INDOGERMANICA ET ITALICA

Festschrift für
HELMUT RIX
zum 65. Geburtstag

Unter Mitarbeit von

Jadwiga Bendahman, Jón Axel Hardarson
und Christiane Schaefer

herausgegeben von

Gerhard Meiser

SONDERDRUCK

INHALT DES GESAMTBANDES

Some Anatolian words and forms

CALVERT WATKINS

Harvard University

It is a pleasure to dedicate to Helmut Rix these three short studies, which I hope may show the mutual dependence of the study of the languages of Anatolia, and those of Italy and Greece which he has so illuminated by his many works.

I. Luvian *ḫīrūn*, *ḫīrūt-*

My first topic concerns the vocabulary of swearing in Luvian. It is clear that the lexical items in question have both a good and a bad sense, as we would naturally expect in this semantic field: swear shades into curse, the oath into perjury, sworn into forsworn, and speech into malediction (compare Engl. *swear-word*, *cuss-word*). The vocabulary is that of speech acts: Hittite *taranzi* 'they say,' but Luvian *tatariyaman* 'curse'. The word for oath in Luvian is the neuter nom *ḫīrūn*, stem *ḫīrūt-*. The stem is given by Laroche DLL as *ḫirunt-*, but the nasal is never noted before the (always single) *-t-*, either in Luvian (dozens of attestations) or in Hittite (abl. *ḫirutaza parkui ēšdu* 'may it be pure of curse' KUB 34.57,8). Since the Luvian sequence *-unt-* is stable in both languages throughout the historical period in the divine name ᴰTarḫunt-, it is preferable to take *ḫīrūt-* at face value.

The 'good' value of *ḫīrūt* 'oath' is found in the epithet *ḫīrutallis* ᴰUTU-*waza* KUB 35.78 i 9', 11', 12', 13', *Tiwaz* of the Oath. In view of the doubtless inherited juncture *tātiš* ᴰ*Tiwaz* 'father *Tiwaz*' (: Ζεῦ πάτερ, *Iu-ppiter*, etc.) one is tempted to compare *ḫīrutalliš* ᴰUTU-*waza* with Ζεὺς ὅρκιος 'Zeus of the oath.'

Most if not all of the actual instances of Luvian *ḫīrun* have the 'bad' value of 'perjury,' 'imprecation' or the like; 'etwas Unerwünschtes' (Otten 1953; 95[166]) which must be exorcized or transformed by the ritual: 'may the *tapāru*, the imprecations (*ḫīrūta*), and the curses (*tatarriyamna*) become oil and honey,' as in the *dupaduparša* ritual passim.

Luvian *ḫīrun* been etymologically analyzed as *$h_3\bar{e}r$-u̯-* (via H. Eichner's *meḫur* rule) by Oettinger apud Mayrhofer, Idg. Gr. I 133; Oettinger connects the word with Greek ἀραρίσκω 'fit', with ἀρ- from *h_2er-. Cf. also M. Peters, Spr. 32, 1986 [1988] 380 n. 59. I concur with Oettinger's (independent) analyses as *$h_3\bar{e}r$-u-*; *$\bar{e}$ is the most plausible

source for Luvian *i* adjacent to laryngeal *h*. But a semantically and formally much closer match to the Luvian noun is Greek ἀρά, Homeric ἀρή from *aru-á- 'prayer; imprecation, curse,' from *h₂er-u-. compare also Arcadian καταρϜος 'accursed.'

Morphologically the pattern with root apophony and both vocalic (-o/ah₂-) and athematic consonantal (-t-) suffixes in

*h₂er-u-o/ah₂-	ἀρϜᾱ, -αρϜος
*h₂ĕr-u-t-	ḫīrūt-

closely parallels an isolated set of nominal forms signalled as archaic over 60 years ago by Meillet (BSL 28, 1928, 40-2):

*sol(h_x)-u-o-	sárva-, hauruua-, gjalë, ὅλος
*slh_x-u-o-	saluos, **salavs**
*slh_x-u-t- => *sluh_x t-	salūt-

The laryngeal of the root (lost in the o-grade by Saussure's Law) is pace Meillet guaranteed by Irish *slán* and the geminate in Hittite *šalli-*. Luvian *ḫīrūt-* closely parallels Latin *salūs*; thirty years ago Myles Dillon told me that thirty years before that Meillet had ended one of his classes with "C'est une merveille que *salūs*."

