INVESTIGATIONES PHILOLOGICAE ET COMPARATIVAE

Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser

Herausgegeben
von Erich Neu

Calvert Watkins

Notes on the Plural Formations of the Hittite Neuters

For the Hittite *u*-stem adjective *aššu*- ‚good' the handbooks and dictionaries, e. g. J. Friedrich, A. Kammenhuber, H. Kronasser, give the nominative-accusative plural neuter as *aššawa* / ásawa/, with full grade -*aw*- of the suffix, and the ending -*a*. For the substantive *aššu*- in the meaning ‚good thing', ‚goods', ‚property' the same handbooks and dictionaries give the nominative-accusative plural neuter as *aššuwa* /ásua/, with zero-grade -*u(w)*- of the suffix, and the ending -*a*. The neuter singular *aššu* / *ásu* / with regular zero ending, both as adjective and substantive, is constant from Old Hittite texts on; but significantly the plurals *aššawa* and *aššuwa* are both attested only in neo-Hittite compositions.

Now beside these forms a spelling *a-aš-šu-u* is found, with scriptio plena *Cu-u*, which is nearly unique in the *u*-stems, both adjectives and substantives. This form is completely ignored by the handbooks, despite its fourfold occurrence in a text edited by A. Götze (Madduwattas) as early as 1927. The spelling *a-aš-šu-u* is taken implicitly as an allograph of the neuter singular *a-aš-šu* by the one Hittitologist to note its existence, H. Otten in his commentary to the Madduwattas text (StBoT 11, 1969).

In fact, the spelling *a-aš-šu-u* with scriptio plena occurs no less than 19 times, in 11 different texts, from a variety of genres of written Hittite. Again significantly, the attestations of *a-aš-šu-u* are confined to texts of Middle Hittite and Old Hittite date. The form is therefore ancient, cannot be accidental, and requires explanation. The evidence for *a-aš-šu-u* is set forth below.

A. Middle Hittite compositions (12 × in 5 texts)

1. KUB XIV 1 Vs. 49, 50, 54, 55 (Madduwattaš) MH script
    ŠA Madduwatta DAM.MEŠ-*ŠU* DUMU.MEŠ-*ŠU* NAMRA.ḪI.A-*ZUNU*
    a-aš-šu-u-ya
    ‚Madduwatta's wives, children, their chattels and goods'; 50 has *a-aš-šu-u-ya hu-u-ma-an-ta-pát*, ... and goods – all of them'

2. KUB XVII 21 I 11 (Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal) MH script
    nu-za šumenzan ŠA [DINGIR.MEŠ] *a-aš-šu-u* KÙ.BABBAR GUŠKIN
    BIBRI.ḪI.A TÚG.ḪI.A *anzel iwar* EGIR-*an* UL *kuiški kappuwan ḫarta*
    ‚No one kept you gods' valuables – silver, gold, vessels, garments – as well looked after as we'

3. KUB XXIII 77 (Rs.) 52–4 (Kaška treaty) MH script
    [*mān-kan* IŠTU KUR ᵁᴿᵁ *Ḫatt*]*i pitteyanza* INA KUR ᵁᴿᵁ *Kašga takšulaš*
    URU-*ya uizzi*
    [*n-aš mān* ÌR-*aš nu*] ŠA BELI-*ŠU a-aš-šu-u udai našma-aš* LÚ ᴳᴵˢTUKUL
    nu ŠA ᴸᵁ TAPPI-*ŠU a-aš-šu-u uda* <*i*>
    [*nu a-aš-šu-u* EGIR-*pa pi*]*šten apāš-a pitteyanza šumaš ēštu*
    ‚If a fugitive from the land of Hatti comes to a Kaska city with which there is a peace treaty,
    if he is a slave and brings his master's goods, or a ᴳᴵˢTUKUL person and brings his comrade's goods,
    give back the goods, but you can have that fugitive'

4. KUB XXVI 17 II 11–13 (Bēl Madgalti instructions) MH script
    n[*ašm*]*a* ŠA É.GALᴸᴵᴹ *kuiški*[
    n]-*at pē ḫarzi n*[*ašm*]*a* ŠA BELUM *a-aš-šu-u*[
    n-at p]*ē ḫarzi*
    ‚or someone from the palace [has stolen something] and has it at hand, or [a slave has stolen] his master's goods and has [them] at hand'

5. KBo XVII 62 + 63 IV 13–18 (Birth ritual) MH script(?).

    nu mān DUMU.NI[TA] *kuwapi miyari nu* ˢᴬᴸ ŠA.ZU *k*[*iššan*]
    tezzi kā[*ša*]-*wa kinun* ŠA DUMU.NITA *a-aš-šu-u uda*[*ḫḫun*]
    parā-ma-wa M[U-*an*]*ni* ŠA DUMU.SAL *a-aš-šu-u udallu*

    —

    mān DUMU.S[AL] *nu kiššan tezzi kinu*[*n-wa*]
    kāsa Š[A DUMU.S]AL *a-aš-šu-u udaḫḫun para-ma-*[*wa*]
    MU-*anni* [ŠA DUMU.NIT]A *a-aš-šu-u udallu*
    ‚And whenever a boy is born, the midwife says as follows:
    ,,Behold now I have brought forth the good things of a boy;
    but in a year's time may I bring forth the good things of a girl.''

