'great'

Šalli- is derived from the root **sh₂*, with a suffix *-i*-. cf. Luwian *šalhitti* 'growth' and Luwian *šalha/i* 'great, grown' (Melchert 1993: 186). It can also be a derivative of **sēlh₂-i* (Oettinger 1979: 550). The Luwian forms and Hittite *šalli*- point to a Proto-Anatolian *i*-stem (see also Melchert 1994: 51).

The neuter plural *šalli* occurs in the same Middle Hittite text as *parkui* (see 2.11.2) and refers to *siskur*^{§1.4} 'offerings'. In spite of the problems with the plural determinative ^{§1.4} (see 1.4.3), I assume that *šalli* is plural because it clearly means 'offerings'. Moreover, the distributive iterative verb *pišk*- 'to give repeatedly' suggests that actually many offerings are meant.

However, *šalli* is not the only neuter plural of this adjective: in e.g. KUB 1.16 (OH/NS, Melchert 1977: 45) ii 66f (66) we have *šalla*: *ša-al-la ē-ir kue ne natta* [*parkunuttati*] *ziga parkuyātar iya* 'The big houses which (there were), they [were] not [purified]. You perform the purification!' (translation and restoration by Gertz 1982: 73).

One can wonder which of the two forms (*šalla* or *šalli*) is older. If the tablet has been faithfully copied from an older manuscript, *šalla* must be the older form. However, the ending *-a*, which is characterized as opposed to the singular, is the productive ending (see 2.11). Consequently, it is more likely that the scribe modernized old **šalli* to the, for him, more intelligible modern form *šalla*.

Therefore, *šalli* is older than *šalla*. Hittite inherited an uncharacterized neuter plural *šalli*.

3.8.3.4 Conclusion for the uncharacterized neuter plural of the *i*-stem adjectives

In the *i*-stems the uncharacterized neuter plural in *-i* is old. The burden of proof rests upon *šalli* 'big' and *parkui* 'clean'. However, there is nothing which gives positive evidence for the fact that this *-i* goes back to **-ih₂*: the form *mekki* (see 2.4.3 and 3.6.1.1), which might support *ī* < **ih₂*, is not a plural. Consequently, the neuter plural of the *i*-stem adjectives was originally not characterized by a plural morpheme. Therefore, this form simply was a grammatical singular. The short *-i* in *šalli* and *parkui* forms a parallel with the short *-u* in *idālu* 'evil'. The prehistoric Hittite *i*-stem adjectives seem to have had an uncharacterized neuter plural.

3.8.3.5 The ending *-a*

The ending *-a* is the productive neuter plural ending of the *i*-stem adjectives. The most simple and straightforward explanation for this ending is **-aya* with loss of intervocalic *i* (Friedrich 1960: 27, Melchert 1984a: 163). Melchert 1984a: 44f suggests that this *-a* is long.

He points out that there is an apparent difficulty with the loss of intervocalic *i*: there are no instances of plene writing in the oblique cases, which we would expect because the *a* in the oblique cases originated from **-ay-a*-. We do not have ***pal-ḫa-a-aš*. This orthography would be expected as is indicated by the spelling of e.g. *a-an-ki* which contained **oy-o* (Eichner 1992: 42f) and *da-a-an* 'twice' < **dwoyom* (Melchert 1984a: 51f). In the oblique cases of the *i*-stems we have e.g. the dat.loc. pl. *pal-ḫa-aš* from *palḫi*- 'wide' (KBo 20.3 rev. 4) and *ša-al-la-aš* dat.loc. pl. from *šalli*- 'big, great' BoTu 23 A ii 31, both examples without plene writing of the suffix.

For the neuter plural in *-a* < **-aya* we have the same problem: why do we not have one single instance of plene written final *-a* if this *-a* comes from **-aya*, which contained the full grade of the suffix. Because full grade was accented in PIE, we would expect plene writing of the <A>.

Melchert thinks that we do have to read this *-a* (< *-aya*) as *ā* and therefore suggests ***pal-ḫa-a-aš* (/palḫās/). His argumentation runs as follows: examples of oblique cases of the adjectival *i*-stems in OH manuscripts are rare. If there were more instances of oblique cases of *i*-stem adjectives we would most certainly have had examples of plene written vowel in the last syllable. Because the frequency of plene writing in later manuscripts is not as high as in older Hittite, we need not be surprised not to find plene writing in the oblique cases of the *i*-stem adjectives in later Hittite either. In other words, Melchert suggests that we have to assume **pal-ḫa-a-aš*, a form which is not attested, because it would be the expected reflex of **palḫayas*/. Mutatis mutandis Melchert suggests that the neuter plural of *palḫi*- must have been ***palḫā*.

Melchert's explanation is inspired by the theory that (earlier) accent is reflected in the plene writing and that the oblique cases must have been accented because of the full grade. However, it is not necessarily true that for prehistoric Hittite we have to reconstruct e.g. */palḫ-āyas/* with accented full grade in the suffix.

It is widely agreed upon that plene writing synchronically marks vowel length, e.g. Kimball 1983 and summarizing Melchert 1994: 27. Plene writing often corresponds with the reflex of accent in short and long vowels. A short accented vowel is reflected in e.g. *e-eš-zi* < **ēsti*, *a-ap-pa* < *h₁ōp*- and in *ka-a-aš-za*-

'hunger' < **kós-t-s*, cf. Toch. *kašt*). A long accented vowel seems to be reflected in *widār* < *udōr* (see 3.3.2.2).

Does this also imply that all vowels which appeared after the loss of intervocalic *-i* were written plene? The answer to this question is negative. The evidence provided by *ānki* and *dān* provide only a safe indication that those forms were accented: **duoyom* and **oy-o(nki)*. These forms must have had their PIE accent on either the first or on the second syllable. The plene writing implies that these words still retained their accent after the loss of intervocalic *y*. Therefore, the plene written <A> in *da-a-an* and in *a-an-ki* goes back to accented **o*. Here the plene writing faithfully reflects PIE accent.

However, with the full grade of the *i*- and *u*-stems, the situation is different. Weitenberg 1984: 350 points out that the oblique cases of the *u*-stem adjectives hardly ever have plene writing in the suffix. This is significant, because it implies that the full grade of *u*, viz. *-aw-*, was not accented when it replaced the original zero grade. As Weitenberg also points out, the root of the adjectives often has plene writing: this suggests that originally the root-vowel was accented and not the suffix. This means that the full grade of the suffix in the adjectival *i*-stems was not accented.¹⁴⁰

Because the *i*- and *u*-stem adjectives inflect in a parallel way, the proto-form of the suffix of the *i*-stems cannot have been an accented full grade inherited from PIE. The full grade must have arisen only after accented PIE vowels (the reason for the plene written vowel?) were lengthened (read: received the feature, which caused them to be written plene). Therefore, the oblique cases of the adjectival *i*-stems were, just like the *u*-stems, not written plene. The most logical proto-form of *šallaš* is *šallayaš*, with unaccented full grade of the suffix.

Melchert 1984a: 44f suggests that the full grade *-ay-* replaced **-éy-* with accented *é* or that it arose on the analogy of the full grade *-aw-* of the *u*-stems. However, if the proto-form of *šallaš* originally had accented *é*, we would have had an *e* in the suffix and not an *a*. The full grade **-aya-* in the suffix cannot reflect a PIE accented suffix.

To sum up, the neuter plural ending *-a* may reflect earlier **-aya* with full grade of the suffix. However, this full grade combined with the ending *-a* is secondary. Hittite cannot have inherited an accented full grade because we would have had instances with plene writing.

3.8.3.6 Conclusion for the *i*-stem adjectives

In the *i*-stem adjectives prehistoric Hittite had an uncharacterized neuter plural: this archaic form is attested in *šalli* 'big' and *parkui* 'clean'.

The ending *-a* < **-aya* is younger. It has a secondary full grade.

3.8.4 The *u*-stem adjectives

The adjectives of the *i*- and *u*-stems have a parallel inflection: in the oblique cases they show full grade of the suffix, e.g. the gen. sg. *šuppayaš*, which replaces older *šuppaš* < **suppayas* vs. the gen. sg. of the *u*-stems, e.g. *aššawaš* from *aššu-* 'good'.

The *u*-stems have two neuter plural endings, viz. *-u* and *-awa*. As is clearly shown by the material cited sub 2.10, the ending *-awa* is predominantly young and replaces old *-u*.

Some scholars think (see 3.6.1.1) that this *-u* is the reflex of PIE **-uh₂*. However, as argued sub 3.6.1.1, the evidence for **-uh₂* is weak. The only good case for a neuter plural is *a-aš-šu-u*. Because *a-aš-šu-u* is a substantivized adjective and because its explanation is difficult and controversial, it deserves a separate treatment, for which see 3.9.3 and 3.9.4. There is little evidence that the short *-u* in e.g. *idālu* comes from **-uh₂*. Therefore, one can argue that just as in the substantives, the short *-u* has to be taken at face value: prehistoric Hittite had short *-u* here. In the *u*-stem adjectives it did not have a characterized neuter plural.

3.8.5 Conclusion for the *i*- and *u*-stem adjectives

The uncharacterized endings of the *i*- and *u*-stem adjectives (e.g. *šalli* 'great, big' and *idālu* 'evil, wicked') reflect a situation in prehistoric Hittite when *i*- and *u*-stem adjectives did not have a neuter plural. The original agreement pattern of adjective and substantive was singular ↔ singular.

The process of replacing the old uncharacterized neuter plural by a characterized form started in prehistoric Hittite with the *i*-stems. This stem class replaced short *-i* by a younger form (*-a* or **-aya*), whereas the *u*-stems were slower to take the younger form *-awa*.

In prehistoric Hittite, then, neither the *i*- nor the *u*-stem adjectives originally had a neuter plural. Their neuter shows the same indifference to grammatical number as the substantives of the same stem classes.

3.8.6 *Tamai*- 'other'

The form *tamai* is both singular and plural: it is singular in e.g. *tamai šagae dameuman* '(if some) other omen is strange' vs. *tamai kuekki uddār* 'what-

¹⁴⁰ Differently Melchert 1994: 138.

ever other affairs' (plural). As such, it shows the same pattern as the hysterodynamic neuter plural substantives, which are indifferent to number, e.g. *LU.SU GI-ešša* 'senate' vs. *partawa* 'wings'.

3.8.7 The *nt*-stems

The *nt*-stems show a distribution: as a rule, the predicative participles appear in their singular form, whereas the attributive participles and the other *nt*-stem adjectives have a characterized neuter plural in *-a*. As Hardarson 1987: 84 argues, this situation represents an archaism:¹⁴¹ in prehistoric Hittite the neuter gender did not have a plural.

As for the *nt*-stems, Hittite was well on its way to form a neuter plural from a neuter singular, by giving these adjectives a marker *-a*.

The ending *-a* in the *nt*-stems already existed in older Hittite: *ḫumanta* from *ḫumant* 'all' and *amiyanta* from *amiyant* 'small, little', and so on.

The neuter plural in *-a* of this stem class is usually compared to the *-i* in e.g. Skt. *bhāranti*, and the short *-a* in Gk. *φῑρντα*. Because after stops $*-h_2 > -a$ (see 3.5.2), the proto-form is most likely to be $*-en(h)_2$ with single $*-h_2$ with preservation of the final laryngeal. It is also possible that the nom. acc. neuter plural of the *nt*-stems arose on the analogy of the *-a* of the *a*-stems.

Gertz 1982: 309ff suggests that the only neuter plural formant in PIE was the lengthened grade and that the *-a* originated later. Therefore, she argues that also the neuter plural of the participles and the *nt*-stem adjectives must have had a plural with lengthened grade (PIE $*b^h erōn$ with loss of final *-t*) and that it is possible that in the other Indo-European languages the *-a* arose through parallel but separate innovations. She suggests that *-an* in the singular participle in e.g. *n-e-ššan wetan* 'the palace (a collection of rooms, and therefore plural) has been built', is the reflex of the lengthened grade. Gertz suggests that PIE had two neuter plural formations, viz. an old lengthened grade and a competing *-a* which was, judging from the Hittite data, present at a very early stage: only in consonant-clusters (the *nt*-stems) and not in stems ending in resonants. Gertz (following Cowgill, p.c.) suggests that in Proto-Anatolian the $*-a$ originated as a supporting vowel because of the reintroduction of the stem-final consonant into the surface form: $*b^h eront > *b^h eron > *b^h eron(h)_2$.

However, there is no evidence that the PIE *nt*-stems possessed a lengthened

¹⁴¹ Houwink ten Cate 1973b: 205f argues that this a recent phenomenon. However, in many other respects prehistoric Hittite does not seem to have had a neuter plural. Therefore, it is more likely that a neuter singular participle accompanying plural objects is an archaism and that the neuter plural predicative participle represents an innovation.

grade. Therefore, the ending *-a* must have been added to $*-ont$. We have two possibilities. Firstly, Hittite inherited $*-h_2$ which became *-a* and we can posit $*-RCh_2 > -RCa$. This implies that prehistoric Hittite inherited a $*-h_2$, except in the predicative participles. Secondly, if we want to follow the suggestion of Gertz, we can assume that the *-a* originated as a supporting vowel. In that case too the *nt*-stems originally did not have a neuter plural. Only the predicative participles did not receive a neuter plural.