The long vowel of *salūt-* might be due to laryngeal metathesis, as tentatively suggested here, but it might have some other origin. Latin *palūs, palūdis* (f.) shows a similar long vowel, but the dental suffix is this time -d- or -dh-.

Luvian *ḫīrūt-* is similarly ambiguous. The frequency of the scriptio plena both in the nom. sg. *ḫi-i-ru-ú-un* and the stem *ḫi-i-ru-u-t-* would argue for a real long -ū-, whatever its origin, and the single -t- can continue old *-d-, *-dʰ-, or (by lenition) *-t-. In its morphological opacity and near isolation but clear and plausible etymology Luvian *ḫīrūn-* closely parallels Latin *salūs, palūs*, or *tellūs*. For parallels to the morphology, see the following section.

I add a final point. Several times in the corpus we find asyndetically conjoined forms of two denominative verbs of swearing: KUB 9.6+ i 23 (StBoT 30.112) *kuiš ḫīrutan/iyatt/a tiwataniyatta* 'whoever has cursed (and) sworn'. The participles occur in an active intransitive sense like Latin *iūrātus* 'having sworn, under oath; in conspiracy': 35.58 ii 3' (StBoT 30.164) *ḫirutaniyamma/t/i tiwataniyammati (... ḫalališ āšdu)* '(may he be pure...) of the one who has cursed, of the one who has sworn.' The second verb *tiwataniya-* is an obvious denominative from the divine name ᴰ*Tiwat-*, whence Laroche's translation 'littéralement "ensoleiller".' But the verb truly must mean just 'swear', in mala parte 'curse'. Its formation is exactly parallel to that of the Oscan verb *deiua-* 'swear', participle *deiuatu<n>s 'iūrātī*, having sworn,' a denominative from the word for 'god': 'take the gods to witness,' as Benveniste notes (Vocab. 2.112). Italic *deiw-ā-* and Luvian *diwat-aniya-* are like responses to the same conditions, in the context of Indo-European semantics.

II. Reflexions on ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*ḫarzazu-*

The paradigm of the Luvian word for 'oath'

nom. acc. sg. nt.	ḫīrūn pl. ḫīrūta
abl.-inst.	ḫīrūtati

is not unique in Anatolian, as was recognized nearly a quarter-century ago by Onofrio Carruba, 'Über die "churritischen" Deklinationsformen im Hethitischen', RHA f. 81, 1967, 151-156. We find the same in the Hittite breadstuff word given by Friedrich HWb. as ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*ḫarzazu-* ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*ḫarzazuta-* (mit churr. suffix -ta), n./c.' cf. also HE² 60, basically following Sommer's notation ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*ḫarzazu(ta)-* HAB 172. The form and meaning of the word is most fully discussed in Harry A. Hoffner, Alimenta Hethaeorum 157-8 (1974), and most recently, with some additional text citations, by J.J.S. Weitenberg, Die hethitischen u-Stämme 245-6 (Amsterdam 1984). Hoffner's definition, followed by Weitenberg, is 'a dish of soupy consistency whose base was fragmented breads but to which had been added bits of cheese, herbs or vegetables: For simplicity, I will translate as '*ḫ-pudding*', though I confess the dish, which is always prepared (*iya-, ie-*) during the ritual as part of the ritual action itself, makes me think of the (dreaded) cold cornbread crumbled up in clabber of my childhood.

The correct determination of inflexion (and gender) was made by Hoffner on the basis of a complete collection of the attestations available up to 1971. The examples since published conform entirely to his paradigm:

(nom.-)acc.sg.neut.		ḫar-za-zu-un	nom-acc.pl.		ḫar-za-zu-ta
	1x	ḫar-za-šu-un	1x		ḫar-za-zu-ú-ta
	1x	ḫar-za-šu-ú-un			
			gen.pl. 1x		ḫar-za-zu-ú-ta-an
dat.sg.	1x	ḫar-za-zu-u-ti	acc.pl.comm. 1x		ḫar-za-zu-uš
inst.		ḫar-za-zu-ti-it			
	1x	ḫar-za-zu-<ti->it			

These forms are commented on in detail below.