    —

    And when a girl, she says as follows: ,,Now
    behold, I have brought forth the good things of a girl; but in a
    year's time may I bring forth the good things of a boy.'' '

B. Old Hittite compositions (7 × in 6 texts)

6.   KBo VII 28 + VIII 92 Vs. 11–13 (Prayer to Sun-Goddess of the Earth) MH
     script
     a-aš-šu-u IGI.ḪI.A-*KA lāk LIM laplippuš karap n*[(*a*)*šta*] / LUGAL-*un anda*
     a-aš-šu šakuwaya GEŠTUG.ḪI.A-*KA lāk nu a-aš-šu utta*[*r*] / [*i*]*štamaš*
     ‚Hail! Incline your eyes, lift the thousand eyelids, and gaze well on the king!
     Incline your ears, and hear the good word!‘
     (Here the neuter plural is adverbial and interjectional; contrast *a-aš-šu-u* with
     the adverbial and attributive adjective *a-aš-šu.*[1]

7.   KBo XII 42 III 10 („Merchant epic") NH script
     a-aš-šu-u-ya-wa KÙ.BABBAR GUŠKI[N] NA₄ZA.GÌN . . .
     ‚and valuables: silver, gold, lapis lazuli, . . .‘
     The newly found join to the duplicate ABoT 49 + 2007/u (H. Otten–Chr.
     Rüster, ZA 62, 1972, 235) Vs. 11 confirms *a-aš-šu-u-ya-w*[*a*].

8.   KBo XXV 122 II 9–12 (Hittite-Hattic religious text, invocation) OH script[2]
     D*Katteshawi* LUGAL-*ui* URU*Ḫat*[*tušaz*]
     katta a-aš-šu-u utir n-at katta KI.L[AM-*na utir*]
     GAL.ḪI.A SIG₅-*anda* GUŠKIN-*an* SIG₅-*anda*[*n utir*]
     n-at katta KI.LAM-*na* × [
     ‚Katteshawi, King! They have brought down valuables from Hattusa, and
     brought them down to the Gate-house. They have brought good vessels (and)
     good gold, and brought(?) them down to the Gate-house‘.
     (The anaphoric neuter singular pronominalization -*at* reflects a collective
     sense; the same -*at* serves to pronominalize the following ‚vessels neut. pl.
     (and) gold anim. sg.‘)

9.   KUB XLIII 60 I 22–3 (myth) NH script
     nu-šši-ššan kue a-aš-šu-u
     IX¹-*andaš ḫappešnaš šer ḫaššan n-e* . . .
     ‚And whatever good things are born to her on her nine members, they . . .‘
     (For the idiomatic sense of *a-aš-šu-u*, rather like „blessed event", cf. the birth
     ritual in 5. above.)

10. KUB II 2 + III 12–13 (Hattic-Hittite bilingual) NH script[3]
     dankuwai-ma takni̅ [*idalauwa*(?)] *munnandu*
     aš-šu-u-ma[4] LUGAL-*i labarn*[*ai piyandu*]
     ‚But in the dark earth may they conceal the bad things;
     but the good things may they give to the king, the labarna.‘
     The preceding context makes it clear that we are dealing with a plurality
     (four each, enumerated) of bad things and good things.[5]

11. KUB VIII 34 + XLIII 13 III 16–17 (Hepatoscopy bilingual) NH script[6]
     takku TIBI IM *kitta n-ašta* KI.GUB *and*[*a*
     LUGAL-*wa* <*š*>[7] -*kan* É.GAL *anda a-aš-šu-u kuěkki*[8] × [
     ‚If the „wind-rise" is placed (there) and the KI.GUB „standing-place" (is)
     in (it), in the king's palace [will be] some good things.‘

3 Edited by H.-S. Schuster, Die Ḫattisch-Hethitischen Bilinguen, Leiden, 1974. For the dating
  of text and manuscripts see pp. 60, 63.
4 Probably a scribal error for *a-aš*.
5 Note the contrast between attributive SIG₅-*ant-* (III 7 SIG₅-*in-ma* GIŠ-*ru* SIG₅-*antan*
  [GIŠ U]R ‚good wood, good beam') and substantival *aššu*, and note 1 above.
6 As noted by H. C. Melchert, Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite (diss. Harvard, 1977, ms),
  ‚It is likely that most, if not all, the Hittite translations of Babylonian omen literature were
  made already in Old Hittite and subsequently modernized in the process of recopying'
  (p. 79). Our text shows 10 × of old *takku* (beside 6 × of renewed *män*, all in the lower
  section of the tablet) as well as other orthographic and grammatical features of Old Hittite
  composition, and may confidently with H. C. Melchert (p. 58, 80) be regarded as an Old
  Hittite translation, recopied in the New Kingdom.
7 I assume <*aš*> was omitted by haplography after *wa*), since a directive (terminative) is
  not expected with a personal noun. Cf. the examples in E. Laroche, RHA XXVIII, 1970,
  43, and F. Starke, StBoT 23 passim.
     I disagree however with Starke's claim that a personal noun in a ‚dimensional' case can
  only appear in the dative (ibid. 126 and ZA 69, 1979, 50). The instrumental of agent with
  a true passive is a rare construction in Hittite of all periods, but it is a genuine construction,
  and one directly inherited from Indo-European. F. Starke himself in ZA 69.55–6 cites
  Neo-Hittite KBo VI 28 Vs. 4–5 (Ḫattušili III on Ḫattušili I) ŠA LUGAL URU*KUŠSAR*
  D*šiunit k*[*anešša*]*ndaš* NUMUN-*aš* ‚of the seed of the King of Kuššar chosen for recog-
  nition by the god(s?)', with the clear implication that it continues an old formula. The
  formula indeed recurs in the omen-text KUB XLIII 8 II 11, III 8, 11, cited by E. Neu,
  StBoT 6.113–15 (1968). For this and the other Hittite agentive instrumentals see E. Neu,
  loc. cit., and H. C. Melchert (note 5 above). For the agentive instrumental in Indo-European
  see S. Jamison, Die Sprache 25, 1979, 129–43. F. Starke's further claim (ibid. 101 ff. and
  ZA 69.50) that the Old Hittite expression of agency was uniquely *INA QATI* (= *kišari*) +
  gen. of the personal agent is simply not valid, since the verbs in the two sentences in quest-
  ion are intransitives and not passives: Laws I § 75 *INA QATI* DINGIR^LIM *akkiš* ‚it died
  at the hand of a god', and Bo 2489 + 4008 II 12–14" KUR URU*ḪATTI*-*yi*[*a-ka*] in