In both cases the neuter singular predicative participle is an archaism. It is therefore possible that this participle reflects the original situation: also the adjectival *nt*-stems originally did not have a plural.

As argued above, the ending *-a* shows a larger spread in the adjectives: prehistoric Hittite also had a $*-h_2$ in the *a*-stem adjectives < PIE *o*-stems, and in the substantivized *i*- and *u*-stem adjectives (for which see 3.9). Also the *nt*-stems had an *-a*. Only the predicative participles retained their original singular and were slow to adopt the new ending *-a*.

To sum up, the *nt*-stems were well on their way of forming a neuter plural.

3.8.8 Conclusion for the adjectives used as adjuncts

The adjectives used as adjuncts seem, like the substantives, to give some evidence that prehistoric Hittite only marginally had a neuter plural: this can be seen very clearly in the *u*-stems: *idālu uddār* 'evil words'. The forms *šallī* 'big' and *parkui* 'clean' indicate that the *i*-stem adjectives did not have a neuter plural either. The replacement of singular adjectives by plural forms in *-a* has gone further in the adjectives than in the substantives: the *i*-stems have, already in older Hittite, replaced the original ending *-i* by *-a* < $*-aya$ (?), e.g. *šuppa uddār* 'holy words', whereas the neuter substantives consistently show short *-i*. In Young Hittite the *u*-stem adjectives replaced the original *-u* by a full grade of the suffix plus the ending *-a*, e.g. *idalawa*. The *a*-stems only show an *-a* < $*-eh_2$. This ending already occurs in older Hittite. The *nt*-stems had, for about 75%, replaced the old singular form by a plural: it is possible that the singular predicative participle agreeing with a neuter plural is a relic of an earlier stage in which the neuter *nt*-stem adjectives (adjectives and participles) did not have a plural.

3.9 THE SUBSTANTIVIZED ADJECTIVES

3.9.1 Introduction

In the previous sections I have argued that the adjectives used as adjuncts only late developed an *-a* as the nom. acc. neuter plural marker.

In the next sections I will argue that prehistoric Hittite probably did possess a marked neuter plural in the substantivized adjectives. The substantivized adjectives are *i*-stems, viz. the series represented by *palḫa* (see 2.7.3) and *a-aš-su-u* 'goods', which is an *u*-stem. Before embarking on the discussion, it is necessary to mention an important point: the meaning of the substantivized adjectives differs largely from the meaning of the substantives: there is a larger difference between *āššu* 'good' and *āššu* 'goods' (with final plene written vowel) than between the adjective *idālu* 'evil' and substantivized *idālu* 'evil'. For *āššu* we have the same development as e.g. in English. 'Good objects' are used in the specialized meaning 'goods'. The same applies for the *i*-stems *palḫi* 'wide' vs. *palḫa* 'cups': 'wide objects' received the meaning 'cups'. Also *ḫarša* 'thick objects' (from the adjective *ḫarši*-) became '(thick) loaves'.

The substantivized adjectives discussed here have in common that they are used in a specialized meaning. The fact that their meaning is specialized suggests that the *-ā* in *āššu* and the *-a* in e.g. *palḫa* represent an archaism.

3.9.2 The *i*-stems

For a discussion and an enumeration of the substantivized *i*-stem adjectives, see 2.7.3. These adjectives have an *-a*, e.g. *palḫa* 'cups' from *palḫi* 'broad, wide'. As the material cited sub 2.7.3 shows, words having this ending are rare. However, from the material it is also clear that the ending *-a* in the substantivized adjectives mainly occurs in older Hittite. This indicates that the ending *-a* is an archaism. Here, in the substantivized *i*-stems, the pattern is different from the pattern seen in the attributive adjectives: in the substantivized *i*-stem adjectives the *-a* is old, whereas in the attributive *i*-stem adjectives, the *-a* is a secondary creation. Thus, prehistoric Hittite probably had a separate nom.acc. neuter plural for the substantivized *i*-stem adjectives. In this class of adjectives the ending *-a* fell into disuse. The substantivized adjectives received normal substantival inflection.

The most easy and straightforward explanation for this *-a* is **-aya* (e.g. Melchert 1984a: 45 and 163) with loss of intervocalic *-i-*. This development is phonologically impeccable. However, we have to assume that prehistoric Hittite had two different morphemes **-aya* for the marking of the nom.acc. neuter plural of the *i*-stems. The first one is attested in the substantivized adjectives. This **-aya*, e.g. **palḫaya* became *-a* in *palḫa* 'cups' from *palḫi* 'wide'. Later this *-a* fell into disuse. In a later period substantivized adjectives were formed differently. E.g. *palḫa* 'cups' < **palḫaya* was replaced by *palḫaes* 'cups', as the data provided by CHD vol. P: 66 show. The second *-a*, viz. the

-a in the adjectives used as adjuncts, became the productive ending and we can see it spreading before our very eyes in the period Hittite was recorded. Although this explanation (*-a* < **-aya*) is phonologically impeccable, it is not attractive to assume two stages for the introduction of the *-a*.

Therefore, one can look for an alternative explanation for the *-a* in the substantivized *i*-stem adjectives. In the next paragraphs I will suggest that there may be a connection between the so-called "i-Motion" and the substantivized adjectives of the *i*-stems.

After an examination of the Anatolian evidence concerning the so-called "i-Motion", which was used in Luwian to characterize the nominative and accusative of the common gender, Starke 1990: 85ff concludes that the "i-Motion" probably originated in the Proto-Anatolian *a*-stem adjectives. Relics of this original situation can still be discerned in the Hittite adjectives in *ui*-, e.g. *parkui* 'clean' and *dankui*-. as Starke 1990: 77 argues, adjectives in *ui*-, are, as a rule, original *wa*-stems: *manenkui* 'near' has a suffix **-enk^wo-*, which is also attested in Lat. *propinquus* 'near'. *Dankui* 'dark' has cognates with the suffixes *-wo-* and **-eh₂-*, e.g. OIc. *dþkk* 'dark' and Old Frisian *diunk* 'dark' < **d^hengwo-*.¹⁴² Starke suggests that its antonym *parkui* 'clean', which has a cognate in Goth. *bairhts* 'bright', Skt. *bhrājāte* 'shines', Lith. *bėrzas* 'birch' has an adjectival suffix *-wo-* denoting colour. The PIE root is probably **b^herH₂*. The other relic of "i-Motion" in Hittite assumed by Starke 1990: 79 is the enclitic possessive pronoun. This pronoun has both *i*- and *a*-stem forms. After reviewing the evidence, Starke concludes that the *i*-stem forms in older Hittite only occur in the nom. and acc. common gender. This corresponds exactly to the pattern of the "i-Motion" in Luwian, where the *-i* is also attested only in the nom. and acc. common gender. He suggests, p. 82, that the "i-Motion" already existed in Proto-Anatolian and that it had been given up already in prehistoric Hittite. Therefore, the paradigm of the adjectives had been levelled. This was the reason why the adjectives generalized either the *i*-stem or the *a*-stem.

Starke's reasoning implies that in prehistoric Hittite many adjectives, which later only had either *i*- or *a*-stem inflection, must have had both *i*- and *a*-stem forms. Some scanty remains can still be seen in the fluctuation between *i*- and *a*-stem forms in *mekki*- vs. *mekka*- 'big, great' (CHD vol. L-N: 245) and *ḫatuki*- vs. *ḫatuga*- 'terrible' (Puhvel 1991: 274).

Because the meaning of the substantivized adjectives cited sub 2.7.3 diverges from the meaning of the original adjectives, it is possible that the substan-

¹⁴² References taken from Kimball 1983: 496.

tized adjectives contain an archaism. If prehistoric Hittite had "i-Motion", also the adjectives from which *palḫa*, *ḫarša* etc. have been derived must have had both i- and a-stem forms.

The adjectival forms became i-stems and the substantivized adjectives kept their (neuter plural) -a as archaisms.

Therefore, it is worthwhile to examine to what extent a-stem forms can still be detected. In the following paragraphs a discussion will be given of the words having a nom. acc. neuter plural in -a besides i-stem forms.

For *palḫa* 'cups' we have one parallel, viz. ^{DUG}*palḫa ḫuman[da ekuer]*. 'They drank all the cups' KUB 17.6 i 6' (OH/NS). This sentence has a parallel in *n-ašta* ^{DUG}*palḫan ḫumandan ek[uer]* KUB 17.5 i 11. Melchert 1989: 182 suggests that *palḫan* is a genitive plural. In this case the -an in *palḫan* may have come from -ayan. However, *palḫan* is also a perfectly normal acc. c. of an a-stem. Thus, *palḫan* is not an i-stem, since we would expect ***palḫin*, but a common-gender a-stem.

The evidence that *šuppa* is an i-stem is small. I only know of a genitive *šuppayaš* in KUB 20.88 vi 15. Nevertheless, most scholars claim that *šuppa* is a derivative of the i-stem adjective *šuppi-*. *Šuppa* would be a derivation of **šuppaya* 'clean, pure' (e.g. Friedrich 1952: 198): 'ritually pure' > 'ritually pure meat' > 'meat'. As Gertz 1982: 20 points out, it is also possible that *šuppa* was originally an a-stem or a consonant-stem and only related to the adjective *šuppi-*. She suggests that *šuppa* may later have been reinterpreted as an i-stem. To my mind, it is possible to use an additional argument in favour of separating *šuppa* 'meat' from *šuppi-* 'clean'. Hittite also has a word *šupp(a)-* 'cattle' (see 2.7.2.1). It is possible that *šuppa* 'meat' and this *šupp(a)-* are ultimately related. *Šupp(a)-* shows no trace of an i whatsoever. Therefore, one can assume that prehistoric Hittite had a root *šup-* from which two words were derived: *šupp(a)-* 'cattle' and an a-stem *šuppa* 'meat'.¹⁴³

Ḫarša 'breads' is the only neuter plural form of *ḫarši-* 'wide, thick'. Already in Old Hittite this word had become a common-gender i-stem (see 2.7.3.3) and

ḫarša was an archaism which had been preserved in a ritual formula.

For *zalta* 'cart' the picture is different: in Middle Hittite this word has adjectival by-forms in -aya. Young Hittite, however, has a form *zaltin* (see 2.7.3.5 for an overview of the instances).

To sum up, the ending -a of the substantivized adjectives is an archaism and already in Old Hittite it occurs rarely. I have argued that the ending -a and the so-called "i-Motion" may be connected, the -a being a relic of ancient a-stems. The ending -a can also be accounted for by assuming loss of intervocalic *-y-: prehistoric Hittite *-aya > -a. Note that the replacement of the old singular -i by *-aya is older in the substantivized adjectives than in the adjectives used as adjuncts. In 3.9.4 I will elaborate on this suggestion in more detail. I want to stress explicitly, that the -a in the substantivized adjectives is more archaic than the -a in the i-stem adjectives used as adjuncts.

3.9.2.1 Mekki 'big, great'

Mekki 'a large part' is also a substantivized adjective. Watkins 1982: 259 claims that the plene written final vowel in *mekki* comes from *-ih₂. Therefore, this -i should have plural value. However, *mekki* is not a good example for -i < *-ih₂ because there is no positive proof that *mekki* has plural meaning: it simply means 'a large section of' (see 2.4.3). It is not possible to use *mekki* as an argument that originally the substantivized adjectives had a neuter plural.

3.9.3 A-aš-šu-u 'goods'

This form is a repository of difficulties, the solutions one can offer are manifold and not one of them is entirely satisfactory.

Āššū means 'goods, possessions' Because 'goods' are tangible objects, the meaning of *āššū* is very remote from the adjective for 'good' (*aššu-*). Because of this remoteness it is possible that the form *a-aš-šu-u* 'goods' represents an archaism, just as the final -a in the substantivized adjectives belonging to the i-stem adjectives discussed sub 3.9.2.

The plene written final vowel indicates that *a-aš-šu-u* is a plural form. This is clearly shown by the opposition *kuit āššū* vs. *āššū ḫumanda* (see 2.4.2). Concerning the origin of the plene written final vowel there are several theories.

Watkins, followed by others, explains the final -ū by *-uh₂. As pointed out sub 3.6.1.2, this is not compelling, because *a-aš-šu-u* is the only piece of evidence: we would expect to find more cases of plene writing in the last syllable. Kimball 1983: 487 argues along the same lines. She suggests that the lack of plene writing in e.g. *idālu*, *wellu* etc. is due to accident.

This serious difficulty arising from Watkins' interpretation has already

¹⁴³ The grammatical number of *šuppa* 'meat' is of extreme interest since its meaning is collective. A grammatical singular is suggested by *ḫuišū* ^{UZU}*šuppa* 'raw meat' KBo 12.96 iv 15-16 (Young Hittite according to Gertz 1982: 120). Since Young Hittite tends to replace the nom. acc. neuter plural of the u-stem adjectives by -awa, it is conceivable that the nom. acc. in -a in *šuppa* kept its singular/collective connotation. If the ideogram UZU 'meat' represents *šuppa* one can also point to HT 1 i 50 UZU-na ḫuman 'and all the meat'. The neuter singular *ḫuman* suggests that behind UZU a neuter singular is hidden.

been signalled by Gertz 1982: 303. She objects that if the final vowel of *a-aš-šu-u* was indeed a long vowel < PIE *-u_{h2}, we would expect more cases of final plene vowel for the nom. acc. neuter plural of the *u*- and *i*-stems: they also originated from *-i_{h2} and *-u_{h2}. She then argues that the final vowel in *a-aš-šu-u* is not the result of compensatory lengthening of *-u* because of loss of final *-h₂: "plene spelling and inherited vowel length are not necessarily linked".