Weitenberg prefers to take *ḫarzazu-* as a common gender u-stem, with *ḫarzazun* as its ordinary acc. sg., and regards *ḫarzazuta-* as in some sense a different (but homonymous) word, a thematic neuter a-stem. He acknowledges that these are 'auffällige Genusverhältnisse,' while rightly noting that they speak against a stem *ḫarzazu(n)t-* with Laroche BSL 55 (1960) 164. But the two-stem analysis would be a morphological monstrosity as a synchronic Hittite form; it would be as though Hittite *ḫaššu-* and Vedic *asurá-* were coexisting stems in the same synchronic system. It furthermore ignores the evidence of the scriptio plena in *ḫarzazūt-*, which must be the same as that of *ḫarzašūn*. The evidence collected by Weitenberg himself (p. 345 ff.) shows that scriptio plena in nom. or acc. sg. comm. u-stems is confined to words of the type *mi-(i-)u-, ḫé-(e-)u-, šu-ú-*, where it merely marks the stem, or to personal

names of various or uncertain origin. The paradigm must be *ḫarzaz/šun*, obl. *ḫarzaz(/š)ūt-*, neut.

Particularly clear are the three examples now published as KUB 58.6 + 28.91 i 4'-10', cited as Bo. 2708 by Hoffner, and transcribed and translated in part by E. Neu, StBoT 12.75. I give this typical passage in extenso to explain one peculiarity.

4' LU*ḫa-mi-na-aš* 2 NINDA KU₇ BA.BA.ZA 1 *UP-NI pár-ši-ya*
   ta-aš NINDA*ḫar-za-zu-ta i-ya-zi ta-at-kán* LU*ḫa-mi-na-aš*
6' GIS*za-al-wa-ni da-a-i* 1 DUG*ḫal-wa-tal-la-ya-aš-ša-an*
   GIS*za-al-wa-ni da-a-i* LU*ḫa-mi-na-aš* NINDA*ḫar-za-zu-ta*
8' GIS*za-al-wa-ni-it* LUGAL-*i pa-ra-a e-ep-zi* LUGAL-*uš QA-TAM*
   da-a-i

   LU*ḫa-mi-na-aš* 3 NINDA*ḫar-za-z[u-u]n iš-ta-na-ni*
10' *A-NA* D*U URU Zi-ip-la-[a]n-da da-a-i*

'The chamberlain breaks two sweet "porridge" loaves of one *upnu*, and he makes them into ḫ-puddings. The chamberlain places them on a platter, and he places an ḫ-vessel there on the platter. The chamberlain proffers the ḫ-puddings to the king. The king puts his hand (on them).

The chamberlain offers three ḫ-puddings on the sacrificial table for the Storm God of Ziplanda'.

As Hoffner noted, the singular *ḫarzazun* may be used in counting with numerals higher than one, as confirmed in line 9'. Cf. also KUB 11.35 ii 12'-16' for a virtually identical sequence as 4'-9':

2 NINDA*dan-na-aš pár-ši-ya na-at* NINDA*ḫar-za-zu-ta i-ya-an-zi*
UGULA LU.MES*MUḪALDIM* NINDA*ḫar-za-zu-ta* / LUGAL-*i pa-ra-a e-ep-zí*
LUGAL-*uš QA-TAM da-a-i* UGULA LU.<MES>*MUḪALDIM* 3
NINDA*ḫar-za-zu-un* / ZAG.GAR.RA-*ni da-a-i*

IBoT 4.134 obv. 3'-5' (cf. Hoffner, Desc. Catalogue) gives another example, 3 NINDA*ḫar-za-zu-un* SA₅; the adjective 'red' here is the only epithet I have found for *ḫarzazūt-*.

The sentence at 5' requires a note. Neu StBoT 12.75 translated 'und verfertigt (daraus) ein *ḫarzazu*-Brot,' apparently taking *ta-aš* as (the expected) 'et is'. This would violate a rule of Hittite syntax, since subject clitics are found only with intransitive verbs (rule stated by Watkins, EC 12 [1968-9] 93, and conclusively demonstrated by A. Garrett, AOS, Chicago, March 1988 and *Lg.* 66.261-96 [1990], with references). We must therefore analyze *ta-aš* as 'et eos,' and translate the normal Hittite and Indo-European double accusative construction (*aliquem consulem creare*) as 'make them (into) ḫ-puddings'.

That this analysis is correct is proved by KUB 10.111 iii 17-18 I NINDA.KUR₄RA *pár-ši-ya na-an* 6 NINDA*ḫar-z[a-z]u-un i-ya-an-zi*: 'He crumbles one leavened loaf, and they make it (-*an*) into six ḫ-puddings.' Compare the virtually identical formula in KUB 11.35 ii 12'-14': 2 NINDA*dan-na-aš pár-ši-ya na-at* NINDA*ḫar-za-zu-ta i-ya-an-zi* 'He crumbles two *dannaš*-loaves and makes them (-*at*) into ḫ-puddings.'