1 H. G. Güterbock in: The Frontiers of Human Knowledge (Uppsala, 1978), p. 128, has most
  recently translated *aššu* here as an attributive adjective, neuter plural accusative: ‚Incline
  your good eyes' (*aššu* IGI.ḪI.A-*KA lāk*), thus agreeing with underlying *šakuwa-ttet*. But I
  know of no other examples of attributive *aššu* with scriptio plena and am not convinced
  that his version is correct. Contrast substantive *aššu* and attributive adjective SIG₅-*anda* in
  example 8 below.
2 Cited in F. Starke, StBoT 23; see now E. Neu, StBoT 25 Nr. 122.

To summarize these examples, we are dealing in all cases with a substantial form meaning either concretely ‚goods, property‘ or abstractly ‚good things‘; twice as ‚good things (of a boy/girl)‘ in an evidently idiomatic sense, and once adverbially as an interjection. Example 8 is significant, for is it in the Old Kingdom handwriting; it proves that in our oldest Hittite there was a phonological contrast between *a-aš-šu* in the function of nominative-accusative neuter *singular*, and *a-aš-šu-u* with scriptio plena, in the function of nominative-accusative neuter „x“. The conclusive evidence is furnished by examples 9 and 11: the unambiguous gender, case, and number agreement with neuter and anaphoric pronouns in neuter nominative plural *kue a-aš-šu-u … n-e* ‚whatever good things … they …‘, ‚quaecumque bona … ea …‘, *a-aš-šu-u kuēkki* ‚bona quaedam‘ proves that function „x“ is neuter plural. We are led to the conclusion, by examining carefully the synchronic Hittite evidence, that *a-aš-šu* ‚goods, bona‘ is the oldest plural of the neuter *a-aš-šu* ‚good, bonum‘.[9]

What then of the comparative evidence? The Old Hittite ending of neuter plural *a-aš-šu-u* ‚good things‘ can be immediately equated with the Indo-Iranian *u*-stem nominative-accusative plural *-ū*, from IE *$*-u-h_2$, with zero-grade suffix *-u-* and the neuter plural ending *$-h_2$*. The ending is found notably in the semantically identical and formally parallel substantive seen in Rig Veda neuter plural *vásū* ‚good things‘, occurring only 3 ×, in a flexible formula in two archaic strophic hymns, in a metrical slot in the cadence favorable to the preservation of the long vowel:

VII 32.25   *suvédā no vásū kr̥dhi*
         ‚make the good things easy to find for us‘
VI 48.15   *avír gūlhā́ vásū karat*
         suvédā no vásū karat
         ‚may he make the hidden goods visible,
         may he make the goods easy to find for us‘.

---

labarnaš SAL *tawanna*[(nn)]*aš kiššari tarrū ú*[(*eš*)]*ttaru* ‚let the land of Hatti at the hand of the *l.* (and) the *t.* graze *safely*(?)‘. For the diathesis of *akk-* ‚die‘, not *necessarily* the passive of *kuen-*, see. C. Kühne, ZA 67, 1977, 242ff. Here *kiššari* is a stylistic, not a syntactic feature, just as much as the image of the land grazing like the shepherd's flock. For *tarrū* see below.

8 I am grateful to Prof. E. Neu for the correct reading of the final sign of this word. Note older *kuekki* rather than younger *kueq(q)a* (nominative-accusative plural neuter!), HW 114. I likewise owe to Prof. Neu the correct reading and interpretation of *TI-BI* IM, wind-rise‘; he refers to *ti-bi šarim* apud W. von Soden, AHw 1355b (sub *tibu*, B 1 d), apparently some sort of blister.

9 The correct appreciation of *a-aš-šu-u* as neuter plural ‚Güter‘ (without references) has been made by H. Eichner, in Etymologie und Lautgeschichte, Akten der 6. Fachtagung der Idg. Gesellschaft (Wien 1980) p. 153. I am grateful to the author for sending me the page proofs of this important article before its publication.

The same form is found in the Older and Younger Avestan formula *vīspā vohū* ‚all good things‘:

Gathic Avestan	Y. 37.1 *vīspācā vohū*
Younger Avestan in formulaic context	Yt. 5.89 *vīspa vohū*
Younger Avestan	Y. 70.1 *vīspa vohu.*

A cognate formula is found in Vedic, with the much commoner neuter plural with short vowel, *víśvā vásu* ‚all good things‘:

VIII 103.6 (Anhangslied)	*víśvā vásu*
IX 36.5	*sá víśvā dāśúṣe vásu*
IX 64.6	*té víśvā dāśúṣe vásu*
IX 57.4	*sá no víśvā divó vásu*
IX 90.1	*víśvā vásu* ‖
X 45.11	*víśvā vásu* ‖

In neuter plural *vásu* the short vowel was presumably produced by sandhi-loss of the laryngeal ending in verse-final or verse break position; note in the Rig Vedic examples that *vásu* is most commonly verse final in octosyllables or before the main caesura in 11 or 12 syllable lines. In the same metrical slot as the latter we find the formula *dā́tā vásu* ‚giver of good things‘ (for plural cf. *dā́tā vásūnām*, VIII 51.5):

VI 23.3   #*kártā* . . . . *u lokám* #   ‚place-maker‘
         # *dā́tā vásu* ‖
VII 20.2   #*kártā* . . . . *u lokám* #
         # *dā́tā vásu* ‖ *múhur ā́* . . .
         (*vásū* would give better meter)

The larger context shows that we are dealing with a repeated formula. The commonest Vedic neuter plural is of course *vásūni*, with suffixed element *-ni*. This form is both adjective ‚good‘ and substantive ‚good thing‘, whereas the older short forms of neuter plural *vásū* and *vásu* are nearly always substantives.