As an alternative explanation for *a-aš-šu-u* Gertz 1982: 303f suggests that plene written *-u* stands for *ō*, which had been monophthongized from **āu*. She takes up the old idea that the Hittites used the signs <U> for /o/ and <Ū> for *u*. The evidence that <U> was used for /o/ and <Ū> for /u/ is not strong. As pointed out by Melchert 1992b: 186f, examples of alternation are not rare: we find both *a-pu-ū-uš* and *a-pu-u-uš* (acc. pl. c.) 'those' and, for instance, *ḫu-u-ni-ik-zi* and *ḫu-ū-ni-ik-zi* 'he batters'. Moreover, it is now generally agreed upon that PIE *-o > Hittite *a*. The theory that <U> denoted /o/ has lately been modernized by Held and Schmalstieg 1969: 105ff, Hart 1983: 124ff and Eichner 1980: 156. They suggest that the Hittites used the sign <U> for the reflexes of PIE **Vu* diphthongs, whereas the sign <Ū> was used to spell reflexes of PIE **u*.

Gertz suggests that the plene final *-u* in *a-aš-šu-u* is the reflex of an old **āu*, just as *ḫaštāi* reflects *-āi. Gertz suggests that in the latter form no monophthongization took place because the two components of the *āu* diphthong are phonetically closer than they are in *āi*. Gertz also argues that the form *u-uḫ-ḫi*, 1 sg. pres. from *auš* 'see' is, like *a-aš-šu-u*, consistently written with <U> and not with <Ū>. If the final vowel of *āššū* represents /u/, we would expect some cases of *a-aš-šu-ū*. Therefore, she suggests that we have to read /*āššō*/ and suggests that also in *u-uḫ-ḫi* the plene written <U> may have arisen as a result of monophthongization of /*āu*/ to /*ō*/ (I infer that Gertz reconstructs with Pokorny 1949-1959: 78 a root **au*, *awēi* "sinnlich wahrnehmen, auffassen").

Secondly, she argues that the *-au-* in the Hittite *au*-stems, which are generally assumed to reflect the PIE hysterodynamic accentuation type, (CCū, gen. CCū-*ōs*, see among others Weitenberg 1979, 1984: 356 and Melchert 1984a: 62) is not the direct reflex of PIE /*ōu*/, because "they are actually normal *u*-stems whose stem vowel is preceded by *-a*." She suggests that they do not ablaut as the PIE hysterodynamic nouns do and that the *au*-stems do not have convincing etymologies. The argument that this stem class does not ablaut as the hysterodynamic *au*-stems do, is not correct, because, as Weitenberg 1984: 264ff

shows, this stem class has ablauting forms, e.g. *ḫar-nu-wa-aš-ma* KBo 17.65 obv. 15 from *ḫarna-u*-n./c. 'birthing-chair'. Therefore, one must conclude that the *au*-stems indeed reflect a hysterodynamic paradigm with nom. *-*ōu*, gen. *-*ōu*. This implies that the final <U> cannot reflect *-*ōu*.

Melchert 1992b: 186f gives an alternative explanation of the <U> in *u-uḫ-ḫi*, which is also believed by Gertz to reflect **ōu*. He points out that "virtually the only evidence" that the sign <U> is the reflex of an original *u*-diphthong is the paradigm of *auš* 'see': *u-uḫ-ḫi* 'I see' vs. *ū-me-(e)-ni* 'we see'. In this verb we always have the sign <U> in the initial syllable whereas the 3 pl. is consistently written with <Ū>.

He agrees with Oettinger 1979: 83, 407, that it is possible that this verb had an ablauting present: 1 sg. **au-h₂ci* (> *u-uḫ-ḫi*), 1 pl. **u-wēni* > *umeni* /, written *ū-me-(e)-ni*. The plene <U> in *u-uḫ-ḫi* then would be a continuation of the old diphthong **au*, whereas the <Ū> in *ū-me-(e)-ni* may reflect the zero grade **u*. The difference between the <U> (alleged /o/) and <Ū> (/u/) seems to corroborate /*ōḫḫi*/. However, Melchert 1992b: 186f offers an alternative solution for the consistent spelling of <U> in *u-uḫ-ḫi*. He signals that, whereas both the signs <U> and <Ū> are used to spell /u/ and /w/ in intervocalic position, only in initial position before vowel signs the <U> and <Ū> are not interchangeable. He suggests (p. 187): "initially before a V or VC sign (other than uC), the Hittites use <Ū> to indicate vocalic /u/ and /ū/ to spell /w/." This explains *u-i-ya* 'send' vs. /*uya*-, but *ū-i-ya-(i)* 'cry out' vs. /*uiya(i)-*/. This also accounts for *u-uḫ-ḫi*: this must be spelled with <U> because *ū-uḫ-ḫi* would represent /*wḫhi*/.

Therefore, only *a-aš-šu-u* is left as evidence that the sign <U> must be read as /*ō*/.

Catsanicos 1984: 150ff and Oettinger 1993: 210f also argue that the plene writing of *a-aš-šu-u* is indicative: the first vowel is also written plene and must therefore have had its original accent on the first syllable. We have to reconstruct **h₁ōs-u* from **h₁es* 'be loved' (for this root see Weitenberg 1984: 97 with ref.). They suggest that the final *u* received length (expressed by plene writing) on the analogy of plurals like *ū-i-da-a-ar* < *wēdōr*, which is also a plural/collective. This explanation is doubtful. Why would *a-aš-šu-u* of all other *u*-stem plurals, like *taru* 'wood' etc., which can also be regarded as collectives, be the only one to have received a plene written final vowel? Secondly, a shift of the accent to the last syllable in e.g. *ū-i-da-a-ar* is difficult, as pointed out sub 3.3.2.2.

The explanations for the final <U> in *a-aš-šu-u* are unsatisfactory and

alternative possibilities can be taken into account. I will elaborate on the problems concerning the plene written <U> in the next section.

3.9.4 The substantivized adjectives revisited

It is important to keep in mind that the neuter plural marker *-a* of the substantivized adjectives is more ancient than the neuter plural marker of the adjectives used as adjuncts. *Palḫa* and *āššū* are both old substantivized adjectives. Therefore, it is possible that the formations prehistoric Hittite formed them with, were no longer alive.

In the following paragraphs I will discuss the possibility that the proto-forms of *palḫa* and *āššū* may have possessed the same structure. It is very well possible that the *-a* of the *i*-stems in e.g. *palḫa* originated from **-aya*. This *-aya* contains the full grade of the suffix followed by the ending *-a*. In the Indo-European languages the *i*- and *u*-stem adjectives inflect in a parallel way. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that also the neuter plural of the substantivized *u*-stem *āššū* 'goods' had the same structure. We then have to assume a full grade in the suffix, also in *āššū*.

The first element to be discussed is the ending *-a*. It is not likely that the ending was **-eh₂* (> *-a*) because the *u* would have developed into a glide and we would have *āšš-aw-a*. Therefore, we can posit single **-h₂*. Because the *i*-stems inflect in a parallel way, also the ending in the substantivized *i*-stems may have been single **-h₂*. The substantivized adjectives cannot have taken their ending from the neuter substantives, because originally the neuter substantives did not have a neuter plural. It is not possible that they took **-h₂* from the adjectives used as adjuncts because those adjectives did not have a neuter plural either. The most likely source then must have been the pronouns. Therefore, one may posit that there were pronouns which had a neuter plural in **-h₂*. The most obvious candidate are the *i*-stem pronouns, e.g. *anṇi* which seems to have had a neuter plural in **-ih₂* (see 3.5.2).

For the full grade we have the choice between three vowels, firstly *e*. This is not attractive because in Hittite we do not have an *e* in the full grade of the *i*- and the *u*-stems. One can point to Gk. *εὔπεία*, the nom. acc. neuter pl. of *εὐπός*. However, the full grade in the nom. acc. pl. in Greek arose on the analogy of the oblique cases. Secondly, the most obvious candidate, is *a*. This *a* can be the same as the *a* in the suffix of the oblique cases attested in historical times. Thirdly, we must consider *o* to be a possible source. There are indications that prehistoric Hittite made a distinction between a en *o*: the reflex of accented **-o* is often written plene, e.g. *ta-a-ru* < **dōru*. The full grade of the suffix

in the *u*- and *i*-stem adjectives must have been unaccented because it is never written plene (see 3.8.3.5 and 3.8.4). Therefore, it is not impossible that the secondary full grade was *-ow-* or *-oy-*, with unaccented *o*. If the source of the full grade was an unaccented *o*, the substantivized adjectives were old.

We may posit then: **-oy-h₂* yielding *-a* for the *i*-stems. For the *u*-stems prehistoric Hittite had **-ou-h₂*. This yielded *ū*.

For the *ū* in *a-āš-šu-u* I propose the following scenario: since there is no positive evidence that final **-h₂* vocalized, it is not necessarily true that a proto-form **h₁os-ouh₂* yielded **a-āš-ša-wa*.

On the other hand, it is fairly certain that the *u*-diphthongs monophthongized (Melchert 1984a: 59ff) into *u*. The suffix in the full grade originated at a time when Hittite possessed an *o*. The full grade was unaccented. The proto-form of *a-āš-šu-u* ended in **-ouh₂*. The diphthong monophthongized. This yielded **a-āš-šuh₂*, which became **a-āš-šu-a*. Subsequently, the schwa disappeared with compensatory lengthening of the final vowel. This yielded long final *-ū*.¹⁴⁴

For the *i*-stems one can posit a proto-form **-oy-h₂*. In order to come to **-aya* we can assume early **o > a*, and vocalisation of the final **-h₂*. This vocalisation of final **-h₂* parallels the evidence in 3.5.2. In that section I have argued (contra e.g. Melchert 1994: 87) that there is evidence that final **-h₂* did vocalize into *-a*. This yielded the proto-form **-aya*. Finally, intervocalic *-y-* disappeared.

The outcome of two similar proto-structures are so fundamentally different because in *o/(a)u* the first and second element of the diphthong are phonetically closer than the two elements in *o/(a)y*.

In order to account for the different outcome one can assume a chronology. Firstly, an early monophthongization of **ou* into *u*. This yields **āššuh₂*. We now have **-oy-h₂* and **-uh₂*, two different forms. Secondly, **-h₂* disappeared with compensatory lengthening of the *-u*. In the *i*-stems the structure was different: **-oy-h₂*. Here the **-h₂* could vocalize into *-a*, because of the vowel preceding the *-y-*. Here originated **-oya* or *-aya*, with **o > a*. Thirdly, intervocalic *-y-* disappeared. Note that Melchert 1994: 130 signals that the loss of intervocalic *-y-* is a comparatively recent development.

The fact that *a-āš-šu-u* is an ancient substantivized adjective, can explain that only in this form Hittite shows plene <U-U>: the Hittite attributive adjectives did not inherit a long *ū* < **-uh₂*.

¹⁴⁴ Palaic *wāšū* 'good things' (?) (see 3.5.2) may have had the same proto-structure as

3.10 CONCLUSION FOR THE ADJECTIVES

The material provided by the adjectives clearly shows that the ending *-a* occurs more often in the adjectives than in the substantives.

Nevertheless, there is evidence that originally the adjectives used a singular form when they accompanied plural objects. In other words: the adjectives also provide evidence that the neuter gender did not have a plural.

The *a*-stems consistently have an *-a*. It is noteworthy that *āra* '(it is) allowed' and *kunna* '(it is) advantageous' have an ending *-a*, where Latin and Greek have a neuter singular (see 3.8.1.1). This may indicate that originally in the adjectives the ending *-a* < *-(e)_{h2} had singular value too, like the *-a* in *kušata* 'dowry'. Singular value for the ending *-a* may also be provided by the adjective *šuppa*, if it modifies the neuter singular *asru kuitki* 'some place'. *Tamāi* 'other, different' is indifferent to number. As such it shows the same pattern as the hysterodynamic substantives. The adjectives in *-nt* consistently have an *-a*. Only the predicative participles occur in their singular form. This is an archaism and provides additional evidence that in prehistoric Hittite the neuter did not have a plural.

The *i*-stem adjectives used as adjuncts originally had the same ending for both the neuter singular and plural, viz. short *-i*. They did not have a separate neuter plural ending. The *-a* is typologically young, and *-aya* is even younger. The *u*-stem adjectives used as adjuncts have an old nom. acc. neuter plural in *-u*, which is the reflex of short **-u*. The characterized plural in *-awa* is young.

The substantivized adjectives show a different pattern: in prehistoric Hittite the *i*-stems seem to have had an old ending *-a*, possibly < **-aya*. It is possible that the long *-ū* in *a-as-šu-u* is the reflex of **-ouh₂*. If this were true, the suffix of both the substantivized *i*- and *u*-stems appeared in the full grade.