The form *ta-aš* is a morphological anomaly. The normal Old Hittite form of *ta* + -*uš* is *tu-uš*, as shown by the many attestations in Old Script (Neu, StBoT 26.5). As Neu notes, we find instances beginning in Old Hittite of -*ma-aš* 'eos autem' (-*ma* + -*uš*) beside the rarer -*mu-uš* 'id.' (Middle Hittite +). There seem to be no Old Script examples of *ta-aš* or *na-aš* in the meaning 'et eos'. The vast predominance of *tu-uš* even in later copies of these old rituals would indicate that *ta-aš* 'et eos' is a Neo-Hittite solecism. But the form is real, and should figure in our dictionaries. The model of -*ma-aš*, of -*ya-aš* 'atque eos' in the legal formula *kuenzi =uš* LUGAL-*uš ḫuišnuzi =ya =aš* LUGAL-*uš* Laws 198-199 (OH/MS) 'the king can kill them, and the king can let them live', led to the creation of *na-aš* 'et eos' beside *nu-uš* (recognized in Friedrich, HG² 36) and *ta-aš* 'et eos' beside *tu-uš*. We find examples of each in succession in KUB 2.1 i 3'-12', with its duplicate 58.22 i 4'-10' (CTH 626, EZEN *nuntariyašḫaš*):

   GUB-*li-it ki[(-iš-ša-ri-it)*
   NA4*[pa-aš-ši-lu-uš ḫar-zi*
   n[a-aš A-NA DUMU É.GAL
   GUB-*li-it* SU-*it* (dupl. *ki-iš-ša-ri-it*) *pa-a-i*

   DUMU É.GAL-*ma-aš* GUB-*la-az*
   ki-iš-ša-ra-az LUGAL-*i pa-a-i*
   na-aš-za-kán LUGAL-*uš* GUB-*la-az*
   ki-iš-ša-ra-az (dupl. ŠU-*za*) *še-er ar-ḫa*
   wa-aḫ-nu-zi
   ta-aš-kán ÍD-*i an-da iš-ḫu-u-wa-i*

'With his left hand he holds pebbles, and he gives them with his left hand to the courtier. But the courtier gives them with his left hand to the king, and the king brandishes them about with his left hand, and then he throws them in the river.'

The forms *ta-aš* and *na-aš* evidently stood in the exemplar of both these (Neo-Hittite) tablets.

That *ḫarzazun* is the singular is clear form its use with the numeral 1 (11.18 ii 1-3, 21 iv 6-9, etc.); the singular is used with numbers higher than one, but one requires the singular.

Beside this spelling the singular appears also spelled *ḫar-za-šu-un* (KBo 21.49 = 445/c i 5') and with scriptio plena *ḫar-za-šu-ú-un* (Bo 3083 iii 15'), as cited by

Hoffner (non vidi). Whether this spelling represents a dissimilation of -zazu- or whether -zazu- is assimilated form -zašu cannot be determined with certainty. No Old Hittite/Old Script spellings of the word are attested; the only occurrence in an Old Script manuscript is Neu's probable restoration at StBoT 25 no. 98, 5'-6' 2 NINDA.KUR₄R[A/ ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-u/n ya-an-zi (see StBoT 26,58 with n. 267), which of course could as well be -šu-(ú-) as -zu-(ú-). Note the old spelling of ya-an-zi. In view of the scriptio plena, found also in the plural (v. infra) I am inclined to take ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫarzašūn as the oldest form. This would imply that the stem ḫarzazut- was from *ḫarzašūt-, with even more favorable conditions for assimilation of the stop feature. For s > z cf. also zamankur 'beard' from IE *sm-.

Other forms of the paradigm attested are the following: dat.-loc. sg. at KUB 27.69 iii 5'-7' (CTH 591, Festival of the Month) /nu-uš-/ša-an SAL.LUGAL /A-N/A ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-u-ti /p/u-ri-in da-a-i 'The queen puts her lips to the ḫ-pudding.'