This comparison has a number of implications. We are entitled to conclude that the Indo-European *u*-stem neuter plural *-uh₂*, hitherto evidenced only in Indo-Iranian, was phonologically distinct from that of IE neuter singular *-u* > Hitt. *-u*. The most natural phonological assumption is that the reflex of IE *$*-uh_2$* was in the first instance in pre-Hittite a long *-ū*, the by now standard doctrine that word-final h_2 after vowel was simply lost must thus be modified. The only other possible explanation of the scriptio plena in the second syllable of *a-aš-šu-u* would be to mark stress: but an oxytone */asú/ we would expect to be spelled *$*a$-*šu-ú* (cf. *a-ša-a-an-zi* /asánzi/ ‚they are‘, *a-ta-a-an-zi* /adánzi/ ‚they eat‘), and an accentual contrast neuter singular /ásu/ but plural */asú/ has no basis whatsoever in Indo-European morphology.

A corollary is that in the oldest Hittite, vocalic length was distinctive in absolute *Auslaut*, as elsewhere: the standard example is *ut-tar* ‚word‘ vs. plural *ud-da-a-ar*

beside Gathic Av. *aiiarǝ̄* ‚day‘, plural *aiiārǝ̄* (K. Hoffmann, Aufsätze zur Indoiran. 72). It follows that one of the functions of the scriptio plena was precisely to mark length. Future Hittite phonologies must take these facts into account.

The consonant-stem neuter plural is consistently spelled short -*a* already in Old Hittite, old ductus texts. Neo-Hittite texts likewise show -*a* for thematic **o*-stem nouns (*šuppala*) and adjectives (*dannatta*), though these forms are rather rare;[10] none of the common thematic neuter nouns like *pedan, iugan, egan,* NUMUN-*an* seem to have attested nominative-accusative plural forms written syllabically at all.[11] But the sister Anatolian language Palaic, contemporary with or slightly older than Old Hittite, shows for the thematic neuter plural the endings -*a·ga* / -*a·a* / -*a*.[12] We must assume that the Indo-European thematic neuter plural **-e-h₂* (Indo-Iranian -*ā*) went first to Common Anatolian **-ah*, whence pre-Hittite **-ā*. Similarly, IE *u*-stem nt. plur. **-u-h₂* went first to Common Anatolian **-uh*, itself perhaps attested in Palaic *a-an-ni-i wa-šu-u-ha* ‚these good things‘. The Hittite form *a-aš-šu-u* presupposes Common Anatolian **-uh* > pre Hittite -*ū*, and parallelism would favor as well a prehistory of *i*-stem nt. pl. IE **-i-h₂* > C Anat. **-ih* > pre-Hitt. **-ī*; cf. Palaic *a-an-ni-i*, just cited.

We have noted that the obstruent stem neuter plurals like *ḫu-u-ma-an-da,* SIG₅-*anda* regularly show -*a* (< **-h₂*)[13] in old ductus texts. I have no examples of any thematic neuter plurals in old ductus, but those in later ductus show -*a*, presumably < **-ā* < **-eh₂*, with loss of vowel length of -*ā* in absolute *Auslaut* in polysyllables. The date of that sound change is uncertain.[14] On the other hand it

10 The apparent form *i-ya-ra* of the Palace Chronicle KBo III 34 II 34 (cf. BoTU 12 A; H. G. Güterbock, ZA 44, 1938, 110; A. Kammenhuber, Materialien 4, 1975, Nr. 5, p. 67) is now to be read ‚mit einlicher Gewißheit‘ *i-ya-al,* as Professor Neu kindly informs me, noting also N. Oettinger, Stammbildung 409 n. 25, where the passage is explained in full.

11 Note the Akkadogram *nakki AŠRI*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ ‚the inaccessible places‘ KBo IV 4 IV 29.

12 See Flexion und Wortbildung (ed. H. Rix). I am not persuaded by the remarks of O. Szemerényi, Florilegium Anatolicum (Mélanges E. Laroche) 315–19.

13 The Hittite reflex *a* from vocalic **ǝₓ (*hₓ)* has been long assumed (e. g. A. Kammenhuber, Hethitisch, ... in Handbuch der Orientalistik (ed. B. Spuler) I 2, I/II 2: Altkleinasiatische Sprachen, Leiden–Köln, 1969, p. 181, 303); see now H. Eichner, op. cit. (n. 9 above) 129 n. 41, as well as J. D. Hawkins, KZ 92, 1978, 112–6, for Hier. Luv. *tú-wa/i-tara/i-* ‚daughter‘.