To sum up, in prehistoric Hittite the adjectives used as adjuncts did not have a plural. The substantivized adjectives, on the other hand, show the reflex of final **-h₂*. This implies that there is some evidence that prehistoric Hittite made a distinction between substantivized adjectives and adjectives used as adjuncts: the substantivized adjectives received a separate plural ending. This means that the substantivized adjectives received their marker of the neuter plural earlier than the other adjectives.

3.11 AGREEMENT PATTERNS

3.11.1 Introduction

In the previous sections I have argued that in prehistoric Hittite the neuter plural was, at best, only marginally present. The material indicates that Hittite had the formative elements used in the other Indo-European languages to form neuter plurals. However, the material suggests that in prehistoric Hittite these formations had neuter singular value. Therefore, one may conclude that the Hittite neuter plural developed out of a neuter singular.

In this section the agreement patterns of nouns which are modified by adjectives, pronouns and participles will be shortly dealt with. By means of the Hittite agreement patterns I will illustrate how a formation which originally served as a neuter singular could develop into a neuter plural.

As a rule, the Indo-European languages show agreement of nouns with pronouns and adjectives. It is generally assumed that in PIE the situation was the same: an adjective or pronoun agreed in number, case and gender with a substantive. I assume that also in prehistoric Hittite the situation was the same: it must have had a system in which a noun agrees in number, case and gender with its modifying adjective and pronoun.

However, the agreement patterns of the neuter plurals with their adjectives and pronouns in Hittite are different from the patterns in the other Indo-European languages: the pattern neuter plural substantive with a plural in *-a*: plural adjunct with the ending *-a* is not consistently attested. Instead, the patterns singular: plural (e.g. *idālu uddār* 'evil words' and plural: singular (*išharuanta išmeri*) 'bloodstained reins' occur frequently. Another example which shows that Hittite behaves differently from the other Indo-European languages, is provided by the lengthened grade of the suffix. In Sanskrit and Avestan this lengthened grade is characteristic for a neuter plural. However, in Hittite this formation can also agree with singular forms, e.g. *ḥašduēr kuit* 'brushwood which'.

Another peculiar feature in Hittite is that the formations used to form neuter plurals, e.g. the ending *-a*, are often used to denote grammatical singulars. In a few instances the ending *-a* seems to have neuter singular value, both in the adjectives (*šuppa asru kuitki* 'some holy place') and in the substantives (*kušata kuit* 'the dowry which'). Therefore, the Hittite agreement patterns are of extreme interest. I will show that in the course of its history Hittite too tended to have the same consistent agreement pattern of substantives with its modifiers, as e.g. Latin (*quae magna victoria reportata est* 'which big victory has been attained').

Hittite is unique because we can see before our very eyes how a neuter plural developed from a neuter singular. In the course of the period in which Hittite has been recorded, the agreement patterns changed from regular agreement neuter singular ↔ neuter singular to neuter plural ↔ neuter plural.

The change of agreement patterns caused 'irregularities' in the Hittite language system. These inconsistencies are precisely what we would expect in a transitory phase.

Hittite has more agreement patterns for neuter plurals than the other Indo-European languages. I will list them below and provide them with the label singular or plural, according to the status the corresponding ending has in other Indo-European languages. In other words: e.g. *idālu* is singular, because it is not characterized by an -a. *Kuśata* 'dowry' is singular in Hittite because it is followed by a neuter singular relative pronoun *kuit*, but because of the -a, I list this form as plural. In the last column I will note the grammatical number the syntagma has in Hittite, because they are not all necessarily plural.

I have omitted all references to texts and to sections in this monograph. For forms which can be considered neuter plural the following agreement patterns have been attested in the source material for this monograph.

1	substantive sg.	adjectives sg.	singular
	<i>śagac</i>	<i>dameuman</i>	
2	substantive pl.	adjective pl.	plural
a:	<i>partawa</i>	<i>amiyanda</i>	
b:	<i>uddār</i>	<i>idalawa</i>	
c:	<i>uddār</i>	<i>šuppa</i>	
3	substantive pl.	adjective sg.	plural
	<i>uddār</i>	<i>idalu</i>	
4	substantive sg.	adjective pl.	plural
a:	<i>utnē</i>	<i>araḫzena</i>	
b:	<i>utnē</i>	<i>ḫumanda</i>	
c:	<i>išmeri</i>	<i>išḫarwanta</i>	
5	substantive sg.	adjective pl.	singular
	<i>AŠRU kuitki</i>	<i>šuppa</i>	
6	substantive pl.	pronoun pl.	plural
a:	<i>uddār</i>	<i>kue</i>	
b:	<i>ḫuppiyalla-</i> (ya)	<i>kue</i>	

7	substantive sg.	pronoun pl.	plural
a:	<i>utnē</i>	<i>kue</i>	
b:	<i>terippi</i>	<i>kue</i>	
c:	<i>išḫiul</i>	<i>ke kue</i>	
d:	<i>uppeššar</i>	<i>kue</i>	
8	substantive pl.	pronoun sg.	singular
	<i>kuśata</i>	<i>kuit</i>	
9	substantive sg.	pronoun sg.	singular
	<i>utnē</i>	<i>kuit</i>	
10	substantivized adj. pl.	adjective pl.	plural
a:	<i>a-aš-sū-u</i>	<i>ḫumanda</i>	
b:	<i>āššūwa</i>	<i>dapida</i>	
11	substantivized adj. pl.	pronoun sg.	plural
	<i>a-aš-šu-u</i>	<i>n=at</i>	
12	substantive sg.	participle pl.	plural
	<i>LU-natar</i>	<i>ašanda</i>	
13	substantive pl.	participle sg.	plural
	<i>uddār</i>	<i>irḫān</i>	
14	pronoun pl.	participle sg.	plural
a:	<i>n=e¹⁴⁵</i>	<i>wetan</i>	singular
b:	<i>kue¹⁴⁶</i>	<i>terippiyan</i>	plural
15	pronoun pl.	participle pl.	
	<i>kue</i>	<i>tarnanta</i>	

3.11.2 Development from neuter singular to neuter plural

In this section, I will use the agreement patterns mentioned in 3.11.1. The formations used in the other Indo-European languages to form neuter plurals were already present in prehistoric Hittite.

However, in prehistoric Hittite the situation was different: in Hittite the neuter plural (or formations used in other Indo-European languages to form neuter plurals) had strong connections with the neuter singular or had neuter singular value. Not only the lengthened grade of the final syllable had singular value, but also in a number of instances the ending -a had singular value. This

¹⁴⁵ This form refers to É 'palace'.

¹⁴⁶ This form refers to A.Š.terippi 'ploughed fields'.

suggests that the ending *-a* or *(*-h₂)* may have been a neuter singular ending.

In the next sections it will be shown how an original agreement pattern neuter singular ↔ neuter singular, which was the prehistoric Hittite original agreement pattern for the formations which later developed into neuter plurals, could develop into a system neuter plural ↔ neuter plural. I have made a distinction in three phases: in phase one the regular pattern is singular ↔ singular, in phase two the singular and plural syntagms occur side by side, and in phase three the pattern is regular again: plural ↔ plural.

3.11.2.1 Phase one

In this phase the 'neuter plural' was simply a neuter singular. This means that the formations used in later times to make neuter plurals (**-h₂*, lengthened grade of the suffix) and the uncharacterized neuter plural agreed with singular modifiers. The regular agreement pattern was: neuter singular ↔ neuter singular. As the material cited below shows, this phase is amply attested.

I have listed the lengthened grade and the ending *-a* separately.

A: Lengthened grade in the suffix of the noun agreeing with neuter singular adjective or pronoun. All quoted instances are old:

1. *šaqaē darcunani* 'strange omen'
3. *idāhu uddār* 'evil speech'
9. *utnē kuit* 'the country which'

B: The ending *-a* or reflexes of **-h₂* agreeing with a neuter singular adjective or pronoun:

8. *kušata kuit* 'the dowry which' (old)

3.11.2.2 Phase two

In this phase the formations used to form neuter plurals were felt to be plural only because of agreement with pronouns or adjectives. I assume that if an adjective in *-a* agrees with a later plural formation, the adjective indicates that the noun it agrees with is plural. To us, in this phase the agreement pattern seems to be irregular. The formations were still singular and uncharacterized as opposed to the singular.

A: Lengthened grade in the suffix of the noun agreeing with a neuter singular adjective or pronoun.

3. *idāhu uddār* 'evil words'

B: Lengthened grade in the suffix of the substantive agreeing with a neuter plural or pronoun. It must be noted that the hysterodynamic neuter forms

are indifferent to number. Originally they had singular collective value. This implies that only by means of agreement it was possible to distinguish between singular and plural.

- 4a. *arazena utnē* 'hostile countries'
- 4b. *humanda utnē* 'all countries'
- 4c. *išmeri išharwanda* 'bloodstained reins'

C: The ending *-a*, agreeing with a neuter singular adjective or pronoun:

- 10a. *humanda aššū* 'all goods'

D: Plural pronoun with singular modifier

- 14a. *n=ē uelan* '(the palace) and it has been built'

- 14b. *a.šā terippi kue terippiyan* 'the fields which have been ploughed'¹⁴⁷

E: Singular substantive with a plural modifier

- 7a. *utnē kue* 'the countries which'
- 7b. *terippi kue* 'which ploughed fields'
- 7c. *kue išhiul* 'which treaties'

F: Plene written vowel containing the reflex of **-h₂* with a singular modifier

11. *a-aš-šu-u n=at* 'the goods, and it' (old)

3.11.2.3 Phase three

Here the agreement pattern has arrived at **a**, from our point of view, regular pattern (*illa horribilia bella quae* 'these terrible wars which'). I assume that the formations used later to form neuter plurals were felt to be plural and were clearly different from the singular: in other words, the *-a* and the lengthened grade lost their singular value and were used as plural:

A: Lengthened grade of the suffix agreeing with neuter plural adjective or pronoun.

6. *uddār kue* 'the words which'
- 2a. *partawa amiyanda* 'its wings (are) small'
- 2b. *idalawa uddār* 'evil words'
- 2c. *suppa uddār* 'holy words'

¹⁴⁷ Here the neuter predicative participle is singular too. In cases like this, plural value is proved by the grammatical number of the pronoun. If we only had *terippi terippiyan* 'the field(s) (are/is) ploughed' there would be no conclusive evidence for the number, because of the lack of formal criteria.

4a. *arāḫzena utnē* 'hostile countries'¹⁴⁸

4b. *utnē ḫumanta* 'all countries'

B: Neuter plural -a agreeing with neuter plural formants with an ending -a:

15. *kue taranta* 'the things which have been released'

10a. *a-aš-šu-u ḫumanta* 'all the goods'

10b. *a-aš-šu-wa dapida* 'all the goods'

6a. *uddār kue* 'the words which'

6b. *ḫuppiyallaya kue* 'the blankets which'

C: The neuter plural in -i originated in this phase because the mere uncharacterized form, e.g. *arkuwar* 'pleading' was not considered sufficient and needed a plural marker. In other words: **ke arkuwar* > *ke arkuwarri* 'these pleadings' (see 2.6.2).

In later Hittite there is one instance in which the plural became a singular again, viz. the *r/n*-stems with the suffixes -*cšsar*, -*atar* and -(*a*)*war*. They lost their *r*-less form and became identical in form to the singular again as is illustrated by *uppešsar kue*, example 7d.

3.11.3 Conclusion

The Hittite agreement patterns are manifold. They are often different from the patterns in the other Indo-European languages: in Hittite the formations used in the other Indo-European languages to denote neuter plurals often agree with neuter singular adjectives and pronouns. To put it bluntly, prehistoric Hittite may have had a neuter singular in -a.

To sum up, the Hittite agreement patterns of the neuter plural formations suggest that in prehistoric Hittite the endings which served to characterize the neuter plural had singular value. Like all other Indo-European languages, Hittite developed a true neuter plural out of the neuter singular. In this respect Hittite behaved like its sister languages.

3.12 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In Hittite the forms which are characteristic for the neuter plural occur more frequently in the adjectives than in the substantives. However, it has been argued that in prehistoric Hittite both the adjectives and substantives did not, or

only marginally, have a neuter plural. If this situation had been inherited from PIE, the neuters originally did not have a plural. One can accept Ostrowski's view and assume that the paucity of neuter plurals was caused by the very nature of the neuter gender: it denoted indefinite objects, "ein Solches, ein Etwas" and therefore it did not have a plural.

Prehistoric Hittite retained this original situation to a great extent. Nevertheless, it had the morphemes which were used in other Indo-European languages to form neuter plurals: the *-*h₂* (-a) and the lengthened grade of the final syllable. In one important respect the Hittite situation was different: the ending -a < *-*h₂* and the lengthened grade were grammatical singulars.

However, Hittite needed a neuter plural when the neuter nouns ceased to be exclusively indefinite, "ein Solches, ein Etwas".