Inst. sg. or pl. KBo 4.13 ii 24' (CT 625, AN.TAḪŠUM.SAR Fest.) 2 ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬdan-na-aš ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-ta (acc. pl. neut.) i-ya-an-zi 26' ta ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-ti-it me-ma-li-it K[AŠ-i/t GEŠTIN-it AŠ-RI]ᴴᴵ·ᴬ ir-ḫa-a-an-zi 'They make two d.-loaves into ḫ-pudding ... And they make the rounds of the places with ḫ-pudding, groats, beer and wine.' A close parallel to this text is KBo 30.77 obv. iii 17'-18' 1 ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬdan-na-aš-ma ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-un i-ya-an-zi // ta ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-ti-it AŠ-RIᴴᴵ·ᴬ ir-ḫa-a-i-zi IBoT 2.4 obv. 2'-3' /ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-ti-it/ /-it GEŠTIN-it[. We should therefore probably read at KUB 34.69 obv. 16'-17' EGIR-ŠU ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-<ti->it ta-wa-/li-it /ir-ḫa-a-an-zi, thus correcting the ḫarzazuit of HWb. and HE², perhaps at 949/u, 3 (Carruba, loc. cit. [non vidi]) and restore at IBoT 4.317 obv. 3'-5' 2 ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ[ḫar-za-zu-un] / i-ya-an-zi ta ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-[ti-it ...] / KAŠ-it GEŠTIN-it AŠ-RIᴴᴵ·ᴬ ir-[ḫa-a-an-zi].

The form ḫar-za-zu-uš- 407q 2 taken as nom. sg. comm. by Howard Berman in his University of Chicago dissertation 95 (1972), is better analyzed in context as acc. pl. comm. (Carruba, loc. cit.), probably either a nonce form, a late back-form, or a scribal error.

Friedrich, HWb. and HE² lists a nom.-acc. sg. ḫarzazutan; the form is correctly cited by Hoffner as ḫar-za-zu-ú-ta-an (note the scriptio plena), but without grammatical identification. In context however it should be taken as a partitive genitive plural. The passage (KUB 20.99 ii 16-19, CTH 636.2) reads

> IŠ-TUᴺᴬ⁴ ZI.KIN DIM-ya-kán ku-it
> ᵁᶻᵁNÍG.GIG ḫar-za-zu-ú-ta-an me-ma-al a-aš-ša-an
> na-at-kán ta-pu-ú-ša A-NA ᴺᴬ⁴ZI.KIN ᴰLAMA
> ú-da-an-zi

'Whatever (of) liver, of ḫ-pudding (and whatever) groats are left over from the ḫuwaši of the Storm-God they bring beside the ḫuwasi of ᴰLAMA'

Since the offerings of ḫarzazuta and of memal are always separate it is preferable to take the passage this way rather than as a dependent genitive 'groats of ḫ-pudding'.

The construction may be an archaism. Other forms characteristic of the older language in this tablet are šu-up-pí-aḫ-ḫi (ii 7) and i-e-ez-zi (iii 13), ti-i-e-ez-zi (iii 19'), as well as the scriptio plena in the directive ta-pu-ú-ša above. The parallel KUB 7.25 i 19 (CTH 636.1) shows ta-aš where our tablet has modernized to na-aš (iii 5).

The only example I know in clear nominative function is the neuter plural in a parenthetically embedded sentence in KBo 7.42 iv 8'-9'; 2 ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-ta-ya-aš-šan A-NA NINDA.KUR₄.RA ki-it-ta '--and two ḫ-puddings are placed there on the leavened bread--.' Otherwise both singular and plural neuter nominative-accusative are attested only in accusative function, particularly frequently with the verb iya-. See the references in Hoffner Alim. 157-8 and Neu StBoT 26.58 n. 267. The only one in Old Script is that cited above, restored by Neu (loc. cit.). Otherwise the oldest spelling would appear to be the plural in KUB 20.12, 4'-6' LUGAL-uš pár-ši-ya na/-at...] / ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-ú-ta i-en-[zi...] / nu LUGAL-uš ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-ta/. Note the scriptio plena and the spelling i-en-zi (older ya-an-zi, younger i-ya-an-zi).

The KI.LAM Festival texts go back more or less faithfully to Old Hittite archetypes (Singer, StBoT 27.65, 74, 144); we find there (Singer l.c.B., KBo 20.99 + 21.52 ii 17'-19') 2 NINDA.KUR₄RA 1 GA.KIN.AG ar-ša-a/š/ / pí-ra-an ti-an-zi 1 NINDA.KUR₄RA-ma / ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-un i-ya-an-z[i] 'They place two leavened loaves (and) one cheese before the inner doors. But they make one leavened loaf into ḫ-pudding.' An exact duplicate can be identified in the recently published KUB 58.48 obv. iii 1-3 2 NINDA.KUR₄.RA 1 GA.K[IN.AG a]r-ša-aš / pí-ra-an ti-an-z/i 1 N]INDA.KUR₄.RA-ma ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬḫar-za-zu-un /i-ya-a/n-zi. Lines 4-9 are identical to KI.LAM 1.c.B. ii 20'-25' and permit their complete restoration; the remaining lines 10-28 extend the text by 13 complete and 6 partial lines.