14 Since the notation of vowel length by scriptio plena was never obligatory, even in old ductus, the occurrence of some thematic neuter plurals in -*a* in old ductus tablets would not prove that the change had already taken place in Old Hittite times. On the other hand since the phonetic merger of consonant -*a* and thematic -*ā* into neut. pl. -*a* would result in no functional merger, it could conceivably have occurred earlier than the merger of -*u* and -*ū*, -*i* and -*ī*, which distinguished singular from plural. But it is still unlikely that more than a generation or so would separate a rule *a* → [-long] / — # from a more general rule V → [-long] / — #. I would therefore predict that the thematic noun and adjective neuter plural in Old Hittite was -*ā*, which could have been written *Ca-a*.

is certain that the loss of distinctive vowel quality in *Auslaut* in the case of -*ū* > -*u* must have taken place in Middle Hittite times. The suggested phonological rule

     *-uh₂ > *-uh > -ū > -u

predicts that we should find attested nominative accusative neuter plurals in -*u* and -*i* in early Hittite, i. e. with singular and plural undifferentiated. And indeed these occur, notably in the fixed phrase *i-da-a-lu ud-da-a-ar* ‚evil words‘.[15]

An additional example of this formula in KUB XXXIII 68, a Middle Hittite manuscript of an Old Hittite mythological text,[16] brings a final confirmation to our analysis of *a-aš-šu-u*: II 11 *zig-a* ᴰU *i-da-a-lu ud-da-a-ar arḫa pešši̯a* (12) *nu-za a-aš-šu ud-da-a-ar dā* ‚You, however, Storm God, cast away the evil words, and take to yourself the good words!‘ Here both plurals *idālu* and *aššu* have apparently undergone shortening; compare Vedic *vásu,* and note 1 above.

The phonetic change -*ū* > -*u* resulted in complete merger of singular and plural in the *u*-stem neuter nouns and adjectives. This homophony was eliminated by the introduction of the consonant stem neuter plural in -*a* in the substantives, yielding -*uwa* (*aššuwa* ‚goods‘), and the generalization of the full grade of the suffix — originally confined to the animate gender — in the adjective, yielding -*auwa* (*aššauwa* ‚bona‘, *idālauwa* ‚mala‘). Both -*uwa* and -*auwa* are clearly inner-Hittite innovations.

One further *u*-stem, albeit far from clearly understood, seems to have undergone the same historical transformation. J. Friedrich (HW) lists both a *tarrū* and a *tarraua,* with the gloss „bäuchlings(??)“, on one’s stomach. The reference is to the ˢᴬᴸŠU.GI ritual KUB IX 4, CTH 760.2 (taken by H. C. Melchert 99, 122 as a Middle Hittite composition, perhaps older), and its interpretation by A. Götze, ArchOr 5, 1933, 6¹·²; the passage is treated in full by E. Laroche, DLL 149–50. Col. II 25–6 reads *uizzi-ma-za parā tar-ru-u šešzi n-a[n-š]i-kan [iš]kišaš šer epzi . . .*

15 In the Ritual of Maštigga (CTH 404), version 2A, KUB XXXII 115 +, which is a Middle Hittite manuscript (H. C. Melchert, op. cit., 94, 112), reads (IV 12) *ḫumanda uddār . . . ,the evil words‘* (15) *tuwarnattaru-war-at* (16) [(*ḫum*) *]anda u*{(*dd*)}*]ār ḫurtauššš-a* ‚Let them be broken, all the words and curses‘ (19) *katta-war-a-šmaš-kan waršan ēštu* (20) *idālu uddār* KA × U-*aš* EME-*aš* ‚And let them be wiped off you, the words, (those) of mouth (and) tongue‘. Version 2B has likewise the clear plural *idālu uddār* (KBo IX 106 + III 34, from the same archetype), and Version 3 (KBo XXIV 1 I 19, a Middle Hittite manuscript [H. Otten, Inhaltsübersicht] of a different archetype) has the same. But version 1A, KBo II 3, which is a neo-Hittite manuscript, has renewed *idālu uddār* to *i-da-a-la-u-wa uddār.* The ritual of Maštigga is certainly of Middle Hittite antiquity, and possibly even Old Hittite, as suggested by H. C. Melchert, loc. cit. We have the same in another text showing the identical phrase *i]-da-a-lu ud-da-a-ar,* KUB XLIII 68 Rs.² 7 (CTH 389, fragments de prières (?)), which is a Middle Hittite manuscript, and whose language shows grammatical features of Middle or Old Hittite composition: suffixed possessive pronouns Vs.² 6 DINGIR MEŠ-*iš waštauš-muš ḫarnikten;* 11 *kišš*]*ari-mi daišten.* Finally, note also KBo XV 10 + (CTH 443, G. Szabó, THeth 1971) II 15 *idālu uddār* ‚evil words‘ and the unambiguous *idālu . . . kue* ‚evils . . . which‘. Here as well it is noteworthy that H. C. Melchert (op. cit. 56, 78) for other reasons assumes a Middle Hittite manuscript but an Old Hittite archetype.

29–31 *n-aš-za uizzi* EGIR-*pa pár-aš-za šešzi nu-šši-ššan* UDU ᵁᶻᵁ GAB-*i šer epzi*. Following A. Götze, E. Laroche translates ‚Il vient se coucher à plat ventre, elle le (= le mouton) lui tient sur le dos . . Il vient se coucher à la renverse; elle tient le mouton sur sa poitrine‘. The partial duplicate IX 34 III 9 has *tar-ra-u-wa* instead of *tar-ru-u*. The meaning ‚on one's stomach‘ is a guess from the context here; the context would also support ‚on all fours‘, ‚on hands and knees‘, or the like.[17] But the variants *tarru* and *tarrauwa* in these two duplicate passages point morphologically to a *u*-stem neuter plural, evidently functioning as an adverb. IX 4 shows many more archaisms than IX 34, which could corroborate the claim that *tarrauwa* is a morphological renewal of *tarru*.