The process in which the neuter gender received a plural probably passed through several stages. The evidence provided by the Hittite material indicates that the adjectives and pronouns received a plural earlier than the substantives did. Because the adjectives already modified the neuter substantives, the neuter substantives were slower in taking over the plural morpheme. The substantivized adjectives received the ending *-*h₂* earlier than the other adjectives. In Old Hittite we only see scanty traces of the archaic flexion of the substantivized adjectives. The development from neuter singular to neuter plural passed through the following four stages:

1. Substantivized adjectives got an *-*h₂*, which developed into an -a, except in *a-aš-šu-u*. The *-*h₂* was still felt as a collective: *a-aš-šu-u* 'goods' has collective notion. *Palḫa* 'cups' can be thought of as 'kitchenware', *ḫarša* can be regarded as the total amount of bread which has to be produced. *Šuppa* 'meat' clearly is a collective. There is some evidence that *šuppa* had neuter singular value. One can conclude that the substantivized adjectives received an -a because prehistoric Hittite wanted to characterize them as collective (singular).
2. The neuter started to receive plural value by means of agreement. It is very easily conceivable that the grammatical category in which this process occurred the first time was the category of the pronouns. They already had a formation to mark plurals.
3. The pronouns triggered the following stage in which the adjectives also needed a formation to indicate that the nouns they agreed with denoted plural entities. At this stage Hittite must have become a language in which nouns were automatically assigned to a certain gender. The system definite - indefinite had broken down into a system common gender -

¹⁴⁸ I use the last examples also for phase two. However, it is necessary to use them twice, because it is clear, especially for the lengthened grade of the *r/n*-stems that in this phase those formations were felt as plural: *ud-da-a-ar* now means 'words'.

neuter gender. Therefore, the adjectives did not use formations taken from the common gender but adopted a neuter morpheme. They took the collective suffix *-a*. This *-a* was the only morpheme the neuter adjectives could use, because it was a neuter morpheme and did not denote singular entities. In older Hittite the adjectives had only partially developed a plural.

4. From the adjectives the ending *-a* spread to the substantives. However, this process started late, as is suggested by the evidence. In the neuter substantives the ending *-a* is rare and we can see it spreading before our very eyes.

The ending *-a* occurred frequently in nouns with common gender. This is only what we expect: neuters did not need a collective because by nature they already had the feature 'collective': they were indefinite (and therefore also had the notion of collectivity). When common-gender nouns needed a collective, they took the *-a*, which was a neuter singular collective suffix. This is the type represented by Lat. *locus*, *loci* vs. *loca*.

To sum up, I have put forward arguments for the view that in prehistoric Hittite the neuter plural was a neuter singular. In PIE the situation may have been the same as in prehistoric Hittite. Even if one does not accept the view that in PIE the neuter plural was a neuter singular, I hope to have made clear two things: firstly, the Hittite material does not provide much evidence for the assumption that prehistoric Hittite had a neuter plural. Secondly, a close look at the historical phonological developments that affect the neuter plural suggests that many issues in the Hittite historical phonology are still open to debate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALP, S.
1991 *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük*, Ankara
- ARCHI, A.
1979 'L'humanité des Hittites', in *Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, Paris, pp. 37-48
- BECKMAN, G.
1977 *Hittite Birth Rituals*, Doctoral thesis Yale
- BECKMAN, G.
1983 *Hittite Birth Rituals*, StBoT 29, Wiesbaden
- BEEKES, R.
1969 *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek*, The Hague/Paris/London
- BEEKES, R.
1979 'GAv. *uziridyāi* and *rārāša-*', *MSS* 38, pp. 5-20
- BEEKES, R.
1981 'The Neuter Plural and the Vocalisation of the Laryngeals in Avestan', *IJJ* 23, pp. 275-287
- BEEKES, R.
1985 *The Origins of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection*, IBS 46, Innsbruck
- BEEKES, R.
1987 'Indo-European neuters in *-i*', in G. Cardona and N.H. Zide, *Festschrift Henry Hoernigswald*, Tübingen, pp. 45-56
- BEEKES, R.
1988a 'Laryngeal Developments: a Survey', in A. Bammesberger, *Die Laryngaltheorie*, Heidelberg, pp. 59-105
- BEEKES, R.
1988b *A Grammar of Gatha-Avestan*, Leiden

- BEEKES, R.
 1989 Review of 'A. Nussbaum *Die Laryngalthorie*', *Kratylos* 34, pp. 55-59
- BEEKES, R.
 1990 *Vergelijkende Taalwetenschap*, Utrecht
- BEEKES, R.
 1994 'The Neuter Plural of Thematic Nouns. Derivatives from a Stem in -e- from Thematic Nouns', in G. Dunkel et al., *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch*, Wiesbaden, pp. 1-15
- BENVENISTE, E.
 1962 *Hittite et indo-européen, études comparatives*, Paris
- BERMAN, H.
 1972 *The Stem Formation of Hittite Nouns and Adjectives*, Doctoral thesis University of Chicago
- BOLEY, J.
 1989 *The Sentence Particles and the Place Words in Old and Middle Hittite*, IBS 60, Innsbruck
- BOYSAN-DIETRICH, N.
 1987 *Das hethitische Lehnhaus aus der Sicht der Keilschriftquellen*, TdHeth 12, Heidelberg
- BROSMAN, P.
 1964 'The Neuter Plural of Hittite *i*- and *u*-Stems', *JAOS* 84, pp. 344-348
- BURROW, T.
 1965 *The Sanskrit Language*, 2nd edition, London
- CATSANICOS, J.
 1984 Review of 'E. Neu, ed. *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae. Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*', *BSL* 79/2, pp. 129-158
- CATSANICOS, J.
 1986 'À propos des adjectifs hitt. *šu-ḫmili-* et véd. *śu-māya-*: quelques remarques sur le traitement du groupe **V-HxC*° à la jointure des composés', *BSL* 81/1, pp. 121-180
- CATSANICOS, J.
 1991 *Recherches sur le vocabulaire de la Faute*, Cahiers de NABU 2, Paris
- CHD
 1980 Hans G. Güterbock and Harry A. Hoffner, eds. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, vol. L-N and vol. P, Chicago

- ČOP, B.
 1955 'Notes d'étymologie et de grammaire hittite', *RHA* 13, pp. 63-71
- ČOP, B.
 1957 'Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung 2', *Die Sprache* 3, pp. 135-149
- ČOP, B.
 1965 'Sur une règle phonétique de la langue louvite', *Linguistica* 7, pp. 99-123
- ČOP, B.
 1970 'Eine luwische orthographisch-phonetische Regel', *IF* 75, pp. 85-96
- COTTICELLI, P.
 1988 *Materialien zu einem hethitischen Thesaurus*, Lief. 11, Heidelberg
- COTTICELLI-KURRAS, P.
 1991 *Das hethitische Verbum 'sein'*, TdHeth 18, Heidelberg
- DROHLA, W.
 1949 *Die Kongruenz zwischen Nomen und Attribut sowie zwischen Subjekt und Prädikat im Hethitischen*, Doctoral thesis Marburg
- DURHAM, J.
 1976 *Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian*, Doctoral thesis Harvard
- EICHNER, H.
 1973 'Die Etymologie von heth. *mehur*', *MSS* 31, pp. 53-107
- EICHNER, H.
 1975 'Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystems', in E. Rix, *Flexion und Wortbildung*, Wiesbaden, pp. 71-103
- EICHNER, H.
 1980 'Phonetik und Lautgesetze des Hethitischen — ein Weg zu ihrer Entschlüsselung', in M. Mayrhofer et al., *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie*, Wiesbaden, pp. 120-165
- EICHNER, H.
 1985 'Das Problem des Ansatzes eines urindogermanischen Numerus "Kollektiv" ("Komprehensiv")', in B. Schlerath, *Grammatische Kategorien, Funktion und Geschichte*, Wiesbaden, pp. 134-169
- EICHNER, H.
 1988 'Anatolisch und Trilaryngalismus', in A. Bammesberger, *Die Laryngalthorie*, Heidelberg, pp. 123-151
- EICHNER, H.
 1992 'Anatolian', in J. Gvozdanović, *Indo-European Numerals*, Berlin/New York, pp. 29-96

- ERTEM, H.
1974 *Boğazköy metinlerindeki görece Hititler devri Anadolu'sunun Florası*, Ankara
- FORSMANN, B.
1965 'Gr. πρόμνη, ai. *nimná*- und Verwandtes', *KZ* 79, pp. 11-28
- FRIEDRICH, J.
1926 'Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in Hethitischer Sprache, I. Teil', *MVAeG* 31, pp. 1-181
- FRIEDRICH, J.
1952 *Hethitisches Wörterbuch (= HW), Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter., with three additional volumes (= HW. Erg.), published in 1957, 1961, 1966, Heidelberg*
- FRIEDRICH, J.
1960 *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* 1, 2nd ed., Heidelberg
- GARRET, A.
1990 *The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics*, Doctoral thesis Harvard
- GERTZ, J.
1982 *The Nominative-Accusative Neuter Plural in Anatolian*, Doctoral thesis Yale
- GÖTZE, A.
1930 'Neue Bruchstücke zum grossen Text des Hattusiliš und den Paralleltexten', *MVAeG* 34.2, pp. 1-88
- GÖTZE, A.
1933 'Die Annalen des Muršiliš', *MVAeG* 38, pp. 1-329
- GÖTZE, A.
1947 'Contributions to Hittite Lexicography', *JCS* 1, pp. 307-320
- GÖTZE, A.
1954 Review of 'HW', *JAOS* 74, pp. 186-190
- GÖTZE, A.
1955 'Hittite Dress', in H. Krahe, *Corolla Linguistica (Festschrift Sommer)*, Wiesbaden, pp. 48-68
- GÖTZE, A.
1956 'The Inventory IBoT I 31', *JCS* 10, pp. 32-38
- GÖTZE, A.
1960 'The Beginning of the Hittite Instructions for the Commander of the Border Guards', *JCS* 14, pp. 69-73

- GÖTZE, A. PEDERSEN, H.
1934 *Muršili's Sprachlähmung: ein hethitischer Text mit philologischen und linguistischen Erörterungen*, Det. kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser 21, 1
- GÖTZE, A. AND E. STURTEVANT
1938 *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi*, New Haven
- GURNEY, O.
1940 'Hittite Prayers of Muršili II', *AAA* 27, pp. 3-163
- GURNEY, O.
1948 'Mita of Pahlhuwa', *AAA* 28, pp. 32-47
- GURNEY, O.
1990 *The Hittites*, London
- GÜTERBOCK, H.
1946 *Kumarbi. Mythen vom churritischen Kronos aus den hethitischen Fragmenten zusammengestellt, übersetzt und erklärt*, Istanbuler Schriften 16, Zürich/New York
- GÜTERBOCK, H.
1952 'The Song of Ullikumi', *JCS* 6, pp. 8-42
- GÜTERBOCK, H.
1957 Review of 'Friedrich, J. HW', *Oriens* 10, pp. 350-362
- GÜTERBOCK, H.
1958 'The Composition of Hittite Prayers to the Sun', *JAOS* 79, pp. 237-245
- GÜTERBOCK, H.
1967 'Lexicographical Notes. 3', *RHA* 25, pp. 141-150
- GÜTERBOCK, H.
1995 'Reflections on the Musical Instruments *arkammi*, *galgalturi*, and *huḫupal* in Hittite', in Th. van den Hout and J. de Roos, *Festschrift Houwink ten Cate*, Leiden, pp. 57-72
- GÜTERBOCK, H. AND TH. VAN DEN HOUT
1991 *The Hittite Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard*, Chicago
- HAAS, V. AND G. WILHELM
1974 *Hurritische und Luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna*, Hurritologische Studien 1, Neukirchen-Vluyn
- HAAS, V. AND H. TIEL
1978 *Die Beschwörungsrituale der Alaitura(h)hi und verwandte Texte*, Hurritologische Studien 2, Neukirchen-Vluyn

- HARDARSON, JÓN AXEL
 1987 'Zum urindogermanischen Kollektivum', *MSS* 48, pp. 71-113
- HARDARSON, JÓN AXEL
 1994 'Der Verlust zweier wichtiger Flexionskategorien in Urnaratolischen', *HS* 107, pp. 30-41
- HART, G.
 1980 'Some observations on plene-writing in Hittite', *BSOAS* 43, pp. 1-17
- HART, G.
 1983 'Problems of writing and phonology in Cuneiform Hittite', *TPS*, pp. 100-154
- HAWKINS, J., A. MOPURGO DAVIES AND G. NEUMANN
 1974 'Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: New evidence for the Connection', *NAWG, Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 6, pp. 145-197, Göttingen
- HELD, W., W. SCHMALSTIEG AND J. GERTZ
 1987 *Beginning Hittite* 6, Ohio
- HOFFNER, H.
 1974 *Alimenta Hethacorum*, New Haven
- HOFFNER, H.
 1978 Review of 'HW₂', *BiOr* 35, pp. 242-246
- HOFFNER, H.
 1994 'The Hittite word for "Oil" and its derivatives', *HS* 107, pp. 222-230
- HOFFMANN, K.
 1975 *Aufsätze zur Indo-iranistik* part 2, Wiesbaden
- VAN DEN HOUT, TH.
 1984 'Einige luwische Neutra auf za/ša in überwiegend junghethitischen Texten', *KZ* 97, pp. 60-80
- VAN DEN HOUT, TH.
 1989 *KBo IV 10 + (CTH 106), Studien zum spätjunghethitischen Texte der Zeit Tudhaliyas IV*, Doctoral thesis University of Amsterdam
- HOUWINK TEN CATE, PH.
 1967 'Mawatallis' Prayer to the Storm-God of Kummanni (KBo 11.1)', *RHA* 25, pp. 101-127
- HOUWINK TEN CATE, PH.
 1973a 'The Particle -a and its Usage with Respect to the Personal Pronoun', in E. Neu and C. Rüster, *Festschrift Otten*, Wiesbaden, pp. 119-139