The fact that KUB 58.58 ii duplicates the 'third tablet' of the festival then confirms the tentative suggestion of its editor M. Popko (Inhaltsübersicht v, 'Zu CTH 627??'). More importantly col. iv of the new tablet, of which we have regrettably no duplicates at all in the published KI.LAM material, contains a dialog in dramatic form -- complete with stage directions -- between the king and the chief of the men of Tissaruliya, then at the king's behest between the chief of the bodyguards and the man from Tissaruliya. This confirms the suggestions of I. Singer (StBoT 27.49, 61-2) and V.G. Ardzinba and V.V. Ivanov (cited ibid.) that the KI.LAM Festival contained episodes of a literary nature, recitations of mythological or other matter, perhaps in verse (Ivanov), as clearly in 1.b.iii 1'-14'. The passage of 58.58 rev. iv (which also enriches Old Hittite verb morphology by the form ú-e-eš [6', 13'], clearly 2 sg.pret. 'you came') makes the impression of an 'entertainment' in dramatic dialogue form. Like the dramatic stichomythic and choral episodes in other Hittite ritual texts like those in CTH 820, 412, KUB 43.23, 43.60 and doubtless others, these texts have much to teach us about the possible ritual origins (or 'antecedents', with J.-P. Vernant, Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne, p. 28) of drama in Early Greece as well. I will treat the passage as a whole elsewhere.

The two KI.LAM paragraphs cited above are followed by one detailing the 'rounds,' the offering of a ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬparšulli, a 'dollop' (rather than 'breadcrumbs') of ḫ-pudding

on the hearth, before the walls, on the doorbolt, and beside the altar. KUB 58.11 obv. 3 (ed. V. Haas, Nerik 214-217 as Bo. 2710) gives the same action with a different breadstuff, in abbreviated form: 1 ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*dan-na-aš-ma* ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*har-za-zu-un i-ya-an-zi ta* ᴸᵁGUDU *AŠ*[RIᴴᴵᴬ] *ir-ha-a-iz-zi* 'They make one *dannaš* loaf into h-pudding and the priest makes the rounds of the "places".' Compare the passages from CTH 625 cited above.

One is struck by the extremely stereotypic nature of the contexts of our word, particularly in the older compositions, and the very restricted set of texts in which the word appears at all. The simple grammatical conjunction by geminating -*a* like KUB 10.99 i 28' *A-NA* LUGAL GEŠTIN *har-za-zu-un-n*[*a* 'to the king wine and h-pudding...' is rare, perhaps unique. An example like KBo 19.128 iii 16 ff. (Otten, StBo 13.8) is from a later reworking of a festival ritual (CTH 626): EGIR-*anda-ma* UGULA ᴸᵁ·ᴹᴱˢMUHALDIM ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*harzazuta/udai nu* 1 ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*paršulli* GUNNI [*i*]*štarna pēdi dāi* / [*še*]*rr-a-ššan* ᵁŽᵁNÍG.GIG ᵁŽᵁŠA' / *kuirzi dāi* 'Afterwards the head of cooks bring h-puddings and puts one dollop in the middle of the altar. On top of it he cuts and puts liver and heart.' The 'free' use of *harzazuta* as object of *udai* makes a late impression, as does the serial verb *kuirzi dāi*: older usage would have a coordinated construction with a participle, as in KUB 10.6., 5-7]*har-za-zu-ta i-ya-an-zi* / ...]ᵁŽᵁNÍG.GIG ᵁŽᵁŠÀ *ku-ra-an* / ...]*iš-tar-na pí-di* 1-ŠU.Similarly the unparalled KUB 25.22 iii 5-7 [ᵁŽᵁ*šuppa h*]*uesawaz zeyantaza ANA* DINGIRᴹᴱˢ *dapiaš* / [*aššanuwan*]*zi* AŠRIᴴᴵᴬ DINGIRᴹᴱˢ-*ya* ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*harzazuta IŠTU* KAŠ GEŠTIN / [*tia*]*nzi* 'they offer meats, raw and cooked, to all the gods, and on the places of the gods they put h-puddings with beer and wine.' The passage is a sort of ritual pastiche, and probably rightly dated by V. Haas, Nerik 240,41, to the reign of Tudhaliyas IV.