We expect parallelism between *u*- and *i*- stems, and therefore an old neuter plural -*iḫ₂* (Ved. *súcī, bhū́ri*) > *-iḫ > -ī̆* (written -*i-i/-i*) > -*i*. In the case of neuter *i*-stem substantives, which are not that common, this is precisely what we get: ᴳᴵˢ*zu-up-pa-ri*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ ‚torches‘.[18] Similarly Middle Hittite ᴰᵁᴳ*iš-pa-an-tu-uz-zi* ‚wine vessels‘,[19] and Old Hittite (later copy) ᴳᴵˢ*iš-pa-ru-uz-zi* ‚rafters‘.[20] This ending may have spread to neuter plurals like ᴰᵁᴳ*ḫu-up-pa-ri*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ ‚bowls‘ (KUB XXVII I III 14), to ᴰᵁᴳ*ḫu-u-up-pár* (Tunnawi I 22 etc.), *ḫu-u-up-pár* (KBo XII 123, 13), and *kururi*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ beside *kurur*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ (attestations in HW s. v. *kurur*-), both of which are *r*-stems, and despite the lack of clear etymologies, probably inherited.[21]

---

16 H. C. Melchert, pp. 53, 74 (CTH 332.3).

17 Prof. E. Neu informs me that he likewise analyzes *tar-ru-u* as an old neuter plural *-uḫ₂, remade to -*awa*. See now his „Studien zum endungslosen ‚Lokativ‘ des Hethitischen", Innsbruck 1980 (IBS, Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften 23), 48 n. 113, with references. The real meaning of the adjective *tarru*- eludes us. Cf. acc. *tarrun šaštan* KBo XII 70 Vs.¹ 12 and E. Laroche, Ugaritica V, 1968, 779ff.; adv. *tarru* KUB XXXI 105, 8; KBo XXI 6 Vs. 1; Bo 2489 + 4008 II 14 and F. Starke, StBoT 23.102 (cited in n. 7 above); *tar-ra-u-aš-ša* Hedammu 16, 12 and J. Siegelová, StBoT 14.60. Morphologically the verb *tarranu-* (HW 213 and Erg. 2,24) ought to mean ‚make *tarru*-‘; originally ‚strong, solid, sound‘ (IE *terh₁-, Hitt. *tarḫ-, tarra*-) whence „resting solidly on four feet (of a bed) or on hands and knees (of a person)"? E. Laroche, BSL 53, 83 and DLL 79, equates Hittite *parā tarru* and Luvian *parritarw-alliya-, parritarw-aši-*. Given the rarity of Anatolian compounds with preverb/adverb as first member, it is tempting to connect the Anatolian forms with Latin *prōtervus*, and assume for the latter a basic meaning ‚headlong‘, ‚headstrong‘.

18 See H. Otten, StBoT 15.7; the gender and number are proved by 1926/u (ibid. 46) *zup*]-*pari*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ *kue lukkanzi* ‚the torches which they light‘, and in an Old Hittite composition (neo-Hittite script) ᴳᴵˢ*zuppari*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ GAL*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ šiuni piran lukkan ḫarkanzi* ‚they hold large torches lit before the god‘ KUB XX 96 IV 1f.

19 In clearly plural context in KUB XVII 21 II 16, IV 10 (CTH 375, prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal, ed. E. von Schuler, Die Kaškäer, 1965, 152ff.).

20 So A. Goetze, ANET 358; literally ‚spreaders‘ (*išpar*-), KUB XXIX 1 III 18 (CTH 414, Bauritual).

21 The ablaut *ḫuppar : ḫuppar*(+*i*) recalls *uttar : uddār, ḫultar : ḫuitār* as well as *watar : widār*; nothing speaks against a *h₂óupr̥ : *h₂éupōr*, which could well belong with the difficult

---

In the case of *i*-stem adjectives the picture is different. The handbooks give -*a* (contracted from -*aya*, HEI² § 15a) or -*aya*.[22] These forms could have arisen analogically, as with the *u*-stems. Prof. Neu (per litt.) calls my attention to the Old Hittite, old ductus neuter plural forms *pal-ḫa-e-a*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ ‚p.-vessels‘ KUB XXXI 143 Vs. II 22 and *t*]*a-ma-a-e* KBo XXV 18 + KBo XXV 65 Rs.? 4 (*tamāi*- ‚other‘). Rather than comparing the pronominal ending -*e* with E. Neu, I would note the similar *šu-up-pa-e-a* ,and (-*a*) ᵁᶻᵁ*šuppa*‘ KBo XX 24 Vs.? II 6 beside *šu-up-pa-aš-me-et* ibid. 16 Vs.? 5 (both „*alter Duktus*", H. Otten). *šuppae, palḫae, tamāe* are for *šuppaya, palḫaya, tamāya*, i. e. represent full grade stems -*ai*- and neuter plural ending -*a*. The -*ae* treatment recalls the variation *a-ru-wa-a-an-zi* and *a-ru-wa-a-en-zi* in the KI.LAM text KBo XII 131 II 6, 8, as well as *an-da-e-še* for *anda + ya* ,and‘ in Laws § 149.[23] Phonologically, note old ductus 1 sg. pres. (*tarm*)-*a-e-mi* > later -*a-a-mi*, as well as voc. *iš-ha-a-mi* < *-aye + mi*. The age of these attestations suggests that the replacement of -*ū* by -*awa* and -*ī* by -*aya* (> -*a*) may not have been contemporary.