- HOUWINK TEN CATE, PH.
 1973b 'Impersonal and Reflexive Constructions of the Predicative Participle in Hittite', in M. Beek et al., *Festschrift De Liagre Böhl*, Leiden, pp. 199-210
- HUTTER, M.
 1988 *Bekehrung, Entsöhnung und Heilung*, Göttingen
- IMPARATI, F.
 1974 'Una concessione di terre da parte di Tudhaliya IV', *RHA* 32, pp. 3-211
- JESPERSEN, O.
 1924 *The Philosophy of Grammar*, 11th impression 1975, Oxford
- JOSEPH, B.
 1984 'A Note on Assimilation in Hittite', *Die Sprache* 30,1, pp. 1-15
- KAMMENHUBER, A.
 1954 'Studien zum hethitischen Infinitivsystem 1', *MIO* 2, pp. 44-77
- KAMMENHUBER, A.
 1961 *Hipplogia Hethitica*, Wiesbaden
- KAMMENHUBER, A.
 1965 'Die hethitischen Vorstellungen von Seele und Leib, Herz und Leibesinnerem, Kopf und Person, 2. Teil (= Körper/Leib)', *ZA* 57, pp. 177-222
- KAMMENHUBER, A.
 1969 'Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch, und Hieroglyphenluwisch', in *Alt klein-asiatische Sprachen*, Leiden, pp. 119-357
- KAMMENHUBER, A.
 1979 'Direktiv, Terminativ und/oder Lokativ im Hethitischen', in E. Neu und W. Meid, *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, Innsbruck, pp. 115-142
- KAMMENHUBER, A. AND A. ÜNAL
 1974 'Das althethitische Losorakel KBo XVIII 151', *KZ* 88, pp. 157-180
- KELLERMAN, G.
 1980 *Recherche sur les rituels de fondation hittites*, Doctoral thesis Université de Paris
- KEMPINSKI, A. AND S. KOŠAK
 1970 'Der Ismeriga-Vertrag', *WO* 5, pp. 191-217
- KIMBALL, S.
 1983 *Hittite Plene Writing*, Doctoral thesis University of Pennsylvania

- KIMBALL, S.
1987 '*H₃ in Anatolian', in G. Cardona and N.H. Zide, *Festschrift Henry Hoernigswald*, Tübingen, pp. 185-191
- KOŠAK, S.
1982 *Hittite Inventory Texts*, (CTH 241-250), TdHeth 10, Heidelberg
- KOŠAK, S.
1990 'Night and day in war and peace', *Journal of Ancient Civilisations* 5, pp. 77-86
- KRONASSER, H.
1956 *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*, Heidelberg
- KRONASSER, H.
1957 'Gutturale und dentale Erweiterungen', in E. Pulgram, *Studies presented to Joshua Whatmough*, 's Gravenhage, pp. 121-129
- KRONASSER, H.
1961 'Fünf hethitische Rituale', *Die Sprache* 7, pp. 140-167
- KRONASSER, H.
1966 *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache* Band I, Wiesbaden
- KÜMMEL, H.M.
1967 *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König*, StBoT 3, Wiesbaden
- KÜHNE, C.
1973 'Das Ritualfragment KBo XVI 65 + 56 + KUB XXXIV 85', in E. Neu and C. Rüster, *Festschrift Otten*, Wiesbaden, pp. 161-167
- KUIPER, F.
1955 'Shortening of Final Vowels in the Rigveda', *MNAW* 18/11, pp. 253-289
- KURYLOWICZ, J.
1964 *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*, Heidelberg
- LAROCHE, E.
1947 'Hattic deities and their epithets', *JCS* 1, pp. 187-216
- LAROCHE, E.
1949 'Le vœu de Puduḫepa', *RA* 43, pp. 55-78
- LAROCHE, E.
1953 'Šuppiluliuma II', *RA* 47, pp. 70-78
- LAROCHE, E.
1959 *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*, Paris
- LAROCHE, E.
1962 'Un 'ergatif' en indo-européen d'Asie Mineure', *BSL* 57, pp. 23-43

- LAROCHE, E.
1965a 'Études de linguistique anatolienne', *RHA* 23, pp. 33-54
- LAROCHE, E.
1965b 'Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription, première partie, Mythologie d'origine anatolienne', *RHA* 23, pp. 61-178
- LAROCHE, E.
1967 Review of 'Friedrich, J. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (= HW), *Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*, with three additional volumes (= HW. Erg.), published in 1957, 1961, 1966' *OLZ* 62, pp. 31-34
- LAROCHE, E.
1968 'Textes de Ras Shamra en langue hittite', *Ugaritica* 5, pp. 796-784
- LAROCHE, E.
1970 'Études de linguistique anatolienne III', *RHA* 28, pp. 22-71
- LAROCHE, E.
1973 'Fleuve et ordalie en asie mineure hittite', in E. Neu and C. Rüster, *Festschrift Otten*, Wiesbaden, pp. 179-189
- LINDEMANN, F.
1983 'Zu althethitisch a-aš-šu-u', *Die Sprache* 29.1, pp. 41-43
- MEILLET, A.
1936 *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*, 2nd ed., Vienna
- MEILLET, A.
1937 *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*, 8th edition, Paris
- MELCHERT, C.
1973 'Hittite ḫašša ḫanzašša', *RHA* 31, pp. 57-70
- MELCHERT, C.
1977 *Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite*, Doctoral thesis Harvard
- MELCHERT, C.
1983a 'Pudenda Hethitica', *JCS* 35, pp. 137-145
- MELCHERT, C.
1983b 'A 'New' PIE *men-Suffix', *Die Sprache* 29.1, pp. 1-26
- MELCHERT, C.
1984a *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*, Göttingen
- MELCHERT, C.
1984b 'Notes on Palaic', *KZ* 97, pp. 22-43

- MELCHERT, C.
 1987 'Reflexes of *h₃ in Anatolian', *Die Sprache* 33,1, pp. 19-28
- MELCHERT, C.
 1988a 'Word-final -r in Hittite', in Y. Arbeitman, *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwarz (Studies in Anatolian, Italic and other Indo-European languages)*, Louvain-la-Neuve, pp. 215-234
- MELCHERT, C.
 1988b 'Luwian Lexical Notes', *KZ* 101, pp. 211-243
- MELCHERT, C.
 1989 Review of 'D. Yoshida *Die Syntax des althethitischen substantivischen Genitivs*', *Kratylos* 34, pp. 181-182
- MELCHERT, C.
 1992a 'Relative Chronology and Anatolian: the Vowel System', in R. Beekes et al., *Rekonstruktion und Relative Chronologie*, Innsbruck, pp. 41-53
- MELCHERT, C.
 1992b 'Hittite Vocalism', in O. Carruba, *Per una grammatica ittita, Towards a hittite grammar*, Pavia, pp. 183-196
- MELCHERT, C.
 1993 *A Cuneiform Luwian lexicon*, *Lexica Anatolica* Vol. 2, Chapel Hill
- MELCHERT, C.
 1994 *Anatolian Historical Phonology*, *Leiden Studies in Indo-European* 3, Amsterdam/Antonia
- MELCHERT, C.
 1996 Review of 'CHD vol. P fasc. 1', *JAOS* 116, pp. 777-778
- MERIGGI, P.
 1960 'Sur quelques fragments rituels Hittites', *RHA* 18, pp. 87-106
- MILEWSKI, T.
 1936 *L'Indo-hittite et l'indo-européen*, *Bulletin international de l'académie polonaise des sciences et des lettres, classe de philologie — classe d'histoire et de philosophie* No. supplémentaire 2, Cracow
- NEU, E.
 1968 *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen*, StBoT 5, Wiesbaden
- NEU, E.
 1969 Review of 'W. Kastner *Die griechischen Adjektive zweier Endungen auf *-os*', *IF* 74, pp. 235-241

- NEU, E.
 1970 *Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual*, StBoT 12, Wiesbaden
- NEU, E.
 1974 *Der Anitta-Text*, StBoT 18, Wiesbaden
- NEU, E.
 1979 'Einige Überlegungen zu den hethitischen Kasusendungen', in E. Neu und W. Meid, *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, Innsbruck, pp. 177-196
- NEU, E.
 1980a *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*, StBoT 25, Wiesbaden
- NEU, E.
 1980b *Studien zum Endungslosen "Lokativ" des Hethitischen*, Vorträge und kleinere Schriften, Innsbruck
- NEU, E.
 1982 'Hethitisch /r/ in Wortauslaut', in J. Tischler, *Serta Indogermanica, Festschrift G. Neumann*, Innsbruck, pp. 205-225
- NEU, E.
 1983a *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten*, StBoT 26, Wiesbaden
- NEU, E.
 1983b 'Zur Datierung der hethitischen Pferdertexte', in H. Hoffner, G. Beckman, *Festschrift Güterbock*, Leiden, pp. 151-163
- NEU, E.
 1992 'Zum Kollektivum im Hethitischen', in O. Carruba, *Per una grammatica ittita, Towards a hittite grammar*, Pavia, pp. 199-212
- NEU, E. AND C. RÜSTER
 1989 *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon*, Wiesbaden
- NUSSBAUM, A.
 1986 *Head and Horn in Indo-European*, Berlin/New-York
- OETTINGER, N.
 1978 'Die Gliederung des anatolischen Sprachgebietes', *KZ* 92, pp. 74-92
- OETTINGER, N.
 1979 *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*, Nürnberg
- OETTINGER, N.
 1986 *"Indo-Hittite"-Hypothese und Wortbildung*, Vorträge und kleinere Schriften, Innsbruck

- OETTINGER, N.
1987 'Bemerkungen zur anatolischen i-Motion und Genusfrage', *KZ* 100, pp. 35-43
- OETTINGER, N.
1993 'Der Akzent des indogermanischen Kollektivums in Lichte des Hethitischen', *MSS* 54 [1994], pp. 207-214
- OETTINGER, N.
1995a 'Pluralbildungen und Morphologie hethitischer Neutra auf -ulli, -alli, -ul, -al', in O. Carruba et al., *Atti del 2 congresso internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia, pp. 313-320
- OETTINGER, N.
1995b 'Griech. ὁστέον, heth. kulēi und ein neues Kollektivsuffix', in H. Hettrich et al., *Festschrift K. Strunk*, Innsbruck, pp. 212-228
- OSTROWSKI, M.
1982 'Zu den substantivischen Kategorien des Urindogermanischen', in H. Seiler, *Apprehension. Das sprachliche Erfassen von Gegenständen*, Tübingen, pp. 270-274
- OSTROWSKI, M.
1985 'Zur Entstehung und Entwicklung des indogermanischen Neutrums', in B. Schlerath, *Grammatische Kategorien, Funktion und Geschichte*, Wiesbaden, pp. 313-323
- OTTEN, H.
1958 *Hethitische Totenrituale*, Berlin
- OTTEN, H.
1961 'Eine Beschwörung der Unterirdischen aus Boğazköy', *ZA* 54, pp. 114-157
- OTTEN, H.
1966 'Hethiter, Hurriter und Mitanni', in *Fischer Weltgeschichte*, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 102-176
- OTTEN, H. AND W. SOUCEK
1969 *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*, StBoT, 8, Wiesbaden
- OTTEN, H.
1971 *Materialien zum hethitischen Lexikon*, StBoT 15, Wiesbaden
- OTTEN, H.
1976a Review of 'Kammenhuber, A. *Materialien zu einem hethitischen Thesaurus*, *lief. 3/4*', IF 81, pp. 305-308

- OTTEN, H.
1976b 'Bemerkungen zum Hethitischen Wörterbuch', *ZA* 66, pp. 98-104
- OTTEN, H.
1981 *Die Apologie Hattusiliš III. Das Bild der Überlieferung*, StBoT 24, Wiesbaden
- PEDERSEN, HOLGER
1938 *Hittitisch und die anderen indo-europäischen Sprachen*, Danske Vidensk. Selskab, hist.-filol. Meddelelser 25/2, Copenhagen
- POKORNY, J.
1949-59 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (= *IEW*), Bern/Munich
- POLVANI, A.
1988 *La terminologia dei minerali nei testi ittiti. Parte prima*. Eothen 3. Collana di studi sulle civiltà dell' Oriente antico diretta da Fiorella Imparatti e Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli, Florence
- POPKO, M.
1974 'Notes on Hittite Vocabulary', *JCS* 26, pp. 181-182
- PUHVEL, J.
1972 "'Bartholomae's Law" in Hittite', *KZ* 86, pp. 111-115
- PUHVEL, J.
1979 'Hittite words with initial *pī/pāt* sign', in E. Neu and W. Meid, *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, Innsbruck, pp. 209-217
- PUHVEL, J.
1984 *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* 1-2, Berlin/New York/Amsterdam
- PUHVEL, J.
1986 '*Huidar* and *vidnir*: Creatures and Critters in Anatolia and Iceland', *Die Sprache* 32, pp. 54-57
- PUHVEL, J.
1991 *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* 3, words beginning with *ḫ*, Berlin/New York
- RIEKEN, E.
1994 'Der Wechsel -a-/-i- in der Stammbildung des hethitischen Nomens', *HS* 107, pp. 42-53
- RIEMSCHNEIDER, K.
1970 *Babylonische Geburtsomina in hethitischer Übersetzung*, StBoT 9, Wiesbaden