The substance and the word for it is essentially confined to the great festival rituals (EZEN) belonging to the Hattic layer of Hittite cult, often containing recitations in Hattic (like KUB 58.6 + cited in extenso above, cf. rev. vi 1 ff.), and clearly representing stereotypic versions or reworkings of compositions of Old Hittite date, or later derivatives of these like CTH 660, the offerings to images of the kings. It is not found in any private rituals (*aniur*, SISKUR) or conjurations (*hukmaiš*), which leads one to suspect it was not - or no longer - an ordinary part of the Hittite diet. The word never appears in cultic texts for deities of the Hurrian pantheon, only the Hattic or Anatolian, which is alone enough to refute the widespread view that the word is of Hurrian origin (Friedrich, loc. cit; Carruba, loc. cit.; Kronasser, Etym. 156; H. Berman, Diss. 95; Tischler, Heth. Etym. Glossar 191). That view was based on the erroneous identification of the nom. pl.-*ta* with that of words of 'Hurrian inflexion'; Berman, loc. cit., correctly noted that the well-attested instrumental *harzazutit* was anomalous under this interpretation.

If the word is indeed borrowed, then a Hattic source is inherently more likely, with Weitenberg 246. The Hattic divine name *Katarzašu-* (var. ᴰ*Katarzašū-*) figuring in the KI.LAM Festival shows that the phonological shape of one Hittite variant is canonical Hattic. V. Georgiev (see Tischler HEG s.v.) proposed an IE etymology as a

compound, the first member being cognate with Greek *artós* 'bread' (already Mycenean, *arto-poqoi*). As it stands the etymology is fantastic, despite the approval of V. Haas, Nerik 219.

There is no evidence that our word is borrowed from Luvian, either from the characteristic Hittite texts (which show no other Luvianisms) or from the Luvian texts and vocabulary. At most one could point out the co-occurrence with the breadstuff *tarhuntitiyaš*, probably of Luvian origin, in KUB 20.12.3', 8.

In view of Luvian *hirūn*, stem *hirūt-*, the suffixal morphology of Hittite *harzaz/šun*, stem *harzazūt-*, seems native Anatolian, whatever its origin. Craig Melchert reminds me that ᴳᴵˢ/ᴺᴵᴺᴰᴬ*kihtun* 'trestle vel sim.; trestle-shaped bakery product' shows a similar inflexional pattern, at least in part, as was also noted some time ago by Carruba, loc. cit. Again we have no choice but to recognize the same aporia as for *salūt-*, *palūd-*, or *tellūr-*.

III. Pal. *iška*

One of the many merits of Craig Melchert's seminal study 'Notes on Palaic,' KZ 97 (1984) 22-43, was to determine the translation of Palaic *iška* in text 2 A (Carruba StBoT 10) ro. 21-22: [(*nu-ku*)] *pašhullašaš ti*[*y*]*az tabarni* LUGAL-*i pāpaz-kuar tī* [(*ānna*)]*z-kuar tē iška*. It is 2 sg. ipv of the 'iterative' of *āš-* 'be': 'And now, o Sun-god *p.*, be thou father and mother to the tabarna the king,' or as Melchert translates the possessive construction with the dative and the substantive verb, 'may the tabarna the king have you as his very father, you as his very mother.'

That the -*sk*-form functions as substantive verb (verbum existentiae) is shown first by Old Latin *escit* in the Laws of the XII tables, as correctly analyzed by E. Fraenkel, 'Zum Texte römischer Juristen,' Hermes 60, 1925, 415-443, esp. 442 f. (Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 2.4444-5 [Roma, 1974]; still incorrectly 'erit', Leumann, Lat. Gr.² 1.523, 535 [1976]). It is confirmed by Greek ἧσκε in Alcman 74 P. ἧσκέ τις Καφεύς Γανάσσων 'There was...,' '*āsid rājā*,' '*būvo karālius*' (Hom. ἔσκε with Leumann only in Od. 9.508 ἔσκε τις ἐνθάδε μάντις). These and other forms are discussed by Madeleine Keller, Latin *escit*, *escunt* a-t-il des correspondants?, RPh 59 (1985) 27-44. She however does not know Fraenkel's paper, and fails to distinguish syntactically and semantically between copula (ἐστί, ἧσκε, Irish *is*, Old Latin *est*), and substantive verb (ἔστι, ἧσκε, Irish *tá*, Old Latin *escit*).