Beside these forms, which show an early -*aya* (perhaps modelled on *tamāe*, *tamāya*, where the ending is old), we should note Old Hittite *me-ek-ki-i*, Laws § 47 (A, old ductus): *takku* LÚ ᴳᴵˢTUKUL-*aš* A.ŠÀᴴᴵ·ᴬ·*ŠU ḫumandan kuiški waši* . . . *takku* A.ŠÀᴴᴵ·ᴬ·*na me-ek-ki-i waši*, which can be interpreted ‚If someone buys all a ᴳᴵˢT.-person's land (animate singular accusative) . . . but if he (only) buys lots = „some" (neuter plural accusative, in partitive apposition)‘.[24] The identification of *mekkī* as neuter plural here would be corroborated if we had a later version of a similar construction, with the spelling *me-eq-qa-ya*, in KUB XLVI 42 III 1–2 *nu mān* UNUTEᴴᴵ·ᴬ *meqqaya*, . . . UNUTEᴴᴵ·ᴬ-*ma-kan ḫuman*, . . . ‚if the gear is lots = „if there is some gear", . . . but all the gear = „the whole lot" . . .‘[25]

Other *i*-stem adjectives do not appear to show spellings in -*i-i*, with the exception of *nakkī*-. But here the considerable number of neuter singulars in *na-ak-ki-i* as against few in *na-ak-ki* (without following enclitic), as well as the several cases of

---

family of Eng. *oven*, Ger. *Ofen*, Lat. *aulla*, Skt. *ukháh*, Gk. ἰπνός (Myc. *ipono*). See J. Pokorny, IEW 88, P. Chantraine DELG s. v. ἰπνός, and M. Mayrhofer, KEWA 1.98, 3.657, with references.

22 In my opinion many of those in -*a* may be simply consonant stem alternants.

23 It cannot be absolutely excluded that (-*a*)-*e-a* is a notation for -(*a*)*ya*; cf. perhaps KBo XX 10 I 5–6 *mān zinnizi-ma* ANA LUGAL *ḫekta a-ap-pa-e-a ḫekta* ,and he bows back‘ (?), or the obscure KBo VII 14, 10 (Zukraši) X-*az/uk-e-a*.

24 The suggestion to see partitive apposition here is due to H. C. Melchert. For the construction in Old Hittite cf. F. Starke, StBoT 23.175–6. An Old Hittite example in later script is *aruni* ZAG-*ši* ,on the edge of the sea‘ in the Appu-tale I 8–9 (J. Siegelová, StBoT 14).

25 On the text (part of CTH *495) see E. Laroche, RHA XXXIII 1975, 66.

animate *na-ak-ki-i-iš*, would indicate rather that the adjective was end-stressed /nakī-/.[26]

One form shows a replacement of earlier -*i* by later -*aya*, exactly paralleling that of -*u* by -*awa*; the relation of this -*aya* to Old Hittite -*ae* is uncertain. The expression *kar-ši zaḫḫiya-* ‚to fight definitely, unconditionally, without hesitation‘ occurs in Madduwattaš and a number of other Middle Hittite texts, all instructions, protocols, or treaties, as noted by H. Otten in his commentary, StBoT 11.17; compare also late Old Hittite *kar-ši tetten* ‚speak frankly, incisively!‘ Telepinu Edict § 30. H. Otten states (loc. cit.): ‚In J. Friedrich, Staatsverträge, findet sich der Ausdruck ebensowenig wie mediopassive Formen von *zaḫḫiya-*.‘ But what does appear in the Neo-Hittite treaties is *kar-ša-ya zaḫḫiya-* in the identical meaning (Targ. § 12 II 30, var. *kar-aš-ši-ya* Duppi-Tešup D II 4), and *kar-ša-ya ŠU-PUR* ‚write without hesitation‘ (Kup. § 18 D 57, var. *kar-aš-ša-ya* Al. A II 81); *karši zaḫḫiya-* in a text of Hattušili III, KUB XXI 12, 13, may be archaizing. The simplest way to reconcile MH *karši* and NH *karšaya* is to assume the morphological renewal of an *i*-stem neuter plural, here in adverbial function as in Greek (E. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik I, 1977⁵, 620; P. Chantraine, Grammaire Homérique I, 1958, 250; E. Risch, Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache, 1974², 364), like Hittite adverbial *āššū, tarrū*. For *u*-stems and *i*-stems the oldest Hittite nominative-accusative plural neuter is thus -*ū*, -*i*, faithfully continuing IE *-*uh₂*, *-*ih₂*.

[26] A case like KBo IV 4 IV 30–1 (AM) *na-ak-ki-i AŠ-RI*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ ‚difficult places‘ says nothing about the quantity of the vowel, but does indicate a neo-Hittite neuter plural /nakí/, identical with the singular.

Appendix

I set forth below the Indo-European situation as I see it for the two closely similar words for ‚good‘, with representative cognates. The basic form is an acrostatic neuter substantive (with accent on the root throughout) meaning ‚good, good thing‘. From this substantive is internally derived a proterokinetic possessive adjective (with accent on the root in the strong cases, on the suffix in the weak cases) meaning ‚good‘, with paradigmatic levelling of full grade in the root:

acrostatic neuter substantive →	proterokinetic adjective
‚Good, good thing‘ →	‚good‘
str. $h_1ós\text{-}u$ pl. $h_1ós\text{-}uh_2$	$h_1és\text{-}u\text{-}$
wk. $h_1és\text{-}u\text{-}$	$h_1es\text{-}éu\text{-}$
Hitt. *āššu*, pl. *āššū*	
Gk. *eú*	Gk. *eús*
str. $h_1uós\text{-}u$	$h_1ués\text{-}u\text{-}$
wk. $h_1ués\text{-}u\text{-}$	$h_1ues\text{-}éu\text{-}$
OIr. *fó*, original oblique stem *feb-*	
Pal. *wa-a-šu*	
Ved. *vásu*, gen. *vásvah*	Ved. gen. *vásoh*
Av. *vohū*, gen. *vaηhuuąm*	Av. gen. *vaηhə̄uš*

For a clear semantic and morphological parallel for the derivation of the adjective ‚good‘ from a substantive ‚Good‘ consider only the obvious derivational history, as indicated by the direction of the arrow, in Luvian *adduwāl* ‚Evil, Bad, le Mal‘ → *adduwal-i-* ‚bad, mauvais‘.