- RIZZI MELLINI, A.
 1979 'Un "istruzione" etea di interesse storico: KBo XVI 24 + 25', in O. Carruba, *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*, Pavia, pp. 509-553
- DE ROOS, J.
 1984 *Hettitische geloften*, Doctoral thesis University of Amsterdam
- ROST, L.
 1956 'Die außerhalb von Boğazköy gefundenen hethitischen Briefe', *MIO* 4, pp. 328-350
- SCHINDLER, J.
 1975 'L'apophonie des thèmes indo-européens en -r/n', *BSL* 70,1, pp. 1-10
- SCHMIDT, J.
 1889 *Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra*, Weimar
- SCHRIJVER, P.
 1991 *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*, Leiden Studies in Indo-European 2, Amsterdam/Atlanta
- VON SCHULER, E.
 1957 *Hethitische Dienstanweisungen für höhere Hof- und Staatsbeamte. Ein Beitrag zum Antiken Recht Kleinasien*, AfO Beiheft 10
- VON SCHULER, E.
 1965 *Die Kaskäer (Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasien)*, Berlin
- SCHWYZER, E.
 1977 *Griechische Grammatik* 1, Munich
- SCHWYZER, E. AND A. DEBRUNNER
 1950 *Griechische Grammatik* 2, Munich
- SHIELDS, K.
 1993 'Hittite Nom. Sg. uk', *HS* 106, pp. 20-25
- SIEGELOVÁ, J.
 1986 *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventardokumente*, Prague
- SINGER, I.
 1983 *The Hittite KILAM Festival, part one*, StBoT 27, Wiesbaden
- SINGER, I.
 1984 *The Hittite KILAM Festival, part two*, StBoT 28, Wiesbaden

- SINGER, I.
 1996 *Muwatali's Prayer to the assembly of gods through the Storm-god of Lightning* (CTH 381), Atlanta
- SOMMER, F.
 1932 *Die Ahhijavā-Urkunden*, Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Abt., Neue Folge 6, Munich
- SOMMER, F.
 1953 'Zu den letzten Publikationen hethitischer Keilschrifttexte aus Berlin', *OLZ* 48, pp. 6-19
- STARKE, F.
 1977 *Die Funktionen der dimensionalen Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen*, StBoT 23, Wiesbaden
- STARKE, F.
 1985 *Die keilschrift-huwischen Texte in Umschrift*, StBoT 30, Wiesbaden
- STARKE, F.
 1990 *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-huwischen Nomens*, StBoT 31, Wiesbaden
- STARKE, F.
 1995 *Ausbildung und Training von Streitwagenpferden*, StBoT 41, Wiesbaden
- STURTEVANT, E.
 1933 *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*, 1, Philadelphia
- STURTEVANT, E. AND A. HAHN
 1951 *A comparative grammar of the Hittite Language* 1, Rev., New Haven
- SÜRENHAGEN, D.
 1985 *Paritätische Staatsverträge aus Hethitischer Sicht. Zu historischen Aussagen und literarischer Stellung des Textes*. CTH 379, *Studia Mediterranea* 5, Rev., Pavia
- SZABÓ, G.
 1971 *Ein hethitisches Entschuldigungsritual für das Königspaar Tudhaliya und Nikalmati*, TdHeth 1, Heidelberg
- TISCHLER, J.
 1982 *Hethitisch-deutsches Wörterverzeichnis*, IBS 39, Innsbruck
- TISCHLER, J.
 1983 *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* 1, A-K, Innsbruck
- TISCHLER, J.
 1990 *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* Lieferungen 5 und 6, (L-M), Innsbruck

- TISCHLER, J.
 1991 *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* Lieferung 8, (T-D/1), Innsbruck
- TISCHLER, J.
 1994 *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* Lieferung 10, (T,D/3), Innsbruck
- ÜNAL, A.
 1974 *Hattusili III*, TdHeth 3
- ÜNAL, A.
 1978 *Ein Orakeltext über die Intrigen am hethitischen Hof* 6, TdHeth, Heidelberg
- WALLACE, R.
 1982 'A Note on the Development of PIE *ei and ē in Anatolian', *KZ* 96, pp. 50-55
- WATKINS, C.
 1969 'A Latin-Hittite Etymology', *Language* 45, pp. 235-242
- WATKINS, C.
 1975 'Die Vertretung der Laryngale in gewissen morphologischen Kategorien in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens', in H. Rix, *Flexion und Wortbildung*, Wiesbaden, pp. 358-378
- WATKINS, C.
 1982 'Notes on the Plural Formations of the Hittite Nouns', in E. Neu, *Investigationes Philologicae et Comparativae, (Festschrift H. Kronasser)*, Wiesbaden, pp. 250-262
- WEITENBERG, J.
 1975 'Hethitisch *kuša-*', *IF* 80, pp. 66-70
- WEITENBERG, J.
 1979 'Einige Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Diphthong-Stämmen', in E. Neu and W. Meid, *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, Innsbruck, pp. 289-303
- WEITENBERG, J.
 1984 *Die Hethitischen u-Stämme*, Amsterdam
- WEITENBERG, J.
 1987 'Proto-Indo-European Nominal Classification and Old Hittite', *MSS* 48, pp. 213-230
- YOSHIDA, D.
 1988 'Ein Hethitisches Ritual gegen Behexung (KUB 24 12) und der Gott Zalipuri/Zalipura', in H.I.H. Takahito Mikasa, *BMECCJ*, Wiesbaden, pp. 45-61

- YOSHIDA, K.
 1990 *The Hittite Medio-Passive Endings in -ri*, Berlin
- ZUCHA, I.
 1988 *The Nominal Stem Types in Hittite*, Doctoral thesis Oxford University

Samenvatting

Het Hittitisch maakt deel uit van de Anatolische tak van de Indo-Europese taalgroep. Tot deze taalgroep behoren vrijwel alle talen in Europa, behalve bijv. het Baskisch en het Hongaars. De talen van de Anatolische taalgroep werden in het eerste en tweede millennium voor Christus gesproken.

Verreweg het meeste materiaal van de Anatolische taalgroep behoort tot het Hittitisch. De chronologie van het Hittitisch kan onderverdeeld worden in drie perioden: het Oud-Hittitisch (16e – 15e eeuw voor Chr.), het Middel-Hittitisch (eind 15e – begin 14e eeuw voor Chr.) en het Jong-Hittitisch (begin 14e – begin 12e eeuw).

In de Vergelijkende Indo-Europese Taalwetenschap is de positie van het Hittitisch controversieel. Het Hittitisch is de oudste geattesteerde Indo-Europese taal. Uit dit feit zou men kunnen afleiden dat het Hittitisch veel gelijkenis met het Proto-Indo-Europees moet vertonen. Het Hittitisch mist echter veel grammaticale categorieën die andere Indo-Europese talen wel hebben, of zeker hebben gehad. Zo heeft het Hittitische werkwoord geen optativus, het heeft maar één verleden tijd en het zelfstandig naamwoord kent maar twee geslachten, nl. een genus neutrum (onzijdig) en een genus commune, terwijl andere Indo-Europese talen drie geslachten hebben. Het is de vraag of het prehistorische Hittitisch de grammaticale categorieën die de overige Indo-Europese talen hebben, of in ieder geval hebben gehad, überhaupt ooit heeft bezeten.

Deze dissertatie gaat over een van deze grammaticale categorieën, nl. de nominativus/accusativus meervoud van het neutrum. Indo-Europese talen hebben, veelal in oudere stadia, een nominativus/accusativus neutrum meervoud, waarvan de uitgang wordt gereconstrueerd als $^{*}-(e)h_2$. Deze uitgang is vaak een $-a$ geworden.

In het Hittitisch daarentegen heeft de nominativus/accusativus neutrum meervoud lang niet altijd een uitgang op $-a$ (of de reflex van $-h_2$). In een groot aantal gevallen heeft de nominativus/accusativus neutrum meervoud van de adjectiva en substantiva aparte meervoudsvormen. De centrale vraag in deze dissertatie is dan ook of het prehistorische Hittitisch wel een neutrum meervoud bezat. De conclusie luidt dat er weinig aanwijzingen zijn dat het prehistorische Hittitisch beschikte over een nominativus/accusativus neutrum meervoud.

In 1.2 worden theorieën over de grammaticale status van het neutrum meervoud in het Proto-Indo-Europees beschreven. De meest verbreide theorie is dat de uitgang $^{*}-(e)h_2$ oorspronkelijk een vrouwelijk enkelvoud aanduidde dat collectieve waarde had. Het Hittitisch heeft echter geen vrouwelijk. **Hardarson** 1987 heeft voorgesteld dat het neutrum meervoud oorspronkelijk een neutrum

enkelvoud is geweest. Dit wordt geïllustreerd in *ke ṭUPPA anīyan ešta* 'deze tabletten zijn samengesteld'. In deze zin staat het participium *anīyan* 'samen-gesteld' in het enkelvoud, terwijl we zouden verwachten dat het in het neutrum meervoud staat, nl. *anīyanta*.

In 1.3 en 1.4 worden de criteria opgesteld aan de hand waarvan bepaald wordt of vormen neutrum meervoud zijn. Tevens wordt er een aantal beperkingen genoemd. Het gaat daarbij onder meer om de uitgang -a, omdat er aanwijzingen bestaan dat het Hittitisch neutrum enkelvoudsvormen op -a had. Daarom moeten we woorden op -a niet automatisch het label "neutrum meervoud" geven. In 1.5 wordt de distributie van de uitgangen van de nominativus/accusativus neutrum meervoud besproken. Grofweg kan men zeggen dat de adjectiva vaker een meervoudsvorm hebben dan de substantiva. De substantiva ontwikkelen pas laat een gekarakteriseerd meervoud.

In de paragrafen 2.1 - 2.8 worden de gevallen van de nominativus/accusativus neutrum meervoud in de substantiva per stamklasse besproken. In de *r/n*-stammen is de laatste vocaal gerekt, bijv. *uddār* van *uttar* 'woord'. Het meervoud van de *r/n*-stammen met de suffixen -*eššar*, -(a)*war* en -*atar* heeft in het Oud- en Middel-Hittitisch geen -*r* (bijv. *partawa* van *partawar* 'vleugel'). In een groot aantal gevallen echter lijken deze vormen een enkelvoudige betekenis te hebben (bijv. *ḫanešša* 'oordeel'). In de vorm *a-aš-su-u* 'goederen' is de laatste vocaal plene (dubbel) geschreven. Het is zeker dat deze plene geschreven vocaal aangeeft dat *a-aš-su-u* een neutrum meervoud is. In andere woorden (bijv. in *tu-ni-ip-tu-u*) echter is de plene geschreven laatste vocaal geen meervoudsuitgang. In de *i*-, *u*-, *r*- en *l*-stammen heeft het neutrum meervoud van de substantiva in de oudere taalfases bijna nooit een andere vorm dan het enkelvoud. In de *r*- en *l*-stammen ontstaat later een uitgang -*i*, bijv. *išhiul-i* van *išhiul* 'verdrag'.

De uitgang -a, die in de overige Indo-Europese talen de belangrijkste uitgang is, komt bij de Hittitische substantiva in drie categorieën voor: ten eerste in de communia (bijv. commune *alpa* 'wolk' heeft naast een normaal commune meervoud *alpuš* een neutrum meervoud *alpa*). Het wordt door verschillende geleerden aangenomen dat het Hittitisch woorden had van het Latijnse type mannelijk enkelvoud *locus* 'plaats', mannelijk meervoud *loci* 'plaatsen' en als onzijdig "meervoud" *loca* 'gebied'. *Locus* is een mannelijk woord dat niet alleen een mannelijk meervoud heeft, maar ook een neutrum meervoudsvorm, nl. *loca*. Deze vorm is een collectivum, 'gebied' en kan als een verzameling plaatsen beschouwd worden. Het Hittitische filologische materiaal van dit type is niet erg sterk, maar alles in ogenschouw genomen, mag men aannemen dat

het Hittitisch dit type substantiva wel had. Ten tweede is de uitgang -a geattesteerd in een aantal gesubstantiveerde *i*-stammen (bijv. *palḫa* 'vaten' van *palḫi* 'breed'). Tenslotte vervangt in het Jong-Hittitisch de uitgang -a de oude ongekaracteriseerde vorm. Het is moeilijk om hier voorbeelden van te vinden, maar voor de *u*-stammen schijnen we een oude vorm **tāru* 'bomen' te hebben en in het Jong-Hittitisch *ḡenuwa* 'knieën'.