Melchert takes the form as full grade and active: *iška* < *$h_1és\hat{k}e$*. Now the phonological difficulties with this analysis are overwhelming: *$h_1és$*- give *a-aš*- in ipv. 3 sg. *āšdu* (3 pl. *ašandu*) 'may it/they be' and -*sk̂e* gives -(*š*)*ki-i* in ipv. 2 sg. *az-zi-ki-i* 'eat!,' all in text 2 A in Old Script.

A far simpler solution is to take the form *iška* as middle, as in the oldest layer of *sk*-presents (Idg. Gr. III/1.74) of the Old Hittite type *ēškahha* 'I am sitting,' *paišgahat*

'I used to go,' with zero grade of the root and an ending -a which can hardly be from anything but *-o:

$$iška < *h_{r}s\text{-}sK^{w}o$$

Both the middle voice and the zero grade can be paralleled for this verb in Tocharian B, in the 3 pl. copula form *skente*, suffixed *skentar-ne* (TE 1 § 354.1) reflecting *(h₁)s-sK̑onto(r)*: cf. Idg. Gr. III/1.200 (1969); Jasanoff, Harvard lectures, May 1987; Adams, Toch. Hist. Phon. and Morph. 59 (AmOrSer. vol. 71), New Haven 1988.

In the Palaic ending -a from IE *-o I would suggest that we see the oldest Anatolian and Indo-European 2 sg. thematic middle imperative; so already Idg. Gr. III/1.52. Palaic *a-aš* and Hittite *e-eš* show the bare root *h₁es* in the athematic active 2 sg. imperative. Just so Hittite *ēḫu* 'come!,' minus the particle -ḫu (lenited from ḫḫu), and probably Palaic *i-u* minus -u, can be equated with Latin *ī* and Lith. *eĩ-k* (plus particle) from the bare root *h₁ei̯*. On -(ḫ)ḫu cf. S. Kimball, Hittite Plene Writing 355, 435 n. 71 (Univ. Microf., Ann Arbor).

In the thematic active *sk*-verb 2 sg. imperative Palaic and Hittite show the accented e-grade bare stem form *-sk̑é* in *az-zi-ki-i, zi-ki-i*, as we expect (*p̥cchá* ŚB 2.5.3.8-12, lengthened *uc̣chá* 'shine' RV 6.65.6).

I suggest that the Hittite thematic middle 2 sg. imperatives like *paiškaḫḫut* (KUB 33.60 ii 10, 61 iv 10 Inara myth, archaic), *iyaḫḫut* (KBo 8.42 obv. 16 [OH/OS] et passim) minus the particle chain -ḫḫu-t, can be equated for the form with Palaic *iška*. The *ieḫut* KBo 8.66 obv. 8 is from an aberrant text 'en hittite barbare' (Laroche CTH 826), and is taken as secondary by Puhvel, HED. We have thus a Common Anatolian 2 sg. imperative middle form -*ška* < -*sk̑o*, thematic -a < *-o*. These Common Anatolian forms can then be equated with the Common Indo-Iranian thematic middle 2 sg. imperative forms in *-(śé)a-su̯a*, minus the particle -su̯a: *p̥cchasva* (Khil. 2.13.1, 4.5.11) = YAv. *pərəsaŋᵛha* (V. 15.13), thematic *jusásva* (RV passim). Note YAv. *apa.stauuaŋᵛha (daēnam māzdaiiasnīm* V. 109.6) 'abjure!'; the underlying *stau̯a* may be compared with the *stéu̯o* I reconstructed for Ved. *stáve* in Idg. Gr. III/1.115,142. Jay Jasanoff (letter of 28 April 1989) has gathered other evidence for an Indo-European 2 sg. mid. ipv. = 3 sg. mid. indic. *-o*, the bare thematic stem vowel in the *o*-grade. I differ from him in that I still take (cf. Idg. Gr. III/1.52, 115) the Indo-Iranian particle -*s(u)u̯a* as the pronominal 'self, own.'

[See now on *ḫirut-* and *ḫarzazu-* F. Starke, Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens, StBoT 31, 1990, 572-6; on *ḫarzazu-* J. Puhvel, Hitt. Etym. Dict. 3.206-9 (Berlin: de Gruyter 1991); and on the new text KUB 58.58 Theo P.J. van den Hout, "A tale of Tissaruli(ya): a dramatic interlude in the KI.LAM festival?" JNES 50, 1991, 193-202.]