The Hittite cognate *idālu-* ‚bad‘ must be similarly derived, but with a different secondary suffix, perhaps copying that of its antonym *āššu-*. The Indo-European prototype of the substantive ‚Evil‘ may be set up as *$h_1eduól$, comparable in shape to *$seh_2uól$ ‚sun‘, and ultimately a derivative of the root *$h_1ed\text{-}$ ‚bite‘ (> eat)‘ like the similarly formed IE *$h_1eduó(n)$ ‚pain, mal‘.[27]

The derivation, internal or external, from a neuter substantive meaning ‚Good‘ or ‚Evil‘, of a possessive (bahuvrīhi) adjective meaning ‚good‘ or ‚bad‘ finally permits us to offer a simple morphological solution to a long-standing etymological problem in Greek: *ἐσθλός* ‚good‘. I postulate that from a neuter substantive *$h_1és\text{-}dhlom$ (with the suffix in Gk. -*θλον*, Lat. -*bulum*) is derived a possessive adjective

[27] On which see J. Schindler, KZ 89, 1975, 53–65 and IE Studies II, 1975, 252–74.

in accented thematic vowel $*h_1es\text{-}dhl\text{-}ó\text{-}$. The root I presume to be the verb of
existence; the derivative $*h_1és\text{-}dhlom$ would have meant ‚that by which one really
is‘, ‚that which establishes one in his prerogative‘, whence the range of meanings in
the possessive adjective which we have in Greek ἐσθλός·[28]

---

28 [Addendum. The linguistically old birth-ritual text KBo XVII 61 shows (Vs. 16–17) the
i-stem plural forms GIŠ*kur-ta-al-li*HI.A (nom.-acc.) and GIŠ*kur-ta-li-aš* (prob. dat.-loc);
cf. Otten, Totenrituale 134, H. Berman, JAOS 92.466–8 (1972) (for the text), and Otten,
StBoT 17.16 (for the dating). The text is at least Middle Hittite (H. C. Melchert, Abl. and
Instr. 96, 113). In the same text, in the series of body parts treated in the familiar fashion
(IGIHI.A-*kan A-NA* IGIHI.A-*ŠU handan* ‚eyes are fixed to eyes‘, etc.) the number agrees
between nominative and dative. Therefore in Rs. 16′ [*gi-(e-)*]*nu-kan A-NA ginuwaš*
KI.MIN we probably have nom. pl. *genu* ‚knees‘, shortened from *genu*: possibly the same
preform as Lat. (Aen. 1.320) *nūda genū*, on which Leumann, Lat. Gr. I²441 with recent
literature. This view is to some extent confirmed by the thematically parallel description
in KUB XLIII 53 I 14′–15′: [*mi-*]*e-u-ra-aš-ši-iš mi-u-ra-aš gi-nu-aš-ta gi-nu-aš da-a-ak-ki*
(15′) GIRMEŠ *A-NA* GIRMEŠ *ták-kán-zi* ŠU[HI.A-]*sa-pa* ŠUHI.A-*aš ták-kán-zi*, with its
Old Hittite,   old ductus duplicate KBo XVII 17 Rs.? IV? 4′–5′]×-*ŠU* KI.VII *mi-u-ri-*
še![- (5′) GIRHI.A-*ŠU ták-kán-zi* ŠUHI.A-*š*[*a-pa*. For the texts see now E. Neu,
StBoT 25, Nr. 9. The old ductus from *mi-u-ri-še*[-*eš* points to an animate nom. plur.
subject *miureš-še*š ‚his m.‘, so that the last four body parts in the list would be plural; the
singular concord in *gi-nu-še-ta . . . da-a-ak-hi* ‚his knees correspond . . .‘ is of course expected
with a neuter plural subject. N. Oettinger, Stammbildung 427, also translates the passage
(as Bo. 3263+) as plural: ‚seine Knie gleichen den Knien‘. In view of this it is tempting in the
same paragraph (IV? 11′ *ge-en-zu-uš-še-ta ge-<en-> zu-wa-aš da-[a-]ak-ki*) to take
genzu=*šet*=*a* likewise as nom. plur. neut., such that the fairly frequent, if semantically
unclear word (*uzu*)*genzu* (Friedrich, HWb. 107) might be a plurale tantum. And in this light
the spelling *an-da ge-en-zu-ú da-aš-ki-ú* KUB XXX 127 I 5 appears significant; the manu-
script of the Sun-hymn but the composition obviously of Old Hittite antiquity;
and O. Carruba already in 1969 (ZDMG Suppl. I 234–5), called attention in neo-Hittite
copies of old manuscripts to the tendency for archaisms to be preserved at the very be-
ginning of the text, as here.]

Indices

(Die Zahlen verweisen auf die Seiten. In die Indices zu den Einzelsprachen sind nicht alle im
Sammelband zitierten Wortformen aufgenommen. Die Notationen wurden teilweise verein-
heitlicht)

A. Einzelsprachen

1. Indogermanisch