De paragrafen 2.9 - 2.13 behandelen per stamklasse de nominativus/accusativus neutrum meervoud van de adjectiva. Bij de adjectiva komt de uitgang -a vaker voor dan bij de substantiva. Bij de *nl*-stammen komt de -a voor bij de attributieve participia, bijv. *ašanta* *KUR.KUR*^{TIN} 'landen die (aan mijn vader) toebehoorden', de attributive adjectiva, bijv. *išḫarwanta*^{SG} *išmeri* 'bloedbevleete teugels' en bij de predicatief gebruikte adjectiva, bijv. *partawa amiyanda* 'de vleugels (zijn) klein'. In verreweg de meeste gevallen verschijnt het predicatieve participium in de enkelvoudsvorm wanneer het refereert aan onzijdige meervoudsvormen, bijv. *ke ṭUPPA anīyan ešta* 'deze tabletten zijn samengesteld'. Bij de *u*-stammen verschijnt de -a pas laat en wordt gehecht aan de voltrap -*aw*- van het suffix -*u*-, bijv. *idalawa* van *idalu* 'slecht'. De *i*-stammen daarentegen hebben al eerder een uitgang -a ontwikkeld, bijv. *suppa* van *šuppi* 'rein' (synchroon met deletie van de -*i*). Desalniettemin zijn er gevallen van een ongekaracteriseerd neutrum meervoud. De *a*-stam adjectiva hebben altijd een uitgang -a, bijv. *dannatta* 'onbewoond, leeg'.

De belangrijkste conclusie van deel twee is dat de nominativus/accusativus meervoud in de substantiva later tot ontwikkeling kwam dan in de adjectiva. De -a in de communia en de gesubstantiveerde adjectiva is ouder dan die in de adjectiva en substantiva.

In deel drie krijgt het materiaal een taalhistorische uitleg, voorafgaand door een lijst van het geattesteerde materiaal. In 3.3 wordt betoogd dat het meervoud van de *r/n*-stammen, van *utne* 'land' en *šarama* (een soort brood) teruggaat op een hysterdynamische nominativus/accusativus (type *CeCōR*), met een gerekte vocaal in de laatste lettergreep. Alleen in de *r/n*-stammen met de complexe suffixen -*atar*, -*eššar* en -(a)*war*, was de eindvocaal niet geaccentueerd. Bij deze hysterdynamische formaties was er geen verschil tussen enkelvoud en meervoud.

Omdat er in ieder geval in één van de formaties, nl. het type *CeCōR*, in het Hittitisch geen verschil tussen enkelvoud en meervoud was, wordt in 3.5 nog eens aandacht besteed aan de status van het Proto-Indo-Europese neutrum meervoud. Het wordt over het algemeen aangenomen dat het Proto-Indo-Europese neutrum meervoud zwak ontwikkeld was. Om een nominati-

vus/accusativus neutrum meervoud te maken beschikte het Proto-Indo-Europees over de uitgang *-h₂* en een hysterodynamische formatie met een gerekte vocaal in de laatste lettergreep. Deze formaties heeft het Hittitisch ook, met dien verstande dat zowel de uitgang *-a* als de hysterodynamische vormen in het Hittitisch sterkere banden hebben met het enkelvoud dan elders, in andere woorden: in het prehistorische Hittitisch waren er neutra die geen meervoud hadden. Om dit verschijnsel te verklaren, wordt teruggegrepen op de theorie van Ostrowski 1982 en 1985. Deze suggereert dat het neutrum oorspronkelijk ongeïndividualiseerde nomina aanduidde, 'ein Solches, ein Etwas'. Zulke woorden konden niet geteld worden en hadden dus geen meervoud.

Voor de rest van het materiaal zijn er twee mogelijkheden. Het is mogelijk dat het prehistorische Hittitisch helemaal geen neutrum meervoud had. Aan de andere kant is het ook denkbaar dat in het prehistorische Hittitisch alleen de formaties die besproken zijn in 3.3 en 3.4 (de hysterodynamische vormen en de enkelvoudsvormen op *-a*) geen verschil tussen enkelvoud en meervoud hadden. In dit geval is voor de rest van het materiaal de situatie zoals we die in het Hittitisch aantreffen secundair.

Een probleem hierbij is de ontwikkeling van finale *-h₂*. Dit was de uitgang van de nominativus/accusativus neutrum meervoud. Het Hittitische materiaal dat niet afkomstig is uit deze naamval is moeilijk te interpreteren. Daarom kunnen we ons hier niet op baseren als we een theorie ontwikkelen over het materiaal voor het neutrum meervoud dat niet hysterodynamisch is.

In 3.6 worden de substantiva besproken. Er zijn geen aanwijzingen dat de nominativus/accusativus neutrum meervoud van de *i*- en *u*-stammen eindigde op **-ih₂*, resp. **-uh₂*. Ook de resonantstammen hebben een ongekaracteriseerd meervoud. Er is geen bewijs dat dit oorspronkelijk **-Rh₂* was. In de oudere teksten gelezen voor deze dissertatie komt de uitgang *-a* slechts voor bij *iškiša* 'ruggen' (de formatie van deze vorm stamt niet rechtstreeks uit het Proto-Indo-Europees) en bij *šakuwa* (de uitgang *-a* is afkomstig van de adjectiva of het is een restant van een dualis). Aan de hand van *welh₂wa*, het meervoud van *welh₂* 'weide' wordt voorgesteld dat de betekenis zich ontwikkelde van een collectief/ongeïndividualiseerd begrip naar een geïndividualiseerd/telbaar begrip (bijv. van 'weide' naar 'weilanden'), omdat neutra een meervoud nodig hadden, toen ze de notie van "ein Solches, ein Etwas" verloren hadden.

Er zijn dus geen aanwijzingen dat de substantiva in het prehistorische Hittitisch een nominativus/accusativus neutrum meervoud op **-h₂* hadden.

In 3.7 en 3.8 worden de adjectiva besproken. De *a*-stammen bezaten in het prehistorische Hittitisch een uitgang **-eh₂* voor de nominativus/accusativus

neutrum meervoud. Deze uitgang was een innovatie. Het is opvallend dat de zinswendingen *ul āra* en *ul kunna* een *-a* hebben, waar het Latijn en het Grieks een neutrum enkelvoud hebben: *permissum (est)* en *ἔξόν* 'het is toegestaan'. Dit zou er op kunnen wijzen dat de *-a* in deze zinswendingen grammaticaal een enkelvoudsvorm was. Ook de *u*-stammen hadden oorspronkelijk geen nominativus/accusativus neutrum meervoud. Dit kan ook, zij het minder stellig, gezegd worden van de *i*-stammen. In deze stamklasse is de productieve uitgang een *-a*. Deze *-a* is in het prehistorische Hittitisch ontstaan uit **-aya*. Deze uitgang is ook een innovatie, omdat de *i*-stam adjectiva in het Proto-Indo-Europees oorspronkelijk geen voltrap in het suffix hadden. In de *nt*-stammen is de enkelvoudsvorm van het predicatieve participium van de *nt*-stammen waarschijnlijk een archaïsme. Ook deze klasse van adjectiva had oorspronkelijk geen meervoud.

De gesubstantiveerde adjectiva (3.9) hadden al in het prehistorische Hittitisch een *-a* of de reflex van **-h₂*. In de *i*-stammen, bijv. *palha* 'bekers' en *šuppa* 'vlees', is deze *-a* duidelijk een archaïsme. Behalve in *šuppa* is de *-a* ten tijde van de historische overlevering bijna verdwenen en alterneert met *i*-stam vormen, bijv. *harša* '(dik) brood' vs. *haršiš*. Voor deze *-a* kan men verschillende verklaringen suggereren. Ten eerste **-aya* > *-a*. Er wordt tevens gesuggereerd dat er een verband bestaat met de zgn. "i-Motion", het verschijnsel dat in het Luwisch, een zustertaal van het Hittitisch, de nominativus en accusativus van communia gekarakteriseerd worden door een *-i*. De "i-Motion" is mogelijk in het Proto-Anatolisch ontstaan in de *a*-stam adjectiva (Stärke 1990: 85ff) en zijn de gesubstantiveerde *i*-stam adjectiva op *-a* restanten hiervan. Omdat de gesubstantiveerde adjectiva qua betekenis ver van de betekenis van het oorspronkelijke adjectivum verwijderd waren (bijv. *šuppa* 'vlees' van *šuppi* 'rein' en *harša* '(dikke) broden' van *harši* 'dik'), hielden zij een *-a*, terwijl het adjectivum zelf een *i*-stam werd. In elk geval is de *-a* in de gesubstantiveerde adjectiva ouder dan de *-a* in de adjectiva die als een bepaling werden gebruikt.

Het gesubstantiveerde adjectivum *a-aš-su-u* 'goederen' is de enige *u*-stam met een dubbel geschreven finale <*-U-U*>. De verschillende verklaringen, met name die van o.a. Watkins 1982 dat het een rechtstreekse reflex is van Proto-Indo-Europees **-uh₂* worden besproken. Geen enkele theorie over deze vorm is overtuigend. In deze dissertatie wordt als alternatieve oplossing het volgende voorgesteld: als de *-a* en de *-ū* beide even oud zijn, kan men aannemen dat de gesubstantiveerde adjectiva van de *i*- en *u*-stammen oorspronkelijk dezelfde structuur hadden, nl. de voltrap **-oih₂* en **-ouh₂*. Zo is het te verklaren dat *a-aš-su-u* de enige *u*-stam pluralis is met een dubbel geschreven eindvocaal.

Samenvattend (3.10), in het prehistorische Hittitisch hadden de adjectiva

Stellingen behorende bij het proefschrift van Anna Prins:
Hittite Neuter Singular - Neuter Plural
some evidence for a connection

1. Pronomina en adjectiva die naar sumerogrammen en akkadogrammen verwijzen, zijn vaker neutrum dan men op grond van het Hittitische woord dat er gewoonlijk achter ligt, zou verwachten.
2. Het Hittitische materiaal dat correspondeert met het morfologische systeem dat tot uiting komt in het Latijnse patroon *locus* 'plaats', *loci* '(individuele) plaatsen' vs. *loca* '(groep van) plaatsen' is veel minder draagkrachtig dan men op grond van het secundaire materiaal zou mogen verwachten.
3. Wanneer Hittitische vormen die op -a eindigen, vertaald worden als collectiva, zoals bijv. *alpa* 'bewolking' van *alpaš* 'wolk', wordt meer de theorie hierover weerspiegeld dan de werkelijkheid van het tekstmateriaal (contra bijv. E. Neu: *Zum Kollektivum im Hethitischen*, in: 'Per una Grammatica Ittita', ed. O. Carruba, Pavia 1992 en C. Melchert, 'review of: Güterbock and Hoffner, eds. *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*, vol. P., fasc. 1' in *JAOS* 106, 1996, 777f).
4. Het is een onjuist gebruik van de historisch-vergelijkende methode om alleen op grond van etymologie een semantische verbinding tussen twee woorden te suggereren (contra Eichner, 'Die Etymologie von heth. *meḫur*', *MSS* 31, 1973, 53-107, pp. 71 en 96 n. 65, die de vaatwerk-aanduiding ^{DUC}*ḫakkunai-* verbindt met *ḫekur* 'akropolis', vel sim. en suggereert dat ^{DUC}*ḫakkunai-* spitsvormig is, terwijl daar geen aanleiding toe bestaat).
5. Etymologische studies zijn afhankelijk van een goede filologische basis. Dit blijkt eens te meer uit de identificatie van de vorm *śaknas* als een nominativus singularis van een tot dusver onbekend lemma *śakna-* c. 'olie'; de eerder aangenomen relatie met een heteroclitisch

śakkar 'mest' komt daarmee te vervallen (H. Hoffner, *Hittite 'Oil' and its Derivatives*, *HS* 107, 1994, 222-230).

6. Genuswisseling bij het gebruik van het enclitische pronomen possessivum kan niet zonder meer dienen om aan een nomen een meervoudig genus (c./n.) toe te schrijven, omdat alleen substantiva communis generis door deze wisseling neutrum schijnen te worden. Vormen als *menašset* van *mena-* 'wang, gezicht' en *arrašmit* van *arra-* 'aars' wijzen niet op het bestaan van genuswisseling bij deze nomina. De enige uitzondering hierop is een incidentele vorm *genuššus* dat beschouwd kan worden als een accusativus commune van *genu-*, n. Deze schijnbare uitzondering vindt een verklaring in Eichner ('Hethitisch *ḡenuššus*, *ginušši*, *ginuššin*' in *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, ed. E. Neu, and W. Meid, Innsbruck 1979, 41-61), die *genuššus* van een lemma *genušša-* c. 'kniegewricht' afleidt.
7. De gewoonte om spijkerschrifttekens waarin de palatale vocaal wordt weergegeven te disambigueren op grond van de context, bijv. <KE-E> naast <KI-I> kan misleidend zijn omdat ten onrechte een plene geschreven vocaal wordt gesuggereerd. Als men deze gewoonte bij "bound"-transcriptie handhaaft, kan de indruk ontstaan dat vormen als *ki-c* 'deze' en *c-ip-mi* 'ik pak' een lange vocaal hebben, nl. *kē* en *ēpmi*.
8. Als de Hittitische uitgang van de derde persoon pluralis van de mi-werkwoorden bijna nooit plene geschreven is en niet teruggaat op geaccentueerd *-*ēnti* en als *kuenzi* 'hij doodt' een klankwettige en geen analoge vorm is, moet de regel -ERC- > -ARC- worden herzien.
9. Modern "milieu-bewustzijn" lijkt nogal eens op het onnozele geloof waarmee men vroeger aflaten dacht te verdienen.
10. Vaak bestaat er een omgekeerd evenredige verhouding tussen het aantal copieën dat een student maakt en zijn studievoortgang.